AN ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN TURKISH EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Article · December 2015

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

NUCASE- Newcastle University Corpus of Academic Spoken English View project

The Digital Kitchen project View project

AN ANALYSIS OF CODE-SWITCHING IN TURKISH EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

GÖKHAN AKKAYA
CIHAT ATAR

Abstract

This study investigates the role of code-switching (CS) between Turkish (L1) and English (L2) in Turkish EFL (English as a foreign language) classroom interaction. It aims at describing and analyzing the pedagogical functions and sequential organization of CS in teacher talk. The research draws on the recordings of four intermediate level listening/speaking lessons collected at Yildiz Technical University in Istanbul, Turkey. CS examples from the transcriptions are analyzed according to functional analyses of Discourse Analysis (DA) and sequential analysis of Conversation Analysis (CA). The findings reveal that teachers code-switch to L1 for thirteen pedagogical functions: ensuring comprehension, checking comprehension, elicitingL1 equivalent, giving expanded explanation, giving feedback, classroom management, shift to main topic, encouraging learners to use L2, for humour, dealing with procedural trouble, time management, expressing cultural identity and providing metalanguage information. The findings also show that there is a systematic preference organization in CS in teacher talk.

Key words: Code-switching, classroom interaction, functions of code-switching, Turkish learners of English, preference organization

Introduction

Throughout the history of English language teaching researchers have used different methodologies and approaches to investigate the nature of learning and teaching English. While approaches like Grammar Translation and Audio-lingual Method were

popular in early years, communicative approaches to language teaching have been dominating the language teaching practices in the recent years. However, communicative approaches and related research have failed to give necessary importance to understanding the dynamics of communication in language classrooms. This deficit in language research has been criticized harshly and new approaches for SLA research have been proposed recently (Firth and Wagner, 1994; Cook, 2002; Seedhouse, 2004). In this respect, Firth and Wagner (1997:285) accused the mainstream SLA research of 'failing to account in a satisfactory way for interactional and sociolinguistics dimensions of language'.

Following this criticism of SLA research, more emphasis has been given to understanding the actual interaction taking place in classrooms. Methods like CA, which tries to take the participants' understanding of the interaction into account, has begun to be used more commonly in second language research. This study is also a result of this recent tradition and aims to understand the dynamics of classroom interaction by investigating a commonly observed phenomenon, CS, in bilingual classrooms.

In the next parts, the rationale and focus part explains the focus of the study and the justification for doing it. Then, the Background part reviews the literature on CS in different conventions. After that the Methodology part explains the methodological considerations of this study. The analysis and discussion parts analyse and evaluate the findings from the data and finally, the conclusion finishes this article.

The rationale and focus of the research

The purpose of this study is to analyze CS in Turkish EFL classroom interaction. The study aims to fulfil this purpose by describing and analyzing CS examples in teacher talk in four listening/speaking lessons at a Turkish university. As mentioned in the previous section even though there are a number of CS studies in both classroom and out-

of-classroom contexts, they do not consider the current sociolinguistic issues in language teaching as Firth and Wagner (1997) and Seedhouse (2004) suggest and there is also a need for further research in specifically the Turkish EFL context as will be explained in the Background part. This study also uses CA to inform the analysis of CS, unlike most studies, which in turn enriches the understanding of the data.

Background

Code-switching

Code-switching which can simply be defined as 'the alternate use of two or more languages, varieties of a language, or even speech styles' (Hymes, 1977: 103) is a commonly-observed phenomenon in language teaching classrooms. One of the tensions observed in language classrooms is referred in Jacobson and Faltis (1990: 174-175) as 'the tension between the desire to use the target language exclusively and the need of the student to understand as much as possible of what is being taught'. The effects of this tension are salient in CS phenomenon.

Even though there is considerable amount of CS research in other contexts, this study builds its bases on CS studies in language classroom settings and is mainly concerned with CS in teacher talk. For this reason, the rest of the chapter will touch upon the studies related to classroom discourse.

