

Marzena WYSOCKA-NAREWSKA

University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland

marzena.wysocka-narewska@us.edu.pl

FL CODE-SWITCHING IN THE L1 ENVIRONMENT AMONG EARLY-AGED MONOLINGUAL LEARNERS: A PILOT STUDY

Abstract: Code-switching has recently become an interesting phenomenon to study because it is a part of the developmental processes, as well as the result of the use of, and exposure to, multiple languages. For this reason, code-switching usually occurs during foreign language teaching and learning, “especially when studying English based on the different backgrounds and reasons” (Yusuf, 2009). Accordingly, code-switching can be examined from various viewpoints such as the form, location, patterns, conditions, and functions, in relation to the use or the roles of the L1 and L2 or FL in the classroom, the former being most often referred to. This paper aims to determine the conditions for the use of code-switching in a quite different situation, namely, among very young learners conceived of as monolinguals who happen to switch to English (FL) in the L1 classroom environment. The article opens with a brief characterization of code-switching, defining its most frequent forms and functions, and a description of bilingual and monolingual code-switching contexts, an emphasis being put on the role of L1 in the language adaptation process and switching. The study, composed of a questionnaire distributed among 5 kindergarten teachers in public kindergartens in Poland, has shown bits and pieces of code-switching to be observed among four groups of Polish children (early-aged monolinguals), and their “linguistic behaviors” on a daily basis in the kindergarten classroom. What has been hinted at ranges from the exact situations of switching to language samples, presented according to age, and possible reasons for the current state of affairs.

Key words: L1 environment, code-switching, kindergarten teachers, very young learners.

Introduction

Most research to date has discussed code-switching in the adult-to-adult speech environment, paying little attention to early school-aged children who are placed in a setting consisting of the presence of other students with the same native language, and simulated communication. Such a context, based on Grosjean (1982),

is additionally “equipped” with, and at the same time determined by, the characteristics of the interlocutors, the conversational topic, the exact circumstances in which the conversation is held, the goal of the interaction, and the level of linguistic correctness.

Defining code-switching

Code-switching was first defined by Haugen (1956: 40) as the phenomenon that "occurs when a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word from another language into his speech." Over the years, the definition has been broadened to include any situation when a speaker shifts between two or more languages interchangeably or simultaneously during one communicative episode (Heller, 1988: 1).

According to Poulisse (1999), switching can be either unintentional or intentional (strategic). The former usually stems from linguistic defects, communicative pressures and/or temporary inaccessibility of some of the elements of the currently used language, and even may be regarded as a manifestation of language interference. What is more, unintentional code-switching is common with less fluent language learners who are often unfamiliar or less familiar with the vocabulary, grammar and phonology of either of their languages. Such a linguistic situation can also be called performance code-switching which, as Poulisse (1999) claims, is tantamount to slips of the tongue related to accessibility, i.e. the differential activation of individual lexical items in the mental lexicon of the selected vs. the non-selected language, low proficiency level, and low word frequency (Walters 2005: 82). Intentional code-switching, on the other hand, signals the learner’s conscious use of the language, and hence is often compared to a strategy for solving a communication problem. In other words, when a learner does not know or cannot access a word for a message, s/he may consciously decide to use the L1 word if s/he considers that his/her interlocutor will understand. S/he may also use the L1 word inadvertently, in the belief that it is (also) an L2 word, especially in the case of the so called false cognates. Or, analogically, the learner may decide to choose the L2 form instead of L1, just because it sounds better for him/her in the TL or attracts someone else’s attention.

Irrespective of the speaker’s (un)intentional choice of the language mode, code-switching is always associated with “the juxtaposition of two languages” (Grosjean (2010), and, following Poplack (1980)), can take three different forms:

- inter-sentential switching (a whole sentence or more than one sentence is produced in one language before there is a switch to another one. This is usually done at sentence boundaries.)

- intra-sentential switching (consists of a switch within the same sentence or sentence part. The shift is done in the middle of a sentence, with no interruptions, hesitations, or pauses to indicate a shift).
- extra-sentential or tag-switching (this is the switching of either a single word or a tag phrase (or both) from one language to another).

