

Language Use as Audience Design: The Dichotomy of Language Choice in Content-Based Classrooms in a Malaysian University

Kamisah Ariffin^{1*}, Norzie Diana Baharum² and Rahimah Abd Wahab³

^{1,2,3}Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Pahang, Bandar Tun Abdul Razak Jengka, Pahang, Malaysia
kamisah@pahang.uitm.edu.my; norziediana@pahang.uitm.edu.my;
rw6106@pahang.uitm.edu.my

*Corresponding author

Abstract: The language policy in Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) clearly stipulates that English should be used as the medium of instruction in all programmes taught (*Surat Pekeliling TNC/100-UiTM (TNC(A) 1/1*, 7 May 2003). However, it has been observed that such language policy cannot oversimplify the complexities of the actual language use in the (at least) bilingual context of interaction in the classroom. This paper sets to present and discuss the extensive use of both BM and English in the formal classroom setting in Universiti Teknologi MARA despite the stipulated language policy. The data were represented by the discourse of content-based classroom sessions. The findings suggest language choice was highly governed by the social and psychological variables of the speakers. This paper, however, only focuses on speakers' language choice and use as audience design in the context of interaction. Using Bell's (1984; 2001) audience design model as a framework, the data indicate that the impact of the audience on the speakers' speech style depends on how they ratify and accommodate the audience in terms of their norms of interaction, competence, linguistic awareness and accommodation of the audience's needs. In addition, speakers' style-shifting in response to topic(s) is also due to the association of topics with the audience. This study contributes to the advancement of knowledge in the sociolinguistic phenomena in real communication, by providing real examples from a situated discourse. The findings have shown that the regulation of the institutional language policy has oversimplified the complexities of the actual language use in a bilingual/multilingual context of interaction.

Keywords: audience design, language choice, language use, classroom discourse

Introduction

The academic policy in Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) has decreed that English should be used as the medium of instruction in all courses taught (Ahmad, 2003). This approach, known as Content-Based Instruction (CBI) or Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), aims at improving the local students' English language competence incidentally through the exposure of English in the content-based classrooms. The approach has been increasingly adopted as a means of developing both linguistic and content ability (Howard, 2006; Song, 2006; Corrales & Maloof, 2009). With the vast amount of information currently available in English, most higher learning institutions in Malaysia have now moved towards the CBI/CLIL approach with the hope that the exposure to English can help to improve the students' English language competence. This, in turn, will give them access to the information and facilitate the acquisition of knowledge in their fields.

To date, there has been no formal thorough assessment carried out since the enactment of CBI/CLIL policy in UiTM. This paper reports a part of an investigation of the language(s) favoured by the speakers in the classroom domain by examining the discourse of the content classroom sessions in terms of the speakers' language choice and use, and the factors governing the choice which could provide insights into a range of perspectives underlying the choice despite the stipulated policy. The main focus of this paper is on speakers' language choice as audience design in the context of interaction.

Language Use in the Content-Based Classroom

The basic premise of content-based instruction (CBI) or Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), is using the target language (TL) to teach the subject content. It aims at fostering the integration of language and content with 'language as a medium for learning content and content as a resource for learning and improving language' (Stoller, 2002). The CBI/CLIL approach has been widely adopted due to its benefits in language and content learning. It acts as a dual sword in learning,

that it can promote academic growth while developing language proficiency at the same time (Crandall, 1993; Short, 1997; Snow, 1998; Stoller, 2004). Curtain and Pesola (1994, p.35) contend that

... in content-related instruction, the foreign language teacher uses concepts from the regular curriculum to enrich the program with academic content . . . The curriculum content is chosen to provide a vehicle for language learning and to reinforce the academic skills needed by the students.

Although arguments on the potential benefits of content-based instruction have been replete, research has shown that such policy cannot oversimplify the complexities of the actual language use in the classroom context (Setati et al., 2002; Kamisah, 2009). How this type of instruction is actually appropriated, understood, and carried out in practice in the classroom should be evaluated. Classroom observations have provided evidence that the policy of a single language use of the TL in the content-based classrooms can be wide off the mark. For example, instructors not only have to be competent in content knowledge, they also need the linguistic ability to deliver the content effectively. Likewise, students' linguistic competence should also be sufficient to handle the curriculum. In addition, a range of socio-cultural and linguistic factors can also affect speakers' language use in the context of interaction.

