CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to solve the problems of the research, some theories are really needed as a basic requirement. Therefore, this chapter will discuss some theories of related study.

A. Sociolinguistics

1. The Definition of Sociolinguistics

The term of “Sociolinguistics”, according to Holmes (1990) is the study of the relationship between language and society. They are interested in explaining why we speak differently in different social contexts, and they are concerned with identifying the social meaning.

According to the quotation above, sociolinguistics is a kind of study that concerns the importance of language to the society. It also means that sociolinguistics is concerned with how people use language when they interact in any kinds of situation.

Trudgill in Fasold’s “The Sociolinguistics of Society” (1984) states that sociolinguistics, as the term itself suggests, is a discipline that is capable of combining linguistic and societal concerns in varying degrees. It deals with that lay towards the societal end of the language and society spectrum. Meanwhile, Fishman in Chaer and Leonie (1995 : 4) states that sociolinguistics is the study of the characteristics of language varieties, the characteristics of their functions, and the characteristics of their speakers as these three constantly interact, change and change one another within a speech community. In other words, it can be said that sociolinguistics is the linguistics which is focused more on the correlation between language and its social factors within a society. It is used to search for
general patterns which underlie the relationship between language and society, and some other aspects surrounding the language use.

The study covers social factors which significantly influence the use of language, as well as the situational factors. There are two main factors which influence the language use by speaker. Those are social factors, covering social status, educational level, gender, age, and many more; situational factors, covering the language use, participants, topic, setting, and event.

In short it is clear that sociolinguistics talks about language problems on relation to society, such as who the speakers and hearers are, what group they come from, what type of social relationship of the participants involved in a conversation and so on. By understanding sociolinguistics’ principles, a speaker will realize the importance of the role of language choice in relation to social context. Besides, a speaker will pay attention to grammatical structural rules in using the language.

2. The Scope of Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics covers two main areas, macrosociolinguistics and microsociolinguistics.

a. Macrosociolinguistics

According to Trudgill (1992) the term macrosociolinguistics refers to sociolinguistics areas involving the study of relatively large groups of speakers. It covers secular linguistics and the sociology of language.

Secular linguistics is also known as quantitave sociolinguistics, or correlation sociolinguistics, it works on the assumption that linguistics hypotheses and theories should be based on observation and analysis of vernacular varieties as these are used by ordinary speakers in everyday social contract. (Trudgill, 1992:65).
In macrosociolinguistics, we treat language (and specific language along side other human cultural phenomena (Spolsky, 1998: p.6). It means that macrosociolinguistics focuses on the society rather than the individuals.

b. Microsociolinguistics

Microsociolinguistics is a term used to cover a study of face to face interaction, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and other areas of sociolinguistics involving the study of relatively a small group of speakers (Trudgill, 1992: p.52)

Overall, in microsociolinguistics, the selection among available socially marked variants communication important social information about the speaker and listener and about their relationship to each other (Spolsky, 1998: p.6). It means the microsociolinguistics focuses on the individuals rather than the society.

The scope of this research belongs to microsociolinguistics because the data is the conversation in a small group of speakers. In this case, the speakers are lecturers and students in the classroom area. It focuses on the individual case rather than a large society. This research focuses on the lecturers and the students in the classroom as the speakers.

3. The Subdivision of Sociolinguistics


a. Descriptive Sociolinguistics of Language

Descriptive sociolinguistics of language which is also known as the descriptive sociolinguistics seeks to provide an answer to the question “who speaks (or writes) what language (or what language variety) to whom and to what end” (Fishman, 1972:3). It tries to
displace language usage – the social pattern of language use and of behavior toward language – which are generally accepted and implemented, or particular larger or smaller social network and communities.

According to Fishman the task of descriptive sociology of language is to describe the general or normative pattern of language use. Within a speech network or speech community so as to show systematic nature of the alternation between one variety and another among individuals who share a repertoire of varieties (Giglioli, 1982; p.48). This task is based on the basic insight of this part of disciplines that says that members of social network and communities do not always display either the same language usage or the same behavior toward language. For a better understanding, may be these following examples given Fishman will help.

Government office in Brussles, Belgium, masters two kinds of languages: Dutch and French. However, they do not speak Dutch to each other, even when they all know Dutch very well and equally well. There are some occasions when they speak French to each other instead of Dutch. In addition, there are also some occasions when they speak standard Dutch and other when they use one of another regional variety of Dutch with each other. Indeed, some of them also use different varieties of French with each other as well. All of those varieties of Dutch and French constitute the linguistic repertoire of certain social network in Brussels.

