

**THAI - ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING OF STUDENTS IN
THE MINI ENGLISH PROGRAM (MEP)**

Unchalee Chaiwichian

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in English Language Studies**

Suranaree University of Technology

Academic Year 2007

การสลับภาษาระหว่างภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษโดยนักเรียนที่ศึกษาในหลักสูตร
การเรียนการสอนแบบสองภาษา

นางสาวอัญชลี ชัยวิเชียร

วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาศิลปศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต
สาขาภาษาอังกฤษศึกษา
มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีสุรนารี
ปีการศึกษา 2550

**THAI - ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING OF STUDENTS IN
THE MINI ENGLISH PROGRAM (MEP)**

Suranaree University of Technology has approved this thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's Degree.

Thesis Examining Committee

(Dr. Sarit Srikhao)

Chair Person

(Asst. Prof. Dr. Anchalee Wannaruk)

Member (Thesis Advisor)

(Dr. Sanooch Segkhoonthod Nathalang)

Member

(Dr. Jitpanat Suwanthep)

Member

(Assoc. Prof. Dr. Saowanee Rattanaphani) (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Prapawadee Suebsonthi)

Vice Rector for Academic Affairs

Dean of Institute of Social Technology

อัญชลี ชัยวิเชียร : การสลับภาษาระหว่างภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษ
โดยนักเรียนที่ศึกษาในหลักสูตรการเรียนการสอนแบบสองภาษา (THAI –
ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING OF STUDENTS IN THE MINI
ENGLISH PROGRAM (MEP)) อาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาวิทยานิพนธ์ :
ผู้ช่วยศาสตราจารย์ ดร. อัญชลี วรรณรักษ์, 117 หน้า.

การวิจัยนี้ จัดทำขึ้น โดยมีจุดประสงค์เพื่อสืบค้นปรากฏการณ์การสลับภาษาระหว่าง
ภาษาไทยและภาษาอังกฤษ ของนักเรียนที่ศึกษาในหลักสูตรการเรียนการสอนแบบสองภาษา
(Mini English Program – MEP) ซึ่งในโครงการนี้มีการเรียนการสอนเป็นภาษาอังกฤษใน
รายวิชาคณิตศาสตร์ ภาษาอังกฤษ และ วิทยาศาสตร์ การวิจัยนี้มีการเก็บข้อมูล 2 ช่วงเวลา ข้อมูล
แรกเก็บเมื่อนักเรียนเข้าเรียนในหลักสูตรดังกล่าวได้ 1 ปีครึ่ง และข้อมูลที่สองเก็บหลังจากข้อมูล
แรกถัดมาอีก 2 ปี จากนักเรียนชายจำนวน 3 คน และ นักเรียนหญิงจำนวน 3 คน

ผลการวิจัยพบว่า ความถี่ของการสลับเปลี่ยนภาษาพบมากขึ้นเมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับข้อมูลชุด
แรก ซึ่งนั่นแสดงให้เห็นว่า นักเรียนมีการสลับเปลี่ยนภาษาจากภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษมากขึ้นทั้ง
ที่เกิดขึ้นภายในและภายนอกห้องเรียน อย่างไรก็ตาม ความถี่ของการสลับเปลี่ยนภาษาที่พบภายใน
ห้องเรียนโดยรวมแล้วมีจำนวนลดลง ผลการวิจัยแสดงให้เห็นว่า ความถี่ในการสลับเปลี่ยนภาษาจาก
ภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทยที่พบภายในห้องเรียนมีจำนวนลดลงถึง 50 เปอร์เซ็นต์ เมื่อพิจารณาที่
การสลับเปลี่ยนภาษาในระดับคำและกลุ่มคำ นอกจากนี้ยังพบหน้าที่ของการสลับภาษาถึง 8
คุณลักษณะ ได้แก่ การเน้นย้ำ การร้องขอ การอธิบาย การเรียกความสนใจ การแสดงความ
ขอบคุณ การถาม การขอโทษ และการอุทาน การวิจัยนี้ยังพบปัจจัยอันเป็นเหตุที่ก่อให้เกิดการ
สลับภาษาคือ ความคุ้นชินของคำ วลี หรือ ประโยคสั้นๆ ความไม่ชำนาญในภาษาอังกฤษ หัวข้อ
ของการสนทนาและผู้ร่วมสนทนา

จากการเปรียบเทียบกับการเก็บข้อมูลแรก ในข้อมูลที่สองไม่ปรากฏว่าพบหน้าที่ของการ
สลับภาษาที่แสดงถึงการเรียกความสนใจ แต่ยังคงปรากฏหน้าที่อื่นๆ เช่นเดียวกับข้อมูลแรก อีกทั้ง
ยังไม่พบปัจจัยอันเป็นเหตุที่ก่อให้เกิดการสลับภาษาที่แตกต่างจากข้อมูลแรก

สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ
ปีการศึกษา 2550

ลายมือชื่อนักศึกษา _____
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา _____
ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาร่วม _____

UNCHALEE CHAIWICHIAN : THAI – ENGLISH CODE
SWITCHING OF STUDENTS IN THE MINI ENGLISH
PROGRAM (MEP) THESIS ADVISOR : ASST. PROF.
ANCHALEE WANNARUK, Ph.D., 117 PP.

CODE SWITCHING/MEP/CS FUNCTIONS/CS FACTORS/INSIDE
CLASSROOM/OUTSIDE CLASSROOM

This study aims to investigate Code Switching (CS) phenomenon of students, who attended Mini English Program (MEP), learning Math, English, and Science through the medium of English. Two groups of data were collected. First data were collected when students had studied in this program for one and a half years and the second data were collected two years later. There were three males and three female students participating in this study.

The findings found an increase of CS frequency comparing between the first and the second data. It showed that students switched more from Thai to English both inside and outside the classroom. Noticeably, they switched more English to Thai outside classroom; however, frequency of CS reduced when students were inside the classroom. The results showed that frequency of CS from English to Thai inside the classroom reduced almost 50% at intrasentential level. This study found 8 functions, which were emphasis, request, clarification, calling for attention, gratitude, question shift, apology, and interjection. Moreover, 4 factors; familiarity, limited English ability, topics of the conversation, and interlocutors, motivating CS found from the interview were discussed.

In comparison to the first data, the second data indicated that students did not switch language to call for other attraction whereas all other functions appeared on students' conversation. Furthermore, the study found indifferent factors on the second data.

School of English

Academic Year 2007

Student's Signature _____

Advisor's Signature _____

Co-advisor's Signature _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people who kindly have supported and provided advice during the period I undertook the research study

I wish to express my gratitude to my advisor Assistant Professor Dr. Anchalee Wannaruk through supervision and invaluable suggestions, which made this research possible. I recognize that I could not have completed this research without her expert advice.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Sanooch Segkhoonthod Nathalang and Dr. Jitpanat Suwanthep, who provided invaluable comments on my research.

My thanks especially go to all my subjects, MEP students, and teachers at Benjama Maharaj School in Ubon Ratchaithani. They are lovely and friendly, also willing to give me valuable data in order to conduct this research.

I also would like to acknowledge my special thanks to Mr. Tanongsak Suprom who has helped and encouraged me whenever I felt weak and discouraged.

My gratitude also goes to all those who provided assistance in one way or another. Without them, it would have been difficult to complete this research.

Last, but not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my parents: Mrs. Anong and Mr. Somboon Chaiwichian, the holiest people in my life, who gave me their understanding, sincere support and warmest love until this research was completed.

Unchalee Chaiwichian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| ABSTRACT (THAI)..... | I |
| ABSTRACT (ENGLISH)..... | II |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | IV |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS..... | V |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | X |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Statement of the Problem..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Objectives of the Study..... | 3 |
| 1.3 Research Questions..... | 4 |
| 1.4 Significance of the Study..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Definitions of Key Terms..... | 4 |
| 1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study..... | 5 |
| 1.7 Summary..... | 6 |
| 2 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE..... | 7 |
| 2.1 Definitions of Code Switching..... | 7 |
| 2.2 Code Switching Classifications..... | 8 |
| 2.2.1 Code Switching classified by Blom and Gumperz (1972)..... | 8 |
| 2.2.1.1 Situational Switching..... | 8 |
| 2.2.1.2 Metaphorical Switching..... | 9 |
| 2.2.1.3 Conversational Switching..... | 9 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 2.2.2 Code Switching classified by Hammink (2000)..... | 10 |
| 2.2.2.1 Intrasentential CS..... | 10 |
| 2.2.2.2 Intersentential CS..... | 11 |
| 2.2.3 Inside-classroom and Outside-classroom CS..... | 12 |
| 2.3 CS Functions..... | 12 |
| 2.3.1 Representative or Representation of Speech..... | 13 |
| 2.3.2 Directive..... | 13 |
| 2.3.3 Expressive..... | 13 |
| 2.3.4 Declarations..... | 14 |
| 2.3.5 Interjection..... | 14 |
| 2.3.6 Emphasis..... | 15 |
| 2.3.7 Clarification..... | 15 |
| 2.3.8 Question Shift..... | 17 |
| 2.3.9 Equivalence..... | 17 |
| 2.3.10 Floor-holding..... | 17 |
| 2.3.11 Conflict Control..... | 17 |
| 2.3.12 Calling for Attention or Sense of Humor..... | 18 |
| 2.4 Factors motivating CS..... | 18 |
| 2.4.1 Topic of the Conversation..... | 18 |
| 2.4.2 Interlocutors..... | 22 |
| 2.4.3 Targeted Language Ability | 24 |
| 2.4.4 Familiarity of Words, Phrases, or Sentences..... | 24 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.5 English Loan Words in Thai..... | 25 |
| 2.5.1 Borrowing Words..... | 25 |
| 2.5.2 Words with different Pronunciation..... | 25 |
| 2.5.3 Words Creation..... | 26 |
| 2.5.4 Meaning Change..... | 26 |
| 2.6 Summary..... | 26 |
| 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | 28 |
| 3.1 Phase I: Finding out the CS Phenomenon..... | 28 |
| 3.1.1 Subjects of the Study..... | 29 |
| 3.1.2 Data Collection Procedures..... | 29 |
| 3.1.3 Data Analysis..... | 29 |
| 3.1.3.1 Coding..... | 30 |
| 3.1.3.2 Statistical Procedures..... | 31 |
| 3.1.4 Findings..... | 31 |
| 3.1.4.1 CS Behavior..... | 31 |
| 3.1.4.2 CS Functions..... | 32 |
| 3.1.4.3 Factors Motivating CS..... | 33 |
| 3.2 Phase II: Main Study..... | 33 |
| 3.2.1 Subjects of the Study..... | 34 |
| 3.2.2 Research Instrument..... | 34 |
| 3.2.3 Data Collection Procedures..... | 35 |
| 3.2.4 Data Analysis..... | 36 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | Page |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|
| 3.2.4.1 Coding..... | 36 |
| 3.2.4.2 Categorization..... | 37 |
| 3.2.4.3 Statistical Procedures..... | 43 |
| 3.3 Summary..... | 43 |
| 4 RESULTS..... | 45 |
| 4.1 General Behavior of CS..... | 45 |
| 4.1.1 CS from Thai to English..... | 47 |
| 4.1.1.1 CS Inside the Classroom | 48 |
| 4.1.1.2 CS Outside the Classroom | 52 |
| 4.1.2 CS from English to Thai..... | 56 |
| 4.1.2.1 CS Inside the Classroom | 57 |
| 4.1.2.2 CS Outside the Classroom | 60 |
| 4.2 Functions of CS..... | 62 |
| 4.2.1 Emphases..... | 64 |
| 4.2.2 Requests..... | 65 |
| 4.2.3 Clarifications..... | 65 |
| 4.2.4 Calling for Attention..... | 66 |
| 4.2.5 Expressions of Gratitude..... | 67 |
| 4.2.6 Question Shifts..... | 68 |
| 4.2.7 Apologies..... | 69 |
| 4.2.8 Interjections..... | 69 |
| 4.3 Characteristics of CS Behavior..... | 70 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 4.3.1 General Behavior of CS..... | 70 |
| 4.3.2 CS from Thai to English..... | 72 |
| 4.3.3 CS from English to Thai..... | 73 |
| 4.4 Functions of CS..... | 76 |
| 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION..... | 79 |
| 5.1 CS Behavior..... | 79 |
| 5.2 CS Functions..... | 83 |
| 5.3 Factors Motivating CS..... | 86 |
| 5.3.1 Familiarity of Words, Phrases, and Sentences..... | 86 |
| 5.3.2 Limited English Ability..... | 95 |
| 5.3.3 Topics of Conversation..... | 98 |
| 5.3.4 Interlocutors..... | 100 |
| 5.4 Conclusion..... | 103 |
| 5.5 Implications..... | 104 |
| 5.5.1 Pedagogical Implications..... | 104 |
| 5.5.2 Further Study..... | 105 |
| REFERENCES..... | 106 |
| APPENDICES..... | 112 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE..... | 117 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Tables | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.1 CS frequency of use from Thai to English and from English to Thai | 31 |
| 4.1 Frequency of CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai | 45 |
| 4.2 Frequency Use of Thai to English and English to Thai CS by each student.. | 46 |
| 4.3 Frequency of CS by Location..... | 47 |
| 4.4 CS Frequency of Use from Thai to English by Location and sub-categories according to CS levels of Use..... | 47 |
| 4.5 CS Frequency of Use from English to Thai by Location and sub-categories according to CS levels of Use | 57 |
| 4.6 Frequency CS Functions from Thai to English and from English to Thai..... | 63 |
| 4.7 Comparison of Frequency of CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai..... | 71 |
| 4.8 Comparison of CS Frequency Inside and Outside the Classroom..... | 71 |
| 4.9 Comparison of Frequency of CS from Thai to English..... | 72 |
| 4.10 Comparison of Frequency of CS from English to Thai..... | 73 |
| 4.11 Mean of CS Directions Inside the Classroom for 1 st and 2 nd set of Data..... | 74 |
| 4.12 Mean of CS Directions Outside the Classroom of 1 st and 2 nd set of Data..... | 74 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

English language nowadays plays an important role in Thai education. English is included in the core course in every school and it is taught from kindergarten level until university level. However, most Thai students still have problems with English. Because of these problems, the Ministry of Education has tried to solve this problem by setting up a Mini English Program (MEP), which they have put into the leading schools of each province.

According to the Ministry of Education, the MEP started with the secondary school students in 2003 (An Introduction to Mini English Program, 2003). The Minister of Education then assigned the leading school in each province to follow this curriculum. MEP has been set up in all 4 parts of Thailand since the academic year 2003. It was set up to improve the English language proficiency of Thai students. This program nowadays is used to teach secondary school level students. Either Thai teaches math, Science and English in English language or foreign teachers, however, all other subjects are taught in Thai.

The MEP has 3 main goals. First, this program aims to develop more positive attitudes toward English learning. Second, MEP students can use English appropriately when communicating with people from different cultures. Finally, by

using English, MEP students can solve problems they face in daily life and can develop their logical thinking.

The MEP curriculum follows the regular curriculum of the schools. Books used in Math, Science, and English are written in English and are imported and selected to match the program. Moreover, a school director, teacher advisors, and the representative of the students' parents are members of the MEP board. They are responsible for suggesting, developing, and supporting the program.

Code-switching, which is when students change from one language to another, is interesting to study because Thai is the mother tongue of students, whilst English is a much needed second language used in the classroom. Reyes (1995) states that speech-language pathologists have viewed code switching (CS) to be an indicator for language proficiency.

Most of the research on CS has looked at adult-adult and adult-child interaction. A few studies on peer CS as McClure (1982) have shed some light on how bilingual children use a different language when addressing someone in particular. Code-switching between Thai and English raises issues about language learning. The language switching of MEP students might lead them to either an improvement or an impairment of their ability to communicate in English. The way students switch from Thai to English or from English to Thai might confuse them and lead to problems in their learning of both Thai and English. Reyes, (2001) states that while CS might be an indicator of bilingual ability in adults, it might clarify development of bilingual communication in children, who are still learning a second language.

The use of CS appears to serve as a bridge between the two languages that a person is learning (Brice, 2000). Brice states that CS could enhance second language efficiency. Similarly, Sert (2004) supports the view that the use of CS somehow builds a bridge from known to unknown and may be considered as an important element in language teaching when used efficiently.

Certainly, the study of language alternation has been fruitful over the past several decades. The identification of various constraints, though sometimes controversial, has inspired a great deal of work in syntax, morphology, and phonology. A structural focus has been similarly constructive for a production model or as evidence for a grammatical theory. By ignoring questions of function or meaning though, this structural focus fails to answer basic questions of why switching occurs.

However, CS functions are still the focus of several studies and it is clear that there is a need for considerably more research in this field. Auer (1995) indicates that CS functions need to be examined in order to gain some more clearly defined sociolinguistic explanation.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The present study aims to investigate

- 1.2.1 the CS behavior of speakers who switch from both Thai to English and English to Thai and,
- 1.2.2 the nature of CS at the intrasentential and intersentential level of both Thai to English and English to Thai and,

1.2.3 and the functions, which account for CS behavior

1.3 Research Questions

The present research is specifically designed to answer the following questions:

- 1.3.1 What are the characteristics of code switching behavior among MEP students in terms of direction and discourse unit sizes?
- 1.3.2 What functions does code switching behavior perform?
- 1.3.3 How does the code switching behavior of students change after three and a half years in a Mini English Program?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study will lead scholars to a better understanding of CS behavior between Thai and English MEP students and will provide useful information about CS for teachers and educational authorities which will be of value for the development of the English language proficiency of students. This study will help other researchers to conduct further studies concerning CS research. Moreover, bilingual education researchers may benefit from this sort of research because this study shows how bilingual students talk in the classroom when they react with each other.