Mechanisms determining types of code-switching

As stated by Boumans (1998), the form of code-switching is determined by either insertion or alternation of units across the two languages. An insertional perspective treats code-switching as the ‘embedding’ of elements of one language into the syntactic frame of another language, creating an asymmetrical relationship between the languages. This situation perfectly fits the Matrix Language Frame model designed by Myers-Scotton (1997), where the matrix language (ML) provides the syntactic frame while the embedded language (EL) plays a more secondary function. Accordingly, the elements from the EL are inserted into the frame that maintains the grammatical structure of the ML. As a result, ‘mixed utterances maintain the word order, inflections, and the system morphemes of the matrix language, and any insertions must maintain congruency with the element of the matrix language that would have otherwise been used’ (Bail et al. 2015: 1044). From the alternation perspective, on the other hand, code-switching is viewed as a switching back and forth between the languages, mostly appearing at the level of sentences and utterances. Following Bail et al. (2015: 1044), ‘rather than embedding one language into a base language, there is a complete switch from the grammar and lexicon of one language to the other’.

Factors conditioning code-switching

Irrespective of the real nature of code-switching, it can be observed on many different occasions conditioned by many different factors. Azlan and Narasuman (2013) relying on Malik (1994) enumerate them:

- a) Lack of Facility -- speakers code-switch when they are unable to find the word or phrase in L2 that has the same meaning as in L1;
- b) Lack of Register -- sometimes certain words or phrases sound better for the speaker in their L2 than L1;
- c) Mood of the Speaker -- the mood of the speaker has an impact on the kind of language they are about to use, and may trigger code-switching;
- d) Emphasis -- in the situation when a certain word or phrase needs to be emphasized the speaker may shift to another language or repeat the same word or phrase in both languages for the audience’s better understanding;

- e) Habitual Experience – the speaker may have a habit of using certain discourse markers and use them in the other language;
- f) Semantic Significance -- code-switching can be treated here as a signal for the speaker’s intentions, attitudes and emotions;
- g) Identity with a Group – the speaker may switch to establish similarity with the group they want to be identified with. Sometimes code-switching may be used for the opposite reason: to exclude a certain group that does not know the other language;
- h) Addressing a Different Audience – the speaker may switch to the other language to address or admit someone new;
- i) Pragmatic Reasons – the speaker may use L1 and L2 to stress different things depending on the context of the conversation;
- j) Attracting Attention -- the speaker may use the other language to attract the attention of the audience.

Learner functions of code-switching

What often happens in the classroom is that students’ language behavior is influenced by the first two situations, namely they switch to L1 due to some gaps in the target language, or attempt to replace L1 words and/or phrases with their L2 counterparts for various reasons. More specifically, as Eldridge has it, (1996, pp. 305–307) learners’ switches fulfil several functions;

- *equivalence*,
- *floor-holding*,
- *reiteration*, and
- *conflict control*.

As far as the function of *equivalence* is concerned, the student makes use of the native equivalent of a particular lexical item in the target language, and code switches to the native tongue. In other words, the student uses the native lexical item when s/he does not have the competence for using the target language equivalent for a particular lexical item. Therefore, *equivalence* functions as a defensive mechanism for students as it gives them the opportunity to continue communication by bridging the gaps resulting from foreign language incompetence.

Floor-holding consists of conducting a conversation in the target language and filling in the gaps with the native language use, as a mechanism to avoid deficiency in communication. Code-switching deriving from the need to hold the floor indicates lack of fluency in the target language or inability to recall the appropriate target language structure or lexicon.

Reiteration is a situation where “messages are reinforced, emphasized, or clarified where the message has already been transmitted in one code, but not understood” (Eldridge 1996, p. 306). In this case, the student repeats the message

in the native tongue, either because he/she may not have transferred the meaning exactly in the target language or because simply it is more appropriate to code switch in order to indicate to the teacher that the content is clearly understood.

