English Language Teachers' Attitude towards Fante – English Code-Switching and Its Pedagogic Functions in Ghanaian Primary Schools

Stephen Acquah

University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Abstract – In as much as some experts advocate the sole use of target language as the medium of instruction, others advocate a bilingual mode of classroom instruction such as code-switching, making code-switching in the language classroom a debatable issue of concern. This study therefore investigated English Language teachers' attitude towards the socio-linguistic phenomenon of code-switching and its pedagogic relevance resulting from the types of code-switching utilized in the language classroom. In order to provide an in-depth information on code-switching during classroom discourse, case study research design was adopted. Nine upper primary English Language teachers and their respective learners were purposively sampled from 3 public basic schools in Yamoransa within the Mfantseman Municipality. Qualitative data in the form of interview and observation were collected and analysed using discourse analysis method. The study revealed that teachers have predominantly positive attitude towards code-switching and they use intersentential, intrasentential and tag switching during English language lessons as an integral pedagogic resource to enhance learners' understanding and vocabulary acquisition. In view of this, it is recommended that both teacher trainees and practicing English language teachers should be educated on the existing types of code-switching and how to use them strategically to induce learning and enhance acquisition of the English language.

Keywords – Code-switching, Bilingual, Multilingual, Pedagogic functions, NALAP, TESOL, L1

I. INTRODUCTION

English Language, a British legacy on Ghana is the only official language with de jure status in the country. Ghana has adopted English as her official language because of the multilingual status of her indigenous languages coupled with the impossibilities surrounding the choice of an indigenous language (L1) as her official language. As such, Ghanaians who are abreast with the English Language communicate in English or in an indigenous language depending on the sociolinguistic context. For instance, English is predominantly used during formal occasions while the indigenous languages are used during informal occasions. It is worth noting that the education system in Ghana, particularly, at the basic sector is characterised by a bilingual policy (National Literacy Acceleration Programme; NALAP), although the country has legitimately adapted only English as her official language. NALAP specifies the use of an indigenous language (Akan; Fante, Asante and Akwapim Twi, Nzema, Ga, Ga-Adangbe, Ewe, Gonja, Kasem, Dagbani, and Dagaare) as the medium of instruction and English as a subject of study at the lower primary level, while English is used as the medium of instruction, and an indigenous language as a subject of study at the upper primary level and beyond (Education Development Centre, Education Quality for All Project, 2010). The English Language and the Ghanaian indigenous languages in contact has resulted into diverse sociolinguistic phenomena such as interference, code-mixing, code-switching (CS), pidgin and so on. Poplack (2004, p. 589) remarks that code-switching among others is the "linguistic manifestation of language contact".

Studies that focused on investigating the use of more than one language in teaching and learning found CS to be one of the common phenomena encountered in bilingual/ multilingual education settings (Macaro, 2009; Sampson, 2012). However, the use of CS in bilingual/ multilingual teaching and learning context has become a debatable issue among language scholars. For instance, most advocates of the use of only English Language in the classroom argue that the use of the L1 limits learners' exposure to the English Language (Cook, 2010; Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). Chitera (2009) notes that code switching in the English Language classroom can cause anxiety among teachers and their learners because of the "examination oriented curriculum that is practised in many African educational systems" (p. 436). In this perspective, it is assumed that CS can undermine both the learning and the acquisition of English Language, as well as students' capability to perform in standardised examinations conducted in English. Also, Cook (2002) believes that code switching between English and a particular L1 in a multilingual classroom setting where the learners have different L1, may lead to the marginalisation of learners whose L1 are not represented in the teaching and learning process. On the other hand, code switching between L1 and English Language does not obstruct the English Language acquisition process, but it facilitates the English Language teaching and learning process, and improves upon learner's proficiency in English (Miles, 2004; Vaezi & Mirzaei, 2007). Following the research trend, the most essential debate is centred on two main reasons; first, why English Language teachers and their learners switch code in a bilingual/ multilingual educational setting, and second, the role of CS in language learning or acquisition, that is, whether CS is a resource or an impediment.

It is against this background that this study sought to investigate English teachers' attitude towards Fante – English code-switching and its pedagogic functions in Ghanaian Primary Schools. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions; what is the attitude of English Language teachers towards CS? What are the types of CS used by English Language teachers in their classroom interaction with learners? And, what are the pedagogic functions of Fante – English code-switching in the English Language classroom? To address these research questions, the remainder of the paper constitutes the review of related literature, research methods, data analysis, discussion of findings, and conclusion and implication.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on two theories of language. These are; Gumperz's (1982) Sociolinguistics Approach and Halliday's (1961) Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL). SFL is a theory of language centred on the relationship between language and its functions in social settings. It was developed by Halliday who had been influenced by the work of the Prague School and British linguist J. R. Firth (Trask & Stockwell, 2007). According to Trask and Stockwell, SFL is made up of the following strata; meaning (semantics), sound (phonology), and lexicogrammar (syntax, morphology, and lexis). SFL does not only account for the syntactic structure of a language but also focuses on the function of a language. According to Halliday (1994), the development of language is as a result of the response to three kinds of social-functional needs including; understanding experiences in terms of what is happening around or inside us (ideational), interacting with the social world through the negotiation of social roles and attitudes (interpersonal), and being able to construct messages in order to convey meaning based on the theme of the message (textual). SFL considers the practicality of language in different social contexts (Anyadiegwu, 2015).

