

A Professional Development Presentation for Code-Switching

By

Patsy Lor Lee

A capstone project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of TESOL

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

August 2019

Capstone Project Facilitator: Julianne Scullen, Ed.S.

Content Expert: Zarah Farah

Peer reviewer: Derek Swart

DEDICATION

To my family and friends for their encouragement and support. To Professors who supported me through this Capstone Journey. Thank-you.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction...	5
My experience code-switching	6
WIDA.....	9
Code-switching in the Classroom	10
Research questions and the goals of the study	11
Summary	12
Chapter Two: Literature Review	14
History of Bilingualism and ESL Education.....	16
Code Switching Definitions.....	17
History of code-switching.....	18
Types of code-switching	19
Gumperz Theory	20
Myers-Scotton Markedness Model	20
The ‘code-in-between	23
Functions of code-switching	24
Reiteration Function.....	24
Equivalence Function.....	25
Identity and Relationships.....	26
Avoidance, Defiance, and Power.....	29
Floor holding.....	30
Benefits of code-switching	30

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT).....	32
Summary	34
Chapter Three: Methods	36
Introduction.....	36
Project Description.....	36
Framework and Paradigm	37
Location and Audience	39
Project timeline and overview	39
Rationale	42
Conclusion	43
Chapter Four	44
Overview.....	44
Code-switching Professional Development Outline Preview	44
Literature.....	45
Implications and Limitations... ..	47
Impact... ..	47
Contributions.....	48
Future Research... ..	49
References.....	50

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

As a young child, I mostly spoke in my first language: Hmong. I grew up speaking Hmong every day to communicate my feelings, wants and needs until I attended elementary school near my home. My parents came to the United States as refugees to seek better living conditions before I was born. My parents began to shift their focus of the Hmong language to English because of the linguistic challenges they faced living in the United States. They understood that to be able to survive was to learn English. It was the key to be able to communicate one's needs and wants. Although my parents placed more emphasis upon the English language, they expected me to communicate fluently in Hmong when it was appropriate.

When attending elementary school, I had a teacher who placed heavy emphasis on speakers of a different language to speak only English in the class. This particular teacher wanted her students to excel in English; therefore, she discouraged the use of one's first language if it was not English. Her expression of disapproval made me feel ashamed and that my Hmong language was not valued. For this reason, I concluded that English was perhaps a more superior language compared to my home language.

As I grew older in late elementary school, I noticed that “English only” policy was no longer enforced. Since it was no longer frowned upon, my friends and I began to intertwine our first language, Hmong, and our second language, in this case, English, to build meaning and context when speaking to each other. We would mix our first and second languages to form meaning in sentences or conversations, therefore one of the meanings of what code-switching is. From my experiences, and observation my capstone project questions are: *What do educators need to know about Code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge?*

My Experiences in Code-Switching

Code-switching (CS) has become a worldwide phenomenon in which almost everyone participates, even if one may not recognize it right away. This topic is a passion of mine because I am a bilingual learner, and this research project will focus on code-switching among bilingual learners.

Code-switching is defined as a linguistic phenomenon of changing language (or languages) that may include different dialects, words, or phrases in the middle of the utterance (Klein, U & Kracht M, 2014). Dulm and Rose (2006) define it as “alternations of languages within a conversation that involve switches within an utterance, in this case, a single conversation” (p.1). Therefore, code-switching is a linguistic event that takes place in one’s utterance in which the individual is using two or more languages to make meaning verbally to their target audience. In addition to code-switching, there are many events in which one may be using “code mixing” or a “variety mix” (Dlum & Rose, 2006).

Bilingual speakers may switch between languages for a variety of reasons. Sometimes languages can be used as code when speaking to each other, especially when the speakers do not want their conversations to be heard or known by English-speaking individuals. The notion of code-switching is true for my friend and I when we are out for coffee. For the purpose of the code-switching in the coffee shop is to ensure that the content is kept in private in a public space, such as a breakup, sickness in the family or personal life events. Another reason for the CS would be a speaker, in this case, my friends and family members, do not have a word or phrase in their first language that can convey the same meaning as certain words in English. It could also be that CS between languages is easier because, from my own experiences and observations of my peers and family members who are first and second generation, speakers are so immersed in the American culture that they struggle to use their first language in communicating meaning or a word itself. In these cases, these individuals choose to limit their use of their first language and switch to English more often when communicating with their listeners.

I am guilty of doing all of the above because CS has become normalized to my brothers and I as well as within the community regarding first and second generation. For example, I may say to my mother:

“Kuv mus to the store.”

I am going to the store.

In this case I am mixing phrases in different languages within an utterance, and switching back and forth. As a result, it is understood among those who CS how to fill in the gaps between their home language and vice versa

I have always found CS to be intriguing in how the mind can code switch in seconds as well as have the ability to recognize the meaning that the words and phrases may carry conveys a command, request, to statement to their listeners. Besides, I acknowledge that I tend to CS throughout my day, not questioning why it happens or why I do it. I assumed that I was losing my first language (L1) because of my frequent use of CS when having a conversation with my family members. Over time, as I immersed myself in English, I found myself using English (L2) more often because it seemed natural to communicate. Due to my 90% usage of the English language at home and outside, I felt that I would need to go back and relearn my first language, but research states that this change in behavior and language use exists due to the choice of the speaker. Code-switching is not due to the failure of learning one language over another (Ritchie & Bhatia, 2012; Lucarelli, 2018).

Throughout my experiences as a teacher, I have always worked with a diverse group of people as an educator. I have worked at the University of Minnesota and then left to teach English in South Korea for a year. Now, I have been teaching at a high school in the Twin Cities for two years as an English Language Development (ELD) teacher. In working with the students that I have come across, I have noticed at some point within a teaching moment or conversations there will always be a switch in code from either a person's L1 to L2, or formality

in addressing one’s speech. I noticed that the occurrences of CS often happen in my classroom.

WIDA

As an ELL teacher in Minnesota, we work with an English Language (EL) tool known as World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA).

WIDA’s mission is to support students who are “culturally and linguistically diverse,” in their second language development in schools academically and

socially (Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, 2018). In

WIDA, there are six levels that EL students may be placed in that is determined by the result of their assessment. These levels are from 1 to 6; they are shown below

in figure 1: Performance Definitions for the levels of English language proficiency

6 Reaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specialized or technical language reflective of the content area at grade level • a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in extended oral or written discourse as required by the specified grade level • oral or written communication in English comparable to proficient English peers
5 Bridging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the technical language of the content areas; • a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in extended oral or written discourse, including stories, essays, or reports; • oral or written language approaching comparability to that of English proficient peers when presented with grade level material
4 Expanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific and some technical language of the content areas; • a variety of sentence lengths of varying linguistic complexity in oral discourse or multiple, related paragraphs; • oral or written language with minimal phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that do not impede the overall meaning of the communication when presented with oral or written connected discourse with occasional visual and graphic support
3 Developing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general and some specific language of the content areas; • expanded sentences in oral interaction or written paragraphs; • oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that may impede the communication but retain much of its meaning when presented with oral or written, narrative or expository descriptions with occasional visual and graphic support
2 Beginning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general language related to the content areas; • phrases or short sentences; • oral or written language with phonological, syntactic, or semantic errors that often impede the meaning of the communication when presented with one to multiple-step commands, directions, questions, or a series of statements with visual and graphic support
1 Entering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pictorial or graphic representation of the language of the content areas; • words, phrases, or chunks of language when presented with one-step commands, directions, WH-questions, or statements with visual and graphic support

Note: Data for the Performance Level descriptors in WIDA from Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System (2018)

In figure one, there are six levels that an EL student may be placed based upon their skills via an assessment that is taken. The highest is Level 6, in which the EL students are considered to be proficient in the English language. Also, in the figure, there is a short description of what each level can do. In comparison to level 6, level 1 EL students are the lowest in their English proficiency academically and socially. These students in this level are at a kindergarten reading level and learning Wh- questions and answers. As a high school teacher, I teach students who are at WIDA level 2. This means that students at this level are reading, writing, and speaking at a 3rd grade level in their academic learning. However, an individual student's level of learning within the grade level may vary depending on the type of learner they are and what they may have already learned before.

