



### Chief Editor

**Dr. A. Singaraj**, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

### Editor

**Mrs.M.Josephin Immaculate Ruba**

### Editorial Advisors

1. **Dr.Yi-Lin Yu**, Ph. D  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Advertising & Public Relations,  
Fu Jen Catholic University,  
Taipei, Taiwan.
2. **Dr.G. Badri Narayanan**, PhD,  
Research Economist,  
Center for Global Trade Analysis,  
Purdue University,  
West Lafayette,  
Indiana, USA.
3. **Dr. Gajendra Naidu.J.**, M.Com, LL.M., M.B.A., PhD. MHRM  
Professor & Head,  
Faculty of Finance, Botho University,  
Gaborone Campus, Botho Education Park,  
Kgale, Gaborone, Botswana.
4. **Dr. Ahmed Sebihi**  
Associate Professor  
Islamic Culture and Social Sciences (ICSS),  
Department of General Education (DGE),  
Gulf Medical University (GMU), UAE.
5. **Dr. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury**,  
Assistant Professor,  
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development,  
An ICSSR Research Institute,  
New Delhi- 110070.India.
6. **Dr. Sumita Bharat Goyal**  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Commerce,  
Central University of Rajasthan,  
Bandar Sindri, Dist-Ajmer,  
Rajasthan, India
7. **Dr. C. Muniyandi**, M.Sc., M. Phil., Ph. D,  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Econometrics,  
School of Economics,  
Madurai Kamaraj University,  
Madurai-625021, Tamil Nadu, India.
8. **Dr. B. Ravi Kumar**,  
Assistant Professor  
Department of GBEH,  
Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College,  
A.Rangampet, Tirupati,  
Andhra Pradesh, India
9. **Dr. Gyanendra Awasthi**, M.Sc., Ph.D., NET  
Associate Professor & HOD  
Department of Biochemistry,  
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Biomedical & Natural Sciences,  
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
10. **Dr. D.K. Awasthi**, M.SC., Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Department of Chemistry, Sri J.N.P.G. College,  
Charbagh, Lucknow,  
Uttar Pradesh. India

ISSN (Online) : 2455 - 3662  
SJIF Impact Factor :4.924

## EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed  
International Online Journal

Volume: 4 Issue:7 July 2018



**Published By :**  
**EPRA Journals**

**CC License**



**EPRA International Journal of  
Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)**

**OCCURRENCE AND COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSES OF  
FILIPINO CODE- SWITCHING IN HEADLINES OF FIVE  
PHILIPPINE TABLOIDS**

**Jonas V. Palada, Ed.D.<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Professor,  
Graduate School, Eastern Samar State  
University,  
Philippines

**Jovito B. Madeja, Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor,  
Graduate School, Eastern Samar State  
University,  
Philippines

**ABSTRACT**

*In the Philippine setting, codeswitching (henceforth, CS) from Filipino to English or from English to Filipino if treated as a language is like a lingua franca by which a number of users are largely increasing. This switching has even become a medium used in some commercial advertisements and even in hosting of formal gatherings like Binibining Pilipinas, Manila Film Festival and many other related functions. In fact, teachers and students in State Universities and Colleges and even private universities are already embracing this sociolinguistic phenomenon. In order to answer the question on communicative purposes and functions of code switching in this study, the sampled headlines will be coded according to the framework of Hamers and Blanc's (2000) main types of CS and Bautista (1999). The presence or occurrence of CS in headlines of five Philippine tabloids circulating in metro manila does not mean the incompetence of reporters or writers in L1 and L2 but is only done for some journalistic strategy or techniques to make their product which is the tabloid more catchy and interesting to the target reading public. This codeswitch in print media is not a sign of lack of proficiency in one of the two languages which is termed by Bautista (2009) as "deficiency-driven codeswitching." Communicative purposes in the use of codeswitching in this study is transparently for efficiency and impact. Headlines should appear catchy to the target readers and the editorial staff should find some ways to make their products saleable to the target market by using some linguistic devices or features that is acceptable to the reading public. Furthermore, codeswitching opens a lot of meaningful linguistic unit even with the use of single word as compared to the use of lengthy words, phrases, and sentences even it has similar thought or meaning if used in context.*