Studies have indicated that bilingual instructors in multilingual classrooms tend to switch their languages when the situation requires them do so (Algarin-Ruiz, 2014; Jegede, 2012; Gulzar 2010). Chavez (2006 as cited in Jones, 2010, p. 11) puts forward that 'the motivation for using the L1 in language instruction ranges from the perceived need to accommodate students in their native tongue to offer explanations of L2 concepts that do not exist in the L1'. Along the same line, Zazkis (2000) reports classroom communication where the official language of mathematical instruction is frequently English. In this setting, teachers code-switched in order to translate or clarify instructions as well as to reformulate and model appropriate mathematical language use. Students, on the other hand, code-switched to seek clarification and to express their ideas or arguments.

In the same vein, Abad's (2005) study on classroom discourse in a high school Christian Life Education class indicates that teachers' code-switching helped the teachers to bridge the gap between the Bible and the learners to explain the concepts in simplified form and help them find meaning in Bible reading. Abad (2010) also found that code switching in Chemistry and Geometry is a resource in making knowledge more comprehensible to the students than when only English is used.

In addition, Jegede (2012) examined language use in the teaching and learning of mathematics in multilingual public primary schools in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. He found that code-switching is a useful strategy in classroom interaction and an efficient way of transferring knowledge to students rather than conforming to only one language instruction.

Apart from that, languages other than the TL have also been used for pedagogical and social purposes in the classroom. Pedagogically, teachers switch and mix codes for explaining and clarifying concepts, checking understanding, giving directions and procedures and translating (Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff, & McHatton, 2006; Fennema-Bloom, 2009; Gulzar, 2010). In short, the use of both L1 (or other languages understood by the students) and the TL can provide teachers with the flexibility to express concepts and ideas with more precision than they would if only one language (Bernardo, 2005). Socially, such speech mode is also used for establishing and maintaining solidarity and group membership, affective function and as a role of administration or management (Kamisah, 2009; Xing, 2010).

These findings indicate that the actual practice of CBI in the classroom might not be aligned to its principle, i.e using the TL to teach content. A range of factors may contribute towards this non-alignment, one of which is audience design, which is the focus of this paper.

Language Use and Audience Design

Audience design is the speaker's action in shaping his/her language and linguistic elements by taking into account his/her audience in the context of interaction. This involves shifting his/her stylistic

choices in order to respond to the audience or to meet the audience's communicative need in the interaction.

Bell (1984; 2001) proposed that speakers design their style of speech according to their audience. In his audience design model, Bell explained that speakers adjust their speech in response to the audience – they may choose a style towards the audience's speech to express solidarity with them, or at the other end, away from the audience's speech to express distance from them. According to the model, there are four types of audience based on the speakers' perspective – 1) addressee – the known audience in the speech context and directly addressed, 2) auditor – the ratified or acknowledged audience in the speech context but not directly addressed, 3) overhearer – the non-ratified listeners but are aware of (by the speaker), and 4) eavesdropper – the non-ratified listeners and are not aware of (by the speaker). Bell attested that the impact of the audience on the speakers' speech style depends on how they ratify and accommodate the audience. In addition, Bell also suggested that speakers' style-shifting in response to topic(s) is also due to the association of topics with the audience.

Studies have shown that speakers tailor their speech according to their audience. Milroy (1987, p. 185), for example, observed that 'in the West of Ireland, Irish/English bilinguals will switch to English not only in addressing an English-speaking monolingual, but in the presence of such a person who in Bell's (1984, p. 172) term is an auditor - that is, a person ratified as a participant in the interaction'.

Along the same line, Morais (1995) in her research on the code-switching phenomenon in a Malaysian workplace setting found that there was a sign of mutual convergence between the bosses and subordinates. The subordinates' use of English, and the bosses' switch to Bahasa Malaysia (BM) were seen as a counter move towards reaching and preserving some 'semblance of balance in the interaction' (Morais, 1995, p. 46).

Similarly, Nair-Venugopal (2000), in her study on multilingual speakers' language use in two business organisations in Malaysia, found that language choice of the interlocutors depended largely on the audience in the context of interaction. She found that English was used when the audience was from the upper rung of the ladder in the organisation as they were expected to have a good level of competence in that language. The local variety and BM, on the other hand, were used to accommodate those who had lower level of competence in English.

