Hacettepe University Journal of Education

Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi

e-ISSN: 2536-4758

Türkçenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildiği Sınıflarda Öğretmenlerin Kullandığı Dil Değişiminin İncelenmesi*

Fatma KARACA TURHAN**, Bayram BAŞ***, Osman TURHAN****

Makale Bilgisi	ÖZET
Geliş Tarihi: 14.05.2020	Yabancılara Türkçe Öğretimine (YTÖ) yönelik araştırmalar son zamanlarda göç, eğitim, vb. farklı gerekçelerle popülerlik kazanmıştır. YTÖ, yabancı dil eğitimi literatürüne farklı bir bakış açısı sunmaktadır. Bu çalışma, öğretmenlerin sınıf içinde kullandıkları dil değişiminin işlevlerini tespit etmeyi ve öğretmenlerin sınıf içindeki uygulamalarını öğretmenlerin dil değişimine yönelik genel görüşleri ile kıyaslamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu kapsamda İngilizce yönünde görülen dil değişimi değerlendirmeye alınmıştır. Veri toplama işlemi, sınıf içi gözlem, ses kaydı ve kayıtların deşifre edilmesi ve katılımcı öğretmenlerin görüşleri aracılığıyla tamamlanmıştır. Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre en sık karşılaşılan dil değişimi işlevi bir kelimeyi tanıtmaktır. Bu işlevi sırasıyla, söyleneni onaylamak, soruları yanıtlamak, etkinlik yönergeleri sunmak işlevleri takip etmektedir. Bulgulardan hareketle, öğretmenlerin çoğunlukla eğitsel amaçlarla kısmen ise iletişimsel amaçlarla dil değiştirdiği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Eğitsel amaçların çoğunlukla kelime düzeyinde kullanıldığı, iletişimsel amaçların ise çoğunlukla cümle düzeyinde örneklendiği gözlenmiştir. Son olarak sınıf içi uygulamaların ve öğretmen görüşlerinin büyük ölçüde benzerlik gösterdiği söylenebilir. Öğretmenler, sınıf içinde asgari kullanım düzeyi ile sınırlandırılması koşulu ile bazı noktalarda İngilizceyi yardımcı olarak görmektedir.
Kabul Tarihi: 10.08.2020	
Erken Görünüm Tarihi: 02.09.2020	
Basım Tarihi: 31.10.2021	

Anahtar Sözcükler: Dil değişimi, dil değişiminin işlevleri, öğretmen konuşması, Türkçe'nin yabancı dil olarak öğretilmesi, öğretmen algısı

Investigating Code-switching in Teacher Talk in Turkish as a Foreign Language Classrooms

Article Information	ABSTRACT
Received: 14.05.2020	Teaching Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) has recently gained popularity because of various reasons such as migration, education, etc. Studies investigating Turkish offer a different perspective to foreign language teaching. This study sets out to investigate code-switching functions of teacher talk in TFL classrooms and to compare in-class practices with teachers' perceptions. Within the scope of the study, English as the code-switched language was investigated. Data were collected by using semi-structured observation, audio recording, transcription of recordings, and by interviewing four teachers. Findings of this study showed that introducing a lexical item was the most frequently used function, followed by confirming, answering a question, giving instructions. The findings indicated that teachers code-switched to English mostly for educational purposes, and partly for conversational purposes. Educational purposes were mostly observed at word level, whereas conversational code-switching was mainly exemplified at sentence level. Finally, the findings showed that classroom practices and teacher perceptions mostly aligned with one another. Teachers regarded English as an ally for TFL teaching at certain points on condition that it is kept at minimum level.
Accepted: 10.08.2020	
Online First: 02.09.2020	
Published: 31.10.2021	

Keywords: Code-switching, functions of code-switching, teacher talk, teaching Turkish as a foreign language, teacher perceptions

* This article was adapted from the Master Thesis of the first author titled as "*Functions of teachers' code-switching in Turkish as a foreign language classrooms: A case study in A1 level*", under the supervision of the second author. Part of data used in this manuscript were presented orally at the 4th International Scientific Research Congress.