**KEYWORDS:** Code-Switching, Tabloids, Headlines, Communicative Purposes

## INTRODUCTION

In the Philippine setting, codeswitching (henceforth, CS) from Filipino to English or from English to Filipino if treated as a language is like a *lingua franca* by which a number of users are largely increasing. This switching has even become a medium used in some commercial advertisements and even in hosting of formal gatherings like Binibining Pilipinas, Manila Film Festival and many other related functions. In fact, teachers and students in State Universities and Colleges and even private universities are already embracing this sociolinguistic phenomenon. It was found that students or teachers code-switch not only as a fallback method when their knowledge of the L2 fails them, or for other participant-related functions, but also for discourse-related functions that contextualize the interactional meaning of their utterances. These uses strikingly resemble code-switching patterns in non-classroom bilingual settings and show that language learners are able to conceptualize the classroom as a bilingual space. Learners orient to the classroom as a community of practice (Wenger, 1998) through their code-switching patterns as manifestations of a shared understanding about their actions and about themselves as members of that community.

Based on several decades of research on bilingual interaction, it is clear that code-switching has been defined as the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single conversation or utterance and it has a characteristic feature of bilinguals' speech rather than a sign of a deficiency in one language or the other (Li, 2000, p. 17). In interactional contexts, CS has been shown to serve both *discourse-related* functions, which organize conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance, and *participant-related* functions, which are switches corresponding to the preferences of the individual who performs the switching or those of coparticipants in the conversation (Auer, 1984, 1998). Although this distinction was originally made based on observations of bilingual interaction in non-institutional settings, Martin-Jones (1995, 2000) argues—based on the fact that classrooms often include groups of people with differing language abilities and communicative repertoires—that this distinction is particularly useful for research on classroom interaction.

Furthermore, a great many scholars in sociocultural linguistics use a definition of *code switching* similar to Heller's: "the use of more than one language in the course of a single communicative episode" (1988a:1). Auer and Myers-Scotton, who largely disagree on how or why code switching occurs, nonetheless sound quite similar in their definitions of the phenomenon. Auer (1984:1) refers to "the

alternating use of more than one language," while Myers-Scotton (1993:vii) mentions "the use of two or more languages in the same conversation." Romaine (1989) cites Gumperz as the source of this definition. However, these definitions introduce an element not strictly present in Gumperz's definition: "Conversational code switching can be defined as the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (Gumperz 1982:59).

Note that Gumperz's original definition refers to "grammatical systems or subsystems," while the subsequent restatements refer to *languages*. While the former is scarcely more concrete or less ambiguous than the latter, it need not be assumed that the two terms are identical. The plural *languages* seems to suggest discrete varieties (as English, Spanish, Kiswahili, etc.), while the more equivocal "systems or subsystems" might equally imply languages or elements of a language, such as lexical items, syntactic constructions, and prosodic phenomena. This list of grammatical subsystems is very similar to Goffman's (1979) list of footing cues and virtually identical to Gumperz's (1982) preliminary list of contextualization cues.

The attempt to define *language* and *languages* is a perennial controversy in linguistics. By defining *code* simply as *a language (or variety of language)* without first defining these basic terms, scholars have essentially put off what should be a foundational question. Alvarez-Cáccamo (1990, 1998, 2000) provides exceptional attempts to define *code* and *code switching*. His discussion relies in turn on work by Jakobson (1971b; Jakobson, Fant and Halle 1952, inter alia) and Gumperz (1982, 1992, inter alia). Alvarez-Cáccamo (1998) points out that for Jakobson, an early adopter of the term *code switching* who was influenced by information theory, languages *have* codes; they do not comprise codes. A language user thus makes use of a code or codes when speaking, listening, etc. The precise nature of any language user's codes cannot be ascertained by an analyst nor by fellow speakers.