On the other hand, John J. Gumperz, an influential sociocultural linguist whose work on code-switching and contextualisation has been influential in the fields of sociolinguistics, linguistic anthropology, and the sociology of language has been credited with the Interactional Sociolinguistics (IS) Approach (Nilep, 2006). "IS is a qualitative, interpretative approach to the analysis of social interaction that developed at the intersection of linguistics, anthropology and sociology" (English Language Learning Forum, 2010, para 1). As an approach to discourse, IS embraces theories and methods that help researchers to investigate the functions of language, as well as comprehend the processes of building and maintaining relationships, exercising authority, negotiating identities, and creating communities. Observing speakers (e.g. participant and non-participant) and recording (audio/video) social interactions are ways of obtaining data in IS (English Language Learning Forum, 2010). According to Schriffrin (as cited in Gordon, 2011), IS methodology also include transcribing post-recorded interactions in the form of audio/video taped dialogues, and cautiously analysing conversational elements in relation to the information accessed.

B. Conceptual Review

1. Code-switching: According to Wardhaugh (2010), the term "code" refers to "any kind of system that two or more people employ for communication" (p.84). A code can simply be a morpheme, word, phrase, clause, or complete scheme of language (Carey, Grainger, & Nguyen, 2016). Therefore, CS can be defined as a term in sociolinguistics usually used to describe the phenomenon of changing languages during conversation (Gumperz 1982; Holmes, 2013; Matras, 2009). Wardhaugh (2002, p.100) states that CS is a "process when people are usually required to select a particular code whenever they choose to speak, and they may also decide to switch from one code to another or to mix codes within sometimes very short utterances". Myers-Scotton (1993, p. 3) sees CS as "the selection of forms by bi/multilinguals from an embedded variety/varieties in utterances of a matrix variety during the same conversation". According to Holmes (2013), CS takes place when a bi/multilingual speaker alternate between languages. Many researchers have argue that CS is a rule-governed phenomenon triggered by social, socio-cultural and psychological motivations but not as a result of linguistic deficiency of interactants (Bhatia & Ritchie, 2013; Kim, 2006). Similarly, Poplack (2004) admits that the form of CS produced in discourse is not randomly constructed, but rather a rule-governed phenomenon.

2. Types of Code-switching: Considering the contributing factors, Blom and Gumperz (1972) categorize code-switching into two main types. These are situational code-switching and metaphorical code-switching. Based on the metaphorical meanings concerning the attribute of "in-group" and "out-group" in code-switching, Gumperz (1982) advances two more categories of code-switching called "we-code" and "they-code". Auer (2002) proposes two types of code-switching; discourse-related code-switching and participant-related code-switching. These two types are differentiated by the influence of two major factors in the context of conversation – participants and topic of discourse (Auer, 2002). Romaine (2000) and Poplack (1980 as cited in Poplack 2004) identify three (3) types of code switching as intrasentential code-switching, intersentential code-switching, and tag switching.

Considered as the most complex type of CS, intrasentential code switching concerns language shifts that happen within a clause or sentence structure (Poplack, 2004). On the other hand, intersentential CS as described by Appel and Muysken (as cited in Susanto, 2008, p.48) refers to "the switch involving movement from one language to another between sentences". Intersentential CS also include the alternation of different languages in different sentence structures of the same idea or paragraph. It is useful in making emphasis by rephrasing a point or message in an alternating language (Appel & Muysken as cited in Susanto, 2008). As it differs

from intrasentential and intersentential CS, tag-switching is a code switching phenomenon where a tag (usually a word or morpheme) is introduced in an utterance which is completely captured in a language different from that of the tag's language (Poplack, 2004). Tags of different language are often inserted at different points as a monolingual utterance unfolds without braking syntactical or grammatical rules (Romaine, 2000). According to Romaine "intersentential switching could be considered as requiring greater fluency in both languages than tag-switching since major portions of the utterance must conform to the rules of both languages" (p. 160).

3. Functions of Code-switching in the Classroom: CS in the classroom encompasses the concurrent usage of two different codes (i.e., the learners' L1 and the target language) during teacher-learner and learner-learner interactions (Kamwangamalu, 2010). According to Lin and Li (2012), findings on CS remains complicated and controversial. The functions of CS in the English Language classroom context have been provided in this section of the paper. It is consistent in literature that teachers' proficiency in learners' mother tongue is a useful and positive resource in the English Language class (Mahboob & Lin, 2016). As put forward by Halliday (as cited in Carey et al., 2016), there are three main functions of CS – ideational, textual and interpersonal functions. The ideational functions constitute explaining, translating, elaborating and/or exemplifying English Language content using the mother tongue. The textual functions constitute marking out transitions between varying activity types or foci. The interpersonal functions constitute sharing cultural values and negotiating shifts in identities and role relationships (Halliday 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Ferguson (2003) categorises classroom CS into three main functions. These are CS meant for assessing learners' work or performance, CS meant for classroom management and behaviour control, and CS meant for discussing agendas outside the teaching and learning content or subject matter.

Finally, the three most common functions of CS in the classroom context are linguistic explanations, classroom management, and building social and interpersonal relations (Ferguson, 2009; Forman, 2012; Macaro, 2005). It can therefore be concluded that the functions of code-switching in the classroom context is driven by interlocutors' intentions which include the strategic usage of CS to facilitate comprehension, language learning, and acquisition as well as classroom management and also to construct bilingual identities.

