

**Volume 6/3 September 2018**

p. 106 / 120

**TEACHER CODE SWITCHING IN EFL**

**CLASSROOM: FROM A CONVERSATIONAL**

**ANALYSIS PERSPECTIVE**

**Yabancı Dil Sınıfında Öğretmen Kod-Değişimi: Konuşma**

**Çözümlemesi Bakış Açısı**

**Emel TOZLU KILIÇ<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract**

This study aimed to discover the potential effects of two types of teacher code switching- teacher initiated and teacher induced- on the pedagogical focus of the teachers. The data was gathered at Giresun University School of Foreign Languages. Participants are all elementary level students and 4 classroom hours were recorded and transcribed referencing the Jefferson's transcribed system. 6 extracts, three of which are related to teacher induced code switching and the rest are representatives of teacher-initiated code switching, have been analyzed in detail to represent the research topic by employing the methods of conversation analysis (henceforth CA). Considering the data, it can be said that the teacher usually induces code switching when the pedagogical focus in on the vocabulary teaching. On the other hand, when the pedagogical focus shifts from meaning to form, the teacher usually initiates the code switching to explain the possible meanings and the accurate use of the form in the context. She switches from English to Turkish and occasionally from Turkish to English to explain a grammar pattern (i.e. can) for translating and checking the comprehension.

**Key words:** conversation analysis, teacher induced code switching, teacher-initiated code switching

**Öz**

Bu çalışma öğretmenin dil değişiminin iki türünün dersin amacını gerçekleştirmek üzerine olası etkilerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamıştır. Veri Giresun üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulunda toplanmıştır ve katılımcıların hepsinin İngilizce seviyeleri orta düzeydir. 4 ders saati kaydedilmiş ve Jefferson (2004) kodlama sistemi kullanarak veri yazıya aktarılmıştır. Üçü öğretmen başlangıçlı ve diğer üçü ise öğretmen kaynaklı dil değişimi olmak üzere toplamda 6 kesit konuşma çözümlemesi yöntemiyle analiz edilmiştir. Veri analizi, öğretmen kaynaklı dil değişiminin dersin amacı kelime öğretmek olduğunda öğretmen tarafından uygulandığını ortaya koymuştur. Öte yandan öğretmen başlangıçlı dil değişiminin ise dersin amacı anlamdan kurala geçtiğinde, hedef kuralın doğru anlaşıldığından emin olmak adına uygulanmıştır. Öğretmen, dilbilgisi kuralı olan "ebilmek" kipinin açıklanmasında İngilizceden Türkçeye ve kısmen de Türkçeden İngilizceye geçiş yapmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** konuşma çözümlemesi, öğretmen kaynaklı kod değişimi, öğretmen başlangıçlı kod değişimi

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, Giresun University, School of Foreign Languages. emeltozlu28@gmail.com

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

As a form of using L1 in language classroom, code switching can simply be defined as language alteration in multilingual classroom settings employed by either learners or teachers as an interactional resource. Teacher- initiated code switches in English language classrooms have been observed in various context by looking at English in foreign language context (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005), in bilingual context (Cummins & Swain 1986;) and in multilingual contexts (Sert, 2015).

This study also depicts the link between teacher language choice and the pedagogical focus in the language learning/ teaching environment of English as a foreign language (EFL) at a Turkish state university. Focusing on teachers' language alteration in the classroom setting, the purpose of this study is to define the functions of two types of teacher code switching in fulfilling the pedagogical agenda in the foreign language classroom. With the aim of understanding the phenomenon from the participants' perspective in a naturally occurring data, CA is adopted as a research methodology to reveal the organization of L2 classroom interaction and the link between teacher code switching and pedagogical focus of the teachers. A focus on the literature relevant to the study will be provided and then data will be analyzed under two headings: teacher induced code switching and teacher-initiated code switching. At the end of each part a short discussion of the finding will be provided. In the discussion part two types of code switching and the findings will be discussed in terms of the teachers' pedagogical focus.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Code-switching and types of code switching**

Code-switching occurs when a speaker alternates between two or more languages in the context of a single conversation and it has always been an inevitable consequence of communication. Also called as code-shifting, code-choice, code-swaying, code-alternation or code-changing by various linguists, code switching has been a topic for various studies and many scholars proposed various definitions. While Gumperz (1982, p.59) defines it as "the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems", Cook (2000, p. 83) refers to it as the process of "going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same languages". According to Lightbown (2001, p.598) code switching is "the systematic alternating use of two languages or language varieties within a single conversation or utterance". Accordingly, code switching can be briefly defined as language alteration in multilingual settings and within classroom context it can be considered as various alternative use of target and mother languages either by teachers or learners.