Nair-Venugopal (2000) also observed that style-shifting also occurred as a convergent strategy in communication. She found that in the discourse of an organisational training programme, the trainer changed his language of instruction from English to BM in order to accommodate the trainees' request. He claimed that in order to achieve effective communication, he needed to 'come down to the level of the participant' as 'with this kind of crowd, you got to play by the ear' (Nair-Venugopal, 2000, p. 151).

In addition, Jariah (2003), in her micro-ethnographic study of talk exchange among working adults during office meeting in a Malaysian public department, illustrated how speakers design their talk to wield power among the audience. The analysis revealed how speakers shifted their speech style to show their social standing in the context of interaction – the participants code-switched between English and BM to show dominance, assertiveness and indicate the exercise of power to the audience in the interactional context.

Along the same line, Asmah (2003), found a pattern of language choice among bilingual speakers in Malaysia. She found that the bilinguals would use their own language or dialect when communicating with people from their own ethnic groups. On the other hand, they would use Bahasa Malaysia and English or a mixture of these languages when there were people from other ethnic groups involved. Asmah claimed that the choice was due to the speakers' effort to conform to the group as 'in social interaction, it is natural for speakers to conform to one another and to echo each others' choice and style' (2003, p. 165).

Last but not least, Nguyen (2015) examined the use of minority languages on Twitter across various settings. The findings indicate that, even in communication via social media, users (liken to speakers in oral communication) tend to adapt their language choice to their audiences. In Twitter conversations, the users' language choice is mainly influenced by the language of the tweet they are responding to.

The Study

Like other CBI/CLIL implementation in other countries, there are also issues regarding the CBI/CLIL approach in Malaysia. Classroom observations have provided evidence that the policy of using English in the content-based classrooms may not be easy to implement. The success highly depends on the instructors' competence in delivering the content in English as well as the students' linguistic ability to receive it. Besides, other factors such as attitude towards the TL can also affect the language use in the classroom. Although evaluations on the actual language use in CBI/CLIL in the Malaysian classrooms have been scarce, there is broad consensus that speakers do use other languages besides BM in their interaction in this domain. This is because a speaker can and may choose a code from his or her repertoire when communicating, influenced by an array of factors influencing the choice.

The main objective of this study is to obtain a picture of language use in the CBI/CLIL context. In addition, it examines the audience design factors that shape the speakers' language and stylistic choice despite the regulation set by the university's language policy in this domain. Thus, the research question can be expressed as the following:

- i. What is the pattern of language use in the CBI/CLIL sessions?
- ii. What are the audience design factors that influence the speakers' language use in the CBI/CLIL sessions?

Methodology

The study employed 2 types of data gathering techniques; recorded discourse and interviews. The initial intention of including classroom observation as one of the data collection procedures was eliminated as the instructors objected to it. Convenience method of data collection was employed as it depended largely on the consent of the instructors for audio recording of the classroom discourse and interviews.

Four CBI/CLIL lessons and four instructors were involved in this study: one from the Faculty of Applied Business Management (Session A), one from the Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences (Session B), one from the Faculty of Business Management (Session C) and one from the Faculty of Accountancy (Session D). The audio-recorded lessons of these courses formed the main data for analysis. It contained segments of monologic instructors' talk as well as the interactive segments between the instructors and students. This was complemented by data from the interviews with the instructors.

The recorded discourse was transcribed using the generally accepted conventions of broad orthographic transcription. Specific details like prosodic elements of or other conversational behaviour were not transcribed as the study was only interested into looking at the pattern of language use.

The analysis of the discourse incorporated an integrated framework of data analysis to explain language use in interaction – audience design (Bell, 1984; 2001), domain analysis (Fishman, 2000), ethnography of speaking and communication framework (Hymes, 1968), code-switching (Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Poplack, 1980; Bakhtin, 1981; Myers-Scotton, 1992).

Findings and Discussion

The analysis of the data reveals that both of the CBI/CLIL sessions were not fully carried out in English, the stipulated language of instructions. It is found that the speakers, who are at least bilinguals of Bahasa Malaysia (BM) and English, as a result of the country's compulsory bilingual education system, would choose any of the languages in their repertoire and understood by others in the context of interaction. Thus, where English has been decreed as the language of instruction in the CBI/CLIL classroom, it was not the only language use throughout. BM also emerged as a preferred choice in the interaction although it was not produced at a full range within one particular speech event. There were evidence of code-switching or code alternation and code-mixing between these two languages.

