
Speech Task Accomplishment in the Task Based Second Language Teaching Classroom: What is the Role of Language Choice?

Mihiri Jansz
International Institute of Health Sciences

Key Words: Peer Interaction, Language Choice, Bilingual Code Switching, Speech Tasks, University Students

1 BACKGROUND

This paper looks at collaborative speech tasks through the lens of language choice during student peer interaction, in an effort to identify the role (if any) which language choice plays in task accomplishment. Further, student perspectives are sought to identify their views on language choice during collaborative task interaction. Collaborative tasks themselves are a hallmark of task based language teaching methodology. Collaborative tasks or group work has been viewed from many perspectives: as a facilitator of student practice of the second language (L2) (Hancock, 1987); as a locus of second language learning (Long 1981, and Swain 1985, cited in Mitchell and Myles, 2004); and as a zone of proximal development (Vygotsky 1974, cited in Oxford, 1997).

The concept of 'Language choice' is based on the premise that individuals in multilingual societies have available to them more than one code with which to communicate (Wardhaugh, 2010, p. 84). Individuals make a choice of one code over another in different situations and circumstances (Fishman, 1965/ 2000). This phenomenon is known as language choice (LC). It is further illustrated by Spolsky and Shohamy (2000, p. 6) who state that "Every speaker has his or her own language practice, his or her own 'course of action' in the choice of a language from among alternatives".

Task accomplishment is also a key term in this paper and refers to the successful achievement of a task in the second language classroom. The term 'task accomplishment' is used by Mondada and Doehler (2004, p.502) in their study of language acquisition in a second language classroom. It can be defined by using Ellis' (2003, p. 178) description of a task as "tools for constructing collaborative acts". Additionally, taking into consideration that he also states that "learning takes place when learners actually use a new skill in the accomplishment of some goal", one can deduce that 'task accomplishment' is the use of a new skill in a collaborative act in the accomplishment of some goal.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The relationship between task accomplishment and LC has not been, in general, explicitly studied by researchers, but research conducted on LC in the classroom and research on code switching (CS) in particular have highlighted the relationship. Some of the findings relevant to this paper are from Hancock (1997), Behan and Turnbull (1997 cited in Swain and Lapkin, 2005), Anton and Dicamilla (1999), Fotos (2001), Mori (2004) and Unamono (2008).

Hancock (1997) examined the LC of eighteen students learning English, whose first language (L1) was Spanish. He analysed the recordings of students performing two different role-playing activities of one and a half minutes duration each. Hancock, in his study, identifies a number of salient instances of functional CS by learners: these include, 'prompt appeal', 'prompting' and 'boundary exchanges' categorized as metatask. Hancock defines 'metatask' as "discourse about the task" and 'metalanguage' as discourse about language (p. 224). However, because Hancock has recorded what the students speak as the end product of the task, it can be argued that Hancock has recorded the performance and not what would normally constitute group work interaction, which is the preparatory interaction within the group. Observation and analysis of within group interaction would be more salient to assess the language choice of learners during group activity.

Anton and Dicamilla (1999) studied the collaborative talk of five dyads of students completing writing tasks in a foreign language classroom. The students were native speakers of English with limited proficiency in Spanish and learning it as a foreign language. Interactions between these dyads during three collaborative tasks were analysed. A finding from the study that is very relevant to this research paper is that their L1 was used to create a social pace that would facilitate the completion of the task through 'intersubjectivity', a shared perspective of the task.

Moreover, Fotos (2001), in her study of Japanese university students with a low proficiency in English as an L2, found that CS is used for clarification, to signal repair, as fillers, to indicate task terms and to show emphasis.

Additionally, Mori (2004) highlights the facilitative use of L1 and / or CS. In her single case study, which utilized a methodology based on Conversational Analysis, it was found that though her subjects were in a classroom which enforced the maximum use of L2, they used L1 for a variety of purposes including that of 'meta task talk'¹. She also notes

¹Mori defines this as discourse about the task. This term is parallel to the term 'metatask' used by Hancock (1997).

that students respected the L2 policy of the class in front of the instructor, but that this led to an inefficiency of communication. Stemming from this observation, Mori raises the issue of whether the target language (TL) only policy causes "unnecessary hindrances" (p. 547).