DA Studies on CS

As mentioned above because of the word limit this section only focuses on CS in L2 classrooms, the second group of studies proposed by Ferguson (2003). In his review of discourse-analytic CS studies, Ferguson (2003:39) classifies the studies into three groups as follows:

1) 'CS for curriculum access (e.g., to help pupils understand the subject matter)'

2) 'CS for classroom management discourse (e.g., to motivate and praise pupils and to signal a change of footing)'

3) 'CS for interpersonal relations (e.g., to negotiate different identities)'

One example is Qian et al. (2009). They investigated CS between Chinese and English in a primary school in China. In their study, they analyzed 20 video-taped lessons from grades 1-4. The study reveals three broad categories of CS functions, namely methodological, social and multiple functions (see Qian *et al*., 2009). The results also suggest that a suitable amount of CS can improve positive habits of learning and strengthen teacher-student relationship. However, what this suitable amount is is unknown.

Sert (2005) also critically evaluates the functions of teacher CS and he suggests that opposed to the commonly believed idea, in communicative language teaching approach basically, that CS jeopardizes language learning process, it can foster classroom interaction and language teaching if it is used effectively. However, he also warns that if teachers fail to prevent possible negative outcomes of CS, such as using L1 too frequently, learners may have problems in long term. In the same vein, Raschka et al. (2009:170) suggests that " 'English-only' is a lazy rule in that we do not have to think about when and where CS is valid and useful and where and when it is pedagogically invalid and less than useful".

All these DA studies converge in that CS in teacher talk can serve different pedagogical and non-pedagogical functions and it can be supportive for learning and teaching process if it is used cautiously and efficiently. However, how exactly this can be achieved is not answered clearly. In addition, these studies imply that CS can be inevitable for teachers in most of the situations (Ustunel, 2004).

CA Studies on CS

A conversation-analytic approach to study SLA concepts does not have a long history. An increase in such studies has been observed after Firth and Wagner's (1997) seminal work in which they criticize SLA studies for the lack of emic approach and ignoring the social and contextual aspects of language learning.

The earliest example –on CS- is Ustunel (2004) who recorded six beginner level English classrooms in Izmir, Turkey. She analyzed the data from lessons according to sequential analysis of CA. She scrutinized the CS instances by asking the basic question of CA which is *"why that, in that language, right now?"* (p.1). The findings reveal that there is an order in terms of preference organization in teachers' CS. It is also found that teachers code-switch to L1 to repair trouble if students give a pause of more than one second before replying to a teacher's question. She concludes that using the L1 is inevitable for teachers in most of the situations and it can be harder for students not to code-switch in EFL classrooms. For this reason she recommends using both L1 and L2 in EFL contexts.

After this first attempt, there have been other similar studies on CS using CA. For instance, Ziegler et al. (2012) analyzed the multilingual resources used by plurilingual teachers and students in Luxemburg. Using data obtained from two English language classrooms, they provided examples of students' use of multilingual resources and how teachers manage next turns. The findings suggest that students utilize multilingual resources in accordance with pedagogical focus in classroom discourse.

Lastly, Lehti-Eklund (2012) investigates the role of CS in teaching and learning Swedish as a foreign language in Finland. The study looks into learners' language choice when they repair turns. The findings suggest that learners make a distinction between their L1 and L2 in terms of repair patterns.

Code-Switching Studies in the Turkish EFL Context

One of the first studies carried out on CS in Turkish EFL setting is Eldridge (1996). In his study he describes and analyzes CS in young learners' talk in a secondary school in Turkey. He concludes that CS in language teaching classrooms is a very normal and purposeful phenomenon and it can foster language teaching and classroom interaction. Even though preventing CS in classroom can facilitate some students' learning by providing them with more opportunities of interaction in L2, it can also negatively affect the development of learners by decreasing motivation.

Sen (2010) also looks into the use of Turkish in EFL in Turkey. Using pre-observation interview and classroom observations, he describes how teachers use L1 to focus on form. The findings of the study suggest that teachers use CS in order to try and ensure understanding. The study also asserts that teachers apply to CS as a last resort when the focus is on form. The teachers in the study believe that their explanations in L1 play a reassuring role and consolidate what learners have learned in L2.

Finally, Ustunel and Seedhouse (2005) investigate CS in a Turkish university EFL classroom setting and describe the organization of CS using CA methodology. The study makes a connection with pedagogical focus and language alternation. They conclude that CS is an invaluable resource and both teachers and students can use it to maintain classroom interaction.