The last function, namely *conflict control*, involves using code-switching in order to avoid misunderstanding. It is a strategy to transfer the intended meaning whenever there is a lack of some culturally equivalent lexis in both the native language and the target language.

Teacher functions of code-switching

Code-switching is not limited to learners, because teachers also use it as a tool or strategy providing a form of correspondence between the first language and the second. According to Mattsson and Burenhult-Mattsson (1999, p. 61), the teacher functions involve:

- *topic switch*,
- *affective functions* and
- *repetitive functions*.

In *topic switch* cases, teachers alter their language according to the topic that is under discussion. This type of switching is mostly observed in grammar instruction, namely when teachers shift into the students' mother tongue in dealing with particular grammar points taught at that moment. The students' attention is directed to the new knowledge by the teacher's making use of code-switching, that is, making use of the native tongue. In such a situation, by code-switching, teachers construct a bridge from the known (native language) to the unknown (new foreign language content) in order to transfer the new content and meaning (Sert, 2005). In other words, this is just exploiting students' previous L1 learning experience to increase their understanding of L2.

Affective functions serve the purpose of expressing emotions. For example, code-switching is used by the teacher in order to build solidarity and intimate relations with the students or to create a supportive language environment in the classroom. Modupeola (2013) claims that code-switching helps learners to enjoy their learning due to their ability to comprehend the teachers' input. Understanding what is being said constitutes psychological support for the learners, allows them to feel less stressful and anxious, and makes the TL more comfortable for them. In that state, learners can focus and take part in classroom activities in a more successful way.

Finally, the *repetitive function* of code-switching allows the teacher to use code-switching in order to transfer the necessary knowledge with further clarity. Following the instruction in the target language, the teacher code switches to the native language, clarifying the meaning for efficient comprehension.

Evidently, both learner and teacher-oriented code-switching functions overlap with a conversational strategy defined by Gumperz (1982) as an invaluable tool used to dealing with communication trouble spots such as not knowing a particular word or misunderstanding the speaker by means of interjection, reiteration, message qualification and personalisation, to name a few. Accordingly, interjections or sentence fillers go well with floor-holding and learner's language deficits. The use of code-switching in repeating a message from one language to another reflects before-mentioned reiteration and repetitive functions employed to clarify or emphasise the message. Code-switching as a means of qualifying a message resembles topic switch or equivalence, notably, a situation where a topic is introduced in one language and explicated in another. Last but not least, personalization consists in distinguishing the language selection, including the degree of writer involvement in or distance from a message, and interacts with affective functions in the shape of personal opinion, experience or knowledge.

The Polish context and code-switching

Bilinguals

The study conducted by Papaja and Wysocka-Narewska (2020) shows that the Polish bilinguals (learners of English as a FL) make use of the reiteration function (asking for clarification and explanation), and equivalence (looking for English equivalents), but most frequently, they overuse switching to L1 when "talking about something private" or during group and pair work. Among the reasons for this situation, language difficulties the learners face while studying English should be mentioned. In spoken language, these are manifested by problems with pronunciation, lack of specialized vocabulary, reliance on false friends, translating concepts from one language to another over and over again, and being silent/getting stuck. When it comes to writing, the learners have problems with sentence structure and spelling, often translate literally from English into Polish and vice versa, and use too many contractions, slang, and Internet vocabulary. As a result, learners' code-switching is more often than not evidence of poor competence and the lack of appropriate forms and features, a compensation strategy, and/or a certain defensive mechanism thanks to which the learners follow the content of the course successively, though sometimes at the expense of language advancement. Teachers, on the other hand, do not hesitate to code-switch to Polish in any problematic situation, claiming that it facilitates a stress-free classroom environment, helps learners to understand difficult concepts better (e.g. new vocabulary), and prevents them from being lost and discouraged from participating in class interaction, among other benefits.

Early-age monolinguals

Based on the above discussion, to have code-switching happening, the speaker is supposed to have a certain degree of competence in both languages (Dabène and Moore (1995:24). Definitely this is not the case of early-age monolinguals, because children who are in their first months of second language acquisition typically lack knowledge in their second language, which makes them look for words in their native language in order to communicate (cf. Huang 2008).

