EFL Classroom

Code-Switching

Eda Üstünel

EFL Classroom Code-Switching

This book makes an important contribution to understanding language alternation practices in a Higher Education EFL context, and adds to a small but growing body of work on CA and classroom learning and code-switching. Üstünel's study confirms previous findings from other studies on language choice, but in doing so it extends this work by bringing rigour in terms of the methods used for interpretation of the data.

— Anna Filipi, Senior Lecturer
Monash University, Australia

Eda Üstünel

EFL Classroom Code-Switching

palgrave
macmillan

Eda Üstünel
Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi,
Muğla, Turkey

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of Abbreviations

A	Answer
CA	Conversation Analysis
CA-for-SLA	Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition
DA	Discourse Analysis
EAL	English as an Academic Language
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
ESL	English as a Second Language
IRF	Initiation/Response/Feedback Follow-up
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
Q	Question
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
T	Teacher
TL	Target Language
TETE	Teaching English through English
TESOL	Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development

1

Introduction to Some of the Terminology

1   Definitions

1.1   EFL and EFL Classroom Discourse

Crystal (1995: 108) defines the term "English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL)" as "English seen in the context of countries where it is not the mother tongue and has no special status, such as Japan, France, Egypt, and Brazil". English as a second language (ESL) is another term which can be found in English language teaching (ELT) literature. Crystal defines the term "ESL" as "English in countries where it holds special status as a medium of communication" (ibid.). This term has also been applied to "the English immigrants and other foreigners who live within a country where English is the first language" (Crystal, ibid.). In this book, I define the research context as an EFL classroom setting because Turkish is the official mother tongue of Turkey and English has no special status.

Classroom discourse, here in particular EFL classroom discourse, is the collection and representation of interactional practices that are centred on the institutional goal of teaching in instructed (language) learning contexts. An instructed language learning setting may refer to a traditional

foreign language classroom, as well as to one-to-one language tutoring contexts and online or face-to-face teaching contexts.

1.2   L2 and L2 Classroom Discourse

The term second language (L2) in this book does not only refer to a second language as in mainstream Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. L2 is more of an umbrella term that stands for a second/foreign/additional language used in an instructed language learning setting.

L2 classroom discourse is unique in many ways. L2 classrooms have their own interactional architecture (Seedhouse 2004) that can be tracked through the institutional finger prints (Drew and Heritage 1992) observed in exchanges between learners and teachers and also between learners in a given classroom setting. Classrooms are institutional settings in which learning is co-constructed between participants. Language learning is guided by foreign language teachers, both directly through talk-in-interaction, and indirectly through teachers' facilitation of peer and/or group interactions or autonomous learning opportunities through classroom activities.

1.3   Monolingual vs. Multilingual Classrooms

With regard to the distinction between monolingual and multilingual classrooms, Atkinson (1993: 1) defines a "monolingual English class" as "one where the learners all have a common language other than English (and often a common culture, too)". He adds that, in monolingual classes, "the teacher knows the learners' language since in most cases the teacher is a native speaker of that language". In the research context of this book, all of the Turkish teachers of English teach monolingual classes, as opposed to the "multilingual" situation, "where a native speaker of English teaches a group of mixed nationalities in countries such as Britain, the USA, Australia, and Canada" (ibid.). Thus, I define the research participants in this book as monolingually raised EFL teachers and learners. Turkey is a predominantly monolingual context where learners mostly learn English as their first foreign language.

2   Research Context

2.1   Educational Bodies in Turkey

The Turkish Ministry of National Education is responsible for all state education up to the higher education level. The responsibility of the state for education is defined in the constitution and the foundation for national education is set down in the Education Integrity Law, dated 1924. The Turkish Ministry of National Education is also responsible for determining the details of education policy. Government programmes and five-year development plans, prepared by the State Planning Organisation, define the basic policies and strategies of the national education programmes.

The Higher Education Council (YÖK), which was established in 1981, regulates all universities and higher education institutions. The YÖK is an autonomous organisation that directs the activities of the higher education institutions, prepares short- and long-term plans to establish and develop higher education institutions, and arranges for the education of academic staff in Turkey or abroad. The YÖK also maintains co-operation and co-ordination among the higher education institutions. The YÖK is in the process of transforming itself into an inter-university co-ordination institution, to provide full autonomy to the universities and to give the opportunity to be represented in teaching staff members, research assistants and learners the administration of the university. Additionally, great importance is being accorded to transforming the education-training programmes in order to conform to international standards.

The Student Selection and Placement Centre (ÖSYM), previously called the Inter-university Student Selection and Placement Centre (ÜSYM), was established in 1974 by the Inter-university Board. The centre is regulated by the YÖK. The ÖSYM determines, in the context of fundamentals established by the YÖK, the examination principles for learners to be admitted to the institutions of higher education. It prepares the tests, administers them, and evaluates them on the basis of their results and the principles determined by the YÖK. According to learners' demands, it carries out the placement of learner candidates in universities and other higher educational institutions, taking into account the learn-

ers' own preferences. It also conducts research related to these activities. Starting with the 1999 administration, the university entrance test is now based essentially on a one-stage examination conducted centrally.

In Higher Education, undergraduate studies cover two distinct programmes with durations of two years and four years. A Bachelor's degree is awarded to the graduates of four-year programmes. Graduates of two-year programmes receive a pre-graduate degree. These programmes are more vocation-oriented than the four-year programmes. Some four-year programmes accept those graduates of two-year programmes with outstanding achievements into their third year.

2.2   Foreign Language Teaching and EFL in Turkey

The most commonly taught foreign language in Turkey is English and it is taught in public schools from 2nd grade (age 7) onwards, till the end of high school, which makes it a core subject within 12-year compulsory primary and secondary education (4 + 4 + 4). A second foreign language is also introduced to learners if they choose a language-based module at high school. However, the number of lessons given at public schools is relatively reasonable compared to private schools and colleges where a policy of "the earlier the better" is frequently adopted and learners begin learning English as early as in the kindergarten years. It is not rare to see that very young learners such as those aged 4–5 have English lessons twice or three times a week in their timetables.

The use of mother tongue by teacher and learner in the classroom varies considerably corresponding to the educational focus and policy of language schools. In the case of an exam-based language course, the main concern is the learner's overall success in the specific components of the exams such as YDS (Foreign Language Exam by the Student Selection and Placement Centre), which assesses the level of learners with reading, vocabulary and grammar questions whilst lacking the components assessing listening, speaking and writing skills. In such a context, the use of English as the medium of teaching does not serve the purpose. On the contrary, in EFL classes where focus is on communication, the use of the target language (TL) is generally a requirement of the institutional policy

and constitutes the key element of the institution's marketing strategy. In these cases, the use of mother tongue (L1) is discouraged in the classroom because L2 is considered the default language.

Highlighting the quality issues regarding language teaching in Turkey, a study (2013) carried out by the British Council with the support of TEPAV (Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey) and the Turkish Ministry of National Education has revealed that the practice of teaching English in Turkish public schools is in urgent need of improvements.

2.3   L2 Teacher Education in Turkey

L2 teacher education, in Turkey, mainly starts with four-year undergraduate programmes run by Education Faculties of more than 60 universities. Besides, candidates who are studying in the English Linguistics, American and British Literature and Culture, and Translation and Interpretation departments can also be eligible to become language teachers provided that they obtain a teaching certificate from a higher education institution. The prospective L2 teachers, who enrolled on four-year undergraduate programmes, undergo a high school education in the "languages" section, and take a central university entrance examination upon graduation from high school. This examination includes a paper-and-pen language test consisting of multiple choice questions on grammar, vocabulary, and reading, without any questions that assess L2 listening and speaking skills. This situation has created a washback effect (Yıldırım 2010) that has led candidates to neglect listening and speaking skills over a number of years, a controversy that has deeply affected the spoken fluency and accuracy of prospective L2 teachers, who are supposed to teach their learners how to interact in English.

The four-year undergraduate education programme in ELT departments includes advanced language skills courses in the first year (including listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and lexical competence), followed by courses like linguistics, language acquisition, literature, and research methods in the second year. In the third year, prospective L2

teachers take specialised courses in ELT, including teaching English to young learners, instructional technology and materials design, methods and approaches in foreign language teaching, and teaching foreign language skills. In the fourth year, the prospective L2 teachers (i.e., pre-service teachers) observe an experienced L2 teacher in a secondary school for more than 12 weeks in the first semester, and they begin preparing lesson plans and teaching English as a foreign language in the second semester. At least one of the ELT classes they teach at a secondary school is observed by an ELT faculty member (i.e., mentor), and the prospective L2 teachers are assessed based on the L2 classroom observation reports they write in the first semester, the ELT lesson plans they prepare in the second semester, and the evaluation report of their L2 teaching performance by the mentor from the ELT faculty.

2.4   Current Status of EFL in Turkey

It is obvious that an increasing number of parents and learners in Turkey are coming to terms with the criticality of learning a foreign language such as English for a successful professional career. In addition to bringing high status to the individual in social terms, foreign language proficiency plays an important role in extending job opportunities for individuals. It is one of the most apparent motives behind the growing number of families' insistence in registering their children with private language schools in Turkey. Language schools cater for the needs of different learners who prefer learning English in better equipped and modern classrooms with more motivated teachers in comparison to public schools. Language schools also provide a wide range of English language classes, among which English for Specific Purposes (ESP), University-level language courses focusing on academic or general language skills and vocational English courses can be mentioned. The majority of English teachers in private and public institutions are native Turkish speakers. However, it has been a recent trend that language schools in the country recruit one or more native English speakers or those who speak English as a foreign language from other nationalities for communication-based classes they offer.

3   CA Methodology

Following a conversation analysis (CA) approach, in this book, the analysis of L2 classroom interaction will provide a detailed investigation into teachers' and learners' interactional practices by paying close attention to verbal utterances, suprasegmental feautres of language, and non-verbal details. Keeping the nature of CA in mind, no external theory will be asserted in this book. Instead, the discussions will be based upon the actual interactions between participants in the EFL classrooms and the representation of these interactions in the transcriptions will inform the claims made or the forming of evidence. The use of CA in analysing L2 classroom discourse brings us to two perspectives namely "an emic perspective" and "contextuality".

When applying an emic perspective in the micro-analytic approach to L2 classroom interaction, only participants' orientations to each other's utterances should be used to make claims in the data analyses, rather than participants' given identities or the researcher's assumptions. When following the idea of contextuality, the meaning of and the action accomplished by what I say in interaction can be understood by looking at the content and the organisation of preceding talk, and what I say also establishes the context for whatever happens after what I say. Both the emic perspective and contextuality will guide the data analyses carried out throughout this book. It is important to make this point clear for the reason that any evidence to the claims made about EFL classroom discourse will be brought through the guidance of these perspectives.

CA has previously been employed in the analysis of L2 classroom discourse by a number of researchers (e.g. Markee 2000; Seedhouse 2004; Hellermann 2008). It is advisable to the readers to notice that different research methodologies can reach diametrically opposing conclusions even when applied to the same discoursal data (Seedhouse 2010). Therefore, researchers taking different approaches to L2 classroom interaction may not approach the EFL classroom data in the way that I will do in this book.

This book does not intend to teach readers how to do conversation analysis. Instead, it aims to present a working knowledge of CA by

referring to the principles and analytic tools of CA and by familiarising the readers with this approach through the use of detailed, but reader-friendly, CA transcriptions and analyses.

3.1   Validity

CA is, in particular, "rigorous in its requirement of an empirical grounding for any description to be accepted as valid" (Peräkylä 1997: 202). Anchoring analytic observations firmly in data is similarly imperative in all qualitative analyses.

As Stroud (1992) points out, such tendencies can misrepresent and obscure the complexity and dynamics of code-switching. The factors below have been taken into consideration to increase the validity of my research in this book:

- **Standardisation**: The transcription system developed by Jefferson (1988) has been used to ensure standardisation. According to Ten Have (1999: 77), Jeffersonian conventions are the canonical transcription of a "common language" with some dialects. Because transcript variation has always been considered as a problem—a problem of inconsistency in the writings of the authors themselves (O'Connell and Kowal 1990), a problem of reproduction, quotation, or editing of transcripts (Kitzinger 1998), or a problem of reliability and intersubjectivity (Kerswill and Wright 1990; Peräkylä 1997).
- **Transparency**: In the transcripts, the original language is also provided with the translation to be able to achieve transparency. Many researchers are criticised for only presenting the translation in the data (e.g., Aronsson and Cederborg 1997) or showing the original version in the data and producing the translation in the appendix. However, Ten Have (1999: 93) claims that these methods are not enough to make the data clear. By keeping in my mind that transparency and access ensure validity, I have provided the reader with as much information on the original as possible. This way, the acceptability of the

translation constructed remains, at least potentially, open to challenge and suggestions of alternative improved versions.

- **Availability**: Both the tape and the transcript allowed me to come back repeatedly to give priority to any unique moment if needed. That helped me have a form of "professional vision" (Goodwin 1994) and "professional listening".

- **Technology**: The study has been enhanced by a software named "Transana" to transcribe the data because it has simplified the complexity of transcripts and transcribing practices. Transana offers facilities to include basic Jeffersonian symbols and add time codes to link the audio-visual files and the transcript. It is very helpful for databasing and organising (Ten Have 2007). With the help of the software, the fundamental features of interaction has been recorded and studied effectively.

- **Emic Perspective**: CA analysis is built on the emic perspective. According to Seedhouse (2004: 314), an analyst "cannot make any claims beyond what is demonstrated by the interactional detail without destroying the emic perspective and hence the whole validity of the enterprise". Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that a valid study can only be done by evidencing what has been claimed through a detailed sequential analysis (internal validity).

- **Generalisability**: It would be wrong to extend the findings beyond the specific classrooms investigated in one research (external validity) (Bryman 2001). In Stroud's words, "the problem of intention and meaning in code-switching is the problem of knowing to what extent the intentions and meanings that we assign to switches can in fact be said to be intended by a speaker or apprehended by his or her interlocutors" (1992: 131).

- **Data-driven**: The CA approach to conversational code-switching avoids an imposition of analyst-oriented classificatory frameworks, attempting rather to reveal the underlying procedural apparatus by which conversation participants themselves arrive at local interpretations of language choice. The researcher can only see and interpret the data as much as transcriptions allow (Liddicoat 2007).

3.2   Reliability

Both the factors above and the ones below have increased the reliability of my research in this book:

- **Multiple Hearing**: The data as a transportable, repeatable resource has allowed me to share it for multiple hearings as well as access to other readers. According to Ten Have (1999: 97), friendly supervision, comparing and refining transcripts and translations with other researchers often provide a practical starting point. I aim for researching the functions of code-switching in the reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction in the classroom no matter who is transcribing the data.
- **Anonymity**: In the course of data collection and analyses learners and teachers remain anonymous and outcomes are not related to their personalities.
- **Triangulation**: Since any one source of information above is likely to be incomplete or partial, a triangular approach (i.e., collecting information from two or more resources) is recommended, which also makes the collected information more reliable (Richards 2001). The recorded datasets are accompanied with participants' questionnaires and researchers' fieldnotes from classroom observations.
- **Sampling**: Reliability of the research is also satisfied by the 22-hour recording in total of both datasets.
- **Technical quality:** The quality of the recordings is ensured by using a high-quality HD recorder.
- **Relevancy:** Kirk and Miller (1986) claim that the findings should be "independent of accidental circumstances of the research" (cited in Peräkylä 2004: 285). In other words, purposefully selected extracts have a great impact on the research in general as they can potentially change the result of the research. The relevance of the extracts selected has been given utmost attention to maximise reliability.
- **Background Information**: In the beginning of each extract, background information is provided to give a clear picture of the classroom to the reader. It is critical to become familiar with the setting (Heath et al. 2010) in order to understand the interaction fully.

4   Data

4.1   Dataset 1

The first dataset consists of video and audio recordings of six beginner-level university EFL classrooms. The research context for this book is a state university that offers intensive English language courses to prepare learners for the English medium teaching/learning system in their departments (e.g., engineering, law, business administration, etc.). Most of the learners who participated in this research came from state high schools. A few of the learners came from private high schools and state Anatolian high schools, which have a large English component. The EFL course that the learners are attending is registered as a full-time one-year preparatory (prep) class. At the end of the academic year, the learners are entitled to take a written and an oral exam in order to continue with their undergraduate studies in their subject fields.

I regard both teachers and learners as bilingual speakers in this book. Johnson (1995) distinguishes between two types of bilingualism: "societal bilingualism" and "individual bilingualism". Dehrab (2002: 95) quotes Johnson's for his definition of societal bilingualism as referring to: "when more than one language is used by members of one human social group". Bilingualism as an aspect of a society is related to individual bilingualism in the sense that a person has the ability to use more than one language in socially constructed speech events. Individual bilingualism is defined as "being even minimally competent in more than one language (Dehrab 2002: 95)". These terms are more related to the purpose of this book than are childhood bilingualism terms such as "simultaneous" (both languages are used at home) as opposed to "sequential" bilingualism (one of the languages is used at home and the other at school), or bilingual terms such as "elective" (people choose to learn a language) as opposed to "circumstantial" bilingualism (people learn a language to survive) (both terms are introduced in Baker 2001). Similarly, Valdés-Fallis (1978: 3–4) uses the word bilingual as "a general term that includes varying degrees of proficiency in two languages". On the basis of both Valdés-Fallis' definition of a bilingual person and Johnson's concept of individual bilingualism, I regard both teachers and learners as bilingual speakers in this book.

Recorded classes represent a range of departments at the same university in İzmir, Turkey. All of the classes except one (in the Linguistics Department) are in the Modern Languages Department. All of the observed lessons were chosen from conversation classes. I intended to observe in particular those conversation classes in which the lesson activities were designed to provoke teacher-learner(s) interaction. Thus, the amount of recorded spoken data would be larger than that obtained from reading, writing or grammar classes. Classroom activities include role-plays, teacher-guided whole class discussions, grammar lessons, pair work activities, scriptwriting, and listening games. It is important to emphasise the fact that all teachers and learners are Turkish native speakers, teaching or studying EFL.

4.2   Dataset 2

The second dataset is a group of university learners, whose level of English ranges from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate have been selected. The group is relatively small, consisting of nine learners: three female and six male learners. They are at B1 level (intermediate, upper-intermediate level designated by English Language Portfolio), aged between 19 and 23. The learners are all native speakers of Turkish.

The teacher never uses the mother tongue (L1) in the class which makes this study more distinctive from other research in the field. She either speaks slowly or simplifies the words she uses or, alternatively, asks a learner to translate for the rest of the class when she feels that learners struggle to understand instructions or the content of lesson.

In Turkey, most learners are exposed to English in the classroom as they have limited opportunities for practising a foreign language in their daily lives. According to Macaro (2001: 537), "after a certain threshold of teacher L1 use, there is a rise in learners' L1 use with possible effects on learning". Consistent with this statement, some language schools in Turkey have a general policy of requiring teacher to speak English as the language of instruction to maximise learners' contact with the TL. On the other hand, there is generally encouragement or at times teacher's insistence rather than the pressure of official rules on learners who make their

decisions about whether to use English or Turkish in EFL classes offered by private language schools. In this context, teacher code-switching is discouraged in the classroom unless learners are at a very low level such as A1. In this book, the teacher does not code-switch between L1 and L2 to ensure that learners receive the maximum L2 exposure.

Nevertheless, the learners often code-switch between Turkish and English. The data also confirms that code-switching has been frequently employed by the selected group learners in various situations such as answering questions, talking to or discussing with their peers, commenting on topics, asking permission and so on. The original contribution of this study to the literature is its examination of a classroom where the teacher never code-switches whilst the learners are free to alternate between L1 and L2 whenever they find appropriate.

As an important note, the language school where the data for this book offers English classes where lessons are planned and taught in accordance with the criteria of the European Language Portfolio. Speaking and listening are prioritised over other language skills in order to generate an environment for learners to advance their communication skills in L2.

4.3   Data Collection

4.3.1   Dataset 1

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyse the sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching between Turkish and English in a Turkish University EFL setting. The research question answered in this study is: How are teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching sequences organised in Turkish EFL classroom interaction?

Code-switching is presented in two working definitions in this study for the sake of describing the different language choices the learners use after code-switched turns. I define "teacher-initiated code-switching" as a type of code-switching in which the teacher code-switches to Turkish or English according to the pedagogical focus, and the learner follows the code-switched turn in Turkish or English. On the other hand,

"teacher-induced code-switching" is defined in this study as a type of code-switching in which the teacher encourages learners to take a turn in Turkish, while s/he uses English in his/her turn (e.g., asking in English for the Turkish equivalent of an English word).

Using a marriage of the sequential analysis of conversation analytic approach and the functional analysis of a discourse analytic approach, this teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching study illustrates how EFL classroom interaction can illuminate a particular interactional phenomenon and reveal its systematic properties. I expect that recording EFL classroom interactions will yield a contextualised perspective on the phenomenon of code-switching; that is, it will highlight its forms and roles in the organisation of language use in Turkish EFL classrooms. More specifically, the study is designed to describe, on the one hand, how teachers use code-switching within EFL lessons; on the other hand, the study also examines the learners' responses to their teachers' use of code-switching and the role their responses play in their use of the target language. An understanding of these processes will benefit teachers, curriculum developers, researchers, and learners of English.

Teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching is an interesting area to investigate, in that I was able to conduct this study from three different perspectives: sociolinguistics, SLA, and language teaching. In relation to this sociolinguistic context, this study, thus, "focuses particularly on the interactional aspects of code-switching within the sequential environment in which it occurs, as well as on the dynamic processes through which participants in the classroom negotiate meaning using two languages" (Martin 1999b: 130).

Most studies of L1 ["the language first acquired by a child" (Crystal 1995: 108)] and L2 ["a language which is not a person's mothertongue, but which is used in order to meet a communicative need" (Crystal, ibid.)] use focusing on the language teaching perspective are prescriptive (e.g., Atkinson 1993); that is, they have strong implications regarding whether to use the first language or to abandon its use in L2 classrooms. In this book, I apply a descriptive and analytical approach to the data and do not prescribe a favourite teaching method. However, my position in the discussion of L1 use in L2 classrooms is in the similar vein with Cook's (2001) that code-switching is a natural phenomenon and the

concurrent use of L1 and L2 is inevitable in L2 classrooms. As Martin (1999b: 137) suggests, code-switching studies should "move away from the deficit notions of code-switching in the classroom and to explore how two or more languages can contribute to the accomplishment of teaching and learning in the classroom".

The limited amount of research focusing on code-switching in L2 classrooms has resulted in a research gap. The number of such studies dealing with code-switching between English and Turkish is even smaller. In the literature, I have come across only one study focusing on English to Turkish code-switching in an EFL classroom at a Turkish high school, namely, Eldridge's (1996) study on teachers' attitudes toward code-switching in the classroom and his implications are limited to teacher-training. However, in my research, I have chosen my subjects at the university level, focused on teacher-learner interaction in EFL classrooms, examined transcripts according to a sequential conversation analysis, and categorised teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching extracts according to their pedagogical functions.

4.3.2   Dataset 2

The data which is required for the actual analysis in this book comes from MP3 recordings of learners while performing various tasks alone, in pairs or groups in the classroom. In the selected research setting (a Turkish EFL classroom), there is no official teaching method that the teacher is supposed to follow; however, there is an institutional policy that encourages as much L2 use as possible in teaching. Lessons are designated to integrate four skills, so the teacher is expected to plan her lessons focusing on the development of reading, writing, speaking, and listening equally.

Some short but exemplary extracts from the transcribed conversation have been used in the analysis of the audio data. These extracts have been scanned meticulously for evidence for the functions of learner code-switching in the light of CA. No attention is paid to other variables such as speaker's identity in accordance with the CA approach, which necessitates that only if participants themselves employ such categories in the production of conversation, then they can be a topic of interest to conversation analysts (Levinson 1983: 295).

The class has been chosen randomly, but the proficiency of learners is at intermediate level or above, which ensures that they do not solely code-switch due to lack of ability. Each transcript features 40-minute recorded data and the participants and the teacher were informed about and asked for their consent for the recordings. In order to make sure that learners were not affected psychologically by being recorded, maximum attention was given to the spontaneity, authenticity and naturalness of the classroom interaction.

The data has been transcribed first and analysed afterwards line by line to detect specific patterns without any presumptions. The interactional sequence has been paid great importance in order to work out why an utterance is organised in a specific way (in L1 or L2).

For this book, 16 teaching hours (40 minutes each) were analysed in detail. Ten pedagogical functions were identified in relation to learner code-switching. In order to avoid ambiguity, the data was presented in its original form with all its imperfections such as misspellings, uncorrected grammar or sentence patterns as well as the use of capitalisations, abbreviations, shortened forms, asterisks and symbols. Changes were not made to avoid altering the meaning and message contained in the data. To differentiate between the base language and code-switching discourse, all Turkish words were italicised and the translations (marked with italic) were given in square brackets. A side arrow (→) only shows a sample of a function of learner code-switching. The interactions analysed below are all part of an ongoing exchange between teacher and learner that neither started nor stopped with this particular interaction. The relationship between pedagogical focus and language choice will be discussed by sequentially analysing these extracts (T = teacher, Lx = identified learner).

4.4   Ethical Considerations

All participants in this book are anonymous. They were clearly informed about their part in the project and their consent was sought. Prior to the data recording, the principal of the school as well as the teacher of the selected class granted approval for the research. Furthermore, the participants were informed about the aims of the project, that participation was

voluntary and completely anonymous and that the retrieved information would be used in this book (Johansson and Svedner 2006).

5   The Significance of This Book

Recent studies are investigating the use of "other languages" in L2 classrooms from psycholinguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural paradigms. While approaching the phenomenon of language choice in classrooms, researchers have used a variety of terms including "the use of L1" and "code-switching" (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005; Amir and Musk 2013; Cheng 2013; Lehti-Eklund 2013), "own-language use" (Hall and Cook 2012a, b), use of "bilingual practices" (Bonacina and Gafaranga 2011), "plurilingual resources/repertoires" (Moore et al. 2013; Ziegler et al. 2013), and "multilingual resources" (Ziegler et al. 2015). In this book, I use the term "code-switching" consistently.

Researchers have tended to affiliate with one of the three following camps regarding the place of code-switching in L2 classrooms:

1. The role of L1 should be open, with no restrictions.
2. L1 can be a resource, but its contribution to L2 learning should be clearly defined.
3. L1 should be excluded from L2 classrooms as it may inhibit learning (Arnett 2013).

CA studies have shown that code-switching can be an interactional resource for both learners and teachers in language classrooms. Based on the EFL classroom extracts, it will be argued that the shared languages in the foreign language classroom can prove to be important resources to carry out the institutional task of learning and teaching the L2.

The use of mother tongue in language classrooms is a common practice. Some teachers and researchers consider it as a deficiency, but a considerable number of researchers describe it as a natural and essential component of language teaching and learning. According to Lee (2000), code-switching in exchanges is a typical feature of a bilingual's speech. Recent studies (Halmari 2004; Simon 2001) have shown that

code-switching plays a central role in communication among learners if used properly.

Opinions concerning the use of L1 in the classroom tend to vary and remain conflicting. Some scholars suggest that code-switching should be banned from language classroom because it seriously impedes the progress of the TL (Prucha 1983; Ellis 1984; Wong-Fillmore 1985; Chaudron 1988). This may sound reasonable in some cases particularly when the learner tends to simply rely on the teacher's code-switching and lose interest in some vital processes of meaning negotiation such as guessing and inferring. It has also been claimed that frequent use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms can affect the way learners communicate in the TL adversely (Bhatt 1997; Martin 1999a, b; Zhu 2008).

In response to this criticism, recent researchers (Üstünel 2004; Yang 2004; Greggio and Gil 2007; Then and Ting 2009; Lee 2010) have examined teachers' code-switching and found out that it fulfils some vital functions in the language classroom. In her work, Üstünel (2004) focuses on "teacher-initiated" versus "teacher-induced" code-switching. She identifies 12 functions such as "encouraging learners to participate" and "providing metalanguage information" in relation to pedagogic focus of lessons. It would not be wrong to say that explaining particular linguistic rules and features in mother tongue could prove more effective and time-saving as researchers such as Crystal (1987), Cook (1991), Levine (2003) and Sert (2005) reveal in their studies. Similarly, Greggio and Gil (2007) assert that use of mother tongue can strengthen learners' motivation as a possible outcome of understanding complex structures and rules more easily.

Lee (2010) notes these benefits of teacher code-switching, and tries to unify them by constructing a model of the effectiveness of code-switching. Through such a model, he hopes to facilitate future investigation into the actual value of code-switching as a pedagogical tool. In his own review of the literature, he praises the move away from a monolingual approach towards a bilingual one, but suggests that this could be improved further by adopting a sociolinguistic view of bilingualism in EFL. A sociolinguistic approach discusses whether we can view the EFL classroom as a kind of bilingual community; after all, L2 learners are to a greater or lesser extent developing bilinguals. We will now run with this idea, briefly outlining concepts of EFL classrooms as bilingual communi-

ties, before using it to explore the ways in which bilingual education has theorised code-switching and its uses as a pedagogical tool.

Another important issue, learner code-switching, has also aroused interest from researchers such as Butzkamm (1998), Zabrodskaja (2007), Martin (1999a, b), Mwinsheikhe (2003) and Probyn (2005). They have provided valuable insights into the reasons why learners frequently keep falling back to their mother tongue. Their studies have demonstrated that code-switching is not performed due to lack of ability, but it actually serves several communicative purposes.

As stated by Seedhouse (2004), one peculiar feature of foreign language classrooms is that language is both the medium and the content, which means that language teachers' effective use of it provides L2 input to learners. The effective use of foreign language also shapes L2 input in a way that will be intelligible and comprehensible to the learners. Both the effective use of foreign language and the interactional resources to which a foreign language teacher resorts can facilitate learner participation and engagement, which are crucial for foreign language learning.

A comprehensive, detailed and in-depth knowledge of what is actually happening in L2 classrooms will guide us to understand foreign language learning and foreign language teaching practices. This understanding is essential for language teachers and language teacher educators, as well as syllabus designers, materials developers, and policy makers. The reason for this is that any kind of traditional or innovative educational practices for classrooms can be evaluated and understood best by revealing how successful the emerging classroom interactions are. This understanding requires a micro-analytic approach to L2 classroom interactions so as to uncover epistemic and pedagogical phenomena, by paying close attention to participants' utterances, non-verbal details of talk, suprasegmental features of language, gaze movements, gestures, and orientations to classroom artefacts.

6   Contents of This Book

The study is structured in five chapters, of which this introduction is the first. The second chapter contains the literature review that serves as the conceptual and theoretical framework that guided the study. This section

of the research presents a review of the literature in areas pertinent to the research. The literature review describes the theoretical grounds of CA, SLA, and code-switching. The third chapter describes the methodology of the research. Chapter 3 also provides a presentation of the research strategies employed in collecting the data, the selection of the themes to be focused on, and the methods of data analysis. In the fourth chapter, I analyse the data by using extracts from the classroom transcripts and relating them to the teacher's pedagogical functions. The focus will be on how teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching emerge in L2 classrooms. The analyses of EFL classoom transcripts will put forward how the teacher displays his/her pedagogical agenda and how learners attend to pedagogical goals made relevant by the teacher as s/he employs and orients to multilingual resources. Chapter 5 is the closing chapter of the study, in which I summarise the research findings and answer the research question. I also talk about the limitations of the study and include some suggestions for further research.

7   Summary

This chapter introduces some background information on code-switching in foreign language classrooms. The research context, the CA methodology, datasets, and the significance of this book are also presented in this chapter.

   This chapter highlights that static language policy views of language choice (e.g., an English-only classroom) are something to be questioned, as teacher and learners deploy multilingual resources skilfully in negotiating the fluid relationship between pedagogy and interaction in L2 classrooms. The traditional beliefs regarding the use of "target-language-only" policies in L2 classrooms and emerging language policing practices are now being questioned by more researchers in the field of applied linguistics. This development is closely related to the rejection of the native speaker norm that has been a mainstay of cognitive SLA for decades. L2 users are not considered as inferior and incompetent speakers as was the case in deficit models of language learning (Cook 2007). More researchers are investigating the interactional competencies and interactional accom-

plishments of learners, and this line of research also includes the different roles that students' previously learnt languages (e.g. first languages) play in communicating and meaning-making in an L2 classroom.

References

Amir, A., & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: Micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse, 4*(2), 151–167.

Arnett, K. (2013). Using the first language and code-switching in second language classrooms. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. doi:10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1240.

Aronsson, K., & Cederborg, A. (1997). A love story retold: Moral order and intergenerational negotiations. *Semiotica, 114*(1–2), 83–110.

Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bhatt, R. M. (1997). Code-switching, constraints, and optimal grammars. *Lingua, 102*, 223–251.

Bonacina, F., & Gafaranga, J. (2011). "Medium of instruction" vs. "medium of classroom interaction": Language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(3), 319–334.

Bryman, A. (2001). *Social research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*(2), 81–99.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, T. P. (2013). Codeswitching and participant orientations in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(4), 869–886.

Cook, V. (1991). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Melbourne: Edward Arnold/Hodder Headline Group.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402–423.

Cook, V. (2007). The nature of the L2 user. In L. Roberts, A. Gürel, S. Tatar, & L. Martı (Eds.), *EUROSLA yearbook* (Vol. 7, pp. 205–220). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dehrab, B. A. (2002). *A study of code-switching in four English for specific purposes (ESP) classrooms at the College of Business Studies in Kuwait*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Ohio State University.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303–311.

Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist, 96*(3), 606–633.

Greggio, S., & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino, 10*(2), 371–393.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012a). Own-language use in language teaching and learning: State-of-the-art. *Language Teaching, 45*(3), 271–308.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012b). *Own-language use in ELT: Exploring global practices and attitudes* (ELT Research Paper). London: British Council.

Halmari, H. (2004). Code-switching patterns and developing discourse competence in L2. In D. Boxer & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Studying speaking to inform second language learning* (pp. 115–144). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Heath, C., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research: Analysing social interaction in everyday life*. London: Sage.

Hellermann, J. (2008). *Social actions for classroom language learning*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (1988). On the sequential organisation of troubles talk in ordinary conversation. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 418–442.

Johansson, B., & Svedner, P. O. (2006). *Examensarbetet I ärarutbildningen*. Uppsala: Kunskapsföretaget.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kerswill, P., & Wright, S. (1990). The validity of phonetic transcription: Limitations of a sociolinguistic research tool. *Language Variation and Change, 2*(3), 255–275.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Kitzinger, C. (1998). Inaccuracies in quoting from data transcripts: Or inaccuracy in quotations from data transcripts. *Discourse and Society, 9*, 136–143.

Lee, M. (2000). Code-switching in media texts: Its implications on society and culture in post-colonial Hong Kong. In D. Li (Ed.), *Language and education in post-colonial Hong Kong* (pp. 95–130). Hong Kong: The Linguistic Society of Hong Kong.

Lee, H. L. J. (2010). Code switching in the teaching of English as a second language to secondary school students. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 6*, 1–45.

Lehti-Eklund, H. (2013). Code-switching to first language in repair: A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(2), 132–152.

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal, 87*, 343–364.

Levinson, S. L. (1983). *Conversational structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2007). *An introduction to conversation analysis*. New York: Continuum Intl Pub Group.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531–548.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Martin, P. (1999a). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary classroom in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education, 13*(1), 38–58.

Martin, P. W. (1999b). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: Interactional practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(2), 127–140.

Moore, E., Nussbaum, L., & Borràs, E. (2013). Plurilingual teaching and learning practices in "internationalised" university lectures. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 16*(4), 471–493.

Mwinsheikhe, H. M. (2003). Science and the language barrier: Using Kiswahili as a medium of instruction in Tanzania secondary schools as a strategy of improving student participation and performance in science. In B. Brock-Utne, Desai Z. & Qorro, M. (Eds.), *The language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa* (pp. 129–149). Dar es Salaam: E & D Publishers.

O'Connell, D. C., & Kowal, S. (1990). Some sources of error in the transcription of real time in spoken discourse. *Georgetown Journal of Languages and Linguistics, 1*(4), 453–466.

Peräkylä, A. (1997). Reliability and validity in research based on transcripts. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 201–220). London: Sage.

Peräkylä, A. (2004). Reliability and validity in research bases on naturally occurring social interaction. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 283–304). London: Sage.

Probyn, M. J. (2005). Learning science through two languages in South Africa. In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rostlad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Prucha, J. (1983). Using language: A sociofunctional approach. In B. Bain (Ed.), *The sociogenesis of language and human conduct* (pp. 287–297). New York: Plenum Press.