The data also indicate that speakers' language use cannot be regulated by any policy. Rather, the language of interaction was influenced by a range of social and psychological factors. This is in line with many empirical research on language use in bilingual classrooms (Algarin-Ruiz, 2014; Jegede, 2012; Kamisah, 2009). The following section describes how the speakers took into consideration the audience factors when designing their speech.

Norms of Interaction

The analysis shows that speakers' language use was regulated by the norms of the community rather than the set policy. The data indicate the speakers took into account the audience's language norms of interaction when delivering their speech, that is, they tended to choose the language that audience normally use in their communication.

For example, in Session A, the instructor used both English and BM extensively as he was aware of the audience linguistic behaviour in communication. Being a bilingual of BM and English, he knew that it is normal for bilinguals to mix both languages in interaction. He attested in the interview that he mixed both languages as it seemed that it was the natural thing to do in speaking:

"It is *natural*, kan. Kita memang cakap *both language* pun kalau kat luar kelas. Jadi kalau guna dua-dua bahasa pun, *it is not something* yang pelik pun. Kalau cakap English semua tu yang pelik, jadi kelas English lak hahah."

(It is natural, isn't it? We do speak both languages outside class. So if (we) use both languages, it is not something out of the ordinary. It will be strange if we use English totally, it will become English class then hahah.)

There is rampant evidence of mixed languages of English and BM in both his and the audience's speech. The excerpt below illustrates this language use which reflects the norm of interaction of the speech community:

Excerpt 1

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Instructor | <i>Most of you</i> , ni kan. <i>How many times</i> saya nak cakap. <i>You all</i> tak faham ke. Atau tak nak dengar.
<i>(How many times should I tell you? Don't you understand? Or you just don't want to listen.)</i> |
| Student 1 | <i>Sorry</i> , Encik. <i>Confuse</i> , Encik.
<i>(Sorry, Sir. [We were] confused, Sir.)</i> |
| Student 2 | Haah. <i>We all confuse</i> part tu. Ingat kena buat <i>column</i> .
<i>(Yes. We were confused on that part. We thought we had to make a column)</i> |
| Instructor | <i>Sorry</i> , morry. Yang ni tak patut ada <i>column</i> . <i>No column</i> . <i>Please remember that</i> . <i>There shouldn't be any column!</i> Siapa buat <i>column</i> lagi, siap!
<i>(Sorry, morry. This one should not be a column. No column. Please remember that. No column. Who made a column next time, you know what will happen!)</i> |

Similar evidence can also be found in Session B. Based on the interview data, the instructor was aware that BM is the language norm in the students' daily communication. However, being the computer science students, they cannot avoid using English when it comes to technical jargons and referential items. It is a norm for these students to use English technical words amidst the matrix language of BM in their speech. Thus, it is not surprising when similar behaviour is observed in the classroom. As claimed by the instructor in the interview,

"*Students* ni memang biasa macam ni. Cakap memang BM, tapi bila *technical words* je, terus guna English. Dalam kelas pun macam tu juga. Dah memang macam tu."

(It's the norm [for the students]. [They] will speak in BM but when it comes to technical words, they will use English straight away. It is the same in class. It is the norm.)

The following excerpt is one of the examples:

Excerpt 2

- Instructor Sebelum tu kita kena tentukan beberapa perkara seperti *paper size*, *scale* dan juga beberapa *measurement unit*. Mula-mula, pergi kepada menu bar, kemudian *file*, lepas tu *setup*. Ok? *Windows* pada *setup* tu akan tunjukkan *print setup*, *page size*, *drawing scale*, *page properties*, *layout and routing* dan juga *shadows*. Nampak tak?
(*Before that, there are a few things we need to determine, such as proper size, scale and measurement unit. First, go to the menu bar, then file, and then setup. Ok? The setup windows will show print setup, page size, drawing scale, page properties, layout, routing and shadow. Can you see those?*)

Competence

The data illustrate that linguistic competence was one of the major factors influencing one's choice of a language. However, the data also demonstrate that it is not only the speakers' competence that determined the choice but rather the audience's competence. This is because the speakers wanted to ensure understanding and achieve the communication objectives.