This branch of study here tries to discover the things concealed behind the alternation of language or language variety done by the speakers during their speeches. This alternation of language or language variety is usually called code switching whose further explanation will be provided separately.

b. Dynamics Sociology of Language
This part of sociolinguistics seeks to provide an answer to the question “what accounts for differential change in the social organization of language use and behavior toward language?” (Chaklader, 1990: p.6). It tries to explain why and how the social organizations of language use and behavior toward language have became selectively different in the same social network or communities on two different occasions. Besides, it also seeks to explain why and how two similar social communities have a quite different social organization of language use and behavior toward language. The French immigrants in USA and Canada for example, have shown different degrees of language persistence or shift, this is what the dynamic sociolinguistics tries to explain.

c. Applied Sociology of Language

Applied sociolinguistics concern with the significance of the application of language in social setting (Chaklader, 1990: p.6). It studies the significance of native language, for instance, language acquisition, language maintenance, language shift, language teaching and others.

The subdivisions of sociolinguistics in this research belongs to descriptive sociolinguistics of language. This branch of study deals with language varieties which involves code switching. This research was done to reveal the code switching case done by the lecturers, so this research belongs to descriptive sociolinguistics of languages in order to describe the general or normative pattern of language use.

B. Ethnography of Speaking

The ethnography of speaking as a branch of sociolinguistics studies the rules and the norms for using language in social situations in different cultures and is thus clearly important for cross cultural communication (Trudgill, 1992: p.53).
Ethnography of speaking carries out the concepts of speech community, speech situation, speech events, and speech acts. Fasold (1990) explain the concepts of the ethnography of speaking based on the speech community which consists of the units of interaction. Those units are speech situations, speech events, and speech acts:

a. Speech community

The term of speech community is widely used by sociolinguistics to refer to a community based on language. They define the terms as follows:


Hymes (1974:51) defined speech community as a community sharing knowledge of roles for conduct and interpretation of speech, rules for interpretation of at least one language variety. Coulthard (1985:35) also uttered similar definition to Dell Hymes that a speech community is any group which shares both linguistic resources and rules for interaction and interpretation.

Moreover, Spolsky (1998:24) gave a more detailed definition of the speech community as a complex interlocking network of communication whose members share knowledge about and attitudes towards the language use patterns of others as well as themselves. Concerning with the scope of speech community, he stated that there is no theoretical limitation on location and size of speech community. It is the abstract “space” studied repertoire takes place. In practice, it is defined by sharing a set of language varieties (its repertoire) and a set of norms for using them.

From the definition above, it can be seen that a speech community is a group of people who do not only employ the same forms of language, but also use the same norms of language. It means there must be a mutual intelligibility among them. Each of them has to know how to use that language appropriately in the society in which they live, when, and to
whom it is used as they communicate and interact with one another. Therefore, the goal of sociolinguistic study of speech community is to relate the significant language varieties to the significant social groups and situations.

b. Speech situation

A speech community consists of three hierarchies of speech. They are act, speech, and situations (Hymes, 1974:56).

Hymes (1974) defined speech situation as situations associated with or marked by the absence of speech. The examples he gives are ceremonies, fights, hunts, or love making. As he sees it, speech situation is a non-verbal context which may compose of both communicative and other kinds of events. Speech situation are not themselves subject to rules of speaking, but it can be referred to be rules of speaking as contexts. Thus, the speech situation can affect to the communicative behavior within a speech community.

c. Speech events

Speech event, according to Hymes, are both communicative and governed by rules for the use of speech. Hymes describes that the term speech event will be restricted to activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules of norms for the use of language.

A speech event takes place within a speech situation and is composed of one or more speech acts. For examples, a request might be a speech act that is a part of conversation (a speech event) that takes places at dinner (the speech situation).

d. Speech act

According to Hymes (1974), speech act is the simplest set since it was the smallest term in the speech hierarchy (p.56). However, it is also a complicated one since it refers to both illocutionary force and the language or code being to express the illocution. As stated by Scarle (1976) that speech acts as what he or she says utterance that means he or she
does certain social acts. For example, people say a promise, asking something, giving advice, and so on. There are called speech act or illocution (p.10). Thus, speech act in sociolinguistic study can be construed on the use one code over another in a given social interaction.