Richards, C. J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching: Course planning and syllabus design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Malden: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, P. (2010). How research methodologies influence findings. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 4*(1), 1–15.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(8). Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Simon, D. L. (2001). Towards a new understanding of code-switching in the foreign language classroom. In J. Jacobson (Ed.), *Code-switching worldwide II* (pp. 311–342). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Stroud, C. (1992). The problem of intention and meaning in code-switching. *Text, 1*, 127–155.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.

Then, D. C. O., & Ting, S. H. (2009). Preliminary study of code-switching in English and science secondary school classrooms in Malaysia. *Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language (TESL-Electronic Journal), 13*(1), A3.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302–325.

Üstünel, E. (2004). *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching in a Turkish University EFL setting*. PhD thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Valdés-Fallis, G. (1978). *Code-switching and the classroom teacher* (Language in education: Theory and practice, Vol. 4, pp. 22–26). Arlington: Centre for Applied Linguistics.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rawley: Newbury.

Yang, M. (2004). A study of code-switching in Chinese EFL classrooms: A pragmatic approach. *Sino-US English Teaching, 1*(10), 43–49.

Yıldırım, Ö. (2010). Washback effects of a high-stakes university entrance exam: Effects of the English section of the universit entrance exam on future English language teachers in Turkey. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 12*(2), 92–116.

Zabrodskaja, A. (2007). Russian-Estonian code-switching in the university. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching, 14*, 123–139.

Zhu, H. (2008). Dueling languages, dueling values: Code-switching in bilingual intergenerational conflict talk in diasporic familie. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*(10), 1799–1816.

Ziegler, G., Duruş, N., & Sert, O. (2013). Plurilingual repertoires in the ESL classroom: The case of the European School. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 643–650.

Ziegler, G., Duru, N., Sert, O., & Family, N. (2015). Multilingual practices in ELT classrooms: The case of Luxembourg. In C. J. Jenks & P. Seedhouse (Eds.), *International perspectives on ELT classroom interaction* (pp. 188–207). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

2

Foreign Language Classroom Code-Switching: An Overview (Issues, Theories, and Frameworks)

1   Definition of Code-Switching

In basic terms, code-switching is related to bilingualism in that one needs to be bilingual (i.e., have the use of two languages) in order to code-switch between two languages. Martin-Jones (1995) suggests that research into code-switching ranges from educational research into classroom interaction to CA and the ethnography of interaction. Owing to its cross-disciplinary nature, many other terms are used to refer to code-switching. In this chapter, I define each one and highlight the differences between them.

1.1   Definition of Code

Alvarez-Caccamo (2001: 23–24) points out that "the term '*code*' was systematically applied to speech first by information theorists (Fano) and, then, fundamentally, by Roman Jacobson. Jacobson reframed Saussure's langue/parole dichotomy in terms of code/message. In this model, the speech signals would match "meanings" in the linguistic "code", equivalent here to "grammar"". However, the discrete conceptualisation of

"codes" with stable boundaries is challenged today and "… reconceptu-alised as a social practice that is part and parcel of everyday social life" (Lin 2013: 2). In other words, the current view on language, which is sociocultural rather than poststructural, sees language not as static codes with solid boundaries but rather, as fluid resources in meaning-making practices (Pennycook 2010). In line with this view, recent use of the terms "*code-meshing*" (Canagarajah 2011) and "*translanguaging*" (García 2009; Creese and Blackledge 2010; Lewis et al. 2012) are added in the list of terms such as "*code-mixing*" (Muysken 2000) and "*code-switching*" (Gumperz 1982).

1.2   Definitions of Code-Meshing, Translanguaging, Code-Switching, and Code-Mixing

The term "translanguaging" was first introduced by Williams (1996) to refer to a bilingual pedagogical practice that switches languages in the input and output. García (2009: 45) extended the concept and defined it as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds".

According to Canagarajah (2011: 401), "translanguaging" is "the abil-ity of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system". In his article, Canagarajah (2011: 403) compares the terms "code-meshing", "code-switching" and "translanguaging" and clearly states the differences between them:

> Whereas codeswitching treats language alternation as involving bilingual competence and switches between two different systems, codemeshing treats the languages as part of a single integrated system. Unlike translan-guaging, codemeshing also accommodates the possibility of mixing com-municative modes and diverse symbol systems (other than language).

He uses "translanguaging" for "the general communicative competence of multilinguals" and uses "code-meshing" for "the realization of trans-languaging in texts".

The definition of code-switching may differ slightly with the change of setting and context just as its functions. It can happen "between two or more languages simultaneously or interchangeably within one conversation" (Grosjean 1982: 145). A speaker can replace words, chunks or a whole sentence to keep the conversation flowing.

Udoro (2008: 15) defines code-mixing as "the process whereby speakers indulge in code switching between languages of such rapidity and density, even within sentences and phrases that are not possible to say at any given time which language they are speaking". Code-mixing can be seen in spoken and written language. Muysken (2000: 1) explained that based on intra-sentential, contextual and situational conversation, code-mixing is expressively purposing languages that are combined to increase social status or to keep the speaker's prestige in the society. While, Ruan (2005: 2) specifically adds that code-mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity of the participants, in order to infer what is intended, the participants must reconcile what they hear with what they understand. Then, code-mixing is a situation in which language parts come into another language. In formal situations, it infrequently happens. However, if it happens, it is just caused of no proper expression to the language being used. Thus, it is necessary to use other language.

In this book, the term classroom "code-switching" is used to refer to "the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants (e.g., teacher, students, teacher aide)" (Lin 2013: 1–2). Thus, in this sense, the term code-switching here can include both "*code-mixing* (intra-clausal/sentential alternation) and *code-switching* (alternation at the inter-clausal/sentential level)" (Lin 1990, 2008).

The phenomenon of code-switching may also be defined from two different perspectives: sociolinguistic and pedagogical; and as two separate kinds of talk: ordinary and classroom. From the sociolinguistic perspective, Blom and Gumperz (1972) study code-switching in terms of social relationships among speakers. They distinguish the roles of code-switching in the shifts of role relationship and topics, markedness in identity, and the expression of solidarity or intimacy within the conversation.

In addition to conveying social information, Valdés-Fallis (1981: 96) notes that bilinguals may use code-switching as a stylistic process, that is, "as a personal rhetoric device which is used both to add colour to speech and to emphasize a given statement". The above descriptions are related to bilingual settings, so how does this affect EFL classroom settings?

2   Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

Initially, research that was inspired by Auer's insights primarily examined multilingual interaction in diverse non-educational settings (Gafaranga 2007; Gafaranga and Torras 2001, 2002; Wei 1994, 1995, 2002, 2005). More recently, however, code-switching has been studied in foreign language classrooms, thereby providing insights into how participants use code-switching as an interactional resource to organise the diverse actions that characterise language classrooms.

Code-switching is a common phenomenon in language classrooms. The language classroom setting resembles that of a bilingual community. It is a known fact that no matter what type the class is—EFL, ESL or "English as an Academic Language" (EAL)—the language of instruction is often supplemented with L1 or the TL.

Romylyn (2009: 44) asserts that "the pedagogical and communicative functions of classroom code-switching justify its use in teaching and learning contexts". In EFL classroom interaction, language contact occurs between the TL studied and the learners' native language. Thus, interaction in English constitutes both input and output in EFL classrooms: "Learners are learning English and learning in English" (Hammond 2001: 92). As in ordinary talk, no interactional exchange happens randomly in the classroom. Every utterance is closely linked to the pedagogical focus of lesson. In Milroy and Muysken's (1995) work, two intersecting but separate distinctions are drawn: (a) between "exolingual interaction", where speakers of different languages interact, and "endolingual interaction", involving speakers with the same language background; (b) between "unilingual" (among monolinguals) and "bilingual" (among bilinguals) interaction. The combination of endolingual and unilingual

types applies to the situation in EFL classrooms in fact. In such a situation, the institutional goal is for the teacher to teach the learners the TL, but the institutional goal does not stipulate that L1 cannot be used to facilitate this goal, which does in fact relate to many classroom implications that the use of L1 can facilitate TL learning and teaching.

2.1 The Monolingual Approach (English-Only Policy) to EFL Instruction

The monolingual principle refers to exclusive use of the second language (L2) as instructional language to enable learners to think in L2, with minimal interference from L1 (Howatt 1984). Enama (2016: 21) summarises the "Monolingual Approach" or "English-only Policy" in three points:

> First, the EFL teacher is not likely to know all his students' L1s in a multilingual classroom. Hawks (2001) argues that unless the teacher is capable of using all the L1s, she must not venture in such a difficult task lest she could compromise her authority in the classroom. Besides, a failed attempt to use the L1 in a constructive way only inhibits learning. The second point opposes the idea that the L1 is an indispensable scaffold for teaching difficult language structures in the EFL classroom. Proponents of this argument (Pachler and Field 2001; Willis 1981) believe that visual aids, appropriate body language and modelling speech according to learners' level of language development can help teach in English even the most difficult aspects of language structure. The third point is built around the idea that maximum exposure to the TL is the determining factor in SLA. Krashen (1982) holds that the TL should be used to the most in the classroom, given that most EFL learners are exposed to English only in the classroom. This point draws from the behaviouristic view that learner's language develops through imitation and habit formation.

For years, English-only has been a taken-for-granted dogma in language instruction due to a concern over learners' maximum exposure to English, or a perceived lack of TL competence on the part of non-native teachers, or sometimes even sheer necessity when a teacher does not share the same linguistic background with learners (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009), the

monolingual approach has become a default position of English Language Teaching (ELT) pedagogy. At policy level (Littlewood and Yu 2011), teachers are advised by national curricula to either "ban the L1 from classroom" or "minimize" it as "the L1 is not something to be utilized in teaching but to be set aside" (Cook 2001: 404). In practice, L1-free lessons are perceived by some language teachers as "a badge of honor" (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 24); while for others, use of L1 in TL classrooms is "… a taboo subject, [and] a source of embarrassment" (Prodromou 2002: 6).

Despite this popular belief and common practice, avoidance of L1 in foreign language classrooms "has no straightforward theoretical rationale" (Cook 2001: 410). On the contrary, empirical research in recent years has proved that L1 is "the most important ally a foreign language can have" (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 24). Since "we only learn language once" in the sense that "every new language is confronted by an already existing L1" (ibid.: 66), compartmentalised language pedagogy as prescribed by the monolingual principle, in effect, contradicts the interdependent nature of L1 and L2. Following the belief that the human brain has the same language faculty for L1 and L2, Cummins (1981) proposed the interdependency hypothesis, which acknowledges the contribution of L1 in TL development.

This hypothesis was supported by evidence of positive cross-lingual transfer in the areas of conceptual understanding (Swain and Lapkin 2000), meta-cognitive skills (Hardin 2001), phonological awareness and functional awareness (Durgunoğlu 2002), between a non-alphabetical language (e.g., Chinese) and an alphabetical language (e.g., English) (Geva and Wang 2001). Such evidence led to the conviction that "learning efficiencies can be achieved if teachers explicitly draw students' attention to similarities and differences between their languages and reinforce effective learning strategies in a coordinated way across languages" (Cummins 2007: 233).

2.2   The Bilingual Approach to EFL Instruction

Atkinson (1993) and Auerbach (1993) developed the bilingual approach that draws essentially from Cummins' (1978) linguistic interdependence hypothesis, which holds that success in L2 acquisition depends on L1

development and competence. A key point in the bilingual approach is that human beings learn an L2 within the framework of the L1, and, therefore, the L1 should have a place in the EFL classroom (Enama 2016).

Vygotsky, one of the earliest proponents of this approach, argued that "success in learning a foreign language is contingent on a certain degree of maturity in the native language" (1962: 110). In the same line of thought, Cummins' linguistic developmental interdependence hypothesis (1978) emphasised that success in L2 acquisition depends on L1 development and competence. However, the bilingual approach really garnered attention only after researchers provided a comprehensive outline of L1 use in the EFL classroom (Enama 2016).

In the classroom context, code-switching appears to be used both by learners and teachers (Borlongan 2009) because it is considered to be a natural and purposeful phenomenon, which facilitates both communication and learning (Eldridge 1996). In the relevant literature, two main reasons for the use of the learner's L1 in the EFL classroom are discussed. First, the L1 facilitates both teaching and learning. For instance, "judicious use of the L1 can build an atmosphere of confidence and friendship in the classroom" (Balosa 2006: 31), develop harmony and cooperation, and provide learners with feelings of security and self-confidence that motivate them and make them feel more comfortable (Peregoy and Boyle 2013; Schweers 1999). Furthermore, the L1 saves teaching time and makes input much easier to understand (Cook 2002). Second, the L1 contributes to the learner's cognitive and socio-professional development. At the cognitive level, the L1 prepares and stimulates the learner's brain to perceive and relate new knowledge to prior knowledge, with the aim of activating that prior knowledge (Paradowski 2008; Caine and Caine 1994). Auerbach (1993: 29) highlights this point when she says: "starting with the L1 provides a sense of security and validates the learners' lived experience, allowing them to express themselves. The learner is then willing to experiment and take risks with English". Using the L1, therefore, is a means for teachers to build learner confidence and self-esteem. When learners' identities are not rejected, they do not feel as if they are choosing between their own language habits and English (Halliday 1968; Rinvolucri 2001), and this makes learning a more enjoyable experience (Enama 2016). Also, judicious use of the L1 in the EFL classroom sharp-

ens the learner's metalinguistic awareness (Cook 2002) and "allows the fullness of the learner's language intelligence to be brought into play" (Rinvolucri 2001: 44).

Supporters of the bilingual approach have proposed ways of using the L1 efficiently in the EFL classroom. These strategies include the L1 break to summarise content in the learners' L1 either at the middle or end of the class (Reis 1996), sandwich stories, bilingual vocabulary tennis and semantic flip-flops (Rinvolucri 2001), which all consist in juggling English with the L1 regularly (Enama 2016).

3   Sociocultural Theory and Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

Sociocultural theory puts forward that education is not only about theories, but about teaching learners how they can learn on their own and continue to learn as well (Williams and Burden 1997). Vygotsky (1962: 150) states that "direct teaching of concepts is impossible and fruitless. A teacher who tries to do this usually accomplishes nothing but empty verbalism, a parrot like repetition of words by the child, simulating a knowledge of the corresponding concepts but actually covering up a vacuum". Vygotsky's (1896–1934) sociocultural theory has hugely affected the field of education. It would not be wrong to say that his most remarkable contribution to the field is the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). In this section, I define the terms "ZPD" and "scaffolding" and relate them to the EFL classroom context by citing some prominent studies in the field.

3.1   The Definition of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

Vygotsky's ideas have been widely referred to in the field of education. Vygotsky (1978: 86) defines ZPD as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers". The

actual developmental level indicates a learner's level of mental development at a particular time and shows the functions that have already matured in the learner. The level of potential development refers to those functions that have not yet matured. The ZPD has been redefined by Ohta (2005) to fit in the educational setting. According to Ohta's version of ZPD, individual linguistic production determines the actual developmental level in EFL classrooms. Language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer also shows an individual's potential development level. Wertsch and Hikmann (1987 cited in Ohta 2000) claim that a teacher can only decide on a learner's ZPD by negotiating through collaborative interaction. This helps the teacher notice what the learner can do on their own and with assistance. Knowing the limits of learners can help the teacher encourage them to fulfil their potentials to the limits of their ZPD (Shayer 2002).

3.2   Applications of ZPD in EFL Context

Hedegaard (1990: 349) supports the importance of context and summarises the underlying assumption behind the notion of ZPD: "psychological development and instruction are socially embedded; to understand them one must analyze the surrounding society and its social relations". These two statements are related to the pedagogical functions of teachers' and learners' code-switching within its social context through a turn-by-turn sequential analysis of classroom extracts. Hedegaard (1990: 365) examines the integration of scientific knowledge (e.g., biology, history, and geography) into personal knowledge in Danish elementary schools from the third to the fifth grade and provides her definition of the ZPD at the conclusion of her study as "a relation between the planned instructional steps and the steps of the children's learning/acquisition process". Linking Hedegaard's findings to the classroom extracts analysed in this book, I explicate how code-switching as a teaching strategy is used in EFL classrooms.

It is proposed by Ohta (2005) that the ZPD should not be considered as a non-interactive interpersonal space. Instead, knowing how the mechanisms of ZPD work in the process of development will help learners manage their own ZPD. Hence, they become aware of their own needs and start to look for solutions. For this purpose, learners frequently ask questions for clarification, they want to show comprehension, and

they want the confirmation of what they have understood is correct by code-switching to L1. In this book the classroom extracts that I have analysed are from EFL classrooms in Turkey. A Turkish EFL classroom is a monolingual classroom, where English being taught is used in the classroom only. The teacher is a competent user of L2. However, there are some capable learners who scaffold for their peers by code-switching to L1 within their peer's ZPDs in certain cases (see Chap. 4 for classroom extracts). In the EFL context, fluency in TL can be regarded as the level of potential development while the learners' current level is the one at which they use code-switching as a resource to reach the level they aim for. Linking sociocultural theory to my research, I try to find out in this book how teachers' and learners' code-switching as a way of scaffolding is used in L2 classrooms. The chosen classroom extracts are analysed by looking at how teachers' and learners' code-switching make them generate their own ZPDs. Thus, the classroom extracts (see Chap. 4) analysed within the framework of four characteristics of CA theory of knowledge reveal the pedagogical functions of self/other (peer)-initiated or teacher-induced learner code-switching as an aid of scaffolding to create ZPD.

3.3   The Definition of Scaffolding

The scaffolding metaphor is used extensively in language teaching, and is defined as an instructional strategy, where scaffolding supports learning during its early phases through such techniques as demonstrating how tasks should be accomplished, giving hints regarding the correct solution to a problem or answer to a question, and providing leading questions (Snowman and Biehler 2000). In other words, the process that enables learners to move from their actual developmental level to their potential developmental level is referred to as "scaffolding" (Wood et al. 1976). The teacher can decide on the level of scaffolding needed because scaffolding can be "used most effectively when it is tailored depending on learners' needs in response to learner development" (Lantolf and Aljaafreh 1996). The eventual aim of scaffolding is that, when it is removed, the building will then stand on its own—"learners become more capable of working independently (ibid.)". Scaffolding may be carried out by peers as well as by teachers (termed "peer assistance" in Ohta 2001: 88).

3.4   Scaffolding and Its Use in the Language Classroom

Assistance in ZPD is called scaffolding in L2 classrooms (Wood et al. 1976). ZPD and scaffolding have often been used interchangeably and they refer to the same notion in this study. In the most general terms, scaffolding works as an instructional structure in the classroom. For example, the teacher models the TL or demonstrates tasks and then gradually decreases the assistance and encourages learners to take more responsibility. That's the reason why the teacher manages the amount of scaffolding as well as the amount of code-switching in the class. Vygotsky suggests that the more capable peers 'nudge' their peers to make them perform better or undertake a task in the ZPD in a social interaction.

Johnson (1995) defines scaffolding in relation to repair in language teaching. One of the types of repair used in the data is "embedded correction" (Jefferson 1987: 95): that is, "a repair done as a by-the-way occurrence in the context of a conversational move, which in this case is a move of agreement and confirmation". This technique of correction and expansion is often termed "scaffolding" (Johnson 1995: 75) (see Extract 34 in Chap. 4 as one example of "embedded correction"). Another type of repair used in the EFL classroom extracts is "exposed correction" (Jefferson 1987), or "corrective feedback" (Ohta 2001: 135), where the teacher uses other-initiated, other-repair techniques "in which correction becomes the interactional business; the flow of the interaction is put on hold while the trouble is corrected" (Seedhouse 2004: 234) (see Extract 49 in Chap. 4 as one of the examples of exposed correction).

All considered, scaffolding offers the following advantages (McKenzie 1999), which can also be observed in the functions identified in Chap. 4:

- It provides clear directions for learners. (e.g., see Extract 35)
- It clarifies purpose of the task. (e.g., see Extract 9)
- It keeps learners on task. (e.g., see Extract 13)
- It offers assessment to clarify expectations. (e.g., see Extract 6)
- It points learners to worthy sources. (e.g., see Extract 54)
- It reduces uncertainty, surprise and disappointment. (e.g., see Extract 43)

The participants in this study have shown that a more able learner assists a less able one by scaffolding in the form of code-switching (see Extract 42 in Chap. 4). The learner tries to improve conditions in which her/his peer (novice) can participate in and extend their skills. In his defence of this phenomenon, Donato (1994) also advocates that collaborative work among learners give them opportunity as much as the scaffolded help provided by teacher as in expert-novice relationships in real life (see Extract 60 in Chap. 4). However, "peer assistance" (Ohta 2001: 88) becomes unnecessary if a learner is capable of performing a task on her/his own, so it may not be validated by the teacher (see Extract 60 in Chap. 4 for an example).

In this book, what I aim to do with regard to the teacher's and learner's scaffolding is to analyse the role of code-switching in the sequential organisation of interaction where scaffolding occurs. From the analysis of EFL classroom extracts, it appears that teachers use code-switching as a scaffolding technique to create a ZPD in relation to particular pedagogical functions (e.g., translating, asking a question in L1 if there is no learner response when it is asked in English, eliciting L1 translation, giving feedback, checking comprehension in L2, giving metalanguage information). Among these pedagogical functions, learners follow up teacher-initiated code-switching in Turkish when teachers code-switch to give feedback and check learners' comprehension in L2. For the rest of the pedagogical functions, learners follow up teacher-initiated code-switching either in Turkish or in English. Therefore, the analysis concludes that code-switching can sometimes create a scaffolding effect, depending on which pedagogical function it serves.

4 Functions of Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

4.1 Learner Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

Code-switching fulfills important functions in L2 classroom interactions and is widely employed not only by teachers but also learners of a foreign language. Code-switching is also regarded as a "sign of laziness or mental sloppiness and inadequate command of the language" (Sridhar

1996 in McKay and Hornberger 1996: 59). That is, from the teacher's perspective, learners, who persistently resort to L1, are simply viewed as underperforming. In general, learners tend to choose their L1 over L2 to communicate with other learners. Martin-Jones (1995, 2000) relates this with the level of learners because classrooms often include groups of people with differing language abilities and communicative repertoires. Most code-switching takes place automatically and unconsciously because of this distinction (Skiba 1997; Sert 2005; Jingxia 2010). When one learner has the same or different perception of the received information, the other asks and checks what s/he knows. This generally causes learners to code-switch to negotiate meaning in a simplified way and thus help their own learning process (Simon 2001).

From a different perspective, on the other hand, learners have several reasons for code-switching. For example, learners' most common reason for switching to their L1 during foreign language studies is that their mastery of the foreign language is not equal to that of their native language or to their teachers' mastery of the foreign language (Simon 2001). According to Sert (2005), learners tend to code-switch and "use the native lexical item when s/he has not got the competence for using the TL explanation for a particular lexical item". Eldridge states that even though learners are aware of it or not, their code-switching serves a purpose such as "reinforcing, emphasizing or clarifying" their message content that they have tried to convey in L2 but thought that one of the participants has not comprehended (Eldridge 1996: 306).

4.2   Teacher Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

Code-switching is a strategy that a bilingual uses to transmit her/his content effectively. Brown (2006) argues that speakers use code-switching to compensate for their lack of ability in the TL by using their L1 to keep a flow during the communication. On the other hand, Heredia and Brown (2005) define code-switching as a strategic tool that speakers use to overcome gaps and flaws in conversations. According to Tarone (1977), a language switch is a communicative strategy, just like literal translation,

appealing for assistance, mime, paraphrase, or avoidance. Also, Brown (2006) claims that code-switching is a "complex strategy" because it gives opportunity to bilinguals to transmit their messages beyond its referential meaning. Switching between languages can mean that speakers have immediate access to both languages effectively (Myers-Scotton and Jake 2001). McDonough (1995: 25), on the other hand, promotes a different view by defining code-switching as an "achievement strategy" that is used by speakers when they need to compensate for their lack of language competence. Speaker can use code-switching strategically to restart a conversation at the end of an interactive episode, to change conversational direction or to keep track of the main "drift" of the interaction by mapping out complex nested structural patterns in the conversation (Wei 1998).

In my PhD thesis (Üstünel 2004, published as a book in 2009), I introduce the term "teacher-induced code-switching" to refer to the pattern where the learner is encouraged to use L1 after the teacher's code-switched turn. This type of code-switching is different from teacher-initiated code-switching, which requires the learners to respond in L2 to show their alignment to the macro context; that is, the institutional aim (teachers teach L2 and learners learn L2). Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) were the first to examine the pedagogical functions of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching in FL classrooms by explicating the intricate relationship between language choice and pedagogical focus. In this respect it is useful to separate "teacher-induced code-switching" from "teacher-initiated code-switching" for the discussion of the requirement of different language choice.

The fact that code-switching has several pedagogic and other functions is also backed by the Accommodation Theory. This theory basically asserts that speakers adapt their language use and strategically vary their language as a tool for communicating in different environments (Mesthrie et al. 2000). This confirms that learners as well as teachers in certain situations choose to adapt their language in order to fit in or to show their status in the current interaction as bilinguals do.

Jacobson and Faltis (1990: 174–175) discuss the gap between policy and practice associated with using L2 and suggest that code-switching addresses a problem inherent in foreign language classrooms: namely, "the tension between the desire of the teacher to use the TL exclusively and the need of the student to understand as much as possible of what is being taught".

Thus, it is difficult for teachers to avoid use of the L1, and perhaps even more difficult for learners to ignore it in foreign language instruction.

5   Summary

This chapter provides an overview of the literature on code-switching and the use of the mother tongue in foreign language classrooms. The available research in the field is introduced and discussed in this chapter. The chapter also presents the method of CA and the reasoning behind it.

References

Alvarez-Caccamo, C. (2001). Codes. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Key terms in language and culture* (pp. 23–26). Oxford: Blackwell.

Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman.

Auerbach, E. (1993). Re-examining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 9–32.

Balosa, D. (2006). Three examples of better English learning through the L1. *Essential Teacher, 3*(1), 28–31.

Blom, J., & Gumperz, J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structures: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in socio-linguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Borlongan, A. M. (2009). Tagalog-English code-switching in English language classes: Frequency and forms. *TESOL Journal, 1*, 28–42.

Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1994). *Making connections. Teaching and the human brain*. Parsippany: Dale Seymour Publications.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402–423.

Cook, V. (2002). Background to the L2 user. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Portraits of the L2 user* (pp. 1–28). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(i), 103–115.

Cummins, J. (1978). Metalinguistic development of children in bilingual education programs: Data from Irish and Canadian Ukrainian-English programs. In M. Paradis (Ed.), *Aspects of bilingualism*. Columbia: Hornbeam Press.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 221–240.

Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33–56). London: Ablex Publishing.

Durgunoğlu, A. Y. (2002). Cross-linguistic transfer in literacy development and implications for language learners. *Annals of Dyslexia, 52*, 189–206.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303–311.

Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(1), 19–30.

Gafaranga, J. (2007). *Talk in two languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*, 195–220.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 6*, 1–22.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Geva, E., & Wang, M. (2001). The development of basic reading skills in children: A cross-language perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 182–204.

Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1968). The users and uses of language. In J. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 139–169). The Hague: Mouton.

Hammond, J. (2001). *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education*. Sydney: Primary English Teaching Association.

Hardin, V. B. (2001). Transfer and variation in cognitive reading strategies of Latino fourth-grade in a late-exit bilingual program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(4), 539–561.

Hawks, P. (2001). Making distinctions: A discussion of the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom. *Hwa Kang Journal of TEFL, 7*, 47–55.

Hedegaard, M. (1990). The zone of proximal development as basis for instruction. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 127–154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heredia, R., & Brown, J. M. (2005). Code-switching. In P. Strazny (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of linguistics*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Howatt, A. (1984). *History of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jacobson, R., & Faltis, C. (1990). *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jefferson, G. (1987). On exposed and embedded correction in conversation. In G. Button & J. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation* (pp. 86–100). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistic Journal, 3*, 10–23.

Johnson, K. E. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Lantolf, J. P., & Aljaafreh, A. (1996). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: A revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*(7), 619–632.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655–670.

Lin, A. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms* (Research Rep. No.3). Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In K. A. King & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of lan-*

guage and education (Research methods in language and education 2nd ed., Vol. 10, pp. 273–286). New York: Springer Science.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 195–218.

Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2011). First language and target language in the foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching, 44*(1), 64–77.

Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Codeswitching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching, 33*(1), 1–9.

McDonough, S. (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London: Edward Arnold.

McKenzie, J. (1999). Scaffolding for success. *The Educational Technology Journal, 9*(4). Retrieved from: http://www.fno.org/dec99/scaffold.html

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. L. (2000). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Milroy, L., & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross disciplinary perspectives on code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code mixing*. London: Cambridge University.

Myers-Scotton, C., & Jake, J. L. (2001). Explaining aspects of codeswitching and their implications. In *One mind, two languages: Bilingual language processing* (pp. 84–116). Oxford: Blackwell.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ohta, A. S. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. *System, 33*, 503–517.

Pachler, N., & Field, K. (2001). *Learning to teach modern foreign languages in the secondary school*. London: Routledge.

Paradowski, M. (2008). Corroborating the role of L1 awareness in FL pedagogy. In *33rd international LAUD symposium. Cognitive approaches to second/foreign language processing: Theory and pedagogy*. Essen: Landau/Pfalz, 515–580.

Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. London/New York: Routledge.

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2013). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Prodromou, L. (2002). The role of the mother tongue in the classroom. *IATEFL, 2002*, 6–8.

Reis, L. (1996). The myths and the practical needs of using L1 in EFL classes: A learner training experiment. *English Teaching Forum, 34*(3–4), 61–62.

Rinvolucri, M. (2001). Mother tongue in the foreign language classroom: Why and how. *Modern English Teacher, 10*(2), 41–44.

Romylyn, A. M. (2009). Decoding the switch: The functions of codeswitching in the classroom. *Education Quarterly, 67*(1), 44–61.

Ruan, J. (2005). *A study of bilingual speech: Chinese English children's code switching behavior*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma.

Schweers, C. W., Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 7*(2), 6–13.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *Conversation analysis perspective on the organisation of L2 classroom interaction*. London: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(8). Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Shayer, M. (2002). Not just Piaget, not just Vygotsky, and certainly not Vygotsky as an alternative to Piaget. In M. Shayer (Ed.), *Learning intelligence, cognitive acceleration across the curriculum from 5 to 15 years* (pp. 179–196). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Simon, D. L. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II* (pp. 311–342). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Skiba, R. (1997). Code switching as a countenance of language interference. *The Internet TESL Journal, 3*(10), 1–6.

Snowman, J., & Biehler, R. (2000). *Psychology applied to teaching*. Boston: Houghton Miflin Company.

Sridhar, K. (1996). Societal multilingualism. In N. H. Hornberger & S. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 47–70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(3), 252–274.

Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yario, & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *TESOL*, Washington, DC (pp. 194–204).

Udoro, B. (2008). *The analysis of English code mixing used in MTV Ampuh*. Retrieved from: http://etd.eprints.ums.ac.id/2173/1/A320040094.pdf

Üstünel, E. (2004). *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced codeswitching in a Turkish university EFL setting*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Üstünel, E. (2009). *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced codeswitching in a Turkish University EFL setting*. Berlin: VDM Verlag.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Codeswitching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302–325.

Valdés-Fallis, G. (1981). Code-switching as a deliberate verbal strategy: A micro-analysis of direct and indirect requests among bilingual Chicano speakers. In R. P. Duran (Ed.), *Latino language and communicative behaviour*. Norwood: ABLEX Publishing Corporation.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wei, L. (1994). *Three generations, two languages, one family: Language choice and language shift in a Chinese community in Britain*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wei, L. (1995). Code-switching, preference marking and politeness in bilingual cross-generational talk: Examples from a Chinese community in Britain. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 16*, 197–214.

Wei, L. (1998). The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code switching. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 156–176). London: Routledge.

Wei, L. (2002). "What do you want me to say?" On theconversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society, 31*, 159–180.

Wei, L. (Ed.). (2005). Conversational code-switching [Special issue]. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37.

Wertsch, J. V., & Hickmann, M. (1987). Problem solving in social interaction: A microgenetic analysis. In M. Hickmann (Ed.), *Social and functional approaches to language and thought* (pp. 251–266). San Diego: Academic Press.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 193–211). Llangefni: CAI.

Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman. Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology, 17*(2), 89–100.

3

Code-Switching Studies of L2 Classrooms (Methodological Background of Code-Switching Studies of Foreign Language Classrooms)

Martin-Jones (1995) examines two broad strands of code-switching research in classrooms:

(a) The first consists of early studies where the first attempts were made to conduct classroom *discourse analysis* in bilingual contexts. This research focused primarily on the communicative functions of code-switching in teacher-led talks and on the frequency with which particular languages were employed to perform different functions.

(b) The second strand consists of more recent studies which have taken more account of the sequential flow of classroom discourse and of the way in which code-switching contributes to the interactional work that teachers and learners do in bilingual classrooms. This research has incorporated elements of a *conversational analytic* approach to code-switching and has generally been grounded in ethnographic observation.

Apart from the discourse analytic and conversation analytic approach to code-switching as mentioned above, there are some, although not many, other studies which used quantitative research methods and mixed

research methods. In this chapter, I review previous studies on language classroom code-switching according to their research methodology.

1   Quantitative Studies of Code-Switching

The early studies on classroom code-switching have been conducted in North American settings in two main kinds of contexts: "(1) second language contexts (e.g., ESL classrooms) and (2) bilingual education classrooms" (Lin 2013: 197). Quantitative and functional coding analysis was often used in these studies. The research questions usually focused on the relative quantities of L1 and L2 use in different activity settings and the functional distribution of L1 and L2. In this section, I examine previous studies which fall in this category.

1.1   The Amount of L1/L2 Use Across Activity Types and Settings

This type of research has largely been conducted in North American settings with children in bilingual education programmes. Lin (2013: 198) states that "the main emphasis of such work is to investigate whether linguistic minority children's L1 (e.g., Spanish, Chinese) and the wider, societal language (English) are given equal emphasis by calculating the relative quantities of use in the classroom (in terms of the number of utterances in each code or the time spent on it)". Data for such studies is typically collected through class visits and observations with subsequent analysis of field notes and audio/videotapes. For instance, Wong-Fillmore (1980) found a range of L1 use depending on the degree of individualisation in teacher-learner interaction. In a Cantonese-English bilingual programme, the teacher spoke the least L1 (8 % of all her utterances) and the most L2 (92 %) during whole-class instruction. She spoke more L1 (28 %) during interactions with individual learners in seatwork. The child chosen for observation, on the other hand, spoke much more L1 (79 %) in seatwork than during teacher-directed whole class instruction (4 % L1). This study suggests the preference for the use of L1 in less formal, more intimate participant structures.

In another study (Frohlich et al. 1985) on the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms in four different programmes in Canada (e.g., core French, French immersion, extended French with subject matter courses, ESL classrooms), teacher talk in all four programmes was found to reflect very high L2 use (96 %). However, the researchers noted that learners generally used the TL only while the teacher exercised control over classroom activities. During seatwork most interaction occurred in the learners' L1. Again, it seems that learners show strong preference for using L1.

While the interactive sociolinguistic notion of "participant structure" (Goffman 1974; Heller 2001) was not used in these early studies, the early researchers relied instead on the related notion of activity type or setting (e.g., individual seatwork, group work, whole-class instruction) as an important factor affecting the relative amounts of L1/L2 use in both studies mentioned above. In contrast, other work used functional coding systems in their analysis to develop categories of functions of L1 use.

1.2   Functional Distribution of L1/L2 Use

Many of the functional studies were conducted in bilingual content classrooms in the USA and only a few in L2 and foreign language classrooms. In these studies, classroom utterances were usually coded by the observer with a functional coding system (e.g., Flanders 1970). This yields frequency counts of distribution of L1 and L2 across different functional categories. For instance, in a study of five kindergartens in Spanish bilingual programmes using an adaptation of Flanders' Multiple Coding System, Legarreta (1977) reported on the functional distribution of Spanish (L1) and English (L2) in two different programme models: the Concurrent Translation and Alternative Days. She found that the Alternative Days model generated an equal distribution of Spanish and English by teachers and children overall, with more Spanish used for warming and directing functions and English as the primary choice for disciplining children. However, in the Concurrent Translation model, instead of using the L1 (Spanish) of the majority of the pupils to express solidarity (warming, accepting, amplifying), the teachers and aides predominantly used English for these functions.

In another study, Milk (1981) coded teacher talk in a twelfth-grade civic education lesson according to eight basic pedagogical functions (e.g., informative, directive, humour-expressive) based on Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). English (L2) was found to dominate the teacher's directives (92 %) and meta-statements (63 %) while there was a greater balance between L1 and L2 in other functions (e.g., elicitation, expressive, reply, informative). In addition, Milk described the skilful manner in which the bilingual teacher employed extensive switching between Spanish and English to create humour, both as a means of social control and as a way to arouse learners' interest.