4. Attitudes Toward Classroom Code-switching: The literature on attitude towards CS in the educational context is characterised by several controversies. That is, some scholars argue in favour of the use of CS in the classroom while others do not. For instance, Ahmad and Jusoff (2009) support the view that code-switching is effective in conveying meaning by enriching vocabulary and grammar, and relaxing learners to foster comprehension of concepts taught. Similarly, Brown (2006) is in favour of using the L1 to facilitate the process of

learning in the classroom and harmonize different capacities of language competency. Most scholars who advocate the use of CS in the classroom believe that CS should not be considered as a teacher's defect but as a teaching strategy (Hmeadat, 2016; Zabrodskaja, 2007).

In contrast, many scholars consider the use of CS in the classroom to be inappropriate, thus, it restricts learners' exposure to the English Language and decreases its usage (Cook, 2010; Howatt & Widdowson, 2004; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Cook (2002) comments that code-switching in multicultural classroom may be problematic if there is no mutual language for all the students and if the instructor does not know the mother tongue of the learners. He continues that if a class is multilingual with different first languages, it seems unreal to take into account all of them.

C. Empirical Framework

The sociolinguistic phenomenon of code-switching in bilingual/multilingual educational contexts has been the subject of scholarly attention for many years. This section of the paper chronologically reviews some researches that have been conducted on code-switching in the Ghanaian educational context.

Amekor (2009) studies the use of code-switching in the classroom in selected schools in the Keta Municipal and Akatsi District in the Volta Region, Ghana. The research aimed, among other things, to explore the language use patterns in classroom settings where English is the expected code choice, and the motivations behind any code choice in those classrooms. Based on the data gathered through observations and questionnaire surveys, Amekor indicates that code-switching was found in all the classrooms understudy. The reason behind the pervasive use of code-switching is as a result of some teachers' and students' insufficient command in the English Language. He suggests that teachers should be introduced to the concept of code-switching in order to enable them to be abreast with the existing types of code-switching and their appropriateness in enhancing both language acquisition and learning.

In a research conducted by Adjei (2010) on Ewe – English code-switching in a rural primary school, he observes three code-switching patterns used by teachers – intrasentential, intersentential and repetitive. He therefore states that "teachers employ repetitive intersentential code-switching due to the learners' low comprehension of concepts introduced in the L2 (English) by translating the same ideas into the L1 (Ewe)" (p. 24). Adjei indicates that teachers have positive attitudes towards code-switching as they believe it is the code choice that will increase learners' understanding during lessons.

Furthermore, Brew-Daniels (2011) explores the code choices of teacher trainees from selected Colleges of Education in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. Questionnaire, interview and audio recordings of classroom interactions, were the kinds of data collected in order to determine teachers' language use patterns and their effects on students'

performances. Based on the data collected and analysed, Brew-Daniels remarks that there is a pervasive use of code-switching inside and outside the classroom by the teacher trainees' understudy. The teachers indicated that they code switch in the classroom to facilitate learners understanding and participation, and also "to cover up for their inability to express themselves comprehensively in one language" (p.50). The respondents (teacher trainees) were asked to teach two different lessons using different medium of instructions and assess the learners' academic performance by conducting a post-test in order to determine the impact of the medium of instructions used on the learners. First, they were asked to use the English-only medium of instruction and second, to code-switch between English and Asante-Twi (the learners' L1). Based on a comparative analysis of the post-tests from the English-only medium and the code-switched medium, Brew-Daniels points out that the learners performed better when taught in Twi-English code-switching than the English-only medium used. He therefore concludes that code-switching in the classroom does not necessarily cause a deficiency in learning a language but it can enhance learners' performances. However, he cautions that it should be used wisely since its persistent use might have effect on learners' competence in the acquisition of the target language.

Moreover, Yevundey (2013) studies the pedagogic relevance of Ewe – English code-switching in lower primary classrooms in two mission schools in Ho Township in the Volta Region of Ghana. His study aims at exploring the pedagogic functions of code-switching in the classroom interaction between teachers and learners, and also to find out teachers' attitudes towards code-switching. He uses multiple data collection methods in the form of observation through recording of classroom interactions, interviews, and questionnaire surveys. Based on the data collected, Yevundey argues that code-switching between Ewe and English during instructional period enables learners to understand concepts in both languages and encourage active participation.

In conclusion, perhaps, the phenomenon of code-switching in the educational context is characterised by controversies, many researchers based on empirical studies argue that it can play an important role in the teaching and learning processes as it can be used strategically to enhance learners' participation and also create a conducive atmosphere for teachers and learners to negotiate meaning and offer comprehensible input aimed at improving English Language acquisition and learning. Despite the significance of code-switching, both teachers and learners are cautioned to use it sparingly as its pervasive use might have adverse effect on learners' competence in the acquisition of the target language (English Language). Although several studies have been conducted on code-switching in the Educational context, it appears that no research has been conducted on Fante-English code-switching. Hence, this present study aims to investigate teachers' attitude towards Fante – English code-switching and its pedagogic functions in Ghanaian Primary Schools in order to contribute to the burgeoning literature on code-switching in the Ghanaian educational context.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