This issue of imposed LC policy causing adverse effects was raised earlier by Behan and Turnbull in 1997 (cited in Swain and Lapkin, 2005). Behan and Turnbull, in a classroom based research on immersion programme students, conducted an experimental study where groups were given a cognitively demanding oral presentation task. Two of the groups were monitored and were told to speak French (the TL) when they 'slipped' into their L1 (English). The other two groups were unmonitored. However, the oral presentations of the unmonitored groups were assessed as better than the monitored groups, indicating that the freedom to use L1 during collaborative tasks has a beneficial effect on task activity as well as on L2 development.

A more recent study by Unamuno (2008) focuses on four immigrant- native adolescent dyads in the multilingual classroom. He found that CS served the purpose of addressing task management and task accomplishment. This reinforces the view of CS being a 'task facilitator' in the L2 classroom.

Furthermore, Carless (2008, p. 337) points out that the LC of mother tongue during collaborative task interaction could occur as a result of "unfamiliarity with the topic, lack of planning time, or cognitive complexity".

The use of L1/ CS and thus LC has been shown by researchers to be a factor in task accomplishment. However, research on the role of LC during collaborative task interaction in the Sri Lankan context is lacking. Furthermore, a student perspective on LC is additionally lacking. This paper attempts to fill the research gap identified.

3 SAMPLE AND METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted with second year under-graduates in the Faculty of Management and Finance, University of Colombo. The methodology consisted of a qualitatively weighted mixed method case study approach. Data from 18 recordings of students interacting during tasks; 172 questionnaire responses and 15 interviews were analysed for the study.

Participants from four different levels of L2 proficiency were first recorded interacting during a given speech task. Later, for comparison, a different speech task was given to participants from the four levels of L2 proficiency and their interaction recorded again.

The study made the assumption that participants had available to them the languages or codes of: Sinhala; English; and CS. Participants were selected who shared a common L1 of Sinhala (with one exception²), and who studied in a faculty which had English as its medium of instruction. Furthermore CS of Sinhala and English can be considered a separate language on the basis of work by Senaratne (2009, p. 258) who concludes that the Sinhala-English "mixed variety" is "an evolved linguistic code".

4 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The findings in this study will be discussed under two major headings; namely findings from analysis of the audio recordings dealing mostly with LC and task accomplishment and subsequently the data from the questionnaires and interviews will be considered which will primarily deal with participant perspectives of LC.

4.1 Findings based on recorded interaction

After analysis of the tape scripts, it was found that generally participants used a combination of L1, L2 items and rehearsed L2, in varying proportions during interaction, to accomplish the task. This pattern is not typical of advanced L2 proficiency participants who in some groups which were male dominated utilized this language choice pattern whereas the female dominated groups in the advanced level had much more use of L2. The LC patterns identified among a majority of the participants revealed interesting uses of LC for task accomplishment. Primarily the L1 served as the language that handled the cognitive load of the task, but most often this code was integrated with lexical items from the L2 relevant to the task at hand; which made the code of interaction a mixed code according to the matrix language frame (MLF) model proposed by Myers-Scotton (1993). Using the MLF model, the mixed code can be described as a combination of the matrix language being L1, Sinhala and the embedded language of English the L2.

A good example of the L1 integrated with L2 items to handle the cognitive aspects of the task is presented below, in this excerpt it is clear that students use L1 to discuss the main requirement of the task, which in this case is creating a story based on pictures given to the group.

²As the numbers were very small in the lowest L2 proficiency level the researcher had to record and analyse an interaction with a participant whose L1 was Tamil.