1.5 Definitions of Key Terms

“Code switching” is defined as the use of two languages, which implies some degree of competence in the two languages, even if bilingual fluency is not yet stable

(Duran, 1994). CS typically means changing back and forth between two languages in conversation. In this study, code switching refers to switching between English and Thai and Thai and English.

The “MEP students” used in this study are 3 male and 3 female students who are studying in Mattayom 2/17 at Benchama Maharaj School in Ubon Ratchatani.

“Directions” in this study means switching from Thai to English and English to Thai.

“Discourse unit sizes” means levels of code switching which Hammink (2000) divides at intrasentential level and at intersentential level and the code switching settings are inside-classroom CS and outside-classroom CS.

“Intrasentential CS” is switching which occurs at the word and phrase level.

“Intersentential CS” is switching which occurs at the sentence level.

“CS functions” are language functions, which occur during a conversation

“CS factors” are factors influencing CS

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

1.6.1 The researcher conducted this study with 6 MEP students at Benchama Maharaj School, Ubon Ratchatani province, so the CS phenomenon occurs within this group of subjects.

1.6.2 The CS here means only switching between Thai and English and English and Thai at both intersentential and intrasentential levels and this study will collect data from both inside and outside the classroom and it does not consider other settings.

1.6.3 The findings from this research study of CS may help explain the CS phenomenon of these subjects. The functions and causes found in this study describe the CS behavior of these subjects when they studied in MEP for one and a half years and three and a half years after they studied in MEP.

1.7 Summary

In conclusion, this chapter presents a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study and the research questions for the CS of a small group of MEP students between Thai and English and English and Thai. This chapter also presents the definitions of key terms to define the research variables. The scope and limitations of the study are explained as well as the research implications in the last part of the chapter.

To achieve the objectives of the research, the researcher first reviewed the related literature and previous studies that are in the next chapter in order to provide the necessary background to this research study of CS.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature concerning CS. It begins with the background to the Mini English Program (MEP) at Benchama Maharaj School, Ubon Ratchatani province, including its objectives, goals, and curriculum. Definitions of CS given by different researchers will be presented as well as various classifications of CS. This chapter concludes with the review of CS related studies conducted by both Thai and foreign researchers.

2.1 Definitions of Code Switching

Different linguists define CS as follows:

Bloom and Gumperz (1972) stated that CS is the alternating use of the two or more codes in the same conversational situation. Moreover, CS is defined as the changing back and forth between two language varieties, especially in a single conversation (Trask, 1995).

Additionally, Poplack (2000) defined CS as the mixing by bilinguals (or multilinguals) of two or more languages in discourse. Furthermore, Valdes and Fallis as cited in Duran (1994), said that CS is “the use of two languages, which implies some degree of competence in the two languages even if bilingual fluency is not yet stable”.

In brief, CS is the situation in which speakers switch between two or more languages in conversation within the same context.

2.2 Code Switching Classifications

In the field of CS study, many linguists have examined the different characteristics found in CS

2.2.1 Code Switching as classified by Bloom and Gumperz (1972)

Bloom and Gumperz (1972) were the first linguists to introduce the concepts of setting, situation, and events taken as stages recognized in the enactment of personal strategies to analyze the meaning of choice between the two varieties as, for example, situational switching and metaphorical switching.

2.2.1.1 Situational Switching

In terms of situational switching, each point of switching corresponds to a change in the situation. In other words, one speaker may speak a different language depending on the situation, but the language spoken in that particular situation does not vary. In this situation, many features relating to social factors are involved in determining which language is to be used. So the notion of situational switching assumes a direct relationship between language and social situation in which such changes are defined by the rights and obligations of the participants. (Bloom and Gumperz, 1972)

In brief, situational code switching occurs when the language being used is changed according to the situation in which the interlocutors find themselves. In other

words, the participants speak one language in one situation and another in a different situation.

Davies and Bentahila (1994) studied why people switch languages in terms of situational switching. They pointed out that a speaker might speak one language at home then switch to another language at his or her workplace. In other cases, there may be an overlap between the domains of each language used so that the speaker will use different languages in different settings. It is assumed that the speaker has the psychological or linguistic ability to evaluate the language used in different situations correctly, to make a choice as to style or code, and to realize that choice correctly. Moreover, Spolsky (1998) stated that the situation is an important factor determining which dialect or language is to be used.

2.2.1.2 Metaphorical Switching

In metaphorical switching, speakers use two languages at the same time to signal identities and a change of role. The particular topics or subject matter of the conversation mark metaphorical switching. There is more freedom of language choice allowed to the participants and the situation does not have much influence on metaphorical switching (Bloom and Gumperz, 1972). Bloom and Gumperz noticed that the subjects of their study, clerks, used both standard and dialect phrases, depending on whether they were talking about official matters or not.

In brief, metaphorical switching occurs when the speakers code switch to signal identities or a change of relations in the roles of the participants in the conversation. Metaphorical switching is influenced by the topics of the conversation and it is not influenced by the social situation.

2.2.1.3 Conversational Switching

In 1976, Gumperz suggested another kind of CS, which he called “conversational switching”.

Conversational switching is different from the two kinds of code switching mentioned earlier. There is no change in topic, which might lead to metaphorical switching and no change in the situation, which would occur in situational switching. Instead, the two varieties are produced in equal proportions. The speaker may switch within a single sentence, and may even do so many times. One sentence is expressed in one variety and the next sentence in another variety, and so on (Gumperz, 1976). Moreover, Hudson (1980) stated that conversational switching takes place when the varieties are distinct languages.

2.2.2 Code Switching Classified by Hammink (2000)

2.2.2.1 Intrasentential CS

The intrasentential CS is switching at the clause, phrase or word level if no morphophonological adaptation occurs. It is the most complex type of code switching, requiring as it does that the speaker be able to control two linguistics systems simultaneously.

e.g. : Abelardo tiene los *movie tickets*.

(Abelarda has the movie tickets.)

(Hammink, 2000:3)

“It is the most complex type of CS in which the speakers are able to control two linguistic systems simultaneously” (Poplack, 2002). Poplack (2002) had established two constraints on intrasentential CS including constraints of equivalence, word order immediately before and after a switch point must be grammatically

possible in both languages, and free morpheme constraint, no switches are allowed between stem and affix, and few within idiomatic expressions and set phrases. These constraints were derived from Poplack's observation of CS behavior and are descriptive, not prescriptive. She tried to predict points where intrasentential CS might occur. Poplack found that the violations of the equivalence constraint, produced by her respondents, usually involved adjective placement, and were uncommon. Poplack also observed that, while idiomatic expressions are often considered to behave like bound morphemes, a small number of switches within idiomatic expressions occurred in the speech of her respondents.

2.2.2.2 Intersentential CS

The intersentential CS is switching at the sentence level. It may serve to emphasize a point made in the other language, signal a switch in the participants' conversation, indicate to whom the statement is addressed, or provide a direct quote from, or reference to, another conversation. The following examples are from Hammink's (2000) CS research between Spanish (in plain text) and English (in italic text)

e.g. : Y luego me dijo '*don't worry about it.*'

(And then he told me 'don't worry about it.')

La dije gue no quería comprar el carro. *He got really mad.*

(I told him I didn't want to buy the car. He got really mad.)

(Hammink, 2000:2)

Don (2003) found that CS switching was mostly made up of intersentential CS. He conducted research about language-dialect CS (specifically Standard Malay/Kelantanese Malay CS). The study attempted to present the main findings of an

analysis of CS carried out at the University of Malaya among Kelantanese Malay undergraduates who were 20 to 25 years old. The data came from recordings of spontaneous conversations collected over a period of 3 months, and interviews conducted with the informants. The results revealed that the majority of his subjects code switched intersententially. CS within a single turn of talk is a common characteristic activity of this group of subjects. Most of the CS involved a whole utterance while there were few occurrences of small constituents in utterances.

2.2.3 Inside-classroom and Outside-classroom CS

CS performs differently when it occurs in different settings. Macias and Quintero (1992) found that children are able to speak both languages inside the classroom. The purpose of their study was to describe different aspects of CS in the learning process in a classroom setting with young bilingual children and their parents. The results showed that the children used both languages freely in oral discourse to their teacher and their parents and they also communicated effectively through the use of English and/or Spanish.

Dandee's (2003) study reinforces that of Macias and Quintero (1992). She studied CS between English and Thai and focused on study-days (inside the classroom) and non-study-days (outside the classroom). She investigated the relationship of CS and social factors: interlocutor, location, subject matter, gender, and educational background. The results revealed that CS occurred inside the classroom more than outside the classroom.

2.3 CS Functions

CS is a widespread phenomenon of the fluent speech of many bilinguals so CS nowadays is becoming an interesting topic and many linguists have done a lot of CS research in this area. Each study has its own point of view. Some researchers study CS types and many other researchers focus on CS functions and social factors or causes, which influence CS.

Linguists nowadays are interested in CS functions. CS functions are categorized as directive, expressive, declarations, interjections, emphasis, clarification, question shift, equivalence, floor holding, conflict control, calling for attention or sense of humor, gratitude and apology.

2.3.1 Representative or Representation of Speech

Soon (1987) studied the functions of CS in Malaysia and Singapore. He examined the CS patterns in the speech of immigrant Spanish-speaking children. 10 hours of conversations were audio taped. The children's speech was collected in two contexts: while the children waited for an excerpted science experiment and when they worked together to follow an instruction worksheet. CS serves as 'representative' according to Gumperz (1982) when "a message in one code is repeated in the other code, either literally or in somewhat modified form".

Similarly, Reyes (2004) conducted research about the functions of code switching in schoolchildren's conversations. This study presented data on the functions that occur in Spanish and English according to context. She also presented CS functions as 'representation of speech', which CS employed to represent talk.

2.3.2 Directive

Directive CS is one CS function mentioned by Soon (1987). When someone switches to a more formal code, it implies that he gives his utterances an added ring of power.

2.3.3 Expressive

People switch from one code to another in order to express something. For example, 'Akhir kata Happy New Year. May God bless you' was spoken by a Malay female under graduate student. The use of CS here shows her consideration respectively for her friend and from this the interlocutor can infer her sincerity.

2.3.4 Declarations

Sometimes CS functions as 'declarations'. When declarations occur, it is not surprising that the speakers usually utter them in a 'formal' code as they are intended to be serious and binding.

e.g. A: Well, we're friends. Only time will tell if we can progress into better friends. But I wish you would not be so arrogant and 'xiao qi'.

(Soon, 1987)

It is possible that the switching occurred because the speaker did not know the English equivalent of 'xiao qi' that can be roughly translated as 'narrow-minded'. 'Sensitive' might have been what the speaker wanted.

2.3.5 Interjection

People sometimes switch codes when they utter interjections. Interjections are mentioned by Koziol (2000) who conducted research about code switching between Spanish and English in contemporary American society. Koziol stated that fewer than

5 percent of the utterances of her research could be classified as interjections. Two examples would be:

1 *Dios mio*, it's past your bedtime! (general conversation in English)

Goodness, it's past your bedtime!

2 Hey you, *ése es mi silla!* (general conversation in Spanish)

Hey you, that's my chair!

(Kaziol, 2000)

In both sentences, the speaker has used an interjection in a language that was not being used in the general conversation. This linguistic action served to get the interlocutor's attention. It also highlighted what was to follow the interjection.

2.3.6 Emphasis

CS is used as a function of emphasis for a specific command (Reyes, 2004). Koziol (2000) has similarly points out that code switching can be classified when emphasis is being given to a certain segment of the utterance. The following sentence shows how emphasis can be given by CS to make clear the underlying meaning of the discourse.

e.g. *Los Hispánicos no son importantes para los políticos o para la policía, except in this election.*

(The Hispanics aren't important to the politicians or to the police, except in this election)

(Koziol, 2000)

The emphasis in the code switching utterance above is twofold. The speaker is not only emphasizing his point, but he is emphasizing the fact that the election is an American process and institution that is generally not sympathetic to the Hispanic

community.

Eldridge (1996) has reported a similar function of CS which is called “reiteration” when the message, which has already been transmitted, is reinforced or emphasized, because it was not understood.

2.3.7 Clarification

Both Koziol (2000) and Reyes (2004) mentioned describe the same CS as clarification. Similarly, Chan (2006) names this function “explanation”. With this function, the CS gives more information to clarify an idea or the message of the speaker. In other words, the use of CS here can be attributed to the need for a clarification of the message and occurs when a speaker wants to make clearer what he or she is talking about. Additionally, Reyes (2004) explains that the children in the study used their native language (Spanish), in addition to CS, to negotiate conversational involvement while seeking explanations during the science activity, as exemplified below.

- e.g. A: que es lo que los im::anes hacen al compass *brujula brujula?
(What do magnets do to a compass, compass?)
- B: um...
- A: Compass?
(Compass?)
- B: estas segura?
(Are you sure?)
- A: (you) know
- B: ~um-huh
- A: do you understand one?

- B: can you use it?
- A: entiendes numero uno?
(Do you understand number one?)
- B: huh?
- A: le entiendes?
(Do you get it?)
- B: yeah, it goes north

(Reyes, 2004)

In the above example, two fifth-grade girls are switching back and forth between Spanish and English to check with each other their understanding of one of the questions during the science activity. In this particular example, the children use CS as a clarification function to answer the questions on the worksheet.

2.3.8 Question Shift

Question shift is another function stated by Reyes (2004) in which CS indicates a switch in language when children have a question. For example, let me see *cómo le hiciste?* (let me see how you did it?)

There are three more functions presented by Eldridge (1996), which are Equivalence, Floor-holding, and Conflict Control.

2.3.9 Equivalence

The equivalence function is a defensive mechanism for students because it gives the student the opportunity to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence.

2.3.10 Floor-holding

The next function to be introduced was floor-holding. During a conversation in the target language, the students fill the stopgap with use of their native language. It may be suggested that “this is a mechanism used by the students in order to avoid gaps in communication, which may result from the lack of fluency in the target language” (Eldridge,1996: 305)

2.3.11 Conflict Control

Eldridge (1996) describes conflict control as a function for the potentially conflictive language use of a student, which means the student tends to avoid a misunderstanding or tends to utter words indirectly for specific purposes. The CS is a strategy to transfer the intended meaning indirectly.

2.3.12 Calling for Attention or Sense of Humor

Some researchers call this function Sense of Humor and some describe it as Calling for Attention. People sometimes use metaphorical switching to create a sense of humor or make a joke (Duran, 1994). Barredo (1999) has reported a similar function of CS that conveys humor.

e.g. topic : the speaker’s sister

P : bai bai /o sea/ oronda y lironda!

P : right, right, *I mean, a little butter ball!*

The above example shows that the speaker uses an idiomatic Spanish expression to refer to his sister’s weight. Had he continued using the Basque term “potola” or “fat”, the result of his utterance would have been much stronger and with negative connotations. The idiomatic Spanish expression adds a loving tone to what he is

saying and makes the other participants laugh.

2.4 Factors motivating CS

2.4.1 Topic of the Conversation

Topic shift is an interesting factor that many researchers refer to and investigate. Fishman (1965) as cited in Wei (2000) said that the implication of topical regulation of language choice is that certain topics are somehow handled better in one language than in another in particular multilingual contexts. The very multiplicity of sources of topical regulation suggests that the topic may not be a convenient analytical variable when language choice is considered from the point of view of the social structure and the cultural norms of a multilingual setting. However, topics usually exhibit patterns, which follow those of the major spheres of activity in the society under consideration. Fishman's claim is supported by Reyes (2004) who indicates that topic occurs in CS because of a change of topic in a conversation. The following example is quoted from Reyes (2004).

e.g. We finished all the books..... Thank you *mira mis calzones se me andam cayendo*

(We finished all the books..... Thank you *look at my underwear they are falling.*)

(Reyes, 2004)

The example shows that the speaker switches from English to Spanish when he or she changes the topic of the conversation. Nevertheless, Koziol (2000) indicates that topic shift is a difficult category to determine because although there are general shifts between languages and topic, they are rather gradual and not at all pronounced.

According to Dandee (2003), topics of conversation influence the CS of students. Her research revealed that when students had conversations related to academic topics, they usually used English, but they spoke Thai when discussing general topics. In addition, she stated that CS occurred in conversations on general topics more than in conversations on academic topics.

Barredo, (1999) suggests that bilinguals use CS as a strategy to negotiate the development of the conversation, and therefore, to organize or structure their discourse; this type of switching (i.e. switching in order to structure or organize discourse) can also be seen in the example below, where the speaker introduced or marked new topics for discussion by switching into Spanish.

eg. Topic: should bars have restrooms?

A: fabrika baten / ere / da / *un servicio al publico* // *edo zuen tallerrean da un servicio al publico* / ez du esan nahi komuna euki beharra daukatela jendearentzat!

(A factory is also *a public service* (the speaker is assuming that a bar is also a public service), or even your garage is *a public service*, but it doesn't mean that you should have rest rooms for the people!)

B: *es que un servicio publico* daude gauza asko al servicio del publico

(*But in a public service* you have many things *to serve the public*)

In the above example, the first speaker introduced the idea of what a public service should offer. The interesting fact is that since that moment and whenever they

talk about that specific point, the NP public service is always and only expressed in Spanish (even though it could easily be translated or adapted to Basque). The very same happened whenever either of the speakers wants to add a new point for discussion: the point in question is introduced by an NP in Spanish and this NP is used by both speakers whenever they want to bring it back into the discussion, or as long as they keep talking about it. As a result, a more lingual mono-lingual speaker of Spanish would have an accurate idea of what went on during the discussion by just looking at the code-switched instances.

