INTRODUCTION

In foreign language classrooms, code-switching (CS) is a typical occurrence (Almelhi, 2020). When bilinguals or multilinguals blend two or more languages in a sentence without changing the subject or interlocutor, this practice is known as code-switching (Poplack, 2001).

With 171 spoken languages and a population that is bilingual or multilingual, the Philippines as an archipelago is rich in linguistic and cultural diversity (Garcines and Alvarez, 2017). Code-switching is now typical among bilinguals and multilinguals as a result. As a tool for communication in the classroom, code-switching is gaining popularity as a teaching and learning tool.

Many researchers have presented opposing viewpoints on code switching. Some advocated for its use in classroom instruction to aid learning, while others opposed it. Students see code switching as an effective instructional tool for making learning easier and thus increasing student involvement in learning (Alenezi, 2010). Meanwhile, the
majority of teachers are optimistic about code-switching. Furthermore, they only use it when necessary. Indeed, according to a study by Ibrahim and Haliza, teachers believe in the purpose of code-switching to facilitate second language learning (Garcines and Alvarez, 2017). Thus, it is proposed that code-switching be viewed as a resource for teaching and learning (Borlongan, 2012).

Code-switching practice in college consists of teachers and students conveying ideas by switching between two or more languages concurrently within a conversation. Code-switching has received a lot of attention in classroom instruction from Filipino scholars, according to Borlongan (2012).

However, can code-switching be considered a method for students to acquire knowledge more efficiently? The purpose of this study was to investigate the occurrence of code-switching among Senior High School (SHS) students in the Technical Vocational Livelihood (TVL) Drafting and Language classes of Isabela School of Arts and Trade (ISAT). It also investigated the most common types or levels of code-switching employed by students. Furthermore, the study determined the students' motivations for using CS in the teaching and learning environment.

Objectives of the Study
The research aims to achieve the following goals:
1. To determine the profile of the students in terms of age, sex and language spoken;
2. To assess the frequency of code-switching performed by the students in their respective courses or subjects;
3. To find out the kinds of code-switching types or level of the students;
4. To extract reasons from the students in using code-switching in utterances;
5. To relate the students’ profile and code switching in classroom instruction.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Code-Switching Background
Scholarly works and studies on code-switching have existed for more than four decades, and many researchers continue to find its essence, especially when pedagogical implications are at stake. Recent developments in the field of code-switching have resulted in two distinct positions/stances among advocates.

Linguistics scholars laid the groundwork for studies on structural and grammatical constraints on language alternation. Poplack's copula (1980); Sankoff and Poplack (1981); Bentahila and Davis (1983); Klavans (1985); Joshi (1985); Di Sciullo et al. et al., 1986; MacSwan, 1999 were two examples. This group of researchers defines code-switching as an interference or deviation from the norm of both languages that occurs in bilingual speakers' speech.

Weinreich (1952); Blom and Gumperz (1972); Romaine (1989); Myers-Scotton (1993); Rampton (1995); Cenoz and Genesee (2001); Fotos (2001); Benson (2001), on the other hand, investigated the Science of Linguistics of code-switching from Socio-cultural and Sociolinguistic perspectives. This school of thought looks at code-switching through a different lens, rationalizing the "whys" of code-switching occurrences that the structural focus of CS did not address.

Uriel Weinrich's Languages in Contact (1953) is a cornerstone in code-switching in this field. He contends that the absence of some extralinguistic factors could impede the precise explanation of certain language contact problems; in fact, some phenomena could not be explained at all if these factors were not taken into account. A compartmentalized
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investigation in linguistics and sociology would also fail to resolve all of the complex relationships on the axis of language - nation - setting - politics. Because these two disciplines were discovered to be complementary, a reliable study of language contact must rely on both linguistic and sociological data.