Example 01: SM1: eeta passe yage yage girlta girlge birthday ekata yaata
 /eeTə passe jaage jaage galTə galge batde ekaTə jaaTə/
(after that, for his for his girl girl's birthday, y for her)

phone ekak ganna kivanna eka thamai mea (tika) thiyenne haridha?
 /foon ekak ganna kijanna ekatamai me (Tika) tijenne harid?/
(he tells him to buy a phone, that is what is in this, right?)

mea phone (kawuruth) () passe yaluwek ekka katha karanavaa mona
 / me foon (kawurut) () passe jaaluwek ekka kata karanavaa mona/
(this phone (anyone)() later, he talks with his friend to ask which)

phone vargayadha ganna kiyala passe=
 / foon wargajada ganna kijala passe /
(phone brand to buy, later=)

A further example of how the task is discussed with a mixed code is presented below.

Example 02: SM25: DVD players dhamudha athulata?
 /damuda aetulaTə?
(shall we include DVD players?)

SM26: play karanava kiyala dhamu
 / karanawa kijala damu /
(we'll say that it plays them)

SM25: nathnam TV ma kiyala dhaanna puluwang ne?
 /naetn/ /mə kijala daanna puluwang ne/
(or we can just put is as a TV, no?)

ehama nedha?
 /ehema neda /
(isn't it so?)

The following example is very interesting as before the episode was given, the students were using more L2, however when they came to a difficult point in the task that needed resolving they switched to the mixed code, as seen below:

Example 03: SF12: meake beach ekak vage

/mekə biit[ekak wage/

(this is like a beach)

SF14: paarak nedha?

/Paarak neda/

(it's a road, isn't it?)

SF12: naa, naa gaagak nedha? Beach ekak mehema enne

/naeae naeae gangak neda biit[ekak mehema enne/

(no, no isn't this a river? A beach comes like this

naa ne?

/naeae ne/

(not, no?)

SF12: naa, ow ne, meaka bridge ekak thiyana ekakak

/naeae ou ne meka bridʒ ekak tijaŋa ekak/

(no, yes, no, this is something that has a bridge)

The use of rehearsed L2³ in combination with the mixed code is a fascinating LC as it proves to be crucial for both task accomplishment as well as meta talk⁴. Typically one student from the group would dictate the final script for the task, while another member wrote it down. As the participant dictated there is ample opportunity for the other members to contribute and correct the script, this leads to discussion on both the content and the language of the script: Giving participants the opportunity to refine the final product of the task, facilitating task accomplishment. See the examples below.

³Rehearsed L2' is a phenomenon identified by the author of this paper. It refers to the mechanical use of spoken L2 that cannot be identified as a dialogue but more of a recited or read out form of vocal L2.

⁴Meta talk has been postulated according to Swain, Brooks and Tocalli-Beller (2002) to be a locus of L2 learning. However, this aspect is beyond the analytical scope of the present paper.

Example 04 : SM3: **the mans reading the newspaper. The mans**

SM4: **are**

SM3: **are reading the newspaper. Reading the reading the
newspaper.**

Example 05: SM11: **after kiyala dhaamudha? onnaa ne after kiyala...**

/afta kijala damuda? onnaeae afta kijala /

(shall we put after. No need no to put after)

Example 06: SF21: **we..can we can work with**

SF22: **work it]**

SF23: **use it]**

SF21: **ow, naa, apita vada karanna puluvan. ekiyanne**

/ ow naeae apiTa waeda karanna puluvan ekiyanna/

(yes, no, we can work. that means)

we can work with mini computers. smart mini computers.

Example 07: SF26: **immediately** nathuwa vena mokkak hari liyaa ganna ko.
/naetuwa vena mokak hari lijaa ganna koo/
(write something else without using 'immediately')

SF28: ↑ **quickly quickly quickly**

SF27: **Quickly**

SF30: haridha?
/harida/
(right?)

Example 08: SM16: **drunk** nedha (1) drink wala past tense.
/Drank neda Drink/ wala pasT Tens/
(isn't it 'drunk', the past tense of 'drink'?)

Finally, the use of the language choice patterns is to aid task management which in turn aids task accomplishment. Task management includes clarification about task demands and role assignment. As Macaro (2005) highlighted, in many L2 classrooms although tasks are given, task management language is rarely discussed or taught, leading participants to use L1 or CS for this. However, this use of L1 / CS was the least cited as a reason for LC by the participants in this study.