Furthermore, research by Suraratdecha (2003) also shows that the topic of a conversation was one of the two factors to influence constraints on code-choice. Suraratdecha (2003) studied Thai-English CS by Thai students at the University of Hawaii at Manoa by taking into account Bell's audience design factors (i.e. speakers will accommodate their styles according to their design), speech accommodation theory (a way of accounting for inter-and-intra speaker variations), and other psychosocial factors. The eight subjects of this study were selected and divided into three groups of close friends. Each interview took about one to two hours. After the interview, all instances of shift from Thai to English were transcribed and each informant was asked to complete an open-ended questionnaire. The results stated that CS seemed to be unmarked, or a norm, for Thai people who currently live in a linguistically diverse place: Hawaii, in this case. The fact that some Thai students switch language, but some resist it, also reflects the influence of psychological and social factors, such as their attitude toward CS, the expressiveness of Thai and English, and their perception of self. Moreover, Thai students depend on the speaker's personal history, their audiences, and topics. In the case of Thai students'

use of CS, the conversation topic and its domain are the most influential factors in determining the choice of code.

Similarly, Poplack (2000) agrees that the topic of the conversation is the reason that influences the speaker to switch languages.

However, with a different focus, Nishimura (1995) presents a mixed variety of CS, where switches take place both at intersentential and intrasentential level. Nishimura had personal connections with the Niseis - second generation Japanese - and was able to record 3 in-group interactions including an interview. He had studied a functional analysis of Japanese and English CS in Canadian Niseis in-group speech and found that the Niseis mostly code switch using a mixed variety. The patterns of CS in this study were classified into four categories: first, those which are related to the interactional processes between the speaker and the interlocutor(s); second, those concerning the organization of discourse; third, those which give stylistic effect; and fourth, those whose motivations are not clear. The study showed that the Niseis choose their language(s) according to their interlocutor(s) in their in-group interaction: Japanese or English or both. Within each choice, the Niseis use certain patterns of CS to mark certain functions. Considering the linguistic and interactional characteristics of each choice, the patterns of CS and their functions seem 'natural' in each choice.

2.4.2 Interlocutors

Sridhar (1995) shows in his study that each speaker attempts to speak the interlocutors' native language. Wardhaugh (1998) shares Sridhar's point of view. He states that people switch to the interlocutor's language when they want to show politeness to strangers. Further evidence is provided in Poplack (2000) as she

mentions that the speakers in her study would switch languages if they are concerned about their audience's perception.

When the speakers agree with and comply with the interlocutor's choice of code, it means speakers choose another dialect or language instead of their own to use their interlocutors' language and the speakers agree to that. Spolsky (1998) said that some interlocutors switch language for convenience.

Reyes (2001) found that older children, who have developed bilingual communication competence, were aware of their listener's linguistics abilities, as exemplified in the following conversation of two fifth graders:

e.g.

Alberto: hay *vas mas o menos con el *ingles
 (You're getting English more or less)

Francisco : yo invento *cosas
 (I invent things)

Alberto : *eh?
 ('Huh?')

Francisco : *yo invento *cosasl
 (I invent things)

Alberto : pero *porque buey?
 (but why dude?)

Francisco : asi como el *ingles le *hace...le hace mi * hermana..I.. esta..-
 ta todavia -ta *Chiquita y le hace...lo *hacel
 (like in English, she goes...my sister goes.. I-... she's she's still
 she's small and she goes.... like this')

Francisco : [with a deep Spanish accent] oh tu espeak *espanish.. *no/ no
*inglish..no *comprede

(Oh you speak Spanish no.. no.. English.. you don't understand)

She say oh you speak Spanish no.. no.. you don't understand

(She says oh you speak Spanish ... no.. you don't understand English)

Alberto : oh /good/

In the example, Alberto (bilingual) and Francisco (Spanish dominant) are talking about how Francisco is getting better at speaking English. Alberto refrained from CS and carried out a conversation with Francisco mostly in Spanish. In this example, Reyes also observed one of the two code switches produced by Francisco during their conversation. This example supports the claim that those children who can code switch to accommodate peers during interaction demonstrate higher bilingual communicative skills.

2.4.3 Targeted Language Ability

Sert (2004) studied CS in the ELT classroom that was used either in the teachers' or the students' discourses. The results show students who are unable to express themselves clearly in one language often switch languages to avoid difficulties. Sert believes this to be an important factor that influences speakers to switch languages.

Other researchers have reported the same factor. Skiba (1997) found that the participants switched language due to the lack of language ability in the target language. This is supported by Barredo (1999) who studied CS between Basque and

Spanish. The results indicated that some of the switching was linguistically motivated in the sense that speakers switch into Spanish when they lack a Basque lexical item.

2.4.4 Familiarity of Words, Phrases, or Sentences

Speakers switch into another language because they are more familiar with the lexical items in that particular language than in their native language. Barredo (1999) explains that the speakers switch from Basque to Spanish whenever they are more familiar with words, phrases, or sentences in Spanish. This view is also found in Koziol (2000), whose interview results indicate that the subjects normally switch to the language to which they are most accustomed.

2.5 English Loan Words in Thai

Phanmaetha (1980) refers to 4 types of English loan words used in Thailand as follow:

2.5.1 Borrowing Words

If there are not any Thai words that can be identified with an English word or if Thai words have been coined instead of English words, but they are not widespread, then Thais use English words instead of Thai words, such as credit, film, shirt, chocolate, ice cream, bonus, office, tent, bungalow, term, kilogram, benzene, beer, football, gas, salad, soup, etc. However, some of these words are pronounced slightly differently in Thai.

2.5.2 Words with different Pronunciation

Thais use English words but with a different pronunciation, for example, Thai vowels are used in place of English vowels to make pronunciation easier in order to

pronounce easily.

e.g. “Sign” becomes “sen”, and “File” becomes “fam”.

Thais sometimes reduce English pronunciation.

e.g. “Number” becomes “ber”

“Uniform” becomes “form”

“Air-conditioner” becomes “air”.

2.5.3 Word Creation

Many English words are translated and used in Thai, however, sometimes Thai cannot directly translate the meaning of an English word in Thai, so Bali and Sanskrit words are used in place of English words.

“Restaurant” becomes “Phattakhan”,

“Moral” becomes “Sinlatham”

“Skill” becomes “Thaksa”.

2.5.4 Meaning Change

Meaning is somehow changed to be narrower, wider or totally changed in meaning.

e.g.

“fan, fanatic” originally means a person who likes a sports champion very much, but, Thai now uses “fan” additionally to mean “boy-girlfriend, husband-wife, actor-actress-singer or lover”.

With regard to these four types of English loan words in Thai, the researcher would like to make it clear that the account of CS in this research does not include them.

2.6 Summary

To sum up, code switching is a situation in which a speaker switches from one language into another in a conversation. Many linguists have investigated different categories of CS and analyzed them from different points of view. Bloom and Gumperz (1972) introduced situational switching, metaphorical switching and conversational switching. Hammink (2000) categorized CS as intersentential CS and intrasentential CS. Many related studies included in this study review CS behavior according to the functions of CS in conversation, both inside the classroom and outside the classroom. The last part of the literature review refers to English loan words, which are not included in this study of CS.

The next chapter will explain the research methodology, the background information about the subjects, the procedures used in this study, and how the data was analyzed.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the procedures used to answer the research questions including the research methodology and the findings of two studies, namely the feasibility study and the present study. The research design is explained as well as the subjects and the sampling techniques. Then the data collection methods are presented and the analysis of the data and the statistical procedures are also explained. As a result of the findings from the feasibility study, the appropriate methodology was determined for the present study.

3.1 Phase I: Finding out the CS Phenomenon

With the primary purpose of finding an appropriate methodology for the study, the first phase of the study was conducted with MEP students at Benjama Maharaj School in Ubon Ratchatani to find out about the CS phenomenon as well as to investigate the functions and factors motivating CS.

In this study, the researcher had students record their conversations inside the classroom and outside the classroom. Inside the classroom, students studied English, Math, and Science in English language with three teachers who are Thais with B.As. in English and who have more than ten years' experience in English language teaching. One teacher, who teaches Science, studied in New Zealand for 4 years and a Math teacher is half Thai and half Australian. The researcher selected one out of two

MEP classrooms and asked 4 student volunteers to be the subjects of the pilot study.

3.1.1 Subjects of the Study

This study involved four-second year students of MEP. All the subjects were native speakers of Thai who willingly participated in this study. As regards the students' proficiency levels in English, their teacher considered these students to be intermediate learners.

3.1.2 Data Collection Procedures

The methods used to collect data in this feasibility study were to record students' conversations and then to interview them. In order to avoid unnatural conversation, students were assigned to record their interactions for one hour inside the classroom and another hour outside the classroom. Students were free to speak whenever they were recording themselves. All the recording tapes were transcribed. Each student's transcription was checked and the students confirmed which dialogues they participated in.

Each student was then interviewed about their background in English language, what sort of English they used in their daily lives and the reasons for CS. The interview took approximately twenty minutes to half an hour for each subject.

A rater was used who had obtained a Bachelor of Arts Degree, with a major in English and a Master's Degree from Australia with a major in writing in publishing media. The rater was then trained to understand what the researcher wanted to investigate. The rater and the researcher analyzed and categorized the data concerning CS behavior, CS frequency, CS functions, and CS factors.

3.1.3 Data Analysis

This section explains how the conversations recorded by the subjects were

coded. Also, it describes the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

3.1.3.1 Coding

All the data from the MEP students were coded according to the CS directions and discourse unit sizes classified by Bloom and Gumperz (1972) and Hammink (2000).

As regards English loan words in Thai as already mentioned in chapter 2, the researcher had trained the raters not to include four categories of CS occurrences, such as: borrowed words, words with different pronunciation, new words, words whose meaning had changed. Moreover, code switching used for designating food names, places, and proper names were omitted from the analysis.

The following example shows how the uses of CS were counted in this study.

e.g.

Situation : A student is asking her friend about the homework that the teacher had assigned.

Student : เราต้องแปล article นี่เป็นการบ้านใช่ไหม แล้วต้องแปลที่ paragraph ี่ว่า

(Rao Tong Plae *article* Ni Pen Kanban Chai Mai Laeo Tong Plae Ki *paragraph* Wa)

(We have to translate this article for our homework, don't we? How many paragraphs do we have to translate?)

The above example shows the occurrences of CS from Thai to English which a student used twice by switching to “article” and “paragraph” in a Thai

context, All the rest of the speech is in Thai. The student first spoke in Thai to her friend, then switched to “article” in English. Later, she switched to “paragraph” in English. The researcher therefore counted two occurrences of CS, both examples from Thai to English

3.1.3.3 Statistical Procedures

The data collected from the subjects were analyzed. The researcher then calculated the total number of CS frequencies occurring both outside and inside the classroom by using percentages of use.

3.1.4 Findings

3.1.4.1 CS Behavior

The results show that the researcher and the rater were in agreement at a level of 81.09%. The findings reveal that these subjects of the pilot study switch both from Thai to English and from English to Thai CS. The following table indicates frequencies of use of CS.

Table 3.1

CS frequency of use from Thai to English and from English to Thai

| | CS frequency | Percentages | CS Setting | CS frequency | Percentages |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Thai - English | 93 | 71.5 | Inside the classroom | 34 | 36.6 |
| | | | Outside the classroom | 59 | 63.4 |
| English - Thai | 39 | 29.5 | Inside the classroom | 25 | 64.1 |
| | | | Outside the classroom | 14 | 35.9 |
| Total | 132 | 100 | | 132 | 100 |

This table illustrates that students switch from Thai to English more than from English to Thai with 93 (71.5%) out of 132 times whereas they switch from English to Thai CS 39 times (29.5%). Students added that they are not very good at speaking

English in full sentences; they just use English words in isolation in their daily conversation.

It is clear that there is a difference in CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai inside and outside the classroom. Students mostly switch from Thai to English outside the classroom (63.4%) whereas they switch from English to Thai mostly inside the classroom (64.1%). All four students informed the interviewer that they were not allowed to speak Thai in the classroom. Their teachers spoke to them in English only. However, because they are not good at speaking English yet, they mostly switch from English to Thai when they do not know the English words or phrases they require. Although they are free to speak Thai outside the classroom, they also used some English words when speaking Thai. One student stated that he is more familiar with some English words than with the equivalent Thai words so he chose to insert English words when speaking Thai.

3.1.4.2 CS Functions

The functions found in this pilot study are emphasis, requests and question shifts. The results indicate that students switch languages to emphasize their points. One student informed the interviewer that she was not sure whether her interlocutor would understand her English or not so she decided to make her meaning clear by using the equivalent word in Thai. Another function is requests. All students agreed that if they could not think of English sentences to request something, they would use Thai sentences because then they can communicate easily with everybody and they were able to get what they needed. The last function of CS used in this pilot study is question shifts. Question shifts here means switching which occurs when speakers would like to ask a question and they choose the appropriate language to speak to

their interlocutors. Students stated that they had to switch from Thai to English when they spoke to their teacher.

3.1.4.3 Factors Motivating CS

The findings reveal that when CS occurs, there are some factors, which cause students to switch languages during their conversations.

This pilot study found that students switch languages because of their greater familiarity with certain words, their limited English ability and the topics of their conversations. If students are more familiar with some words in English or in Thai, they will use those words, even though they are speaking another language. Additionally, their English proficiency is also an important reason that influences their language switching. Students stated that when they could not think of English words, they switched to Thai words to keep the conversation going. Therefore, the topic of the conversation could influence students' CS. The results show that students mostly switch from Thai into English when they need words relating to academic topics. For example, they use “article, paragraph, report, project” when talking about their homework in Thai.

All the information found in this initial phase will therefore be used to provide a base line for the main study.

3.2 Phase II: Main Study

This phase aims to answer the research questions of the main study. To achieve the purposes of the present study, the following research methodology was employed.

This study was designed to be both quantitative and qualitative. Its aim is to investigate CS behavior, CS functions, and the causes of CS. This study involves recording conversations on tapes and interviews of MEP students at Benchama Maharaj School in Ubon Ratchatani. Two groups of data were collected in 2 periods of time in order to compare the development in the English language by the students after 2 years. The first group of data was collected when the subjects were studying in Mathayom 2. The second group of data was then collected two years later. It was important to collect two sets of data because the CS behavior of the same subjects might be different after studying in MEP for a long period.

3.2.1 Subjects of the Study

The purposive samplings of non-probability sampling are used for this study. The ten students who participated in the first part of the main study are five males and five females. All subjects must meet the following criteria. Their English proficiency must be only grade A or grade B based on the regular criteria of the school. This is important because the English proficiency level might affect the frequency of use of CS.

The subjects of second part of the main study which was conducted two years after the first part, consists of 6 secondary school students of MEP at Benchama Maharaj School in Ubon Ratchatani. They are three male and three female students . All of the students have to study in the same classroom to learn English, Math, and Science in English.

3.2.2 Research Instruments

The research instruments of this study are recording tapes and interviews. Both sets of data for the two parts of the main study were collected by the same

methods. The researcher had each student record their daily conversation for 24 hours and for another 24 hours for the second set of data. Then, each student was interviewed for twenty minutes to half an hour after one and a half years of MEP and then after three and a half years of MEP.

3.2.3 Data Collection Procedures

Firstly, the researcher let the subjects record their conversation themselves in order to provide natural dialogues, by using a small highly sensitive clip-on microphone, so the tapes are of high quality. Each subject had to record his or her conversations for 4 hours: 2 hours inside the classroom and the rest outside the classroom. All students then had to re-record because they did not speak naturally the first time. One student had to record his first tape 3 times because he addressed the researcher in the previous two tapes.

Secondly, the researcher transcribed the dialogues of all the students. Each recording tape was checked as to whether it met the researcher's requirements and was natural. Furthermore, the researcher asked students to check their transcriptions and to confirm that all the transcriptions were from the dialogues they recorded. Finally, each student was interviewed for approximately twenty minutes to half an hour. All of the students were asked about their family backgrounds, English language backgrounds, and their daily lives. During the interview, the researcher also showed each student's their transcriptions in order to ask the subjects for in-depth information. When the students expressed their opinions during the interviews, this information was used to provide qualitative data for this research study.

Within the same group of subjects, the researcher decided to collect data from a different period of time. The first set of data was collected when the subjects

studied in the MEP for one and a half years. The second set of data were then collected when the subjects had attended this program for three and a half years or, that is to say, two years later.

The data from the recording tapes was divided into CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai. Then, the data was further sub-divided according to whether the recordings were carried out inside or outside the classroom. Additionally, inside-classroom CS and outside-classroom CS were categorized into intrasentential and intersentential levels for which the results were presented in percentages. The functions and factors of CS were then analyzed and presented in percentages. Finally, the interview data was analyzed and collated to be used with reference to the data transcription.

3.2.4 Data Analysis

This section explains how the CD data obtained from the subjects were coded and categorized. Also, it describes the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

3.2.4.1 Coding

Since two groups of data were collected, the data had to be examined to see if they matched the criteria used in this research. The researcher then coded the main components into the relevant categories of CS (i.e. CS settings, CS functions)

In order to confirm that the analysis of the CS recording tapes was reliable an intercoder reliability measure was used. The two people used as raters were, firstly, a rater who was half English and half Thai and, secondly, a native Thai speaker who obtained a Bachelors Degree in Arts with a major in English and a Master's Degree from Australia with a major in writing in media publications. Generally, the intercoder reliability value should be more than 80%. (Wannaruk, 1997) Where there

was disagreement the raters the items were discussed until they reached a consensus.