Methodology

Research Questions

This study aims to describe and analyze the functions of CS in teacher talk in four intermediate level speaking/listening lessons at a university in Turkey. It also aims to

investigate the sequential organization of CS in this classroom discourse. To fulfil these aims, the following research questions are posed:

i) What are the pedagogical functions of CS in teacher talk in language classrooms?

ii) What is the sequential organization of teachers' CS in these classrooms?

Participants and the Research Context

English has an EFL status in Turkey as it is not an English speaking country. The research context for this study is a school of foreign languages at a Turkish state university, Yildiz Technical University, in Istanbul, Turkey. Most of the degrees in this university have at least 30% of English as the medium of instruction. So, in order to meet the demands of their departments, students have to know English at least at intermediate level. In these intensive course the school aims to prepare students for their prospective education. Students are high school graduates who are mostly around 18-19 years old. They are almost completely from Turkey, but there are sometimes a few foreign nationals in the classrooms. Their level was intermediate when the data was collected.

Data Collection

Data was collected from four ELF classrooms in Yildiz Technical University. The classes were chosen from the Basic English Department in School of Foreign Languages. The data consists of four speaking/listening lessons in four different classrooms. The data was collected from only listening/speaking lessons since these lessons are expected to create a larger amount of spoken data compared to course book, reading or writing lessons. The data was collected in April 2012 in a three-day period. The four lessons provide around 6 hours of classroom interaction in total.

Each lesson was recorded using a digital video camera. In addition, two voice

recorders, one on the teacher's desk and one among the students, were used to record the talk in different parts of the classroom. The researcher was not present in the classrooms during the recordings as this could affect the interaction in classrooms. This also helps decrease observer's paradox.

Data Analysis

There are two research methods in this study: the sequential analysis of CA and functional analysis of DA. DA is used to categorize CS examples into functions with regard to teachers' pedagogical functions. This study uses similar methods to answer similar questions asked in Ustunel (2004). In this respect, this study can be regarded as a replication of Ustunel's study as it investigates a similar context in Turkey, but as discussed in the Discussion session, this study has its own authenticity and there are also original findings. CA is also used to give a better understanding of the organization of CS in classroom discourse. The emic perspective of CA helped researchers understand participants own understanding of interaction better.

For a list of conventions used in transcriptions please see Appendix 1.

Conversation Analysis

Hutcby and Woofitt (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"*. CA is an approach to spoken language that considers it as a means of social interaction in contexts of everyday life (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974). The underlying philosophy of CA is that speech in social contexts is not static. The social contexts in which communication occurs are constantly shaped by how participants use

language. CA also studies language at micro level and it starts the analysis with an open mind. Therefore, the aim is to let the data speak for itself.

However, CA also has some limitations and there are criticisms against it as a method. One criticism is that CA can handle only very limited data and it is obsessed with locality and it ignores the general picture. As Maynard (2005: 62-63) puts it "Without explication of the larger context of that talk, CA misses the forest for the trees". This issue is addressed in Validity section and this criticism has a point. However, it was mainly in the initial years of CA that researchers purely focused on data at micro level. As explained in the Validity section, now CA also tries to make generalizations and find out patterns. Another problem with CA is that transcriptions do not fully represent the reality (Seedhouse, 2004). Transcription is only a tool for representing the reality and quite naturally it cannot account for everything in the data. But, the point of the authors is that CA is still strong in this point as CA transcriptions offer much more information about the data compared to quantitative methods such as Discourse Analysis. Finally, CA researchers tend to think that CA is a sufficient methodology on its own as it is inductive and it starts with an open mind, but it may be better to combine it with other methods to have a more valid and reliable account of data (see Hammersley, 2003). This is also a valid claim and depending on the purposes of a study, those using CA as a method should consider triangulation. In fact, in this study CA is used together with DA to make sense of the data in a better way.

The methodology of CA

The fundamental characteristics of CA are summarized by Markee (2000: 40) as follows:

i) Conversation has structure.

ii) Conversation is its own autonomous context.

iii) There is no a priori justification.

iv) The study of conversation requires naturally occurring data.

The CA framework has tools to analyze data which are Adjacency Pair organization, Turn-taking, Sequence Organization, Repairs mechanism and Preference Organization. Space precludes an account of them in this article, but see Schegloff (2007) and Liddicoat (2011) for a full account of them. The mechanisms of this framework are used throughout the Data Analysis part in order to understand the interactional organization in CS.