Example 09: SM8 (mother tongue – Tamil): mey thuna kiyapang

/ me tuna kijapan/

(tell these three things)

- Example 10: SM9: () **pictures** ne? Thiyana pilivelata ganna onedha dhannaa ne?
/ne? tiəna pilivelata ganna oneda dannaeae ne?
(pictures, no? Don't know if we have to take in the order it is in?)
- SM1: naa pilivelata naa
/naeae pilivelata naeae/
(no, not in order)
- SF: naa order ekata naa
/naeae oda ekəTə naeae/
(no, not in order)
- SM2: [eka]
/eekə/
(it)
- SF: **story** ekak (...)
/ekak/
(it's a story)
- SM10: pinthurəyak, **story** ekak
/pintuurajuk/ /ekuk/
(picture, a story)

- Example 11: SM17: visthreta mea pahata ekai dha dheikai dha?
/vistareta me pahaTa eka da dekai da/
(the explanation for five , one or two)
- SM18: pahatama ekai. Ekak hadhala liyanna venne (04)
/pahata ekai akak hadala lijanna venne/
(all five in one. We have to make one and write)
- (SM): ()
- SM19: dhang onne mea mea tiken ()=
/dan onna me me tijenne tiken/
(now from this)
- SM18: ekak ekak hadhana hati pahadhili karamu. Meya paththaren
/ekak ekak hadana haeTi paeaedili karamu. Meja pattaren/
(let's get it clear how to get one done .this person, newspaper)
dhakinava. Mea tharaga vagayak thivenava kiyala=
/dakinavaa. Me taraga vagajak tijanava kijala/
Sees. That there are some competitions)
- Example 12: SM31: bedhaa gamu ko↑
/bedaa gamu ko/
(lets divide it)
- SF23: ekkenek ne kiyanne?
/ekkenek ne kijanne/
(isn't it one person who tells it?)
- SF24: naa
/naeae/
(no)
- SM31: naa, hatharadhenaama kiyanna ...
/naeae hataradenaama kijanna/
(no, all four have to tell)

Example 13: SF29: Kaw dha **introduction?**
/kauda /
(who the introduction?)
SF30: meyaa
/mejaa/
(this one)

The examples given indicate that the unique LC pattern of collaborative task interaction is indeed an important factor in task accomplishment. It can be seen that LC is relevant to task accomplishment in three distinct roles:

1. Aid participants in handling the cognitive load of the task
2. Provide opportunity for participants to provide input and refinement of the final product of the task
3. Facilitate task management

4.2 Findings concerning participant perspectives

A number of factors, both pragmatic and affective, have impinged on LC during collaborative task interaction according to participants. Some of the most salient have been discussed in this paper.

Participant perspectives of LC contributing to task accomplishment is noteworthy as the majority of participants reject it. However, the word 'quickly' could have negatively influenced this outcome. It could be deduced based on this response that students are unaware of how their LC contributes to task accomplishment.

Table 1: Response to statement: "During group activity in the English class I talk in Sinhala to finish the activity quickly"

During group activity in the English class I talk in Sinhala to finish the activity quickly		level of proficiency in English				Total
		1	2	3	4	
strongly agree	Count	2	7	3	1	13
	P. W. L. P*	28.6%	10.6%	4.8%	2.7%	7.6%
Agree	Count	1	16	16	8	41
	P. W. L. P*	14.3%	24.2%	25.8%	21.6%	23.8%
Disagree	Count	2	30	35	16	83
	P. W. L. P*	28.6%	45.5%	56.5%	43.2%	48.3%
strongly disagree	Count	2	13	8	12	35
	P. W. L. P*	28.6%	19.7%	12.9%	32.4%	20.3%
Total	Count	7	66	62	37	172

* P.W.L.P - Percentage within level of proficiency

On the other hand, many participants from different levels of L2 proficiency did cite the use of L1/ CS to help them deal with the cognitive aspects of the task, in open ended questions and interview responses. Specifically some participants have stated that the exchange of ideas, unhindered by misunderstanding is more easily done in the L1. Furthermore, interviews elicited such statements as the following:

A: samahara eva sinhalenma vitharak baa engreesiven kiyannath baa,
/samaharak evaa sinhalenma vitarak baeae inriisijen kijannat baeae/
ea avasthaavea sinhalai engreesi dhekama paavichchi karaama apata
/ ee avastaave sinhalai inriisi dekaama paavit[ti karaama apata/
ara hithea thiyana adhahasama kiyavaganna puluvang.
/ara hite tijena adahasma kijavaaganna puluwan/
(some things we cannot say only in Sinhala we can't tell it in English either. In those instances, using both Sinhala and English helps us to express what is in our mind)

B: sinhalen ideas share kara gena eeta passe kattiyama vachana
/ sinhalen aiDias [aer kara gena iTa passe kaTTijama wat[ana /
varadhena thang hadhala ehama thamai karanne.
/waradena taen hadala ehema tamai karanne/
(We share our ideas in Sinhala and then correct the words we get wrong, that's how we do it)

C: sithuvili hodhata ganudhenu karanna puluvan vennea sinhalen.
/sithuvili hodaTe ganudenu karanna puluwun wenne sinhalen/
ea nisaa sinhalen kathaa karanava.
/e nisaa sinhalen kataa karenawaa/
(Thoughts can be better exchanged in Sinhala so we speak in Sinhala)

This confirms that one use of LC is to negotiate the cognitive load of the task.

As indicated in quote A above and quotes D, E and F below, Participants generally seemed to have a very positive view of the role of CS. The following quotes indicate support for the stance of various researchers such as Hancock (1997), Anton and Dicamilla (1999), Fotos (2001) and Mori (2004) concerning the pragmatic functions of L1 and/ or CS such as lexical and content assistance.

- D: vadi pura kalavamak thama katha karanne, dhigatama engreesiyen
/waeDi pura kalavəmak taama kataa karanna digəTəmə inriisijen/
katha karanna baa
/kataa karanna bæəə/
(mostly we speak in a mixture, because we can't talk continuously in English)
- E: kalavamak katha karanne ithing boho dhurata engreesi vachana
/ kalavəmak kata karanna itin bohoo durəTə inriisi wat[əna/
samahara engreesi vachana thiyenavaa mee api ething kohomath katha
/samaharə inriisi wat[əna tjeəvəə me api itin kohomat kata/
karana kota engreesi vachana amathaka novenniy
/ karəə koTə inriisi wat[əna amətəkə novennai/
saamanyayen saamanya minissu athara baavithaa vana nisaa
/ saamaanjəjen saamaanjə minissu atəra baawitaa vənə nisaa/
(We talk in a mixture because to a certain extent there are some English words, so when we speak, so that we won't forget the English words...generally people use it in everyday conversation.)
- F: Sinhala ehema bhavithaa karanne samahara ea vachana dhannathi
/sinhala ehəmə baawitaa karanna samaharə ee wat[əna dannati/
kamak thiyənavaa
/kamak tijeəvəə/
(Sinhala is used like that because some words are not known)

However, a more alarming view of L2 was also revealed in both the open ended question responses and the interviews. A pervading reluctance to make errors in the L2 seems to be inhibiting students from using the L2. This can be likened to a manifestation of 'unwillingness to communicate' as postulated by McCroskey (1984, cited in Oxford,1997) as one of its features is "perceived incompetence" (p. 451).

These quotes would give an indication of this inhibitive phenomenon, quote H is taken from the open ended question responses:

G: apata katha kara ganna puluwang eganagaththa varadhdhak nathuva
/ apata kataa kara ganna puluwun iganagatta vaeraeddak naetuwa/
puluwan kiyala avasthaavak apata hagunoth ewage velaavakata
/puluwan kijala avastaavak apəTə haegunot ewage welaawəkəTə/
engreesi bhavitha venavaa
/ inriisi baavita wenəvaal

(If there is an instance when we think we can speak, or we can speak without a mistake, or something we have already learnt even, then we will use English)

H: mata engreesi baa ne
/mata ingriisi baeae ne/
(I can't speak/use English)

There were also other numerous references in the open ended question responses to a lack of 'fluency' in the L2 preventing the participant from using L2 in collaborative task interaction.