Hymes explained that speech act is to distinguished from the sentence and is not to be identified with any unit at any level of grammar. For Hymes, a speech act gets its status from the social contexts as well as grammatical form and intonation. As she puts it, “the level of speech mediates immediately between the usual levels of grammar and the rest of a speech event or situation in that implicates both linguistic form and social norms” (Hymes, 1974:57).

C. Language Choice

The possibility that can be made in a society among language varieties is language choice. The people have to choose between languages and between varieties within the same languages.

According to Fasold (1984), there are three kinds of language choice. First, one of the major kinds of choice we have to deal with is code switching. Second, code mixing, where the pieces of one language are used while a speaker is basically using another language. Third, variation of language within the same language. It can be interpreted that the use of language choice is deal with code switching in which people choose to carry out the typical language within a conversation. Other occurrences of language choice usually appears in the term of code mixing and borrowing.
There are two considerations in language choice purposed by Hudson (1996). First, which language will be comprehensible to the person addressees, where speakers choose a language which the other person can understand. In this research, the consideration is applied by the lecturer when giving explanation in certain language to be more comprehensible for students.

**D. Domain**

Dealing with language choice, one must consider which one is appropriate to a certain domain. In Trudgill’s book Introducing Language and Society, it is considered as a concept employed particularly in studies of code switching in multilingual contexts and in the study of other situations where different language, dialects or styles are used in different social contexts. While according to him, a domain is a combination of factors, which are believed to influence choice of code (language, dialect, or style) by speaker. Those factors are participants (in conversation), topic, and location (1992:29).

In Fasold, Fishman introduced one way of examining language choice from one sociologist’s point of view. He proposed that there were certain institutional contexts called domains, in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another (1984:183).

Fasold (Ibid) describes domain as constellation of factors such as location, topic, and participants. For example, if a speaker talks to other member of her family about a daily topic, the speaker is said to be the family domain. Domain relates to diglossia, and some domains are more formal than others. In diglossia community, the lower language is used in the family domain. On the other hand, the higher language will be used in a more formal domain, such as education.
Thus, several definitions of domain which have been described above will be used to discover in which domain the data of the research belong to, since there is differentiation of domains such as family, friendship, neighborhood, education, government, and employment proposed by some sociolinguists in their research.

The domain appropriated to the research data belongs to education, since the observation took place at English Department, Sebelas Maret University, and the participants who are involved in the conversation are lecturers and students. In addition, the topic which is discussed by the participants is related to the subjects belong to English Department syllabus.

E. **Monolingualism, Billlingualism, and Multilingualism**

Contact between people living as different communities have been progressing more rapidly since the industrialization. And today, modern advanced technology (Computers, Smartphones and the Internet) is intensifying in the contacts. This situation has kept the importance of having a competence in understanding and using more than one language.

There used to be communities whose members used one language as a means of communication. We can call the individuals of such community monolinguals (Jendra, 2010, p.68).

Bilingualism is a study of people who speak two or more languages. It also studies the effect of one language on the others. Many linguists try to give their opinions or arguments concerning the definition of bilingualism and how the bilingual society is develop.

Bloomfield (1953: 7) offers his basic concept of bilingualism. He defines bilingualism as a native control of two languages. According to this view, a bilingual
speaker has a full range of competence in both languages, just like what a native monolingual speaker has one language. It is hard, in fact, for a speaker to master and then use two languages equally in his or her everyday life.

Chaika offers a more moderate opinion than Bloomfield. Chaika says that bilingual people speak more than one language. They may have different levels of proficiency in each of their language, and they use both languages for every different social purpose and in different social situation (1994 : p.34). It means that bilingual speakers may vary in their levels of proficiency by using both languages which are different from each other. They are used to fulfil certain social purposes in a situation.

If a bilingual individual is speaking to a monolingual individual, both speakers usually function within the language they have in common. Variation may occur in style or degree of formality; for example, there can be a style change from informal to intimate, or from informal to formal, just to mention a few. However, if bilinguals who share the same linguistic background are taken into consideration, this phenomenon becomes much more complex and involves more aspects than language choice only; it may involve aspects like code-switching and borrowing. (Grosjean, 1982).