Code Switching in the Classroom

While teaching, I have noticed that many of the students at the school and in classrooms are code-switching. Their reasons for code-switching, or for mixing or using both of their languages, may differ for many reasons. In class, I observed students' behavior in code-switching as a way for students to transfer information from their L1 to their L2 to communicate what they have learned, or to express themselves more easily. I also noticed that students tend to code-switch when they do not want me to know what they are discussing, as well. Besides, many students use CS to explain and exchange information with one another about what is

learned in the class in order to perform a task or assignment that is asked for them.

Code-switching is essential for educators, parents, students, and community members. It can be a tool that is used to hinder or excel in one's education. This means that both parties would need to understand CS, and it's a core value in what is needed to know about CS in order to support students with it. CS can impact students' motivation for learning. From the literature findings, there may be changes and adaptations that may be needed to support students in their learning and social development within the education field. This project will inform how educators can incorporate code-switching into the classroom and students' learning.

The research in this project is vital to students, families and community members so that they may have a deeper understanding of the importance of keeping their first language. It may strengthen their cultural identity. This can strengthen the relationship among students with their families and understanding of their culture and language. This research will instill the importance for all parties to maintain their languages because as a teacher, I hear many parents express that they “only” want their children to learn English with the idealism of English equals success. But to strengthen both the student’s home language and second language will create a greater opportunity for their education endeavors.

Research Question and The Goal of the Study

For this capstone project, I will develop a Professional Development (PD) that will provide research and information regarding my capstone project: *What*

do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge? The reason I am developing a PD is because CS has not been explicitly brought up in classrooms, meetings, or put into a PD format. As a result of this, I would like to be the bridge in developing a PD platform that can be readily accessible to educators who are and not familiar with the concept of CS. My mission for this PD it to be able to give educators information about the use of CS in bilingual classrooms, as well as use it to support student linguistics in education.

Summary

In this capstone, I seek to create professional development (PD) for educators and administrators with the following questions in mind: *What do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge?* By creating a PD, I hope these insights will help educators, parents, students, and administrators in understanding why students use CS in their classrooms and at school. I hope that schools and educators may be able to use these findings in order to incorporate students' code-switching to support and enhance their social and academic learning.

In Chapter One, I provided my personal experiences and explained my interest in code-switching. I gave my rationale for why researching code-switching would be beneficial to schools, educators, and the community. In Chapter Two, I will give an overview of the research that has been done in relation to the research questions that I have presented. In Chapter Three, I will

talk about the framework that I will be using to create a Professional Development (PD) of CS, as well as give a preview of how the PD will look.

CHAPTER TWO:

Literature Review

The previous chapter addressed my personal experiences, background, and the questions that are addressed: What do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge? In this chapter, there will be an overview of the literature found. In this chapter, the history of code-switching (CS) and bilingual education will be addressed. Then discuss the types of code-switching, and reasons for why it may occur. Also, addressing the theories regarding CS, as well as how it may be applied in conversations.

History of Bilingualism and ESL Education:

The use of bilingualism in education has been researched and debated for years. These debates are usually centered around whether a speaker who is a non-native should use their first language (L1) or second language (L2) in different contexts. Some people believed that in a school setting, L1 should not be used, but others argue that using L1 in the classroom would strengthen L2, their second language acquisition (Romaine, 2002; Strupeck, 2006). Due to these split viewpoints, bilingual education was viewed negatively because bilingual

education aims to maintain the languages, beliefs, and cultures of the individual whose native language is not English. This negativity towards bilingual education arises through the fear that English will be overtaken as the dominant language. (Bybee, Henderson & Hinojosa, 2014; Pavlenko, 2002). Due to this fear, Eldridge (1996) asserts that teachers and researchers in ESL attempted to minimize code-switching occurrences in the classroom because it is believed to be a failure to learn (or unwillingness to learn) the dominant language (Strupeck, 2006). As a result, enforcement of “only” English was placed onto non-native speakers, in the form of “English only policy.”

The "English only policy" was to serve as an English immersion classroom in which non-native speakers would only be using English in speaking, reading, listening, and writing (Bybee, Henderson, & Hinojosa, 2011; Samson, 2011). The purpose of this policy is not only to have non-native speakers become immersed in the language but to have them immersed in the culture itself. Therefore, in hopes to have students in the classroom become "Americanized," they should assimilate into the English ideologies of what is proper, correct and right (Blanton, 2005; Bybee, Henderson, & Hinojosa, 2014; Garcia, 2009; Kloss, 1998; Ricento, 2005). Despite the efforts of this policy, many non-native speakers still spoke using their L1 in classrooms.

In the case *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1924), the Supreme Court overturned the English-only policy, asserting that the law violated the fourteenth amendment rights. This helped in the slow process of returning bilingual education. Later on, another case followed: the *Independent School District v. Salvatierra*, which

brought attention to linguistic segregation of students. This case was overruled due to the argument of 'special needs.' After that, many other cases followed. A significant shift in bilingual education occurred when President Lyndon B. Johnson spoke Spanish in an English Language instruction classroom in Texas (Blanton, 2001; Bybee, Henderson & Hinojosa, 2014). This action resulted in the establishment of the Bilingual Education Act (BEA), Title Act VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1968 (Blanton, 2005; Bybee, Henderson & Hinojosa, 2014).

This act provided support for many bilingual students in its funding and allowed for more teacher aides, resources for educational programs, development, dissemination of materials and encouraged parent involvement (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988; Strupeck, 2006). This was the start of a movement in noting the encouragement of bilingual education in schools and many court cases that soon followed.

One of the most famous cases in the education field is *Lau v. Nichols* in 1974. Lau asserted that bilingual students did not receive equal education opportunities, and they were not benefiting from the English education that was provided. This case relied on the Civil Rights Act (1964), Title VI which states: "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (Section V – Defining Title VI, 2017). From this claim, Romaine (1995) asserts, the Supreme Court deemed that non-native speakers were not

receiving the same educational opportunities as native speakers, resulting in non-native speakers' use of their first language being recognized as a civil right (as cited in Strupeck, 2006).