Building on Mondada (in Moore 2010), L1 can fulfil a wide range of functions in the L2 classroom, particularly in the case of young learners and those beginning their bilingual education. What is at issue here is the role the learners' L1 plays in conversational negotiations which focus attention on areas of language that lie outside the model provided by the expert. To be more specific, such negotiations open the path to the need for mutual adjustment, and usually lead to an attempt towards simplification or reformulation on the part of the expert. (Gass and Selinker 1994). As a result of it, some sort of modification of the form of the speech produced by the interlocutors, and modification of the structure of the conversation itself, are to be expected. Great efforts are also made to maintain the flow of conversation, despite limited linguistic skills on the young learners' part, just to promote the checking of linguistic forms and encourage proficiency in the second language in a long-term perspective.

The second important factor determining the learners' success here is attention-raising, understood as the degree of the learner's attention that is paid to the data at a specific time of exposure (Moore 2010). It is often the case that a certain dose of information is overlooked or unnoticed by learners, most typically for affective reasons, or is beyond the learners' comprehension because of a very high level of input. With the help of L1, whether its use is initiated by the teacher or by the student, the problem situation is likely to be resolved, redirecting the classroom attention to discourse content, form, or both, depending on the context and the young learners' needs.

This use of L1 as a problem-solving strategy should stand as a key-word in facilitating the learning progress, and should be treated as a part of the adaptation process in each classroom of very young learners whose linguistic competences differ slightly and are subject to change with age.

At the age of 3–5, children are expected to show their command of a native language by (Scott and Ytreberg, 1990):

- using sentences with a developing grammar,
- using a fuller range of speech sounds and speech that is becoming clearer; however, the speech sound system and clarity are still developing at this stage,
- taking part in a conversation with adults or other children,
- showing good conversational understanding,
- showing an understanding of concepts such as size, colour and position,

- taking part in a sequence of pretend play and making use of language as a commentary to this,
- beginning to use language in different ways, e.g. to relate past events and to comment, name or ask questions in relation to the here and now,
- reacting to other people's facial expressions and feelings.

Older learners, aged 5-6, understand that single words might have different meanings, so they start to rely more on the context of a word to know what it means. Also, they use longer words, can understand and combine words to form active sentences, and are also starting to understand passive sentences. Children at this age get much better at telling stories, use different linking words in the right way, and use different sentence types to present the same information, understand the difference between fact and theory, and start to realize that there are exceptions to grammatical rules. On the whole, as Tsimpli (2014) has it, early school years (ages 5–6) children have usually acquired the formal aspects of their native language, including morpho-syntactic properties of local and non-local dependencies, transitivity alternations, the semantics of quantification, and the syntactically-encoded properties of information structure.

Knowing all this, we can see that the use of code-switching in L1 beginner classrooms is due, on the one hand, to the learners' lack of competences in L2, and, on the other, to their increasing awareness and knowledge of their L1. Whenever a language problem appears, it is a common practice for a teacher to spontaneously switch codes (from L2 into L1), and:

- give clear instructions,
- answer questions asked in L1 not related to the lesson,
- encourage children to do something,
- solve arguments or fights (Alcantud Diaz, 2013).

The study focus

The focus of the paper is the opposite situation, namely the circumstances under which the early-age monolingual learners code-switch from L1 to L2. The very situation includes children's language behaviours that reflect instances of single words/phrases and/or longer pieces of utterances produced in English, instead of Polish. The area of interest is a typical day in the classroom, filled with about 20-25 children and one or two teachers (depending on the group age).

The kindergarten

In Poland public kindergartens are intended for children aged 3 to 6 years, open from Monday to Friday. They serve as care and education institutions,

providing care for children while parents are at work, but are also conducive to their social (contacts with peers in the same group) and intellectual (learning activities) development. Five hours per day of instruction is provided free of charge for each child, which is why this period of time is taken into account in our investigation of children's code-switching. Within the scope of these 5 hours daily, children are offered 2 meals (paid) and educational activities conducted by the kindergarten staff (www.podstawaprogramowa.pl).