Case study research design was adopted. Yin (2009) defines case study design as an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context. The type of case study design adopted for this study is the qualitative case study design. The study took place in Yamoransa within the Mfantseman Municipality in the Central region of Ghana. Yamoransa was chosen because it is one of the predominantly Fante spoken communities where Fante is taught as a subject of study in the upper primary (Basic 4-6). In order to provide an in-depth information on CS in the English classroom, the purposive sampling technique was used to sample three government (public) basic schools and nine upper primary English teachers and their learners within the sampled schools. The average number of the upper primary learners in the three selected schools were 38 in a class. For confidential reasons, the names of the selected schools are not mentioned in this paper. Observation and interview were the data collection instruments used. Classroom interactions were observed and recorded. Each observation was done within the instructional period for a single lesson (30 minutes in the upper primary). The classroom recordings of the observations provide insights on the type of CS used as well as its pedagogic functions. In addition to the observed English Language lessons, the teachers involved were interviewed based on their attitude towards CS in the language classroom. The interviews which took a minimum of 13 minutes 20 seconds and a maximum of 14 minutes were recoded for analysis purposes.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

This study investigates English teachers' attitude towards Fante – English code-switching and explores the types and pedagogic functions of CS in Ghanaian Primary Schools. The analytical method adopted for the data analysis is the discourse analysis method. From Allwright and Bailey's (1991) point of view, discourse analysis is a method of data analysis in an educational setting where spoken content of teacher and learner is analysed. The data analysis begins with the interview data collected on English teachers' attitude towards Fante – English CS in the classroom, followed by the recordings of classroom observation on teacher–learner CS interaction to determine the types of CS used and its pedagogic functions. In analysing the types of CS used in the classroom interaction, Romaine's (2000) and Poplack's (as cited in Poplack 2004) typology of CS was adopted.

A. English Language Teachers' Attitude towards Fante – English CS in the Classroom

Table 1: Background Data of the Teachers

Teacher	Class	Years of teaching English
1	4	More than 10 years
2	5	8 years
3	6	7 years
4	4	More than 10 years
5	5	More than 10 years
6	6	3 years
7	4	7 years
8	5	8 years
9	6	More than 10 years

All the teachers interviewed in this study are upper primary teachers teaching either class 4, 5, or 6. Based on their responses with respect to the number of years they have been teaching English, majority of them disclosed that since they are class teachers at the upper primary level, they have been teaching English in addition to the other subjects taught at the upper primary level. From the data in Table 1, 4 teachers confirmed that they have been teaching English for more than 10 years, although they could not state emphatically the number of years. 2 teachers said they have been teaching English for the past 8 years and 2 teachers said they have been teaching English for 7 years while only 1 teacher had 3 years of teaching experience in English. The number of years the teachers have been teaching English at the upper primary level give a clue of their teaching experience, hence, the opinions expressed on their attitude towards CS in the English classroom can be attributed to their teaching experiences.

All the teachers who were interviewed had some background knowledge on CS. Although some of them did not know that the special sociolinguistic term giving to the phenomenon where bi/multilingual speakers use two or more languages interchangeably in an utterance or in a conversation is referred to as CS, but upon the researcher's explanation, they expressed familiarity of the term and even gave examples.

The teachers expressed their opinion that they will encourage CS in the teaching and learning context. The reasons given revolved around ensuring better understanding by learners and providing opportunities for better understanding. Some of these reasons have been quoted below: "It makes it easy to explain something for learners to understand better"; "it makes the topic easier to understand"; "it provides opportunities to explain concepts which learners do not understand". The respondents further claimed that learners would be actively involved in the teaching and learning process, understand the subject matter better, and interpret concepts that are difficult to be expressed in English in the Fante language. These views are in agreement with those presented by scholars such as Ahmad and Jusoff (2009), Miles (2004), Vaezi and Mirazaei (2007).

Although all the teachers expressed their views on why they will encourage CS in the classroom teaching and learning context, few teachers gave reasons why they will not encourage CS. One teacher said:

CS in the classroom does not help learners because during English examinations only responses in English are accepted, therefore code-switching Fante and English will restrict learners' exposure to the English language.

Another remarked: *I am fortunate that all the learners speak Fante, else using both English and Fante would have neglected learners who could not speak Fante in classroom interactions.* These opinions are not different from those expressed by Chitera (2009), Cook (2010), and Howatt and Widdowson (2004).

Also some of the teachers said they will accept learners' response during instructional time when they code-switch, and further mentioned some strategies that they will adopt to assist such learners. For instance, most of the teachers mentioned that they will instruct learners to repeat any code-switched response in English only, or call upon another learner to translate the Code-switched response to English. However, few teachers said they will not accept code-switched response from learners based on setting situations, since some learners could make it a habit. Teachers who favoured code-switched responses suggested reasons including; learners' inability to understand setting vocabulary items and concepts, as well as their difficulties in expressing setting ideas in English.

B. Types of CS Used in the English Classroom and Pedagogic Functions

Based on the observations of teacher-learner interactions during English lessons, the types of CS identified can be categorized as intrasentential, intersentential, and tag switching following Romaine's (2000) and Poplack's (1980 as cited in Poplack 2004) typology. Intrasentential code switching concerns language alternation that occurs within a sentence or clause boundary (Poplack, 2004). Intersentential code-switching on the other hand refers to "the switch involving movement from one language to another between sentences" (Appel & Muysken as cited in Susanto, 2008, p.48). While tag switching involves the insertion of a tag from one language into an utterance which is otherwise entirely in other language (Poplack, 2004). The pedagogic functions of these identified types of CS have been highlighted below:

C. Pedagogic Functions of Fante – English CS

1. Explanation: It was evident from the classroom observations of teacher-learner interactions that the teachers mostly employ both intersentential and intrasentential CS to explain questions or statements that learners failed to understand. Example 1 for instance portray how a teacher employed CS to explain a question in other to elicit learners' response.