Even with the court cases and law changes in bilingual education there is still an overwhelming fear of losing the 'American' identity. In 1988, the "English only policy" re-emerged only in certain parts of the United States (Strupeck, 2006). Although now, in the present, it may seem that the United States may welcome bilingualism when it is deemed beneficial and useful, it rejects those it sees as harmful and hurtful to its identity and language (Romaine, 2000; Strupeck, 2006). From these changes in bilingual education, now there are more occurrences and acceptance of L1 usage in the class as well as the intermix of both L1 and L2.

Code Switching Definitions:

Code-switching (CS) has many similar meanings, defined by Gumperz (1977) "a juxtaposition of the passage of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems of a subsystem, within the same exchange" (p. 1). It has also been defined by Dulm and Rose (2006) as "alternations of language within a single conversation, often involving switches within a single speaker's turn or a single sentence" (p. 1). To put it in layman's terms, CS is an occurrence when a speaker is moving back and forth from their native language to their second language, or vice versa, using codes that are known to them and their listeners. When CS happens, the speaker is speaking in code, defined as a system of signals that conveys meaning (Berstrain, 1971; Riehl, 2005; Shay, 2015). Thus, the code

can be used to refer to any language system that is used to convey meaning via communication (Wardhaugh, 2010; Shay, 2015). It is a change in the beginning, middle, or end of one's sentences (Klein & Kracht, 2014). Therefore, the speaker may not know the correct grammatical system in their L2 but will find a code in their L1 to express the meaning or information to their audience (Gumperz, 1977). The speaker is choosing a language, word, or phrase that is appropriate for the conversation in its setting, such as place, time, audience, and purpose for the communication (Wheeler, 2005).

History of Code Switching:

Code-switching (CS) is a worldwide linguistics phenomenon among the bilingual and multilingual community and society (Dulm & Rose, 2006). This phenomenon is most prevalent among bilingual and multilingual speakers (Kumar, Nannapaneni Siva; Narendra, 2012). The first to raise interest in CS was Lado's work in the 1970s (Moore, 2000). Gumperz (1977) later conducted his own CS research, finding that CS is a pragmatic phenomenon that uses verbal sequences to make meaning. Along with Gumperz and Lado's studies, many studies have been done within this topic (Luaracelli, 2018). In recent years there have been many studies that looked into Second Language Acquisition (SLA) in the use of L1 and L2 in the education field (Luracelli, 2018; Moore, 2002). Most of the research that has been conducted was done by interactional sociolinguistics investigating the reasoning of CS and its operations (Wang, 2006).

Due to the amount of research that has been done, the operation of CS was normalized in speeches and conversations in bilingual interaction that requires a

good amount of linguistics competence among users (Muysken, 1995; Sampson, 2011; Shay, 2015). Since the phenomenon became known, many researchers have been studying it for the past few years. CS is mainly studied for the grammar that is used in CS, sociolinguistics, speech style, language choices, and proficiency, as well as interest (Cantone, 2007; Dulm & Rose, 2006).

Types of Code-Switching:

Scholarly literature notes that CS is placed into two different linguistic categories: inter-sentential and intra-sentential alternation (Gulzar & Sultana, 2010; (Brice & Rivero, 2013); Shay, 2015). Inter-sentential alteration occurs during a conversation from sentence to sentence. The switch does not happen within a sentence, but either at the beginning or end of the sentence, or utterance of the speaker. Intra-sentential alternation, like inter-sentential too, occurs in conversations, but within the utterance or sentence. It is an alteration or change of one language to another between sentences, utterance or within the same turn (Brice & Rivero, 2013; Kamwangamalu, 1992; Mahsain, 2014; Shay, 2015). When intra-sentential alterations occur, it is usually done so in the usage of phrases, words, or sentences of both L1 and L2 within the utterance. In this particular case, code-switching can be used to restate an utterance in the L1, if L2 is not understood. An example to show this alternation is when a teacher incorporates words or phrases from L1 and L2 into a sentence: "Mira aqui (look here), how many tulips did we see?" (Brice & Rivero, 2013, p. 20). During these alterations of words or phrases, one must have a good understanding of the metalanguage in both their L1 and L2. As a result of the alterations, the speaker is

fluent in both languages and can overlap the grammar of the two languages within an utterance (Brice & Rivero, 2013; Aguirre, 1988; Grosjean, 1982; Kamwangamalu, 1992; Miller, 1984; Pennington, 1995). For this research, I will define CS as a code alternation between two languages that are the speaker's L1 and L2. These switches will include a switched code either within or at the beginning or end of an utterance. In this research, the two languages that will be investigated are the L1 in Somali and L2 in English.

Gumperz's Theory:

Besides facilitating communication for bilingual or multilingual people, CS has a powerful social function. Gumperz was one of the first scholars to express the idea of CS as a linguistic, points out, that a "code" is used to explain or expand word meaning in which bilingual individuals use to include or exclude someone in a social context and grouping (Gulzar & Sultana, 2010). Gumperz (1982) notes this to be the "we-code" and "they-code" (Lurcarelli, 2018). The "we" vs. "they" code is associated with formal and informal interactions. The "we" is built on the perceptions of informalities and is associated with one's social group, thus the minority. The "they" is perceived to be those who are outside of the social grouping of the speaker and as a result, is considered one of the majorities, the out-group (Sopocleous, 2007).

Myers-Scotton Markedness Model:

Myers (2002) states that CS is a linguistic choice that is used to respond to social norms within their communities concerning the Rights and Obligations via interaction (Sopocleous, 2007). The model notes that the speaker has many

different identities when engaging in CS, which is known as the markedness evaluator. The markedness evaluator lets the speakers take in information from their listener's personality and behavior in order to make choices that are most favorable to their outcome in the future (Myers-Scotton, 2002). This means that speakers are "goal-oriented," meaning that the speaker has an end goal when switching code in their utterance (Myers, 2002). These CS's are either marked, unmarked, or an exploratory choice made by the speaker or the user (Dulm & Rose, 2006; Lucarelli, 2018). The speaker selects codes based on the perceptions and the relationships that they wish to experience with the listener (Dulm & Rose, 2006)

The marked choice is the choice of the speaker to explore, and self-express in negotiating new identities or multiplying the one that they already have (Lucarelli, 2018; Myers-Scotton, 2002). Marked choices are words that are changed in order to add more meaning to them, such as adding a morpheme, s to indicate more, or ed for past. Marked code switches occur in formal conversational interactions (Myers-Scotton, 2002). These switches are for clarification to understand a single word or phrase or used to expand meaning as well. This example is quoted from Dulm and Rose (2006), which is shown below.

Example (one) is spoken in Afrikaans.

Example (one):

T: Okay there is a little word there, two-word *kla-kla*, *wat is kla-kla*, *julle*,?

Moan-moan, what is moan-moan, you-plural

wat is kla? Finished? Okay, with an r is finished, maar kla?

S1: Quickly, quick-quick.

S2: Moan, it's moaning.

T: *Nee*, it's moaning, *as jy kla dan moan jy*. *Julle weet almal hoe om te kla*, *nan*

No when you moan then You know all how to moan
Zoe? Kla-kla, what does that you, complain-complain? What? Does that say moan-moan
 where? Does that say when? Does that say how? How is father digging in the garden?
 S: Moaning, moaning.
 T: Moaning, moaning.
 S: And groaning.
 T: So *kla-kla* is manner. (p. 9)

Example (one) shows that the teacher is expanding the word, *kla-kla* in the class to ensure that their students understand the meaning. The teacher uses *moaning* about stressing the action as well as relates the word to students' L1 in their understanding of *kla-kla* (Dulm & Rose, 2006). Once students understand the meaning, the teacher reinforces the meaning one more time at the ending using markedness.