Undeniably, CS has become a sort of fashion or trend in language for it has become a phenomenon though some institutions like universities, broadcast and print media, church, private and government offices, and business and commerce find less acceptable and less favoured for political, social, and cultural reasons (Baker, 2006). It may be regarded as a form of disloyalty between different ethnic groups where language may be perceived as a prime marker of separate identity, power distinction, or social hierarchy (Baker, 2006). It may also be viewed as a sign of discourtesy in both formal and informal conversations

especially if one of the interlocutors does not understand the language the other party switches to. These perceptions and attitudes prevail despite the growing awareness that “those who are more fluent in a language have a tendency to code-switch” (Meisel, 2004, in Baker, 2006, p.109).

This distinction in the use of English and Tagalog affirms the observation that in diglossic societies where two languages exist side by side within a geographical area (Fishman, 1972, 1980), “the language community is unlikely to use one language for exactly the same purpose” (Baker, 2006, p. 69) and that this community assigns specialization of functions between different languages (Fishman, 1980). According to Baker (2006), “the use of,” for example, Tagalog, in a situation where English is expected is “typically embarrassing or belittling” (p. 70). However, in the same breath, he states that C-S is “a valuable linguistic tool” (p.109) which demonstrates a bilingual’s full use of language resources available to him, usually knowing that the listener fully understands the code-switches. He posits that C-S does not happen by chance. A bilingual person is driven by a purpose and logic whenever he switches codes. Myers-Scotton’s (1990) Markedness Model states that code-switching is “a negotiation of position, and people code-switch because of personal motivations” (in Bautista, 1999, p. 26). Bautista (1999) further explains that “this model is a restatement of Poplack’s (1980) comment that C-S is an over-all discourse mode and it is ‘the choice (or not) of this mode which is of significance to the participants rather than the choice of switch points’” (p. 26). Within this context of over-all code-switching, Bautista (1999, p. 26) proposes that “communicative efficiency—the fastest, easiest, most effective way of saying something” — is the answer to the question: Why do bilinguals switch here in this particular place rather than there?

Various terms have been used to describe switches between languages in both oral and written discourses. According to Baker (2006), “code-mixing is sometimes used to describe changes at the word level and a mixed language sentence” (p. 111). However, he argues that generally speaking, when two interlocutors switch codes whether at word, sentence or discourse levels, C-S occurs. Following is a brief explanation and illustration of Hamers and Blanc’s (2000, p. 259-260) four main types of C-S: Inter-sentential C-S where there is “...switch at clause/sentence boundary, one clause being in one language, the other clause in the other...” e.g., “So *tapos na tayo* (we are done) we made this already ” Extra-sentential (or tag) C-S where “...the insertion of a tag, e.g. ‘you know’, I mean’, from one language into an utterance which is entirely in another language.” e.g., “I think it’s a given, ‘*lam mo yun* (you know that).” Intra-sentential C-S “...where switches

of different types occur within the clause boundary, including within the word boundary...” e.g., “*Tapos magko-concentrate tayo sa drinking* (Then we will concentrate on drinking).” However, scholars put some linguistic constraints on occurrences of C-S. *The free morpheme constraint* (Poplack, 1980; Sankoff & Poplack, 1981) predicts that a switch cannot occur between a bound morpheme and a lexical form unless the latter has been phonologically integrated into the language of the former (i.e., borrowing). *The equivalence constraint* (Hamers & Blanc, 2000) “...predicts that the order of sentence constituents immediately adjacent to and on both sides of the switch must be grammatical with respect to both languages simultaneously” (p. 261). This is problematic though in terms of its universality because of the perceived differences in the grammatical categories of various languages. *The Matrix Language Frame Model* (Myers-Scotton, 2002, in Baker, 2006) claims that every act of C-S has a base and/or dominant language (Matrix Language; ML), in which element(s) of an Embedded Language (EL) is/are inserted and that ML “provides the grammatical frame or rules for grammar” (p. 109). She further claims that C-S is bound by rules (e.g., word order, verb endings) governing the use of secondary language, as its insertions will fit those ML rules.