Example 1: Using CS to explain a question during an English lesson in classroom 2

T.2: If you are writing a letter to your relative what will you write first?

Yes, [name of learner], **Aha** (*Yes*)

What are you going to write? [Teacher expects an answer but the learners are quiet]

Sɛ eretwerew letter **no a, Ebɛnadze na ɛbɛ dzikan atwerɛw** (*If you are writing the letter, what will you write first?*)Yes [name]

P.2: Address.

Example 1 is an extract from classroom 2 where the teacher was teaching the learners how to write a letter to their relative (informal letter). A careful look at the extract in example 1 shows that the teacher asked the learners a question using the target language (English) but none of the learners gave a response. This could be attribute of the learners' inability to understand the teacher's expression in the English Language. The teacher upon receiving no response from the learners, code-switched (intrasentential code-switching) by explaining what she said in English in Fante, and this time, the learners could respond. The English-only medium of instruction which was initially adopted by this teacher in asking the question yielded no response. This suggests that a monolingual mode of instruction, especially during English lessons, does not aid learners' understanding and participation. Therefore, code-switching instruction in the form of English – Fante CS will help in facilitating learners' understanding and participation.

2. Repetition of sentences to facilitate understanding: In almost all the English lessons observed, teachers used code-switching through translation of English statements or words into Fante and sometimes back into English. This repetitive code-switching strategy was used by these teachers to facilitate learners' understanding and to increase their participation during lessons. One of these instances has been presented in example 2 where the English teacher repeatedly switched between Fante and English in order to enhance learners' understanding during a composition lesson in classroom 2.

Example 2: Using CS to facilitate understanding through repetition (classroom 2)

T.2: What else, what else are you going to write?

P.2: **Enkyea** (*salutation*)

T.2: We are doing English so repeat it in English

Eretwerɛ wo address **no wie a, ebenadzi bio na ɛbɛ twere?** (*After writing the address, what else will you write?*)

P.2: **Deɛ wo twerɛ** letter **no akoma no no na** address (*the address of the one you are writing the letter to*)

T.2: **Deɛ wo twerɛ letter no akoma no no na address?** (*Is it the address of the one you are writing the letter to?*) Are you sure?

Ps.2: No

T.2: You have omitted something

Yesturday **koraa me hu sɛ asɛ na mo yɛ no wɔ Fante** (*Even I saw you doing something like that in Fante yesterday*)

Ps.2: Yes, Madam

T.2: Yes [name of learner]

After address **ebɛnadze na ɛwo sɛ wo twerɛ** (*after address what do you have to write*)

P.2: Madam, Date

T.2: Date!

Good

Clap for him [learners' clap]

3. Correction of Learners' Answers: Additionally, CS was used to correct learners when they gave incorrect answers. This was common in all the nine classrooms observed. Example 3 is an extract from an English lesson in classroom 7 where the teacher used intersentential, intrasentential and tag switching to correct a wrong response provided by a learner. In classroom 7, the teacher was teaching subject verb agreement and she wrote a sentence with a plural subject on the board and provided learners with two options; a singular verb and a plural verb, and asked the learners to read aloud the sentence on the board, after which she called one of the learners to say the correct answer. The learner on her first attempt had the answer wrong and the teacher tried her best using Fante – English CS to bring the learner back to track. What transpired in the classroom when the teacher tried to correct the learner has been presented in Example 3.

Example 3: Using CS to correct learner's response (classroom 7)

T.7: (3) Some people (think/thinks) I am a lazy girl

Repeat

Ps.7: Some people (think/thinks) I am a lazy girl

T.7: So what is the answer for sentence 3? Is it "think" or "thinks"?

Yes [name of learner]

P.7: Thinks

T.7: Oh, are you sure?

Ps.7: No Madam

T.7: [name of learner] why did you say it is 'thinks'? Yes

[The learner is silent]

Ahwɛ sentence **no yie?** (*Have you looked at the sentence properly?*)

Ehu sentence **no?** (*Have you?*)

Dza ɔwɔ hen na ɔyɛ subject? (*Which one is the subject?*)

Dza ɔwɔ hen na ɛhwɛ a ɔyɛ subject **no?** (*Which one do you think is the subject?*)

    P.7: People

    T.7: **ɛnti** people **no ɔyɛ dzen** subject? (*So people is what type of subject?*)

Sɛ hwɛ a ɛyɛ plural **anaa sɛ ɛyɛ** singular? (*Looking at it, is it plural or singular?*)

    P.7: Singular

    T.7: **ɛyɛ** singular? (*Is it singular?*)

    P.7: No

    T.7: People! People! People!