Blom and Gumperz's (1972) paper has become a standard in code-switching research. They contended that "linguistic The separation between language and standard... is determined by social factors. As a result, each breed is considered to exhibit slight differences in appearance as well as slightly distinct social functions. Blom and Gumperz propose that social facts, contexts, and topics determined by participants "constrain the choice of linguistic variables" in a similar way that is, in a given social situation, Some forms of language may be more appropriate than others. Blom and Gumperz call this type of change situational change, in which a change in linguistic form represents a change in social framework (Nilep, 2006).

Carol Myers-Markedness Scotton's model was described in the book Social Motivations for Codeswitching: Evidence from Africa by Carol Myers-Scotton (1993). She claims that in a multilingual community, each language is associated with specific social roles, which she refers to as right-and-obligations (RO) sets. Myers-Scotton assumes that when choosing a specific language or code, the interlocutor should have some understanding of its social meanings. Otherwise, the interlocutor would be unable to comprehend the significance of code choices. As a result, The social meaning of the choice of language (code), as well as the causes of the switch, are determined entirely in terms of the rights and obligations of the participants.

What Code-Switching Means

Timm (1975) defines code-switching as a complicated, systematic, rule-governed communication performed by linguistically competent bilinguals to achieve a variety of communicative goals. The language of bilinguals has structural, semantic, pragmatic and sociolinguistic features, which are the product of closely related sociolinguistic factors. “Interlacing two languages within a single discourse, sentence, or composition” (Poplack, 1980) is his definition of code-switching within a single discourse, sentence, or composition.

According to Romaine (1994), code-switching is a communication option available to bilingual members of a speech community, in the same way that style or language switching is an option for monolingual speakers.

Types of Code-Switching

There are three types of code-switching possibly occurring in discourse as distinguished by Poplack (1980), namely: tag switches, intrasentential switches, and intersentential switches.

Tag switches

As in the statement Biladna tayyeba (Our country is very good, you know), tag switches often require introducing a tag or a brief expression in one language, such as discourse markers or fillers like "you know" or "I mean," into a sentence in the other language that is not being used at the time. For instance, it is simple to introduce discourse markers or conversational fillers into a discussion without altering the matrix language's or the dialogue's language's grammatical structure.

Intrasentential switches
These alteration can take place within the limits of a clause in a sentence or even within the limits of a word. In other words, changes from one morpheme level to a higher level occur intrasententially inside the same phrase. This indicates that both languages may be used simultaneously. Poplack contends that intrasentential code-switching calls for interlocutors to be highly skilled and proficient in the two languages that bilinguals switch between. The effort to integrate two or more language systems into one mainstream discourse, according to Romaine (1994), creates a high syntactic risk for intrasentential code-switching. However, this is typically regarded as the worst sort of code-switching employed due to laziness or a lack of or insufficient linguistic proficiency.

*Intersentential switches*

This type of code-switching occurs at sentence boundaries when the speaker fully completes a sentence in one language or the other. This shows that all phrases can be formed in a single turn while speaking Spanish in an English-speaking situation. This kind of code switching necessitates more skill and agility in both languages when the tag switching does.

**Code-switching Functions**


1. **Quotation** - a code-switch that clearly distinguishes between a direct quotation and a reported speech.
2. **Addressee selection** - the switch routes the message to one of several possible recipients.
3. **Interjection** - a code that indicates an interjection or sentence filler.
4. **Reiteration** - occurs when a code-switch rehashes a message in one code within the other code, it is referred to as reiteration.


1. **Quotation** - a code-switch that is clearly identifiable as a coordinate citation or as detailed speech.
2. **Recipient parameters** - the switch forwards the message to one of the possible recipients.
3. **Interjection** - a code-switch used to indicate an interjection or sentence filler.
4. **Reiteration** - occurs when a code-switch rehashes a message in one code within the other code, either truly or marginally altered.
5. **Personalization versus objectification** refers to the refinement between conversation around the activity and conversation as the activity, the degree to which the speaker is linked or separated from the message, whether the explanation whether it reflects an assumption or personal information, whether it refers to specific occasions. Experts generally recognized the fact.