A typical day in the kindergarten can be divided into:

- opening activities (e.g. good morning song, talking about the weather, calendar, the morning message)
- breakfast time
- developmental and cooperative activities (e.g. shared reading, word work, vocabulary development, handwriting, movement activities, arts and crafts)
- recess time (e.g. outdoor playground activities, playing games)
- lunch
- rest time / quiet time (e.g. having a nap, listening to soft music, watching a cartoon)

Attending kindergarten is mandatory for children six years of age as it is the last year of kindergarten, and is treated as a preparation for the child's school attendance. During this year, children, in addition to the previously-mentioned activities, learn literacy and numeracy skills at basic levels to attain so-called school readiness.

The study classroom

The research environment consisted of public kindergartens located in 4 cities in Zagłębie Dąbrowskie, in southern Poland. Each sample was composed of 4 groups of children: 3-, 4-, 5- and 6-year-olds respectively. The size of the group in each classroom was similar, consisting in each case of 24 or 25 children of Polish background growing up in households where Polish is used exclusively. Each of the groups under investigation had 2 meetings with an English teacher a week. In the case of the youngest children, one English "lesson" lasted 15 minutes. The children aged 4 and above met their teacher for 30 minutes on each occasion.

The aim of the study was to ascertain if very young learners code-switch from Polish, as well as to investigate the language switch directions, involving the reasons for this behaviour, and situations exhibiting the phenomenon, including the real expressions of the language used/changed.

The tool

In order to gather all the necessary data, a questionnaire for kindergarten teachers was designed (see Appendix). It was prepared in Polish, and administered

in a traditional way in February 2020. Its first part, providing background knowledge, concerned the subjects' professional experience and evaluation of their command of English, while the main section examined code-switching among kindergarten learners, and was divided into the various situations in which the switches occurred, and the samples of language being produced.

Table 1. Code-switching situations

SITUATIONS	POL.→ENG.	POL.→OTHER LANGUAGES	EXAMPLES/COMMENTS
While playing with other kids			
While doing the language/cooperative activities			
While eating			
While doing the physical exercises			
While talking to a teacher			
While going for a walk			
When on a playground			
Other			

The language content section involved a couple of suggestions just picturing possible language use, and information on the frequency of linguistic items spotted, according to a 5-point rating scale. It contained the following:

Table 2. Code-switching language examples

LANGUAGE EXAMPLES	NEVER	OCCASIONALLY	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>
OK expression					
YES/NO					
POLITE WORDS (e.g please/sorry)					
GREETINGS (e.g. HELLO)					

1	2	3	4	5	6
NUMBERS, e.g. one, two					
COLOURS, e.g. blue, white					
ANIMALS, e.g. cat, dog					
OTHER.....					

The sample

Five kindergarten teachers were the source of information here, as they were asked to respond to the above-described questionnaire. All the respondents spend 5 hours daily with the learners, which is the time taken into account in this study.

Teacher 1 -- She has been working as a kindergarten teacher for 29 years, and 5 years in her most recent school. She has a master's degree in the field of early-school education. She graduated from the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland. Her qualifications for teaching English are confirmed by the First Certificate in English (FCE) gained 10 years ago. Aside from the professional context, she seldom uses English, and assesses her skills as basic, and mainly receptive.

Teacher 2 – Her teaching experience is 25 years. She has been working in this kindergarten for 6 years as a teaching assistant with the lowest age groups only, namely groups of 3-year-old children, helping the lead teacher (tutor), and as an English teacher. She has a master's degree in early-school education, and master's degree in speech language pathology, and graduated from the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland. As for her level of English, she received a TOEFL certificate 10 years ago. She is satisfied with both her speaking and writing skills.

Teacher 3 -- She has been working in this kindergarten for 4 years. It is her first professional experience. She has a master's degree in the field of pre-school and early-school education with an English language specialty. She graduated from the Pedagogical University of Krakow, Poland, and considers her English skills to be at the advanced level, and herself "fairly communicative".