The data demonstrate that the instructor in Session C mainly used BM during the lesson and this was highly due to the participants' level of competence in the languages.

Excerpt 3

- Instructor Yes, that is brand. Very important in marketing. People, consumers, associate brands with something like price, luxury. But not necessarily in all categories. For example, some consumers are content with generic laundry detergent or paper towels, but would not consider purchasing or using a generic hair product. Follow me?
- Students (Silence)
- Instructor Tak paham?
(*[You] don't understand?*)
- Student 1 Apa maksud *generic*?
(*What is generic?*)
- Instructor *Generic* tu jenis yang *common*, yang biasa.
(*Generic means of the common type*)
- Student 2 Tadi Puan cakap *content*. *Content generic*?
(*Just now you mentioned content. Content generic?*)
- Instructor Tak. *You all* tak paham *content* tu. Maksudnya puas hati. *Happy*. Ok je. So tak semestinya *customer* ok je jenama yang biasa untuk satu produk tu macam sabun, dia akan beli jugak jenama yang biasa untuk produk yang lain macam untuk mekap.
(*No. You don't understand the meaning of content. It means satisfied. Happy. Ok with it. So, if a customer is ok with the common brand of a product like detergent, not necessarily he or she will also buy the common brand for other products for cosmetics.*)
- Student 1 Oooo *content* tu maksudnya suka atau puas hati la.
(*Oooo. The meaning of content is 'like' or 'satisfied'*)

As can be seen from Excerpt 3, the instructor automatically switched her speech to BM when she realized that the students were not able to understand the concept of marketing when they did not know the meaning of certain words. She switched to BM in order to aid the students' understanding. The last comment by Student 1 indicates that the understanding of the concept was actually hindered by her (and other students') incompetence in the TL. Similar findings have also been observed in Kamisah's (2009) and Nair-Venugopal's (2000) research in bilingual interaction.

The interview data confirm that the tendency for the instructor to use a language depended on his or consideration of the audience's level of competence in that particular language.

“Dah nampak tercengang-cengang, kenalah guna BM. Tak boleh guna *bombastic words* sangat dengan dia orang ni”

(*They seemed lost, so I had to used BM. [I] cannot really use bombastic words in this class.*)

On the other hand, the instructor in Session D clearly favoured English when she knew that the students were competent in that language. She started her explanation in English and checked the students' understanding by asking them to retell what had been explained in their own words. Once she was satisfied with students' capability of understanding her explanation in English, she continued using the language mainly throughout the lesson. The interview data concur that the instructor continued using English during the lesson as she found that the audience did not have any difficulties in understanding her speech and were able to give appropriate response confidently and competently in that language. This can be shown in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 4

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Instructor | Now we look at assets and liabilities. Err.. Assets are property or legal rights owned by an individual or business to which money value can be attached. Liabilities is the opposite. It means what the business owes to outsiders. Clear? |
| Students | Yessss. |
| Instructor | Shazwani, what is the difference between assets and liabilities. |
| Student 1 | Err asset is what we have. Assets with value |
| Instructor | Such as? |
| Student 1 | House, car, ..errr |
| Instructor | Yes, good- |
| Student 2 | Pen, pencil hahah |
| Student 3 | Father, mother, children.. |
| Instructor | Haha yes. Those are assets too, right. Different kinds of assets. So liabilities is just the opposite. That is why we put assets in the left side of the balance sheet and liabilities on the right side. |

Linguistic Awareness

The analysis also shows that the instructors were aware of the problems faced by the audience with regards to the discrepancies of the linguistic aspects between English and their mother tongue. With this in mind, instructors switched from English to BM for the purpose of reiterating the messages to ensure mutual understanding. Zazkis (2000), Abad (2005) and Abad (2010) also found similar functions of code-switching in their research. The following excerpt from Session D illustrates this.

Excerpt 5

- | | |
|------------|--|
| Instructor | Calculate the total profit if R is fifteen percent, <i>lima belas</i> percent more than Y. |
|------------|--|

As can be seen from Excerpt 5, the speaker reiterated the word 'fifteen' in BM 'lima belas' to ensure that the audience would not mistakenly understand it as 'fifty'. As a member of the speech community herself, she was aware that the vowel quality would usually cause misunderstanding in communication among the Malaysians. This is because pronunciation in BM does not have any discrepancies in meaning between long and short vowels.