Discourse Analysis

DA is a methodology to address "all issues that have been dealt within the linguistic study of text and discourse" (Ostman and Verschueren, 1995). A significant concept in DA is speech acts. The Speech Act Theory developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) lists these acts as follows:

i) Locutionary act: it is literal meaning

ii) Illocutionary act: it is the intended meaning

iii) Perlocutionary act: it is what happens as a consequence of what is said

Grouping speech acts in such categories can sometimes be problematic since, as Levinson (1983) states, single sentences may perform more than one speech act. Consequently, it is not always possible to match examples of CS with only one pedagogical function in this study and CA helps better understand the phenomena. This explains why a CA-DA approach is chosen in this study.

Validity

The validity of this research depends mainly on the quality and analysis of transcriptions. The transcripts of the study were checked by both of the researchers of this article and also it was shared with some colleagues from the department who also study CA and the supervisors also checked analysis of the extracts. This study also has external validity, because as Seedhouse (2004) asserts interaction in institutional discourse is organized according to the goals of the institution. If all language classrooms are regarded to serve similar institutional goals (i.e., teaching a language), then the findings of this study may be generalized to other similar contexts.

Reliability

The reliability of CA studies rests upon the selection of the recorded data, general quality of recordings and transcripts (Perakyla, 1997). Other researchers have access to transcriptions provided in the analysis and the authors can be contacted for the recordings.

Data Analysis and Discussion

In accordance with the aim of this study, thirteen different pedagogical functions of CS in teacher's talk are identified. It is also observed that there is a systematic preference organization for specific functions. Due to space limitations of this article, only 5 of the functions which are more salient in the data will be demonstrated and analyzed in this section. Also, as a result of the word limit, the discussion will follow the analysis of the function in each extract.

The extracts analyzed here are from classes that are EFL contexts and the research context is the school of foreign languages Yildiz Technical University, in Istanbul, Turkey.

Students are high school graduates who are mostly around 18-19 years old. They are almost completely from Turkey, but there are sometimes few foreign nationals in the classrooms and their level was intermediate when the data was collected.

1) **Ensuring Comprehension**

Extract 1

```
1    T1:  so this text is a summary of the whole listening
2         text (0.5) you should understand the text first
3         (0.3) yani anlamadan not alamazsiniz cunku bu bir
4         ozet (0.3) o zaman nasil not almaliyim not almayi
5         cok iyi biliyoruz artik (.)
```

So you cant take note without understanding because this is a summary. Then how should I take note? We know how to take note very well.

```
6         there are two different architects ((grabs the pen
7         and tries to write the names of architects on the
8          board)) the first one is kuma? (0.4)and the second
9         one is from austria(0.5)something HA- wassee (0.2)
10        something like that neydi adamin adi,
11                              [((looks at the book))]
```

What is man's name?

```
12   Ss:                      [°hundertwasser°]
13   T1:                      [hundertwasser] oka:y we need
14        to take some notes (0.3) try to have some
15        adjectives (0.7) take some adjectives in your notes
16        okay? Are you ready shall we start listening again
17        right (0.5) then we will (0.3) complete the summary
18        ((starts the tape))
```

Analysis: The focus of the lesson in this extract is on two architects who clearly have different styles of construction. After listening to a text about these architects, students are expected to complete a summary of a text they have just listened to. Referring to the text on this page, T1 explains the nature of the text in line 1. Then, in line 2 she starts to give an explanation about the task, note-taking while listening and code-switches back and forth between English and Turkish. After a pause of 0.3 second in line 3, T1 translates the sentences in the first two lines**.** Then, after another short pause she starts to give an extended explanation about note-taking and shows how to do it on the board. The pedagogical function of CS in line 3 is to '*ensure learners' comprehension'* about the procedure of the task. Unlike Ustunel (2004) this function is not named as 'giving a Turkish translation' or 'dealing with procedural trouble' since this CS mainly aims to prevent a likely procedural trouble by making sure that learners comprehend how to do the task successfully. An important point to note here is that T1 code-switches to the L1 after a short pause (0.3 second) in line 3. This pause can be regarded as too short to signal a trouble on the learners' side and a close examination of the data indicates no evidence of comprehension trouble to deal with. Other examples in the data from four teachers in different classes also suggest that teachers do not give a long pause before using L1. This recurring pattern of preference organization implies that teachers code-switch to L1 without a long pause (less than half of a second) for this specific pedagogical function. The underlying motive to use L1 without any evidence of trouble could be to prevent would-be procedural troubles, consequently to save time, and awkward silence in the lesson. As teachers have been teaching these classes for a long time, they could predict the possible sources of procedural troubles and try to prevent them in advance by ensuring learners' comprehension.