Teacher 4 – She has been working in this kindergarten for 4 years. Previously, she was employed in a private institution, where she gained teaching experience, teaching there for 15 years. She has a master's degree in pre-school and early-school education with an English language specialty, and graduated from the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland. If it were not for her professional work, she would not use English a lot.

Teacher 5 – Her teaching experience is 11 years. She has a master's degree in the field of pre-school and early-school education with an English language specialty. She graduated from the University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland. She has been at her current place of work since beginning her career. When asked about using English outside work, she reports on using it from time to time, on holiday, and evaluates her skills as intermediate.

The results

TEACHER 1 -- This tutor among the youngest children in the kindergarten notices code-switching on a number of occasions. While playing (e.g. when using building blocks) children tend to say *OK, sorry, please, thanks*, and *yes/no* pretty often. During meals, when generally children are obliged to be silent and concentrated on eating only, the teacher hears some whispering in English, especially, the words *delicious* and *yummy*. The third situation reported on by her includes numerous examples of using English colours and numbers instead of Polish ones while doing the so-called language/developmental activities. Children work with the teacher then, and often, when expected to say *żółty* they say *yellow*, or instead of *niebieski* they say *blue*. It happens very often. Slightly less frequent (and, hence, labelled sometimes) appear to be switching of numbers, and counting in general, from 1 to 5 in English when responding to a given task and/or the teacher's instruction. Switching is almost unnoticeable in greetings. The teacher refers to *hello* as an occasional word, used correctly, that is, when children see each other for the first time in the morning. What never happens in the classroom, on the other hand, is the incorporation of English animal names into the child's native language.

TEACHER 2 – This tutor in the group of 4-year-olds seeming to be very much aware of the situation as she has ticked all the possible code-switching occasions on the list, justifying her choice by citing big difficulties with differentiating between one situation and another. When it comes to the language expressions used by the learners, they are reported to use the word *OK*, and polite words (*sorry* exclusively).

TEACHER 3 – This tutor in the form of 5-year-old kindergarten learners has chosen almost all the situations from the questionnaire as provoking children to use English instead of Polish, namely, playing time, working on a task, the meal time, physical activities, and walking and playing outdoors. Talking to the teacher is the only category of activity that she did not check.

Linguistically speaking, the teacher refers to the expressions *OK* and *sorry* as the most frequent ones, but also the only ones. It seems that they are used by the kids irrespective of the place and time of day. What is also interesting here is the fact that children switch to English among themselves only.

TEACHER 4 – This tutor in the classroom of 6-year-old children, which is also called the “zero form”, perceives learners’ switches from Polish into English as two-fold, namely, appearing both when children are talking to the teacher and when they talk among themselves. The former situation seems to include the *yes/no* responses, and other, such as *oh, no!*, as well as thanking for anything given or distributed to the group. The latter situation, on the other hand, reflects playing time and one extra situation described by the teacher as taking the form of teasing other children. By teasing she means using English words when talking to other children who do not really like being approached this way.

The occasions are reported to be full of English words, phrases and even sentences. Apart from those listed in the questionnaire form, the teacher reported children singing parts of songs, such as “*Hello, hello*” ... “*Baby shark*” or “*Walking in the jungle*”.

None of the other situations on the form have been reported by this teacher, who explains that it is very hard to overhear anything during the meal time because children keep silent with a few exceptions only. The same is true of cases like going for a walk or playing on the playground. Simply the children are too far from the teacher for her to hear what they are talking about.

TEACHER 5 – This teacher assistant in the group of 3-year-olds, marked all the occasions and regarded them as conducive to switching to English among the kids in question. She commented that children switch whenever they have some speech problems, such as with uttering a given consonant, especially *l, l, and r* in Polish. Consequently, instead of marking a certain language item on the list, the teacher composed her own inventory of the so-called “linguistic replacements” for inconvenient words in Polish. They are as follows:

Table 3. A list of most common switches into English

POLISH	ENGLISH
Lody	Ice cream
Proszę	Please
Dobre	Yummy
Super	Wow
Żółty	Yellow
Lekarz	Doctor
Dobrze	OK
Ryba	Fish
Lato	Summer

Concluding remarks

It is clear from these results that code-switching (from Polish into English) occurs in all of these monolingual classrooms, though it differs as to frequency and scope from group to group.