According to Grosjean’s approach to bilinguals’ decision–making process, a bilingual speaker will choose a language as basis for the conversation first according to the linguistic background of his or her interlocutor. Both speakers will agree about the language to be used. This means that, if a bilingual individual is speaking to a monolingual individual, conversation in the monolingual individual’s language will take place. On the other hand, if a bilingual is speaking to another bilingual of the same linguistic background, communication will take place within either language as a base language, with or without code-switching.
In addition to the concept of bilingual, the term multilinguals is also
sometimes used to refer to the people who can use more than two languages. However, it has
been now common to use the term bilinguals to include people who are actually more
properly identified as multilinguals (Jendra, 2010, p.68).

F. Code Switching

In a multilingual country, people consequently switch from one language to
another. Therefore, code switching is the consequence of multilingualism. However, people
do not only switch from one language to another, but also from one dialect to another. It is
supported by Trudgill’s definition of code switching. He defines code switching as ‘the
process whereby bilingual or bidialectal speakers switch back and forth between language or
dialect and another within the same conversation’ (1992 : p.16).

On the other hands, Hymes adds that “code switching has become a common
term for alternating us of two or more language, variety of language or even speech styles.”
Thus, it is clear that people do not only switch from one language to another, but also from
one dialect or language variety to another, for example from formal to informal situation.

The occurrence of code switching, however, is related or influenced by many
factors, such as setting, topic, relative status and interlocutors, speaker’s motivation, etc. it is
supported by Chaika’s opinion that a particular language is selected in a given situation
depending upon the topic, the social scene, the relative status of speakers, the feeling of
identity and speakers motivation as well (Chaika, 1994 : 35).

Trousdale (2010) defines that code switching is the linguistic situation where a
speaker will alternate between two varieties (code) in conversation with others who have
similar linguistic repertoire. Romaine (2000) has stressed the point that switching is a
communicative option available to a bilingual member of a speech community on much the same basis as switching between styles or dialects is an option for monolingual speaker. Wardhaugh (1998) has defined that code switching is a conversational strategies used to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries; to create, evoke interpersonal relation with their right and obligations. While Gumperz (1983) has argued that code switching is a conversational strategy, the function of which is to express social meanings.

1. The Types of Code Switching

Code-switching can be classified in accordance with two different classifications named here grammatical and contextual classification. The grammatical classification is based on where in the sentence or utterance the switching appears while the contextual classification is based on the reasons why a bilingual switches.

Poplack in Romaine (1994: p.178) divides the types of code switching based on the grammatical classification into three types:

1. Tag switching

The first type involves the insertion of tag in one language into utterance, for example: you know, no way, it's okay. I mean, well, etc.

2. Inter-sentential switching

Whereas inter-sentential switching covers a switch at a clause or sentence boundary, where each clause or sentence is in one language or another. This type is thought to be the most difficult kind of switching since it requires greater fluency in both languages. For example:

An Indonesian bilingual switches from Indonesian to English e.g. Ini lagu lama, tahun 60an. It’s oldies but goodies, they say. Tapi, masih enak kok didengerin.
3. Intra-sentential switching

The last type, intra-sentential switching, is the most frequent kind of switching found in bilingualis’ conversation. This switching allows for an impression that speakers are insufficiently proficient in another language to finish what they want to say in one language.

For example: An English bilingual switches from English to Indonesian e.g. *The hotel, yang sangat megah itu, is really huge and unbelievably magnificent.*

Unlike the grammatical classification, which is based on the position of the different codes found in the utterances, the contextual classification is based on the reasons why people switch. The classification based on sociolinguistics point of view based on the Gumperz’s Theory is divided into two types of code-switching, namely the Situational and Metaphorical code-switching.

1) Situational Code-Switching

A situational code-switching appears when there is a change in the situation that causes the bilingual switches from one code to the other. The changing situations involved could be the Setting, the Participants, or the Norms of Interaction (Gumperz, 1982: p.73). The following short dialogue describes an example of a situation when a lecturer switches from English to Bahasa Indonesia because of the presence of an observer who did the observation during the teaching learning process (third participant).

Example: Speaking class for third semester student.

L : Ya that’s not good because everything I have the purpose behind it. *Bukan begitu mbak? Tanyakan sama yang sudah semester atas.*

S : iya bu.
The example of Situational Code Switching above shows that the reason of the lecturer change the language from English to Indonesian is the situation in the class. The lecturer explains that the speaking class is important when the students reach upper semester. The lecturer asks to the researcher who is the upper semester who did the observation sit in front of her and asks whether what the lecturer said is true or not. In this case, the Situational Code Switching only happens if there is a situation which make the the lecturer have to switch code.