The percentage of agreement between the researcher and intercoders was 84.18%.

3.2.4.2 Categorization

Based on the CS occurrences found in both sets of data, the examples of CS found in this study were categorized as follows:

1) CS Behavior

In this study, the researcher categorized CS into three main types which were, firstly, from Thai to English or from English to Thai, secondly, according to whether CS occurred inside the classroom or outside the classroom CS, and thirdly, whether the CS occurred at the intrasentential or the intersentential level.

A. From Thai to English and from English to Thai CS means switching languages from Thai (mother tongue) to English (target language) or switching languages from English (target language) to Thai (mother tongue).

B. Inside-classroom and outside-classroom CS means switching, which occurs while speakers are inside or outside the classroom.

C. Intrasentential and intersentential CS means CS found within or between sentences in Thai or in English.

Intrasentential (Thai to English CS)

e.g. พวกเราต้อง summary เรื่องนี้เป็นการบ้านใช่ไหม

(Phuakrao Tong summary Rueang Ni Pen Kanban Chai Mai)

(Do we have to summarize this story for homework?)

Intersentential CS (English to Thai CS)

e.g. I have learnt piano since I was 7 years old. ใช่ไหมคะ

I have learnt piano since I was 7 years old *Chai Mai Kha*

(I have learnt piano since I was 7 years old, haven't I?)

2) CS Functions

A. Emphasis

Emphasis of an idea means whenever students want to emphasize an idea, they might switch to English or Thai to gain the audience's attention. Both Reyes (2004) and Koziol (2000) hold the same point of view, which is that CS can convey added emphasis by changing a sentence from one language into another language.

e.g.

Situation : A student is answering a teacher's question.

Teacher : Why can't she swim?

Student : She has a problem with her shoulders at the top .. umm.. ตรง

หัวไหล่ ค่ะ

She has a problem with her shoulders at the top .. umm..

Trong Hualai Kha.

(She has a problem with the top of her shoulder .. umm .. at the top of her shoulder.)

The above example shows that the student switches from English to Thai to give added emphasis in her answer to her teacher.

B. Request

This function occurs whenever students ask for anything that they would like to do. They might ask for some help or they might want to respond to what another student is saying.

e.g.

Situation : A teacher is teaching Math and one student can not follow his words.

A : One more time. อาจารย์ อีกทีครับ

One more time. *Achan Ik Thi Khrap*

(One more time, Sir. One more time.)

The student switches from Thai to English in order to ask the teacher to repeat his explanation because he could not follow the lesson while he was studying inside the classroom.

C. Clarification

Clarification means switching languages to clarify or amplify the meaning of an utterance, which Reyes (2004) and Koziol (2000) refer to in their research. This occurs, for example, when speakers want to add further information to what they are saying in order to be sure the listener fully understands their meaning.

e.g.

Situation : Students are holding a conversation using directions in English.

A : Turn left at the corner and go straight, you will see the Victory Monument

B : Ahh..

A : ก็ตรงไปแล้วแกก็จะเจออนุสาวรีย์ชัยฯ ไรแล้ว

*Ko Trong Pai Laeo Kae Ko cha Choe Anu Saowa Ri Chai Ngai
Lao.*

(Go straight, and then you will see the Victory Monument.)

Student A thought that Student B might not understand her meaning so she decided to switch to Thai to explain what she had said.

D. Calling for Attention

This study found that students switched languages to gain attention. Sometimes they switched from Thai to English to attract the audience's interest. Choi and Kuipers (2004) stated that their subjects sometimes switched from Hispanic to English to call for each other's attention.

e.g.

Situation : A teacher is teaching about synonyms in English and he gives an example of the word "fix" . One student wants to make a joke so he says to his teacher.

Teacher : If you have to fix, you have to maintain something.

B : Fix and maintenance. I think it is fork.

Teacher : Why fork?

B : Fork ก็ซ่อมไงครับ ซ่อมรถนะ

Fork *Ko Som Ngai Khrap Som Rot Na*

(Fork is to fix such as to fix a car.)

(In Thai the words "fix" and "fork" are homonyms)

All : (laugh)

Student (B) makes a joke in order to gain his friend's and teacher's attention so he switches languages and plays on the Thai homonyms for "fix" and "fork". Because of this switching, everybody laughs at his joke.

E. Question Shift

Speakers sometimes switch languages to ask a question (Reyes, 2004). In this study students switch from Thai to English and from English to Thai to ask their teachers or foreigners for more information.

e.g.

Situation : Students are talking about the Science lesson and have a question.

A : โครโมโซมสองตัวนี้มันต้องรวมกันนะโว้ย

Chromosomes Song Tua Ni Man Tong Ruam Kan Na Woi

(These two chromosomes have to combine together.)

B : เออ .. จริงหรือ

Oe Jing Roe

(Really?)

(Turning to ask his teacher)

Teacher, why can't these chromosomes stand alone?

The students know that they have to speak English to their teacher. Even though they are speaking in Thai, they switch to English to ask their teacher a question.

F. Gratitude

The function of gratitude was found in this study. To my best

knowledge, the researcher was unable to find this function in other research. In this case, CS occurs to show the speakers' gratitude toward their interlocutors. The speakers are sometimes reluctant to express gratitude through their native language so they switch to the other language. The following example is quoted from the findings of this study.

e.g.

situation : The students are talking about homework.

A : สมุดเลขชั้นอยู่ไหนล่ะ แกว่าแกยืมไปไม่ใช่หรอบูม

(Samut Lek Chan Yu Nai La Kae Wa Kae Yuem Pai Mai Chai
Roe Bum)

(Where's my Math book? I think you borrowed it, Bum.)

B : อะ นี่ไง Thank you หลาย

(Ni Ngai *Thank you* Lai)

(Here you are. Thank you so much.)

The example shows that the student switches from Thai to English to show gratitude to her friend for allowing her to borrow her book.

G. Apology

This function is also found in this study and, to my knowledge, no other research mentions this function. The speaker switches languages to apologize his/her interlocutor.

e.g. Situation : Students are chatting

A : แล้วตกลงแกได้เอารองเท้ามาให้ฉันไหมเนี่ย

(Laeo Toklong Kae Dai Ao Rongthao Ma Hai Chan Mai Nia)

(Did you bring your shoes for me?)

B : เอ้อ Sorry ว่าจะ ชำนิลืม

(Oe *Sorry* Wa Chan Luem)

(Uhh.. Sorry, I forgot.)

The above example shows a student apologizing to her friend because she forgot to bring her friend's shoes. She switches from Thai to English to make her apology.

H. Interjection

Both Thai and English interjections are found in this study as shown in the examples below.

e.g.

Situation : A student was studying and interjects Thai words while he is speaking English to his friend.

Student : Do all of this? ปัดติไ้ If I don't do.

Do all of this? *Pat Ti Tho*, and if I don't do it?)

(Do all of this? (*Thai interjection*) and if I don't do it?)

The student interjects his English sentences by switching to Thai.

3.2.4.3 Statistical Procedures

In order to determine the significance of any differences, the frequency data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively as a function of the two sets of data. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS for Windows version 12.0.

3.3 Summary

To sum up, this research is designed with both qualitative and quantitative aspects with 6 students who are 3 males and 3 females in the MEP at Benchama Maharaj School. Using 24-hour recording tapes, each student has to record 2 hours of conversation inside the classroom and 2 hours outside the classroom. Then, the researcher analyzes the CS behavior of both Thai to English and English to Thai CS that are divided into inside the classroom and outside the classroom CS. After that, all the subjects are interviewed in-depth for further information, such as students' academic backgrounds, families, and relationships with their friends, teachers, and parents. Finally, the researcher discusses and collates all the findings, including the functions and factors of CS.

The next chapter will present the results from both periods of this study. They will be presented according to the research questions they answer.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the data from the study of CS from both Thai to English and from English to Thai CS, which takes place inside and outside the classroom. The study also presents the functions of CS for both inside and outside the classroom as well as the factors, which motivate the students to use CS. Moreover, this study shows both similarities and differences between the two sets of data collected at an interval of two and a half years.

Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of CS behavior among MEP students in terms of directions and discourse unit size?

4.1 General Behavior of CS

It was found that MEP students at Benchama Maharaj School code switched from both Thai to English and English to Thai in different proportions and each student code switched differently from the other students. .

Table 4.1

Frequency of CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai

| | CS Frequency | Percentages |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|
| Thai - English | 138 | 56.7 |
| English - Thai | 105 | 43.3 |
| Total | 243 | 100 |

This table shows that the total frequency use of CS of the MEP students is 243 times. Students mostly switched from Thai to English with a frequency use of 138 times (56.7%) during a 24 hour recording of dialogues compared to a frequency use of CS from English to Thai 105 of times (43.3%).

Table 4.2

Frequency Use of Thai to English and English to Thai CS by each student

| Student | Thai - English | English - Thai | Total | Percentages |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|-------|-------------|
| M2 | 47 | 35 | 82 | 33.8 |
| F1 | 31 | 28 | 59 | 24.3 |
| F3 | 28 | 19 | 47 | 19.3 |
| M3 | 14 | 9 | 23 | 9.5 |
| F2 | 10 | 9 | 19 | 7.8 |
| M1 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 5.3 |
| Total | 138 | 105 | 243 | 100 |

F = Female student, M = Male student

This table illustrates the differences of CS frequency use of CS between Thai to English and English to Thai for all students. It was found that the frequency use of Thai to English CS of all students was higher than those of English to Thai CS. M2 had the highest frequency of both Thai to English and English to Thai CS with a total of 82 times (33.8%). By contrast, M1 had the lowest frequency for both with only a total of 13 times (5.3%). F1 had the second highest frequency for both Thai to English (31 times) and English to Thai (28 times) and F1 had the second highest frequency use with 59 (24.3%).

The following table presents the CS from both Thai to English and from English to Thai according to the location.

Table 4.3

Frequency of CS by Location

| CS Location | CS frequency | Percentages |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Inside the classroom | 94 | 38.6 |
| Outside the classroom | 149 | 61.4 |
| Total | 243 | 100 |

Table 4.3 shows that students mostly switch languages outside the classroom with 149 times (61.4%) compared to 38.6 percent of CS inside the classroom. Moreover, the results also show how the CS behavior from Thai to English and from English to Thai is different. These patterns are also analyzed according to whether they occurred inside or outside the classroom.

4.1.1 CS from Thai to English

Most CS is from Thai to English (see table 4.1) in which students use Thai, then switch to English. It was found in this study that CS from Thai to English occurs both inside and outside the classroom. Moreover, CS inside the classroom and outside the classroom was further categorized into intrasentential and intersentential levels.

Table 4.4

CS Frequency of Use from Thai to English by Location with sub-categories according to CS Levels of Use (i.e. intrasentential and intersentential).

| CS Setting | CS Frequency | % | CS Levels | CS Frequency | % |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------|------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Inside-Classroom | 23 | 16.7 | Intrasentential | 17 | 73.9 |
| | | | Intersentential | 6 | 26.1 |
| Outside-Classroom | 115 | 83.3 | Intrasentential | 105 | 91.3 |
| | | | Intersentential | 10 | 8.7 |
| Total | 138 | 100 | | 138 | 100 |

The finding shows that students switch from Thai to English outside the classroom (83.3%) more than inside the classroom (16.7%). Students use English as a target language and then switch to Thai in particular contexts inside the classroom. On the other hand, students use Thai as the basic language outside the classroom and then switch to English in particular contexts. All students show that they are more relaxed outside the classroom so the frequency of use of CS is higher outside the classroom than inside the classroom.

4.1.1.1 CS Inside the Classroom

Students use English as their main language in the classroom. They are required to speak English to both their teachers and their friends. However, students occasionally switch to Thai and sometimes speak Thai more than English in the classroom, so there are in fact two languages used in the classroom.

A. Intrasentential CS

The findings show that CS at the intrasentential level only occurs at word level. The results indicate that students mostly switch from Thai to English in the classroom with 17 out of 23 times (74%) at the intrasentential level. M2 had the highest CS frequency from Thai to English with 7 times which was higher than any other students' CS frequency. F3's and F1's CS were the second highest frequency with switching 3 times. But F2 did not switch from Thai to English at this level in the classroom. The following examples show CS at the intrasentential level, which occurred, inside the classroom.

Example 1

Situation : A teacher is teaching English idioms. One student is bored so he complains to himself.

A : ยังไม่จบอีกบ่มี my way, high way อยู่นั่นแหละ
 (Yang Mai Chop Ik Bo Ni my way, high way Yu Nan Hla)
 (He hasn't finished yet. Still talking ““my way, high way””)

Teacher : Do you understand?

A : Umm, Yes, I understand.

The above example presents an example of switching from Thai to English. It shows that student (A) was complaining about his teacher (B). He spoke in Thai and switched to English by quoting his teacher's words and then switched back to Thai. Finally, he turned to English to answer his teacher's question.

Example 2

Situation : A teacher is assigning homework to his students. One student did not understand properly so he asks his friend.

A : บิว บิว อาจารย์สั่งทำ lesson ไหนนะ
 (Bio Bio Achan Sang Tham lesson Nai Na)
 (Bio Bio, which lesson did the teacher assign us?)

B : อาจารย์สั่ง lesson 4 ข้อ 5 ถึงข้อ 10
 (Achan Sang lesson 4 Kho 5 Thueng Kho 10)
 (The teacher assigned lesson 4, number 5 to number 10)

Student (A) was asking his friend (B) about the homework that the teacher had assigned. He asked the question in Thai using the English word “lesson”. Similarly, his friend answered the question in Thai and he also switched to English “lesson”.

Example 3

Situation : Two female students are talking about looking for gifts to draw in a lottery at the New Year party while a teacher and his friends are discussing the party.

A : เค้าว่าจะไม่ซื้อตุ๊กตาหรอกนะ มัน basic เกินไป แต่ยังไม่รู้เลยว่าน่าจะซื้ออะไร

Khao Wa Cha Mai Sue Tukkata Rok Na Man *basic* Koenpai
Tae Yang Mai Ru Loei Wa Na Cha Sue Arai

(I guess I will not buy dolls. It's too basic but I don't know what I should buy.)

B : นาฬิกา เป็นไง

(Nalika Pen Ngai)

(How about a watch?)

Teacher : Are there any ideas? Wichet, what do you think?

A : วันนี้เราไป shop ที่โรบินสันดีมั้ย

Wanni Rao Pai *shop* Thi Ro Bin San Di Mai

(Shall we go shopping at Robinsons department store today?)

B : Good idea!

Teacher : Good idea of what? Rapepan.

The above example identified that student (A) switched from Thai to English twice by saying “basic” and “shop” when speaking to her friend. She stated that this switching occurs because she was more familiar with those words than the Thai words.

B. Intersentential CS

Intersentential CS in this study is language switching at sentence level. The researcher rarely found switching from Thai to English at this level in the classroom.

Not many instances of CS occurred at the intersentential level. Students switch from Thai to English at sentence level for some particular context. The result indicates that three students (M1, F1, F3) did not switch from Thai to English at all at this level. There were low frequencies of switching for each student, even M2, whose CS frequency is the highest, only switched from Thai to English 3 times at this level and the rest of the students only switched from Thai to English once each. M2 stated that he could not use CS at this level inside the classroom; he just spoke as he normally did. The following example was quoted from F2's CS.

Example 4

Situation : Students are inviting the teacher to join in a lottery game

A : นะคะ อาจารย์ เอาของขวัญมาจับสลากด้วยกัน

(Na Kha Achan Ao Khongkhwan Ma Chap Chalak Duai Kan)

(Please, teacher. Bring a gift for us to draw from the lottery.)

Teacher : O.K. What's the lowest price of the gift?

A : เออ.. เท่าไหร่วะ We have not decided yet. I think one hundred.

พวกเค้าว่าไง

(Oe . . . Thaorai Wa We have not decided yet. I think one hundred. Phuak Kae Wa Ngai)

(Ahh. How much? We have not decided yet. I think one hundred. What do you guys think?)

The student knew that the teacher did not speak Thai to her inside the classroom so she had to switch from Thai to English to answer the teacher's question. She explained later that she had forgotten to ask her teacher in Thai, but she realized her mistake when the teacher responded to her in English so she then switched to English to respond. Interestingly, the student switched from English to Thai to communicate to her friends. This clearly shows that CS is used differently for separate groups of interlocutors.

4.1.1.2 CS Outside the Classroom

As mentioned earlier, students mostly switched from Thai to English outside the classroom more than inside the classroom because Thai is the students' mother tongue and they are not required to speak English outside the classroom. However, students still used CS to English in their communication outside the classroom. Students spoke Thai outside the classroom and sometimes switched to English words or sentences in their conversation.

A. Intrasentential CS

The data from this study indicates that students mostly switched from Thai to English outside the classroom. The results show that students switched from Thai to English outside their classroom 105 out of 115 times (91%) at the intrasentential level. M2 had the highest frequency of CS from Thai to English with 33 times (29%) which was higher than the other students' CS. The CS frequency use of the other students was similar. However, M1 had the lowest frequency of CS at this level with 6 times (5%).

The following examples show CS from Thai to English outside the classroom at intrasentential level.

Example 5

Situation : Two students are talking about homework. One of them has not finished her homework so she decides to copy from her friend.

A : ตาวขอยืมคณิตศาสตร์หน่อย ยังไม่ได้ทำ part นึง เออ. . . เค้าเอาไปลอกนะ

(Tao Khoyuem Khanittasat Noi Yang Mai Dai Tham *part* Nueng E O . . Khao Ao Pai Lok Na)

(Taaw, can I borrow your Math book? I have not done one part. I will copy yours, okay?)