In this paper, the term code-switching will be used to refer to the language alteration from English (L2) to Turkish (L1) and the focus will be on two types of teacher code switching. This alteration may be categorized as intersentential code -switching (i.e. switching languages across turn) or translations elicited and provided by the learners in language classrooms and intrasentential code-switching (i.e. changing languages in a turn). In other words, while intersentential switching is seen between clauses or sentences; intra sentential switching which occurs within the clauses or sentences and it is mostly at word level.

Sert (2015) mentions three camps considering the place of code switching in L2 classrooms: (1) There should be no restriction for L1; (2) considering L1 as a resource, its contribution to L2 learning needs to be clearly defined; (3) as L1 may inhibit learning, L1 should be excluded from L2 classrooms (Arnet, 2013). CA studies have revealed that learners and teacher can employ code switching as an interactional resource in language classrooms. In line with these studies, the extracts analyzed in this paper will also be an attempt to exemplify how code switching is used as a resource to facilitate the learning and teaching process in a foreign language classroom. Yet, as mentioned before, the focus will be on the teacher code switching so it can be appropriate to focus on different perspective of teachers' code switching in L2 classrooms.

## **2.2 Teachers' Code Switching and Its Types in Second / Foreign Language Classroom**

To date, target language only classroom has been open to debate and code switching has become a hot topic for scholars. Hence, different perspectives have been proposed for the various language use within second and foreign language classroom. For instance, Ellis (1984), Wong-Fillmore (1985), Chaudron (1988), Lightbown (2001), support the target language exclusivity claiming that teachers are only linguistic models who should target to create a pure foreign classroom. They also stress that code switching can result in negative transfer. Similarly, Chaudron (1988), Ellis (1984), and Wong-Fillmore (1985) stress that teachers should create a target language environment in the classroom in order to make learners expose to as many functions of the second or foreign language as possible. Others like F. Chambers (1991), Halliwell and Jones (1991) and Macdonald (1993) also emphasize the necessity of target language only classroom by arguing the significance of using target language to make the language real for learners.

On the other hand, some other scholars highlight the importance and the facilitative role of L1 in the language classroom. To start with, Cook (2000, p.242) defines learners' use of their mother tongue as "learner preferred strategy" and he argues that L1 is not a barrier rather it is a resource which helps learners be more authentic users of the target language because when learners are allowed to use their mother language, they can express what they want. According to Cook (2001), the classroom is "a natural code-switching situation" (p. 406) and code switching is "a highly skilled activity" (p.408). He argues the facilitative role of L1 on explaining grammatical rules, organizing the task and disciplining the students and implementing the test. Also, he encourages teachers to use the mother tongue when the target one is difficult, and time consuming for the students to process and understand. Harbord (1992, p.350) remarks that "many ELT teachers have tried to create an EO [English only] classroom but have found they have failed to get the meaning across, leading to student incomprehension and resentment" and he 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, p.351)

To sum, scholars have different arguments in terms of the inclusion of code switching in language classroom. However, regarding the supportive arguments on using L1, this paper can also contribute the facilitative role of teacher code switching on the fulfillment of their pedagogical agenda. Accordingly, following section is devoted to the types of teacher code switching as well as their reasons and functions.

### **2.3 The Reasons and Functions of Two Types of Code Switching**

In their first conversation analysis study to examine code switching in foreign language classrooms, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) define two types of teacher code switching: teacher-initiated and teacher induced. They argue that while teacher-initiated code switching occurs when the teacher himself/ herself initiates the switching from the target language to the mother tongue or vice versa, “teacher-induced code switching occurs when the teacher uses one language in his/ her turn to encourage or ‘induce’ learners to take turn in the other language, e.g asking English for the Turkish equivalent of an English word” (p.303). According to Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) teacher code switching to L1 can occur at the beginning of the activity or during the activity when learners encounter a problem and switching to L1 can be more effective to motivate, praise and discipline the learners as it is more useful and meaningful to attract learners’ attention. Following the Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) study, Sert (2005) focuses on the emergence of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code switching in language classroom and their functions in the classroom and states that “code- switching helps a lot to create a supportive language learning environment” (p.3).