2) Classroom Management

```
Extract 4

1    T3:   okay they don't have to teach but er: think
2          about these things.
3          ((S11 and S12 giggle))
4    T3:   arkadasla::r  ((with an angry intonation))
           Guys!
5    S13:  °yeter ama ya°
           It is enough!
6    T3:   murat [disari cikmak ister misin]
           Murat do you want to leave the classroom?
7    S13:        [kamerayi gordunuz simardiniz]
                 You see the camera and get spoiled.
8    S11:  °ben naptim hocam ya°
           What did I do ma'am?
9    T3:   okay think about this if they (0.3)er:: how can
10         children learn about moral values if they play games
```

Analysis: In this extract, the discussion topic is whether games should teach moral values or not. While T3 is repeating another student's opinion on the topic and trying to trigger more discussion in line 1, S11 and S12 giggle and distract T3. To deal with this problem T3 code switches to Turkish to silence students and secure '*classroom management*'. In line 5, S13 uses L1 to make fun of his friends. In line 6, T3 shows her anger by offering S11 to leave the classroom which is a strategy occasionally applied by some teachers as a last resort. In line 7, S13 refers to presence of the video camera and continues mocking S11 and S12. In line 8, S11 refuses to leave the classroom and by asking a question in Turkish, he claims that he has not done anything wrong. In line 9, T3 uses discourse marker 'okay' to shift to the main business. As can be seen in lines 4 and 6,

T3 chooses L1 to maintain classroom management. Other examples from the data also prove that teachers apply CS to deal with discipline problems which is also supported by previous studies (Ferguson, 2003; Ustunel, 2004).

3) For Humour

```
Extract 5

1    T1:   butterfly: <is a prey (0.5) for>
2    S6:   ((unintelligible utterance))
3    T1:   it is a pray ↑for (0.4) birds lets say hic de
4          kelebek yiyen kus gormedim
           I have never seen a bird that eats butterflies
5    S6:   yani
           exactly
6    Ss:   ((laughter))
```

Analysis: In this extract the focus of the lesson is to practice *there is* and *it is* by completing the blanks in a paragraph. T1 tries to teach the words *prey* and *predator*. In line 1, T1 forms a designedly incomplete utterance to elicit learner response. Unfortunately, the utterance in line 2 is unintelligible but it seems T1 does not get a proper answer. So, T2 repairs her sentence and provides the correct answer after a short pause in line 3. After starting a new sentence in English, she code-switches to the L1 in lines 3 and 4. In this CS she utilizes humour in L1, probably to make the lesson more interesting and engaging for students. S6 acknowledges this function in line 5 and the following laughter shows that T2 achieves her goal by using L1. The pedagogical function of this CS is also referred as 'to humanize the affective climate of the classroom' (Ferguson, 2003).

4) Dealing with Procedural Trouble

```
Extract 6

1          (( T4 interrupts students ))

2     T4:  arkadaslar (0.7) icinizden birisi fazla olursa eger

3          karakter olarak? biriniz dis ses olabilir.

           Guys! If there is an extra person in your group,
           one of you can be the outer voice.

4     S14: ben

           Me!

5     S15: tamam ben olurum

           Okay I will be.

6     T4:  yani(0.3)her grupta soyle ki(0.8)you know cok guzel

7          hareketler bunlar (0.9) one person (0.7) gives some

8          information to the audience about the things
           happening in

9          the on stage(0.6)hakan gelir,(0.5)kapiyi acar,(0.4)

10         anlasildi mi

           That is,in each group you know Cok GuzelHareketler
           Bunlar (a popular parody show on TV) One person
           gives some information to the audience about the
           things happening in the on stage. Hakan comes…
           Opens the door…  Clear?
```

Analysis: In this example, students are preparing for a pair-work activity. However, there is an extra student who cannot find a partner with whom to role play. Recognizing this problem, T4 interrupts students and gives a further instruction about the task procedure in line 2. She addresses this procedural trouble by code-switching to Turkish in which she offers a possible solution to solve the problem. In line 6, T4 provides a further explanation in Turkish to ensure their comprehension. She code-switches back and forth in lines 7 and 8 and finishes her turn with a comprehension check question in L1. CS in line 2 aims to *'deal with procedural trouble.'* We regard this example of CS different from the 'ensuring

comprehension' function in that this type of CS occurs after procedural trouble unlike the former one.