B : อืม แต่ถ้าผิดอย่ามาว่าเค้านะ

(Huem Tae Tha Phit Ya Ma Wa Khao Na)

(Umm, don't blame me if I did it wrong.)

Student (A) was asking to borrow her friend's (B) book. Students (A) spoke in Thai and switched to English "part" and finally thanked her friend (B) in English. (Where is this?)

Another example is from M2's CS.

Example 6

Situation : Students are surfing the internet. One student wants to log on to his friend's e-mail address so he asks for the password.

However, he can not log on to his friend's e-mail address.

A : กิต ทำไมเข้าไม่ได้ล่ะ

(Kit Thammai Khao Mai Dai La)

(Kit, why can't I log on to your mail box?)

B : ก๊อฟเอาไป log on แล้วมั้ง มันมีคนรู้ password เค้าตั้งเยอะ

(Kop Ao Pai log on Laeo Mang Man Mi Khon Ru password
Khao Tang Yoe)

(Golf took it to log on to my mail box, I guess. Lots of people
know my password.)

The dialogue above shows that student (B) was talking to his friend in Thai and switched to English words when he talked about how to log on to his friend's e-mail address.

The following example is quoted from F3's CS when she was discussing a report with her friend.

Example 7

Situation : Students are doing a report in the library. One of them warns her friend to save data on to a diskette.

A : เสร็จแล้ว save เลยไหม

(Set Laeo save Loei Mai)

(Finished, should I save it now?)

B : บุ่มๆๆ save ใ้ disk เตื่อ เตี้ยวๆๆ save ใ้ disk เตื่อ save เลข

(Bum Bum Bum save Sai disk Doe Diao Diao Diao save Sai
disk Doe save Loei)

(Bum Bum Bum, save it on the diskette. Wait wait wait, save it on the diskette.)

Student (B) was telling her friend to save data on to a diskette. Note that she switched from Thai to English when using words related to the computer.

Another example is quoted when students discussed an assignment for an interview.

Example 8

Situation : Three students are discussing what to do for an interview that the teacher had assigned.

A : แล้วแก้วเราควร interview ใครดี

(Laeo Kae Wa Rao Khuan *interview* Khrai Di)

(Who do you think we should interview?)

B : ใครก็ได้ที่ speak English กับเราได้ดี

(Khrai Kodai Thi *speak English* Kap Rao Dai Di)

(Anyone that can speak English to us.)

Students were assigned to interview foreigners. The example showed that student (A) switched to “interview” instead of using the Thai word. Similarly, student (B) switched to “speak English”. Both explained that they sometimes switched to these two utterances in English; however, Thai utterances were still spoken in their daily communication.

B. Intersentential CS

CS from Thai to English at the intersentential level is hardly found in conversations outside the classroom. The findings show that students switch from

Thai to English 10 out of 115 times (8.7%) and that they switch to short expressions such as “I’m sorry” or “Thank you very much”. The following example shows an example of CS use when a student is apologizing to her teacher.

Example 9

Situation : Students and a teacher are going to Pha-Tam National Park. They are waiting for one of the students.

A : เมื่อไหร่ก็มันจะมา
(Muearai Kik Man Cha Ma)
(When will Gig come?)

Teacher : She’s coming. Look!

A : แกมาช้ามากเลยนะ พวกฉันรอแก้ตั้งนานแล้วนะ
(Kae Ma Cha Mak Loei Na Phuak Chan Ro Kae Tang Nan
Lao Na)
(You’re so late! We have waited so long for you.)

B : โทษทีแก ฉันลืมเป๋าดังค์ I’m sorry ค่ะ อาจารย์
(Thot Thi Kae Chan Luem Pao Tang *I’m sorry* Kha Achan)
(Sorry guys, I forgot my purse. I’m sorry, teacher.)

Teacher : Don’t be late next time !

When the student spoke to her friend, she used her mother tongue to answer and to apologize to her friend. Even though she could speak Thai to a teacher while she was not in the class, she then switched to English to apologize to her teacher. She explained that she tried to speak English to the teacher even though she was not in the class.

4.1.2 CS from English to Thai

This study found that CS from English to Thai occurred both inside and outside the classroom. Similar to CS from Thai to English, CS from, English to Thai occurred both inside the classroom and outside the classroom. The data is categorized into intrasentential or intersentential levels.

Table 4.5

Frequency of English to Thai CS categorized by CS Setting & CS Levels

| CS Location | Frequency | % | CS Levels | Frequency | % |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Inside the Classroom | 71 | 67.6 | Intrasentential | 42 | 59.2 |
| | | | Intersentential | 29 | 40.8 |
| Outside the Classroom | 34 | 32.4 | Intrasentential | 3 | 8.8 |
| | | | Intersentential | 31 | 91.2 |
| Total | 105 | 100 | | 105 | 100 |

On the other hand, when students CS from Thai to English, they switched from English to Thai inside the classroom (67.6%) more often than outside the classroom (32.4%). All the students stated that they were required to use English in the classroom. Their teachers spoke English to them and did not respond to students' questions if the students spoke to them in Thai. So the frequency use of CS from English to Thai in the classroom was higher than that for outside the classroom.

4.1.2.1 CS Inside the Classroom

Students mostly switched from English to Thai inside the classroom. This was because students spoke English as the first language in class; however, they sometimes spoke Thai to their friends and teachers.

A. Intrasentential CS

This study found that students switched from English to Thai at the intrasentential level more than at the intersentential level. It was found that all the students switched from English to Thai inside the classroom with a total of 42 times (59.2%) compared to 29 times (40.8%) outside the classroom.

Example 10

Situation : Two students are talking about their friend who did not come to class.

A : I think it's strange that Bell โดดเรียน

(I think it's strange that Bell *Dot Rian*)

(I think it's strange that Bell skips the class.)

B : I think so.

It was clear that student A did not know the phrase “skip the class” so he switched to Thai. Moreover, he felt switch to Thai as he could not think of the English word and he was talking to his friends. If he was speaking to the teacher, he might not have switched to Thai. He might have tried to explain “Doad Rian” in English instead of switching to Thai.

B. Intersentential CS

The results for CS at the intersentential level show that the MEP students use CS from English to Thai CS. The data shows that 5 out of 6 (except for M1) students switched from English to Thai at the intersentential level in the classroom. M2 most frequently switched from English to Thai with 8 times while F2 and M3 switched only once or twice. Moreover, F1 and F3 had the same CS

frequency of use with two times whereas the rest of the students seldom switched from English to Thai at this level in the classroom.

The following examples show CS from English to Thai.

Example 11

Situation : A teacher is teaching Science and one student does not understand his explanation.

A : Teacher, why this chromosome cannot combine to others ละ
 ครับ เอ่อ ทำไมโครโมโซมของแม่ตัวนี้ถึงไม่สามารถรวมกับตัวอื่นได้ละ
 ครับ

(Teacher, why this chromosome cannot combine with others *La Khrap Oe Thammai Khromosom Khong Mae Tua Ni Thueng Mai Samat Ruam Kap Tua Uen Dai La Khrap*)

(Teacher, why can't this chromosome combine with others?
 Umm, why can't this chromosome of the mother combine with
 the others?)

Student (A) could not follow his teacher's explanation so he first asked the teacher in English then repeated his question in Thai in order to make sure he was fully understood.

Example 12

Situation : A teacher is teaching Math and one student is talking to himself.

A : Saving not income. โอ้ย มีปัญหาอยู่เรื่อย ั้ง Saving is ten
 thousand.

(Saving not income. *Oi Mi Panha Yu Rueai Ngan* Saving is ten thousand.)

(It is saving, it is not income. Oh, there usually is a problem. So the saving is ten thousand.)

Student (A) talked to himself first in English then switched to Thai to complain and switched back to English to keep talking about the lesson.

4.1.2.2 CS Outside the Classroom

The results for CS outside the classroom show that students hardly switched from English to Thai outside the classroom, as students were free to speak Thai when they were not in the class. However, students still used English when they communicated in the classroom. Students sometimes spoke English outside the classroom and switched to Thai in their conversation. The following examples show CS from English to Thai outside the classroom at intersentential level.

Example 13

Situation : A student is answering a question from a foreigner.

A : Excuse me. Where is “Tung Kamnamsap” (a park)?

B : Go down this way.

/Then he turns to speak to his mother in Thai/

แล้วก็เลี้ยวขวาไปห้แม่

(Laeoko Liao Khwa Chai Mai Mae)

(Then turn right, is that right, mom?)

/After that, he turns to answer the foreigner’s question/

Turn right and pass two traffic lights.

(Go down this way. Then turn right, is that right, mom? Turn right and pass two traffic lights.)

A : Go down this way and turn right. Okay. Thank you.

B : You're welcome.

Student (B) had to speak English to the foreigner. However, he switched to Thai to ask his mother because he was not sure of the directions and his mother could not understand English. Then he switched back to English to answer the foreigner.

A. Intrasentential CS

The findings show that students hardly switch from English to Thai at the intrasentential level. Almost all of them (5 out of 6) do not switch from English to Thai at this level outside the classroom.

These results show that there were 3 switches from English to Thai at this level outside the classroom and these three switches were by M2.

Example 14

Situation : A student is interviewing a foreigner.

A : Could you tell me that what is your favorite Thai food?

Foreigner : Chicken curry and Tom Yum Kung.

A : Ahh.../pause/ ... มีส้มตำไก่ อ้อ chicken curry and ต้มยำกุ้ง

(Ahh.../pause/ Matsaman Kai O chicken curry and

Tomyam Kung)

Foreigner: (Ahh.../pause/ Chicken curry. Yeah, chicken curry and Tom Yum Kung.)

While the student was interviewing the foreigner, she forgot the meaning of “chicken curry” for a while. Then she switched to Thai to explain its meaning to him. The student later explained that it helped her to remember when she spoke the Thai words out loud.

B. Intersentential CS

Most of the CS from English to Thai occurs at the intersentential level. Students mostly switched from English to Thai at the intersentential level outside the classroom (31 times). M2 and F1 had the highest and the second highest number of switches with 10 and 9 times, respectively. However, M1 did not switch from English to Thai at this level. Other switches by the rest of the students were similar with two switches by F3 and F2) and 3 switches by M3

Example 15

Situation : Students are interviewing foreigners who visit Pha-Tam National Park.

A : Is this your first time visiting here ?

Foreigner 1 : Yeah.

Foreigner 2 : Yeah. Really fascinating

A : อะไรอะ fascinating

(Arai Wa *Fascinating*)

(What? Fascinating?)

B : ก็คล้ายๆสวยงาม มีเสน่ห์นั่นแหละ

(Ko Khlai Khlai Suai-ngam Mi Sane Nan Hae La)

(It's similar to beautiful and charming.)

Student A did not know the meaning of “fascinating” so he switched to Thai to ask the meaning from his friend.

Research Question 2: What functions does code switching behavior perform?

4.2 Functions of CS

The tapes recorded by the students for 24 hours by 6 MEP students at Benchama Maharaj School can be categorized into 8 functions, which are found in CS both from Thai to English and from English to Thai. The 8 functions found are emphases, requests, clarifications, calling for attention, expressions of gratitude, question shifts, apologies, and interjections. It was found that all the, CS functions are found at the intersentential level and none from the intrasentential level.

The following table demonstrates the CS functions that occur when speakers switch from Thai to English and from English to Thai.

Table 4.6

Frequency CS Functions from Thai to English and from English to Thai

| CS Functions | T - E CS frequency | % | E - T CS frequency | % |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|
| Emphases | 3 | 16 | 5 | 11.5 |
| Requests | 3 | 16 | 4 | 9.5 |
| Clarifications | 0 | 0 | 14 | 33 |
| Calling for Attention | 1 | 5 | 4 | 9.5 |
| Expressions of Gratitude | 4 | 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Question shifts | 2 | 10 | 10 | 23 |
| Apologies | 3 | 16 | 1 | 2 |
| Interjections | 3 | 16 | 5 | 11.5 |
| Total | 19 | 100 | 42 | 100 |

The most frequent CS function is expressions of gratitude (21%), which students used to show their gratitude to their friends by switching to English. The results indicate that 16% of the students' CS is used to stress students' ideas or messages toward their interlocutors, to request something from others, to make apologies, and to use interjections. It was found that students did not switch to English to clarify. On the other hand, the most frequent CS function from English to Thai is clarification, which was used 14 times (33%).

After analyzing the data, it was found that students mostly switched from English to Thai to express gratitude to their interlocutors. The results showed that even though students were in the classroom, they usually switched from English to Thai to chat with their friends. The second and third most frequently used switches were clarifications, emphases and expressions of gratitude. Students stated that they have to explain in Thai because they are not good at explaining in English. Moreover, if they explain in English, they are afraid of being misunderstood by their interlocutors.

4.2.1 Emphases

This study found that students switch languages due to the fact that they would like to emphasize their words, sentences, or ideas by switching languages.

For example, students had conversations with their friends and switched to another language for a while and then returned to the first language to stress their idea again.

Example 16

Situation : Two female students go shopping together. They are discussing a skirt, which they will dress up in for a play.

A : ตกลงจะเอาแบบไหน แบบนี้ไหม

(Toklong Cha Ao Baep Nai Baep Ni Mai)

(Which style do you like? This one?)

B : ไม่ใช่มันจะมีแบบนี้น่ารักๆ หรือเอา style ไหนก็ได้ แต่ไม่เอา brand name นะ ของมีชื่อหือมันแพง

(Mai Chai Man Cha Mi Baep Narak æ Rue Ao style Nai Kodai Tae Mai Ao brand name Na Khong Mi Yiho Man Phaeng)

(There are many cute styles but I don't prefer brand name one.

Brand name goods are expensive.)

As the dialogue above shows, student (B) spoke in Thai then switched to English and then switched back to Thai again. It shows that student (B) spoke two languages for the same “brand name”. It shows that she would like to emphasize that the brand name goods are really expensive. So she switched language to stress her idea.

4.2.2 Requests

The examples of CS found in this study showed that the subjects switched from Thai to English or from English to Thai in order to request or ask for something. The following example presents an example of a CS used to request an explanation from the teacher.

Example 17

Situation : A teacher is teaching Math and one student can not follow his words.

A : One more time. อาจารย์ อีกทีครับ
 One more time. Achan Ik Thi Khrap
 (One more time, Sir. One more time.)

Student (A) switched from English to Thai to make a request. He really wanted more explanation or he wanted his teacher to repeat the explanation.

4.2.3 Clarifications

The study found that students sometimes switch languages to try to clarify something. The following example shows a student explaining an English sentence in Thai for his friend.

Example 18

Situation : A student is asking her friend to explain an English sentence.
 (They are in the classroom)

A : What does this sentence mean ?

B : This sentence? Consist of issues to serve the heart. อันนี้น่ะ
 หมายถึงว่า มันจะประกอบด้วย เนื้อเยื่อที่ทำงานให้หัวใจ

(This sentence? Consist of issues to serve the heart. An Ni Na
 Maithueng Wa Man Cha Prakopduai Nueayuea Thi
 Thamngan Hai Huachai)

(This sentence? It consists of issues to serve the heart which means it consists of issues that work for the heart.)

The example above is from M2 or student (B). His friend asked for an explanation about a difficult sentence. Student (B) first spoke in English and then switched to Thai to explain that sentence.

4.2.4 Calling for Attention

This function is used to gain another person's attention. The following example is from M3. He tried to make the other students laugh with a joke.

Example 19

Situation : A teacher is teaching synonyms in English and he gives an example of the word "fix" . One student gets an idea to make a joke so he says to his teacher.

Teacher : If you have to fix, you have to maintain something.

B : Fix and maintenance. I think it is fork.

Teacher : Why fork?

B : Fork ก็ซ่อมไงครับ ซ่อมรถนะ

Fork *Ko Som Ngai Khrap Som Rot Na*

(Fork is to fix, for example, to fix a car.)

(The words "fix" and "fork" are homonyms in Thai

All : (laugh)

Student (B) wanted to attract the attention of his teacher and his friends by switching to Thai to make a joke. It worked.

4.2.5 Expressions of Gratitude

Because of their close relationship, the students feel free to talk to their friends in English when expressing gratitude. This study found that CS is used to express gratitude in English.

Example 20

Student : จริงหรือ Thank you

Ching Roe Thank You

(Really? Thank you.)

Example 21

Student : ทำเสร็จหมดแล้วหรือ เออ Thank You มากๆ

Tham Set Mot Lao Roe Oe Thank You Mak Mak

(Have you finished all of these? Thank you very much.)

These examples illustrate that students say “thank you” in English instead of using Thai to show their gratitude. They add that they usually say “thank you” to their friends because they are close to each other; however, they will not say “thank you” to adults or an unfamiliar person because they know it is not appropriate.

4.2.6 Question Shifts

Many researchers found that CS is used when asking questions. This study also found that the students sometimes switch languages to ask questions. The following example clearly identifies this function.

Example 22

Situation : One student is reading a message on his mobile phone to his friend without answering his friend’s question.

A : I’m getting married next month that there would be a small party.

B : ใคร อะไรนะ

(Khrai Arai Na)

(Who? What is it?)

A : And only few people will be in this party.

- B : อะไรรึนะ
(Arai Na)
(I'm Sorry?)
- A : Don't bring any gift to me.
- B : เดียวก็พูดภาษาอังกฤษคืนเลย
(Diao Ko Phut Phasa Angkrit Khuen Loei)
(Then I will speak English.)
- A : Just bring someone to marry with me.
- B : What? Why?
- A : ไม่เข้าใจเธอ
(Mai Khaochai Roe)
(Don't you get it?)