A similar example is also found in Session C where the instructor translates the English confusable words into BM to ensure understanding as shown in Excerpt 6.

Excerpt 6

Instructor	What is a market? Anybody?
Student 1	Business.
Instructor	What about business?
Student 2	Trading. Buy and sell.
Instructor	Partly you are right. Err Market is where forces of demand and supply operate, and where buyers and sellers interact, err directly or through intermediaries, to trade goods, services, or contracts or instruments, for money or, or barter. And, and it also includes mechanisms or means for determining price of the traded item. Price ya, p-r-i-c-e. <i>Harga, bukan p-r-i-z-e. yang tu hadiah.</i> (.. price, not p-r-i-z-e, that is prize.)

Speaker-Audience Relationship

Another important factor determining speakers' language choice is their concern of their relationship with the audience. This could be examined under two dimensions: the status relationship and the social distance between them.

There is evidence in the discourse that the instructors tried to build a friendly and relaxed atmosphere rather than a formal one. One of the strategies to achieve this was by being accommodating to the language style of the audience. This is shown in the following excerpt from Session C.

Excerpt 7

Instructor	How to sell your product? Fadil, if you have a business, budu bisness, how do you sell it?
Fadil	Haha jua kat Azrul jah. Kaki budu tu haha (<i>Haha, just sell it to Azrul. He loves budu haha</i>)
Instructor	Ho la, mu bisnes ngan Azrul jah, camna nak untung. (<i>Ha – if you just do business with Azrul only, how are you going to get any profit?</i>)
Class	(Laughter)
Instructor	Musti la ado strategi. Musti plan. Camno nak buak? Research dulu. So, a good marketing strategy should be based on market research and focus on the product mix in order to achieve the maximum profit and sustain the business. (<i>[You] must have strategies. [You] must have plans. How do you do it? Do some research first ...</i>)

As can be seen in Excerpt 7, the instructor shifted her speech style from English to the Kelantanese dialect when Fadil, a Kelantanese, spoke in that dialect. Although the instructor was not from Kelantan, she accommodated to Fadil's language style in order to affiliate herself with the audience and to create a friendly and relaxed atmosphere. It is also her strategy to attract the audience's attention to the topic of discussion. In addition, this is also as a strategy to affiliate with the group (Asmah, 2003; Xing, 2010).

Accommodating to the Needs of the Audience

The data show that speakers' language choice is also associated with their effort to accommodate to the audience's needs. There was evidence that speakers' design their talk according to the audience needs and requests as shown in the following excerpt from Session A.

Excerpt 8

Instructor	Look at the definition of orientation in your book. What is it? Aisyah what
------------	---

	does it say?
Student 1	Err orientation is the process of new employee assimilation, and a part of his or her continuous socialization process in an organization.
Instructor	What does it mean? In your own words?
Student 1	Err orientation, err orientasi.
Instructor	Yes, orientasi.. right, and?
Student 1	Tak tau la Encik. <i>(Don't know, Sir)</i>
Instructor	How about the new employee assimilation? Look at the word socialization.
Student 1	Tak paham Encik. Cakap BM boleh? <i>(Don't understand, Sir. Can you speak in BM?)</i>
Instructor	Hmmm macam ni la. Mula-mula register sini dulu awak ingat tak Minggu Wawasan Siswa? <i>(Mmmm it's like this. When you first registered here, do you remember Minggu Wawasan Siswa?)</i>
Students	Ingattttt. <i>(Yes, we do)</i>
Student 1	Macam tu ke? <i>(Is it like that?)</i>
Instructor	Lebih kurang macam itulah konsepnya. Assimilation tu maksudnya macam mana awak menyesuaikan diri dengan tempat baru. Jumpa orang, kenal tempat. <i>(It is more or less the same concept. Assimilation means how you adapt yourself to the new place. Get to know people, know the place)</i>

As can be seen from the data, the instructor shifted to BM when the student requested him to do so. Although he seemed reluctant to do it at first, he obliged and switched to BM to explain the concept of orientation and assimilation. His switch seems to facilitate understanding as it is evident that the students started to understand the concept when the instructor gave explanation in BM. This is in line with Abad's (2010) and Jegede's (2012) findings that switching to the language understood by the students can be a resource in making knowledge more comprehensible to the students than when only English is used.