Similarly, Duff and Polio (1990) clarified one of the reasons of the uses of L1 in teacher speech is to express empathy and solidarity towards learners. They stress that by using L1, teachers can lessen the distance between them and the learners and they can show their understanding when students feel nervous or when they have problem in understanding, thereby making learners feel more relaxed in the classroom. According to Duff and Polio (1990) some of the reasons of the teachers’ code switching in language classroom are to manage class and maintain discipline, to express empathy and solidarity towards students, to translate unknown vocabulary and to help students when they have difficulty in understanding. Macaro (1997) points out the reasons of the teachers’ code-switching as giving and clarifying instructions for the classroom activities, providing feedback to students as well as translating and checking their understanding.

Considering the abovementioned functions and reasons of the teacher code switching and the related studies, it can be induced that the teachers resort to L1 mainly for teaching purposes such as grammar rule explanation and vocabulary translation, for classroom management (i.e. explaining instruction, saving time and energy) and for affective factors such as motivating learners and reducing their anxiety. Adopting a CA perspective, this paper will also be an attempt to reveal the potential role of the teachers’ choice of language on the fulfillment of their pedagogical focus in the classroom. Accordingly, the following section methodological issues will be handled.

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1 Data**

The data for this study were gathered from School of Foreign Languages at a Turkish state university. School of Foreign Languages offers one-year ELT programme for learners who are working on English language skills as an undergraduate degree. Students English language proficiency test at the beginning of the first academic year have to take one- year preparatory class. The data was taken from one of these preparatory classes. Both the teacher and the students are the native speakers of Turkish. The teacher of the class stated that they do not have to follow an official teaching method, but her aim is to encourage students to speak English during the class as much as possible. A camera was placed on the back corner of the classroom. The focus was mainly on the teacher in relation to the research topic. Participants are all

elementary level students. 4 classroom hours were recorded and transcribed referencing the Jefferson's (2004) transcription convention (see Appendix) 6 extracts out of 18 were analyzed in detail to represent the research topic.

#### 4.0 Data analysis

The phenomena were analyzed through the robust methodological underpinnings of ethnomethodological CA which aims to “describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life” (Sidnell 2010, p.1). Micro-analytic CA approach the data was employed because methods of CA uncover social actions through observing and describing turn-taking, repair, and preference organisation practices.

Six representative extracts of teacher code switching from the data are included in this paper; three of which are related to teacher induced code switching and the rest are representatives of teacher-initiated code switching. In the first part, three extracts will be analyzed to exemplify the teacher induced code switching and the findings will be discussed at the end of each extract. In the second part, three representatives of teacher-initiated code switching will be provided with discussion of the findings at the end of the part.

#### 4.1 TEACHER INDUCED CODE SWITCHING

Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) state that “teacher- induced code switching occurs when the teacher uses one language in his/ her turn to encourage or ‘induce’ learners to take turn in the other language, e.g asking English for the Turkish equivalent of an English word” (p.303). Considering this definition, I will attempt to explain teacher induced code switching and the reason of the teacher employing it in relevance to her pedagogical focus

##### Extract 4.1.1: Teacher-Induced Code Switching

- 1 T: okay (1.4) so this is the (.) compettition. †a::nd in o  
ses türkiye there are some people (.) like hadise,  
2 mu[rat boz], ebru gündeş so who: are these people?  
3 S13: [murat boz]  
4 (1.7)  
5 S13: jüri değil mi o=  
6 T: =yeah they're [the]  
7 S2: [they] are  
8 S13: jüri  
9 T: in english?  
10 S9: huh huh.  
11 T: they are the?  
12 (1.9) judges.