Baker (2006) hypothesizes that whenever CS is prevalent in a language group, it may be “regarded as a sign that the minority language is about to disappear or becomes a key indicator of the health of a minority language” (p.109). For example, if the matrix language is Kapampangan and there are Tagalog insertions, this indicator for the future of Kapampangan will be positive. However, following Baker’s (2006) arguments, if the grammatical frame is Tagalog, this indicator for Kapampangan may be negative. It is very seldom that bilinguals keep their languages completely separate (Baker, 2006). The ways bilinguals mix them are complex and varied. To reiterate what has been said earlier, C-S varies according to who is/are engaged in a conversation, what is being discussed, and in what situation or context the conversation takes place. The interlocutors are constantly negotiating languages, topics or meaning in their conversations. Political, social, economic, cultural, and symbolic factors can influence C-S (Treffers-Daller, 1992, 1994; Stroud, 2004, in Baker, 2006).

D’Souza (1992) claims that there are three kinds of code-switching (code-mixing/CM in her study): *Competence-related CM* – where a person’s competence in L2 is low and therefore has to go back to L1, *Communicative CM* – where a person’s proficiency in two languages makes it easy for him/her to shift from one language to another, and *Culture-related CM* – where a person uses terms and expressions in L2 that cannot be expressed in L1. Based on D’Souza’s classification, Bautista (1999) proposes her own: *Deficiency-driven C-S*

– occurs when a person is not competent in L2 and therefore has to shift back to L1, and *Proficiency-driven C-S* – occurs when a person’s competence in both languages makes him/her decide to switch for a more effective/proficient way to express an idea .

Speakers use communicative codes in their attempts (linguistic or paralinguistic) to communicate with other language users. Listeners use their own codes to make sense of the communicative contributions of those they interact with. Listeners may need to shift their expectations to come to a useful understanding of speakers’ intentions. Similarly, speakers may switch the form of their contributions in order to signal a change in situation, shifting relevance of social roles, or alternate ways of understanding a conversational contribution. In other words, switching codes is a means by which language users may contextualize communication. A useful definition of *code switching* for sociocultural linguistic analysis should recognize it as an alternation in the form of communication that signals a context in which the linguistic contribution can be understood. The ‘context’ so signaled may be very local (such as the end of a turn at talk), very general (such as positioning vis-à-vis some macro-sociological category), or anywhere in between. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that this signaling is accomplished by the action of participants in a particular interaction. That is to say, it is not necessary or desirable to spell out the meaning of particular code switching behavior *a priori*.

Rather, code switching is accomplished by parties in interaction, and the meaning of their behavior emerges from the interaction. This is not to say that the use of particular linguistic forms has no meaning, and that speakers “make it up as they go.” Individuals remember and can call on past experiences of discourse. These memories form part of a language user’s understanding of discourse functions. Therefore, within a particular setting certain forms may come to recur frequently. Nonetheless, it is less interesting (for the current author at least, and probably for the ends of sociocultural linguistic analysis) to track the frequency or regularity of particular recurrences than to understand the effect of linguistic form on discourse practice and emergent social meanings.

Finally, *code switching* is obviously a practice of parties in discourse to signal changes in context by using alternate grammatical systems or subsystems, or *codes*. The mental representation of these codes cannot be directly observed, either by analysts or by parties in interaction. Rather, the analyst must observe discourse itself, and recover the salience of a linguistic form as code from its effect on discourse interaction. The approach described here understands code switching as the practice of individuals in particular discourse settings. Therefore, it cannot

specify broad functions of language alternation, nor define the exact nature of any code prior to interaction. Codes emerge from interaction, and become relevant when parties to discourse treat them as such. Furthermore, CS can be used to emphasize a particular point, clarify a point, reinforce a request, substitute a word, and/or express a concept that does not have direct equivalence in the other language. It can also be used for wider sociolinguistic reasons: indicating solidarity; humor; signaling a change of attitude or relationship; and/or including or excluding someone from the conversation (Baker, 2006, p.1111-112).