**Code Switching Causes**

Malik (1994) created ten communicative capacities of code-switching in her think about, from which the current study conceived a framework for the reasons for code-switching in the classroom.
1. **Lack of Facility.** Bilingual or multilingual speakers frequently code-switch when they are unable to locate the right terminology or word(s) from the L2 lexicon to match the word(s) of their original language L1. Due to Islam's ban on drinking, for instance, the term "social drinker" does not exist in Malay (Muthsamy, 2009).

2. **Lack of Register.** According to Anderson (2006), certain words sound better in the L2 than the L1, which typically leads in code flipping. This is true, according to Muthsamy (2009), when "a specific vocabulary is not available to a speaker in the first language during a dialogue." As an illustration, "over my head" is an English expression that implies "beyond my comprehension." "La clase de hoy fue way over my head."

3. **Mood of the Speaker.** The speaker's mood affects the language that is employed. It is possible to come up with suitable vocabulary to employ in the target language when one is in a stable and sane mental state (Muthasamy, 2009). Code flipping happens when the speaker is emotionally influenced, such as when they are irritated, thrilled, fatigued, joyful, astonished, terrified, or distracted (Crystal, 1987 as referenced by Skiba, 1997).

4. **Habitual Expression.** You can occasionally employ common discourse markers like "you know," "I mean," or "like" in the other language before or in the middle of a phrase (Romaine, 1989).

5. **Pragmatic Reasons.** Code switching is a technique that speakers sometimes employ to highlight the conversation's context (Malik, 1994). A speaker might, for instance, utilize his L1 to stress his personal sentiments about the topic and his L2 to emphasize the referential context—his doctor's advice—in a talk about diets (Holmes, 2001).

6. **To Get People's Attention.** In order to draw readers' interest, English newspapers in India, according to Malik (1994), often use non-English words from Hindi or other Indian languages. The reader must make use of his or her language schemata in order to comprehend what the newspaper is trying to say.

**Code Switching: The Philippine Case**

The state of language in the Philippines is now a prominent area of study. A founding member of the Philippine Linguistic Society named Bonifacio Sibayan asserted that "the language circumstance within the Philippines is probably the foremost examined within the world" (Thompson, 2003). Most academic publications deal with topics like language planning and policy, English usage continuity, Survey of Philippine Standard English and Language Use. Studies on code-switching politics, bilingual media habits, and bilingual linguistic attitudes have also been conducted.

The study of code-switching and the Philippine context interact, however research on Tagalog-English code-switching is still in its infancy. The first study on Taglish was done by Azores in a 1967 thesis. He examined code-switching written in The Sun, a biweekly newspaper that Bautista calls "the first periodical to document Tagalog-English code-switching in print." Notable Philippine linguists with notable theses and dissertations include Pascasio, Marasigan, Marfil and Pasigna, Palines, Pimentel, Sadicon and Sobolewski (Bautista, 2004). Almost ground-breaking research projects were conducted in the 1970s and early 1980s.

Taglish expert Maria Lourdes S. Bautista is well-known. Her 1980 dissertation, The Filipino Bilingual's Competence: A Model Based on an Analysis of Tagalog-English Code-Switching, served as the foundation for decades of research. In it, she came to the conclusion that switching between the two languages was possible anywhere where the Tagalog and English structures were compatible. She has also compared Sankoff and Poplack's 1988 framework with Myers-Matrix Scotton's Language Frame (MLF) model using comprehensive data from bilinguals who speak Tagalog and English.
dissertation, she first looked into the morphosyntactic, lexical, semantic, and sociolinguistic components of Tagalog-English code-switching. In this book, she revisits these topics. According to Bautista (2004), taglish is "a mode of discourse that can even serve as a form of linguistic resistance... against monolingualism and globalization". Tagalog-English code-switching is divided into two categories by Bautista.

According to Bautista (1999), the first kind of code-switching is "deficiency-driven code-switching," which happens when a speaker needs to switch back to their native tongue because they are not entirely proficient in the first language. The second sort of code-switching, called proficiency-driven code-switching, occurs when an individual is familiar in both languages and can rapidly switch between them for the best outcome.