Another affective consideration that participants referred to is the use of L1 because it is the group norm; this is a manifestation of 'communication accommodation theory' proposed by Sachdev and Giles (2004, cited in Be Chin and Wigglesworth 2009, p. 118). According to this theory individuals use communication to indicate their attitude to each other and adapt their communicative behaviours to accommodate their interlocutor. This is also known as 'convergence'. Accommodation to and the citing of the shared L1 of Sinhala as a group norm during collaborative task interaction was reported from all levels of L2 proficiency but more so among more advanced L2 proficiency participants. This can be

observed in the response to the statement "During group activity in the English class I prefer to speak in Sinhala because it makes me feel closer to my group members" in table 02. One advanced L2 proficiency participant also stated in the close question response that it was difficult to bond using L2 while another commented that, if there is 'a lack of bonding', participants do not use L2.

Table 2: Response to statement: "During group activity in the English class I prefer to speak in Sinhala because it makes me feel closer to my group members."

During group activity in the English class I prefer to speak in Sinhala because it makes me feel closer to my group members.		level of proficiency in English				Total
		1	2	3	4	
strongly agree	Count	0	5	8	6	19
	P. W. L. P*	.0%	7.6%	12.9%	16.2%	11.0%
Agree	Count	2	30	29	16	77
	P. W. L. P*	28.6%	45.5%	46.8%	43.2%	44.8%
Disagree	Count	2	25	19	14	60
	P. W. L. P*	28.6%	37.9%	30.6%	37.8%	34.9%
strongly disagree	Count	3	6	6	1	16
	P. W. L. P*	42.9%	9.1%	9.7%	2.7%	9.3%
Total	Count	7	66	62	37	172

Participants in interviews reveal a sense of alienation from the L2 and also indicate that L1 and/or CS were more natural. Therefore language choice among students in the higher L2 proficiency levels is a strong identity and community maker as proposed by Be Chin and Wigglesworth (2009). Further, the lack of identification with the L2 is revealed to greater extent in the closed question response with an overall majority of participants indicating agreement to the statement "during group activity I don't speak English because it's a language not close to me" (Table 3). However, the least agreement to the statement is by the participants in the highest level of proficiency

Table 3: Response to statement: "During group activity in the English class I don't speak in English because it's a language not close to me."

			level of proficiency in English				Total
			1	2	3	4	
During group activity in the English class I don't speak in English because it's a language not close to me.	strongly agree	Count	3	12	8	1	24
		* P.W.L.P	42.9%	18.2%	13.1%	2.7%	14.0%
	agree	Count	1	31	30	12	74
		* P.W.L.P	14.3%	47.0%	49.2%	32.4%	43.3%
	disagree	Count	3	17	16	18	54
		* P.W.L.P	42.9%	25.8%	26.2%	48.6%	31.6%
	strongly disagree	Count	0	6	7	6	19
		* P.W.L.P	.0%	9.1%	11.5%	16.2%	11.1%
Total		Count	7	66	61	37	171

Finally, the role of language anxiety in dictating LC, is complex as the responses from the questionnaire and interviews don't quite tally. It does emerge though that language anxiety may be lesser with peers than in teacher- student interaction. One aspect of language anxiety highlighted by Tsui (1996) is evident in collaborative task interaction that is the reluctance to display greater proficiency in the L2 than peers. This is clear from the interview response below.

I: Boys innava api English valin katha kaloth egollo nung hithanavaa
/bois innava api ingli[valin kataa kalot egollo nur hitenavaa/
kapila peenna nisaa kiyala. Eka nathi karannata sinhalenma katha
/kaepila peenna nisaa kijala. eeka naeti karanneta sinhalenma kataa/
karanavaa.
/karanavaa/

(There are boys, and if we talk in English they think that we are trying to stand out, to avoid that we talk in Sinhala itself)

Participant perspectives of LC are varied; some of the most salient for language teachers and material developers are that students recognize that L1/ CS has certain strategic value during collaborative task interaction. While students do not expressly state that this aids task accomplishment, it is not too much of an extension to postulate that it does.