** Lect., Yildiz Technical University, İstanbul-TURKEY. e-mail: karacafatma@ymail.com (ORCID: 0000-0001-9665-1032)

*** Assoc. Prof. Dr., Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education. İstanbul-TURKEY. e-mail: bayrambas@gmail.com (ORCID: 0000-0003-3569-9395)

**** Res. Assist., Yildiz Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish Language Education, İstanbul-TURKEY. e-mail: osmant@yildiz.edu.tr (ORCID: 0000-0003-4800-5786)

1. INTRODUCTION

Code-switching is an essential aspect of bi/multilingual environments. It is characterized as the use of more than one linguistic variety in the same discussion or even in the same sentence. (e.g., Jacobson, 1976; Milroy & Muysken, 1995; Myers Scotton, 2005). Code-switching happens at focuses where juxtaposition of first language (L1) and second language (L2) components does not ignore a surface syntactic standard of either language and it is a delicate marker of bilingual capacity. (Poplack, 1980). As indicated by Gumperz (1982), it is significant for our comprehension of how verbal signs work in human communication. Code-switching can be seen in multilingual networks, in which speakers prefer to use their native language or a widely used language for a wide scope of aims, either deliberately or unknowingly (Sert, 2007).

1.1. Code-Switching in Language Classrooms

Viewing a language classroom as a social and bi/multilingual group, Sert (2005) states that code-switching takes place naturally in an ordinary discourse of society, which can also be applied to a foreign language classroom. From this point of view, code-switching falls within the scope of language education.

Most of the studies carried out within the scope of second/foreign language education choose English as a subject, and code-switching is not an exception. Similarly, in Turkey, many studies examine English language classrooms (Eldridge, 1996; Ataş, 2012; Horasan, 2013; Demirci, 2014; Yatağanbaba, 2014; Ustaoğlu, 2015; Raman, 2015; Kavak, 2016; Coşkun, 2016). In these studies, mother tongue is Turkish and foreign/target language (TL) is English. The language which brings the instructor and students together on the same page is naturally Turkish which is generally the native language for both parties. For this reason, teachers tend to switch to L1 (Turkish) which has been agreed upon culturally by both parties. However, in countries with more linguistic diversity, the situation may change greatly. In line with this perspective, Hall and Cook (2012) state that in many academic settings, the mutually used language is not the L1 of all pupils (e.g., even though German is likely to be used while teaching English in Germany, it is not an L1 for immigrant students).

When code-switching is examined in a classroom discourse, there are two approaches dominating the language teaching area, one of which is monolingual approach favouring use of TL as the only language to be used in a classroom, the other is bilingual approach favouring interlingual knowledge of language teachers and regarding other languages (specifically learners' L1) as allies in language classes. Over the centuries, monolingual approach has dominated the language education field.