5) **Expressing Cultural Identity**

```
Extract 7

1      T2: now dots and boxes(0.2)ne var bizde,kek vardi(.) kek

2          miydi kek oynuyorduk soyle hatirliyor musunuz?

3      ((draws on the blackboard))

       Now dots and boxes. What do we have? It was KEK. Was it
       KEK? We used to play like this. Do you remember?

4      S10: sos hocam

           SOS teacher.

5      T2:  sos kek ne olursa

           Sos Kek whichever.

6      Ss: ((unintelligible utterance))

7      T2: sos da oluyordu kek de oluyordu so it is a board

8          game

       It was called either kek or sos.
```

Analysis: In this extract, T2 and students talk about a game called *'Dots and Boxes'*. In line 1, after a short pause of 0.2 second, she code-switches to Turkish to refer a similar game played in Turkey. Teacher's word choice in this CS (*Tr: What do we have? We used to play like this.*) serves a specific function. Using the subject pronoun *'we'*, T2 implies that she comes from the same cultural background with learners and underlines their membership in Turkish society. S10 also acknowledges this reference to identity (line 4) and this contributes to the teacher's pedagogical goal. This example shows that teachers may also use CS to 'express cultural identity' (Ustunel, 2004) in classroom interaction. As Seedhouse (2004) puts it, teachers talk a local identity into being.

These functions discussed above are in accordance with the findings of previous studies to a great extent (Ustunel, 2004; Ferguson, 2003; Rashcka et. al., 2009). While naming some functions, Ustunel's (2004) categorization was used as the starting point. However, some new functions were identified which are ensuring comprehension, giving expanded explanation, shift to main topic, humour and time management in addition to her findings. The present study confirms the findings of Sen (2010) in that teachers often code-switch for metalanguage information. However, unlike Sen the function of ensuring comprehension is not limited to focus on form instances of CS, as seen in the discussion above.

As for the sequential organization of CS in classroom interaction, the analysis of the extracts shows that there is a recurring pattern with regard to 'ensuring comprehension' function. Teachers give a very short pause (less than half of a second) or no pause at all before code-switching when the pedagogical focus is on ensuring learners comprehension of the task. It is also found that teachers use CS to repair any present or likely trouble in interaction.

A close examination of the recordings also indicates the tension which is referred by Jacobson and Faltis (1990:174-175) as 'the tension between the desire to use the target language exclusively and the need of the student to understand as much as possible of what is being taught'. It is possible that this tension is an underlying cause for most of the CS examples in this study as teachers use CS without thinking much, as evidenced by the very short pauses before CS use, and then they immediately switch back to L2.

Finally, this study agrees with Sert's (2005) position that CS is a very common phenomenon in bilingual classrooms, although it is not favourable in many English as a Foreign language settings, and the alternating use of L1 and L2 is inevitable. The analysis of the extracts shows that use of CS is not a negative thing as suggested by communicative

language teaching approaches. On the contrary, as Sert (ibid) suggests CS is one of the resources that teachers can use in classrooms for certain pedagogic goals and to improve their teaching.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to describe and analyze the pedagogical functions and sequential organization of CS in teacher talk. The research suggests that CS is used for 13 functions in this data and, for the 5 of those functions mentioned in this paper, that there is a systematic preference organization in teachers' CS. These results are categorized by DA and interactionally evidenced by CA mechanisms.

As for the limitations, the extracts provided in this study may not serve only one function, because in some cases they aim to fulfil different pedagogical goals. To minimize this problem evidence from CA analysis through adjacency pairs and next turn procedures were used. Also, as a result of the word limit parts of the article were kept very short. If detailed information is needed, the authors can be contacted.

The implication of this study is that CS is not a negative phenomenon as suggested by communicative language teaching approaches (Cook, 2002). On the contrary, it can be a valuable resource for language classrooms. However, there is a need for more studies in this area in order to understand how this can be achieved.