Unmarked, is when the word itself is in its most neutral state, or base, for example, such as the word *laugh*. The word *laugh* is an unmarked while, the *laugh(ed)* with the *ed* would be considered to be marked because the word itself had changed in meaning about the past (Kean, 2003; Lucarelli, 2018; Marked & Unmarked Terms, n.d). The functions of unmarked CS may be used for humor, in informal interactions in class. It is used to fill in social interactions with their peers for the feeling of belonging. It too is used to substitute in a word that may be equivalent to the L2. Like markedness, words and phrases can be used to help in understanding the word or phrase in more detail (Dulm & Rose, 2006). An unmarkedness example is shown below and labeled; example (two). In this example two, it also spoken in Afrikaans.

Example (two):

S1: Guess what Tammy and I are eating now at break - pizza slices! Ha, look at your face.

S2: Will you give me a *hap* (*bite*).

S1: Yes man, I will give you a *hap* (*bite*).

(p. 6).

In example (two), two students are using the unmarked word, *bite*, from their L1 in their conversation. In this conversation, they are building a social relationship in which they are using the word to convey humor. This is seen from S1 asserting "I will give you a *hap* (*bite*)" (Dulm & Rose, 2006).

The third CS in Markedness Model is Exploratory CS. This CS occurs when an unmarked CS is not clear. As a result of the unclear CS, the speaker and the listener is not sure what the utterance is, nor the meaning that it carries (Myers-Scotton, 2002). Exploratory CS occurs quickly and for a short time in which it is done in a new or uncertain situation or interaction (Kieswetter, 1997; Myers-Scotton, 2000).

The 'code-in-between':

Kamwangamalu (1998) states that CS cannot be explained only by social negotiation of the "Markedness Model of Right and Obligation" or "Power Relationship," but looked at in the perspective in which it is used in a social situation. As a result, it led to the revision of Gumperz's work to what is known as the 'code-in-between.' The 'code-in-between' is used as a neutral strategy that assists the speaker to achieve their goals (Ncoko et al., 2000).

The Myers Markedness Models, Gumperz and Kamwangamalu's code-switching theories are one of many that have been presented, reviewed, discussed,

and practiced. In this research, theories and models will not be used to understand the perspectives, when and how CS is used in the classroom in a high school setting among bilinguals.

Function of Code-switching:

Literature reviews show that there are many reasons why bilingual individuals may code switch from their L1 to L2. One of the main reasons why students may use CS is to relay information in an utterance to their listener or audience. It is used to give explicit and implicit information from the speaker (Wang, 2017). Most of these code switches are made either consciously or unconsciously by the speaker (Strupeck, 2006; Ncoko et al., 2000).

Reiteration Function:

This CS functions as a transfer the knowledge and to clarify its meaning (Shay, 2015). In a classroom setting, CS is mostly used to expand, clarify, or introduce new words, phrases, concepts, and content to students in the classroom. The teacher or the students can do CS. When a concept is introduced, CS may be used to amplify or emphasize the given information (Brice & Rivero, 2013); Gumperz, 1982; Kamwangamalu & Lee, 1991; Mirret, Cleghorn, Abagi, & Bunyi, 1992; Tay, 1989). The emphasis that is placed can be to clarify the meaning of a word, concept, or direction of the meaning. An example is known by Brice & Rivero (2013, p. 20).

Example (three)

“You know what? You need to leave a space, “*un espacio, aqui vas a poner la respuesta*, (space where you are going to put that answer).”

Identity and Relationships:

CS can be used to express their identity. Sociolinguistic research has found a link between a speaker's native language and identity (Day, 2002; Norton & Peirce, 1995; McKay & Hornberger, 2001; Toohey, 2000; Strupeck 2006). The speaker's dialect can be used to create kinship or dismiss it. CS functions as a way of negotiating, conveying, and rejecting their or one's identity. The notion of one's native language is thought to be a 'belonging' to the speaker (Ellwood, 2008; Rampton, 1988; p. 548). When students use CS, they are misusing the phrase, or during an inappropriate event to convey solidarity. This is displayed below in example (five) from Sampson (2012, p. 299).

Example (five):

T: An what about drinking?

C: So-so, some drinking is not so bad, you can relax very much if you, er, Drink a beer.

E: Ay, *este borracho*. [Oh, what a drunk.]

F: (laughing) But not too much, if it's too much it's bad for you.

Example (five) shows that these students are engaging in inappropriate conversations in the classroom in order to build solidarity among each other in participating in CS. They solidify their identity in engaging and responding to CS. This form of solidarity can either be formed as in example (five) or rejecting their solidarity. This rejection is demonstrated in example (six) from Ncoko et al. (2000 p. 232). This conversation is held in isiZulu.

Example (six):

A: Can I use you koki pens?

B: No, they dry quickly.

A: Oh! Please, *ngizowavala mangiqeda ukuwa-user* (isiZulu).

[I will close them after using them.]

B: No, I don't want you to use them.

A: *Nqiyakucela, toe* (isiZulu) [Oh, please, I beg you.]

B: No.

A: *Kulungile* (isiZulu) [It's fine], I am not going to let you use my wax crayons.

B: Who cares

From the conversation above, student A used English in asking permission to use student B's wax crayon in school. When student B gave student A a negative answer, student A code-switched into their L1 language in hopes to build solidarity between them, in which both are of the same ethnic group (Ncoko et al., 2000). Although the CS was successful, student B still gave student A negative response in English, in turn rejecting the solidarity in their L1, but identifying as the same ethnic group (Ncoko et al., 2000).

Although CS can function a form of unity, it serves as a tool to hide the speaker's identity (Grosjean, 1982; Ncoko et al., 2000). The speaker may want to hide their identity due to the negative perception that may receive from those of the dominant speaking culture. For example; Iannaccci (2008) study found that some teachers believe that students' L1 serves as a barrier to their academic achievement. As a result, their identity is concealed, and their native language in which they have internalized the majority's norms is hidden (Ncoko et al., 2000).

Avoidance, Defiance, and Power:

Avoidance, defiance, and power occur when the speaker chooses to use their L1 instead of their L2 even though they are fluent in their L2. This occurs in conversations when the speaker may want to avoid tasks, conversations, or

diverge from the lesson. This is seen by example (seven), which is taken from Sampson (2012, p. 300).

Example (seven):

C: So maybe Thursday is...

D: ...is the...

C: ...yes is *¿el día que nacio?*
[the day he was born?]

D: *Si puede ser.*
[Yes, it could be.]

C: *¿Que día naciste tu?*
[What day were you born?]

D: No *se*. *¿Tu?*
[I don't know. You?]

T: Okay, so what do you think?

C: Er, this good idea. *Hay muchos lugares para caminar aquí.*
[There are many places to go walking here.]

D: *Si ... ¿ Tu haces algún ejercicio?*
[Do you do any exercise?]

C: *¡Nada!* I do nothing.
[nothing.]