1.1.1. Monolingual approach

Monolingual approach claims that the TL in foreign language classes should also be the language used in the classroom. By showing "a red card for the mother tongue" (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009, p. 16), this view reduces the use of L1 to none in foreign language classes. For instance, Berlitz Schools are among the strongest advocates of this approach. Building on Direct Method, "although Berlitz never used the term, but referred to the method used in his schools as Berlitz Method" (p. 12), Berlitz Schools set the classroom instruction exclusively on the TL, and therefore demonstration is promoted while translation is excluded (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). According to this approach, using the TL only is highly appreciated by foreign language instructors, and teaching without using L1 becomes almost a holy rule for them (Butzkamm & Caldwell, 2009). On theoretical grounds, Enama (2016) states that monolingual approach is grounded upon three main ideas. The first is that the teacher is not able to speak all students' native languages in linguistically diverse classrooms. Therefore, an unsuccessful transfer made at any point to the L1 prevents them from facilitating learning. The second important point takes a stand against the thought that the L1 is vital for teaching complex language forms in foreign language classes and supports that there are different ways to facilitate learning other than using a different language. The last point is that the maximum exposure to the TL is indispensable for the second language acquisition (pp. 21-22). Along the same lines, Chambers (1991) clearly states that using the TL for all conversation is clearly an indicator of a good language class. Students can observe that the TL is not only the object of course but also a powerful mechanism for managing a typical classroom. Favouring the maximum use of TL in classroom, Turnbull (2001) features a few drawbacks of depending greatly on the L1 and questions the meaning of 'maximizing' in terms of an ideal or tolerable amount of TL and the L1 use. Accordingly, teachers do not need licensing to use the L1 since they use it anyway, and allowing teachers to speak the L1 in their language classrooms would result in an excessive use of that language by numerous language teachers (pp. 531-7).

1.1.2. Bilingual approach

As can be inferred from its name, bilingual approach offers a different perspective to language teaching. Starting with "Dodson's groundbreaking work" (1967) on bilingual method, many researchers were inspired to repeat his tests entirely or to implement structurally similar comparisons of methods (Butzkamm and Caldwell, 2009, p. 21). The principle used to rationalize monolingual approach in the language classroom is criticized for being "inconclusive and not pedagogically sound" (Auerbach, 1993, p. 15) and for being irresponsible and unjustified (Butzkamm and Caldwell, 2009). Similarly, Cook (2001) argues that the rationale of the opinion that the L1 should not be used in the classroom by both parties is based on a questionable analogy with L1 acquisition, and on a doubtful classification of L1 and L2 in the brain. He further claims that the goal of maximizing learners' exposure to the L2 is noteworthy but not conflicting with use of the L1. Cook (2005) stresses out

that code-switching, instead of being avoided, may be intentionally used by the teacher for the benefit of the students. Supporting the bilingual education, Coelho (2006) suggests turning multilingualism into an advantage by recognising and embracing it in the classroom, by offering students a chance to use their native languages and learn about different languages in the classroom. Based on his research findings, Macaro (2005) highlights that code-switching has no adverse effect on the quantity of learners' L2 production, and that code-switching on condition that it is used professionally may better their L2 production. According to Cummins (2005), learning can be accomplished if teachers point out the similar and different aspects between languages and offer efficient learning techniques in cross-lingual transfer. Similarly, Sert (2005) states that some basic functions of code-switching can be useful in foreign language settings.

Teaching Turkish as a foreign language (TFL) may take place in both monolingual and multilingual settings. Knowing the demographic characteristics of the target audience provides an advantage for the teacher. It is beneficial for the teacher to speak the L1 of the target audience, but unfortunately, this is not very common in practice.

1.2. Functions of Teachers' Code-Switching: Classroom Applications

Canagarajah (1995) separates functions of code-switching into two main categories as micro and macro functions. On one hand, micro functions are separated into two sub-categories as classroom management and content transmission. Macro functions, on the other hand, are associated with socio-educational implications and question how language classes prepare individuals for bilingual communities (pp. 179-192). Saville- Troike (2003) proposes ten functions including to soften/strengthen a request/command, to intensify/eliminate ambiguity, to express a closer/more informal relationship, to establish authority in a confrontation situation, humorous effect, direct quotations, lexical need, to exclude other people within hearing, avoidance strategy, repair strategy, to make an ideological statement, to ease group boundaries (pp. 54-58). Ferguson (2003) prefers to cluster functions under three main categories as curriculum access, classroom management discourse and interpersonal relations. Recruiting code-switching as an ally in language learning environments, Sert (2005) highlights three functions as topic switch, affective functions, and repetitive functions. Macaro (2005) reports five areas in which teachers use L1: building interpersonal relationship with learners, giving complex procedural instructions for an activity, controlling pupils' behaviour, translating and checking understanding in order to speed things up, and teaching grammar explicitly. Hobbs, Matsuo, and Payne (2010) list twelve categories namely as, opening, warm-up, instructions, explanation, checking comprehension, translation, timekeeping, praise, elicitation, answering a question, correction. Cahyani, Courcy and Barbett (2018) categorize four functions which are knowledge construction, classroom management, interpersonal relations, and personal/affective meanings (p. 470).