The group of 3-year-old children, evaluated by two teachers, has one common denominator, namely: they use English on a variety of occasions. The second feature to be mentioned here is that the range of L2 is wide in scope, from polite expressions to individual vocabulary which depends on the child's alleged problems with the articulation of individual sounds in L1. This recalls Malik's (1994) lack of facility, or even lack of register, meaning that some words simply sound better in L2 than in L1. As the learners' conscious choice of the language is not that obvious here and should be treated as a trigger for further research, the instances of the real language overheard in the classroom are worth pondering over.

The 4-year-old children, assessed by their teacher in the most general way here, seem to resort to L2 polite expressions on a daily basis, regardless of the situation/activity/place. Going back to Malik's factors conditioning code-switching, this may reflect the speakers' habitual experience or that mood is influencing the choice of the language.

Among the 5-year-olds, the L2 use is more limited in and seems to be confined to the accepting (*OK*) and apologizing (*SORRY*) expressions. Secondly, the situations of code-switching here are said to be restricted to communication between learners, while the words chosen may reveal some pragmatic reasons.

Finally, the 6-year-old children use L2 bilaterally, that is, when communicating both with their teacher and with their peers. The former situations consist of learners' responses to the teacher's talk in the classroom, and can be explained by the L2 being more attractive for children than L1, or may resemble Malik's habitual experience. The latter behavior, on the other hand, as exemplified by the cases of children teasing each other, can be classified as switches influenced by the desire of some children to get attention, among other causes.

All things considered, the switches made by children in question do not represent so-called free switching, that is, for no apparent reasons. Although the learners may not be fully aware of the motivation behind the usage of L2, it seems that they switch to English due to its shorter length of words, and to convey certain emotions.

To go even further, some of the forms (over)used by children in question are difficult to classify as code changing (e.g. *OK* or *WOW*) as they may simply be the manifestations of informal speech, used in Polish on a regular basis.

Nevertheless, the reasons for learners' use of L2 may lie in other sources. The exposure to L2 input in the form of e.g. TV cartoons or super simple songs from the youtube channel, outside the kindergarten environment, should be treated as being of the first importance here. Secondly, the children's "linguistic behaviours",

influenced by other factors, such as, for example, motherese talk at home, should be taken into consideration. Supposedly, the switches from L1 to L2 used by children at home are also to be observed elsewhere and the other way round.

Further research

The hypothesis itself is one of the areas for further investigation in the future. It seems necessary to include learners' parents in the research, and to ask them for the (re)appearance of such language samples among their children. Another direction in the future study might involve children's parents and examination of their speech, seeking traces of language alteration and its functions.

It may also be important to enter the kindergarten classroom for a series of observations, and develop a more thorough description of the phenomenon in question, and to involve more kindergartens in the study.

All in all, in further research, it will be crucial to suggest ways of working with learners switching from L1 into L2 in the classroom as well as investigate their home environment, looking for both language interferences, inhibitors and language enablers.

References

- Alcantud Diaz, Maria (2013) "Be quiet niños please". Uses of Code-Switching in Four-Year-Old Monolingual Children's Second Language Acquisition, [In:] Nicolas Estevez Fuertes, Begona Clavel-Arroitia, (eds.), *Adquisición de segundas lenguas (L2) en el marco del nuevo milenio : homenaje a la profesora María del Mar Martí Viaño*, València: Universitat de València; 23–38.
- Azlan, Nik, Mastura, Nik, Ismail & Narasuman, Suthagar. (2013) The Role of Code-Switching as a Communicative Tool in an ESL Teacher Education Classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 90; 458–467.
- Bail, Amelie., Morini, Giovanna & Newman, Rochelle.S. (2015) Look at the gato! Code-switching in speech to toddlers*. *Journal of Child Language*; 42, 1073-1101.
- Dabène, Louise. & Moore, Daniele. (1995) Bilingual Speech of Migrant People. [In:] Lesley Milroy, Pieter Muysken (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages. Cross Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 17-45.
- Gass, Susan & Selinker, Larry (1994) *Second Language Acquisition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grosjean, Francois (1982) *Life with Two Languages. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grosjean, Francois (2010) *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz, John Joseph (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, Einar (1956) *Bilingualism in the Americas: A bibliography and research guide*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Heller, Monica (Ed.) (1988) *Code-switching: anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