*+teacher writes the word on the board*

- 13 T: judge (.) like jury. okay so these people are †the jury.  
*+teacher writes the word on the board*

In line 1, the teacher starts with an example that she thinks the students are familiar with to focus on the target words. In line 4, S13 overlaps the teacher speech to show his familiarity with the example. In line 6, S13 responds in his mother tongue and he initiates code switching after 1.7 second of silence so that he analyzes the content and the action of the utterance as well as requesting clarification/confirmation through the use of L1, which actually projects the follow up turn of the teacher. Considering the next time proof procedure in conversation analysis, the question in line 3 (who: are these people?) directed by the teacher about the people in the first pair part is acknowledged as the teacher induced code switching since S13 responds to that question in his mother tongue in line 6 but he also uses a hesitation token uttered in Turkish (değil mi o) to ask for confirmation. In line 7, the teacher directly uses a confirmation token which is followed by her repair initiation to elicit the target word from the student. As his Turkish response in line 6 is confirmed by the teacher, he repeats the same answer in Turkish rather than in English. This indicates his misalignment with teacher's pedagogical focus. Therefore, the teacher asks the students to switch to English (in English?) in line 10, which is also an action of language policing (Amir & Musk, 2013). In line 12, teacher uses a designedly incomplete utterance and her 1.9-second of silence shows that she waits for eliciting the target words from the students. As no response is provided by the students, she provides the correct answer. In line 12, she puts an emphasis on the word while she is writing it on the board to mark it as a learning goal for the students and to attract their attention to it.

#### **Extract 4.1.2: Teacher Induced- Code Switching**

- 1 T: †a:::nd the people come to the (1.3)song competition they  
2 come †to (.) o ses türkiye and they †sing their songs so  
3 who are these people? ((teacher looks around the class))  
4 (2.8) they come and they sing their songs (1.1) >so< who  
5 are they?  
6 S2: şey (1.8) com-  
7 S3: °yariřmacı°  
8 T: okay in †english?  
9 Ss: heh heh heh  
10 T: so compe-ti-tion yariř†MA (.) yariřma†CI? competi†tor  

*+teacher writes the word on the  
board*

11 S2: °competitor°  
12 T: huh huh. †so they co:me they sing their song so  
13 these people are the (0.6)competitors okay.

In line 1 the teacher continues from the same example to elicit another target word from the students. In this extract she defines the target word as ‘competitor’ and she directs elicitation questions to students to help them find out the target word by themselves. In line 3, she initiates the question (who are these people?) and she looks around the class to elicit the preferred response from the students. Waiting for 2.8 second, she paraphrases sentences and the question. In line 6, S2 selects himself to take the next turn and tries to utter the word. The cut off in line 6 shows that S4 knows the correct answer, but he has difficulty in recalling. In line 7, S3 switches to Turkish and utters the word (°yarışmacı) in a low voice. In line 8, following her confirmation token, the teacher asks the students to switch to English (in ↑english?). In line 9, the students’ laughter shows that they see S3’s language choice as deviant behavior because of its misalignment with the teacher’s pedagogical focus. In line 10, the teacher provides the target word by linking them the word ‘competition’ that she knows the students are already familiar with. At the same time, she initiates the code switching to clarify the meaning by providing the Turkish equivalent of the word ‘competition’ and then she switches back to English to provide the English equivalent of the word ‘yarışmacı’. Rising intonation and emphasis on the last syllable is used by the teacher to raise students’ attention to the formulation of a word from another word while she is marking these words as a learning goal by writing them on the board.

#### Extract 4.1.3: Teacher Induced Code-Switching

- 1 T: so ↑first look at the: (.) gary’s sentence  
+ teacher shows the dialogue on her book
- 2 it says the ↑traffic is: (.) terrible (0.3)↑terrible?
- 3 Ss: korkunç
- 4 T: yeah bu(t) in ↑english (2.1) ↑terrible (.) in english?
- 5 ↑can you tell me in english  
+teacher writes the word " terrible " on the board  
for 3.7 seconds.
- 6 S2: (dangerous)°felan° olabilir mi
- 7 (0.6)
- 8 T: kind of
- 9 S1: °dangerous°
- 10 S12: dangerous:=
- 11 T: =no:: >no no no<
- 12 S2: şey::
- 13 T: it means it is very (.)very bad:(2.1) it’s very bad(.)
- 14 it is ↑terrible okay↓ (1.2)