The studies so far have revealed a great number of functions of code-switching in teacher talk. However, studies investigating code-switching in TFL teaching are lacking. TFL has been quite a trending topic in Turkey as it has been receiving an increasing number of immigrants with different linguistic backgrounds for economical, educational, etc. motivations. Regardless of their motivation, they are enrolled in a language course to learn Turkish in order to survive in Turkey. Unfortunately, similar to Enama's (2016) point of view, it is unlikely for language instructors to know the first/native language of each and every student. At this point in TFL, an educational setting where teachers may not know all students' native languages, two significant questions emerge: Can the teacher deviate from the target language in order to sustain the two-way interaction with students? If yes, can global lingua franca (Sert, 2007, Jenkins, Baker & Dewey, 2018; Biricik Deniz, Özkan & Bayyurt, 2020), the most popular foreign language in Turkey (Sert, 2007), in other words English be used as a means to teach Turkish?

Against this backdrop, this research sets out to investigate code-switching in teacher talk in TFL classrooms in Turkey. It examines English as the code-switched language. Despite the high number of studies investigating code-switching in ESL/EFL classrooms, in TFL teaching, medium of instruction and code-switching have not been investigated yet. Unfortunately, the literature does not offer any published research or findings to compare our results in TFL setting specifically. Therefore, this research is significant in offering findings from TFL teaching in terms of teachers' code-switching. Additionally, code-switched language is English in this study, which is neither teachers' nor the students' native language. From this perspective, this study offers a new point of view to language teaching, in general.

Given this overall purpose of the present research, the following research questions were addressed:
- What are the functions of teachers' code-switching to English in TFL teaching classrooms?
- What are the teachers' perceptions towards code-switching?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Participants

Native teachers of Turkish in İstanbul University Language Center were asked whether they were using English during their courses, and four teachers who confirmed to do so only when necessary were identified, based on their self-reports. Three of the teachers hold BA Degrees in Turkish and Literature department and one teacher holds a BA Degree in Comparative Linguistics. Three of them have been teaching Turkish as a foreign language for over 3 years. One teacher taught Turkish as a

foreign language abroad for nearly 3 years. Three of them were abroad for touristic motivations and for teaching. They all taught Turkish in multilingual environments. There were 70 students in total in four different TFL classes aged between 18-28 (19 students in A1.1 TFL Class, 19 students in A1.2 TFL Class, 14 students in A1.3 TFL Class, and 18 students in A1.4 TFL Class). Students were pursuing undergraduate and graduate degrees at different universities and departments in İstanbul. Based on their self-reports, they all spoke English as either a foreign or a second language. According to the findings of the research conducted by Momenian and Samar (2011) teachers of elementary level classes code-switched more than those of advanced levels. Given this information, this research is limited to A1 level of Turkish. By using purposive sampling, teachers were selected based on their preferences to use English in their courses.

2.2. Data Collection

2.2.1. Observation

In the first part of the study, teachers and students were observed using semi-structured observation in the classroom. During the observation, the researcher audio-recorded the lectures and took some notes at points which were relevant to the research questions. However, she did not participate in the activities or in the lectures. Each teacher was observed for three hours per week for two weeks by the researcher. Each observation lasted for approximately 60 minutes which is the duration of a single lesson. 24 teaching hours, approximately 1400 minutes of data were recorded in total.

2.2.2. Transcription

Audio-recordings were manually deciphered by the researchers by using Express Scribe Transcription Software. Upon finalizing the transcribed data, they were transferred to an excel file. Later, code-switched utterances of the teachers were highlighted.