Guthrie (1984) used similar research methods in a study of an ESL lesson attended by 11 first-grade Cantonese-American learners (ranging from limited English proficiency to fluent). Two types of lessons were analysed: reading in English with a Cantonese-English bilingual teacher, and oral language with an English monolingual teacher. Field notes and audio-recording of six hours of lessons were obtained and coded by two bilingual observers. Guthrie found that interactions of the English monolingual teacher with the limited English proficiency learners in the oral lessons were characterised by a higher proportion of conversational acts such as "attention-getters", "requests for action" and "protests", indicating a certain lack of teacher control and a frequent loss of learner attention. On the other hand, while the bilingual teacher used Cantonese (L1 of the learners) very rarely (less than 7 % on average) in the English reading lessons, when she did it was for a distinct reason. She told the researchers that she tried to avoid using Cantonese during these lessons and was surprised to find she has used L1 as much as she had. The functions of L1 use reported by Guthrie can be summarised as: (a) to act as a "we-code" for solidarity, (b) to clarify or check for understanding, (c) to contrast variable meanings in L1 and L2 and to anticipate likely sources of confusion for learners.

Lin (2013: 198–200) points out that "while the functional coding approach dominated early work, in some studies (e.g., Milk 1981; Guthrie 1984) preliminary use of ethnographic interviews and interactional sociolinguistic methods were incorporated, a trend which continued in later work".

2   Discourse Analytic Studies of Code-Switching

2.1   The Definition of Discourse Analysis

The definition and use of discourse analysis (DA) has been applied in many different disciplines (e.g., anthropology, sociology, psychology, and philosophy). Because of this, DA serves as an umbrella term for "all issues that have been dealt with in the linguistic study of text and discourse" (Östman and Verschueren 1995: 240). Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000: 4) suggest that "DA has taken at least two different paths: one is theoretical in nature and will often be related to a particular school of linguistic analysis such as formal linguistics or systemic linguistics; the latter is more concerned with describing actual communication within institutionalised contexts (e.g., foreign language classroom interaction, doctor-patient interaction)". The first of which is related to the functional analysis and the second one is related to CA and the institutional talk (i.e., classroom talk). Some language classroom code-switching studies see the integration of two research methodologies: the functional analysis of DA into the CA sequential analysis. Seedhouse (2004: 66) explains how DA functional analysis can be fitted into the CA sequential analysis as follows:

> … the basis of DA, i.e. form-function mapping, forms an integral part of CA, namely the why that? part of the question why that, in that way, right now? … Form-function mapping or speech move DA analysis is certainly undertaken, but it forms only a part of a much broader perspective which concentrates on the relationship between pedagogical focus and the organisation of the interaction, in particular the organisation of turns, sequence, repair and topic. So a CA institutional discourse approach to L2 classroom interaction is very much founded on and compatible with the many studies of L2 classrooms undertaken in a DA paradigm.

For example, Seedhouse (2004) uses Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) cycles, which are one of the examples of DA functional analysis, to contextualise the functions of the utterances/speech acts. He then uses CA

sequential analysis to analyse the utterance on a turn-by-turn basis. In this book, I apply the same type of analysis for the classroom extracts in Chap. 4.

2.2   Characteristics of Discourse Analysis

Levinson (1983: 287) notes that "the main strength of the DA approach is that it promises to integrate linguistic findings about intra-sentential organisation with discourse structure". To exemplify this quote in relation to the scope of this book, I analyse the pedagogical functions of teacher-initiated, teacher-induced and learner-initiated code-switching utterances within their intra-sentential organisation in the light of the pedagogical frame (i.e., discourse structure).

DA analysts can be further divided into two general categories: "the text grammarians and the speech act (or interactional) theorists" (Levinson 1983: 288). For the purpose of this book, I include the summary of a discussion about the second category only in this section (For further information about the first and second categories, please refer to Levinson 1983: 288–294.) The philosophical background of the second category claims that "all utterances, in addition to meaning whatever they mean, perform specific actions through having specific forces" (Levinson 1983: 236). According to this notion, Austin isolates three kinds of acts that are simultaneously performed in a discourse. In this section, I explain each kind of act by giving its definition and providing an example (detailed definitions and relevant discussion of the term "speech act" can be found in Austin 1962 and Searle 1969):

Extract 1

1 →T: not reading ((T looks at L1))
2   (1.5) ((LL talk in pairs))
3   .hh *arkadaşlar bir dakika* (0.5) *okumanızı istemiyorum.* (1.0) *bakabilirsiniz*
4   *kağıda ama okumanızı istemiyorum.* [tr: hold on a minute mates (students) I do not want you to read you can look at the paper but I do not want you to read it]

5   (.)
6 L1:   =okay
7   (1.0)
8 T: it is just for ideas
         ((LL talk in pairs))

1. "Locutionary act: The utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference"

For example, in the above extract, the teacher initiates a code-switching from TL to L1 in lines 3 and 4: "*Arkadaşlar bir dakika okumanızı istemiyorum. bakabilirsiniz kağıda ama okumanızı istemiyorum.* [tr: hold on a minute mates (students) I do not want you to read you can look at the paper but I do not want you to read it]".

2. "Illocutionary act: The making of a statement, offer, promise, etc. in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with (or with its explicit performative paraphrase)"

One way DA has been applied in classroom interaction is "to analyse discourse in a structural functional linguistic way (Chaudron 1988: 14)". This is what I adopt with DA. For instance, in the above example, the teacher-initiated code-switching can be mapped as "order" because in the code-switched turn, the teacher orders learners to do task instructions in order to accomplish the task successfully. In the macro context (i.e., in relation to the institutional goal), the pedagogical function of this code-switching can be mapped as "to deal with the procedural trouble" because the teacher initiates code-switching as a result of learners' misapplication of the task (line 1). The act of this code-switched turn is defined according to the analysis of the micro context (i.e., turn-by-turn sequential analysis of classroom discourse). The information related to the non-verbal behaviour (e.g., "T looks at L1") and the length of pause (e.g., (1.5) in line 2) help to describe the sequential organisation of the code-switched turn, and thus interpret its function in relation to the institutional context.

3. "Perlocutionary act: The bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance"

The perlocutionary act of the teacher-initiated code-switching in the above classroom extract can be seen in line 6 when Learner 1 shows his comprehension and approval of the teacher's order (task instruction) by giving an affirmative reply after a micro pause. This act would suggest that the learner repairs his misapplication of the task instruction and does it in the way the teacher instructed him to do so.

However, the process of mapping utterances into speech act categories is not always straightforward because "single sentences can be used to perform two or more speech acts in different clauses, and each clause may perform more than one speech act" (Levinson 1983: 291). Illustrating this point from the same sample extract, the teacher-initiated code-switching serves for the pedagogical function of dealing with the procedural trouble as well as classroom discipline (i.e., the teacher stops learners from talking in pairs by saying "hold on a minute, mates"). It can also be suggested that the code-switching extract serves for the pedagogical function of giving L1 equivalent because the teacher translates what she has said in line 1 into L1 in lines 3 and 4. To conclude this point, it should be emphasised that one teacher-initiated code-switching extract can serve for more than one pedagogical function at the same time.

2.3   The Discourse Analytic Approach to EFL Classroom Code-Switching

In her study, Lin (2006: 7) proposes that "different frames or footings that are being evoked (or signaled and proposed by a speaker) involve the simultaneous negotiation of different role-relationships and the associated sets of rights/obligations". A shift in footing was defined by Goffman (1981: 128) as "a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance". Lin's studies (1990, 1996), for instance, draw on these interactional sociolinguistic analytic concepts to analyse code-switching in Hong Kong classrooms.

Lin ([1999](): 408) also shows that "by intertwining the use of L1 (Cantonese) for a story focus with the use of L2 (English) for a language focus, a bilingual teacher in a Hong Kong English language classroom successfully got her learners interested in learning English and gaining confidence in reading English storybooks, and thus transforming the habitus of these working class learners for whom English had been an alien language irrelevant to their daily life". Drawing on Heap's ([1985]()) notion of discourse format, which was in turn built on Sinclair and Coulthard's ([1975]()) seminal analysis of the IRF exchange structure, Lin ([1999]()) offered a fine grained analysis of how L1-L2 code-switching was built into two kinds of IRF discourse formats to enable the teacher to engage learners in both enjoying the story and in learning English through this process.

The fine-grained sequential analysis of classroom code-switching drawing on both Sinclair and Coulthard's ([1975]()) IRF analytical tradition and CA continued in later work as exemplified in Üstünel and Seedhouse's ([2005]()) study on how learners displayed their alignment or misalignment with the teacher's pedagogical focus in an EFL classroom in a Turkish university. The fine-grained discourse analytic methods were also productively used in conjunction with a stimulated recall procedure in Scott and De La Fuente's ([2008]()) study of the role of L1 when pairs of intermediate-level college learners of French and Spanish are engaged in consciousness raising, form-focused grammar tasks. An increasing number of studies are drawing on a wider range of research methods including both qualitative and quantitative ones.

In his early works, Johnson was already experimenting with different bilingual ways of presenting teaching content, both in oral and written modes and documenting the effects of different modes of presentation (bilingual vs. monolingual; oral vs. written) on learners' comprehension of content in Hong Kong secondary schools (Johnson [1983](); Johnson et al. [1985]()). Johnson and his colleagues investigated the effects of various modes of presentation and questioning (e.g., English / Chinese / bilingual texts and questions, or different combinations of them). He also looked at the code-switching strategies used by experienced teachers in English medium schools. Research studies in the early and mid 1980s in Hong Kong were characterised by optimism in the possibility of developing bilingual oral and/or written strategies in English medium schools

to solve the dilemma created by the overwhelming parental demand for an English medium education for their children and the often limited English proficiency of the majority of children to benefit from a purely English medium education.

In the first study (Johnson 1983), it was found that teachers systematically code-switched between Cantonese and English for different purposes. In general, English was found to be associated with text-dependent, formal and didactic functions; whereas Cantonese was found to be associated with text-independent, informal and explanatory functions. In his conclusion, Johnson wrote:

> Separation of the languages is one simple, but possibly also simplistic, approach to the problems of bilingual education, and I am not convinced that there is anything intrinsically wrong with code-switching in bilingual classrooms. At the very least, the teaching strategies identified here are capable of greater sensitivity to differences amongst learners and groups of learners than the separation approach. (Johnson 1983: 282)

In the second study, Johnson et al. (1985) tested for the effects of different linguistic modes of presentation and questioning on the subsequent comprehension test scores among 1,296 Form 3 (Grade 9) learners. It was found that irrespective of the linguistic mode of presentation of the texts (on the topic of how bean curd is made), learners scored higher on average when answering Chinese questions, and irrespective of the linguistic mode of questioning, learners scored higher on average when the texts had been presented in the Cantonese mode or the bilingual mode. When asked about their preferences on the medium of instruction, less than 3 % of the 1,296 learners preferred English-only instruction. In the oral mode, the learners were about equally split in their preference for Cantonese-only instruction or Cantonese-English bilingual code. In the written mode, over 70 % of the learners preferred to study with Chinese texts, although 11 % would also like to have English glosses added to the Chinese text, and 32 % would also like to have a corresponding English text side by side with the Chinese text. Johnson et al. (1985) conclude that the majority of learners preferred a bilingual to an English-only mode of instruction.

Eldridge emphasises that "even though learners are aware of it or not, their code-switching serves a purpose such as 'reinforcing, emphasizing or clarifying' their message content that they have tried to convey in L2 but thought that one of the participants has not comprehended" (Eldridge 1996: 306). In the journey between L1 and L2, Eldridge (1996) argues that learner code-switching serves the functions of equivalence, floor holding, reiteration, group membership and alignment.

In the literature it is stated that in general, learners tend to choose their L1 over L2 to communicate with other learners. Martin-Jones (1995, 2000) argues that this situation is related to the level of learners because learners' language abilities and communicative repertoires vary widely.

Heller (1988: 92) argues that by code-switching, learners refuse to agree with all the obligations of being English even if they are willing to learn that language. Gumperz makes a clear distinction between "we" and "they" code. According to Gumperz's terms, while a speaker uses L1 as the "we" code, TL is regarded as "they" code. He links these terms with a notion of group identity:

> The tendency is for the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as the "we-code" and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the "they-code" associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations. (Gumperz 1982: 66)

Apart from the above studies which draw on interpretive research paradigms, there is also a major trend of studies led by Heller and Martin-Jones (2001), which draws on both interpretive and critical research paradigms and they relate micro interactional functions of code-switching in the classroom to larger societal issues, such as the reproduction or sometimes contestation of linguistic ideologies in the larger society.

Heller and Martin-Jones (2001) provided some examples on how micro ethnographic studies of classroom code-switching are not actually "micro" in their implications if we see the classroom as a discursive site for reproduction or contestation of linguistic ideologies and hierarchies. The discursive construction/negotiation of what counts as front stage and

back stage (Goffman 1974) and the legitimation of what goes on at the teacher's part as legitimate, standard, valued language vs. what gets marginalised, reproduced as inferior, non/sub-standard language in the back stage. They conclude that usually the societal dominant L2 occupies the first position and learners' L1 occupies the latter position.

Ndayipfukamiye's (2001) study of Kirundi-French code-switching in Burundi classrooms, the bilingual teacher is seen to be using Kirundi (learners' familiar language) to annotate, explain and exemplify French (L2) terms and academic content. While the linguistic brokering functions of code-switching is affirmed (i.e., the value of providing learners with access to the educationally dominant language, French), the linguistic hierarchy as institutionalised in the French immersion education policy in Burundi is largely reproduced in these code-switching practices.

In Simon's (2001) study of code-switching in French-as-a-foreign-language classrooms in Thailand, teachers are seen as code-switching for a number of purposes, among which are those of "negotiating different frames (e.g., formal, institutional learning frame vs. informal friendly frame), role-relationships and identities (e.g., teacher vs. friend). Code-switching is seen as having a 'momentary boundary-levelling effect' in the classroom" (Simon 2001: 326). Whether similar effects might be achieved by code-switching in different contexts would, however, seem to depend on different sociolinguistic statuses and values associated with different codes in different societies.

It has also been claimed that frequent use of mother tongue in EFL classrooms can affect the way learners communicate in the TL adversely. Learner code-switching has also aroused interest from researchers such as Butzkamm (1998), Zabrodskaja (2007), Martin (1999), Mwinsheikhe (2002) and Probyn (2005). They have provided valuable insights into the reasons why learners frequently keep falling back into their mother tongue. Their studies have demonstrated that code-switching is not performed due to lack of ability, but it actually serves several communicative purposes.

Canagarajah (2001) shows how ESL teachers and learners in Jaffna negotiated hybrid identities through code-switching between Tamil and

English,defying both the Tamil-only ideology in the public domains and institutions, and the English-only ideology from the ESL pedagogical prescriptions from the West. Canagarajah argued that both teachers and learners, by code-switching comfortably between these two languages are also constructing their bilingual cosmopolitan identities, refusing to be pigeonholed by essentialising political ideologies or English-only pedagogical ideologies.

Setati et al. (2002) provided a mid-term report on findings from their larger ongoing study of code-switching and other language practices in Mathematics, Science and English language classrooms in South Africa. These schools had adopted a small-group inquiry teaching approach and built on notions of additive bilingualism and strategic code-switching as encouraged by the authorities. Setati et al. (2002) found that the progressive pedagogies (e.g., learner-centred group work) alone did not provide the much-needed direct teaching of subject domain-specific academic discourses and English academic literacies and thus aggravated social inequalities. Setati et al.'s (2002) report, however, did not show much analysis of how this academic discourse can be provided or inserted into the progressive teaching approaches along with the integration of some conventional pedagogies. While this report seems to be work-in-progress, it does point out the importance of drawing on research tools of genre analysis of different subject-specific academic discourses in future studies of code-switching in the classroom.

Song and Andrews (2009) use a stimulated recall procedure to study four teachers' own perspectives on their code-switching instances in their classrooms and their learners' perspectives are also taped using a similar procedure.

As Gumperz (1982) clearly states "switching serves roughly similar functions in different situations, so that a single preliminary typology can be set up which holds across language situations". Some shared and some new functions of code-switching (e.g. "quotations, addressee specification, interjections, reiteration, message qualification and personalization vs objectivization" (Gumperz 1982: 75)) in EFL classrooms have been found and discussed in the literature so far.

3 Conversation Analytic Studies of Code-Switching

3.1 CA for SLA

CA as a branch of ethnomethodology, was introduced and developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson together with the contribution of their learners and colleagues. They scrutinised the fundamental organisation of talk-in-interaction, which is repeatedly shown by participants' conduct in a wide range of social interaction (Mori 2002: 326). Several studies have used CA to understand the aspects of institutional interaction that are reflective of the interrelating relationship between teachers and learners. The studies (Markee 2000; Ohta 2005; Seedhouse 1995, 1997, 1999, 2004) have effectively used CA to present considerable insight into the language of classroom interactions.

Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 13) define CA as "the study of talk; more particularly, the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction: talk-in-interaction". The aim of studying this recorded, naturally occurring talk-in-interaction is "to uncover the tacit reasoning procedures and sociolinguistic competencies underlying the production and interpretation of talk in organised sequences of interaction" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 14). Schegloff (1991: 46) states that CA is a meeting point for linguistics, sociology and several other disciplines, anthropology and psychology among them. As a result of CA's different relevancies in wider disciplines of linguistics and sociology, it is by its nature interdisciplinary. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 37) explain this interdisciplinary nature as follow:

> From linguistics CA takes the view that language is a structured system for the production of meaning. But in line with certain subfields of linguistics such as pragmatics, CA views language primarily as a vehicle for communicative interaction. And, in line with recent developments in sociology, CA sees both communication and interaction as inherently social processes, deeply involved in the production and maintenance of social institutions of all kinds, from everyday intersubjectivity, to the family, to the nation-state.

In this book EFL classroom extracts are analysed by using an approach called CA-for-SLA (Markee and Kasper 2004) that aims at "how the social organization of talk-in-interaction either shapes or contributes to language learning processes" (Mori and Markee 2009: 1). At the centre of this approach is language learning behaviour, which "is presumed to be a fundamental social enterprise, jointly constructed and intrinsically linked to learners' repeated and regular participation in their classroom activities" (Hall and Verplaetse 2000: 11). CA-for-SLA is not a homogeneous approach or theory (Markee and Kasper 2004), although an emerging number of CA-related studies dealing with second-language and foreign-language learning have been carried out. A key question for CA practitioners in the field is whether and to what extent external theories have to be considered. Mori and Markee (2009) distinguish between two emerging tendencies: CA-inspired approaches to SLA, which are (relatively) purist or CA native; and CA-informed approaches to SLA, where CA is used "as a technical tool that provides the methodological muscle for a priori theories of SLA" (Mori and Markee 2009: 2).

The present study contributes to this emerging body of research by demonstrating how teachers and learners in EFL classrooms orient to different types of classroom activity through their varying language choices. Theoretically and methodologically, it is informed by code-switching in classroom interaction, insights from classroom talk, and the relationship between task design and learner performance. Analysis focused on (a) how code-switching is used in this FL classroom; (b) how the learner orients to the teacher's pedagogical focus in different activities; and (c) how CA findings on classroom interaction can be productively used to make direct interventions in professional practices (Antaki 2011a). It suggests that code-switching practices are embedded in the sequential development of the interaction and closely tied to the participants' converging or diverging orientations toward the activities. Antaki (2011b: 8) describes this line of CA research as interventionist applied CA, which carries the following characteristics:

> [I]t is applied to an interactional problem which pre-existed the analyst's arrival; it has the strong implication that a solution will be identified via the analysis of the sequential organization of talk; and it is undertaken collaboratively, achieved with people in the local scene.

3.2   Types of Interactional Organisation in EFL Classrooms

Peräkylä (2003: 175) defines the central strength of CA as its "description of practices and patterns of interaction". He goes on to say that "CA methodology is geared to describe what happens in the interaction, and questions concerning the consequences are really something that CA as such cannot handle". The transcripts are central to guaranteeing the cumulative and publicly verifiable nature of conversation analytic research, since they are made publicly available to anyone who requests them in order to test the accuracy of the analysis or to re-analyse the data.

3.2.1   Adjacency Pairs

One of the core ideas of CA is that "utterances in interactional talk are sequentially organised" and "the concept of adjacency pairs is the major instrument for the analysis of sequential organisation" (Ten Have 1999: 113). For instance, questions and answers, greetings and return greetings; or invitations and acceptances/declinations are called adjacency pairs in the sense that "these pairs of utterance are ordered, i.e., there is a recognizable difference between first parts and second parts of the pair; and in which given first pair parts require particular second parts" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 39).

These sequences are called adjacency pairs because, ideally, the two parts should be produced next to each other. However, there may be some insertions that come between first and second pair parts. The point, then, is that "some classes of utterances are conventionally paired such that, on the production of a first pair part, the second part becomes relevant and remains so even if it is not produced in the next serial turn" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 40). For instance, the following is an example of an insertion sequence:

Extract 2

1 →L18:   *biz konuyu değiştirsek olur mu?*
            [tr: can we change the topic?]

2 T: I don't remember it (.) what was it?
3 L19:   young person old person
4 →L18: *otobüste hani* [tr: in the bus]
5 →L19: *ben sitting oturuyorum* [tr: I am "sitting"]
6 T: okay

In line 1, Learner 18 initiates a question (Q1) to ask for a permission to change the topic of role-play in which she is working on to write and act a dialogue with her partner. In line 2, the teacher initiates another question (Q2) in relation to Q1. Learner 19 and Learner 18 take answer turns (A2) to reply to the teacher's question (Q2) in lines 3, 4, and 5. In line 6, the teacher provides a reply (A1) to Learner 18's question (Q1).

Participants orient themselves to the relevance of adjacency pairs and insertion sequences. Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 41) define the process of orientation as one where "participants display to one another their understanding of what each utterance is aiming to accomplish". Thus, the organisation of adjacency pairs does not simply show that some utterances come in pairs, rather it signifies one of the most basic issues in CA: "how participants display to one another their ongoing understanding and sense-making of one another's talk" (ibid.).

The relationship between the two parts of the adjacency pair is a normative one. That is to say, "after a first pair-part, the next utterance, at first, is heard as a relevant response to the first, as a fitting second pair-part. When that is not possible, when there is no response, or when it does not 'fit', that is an accountable matter, a noticeable absence" (Ten Have 1999: 113). For instance, suppose a question does not get an answer. Such a case, where what is normatively expected to occur does not, is described under the heading of "conditional relevance" (Schegloff 1968). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 45) define conditional relevance as follows: "given the initial condition of a first pair part being uttered, the second part of that pair is then relevant; consequently, the absence of such a second part is a 'noticeable absence', and the speaker of the first part may infer a reason for that absence".

Extract 3

```
1 →T:  hmm
2        (0.5)
3        what is dangerous about it?
4        (2.0)
5        you didn't pay, you ran away? (.) from the back door?
6        (1.0)
7        arka kapıdan mı kaçtın? [tr: did you ran away from the back
         door?]
8        ((Learners laugh))
9        (2.5)
10 L5:  no
11       (1.0)
12       no I didn't.
```

The teacher asks a question in line 3 and repairs his question after waiting for two seconds. The pause of two seconds between the teacher's question and repair turns is a noticeable absence in a question-reply sequence. The teacher repairs his question (line 5) for the second time by code-switching to Turkish in line 7. The teacher waits for a reply turn in line 6 during a second's pause; however, none of the learners initiates a reply. When there is no response in L2, the teacher code-switches to Turkish to translate his question (line 7). His code-switching provokes laughter from the learners which may signal that it is comprehended. After this teacher-initiated code-switching, Learner 5 takes the reply turn in line 10. Within a normative framework, producers of the first part of adjacency pairs assess interlocutors' actions and motives. This shows that "talk-in-interaction is not just a matter of taking turns but is a matter of accomplishing actions" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 43). In the above extract, appropriate junctures for taking a turn occur after the teacher asks questions, and the failure to take a turn when one is required from the learners results in the teacher's repairing his question (line 5) and code-switching to Turkish (line 7).

This discovery of structure in interaction sequences proved to be an important finding because "it confirmed what had been proposed in eth-

nomethodology from the outset, namely, that there is order to be found in the most mundane of interactions, and that close examination of actual occurrences would enable the analyst to discover, describe, and analyse that orderliness" (Psathas 1995: 17). In the following section, I define and exemplify how preference organisation, which is closely related to adjacency pair sequences, is organised in EFL classrooms. Thus, in the above case, adjacency pairs, repair, and preference organisation are all intimately associated with code-switching.

3.2.2   Preference Organisation

The rationale behind "preference organisation" is that there are differences in the design of adjacency pairs (e.g., offers, which can be accepted or refused; assessments, which can be agreed with or disagreed with; and requests, which can be granted or denied), between their positive and negative alternatives. In other words, "the format for agreements is labelled the 'preferred' action turn shape and the disagreement format is called the 'dispreferred' action turn shape" (Pomerantz 1984: 64), and "preferred actions are characteristically performed straightforwardly and without delay, while dispreferred actions are delayed, qualified and accounted for" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 45). The concept of preference is used in CA in relation to "the structural features of the design of turns associated with particular activities, by which participants can draw conventionalised inferences about the kinds of action a turn is performing", instead of "the psychological motives of individuals" (ibid.: 43–44). In other words, the notion of preference in CA refers to the observable and recurrent interactional patterns in talk, which are independent of speakers' personal desires or attitudes.

In CA literature, there are two complementary ways in which the concept of preference is used: the first approach focuses on the structure of sequences, in the sense that "whether a question prefers a 'yes' or a 'no' response is a matter of its speaker's construction of it … the preference is built into the sequence, and is not a matter of the respondent's construction of the response. If the question is built to prefer 'yes', then 'no' is a dispreferred response, even if delivered without delay and in

turn-initial position, and vice versa" (Schegloff 1988: 453). On the other hand, the second approach (Pomerantz 1984) works on how second parts are designed. Thus: "speakers display the kind of action they are doing, and the kind of stance they take toward what they are doing, by their deployment of [dispreferred turn-shapes] … They do the response they do 'as a preferred' or 'as a dispreferred' [response], rather than doing 'the preferred or dispreferred response'" (Schegloff 1988: 453). Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998: 45) sum up these approaches by saying that they are "complementary in the sense that they both tell us something about the inferential properties of sequences".

In the L2 classroom context, the preference organisation of repair is linked to pedagogical focus. Seedhouse (2004: 217) states from an interactional point of view that "what teachers are actually doing in practice is operating a preference organisation which marks linguistic errors as embarrassing and face-threatening". In order words, the preference organisation shows that preferred response is affiliative, while dispreferred response is disaffilative:

> Once repair initiation has been attempted, subsequent repair strategies can be more direct and "bald" without risking disaffiliation as the person repairing is "moving down" the preference structure of repair. … Brown and Levinson (1978: 38–42) suggest that face issues motivate the organisation of preference and pre-sequences. So ethnomethodological conceptions of affiliation and disaffiliation are broadly compatible with Brown and Levinson's conceptions of face and politeness. Since the explanatory system of ethnomethodology underpins CA, analyses do not tend to make massive use of face and politeness, but neither is it necessary to shy away from mention of these concepts. (Seedhouse 2004: 221–222)

The basic point, then, is that there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the organisation of the interaction. As the preference varies, so the organisation of turn, adjacency pairs, and repair varies. In Chap. 4, I show how the interactional organisation can transform the pedagogical focus by examining a case of preference organisation in relation to repair in EFL classroom contexts.

3.2.3   Turn-Taking Mechanism

In the study of turn-taking organisation, Psathas (1995: 34) notes: "the major concern of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1974) was how to account for the complex system by which parties engaged in talk manage to take turns at speaking". To this end, "Sacks et al. (1974) had noted that speakers speak mainly one at a time, that speaker change occurs quite smoothly, that overlapped speech is brief, and that transitions occur from one turn to the next with very little gap and no overlapped speech. Turn transitions are accomplished in a variety of ways, but there appeared to be some systematic features with regard to how these were done that had not been carefully studied or elaborated by analysts of interaction (ibid.)".

The turn-taking mechanism has two components: a "turn construction" component and a "turn distribution" component. Turn-construction units broadly correspond to "linguistic categories such as sentences, clauses, single words (for instance, 'Hey!' or 'What?') or phrases" (Hutchby and Wooffitt 1998: 48). However, conversation analysts do not define what a turn-construction unit is, rather, they describe a turn-construction unit as a legitimate turn that has been built in order to be recognisable by the participants (ibid.). The two key features of turn-construction units are related to this explanation. First, they have the property of "projectability", that is, "it is possible for participants to project, in the course of a turn-construction unit, what sort of unit it is and at what point it is likely to end" (ibid.). The second feature is that turn-construction units have "transition-relevance places" at their boundaries, that is, "at the end of each unit there is the possibility for legitimate transition between speakers" (ibid.). These two properties can be exemplified by the following extract from an EFL classroom:

Extract 4

1 L10: (1.0)
2   we, we go (.)we went to er (1.5) disco with my friends and-

3 T: you were <u>ill</u> but you <u>went</u> to =disco?
4 L10: =/ /no*
5   (1.0)
6   I I was going to er (0.5) I was going to er disco but I was ill

In line 2, Learner 10 takes a reply turn to the teacher's previous question. The teacher interrupts Learner 10's reply at a translation-relevance place (i.e., after the conjuction "and", just before a new independent clause) in order to ask a question in line 3. However, Learner 10 is able to recognise (i.e., projectability) the teacher's question as a form of other-initiated repair, and replies before it has actually finished (line 4). After a second's pause, Learner 10 self-repairs her reply (line 2) in line 6.

Psathas (1995: 36) stresses that the rules proposed by Sacks et al. (1974), which describe how turns come to be allocated at transition-relevance places, are applied to "free-flowing conversational interaction, in which (a) topics were not predetermined and (b) speaker turns were not pre-allocated". Sacks et al.'s account relates to free conversation, which is not examined in detail here. However, "alternative speech exchange systems, such as the interview, a debate, a religious ceremony, or a classroom, would have possibly different turn-taking systems because there are restrictions on who may speak, when they may speak, and sometimes in what order they may speak" (Psathas 1995: 36).

Cazden (2001: 105) defines school in metaphorical terms as "a performance that must be constituted through the collaborative work of a group of actors: the teacher who assumes the dual role of stage director and principal player, and the learners who are relative novices yet essential to the enactment of a culturally defined activity". In relation to the main institutional goal of L2 classrooms (i.e., teacher teaches L2), teachers have the authority to allocate turns in traditional language classrooms (Markee 2000). In traditional classrooms, Cazden (2001: 82) suggests, "the most important asymmetry in the rights and obligations of teachers and learners is over control of the right to speak. … teachers have the role-given right to speak at any time and to any person; they can fill any

silence or interrupt any speaker; they can speak to a learner anywhere in the room and in any volume or tone of voice".

In the analyses of classroom extracts in Chap. 4, it is the teacher who generally allocates turns verbally or non-verbally (Seedhouse 2004). This feature can be seen in many classroom studies. For instance, Mehan (1979) analysed nine traditional lessons and discovered that the teacher nominated learner speakers 88 per cent of the time. The rest of the time, learners spoke out of turn, without being called on. The analyses of classroom extracts in Chap. 4 yield similar results: that is, teacher nomination of learners is not the only way to structure speaking rights. In some extracts, learners self-select themselves and initiate a turn without being allocated. Cazden (2001: 82–83) describes this as follows: "Teachers may decide during some activities not to exercise their power to select learner speakers. Instead of pre-allocation of turns by the teacher, there is then more local management of turn-taking by individual learners at the moment of speaking. With this shift, classroom talk becomes more like informal conversation—not the same as conversation, because there is still the large group of potential speakers and the educational necessity to stick to an agenda, but closer to it". The following extract exemplifies such a case:

Extract 5

1 T: wolf?
2 →L5: *solucan* [tr: worm]
3 T: that's worm
4 →L8: wolf *kurt* [tr: wolf]
5 T: huh uh so wolves is the plural
6   (2.0)
7 L8:   Hmm

In line 1, the teacher asks for either the L1 equivalent or a TL description of the word "wolf". Learner 5 replies in line 2 and her reply receives a repair from the teacher in line 3. Learner 8 provides the L1 equivalent in his reply turn in line 4. The teacher accepts his

reply and gives further metalanguage information. Learner 8 shows his comprehension non-verbally in line 7. In this extract, the teacher does not pre-allocate the turns, rather, Learners 5 and 8 select themselves to take the reply turns. Learner 5 nominates herself to give a reply to the teacher's question in line 2. Since her reply is incorrect, Learner 8 nominates himself to take another reply turn in line 4. The teacher repairs Learner 5's incorrect reply (line 3) and gives positive feedback to Learner 8's reply turn (line 5).

As it is the case with the preference organisation, the organisation of turn taking varies in L2 classrooms as pedagogical focus varies. Seedhouse (2004: 123) explains this relationship as follows:

> … there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogical focus and the organisation of turn-taking and sequence. As the pedagogical focus varies, so the organisation of the interaction varies. It is strongly argued that the data demonstrate that it is not possible to conceive of a single speech-exchange system for L2 classroom interaction. As Markee suggests, "The category of classroom talk in fact subsumes a network of inter-related speech exchange systems, whose number, organizational characteristics and acquisitional functions are as yet little understood" (Markee 2002: 11). A variable perspective which conceives of multiple sub-varieties, or L2 classroom contexts, each with its own basic pedagogical focus and corresponding organisation of turn-taking and sequence, is therefore necessary.

This reflexive relationship between the organisation of turn-taking and pedagogical focus is discussed in turn-by-turn analysis of the EFL classroom extracts in Chap. 4.

3.2.4   The Organisation of Repair

According to Schegloff et al. (1977), repair is a set of practices that resolves the problems of speaking, hearing, and understanding in a systematic fashion. Repair is organised in such a way as to "deal with vari-

ous kinds of trouble in the interaction's progress, such as problems of (mis)hearing or understanding" (Ten Have 1999: 116). Trouble is anything which stops the pedagogical business from progressing (Seedhouse 2004). According to Schegloff et al. (1977), repair can be initiated and completed by either one's self or others, yielding four repair types—self-initiated self-repair, self-initiated other-repair, other-initiated self-repair, and other-initiated other-repair.

In the analysis of EFL classroom extracts in Chap. 4, I noticed that teachers and learners sometimes interrupt the current utterance to restart it, correcting an obvious mistake, or code-switching to use a different expression. In other cases, the teacher sometimes retains the same language choice (which is in this case English) and uses a different expression. Extract 3 above exemplifies these two cases of repair. The teacher repairs his question (line 5) with another one in the same language. However, in line 7, the teacher code-switches to Turkish to repair his question (line 5) because he does not receive a reply turn even after the repair (line 6). This repair exemplifies the first repair type, in which the teacher uses code-switching strategically to repair his questions, to make sure the learners understand the questions, and to obtain a reply from the learners. Extract 5 above shows how an other-initiated, other-repair sequence takes place. The teacher initiates a repair to Learner 5's reply (line 3) and Learner 8 repairs Learner 5's reply (line 4).

3.3 The Conversation Analytic Approach to EFL Classroom Code-Switching

As a methodology, the CA approach has some distinct qualities and these offer key advantages in the examination of code-switching. Auer defines two distinct advantages. First, Auer points to the "sequential implicativeness" of language choices in conversation. That is, a participant's choice of language can change the subsequent language choices in the conversation. The second one is that CA "limits the external analyst's interpretational leeway because it relates his or her interpretation back to the members' mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their

behaviour" (Auer 1984: 6). Examples of the CA approach to bilingual interaction include works by Auer (1998), Gafaranga (2000), Gafaranga and Torras (2001, 2002), and Shin and Milroy (2000). The CA approach to bilingual code-switching addresses three fundamental points: (i) relevance, (ii) procedural consequentiality and (iii) the balance between social structure and conversational structure.

Seedhouse (2004: 96) claims that CA institutional-discourse methodology attempts to relate not only the overall organisation of the interaction, but also individual interactional devices to the core institutional goal. As a type of institutional interaction, classroom interaction has distinct and recognisable characteristics. CA attempts to understand these characteristics and the organisation of the interaction as being rationally derived from the core institutional goal. It is possible to list some interactional properties that come from the core goal and form the interaction. The three distinctive underlying characteristics of ELT classroom discourse properties follow each other in an orderly way and give us a better understanding of L2 classroom interaction (Seedhouse 2004):

- Language is both the vehicle and object of instruction.
- There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction and interactants constantly display their analyses of the evolving relationship between them.
- The linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher in some way.