The above example shows a situation in which student A was reading an English message and ignoring student B's question in Thai. It clearly shows that when her friend did not pay attention to her, she switched to ask that question in English and this caused her friend to respond to her question immediately.

4.2.7 Apologies

This study found that students made apologies in English 3 times, only once switching to Thai (see table 4.6). The following example is quoted from students' chatting.

Example 23

- Students : เอ้อ Sorry ว่าจะ ชื่นลื้ม
(Oe Sorry Wa Chan Luem)

(Uhh.. Sorry, I forgot.)

The student made her apology by switching from Thai to say “Sorry” in English when she found that she forgot something.

4.2.8 Interjections

It is rarely found that students switch from Thai to English to use interjections. The following example is quoted when a student was studying and interjects Thai words while he was speaking English.

Example 24

Student : Do all of this? ปัดติโธ่ If I don't do.

Do all of this? *Pat Ti Tho*, If I will not do them.)

(Do all of this? (*Thai interjection*) If I will not do them.)

M1 and M3 similarly indicated that, if they did not know the English words for an interjection, they decided to switch to Thai.

Research Question 3: How does students' CS behavior change after 3 and a half years in the MEP?

In an attempt to investigate the development of English of the MEP students, the researcher collected data from the same group of participants using the same methodology two years later. Regarding the same research questions, the researcher found similarities and differences for this same group of subjects. The results show that students are more fluent in speaking English both inside the classroom and outside the classroom.

4.3 Characteristics of CS Behavior

It was found that after studying in MEP for two and a half years that students could speak English more fluently when they were inside the classroom and that their CS from both Thai to English and from English to Thai increased in terms of frequency. Interestingly, the frequency of intersentential CS increased when students switched from Thai to English.

4.3.1 General Behavior of CS

The study found some differences and similarities between the two sets of data, which were collected from the same group.

Table 4.7

Comparison of Frequency of CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai

| Directions | 1 | 2 | % of differences |
|-------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Thai - English | 138 | 306 | + 121.74 % |
| English - Thai | 105 | 106 | + 1 % |
| Total | 243 | 412 | + 69.5 % |

Note : 1 = Frequency of CS from first set of data, 2 = Frequency of CS from second set of data

This table clearly indicates that students switched from Thai to English 306 times which is an increase 121.74% in frequency compared to the figure recorded two years previously (243 times). It can be seen that the CS frequency from Thai to English is double that of English to Thai, which proves that students tend to use more English in their conversation than previously. On the other hand, while they are speaking English, they do not often switch to Thai for which the percentage increase for the second set of data is 69.5% compared to first set of data.

The following table shows an increase in frequency CS for both inside and outside the classroom.

Table 4.8

Comparison of CS Frequency Inside and Outside the classroom

| CS Location | 1 | 2 | % of differences |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Inside the classroom | 94 | 153 | + 62.8 % |
| Outside the classroom | 149 | 259 | + 176.5 % |
| Total | 243 | 412 | + 69.5 % |

Note : 1 = Frequency of CS from first set of data, 2 = Frequency of CS from second set of data

The percentage for the frequency of use of CS for both the first set of data and the second set of data are similar to each other which means students are still code switching outside the classroom more than inside the classroom. However, the frequency of use of CS for the second set of data has increased approximately 176.5% in both inside and outside the classroom.

The results show both similarities and differences when the two sets of data are compared. In view of these results, the researcher has decided to focus on CS behavior from Thai to English and from English to Thai both inside and outside the classroom and both at the intrasentential and the intersentential level.

4.3.2 CS from Thai to English

The results of CS from Thai to English are presented in the following table categorized by CS location and CS level.

Table 4.9

Comparison of Frequency of CS from Thai to English

| CS Location | 1 | 2 | CS Levels | 1 | 2 |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|------------------|----------|----------|
| Inside the classroom | 23 | 99 | Intrasentential | 17 | 52 |
| | | | Intersentential | 6 | 47 |
| Outside the classroom | 115 | 207 | Intrasentential | 105 | 113 |
| | | | Intersentential | 10 | 94 |

Note : 1 = Frequency of CS from first set of data, 2 = Frequency of CS from second set of data

The table presents the frequency of CS categorized into locations and levels which clearly indicates that students switch languages outside the classroom much more frequently (207 times compared to 115 times) whereas inside the classroom CS occurs 99 times with a big difference of 23 times. When we consider the CS levels for inside and outside the classroom from the second set of data, the percentages show that there is not a great difference between the intrasentential and intersentential levels which is totally different from the pattern found in the first set of data.

4.3.3 CS from English to Thai

The results of CS from English to Thai are presented in the following table categorized by CS location and CS level.

Table 4.10

Comparison of Frequency of CS from English to Thai

| CS Location | 1 | 2 | CS Levels | 1 | 2 |
|-----------------------|----|----|-----------------|----|----|
| Inside the classroom | 71 | 54 | Intrasentential | 42 | 25 |
| | | | Intersentential | 29 | 29 |
| Outside the classroom | 34 | 52 | Intrasentential | 3 | 33 |
| | | | Intersentential | 31 | 19 |

Note : 1 = Frequency of CS from the first set of data, 2 = Frequency of CS from the second set of data

This table indicates the frequency of CS use from English from English to Thai. It can be seen that, the second set of data indicates the frequency use of CS for inside and outside the classroom are almost the same. The second set of data indicates that students' frequency of use of CS at the intrasentential level inside the classroom was less with switching intrasententially 33 times outside the classroom and 19 times at the intersentential level. The table shows that CS frequency from the second set of data inside the classroom has decreased whereas there is an increase in

frequency of CS outside the classroom. Interestingly, CS outside the classroom at both intrasentential and intersentential levels has increased from 3 to 33 times.

The following table shows the significance of the differences between the 1st and 2nd set of data with regard to the location of the CS for both Thai to English and English to Thai.

Table 4.11

Mean of CS Directions Inside the Classroom for 1st and 2nd set of Data

| CS Directions | CS Location | Mean | N | Std | t | df | Sig (2-tailed) |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------|---|---------|--------|----|----------------|
| Thai to English | Inside 1st data | 3.8333 | 6 | 2.13698 | -4.914 | 5 | 0.004 |
| | Inside 2nd data | 16.5000 | 6 | 7.68765 | | | |
| English to Thai | Inside 1st data | 11.8333 | 6 | 5.03653 | 4.715 | 5 | 0.005 |
| | Inside 2nd data | 9.0000 | 6 | 3.84708 | | | |

The Significant level ($p < 0.005$)

The above table shows, the CS frequency from Thai to English, which occurs inside the classroom of both the 1st and 2nd set of data. It was found that 6 students performed CS frequency for both sets of data at the level of 3.8333 and 16.5000 respectively. The difference between the two of data is significant. (Significant 2-tailed is 0.004)

Similarly, regarding the 1st set of data and the 2nd set of data for CS from English to Thai, it was found that 6 students performed CS frequency at the level of 11.8333 and 9.0000 respectively. The difference between the two sets of data is significant. (Significant 2-tailed is 0.005)

Table 4.12Mean of CS Directions Outside the Classroom for 1st and 2nd set of Data

| CS Directions | CS Location | Mean | N | Std | t | df | Sig (2-tailed) |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------|---|----------|--------|----|----------------|
| Thai to English | Outside 1st set of data | 19.1667 | 6 | 5.63619 | -4.822 | 5 | 0.005 |
| | Outside 2nd set of data | 34.5000 | 6 | 13.18711 | | | |
| English to Thai | Outside 1st set of data | 5.6667 | 6 | 2.73252 | -2.279 | 5 | 0.072 |
| | Outside 2nd set of data | 8.6667 | 6 | 2.83809 | | | |

The Significant level ($p < 0.05$)

The table shows the frequency of CS for 6 students from Thai to English outside the classroom for both sets of data is at the level of 19.1667 and 34.5000 respectively. The difference between the two sets of data is significant. (Significant 2-tailed is 0.005)

By contrast, the difference between the 1st and 2nd set of data from English to Thai outside the classroom is insignificant (Significant 2-tailed is 0.072) in which CS frequency was performed at the level of 5.6667 and 8.6667 respectively.

Obviously, the CS frequencies for both sets of data are different. After two years, students switched from Thai to English at intrasentential level more than they did previously. All of them stated that they also recognized their English words used in daily conversation. Similarly at the intrasentential level students also switched from Thai to English as they did at the intersentential level with increasing numbers.

According to the interviews, M3 and F1 both said that they sometimes remembered sentences, which their teachers spoke to them in the classroom and they used them when they were outside the classroom. This situation is called “prefabricated” which means speakers will remember the patterns of certain sentences and then reproduce them. Moreover, frequency use of CS from English to Thai at

both levels decreased except CS at the intrasentential level outside the classroom. M2 stated that when he spoke English, he sometimes did not know how to say the English words or sentences, so he then switched to Thai. He said he tried to explain the words or sentences in English. The rest stated that if they did not know what to say in English, they would use similar utterances in English to convey a similar meaning. This showed that students had improved their proficiency in English. They knew how to use their limited vocabulary and sentences structures instead of switching to Thai.

4.4 Functions of CS

The functions of CS as they appear in the second set of data are not different from the data collected for the first set of data. Students still switch languages to emphasize their main ideas, to request something, to clarify some information, to show their gratitude and apologize, to make interjections, and to ask questions but the second set of data do not show that they use CS to attract attention.

The results illustrate that students sometimes spoke English when they were talking about inappropriate topics or secret issues. They might not want others to join in their conversations or understand their words so they switch languages as a means of excluding others. The example below shows two female students talking on the telephone and they switched to English when their parents were nearby.

Example 25

Situation : Two female students are speaking on the telephone. One student is in her house with her parents. She is telling her friend about a date with her boyfriend.

- A: วันนี้ต้องอยู่บ้านทั้งวันเพราะเมื่อวานออกไปเที่ยวแล้ว
(Wanni Tong Yu Ban Thang Wan Phro Muea Wan Ok Pai Thiao Laeo)
(I have to stay at home today because yesterday I went out.)
/Student A listened to her friend reply/
- A: ใช่ I went to Nevada with him
Chai I went to Nevada with him
(Yeah, I went to Nevada Cinema with him)
/Student A listened to her friend reply/
- A: Very nice guy, talkative and friendly.
/Student A listened to her friend reply/
- A: อืม ก็หวังว่า He will be the same. เออ แล้วเรื่องโครงงานวิทยาศาสตร์
ต้องเสนออาจารย์พรุ่งนี้ละ
(Uem Ko Wang Wa He will be the same. Oe Laeo Rueang Khrong Ngan Wit Thi Tong Sanoe Achan Phrungni La)
(Umm I hope he will be the same. Ah, what about the Science project that we have to present to the teacher tomorrow?)

Student (A) first spoke Thai with her friend but when she noticed that her parents were listening to her she then switched to English to talk about her date in order to prevent her parents understanding her. She said that she was more comfortable talking in English on this topic. However, she added that she switched to Thai for academic topics because she realized that her parents would be pleased to hear her consulting her friends about academic matters.

According to the interview, students stated many times that they are more comfortable speaking in English in front of their parents because they do not want their parents to hear what they are saying on certain topics. However, M2 stated that sometimes switching from Thai to English could gain more attention from parents because they are suspicious of what their children are talking about.

Additionally, the second set of data shows that students switched languages for two different functions. After two years, students gained greater proficiency in English and they sometimes switched from Thai to English for privacy while talking to their friends. F2 and F3 agreed that they occasionally switched to English if they wanted to exclude their parents or other listeners. Similar to F2 and F3, M1 and M2 explained that when they sometimes talked about inappropriate topics, they chose to use English for greater to keep their privacy.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter the findings of the study will be discussed. First, CS behavior for both sets of data will be discussed and compared. Second, the functions of CS will be presented. Third, the factors motivating the use of CS by the students will be indicated and presented based on the results of both sets of data and discussed on the basis of other researchers' findings. Fourth, all the data will be discussed and conclusions will be presented. Last, the implications of the pedagogical aspects of the study will be pointed out and areas of further study will be introduced.

5.1 CS Behavior

The findings show differences in the use of CS from Thai to English and from English to Thai for the MEP students at Benjama Maharaj School. It is clear that students switch from Thai to English more than from English to Thai. Even though they were studying in the English program at the school and using English in the classroom, they mostly spoke Thai in their daily lives. The results show that students switch languages at both intrasentential and intersentential levels. However, the majority of CS occurs at the intrasentential level, especially from Thai to English. It is assumed that this is because the students had only studied in an English program for one and a half years and there were only three subjects taught in English while the rest were taught in Thai. Therefore, the students' English might not yet be fluent. Students

explained that they still kept speaking Thai outside the classroom even though they had learnt and spoken English while they were studying inside the classroom.

According to the results, the majority of CS occurrences was from Thai to English, most of the students explained that they had learnt English in the classroom and that they found that many English words, phrases or sentences were easier to use and more meaningful than Thai words. A comparison between the first and the second sets of data showed that the students switched from Thai to English more than from English to Thai. They explained that even though their native language was Thai, after they had improved their English, they were more familiar with some English words, phrases, or sentences than with their equivalents in Thai.

On the contrary, many students switched from English to Thai while speaking English. They explained that many Thai words remained more familiar to them and showed Thai characteristics and they could express their emotions and feelings better using these words rather than the English ones.

In comparison with the first set of data, the second set of data showed that the frequency of English to Thai is almost the same. This means when students spoke English after two and a half years on the English program they did not switch to Thai any more frequently than they did at the beginning of the program, although the total number of CS occurrences is almost twice as many. It can be assumed from this that students gained some more in their English proficiency and improved their speaking skills sufficiently to avoid switching to Thai. One student stated that they were taught to avoid speaking Thai by using the “tip of the tongue” technique (which means students have to try to explain unknown words or sentences in English to interlocutors) and she agreed that this technique enhanced her English speaking skills.

It is noticeable that, students' use of CS from Thai to English outside the classroom doubled which means they tend to use English much more in their daily lives and the total number of occurrences of CS from both Thai to English and from English to Thai also more or less doubled. Interestingly, students switched languages at the intersentential level more than two years previously. This is probably because they gained much more in English proficiency during the intervening period so they could also switch more easily at sentence level. Inside the classroom, it can be clearly seen that the frequency CS from Thai to English between the two sets of data are quite different. The first set of data shows that students could switch from Thai to English at the intersentential level only a few times whereas the second set of data shows that the frequency use of CS at this level is almost equal to that of the intrasentential level. It can be assumed from this that the students' English proficiency level is higher because they are able to use English sentences more easily in their daily communication.

Considering the frequency use of the CS levels from both sets of data, there is an increase in frequency of CS from Thai to English at the intrasentential and intersentential level both inside and outside the classroom. (see table 4.9) Interestingly, students explained that they had gained more confidence in speaking English outside the classroom. They were not afraid of making mistakes while speaking to their friends. However, they had to be more careful if they wanted to speak English to others, especially foreigners.

However, the frequency of use of CS from English to Thai at the Intrasentential level for both sets of data inside the classroom remains the same and outside the classroom it is reduced. (see table 4.10) Students informed the researcher

that they had tried to speak English outside the classroom and avoided Thai sentences while speaking English in order to practice their speaking skills; however, by doing this, the CS frequency outside the classroom at Intrasentential level increased. They stated that the more they tried to speak full English sentences, the more they had to switch to Thai words or phrases. Students could not recognize English words many times so, because they wanted to continue the conversation, they decided to switch to Thai and then they switched back to English in order to continue the conversation. They said their English conversation was not interrupted, even though some Thai words were inserted.

Moreover, the topics of the conversations and their interlocutors would also influence students' use of CS, which is the same as for the first set of data. Most of the English words found in the students' conversation are related to academic topics both inside and outside the classroom such as "paragraph, report, article, lesson, summarize, comment, paper, password, etc.". Students use these kinds of words into their conversation when they talk to each other outside the classroom. The second set of data found that not only academic words were spoken in daily conversation, but also some entertainment related words, such as words related to sport and technology. This would indicate that some students learn English words by themselves and then use them in CS in their conversations. Additionally, one student said that she should not switch to Thai while speaking English inside the classroom; however, due to the close relationship between students and teachers, many times she felt free to switch to Thai while studying inside the classroom. Almost all of the students also informed the researcher that most of their interlocutors were Thai and they could not understand English and the students themselves were also Thai so they would prefer to speak

Thai. However, they sometimes realized that they switched from Thai to English many times.

Furthermore, the second set of data showed that some students made exclamations in English that might imply that their English proficiency was higher. Some English interjections found in this study were “Oop!, Aaw!, Shit!, Damn!, Cool!” F1 and M2 said that they were now more accustomed to some English interjections than their equivalents in Thai. They stated that some English interjections were impolite but they could use them because they thought other people did not know the meaning and that interjections were not rude if they were spoken in English. On the other hand, if students use interjections in Thai with the same meaning, they might be blamed. M2 stated that he was quite free to use some English interjections rather than their Thai equivalents.

5.2 CS Functions

The Emphasis function occurs whenever students want to emphasize something. As was found in Rayes (2004), Kozoil (2000), and Eldridge (1996), students switched languages while speaking to their teachers or friends to stress ideas or opinions.

It is rarely found that students switch to apologize to someone, however, 3 such switches were found. One switch was from Thai to English and the other two were from English to Thai

Example 26

Student : ขอโทษครับ Sorry, I'm late.

(Khotot Khrap *Sorry, I'm late.*)

(I am sorry. Sorry, I'm late.)