1. Functional words, especially Tagalog enclitic particles, which are adverbs that only appear in specific set word-order relationships to other sentence components and whose implications form a somewhat heterogeneous grouping, are important in sentences (Schachter & Otanes, 1972). As an illustration
   a. I'll leave for home after my meeting na ["already"].
   b. At five o'clock, we went to Pa ["still"]'s kid's celebration.
   c. We dined in a Cantonese restaurant close to the hotel that evening, naman ["on the other hand"].…

   In an English phrase, enclitics serve as a shortcut for additional circumlocutions. Filipinos might find it difficult to explain in basic English the meaning of words like daw, "according to someone", pala, "turn out further", naman, "on the other hand", and nga, "affirm or confirm." …

2. Examples of content words include lexical concepts related to food, kinship, and culture. …Idioms are Metaphorical expressions exist in one language but not in the other. …

3. The use of a Tagalog or English term to produce a hilarious effect is known as linguistic play. In conclusion, one of the primary reasons for Taglish insertions within the discourse mode is explained by Bautista's notion of "communicative efficiency" (Lesada, 2017).

**Code-switching in the Global Context**

The body of research on code-switching in classrooms overseas has expanded thanks to numerous investigations.

52 in-service teachers and 100 students believed that code-switching is helpful whenever to explain and understand cultural topics, grammar points, lexical items, and something concerned with lesson content in Yao’s (2011) study of teachers' code-switching in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom in local secondary schools in China. Contradictions in some question items, however, imply that the use of CS in EFL classrooms needs to be modified to accommodate practical teaching. Following are some justifications for teachers' code-switching practices:

1. Elicit students’ responses
2. Clarify the lesson content
3. For better classroom management, which includes:
   a. task instructions
   b. discipline students
   c. engage students’ attention
   d. better direct students
4. Promote interpersonal relations (CS is a resource for better negotiating with students.)

Abdollahi, et al. (2015) found that the null hypotheses claiming that different types of The fact that code-switching does not affect EFL learners' grammar teaching and learning
was refuted in a study on the comparative effects of within-sentence, between-sentence and tag-sentence switching in grammar teaching in Iran. for 60 pre-intermediate students.

Paker and Karaagac's (2015) study of 20 English instructors and 286 university students on the use and roles of mother tongue in EFL lessons in Turkey revealed that mother tongue is an inseparable aspect of language teaching. The mother tongue serves three critical functions in language teaching. The first is for rapport building, which includes making jokes, expressing care for the students, demonstrating empathy, and so on (Schweers, 1999; Saxena, 2009; Al Nofaie, 2010; Bateman, 2008). The second step is to clarify the topic/meaning (by providing examples, clarifying, and providing more explanations). The third is used to clarify complex topics or ideas. To summarize, both teachers and students recognized the need of using target language as much as attainable in lesson, but may not deny the require for mother tongue on event.

Azlan and Narasuman (2013) conducted an investigation on the part of code-switching as a communicative instrument in an English as a Moment Language (ESL) educator instruction classroom among 28 understudies in a Malaysian tertiary institution and found that the larger part of the understudies emphatically backed their teachers' utilize of code-switching for the taking after reasons: lessons were simpler to get it. Moreover, the discoveries uncovered that three sorts of code-switching were predominant in classroom communication between understudies and between understudies and the educators: tag exchanging, inter-sentential exchanging, and intra-sentential exchanging. The foremost common was inter-sentential, taken after by intra-sentential. Moreover, English was the overwhelming language of communication, with code-switching utilized to communicate concepts in certain settings and reinforce solidarity within the unique language.

As a result, Azlan and Naruzaman (2013) argue that educating low-proficiency pupils by practicing code-switching is beneficial to their learning. But in the classroom, it must not be permitted to replace the target language. As a result, the overall findings will assist the instructors in managing and planning the usage of CS in their English-focused lesson.

Philippine Studies on Code-switching Practices

The abundance of research has been enriched by numerous studies on code-switching in the classroom in the Philippines.