From this example, students are engaging in a conversation about their birthday, but then take a quick turn to talk about going for a walk. Due to this topic change, the conversation is no longer focused upon the speaker's birthday (Sampson, 2012). Below, there is another conversation held in Mandarin with a boy and his mother. In this conversation, there also a CS in which the young boy avoids and switch the topic conversation. This excerpt is from Wang (2017, p. 9).

Example (eight):

B: Xiaci buneng zai nali, bushi budao nali, buneng zai nali.
(*Next time you cannot be there. It does not mean you are not going there, but not be there.*)

M: Budao nali gen buneng zai nali you sha qubie?
(*Are there any difference?*)

B: You a.

(Yes.)

M: You sha qubie?

(What are the differences?)

B: Can you tape these papers?

M: Gan shenme?

(What?)

B: Tape this one. Right in the middle here.

M: Hm, Zhege jiaoshi haixiang ye buhai.

(Hm, this glue doesn't look good, either.)

In this engagement with Bowen, the young boy in the conversation has a conversation with his mother in his L1 than later switches to L2 to avoid answering his mother question about the differences between 'not going there' and 'not be there.' In this CS, instead of using L1 to avoid answering his mother, he uses L2 as the code to avoid answering, thus bringing in a new topic. Therefore, he successfully evades the question that was given to him in his L1.

Aside from avoidance, there is a practice in defiance used in code-switching by the speaker. This aims to defy regulations and rules of the societal norms. A student observed in primary school was not allowed to use their African language at school. As punishment for using it in class, the teacher had the students hand out a worksheet. While the student was performing the task, he spoke to students who were considered multi and bilingual in the African language (Ncoko et al., 2010). His actions and his usage of the African language served as his defiance to the norms in the class. As a result of this usage of this student actions, one can view it as an act of power struggle of one's L1 and L2.

Language can function as a tool to convey power. It is used to follow, obey, and distinguish one's position, such as the student's position above

(Strupeck; 2006). Research shows that first generation adults tend to maintain their L1 and culture, but the second generation will choose to assimilate into the dominant majority culture (Choo, 2000; Strupeck, 2006). Therefore, CS can be used to resist the power or use it onto others (Heller; 1995; Luracelli,2018). This can be conveyed by a study done by Strupeck (2008, p. 68).

"Speak English," "English makes you smart," "Hmong makes you smart."

In these statements, the students seem to imply that English makes one smart and knowledgeable in the dominant culture rules and norms. Therefore, they encourage each other to speak their L2.

Floor holding:

Floor holding is a CS function to keep the communication going without stopping. Therefore, the communication is endlessly flowing in the conversation. This results in a switch from L2 to L1 because it is much faster to use one's L1 to retrieve phrases and vocabulary to make meaning. In this sense, the learner is pre-intermediate, and knows their L2 pretty fluently, but chooses to use their L1 because of quicker access, thus floor holding (Sampson, 2012; Sert, 2005). This is the desire to have a continuous conversation with their listener (Sampson, 2012).

Benefits of Code-switching:

Many teachers believe exposure to languages and opportunities for interactions with English speakers is essential for non-English students to learn and develop English skills naturally (Harper & Jong, 2004). In order to develop English skills that students are fluent in, they must consciously pay attention to grammatical functions to the English language (Harper & Jong, 2004). To bridge

the gap of learning English fluently, CS may be used as a method to assist in learning the English language. Therefore, CS is considered a style or code in which the members use when communicating (Gumperz, 1977).

There are many benefits to CS, such as using it to include, exclude, avoid, or convey meaning. These are evident when exploring the many functions of CS that are used by multilingual and bilingual speakers. These functions that are used can be a part of their methodologies in learning and understand the languages and what is requested from them. A study found that about 53 percent reported that they use CS as a classroom strategy to help re-iterate content to students in the classroom (Ferguson, 2009; Phuntsog, 2017). It can serve as a way to cope with their anxiety and their emotional health (Lucarelli, 2018; Kamwangamalu, 2010; Mill, 2005; Ütinel, 2016; Yeh et al., 2002). CS allows students to be a participant in their community, therefore, allowing them to have a shared understanding about the purpose of interaction in regards to learning the English language, their L2 (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2005). CS encourages the speaker to use language to construct a bilingual identity (Fuller, 2007). Therefore, maintaining the value of the speaker's culture and traditions.

Also, not only can a student use CS in the classroom, but teachers can as well. Research has shown that when a teacher allows a student to CS in the classroom, it allows them to engage in further understanding of the L2 (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher, 2005). It helps students gain access to their content and academic language. CS uses a mechanism scaffolding to support students' in their learning. CS makes it easier for teachers to communicate abstract ideas that

cannot easily be explained by L2 (Gulzar & Sultana, 2010). Therefore, the use of L1 is more effective in conveying these ideas to the listener (Phuntsog, 2007).

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT):

Gay (2000) defines Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) as, “using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frame of references, performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant, and effective for students” (Bui & Fagan, 2013). CRT acknowledges students’ cultural heritages, connection home and school experiences using a variety of methods to support students’ learning in the classroom. CRT’s goals are to empower students, integrate diversity, understand students’ needs, and relate one’s culture to the instruction and content in the classroom (Guido, 2019). It empowers students in three categories: intellectually, socially and emotionally (Ford, Stuart & Vakil, 2014). Because CRT focuses on empowering students’ through their personal experiences, culture, and heritage, educators must go further than celebrating holidays or have a casual conversation about it. Instead, educators must learn the culture of their students and infuse this into their teachings and instructional practice, according to Gay (2010) asserted by Ford, Stuart & Vakil (2014).

First and foremost, CRT encourages educators to explore their perspectives and biases (Lynch, 2012). By having educators evaluate their cultural values and beliefs, they can reflect upon their actions, behaviors, and attitudes that may have impacted their teachings. As a result, if educators can shape their performance in the classroom, they will be more likely to minimize negative

perceptions and create an inclusive environment in the classroom (Ford, Stuart, Vakil, 2014).

In order to build an inclusive environment, educators must implement rich multicultural education that reflects the diversity in the school and the classroom. This can be in the form of literature, bulletin boards, activities that support cultural practices such as prayer time in the Muslim culture. Educators would also be required to teach what students need in the grade level. Therefore, scaffolding and differentiation are needed to optimize students' learning (Ford, Stuart, Vakil, 2014). As a result of CRT, educators can support students' needs, engage in meaningful conversations, and foster a healthy learning environment in which all voices in the classroom are heard, validated, and valued (Bybee, Henderson & Hinojosa, 2014).

Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) is vital to CS because it enables students to express themselves as with or against a group in relation to their identity. Around the world, homes have become more multicultural and multilingual (Gunn, Brice, & Peterson, 2014). Also, from Bui and Fagan (2013), both noted that from their study that educators witnessed how students make a personal connection to the content can encourage their involvement and motivation.

According to the United States Census Bureau American Community Survey, 1 out of 5 Americans speaks a language other than English (LanguageLine Solutions Team, 2017). Data showed that 13.3 percent of the population in the United States spoke in Spanish at home from age 5 and older in

2016. Chinese was the second most spoken with 3.4 million at home (LanguageLine Solutions Team, 2017). As diversity grows, educators must embed within their teaching Culturally Responsive Teaching methods. These methods focus on students' cultural background knowledge and strength to motivate and support students' success in a bilingual classroom as well as foster a sense of belonging within the world (Lynch, 2012).