- Huang, Pinshane (2008) "Language Use of Beginning Students in a Taiwanese English Immersion Preschool". Retrieved from: <http://www.etlc.ntust.edu.tw/data/051018/Language%20Use%20of%20Beginning%20Students%20in%20a%20Taiwanese.doc>.
- Malik, Lalita (1994) *Sociolinguistics: A Study of Code-switching*. New Delhi: Anmol.
- Moore, Daniele (2010) Code-switching and Learning in the Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5); 279-293.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol (1997) *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Papaja, Katarzyna & Wysocka-Narewska, Marzena (2020) Investigating Code-switching in a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classroom, *TAPSLA*, 6 (1); 51-63.
- Poplack, Shana (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y *TERMINO EN ESPANOL*: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18; 581-618.
- www.podstawaprogramowa.pl (accessed August 25th, 2020)
- Poullisse, Nanda (1999) Slips of the Tongue in First and Second Language Production. *Studia Linguistica*, 54(2); 136-149.
- Scott, Wendy A. & Ytreberg, Lisbeth H. (1990) *Teaching English to Children*, London and New York: Longman.
- Sert, Olcay. (2005) The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*. Volume XI.
- Tsimpli, Ianthi (2014) Early, late or very late?: Timing acquisition and bilingualism. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*, 4(3); 283-313.
- Yusuf, Yunisrina Qismullah (2009) A pragmatics analysis of a teacher's code-switching in a bilingual classroom. *The Linguistics Journal*, 4(2); 6-39.

Appendix

ANKIETA

Szanowni Państwo,
celem niniejszej ankiety jest zbadanie zjawiska zmiany kodu językowego (z języka polskiego na język angielski lub inny) wśród dzieci przedszkolnych.

CZĘŚĆ I. METRYCZKA

Płeć	Wykształcenie (kierunek studiów, uczelnia)
Wiek	Znajomość języka angielskiego: certyfikaty, kursy
Jak często i kiedy posługuje się Pan/i/ językiem angielskim?	Czas pracy z grupą (dziennie), (w tym lekcje j. angielskiego)
Staż pracy.....	Grupa przedszkolna (wiek).....

CZĘŚĆ II. ZMIANA KODU JĘZYKOWEGO

1. Czy zdarzają się sytuacje, w których dziecko zmienia kod językowy (zamiast słowa/słów w j.polskim używa odpowiednika w j.angielskim lub innym języku obcym)? TAK/NIE

W przypadku odpowiedzi TAK, proszę wypełnić tabelę, zaznaczając właściwe sytuacje oraz kierunek zmiany:

SYTUACJA	J.POL.→J.ANG.	J.POL.→INNY JĘZYK OBCY	PRZYKŁAD UŻYTEGO SŁOWA/ ZDANIA
Podczas zabawy z rówieśnikami			
Podczas wypełniania ćwiczeń			
Podczas posiłku			
Podczas gimnastyki			
Podczas rozmowy z nauczycielem			
Na spacerze			
Na placu zabaw			
Inne.....			

2. Jeśli nie potrafi Pan/i podać przykładu wypowiedzianego słowa/zdania w języku angielskim, a takie się pojawiają, proszę przejrzeć listę poniżej i podkreślić odpowiednie, podając częstotliwość występowania:

Przykład	NIGDY	SPORADYCZNIE	CZASAMI	CZĘSTO	ZAWSZE
OK					
YES/NO					
(please/thanks/thank you/sorry)					
HELLO					
LICZEBNIKI, np. one, two					
KOLORY, np. blue, white					
ZWIERZĘTA, np. cat, dog					
INNE.....					