Sɛ yɛka dɛ people **a, moka wo mo kurom ka sa dɛn?** (*How do you say people in your local language L1?*)

    Ps.7: **Dɔm [ɛdɔm]** (*People*)

T.7:   **ɛnti ɛdɔm ɛyɛ** singular **anaa sɛ** plural? Yes [teacher calls the name of the same learner] (*so, is people singular, or plural?*)

    P.7: Plural

T.7:   **Sɛyi sei ara sɛ yɛ ba** verb **no so nso a dza ɔwɔ hen na ɔyɛ** plural verb? (*When we come to the verb also which one is the plural verb?*)

    P.7: Think

    T.7: clap for her [learners clap]

Ebɛnadze ntsi na eka think? (*Why did you say think?*)

    P.7: It is a plural verb

    T.7: Okay.

4. Clarification: Another pedagogic function of CS is to seek clarification. Both teachers and learners can code switch during instruction period to seek clarification of information. From the observed data, teachers used all the identified types of code-switching to clarify learners' responses. Example 4 shows how a teacher used intersentential, intrasentential, and tag switching in a composition lesson to clarify learners' response on 'what to write' as well as 'where to write' setting features of an informal letter.

    Example 4: Using CS to clarify learners' response (classroom 2)

T.2:   After address **ebenadze bio na ɛwɔ sɛ wo twerɛ** (*what do you have to write*)

    P.2: Madam, Date

    T.2: Date, good; clap for him [learners clap]

T.2:   Where should I write the address and date? Should I write it on my left side?

    Ps.2:   No Madam

    T.2: **Na**, (*but*) where?

    Ps.2: On the right side

T.2:   So you have to gage in your book and write it **sɛ dzeɛ ɔbɛyɛ a, ɔbɔkɔ hɔ na ɛnyɛ wo twerɛ bi wɔ aseɛ na aba ɛsuru na aba fɔm, na ayɛ tan tan tan no, ɛhua? Mo ate ate aseɛ?** (*So that, it will occupy the gaged place nicely, you see? Do you understand?*)

    Ps.2:   Yes Madam

T.2:   **Ntsi yɛwie a na yɛ dze** data **no aka ho** (*so when we finish then we add the date to it*).

        Ebenadze bio (*what else?*)

    What else? What else?

    P.2: Madam, name

    T.2: My name?

    Ps.2: No, Madam

    P.2: Salutation

    T.2: Salutation?

        So with that one, what will you write there?

        Yes [learners are silent]

Ntsi ɔno no, ebenadze na ɛbɛ twerɛ no wɔ hɔ (*so with that one, what will you write there?*)

        Yes [name of learner]

Ayɛ dzin no wa num bɔbɔn (*your mouth will smell for being quiet*)

    P.2: **Dear Ama**

    T.2: **ɛhɛ,** (*yes*) so who is that dear Ama

    Ps.2:   Relative.

5. Classroom Management: Using the L1 and the target language interchangeably is one of the major functions which CS serve. From the observations made on the classroom teacher-learners interactions, it was apparent that teachers use both intersentential and intrasentential CS to regulate learners' behaviour in the classroom. Typical example of using CS for classroom management has been presented in example 5 where the English teacher used intersentential CS. That is, the teacher upon a learner's request to go out and drink water shortly after returning from break, used the English Language to instruct the learner to sit down and also switched to Fante to repeat the same instruction.

    Example 5: Using CS to manage the class (classroom 5)

    P.5: Madam, I want to go out and drink some water

    T.5: Just from break? Sit down!

ɔnnyɛ se seiara na ekɔr break **bae** (*is it not just now that you return from break?*)

Kɛtsena ase! (*Go and sit down!*).

6. Vocabulary Acquisition: Explaining lexical items in passages during English reading and comprehension is an integral part of English teaching and learning. This is because it provides a great opportunity for learners to acquire new vocabulary. Teachers sometimes rely on synonyms, context, and demonstrations to ensure vocabulary acquisition. However, there are instances where these strategies may not work optimally, especially when the word cannot be demonstrated; when learners do not understand the synonyms; and when learners do not understand the context in which the word has been used. Another effective strategy teachers can resort to is CS in a bilingual or multilingual classroom setting. Example 6 is an extract of a classroom interaction where the English teacher and the learners incessantly switched code to enhance vocabulary acquisition during a reading and comprehension lesson on the topic *Diligence Ensures Success*.

Example 6: Using CS to enhance vocabulary acquisition (classroom 8)

T.8: We are going to learn the key words, hello

Diligence, who have come across that word before, Yes

Yɛ ka diligence **a nase kyerɛ dɛn?** (*When we say* diligence *what does it mean?*)

P.8: **Edwumadzen** (*Diligence*)

T.8: Diligence

Edwumadzen (*Diligence*)

T.8: Success, what is the meaning of success

Yɛ ka success **a nase kyerɛ dɛn?** (*When we say success what does it mean?*)Yes [name of learner]

P.8: Success **asi kyerɛ dɛ nkonyim** (*success means success*)

T.8: Achievement of your dreams. So diligence ensures success means?

P.8: **Ayɛ Edwumadzen na edzi nkonyim** (*diligence ensures success*)

T.8: **hɔn a wɔwɔ ekyire hɔ no anntse o** (*those at the back didn't hear o*)

P.8: **Edwumadzen ma nkonyim ba** (*diligence ensures success*)

T.8: **Edwumadzen ma nkonyim ba** (*diligence ensures success*)

Diligence ensures success

Edwumadzen ma nkonyim ba (*diligence ensures success*)

So **hon ma yɛn hwɛ** words **no a ɔwɔ** board **no do no** (*let us look at the words on the board*)

Disappointment. What is the meaning?