Overall, Liwanag (2016) advises tolerating or allowing Taglish in the classroom environment because doing so will improve the students' ability to communicate information and messages because it is both comfortable and effective. She also promotes the use of inter-sentential CS, excluding content terms, so that students would still have a better opportunity of becoming fluent in both Tagalog and English-language oral and written conversation. She demonstrates the "English Only" policy for subject-based learning appears unfeasible and unsuccessful in nations where English is the moment or outside language (Abad, 2010). According to Liwanag (2016), code-switching in content areas is a communication ability for bilingual speakers, thus it shouldn't be seen as ineptitude or inefficiency on the part of teachers or students (Abad, 2010). Finally, according to Liwanag (2016), Taglish as a CS must be accepted without reservation as a bilingual hone and a important communicative tool.

The sociolinguistic phenomenon of Filipino-English code-switching attitudes and practices, as well as their connection to English academic performance among Quirino State University freshmen, are also discussed in Valerio's (2015) research. The results demonstrated a substantial correlation between the respondents' academic achievements in English and Filipino and their views toward code flipping. Additionally, despite having positive opinions on teaching English as a second language, the respondents still follow the
standard practice of CS in their English classrooms because they are from a region with a variety of languages. Because of their positive expectations that it will speed up their ability to learn, the adoption of English-Filipino code-switching is preferred. They therefore see themselves as code-switchers who, on the other hand, esteem the imperativeness of English in its around the world substance because they are bilingual learners. Additionally, because to the predominately CS factors, it is challenging for any non-native English speaker to create a "English Speaking" environment. The majority of respondents preferred code-switching as a standard classroom practice.

In their 2017 study, Code-Switching: Boon or Bane?, Garcines and Alvarez asked this question. In the technical writing course at Agusan del Sur State College of Agriculture and Technology, eight faculty members, 100 BSE-Biology students, and 100 BEED students discussed their thoughts on code-switching. According to the study's findings, English is utilized less and English fluency is significantly reduced by English teachers who code-switch to their mother tongue when teaching English. The risk of overexposure to mother tongue also affects pupils' English acquisition. On the employment of CS in the English classroom, however, all students concur. Teachers who are CS-savvy are respected by their students. In a similar vein, students frequently used code switching to communicate themselves clearly, and they appreciated instructors who did so for the same reasons—to aid in comprehension, comfort, and to facilitate straightforward communication.

The findings complement Alenezi's (2010) findings, which show a preference for using English as a medium of instruction. According to Garcines and Alvarez' (2017), learning occurs when instructors and understudies share the common aim of understanding the material. However, if overexposure interferes with learning English, it can be detrimental. As a result, CS is both a benefit and a curse. Teachers and students can benefit from using it wisely and strategically. When utilized excessively, it is a bad approach for teaching English.

**Conceptual Framework**

Poplack's (1980) categories of code-switching theory and Malik's ten (10) communicative functions of code-switching are used to frame this study. Its goal is to discover the different types of code-switching employed by teachers and students in a teaching-learning environment. It is also necessary to investigate why the interlocutors use code-switching. The study's findings are seen to be useful for improving education.

The conceptual system gives the premise in analyzing the information to be gathered. Below is the research paradigm that describes the flow of variables to be investigated.
The illustrated conceptual framework presents the Input-Process-Output demonstrate to appear the relationship of the factors. The input of this inquire about incorporates the (1) profile of the respondents, which includes age, sex and language spoken/ethnic affiliation; (2) respondents’ code-switching types; and (3) respondents’ reasons for code-switching. The process is performed to gather data through class recording, questionnaire and interview to yield the respondents’ reasons for code-switching. All these will be examined and analyzed to generate valuable information that will result in awareness and better understanding of code-switching as a phenomenon in a bilingual or multilingual classroom setting. If and when code-switching may be regarded as a communicative teaching and learning strategy, the by-product of this study is believed to contribute in the further development and improvement of literacy and critical thinking skills of the learners particularly in the TVL and Language classes.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design
This research was a descriptive study. The researcher used the qualitative and quantitative design. The qualitative aspect employed the recording of code-switching data in the classroom and an interview with respondents on their code-switching behavior including
the questionnaire. Gathering the code-switching instances in context allows for determining the frequency of code-switching patterns during classroom instruction, classifying the types of code-switching used and determining the level of code-switching pattern of the respondents. The interview and questionnaire shall gather data on the reasons of the respondents in employing code-switching in the classroom. The survey responses make up the quantitative design of the study.