Based on Bautista’s (1999) findings, the driving force or reason behind code-switching among bilinguals is communicative efficiency. The following are the proposed four sets of specific evidence to support her claim: Insertion of Tagalog adverbial enclitics can communicate an idea more quickly and more easily, e.g.:

She just forgot *pala* to return the chair to her cubicle. In English, this would translate into “It turns out that she forgot to return the chair to her cubicle,” which would make it longer and less efficient. Insertion of content words which refer to cultural items facilitates communicative efficiency, e.g.:

We need to buy some *pasalubong* (gifts from travel) before relatives from the U.S. fly back home.

This content word may have translation equivalents, but not the exact equivalent in terms of emotional nuance or even referential meaning (Bautista, 1999). Use of idioms where availability of metaphorical expressions in the other language facilitates communication, e.g.:

*Marami siyang bala!* (Literally: He has many bullets. Figuratively: He has hidden talents/skills/potentials/surprises.)  
*Lalaki ulo nun!* (Lit.: His head will swell. Fig.: He might become a braggart.)

These metaphorical expressions seem to be pre-packaged, ready-made structures easily available for use as punch lines which lose their meanings when translated into other languages. Use of linguistic play where a speaker code-switches to be able to play with the word, e.g.:

Kikitain mo ba’ng *papa* mo ngayon? It seems that the speaker switched to English to be able to play with the English word, *papa*, to mean someone special. Obviously, previous studies focused on the Filipino-Code –switching in classrooms by both teachers and students. However, this study will consider a different genre specifically in the field of Journalism using Hamers and Blanc’s (2000) main types of CS and Bautista’s (1999) framework, specifically the researcher will look into the occurrence and communicative purposes of Tagalog-English code-switching using 60 headlines from five circulating tabloids in metro manila, namely: Police Files TONITE, Abante TONITE, People’s JOURNAL TONIGHT, BULGAR, and TEMPO.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Corpus**

In order to account for a larger number of occurrence and a comprehensive analysis or description of communicative purposes and functions of Filipino-English code switching in headlines of Five circulating Philippine tabloids in Metro Manila,, a corpus of 60 headlines of five circulating tabloids in metro manila, namely: Police Files TONITE, Abante TONITE, People’s JOURNAL TONIGHT, BULGAR, and TEMPO will be compiled. No specific number of headlines is identified for each tabloid. The sampled headlines are taken if there is an obvious presence of

code-switching in headlines from cover to cover of the tabloids. To get a suffice number of headlines, the researcher considered three different issues of each tabloid specifically issued from December 10 to December 15, 2010. The frequencies of occurrence of Filipino-English code switching in the sampled headlines of five tabloids will be recorded by getting the percentage based on their occurrence.

**Coding of Data**

In order to answer the question on communicative purposes and functions of code switching in this study, the sampled headlines will be coded according to the framework of Hamers and Blanc’s (2000) main types of CS and Baustista (1999).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Table 1. Occurrence of Filipino Code-Switching in Five Philippine Tabloids Circulating in Metro Manila**

Tabloids	No. of Occurrence n=60	Percentage(%)
TEMPO	3	5%
PEOPLE’S JOURNAL TONIGHT	10	17%
BULGAR	13	22%
ABANTE TONITE	26	43%
POLICE FILES TONITE	8	13%

Table 1 shows the occurrence of code switching in headlines of five circulating tabloids in metro manila. ABANTE gets a little over 40%, follows by PEOPLE’S JOURNAL TONIGHT by 17%, BULGAR with a little over than 15% , POLICE FILES TONITE with a little lower than 10%, and TEMPO with a little lower than 5%. TEMPO and PEOPLE’S JOURNAL are the two tabloids in which most of the articles are written in English and the other three tabloids, namely: BULGAR, ABANTE TONITE, AND POLICE FILES TONITE are tagalong-based tabloids. It can be noted from the data in table 1 that TEMPO being an English based tabloid gets only 3 headlines from the 60 corpus as compared to the PEOPLE’S JOURNAL TONIGHT which is another tabloid based on English which only has 10 headlines out of 60 sampled headlines. This indicates that PEOPLE’S JOURNAL TONIGHT welcomes the use of Code switching in writing its headlines the 3 codes witched headlines in TEMPO maintains its use of the English as priority language in writing its headlines.