In line 1, the teacher shows the dialogue in her book to attract the students’ attention and in line 2, she does not directly ask a question to elicit the meaning of the word ‘terrible’ but she marks the word by raising the intonation and emphasizing the word

that encourages the students to switch to Turkish. In unison, a group of students respond with (korkunç) simultaneously in Turkish. In line 4, the teacher provides a confirmation token (yeah) but the nature of her dispreferred response is marked with the opposite conjunction (but) which precedes an action of language policing. In line 4, 2.1 second of silence indicates the teacher's wait time (Walsh & Li, 2013) to elicit a response in the target language. The teacher repeats the word and raises her intonation to invite learners to give the answer in English. In line 5, the repetition of the question by the teacher signals the trouble in the interaction that prevents the aim of the teacher from proceeding. Thus, she modifies the linguistic form in the L2 to clarify the question and pedagogical focus and writes the word 'terrible' on the board to mark it as a learning goal for the students. In line 6, S2's response (dangerous) is an overt instance of hesitancy as it follows a code mixing ('felan olabilir mi') and the following 0.6 second of gap and the utterance (kind of) in line 8 displays the teacher's dispreference one more time. In line 9 another student, S1 utters the word ('dangerous') silently that shows his hesitation in answering. When the same dispreferred utterance is provided by one other student S12 in line 10, the teacher provides an explicit correction right after his response as it is latched in the previous turn. In line 11, the teacher provides embodied correction for the reason that the focus of learning/ teaching is on the accuracy of the meaning of the word marked by the teacher and shows her disaffiliation to the given answer by speeding up her talk. The elongation of the hesitation marker uttered in Turkish in line 12 signals that the student has some trouble providing the answer, and in line 13 the teacher provides the correct answer and marks it as a learning goal by writing 'very bad' on the board. In line 14, the teacher repeats the marked word with raising intonation at the beginning of the word to focus students' attention to the target word one more time to ensure the uptake of the students.

Considering the analysis of the extracts from 4.1.1 to 4.1.3 it can be said that the general aim of the teacher is to make the students familiar with new vocabulary given in a specific unit within a form and accuracy context by encouraging them to participate to make the meaning clear. Instead of presenting the words to students explicitly, she uses code switching strategy to help the students induce the meaning and make the learning more meaningful for them as it can be understood from the flow of interaction. Furthermore, it is possible to claim that she does not interfere the students' response given in their mother tongue instead; she confirms the answer to encourage their participation. When she becomes sure about the students' comprehension of the meaning of the target word, she shifts back to her pedagogical focus- eliciting the target word from the students- through language policing (Amir & Musk, 2013). As it can be understood in these three extracts, the teacher deploys teacher induced code switching strategy whether consciously or not, that is another topic need to be discussed, to make the students first be aware of the Turkish meaning of the of the target word and then she invites them to use the target language to elicit the English equivalent of it in accordance with her pedagogical agenda and the students generally show alignment with the teacher's pedagogical agenda. In this case, teacher induced code switching is deployed by the teacher to clarify the meaning, to elicit answers from students and encourage their participation.

#### **4.2 TEACHER INITIATED CODE SWITCHING**

According to Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005), teacher-initiated code switching occurs when the teacher himself/ herself initiates the switching from the target language to the mother tongue or vice versa. In this part, I will analyze three extracts from my data to



clarify the relationship between teacher-initiated code switching and the pedagogical focus of the teacher and discussion of the findings will be provided at the end of the part.

### Extract 4.2.1

- 1 T: ↑so can you go to the pa:ge one hundred and thirty two  
 2 (0.9) one hundred and thirty two (1.2) we'll look at  
 3 ↑ca:n and can't okay. so you'll here part five a(1.2)our  
 ((The teachers shows the page to the  
 students))  
 4 first sentence say:: <i can sing> but <i ca:n't dance>  
 5 (1.1) so what does <i can sing> mean?  
 +S1 raises his hand
- 6 T: huh huh  
 + teacher points at s1
- 7 S1: er::m i sing music
- 8 T: yeah şarkı söyleyebiliyorum (0.6) yani bunun nasıl  
 9 yapılacağını biliyorum but <i can't dance> dans  
 10 edemiyorum yani bunu yapma↑yı (.) bilmiyorum↓ ok↑ay