Eyɛ dzen? Ase kyerɛ dzen? (*What is it? What is the meaning of it?*)

P.8: Disappointment means **menu me hu** (*disappointment*)

Ayɛ adze na enu wo hu (*to be disappointed after doing something*)

T.8: How do you pronounce this word? [Teacher points at 'disappointment' on the board]

P.8: /Disappointment/ [learners pronounce word].

7. Elicit Learners' response and calling on learners: During classroom interactions, teachers used intrasentential code-switches from Fante in the form of tags. Some of these Fante tags were used to call on learners to respond to class discussions as well as to elicit their responses. Apparently, teachers used both Fante and English tags consciously and unconsciously to call on learners to answer questions or elicit response. Example 7 presents a section of an observed English lesson in classroom 1 where the class teacher employed Fante tags in her English utterances to call upon learners and also to elicit their response. The lesson was a story telling segment and the teacher tried to review learners' relevant previous knowledge by asking them to narrate aspects of what they heard in the previous story.

Example 7: using tag switching to elicit response and calling on learners (classroom 1)

T.1: Last week, I told you a story. I want somebody to tell me what he/she heard.

Hello!

P.1: Hi

T.1: [name of learner]

P.1: **Metse dɛ** (*I heard that*)

T.1: Speak English! Try and speak English

I will correct you

P.1: I hear that

T.1: Say, I heard that **Aha** (*yes*)

You don't want to talk because you can't speak English

Ps.1: Madam, we can speak English

T.1: **Aha, ntsi** (*yes, so*) get up and tell me something

Ehe (*Yes*) **[name of learner]**

P.1: I heard that when the father corrects the children or beat them, their mother becomes angry

T.1: **Mmhmm** *[a tag portraying acceptance]* and what happened.

V. DISCUSSION

This paper investigates English teachers' attitude towards Fante – English code-switching and its pedagogic functions based on the types of code-switching used during classroom interactions between learners and their teachers. Purposively, 9 upper primary teachers and their learners were selected from 3 public schools in Yamoransa within the Mfantseman Municipality. Interview guides and classroom observations were the data collection instruments used to gather data in this study.

Based on the data collected on classroom interaction between teachers and their learners, it has been found that, irrespective of the language policy in Ghanaian education where the mother tongue is supposed to be used at the lower primary as a medium of instruction and not in the upper primary and beyond, the mother tongue (Fante) was still used in the upper primary to serve specific pedagogic purposes as teachers pursue their objectives in the English Language classroom.

Some of these identified purposes include; explanation of concepts, repetition of sentence to facilitate understanding, correction of learners, seeking clarification, classroom management, vocabulary acquisition, and calling of learners. These pedagogic functions were achieved through the use of three (3) main types of CS, namely; intersentential, intrasentential, and tag switching. Wheeler and Swords (2006) posit that amidst all controversies about language and bilingualism, code switching in academic settings is particularly relevant for instruction of speakers who use dialects that are not considered to be Standard English.

The use of the identified types of CS reflected the teachers' attitudes. Generally, the teachers expressed a positive attitude towards CS, however, some of them cautioned that it should be used wisely in order not to prevent acquisition of the target language. Thus, a parallel data was gathered with respect to teachers' attitude towards CS expressed during the interview session and that of the observed teacher-learner interaction during English lessons.

VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

This article provides findings, which highlights the types of code-switching and how teachers utilize it to reflect specific pedagogic functions. It also provides information on teachers' attitude towards code-switching in the English Language classroom. As similarly advanced in the studies conducted by Amekor (2009), Adjei (2010), Brew-Daniels (2011), and Yevundey (2013), code-switching should be considered as an integral pedagogic resource which needs to be incorporated into teacher training courses in the Colleges of Education and Universities such as the university of Cape coast and the University of Education, Winneba who are known to be championing the course of education in Ghana in order to

equip student-teachers to use code-switching to achieve varying classroom purposes in so far as language teaching is concern. Also, workshops should be organised by the Ministry of Education (MoE) and teacher unions in order to introduce practicing English Language teachers to the concept of code-switching, so as to make them abreast with the existing types of code-switching and their appropriateness, as well as how they can be adopted to enhance acquisition and learning of the target language. If these suggestions are considered, both teacher trainees and practicing teachers will have adequate knowledge on code-switching; types of code-switching that could be used in the classroom, and the developmental levels at which code-switching can be adopted to enhance teaching and learning without impeding the English Language learning or acquisition process.

REFERENCES

[1] Adjei, A. F. (2010). Motivation for code-switching in the classroom: The case of rural primary school. Journal of African Cultures and Languages, 1(1), 21-28.

[2] Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code-switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. English Language Teaching, 2(2), 49.

[3] Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[4] Amekor, K. C. (2009). Code-switching as a medium of instruction in selected schools in the Volta region. Unpublished master's thesis. English Department, University of Ghana, Legon. Accra, Ghana.

[5] Anyadiegwu, A. C. (2015). Code-switching and code-mixing the medium of instruction in Lower Basic Education in Nigerian Schools. Journal of Resourcefulness and Distinction, Volume, 11(1), 1-9.

[6] Auer, P. (2002). Code-switching in conversation. London and New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

[7] Bhatia, T. K., & Ritchie, W. C. (2013). Handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

[8] Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Northern Norway. In J. Gumperz, & B. Brock-Utne (Eds.). The most recent developments concerning the debate on language of instruction in Tanzania (pp. 34-60) Institute for Education Research, Oslo: University of Oslo.