To give a clearer picture on the occurrence of code switching in the two English based tabloids, some

of the sampled headlines from the two tabloids are given below:

**TEMPO HEADLINES:**

*Full alert kay Clinton*  
*Friendly reminder lang*  
*Pfizer sa World Pneumonia Day*

**PEOPLE’S JOURNAL TONIGHT HEADLINES:**

*Regine enjoy sa tomboy!*  
*Bulacan cops handa na sa special election*  
*Edu, nag-resign bago sibakin*  
*Bea, dedma sa breakup nila ni Gerald sa London*  
**OFW NALAGLAG MULA 6<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR SA MACAU**  
**MACHINE GUN KUNG MAGMURA**  
*Kwento sa likod ng Vito Cruz, Tondo operations*  
*Mag live-in partner huli sa 2 kilong marijuana*  
*Pakikipagtambal kay Shalani, joke lang ni Jingoy*

From the above headlines, it can be noted that TEMPO uses only one Filipino word in every headline, namely: sa, lang, and kay. Unlike in PEPOLE’S

JOURNAL TONIGHT, headlines are dominated by mostly Filipino words. The remaining percent of headlines found in two English based tabloids not included in the corpus are written in all-English headlines. This clarification is made because in the three Tagalog based tabloids like BULGAR, POLICE PROFILES TONITE, AND ABANTE TONITE, the remaining headlines not included in the corpus are written in all-Filipino headlines.

### Communicative purposes and functions of code switching in headlines of five tabloids based on the framework of Hamers and Blanc's (2000) main types of CS and Bautista (1999)

As this study is basically based on the framework of Hamers and Blanc (2000) and Bautista (2000), my discussion will be guided by these frameworks.

#### Extract 1

Full alert *kay* Clinton

Friendly reminder *lang*

Pfizer *sa* World Pneumonia Day

No prolem *kay* Kobe

Note that the above headlines use Tagalog words *kay*(for), *lang* (just), and *sa* (for). The use of short Tagalog words *kay*, *lang*, and *sa* in English sentences makes the communication more efficient and more quick because they contain a whole lot of meaning, which when expressed in English would be longer, hence, unnecessary in discussion or conversation. Without the use of these words, the sentences would be longer. This is called by Bautista (2009) in her article in the Manila Bulletin as the proficiency driven way of switching which is used by speakers who proficient in the two languages and who code switch for purposes of communicative efficiency. These three short words in Tagalog, *kay*, *lang*, and *sa* definitely have English equivalent but the effect would be a lot different if there is an element of code switching specially if the paper or the tabloid is published in a hugely Tagalog or Filipino speaking country. In effect this code switching from Filipino to English or vice versa in newspaper or tabloid where the target group of audiences is multilinguals. This switching or using of both languages used in the area somehow becomes readers friendly and to some extent create some journalistic appeal to the target readers who belong to the ordinary group of people in the society. These code-switching occurrences showed that the use of Tagalog enclitics like *kay*, *lang*, and *sa* made their observations/explanations more efficient, easier, and faster. These enclitics enabled them to say or explain in fewer Tagalog words what might have taken them longer had they resorted to using English sentences

#### Extract 2

NBI anti-smuggling operation *puputulin*

Regine enjoy *sa* tomboy

The above extract of headlines insert one foreign language to the majority of the language used in context like the verb *puputulin* (cut or stop) is used in the title along with three English words except the noun used as a subject which is NBI. The second headline use the verb *enjoy* along with two other Tagalog words except for the noun used as a subject which is *Regine*. Looking closely at these excerpts, if the English equivalent will be used in the first headline like NBI anti-smuggling *to be cut* or NBI anti-smuggling *to be stopped* would have a different effect and the purpose of communicative efficiency would not be realized. Furthermore the use of English in that line of context would have weaker impact to the readers compared to its original title which uses *puputulin*. I call this switch as **VERB SWITCHING** which is classified by Bautista's (1990) framework as intrasentential.