As the pedagogical focus decides on the sequence of interaction (Seedhouse 2004); they have to agree because only "where language use and pedagogic purpose coincide, learning opportunities are facilitated" (Walsh 2002: 5).

Such an approach analyses sequences of talk rather than single utterances, examining language "in its interactional environment" (Richards and Seedhouse 2005: 15), but at the same time, it identifies the way in which individual turns are constructed and how partici-

pants orient to each other and to the context. It is therefore better able to uncover the variety of pedagogical purposes and linguistic practices used in the classroom (Walsh 2006: 53), and through a detailed analysis of the participants' interactional behaviour, it reveals which particular aspects of the institutional setting are being oriented to (Mori 2002: 326).

Auer (1992) discusses how "meaning" is constructed by code-switching in interaction. He looks for answers to whether meaning is mutually constructed by participants through act of code-switching or meaning in code-switching is already constructed with its distinctive social and symbolic values. In bilingual conversation, "whatever language a participant chooses for the organization of his/her turn, or for an utterance which is part of the turn, the choice exerts an influence on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers" (Auer 1984: 5). The meaning of code-switching must be interpreted with reference to the language choice in the preceding and following turns by the participants themselves. Auer called for a conversation-analytic approach to code-switching which would focus on "members procedures to arrive at local interpretations" (1984: 3).

4   Mixed Methods

In this section I look at research that hints at a slightly different research angle and research that starts to draw on research approaches from diverse fields such as genre theories, theories of academic literacies (Setati et al. 2002) and cognitive processing perspectives and experimental methodologies (Macaro 2009).

Macaro (2009), who has drawn on cognitive processing perspectives and experimental approaches, presented the findings of two studies on the effect of code-switching on learners' vocabulary learning. In the first study a sample of 159 Chinese learners of English, aged 16, were randomly assigned to two different conditions. The context was a reading class in which the teacher orally interacted with the whole class around two challenging English texts. There were two sessions, each

with a different text, and the conditions were rotated with each text. In the first condition, the teacher provided a first-language equivalent of words in the text that she knew her learners were unfamiliar with as determined by a pre-test of vocabulary knowledge. In the second condition, the same teacher provided learners with English definitions of the same unfamiliar words. Learners in each condition were thus given different types of information about unknown words (code-switch vs. paraphrase). A third group was an intact class that acted as a control group, which was given both types of information (code-switch and paraphrase). Macaro concluded that there is at least "no harm" in giving L1 equivalents of words during the teaching activity around the reading texts in terms of long-term vocabulary acquisition and he further hypothesised that giving L1 vocabulary equivalents "lightens the cognitive load freeing up processing capacity to focus on the meaning of the text as a whole" (2009: 43).

In the second study learners' responses to teachers' code-switching (e.g., giving L1 equivalents of unfamiliar words) were tapped through a stimulated recall procedure. The study was set in China, in two universities (one teacher in each university), and involved first-year learners learning EFL. The researcher videotaped sixteen 45-minute lessons of a number of these EFL classes and then, immediately following the lesson, asked individual learners (n = 32) to take part in a stimulated recall session carried out in the learners' L1.

Based on the learners' responses Macaro inferred that "when provided with the L1 equivalents of unfamiliar L2 words, the amount of processing that a learner has to do is in fact increased rather than decreased, suggesting more cognitive processing taking place, and learners may have been afforded deeper processing opportunities than when they are provided with L2 definitions" (Macaro 2009: 47).

Continuing with the experimental approach to find evidence on the impact of code-switching on vocabulary learning, Tian and Macaro (2012) investigated the effect of teacher code-switching on EFL vocabulary acquisition during listening comprehension activities in a lexical Focus-on-Form context. While Focus-on-Form instruction entails a primary focus on meaning and learner attention is drawn

to linguistic features, form-focused instruction entails isolation of learner attention to linguistic elements without focusing on meaning (Long 1991). Eighty first-year learners of English as an L2, in a Chinese university, were stratified by proficiency and randomly allocated to a code-switching condition or to an English-only condition, and their performance in vocabulary tests compared to a control group of 37 learners that did not receive any lexical Focus-on-Form treatment. Results confirmed previous studies that lexical focus-on-form leads to better vocabulary learning than mere incidental exposure. More importantly the results also provided initial evidence that teacher code-switching to L1 may be superior to the teacher providing L2-only information on vocabulary learning. Contrary to some theories of the mental lexicon, proficiency level did not clearly favour one condition against the other, implying that both high and low proficiency learners can benefit from the code-switching condition. However, the researchers also noted that the advantage in vocabulary gain did not sustain in the long run.

5   Summary

This chapter presents information about the methodological background of code-switching studies of foreign language classrooms. Readers will also be introduced with the ways how CA is used as a methodological framework as well as other methodologies in the course of chapter.

References

Antaki, C. (Ed.). (2011a). *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Antaki, C. (2011b). Six kinds of applied conversation analysis. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Applied conversation analysis: Intervention and change in institutional talk* (pp. 1–14). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Auer, P. (1992). Introduction: John Gumperz approach to contextualization. In P. Auer & A. Di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Question and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butzkamm, W. (1998). Code-switching in a bilingual history lesson: The mother tongue as a conversational lubricant. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*(2), 81–99.

Canagarajah, S. (2001). Constructing hybrid postcolonial subjects: Codeswitching in Jaffna classrooms. In M. Heller & M. M. Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 193–212). Westport: Ablex.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303–311.

Flanders, N. A. (1970). *Analyzing teaching behavior*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Frohlich, M., Spada, N., & Allen, P. (1985). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 27–57.

Gafaranga, J. (2000). Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 4*, 327–350.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5*, 195–219.

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of code-switching. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 6*, 1–22.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, L. F. (1984). Contrasts in teachers' language use in a Chinese-English bilingual classroom. In J. Handscombe , R. A. Orem, & B. P. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The question of control* (pp. 39–52).

Hall, J. K., & Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). *Second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Heap, J. L. (1985). Discourse in the production of classroom knowledge: Reading lessons. *Curriculum Inquiry, 15*(3), 345–379.

Heller, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociological perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Heller, M. (2001). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. In M. Heller & M. M. Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 381–402). Westport: Ablex.

Heller, M., & Martin-Jones, M. (2001). *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference*. Westport/London: Ablex Publishing.

Hutchby, I., & Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, R. K. (1983). Bilingual switching strategies: A study of the modes of teacher-talk in bilingual secondary school classrooms in Hong Kong. *Language Learning and Communication, 2*(3), 267–283.

Johnson, R. K., Chan, R. M. L., Lee, L. M., & Ho, J. C. (1985). *An investigation of the effectiveness of various language modes of presentation, spoken and written in form III in Hong Kong Anglo-Chinese secondary schools*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Government, Education Department.

Legarreta, D. (1977). Language choice in bilingual classrooms. *Journal of Social Issues, 23*, 9–16.

Levinson, S. L. (1983). *Conversational structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1990). *Teaching in two tongues: Language alternation in foreign language classrooms* (Research Rep. No.3). Hong Kong: City Polytechnic of Hong Kong.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code-switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education, 8*(1), 49–84.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393–412.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2006). Beyond linguistic purism in language-in-education policy and practice: Exploring bilingual pedagogies in a Hong Kong science classroom. *Language and Education, 20*(4), 287–305.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 195–218.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Macaro, E. (2009). Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain (Eds.), *First language use in second and foreign language learning* (pp. 35–49). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2002, April). *A conversation analytic perspective on quantification and generalizability in applied linguistics and SLA*. Paper presented to the plenary panel at the American Association for Applied Linguistics meeting, Salt Lake City.

Markee, N., & Kasper, G. (2004). Classroom talks: An introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 491–497.

Martin, P. W. (1999). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: Interactional practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Development, 19*(2), 127–140.

Martin-Jones, M. (1995). Code-switching in the classroom: Two decades of research. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code-switching* (pp. 90–111). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching, 33*(1), 1–9.

Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Milk, R. D. (1981). Language use in bilingual classrooms: Two case studies. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.), *On TESOL' 81*. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Mori, J. (2002). Task design, plan and development of talk-in-interaction: An analysis of a small group activity in a Japanese language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(3), 323–347.

Mori, J., & Markee, N. (2009). Language learning, cognition and interactional practices: An introduction. *IRAL, 47*(1), 1–9.

Mwinsheikhe, H. M. (2002). *Science and the language barrier: Using Kiswahili as a medium of instruction in Tanzania secondary schools as a strategy of improving student participation and performance in science.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oslo.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (2001). The contradictions of teaching bilingually in post-colonial Burundi: From Nyakatsi to Maisons en Etages. In M. Heller & M. M. Jones (Eds.), *Voices of authority: Education and linguistic difference* (pp. 101–115). Westport/London: Ablex Publishing.

Ohta, A. S. (2005). Interlanguage pragmatics in the zone of proximal development. *System, 33*, 503–517.

Östman, J. O., & Verschueren, J. (1995). Discourse analysis. In J. Verschueren, J. O. Östman, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 239–253). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Peräkylä, A. (2003). Conversation analysis. In C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage Publication.

Pomerantz, A. (1984). Pursuing a response. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Probyn, M. J. (2005). Learning science through two languages in South Africa. In J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rostlad, & J. MacSwan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th international symposium on bilingualism*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Richards, K., & Seedhouse, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Applying conversation analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, A. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking for conversation. *Language and Education, 50*, 696–735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1988). On an actual virtual servo-mechanism for guessing bad news: A single case analysis. *Social Problems, 35*(4), 442–457.

Schegloff, E. A. (1991). Reflections on talk and social structure. In D. Boden & D. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Talk and social structure* (pp. 44–70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language, 53*, 361–382.

Scott, V. M., & De La Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(1), 100–113.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (1995). L2 classroom transcripts: Data in search of a methodology. *TESL EJ, 1*(4), 1–16.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). The case of missing "no": The relationship between pedagogy and Interaction. *Language Learning, 47*(3), 547–583.

Seedhouse, P. (1999). The relationship between context and the organization of repair in the L2 classroom. *Interactional Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*(1), 59–80.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *Conversation analysis perspective on the organisation of L2 classroom interaction*. London: Blackwell.

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.

Shin, S., & Milroy, L. (2000). Conversational code-switching among Korean-English bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 4*(3), 351–383.

Simon, D. L. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II* (pp. 311–342). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Song, Y., & Andrews, S. (2009). *The L1 in L2 learning: Teachers' beliefs and practices*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.

Tian, L., & Macaro, E. (2012). Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese

vocabulary students: A lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(3), 367–391.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302–325.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3–23.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1980). Learning a second language: Chinese children in the American classroom. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education: Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Zabrodskaja, A. 2007. Russian-Estonian code-switching in the university. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching, 14*,123–139.

4

Current Debates in Classroom Code-Switching

There are many reasons why code-switching in the EFL context has been a popular topic of interest in the last three decades. Western language pedagogy has gained popularity in many countries and the use of the mother tongue has been avoided in the classrooms. Even some who are for and against the code-switching use have used metaphors to elaborate their points further. Teachers who use the mother tongue in the classroom have been blamed for it. In addition, there was a scarcity of authentic resources (Legenhausen 1991) in the past, so the common tendency was the exclusive use of TL by teachers in the classroom, which also created a learning environment in which learners were also encouraged to speak in L2. This Western-style pedagogy has challenged teachers, too. Harbord (1992: 350) points out that "many [ELT] teachers have tried to create an English-only classroom but have found they have failed to get the meaning across, leading to student incomprehension and resentment". He concludes that "translation/transfer is a natural phenomenon and an inevitable part of second language acquisition" (Harbord 1992: 351). After the marginalisation of L1 use practically ended, the debate over the optimum amount of code-switching in language teaching attracted conflicting views. Some researchers have asserted that code-switching should

be barred from L2 teaching. Others have attempted to justify L1 use by highlighting its functions as an effective tool for teaching. Therefore, the literature on the classroom code-switching features examples of conflict and tension.

Looking at pedagogy, a point of controversy in EFL teaching is whether or not the learner's L1 should be allowed in the classroom. There are different policies regarding this issue, as they range from encouragement, allowance, discouragement to total prohibition of code-switching in classrooms (Martin-Jones 2000). While learners need maximum exposure to English in order to develop their language skills, it is also vital that they understand teacher talk and linguistic data addressed to them. Enama (2016: 19) concludes that "if human beings learn systematically by relating new knowledge to prior experience, then, the learning of any additional language takes place within the framework of the L1, and, therefore, the L1 should have a place in the EFL classroom".

1   The Amount of L1 Use

The discussion about the use or non-use of code-switching in the classroom has been a recent research topic. There seems to be no agreement among teachers and researchers on the topic (e.g., Macdonald 1993; Nunan 1991; Harbord 1992; Macaro 1997; Ellis 1985). Sert (2005) states that there are two contrasting sides on the issue of code-switching in language classroom settings. On the one side, there are teachers who prefer code-switching and let their learners use L1, and on the other, there are teachers who stick to the rules strictly and have zero tolerance towards any instances of L1 use in the classroom no matter what the reasons are.

Language teachers, who defend L1 use, believe that code-switching might be an effective strategy in the cases that allow learners to code-switch in the ways that bilingual speakers do. This not only gives them the opportunity to become more comfortable with L2, but also provides them with a free rein to experiment with two languages. Confirming this, Eldridge (1996: 303) notes that code-switching is seen as a highly purposeful way that is related to educational aims. Hence, it is evident that banning the

learner's mother tongue from the classroom is not only impractical but also unwise considering the benefits of L1 use in the classroom.

Citing all these advantages should not mean that code-switching can effectively be used in all classrooms. Code-switching is almost unavoidable for low-level learners due to their need for clear explanations and meaning. Cipriani (2001) has worked on real participation strategies in a beginner classroom and observed that use of code-switching is a good way of fostering oral participation among learners and teacher. Her study has also showed that teacher's use of code-switching as a strategy of clarifying words in communicative tasks engenders a pleasant atmosphere for learners to speak English. However, higher-level learners do not often need such kind of support. Code-switching may be kept at a minimum level with advanced learners due to the fact that they have much better competence in the TL. In other words, those learners are able to understand the different uses of English in the TL, so they do not need to refer back to L1 for the clarification of meaning or instructions.

When we talk about code-switching in the classroom as a linguistic concept, we should also mention teachers' code-switching as much as learners'. Teachers' code-switching has attracted some prominent researchers to investigate it in detail by looking at the effect, functions and qualities of teachers' code-switching as can be exemplified in the works by Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005), Edstrom (2006), and Van Der Meij and Zhao (2010). Also, Sert (2005) asserts that by switching to the learners' L1, the teacher can build "a bridge from the known (native language) to the unknown (new foreign language content)" and meaning can be discussed and understood at an earlier stage by the learners.

Teachers, who avoid code-switching at all costs, should carefully bear in mind its psychological implications on learners. It can lead to emotional distance or detachment between teachers and learners. According to the Accommodation Theory, speakers vary their "use of different language varieties to express solidarity with or social distance from their interlocutors" (Mesthrie et al. 2000: 180). Furthermore, not allowing learners to use their mother tongue can be seen as a threat because L1 represents learners' identity. Schweers (2002) has also observed in his study that the majority of the participants agree that the use of L1 in their classes is important. Otherwise, they feel that their identities are threatened.

There is reasonable ground for the worries researchers have had about the use of code-switching. They express their concern about the fact that code-switching could easily be abused. These can produce both positive and negative outcomes in the long run since weaker learners might wait until the information is introduced in their L1 in the repetitive stage. By waiting till this point and not paying attention to the information, the weaker learners might not attain proficiency in the TL. Turnbull (2001: 536) says that "I fear that licensing teachers to speak the L1 in their second or foreign language classes will lead to an overuse of the L1 by many teachers". In addition, the overuse of L1 might affect the quantity and quality of L2 input. Some researchers have emphasised the importance of the standard of language being used with learners (Guthrie 1984; Hall and Walsh 2002). As a possible consequence, the classroom learning time may not fully be optimised by teachers, and learners do not learn as much as they possibly can when compared to the classes where teachers speak in the TL all the time (Jingxia 2010). It is also feared that the use of code-switching in classroom instruction might lead to internalisation of non-standard L2 form and fossilisation of errors (Wong-Fillamore 1985). The learners might regard errors as standard forms of the language they learn, and therefore, they can stick to it without noticing their mistakes (Jingxia 2010).

Another significant claim is that the use of L1 limits the comprehensible input in the classroom. Some researchers have supported the idea that comprehensible input is vital in a communicative setting (Krashen 1982; VanPatten and Lee 2003). Other studies have found out that simple exposure (limited time allowed for L2 due to frequent L1 use) to the TL is not sufficient. Students need to have comprehensible input as well as opportunity and encouragement to produce output in L2. Swain (1993: 160–161), for example, states that "learners need to be pushed to make use of their resources; they need to have their linguistic abilities stretched to their fullest; they need to reflect on their output and consider ways of modifying it to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy".

Taking the views and opinions of these two groups into consideration, benefits and drawbacks of code-switching in the FL classroom need to be critically reviewed. It would be hard to draw conclusions on whether

code-switching should be banned from EFL classrooms or acknowledged as a valuable resource. Jacobson (1983) claims that before justifying code-switching there are some prerequisites for code-switching to work like clockwork in the EFL classrooms. He maintains that if instruction in which code-switching is used, does not meet these criteria, it is "unstructured". In order for code-switching to be educationally effective, these criteria must be met:

- the language must be distributed at an appropriate ratio of 50/50;
- the teaching of content must not be conscious of his/her alternation between the two languages; and
- the alternation must accomplish a specific learning goal.

Whether researchers in the field accept or not, code-switching has become an inseparable part of foreign language education. Research carried out in the field of code-switching in educational contexts around the world has shown that both teachers and learners use code-switching to communicate and interact in the foreign language classroom (Anton and DiCamilla 1998; Braga 2000; Cipriani 2001; Macaro 2001; Bergsleithner 2002; Turnbull and Arnett 2002; Arnfast and Jorgensen 2003; Melo 2005). Thus, the focus of the debate should not be on whether code-switching is beneficial or not, but instead, why, how, when and to what extent code-switching is possible and meaningful.

1.1 Studies Which Oppose L1 Use

Some research on this issue has been conducted in bilingual education contexts. For instance, Cummins and Swain (1986) study the educational development of bilingual children from both majority and minority language backgrounds and emphasise the importance of clarifying the nature of language proficiency, while assessment is analysed in relation to language planning in a wide variety of educational contexts. However, the research context of this study is EFL classrooms. I have therefore quoted from studies carried out in these contexts, rather than those carried out in bilingual education contexts.

There has been considerable debate regarding the exclusive use of the L2 in monolingual foreign language classrooms. In particular, strong proponents of the communicative approach, which has "an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language" (Nunan 1991: 279), have typically frowned upon the use of L1 in L2 classrooms. For instance, in her practical teacher training course book, Willis (1981) defines teaching English through English (TETE) as "speaking and using English in the classroom as often as you possibly can". She advocates TETE, which demands that teachers teach, and learners learn the curriculum through the medium of English. Willis (1992: 163) analyses spoken discourse in the foreign language classroom from the point of view of two structures: "inner" and "outer". She defines these terms as follow:

> The Outer structure provides the framework of the lesson, the language used to socialize, organize, explain and check, and generally to enable the pedagogic activities to take place. In some classrooms, more usually in countries where the target language is not the medium of instruction, all or most of this Outer language is in the learners' mother tongue.

The Inner language consists of the target forms of the language that the teacher has selected as learning goals. These are generally "phrases, clauses or sentences, presented as target forms, quoted as examples, repeated and drilled or otherwise practised by the class, often as discrete items, the sequence of utterances bearing little or no resemblance to possible sequences in 'normal' discourse" (ibid.).

After dividing the foreign language classroom discourse into two structures, Willis focuses on both teacher- and learner-initiated switches in both outer and inner structures. Willis (1992: 176) suggests that teachers switch from L1 (outer) to L2 (inner) to "correct errors, supply new words, and begin drill or practice sequences that are normally marked by boundary exchanges", and from L2 to L1 to "end transaction and give instructions as a result of a learner's misunderstanding". Willis (1992: 170–171) lists typical patterns that she found in language teaching sequences, such as "only the Outer column used", "mainly the Outer column is used", and so on. Neil (1997) studies the use of the target foreign language

in secondary schools in Northern Ireland by ten German-as-a-foreign-language teachers. His study analyses the TL from the teachers' perspective, looking at the teachers' use of the TL, the teacher's own language learning problems and the learners' point of view.

Duff and Polio (1990; Polio and Duff 1994) carried out research into university foreign language classes. In their research, although many teachers report that it is possible to teach core French almost exclusively in French, many others find this difficult or even impossible. Kharma and Hajjaj (1989) also conducted a study of the Arab learners of English in the Gulf region and conclude that L1 should not be used in second language classrooms, since the aim of second language teaching is to approximate near-native competence. Chambers (1991: 27) states in his research that "the theoretical basis for use of the target language in classroom communication does not seem to be controversial". He then continues by giving examples of when and why this might be so, based solely on a practical survey. Macdonald (1993) argues that switching to the L1 to explain what the teacher has said to learners is unnecessary, and undermines the learning process. Thus, according to these researchers, teaching entirely through the TL allows learners to experience unpredictability, and to develop their own in-built language system. Following this train of thought, although Cook (2001) believes in the existence of an ease for code-switching in the FL classroom, he supports the view that L1 use inevitably cuts down exposure to the L2. The underlying assumption in studies of this type is that it is better to teach the language of English through the medium of English.

In addition to the arguments raised by proponents of the communicative language teaching method, the Direct Method bases its focus on "the exclusive use of the target language in the classroom" (Richards and Rodgers 1986: 11). The meaning of words or structures in the Direct Method is not to be given through "explanation in either the native language or the target language but it is to be induced from the way the form is used in a situation" (ibid.: 36). As can be seen, L1 use is strictly discouraged in L2 classrooms, with the aim of teaching and training learners how to think in L2 when they come across new information. In Turkey, there is an institutional policy that encourages as much L2 use as possible in EFL classrooms.

1.2   Studies Which Support L1 Use

In the classroom context, code-switching appears to be used both by learners and teachers (Borlongan 2009) because it is considered to be "a natural and purposeful phenomenon, which facilitates both communication and learning" (Eldridge 1996).

According to Cook's (2001) multicompetence theory, the positive involvement of L1 can be useful in the L2 learning process. This theory argues that L2 learners are multicompetent as their minds have two grammars. Considering this multicompetence, L2 learners' right to use their L1 cannot be taken from their hands in the L2 learning process. Cook's theory underlines the belief that an extra language can bring richness into the classroom, so teachers can utilise L1 as a tool facilitating L2 learning. Furthermore, the need for and value of code-switching between L1 and TL have also been explored by other scholars (Atkinson 1993; Chambers 1992; Dickson 1996; Macaro 1996, 2001; Mitchell 1988; Neil 1997). Macaro (2003) has particularly demonstrated that code-switching was introduced as a positive substitute for 'the use of L1' and 'recourse to L1'.

Cook (2000) also suggests that allowing L1 in L2 classrooms is a humanistic approach towards the learners. Thus, learners' opportunity to speak what they think would not be limited by the deficiency of not having resources available to them. Cook maintains that rather than looking at code-switching as a barrier, teachers should look at it as a means of facilitating and easing the learning process.

In opposition to the communicative approach, there are those, who advocate careful and limited use of the L1. For instance, Gabrielatos (2001) claims that "an either/or attitude to L1 use in ELT is not helpful", and that instead "a more constructive range of questions", such as "'what for', 'when' and 'to what extent'", is needed. This view has been applied to code-switching studies (e.g., Ellis 1985: 180–189) where L1 use is regarded as a powerful influence on the learning process, since learners tend to treat it as the obvious starting point when learning a new language and a popular communication strategy.

Guthrie (1984) questions the relation between conducting a lesson entirely in L2 and the amount of intake by learners. She concludes that teaching entirely in L2 does not result in greater learner intake. Dickson

(1996) embarks on his research in order to establish the extent to which teachers of modern foreign languages use the TL in the classroom, and to investigate teachers' beliefs about its role in effective teaching and learning. His study provides information about the quantity of TL used by both teachers and pupils at key stages three and four of the National Curriculum, about difficulties encountered in promoting target languages, and about the balance of TL and English thought to be most appropriate for developing foreign language competence. He comes to the conclusion that the quantity of teacher L2 input may not be as influential as the quality of such input. Macaro (1997) explores the concept of teaching exclusively through the TL and relates this to two current pedagogical issues: peer collaboration and learner autonomy. He argues that it is not only impractical to exclude the L1 from the classroom but that it is also likely to deprive learners of an important tool for language learning. Harbord (1992: 350) points out that "many teachers have tried to create an English-only classroom but have found they have failed to get the meaning across, leading to learner incomprehension and resentment". He therefore concludes that "translation/transfer is a natural phenomenon and an inevitable part of second language acquisition … regardless of whether or not the teacher offers or 'permits' translation" (Harbord 1992: 351).

Atkinson (1993: 7–8) claims that despite the long believed advantages of the native speaker teachers of English, non-native speaker teachers are in a good position to understand the possible difficulties which their students may have and therefore "know which aspects of English to concentrate on in their teaching". He suggests, "the L1 can be a very valuable resource if it is used appropriately" (ibid.: 9). The "appropriate" use of L1 is exemplified in the situations where English learners with low-level language proficiency experience stress and frustration when taught in the L2 only. Atkinson (1993: 18) introduces the regular use of "L1 problem clinics", where learners and teacher discuss the areas of difficulty in the mother tongue, and suggests that clinics will improve learner motivation in the sense that "students know that they will have the opportunity to discuss something in the L1 in future", therefore, "they really try during activities in English".

Atkinson (1993: 25–38) characterises certain roles of L1 as being necessary and others as being unnecessary in presenting and practising

a new piece of language in low language proficiency level classrooms. According to him, the necessary roles are: "lead-ins (exploit the L1 to check that the learners have understood the situation), eliciting language (getting language from the learners), giving instructions (especially useful to clarify the written instructions on a worksheet or in a textbook), checking comprehension (whether or not learners understand a word or phrase)"; while the unnecessary roles are: "at listening stage (the assimilation of the meaning of the new language item takes place), drills (helps learners to practise the new language), correction (teacher should encourage learners to correct themselves), personalisation, creativity stage and games (the three activities to give intensive practice of the L2)" (ibid.). Atkinson (1993: 79) concludes his discussion of the L1/L2 balance by saying that "although the teacher should aim for as much L2 as possible in the classroom, the occasional bit of appropriate L1 use is not the end of the world!" Further reasons quoted for allowing L1 use are that it can be very time-efficient in certain situations (Chambers 1992; Atkinson 1993), and for the majority of teachers, teaching entirely in L2 is not really feasible, for a variety of real and perceived reasons (Chambers 1992; Atkinson 1993). Finally, in many cases, it may not be desirable to teach only in the TL, since this creates other sociocultural divisions, such as ethnocentricity, if L1 is banned (Atkinson 1993).

As well as providing a number of reasons why L1 use may be beneficial, a wide variety of situations where its use may be particularly appropriate have also been suggested. Chambers (1992), in the most comprehensive account, gives a list of nine separate situations, most of which have been echoed by other practitioners. Included in this list are practical considerations, such as: (1) giving or checking instructions (also Harbord 1992); (2) discussion of classroom methodology with learners unfamiliar with the teacher's approaches (also Harbord 1992); and (3) the presentation and reinforcement of language (also Harbord 1992). One further possible application of L1 is for classroom management purposes, particularly in cases of learner disruption, when using the TL is likely to have little or no effect, even if understood (Chambers 1992; Harbord 1992).

Cameron (2001: 200) states that "if the teacher and class share a common mother tongue, then not to use that L1 is very unnatural". In her study, she looks for patterns in the types of activity that each language

is used for and lists eleven separate situations where teachers use L1: "explaining aspects of the foreign language, translating words or sentences, giving instructions, checking understanding of concept, talk, text, instructions, eliciting language, focusing pupil's attention, testing, talking about learning, giving feedback, disciplining and control, and informal, friendly talk with pupils" (Cameron 2001: 201). She also suggests two situations where learners may use L1: "asking for help from teacher or peers and responding to teacher questions" (ibid.: 202). Cameron explains these patterns of L1 use as an outcome of strategic motivations which teachers have in order to "create and maintain levels of formality and informality in classroom discourse, and to structure and control lessons and behaviour" (ibid.: 202). Although Cameron's research is related to young learners' classroom discourse, her findings are still applicable to my research at university level. I agree with Cameron's "dynamic view" which involves "considering movement between languages in classroom interaction, rather than just which language is used" (2001: 205). I noticed that teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching and learners' language choices made within and across turns of talk (micro-level) are related to the pedagogical functions of the lesson and school practice (macro-level). Therefore, in this study, I carried out a DA functional analysis by first categorising teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching, and learner code-switching patterns at a macro-level, then analysing each code-switching pattern within its micro-level by using the CA method of sequential analysis.

Moreover, not all of the studies that support L1 use focus on listening and speaking activities. There are a number of other studies of writing and reading tasks that share a common view that L1 use is beneficial for learners. For instance, Anton and DiCamilla (1998) suggest that the L1 is used by learners, with beneficial results, for the purpose of externalising their inner speech during a writing task. Kern's (1994) research into reading tasks reveals a number of advantages of using the L1 in order to reduce memory constraints, convert text into more familiar terms, and avoid losing track of meaning. However, this book is related to spoken code-switching during speaking and listening activities; the analyses of classroom extracts may therefore not concur with the results of studies concerned with written code-switching. Although there are arguments

for and against L1 use in L2 classrooms, my main research focus is on how L1 use is actually organised in L2 classrooms and how it is related to pedagogy. Thus, I do not prescribe a favourite teaching method. However, my position in the discussion of L1 use in L2 classrooms is in the similar vein with Cook's (2001) that code-switching is a natural phenomenon and the concurrent use of L1 and L2 is inevitable in L2 classrooms.

2   The Functions of L1 Use

Many researchers categorise language classroom code-switching according to their functions in three categories with different names though. Merritt et al. (1992) and Ndayipfukamiye (1994: 8–9) use the names for these categories as: "ideational functions" (e.g., switching to L1 to translate or annotate key L2 terms), "textual functions" (e.g., highlighting topic shifts) and "interpersonal functions" (e.g., signalling and negotiating shifts in frames and footings).

Bach Baqueb and Toumi (2012: 262–263) use the term "motivations" instead of functions for code-switching in the classroom and they present three categories as below:

1. "Code-switching for communicative goals":

Amongst the proponents of code-switching in the classroom, Valdés-Fallis (1978) claims that bilingual learners' code-switching should not be automatically considered as a manifestation of a lack of language proficiency. The learners are rather operating within the complex systems of the two languages in order to fulfil a certain communicative end. Code-switching is an approach that reflects their communicative competence in the classroom that "should be understood as a tool for cognitive development and a skill … use[d] to achieve communicative goals" (Reyes 2004: 94), such as topic/question alteration, emphasis, and clarification. Code-switching in the classroom is also a teaching strategy to enhance learners' participation when there are "non-responsive faces" (Huerta-Macias and Quintero 1992: 74). It further facilitates comprehension of difficult topics and ensures classroom

interaction between the teacher and learners as well as amongst the learners. The proponents of code-switching in the classroom believe that the repetition and elaboration of the same referent in the L1 are effective means to obtain accurate answers from the learners and ensure the assimilation of the task at hand. Labelled as "code-switching for curriculum access" (Ferguson 2003: 39) or "code-switching for equivalence" (Kiranmayi 2010: 162), this strategy facilitates comprehension of the lesson mainly when the L2 is the medium of instruction of certain scientific subjects. L1 is a prerequisite to ensure learners' comprehension of the lessons, to give instructions, and to enhance participation in the classroom mainly when the learners' proficiencies in L2 are low (Atkinson 1993; Martin 2003).

Amongst the motivations for code-switching in the classroom is the teacher's aim to "introduce a pedagogical focus" (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005: 314) to which s/he expects an appropriate answer from the learners as "code-switching is one further way of modifying and simplifying the linguistic forms" (ibid.: 315). Although, teachers code-switch to L1, the learners' responses are mostly uttered in L2, which is proof of their "affiliation to the pedagogical focus" (ibid.: 315). The teacher's purpose behind code-switching to L1 is to clarify the purpose of the task, and the learners are aware that their contribution should be in the TL. However, in certain cases, the learners might not comply with the teachers' strategy and "may display their degree of affiliation or disaffiliation with the teacher's pedagogical focus" (ibid.: 317) and respond in L1.

2. "Code-switching for classroom management":

Another argument is that code-switching in the classroom is motivated by both educational and cultural factors (Lin 1996). Indeed, a teacher's code-switch to L2 is mainly indicative of power and high status relationships, whereas a code-switch to L1 is reflective of sociocultural affiliation with the learners. For instance, when the teacher wants to give instructions, check the learners' homework or impose a discipline, s/he uses L2, whereas when s/he reprimands learners either for being late or for not accomplishing a required task, s/he code-switches to L1. This interac-

tion of "cultural member to cultural member" (Lin 1996: 66) or "code-switching for classroom management" (Ferguson 2003: 39) is frequently used to reprimand learners' for misbehaviour, to get their attention, and to elicit participation in the classroom. This strategy is also considered as "a bridge that builds solidarity between the teacher and the students" and helps to create an accommodating linguistic background in the classroom (Kiranmayi 2010: 62).

Within the same train of thought, the promotion of bilingual learning and biliteracy could be achieved through code-switching as a strategy for expressing the learners' dual culture and hybrid identities (Creese et al. 2006). Indeed, "code-switching in the classroom is an important factor in the socialisation of learners into the language norms of the country" (Martin 1996: 140). Muller and Beardsmore (2004) have inspected multilingual interactions in plurilingual classes in European schools, where teachers and pupils barely share a single language of communication. The authors demonstrate that code-switching is used as a tool and an interlinguistic strategy that enables pupils to display their languages, cultures, and linguistic behaviour as well as their diversification and plurality. Code-switching in the classroom defines the learners' "plurilingual competences" (Unamuno 2008: 2), avoids lexical difficulties, and reflects their identities or their multifaceted personality.

It is "code-switching for interpersonal relations" (Ferguson 2003: 39). Indeed, code-switching encodes deference with and also between the learners and creates an affective rapport mainly when the learners belong to different sociocultural backgrounds.

3. "Code-switching as a discourse strategy":

Code-switching in the classroom is further considered as "a means for both discourse-related and participant related uses" (Unamuno 2008: 3). Code-switching is participant related when it is mainly used to overcome a linguistic incompetence, to avoid misunderstanding and facilitate comprehension from the interlocutor or because of some educational constraints. Discourse-related code-switching is more oriented

towards the construction of a discursive activity. This is mainly used to add colour to an utterance, to introduce a joke, to give the floor to a new participant to partake in the activity, or to signal a change in the interaction (Baoueb 2009).

In a study of L2 learners' discourse strategies in science instruction, Reyes (2008: 104) notes that code-switching is used by bilingual peers as a discourse strategy to ask for assistance, clarify difficulties, and challenge or direct each other. She claims that code-switching helps children in "developing their metalinguistic awareness that allows them to explicitly discuss the grammatical and linguistic rules of their languages". Moreover, code-switching discourse strategies help develop the bilingual peers' literacy both in their native language and the language of instruction. Reyes (2008: 105) also points to the role of the teacher in using their L1 and "literacy scaffolding strategies" to develop their learning skills in the subject matter and further promote their biliteracy and bilingual competence. Classrooms are seen as "compound bilingual spaces" where the teachers allow for a supportive L1 environment primarily when the learners face linguistic difficulties in L2 (Van Der Meij and Zhao 2010: 97).

In this book, I use Ferguson's (2003: 39) categories, which are similar to and overlapping with the pedagogical functions that derive from the datasets used for this book. He provides an overview of some significant studies of classroom code-switching in the following three categories:

1. "Code-switching for curriculum access. (e.g., to help pupils understand the subject matter of their lessons)"

Those studies (e.g., Lin 1996; Martin 1999a, b), which examine the bilingual negotiation of the meaning of classroom texts, belong to this category. The common point these studies illustrate is "the significant role of code-switching in providing access to English medium text and in scaffolding knowledge construction for pupils with limited English language resources" (Ferguson 2003: 41). As an example, Martin (1999a: 51–52) analyses an extract from a grade four geography class in Brunei, which

illustrates how the teacher switches from English to Malay in order to "encourage and elicit pupil participation", "clarify the meaning of certain sections of text"—a process that Martin (1999a: 53) refers to as "unpacking the meaning"—and "demarcate reading the text from commentary on it". Similar results are discussed in Chap. 3 of this book. Teachers code-switch from English to Turkish in order to deal with procedural trouble, clarify meaning by providing the Turkish equivalent, encourage and elicit learner participation, elicit Turkish translation, check learner comprehension, and provide metalanguage information. However, for some of the above functions, teachers sometimes code-switch from L1 to TL to encourage learner participation, check comprehension, and elicit L1 translation (e.g., read Extract 16 in this chapter).