**Research Locale and Respondents of the Study**

This study was conducted at the Isabela School of Arts and Trades (ISAT), Calamagui 2nd, City of Ilagan, Isabela. It is one of the schools in Ilagan South District.

The respondents of the study were twenty (20) Senior High School students and three (3) teachers of TVL Drafting, Filipino and English classes.

**Research Instrument**

To collect the needed data for this study, the researcher used video recording in order to document the necessary code-switching utterances or conversations in the classroom. Also, a questionnaire was utilized to gather information on the respondents’ profile such as age, sex and language spoken and an interview to elicit vital and substantial information regarding the reasons of the respondents in utilizing code-switching amid the teaching-learning handle.

**Validation of the Instrument**

To gather reliable and valid information, the instruments used were based on Poplack’s (1980) categories of code-switching and Malik’s (1994) reasons of code-switching in the classroom.

**Data Gathering Procedure**

In arrange to bring approximately the foremost wanted result of the study, the researcher followed the following crucial steps. Initially, permission from the school head of the Isabela School of Arts and Trades (ISAT) will be sought. After the grant to allow the conduct of the study, the researcher documented the classes in TVL Drafting, Filipino and English classes covering 15 hours, of which five hours was spent in every subject. The recorded classroom discussions were transcribed serving as the primary data for analysis and interpretation. The data determined the frequency of code-switching, which occurs along the discourse. This was done by tallying the full number of respondents’ expressions versus the event of expressions with code-switching. At that point, an distinguishing proof of the sorts of code-switching that happened within the respondents’ articulations was conducted. This was done by extricating all the articulations with code-switching from the information and classifying them using Poplack’s (1980) types of code-switching, which include tag switching, intra-sentential switching and inter-sentential switching. Finally, the respondents answered the questionnaire to give information about their profile and reasons of code-switching in the classroom. The interview served as a validation instrument to the questionnaire.

**Statistical Treatment of Data**

The taking after measurable apparatuses were utilized.

1. Recurrence Tally and Rate was utilized to decide the:
   a. profile of the respondents;
b. frequency of code-switching used in the classroom;
c. types of code-switching used in the respondents’ utterances.

2. Frequency and Ranking was used to determine the reasons of the respondents’ usage of CS in the classroom.

3. Chi-square test was utilized to decide on the off chance that there's a critical The relationship between respondent profiles and classroom code-switching patterns.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Profile of the Students
Student profiles are presented in the following tables. Table 1 presents the age distribution of the students. Of the 110 students, majority or 63 (57.3%) were aged 17 and 18; 29 or 26.4 % belonged to ages 15 and 16; and 18 or 16.4 % were 19 years old and older. The mean age was 18 years. As regards sex, majority of the students or 59 (53.6 %) were female and 51 or 46.4 were male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 110)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 – 20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 &amp; older</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 17.6</td>
<td>SD = 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibanag</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocano</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization/Major Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-Fishery</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to language spoken or ethnic affiliation, data shows that majority of the students or 85 (77.3%) were Ilocano and 25 or 22.7 % were Ibanag. As to specialization, majority of the students or 60 (54.5%) were under Oral Communication subject; 22 students or 20 % were specialized in Bread and Pastry Production; 18 or 16.4 % were specialized in Technical Drafting; and 10 or 9.1 % had Bartending as specialization.