#### Extract 3

*Lover* tinanggalan ng mata

*Young actor*, balak pormahan si Kris

P235M bonus sa Makati *employees*

*FETUS* bininyagan para itapon

Gustong pakasalan and nabuntis na *girlfriend* na nag-aaral pa

Lauro umaasa pa rin na matutuldukan ang *massacre*

The English words *massacre*, *girlfriend*, *fetus*, *employees*, *young actor*, and *lover* are used in the headlines along with Filipino lexical items. It can be noted that the words in English are all nouns and are positioned in different syntactic functions which are subjects, objects, and complements. Another type of codeswitching that can be characterized by high proportions of what I call NOUN SWITCHING: switches of a single noun in an otherwise LI utterance, as exemplified in this excerpt: We'll go to the sala. (We'll go to the living room.) . The switching from Filipino-dominated string of words to English like *Lauro umaasa pa rin na matutuldukan ang massacre* and *Gustong pakasalan and nabuntis na girlfriend na nag-aaral pa* does not mean incompetence of writer in the use of Filipino language which is his L1 or his native language. Obviously, the writer aims an effective and efficient way of writing the headline that would capture the attention of the target reading public of his article. Aside from the fact that communicative purpose of efficiency will not be achieved if the Filipino or Tagalog equivalent will be used for these English words *massacre*, *girlfriend*, *fetus*, *employees*, *young actor*, and *lover* which can be translated in English as *massacre – madugong pagpatay or karumal-dumal na pagpaslang*, *girlfriend – siyota or kasintahang babae*, *fetus- ipinalaglag na sangol*, *employees- mga empleyado*

*or mga manggagawa, young actor- batang actor, lover – kasintahan* . Note that if the Tagalog alternative will be used it will take longer space because the Tagalog or Filipino alternative is much longer to type out (Bautista, 2009) and this is contrary to the element of writing headlines of news which demand a shorter or smaller counts of words.

Extract 4

*Machine gun* kung magmura

Gloria tatapyasan ng *Pork Barrel*

Note once again the switch of the writer from English to Tagalog language, *Machine gun kung mamura* or Tagalog to English language, *Gloria tatapyasan ng Pork Barrel* with the use of metaphorical language in English, *Machine gun* and *Pork Barrel*. Machine gun is associated to an overtly talkative individual, while pork barrel is the Countrywide Development Fund which is publicly known to be bulging amount of money for the lawmakers in the lower and the upper houses.

## CONCLUSION/ IMPLICATIONS TO REASEARCH AND LANGUAGE TEACHING

The other functions are not found in the corpus since this study is data-driven which means results are largely based on the data. My corpus is composed of 60 headlines in Philippine tabloids circulating in metro manila. Most of the research conducted focus specifically on oral codeswitching in classrooms participated in by both teachers and students. In my readings, I failed to encounter studies that examines the codeswitching in written materials specifically in the field of print media but what is interesting, I observed that CS is a random phenomenon, most investigators or researchers today appear to agree that it is not random but rule-governed. There is, however, no present agreement on the precise nature of the rules which govern codeswitching even in classrooms or school partly embracing this language system or linguistic phenomena. It seems clear that some of the constraints on its occurrence are out of the linguistic parameters or simply called as extralinguistic. Other factors constraining the occurrence of CS are linguistic, or internal to the discourse. I suggest that these factors covary, such that there will be higher proportions of certain types of switches in the presence or absence of certain extralinguistic factors. In order to describe linguistically the different types of codeswitches, we must first define the total population of possible forms: are there elements in discourse which cannot be switched? Are there environments in discourse where switches cannot occur?