2. Code-switching for classroom management discourse. (e.g., to motivate, discipline and praise pupils, and to signal a change of footing)"

The studies (e.g., Canagarajah 1995; Lin 1996) that fall into this category specifically analyse code-switching which "often contextualises a shift of 'frame' (Goffman 1974) away from lesson content and towards some 'off-lesson' concern—to discipline a pupil, to attend to latecomers, to gain and focus pupils' attention" (Ferguson 2003: 42). Code-switching may also, as Ferguson states, "demarcate talk about the lesson content from what we may refer to as the management of pupil learning; that is, negotiating task instructions, inviting pupil contributions, disciplining pupils, specifying a particular addressee, and so on". Under the same heading of classroom management, Ferguson (ibid.) highlights "the use of code-switching as an 'attention-focusing device' (Merritt et al. 1992: 117); that is, the code contrast functions to redirect pupils' attention—very often at the opening of a new topic". In this book, similar pedagogical functions to those listed by Ferguson are shown in this chapter. Teachers code-switch from TL to L1 in order to deal with classroom discipline (e.g., read Extract 40 in this chapter) and give feedback (e.g., read Extract 17 in this chapter). Code-switching from L1 to TL occurs when teachers shift the frames or topics of the lesson, and serves the function of an attention-focusing device during the shift (e.g., read Extract 57 in this chapter).

3. "Code-switching for interpersonal relations. (e.g., to humanise the affective climate of the classroom and to negotiate different identities)"

The studies (e.g., Adendorff 1993; Merritt et al. 1992) that concentrate on this function of code-switching investigate the social and affective classroom environment where teachers and learners negotiate relationships and identities. Ferguson (2003: 43) clarifies this function as follow:

> In many classrooms, English indexes a more distanced, formal teacher–pupil relationship and the local language—Tamil, Cantonese, Zulu or Maltese—a closer, warmer more personal one. To build rapport with individual pupils, create greater personal warmth and encourage greater pupil involvement, the teacher may, therefore, when the occasion is suitable, switch to the local language.

2.1 Functions of Learner Only Code-Switching Patterns

2.1.1 Code-Switching for Curriculum Access

Extract 6 *Evaluating the Task*

1   T: huh uh they just give your money back
2   L1:   ↑ huh
3   T: and you get the egg
4 →L1:   *çok iyiymiş* [tr: that's good] (laughter)
5   T: yes that's that's very good (laughter) I always did online shopping for my
6   groceries huh uh ok please continue speaking you need to speak more
7   (T warns Hamdi) ok Yusuf he is speaking now (T points Hamdi)

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 40)</div>

In Extract 6, the teacher (T) shares her/his experience about the topic 'online shopping'. In the activity, all of the learners find the question about 'online shopping for groceries' unrelated as it is not popular in Turkey. Yet, T wants them to familiarise with life in the native language countries; as it is a part of the culture so tells learners about it. In line 2, Learner 1 gives a back-channelling response 'huh' with rising intonation. Learner 1 code-switches to Turkish to give 'personal evaluation' about the teacher's experience in line 4. It is clearly a shock for Learner 1 to hear what the teacher explains as it is not a common procedure in Turkey. This evaluation gets a reaction (laughter) from the other participants. In the next line, T closes the interaction and asks learners to continue working in pairs and nominates a quiet learner to take a turn next as T feels that Learner 1 shies away from speaking.

Extract 7 *Shifting the Topic of the Task*

1	L3:	but musics are have to free
2	T:	huh uh ok it it has to be free
3	L3:	yeah
4	T:	so you download huh uh
5 →	L3:	I *başka bişey* [tr: something different] I'm sometimes I buy clothing and
6		shoes online shopping this is good thing for me because if I don't want
7		whatever I want I find clothes and shoes on the website on the website umm
8	T:	↑goo:d good one I like that

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 42)</div>

In Extract 7, learners are expected to talk about their shopping preferences. Learner 3 claims that they should not pay for music, it has to be free. As it is a content-based activity, T disprefers a direct and explicit negative evaluation to Learner 3's mistake in order not to interrupt the flow of the speaking and thus provides recast in line 2. Up till line 5, Leaner 3 aligns with the topic 'online shopping for buying music' and T wants to elicit more about this topic so continues it by commenting in line 4 and uses a discourse marker 'huh uh' to encourage Learner 3 to produce more. Learner 3 aligns by beginning her/his turn in TL, but then switches into Turkish and introduces a new

theme 'online shopping for clothes' which is a subtopic. Learner 3 disaligns to alert the audience for the shift and then aligns back by switching back to TL. Myers-Scotton's 'Markedness Model' proposes that a shift or change in topic can initiate code-switching, which is in the same vein with Blom and Gumperz's situational code-switching (Myers-Scotton 1993: 114–115). In other words, in line 5, the learner highlights for all participants that s/he has changed the topic slightly by code-switching to Turkish. This code-switching serves as a conversational resource to announce the sudden topic change, but is soon afterwards abandoned, so that the new topic is dealt with in English. At the end of her/his turn, the learner signals that s/he is now ready to give up the floor by using a discourse marker 'umm' in line 7. T immediately takes up the floor to give positive feedback and ends with a comment.

Extract 8 *Emphasising the Task*

1 →L3:   *ben başka bir konuya geçtim şu an* [tr: I have shifted to a new topic now] if

2   we send a gift for an important person for us we'll buy product and then we

3   take this person's address and shipping company will deliver=

4   T: =deliver she says for example your friend lives in Ankara you buy a present

5   from the shop you have to send it and you pay extra money for shipping but

6   if you buy it online you just give the address address of your friend and then

7   they ↑will send it

8   L2:   ok

Kavak (2016: 43)

In Extract 8, learners have a discussion about online shopping. While one group supports the advantages of it, the others talk against and claim its disadvantages. T's role is to moderate and to give support when needed. All members talk against each other depending on readiness of themselves and their opinions so they self-select their turns. When learners have difficulty in understanding, they gaze at T so s/he takes over for

a short time to solve the conflict and then passes it back to the learners again to control. As a member of the opposing group, Learner 2 understands what s/he claims after T's explanation between lines 4 and 7. In line 1, Learner 3, not for T but for the opposing group, emphasises that s/he supports her/his opinion by changing the topic slightly to make it more advantageous for her/himself and the group s/he belongs to. S/he disaligns herself by code-switching to L1 for an emphasis and then aligns back by switching back to TL.

Extract 9 *Asking for Clarification about the Task*

1 →L1:		what kind of refund is Ella willing to give ↑*yani*? [tr: it means?]
2	T:	so she said if I don't like the dress if I give it back do I get ↑full refund
3		and she said ↑no you ge:t (.) ↑partial partial? we've got ↑two types of
4		refund it can be partial that means you get the part of the money back
5		↑not all money and that's full refund that's a hundred percent what about
6		partial? it can be you ↓know

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 44)</div>

Extract 9 is taken from a lesson, where learners do a listening activity and then answer some comprehension questions about what they have heard. Learner 1 reads the question first but cannot understand it so asks "*yani?*" in Turkish. In this, "yani" is a discursive item that does not have a specific meaning. Its meaning can only be inferred in a context. Its meaning can vary depending on its intonation even in the same context. This discourse marker signals that the speaker has not understood and needs clarification if it is used with rising intonation. In this extract, Learner 1 expects T to clarify what the question asks. It can be because the word 'partial' has not been introduced before or learners have not heard it with the word 'refund' so they have difficulty in understanding. Between lines 2–6, T gives a lengthy explanation of the question and lexis "partial".

Extract 10 *Asking for Permission about the Task Procedure*

1   T: yes you are giving an advice to somebody who wants to buy a
            house
2   L3:   °ok°
3   T: so: what do you advise?
4 →L1:   *söyliyim mi?* [tr: shall I say it out?]
5   T: I'm just imagine I'm buying a house and you give me advices
            yes
6   ↑ Yusuf?
7   L1:   umm if you want if you want relaxing you should buy house
            with big garden

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 44–45)</div>

In Extract 10, learners are asked to think about giving tips to some-
one, who wants to buy a house. Although T has given procedural infor-
mation before, s/he repeats it in line 1 after giving some time to think
about it. In line 4, Learner 1 code-switches to Turkish and asks for the
teacher's permission to take a turn. Asking for permission to take a turn is
another function of metalanguage. As a second part of the adjacency pair,
T delays granting Learner 1's permission. T first finishes her/his explana-
tion and then validates Learner 1's question by giving her/him a turn in
line 5 and 6.

Extract 11 *Negotiating Meaning during the Task*

1 →L5:   coat of paint ↑*nee:?*[tr: what?]
2   T: paint well painting
3 →L2:   paint *boyama* [tr: paint] paint
4   L5:   ↑ coat of?
5 →L2:   coat *ceket olarak buldum ama*=[tr: but I have found "coat" as
            jacket]
6   T: for example you umm polish your nails one coat and then
            second coat
7   what's that?
8 →L5:   *ikinci tur boyuyo üstüne boyuyo* [tr: she paints for the second
            coat second turn]

9	T:	yes huh uh that means coat for example I paint the wall and one coat and
10		then second coat I ↑again to make it you know all clean and nice
11	L2:	huh uh

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 45)</div>

In Extract 11, learners look at and examine the advertisements about houses. They are written in short forms so they struggle with it. In line 1, Learner 5 does not understand the collocation "coat of paint" and so switches to Turkish to ask its meaning. T replies by simplifying it. In line 3, another learner tries to process the word by saying its name in both languages. However, both Learner 5 and Learner 2 are not satisfied with the simplified answer so Learner 5 asks the part of the collocation that is omitted by T with a rising intonation. Learner 2 also checks it in her/his dictionary and finds the first meaning of it as "a part of clothing" in line 5. Therefore, T decides to explain it again and encourages learners to contribute by inviting them to code-switch ("teacher-induced code-switching"; Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005; Üstünel 2009) to be able to check their understanding. After Learner 5 has given the Turkish equivalence of T's utterance, T provides positive feedback and provides another example by adapting the lexis to the context in lines 9 and 10. Finally, Learner 2 shows that s/he has understood by using discourse marker "huh uh". This extract proves that in language classrooms, learners code-switch to L1 to negotiate meaning.

Extract 12 *Noticing during the Task*

1 →L1:	*ben şimdi bir şeyi bağdaştırdım da* [tr: now I have made a relation with something]
2 T:	huh?
3 →L1:	adulthood *yetişkinlik* childhood *çocukluk* neighbourhood *komşuluk olmaz mı?*
	[tr: adulthood (means) being adult childhood (means) being child isn't neighbourhood being neighbours?]
4 →L2:	*ben de öyle düşündüm komşuluk diye* [tr: I thought the same being neighbours]

5   T: ↑uh huh uh huh
6→L2:   *hatta* brotherhood *kardeşlik falan* [tr: and also brotherhood being neighbours]

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 47)</div>

Extract 12 represents a good example of code-switching for noticing. In this extract, T and learners negotiate the meaning of a lexis "neighbourhood" that is introduced in the previous lesson. However, all the explanations do not satisfy the learners and thus Learner 1 shares her/his hypothesis, which is also the reason why s/he struggles like some of her/his friends in line 1. The suffix "-hood" does not add the same meaning to all words, it can be used to form nouns describing various states of them. This is confusing for Turkish learners because all these nouns mentioned in lines 3 and 6 take the same suffix "*-lık*" (the middle sound "ı" is inflected according to the previous sound so it can change to any vowel accordingly) in their Turkish equivalence. This interference causes a conflict. At first, T does not understand why they still question the previously learned item in line 2 but realises in line 5 that the meaning of the lexis "neighbourhood" should be studied more. In this case, we can see both learners and the teacher noticing in the same extract.

Noticing is an important term introduced by Lewis (1997, 2000). It is a major contribution of the Lexical Approach to the linguistic theory because it helps conscious learning for acquisition to occur. Noticing is like a first step in the learning journey towards the acquisition. Lewis (1997: 52) claims that this journey starts with a "transition from input to intake through exercises and activities which help the learner observe or notice the L2 more accurately, ensure quicker and more carefully formulated hypotheses about the L2, and so aid acquisition". Noticing, therefore, is a prerequisite to internalisation. He goes further to talk about the importance of negative evidence in teaching-learning; this points to the occurrence of potential mistakes in language use, noting that the teacher is an important source of feedback on what is not sanctioned.

Extract 13 *Resolving Problems during the Task*

1   T: did you watch anything or? did you buy anything recently?
2   L1: buy anything?=

3   T: =buy you know
4   L1: buy?
5 →L2:   *=satın aldın mı herhangi bişey?* [tr: have you bought anything?]
6 →L1:   I didn't no *hani ben evdeydim ya buy ı pek bağdaştıramadım* [tr:
            I was at home you know so I haven't made a relation]

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 48)</div>

In Extract 13, T has a light chat with learners and asks them what they have done on a weekend holiday as a warming-up activity. In line 1, T asks questions when there is a pause or s/he feels that the learner lacks ideas. In the process of talking, T remembers the pedagogical focus of the lesson planned "shopping" and uses a deictic language, which can only be understood later on in the middle of the lesson. T might ask this question to connect this activity to the main activity or to raise attention to the upcoming main activity. T asks two questions. First of which is related to the topic but the second is unrelated so gets more attention from the learner. Thus, the first question goes unnoticed and Learner 1 shows her/his reaction to the question by partially repeating the trouble source turn. In this extract, Learner 1 struggles to understand "buy" and finds it irrelevant to the flow of the speech so asks twice in lines 2 and 4, but does not prefer code-switching to Turkish. Learner 2 gives the Turkish equivalence of the question asked in line 1 to help them resolve the conflict. Learner 1 struggles to carry on in the TL thus, in line 6, Learner 1 starts his turn in the TL but feels that it will not resolve the problem so code-switches to Turkish to make her/his point clear.

Extract 14 *Asking for L2 Equivalence during the Task*

1   L3: so: I don't drive fast it's my children umm (.)also back seat
            problem
2   T: huh uh
3 →L3:   for my children I'll *bebek küçükler için koltuk* [tr: seat for little
            ones babies]
4   T: baby seat
5   L3: humm baby seat I'll buy baby seat for them
6   T: huh uh

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 65)</div>

In Extract 14, learners are asked to choose a family or sports car by providing a reason for their preference. This is a role play activity and they act as parents and make a decision in pairs. After they select the car, the class comes together to hear each other's decisions and their reasons for it. T addresses each pair in turn. In line 1, Learner 3 shares their decision they have come to and T uses a discourse marker "huh uh" to signal that s/he is actively listening to them (backchannelling). In the next line, s/he continues with their ideas about why they do not prefer a fast car but s/he cannot recall the lexis to express her/his ideas in line 3 so s/he ends with code-switching to L1 to her/his statement, which is initiated in the TL. In line 4, T responds to Learner 3's request and provides the lexis. The learner initiates her/his turn with a discourse marker to signal that s/he thinks how s/he will adapt the lexis to her/his sentence and repeats the word to gain more time to think and then produce a meaningful and grammatically correct sentence in line 5. In reply to this turn, T gives a positive feedback by using a discourse marker "huh uh" to signal validation in the last line of this extract.

2.1.2 Code-Switching for Classroom Management Discourse

Extract 15 *Floor Holding during the Task*

1   T: around the world we see it on the internet on Tv=
2 →L1:   =yes yes *yani* [tr: I mean] I think very I think all the websites
             ↑not safe=
3   T: not very safe=
4   L1:   =huh huh=

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 71)</div>

In Extract 15, the learners discuss online shopping and they are given some time to take some notes before starting the activity but in the process of discussion, they must not only read or just tell the memorised lines. They have to improvise during the discussion because the topic is mutually shaped by all participants and the direction of it cannot be estimated. T tries not to intervene as s/he wants them to solve the problems and support their ideas. S/he only gives supports when s/he feels that the learners cannot move the discussion forward without it.

In line 1, T prompts Learner 1 a lexis in the previous line and when s/he does not understand T exemplifies it. In line 2, Learner 1 accepts the examples, code-switches to L1 and uses a discourse marker "*yani*". This marker functions as a filler and gives Learner 1 more time to hold the floor. And immediately Learner 1 code-switches back to the TL to say the sentence s/he has just produced but there is a problem with the sentence. The learner fails to place "very" correctly and to use a verb. In line 3, T ignores the second trouble and provides an implicit repair and places it correctly in her/his prompt. In the last line of this extract, Learner 1 uses a discourse marker "huh uh" to signal her/his comprehension.

In all languages, there are words or sounds that do not have a message value. Participants in a conversation use them to signal to others that s/he has paused to think but has not yet finished speaking. The markers can have essential function when the speaker needs to pause for a moment to think before continuing on with verbal communication. In Turkish, "*yani*" (tr: it means), "*şey*" (tr: thing), "*işte*" (tr: that is), and "*falan*" (tr: as such, so on) are common fillers.

Extract 16 *Telling Habitual Experience Related to the Task Procedure*

1 →L5:   humm I can't live without *mp üç player mi dicem*? [tr: shall I say mp3 player?]
2   T: mp three is it this? ((T displays an MP3 player)) (laughter)
3 →L5:   *ağız alışkanlığı* [mp three player [tr: habitual experience mp3 player]
4   T: [mp three player

Kavak (2016: 76–77)

Extract 16 is taken from a speaking activity. The lesson focus is to practise a structure: "I can't live without…". T goes around the class and asks learners what their priority in their lives and the reasons of it. Learner 5 is nominated by T to take a turn and so s/he uses a discourse marker "humm" to signal that s/he is still thinking. After that, s/he initiates the sentence and uses the target structure but in the end s/he code-switches to L1 to check the English equivalence of a lexis so nominates the teacher to reply. In line 2, T scaffolds by both displaying and vocalising the word. In the next line, Learner 5 accepts that s/he has pronounced the

word unconsciously wrong for the context because of habitual experience According to Sert (2005: 4) "in some cases code-switching may be regarded as an automatic and unconscious behaviour". In the last line, T notices (teacher noticing) that they need more exposure to the pronunciation of the word to make them recycle it in other contexts so repeats the word.

It can be seen in the Extract 16 that Turkish speakers struggle with the loan words taken from English. As they do not comply with the complex systems and rules of communication, they generally end up being an exception to the rule. In this context, it would be useful to take a look at the loan words from English such as "play station" or the short forms like "mp", "cd", "dvd". While they are pronounced exactly the same as they are in English, the numbers that come with them are adapted to Turkish so they become a composite of Turkish and English as they carry the features of both languages such as "*play station dört*" (play station four) or "*mp üç*" (mp three) in use.

Extract 17 *Quoting about the Task Procedure*

1 →L1: *burda biri vardı böyle you are familiar dedi [bana* [tr: there was somebody here and he said to me "you are familiar"]
2 →L4: *[neydii?* [tr: what was it?]
3 T: ummm
4 →L1: huh *ben yok dedim çünkü onun ailesinden değilim diye anladım* [tr: I said no because I thought that I was not (a member) of his/her family]
5 L2:   family ((laughter))

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 79)</div>

In Extract 17, T covers a word in the class and the word triggers Learner 1's experience about the word "familiar" so s/he wants to share her/his personal experience in the class. In line 1, s/he prefers to share it in L1 as it is not a part of a lesson focus. S/he quotes a sentence from the conversation s/he has had before with a foreigner and code-switch back to Turkish again.

Some researchers (e.g., Gal 1979: 109; Myers-Scotton 1993: 117) thought earlier that code-switching in quotations may be due to the purpose of preserving the original language. However, Myers-Scotton has later on accepted that that bilinguals code-switch in reported speech to achieve "an aesthetic effect" (1993: 139). It would not be wrong to say that learners like bilinguals can use another language to make their speech richer. Not only by using mimicry, tone of voice, imitation of personal ways of talking, different verbs of saying but also using different languages (code-switching), learners create many voices in their communicative performance. In this way, they use code-switching as a conversational resource to make their discourse "polyphonic" so more effective (Lüdi and Py 1986: 158). Furthermore, by providing an impersonal quotation (line 1), Learner 1 also distances her/himself from the utterance "you are familiar". According to Alfonzetti (1998: 204), "bilinguals use code-switching strategically to 'de-personalise' her/ his own ideas from the person, whose ideas are reported". In this way, the reporter signals that s/he just reports for the content value but it should not mean that s/he agrees on it.

In line 4, Learner 4 continues with the same code (Turkish) to direct a question because s/he does not understand what has happened. In line 3, T participates only by using a discourse marker "umm" to show comprehension. Learner 1 continues sharing the rest of the story and the reason why misunderstanding has happened. In line 5, Learner 2 code-switches to the TL to clarify the misunderstanding between the two words "familiar" and "family" and then the members show a reaction (laughter) to the story. Code-switching to the L1 to resolve a conflict or to clarify a point is not a common pattern in the classroom extracts analysed in this book. This happens the other way round (from TL to L1) as learners prefer code-switching to L1, not the TL when clarification is required.

2.1.3   Code-Switching for Interpersonal Relations

Extract 18 *Creating Humour Effect during the Task*

1   T: hello↑
2 →L2:   *bizde çıkıyoduk hoşgeldin* [tr: we were leaving, welcome] (laughter)

3   T: almost over
4 →L1:   *bitmeye yakın ahh* [tr: almost over] (laughter)

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 55)</div>

In Extract 18, T has started the lesson and one of the learners arrives late and T greets her/him in line 1 with a rising intonation. In the next turn, Learner 2 purposefully code-switches to Turkish to create a humour effect in the classroom. Moyer (1998: 220) claims that code-switching is used for the purpose of "humour effect". These kind of code-switches appear to develop a sense of group solidarity, often occurring in gossip and jokes. S/he also makes a relationship between code-switching and identity and expresses that bilinguals code-switch for humour and irony to show ambivalence which they have about their identity. This is also investigated in Woolard's (1988) research in Catalonia. All learners, even the latecomer learner and T, laugh at the joke after Learner 2's utterance. In line 3, T takes an advantage of the moment and refers to the previous lessons and produces the lexis "almost over", which has been covered recently. T's aim to do this, can be that s/he may have wanted to recycle the lexis or encourage the learners to use the items that have been taught to practise whenever they have a chance. In line 4, another learner continues with L1 and gives a Turkish equivalent of the teacher's turn. Then s/he ends her/his turn with a discourse marker "aah" that is used for expressing surprise. Learner 1 may have provided this marker because s/he may be sorry why s/he has not retained it or it can be a sign of recycling it in the talk in action. Learner 1's indication of her/his surprise with the discourse marker "ahh" creates a humour effect even if s/he has not done it on purpose contrary to the learner's utterance in line 2.

Extract 19 *Expressing Shock about the Task*

1   T: why? so when you do your homework that's how you get dut dudut ((The teacher shows students her detailed feedback))
2   L1:   ohh
3   T: I write loads of notes for you so?
4 →L1:   *hepsini İngilizce mi yazdınız?* [tr: did you write them all in English?]

5	T:	((laughter)) are you asking? I never speak in Turkish in the class I never
6		write in Turkish
7	L1:	yes I know

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 67–68)</div>

In Extract 19, T collects homework and gives feedback on them. As writing a text can take a long time, T prefers to give it as homework and comment on it afterwards. At the beginning of the lesson, T gives out the writing homework and explains if there are questions on it. This is the first time that T gives feedback on their writing and in line 1, s/he shows a sample of homework with the feedback on. In the next line, the learner, who has done the writing, uses a discourse marker "oh" to express her/his shock. T's aim is to show what kind of feedback to expect from their writing homework so T explains it in line 3. In reply to T's explanation, Learner 1 code-switches to Turkish to express her/his mood because s/he is shocked by the length of the feedback written by T. In the next line, T is bemused by the learner's reaction and illuminates the learner as s/he only writes and speaks in English in the class with a strong language by using "never" twice. In line 7, Learner 1 code-switches back to TL as the shock fades away.

Extract 20 *Expressing Frustration about the Task*

1	T:	ok good right ↑ yes Kübra how are you today?
2	L3:	umm not good=
3	T:	=not good why?
4 →	L3:	*hocam şu anda konuşmiyim gerçekten kötüyüm de* [tr: Madam I don't want speak now (because) I don't feel well]
5	T:	really? ok I can see something on your finger as well ((The teacher realises a
6		plaster on the student's finger)) is it an accident?
7 →	L3:	humm *o ayrı* [tr: that's another (thing)]<I cut my finger in the afternoon

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 68–69)</div>

In Extract 20, at the very beginning of the lesson T greets everybody before introducing what to do in the lesson. In the first few minutes, T goes around in turn and chats with learners about light things to make them feel comfortable in the classroom. In the first line, T gives a positive feedback for another learner and a discourse marker "yes" with rising intonation to initiate conversation with Learner 3. T greets her/him, asks about her/his welfare but in the next line, Learner 3 uses a discourse marker "umm" to signal her/his dispreference. The second part of the adjacency pair is delayed and then the learner expresses that s/he is not well. In line 3, T repeats her/his reply without a pause and attempts to elicit the reason of her/his not feeling well. In the next line, the learner disaligns with T and code-switches to L1 and expresses her/his feelings. This classroom extract is examined under the title of "frustration" as the learner looked frustrated while speaking in the video tape. In line 5, T sees a plaster on the learner's finger and makes a relation with the learner's present feelings. T asks if the reason of her/his feeling "not good" (Line 2) results from her/his finger. In line 7, the learner continues in L1 and clarifies that her/his finger is not the main reason, which s/he does not want to talk about. After the clarification, s/he code-switches back to English and describes the minor accident s/he has had.

Extract 21 *Expressing Surprise about the Task*

1   T: huh huh high definition ok good I think we have said all of the
          features
2   so that's good now we'll do little bit of speaking so it's speaking
          spoken
3   production ↑ eight ((The teacher writes the criteria about the
          skills depending
4   on European Language Portfolio)) spoken production eight it's
          from the
5   portfolio right?
6 →L5: *ayyy* [tr: an expression to show surprise and excitement]
7   T: that's the short form do you have it no?
8 →L5: *cık* [tr: a negative expression to show disagreement]

Kavak (2016: 69–70)

In Extract 21, this is the final phase of a reading lesson. The learners have read a description of a camcorder and then talked about the features of it. T shifts the topic and introduces a speaking lesson between lines 1 and 6. Before the activity, the learners are informed about the criterion they will cover from the European Language Portfolio, which they are supposed to have available every lesson. Unfortunately, they generally forget to bring it as it is an evening class and most of the learners attend the course right after their classes after university without having a chance to go home.

After giving the context of the extract, it is easy to understand why Learner 5 is surprised in line 6. When T describes which criterion they will cover in that lesson, Learner 5 replies with an exclamation mark "ayyy" to show surprise and disappointment. In line 6, T completes her/his explanation about the portfolio and feels that the learner does not have the portfolio available so T ends her/his turn with a negative marker "no" by rising intonation. In line 8, instead of replying to T's question with a simple "no" in TL, the learner disprefers that and utters "cık" which is the sound that people make to show their disagreement. It is a very common expression among young people especially in texting. This is the type of language when the class members talk to each other so s/he aligns with the code that the other members of the community (i.e., the classroom) uses, not the one that T expects her/him to use.

To summarise, language learners do not prefer to use TL when they want to express their genuine feelings and opinions. Instead, they code-switch to their L1 in order to express themselves and then switch the code back to TL. Language learners do this unconsciously because it is clear from the extracts that they only use L1 for some functions such as expressing their "moods" and when they have finished doing so, they change the code as they aware of the pedagogical focus of the lesson.

2.2   Functions of Teacher Only Code-Switching Patterns

2.2.1   Code-Switching for Curriculum Access

Extract 22 *Dealing with a Lack of Response in L2 during the Task*

1 →T: okay (.) hh on Tuesday night?
2   (0.5)

3		on New Year's night?
4		(1.0)
5		on Tuesday (.) last Tuesday?
6		(2.0)
7		*Salı günü?* [tr: on Tuesday?]
8	L4:	(0.5)
9		er-
10 →	T:	=*Yılbaşı gecesi?* [tr: on New Year's Eve?]
11	L4:	I (2.0) study (0.5) English

Üstünel ([2009](#): 99)

The above extract is taken from a teacher-learner dialogue in which T asks the learner what s/he did on the night of the New Year. In line 1, T directs a question to Learner 4 but does not receive a reply after a pause of 1 second. Then, in line 3, T asks the same question with a different lexical choice and waits for a slightly longer time (1.5 seconds) to receive a reply from the learner. As the learner does not take the answer turn, T keeps asking the same question in line 5, and s/he doubles the length of the waiting time (to 2 seconds), but there is still no reply. S/he then code-switches to Turkish in her/his repetition of the question in line 7. After asking the same propositional question three times in English, s/he code-switches to Turkish when s/he does not receive a response to his L2 questions. This is consistent with the classroom extracts analysed in this book, which reveal that the T code-switches after a pause. The repetition of a question signals trouble in interaction that prevents the institutional business from proceeding. Although the length of pauses is different between each question, the T uses Turkish after a certain waiting time (line 7). This type of preference organisation is also explained and exemplified in both the previous and the following extracts. Learner 4 initiates a reply turn in lines 8 and 9 but is unable to form a reply. In line 10, the T continues to use L1 to ask the question one more time. In line 11, Learner 4 replies to the teacher's question (line 1) in L2.

Extract 23 *Dealing with a Lack of Response in English*

1	L22:	=/ /*hocam* [tr: ma'am]
2 →	**T:**	<u>yes</u> yes yes to yes

```
3           (0.5)
4           who has- who said hocam?
5           (0.5)
6           hocam diyen? [tr: who said ma'am?]
7 →L22:     ikinci halleri var mı diye soracaktım [tr: I was going to ask
            whether there are the second form (of the verbs)?]
8    →T:    yeah go on, go on
9           (2.0)
10          be quick three minutes left
            ((LL work in groups))
```

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 99–100)</div>

The above extract is taken from an interaction between T and a learner, in which Learner 22 overlaps the interaction with her addressing sequence turn in line 1. T takes a reply turn to the previous learner's question in line 2. After a pause of half a second, s/he takes a reply turn to Learner 22's addressing sequence in line 4. In line 4, T directs a question to the learners in order to find out which learner addressed her/him in line 1. T inserts Learner 22's addressing sequence in the same language as used by the learner (i.e., Turkish) in an English syntactical question forming line 4. After a pause of half a second, T code-switches to Turkish to repeat her question in line 6. The pedagogical function of this teacher-initiated code-switching is to repeat the question in Turkish when there is no response in English. T uses Turkish to repeat the question in line 6 in order to make sure that the learners understand what the question is asking for. Learner 22 takes the reply turn in line 7 in the L1.

Extract 24 *Dealing with a Lack of Response in English*

```
1 →T:     maybe, maybe
2          (1.0)
3          can you ask her?
4          (1.0)
5          sor bakalım ne alcak soruları sen sor ben sormayayım [tr: let's ask
           what will she buy you ask the questions not me]
6  L8:     what will you er (1.0)
7 →T:      neleri sorabilirsiniz? [tr: what can you ask?]
```

8   L8:   what will you take
9 →T: take?
10 L8:   er thing
11 T: buy
12   (1.0)
13   what- wh=at will you buy
14 L8:   =/ /what will you buy* (.) buy
15 T: with your money

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 100–101)</div>

There is a recurring pattern in this extract. T attempts to start institutional business in L2 as a preferred language choice. Since s/he does not receive a reply after waiting for a second (line 4), s/he proceeds fairly quickly and switches to Turkish (line 5), as trouble has occurred which must be repaired. T tries to encourage Learner 8 to ask a question in the TL in line 3. After a second's pause, s/he code-switches to Turkish to translate her/his intention in line 5. In the following line, Learner 8 initiates asking the question in L2, but then hesitates. After a second's pause, T uses Turkish to initiate a question turn in line 7. In line 8, Learner 8 forms a question in the TL. In the following line, T repeats the verb and uses in a rising tone signalling a need to repair. After a hesitation, Learner 8 suggests a repair in line 10. However, T does not accept it, and offers a repair in line 11, as well as providing the question that s/he expects the learner to form in line 13. Learner 8 repeats the question in line 14. In line 15, T takes another repair turn in English. In this extract, T uses code-switching (line 5) when s/he does not receive a reply turn to his question (line 3). The pedagogical function of the teacher-initiated code-switching (line 5) is to encourage Learner 8 to produce a specific question in English. T takes another turn in Turkish in line 7 when Learner 8 hesitates and pauses for a second in line 6. The pedagogical function of her/his turn in Turkish (line 7) is to encourage Learner 8 to continue with her/his turn (line 6). This pedagogical function seems to be working, as Learner 8 initiates a turn in line 8 and continues forming the specific TL output.

Extract 25 *Providing a Prompt for L2 Use during the Task*

1   L8:   er (0.5)
2   we visit er

```
3              (1.0)
4              in er (0.5)
5              every er (0.5)
6              sorry, sorry various =places
7    →T:       =/ /°nere*si mesela?° [tr: such as?]
8    →L8:      such as Çocuk Esirgeme Kurumu [tr: orphanage]
9    →T:       Okay
10   →L8:      such as Yaşlılar Yurdu [tr: old people's house]
11   T:        okay
12             (0.5)
13             after twelve o'clock?
14   L8:       twelve o'clock
```

Üstünel ([2009](): 101–102)

Learner 8 tries to form a L2 sentence as a reply to T's previous question between lines 1 and 6. In line 7, T asks another question in a soft tone of voice in an overlapping fashion in line 7. Although T asks her/his question in Turkish, Learner 8 initiates her/his reply in English, but code-switches to Turkish at the end of his turn in line 8. In line 9, T gives positive feedback to the learner's reply but does not provide the target vocabulary. Learner 8 takes the turn again in line 10 and forms a similar syntactic pattern (code-switching) to the one s/he produces in line 8. In the following line, T again gives positive feedback and does not provide the target vocabulary. Judging by her/his behaviour, we may say that s/he attaches more importance to fluency than to accuracy. After a short pause in line 12, T directs a new question to Learner 8 in line 13, and Learner 8 replies to her/his question in line 14.

Extract 26 *Providing a Prompt for L2 Use during the Task*

```
1    T:        will you ski there?
2    L3:       I want to ski
3    T:        do you know how to?
4    L3:       Yes
5    →T:       (2.0)
6              bi soralım buna nasıl öğrendi? [tr: let's ask him how did he
               learn?]
```

7		(2.0)
8		*nasıl öğrendin?* [tr: how did you learn?]
9	L10:	how do you learn to ski?
10	T:	how?
11	L10:	how do you learn to ski?
12	T:	did you
13	L10:	how did you learn to ski?
14	L3:	uhm my uncle (0.5) in nineteen eighty four

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 102)</div>

T code-switches to Turkish in line 6 in order to guide the learners to ask the question in the TL by themselves. If T asks the question in English, then the learners will know how to do it. Therefore, code-switching is used for this purpose. Code-switching is also necessary in lines 6 and 8, if T wants to see whether the learners can say it in English. S/he waits for two seconds, but since none of the learners initiates the question, s/he continues to talk in Turkish to give them a hint in line 8. Learner 10 provides a question in English (line 9). In line 11, Learner 10 does not repair her/his question and asks the same question again. T repairs the mistake in the question in line 12 and Learner 10 repeats the question in the correct form in line 13.

Extract 27 *Providing a Prompt for L2 Use during the Task*

1	L10:	I was cold
2	T:	you were cold?
3	L10:	very
4	L8:	=catch a-
5	→T:	=/ /you were* feeling cold (0.5) *üşüyor muydun?* [tr: were you cold?]
6	→L10:	*hastalığa yakalandığımı nasıl söyleyecem?* [tr: how can I say I caught a cold?]
7	L8:	=catch a cold
8	T:	=/ /I (.) I have*- I caught a cold okay? I have a cold (1.0)
9	L10:	Yes

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 103)</div>

The above extract is taken from a whole class discussion about the worst New Year celebration. Learner 10 takes the turn in line 1. T's rising tone in line 2 indicates a corrective function. T might be using this strategy to initiate a repair. However, Learner 10 does not repair her/his utterance in line 3. Learner 8 then initiates an alternative as a repair. However, T's turn in line 5 overlaps with the previous two turns and s/he repairs Learner 10's utterance (line 1). T code-switches to Turkish to give a translation of the correct usage in line 7. Learner 10 uses the L1 in line 8 in order to identify trouble.