Types of Code Switching Performed by Students
Table 2 shows Types of code switching performed by respondents in class. The three types of code switching, namely Tag Switching, Intra-Sentential and Intersentential were performed by the students.
Table 2. Types of code switching performed by the students in the classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Switching</th>
<th>Frequency (n = 110)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag Switching</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Sentential Switching</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Sentential Switching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently, the type of code switching that was used dominantly by the students was Intra-Sentential where 95 or 86.4% of the students utilized it. There were 14 students or 12.7% who used the Tag Switching and only one (1) or .9% used the Inter Sentential type of code switching.

This implies that there is a widespread use of intrasentential switching among the students in classroom instruction compared to the other two types of code switching.

Why Students Code Switch in their Utterances

Table 3 presents the different reasons of the students for code switching in the classroom. These reasons were arranged from the top most to the least compelling: lack of facility with mean rank of 7.136, lack of register with mean rank of 7.073, to address different audience with mean rank of 6.618, semantic significance with mean rank of 6.300, to emphasize a point with mean rank of 5.982, to show identity with a group with mean rank of 5.836, mood of the speaker with mean rank of 4.955, habitual expressions with mean rank of 4.427, pragmatic reasons with mean rank of 3.536, and to attract attention with mean rank of 3.182.

Table 3. Reasons for code switching by the students in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facility</td>
<td>7.136</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of register</td>
<td>7.073</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic significance</td>
<td>6.300</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address diverse gathering of people</td>
<td>6.618</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To appear personality with a gather</td>
<td>5.836</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To emphasize a point</td>
<td>5.982</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood of the speaker</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual expressions</td>
<td>4.427</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic reasons</td>
<td>3.536</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To attract attention</td>
<td>3.182</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results reveal that the respondents’ fundamental reason of code switching practice is difficulty driven. This means that they lack the facility to convey message in the target language, so they encode the switch.

Secondary reason is that the students code switch in consideration of the different linguistic backgrounds of the communicators as well as to promote solidarity with them.

Thirdly, the students resort to code switching when they put emphasis more on the meaning or communicative intentions and to stress a point over the language itself.
**Relationship between the Students’ Profile and their Types of Code Switching in Classroom Instruction**

Chi-square was used to test the association between dominant type of code switching and students’ profile variables. By dominant type of code switching, it means, the type where the students have highest number of occurrence during the class interaction. The Yate’s correction formula for the chi-square was used because there are cells in the crosstabs which have less than 5 expected frequency. For the variable age, a dummy variable was made to warrant the use of the chi-square test. The ages were classified as *Young* if the student is 17 (the median) and below; *Old* if the age is 18 or older.

**Table 7.** Cross-tabulation on the relationship between code-switching and respondents’ sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Tag Switching</th>
<th>Intra-Sentential Switching</th>
<th>Inter-Sentential Switching</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computed \(X^2 = 2.151\) \(p = 0.341\) \(df = 2\)  

Table 7 shows the cross tabulation on the relationship between code switching and respondents’ sex using chi-square test with the computed value of 2.151 and \(p\) value of 0.341. Among the male respondents, seven or 13.7 % used tag switching; 44 or 86.3 % used intrasentential switching; and no one uses intersentential switching. Meanwhile, for female respondents seven or 11.9 % used tag switching; 51 or 86.4 % used intrasentential switching; and one or 1.7 % used intersentential switching.

Apparently, almost all the percentages in every cell are the same, thus, the proportion of female and male students using a type of code switching is the same. The invalid speculation is acknowledged at 0.05 level of importance. There's no critical relationship between sex of the respondents and the code switching in the classroom.

This implies that regardless of the sex of the students, the types of code switching used are the same.

**Table 8.** Cross-tabulation on the relationship between code-switching and students’ age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tag Switching</th>
<th>Intra-Sentential Switching</th>
<th>Inter-Sentential Switching</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young (17&amp;Younger)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old (18 &amp; Older)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computed \(X^2 = 11.774\) \(p = 0.0028\) \(df = 2\)  

**Table 8** shows the cross tabulation on the relationship between code switching and students’ age with the computed value of 11.774 and \(p\) value of 0.0028. Among the young respondents, four or 5.6 % used tag switching; 68 or 95.8 % used intrasentential switching; and no one uses intersentential switching. Meanwhile, for old respondents, ten or 26.3 % used tag switching; 27 or 71.1 % used intrasentential switching; and one or 2.6 % used intersentential switching.