Thereby integrating CRT in the classroom, it will allow students to be validated in who they are holistic instead of just a student in the classroom. This includes their culture, heritage, values, and languages. Specifically, language because it one of the most significant forms of communication to make meaning, and most students who are not as fluent in their L2 will tend to intermix their L1 within a sentence. Therefore, code-switching can be included in CRT to enrich and set a foundation for learning in the classroom. As noted throughout this literature review, code-switching is used for various reasons, such as placing one's identity within a group, learning a new concept, creating a private space or engaging entertainment with one another. In order to be culturally responsive and support students in a bilingual or multicultural classroom, one's language must also be integrated.

Summary:

In this chapter, I have discussed the functions, theories, and benefits of CS. Each of these aspects in Chapter Two is important. I have provided several different definitions of what CS is. For this research and project, I will use the definition of code-switching in the broader context; at any point of the

conversation, if there is an alternation in language from the speaker's native language to their non-native language and vice versa, it will be considered as CS in a multilingual and bilingual community. I also emphasize CRT because it will serve as one of the frameworks for the PD.

In the next chapter, I will give an overview of the professional development and the framework that I will use. Also, I will give my rationale and reasoning behind the PD. I will discuss the demographics of where the PD will be held as well as the target audience. Therefore, this will answer my question: *What do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge?*

CHAPTER THREE

Methods

Introduction

In chapter one, I shared my experiences and observation of code-switching (CS). I also addressed the reasons why I chose this topic as well as my research project questions. These questions are: *What do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge?* In chapter two, I discussed the reasons why a speaker may want to code-switch. I discussed theories, models, and research behind it, including the global interest in CS among bilingual and multilingual communities. In short, studies in CS have been done in a variety of communities and countries in looking at grammatical placements, sociolinguistics, style, and choices that are made by the speaker, but research has not yet been brought into the education field or given the opportunity to be applied in the classroom or school (Wang, 2006).

In this chapter, I will address why I chose to create a staff development plan (PD) for CS, in which the target audience is educators and administrators. I will also discuss the frameworks that I will use and how I will measure the effectiveness of the project.

Project Description

This staff development for CS was crucial because it helped teachers, staff, and administrators understand code-switching. This professional development aided educators in their support of CS and in the scaffolding of lessons for students in the classroom to ensure students' success in understanding the material, utterance, and overall comprehension. I hoped to ensure students have support in using their first language in classes so that they can be successful in their overall academic comprehension and gain the ability to socialize. I also hoped to provide educators and administrators information about CS, and that this information would provide a reliable support system and understanding in the classroom.

Framework and Paradigm

I used the Markedness Model by Scott-Meyers as a framework to introduce as well create a CS professional development. In Scott-Meyers' Markedness model, he asserted that the purpose of CS among bilinguals and multilinguals is to convey the meaning and purpose of utterances and relationships that speakers want to have with the listener. In an implementation of the Markedness models, the speaker, whether it be a teacher or student, used CS to have an end goal. This can be to build rapport among students or ensuring students understand their assignments, or completing a task that is asked of them (Wang, 2006).

Another framework that I used for professional development is the methodology of Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). In the educational realm, it is essential for teachers, educators, and administrators to be culturally

responsive towards those they are teaching and supporting. It is vital to understand where students are and who they are in relation to their home, beliefs, and culture. This allows educators to see each student as a whole instead of a part, meaningfully understanding who they are as a person and student. CRT's goal is to maintain students' identity, knowledge, and experiences of their culture when learning in the classroom (Kozleski, 2011). This means that both educators and students negotiate new rules and standards that allow everyone to accept each other's differences and similarities (Kozleski, 2011). Although many schools and teachers have implemented this in their teachings, I, as a teacher, still hear many administrators and teachers fuss over how students must learn the ways of the "American" school system, or say things like "They need to learn English." While this is true, it is vital that educators and administrators empower students to have cultural integrity while using their prior knowledge.

Also, the language transfer theory served to support and develop the PD in explaining the process of L2 acquisition. This can be seen as "the influences of L1 habits on L2 learning" (Nassaji & Karmin, 2013, p. 118). Many researchers consider this as the cognitive progress of L1 to L2. By using this as a framework to help develop the PD, it stresses the importance of how and when CS is used. It is the language that students use to transfer their knowledge via cognition from their L1 to their L2. The theory is essential for understanding the development of one's interlanguage (Nassaji & Karmin, 2013). This will help educators, staff members and administrators think about their experiences with languages and how they may internalize it before speaking to their listeners.

Location and Audience

This professional development (PD) took place in the Twin Cities metro area at an urban charter school. About 95% of students in this school qualify for free or reduced lunch. The school population is made up of about 90 percent of English Language Learners. Many of these students have had no schooling or are SLIFE learners. SLIFE is known as “Students with limited interrupted formal education” (SLIFE, n.d). This means that SLIFE learners had a formal education, but it was interrupted due to various circumstances. Some of these students may or may not know English, but they are educated in their first language (L1) (SLIFE, n.d).

The audience for this professional development was educators and administrators. This included middle and high school teachers, paraprofessionals, reading intervention teachers, individual education teachers, and all administrators who come in contact with students. Most of the educators at the school are bilingual in the students' native language or know another language, such as French, Spanish, Japanese, Hmong, and Arabic. The most common language spoken in school is Somali. All the educators have a background of working with a diverse student body

Project timeline and overview

This professional development had set dates in which all educators and administrators met. The PD took place on Friday at 1:30 pm. This is usually the time that is reserved for all staff to meet and have PD. The first PD was 2 hours with a 10-minute break in between. There was a 10-minute break between the first

and second hours. The 2nd PD ran for an hour and 30 minutes long with a 5-minute break, and the third PD was roughly 30-40 minutes long with no break. The third PD was discussion-based with shared ideas of what methods worked or did not. The goal was to deliver this PD during the 2019-2020 academic school year, preferably fall of 2019 at the beginning of the school year. A recap of this PD was scheduled via the 3rd PD to get feedback regarding how I can support students in CS usage and address questions and concerns about the topic of CS.

When planning this PD, I scheduled dates within the school year and received approval from the administrators, who are the principals and vice principals at the beginning of the school year. Notifying them before the school year starts and establishing dates in the school calendar helped me make arrangements, changes, and preparation in everything I needed to make the CS PD successful for all staff members. Dates were set for October, January, and March. I believed that these were good months to give educators time to observe and use the knowledge of CS to support their students as well as give me feedback about the CS PD.

In the PD session, educators and teachers engaged in a pair activity that helped them to think about the topic, code-switching. After the pair shared, there was a whole group discussion about their experiences and prior knowledge about what they did during the activity. This then lead to what is CS.

After the group shared, teachers drew upon their experiences of CS, including when and how they used it and with whom. After the discussion, a slideshow was shown on the subject matter to explain what CS is and how it can

be helpful in a bilingual and multilingual classroom. Educators and administrators received information via a slideshow with sample clips of students using CS in the classroom. With each large topic, I paused to answer questions that educators and staff members may have.