Extract 28 *Providing a prompt for L2 Use during the Task*

1	→**T:**	huh *sorun bakalım arkadaşları da ağlamış mı* [tr: let's ask him whether his friends cried too]
2	→L4:	*arkadaşların da ağladı mı?* [tr: did your friends cry, too?]
3		((Learners laugh)) (0.5)
4	T:	in English
5	L4:	did you cry in (1.0) (unintelligible learner talk)
6	T:	again, again, again.
7		(0.5)
8		did your =friends

Üstünel ([2009]: 103–104)

In line 1, T uses code-switching to prompt learners to ask a specific question in English. S/he instructs the learners about the grammatical content of the question s/he wants them to form. In line 2, Learner 4 selects herself/himself to take the next turn and uses Turkish. T repairs her/his language choice (L1) in line 4. Learner 4's choice of language (line 2) provokes laughter in the classroom. This shows that the other learners see her/his language choice (L1) as notable behaviour. Learner 4 may have used the L1 as a joke, because when I watched the video-recording of that particular class, I realised that Learner 4 was also laughing in line 3. Learner 4 starts to form the question in English in line 5, immediately after T's instruction (line 4). This may indicate that s/he is capable of initiating a reply turn to T's code-switched instruction in line 1. In lines 6–8, T is engaged in repairing Learner 4's turn (line 5).

2.2.2 Code-Switching for Classroom Management Discourse

Extract 29 *Dealing with Classroom Discipline during the Task*

```
1    LL:   (3 seconds) (unintelligible talk)
2     T:   hush hush (silencing sound) .hh
3          (0.5)
4    LL:   (unintelligible talk in pairs)
5   →T:    yalnız sessiz olalım [tr: but be quiet]
6    L2:   =/ /(1 sec) (unintelligible utterance in English) Kapadokya
7    L7:   =/ /I want to go to* Fethiye
8     T:   Kapadokya? ten million there
```

Üstünel ([2009](#): 87)

In this extract, T and learners are engaged in a post-task role-play activity in which T asks the tourists where they want to spend their holidays. In line 1, more than one learner is talking at the same time. In line 2, T makes a silencing sound, then verbalises her/his intention (i.e., instructs the learners to be quiet) in Turkish in line 5. Learner 2 and Learner 7 start their turns at the same time and both of them form English sentences in their replies to T's question. In line 7, T follows up Learner 2's reply and gives feedback. In this extract, T uses code-switching to silence learners in order to carry out the classroom activity, that is, maintain classroom discipline (Cameron [2001](#)). Following the teacher-initiated code-switching patterns, Learners 2 and 7 use English in relation to the classroom activity.

Extract 30 *Giving Encouragement to Participate in the Task*

```
1     T:   you tell the truth or lie?
2    L6:   Lie
3   →T:    lie, okay .hh who is coming?
4          (0.5) ((L holds up his hand))
5          now you ask the questions not me
6          (2.0)
7          Özgür gel hadi [tr: come (here) come on]
8          (0.5)
9          please
```

10		(2.0) ((Learner moves))
11		okay, let's ask the third question (.) third one, okay? ask him.
12		L21: him?
13	T:	yes (.) ask Özgür
14		(0.5)
15		have you ever::?

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 113)</div>

In line 3, T ends one classroom activity and asks a question to initiate a new activity. A learner replies to her/his question non-verbally in line 4. T initiates a turn to give her/him task instructions in line 5. After a pause of two seconds (noticeable absence of a reply), T code-switches to Turkish to encourage the learner to start the task in line 7. After a short pause in line 8, T repairs the register of her/his turn by changing it from an imperative (line 7) to a request (line 9). After a pause of two seconds (noticeable absence of learner's verbal participation), T instructs the learner to start the activity in line 11. Learner 21 asks a confirmation check question in English in line 12. T gives an answer and repeats her/his instruction (line 11) in line 13. T's initiating of a code-switching to Turkish (line 7) is a result of the absence of learner participation in the task. After the code-switched turn, the learner participates in the task non-verbally (line 10).

Extract 31 *Giving Encouragement to Participate in the Task*

1	L21:	=where did you kill-
2	L14:	=/ /he eat my er my* my grandfather's meat
3	T:	the cat <u>ate</u> your grandfather's meat?
4	L14:	Meat
5	T:	huh?
6	L14:	hungry ((laughter))
7	→T:	*eee?*
8		(2.0)
9		*eee?* [tr: a Turkish filler that means "continue talking"]
10		(1.0)
11		so you killed the cat
12	L14:	(2.0) (unintelligible talk in Turkish)
13	T:	there is a question there

14 L21:   where did you kill?
15 L14:   in Samsun

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 113–114)</div>

In line 1, Learner 21 directs a question in the TL to Learner 14, but her/his turn overlaps with Learner 14's answer turn to the previous question. T repairs Learner 14's utterance and asks a question at the same time in line 3. Learner 14 provides a reply in English in line 6. The teacher-initiated code-switching to Turkish (lines 7 and 9) is used to encourage Learner 14 to talk more about the topic (line 2). After a pause of one second, T code-switches back to English and summarises the topic in line 11. In the following turn, Learner 14 chooses to use Turkish and T comments on her/his utterance in English in line 13. Learner 21 directs a question in L2 to Learner 14 and Learner 14 responds to it in English in line 15.

2.3 Functions of Teacher and Learner Shared Code-Switching Patterns

Available research on code-switching has often looked only at teachers' or learners' use and failed to connect the linguistic behaviours of the two groups. Moreover, the functions of learners' code-switching have largely been neglected. This book addresses this gap and provides the functions of both teacher's and learners' code-switching patterns by analysing EFL classroom extracts.

2.3.1 Code-Switching for Curriculum Access

Extract 32 *Commenting on the Task*

1   T: huh uh to let your hair down good good huh uh ok: I would pass Hamdi
2   because he's just came I would come back to you ↑Fevzi?
3 →L7:   *ne çabuk geldi ya sıra?* [tr: how quick is it my turn?] (laughter) ehh if I
4   had a five thousand Turkish liras in my pocket I would go to Spain and I

5		would (.) watch *ne dicem Barselona'nın maçı ne demek?* [tr: what will I say what does 'Barcelona match' mean?]
6	T	ok Barcelona match football match huh uh
7	→L7:	yes *ehh dört tane değil mi?*[tr: isn't it four?] (.) if I had umm five thousand
8		Turkish liras in my pocket I would buy a new smart phone

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 39)</div>

In this extract, T starts with an activity that reinforces "If clause type 2" and asks learners what they would do if they had five thousand Turkish liras in their pockets. T obviously directs the turns in this activity as it can be seen in line 2. Fevzi is nominated to take a turn and he aligns with T. In line 3, Learner 7 code-switches to mother tongue and this part functions as "preface". Alfonzetti (1998: 193) claims that code-switching can serve as "entry-devices". Before the learner produces her/his sentence s/he comments on the design of the turn-taking and complains about the speed of the turns because s/he probably does not expect T to skip another learner's turn and allocate her/him instead. Although T does not want to break the cycle of turn-taking, s/he gives the reason why s/he skips a learner. T obviously thinks that learners need some 'thinking time' to perform to their best so gives extra time to the latecomer learner. As Learner 7 cannot remember a lexis but is not willing to leave the floor, s/he asks T the L2 equivalence of a group of words. In line 6, T aligns and provides the English equivalence of the words and ends her/his turn with a discourse marker "huh uh" to signal that s/he leaves the floor for Learner 7. In line 7, the learner takes the turn and begins in L2 but code-switches to L1 to elicit procedural information and then switches back to the TL and produces a meaningful and grammatically correct sentence.

Extract 33 *Providing Metalanguage Information*

1	→T:	beef stew?
2		(1.0)
3		*ne demek beef stew?*.hh *stew ne demek? beef ne demek?* [tr: what does "beef stew" mean (in Turkish)? what does "stew" mean? what does "beef" mean?]
4	→L3:	*beef et demek* [tr: "beef" means meat]

5 →T: huh uh *stew onun* (.) =*bir şekilde* yapılmışı* [tr: "stew" is a way
        of cooking it]
6 →L3:   =/ /*haşlanmışı* [tr: stewed (beef)]
7 →T: *şeyde er suda* [tr: in water]
8 →L4:   *terbiye* [tr: a Turkish way of cooking]
9 →**T:**   ***ter**biye değil de haşlanmış gibi belki de (.) gerçi çok da anlamıyorum
        yemek*
10   *yapmaktan ama* [tr: no it is not "terbiye" but perhaps like
         stewed [in water] (.) anyway I am not expert in cooking but]
11   anyway uhm
12   (0.5)
13   the last one birth place?
14 L9:   Houston

Üstünel ([2009](#): 111)

In line 1, T asks for either the Turkish equivalent or a synonym of the target phrase "beef stew". After a second's pause (noticeable absence of a reply), T repairs her/his question by code-switching to Turkish in line 3. Learner 3 provides part of the Turkish equivalent in line 4. In lines 5–10, T and Learners 3 and 4 engage in a reply follow-up sequence of passing metalanguage information related to T's question (line 1). Although T initiates code-switching in line 3 to repair her/his question in English, s/he uses Turkish in lines 5, 7, and 9 to give metalanguage information about the expected reply. Learners follow up the teacher-initiated code-switching in Turkish in order to provide the Turkish equivalent (line 4) and give metalanguage information about the target translation in lines 6 and 8. In line 11, T switches to English and s/he signals a shift of the topic by the English word "anyway" and a short pause (line 12). In line 13, s/he asks a question in English and receives an immediate reply from Learner 9 in line 14. Learner 9 follows up the teacher-initiated code-switching to English in English as s/he is required to provide an English place name as a reply.

Extract 34 *Providing Metalanguage Information*

1   T: seen (.) that's okay, begin?
2   L2:   begun
3   T: began?

```
4    LL:   begun
5   →T:    begu::n begin began begun
6          (1.0)
7          gittikçe sertleşiyor ses [tr: the sound becomes stronger]
8          (0.5)
9          okay, bite?
10   LL:   Bit
11   T:    bite how is it spelt? how is it spelt?
12   LL:   B-I-T-E ((Learners read each letter out))
13   T:    B-I-T-E ((T reads each letter out)) okay .hh third form?
```
<p align="right">Üstünel (2009: 112)</p>

This extract is taken from a teacher-led grammar activity where learners are required to provide an English verb in three different grammatical tenses. In line 1, T gives feedback and starts the activity with a new question in line 1. Learner 2 replies in line 2 and T repairs her/his reply in a question form in line 3. More than one learner replies in line 4. In line 5, T corrects the learners' incorrect pronunciation and after a second's pause, T code-switches to Turkish to give metalanguage information about grammatical tenses in line 7. The pedagogical function of the teacher-initiated code-switching is to repair the learners' incorrect pronunciation (line 4) and to provide information about how to pronounce it correctly. After a short pause in line 8, T code-switches back to English to start the same activity sequence with a new verb in line 9. The teacher-initiated code-switching is embedded in the interaction in a question-reply-feedback/evaluation sequence and the pedagogical function is to repair the learners' mispronunciation by giving metalanguage information about a target verb.

Extract 35 *Eliciting Procedural Information*

```
1    T:    and without looking in your book ok you close the books and
           just
2          write everything like you know buying selling seller insurance
3          tax whatever write everything like this
4   →L3:   sadece kelimeleri mi yazıyoruz? [tr: shall we only write the
           words]
5   →L1:   kelime mi yazalım? [tr: shall we write the words?]
```

6	T:	yes yes yes yes
7	→L3:	*sadece kelimeleri yazıyoruz* [tr: we only write the words]
8	T:	yes

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 41)</div>

In Extract 35, T wants learners to brainstorm about shopping for a house to make them recall the lexis they have studied in the previous lessons. It is proved by many scholars that learners prefer talking in mother tongue rather than in the TL for talking about the task. In line 1–3, T gives procedural information about the activity. Learner 3 prefers code-switching to Turkish to make sure that s/he has understood correctly. Learner 1 continues asking her/his question in Turkish after Learner 3's initiation in line 5. It seems that Learner 3 evaluates what they will do in the activity but before starting the activity needs another confirmation from T in line 7 so repeats the same sentence, but in an affirmative rather than interrogative form.

Extract 36 *Eliciting Procedural Information (Dealing with Procedural Trouble)*

1	→T:	not reading ((T looks at L1))
2		(1.5) ((LL talk in pairs))
3		.hh *arkadaşlar bir dakika* (0.5) *okumanızı istemiyorum.* (1.0) *bakabilirsiniz*
4		*kağıda ama okumanızı istemiyorum.* [tr: hold on a minute mates (students) I do not want you to read you can look at the paper but I do not want you to read it]
5		(.)
6	L1:	=okay
7		(1.0)
8	T:	it is just for ideas ((LL talk in pairs))

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 81)</div>

In this extract, T uses code-switching to repair procedural trouble (trouble is anything which prevents the institutional business from proceeding) because the required pedagogical focus has not been established;

that is, learners are reading the dialogue, instead of acting it without looking at the written script. In line 1, T uses English to repair the learners' misapplication of the task instructions. However, the learners keep talking in pairs instead of applying T's instruction (line 1) during the pause of 1.5 seconds in line 2. T then code-switches to Turkish, both to address the learners and to repair the procedural trouble (lines 3 and 4). The pedagogical function of this code-switching may be to make sure that all the learners understand the instructions for the role-play activity so that they know what to do and how to carry out the task. In line 5, T pauses for a very short time after code-switching. Learner 1 takes a reply turn during this short pause and shows her/his comprehension in English. In line 8, T takes a follow-up turn in English further to repair the misapplication of task instructions. In this extract, T code-switches from English to Turkish (line 3) when learners do not apply her/his task instruction in English (line 1). The teacher-initiated code-switching is embedded in an initiation-answer-initiation sequential pattern and in alternating turns between T and Learner 1. Learner 1 selects himself/herself to take the reply turn as the next-turn speaker (line 6), for the reason that T has directed her/his initial instruction to him (line 1). Learner 1 uses English in her/his reply (line 6).

Extract 37 Eliciting Procedural Information (Dealing with Procedural Trouble)

```
1    T:    okay hh
2          (0.5)
3          tourists
4          (1.0)
5          change
6          (0.5)
7          go to a different travel agent
8          (0.5)
9          go to a different travel agent
10 L9:     here?
11  T:     any (.) yeah
12         (0.5)
13         change to the next one (.) go to the next one
```

14	L2:	(2 seconds) (unintelligible utterance in Turkish) (rising intonation)
15	T:	NO travel
16		(0.5)
17		Tourists
18	L2:	(2 seconds) (unintelligible utterance in Turkish)
19	→T:	*yalnız turistler değişiyor* [tr: only tourists are changing places]
20	L3:	yes.

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 82)</div>

In lines 1–2, T signals a shift to a new classroom activity by using a discourse marker, "okay", breathing, and a pause. In lines 3–9, T gives procedural instructions related to the task. Learner 9 asks a confirmation check question related to task instructions in line 10. T replies to the question in line 11 and after a short pause, s/he repairs her/his previous instruction (lines 7 and 9) in line 13. Learner 2 asks a question in Turkish in line 14. T replies in English in line 15 and after a short pause, s/he repairs her reply in line 17. Learner 2 takes another turn in line 18 but her/his turn is unintelligible. As a follow-up to Learner 2's unintelligible turn, T code-switches to Turkish to repeat her/his instructions (lines 3 and 5), with the additional emphasised word "only". The pedagogical function of the teacher-initiated code-switching to Turkish (line 19) is to make sure that the learners understand the procedural instructions so that they will perform the classroom activity correctly. The teacher's code-switched turn in line 19 may be a repair to Learner 2's turn, since T utters the first word with emphasis. However, it is impossible to prove the correctness of this interpretation, because Learner 2's turn in line 18 is unintelligible. In line 20, Learner 3 expresses her/his comprehension in English after T's code-switched turn in Turkish.

Extract 38 Eliciting Procedural Information (Dealing with Procedural Trouble)

1	→T:	you are in this group ((T looks at Learner 5))
2		(1.0)
3		you find the second form and third form ((T looks at Learner 5))
4		(0.5)

5		*hem ikinci hali hem üçüncü hali °hadi°* [tr: both the second and third form come on]
6	→L5:	*buraya işaretleyecek miyiz?* [tr: are we going to get mark on it?]
7	→T:	yes (0.5) but be careful woke woken the third form
8		((LL talk in pairs))
9		(3.0)
10		no find it only find
11		(0.5)
12		*sadece bul* [tr: just find]
13	→L9:	*altını mı çizelim?* [tr: shall we underline it?]
14	→T:	*sadece buluyorsun orada* [tr: you just find there]
15	→L2:	*hocam iki* [tr: ma'am, two]
16		(1 sec.) (unintelligible talk in Turkish in rising intonation)
17	→T:	*ikinci hali mi üçüncü hali mi* [tr: is it the second or the third form]
18	→L4:	*second mı third mü* [tr: is it the "second" or the "third" form]
19	→T:	Yes
20	L13:	*hocam* [tr: ma'am]
21		(1 sec.) (unintelligible talk in Turkish)
22	T:	be careful woken::
23	→L1:	*üçüncü hali* [tr: the third form]
24	T:	third form
25	L10:	(2 seconds) (unintelligible talk in Turkish)
26	→T:	*üçüncü hali nerde peki o zaman?* [tr: so where is the third form?]
27	→L17:	*hocam birbirimize mi soruyoruz?* [tr: ma'am, are we (going to) asking each other?]
28	→T:	*beraber buluyorsunuz* [tr: find together]
29		(1.0)
30		find it with your friend
31	→L12:	*beraber*? [tr: together?]
32	T:	huh uh find

Üstünel (2009: 83–84)

This extract starts with T's repair of procedural trouble. In line 1, s/he addresses Learner 5 and repairs the task procedure (forming groups/pairs). After a second's pause, T directs another procedural repair to Learner 5 in line 3. After a half second's pause, T repeats her/his repair (line 3) in Turkish in line 5. T waits half a second before code-switching to Turkish. This waiting time may signal that s/he is waiting for a reply turn either verbally or non-verbally from Learner 5. As T does not receive a reply turn verbally (and perhaps not non-verbally either), s/he code-switches to Turkish in order to explain the task instruction. T uses a phrasal verb in a whispered tone of voice at the end of her repair (line 5). Therefore, we may suggest that this teacher-initiated code-switching has dual pedagogical functions. The first is to deal with procedural trouble by explaining the task procedure in Turkish. Its second function is to encourage Learner 5's participation in the grammar activity. In line 6, Learner 5 initiates a question in Turkish, asking whether they are going to be assessed in doing the exercise. Learner 5 challenges the unequal power relations in classroom discourse (Markee 2000) by initiating a question turn without T's turn allocation and actually receiving a reply from T in English (line 7). T continues to repair the procedural trouble in lines 7–10 and initiates another code-switching from English to Turkish in line 12. The sequential organisation of this teacher-initiated code-switching is similar to her/his first code-switched sequence (lines 3–5). In line 10, T initiates a repair of the procedural trouble. After a half second's pause, s/he uses Turkish to repeat the same repair in line 12. Learner 9 follows up T's code-switched repair in Turkish (line 13) and initiates a question turn. T uses Turkish in the reply turn in line 14. In line 16, Learner 2 asks T an unintelligible question in Turkish and T replies in line 17. In line 18, Learner 4 repeats T's reply by translating the numbers in English and adding the translated words in a Turkish syntactic structure. In line 19, T code-switches to English and gives feedback to Learner 4's reply. The use of English in Learner 4's turn (line 18) may trigger T's code-switching in line 19, since T has used Turkish in her/his previous turns (lines 12, 14, and 17). T code-switches back to Turkish and asks a question in line 26. The content of her/his question is related to the repair (line 22) of Learner 13's turn (line 21) and the feedback (line 24) to Learner 1's turn (line 23). Learner 10's turn in line 25 is unintelligible; therefore,

we cannot determine whether the teacher-initiated code-switching (line 26) is related to this turn. T's code-switched question (line 26) is a repair concerned with the use of the correct grammatical tense. The reason why T code-switches to Turkish to repair in line 26 may be in order to make sure that all the learners understand the correct grammatical usage. The last teacher-initiated code-switching in this extract is in line 30 and it is from Turkish to English. In lines 15–28, the organisation of interaction consists mainly of learners taking question turns to ask procedural questions and T replying in the following speaker turns. In line 27, Learner 17 directs a question to T in Turkish and T uses Turkish in her/his reply turn in line 28. After a second's pause, T code-switches to English to repeat the same procedural instruction (line 28). There is a recurring preference organisation of language choice in relation to T's waiting time/pause. The pause in line 29 before s/he switches from Turkish to English is double the length of those preceding the other code-switched turns in lines 4 and 11. There is a longer delay before T switches to English than before s/he switches to Turkish when code-switching has the pedagogical function of solving a procedural trouble. In line 31, Learner 12 initiates a question in Turkish after T's code-switched utterance in English. T takes the reply turn in line 32 and first provides an affirmative reply, then gives a procedural instruction in an imperative form in English in the same line. Code-switching is integrated in the organisation of this extract as a repair-question-reply sequence.

Extract 39 Dealing with Procedural Trouble

```
1   →T:  okay stop
2        (1.0) ((Learners talk in pairs))
3        STOP
4        (1.0)
5        stop. sit down, don't move, don't move
6        (0.5)
7        kımıldamıyoruz kımıldamıyoruz [tr: do not move]
8        hush hush ((silencing sound)) just close the mouth that's all
         what I want (.)
9        okay?
10       (1.0) ((Learners nod))
```

11   you were the tourist? ((T looks at Learner 1))
12   (1.5)
13   tourist?
14   L1:   yes.
15   L7:   NO (.) I am tourist
16 →T   tourist?
17   (0.5)
18   no (.) you were the travel agent
19   (2.0)
20   *sen turist değil miydin?* [tr: weren't you a tourist?]
21 →L1:   *değildim.* [tr: I was not]

                                           Üstünel (2009: 85–86)

    This extract is taken from a classroom activity where learners are acting
a role-play in pairs. In line 1, T gives a classroom instruction to signal
the end of the time allocated for the pair-work activity. During the pause
of one second in line 2, the learners keep talking. T therefore repeats the
classroom instruction in a higher tone of voice in line 3. Learner talk fades
gradually during the pause in line 4, and T repeats the instruction again
in line 5. In the same line, s/he continues giving further instructions.
After a short pause, T code-switches to Turkish in line 7 to translate the
instruction that s/he uttered in English (line 5). T repairs the procedural
trouble in Turkish because, during the short pause in line 6, learners keep
moving around. Therefore, T may feel the need to translate the instruc-
tion into Turkish (line 7) so that everybody understands and obeys the
instruction. After a silencing sound in line 8, T code-switches back to
English to give another instruction related to the silencing gesture. In
line 9, s/he asks a question about comprehension, and during the pause
in line 10, the learners acknowledge T's instruction non-verbally. In the
extract, there is confusion about the partners' roles in the role-play activ-
ity. Therefore, in line 11, T directs a question to Learner 1. Since s/he does
not receive any reply during a pause of 1.5 seconds, s/he repeats her/his
question, yet not in a full question form, in line 13. In line 14, Learner 1
gives an answer to T's question. However, Learner 7 contradicts Learner
1's answer and attempts to claim her/his role in line 15. In line 16, T
questions (it is in line 18 that she says "no". Thus (in line 18 the teacher

"refutes her/his claim" or "contradicts her/him") his/her claim and code-switches to Turkish in line 20 to ask Learner 1 about her/his role in the role-play activity. There is a preference organisation in T's language choice: that is, s/he tries to sort out procedural trouble in L2 (lines 16–19). If the trouble persists, then T switches to L1 to deal with it (line 20). In line 21, Learner 1 gives a negative response to T's question and replies in Turkish. Although the two teacher-initiated code-switching patterns are related to the procedural trouble, their pedagogical functions are different. In the first code-switching pattern (line 7), T uses code-switching to make sure that her/his classroom instruction is understood and applied. On the other hand, T code-switches to dispel confusion about task roles in the second code-switching pattern (line 20). The first code-switching is in the form of an imperative and is followed by T's turn in English. The second code-switching is in question form and requires an answer.

Extract 40 Showing Comprehension

1	T:	page twenty and then you write ↑two more you write ↑two more what do
2		you think about moving out ok:? please read it you've got two minutes
3		(LL start reading in silence)(2.0)
4 →L1:		*gene anlamadım (.) napcamızı anlamadım* [tr: I didn't understand again I didn't understand what to do]
5	T:	you will write two more tips advice
6 →L2:		*anladın mı?* [tr: do you understand?]
7 →L1:		*anladım* [tr: I understand] (laughter)(.)

Kavak (2016: 49)

In Extract 40, T gives procedural information in line 1. Learners are expected to read tips about moving a house and produce two more. After 2 minutes silence (line 3), Learner 1 code-switches to Turkish to express that s/he has not comprehended the task. T replies in the TL in line 5 because of institutional policies. In line 6, Learner 2 asks again because s/he thinks that Learner 1 has not fully understood what s/he is supposed to do for the task. But after T's explanation for the second time in line 5, directing the same question can be face-threatening for both T and the learner.

Learner 1 may find asking the same question again pointless as T does not prefer giving instructions in L1 so Learner 1 does not want to be in a position in which s/he always fails to understand in front of other members of the classroom community. Thus, even if s/he does not fully comprehend, s/he disprefers asking again so pretends that s/he has understood or gives up trying to understand until her/his friend sitting next to her/him asks a question to reveal this. The question and then laughter after it in line 6 and 7 reveals that they both (Learner 1 and 2) have failed to understand.

In most examples including this extract, T is the participant, who never code-switches back and forth between first and second languages so s/he avoids aligning with the learners and speaking in mother tongue. T always speaks in the TL. Learners sometimes align with it and switch back to the TL consciously or unconsciously. When they do this consciously, it is because they are aware of the pedagogical focus of their presence in the classroom. However, when they code-switch back to English unconsciously it is because they may think that it is face-threatening for T.

Extract 41 Checking Comprehension in L2

1	T:	so he is the strongest criminal what is criminal?
2	→LL:	*suçlu* [tr: criminal]
3	T:	criminal got crime
4	→L1:	*hırsız* [tr: thief]
5	→L7:	*suçlu biri* [tr: a person who commits crime]
6	T:	huh?
7	→L7:	*suçlu* [tr: criminal]
8	→T:	*suçlu* [tr: criminal]
9		*okay the strongest criminali soruyor bize shoplifter ne demek?* [tr: (the question) asks for the strongest criminal what does "shoplifter" mean in Turkish?]
10		(3.0)
11	→L1:	*hırsız* [tr: thief]
12	→T:	*yani ilk anlamı ne demek shoplifterin ne diye biliyorsunuz?* [tr: I mean what is the literal meaning of "shoplifter" what do you know it as?]
13	→L3:	*şey =o çok büyük-*[tr: uhm that is very big]

14   →T: =/ /*tabi bunun için* shoplifterin ne demek olduğunu bilmek gerekiyor* [tr: of course you need to know the meaning of "shoplifter" first of all]

15   →L3:   *kasaları sağdan sola taşımak için gereken araç* [tr: [it is] the vehicle used to carry the boxes from right to left]

16   →T: *hayır hayır değil* [tr: no no it is not]

17   →L3:   *atıyorum* [tr: I'm just guessing]

18   →T: *shoplifter ne demek?*[tr: what does "shoplifter" mean in Turkish?]

19   →L1:   *hırsız* [tr: thief]

20   T: huh?

21   →L1:   *hırsız* [tr: thief]

22   →T: *hırsız ama nereyi soyan hırsız?*[tr: a thief but from where does he steal?]

23   →L1:   =*marketi* [tr: a shop]

24   →T: =/ /*shopu* soyan hırsıza shoplifter ama burda diyor ki strongest criminal*
         [tr: "shoplifter" is (called) a person who steals from a "shop" but it says here the "strongest criminal"]

25   (1.5)

26   *öyle bir criminal olacak ki en güçlüsü olacak liftin bir de ne anlamı var?*

27   *bir sözcük oyunu tamamen ha (.) napıyor bu?*

28   *aynen Serkanın söylediği gibi*
         [tr: he is such a criminal who is the strongest what is the another meaning of "lift"? this is a word game (.) what does he do? it's just what Serkan has told us]

29   →LL: *yükleri sırtına alabilen* [tr: (a person) who can hold the things]

30   →T: *bütün dükkanı kaldırabilen en güçlü er en kriminaldir* [tr: (a person) who can hold the whole store is the strongest er is the most criminal]

31   ((laughter))

Üstünel (2009: 109–110)

T asks for the Turkish equivalent of an English word in line 1 and receives reply turns in lines 2, 4, 5, and 7. T code-switches to Turkish to repeat the correct reply as positive feedback in line 8. In line 9, T switches back and forth between English and Turkish. S/he asks another question in Turkish to elicit the Turkish equivalent of an English word in line 9. Learner 1 replies to her/his question in line 11. T follows up her/his reply turn with a question in Turkish in line 12. In line 12, s/he checks the learners' comprehension of the target word "shoplifter". In lines 13–17, there is a reply-feedback sequence between T and Learner 3. In line 18, T repeats her/his question (line 9) as Learner 3 does not provide the correct reply. Learner 1 repeats her/his reply (line 11) in lines 19 and 21. In line 22, T repeats Learner 1's reply as positive feedback and asks another question in Turkish in the same line. Learner 1 initiates a reply in line 23 and T initiates a repair to her/his question (line 22) in line 24 in overlapping turns. In lines 26–29, T uses Turkish to ask two questions to check the learners' comprehension of her/his question (line 9). More than one learner replies in line 30. T accepts the learners' reply and repairs it to extend the information in line 31. The answer provokes laughter from the learners that may indicate their comprehension of the question (line 9) and answer (line 31) sequence. The teacher-initiated code-switching and T's turns in the same language choice (i.e., Turkish) are integrated in the interaction as a question-answer-feedback/evaluation sequence. Although the pedagogical function of the first teacher-initiated code-switching (line 8) is to give feedback and that of the second teacher-initiated code-switching is to ask for a Turkish equivalent, T continues to use Turkish in all her turns (lines 9–31), to give feedback, repair her/his questions, and ask comprehension check questions.

Extract 42 Scaffolding the Learner (Learner to Learner)

1   T:humm so: well you can say I can help
2   →L4:   *help olur mu?* [tr: is help acceptable]
3   T:well you can say yeah
4   →L2:   *ya da sonunda for help gibi bişey ekleyebilirsin* [tr: or you can
          add "for help" in the end]
5   T: huh uh

Kavak (2016: 52)

In Extract 42, the learners are asked to make sentences to practise "If clause type 2" as a warming-up activity. The question "What would you do if you had five thousand Turkish liras in your pocket?" is written on the board. Learner 4 wants to make a sentence but is not sure how s/he can make it. The previous lines are not given here due to the lack of space. In line 1 T produces the discourse marker "humm" that shows s/he is thinking what to say next. It does not take long to decide what to say as a reply so s/he uses another discourse marker "so" to evaluate by stretching the sound in the end. T provides a prompt for the learner. In reply to T's turn, Learner 4 code-switches to L1 and the reason why s/he repeats what T has produced in interrogative form may be because s/he may have been surprised as it is a lexis that has been introduced in lower levels. In line 3, T assures Learner 4 by giving positive feedback in her/his reply. In line 4, Learner 2 takes a turn in Turkish and provides scaffolding for her/his peer by providing an alternative usage.

Scaffolding is the support given during the learning process, which is tailored to the needs of the learner with the intention of helping the student achieve his/her learning goals (Sawyer 2006). It is generally thought that scaffolding can be provided by the teacher in the classroom. Wood et al. (1976) claim that support can be given by the teacher or more knowledgeable peer in providing comprehensible input and moving the learner into the ZPD. In the next turn, T validates L2's turn and gives her/him a positive feedback with a discourse marker "huh uh" to show agreement in line 5. The teacher may have thought that the learners are not only responsible for their own learning but for other members of their classroom community as well.

As stated in the literature, the language classroom serves as a community. Learners feel that they constitute a community in which they share some common properties. One of these properties is the reason to enrol on the course and be present for the instruction in the same setting, which means they have the same goal. It is clearly observable that learners scaffold for each other continually, such as giving each other prompts, providing Turkish or English equivalence or explaining the procedure and so on. They do all of these for three reasons. The first one is that they belong to the same community and the second one is that the teacher asks them to do so and the last one is they are the participants of the interaction and so for the sake of conversation they have to cooperate

(Grice's Cooperative Theory). As Wells concedes, "conversation may not be perfect as a means of information exchange … but when engaged in collaboratively, it can be an effective medium for learning and teaching. In any case, since there is no better alternative, we must do the best we can" (1987: 218).

Extract 43 Asking for L1 Equivalence during the Task

1	L3:	kno:wledge?
2	T:	knowledge
3 →L3:		*o ne demekti tam anlamı?* [tr: what does exactly mean?]
4	T:	it's for example my knowledge about English=
5 →L3:		=*bilgi bilgi pardon bilgi* [tr: knowledge knowledge sorry knowledge]

Kavak (2016: 64)

In Extract 43, Learner 3 asks T for the meaning of a word with a rising intonation. Instead of showing alignment with Learner 3's request, T provides a repair for the mispronounced word in line 2. And then Learner 3 code-switches to Turkish to clarify that s/he is not interested in the pronunciation of the word but the Turkish equivalence of it. As T in this context never uses mother tongue, s/he recasts to make the meaning clearer in line 4. After T scaffolds with an example, Learner 3 uptakes and provides the Turkish equivalence of the word in the next line (line 5). T activates her/his previous knowledge. The example T gives, triggers Learner 3's memory and thus the learner retains it without a pause and feels apologetic for not remembering it before in line 5.

Extract 44 *Translating into L1*

1	T:	they are very, very tired (.) what do they need?
2	L:	Holiday
3 →T:		need?
4		(1.0)
5		*need ne demekti?* [tr: what does "need" mean in Turkish?]
6 →L1:		=/ /*ihtiyacı olmak* [tr: to need]
7 →L3:		=/ /*ihtiyaç* [tr: need]
8 →T:		huh uh what do they need?

9   L8:   we need holiday
10   T: a holiday
11   (1.0)
12   so we (1 sec) (unintelligible talk in English) you go to one,
           two, three, four,
13   five, six
14   (0.5)
15   six different tourist agents not just one
16   (1.0)
17   go six different tourist agents
18   L1:Yes
19   →T: you go and you say
20   (1.0)
21I   need a holiday
22   (0.5)
23   you say- your first sentence (.) *ilk cümleniz bu olsun* [tr: your
           first sentence must be this sentence]
24   I need a holiday
25   (1.0)
26   okay?
27   (1.5)
28   okay.
29   L10: what can I do?
30   T: and you have to persuade-
31   (0.5)
32   what does persuade mean?
33   L10: persuade?
34   L: *ikna-* [tr: persuasion]
35   →T: =/ /*ikna* (0.5) *etmek* (0.3) *ikna etmek* [tr: persuasion (0.5) to
           (0.3) to persuade]
36   you have to persuade these people to
37   (0.5)
38   come to your
39   (0.5)
40   holiday okay?
41   L: (2.0)(unintelligible talk in Turkish)

42 →T: I'll tell you this later (.) *daha sonra* [tr: later on]
43   (1.0)
44   okay you go to one (.) you go over there
45   (0.5)
46   you go over here
47   (0.5)
48   you go to-
49   (1.5)

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 95–96)</div>

In line 1, T asks a question in the TL and receives a reply from an unidentified learner in line 2. In line 3, T uses English to initiate a question asking for either the Turkish equivalent of the English verb ("to need") or a synonym (e.g., "necessitate") and a description of it in English (e.g., "circumstances requiring action"). None of the learners takes a reply turn during a pause of 1 second in line 4. T then code-switches to Turkish in line 5 to repair her question in line 3. The repaired question induces code-switching from the learners in their reply turn. Thus, Learners 1 and 3 provide an answer in Turkish in the overlapping turns in lines 6 and 7. In line 8, T gives positive feedback and asks the same question that s/he has asked in line 1. Learner 8 gives an answer to T's question in line 9. In line 10, T repairs Learner 8's previous utterance and carries on with the task directions (lines 12 and 22). T code-switches to Turkish in line 23 to translate the task instruction and checks for comprehension in the TL in line 26. The point to note in this extract is that although T uses code-switching in her/his turn, in the following turn the speaker (Learner 10) chooses to use the TL to ask a question related to her/his role in the task in line 29. T cuts her/his reply turn short in line 30 and asks for either the Turkish equivalent or an English synonym of the verb "to persuade" in line 32. Such questions are named as a teacher-induced code-switching sequence because in all the cases appearing in the database where T asks a code-switching-inducing question, the learners reply in Turkish, although they do have the alternative of providing an English synonym or a description of the verb. Another point to note is related to the preference organisation in T's pauses: T does not use Turkish to ask that question (line 32), since the length of the pause

in line 31 is less than one second. A learner takes the following turn and s/he uses English to direct a question to T. T does not take an answer turn, and another learner initiates a turn giving the Turkish equivalent in line 34, as a reply to the teacher's question (line 32). T cuts her/his turn short and provides the Turkish equivalent in line 35. T carries on her/his turn by giving task directions in lines 36 and 40. In line 41, a learner talks in Turkish and T follows up in English in line 42, then code-switches to Turkish to translate a part of her utterance into Turkish (line 42). In lines 43 and 49, T gives task directions in the TL and Learner 1 begins conversing on the topic in line 50.