This implies that regardless of the age of the students, the types of code switching used are the same.
Table 8 presents the cross of relationships between profile age of the students and code switching classroom instruction using the chi-square test, with the computed value of 11.774 and p value of 0.0028 at a significant level of 0.01. What makes the finding significant is the proportion of older students using tag switching with 26.3 % which is greater than the younger students who tend to use intra-sentential switching with 95.8%. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is one important thing relationship between the profile age of the respondents and the type of code switching in classroom instruction.

This suggests older students tend to tag switching while younger respondents are inclined to use intrasentential.

**Table 9. Cross-tabulation on the relationship between code-switching and students language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Type of Codeswitching</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tag Switching</td>
<td>Intra-Sentential Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibanag</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilocano</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computed $X^2 = 8.413$  \( p = 0.015 \)  \( df = 2 \) **significant at 0.05**

Table 9 presents the cross tabulation on the relationship between the profile language spoken of students and code-switching in the class instruction using chi-square test with the computed value of 8.413 and p value of 0.0015 at a significant level of 0.05. There were more students among the Ibanags with 26.9 % who use tag switching than Ilocanos with only 8.3 percent. Though a significant number of Ibanags with 69.2 % also use intrasentential switching, there are more Ilocanos with 91.7 % use this type of code switching. The hypothesis is not rejected. There is an important relationship between the language profile students speak and code-switching in the classroom.

The results imply that students who are Ibanags are more inclined to use tag switching while students who are Ilocanos are more inclined to use intrasentential.

**Table 10. Cross-tabulation on the relationship between code-switching and respondents’ specialization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialization</th>
<th>Type of Codeswitching</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tag Switching</td>
<td>Intra-Sentential Switching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartending</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 displays the cross tabulation on the relationship between profile specialization of the students and code switching in the classroom instruction using Chi square test with computed value of 89.468, p value of .000 at a significant level of 0.01 More Drafting respondents with 77.8% use of tag switching than other specializations Bartending 100 percent, English 98.3 percent and Bread and Pastry Production (BPP) 100% who used intrasentential switching.

The results show that writing students tend to use tag switching while the Bartending, English and Bread and Pastry Production were inclined to use intrasentential.

CONCLUSION
Based on the previous results, it can be concluded that code switching is prevalent in classroom instruction and the most commonly used type is *intrasentential*. Students’ use of code switching is due to many reasons foremost of which is difficulty driven. This means that they lack the ease to transmit messages in the target language thus they code switch. Secondly, they code switch in consideration of as well as the diverse linguistic backgrounds of the interlocutors to promote solidarity with them. And thirdly, they resort to code switching when they put emphasis more on the meaning or communicative intentions and to stress out a point over the language itself. Moreover, sex does not influence the type of students’ code switching. However, the students’ type of code switching is affected by their age, language spoken and specialization.

Recommendations
In see of the discoveries and conclusions of the think about, the taking after are suggested:
1. Teachers should judiciously draw the line when to use code switching in classroom instruction. When the class code-switches due to deficiency-driven reasons, meaning students are not completely competent within the use of a target language then a non-discriminating ambience of learning should be encouraged. This way, the environment for learning can help in the understanding and mastery of the lesson. However, this type of code switching should only be used for this purpose so as not to sacrifice English fluency.
2. When the class uses the proficiency-driven code switching which means there is mastery of at least two languages where exchanging from one language to another occurs, then code-switching is encouraged in classroom instruction. This suggests a normal tendency among bilingual countries like ours.
3. For highly technical subjects such as Technical Drafting, Bartending and Bread and Pastry Production (BPP), code switching can be used to make knowledge more accessible and graspable to students.
4. Similar research is suggested to be conducted to confirm the findings of this study.
5. Revisiting the Bilingual Policy is encouraged.
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