M2 came to class late so he first apologized in Thai. However, he immediately switched to apologize in English because MEP students have to speak English to their teachers inside the classroom so he repeated his words again in English to his teacher.

The second set of data also suggests that students use CS as a tool to give emphasis to their opinions or sometimes to stress and confirm their words and sentences.

When students want to ask for something such as an answer or an explanation, they sometimes switch words or language to make their request. The request function could possibly occur due to an inability to use the target language. Therefore, some students' CS indicates that they intend to switch to another language to request something from someone. They knew which language should be used to whom and when in order to get the appropriate response from their interlocutors.

The clarification function as mentioned by Koil (2000) and Reyes (2004) sometimes helps to explain some difficult contexts. By switching, the interlocutors might get a better understanding and the conversation will run smoothly. Both sets of data show similar figures for this function. Not many students switch from Thai to English to clarify unclear topics.

Calling for attention is an interesting function found in both sets of data. Students sometimes switch languages to gain attention. This function occurs when the speaker first speaks, for example, in Thai, but nobody is interested in him or her. Then he or she might switch to another language, English, to attract more attention.

Many students might avoid expressing gratitude through words in Thai but some might show gratitude by using another language.

This function somehow is close to “create linguistic solidarity” function stated by Sert (2004) that CS could be used for building intimate interpersonal relationships among members of a bilingual community. Sert also adds that the language shift these people perform reflects their ethnic identity and functions as a bridge that builds solidarity among them, which is also related to the high intimacy level of their relationship.

Question shift is another function in which students switch to another language because they have questions, as stated by Reyes (2004). The following example quoted from a student’s conversation with a foreigner. The student was assigned to interview foreigners in order to write a report.

Example 27 (13)

Situation : A student is answering questions from a foreigner.

A : Excuse me. Where is “Tung Kamnamsap” (a park)?

B : Go down this way.

/Then he turns to speak to his mother in Thai/

แล้วก็เลี้ยวขวาไปไหนแม่

(Laeoko Liao Khwa Chai Mai Mae)

(Then turn right, is that right, mom?)

/After that, he turns to answer the foreigner’s question/

Turn right and pass two traffic lights.

(Go down this way. Then turn right, is that right, mom? Turn right and pass two traffic lights.)

A : Go down this way and turn right. Okay. Thank you.

B : You're welcome.

The above example reveals that student (B) switched to Thai to ask his mother a question then switched back to English for the foreigner. He had to switch to Thai because his mother could not understand English.

Due to an improvement in students' English proficiency, students used CS to keep their privacy within a group and exclude others by switching languages to avoid others' understanding what they were saying. They chose CS to exclude other people and they did not allow other people to understand their conversation. F1 and M2 agreed that switching to English is quite useful when they do not want others to know what they are talking about. This means that there are occasions when students do not want others to know what they are talking about so they exclude them by switching to English.

5.3 Factors Motivating CS

At intrasentential and intersentential levels, both from Thai to English and from English to Thai, the interviews showed that MEP students switched languages for 4 main reasons, which were familiarity with words, phrases, and sentences, limited English ability, topics of the conversation, and interlocutors.

5.3.1 Familiarity of Words, Phrases, and Sentences

Students mostly switched from Thai to English due to familiarity with words, phrases, and sentences used inside the classroom. All students stated that they used these words, phrases, and sentences in their daily communication. As a result of participating in MEP for three and a half years, the students' English proficiency improved, so they learnt more English words, phrases, and sentences.

As stated by Eldridge (1996), speakers like to hold the floor in a conversation so they try to keep it going by using CS. With respect to students' English proficiency after attending 3 and a half years in MEP, students were able to switch from Thai to English or from English to Thai fluently when they found some difficulties with certain English words, phrases, and sentences.

Many students code switch because of their behavior. Many of them switch from Thai to English and from English to Thai because they are more accustomed to words or sentences in English than those in Thai or sometimes they are more accustomed to those in Thai than those in English. F2 indicated that she sometimes forgot English words so she used Thai words instead, but she claimed that it did not mean that she did not know that words. She had just forgotten them for a while.

F1 stated that she usually switches words to English because she is quite familiar with those particular words. At first she could not speak English, but later she improved her English speaking after studying in MEP at Benchama Maharaj School. The English words she switched were usually spoken in the classroom. The following examples are quoted from her switching.

Example 28

Situation : Two students are talking about the Science midterm scores.

A : อย่าไปคิดมากเกินไป
(Ya Pai Khitmak Loei.)
(Don't worry)

B : ไม่เค้าไม่ได้ serious เรื่องนี้แล้ว
(Mai Khao Mai Dai serious Rueang Ni Lao)
(No, I'm not serious about this anymore.)

Example 29

Situation : A group of female students are talking about clothes while they are in the department store.

A : โห ทำไมแพงอย่างนี้ล่ะ
(Ho Thammai Phaeng Yang Ni La)
(Why is it so expensive?)

B : ของ brand name ญี่ปุ่นนะ กระโปรงตัวนี้ก็เป็นพันเลย
(Khong brand name Yipun Na Kra Prong Tua Nueng Ko Pen Phan Loei)
(The Japanese brand name products are expensive. One skirt costs a thousand.)

The examples mentioned are excerpted CS from both Thai to English and from English to Thai. In example 28, F1 or student (B) said she always used “serious” instead of “Chingchang (“serious” in Thai)” because she was more accustomed to “serious” than “Chingchang” in Thai. She sometimes used “brand name” as in example 29. Similarly, F3 or student (B) claimed that she sometimes switched to English words because she was more familiar with them. She stated that

although she liked studying English, she found that it was quite difficult to speak it. Since she had participated in the MEP, her speaking skill had developed.

Example 30

Situation : Two students are talking about a Thai essay. One student is commenting on her friend's essay.

A : อ่านแล้วเป็นไงบ้าง

(An Laeo Pen Ngai Bang)

(What's your opinion after reading?)

B : แต่ก็คิดว่ามันไม่ค่อย smooth เค้าน่าจะดีกว่านะ

(Tae Ko Khit Wa Man Maikhoi smooth Khao Wa An Ni Na Cha Di Kwa Na)

(I think that one is not quite smooth. I think this one might be better.)

F2 or student (B) indicated that she decided to switch to Thai or English because she was accustomed to those words. She stated that she could speak English but she did not like speaking it to her friends. She was afraid that her friends might not understand. She added that she took a two – month summer course in Australia two years ago.

Example 31

Situation : Two students are doing homework together and one of them asks her friend about an assignment from the teacher.

A : จูน อาจารย์ให้แปล paragraph แรก ถึง paragraph สอง ใช่มั้ย

(Chun Achan Hai Plae paragraph Raek Thueng paragraph
Song Chai Pao)

(June, the teacher has assigned us to translate paragraph one to
paragraph two, hasn't she?)

B : ใช่

(Chai)

(Yes.)

Example 32

Situation : Students are talking about a movie.

A : เมื่อวานไปเช่าวีดีโอเรื่องเดอะเลทเทอร์มา romantic สุดๆ

(Muea Wan Pai Chao Di Widi Rueang Doe Let Thoe Ma
romantic Sut Sut)

(Yesterday, I rented a DVD “The Letter”. It is very romantic.)

B : ฉันร้องไห้ทั้งเรื่องเลย เศร้าสุดๆ

(Chan Ronghai Thang Rueang Loei Sao Sut Sut)

(I cried until the end of the movie. It was so sad.)

C : ฉันก็เหมือนแกเลย

(Chan Ko Muean Kae Loei)

(So did I.)

In the above example, a student states that she uses “paragraph” because this word is always used in the classroom so she is quite familiar with it. She said that she normally used it outside the classroom. In addition, she added that she used

“romantic” because she remembered it from the movie and she used it when talking about this kind of movie.

Furthermore, M2 informed the researcher that he usually switches to English words when they are more familiar as shown in the following examples.

Example 33

Student : เย้!! อาจารย์ comment ดี

(Ye !! Achan comment Di)

(Yeah !! A teacher has given good comment.)

Example 34

Student : อาจารย์แห่ละ confuse เรา

(Achan Hae La confuse Rao)

(The teacher made us confused.)

M2 informed the researcher that words such as “comment” and “confuse” in both examples were normal in his conversation. He also stated that Thai words sometimes could not convey the exact meaning of what he wanted to say, so he used English words to make his meaning clearer. He stated that he studied in Grade 7 in New Zealand for a year, however, he had to come back to study in Thailand because of financial problems. He also agreed that there were many English words that he was accustomed to use in his daily conversation. He stated that he was aware of his CS; however, he could not control it. He was of the opinion that CS might help to improve students’ English speaking if students know how to switch correctly in terms of grammar.

Similar to other students' CS, M1 and M3 switched from Thai to English and from English to Thai because of their familiarity with certain words.

Example 35

Student : เตรียม dialogue รียัง เค้ายังไม่เสร็จเลย

(Triam *dialogue* Rue Yang Khao Yang Tham Mai Set Loei)

(Have you prepared the dialogue? I have not finished yet.)

The above example is from M3's CS. Some of the English words he switched in his daily conversation were from the classroom. In the past, he had never studied in English or spoken English all the time in the classroom; however, now he tried to speak English outside the classroom. He was one of the top ten students at his primary school; however, he revealed that studying on the English program was quite difficult for him. He said that he tried to talk to foreigners when they asked him some questions such as directions. He added that he normally uses some English words in the class so he also tries to use them outside the classroom as well. This can be seen in example 35 where the word "dialogue" is mostly spoken in the class but he also uses it outside the classroom.

Example 36

Student : คอมพิวเตอร์ hang นะ click ไม่ไปเลย

(Khom Man *hang* Na *click* Mai Pai Loei)

(A computer hangs. I cannot click the mouse.)

Example 37

Student : บิว แก่เป็น staff สีแดงหรือ

(Bio Kae Pen *staff* Si Daeng Roe)

(Are you a red staff, Bio?)

M1 said that he was more familiar with “hang” and “click” than the equivalent Thai words. Additionally, M1 informed the researcher that at first his English grades at the primary level were not satisfactory; however, his English proficiency had improved after studying in MEP. Interestingly, M2 claimed that CS might be useful in learning English. He suggested that students might first switch at intrasentential level and develops to intersentential switching in order to enhance their English skills but they should not switch languages anymore when then they can speak English well. He said CS sometimes destroys the Thai language.

M1 also stated that he was familiar with the word “staff” and always uses it instead of the Thai word. Actually, his English grades are very good, mostly at “A” level, but he switched language only 13 times.

Moreover, many students switch languages because prefer to use another language in a particular context.

Example 38

Student : Teacher, what do you say “เสถียร” in English?

(Teacher, what do you say " Sathian " in English?)

(Miss, what is the English word for “stable”?)

F3 stated that she switched to the word “Sathian”, which means “stable” in Thai, because she wanted to ask a question.

Similarly to F1, she agreed that she usually switched from Thai to English intentionally.

Example 39

Situation : Two students are talking about a soap opera.

A : ตอนแรกนี่คิดว่านู่นจะเล่นแบบ innocent แต่จริงๆแล้วไม่ใช่

(Tonraek Nuek Wa Nun Cha Len Baep *innocent* Tae Ching
Ching Lao Mai Chai)

(I thought Noon /an actress/ would play an innocent character
but in fact she didn't.)

B: เชื่อว่ามันตั้งใจจะ promote เต๊ะ

(Khao Wa Man Tangchai Cha *promote* De)

(I think she intends to *promote* herself.)

As in the above situation, F1 wanted to use “innocent” because she thought it had a more sarcastic meaning than the equivalent in Thai. Similarly, she felt that the word “promote” was more meaningful. It was also found that this factor motivated students to switch languages in the second set of data.

All students switch languages because of their familiarity with certain words or sentences. M2 gave his opinion that this factor occurs because he thinks that if he is familiar with a particular word whether it is in Thai or English, he will use that word without considering which language he is using. Additionally, F1 informed the researcher that she usually switches from Thai to English words if she is more familiar with those words in English than in Thai words. The rest of the students also have the same opinions and the data supports their explanations.

Example 40

Situation: Female students are discussing a science project for which they are searching for information from the internet.

A: คำว่า this paragraph มันไม่ค่อย relate กับสมมติฐานของเราเลยนะ delete ทิ้งเนอะ

(Khao Wa *this paragraph* Man Maikhoi *relate* Kap Sommottithan Khong Rao Loei Na *delete* Thing Ne)

(I think that this paragraph doesn't relate to our hypothesis. Let's delete it.)

B: Wait! Wait! Hang on. Print ออกมาก่อนดีกว่า

(*Wait! Wait! Hang on. Print* Ok Ma Kon Di Kwa)

(Wait! Wait! Hang on. Better print it out.)

A: OK. Let's see. ตัวมันเล็กนะ ขยายหน่อยสิ

(*OK. Let's see* Tua Man Lek Na Khayai Noi Si)

(OK. Let's see. The letters are small. Make them bigger.)

B: *No problem.*

The students were doing a report together and consulting about information they should use. The switching often occurred while they were talking, which showed that they were quite close to each other and not aware of which language they were using so they could switch easily from one to another.

5.3.2 Limited English Ability

The results of the interviews indicate that some students sometimes switch from English to Thai because they lack knowledge of vocabulary.

Limited vocabulary is an important factor in students' use of English. For example, F1 agreed that limited vocabulary serious problem for her, so she often switched to Thai words if she could not think of the English words, but she added that the teacher usually encouraged her to use English sentences without switching to Thai.

Students were not afraid to switch from English to Thai in the classroom. M2 stated that he usually used Thai with his friends and many times with his teacher. Probably, students were not afraid of switching from English to Thai while they were speaking with the teacher because they realized that their interlocutor could understand what they were trying to communicate. On the contrary, if their teachers were foreigners, students might have to force themselves to speak English and the use of CS from English to Thai would occur less often. From this we can deduce that limited ability in English causes students to use CS.

The following examples show CS from English to Thai in this context.

Example 41

Student : It's a kind of fruits uhh...ชมพู, red color likes apple but smaller.

(It's a kind of fruits, uhh Chomphu, with red color and it looks like an apple but smaller.)

(It's a kind of fruits, uhh rose apple, with red color and it looks like an apple but smaller.)

Example 42

Student : It's new saving, percent ต่างๆ

(It's new saving, percent Tang Tang)

(It's new saving, *each* percent.)

Example 43

Student : Teacher, when do we, when do we เอ๋...ซ้อม ครับ ?

(Sir, when do we, when do we Oe . . Som Khrap?)

(Sir, when do we, when do we *rehearse our performance?*)

F1 also stated that when she could not think of some English words she then switched to Thai words that she was more familiar with. F2 informed the researcher that she could not think of “rose apple” in English so she switched to Thai and tried to explain what she meant in English. F2 also explained that she switched to Thai words many times because she could not think of English words as in example 41.

Reyes (2004) points out that it is a common assumption to explain children's code switching at the result of not knowing the word in one language. This factor is also found in Chan (2006) who studied conversational code-switching and relevance theory. Chan believes that the speaker does not seem to convey inferences by using CS on top of the lexical meaning. They engage in CS because they do not know a term or there is not an appropriate one in the language that is being used.

It was noted that when some students use CS their speech is marked by pauses as shown in examples by “uhh, umm”. Barredo, (1999) also states that some of the switches are linguistically motivated in the sense that speakers switch into one language when they lack a lexical item in another language. This kind of switching is usually, but not always, marked by pauses and hesitations.

Due to a limited ability in expressing themselves, students use CS as a supporting element in communication as in social interaction; therefore it serves for

communicative purposes in the way that it is used as a tool for transference of meaning (Skiba, 1997). Sert (2004) findings support the idea that students switch languages in order to avoid gaps in communication, which may result from a lack of fluency in the target language. However, Eldridge (1996) stated that CS gives students an opportunity to continue communication by avoiding the gaps that may result from a lack of fluency in the target language. Moreover, CS could build a bridge from unknown to known and might be considered as an important element in language learning.

The first set of data showed that students' limited English ability was like a wall, which prevented them from speaking English fluently. At that time, students had studied in this program for one and a half years, so they had not gained much proficiency in English. However, they had now been studying on this program for three and a half years, so their English proficiency had improved as can be seen by the reduction in the frequencies of CS from English to Thai words. This could indicate that the reduction of switching from English to Thai is an indicator of English proficiency.

5.3.3 Topics of Conversation

This study clearly shows that CS by students also depends on the topics they are talking about in their conversations.

Example 44

Situation : A teacher and students are discussing a play rehearsal but they can not decide on a particular time.. One student is hungry so he interrupts the discussion.

A : I think we should talk later. หิวข้าวแล้วครับอาจารย์

(I think we should talk later, *Hio Khao Laeo Khrap Achan*)

(I think we should talk later, I am hungry now, Sir.)

The example is from M2 or student (A). The situation is that the teacher and the students are discussing a suitable time for their play rehearsal. After half an hour, M2 decided to end the discussion because he was hungry. He used English to end the discussion and switched to Thai to end the conversation.

Example 45

Situation : Two students are talking about a teacher's assignment. One of them has not done his homework so he is worried.

A : ยังไม่ได้อ่าน article นี้เลย อาจารย์ว่าจะถามด้วย อ่านยังป๊อก article นี้

(Yang Mai Dai An *article* Ni Loei Achan Wa Cha Tham Duai
An Yang Pok *article* Ni)

(I haven't read this *article* yet. The teacher is going to ask some questions about it. Have you read it, Pok?)

Student (A) is worried about the teacher's assignment. He asked his friend whether he had done it. He stated that he used "article" when he talked about some reading passages in the book. Additionally, he stated that if he and his friend were talking about articles, it meant they were talking about a lesson or some academic matters because this word "article" is usually used during the lesson.