Topic Association with the Audience

There is also evidence in the data that concurs with Bell's (1984) suggestion that speakers shift their speech style in response to topic(s) associated with the audience. Excerpt 9 below shows that the instructor shifted from English to BM when he narrated his own similar experience that the audience had gone through.

Excerpt 8

Instructor	At times, the orientation process can be very demanding. Macam masa MMS masa minggu tu, awak rasa penat, kan? Dah lah tu, kadang- kadang boring nak mampus. <i>(... It's just like during the MMS. During the week you felt tired, right? Not only that, at times, it was dead boring).</i>
Students	Haha.. betul-betul. <i>(Haha..Yes. It's true).</i>
Instructor	Saya ingat lagi, masa ceramah saya bantai tidur. <i>(I still remember. I slept through the speeches).</i>
Students	Haha. Sama la, encik.. <i>(Haha. We did that too).</i>

The data show that the instructor not only switched languages when describing a topic associated with the students, but he also switched to colloquial phrases such as 'boring nak mampus' (dead boring)

and 'bantai tidur' (slept through). Such style shifting was also motivated by his attempt to show solidarity and create affinity with the students.

Conclusion

This study has shown that the regulation for the language of instruction in content-based classroom has oversimplified the complexities of the actual language use in this domain. The findings have pointed that speakers' choice of language is influenced by the audience in the context of interaction. In other words, who you are talking to and who are present during the interaction affect what you say and how you say it. The findings also call for attention of policy makers. Once decreed, there should be evaluation on the implementation of the policy – how CBI/CLIL is appropriated, understood and executed by the instructors in the classroom. The findings also show that instructors do not conform strictly to the one-language instruction policy as they believe that the use of both students' first language and the TL in the classroom can help them promote better understanding. As contended by Tukinoff (1985, p. 19-20) on the use of two languages for effective instruction:

...effective teachers make use of every available resource – including knowledge of a limited English proficient (LEP) students' native language – to ensure that students learn. ..The purpose for language alternation should be tied to achieving effective instruction.

Acknowledgment

This study is supported by the Ministry of Higher Education, Malaysia, under the Research Acculturation Grant Scheme (RAGS), Project No.600-RMI/RAGS5i3(11912014)

References

- Abad LS (2005) Code-switching in the Classroom: A Clash of Two Languages? Faculty Research Journal of Miriam College, 36-52.
- Abad LS (2010) An Analysis of Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Codeswitching in Teaching Science and Mathematics in a Philippine Private High School. The Journal Of Asia TEFL Vol. 7, No. 1, p. 239-264.
- Ahmad HZ (2003) 'Syarahan dalam Bahasa Inggeris': Surat Pekeliling TNC[100-UiTM(TNC(A) 1/1,7 Mei 2003.
- Algarin-Ruiz KM (2014) Code Switching: A Tool in the Classroom. Education and Human Development. Unpublished master's theses. Paper 393.
http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/ehd_theses/393
- Asmah HO (2003) Language and Language Situation in Southeast Asia: With a Focus on Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur: Akademi Pengajian Melayu, Universiti Malaya.
- Bakhtin M (1981) The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays. Edited and translated by Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bell A (1984) Language Style as Audience Design. Language in Society,(13): 145-204.
- Bell A (2001) Back in Style: Reworking Audience Design. In Eckert, Penelope; Rickford, John R. Style and Sociolinguistic Variation. p. 147. Cambridge: CUP.