The teacher marks the transition to a new exercise and she sets the pedagogical agenda of the activity from line 1 to line 3. In line 3, she makes the students focus on a specific sentence and in line 4 she marks the target forms by uttering them more slowly. Also, she stresses the phrase (ca:n't dance) followed by 1.1 second of silence in line 5 and she asks the meaning of the sentence to induce the translation in Turkish. As S1 raises his hand, the teacher allocates the turn to S1 by pointing at him. Displaying uncertainty with a hesitation marker at the initial position of line 7, S1 attempts to demonstrate his understanding by paraphrasing the teacher's utterance (i can sing). Even though S1 does not provide an appropriate sentence (i sing music), his utterance is oriented by the teacher in the subsequent turn with a confirmation token. Yet, she switches to Turkish for the translation of the first sentence (i can sing) to clarify the meaning with a stress on the word (şarkı). Then in line 9, she switches back to English and utters the sentence (<i can't dance>) more slowly that is followed by the translation of that sentences by the teacher to make the meaning clear.

### Extract 4.2.2

- 1 T: a:nd second sentence says <i can come on tuesday> what's  
2 <i can come on tuesday>  
3 (0.6)  
4 S3: errm [salı]  
5 S1: [salı] gelebilirim  
6 T: salı gelebilirim huh huh  
7 S1: ama çar[şamba gelicem  
8 S3: [Çarşamba  
9 T: çarşamba:?  
10 S2: çarşamba gelemem  
11 T: huh. huh. so what is the mea:ning here? salı gelebilirim,  
12 çarşamba gelemem neden bahsediyorum bi?  
13 (1.8)  
14 S2: buluşmadan  
15 (1.3)  
16 T: >no no< what's the meaning here? (1.6) salı gelmem  
17 müm↑kün (.)yani olasılık ↑var bu- i can't come (0.5)  
18 wednesday ↑çarşamba?  
19 Ss: gele[mem]  
20 T: [gel]emem bunu yapmam mümkün değil so i can come  
21 (.) it is possible (( teacher writes on the board for 5  
seconds))  
22 when i say i can come(.) it is possible bunu yapmam  
23 mümkün gelebilirim. ↑but i can't come it's ((teacher  
continuous to write on the board ))  
24 S2: impossible=  
25 T: = not possib- or it is not possible it is impossible yap-  
26 mam (.) müm-kün=  
27 S: [değil]  
28 T: [değil] okay burda gördüğümüz ikinci anlamı ilk cümledeki  
29 anlamı yapılacağını biliyor muyum bilmiyor muyum (0.9)  
ikinci anlamı mümkün ↑mü değil ↑mi.

In this extract, the teacher deals with another sentence including the same pattern 'can' and she asks the meaning of the sentence. By asking the question (what's i can come on tuesday) in line 2 she tries to induce the Turkish translation of sentence . After 0.6 second of silence S3 self-selects himself to take the turn and gives the Turkish

translation of teacher's previous utterance and his response is overlapped by S1's response in line 5 and that is followed by the teacher's repetition of the response and agreement token in line 6. In line 7, S1 initiates the turn to translate the rest of the sentence in his book and that time his response is overlapped by S3's response in Turkish. In line 9, the teacher repeats S3's Turkish word but with a questioning intonation to initiate the repair for the S1' respond in line 7. In line 10, S2 provides the repair and the correct translation of the sentence. In line 11, agreement token is followed by the teacher's switching to English and she asks the meaning of the sentence by directing a question (what's the meaning here?): that is teacher induced code switching. Then she switches to Turkish and initiates a question in Turkish to elicit the answer. In line 14, S2 gives an answer followed by 1.3 second of silence that signals the answer is dispreferred. In line 16, the teacher shows her dispreference by providing embedded correction and she repeats the question to elicit the correct answer. No response is provided by students during the 1.6 second of silence then the teacher provides the correct answer in Turkish and she switches to English and then she switches back to Turkish by uttering the word (çarşamba:?)with a questioning intonation. In line 19, the students respond in chorus and their response is overlapped by the teacher's response in Turkish in line 20 and she writes the sentence to mark it as a learning goal. In line 22, she continues explaining the meaning in Turkish and then she switches to English to match the sentence with the explanation. In line 23, the teacher initiates another meaning and the correct answer is provided by S2 in line 24, followed by the teacher's repetition of the given answer and explanation of the meaning in English and she switches back to Turkish to provide Turkish translation. In line 28, the teacher initiates the code switching to compare and contrast the two meaning of the same form 'can-can't' to ensure the students understanding.