I had gathered some information from YouTube, personal information, and written samples from the literature that I did. During this time, educators and administrators engaged in various activities and conversations on what they believe is happening when CS is used, and how it is utilized in the classroom. In this session, educators and administrators learned what CS is and how it is defined. This alleviated some of the biases that teachers have regarding students. This is the culturally responsive model.

The second PD was shorter as it was a summary and review of the last PD. There is also a short activity to remind educators and administrators what was discussed in the fall. In addition to this PD, they shared their observations regarding how and when students use CS, when it is helpful and when it is not. How do students use it and in what ways? This second session's target goal was to observe educators' and administrators' insights into the students' use of CS. To go a step further, I asked how they can use CS to support students' learning in school.

This PD, I hope, gave educators and administrators a different perspective because it came from the students and is about the school, and how, when, and why CS occurs. This second PD ended with a sharing of observations and the next steps in how we, as a school, can support our ELL students to be more successful.

This then led into the third PD, which had teachers use CS to support their students in the classroom.

The third PD served as a review of the first two, and asked participants to reflect on how we, as educators, can use this or have been using this to support our students. It also prompted participants to discuss the outcomes that came from using CS in the classroom. Educators listed what they have experienced and when they used CS. Then they shared in small group and large groups. Educators addressed the problems about using CS, and as a group, tried to give ideas or do a small skit on what works and does not. To close this PD, there was feedback and a survey asking what helped teachers, would they recommend this PD, and what more could I put into this CS PD.

Rationale

Much research has been done on CS, but within my project, I would like to see it applied in teachings to understand how CS can be used to scaffold and support students' learning. As we know today, our society is growing in diversity at a fast rate. Many have called the United States a melting pot, but I like to think of it as a tossed salad. Within Minnesota, according to the American Immigrant Council, in 2015, about 49.2% of the population was immigrants. In addition, ethnic groups that reside in Minnesota are from Mexico (13.9 percent), India (7.2 percent), Somalia (5.7 percent), Laos (5.5 Percent) and Ethiopia (4.6 percent). As a result, bilingual and multilingual communities are growing, and CS will continue to be used as a form of communication within schools and communities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, my goal for this capstone project was to bring awareness of the use of CS in the classroom to administration and educators in order to support ELL students. By doing this, three frameworks were used to help create professional development: The Markedness Model, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and the Transfer Theory. These three are vital to the professional development for CS because it shows staff members how and when students are using CS as well as how they are internalizing their L1 to L2. My long-term goal for this project is to have educators be able to use CS within their classroom to support their ELL students

CHAPTER FOUR

Conclusion

Overview

In the previous chapters, I have addressed the questions for this project and provided my rationale on the importance of it. I have delved into the literature of code-switching (CS) and the reasoning for when one may use it. I discussed who the participants were and how the project was presented. I included a brief overview of each Professional Development (PD). In this chapter, I will draft a schedule of the PD that I have designed with the following questions in mind: *What do educators need to know about code-switching in a bilingual classroom? What can educators do to support their students with this knowledge?* I will also address the project's implications, review the literature and highlight its impact and contributions to the profession. Finally, I will conclude this chapter with implications for future research.

Code-switching Professional Development Outline Preview

In this section, the PD presentation will be outlined regarding its objective, purpose, discussion, and activities. The PD presentation's outline will be adjusted according to the needs of the school, staff and student body in order to make the PD more relevant for the following year. The first PD is approximately two hours, the second PD is one hour and 30 minutes, and the third PD is approximately 40 minutes. Below is the drafted schedule for the PD presentations.

Day One: "What and why code-switching?" The objectives will be presented because they will be the foundation for the day's PD. This PD will consist of four sections. Most of these sections are activity and discussion based and address the theme of code-switching. It then will conclude with homework for staff members, educators and administrators to do and report back on during the next PD.

Day Two: Code-switching and Culturally Responsive Teaching. In this PD, the focus will be mainly about Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). It is introduced and discussed. Once staff members and educators are familiar with the framework of CRT, they then are ready to produce a lesson that incorporates CRT in teams. Then they are to present their shared lesson. Similar to the first PD, this PD will conclude with feedback and discussion on everyone's CRT lesson and homework will be assigned to them for the next PD.

Day Three: Reflection, discussion, and feedback about code-switching and CRT. This PD will be a shorter PD. During the PD, educators, staff members and administrators are to reflect individually and engage in large group discussion about what they observed. Feedback is given, and questions are answered regarding lessons that educators and staff members performed in their classroom.

Literature

Using the research in my literature review I was able to create a professional development opportunity for PD for education professionals on the topic of code-switching. As I delved deeper into the literature pertaining to code-

switching, I realized that there was much research done about code-switching, but it was rarely presented or made officially known to educators or those who work in the school systems. This was an important finding because as noted from the data collected via the Census (2000), the United States is becoming a more linguistically-diverse country colored with many different people from all walks of life. The most easily understood concept of CS is when a person is using two different languages in one sentence that convey meaning to the listener.

From the reasoning of when one may want to use CS and how literature defines it, I was able to define it in my words, and apply it in my classrooms and lessons, which prompted my questions via the PD presentations. The application was motivated by literature on Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). This was the core of the presentation and how an educator would apply the values of CS in their classroom and lessons. CRT supports the notion of engaging in meaningful conversations and discussions in which students are able to relate to their cultural experiences. CRT is one of the key factors that educators and staff members could use in everyday activities to relate to students when teaching.

As an ESL high school teacher, acknowledging the change of demographics, language, and culture is important, so CS and CRT together can be a very powerful tool. As a result, the literature that I gathered supported the foundations of my questions.

Implications and Limitations

This project provided many implications and considerations for future study. While many educators were interested and desired to have a CRT classroom and use CS, the reality was that many of them did not have the “time” or the “commitment” to put in. Since implementing CS as a tool is a new concept within the classroom realm, educators would need more time to become comfortable with its application. In addition, educators need to gain an understanding of how one may implement CS into the classroom so it is most effective for their students’ learning. Since this is the first year of implementing the CS PD and asking educators and staff members to apply it in their lessons and teachings, many teachers were left with only what I have given them: suggestions and additional resources that they can find. Therefore, I would propose more information, resources, and workshops regarding CS for educators and staff members to attend. I found that there was not much research done between the relationship of CS and CRT. More research regarding the relationship between CRT and CS in the future will help educators improve their linguistic understanding of how to support students’ educational goals in the classroom.

Impact

The presented PD impacted the staff members and educators through increasing their awareness and acknowledgment of the linguistic differences that students have in the classroom. This meant that educators and staff members began to notice the occurrence of CS languages that are used within their classrooms. Many reported that there were times that they can identify when and

why CS occurred in their classroom. Many students within my school speak Somali, and some teachers were able to use CS as a tool to scaffold and support their students.

In addition, learning about CRT as a whole helped educators and staff members to reassess their attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, and perspectives that are present in the classroom, consciously or unconsciously. This conversation may have been uncomfortable to some staff, but it was eye-opening in how one's thoughts, beliefs, and perspectives can affect the classroom and students. Once educators are aware of this, they are able to be more mindful about how they present themselves in the classroom. This then supported educators and staff members to take a deeper look at how they teach and what elements of CRT they need to include in order to make their lessons and class more culturally relevant. As a result, the classroom will likely become a safe space in which all students' voices are heard and students are recognized as who they are.