The following example shows that the students did not want other people to understand them, so they decided to switch to English.

Example 46

Situation: A male student is talking with his friend about a girl who he has fallen in love with. They are talking in an ice-cream shop.

A: แล้วน้องพลอยเค้าว่าไงตอนเอาของขวัญไปให้

(Laeo Nong Phloi Khao Wa Ngai Ton Ao Khongkhwan Pai Hai)

(What was her reaction after receiving your gift?)

B: เฮ้ย เบาๆหน่อยเกิดมีคนรู้จักน้องเค้าในร้าน

(Hoei Bao æ Noi Koet Mi Khon Ruchak Nong Khao Nai Ran)

(Hey. Keep quiet. There's someone here who might know her in this shop.)

A: OK. What's her reaction?

B: Just smile and said thank you.

A: สัญญาณดีนี่หว่า

(Sanyan Di Ni Wa)

(Sounds good!)

B: ก็ยังดี

(Ko Yang Di)

(Not so bad)

Two boys were chatting about a girl that one has fallen in love with but they are aware that they might be overheard, so they decided to switch to English.

It was found that some topics of conversation were handled better in one language than in the other, particularly in multilingual contexts (Fishman (1965), as

cited in Wei, 2000). Such topics could influence students to switch both from Thai to English and from English to Thai.

The first and second sets of data show the same results, namely, that students chose a particular language when they had considered the topic of the conversation. Additionally, the second set of data demonstrates that students sometimes switch from Thai to English to prevent other people understanding what they are saying.

5.3.4 Interlocutors

Interlocutors are one of the main factors in CS that influence students to switch languages. This was found in both sets of data. Students mostly respond to the language used by their interlocutors. The frequency use of CS influenced by interlocutors is increased particularly from Thai to English outside the classroom. This could indicate that students were less self-conscious outside the classroom when using their English.

The results show that the interlocutor is one of the important causes of CS. Students sometimes switch from Thai to English or from English to Thai depending on who their interlocutors are.

Example 47

Situation : A teacher is teaching Math and asking his students' questions.

Teacher : Okay, and your increased income, how much?

B : Two hundreds and forty nine dollars.

Teacher : Two hundreds and forty nine dollars?

B : ฮี ขาด

(Hue Khat)

(It loses.)

/Student (B) thinks and talks to himself./

Teacher: ขาดไหม

(Khat Mai)

(Does it lose?)

B : ขาดไปหนึ่งตัวครับ

(Khat Pai Nueng Tua Khrap)

(One number loses, sir.)

Teacher : If you add your monthly expense, this is your saving. OK?

How much your income increased?

B : Two hundreds and forty nine dollars.

The quoted example is a dialogue that occurred in a Math class between the teacher and a student (B). It clearly shows that when the teacher talks to the student in English, he then responds in English. Similarly, the student spoke in Thai when his teacher changed to speaking in Thai.

Example 48

Situation: Students are meeting about a New Year performance with their teacher.

A: เราน่าจะจัดเป็น quiz show นะ ให้คนดูมีส่วนร่วม

(Rao Wa Na Cha Chat Pen quiz show Na Hai Khon Du Mi Suanruam)

(I think that we should set up a quiz show and let the audience participate with us.)

B: Cool! Good idea. ลองเสนออาจารย์ดูดี
 (*Cool! Good idea* Long Sanoe Achan Du Di)
 (Cool! Good idea. Let's consult the teacher.)

A: เราหรือ Okay. Teacher, what do you think if we set up a quiz
 show?
 (Rao Phut Roe, Okay. Teacher, what do you think if we set up
 a quiz show?)
 (Me? OK. Teacher, what do you think if we set up a quiz
 show?)

Teacher: Quiz show? Good. Give me some details.

The students knew that their teacher wanted them to speak English in the classroom. Even though the student first spoke to his friends in Thai, he then had to speak to his teacher, so he then switched to English immediately to ask for some suggestions from the teacher.

Bloom and Gumperz (1972) mentioned that social events, defined in terms of participants, can affect CS. For example, among groups of men greeting each other in workshops along the fjord, the variety of language used in different social events may change with the same participants in the same setting when the topic shifts.

Similarly, Gumperz, (1958) indicated that the relationship between speakers affects the choice of language variety. Gumperz describes three levels: village dialects, regional dialects, and standard Hindi. The results show that most male residents, especially those who travel considerably, speak both the village and the

regional dialect. The former is used at home and with other local residents; the latter is employed with outsiders.

5.4 Conclusion

This study aims to investigate CS among students who attended MEP. Three female and three male students participated in this study. The researcher collected data from students' conversations both inside and outside the classroom. All subjects recorded their conversations and were later interviewed in order to gain in-depth information. The purpose of the study was to investigate the use of CS by the students at two different periods in order to find differences, which might provide useful information for the teaching and learning of by Thai students.

In order to find out the answers to the research questions, the quantitative data from the students' conversation were analyzed by using SPSS windows version 12.0. The qualitative data from the students' information and opinions were obtained from interviews and these were also used to determine the results.

The findings found an increase in the frequency of use of CS when the first set of data was compared to the second set of data. The findings showed that students switch more from Thai to English in their conversations both inside and outside the classroom. It was particularly noticeable that the students switched more from English to Thai outside the classroom, while the frequency of use of CS inside the classroom was reduced. The results show that the frequency of CS from English to Thai inside the classroom was reduced by 50% at the intrasentential level.

Moreover, this study found 8 functions of CS in students' conversation, which were emphasis, requests, clarifications, calling for attention, expressing gratitude, question shifts, apologies, and interjections. The factors motivating the use of CS in this study were familiarity of words, phrases, or sentences, limited English ability, topics of the conversation and the identity and nationality of the interlocutors.

5.5 Implications

5.5.1 Pedagogical Implications

The results of this study might be useful for both teachers and for further research. In terms of English teaching, teachers might adapt the English curriculum to match their students' behavior. The results found that there was an increasing frequency use of CS from Thai to English outside the classroom; teachers might also provide more outside activities to enable students to practice their English skills in their daily lives. Moreover, appropriate teaching methodologies should be considered in order to enhance students' English proficiency. Furthermore, strict regulations and penalties should be applied inside the classroom. On the other hand, attractive rewards might encourage students to be more interested in their English lessons.

It is most important that teachers should understand and realize that the use of CS acts as a bridge between Thai and English when students begin studying English. However, the teacher should also realize that students' use of CS should occur less often when they have learned more and gained proficiency in English.

5.5.2 Further Studies

Further studies could provide different activities for the students both inside and outside the classroom and the data collected on CS would provide interesting results. Moreover, with the same group of subjects used in this study it would be useful to collect more data on the frequency of use of CS when the students graduate from the MEP program. This would provide useful information, which could be used to enhance the effectiveness of this and other similar programs.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- An Introduction to Mini English Program.** (2003). Ubon Ratchatani : Benchama Maharaj School.
- Auer, P. (1995). Code-switching in conversation : Language, Interaction and Identity (On-line) available : <http://www.udc.es/dep/lx/cac/c-s/pres.html>.
- Azuma, S. and Meier, R. P. (1997). Open class and close class: Sentence-imitation experiments on intrasentential code-switching. **Applied Psycholinguistics**. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Barredo, I. M. (1999). **Pragmatic functions of code-switching among Basque-Spanish bilinguals**. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.
- Blom & Gumperz, J. (1972). **Directions in Sociolinguistics**. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Brice, A. (2000). Code Switching : A Primer for speech-language pathologists (On-line) available : <http://www.asha.ucf.edu/brice.html>.
- Chan, B. H. (2006). Conversational code-switching and relevance theory. **Paper presented at the 9th Conference of International Pragmatics Association (IPrA9), held at Riva Del Garda, Italy.**
- Choi, J. & Kuipers, J. (2004). Bilingual practices in science classroom : Bilingual Hispanic students' ways of constructing school science. [On line] available : <http://www.gwu.edu/~scale-up/documents/EQRE.pdf>

- Dandee, P. (2003). **Code Switching between Thai and English in Students at International College of Mahidol University**. Master Dissertation, Mahidol University in Bangkok
- Don, Z. M. (2003). Language-dialect CS: Kelantanese in a multilingual context. **Multilingual**. Kuala Lumpur: Walter de Gruyter.
- Davies, E.E. and Bentahila, A. (1994). Patterns of code-switching and patterns of language contact. **Lingua**. 96: 79-93. Morocco : Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah University
- Duran, L. (1994). Toward a Better Understanding of Code Switching and Interlanguage in Bilinguality: Implications for Bilingual Instruction (On-line) available: **<http://www.google.com/search?hl=th&inlang=th&ie=window-874&q=toward+a+better+understanding&btnG>**
- Elgridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. **ELT Journal**. 50 : 303 – 311.
- Fasold, R. (1990). **The Sociolinguistics of Language**. New York: Cambridge, MA: B. Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1965). Who speaks what to whom and when? **Linguistics**. 2 : 67 - 88
- Gumperz, J. (1976). **Discourse strategies**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). **Language and social identity**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson, R. A. (1980). **Sociolinguistics**. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Koziol, J. M. (2000). Code Switching between Spanish and English in Contemporary American Society. (On-line) available : **<http://www.smcm.edu/aldiv/ilc/pdffdocs/koziol.pdf>**.

- Liebscher, G. & Dailey-O’Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. **The Modern Language Journal**. 89 : 234 – 247.
- Macias, A.H. & Quintero, E. (1992). Code-Switching, Bilingualism, and Bilingual Literacy : A Case Study. **Bilingual Research Journal**. 16 : 3 & 4, Summer / Fall 1992
- McClure (1982). Code Switching, Bilingualism, and Bilingual Literacy : A Case study Ana Huerta – Macas. (On-line) available : <http://citesee.ist.psu.edu/451693.html>.
- Myer-Scotton as cited in Wardhaugh (1998)
- Nachmias, F. , Chava and Nachmias, D. (1996). **Sampling Designs Research Methods in the Social Science**. London: Arnold.
- Nilep, C. (2006). “Code Switching” in sociocultural linguistics. **Colorado Research in Linguistics**. 19 : 1 – 22. Boulder : University of Colorado.
- Nishimura, M. (1995). **A Functional analysis of Japanese / English code-switching**. **Journal of Pragmatics**. USA: Elsevier Science B. V.
- Nishimura, M. (1995). A functional analysis of Japanese / English code-switching. **Journal of Pragmatics**. 23 : 157 – 181.
- Phanmaetha, B. (1980). The English Borrowing Words. **Foreign Language in Thai**. Bangkok : Ramkamhaeng University
- Poplack, S. (2000). Code-Switching (linguistic) (On-line) available: [http:// aix1.vottawa. ca/~sociolx/CS. pdf](http://aix1.vottawa.ca/~sociolx/CS.pdf).
- Reyes, B. A. (1995). Considerations in the assessment and treatment of neurogenic disorders in bilingual adults. **Bilingual Speech-Language Pathology**. 1 : 153-182

- Reyes, I. (2000). Code-Switching and borrowing : discourse strategies in developing bilingual children's interactions. **Actas : Proceedings II Simposio Internacional Bilinguismo**. 12 : 319 – 331.
- Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in schoolchildren's conversations. **Bilingual Research Journal**. 28 : 77 – 98.
- Sert, O. (2004). The functions of code-switching in ELT classrooms. (On line) available: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Skiba, R. (1997). Code Switching as a Countenance of Language Interference. **TESL Journal**
- Soon, S.K. (1987). Functions of Code-switching in Malaysia and Singapore. **The English Teacher**. Malaysia : Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
- Spolsky, B. (1998). **Sociolinguistics**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sridhar, S. N. (1995). Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models (On-line). available: www.tc.columbia.edu/tesolalwebjournal/Boztepe.pdf
- Suraratdecha, S. (2003). Social and Psychological factors in Thai student's code-switching. **Manusya: journal of humanities**. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.
- Trask, R. L. (1999). **Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics**. London : Routledge
- Trudgrill, P. (1981). **Sociolinguistics: An Introduction**. Great Britain: Hazell and Viney Ltd.
- Wannaruk, A. (1997). **Black-channel behavior in Thai and American casual telephone conversations**. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.

Wardhaugh, R. (1992). **An Introduction to Sociolinguistics**. USA: B. Blackwell.

Wei, L. (2000). **The Bilingualism Reader**. London : Routledge

Woodard, R. D. (2000). **Historical Linguistics**. Cambridge University Press.

Hammink, J. E. (2000). A Comparison of the Code Switching Behavior and

Knowledge of Adults and Children. (On-line) available :

http://hamminkj.tripod.com/babel/CS_paper.htm

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Interview Guide : English Version

1. How can you attend into this program (MEP)?
2. In your opinion, how is your English proficiency before attending in this program?
3. Which is the most difficult subject taught in English? Why?
4. Have you ever heard about code switching? If yes, please give a brief definition.
If no, the researcher explains code switching definition.
5. Please give some CS words, phrases, or sentences which you speak in your daily conversation.
6. In your opinion, are there any differences between code switching occurred inside and outside classroom?
7. What factor(s) do you think influence you to switch from Thai to English or English to Thai?
8. Please explain why you switch language in this sentence.

Appendix B

The Interview Guide : Thai Version

1. คุณเข้ามาเรียนในหลักสูตร MEP นี้ได้อย่างไร
2. ในความคิดเห็นของคุณความรู้ทางด้านภาษาอังกฤษก่อนเข้ามาเรียนในโปรแกรมนี้เป็นอย่างไร
3. วิชาใดที่เรียนเป็นภาษาอังกฤษแล้วพบว่ายากที่สุด เพราะเหตุใด
4. คุณเคยได้ยินเกี่ยวกับการสับเปลี่ยนภาษามาก่อนหรือไม่ ถ้าเคย กรุณาบอกคำนิยามมาพอสังเขป หากไม่เคย ผู้วิจัยจะอธิบายความหมายของการสับเปลี่ยนภาษา
5. กรุณายกตัวอย่างการสับเปลี่ยนภาษาในระดับคำ กลุ่มคำ หรือระดับประโยคที่คุณพบในชีวิตประจำวัน
6. ในความคิดเห็นของคุณ การสับเปลี่ยนภาษาที่เกิดขึ้นภายในและภายนอกห้องเรียน มีความเหมือนหรือความต่างกันหรือไม่ อย่างไร
7. ปัจจัยใดที่คุณคิดว่าส่งผลต่อการสับเปลี่ยนภาษาจากภาษาไทยเป็นภาษาอังกฤษหรือภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาไทย
8. กรุณาอธิบายว่า เหตุใดคุณจึงสับเปลี่ยนภาษาในประโยคเหล่านั้น

Appendix C

Examples of CS from Students' Conversation

1. พวกเราต้อง summary เรื่องนี้เป็นการบ้านใช่ไหม
(Phuakrao Tong summary Rueang Ni Pen Kanban Chai Mai)
(Do we have to summarize this story as homework?)
2. บิว บิว อาจารย์สั่งทำ lesson ไหนนะ
(Bio Bio Achan Sang Tham lesson Nai Na)
(Bio Bio , which lesson did the teacher assign us?)
3. กอล์ฟเอาไป log on แล้วมั้ง มันมีคนรู้ password เก้าตั้งเยอะ
(Kop Ao Pai log on Laeo Mang Man Mi Khon Ru password Khao Tang Yoe)
(Golf took it to log on my mail box, I guess. Lots of people know my password.)
4. ใครก็ได้ที่ speak English กับเราได้ดิ
(Khrai Kodai Thi speak English Kap Rao Dai Di)
(Anyone that can speak English to us.)
5. โทษทีแถ ฉันลืมเป๋าดังค์ I'm sorry ค่ะ อาจารย์
(Thot Thi Kae Chan Luem Pao Tang I'm sorry Kha Achan)
(Sorry, I forget my purse. *I'm sorry*, teacher.)
6. One more time. อาจารย์ อีกทีครับ
(One more time. Achan Ik Thi Khrap)
(One more time, Sir. *One more time.*)

7. Go down this way. แล้วก็เลี้ยวขวาไปไหนแม่ Turn right and pass two traffic lights.
(Go down this way. Laeo ko Liao Khwa Chai Mai Mae Turn right and pass two traffic lights.)
(Go down this way. Mom, turn right, right? Then turn right and pass two traffic lights.)
8. Teacher, what do you say “เสถียร” in English?
(Teacher, what do you say “Sathian” in English?)
(Madam, what is English word of “stable”?)
9. ไซ้ I went to Nevada with him
(Chai I went to Nevada with him)
(Yeah, I went to Nevada Cinema with him)
10. This sentence? Consist of issues to serve the heart. อันนี้หมายความว่า มันจะประกอบด้วย เนื้อหาที่ทำงานให้หัวใจ
(This sentence? Consist of issues to serve the heart. An Ni Na Maithueng Wa Man Cha Prakopduai Nueayuea Thi Thamngan Hai Huachai)
(This sentence? It is consist of issues to serve the heart which means it is consist of issues that work for the heart.)

CURRICULUM VITAE

Unchalee Chaiwichian was born on July 5, 1979 in Ubon Ratchatani, Thailand. She graduated in English from Chiang Mai University, ChiangMai in 2001. After graduated, she had worked as a teacher at Nakorn Ratchasima Collage teaching English Foundation and Business English. At present, she works as a planning supervisor at Thai Printers and Finishers Co. Ltd. in Nakorn Ratchasima, managing orders' schedule and dealing with foreign customer. Her academic interests include sociolinguistics and English in the workplace. She can be reached at unchalee_chaiwichian@yahoo.com