**Extract 4.2. 3: teacher-initiated code- switching**

1 T: okay so you ↑cant (.) ↑park hereı bu üçüncü anlamımız.  
2 ↑number four?  
3 Sx: °can you help me°  
4 T: can you help me  
5 Ss: yar[dım  
6 S1: [yapabilirsin  
7 S2: yardım eder misin  
8 T: yeah can you ile başlayan bir cümle kuruyorsam ((teacher  
writes on the board))  
9 T: can you help me:, can you do this, can you do that, so it  
10 means ple::ase do it.(( teacher underlines "can"on the  
board))  
11 bir şeyi yapabilir misin bununla başlıyorsam bir  
12 şeyi rica ediyorum (.) lütfen şunu yap lütfen bunu yapar  
13 mısın okay. ↑can i: open the window can ↑i diye  
14 başlıyorsam ((teacher writes the sentences on the board))  
15 (0.8)

16 S13: sen camı aç  
17 S2: ben yapabili-  
18 S2: ben yapabilir miyim  
19 T: ↑can i open the window  
20 S2: camı [aç  
21 S13: [pencereyi aç  
22 T: bunu yapabilir miyim yani ben bunu yaparsam senin için  
23 sorun olur mu(.) okay. can i open the window(.) can i  
24 close the door bla bla so okay is it okay ((teacher  
writes on the board ))  
25 bunu yapsam sorun olur mu bunu yapabilir miyim okay? so  
26 we have <four> (.) different(.) meanings<

In line 1 the teacher starts with referring to the previous example and she repeats the target sentence and the Turkish translation to ensure the students understanding and she forms a basis for the following meaning of the same form 'can'. In line 2, she utters the number of the exercise with a raising intonation that is followed by S7's answer in line 3. The teacher repeats S7's response, and in line 5 a group of students translates the sentence followed by S1's completion in line 6 even if no initiation is directed by the teacher in her turn in line 4. S2's the correct translation of the target sentence in line 7 is confirmed by the teacher, and she switches to Turkish to explain the sentence in line 8. She provides other examples with the same meaning to ensure the students comprehension in line 9. From line 11 to line 13, she provides all the explanation in Turkish and she shifts to another sentence in different meaning in line 13 by writing the sentence on the board and again she switches to Turkish to elicit the meaning from the students. In line 16, S13 provides an answer followed by the correct translation by S2 in line 17. The repetition of the sentences by the teacher shows her dispreference and initiates repair in line 18 and S2 takes the turn to provide the correct answer and his word (aç) is overlapped by S13' response in line 21. From line 21 to line 26, the teacher initiates switching to Turkish in order to clarify the meaning and she switches back to English to support her explanation with other examples while she is writing the sentences on the board to attract students' attention. In line 25, the teacher continues to clarify the meaning in Turkish and then she switches to English to get a confirmation by uttering (okay) in a questioning intonation. Then, in line 25 she continues explaining in English by summarizing the obtained meaning of the same patter through the exercise.

As it is clear in these three extracts, the teacher's pedagogical focus is on a grammatical pattern 'can' and 'can't' and she attempts to help the students induce the different meaning of the grammatical pattern. In this case, the teacher mainly initiates the code switching rather than induce the students to switch to make the meaning clear and to ensure the students comprehension for the reason that the students' uptake of the grammatical pattern accurately is in the centre of the teacher pedagogical agenda.

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Attempts have been made to describe and classify the various reasons and functions of the code switching occurred in the classroom environment either by the teachers or by the learners. While some of the researchers argue that switching to the first language undermines the process of learning, some others believe that teachers should switch to

mother language to facilitate learning and teaching processes- that is still a heated debate.