Extract 45 Translating into Turkish

1	T:	*Ayvalık* here
2		(0.5)
3		so twenty
4		(0.5)
5		twenty
6		(0.5)
7		twenty good persuaders
8	L5:	thank you
9	T:	persuade?
10		(0.5)
11		what was persuade?
12	→L5:	*ikna =etmek* [tr: to persuade]
13	T:	=/ /good* sell of people okay, wonderful .hh this time go back to your original
14		partner
15		(0.5)
16		original?
17	→L2:	=/ /*gerçek* [tr: real]
18	→L5:	=/ /*ilk* [tr: the first]
19	→L7:	=*orjinal* [tr: original]
20	→T:	*yeah ilk partnerinize geri dönüyorsunuz* (.) *beraber yazdığınız* [tr: return to your first partner with whom you have written]
21		((LL talk in English in groups)) (7 minutes)

Üstünel ([2009](): 97–98)

This extract is taken from a post-task activity. In lines 1 and 7, T comments on the task results. In lines 9 and 11, T initiates question turns that induce the learners to code-switch, but s/he does not code-switch to Turkish herself/himself (line 13). T asks another code-switching-inducing question in line 16. There is an immediate reply turn by Learners 2 and 5, therefore T does not code-switch to Turkish to ask the same question. Learners 2 and 5 provide the equivalent at the same time in lines 17 and 18. Learner 7 gives the equivalent after their turn in line 19. In line 20, T gives positive feedback in the TL and code-switches to Turkish to translate the task instruction which s/he has just uttered in the TL (lines 13–14). As soon as T has finished giving task instructions in L1, the learners start talking in English to perform the group-work activity in line 21. In this extract, we see examples of preference organisation in relation to the length of the teacher's pauses. In lines 9–11 and 14–16, T asks code-switching-inducing questions and repairs her/his question in English after a pause of one second. As we have seen in the previous extract(s), T code-switches to Turkish if the waiting time for the reply turn is more than one second. This extract is also a good example of teacher-initiated code-switching-inducing questions that entail the learners' code-switching to Turkish. The difference between this type of question and the teacher-initiated code-switching questions is that the reply turns for teacher-induced code-switching in questions are always in L1 in the data.

Extract 46 *Giving L1 Equivalence during the Task*

1. Teacher-Induced Code-Switching

1	T:	=↑yes they they inspect (T writes it on the board)(.)ok:? get your cars get
2		your car inspected what does it mean in ↑Turkish ↑ gu:ys?
3	→L1:	*kontrol edildi* [tr: it is inspected]
4	T:	uhh huh ↑you: get your car inspected

Kavak (2016: 66)

Extract 46 is a part taken from the post-reading activity. The reading text is about the problems people face when they buy a car. The learners are expected to give advice in the end of the activity. In this part, T checks their comprehension. In line 1, T introduces a word taken from

the passage and writes on the board but there is a short silence and s/he thinks that the meaning of the sentence is not grasped by the learners so s/he continues with a stretched "ok" in risen intonation. S/he notices that more instruction is needed for this word so s/he decides to scaffold and uses the lexis in a sentence (teacher noticing). At the final part of her/his turn, T wants to make sure of their comprehension and invites the learners to provide the Turkish equivalence of the word (teacher-induced code-switching). Learner 1 aligns with T and code-switches to Turkish at T's request (line 2) in line 3. In the next turn, T gives her/him a positive feedback and repeats the example given in line 1 as this lexis is used as a collocation, so T may have repeated the example to help the learners recycle and retain it as a chunk.

Extract 47 *Giving L1 Equivalence during the Task*

2. Learner-Induced Code-Switching

1	L3:	*bir dakika* [tr:(hold on)a minute] what's the meaning of *kənvɜ.taɪ.bl*?
2	→L2:	*dönüşebilen* [tr:convertible]
3	T:	convertible
4	→L2:	*dönüşebilen olması lazım* [tr:it should be convertible]
5	T:	but it can be open or you know covered

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 66–67)</div>

In Extract 47, the topic is "shopping for a car" and learners are asked to talk about the features of cars in a post-listening activity. In line 1, Learner 3 code-switches to Turkish to gain some time to think and then code-switches back to the TL to ask for clarification of the word. Learner 3's question in line 1 functions as the one in line 2 in the previous extract (Extract 46) and Learner 2 aligns with Learner 3 and produces the meaning in Turkish (learner-induced code-switching). In the next line, T provides repair and gives the correct version of the word to make sure that the learners have enough input to learn the pronunciation of the word. In line 4, Learner 2 probably misunderstands T's repetition of the lexis and code-switches back to Turkish again to comment on the lexis (metalanguage). In line 5, T tries to clarify the meaning for the context by exemplifying it.

Extract *48 Giving L1 Equivalent*

```
1          T:no but it's (.) too simple er (0.5) you can give him some
2          punishments
3          (0.5)
4     L15: huh?
5    →T:   ceza verebilirsin [tr: you can give punishment]
6  →L15:   ceza mı verelim? [tr: shall we give punishment?]
7    →T:   tabii [tr: of course]
8          (0.5)
9          uzat yani [tr: make it longer]
10         =make it longer
11    L15: =/ /huh uh
```

Üstünel ([2009](#): 91–92)

The extract is taken from a classroom activity in which T moves around the pairs and helps them to write their dialogues for the role-play activity. The extract starts with T's repair turn (lines 1–2) of Learner 15's procedural trouble. Learner 15 shows her/his miscomprehension verbally in a question turn in line 4. T answers her/his question in Turkish in line 5. The pedagogical function of this teacher-initiated code-switching is to translate what has been said (lines 1–2) into Turkish, because Learner 15 requests that T repeat the repair (line 4). In line 6, Learner 15 follows up T's reply with a question in Turkish in order to ask for confirmation of T's repair (line 5). Learner 15 asks a question in L1 to make sure that s/he understands T's repair (line 5) correctly. T switches back to English in her reply turn in line 10. The pedagogical function of this code-switching to English is the same as that of her/his previous code-switching to Turkish (line 5), which is to translate what has been said previously. In line 10, T translates the procedural instruction (line 9) into English.

Extract 49 *Giving Turkish Equivalent*

```
1    →T:   yeah
2          (1.5)
3          okay, change
```

4		(0.5)
5		change
6		(0.5)
7		clockwise *saat yönüne* [tr: clockwise]
8		(0.5)
9		=clockwise. ((T shows the direction with a hand movement))
10	→L8:	=/ /*saat yönü*ne*. [tr: clockwise]
11	→L2:	*ama saat yönüne göre böyle oluyor* [tr: but the clockwise direction is this way]
12	→L12:	*böyle ters oluyor* [tr: it is reverse if it is like that]
13	→T:	*benim saatime göre-* [tr: according to my watch]
14		(1.0)
15		*doğru böyle oluyor* [tr: that's right it is this direction]
16		(.)
17		.hh anti-clockwise then (.) anti-clockwise

Üstünel (2009: 92–93)

The above extract starts with T's classroom instruction in which s/he instructs the learners to change partners in order to carry on the role-play activity. S/he wants them to move in a clockwise direction. After giving instructions (lines 1–7), T code-switches to Turkish to give the equivalent of the English word in line 7. T repeats the English word in line 9 and Learner 8 repeats the Turkish equivalent in an overlapping fashion in line 10. Both Learner 2 and Learner 12 initiate a repair to correct the mismatch between the propositional meaning of the word "clockwise" and the direction of T's hand movement in lines 11–12. In lines 10, 11 and 12, the learners are engaged in repairing T's code-switched turn (line 7). In line 15, T accepts the learners' initiation of a repair and self-repairs the instruction in English in line 17. This extract is different from the other extracts in the database in that it contains other (learner)- initiated, other (learner)- repair of T's code-switching.

Extract 50 *Giving the Turkish Equivalent*

1	T:	yes that you can remember (.) was it last year? (.) two years ago? five
2		years ago? ten years ago?
3		(0.5)

4   when was it?
5   L8: er (0.5) in ninety er (0.5) nineteen ninety three
6   →T: it was in nineteen (.) ninety (.) three
7   (0.5)
8   er
9   (1.5)
10   how many years? (.) *kaç yıl oluyor bu?* [tr: how many years [ago]
          was it?]
11   L8: ten years
12   T: oh ((T shows surprise)) TEN YEARS (.) long time
13   L8: Yes

                                        Üstünel (2009: 93–94)

This extract is taken from a conversation between T and Learner 8. In lines 1 and 4, T asks questions in order to elicit more information related to Learner 8's previous utterance. In line 5, Learner 8 replies to the teacher's question (line 4). In line 6, T begins her/his turn in English, then asks a question, first in English, and then translating it into Turkish in line 10. Learner 8 takes the answer turn and provides a reply in the TL in line 11. T continues the conversation in English in line 12.

This extract is different from the previous two extracts (48 and 49) because in Extract 48, T code-switches to Turkish after Learner 15 signals her/his need for repair (line 4) and, in Extract 49, T code-switches to Turkish without a pause (line 7). However, in this extract, T initiates a code-switching to Turkish after a micro pause in line 10. Although this extract is similar to the previous two extracts in terms of the pedagogical function (giving L1 equivalent), the organisation of the teacher-initiated code-switching is different than those of the other two extracts.

Extract 51 Giving the Turkish Equivalent

1   →T: okay (.) where? =from* which department store would you
          buy it? *hangisinden*
2   *satın alırdın?* [tr: from which [department store] would you
          buy?]
3   L10: =/ /I er-

4	→L4:	*Beymen'e git bari orada kolay bitirirsin* [tr: go to Beymen you can spend all the money easily there]
5	T:	Beymen?
6	L9:	Vakko.
7	T:	Vakko?
8	L10:	Vakko.
9	T:	okay.

Üstünel (2009: 94)

The above extract is taken from a conversation between T and Learner 10. In line 1, T directs a question to Learner 10 and in line 2, s/he translates what s/he has asked into Turkish. Learner 10 initiates an answer in a fashion which overlaps T's turn (line 1), but then s/he gives the turn back to the teacher so that s/he can finish questioning. In line 4, Learner 4 takes a turn in L1 in order to talk local identity into being. T follows up Learner 4's turn with a question in line 5. In line 6, learner 9 suggests an answer to T's question (line 1). T continues questioning Learner 10 in line 7 and gives positive feedback in the TL in line 9 after Learner 10's reply in line 8.

This extract is also different from the previous three extracts (48, 49 and 50) because in this extract, T initiates a code-switching to Turkish in her/his overlapping turn with that of Learner 10's in which Learner 10 has already initiated a response in L2. In Extract 48, T initiates a code-switching to Turkish as a reply to a request for a repair (line 4); in Extract 49, T code-switches to Turkish without a pause (line 7) and code-switches back to English after a pause (line 9); and in Extract 50, T initiates a code-switching to Turkish after a micro pause (line 10). Although this extract is similar to the previous extracts in terms of the pedagogical function (giving L1 equivalent), the organisation of the teacher-initiated code-switching is different to those of the other three extracts.

(Dis)Alignment with the Task Procedure

There are two types of disalignment. While the one that is validated by the teacher shifts the direction of the topic in the conversation and the

other type that is strategically ignored, is regarded as "not produced at all" by T for pedagogical reasons.

1. Validated by the Teacher

Extract 52

1		T:	no like anybody yes Fevzi so it takes a long time=
2	→L7:		=yes yes *hocam o tamam nasıl başlasam?* [tr: Madam how shall I start?]
3			((unintelligible talk 0.2)) yes I agree but if you use shipping you have to pay
4			money
5		L3:	shipping?
6		T:	so:
7	→L1:		*kar[go* [tr: shipping]
8	→L5:		*[kargo* [tr: shipping]
9		T:	if you do online shopping you have to pay extra money for shipping

Kavak (2016: 74)

Extract 52 is taken from a lesson in which a discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of online shopping takes place. As T realises that some learners dominate the discussion largely, s/he intervenes and disprefers Learner 1 to take a turn and nominates Learner 7 to take a turn and provides scaffolding by summarising the point where the discussion is. In line 2, Learner 7 disaligns and code-switches to her/his L1 even though s/he initiates her/his turn immediately. The learner asks T how to start but the various replies from her/his group members give her/him ideas about it in a short time (0.2). They make a decision and s/he vocalises their point so code-switches back to the TL and produces a meaningful and grammatically correct sentence in line 3. Learner 3 (a member of the opposing team) cannot comprehend the meaning of a lexis in line 5 so invites other group members to code-switch (learner-initiated code-switching). In line 6, T intervenes and supports Learner 3's invitation

with an evaluative stretched discourse marker "so". T validates the learners code-switch to help Learner 3's comprehension.

Here, the teacher's pedagogical focus is to induce learners to code-switch. In these cases, the learners express alignment by code-switching to Turkish as in the sample extract. In line 7 and 8, Learner 1 (a learner from the opposing group) and Learner 5 (a member from the same group with Learner 3) align with Learner 3's request in line 5 and provide Turkish equivalence of the word "shipping". As it is effective at that point of the interaction, this move (code-switching in line 7 and 8) gets positive feedback after an evaluation of the point supported by the group in line 9. By doing so, the learners display affiliation to the pedagogical focus, for example they recognise that the aim is for them to produce an answer in L2. They also thereby display their recognition that the aim of the teacher's invitation to switch to L1 is to clarify the meaning of a word for another participant of the interaction and pedagogical focus. According to Seedhouse (2004), learners do not always affiliate themselves with the teacher's pedagogical focus, for a variety of reasons. Learners' language choice may display their degree of affiliation or disaffiliation with the teacher's pedagogical focus. Considering pedagogical reasons, not all switches are validated by T and get positive feedback, which is exemplified in the next extract.

2. Not validated by the teacher

Extract 53

1	T:	maybe this year?
2	L7:	I think
3 →	L2:	*inşallah* [tr: hopefully]
4	T:	I think Beşiktaş can go ↑no? Fenerbahçe? ok: opponent yes
5 →	L3:	*siz hangi takımı tutuyorsunuz?* [tr: which team do you support?]
6 →	L5:	opponent *neydi*? [tr: what does opponent mean?]
7	T:	well Galatasaray and Fenerbahçe they are [opponents

Kavak (2016: 75)

In Extract 53, Learner 7 shares that if s/he had five thousand Turkish liras, s/he would go to Spain to see a football match. T wants to take advantage of knowing the learner's interest in football and ask more questions to elicit more TL as s/he is a quiet, reserved member of the class. In line 1, T directs the question with rising intonation; Learner 7 aligns and replies to the teacher's question. Another learner (Learner 2), who is a fan of football, takes a turn and code-switches to Turkish to show her/his willingness to participate in the conversation. There might be three possible reasons why Learner 2 has code-switched here. The first one is because of habitual experience, the second one is that s/he wants to express how much s/he is willing to participate in the conversation, the last one is because s/he does not know how to express it in that TL. As Learner 2 is one of the reasonably able learners, the suggested third reason is invalid for this case.

In line 4, T shifts the topic slightly to practise a lexis 'opponent' introduced recently and then Learner 3 takes a turn and code-switches to Turkish to ask a personal question out of personal interest in line 5. T disprefers answering the question because of two reasons: the first one is that it is asked in L1 so it does not serve any purpose for the lesson focus and the latter is that it might disrupt the mood of the class as it is a male-dominant class and they are all interested in football to some degree. T wants to use the time economically and instead of putting the learners in a mood whereby they get less motivated to achieve lesson goals, T disaligns and avoids answering Learner 3's question and directs her/his attention to the question asked in line 6 which is more meaningful for the education goals. Even if the question is asked in mother tongue just like the one asked in line 5 by Learner 3, it aligns with the topic. Therefore, T uses a filler "well" to have more time to think how to clarify the meaning of the word "opponent" the best and completes her/his turn by exemplifying it in line 7.

Extract 54 *Giving L2 Equivalence during the Task*

1 →L1:   ° sometimes° *ürün ne demek?*= [tr: what is product (in English)?]
2   L3:   =pro[duct
3   T: [product huh huh product

Kavak (2016: 80)

In Extract 54, learners talk against each other to support their own ideas by giving reasons in a discussion. In this activity they have to improvise and produce a reply to their opposing team. In line 1, Learner 1 tries to construct her/his sentence, initiates her/his turn in English but disaligns as s/he does not have the lexis available to her/him and then ask a question to her/his group members. Learner 3 code-switches to the TL to give the English equivalence of the word. L3 shows alignment and supports Learner 1 immediately and provides the word s/he needs. In line 3, T only validates Learner 3's reply and Learner 1 continues by constructing her/his sentence by using the word provided by her/his group member.

Extract 55 *Eliciting L1 or L2 Translation*

1	→T:	*peki sıkça düştün mü?* [tr: so did you often fall down?]
2	L3:	yes, yes ((laughter))
3	→T:	can you ask?
4	→L9:	(2.0)
5		*sıkça* [tr: often]
6	L8:	Often
7	T:	huh uh
8	L9:	how often-
9	T:	ask the question and answer((laughter))
10	T:	you ask =your question
11	L9:	=/ /how er * often did you er fall fall.
12	T:	now this is important (.) how often did you (1.0) =fall.
13	L8:	=/ /get down
14	→L10:	*uçurumdan uçtun mu?* [tr: did you fall down a slope?]
15	L3:	no
16	T:	how often did you fall when you were learning?
17	L3:	yes uhm
18		(1.5)
19	T:	very often?
20	L3:	five
21		(0.5)

22		once in five minutes
23	T:	once in five minute?
24	L3:	Yeah
25	→T:	what does he mean?
26		(1.0)
27		what does he mean?
28		(1.5)
29		*ne demek istiyor burda tam olarak anlıyoruz da*? [tr: what does he mean here?]
30	→L10:	*her seferinde beş kez* [tr: five times each]
31	→T:	*her seferinde beş kez* [tr: five times each]
32	→L8:	*hayır beş dakkada bir mi diyor*? [tr: no does he say once in five minutes?]
33	T:	how would you say that?
34	L9:	once in five minutes
35	T:	you fell every five minutes?
36	L3:	Yeah

Üstünel ([2009](#): 104–105)

In line 1, T asks a question in Turkish and receives a reply in the TL in line 2. In line 3, T uses the TL to ask another question in order to direct the learners to ask the question (line 1) in English. After a pause of two seconds, Learner 9 repeats a Turkish word which T has used in his question (line 1). This repetition signals a request to have it translated into English. Learner 8 provides the English equivalent in line 6 and T gives positive feedback by backchannelling in line 7. Although I am unable to determine from this extract whether Learner 8's and T's approval of the help results in long-term acquisition, what is clear is that the peer-peer dialogue resulted in "improved language performance" (Swain et al. [2002](#)). Learner 9 then initiates asking the target question in line 8. T cuts her/his turn short to give instructions in lines 9 and 10. Learner 9 asks the question with hesitations in line 11. In line 12, T explicitly emphasises the grammatical point in the question. Learner 8 overlaps her/his turn and provides a different English verb to replace the one T has suggested in line 13. Learner 10 joins in the conversation in line 14 and asks a question in Turkish. Learner 3 replies to the learner's question in English

in line 15. In line 16, T takes the turn to repeat her/his question (line 12), with the addition of a subordinate phrase. Learner 3 replies to the question in line 17, and a pause in her/his answer turn may signal that s/he is trying to provide more information. T asks another question in line 19. Her/his question is quite similar in nature to the one s/he has asked in line 16. Learner 3 takes a reply turn in lines 20 and 22. In line 23, T asks a confirmation check question and receives a positive reply in line 24. In line 25, T asks a question to check whether the learners have understood Learner 3's reply (line 22). After a pause of 1 second, T repeats her/his question in line 27. Then s/he waits for a slightly longer time and code-switches to Turkish to ask the same question in line 29. Learner 10 chooses to offer her/his explanation in Turkish in line 30. In line 32, Learner 8 contradicts Learner 10's utterance in Turkish and asks for confirmation. T does not reply to her/him, but instead initiates another question turn in English in line 33. Learner 9 answers T's question in line 34. T repairs her/his answer in line 35, uttering it in a rising intonation. In line 36, Learner 3 gives a positive answer, indicating that s/he accepts the propositional meaning of T's question.

Extract 56 Eliciting L1 or L2 Translation

1	→T:	not the whole Hilton Hotel it is not that much money
2		(1.0)
3		okay, you book a room *di mi*? [tr: don't you]
4		book
5		(0.5)
6		what does book mean?
7	L1:	er (0.5) *kiralamak* [tr: to book]
8	→T:	*kiralamak di mi? oda*. [tr: to book a room isn't it?]
9	→L3:	*reserve yapmak* [tr: to make a reservation]
10	→T:	*evet, oda kiralıyorsunbir gecelik* [tr: yes you book a room for a night]
11		okay what do you then?*ondan sonra*? [tr: after that?]
12	L6:	(3.0)
13		with my friends and-
14	T:	=which friends? people from here?

Üstünel ([2009](#): 106–107)

This extract is taken from a conversation between T and Learner 6. T starts her/his turn in English in line 1 and code-switches to Turkish in line 3 in order to form a question tag. In line 6, T does not initiate code-switching but induces it by asking for the Turkish equivalent of an English verb. Learner 1 gives the Turkish equivalent in line 7. T uses Turkish again in line 8 as a confirmation check of the translation. Learner 3 supplies a synonymous word in line 9. T gives positive feedback to the contributions of Learners 1 and 3 in line 10, and code-switches back and forth between English and Turkish in line 11 in order to ask another question. After a pause of three seconds, Learner 6 takes the answer turn and uses the TL. Learner 6's reply in L2 is in alignment with the teacher's pedagogical focus. After Learner 6's turn in English, T also follows up in English in line 14.

This extract is different from the previous extract because in Extract 55, T code-switches from Turkish to English (line 3) in order to elicit an L2 translation of an L1 question (line 1). However, in this extract, T code-switches from English to Turkish to form a question tag in order to elicit an L1 translation of an L2 verb (line 3). Although these two extracts are similar in terms of pedagogical function (eliciting translation), the organisation of code-switching is different from each other.

Emphasising the Pedagogical Focus of the Lesson

The reason why learners code-switch back to the TL is because they usually keep in mind that all the activities conducted in the class have a pedagogical focus.

Extract 57

1	→L2:	*ya bir şeyler yoksa ya motive edemedim derse nolcak?* [tr: if something is not available or if s/he says "I couldn't motivate"]
2	→L3:	*bunun ingilizcesi neymiş onu söyle* [tr: say it in English]
3	T:	yes
4	→L2:	*ivit* [tr: yes] ((laughter))
5	→L5:	°*herkes sustu*° [tr: everybody went quiet]

(Kavak 2016: 83)

Extract 57 is taken from a discussion in which there are two opposing groups. Learner 2 (a learner from group 1) tries to construct her/his ideas in mother tongue but s/he gets a warning in the same code from a learner from the opposing group (Learner 3) in line 2. In the next line, T participates by only agreeing with Learner 3. Learner 2 code-switches back to Turkish and her/his word choice gets laughter from the other learners so in this way Learner 2 softens the mood of the class that can be face-threatening for her/him. In the next turn, Learner 5 (a learner from group 2) makes a statement by continuing in the mother tongue code to signal that the opposing group cannot support their ideas in both codes.

2.3.2   Code-Switching for Classroom Management Discourse

Extract 58 Asking for Feedback

1   L3:   it drives me off the wall when (.)thin (.)the thin person who eat
             too much
2   T: ↑ aww good one ↑ slim?
3   L3:   yes ↑slim person eat too much
4   T: huh uh so:=
5   →L3:   =*yapabildim mi tam?* [tr: did I manage it properly?]
6   T: it drives you crazy when a slim person eats too much but puts
             on no weight
7   L3:   ↑ yes
8   L2:   humm
9   T: yes like me I'm not a slim person but I've got some friends they
             eat too
10   much but they eat ↑more than me and I ↑put on weight they
             ↑don't so
11   you know not good it's annoying ↑annoying?

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 50–51)</div>

In Extract 58, T starts the lesson with some expressions to express dislikes at the beginning of the lesson. Turns are determined by T. In line 1, Learner 3 produces a sentence which is meaningful but grammatically incorrect. In line 2, T disprefers repairing it and gives positive feedback

first. Then s/he only provides a prompt "slim" but not the target sentence in line 2 as T expects the learner to have a try. In reply to this, Learner 3 remakes the second half of the sentence (other-initiated self-repair attempt). When T is getting prepared to provide an implicit repair with a rising intonation of evaluative discourse marker "so", Learner 3 disaligns and code-switches to Turkish to ask T for a feedback about her/his performance in line 5.

In second or foreign language classrooms, learners use their mother tongue to speak about the task. It can be because it sounds artificial or because they are not on-task so there is no need to continue speaking in the target code. T avoids giving feedback and continues her/his sentence by providing the correct version of the sentence in line 6. In reply to T's repair, Learner 3 code-switches back to the TL and produces a positive feedback with a rising intonation "yes", which shows that s/he is satisfied because s/he has been understood by T in line 7. Another learner (Learner 2) tries to comprehend T's utterance in line 6, so produces a discourse marker "humm" that shows understanding. In the next turn, T continues clarifying her/his point and give extra examples for reinforcement (lines 9–11).

Extract 59 Giving Feedback

1	T:	okay, so (.) I think hard has two meanings .hh
2		(0.5)
3		in the question it is different and in the answer it is again different uhm
4		in the question what is even harder than a diamond what does hard
5		mean here?
6		(1.0)
7		in Turkish?
8	→L3:	*sert* [tr: hard]
9	→T:	*Sert* [tr: hard]
10		okay, what about the answer?
11	→LL:	*zor* [tr: difficult]
12	→T:	okay, so, uhm
13		(0.5)

14	*what is even harder than a diamond paying for it (.) okay, burda sadece bir işte*
15	*hardla ilgili şey yapılmış yani sözcük anlamı gibi birşey yapılmış hardın iki*
16	*anlamı kullanılmış hani ilk bakışta çünkü çok mantıklı görünmüyor soruda*
17	*diyor ki hani diamondtan daha sert ne vardır .hh işte onu ödemek Türkçe'de*
18	*böyle birşey sormaya kalktığınızda sorun yaşarız ama onu ödemek zordur*
19	*anlamında* [tr: here there is just something about the word meaning the two meanings (of the word) "hard" is used it does not make sense, at first the question is what is harder than a diamond .hh so (the answer is) to pay for it if you want to ask such a question in Turkish you will have a problem but (the answer) means it is hard to pay for diamond]
20	(1.0)
21	okay Murat will you please help me
22	((T delivers handouts)) (2 min.)
23	okay read the instruction
24	((T reads))

Üstünel (2009: 107–108)

In lines 4 and 5, T induces code-switching from the learners in her question turn. After a second's pause (noticeable absence of a reply turn), T repairs her/his question (line 7) as s/he does not receive a reply. Learner 3 replies and provides the Turkish equivalent. T gives feedback to Learner 3 by repeating her/his reply (line 8) in line 9. The pedagogical function of this teacher-initiated code-switching (line 9) is to confirm the correctness of Learner 3's reply (line 8). T induces another code-switching in her/his question turn in line 10. More than one learner replies in line 11 and provides the Turkish equivalent. In lines 13–18, T uses Turkish to give metalanguage information about the task. After a half second pause in line 19, T shifts the topic and activity type and uses English in line 20. The first teacher-initiated code-switching (line 9) is integrated in this extract in T's question, the learner's reply, and T's

feedback sequence. T code-switches to Turkish for the second time (lines 13–15) to give a metalanguage explanation of a grammatical point in the task. T signals the shift in her/his language choice with an English discourse marker ("okay") in line 13 and uses the same discourse marker to shift the activity type in line 20. Learners follow up the first teacher-initiated code-switching in Turkish (line 11) because they are asked to supply the Turkish equivalent of an English word (line 10). None of the learners follows up the second teacher-initiated code-switching, although T allows a second's pause before s/he shifts the topic and the activity type in line 19.

Giving Support About the Task

1. Self-directed Code-Switching

Extract 60

1	T:	for example I say ↑ swap if you support Galatasaray (a Turkish football
2		team) so if you support you you know ↑change your seat
3 →L3:		*nee?* [tr: what?]
4	T:	so you understand ↑no?
5	L8:	if not?
6 →L9:		*Türkçe olarak bir anlatabilir misiniz?* [tr: can you explain it in Turkish?]
7	T:	I don't speak in Turkish in B1 class in B1 class no
8 →L3:		*şimdi şey söylicek Galatasaray'ı destekliyorsan sen kalkacaksın yani o*
9		*düşünceye katılıyorsan kalkıp yer değiştirceksin* [tr: she will say something if you support Galatasaray you stand up if you agree you swap with somebody]
10	T:	you change your seat

Kavak (2016: 58)

In Extract 60, the learners play a game at the final phase of the lesson. In line 1, T gives the procedural information but the learners struggle to understand the instructions. In the next line, Learner 3 code-switches to L1 to express that s/he has not understood. T tries to check the learner's comprehension in next turn with a rising intonation "no". Learner 8 takes a turn and asks a question to elicit more procedural information about the game in the fifth line. Learner 9 code-switches to Turkish to request T to give the instructions in L1 in line 6. As it is explained in the introduction, T has an only-English policy in the classroom and sticks to it strictly. Therefore, s/he disaligns and prefers speaking in the target code because of pedagogical purposes. S/he does so because s/he thinks that the level of learners is high enough to be able to understand the instructions in English. That is why s/he emphasises the level of the class. Although there is no request from T to Learner 3 to give instructions in Turkish, the learner does so in her/his turn. S/he may have done so because s/he thinks that another participant (Learner 9) needs it to be explained further so Learner 3 supports her/him in line 8 and 9 by giving the Turkish equivalence of all the instructions. This move does not get any praise or feedback from T because T may have considered this as an "unnecessary" use of L1 after her/his rejection of using L1 and emphasising that the learners should be competent enough to comprehend basic instruction like this (line 1). In the final turn of this extract, T only summarises the activity by simplifying it in line 10.

2. Teacher-directed Code-Switching

Extract 61

1 →L1: independently *ne demek?* [tr: what does independently mean (in Turkish)?]
2   T: what does independent mean?
3 →L3: =*bağımsız* [tr: independent]
4 →L7: =*bağımsız* [tr: independent]
5   T: huh uh <for example you buy a car from me and I say go to ↑that car

6	dealer and you go there and he tells lies I tell lies and we sell the car
7	(.)but if you go to a ↑different card dealer different repair-man so: that's
8	an ↑independent

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 59-60)</div>

In this extract, the topic is shopping for a car and they read a text about mistakes that people make when they buy a car. After reading, T checks the learners' comprehension and the learners ask questions about the text. In the first line, Learner 1 takes a turn to ask a word that s/he struggles with. In line 2, T directs the question without selecting any learner to take a turn and provides them with scaffolding by omitting suffix "-ly" to simplify it. This line is a good example of teacher-induced code-switching as T encourages the learners to provide the Turkish equivalence of the word "independent" (Üstünel 2009). T invites learners to code-switch to L1 by asking directly such as "what does it mean in Turkish?", "How do you say that in Turkish?", "what does it mean?", "it means?" or indirectly by rising her/his intonation "socialise?" The learners (Learner 3 and Learner 7) align with T's request and replies to Learner 1's request after T's pointing them in the direction of Learner 1's request.

This function differs from a self-directed support because Learner 3 and Learner 7 get a positive feedback with a discourse marker "huh uh" that shows that their contribution is validated by the teacher. While Learner 3 who aligns with T in this extract gets a feedback, the same learner cannot get a feedback in the previous extract (Extract 60) as s/he disaligns with T and directs herself/himself to support another learner. In Extract 60, T finds support unnecessary considering the level and the pedagogical purposes so the learner's support of explanation of instructions in Turkish is ignored and T continues as if s/he has not heard the previous utterance. Support from the class members or teacher can be a very effective tool if necessary. Teachers try to balance giving support to learners as spoon-feeding would only make learners overdependent on the teacher's help all the time.

2.3.3   Code-Switching for Interpersonal Relations

Extract 62 Telling Personal Experiences Related to the Task

1	T:	but if you're watching the others well you must know how to you
2		know you ↑learn you learn [by watching
3 →L1:		[I can learn I can learn but I don't know
4		*istemiyorum* [tr: I don't want] I don't want
5	T:	you don't want to do it ok that's that's fine=<

<div align="right">Kavak (2016: 61)</div>

In Extract 62, this conversation is constructed in the very beginning of the lesson. One week passes after the last lesson so T wants to do a speaking activity as a warm-up. The learners are asked what they have done at the weekend. The conversation is shaped by the learner's ideas shared. The learner has a routine and boring weekend and, therefore, starts talking about the ideal weekend. In the first line, T takes a turn to elicit more information on the subtopic "dancing". The learner does not allow the teacher to finish her/his turn and takes a turn to express her/his ideas. In the middle of her/his turn, s/he code switches to Turkish to share her/his sincere feelings about it. According to Jørgensen (1998), code-switching can function as "a way of changing the subject into something private, or to express emotions". Turkish is used for private business and for emotional utterances in Extract 62. Because this is her/his personal opinion, s/he prefers to code-switch back to mother tongue as it may sound more genuine compared to more "artificial" TL. Learner 1 reiterates by giving the Turkish and then English equivalence of her/his utterance in line 4. After showing her/his personal idea, s/he immediately aligns with T and switches back to the TL. In reply to Learner 1's turn, T evaluates the situation and closes the topic.

Extract 63 *Sharing Group Solidarity*

1	T	no you have to you have to support your own idea you can't say yes I agree
2		with you (laughter) so: where is discussion then?

3   L1   huh if you don't use the internet you don't make a online
               shopping
4   →L5:   *ee we use internet yani* [tr: of course we use the Internet]

Kavak (2016: 56)

In Extract 63, learners are asked to discuss online shopping. The learners are put into groups and they are supposed to talk against each other and support their ideas. In the previous lines, one of the learners agrees with another learner in the opposing group, which cause a humour effect in the class but T warns the learners in line 1, reminds them of their goal in line 2 by saying "where is the discussion then?" In the next turn, Learner 1 aligns with T's request, shows that s/he has understood by using a discourse marker "huh" and then produces a sentence. In line 4, L5 initiates her/his turn with a discourse marker "ee" to signal that Learner 1's point is not meaningful for their case because they are all competent internet users. At the end of her/his sentence, s/he switches to Turkish to produce "yani", that is a discourse marker used to express her/his Turkishness. As it is in the final position, it does not help the learner to hold the floor as well. Eldridge (1996) claims the similarities between the Liverpudlian "like" and the Turkish "yani" in her/his study. Because they both do not carry any value in terms of the content transmitted. Heller argues that by code-switching, "learners refuse to agree with all the obligations of being English even if they are willing to learn that language" (1988: 92). Gumperz makes a clear distinction between "we" and "they" code. Extract 63 shows that according to Gumperz's terms, while s/he uses Turkish as the "we" code, English is regarded as "they" code. He links these terms with a notion of group identity:

The tendency is for the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as "the 'we-code' and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the 'they-code' associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations". (Gumperz 1982: 66)

In EFL classrooms, the use of a mixture of English and Turkish in language classrooms is very common. It is very interesting to see that learners still prefer this style which is a composite of two languages while—especially in this case—the word that they borrowed from their L1 does not

contribute anything to the sentence in the TL. Rather, the sentence is distorted with the addition of the borrowed word from the mother tongue. Thus, it would be faulty to undermine this issue and state that the only function of code-switching here is to show learners' Turkishness against all the obligations of being English. Thus, Auer (1988: 207) claims that "it seems that members of the same network adapt to each other and develop a common style of linguistic behaviour which may or may not be characterised by code-switching and transfer". I assume that learners use this "careless"' language purposefully because they do not want to look so "competent" in the TL as it will look like "snobbery", which may disturb the other members of the community.