The presence or occurrence of CS in headlines of five Philippine tabloids circulating in metro manila does not mean the incompetence of reporters or writers in L1 and L2 but is only done for some journalistic

strategy or techniques to make their product which is the tabloid more catchy and interesting to the target reading public. This codeswitch in print media is not a sign of lack of proficiency in one of the two languages which is termed by Bautista (2009) as “ deficiency-driven codeswitching.”

Communicative purposes in the use of codeswitching in this study is transparently for efficiency and impact. Headlines should appear catchy to the target readers and the editorial staff should find some ways to make their products saleable to the target market by using some linguistic devices or features that is acceptable to the reading public. Furthermore, codeswitching opens a lot of meaningful linguistic unit even with the use of single word as compared to the use of lengthy words, phrases, and sentences even it has similar thought or meaning if used in context.

For language teachers, CS should not be taken negatively as indicator or sign of teachers’ and students’ incompetence of whatever language they switch from. For nstance, and English teacher wants to explain an idea in literature or concept in grammar and s/he finds the students are uneasy because maybe they have difficulty of understanding the concept because the language used is pure English so the teacher switches to Tagalog in explaining the concept. This premise is supported by the Philippine Bilingual Education Policy (2006) which explains that one’s heritage language must be used as the medium of instruction starting with Grade 1 (with English to be taught as a second language). English becomes the medium of instruction for learning areas like English, Mathematics, Science and Health starting Grade 3. In the secondary level (high school), English is to be used as the primary medium of instruction in all public and private schools. Besides this is also supported in the conclusion of the study of Baustista (1999) that the Filipino bilingual uses the language that provides the easiest, fastest, most effective, or most colorful way of saying something. The bilingual switches to the code that facilitates the best expression of the content he or she has in mind, and the switching can involve a word, a phrase, a pre-packed idiom or expression, a clause, a sentence... (p. 29).

This present study opens a lot of research opportunities to the scholars for it is a different genre and CS In this particular field has a different function. It is also recommended that the future study would look into the possibility of knowing the profiles specifically the educational attainment of the reporters or the writers of tabloids if it gives a great influence of their codeswitching from L1 to L2 or L2 to L1 particularly in print media. It is also interesting to know the reasons why they codeswitch in writing headlines and news stories.

## REFERENCES

1. Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Auer, P. (1995). *The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach*. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Auer, P. (1998). *Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited*. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity* (pp. 1–24). London: Routledge.
5. Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
6. Bautista, M.L.S. (2009). *Why do we code-switch? Manila Bulletin*.
7. Bautista, M. L. S. (1999). *An analysis of the function of Tagalog-English code-switching: Data from one case. The Filipino bilingual: A Multidisciplinary perspective*. M. L.
8. D'Souza, J. (1992). *The relationship between code-mixing and the new varieties of English: Issues and implications*. *World Englishes* 9(2-3), 217-223.
9. Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of language*. Rowley, M.A.: Newbury House.
10. Fishman, J. A. (1980). *Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and societal phenomena*. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 1, 3-15.
11. Goffman, E. (1979). *Footing*. *Semiotica*, 25, 1–29.
12. Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
14. Hamers, J. F., & Blanc, M. H. A. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*, (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
15. Li, W. (2000). *Dimensions of bilingualism*. In W. Li (Ed.), *The bilingualism reader* (pp. 3–25). London: Routledge.
16. Martin-Jones, M. (1995). *Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research*. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Crossdisciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 90–111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Martin-Jones, M. (2000). *Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research*. *Language Teaching*, 33, 1–9.
18. Myers-Scotton, C. M. (1990). *Codeswitching and borrowing: Interpersonal and macrolevel meaning*. In R. Jacobson. (Ed.). *Codeswitching as a worldwide phenomenon*, 85-109. NY: Peter Lang.
19. Poplacks, S. V. (1980). *Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching*. *Linguistics* 18, 581-618.
20. Timm, L. A. (1975) *Spanish-English codeswitching: el porque y how-not-to*. *Romance Philology*. 28.
21. Wentz, J. (1977). *Some considerations in the development of a syntactic description of codeswitching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.