2) Metaphorical Code-Switching

A metaphorical code-switching happens when there is a change in the perception, or the purpose, or the topic of the conversation. In reference with the factors, this type of code-switching involves the Ends, the Act Sequences, or the Key, but not the situation in (Gumperz, 1982 : p.70). Bilinguals that code-switch metaphorically perhaps try to change the participants’ feeling towards the situation.

Example: Reading class for first semester student.

L : Oke let’s start open your book. *Halaman berapa?*

S : Halaman 2.

The example of Metaphorical Code Switching above shows that the lecturer intentionally change the language from English to Indonesian. Metaphorical code switching is used by the lecturer to build communication and relation with the students. To make it clear, the researcher shows the table below to presents the classifications on code-switching (CS) based on two different points of view described here.
Table 1.

Table of the Types of Code Switching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of view</th>
<th>Code-Switching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position of the changing in the utterance</td>
<td>Tag Code-Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-Sentential Code-Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-Sentential Code-Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for switching</td>
<td>Situational Code-Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metaphorical Code-Switching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Reasons for Code Switching

There were a number of possible reasons why to do code-switching from one language to other. Chaer and Leonie (2004) state that:

1) Speakers

A speaker often do code-switching to get advantages from what he/she code-switched. Some speakers code-switch because of their habits.

2) Partners

Partners can cause to do code-switching, for example, as a speaker wants to balance the partner’s language skill. Partners can be an individual or a group.

3) Present of 3rd person

Present of the 3rd person which comes from different backgrounds from the speaker can cause to code-switch because the 3rd person status also determine which language that shall be used.

4) Changing from formal to informal situation or informal to formal situation

The formal to informal situation happens in the class and out the class, in the office and out the office, etc. which depends on the language background of the speakers and partners.
5) Changing of topic

Discussing from one topic to others topic can cause to do code-switch.

3. Functions of Code Switching

The consequence of bilingualism is Code Switching phenomenon, where a speaker, in this case is a bilingual has to face the choice of language in a certain conversation. By switching into other language, a speaker has certain intentions as the reason why s/he changes language. For those reason, Code Switching in a conversation has functions.

Hoffman (1991) classified the functions of codeswitching into seven points, they are as follow:

a. Talking about a particular topic

People sometimes prefer to talk about a particular topic in one language rather than in another. Sometimes, a speaker feels free and more comfortable to express their emotions, excitement, or even anger in a language that is not their everyday language.

b. Quoting somebody else

Regarding this function Hoffman (1991) suggested that “people sometimes like to quote a famous expression or saying of some well-known figures”.

c. Being emphatic about something

Usually, when someone who is talking using a language that is not his native tongue suddenly wants to be emphatic about something, as Hoffman (1991) stated “he/she”,

either intentionally or unintentionally, will switch from his second language to his first language.

d. Interjection (Inserting sentence fillers or sentence connectors)

Regarding the reason, Hoffman (1991) suggested that “language switching and language mixing among bilingual or multilingual people can sometimes mark an interjection or sentence connector. It may happen unintentionally or intentionally.

e. Repetition used for clarification

About this reason, Hoffman (1991) said that “when a bilingual wants to clarify his/her speech so that it will be understood more by the listener, he/she can sometimes use both of the languages that he masters saying the same utterance (the utterance is said repeatedly).

f. Intention of clarifying the speech content for interlocutor

When a bilingual person talks to another bilingual as suggested by Hoffman (1991), it was mentioned that there will be lots of code switching and code mixing that occur. It means making the content of his/her speech runs smoothly and can be understood by the hearer.

g. Expressing group identity

Code switching and code mixing can also be used to express group identity. The way of communication of academic people in their disciplinary groupings, are obviously different from other groups (Hoffman, 1991).

On the other hand, Gumperz in Discourse Strategies (1982:75-80) proposes a number of Code Switching functions in six functions, there are

1. Quotations
The use of code switching is identified as direct quotations or as report speech. The function is as quotation mark when bilinguals report and present a direct speech by using its original language.

2. Addressee Specification

In a second function the switch serves to direct the message to one of several possible addressee.

3. Interjection

In other cases, code switching serves to mark interjection or sentence filler.

4. Reiteration

Frequently a message in one code is repeated in another code, either literary or somewhat modified form. In some cases such a repetition may be served to clarify what is it, but often they simply amplify or emphasizing a message.

5. Message Qualification

Another switch consists of qualifying constructions such as sentences and verb complements or predicates following a copula.