[9] Brew-Daniels, J. (2011). Twi-English code-switching in the classroom: A case study of some selected colleges of education in the Ashanti region. Unpublished master's thesis. English Department, University of Ghana, Legon.

[10] Brown, K. (2006). Encyclopaedia of language & linguistics. Elsevier, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

[11] Carey, M. D., Grainger, P., & Nguyen, N. (2016). Code-switching in English Language Education: Voices from Vietnam. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6(7), 1333-1340.

[12] Chitera, N. (2009). Code-Switching in a college mathematics classroom. International Journal of Multilingualism, 6(4), 426-442.

[13] Cook, G. (2010). Translation in language teaching: An argument for reassessment. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[14] Cook, V. (2002). Portraits of the L2 user. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

[15] Education Development Centre, Education Quality for All Project (EQUALL). (2010). National Literacy Acceleration Program (NALAP): Implementation study. Accra, Ghana: Author.

[16] Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. AILA Review 16, 38-51.

[17] Ferguson, G. (2009). What next? Towards an agenda for classroom code-switching research. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 231-241.

[18] Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. RELC Journal, 43(2), 239–253.

[19] García, O. (2001). Bilingual education is beneficial. In M. E. Williams (Ed.). Education: opposing viewpoints (pp. 126-129). San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

[20] Gordon, C. (2011). Gumperz and interactional sociolinguistics. In R. Wodak, B. Johnson, & P. Kerswill (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics (pp.67-84). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

[21] Gumperz, J. (1982). Discourse strategies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Halliday, M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theory of grammar. Word, 17(3), 241-92.

[23] Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An introduction to functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

[24] Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C .M. I. M. (2014). An introduction to functional grammar (4th ed). Oxon: Routledge.

[25] Hmeadat, S. R. (2016). The impact of limited code-switching on the achievement of the Jordanian English Language learners. The Arab Journal of Sciences & Research, 2(6), 212-224.

[26] Holmes, J. (2013). An Introduction to sociolinguistics (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.

[27] Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, A. (2004). A history of English Language teaching (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[28] Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In H. N. Hornberger, & S. L. Mckay. (Eds.). Sociolinguistics and language education. (pp. 116-142). UK: Multilingual Matters.

[29] Kim, E. (2006). Reasons and Motivations for code-mixing and code-switching. Spring Issues in EFL, 4(1), 23-41.

[30] Lin, A. Y. M., & Ii, C. S. (2012). Code-switching. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), The Routledge handbook of multilingualism. (pp. 470-481). Oxford: Routledge.

[31] Macaro, E. (2005). Teacher use of code-switching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.). First language use in second and foreign language learning (pp. 35-49). Great Britain: MPG Books Group.

[32] Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of code-switching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull, & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), First language use in second and foreign language learning (pp. 35–49). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

[33] Mahboob, A., & Lin, A. M. Y. (2016). Using local languages in English Language classrooms. In W. A. Renandya, & H. P. Widodo (Eds.), English Language teaching today: Building a closer link between theory and practice (pp. 1-18). New York: Springer.

[34] Matras, Y. (2009). Language contact. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[35] Miles, R. (2004). Evaluating the use of L1 in the English Language classroom. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Birmingham, UK.

[36] Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[37] Nilep, C. (2006). Code-switching in sociocultural linguistics. Colorado Research in Linguistics, 19, 1-22.

[38] Poplack, S. (2004). Code-switching. In U. Ammon, N. Ditmmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik: An international handbook of the science of language (pp. 589-596). Berlin: Walter de Gruyta.

[39] Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[40] Romaine, S. (2000). Language in Society (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[41] Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. ELT Journal, 66(3), 293-303.

[42] Susanto, H. D. (2008). Code-switching in Indonesian Islamic Religious discourse: A sociolinguistic perspective. Malang: UIN-Malang Press.

[43] Trask, L. R., & Stockwell, P. (2007). Language and linguistics: The key concepts. London: Routledge.

[44] Vaezi, S. & M. Mirzaei (2007). The effect of using translation from L1 to L2 as a teaching technique on the improvement of EFL learners' linguistic accuracy – focus on form. Humanising Language Teaching, 9(5), 32-61. Retrieved from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/Sep07/mart03.htm.

[45] Wardhaugh, R. (2002). An introduction to linguistics. (4th ed.). Meiden Mass: Blackwell Publishers.

[46] Wardhaugh, R. (2010). An introduction to sociolinguistics (6th ed.). Oxford: Wiley- Blackwell.

[47] Wheeler, R. S., & Swords, R. (2016). Code-switching: Teaching Standard English in urban classrooms. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

[48] Yevudey, E. (2013). The pedagogic relevance of codeswitching in the classroom: Insights from Ewe-English codeswitching in Ghana. Ghana Journal of Linguistics, 2(2), 1-22.

[49] Yin, R. K. (2009). Case study research: Design and methods (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[50] Zabrodskaja, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian code-switching in the university. Arizona working papers in SLA & Teaching, 14, 123-139.

[51] English Language Learning Forum (2010). Gumperz and interactional sociolinguistics. Retrieved from http://englishlanguagelearningforum.blogspot.com/2010/07/gumperz-and-interactional.html?cv=1