- Bernardo A (2005) Bilingual Code-Switching as a Resource for Learning and Teaching: Alternative Reflections on the Language and Education Issue in the Philippines. In D. Dayag & J. Quakenbush (Eds.), *Linguistics & Language Education in the Philippines & Beyond*. p. 549-554. Manila, Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines
- Blom JP, Gumperz, JJ (1972) Social Meaning in Linguistic structures: Codeswitching in Norway. In JJ Gumperz & D Hymes (eds.). *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. pp. 407-434. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Corrales K, Maloof C (2009) Evaluating the effects of CBI on an English for Medical Students Program. *Latin American Journal of CLIL*, 2 (1).
- Crandall J (1993) Content-Centered Learning in the United States. In W. Grabe, C. Ferguson, R. B. Kaplan, GR Tucker, & HG Widdowson (Eds.), *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13. Issues in Second Language Teaching and Learning, p. 111-126. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Curtain H, Pesola C (1994) *Languages and Children: Making the Match*, Foreign Language Instruction for an Early Start Grades K-8. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Fennema-Bloom JR (2010). Code-scaffolding: A Pedagogic Code-switching Technique for Bilingual Content Instruction. *Journal of Education*, 190(3): 27-35.
- Fishman J (2000) Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When? In Li Wei (ed.). *The Bilingualism Reader*.p. 89-108. London: Routledge.
- Gulzar MA (2010) Code-switching: Awareness about Its Utility in Bilingual classrooms. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 32(2): 23-44.
- Howard J (2006) Models of Integrating Content and Language Learning. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 361-83.
- Hughes C, Shaunessy E, Brice A, Ratliff MA, & Alvarez-McHatton P (2006) Code switching among bilingual and limited english proficient students: Possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30: 7-28.
- Hymes D (1968) *The Ethnography of Speaking*. In J. Fishman (ed.). *Readings in the Sociology of Language*. p 99-133. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jariah MJ (2003) Code-switching for Power Wielding: Inter-gender Discourse at the Workplace. *Multilingua* 22:41-57.
- Jegede OO (2012). Roles of Code Switching in Multilingual Public Primary Schools in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 1(3): 40-46.
- Jones H (2010, March 25). First Language Communication in the Second Language Classroom: A Valuable or Damaging Resource.
<http://nativelanguageuse.weebly.com/uploads/4/0/4/5/4045990/roleofnativelanguage.pdf>
- Kamisah A(2009) The Interaction of Language, Topic and Speakers: Code-switching in Classroom Discourse. In David, M.K., Mc Lellan, J., Rafik-Galea, S. & Abdullah, A. (eds). *Codeswitching in Malaysia*. p 81-95. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Milroy L (1987) *Observing & Analysing Natural Language: A Critical Account of Sociolinguistic Method*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.

- Myers-Scotton C (1992). Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 13(1-2): 19-39.
- Morais E (1995) Code-switching in Malaysian Business and Its Role in Management of Conflict. *Jurnal Bahasa Modern, Fakulti Bahasa danLinguistik, Universiti Malaya*, 9:29-48.
- Nair-Venugopal S (2000) *Language Choice and Communication in Malaysian Business*. Bangi: UniversitiKebangsaanMalaysia.
- Nguyen D, Trieschnigg D (2015) Audience and the Use of Minority Languages on Twitter. *Proceedings of the Ninth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Poplack S (1980) Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish y Termino en español: Towards a Typology of Codeswitching. *Linguistics*, 18:581-618.
- Setati M, Adler J, Reed Y., Bapoo B (2002). Incomplete Journeys: Code-switching and Other Language Practices in Mathematics, Science and English Language Classroom in South Africa. *Language and Education* 16(2): 128-149.
- Short D (1997) Reading and writing and . . . social studies: Research on Integrated Language and Content in Second Language Classrooms. In M. A. Snow & D. M. Brinton (Eds.). *The Content-Based Classroom: Perspectives on Integrating Language and Content*. p. 213–232. New York: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Snow MA (1998) Trends and Issues in Content-Based Instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18: 243-267.
- Song B (2006) Content-based ESL Instruction: Long Term Effects and Outcomes. *English for Specific Purposes*, 25: 420–437.
- Stoller FL (2002) Promoting the Acquisition of Knowledge in a Content-Based Course. In J. Crandall & D. Kaufman (Eds.). *Content-Based Instruction in Higher Education Settings*. p. 109-123). VA: TESOL.
- Stoller FL (2004) Content-Based Instruction: Perspectives on Curriculum Planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24: 261-283.
- Tukinoff WJ (1985). *Applying Significant Bilingual Instructional Features in the Classroom*. Rosslyn, VA: InterAmerica Research Associates.
- Qing X (2010) To switch or Not to Switch: Examine the Code-switching Practices of Teachers of Non-English majors. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(4): 109-113.
- Zazkis R (2000) Using Code-switching as a Tool for Learning Mathematical Language. *For the Learning of Mathematics*, Vol. 20(3): 38-43.