About the Authors

Gökhan Akkaya is a Phd student in the UK. His areas of interest are Conversation Analysis and Teacher Training.

Email: g.akkaya@newcastle.ac.uk

Cihat Atar is a third-year IPhD student in Educational and Applied Linguistics department at the School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, Newcastle University, UK. His areas of interest are Conversation Analysis, specifically repair mechanism, and Multi-competence Theory.

Email: c.atar@newcastle.ac.uk

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Clarcndon Press.

Cook, V. J. (2002) Background to the L2 user. In V.J. Cook (ed.) Portraits of the L2 User. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. (pp. 1-28).Eldridge, J. (1996). 'Code-switching in a Turkish Secondary School' *ELT Journal.* 50 (4), 303-331.

Ferguson, G. (2003). 'Classroom Code-switching in Post-colonial Contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies' *AILA Review,* 16, 38-51.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). 'On Discourse, Communication, and (some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA research.' *The Modern Language J ournal.* 81, 285-300.

Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. (1998). *Conversation Analysis: Principles. Practices and Applications.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hymes, D. (1977). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. London: Tavistock.

Jacobson, R. and Faltis, C. (1990). *Language Distribution Issues in Bilingual Schooling.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

*Lehti-Eklund, H. (2012). '*Code-switching to First Language in Repair – A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom.*' The International Journal of Bilingualism.*

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2011). *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis.* New York: Continuum.

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

Ostman, J. 0. & Verschueren, J. (1995). 'Discourse Analysis.' In Verschueren, J., Ostman, J. O. and Blommaert, J. (eds.), *Handbook of Prapmatics,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A primer in conversation analysis 1*. Cambridge, UK Cambridge University Press.

Perakyla, A. (1997). 'Reliability and Validity in Research Based on Transcripts.' In Silverman, D. (eds.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method. and practice,* London: Sage Publications.

Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). 'Codeswitching in the Primary EFL Classroom in China - two case studies.' *System* 37, 719-730.

Raschka, C., Sercombe, P. & Chi-Ling, H. (2009): 'Conflicts and Tensions in Codeswitching in a Taiwanese EFL Classroom.' *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12 (2), 157-171.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. & Jefferson, G. (1974). 'A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn-taking for Conversation.' *Language,* 50, 696-735.

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

Seedhouse, P, (2004). *Conversation Analysis Perspective on the Organisation of L2 Classroom Interaction.* London: Blackwell.

Sen, Y. (2010). 'L1 Use in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms in Turkey' *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi.* 10 (2), 161-171

Sert, O. (2005). "The Functions of Code Switching in ELT Classrooms". The Internet TESL Journal XI, no. 8. posted on 08/08/2005, http://iteslj.org/

Ustunel, E. (2004). The Sequential Organisation of Teacher-initiated and Teacher-induced Code switching in a Turkish university EFL Setting. Unpublished Doctorate of Philosophy dissertation, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Ustunel. 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.

Ziegler, G. & Sert, O. & Durus, N. (2012). 'Student-initiated Use of Multilingual Resources in English-language Classroom Interaction: Next-turn management' *Classroom Discourse*. 3 (2), 187-204.

Appendices

Appendix I

CA Transcription Conventions

Transcription Conventions (Adapted from Atkinson and Heritage, 1984)

[[ ]]   Simultaneous utterances – (beginning [[ ) and (end]])

[ ]   Overlapping utterances – (beginning [ ) and (end])

=   Contiguous utterances (Latching intra/inter turn)

(0.4)   Represent the tenths of a second between utterances

(.)   Represents a micro-pause (1 tenth of a second or less)

:   Sound extension of a word (more colons demonstrate longer stretches)

.   Fall in tone

,   Continuing intonation (not necessarily between clauses)

-    An abrupt stop in articulation

?   Rising inflection (not necessarily a question)

LOUD Capitals indicate increased volume

__   Underlined words indicate emphasis

↑↓   Rising or falling intonation (before part of word)

° °   Surrounds talk that is quieter

hhh   Audible aspirations (out breath)

·hhh   Inhalations (in breath)

.hh.   Laughter within a word

> <   Surrounds talk that is faster

< >   Surrounds talk that is slower

(what) Transcriber unsure

(( ))   Analyst's notes

$ $ 'smile voice'