Further, some significant affective factors detract from student use of L2 during collaborative task interaction; namely, 'perceived incompetence' a feature of "unwillingness to communicate", 'accommodation', and to some degree 'language anxiety'.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper confirms previous findings that LC does indeed play an important role in task accomplishment. It is however a two edged sword: while LC has been shown to have numerous strategic uses, the prompting of certain LC patterns is cause for concern. The inhibitive 'unwillingness to communicate' which has stemmed from a preoccupation with accuracy and fluency has led to students denying themselves opportunities to practice and use L2. Further, some have perceived the need of L1 as a language of accommodation or convergence indicating that insufficient bonding has taken place between students. Language anxiety appears to be lesser in collaborative task interaction. However the reluctance to appear better in the L2 than one's peers is also restraining L2 use.

On the other hand, the strategic uses of L1, CS and rehearsed L2 cannot simultaneously be ignored or discounted. It is a powerful resource for students that enables them to negotiate more complex tasks and accomplish them in L2.

Therefore, it is recommended that teachers, material writers and course developers take into account both the positive and negative motivations for LC. Thereby a dynamic inclusive approach to language choice would evolve.

It is recommended that in complex tasks, task accomplishment be the goal and for language practice less cognitively demanding tasks be given. It is also recommended that the language of task management be introduced to students. It is further stressed that teachers of L2 become more aware of the facilitative nature of L1 and CS in the L2 classroom. The affective factors found in this study that negatively influence LC, should also be addressed urgently: in particular the counter-productive attitude to mistakes in the L2.

REFERENCES

- Anton, M. & Dicamilla, F. (1999) . Socio-cognitive functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83,(2), 233 - 245
- Be Chin, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2009) . *Bilingualism: an advanced resource book*. New York: Routledge
- Carless, D. (2008) . Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT Journal* 62, (4), 331-338
- Ellis, R. (2003) . *Task based language learning and teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press..
- Fishman, J. (2000) . Who speaks what language to whom and when? In L. Wei (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp.89-106). London & New York: Routledge. (Original work published 1965)
- Fotos, S. (2001) . Codes switching by Japan's unrecognised bilinguals: Japanese university students' use of their native language as a learning strategy. In M.G. Naguchi & S.Fotos (Eds.), *Studies in Japanese bilingualism* (pp.329-352). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters
- Hancock, M. (1997) . Behind classroom code switching: Layering and language choice in L2 learner interaction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31,(2) 217- 235
- Macaro, E. (2005) . Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In E. Llorida (Ed.), *Non-Native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp.63-84). New York: Springer
- Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (2004) . *Second language learning theories* (2nd ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.
- Mondada, L. & Doehler, S. P. (2004) . Second language acquisition as situated practice: task accomplishment in the French second language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*. 88, (4), 501-518
- Mori, J. (2004) . Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*. 88, (4), 536-550
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in code switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1997) . Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern language Journal*. 81, (4), 443-456
- Senaratne, C. D. (2009) . *Sinhala-English code-mixing in Sri Lanka: A sociolinguistic study*. Retrieved from Utrecht Publishing and Archiving services: <http://www.lotpublications.nl/index3.html>
- Spolsky, B. & Shohamy, E. (2000) . Language practice, language ideology, and language policy. In R. D. Lambert and E.G. Shohamy (Eds.), *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton* (pp. 1-32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins B. V.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L. & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002) . Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22 , pp 171-185
- Swain, M. And Lapkin, S. (2005) . The evolving socio-political context of immersion education in Canada: some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15, (2), 169-186
- Tsui, A. B. (1996) . Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In Bailey, K. M. & Nunan, D. (Eds.) *Voices from the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Unamuno, V. (2008) . Multilingual switch in peer classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education* 19, (1), 1-19
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006) . *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.