According to the researches focusing on teacher code switching, teachers switch to other language for different purposes such as managing class, giving feedback to students, expressing empathy and solidarity towards the students, explain and clarify the instructions and grammar rules etc. This study aimed to uncover the relationship between two types of teacher code switching- teacher initiated and teacher induced- and the pedagogical focus of the teachers. Considering the data, it can be said that the teacher usually induces code switching when the pedagogical focus is on the vocabulary teaching. She encourages or induces students to switch to their mother language in order to elicit the meaning from them and also to encourage their participation even if they respond in their mother language. When she ensures the uptake of the meaning she invites the students to use the target language in accordance with her pedagogical focus that is seen in all three extracts in part 4.1. On the other hand, when the pedagogical focus shifts from meaning to form, the teacher usually initiates the code switching to explain the possible meanings and the accurate use of the form in the context. She switches from English to Turkish and occasionally from Turkish to English to explain the grammar pattern “can” for translating and checking the comprehension.

Considering these findings, it can be claimed that the teacher allocates more turns and control to the students in their learning process when the focus is on the vocabulary comprehension; therefore, she usually deploys teacher induced code switching to lead them to make the meaning clear for themselves by encouraging them to participate in the interaction. However, she prefers initiating the code switching to make the meaning clear for them when the focus is on the comprehension of grammatical pattern. Therefore, it can also be inferred that students’ understanding of target language form accurately is still in the core of language instruction in Turkish classrooms as the teacher gives much more attention to students’ accurate comprehension of the grammatical pattern. Therefore, she mainly switches to Turkish to make the meaning clear for the students and to ensure their comprehension by using their L1 and allowing them to use it.

To sum up, this paper aimed to discuss the relationship between the teachers’ choice of language and their pedagogical focus. This study has revealed that the teacher deploys two types of teacher code switching: teacher initiated and teacher- induced. While she induces code switching to encourage students to participate in the learning process to make the meaning, she initiates the code switching to provide the accurate meaning to the students when the focus is on the grammar. However, further research from different contexts is needed to support this argument.

#### 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. Cambridge University Press.
- Arnett, K. (2013). Using the first language and code switching in second language classrooms. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
- Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal, 4*(1), 27-31.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*.

- Cook, V. J. (2000). *Second language learning and language teaching*.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (1986). Linguistic interdependence: A central principle of bilingual education. *Bilingualism in education*, 80-95.
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154-166.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom Second Language Development: A Study of Classroom Interaction and Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.
- Halliwell, S., & Jones, B. (1991). *On Target: Teaching in the Target Language. Pathfinder 5. A CILT Series for Language Teachers*.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT journal*, 46(4), 350-355.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, 125, 13-34
- Jingxia, Liu. "Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom." *Open Applied Linguistics Journal* 3 (2010).
- Lightbown, P. M. (2001). L2 Instruction: time to teach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(4), 598-599.
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaborative learning and autonomy* (Vol. 5). Multilingual matters.
- Macdonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Mary Glasgow.
- Sert, O. (2005). "The Functions of Code-Switching in ELT Classrooms." *Online Submission* 11
- Sert, O. (2015). Social interaction and L2 classroom discourse. *Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press*.
- Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- 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., & Li, L. (2013). Conversations as space for learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 247-266.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input. *Input in second language acquisition*, 17-50.

---

**APPENDIX 3. JEFFERSON TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTION**


---

[ ]	Overlapping utterances – (beginning [ ] and (end])
=	Contiguous utterances (or continuation of the same turn)
<b>(0.4)</b>	Represent the tenths of a second between utterances
<b>(.)</b>	Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)
:	Elongation (more colons demonstrate longer stretches of sound)
.	Fall in pitch at the end of an utterance
-	An abrupt stop in articulation
?	Rising in pitch at utterance end (not necessarily a question)
<b>CAPITAL</b>	Loud/forte speech
—	Underline letters/words indicate accentuation
↑↓	Marked upstep/downstep in intonation
° °	Surrounds talk that is quieter
<b>hhh</b>	Exhalations
<b>.hhh</b>	Inhalations
<b>he or ha</b>	Laugh particle
<b>(hhh)</b>	Laughter within a word (can also represent audible aspirations)
> <	Surrounds talk that is spoken faster
< >	Surrounds talk that is spoken slower
<b>(( ))</b>	Analyst notes
<b>( )</b>	Approximations of what is heard
<b>\$ \$</b>	Surrounds ‘smile’ voice

---

 Adapted from Jenks (2011)