Extract 64 Expressing Social Identity

1	T:	FIVE (.) star hotel
2		(0.5)
3		very expensive, do you have enough money?
4	L9:	one night
5	→T:	ONE NIGHT
6		(1.0)
7		you are a student, you have to count how much money
8		(1.0)
9		*o kadar paran var mı?* [tr: have you got that amount of money?]
10		(1.0)
11	L9:	fifty dollars.
12	→T:	fifty dollars? I'm a teacher .hh fifty dollars (0.5) no (0.5)
13		((T uses body language))
14		*benim bile o kadar param yok* [tr: even I have not got that amount of money]
15		((LL talk in groups))

Üstünel (2009: 88)

In line 1, T makes an emphatic comment on the content of Learner 9's previous turn and directs a question to her/him in line 3. Learner 9 replies in line 4. In line 5, T repeats her/his answer in a high pitched voice. After a second's pause, T starts commenting on the meaning of Learner 9's reply

in line 7 and code-switches to Turkish to ask a question in line 9. In line 11, Learner 9 replies in English. In line 12, T code-switches back to English and comments on Learner 9's reply. In line 14, T code-switches to Turkish to give a personal account related to Learner 9's reply (line 11). Therefore, it may be suggested that English is associated with imaginary role-play activities and Turkish with real-world social identities.

A teacher's code-switch to L2 is mainly indicative of power and high status relationships, whereas a code switch to L1 is reflective of sociocultural affiliation with the learners. For instance, when the teacher wants to give instructions, check the learners' homework or impose a discipline, s/he uses L2, whereas when s/he reprimands learners either for being late or for not accomplishing a required task, s/he code-switches to L1. This interaction of "cultural member to cultural member" (Lin 1996: 66) or "Code-switching for classroom management" (Ferguson 2003: 39) is frequently used to reprimand learners' for misbehaviour, to get their attention, and to elicit participation in the classroom. This strategy is also considered as "a bridge that builds solidarity between the teacher and the learners" and helps to create an accommodating linguistic background in the classroom (Kiranmayi 2010: 162).

Extract 65 Expressing Social Identity

1	T:	lie?
2		(0.5)
3		what is lie? do you know?
4		(1.0)
5		lying?
6 →L7:		*yalan söylemek* [tr: to lie]
7 →T:		huh uh you don't say the truth for example you say::
8		((T uses body language))
9		I'm very beautiful lie I'm not very beautiful (.) for example I say I
10		am fifteen years old
11		((laughter)) (1.0)
12		*nerde*:: [tr: Turkish exclamation used to point out imaginary things]
13		((laughter)) (1.5 seconds)

14   okay lie, this is lie
15   L: (2 seconds) (unintelligible talk in Turkish)
16   T: huh?
17   L: (2 seconds) (unintelligible talk in Turkish)

<div align="right">Üstünel (2009: 89)</div>

In lines 1–5, T asks in English for the Turkish equivalent of the word "lie". In other words, T does not code-switch herself/himself; rather, s/he "induces" code-switching. Her/his first question turn (line 1) does not receive a reply turn from the learners. T repairs her/his question and asks two successive questions in line 3. The first question s/he asked in line 3 was not directed at a specified receiver. However, T indicates the receiver of her/his second question by a personal pronoun "you" (i.e., Learner 7) in line 3. Her/his questions do not receive a reply turn in line 4. After a second's pause, T repairs and asks for the Turkish equivalent in line 5. Learner 7 takes the reply turn in line 6 and produces the Turkish equivalent of the English verb. Alternatively, Learner 7 could have replied in English if s/he had chosen to define the verb (e.g., "not telling the truth", etc.). However, Learner 7 replies in L1 to the teacher-induced code-switching question turn. T gives positive feedback in line 7 and starts to give examples of the use of the word "lie" in a particular context in lines 7–10. Her/his example provokes laughter from the learners in line 11. T then code-switches to Turkish in line 12 and utters a Turkish exclamation word. The pedagogical function of the teacher-initiated code-switching (line 12) in this extract is to express membership of Turkish society and to create an impression of common knowledge on the basis of a societal and cultural expression. The learners indicate their understanding of the code-switching by their laughter in line 13. In line 17, T uses an English discourse marker, "okay", to signal the topic shift from a cultural/societal to a pedagogical frame and repeats the target word "lie" in the same line. A learner self-selects a turn in line 15 and uses Turkish after T's code-switched turn in English (line 14). The learner's turn is unintelligible; therefore, we are unable to discuss why s/he initiates a turn in Turkish. In this extract, T uses English to explain and exemplify the target word "lie". S/he code-switches to Turkish to use a Turkish exclamation which receives a sign of mutual understand-

ing (laughter) from the learners in line 13. This teacher-initiated code-switching is integrated in the interaction to help create a social situation related to T's example of the use of the target word "lie" (lines 7–10). Learners indicate their understanding by their laughter after the code-switched turn in line 13.

Extract 66 Expressing Social Identity

1	T:	what does the boss say?
2	LL:	we are in economic crisis
3 →	T:	we are in economic crisis
4		(0.5)
5		*umutlar başka bahara* [tr: a Turkish saying which literally means hope waits for the next spring]6((laughter)) (2.0)
7		next time (.) *inşallah maşallah* [tr: a Turkish idiom used when you wish something to happen soon]
8		next time .hh I'm gonna give you rise for your salary .hh a very very bad boss
9		(.) you're a bad boss aren't you?
10		(0.5)
11		okay, thank you very much, it was great.
12		(1.0)
13		who is the last comer? hu::hu:: ((T mimics calling)) aha I see somebody is
14		getting- is hiding there
15		(1.0)
16		all right
17		(2.0)
18		who are you tell us
19		(0.5)
20	L6:	I'm teacher

Üstünel ([2009]: 90)

T asks a question in English in line 1 and receives a reply from more than one learner in line 2. T repeats the learner's reply, which may function

as positive feedback in line 3. After a half second's pause, T code-switches to Turkish to use an idiomatic phrase in line 5. The meaning of the Turkish idiom ("*umutlar başka bahara*") is related to the learner's reply (line 2); therefore, the code-switched utterance is embedded in the question-reply-feedback sequence. T signals her/his membership to the Turkish society and culture with her/his code-switched idiomatic phrase. Learners show their comprehension of code-switching by laughter in line 7. After the laughter turn, T switches back to English in line 8. This code-switched turn is pragmatically in relation to the learner's reply (line 2); therefore, it is also embedded in T's follow-up turn. T uses Turkish for the second time in line 8. The second teacher-initiated code-switching to Turkish is also based on the shared societal/cultural knowledge between the teacher and learners. The meaning of the code-switched utterance is related to the learner's reply (line 2) in general and to the preceding English utterance ("next time") in particular. T embedded the Turkish idiom as a translation of the English time adverbial phrase "next time". T repeats that English phrase after her code-switched turn in line 9. Although the pedagogical function of both code-switching (lines 5 and 8) is the same (i.e., to address social situation), their reference points are different: the first code-switching refers to the learner's reply and the second code-switching refers both to the learner's reply and the preceding English phrase in its immediate context. T carries on her/his turn in English in lines 9–19 and asks a question word (without rising intonation) to Learner 6 in line 19. Learner 6 replies in English in line 20.

3   Summary

All the categorisations go hand in hand with the other classifications revealed by previous code-switching studies (e.g., Eldridge 1996; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain 2005; Jakobsson and Rydén 2010; Van der Walt 2009) but the chapter expands on them and presents samples of a more-detailed analysis with the help of CA.

The sequential order in which teacher-initiated, teacher-induced and learner code-switching occurs in EFL classrooms is divided into four *turn types* in this chapter. They are as follows:

- the code-switched turn initiated or induced by the teacher

- the learner's next turn in L1 or L2 (for teacher-initiated code-switching) and in L1 (for teacher-induced code-switching)
- the teacher's feedback or initiation turn in L1 or L2
- the learner's initiation or reply turn in L1 or L2

The recurring pattern of *preference organisation* found in the data is the organisation of repair according to the length of pause in teachers' question turns. The preferred option in such repair patterns is that teachers repair their L2 questions in English in less than one second. If they still receive no response from learners in more than one second (the dispreferred option), teachers code-switch to Turkish to repair their questions in L2.

The data are collected from L2 classrooms, thus, the organisation of the *turn-taking* mechanism reflects the characteristics of an institutional talk, specifically, in this research context, L2 classroom talk (Markee 2002). However, we have only been concerned with the organisation of sequences involving code-switching initiated and induced by the teacher, rather than with the organisation of interaction in this context in general. In the classroom extracts, the teacher is the person who controls most of the turn-taking in the classroom interaction. However, in some extracts, it is the learner who allocates himself/herself a turn without the teacher's allocation.

The classroom extracts reveal a variety of *repair trajectories*: exposed, embedded, teacher-initiated peer-repair, and self-initiated teacher-repair. Repair is generally initiated by the teacher, and the focus of the repair is on the production of specific sequences of linguistic forms as well as on the accomplishment of the task and on repairing breakdowns in communication. Since learners generally work on the tasks in pairs or groups, it is sometimes the learners who conduct repair. However, other (teacher) initiated self (learner)-repair seems to be more common in the data. The focus is on repairing any trouble, whether procedural trouble or classroom discipline, which obstructs the instructional business; that is, slows the pedagogical focus.

The link between CA and code-switching is established with Auer's work (1998) in the bilingual interaction. This study addresses a research gap in bilingual studies and expands the scope of previous CA studies of

code-switching by linking CA methodology with code-switching studies in EFL classrooms.

References

Adendorff, R. (1993). Code-switching amongst Zulu-speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education, 7*(3), 41–162.

Alfonzetti, G. (1998). The conversational dimension in code-switching between Italian and dialect in Sicily. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction, and identity* (pp. 180–214). London: Routledge.

Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, 314–342.

Arnfast, J. S., & Jorgensen, J. N. (2003). Code-switching as a communication, learning, and socialnegotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 13*(1), 23–53.

Atkinson, D. (1993). *Teaching monolingual classes*. London: Longman.

Auer, J. C. P. (1988). Conversation analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp. 187–214). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Auer, P. (1998). *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge.

Baoueb, S. L. B. (2009). Social factors for code switching in Tunisian business companies: A case study. *Multilingua, 28*(4), 425–458.

Baoueb, S. L. B., & Toumi, N. (2012). Code switching in the classroom: A case study of economics and management students at the University of Sfax, Tunisia. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 11*(4), 261–282.

Bergsleithner, J. M. (2002). *Grammar and interaction in the EFL classroom: A sociocultural study*. Unpublished master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina.

Borlongan, A. M. (2009). Tagalog-English code-switching in English language classes: Frequency and forms. *TESOL Journal, 1*, 28–42.

Braga, M. (2000). *Humor in the EFL classroom: A sociointeractionist perspective*. Unpublished master's thesis, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (1995). Functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(3), 173–195.

Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal, 4*, 27–31.

Chambers, G. (1992). Teaching in the target language. *Language Learning Journal, 6*, 66–67.

Cipriani, F. (2001). *Oral participation strategies in the foreign language classroom: An ethnographic account.* Unpublished master thesis, Universidad Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianopolis.

Cook, V. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching.* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Edward Arnold Publishers Limited.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402–423.

Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education, 20*, 23–43.

Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education: Aspects of theory, research and practice.* New York: Longman.

Dickson, P. (1996). *Using the target language: A view from the classroom.* Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal, 74*, 154–166.

Edstrom, A. (2006). L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 63*(2), 275–92.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303–311.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(1), 19–30.

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA Review, 16*, 38–51.

Gabrielatos, C. (2001). L1 use in ELT: Not a skeleton, but a bone of contention. *Bridges, 6*, 33–35.

Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria.* New York: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, E. (1984). Intake, communication, and second language learning. In S. Sauvignon & M. Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Hall, J. K., & Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-student interaction and language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 186–203.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal, 46*(4), 350–355.

Heller, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociological perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Huerta-Macias, A., & Quintero, E. (1992). Code-switching, bilingualism, and biliteracy: A case study. *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*, 69–90.

Jacobson, R. (1983). *Intersentential code switching: An educationally justifiable Strategy*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service (No: ED132 221).

Jakobsson, C., & Rydén, H. (2010). *A study of code-switching in four Swedish EFL classrooms*. Unpublished thesis, Lärarutbildningen, Malmö högskola.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in EFL classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistic Journal, 3*, 10–23.

Jørgensen, J. (1998). Children's acquisition of code-switching for power wielding. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 237–261). London: Routledge.

Kavak, İ. V. (2016). *A conversation analytic approach to the functions of learner code-switching in a university level EFL classroom in Turkey*. Unpublished MA thesis. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.

Kern, R. G. (1994). The role of mental translation in second language reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16*, 441–461.

Kharma, N. N., & Hajjaj, A. H. (1989). Use of the mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 27*, 223–235.

Kiranmayi, N. C. (2010). Code switching and code mixing in Arab students—Some implications. *Language in India, 10*(8), 153–167.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon.

Legenhausen, L. (1991). Code-switching in learners' discourse. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 29*(1), 61–74.

Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Lewis, M. (2000). Language in the lexical approach. In M. Lewis (Ed.), *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 126–154). Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 4*, 501–525. Reprinted in *The Modern Language Journal , 89*(2), 234–247 (2005).

Lin, A. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and code-switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education, 8*, 9–84.

Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (1986). *Être Bilingue*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Macaro, E. (1996). Teacher use of the target language. *Languages Forum, 1*(5), 2–7.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning, and autonomy*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), 531–548.

Macaro, E. (2003). *Teaching and learning a second language*. London/New York: Continuum.

Macdonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Cheltenham: Mary Glasgow Publications.

Markee, N. (2000). *Conversation analysis*. Mahwah: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Markee, N. (2002, April). *A conversation analytic perspective on quantification and generalizability in applied linguistics and SLA*. Paper presented to the plenary panel at the American Association for Applied Linguistics meeting, Salt Lake City.

Martin, P. (1999a). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary classroom in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education, 13*(1), 35–38.

Martin, P. (1999b). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: International practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *International Journal of Educational Management, 19*, 127–140.

Martin, P. W. (1996). Code-switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and unplanned language environment in Brunei. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*, 128–144.

Martin, P. W. (2003). Bilingual encounters in the classroom. In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & L. Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond basic principles* (pp. 67–88). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Martin-Jones, M. (2000). Bilingual classroom interaction: A review of recent research. *Language Teaching, 33*(1), 1–9.

Melo, H. A. B. (2005). Examinando a relação L1-L2 na pedagogia de ensino de ESL. *Revista Brasileira de Lingüística Aplicada, 5*(1), 159–184.

Merritt, M., Cleghorn, A., Abagi, J. O., & Bunyi, G. (1992). Socializing multilingualism: Determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. In C. M. Eastman (Ed.), *Codeswitching* (pp. 103–121). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. L. (2000). *Introducing sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mitchell, R. (1988). *Communicative language teaching in practice*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

Moyer, M. G. (1998). Bilingual conversation strategies in Gibraltar. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation*. London: Routledge.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for code-switching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muller, A., & Baetens Beardsmore, H. (2004). Multilingual interaction in plurilingual classrooms: European School practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7*(1), 24–42.

Ndayipfukamiye, L. (1994). Code-switching in Burundi primary classrooms. In C. M. Rubagumya (Ed.), *Teaching and researching language in African classrooms* (pp. 79–95). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Neil, P. S. (1997). *Reflections on the target language*. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Polio, C., & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 313–326.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in school children's conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*(1), 77–98.

Reyes, I. (2008). English language learners' discourse strategies in science instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 31*, 95–114.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schweers, C. (2002). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum Online, 40*(1), 36–43.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *Conversation analysis perspective on the organisation of L2 classroom interaction*. London: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code-switching in ELT classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 11*(8). Retrieved from: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*(1), 158–164.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 171–185.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but…. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(4), 531–40.

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the first and target languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 204–218.

Unamuno, V. (2008). Multilingual switch in peer classroom interaction. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 1–19.

Üstünel, E. (2009). *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced codeswitching in a Turkish University EFL setting*. Berlin: VDM Verlag.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Codeswitching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302–325.

Valdes-Fallis, G. (1978). Code-switching and the classroom teacher. *Language in Education: Theory and Practice, 4*, 22–26.

Van Der Meij, H., & Zhao, X. G. (2010). Codeswitching in English courses in Chinese universities. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 396–411.

Van der Walt, C. (2009). The functions of code switching in English language learning classes. *Per Linguam, 25*(1), 30–43.

VanPatten, B., & Lee, J. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wells, G. (1987). *The meaning makers: Children learning language and using language to learn*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman.

Willis, J. (1992). Inner and outer: Spoken discourse in the language classroom. In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in spoken discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Wong-Fillamore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Rawley, MA: Newbury.

Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology, 17*(2), 89–100.

Woolard, K. A. (1988). Codeswitching and comedy in Catalonia. In M. Heller (Ed.), *Codeswitching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives* (Vol. 48, pp. 53–76). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

5

Conclusion

1   Implications for Language Teacher Development

Code-switching in EFL classrooms must be both planned and strategic to be effective. Developing an optimal code-switching pedagogy is a must in today's bilingual world. As stated by Avery (2013: 6–7), "code-switching pedagogy is beneficial when planned and used strategically, but that maximizing L2 input is still a central aim of EFL classrooms". Within these parameters, code-switching can be used practically to aid language acquisition through such practices such as bilingual teacher talk, scaffolding and consciousness raising, not to mention its usefulness as a classroom management and relational tool.

There are many qualitative studies on how strategic and planned code-switching has pedagogical benefits, and Kamwangamalu (2010) states that the strategic use of code-switching can help in building classroom rapport, compensating for a lack of comprehension, classroom management, and expressing solidarity with learners. He also points to a study by Rubdy (2007) in which Rubdy describes the use of Singlish in the English classroom in Singapore as easily observable but strongly discouraged as

an obstacle to English literacy. She sets out to examine the extent of these adverse effects of teacher code-switching, but instead finds that its strategic use "empowers [teachers] to explain difficult points or concepts, to inject humor, to establish a warmer, friendlier atmosphere in the classroom, to encourage greater learner involvement" (Kamwangamalu 2010: 128).

In the literature, the practical pedagogical uses of code-switching in facilitating language acquisition are less accurately defined. Forman (2012) suggests a concept of Bilingual Teacher Talk within the EFL classroom. Teacher talk is a concept which has been emphasised throughout at EFL literature as particularly important in language teaching. Forman (2012) stresses that it is the same with code-switching in that bilingual teacher talk must always be strategic and learner-centred, and that the aim is to promote L2 language learning. Rather than prescribe how bilingual teacher talk should work, Forman (2012) puts the onus on the reflective language teacher, stating that judicious use of the L1 during bilingual teacher talk must be principled, with the causes and effects of teacher language choice easily discernible, and that the L1 should be a resource for embedding new forms from the L2. He stressed that the L1 should never be allowed too much room, however, as it could replace valuable L2 input, without which language acquisition is difficult.

The classroom extracts analysed in this book reflect that teachers provide Turkish definitions at word, phrase and sentence level when it comes to clarifying classroom activities. Another common strategy found in the data is for the teachers to give the task instructions first in English, and then to translate what has been said into Turkish (e.g., see Extract 35 in Chap. 4). Also, classroom discipline is maintained in Turkish (e.g., see Extract 40 in Chap. 4). Teachers code-switch to Turkish when there is no response to their questions in English (e.g., see Extract 15 in Chap. 4). To sum up, the trainee foreign language teachers' perception change on the relation of L1 and TL is a key issue in sustainability of continued efforts to use L1 systematically in practice.

Code-switching is not only a linguistic matter, but it also reveals a number of other dimensions about teachers' identities. These dimensions involve the way teachers define themselves professionally, teacher beliefs, teacher identity and affective factors.Code-switching is widely explored

in terms of the functions it serves in the language classroom but little is known about the relationship between such switching and the beliefs of the teachers involved. A research may be designed to address this gap. This study should aim to explore the trainee ELT teachers' thought processes in relation to code-switching. The research may involve the analysis of video-recorded EFL classroom interactions, the analysis of individual interviews with trainee teachers focusing on their views of code-switching during their teaching experience and the analysis of stimulated recall interviews with trainee teachers based on selected extracts from their EFL classrooms. Such a study would suggest that code-switching could usefully be included as a topic in foreign language teacher education programmes and also in supervisor/mentor training at foreign language teacher training departments.

Different languages play a dynamic role in the co-construction of intersubjectivity in L2 classrooms. Sert (2015: 133) argues that "translanguaging is a concept that teachers and teacher candidates should be made aware of". Rather than pretending that the institutional task of teaching an L2 is performed only through L2, the different ways in which multilingual resources are employed by teachers and learners should be explored. The findings should systematically inform trainee teachers. Without a detailed description of how different langages are enacted in classrooms, top-down language policies which lack insights from actual classroom practices will prevent us from understanding the dynamics of learning and teaching in classrooms.

2   Implications for Foreign Language Learning and Teaching

We fully understand the need to expose learners to rich linguistic data in TL as often as possible so that they rapidly acquire the appropriate patterns of interaction of their speech communities. However, L2 acquisition of English can be turned into a simpler and more enjoyable experience for learners if teachers choose to develop the new language on the conceptual base provided by the learners' L1. Enama's (2016: 27) study shows that "a structured bilingual approach that takes advantage of the

official bilingualism policy would likely improve Cameroonian EFL students' learning experience".

Following this train of thought, in the analysis of EFL classroom extracts in this book, it is observed that most of the learners seem to be aware of the academic focus of lessons, and so, make frequent use of code-switching to indicate the changes in their orientation towards general classroom interaction or individual members. They do this despite the fact that the teacher does not deliberately model or display the code-switching behaviour. Kavak (2016: 90) suggests that "the use of code-switching can facilitate successful teaching if used carefully as learners use code-switching in L2 context to organise, enhance and enrich their speech, and thus, their learning". Ignoring such a resource in language teaching would mean to take away one of learners' learning aid from them.

Reflecting on learners' use of code-switching in the classroom would be beneficial for learners who can realise their own language habits, raise awareness of their use and show how often code-switching occur. Kavak (2016: 90) suggests that "this kind of reflection in the lesson can help them understand the processes of spoken language and make them more aware of their own speech patterns". She believes that "teachers could also benefit from knowing learners' speech habits, their reasons and limitations and this would help teachers be more aware of interactional and pedagogical dynamics of their learners' learning and their teaching habits in the classroom, which, in turn, may allow them to plan their practices and classroom activities accordingly" (ibid.).

In the context of calls for a paradigm shift in L2/FL instruction (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009) and a guilt-free life in using MT in TL classrooms (Swain et al. 2011), how to use L1 systematically in multilingual environments remains a concern. The classroom extracts in this book have revealed some attempts to make systematic use of L1 for TL development. Instead of viewing L1 use as an issue of teaching technique in the classroom, the analyses show it as a mediating tool and a rich resource pool for possible positive crosslingual transfer.

Using L1 as learning/teaching resources provides scaffolding for learners. By making explicit reference to learners' conceptual understanding of L1, and by raising their conscious awareness of similarities and differences between Turkish and English, learners' existing schema can be

activated. Also using L1 as learning/teaching resources increases learning efficiency and smoothens learning process since it enables us "to learn a new language without at the same time returning to infancy and learning to categorize the world all over again" (Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 72). Taking advantage of what learners have already known conceptually, strategically and linguistically allows a "cumulative development" and "intellectual continuity" in language development, which, according to Widdowson (2003), is "so strikingly absent in our field" (cited in Butzkamm and Caldwell 2009: 242).

Butzkamm and Caldwell (2009: 73) point out that "monolingual lessons without the help of the mother tongue are extrinsically possible, however, monolingual learning is an intrinsic impossibility". In other words, "it is a waste of time," argued Swain et al. (2011: 14), "to tell learners not to use Cantonese when working through cognitively/emotionally complex ideas, as they will do so covertly if not allowed to do so overtly". When monolingual learning is proved impossible because learners' "prior knowledge is encoded in their L1", what we need to do as language teachers is "teaching for transfer" so as to take active control over the learning process through metacognitive strategies (Cummins 2007: 231–234). The classroom extracts analysed in this book serve as footnotes to these statements. Viewing L1 as potentially valuable resources instead of a mere source of interference opens up greater pedagogical space and hence may bear constructive implications for L2 instruction, especially in homogenous contexts where both teachers and learners share the same L1 and TL.

Using code-switching to establish consciousness raising is an idea which Butzkamm (2011) holds as indispensible in language learning. He points out that, since the L2 is built directly onto the L1, this should be reflected in the way languages are used in the classroom. Specifically, he pushes for the use of code-switching to allow double comprehension, where the learner identifies both forms and functions of each language. The idea is that if the learner can use code-switching to apply new L2 forms to their current L1 functions, they will then be able to extend new grammatical forms far beyond the context in which they were initially learned. Butzkamm suggests that this can be achieved through strategic repetition of any given form in both languages, or that learners be made

explicitly aware of connections between languages through mirroring forms and functions in both languages.

To explore such use of L1 in consciousness raising activities Scott and de la Fuente (2008) did an experiment in which pairs of French and pairs of Spanish learners were tasked with working out an English grammar rule embedded in a specially designed text. Half of the pairs were told not to use the L1, and the other half were told they could freely code-switch. Not only did the code-switching groups perform better, but they also found that the non-code-switching groups were using their L1, even though told not to. There was not much L1 actually spoken in the L2-only groups, but retrospective interviews revealed that many of them wasted a lot of time trying to translate what they wanted to say into the L2. The researchers conclude that even if the L1 is banned from the classroom it will inevitably still have a place in the learners' minds. They suggest making use of this as a pedagogical tool along with Butzkamm (2011).

3   Suggestions for New Research Directions

To my knowledge, there have been no published studies of the longitudinal, design-interventionist type. Also, most studies were conducted by a sociolinguist or a discourse analyst, usually an outsider coming into the classroom studying the interactional practices of classroom participants. These limitations in existing studies make it difficult for us to know what will happen if teachers and/or learners become researchers of their own classroom practices, and what will happen if they embark on systematic study of their own practices, getting a deeper understanding of their own practices through their own research and then modify their own practices with systematic action plans and study the consequences, much like the kind of action-research carried out by the teacher-researcher. Below, Lin (2013: 19–20) outlines what a future study might look like in order to achieve new insights into classroom code-switching:

1. "Longitudinal research: Instead of one-shot classroom video/audio-taping studies, we need to have studies that follow the same classroom for a longer period of time; e.g., a whole course, a whole semester.

2. Design-interventionist studies: We need to integrate the sociolinguistic interpretive and conversation analytic with the action-research approaches so that the teacher becomes conscious of trying out specific bilingual classroom strategies with respect to achieving specific sets of goals. We also need to build into the research design ways of ascertaining the degree to which these goals are achieved.

    This is similar to the mode of teacher action research. Close collaboration between teacher and researcher is also needed; e.g., the teacher is the researcher or there is close collaboration between the teacher and the researcher. Likewise, depending on the readiness of the learners, learners can also be solicited to become researchers in the study of their own bilingual classroom practices.

3. Viewing the whole lesson as a curriculum genre and investigating the role of L1 in different stages of the curriculum genre in different pedagogies: Much of the existing classroom code-switching research tends to look at code-switching instances as individual instances but not as an organic part of specific stages of aparticular kind of curriculum genre as a whole. Rose and Martin (2012), for instance, differentiate between different kinds of curriculum genres in different kinds of pedagogies. In some stages of some curriculum genres L1 might have a greater role than in other stages of the curriculum genres, and the kind of curriculum genres that are readily acceptable often depends on the kind of pedagogy dominant in the field in different eras.

4. Drawing up specific goals and designing specific bilingual classroom strategies to achieve those goals: This will require the teacher and researcher to understand the specific situated needs and goals of the educational context in which they find themselves. These educational goals need to be set up with reference to the needs and choices of participants in specific contexts, and not taken to mean any universal set of goals.

5. Drawing on research methods of genre analysis of discipline-specific academic discourses and literacies: For instance, we need to know what are the specific genre features and discourse structures of a biology course in order to design bilingual strategies to provide learners with access to biology discourses through familiar everyday discourses. There will be frequent inter-weaving between academic discourses

(mostly mediated in a less familiar language to the learners such as the L2 or the 'standard' dialect) and learners' familiar discourses (e.g.,everyday life examples and experiences mediated in learners' familiar language such as their L1 or a home dialect). How can the teacher provide access to the formal, academic (often L2) discourses through the informal, everyday, familiar (often L1) discourses of the learners' will become a key research question (e.g., Lin 2012).

6. Integrating the research of classroom code-switching with that of multimodality: e.g., to view code-switching as continuous with mode-switching (e.g., Li 2011), and to investigate how classroom participants engage in classroom code-switching, mode-switching (or analysis of multimodality) and style-switching, all of which constituting an integrated repertoire of the communicative resources of classroom participants.

7. To systematically study the effectiveness of different bilingual classroom strategies, it will require a carefully planned integration of different research paradigms (including interventionist action-research, interpretive, critical) and research approaches (including those from sociolinguistics, academic genre analysis, pedagogical analysis, analysis of learners' spoken and written samples of academic work, plus assessment of learners' mastery of academic genre features and skills in performing academic tasks using the appropriate registers).

8. Taking a holistic, contextualized approach: We need to situate the classroom in its larger socioeconomic and political contexts and to re-examine the pedagogic goals of the classroom to see if they are really serving the interests of the learners. Then we need to find out/explore possible ways to achieve these goals including (but not limited to) bilingual classroom strategies. Both traditional (e.g., teacher whole-class instruction) and progressive pedagogies (learner-inquiry groups) need to be used in conjunction with a consideration of which code-switching patterns can be intertwined with which pedagogical patterns and participant structures. All these require an approach that allows for try-and-see and then document and re-try another pattern and see

what happens and re-design future action plans that will progressively better achieve the goals through both bilingual and other pedagogical practices." (Lin 2013: 19–20).

The teachers who participated in this research used code-switching to address social situations and manage classroom discipline. More research should be carried out in other contexts to support or disregard this finding. To this end, it would be necessary to collect data from more than six classes at several universities (e.g., all those universities offering EFL courses in the west region of Turkey) or at various school levels (e.g., primary, secondary or postgraduate courses) or in a number of different countries.

It is obvious from the data that some learners in each group switch between L1 and L2 more than others. An analysis of the relationship between individual learners and the number and type of switches would be an interesting topic for potential researchers (Kavak 2016). Kavak (2016: 91) also suggests that this book can also assist in "raising the teaching practitioners' awareness on the existence and nature of code-switching in foreign language classrooms, providing teachers with a reference framework for the design of their own code-switching in the class and inviting other teachers to constantly reflect upon their own and their learners' use of languages (both L1 and L2) so as to fulfill pedagogical and communicative purposes better in their teaching."

Most of the literature on classroom code-switching focuses on the teachers' social motivations for code-switching (pedagogical or sociocultural purposes) in the classroom. However, only a few studies (Reyes 2004, 2008) deal with the learners' own motivations for code-switching in the classroom, which could differ from one social background to another. The research, which also examines learners' out-of-classroom interactions mainly during the pre-exam period and inspects their code-switching behaviour with the aim of comparing their linguistic behaviour inside and outside the classroom, will bring new insights into code-switching research.

References

Avery, T. (2013). The pedagogical potential of codeswitching. In *MA TESOL: Developing bilingualism final essay*. Sookmyung Women's University.

Butzkamm, W. (2011). Why make them crawl if they can walk? Teaching with mother tongue support. *RELC Journal, 42*(3), 379–391.

Butzkamm, W., & Caldwell, J. (2009). *The bilingual reform: A paradigm shift in foreign language teaching*. Tübingen: Narr Studienbücher.

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 221–240.

Enama, P. R. B. (2016). The impact of English-only and bilingual approaches to EFL instruction on low-achieving bilinguals in Cameroon: An empirical study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7*(1), 19–30.

Forman, R. (2012). Six functions of bilingual EFL teacher talk: Animating, translating, explaining, creating, prompting and dialoguing. *RELC Journal, 43*(2), 239–253.

Kamwangamalu, N. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.

Kavak, İ. V. (2016). *A conversation analytic approach to the functions of learner code-switching in a university level EFL classroom in Turkey*. MA thesis. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.

Li, W. (2011). Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code- and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *TheModern Lanaguge Journal, 95*, 370–384.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2012). Multilingual and multimodal resources in L2 English content classrooms. In C. Leung & B. Street (Eds.), *'English'—A changing medium for education* (pp. 79–103). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(1), 195–218.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code switching in school children's conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*(1), 77–98.

Reyes, I. (2008). English language learners' discourse strategies in science instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 31*, 95–114.

Rose, D., & Martin, J. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Sheffield: Equinox.

Rubdy, R. (2007). Singlish in the school: An impediment or a resource? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 28*(4), 308–317.

Scott, V. M., & De La Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the problem? L2 learners' use of the L1 during consciousness-raising, form-focused tasks. *Modern Language Journal, 92*(1), 100–113.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Swain, M., Kirpatrick, A., & Cummins, J. (2011). *How to live a guilt-less life using Cantonese in the English class*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education.

Widdowson, H. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendices

Appendix I: Transcription Conventions

The transcription symbols used here are common to conversation analytic research and the system of transcription is a slightly adapted version of Atkinson and Heritage's (1984). It is important to note that:

- linguistic errors made by speakers have not been corrected. All spoken utterances have been transcribed verbatim wherever possible and no attempt has been made to turn the discourse into 'sentences'.
- the normal written uses of punctuation (full stops, question marks etc.) are not followed in this system.
- many passages are marked unintelligible. The lessons were recorded under normal classroom conditions, which meant that background noise was inevitable.

T   Teacher
L   Unidentified learner
L1 Identified learner

LL	Several or all learners
[]	Simultaneously overlapping or simultaneous utterances by more than one learner.
=	If inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and at the beginning of the next Speaker's adjacent turn, it indicates that is no gap at all between the two turn.
→	Arrows in the left margin pick out features of especial interest (code-switching patterns).
(0.3)	Numbers in parentheses indicates silence, represented in tenths of a second. Silences may be marked either within an utterance or between utterances.
(.)	A dot in parentheses indicates a "micropause", a silence hearable but not readily measurable ordinarily less than 2/10 of a second.
?	A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
::	Colons are used to indicate the stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching.
-	A hyphen after a word or part of a word indicates a cut-off or self-interruption.
↑	This arrow is used to indicate some form of stress or emphasis, either by increased loudness or higher pitch.
(())	Double parentheses are used to mark transcriber's description of events, rather than representations of them. Thus ((cough)), ((sniff)), ((telephone rings)), ((footsteps)), ((whispered)), ((pause)) and the like.
evet [tr: yes]	Turkish words are italicised, and are immediately followed by an English translation.
° °	Utterances between degree signs are noticeably quieter than surrounding talk.
go to Miami	Capitals are used only for proper nouns, not to indicate beginnings of sentences.
CAPITALS	Especially loud sounds relative to surrounding talk.
/fʊteɪdʒ/	In the case of inaccurate pronunciation of an English word, an approximation of the sound is given by using the International Phonetic Alphabet between slashes.

References

Atkinson, J., & Heritage, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Structures of social action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix II: Functions of Learner-Only Code-Switching Patterns

Code-switching for curriculum access	Code-switching for classroom management discourse	Code-switching for interpersonal relations
Evaluating the task	Floor holding during the task	Creating humour effect during the task
Shifting the topic of the task	Floor holding during the task (gaining time)	Expressing shock about the task
Emphasising the task	Telling habitual experience related to the task procedure	Expressing frustration about the task
Asking for clarification about the task	Quoting about the task procedure	Expressing surprise about the task
Asking for permission about the task procedure		
Negotiating meaning during the task		
Noticing during the task		
Resolving problems during the task		
Reiteration for clarification		
Reiteration for emphasis		
Asking for L2 equivalence during the task		

Appendix III: Functions of Teacher-Only Code-Switching Patterns

Code-switching for curriculum access	Code-switching for classroom management discourse	Code-switching for interpersonal relations
Dealing with a lack of response in L2 during the task Providing a prompt for L2 use during the task	Dealing with classroom discipline during the task Giving encouragement to participate in the task	No sample extract

Appendix IV: Functions of Teacher and Learner Shared Code-Switching Patterns

Code-switching for curriculum access	Code-switching for classroom management discourse	Code-switching for interpersonal relations
Commenting on the task Providing metalanguage information Eliciting procedural information Dealing with procedural trouble Showing comprehension Checking comprehension in L2 Scaffolding the learner Asking for L1 equivalence during the task Translating into L1 Giving L1 equivalence during the task (Dis)alignment with the task procedure Giving L2 equivalence during the task Giving L2 equivalence during the task (self-awareness) Eliciting L1 or L2 translation Emphasising the pedagogical focus of the lesson Emphasising the pedagogical focus of the lesson (self-awareness)	Asking for feedback Giving feedback Giving support about the task	Telling personal experiences related to the task Sharing group solidarity Expressing social identity

Index