6. Personalization vs Objectivization.

The function of code switching can be used to mark personalization vs objectivization. The code here seems to relate to such things as the distinction between talk about action and talk as action, the degree of speaker involvement in, or distance form, a message, whether a statement reflects personal opinion or knowledge, whether it refers to specific instances or has the authority of generally known fact.

In this case, the interpretation of the function on the use of Code Switching, the researcher uses both theories to find more functions of Code Switching.

4. Code Switching in the Classroom
Bolander (2008) in her book Code Switching in the Classroom: A Sign of Deficiency or a Part of the Learning Process states that that the phenomenon of code-switching is consequently also present in second language classrooms. For instance, during an English lesson in a school, English and first language which also called mother tongue are frequently switched. Many teachers of English see code-switching as a communicative strategy for learners with insufficient vocabulary resources, and thus as a source of concern. Consequently, these teachers may become intolerant of switching to the native language. At the same time, recent studies suggest that code-switching is a part of the process of acquiring a second language and that it may be an important competence in itself in the way the speaker is able to alternate between the two languages and employ each language for specific purposes (Bolander: 2008).

Bolander states that the native language is (in most cases) a common code of communication which makes it possible to level off the linguistic advantage held by the teacher. Thus, in spite of the existing but unwritten pedagogical rule to speak the target language, the second language (L2) learners are aware of the possibility to retreat to the native language if necessary.

Code switching is a widely observed phenomenon especially seen in multilingual and multicultural communities. In ELT classrooms, code switching comes into use either in the teachers’ or the students’ discourse. Although it is not favoured by many educators, one should have at least an understanding of the functions of switching between the native language and the foreign language and its underlying reasons. This understanding will provide language teachers with a heightened awareness of its use in classroom discourse and will obviously lead to better of instruction by either eliminating it or dominating its use during the foreign language instruction.
As mentioned earlier, communication in the foreign language classroom is more complex than social communication in general. Perhaps the most important reason for this is that in the classroom there is a double level of communication. The foreign language is not merely used to exchange ideas and to communicate, but also to talk about the language itself. In other words, we are communicating about communicating, and both communication and meta-communication take place. When the teacher conveys information in the foreign language, the learners commonly intervene in the native language in order to clarify and assimilate the information. A situation where this type of learner intervention is likely to occur is when grammar is being taught. Another typical situation would be when the learners use their native language in order to check their understanding of lexical items. Consequently, the choice of code is closely related to the type of task or activity being performed in the classroom. Oral production tasks and comprehension are examples of activities associated with the foreign language. Hence, meta-communication, for instance, is a trigger for the native language to come into effect and the ultimate reason for this is the learners' need to negotiate meaning in order to help the learning process.

Moreover, Bolander states that code-switching is to a considerable degree connected to changes in roles and role relationships. The student has a sort of double identity - one as a learner and one as a social interlocutor. Similarly, the relationship between the teacher and the students has two aspects - one institutional and one interpersonal. In other words, they do not merely interact as teacher and student, but also as social beings. When either of the interlocutors switches code, there is a shift in social and institutional roles. A switch from the target language to the native language places the learner on more equal social grounds with the teacher. When switching from the foreign language to the native language, the student denies his/her identity as a learner and instead assumes a social role.
According to Bolander, from the students' perspective, the teacher now becomes more of an equal and less of a teacher. Similarly, describes the bilingual teenage daughter who speaks English most of the time, but switches to her native language. Another element that plays an important part in influencing the students to switch codes is related to the content of what is said. In today's school, the language used in foreign language education has becomesynonymous with instruction and is often solely related to school. This is a result of the fact that the learners rarely say what they feel and think in the foreign language class. An example of this is the French learner of English, who answers his teacher's questions (which are very general and asked without any real interest in the content and which have their focus more on the linguistic dimension) in his L2 English, but, as soon as he switches to talking about things that matter to him and about his personal life, switches to his native language.

For different reasons, the two languages become associated not only with different sets of topics, but also with different people and settings. This type of code-switching, in contrast to those discussed above, does not serve the purpose of developing the target language, but from a pedagogical point of view it is a good indicator of the students' desire to take part in the interaction. For example, when the learner switches to the native language in order to understand a grammatical feature, the ultimate reason for this is to be able to make sense of the language and learn. Here, the learner switches to the native language because she or he finds it more important to be able to convey a message, regardless of the language in which she or he does it, than to adhere to the code rules in the classroom. This in turn reflects the student's willingness to participate in the interaction.