Contributions

This capstone project will benefit students, parents, and those working closely in or with the education system by teaching them what CS is and allowing them to have a deeper understanding when and how it is used. By increasing the awareness of CS within schools and acknowledging that CS is occurring, educators and staff members will have tools and resources to support students.

Furthermore, the pairing and implementation of CRT and CS connects one's culture, personal experiences and first language with what is learned in the classroom. This is the most critical part of the capstone project, which allows

educators and school systems to embrace their students' first language (L1) and understand when one may want to use their L1 instead of their second language (L2).

Future Research

Looking ahead at future research, more in-depth research should be done between the relationship of how we as educators, staff members and administrators can further implement CS in a culturally responsive perspective into classroom lessons that will not impede teaching. Therefore, focusing on when and how CS can be used in the classroom effectively would be very beneficial. This capstone project has shed light on this topic, but not to as great a depth as I would have liked. Future recommendations would be to create a curriculum that can strengthen the linguistic diversity that is rising in the schools' while being culturally responsive in the classroom.

REFERENCES

- American Immigration Council. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org>
- Belgarde, M. J., Mitchell, R. D., & Arquero, A. (2002). What Do We Have to Do to Create Culturally Responsive Programs? The Challenge of Transforming American Indian Teacher Education. *Action in Teacher Education, 24*(2), 42-54. doi:10.1080/01626620.2002.1073441
- Brice, A., & Rivero, Y. (2013). Language transfer: First (L1) and second (L2) proficiency of bilingual adolescent students. *Per Linguam, 12*(2). doi:10.5785/12-2-202
- Bybee, E., Henderson, K. and Hinojosa, R. (2014) An Overview of U.S. Bilingual Education: Historical Roots, Legal Battles and Recent Trends. Texas Education.
- Ester De, J. (2016) . “Return to Bilingual Education.” *Colorín Colorado*, www.colorincolorado.org/article/return-bilingual-education.
- Ford, B. A., Stuart, D. H., & Vakil, S. (2014). Culturally Responsive Teaching in the 21st Century Inclusive Classroom. *Journal of the International Association of Special Education, 5*(2), 56-62
- Fuller, J. M. (2007), Language Choice as a Means of Shaping Identity. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology, 17*: 105-129. doi:10.1525/jlin.2007.17.1.105
- Guido, M. (2019, May 06). 15 Culturally-Responsive Teaching Strategies.
- Gunn, A. A., Brice, A. E., & Peterson, B. J. (2014). Ideas for the Classroom:

- Culturally Responsive Teaching: Exploring Children's Names and Cultural Identities. *Childhood Education*, 90(2), 174-176.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1977). The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELC Journal*, 8(2), 1-34.:10.1177/00336882770080201
- Iannacci, L. (2008). Beyond the pragmatic and the liminal: Culturally and linguistically diverse students code-switching in early-years classrooms. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2), 103-123.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (1992). Multilingualism and social identity in singapore. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 3(1), 33-47.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2003). 14. social change and language shift: South africa. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 225-242
- Karim, k., Nassaji, H. (2013). First language transfer in second language writing: An examination of current research. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 117-134.
- Kozleski, E. (2011). Dialectical Practices in Education: Creating Third Spaces in the Education of Teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 34(3), 250-259.
- Kracht, M., & Klein, U. (2014). The grammar of code switching. *Journal of Logic, Language, and Information*, 23(3), 313-329.
- Kumar, N. S., & Narendra, M. (2012). A study of code switching in relation to ESL. *Language in India*, 12(4), 65-71.
- LanguageLine Solutions Team. (2017, September 20). Census: More than 20

percent of U.S.residents speak a language other than English at home.

Retrieved from <http://blog.languageline.com/limited>

[-english-proficient-census](#)

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), 234-247.

Lucarelli, Laura, "Using L1 In Support of Learning English: Code-Switching Behaviors Across Wida Levels" (2018). *School of Education Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations*. 4435.

https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all/443

Lynch, M., & The Edvocate & The Tech Edvocate. (2012, February 13). What Is Culturally Responsive Pedagogy?

Harper C., Jong D E. (2004). Misconceptions about Teaching English-Language Learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 98(2), 152-162.

Kumar, N., Narendra, M. (2012) A Study of Code Switching in Relation to ESL. *Language in India*, 12(4), 65-71

Mahsain, F. (2014). Motivation Behind Code-switching Among Kuwaiti

Bilingual

Schools' Students. (Published doctoral dissertation). University of

Manchester

Marked and Unmarked Terms. (n.d). Retrieved from <http://www.encyclopedia.com/>

Moore, D. (2002). Case Study, Code – switching and Learning in the classroom.

- International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279-293.
- Myers-Scotton C. (2006). Natural Codeswitching knocks on the laboratory door. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 9(2), 203-212.
- Myers-Scotton., C. (2002). Frequency and intentionality in (un)marked choices in code switch: "This is a 24-hour country." *Linguistics Program* 2(6), 205-219
- Myers-Scotton., C. (1998). "Not quite right": Second-language acquisition and Markedness. *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties* (pp. 195-214) Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton., C. (1988). Code switching as indexical of social negotiations. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (pp. 151-186) De Gruyter, Inc.
- Nighat Sultana, N., & Gulzar, A. (2010). National University of Modern Languages. Code Switching as a Teaching Strategy, 8(1), 45-61
- Phuntsog, N. (2018). Tibetan/English code-switching practices in the Tibetan diaspora classrooms: Perceptions of select 6th grade teachers. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 15(2), 214-229.
- Rose, S., & Dulm, O. V. (2006). Functions of code switching in multilingual classrooms. *Per*, 22(2), 1-13. doi:10.5785/22-2-63
- Sophocleous A. (2011). Switching code and changing social identities in face-to-face interaction. *Sociolinguistic studies* 2(5). 201-234
- Wang, W. (2017) Code-switching and its role in language socialization,

International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, DOI:
10.1080/13670050.2017.131380

Wheeler, R. S. (2005). Teaching English in the world: Code-switch to teach standard English. *The English Journal*, 94(5), 108-112.
doi:10.2307/3004736

Woolford, E. (1983). Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 14(3), 520-536. Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only, *ELT Journal*, 66(3), 293 -303,
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccr067>

Sanchez, C. (2017, February 23). English Language Learners: How Your State Is Doing.

Section V – Defining Title VI. (2017, February 10). Retrieved from
<https://www.justice.gov/crt/fcs/T6manual5>

Shay, O. (2015). *To switch or not to switch: Code-switching in a multilingual country* doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.253>

SLIFE. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/el/slif/>

S.O.S. Ncoko, R. Osman & K. Cockcroft (2000). Code Switching Among Multilingual Learners in Primary Schools in South Africa: An Exploratory Study, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 3:4, 225-241, DOI: 10.1080/13670050008667709

Strupeck, R. Anne, "Code switching in an ESL classroom: a case study with four Hmong middle school students" (2006). *School of Education Student Capstone Theses and Dissertations*. 331. <https://digitalcommos.hamline>.

edu/hse_all/33

Zong, J., Zong, J. B., Batalova, J., & Burrows, M. (2019, April 15). Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States. retrieved from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-Requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-state>