2.2.3. Function list

First the literature according to teachers' code-switching functions was investigated, and functions were listed. Later, by investigating the transcribed recordings, eight functions which were related to this research were identified. Those functions are answering a question, giving instructions, correcting mistakes (Hobbs et al. 2010), humour effect, introducing a lexical item (Saville-Troike, 2003), interpersonal relations (Sert, 2005; Cahyani et al., 2018; Macaro, 2005), teaching grammar explicitly (Macaro, 2005), asking for clarification (Yatağanbaba, 2014). One more function was identified in the data, which is confirming, and added to the list.

2.2.4. Interview

In the second part of this study, semi-structured interviews were administered with teachers in order to support the data from various sources, and to gather information which could not be received through observation. They were asked six questions which were shaped by the literature and recorded lectures.

1. Which level is (more) appropriate for a TFL teacher to use English?
2. For which purposes English could be used by teachers in TFL classroom at A1 Level?
3. How often should a TFL teacher use English at A1 Level?
4. Which one is more appropriate for a teacher? Using English at word level or at sentence level?
5. How would you describe your students' reaction when you use English at A1 Level?
6. What is your opinion regarding students' use of English at A1 Level?

2.3. Data Analysis

2.3.1. Content analysis

Content analysis was administered on the transcribed data. According to Patton (2002), content analysis means exploring text for repetitive expressions of themes and tries to determine main consistencies and messages in the text. Using content analysis, functions were coded to the code-switched utterances of teachers by the researcher first, and by an independent researcher later.

Additionally, the data collected through the interviews with teachers were also analysed using content analysis. In this regard, similarities and differences in teacher views were determined. Further, data gathered from the interview and observation were compared. Through this comparison, the harmony between teachers' perceptions about code-switching and its use in the classroom was determined.

2.3.2. Descriptive analysis

Patton (2002, p. 442) states that computers could play a role in qualitative analysis as they do in statistical analysis. In order to describe the frequency of the coded data, Python software was used. Python is a programming language which lets researchers work faster and combine the systems more effectively. Using a Python script, unique functions and their frequencies in the data were listed separately and as total. This helped receive more accurate results by preventing human error.

2.4. Reliability and Trustworthiness

Krippendorff (2004) defines stability as how much a procedure is consistent after some time. It is estimated as the extent to which a specific method submits the same results on several attempts. The first and the second coding reliability results were compared by Kappa test resulting over 0.86 stability. Stability results may be the initial step of confirming the reliability of data (Krippendorff, 2004). Later, stability was supported by inter-coder reliability test scores. According to Lombard, Snyder-Duch, and Bracken (2002), researchers should use min. 50 units or 10% of the full transcription to be coded again to check reliability. For this reason, approximately 30% of the transcribed data were sent to an independent researcher for coding. The independent researcher holds a BA Degree in ELT and an MA Degree in Linguistics. She also participated in a project investigating bilingual children's production skills and coded on code-switching utterances. The results received from two coders were compared using Kappa Test resulting over 0.83 reliability. According to Lombard et al. (2002), results of .80 or greater are sufficient in most situations. Given this information and the results from stability and inter-coder reliability, it can be stated that coding used in the present study is reliable.

According to Merriam and Tisdell (2015), eight strategies for promoting validity and reliability are listed. Within the course of this research, seven strategies (named as, triangulation, adequate engagement in data collection, researcher's position or reflexivity, peer review/examination, audit trail, rich thick descriptions, maximum variation) were used actively. Given this information, it can be claimed that present research is reliable.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Functions of Code-switching

Within the framework of this research, code-switching from Turkish to English were examined, meaning that teachers preferred to use English as a medium of instruction, even though the target language and teachers' native language was Turkish. Frequency of functions in the data are displayed in Table 1. Extracts are presented below following the frequency order.

Table 1.
Frequency of Functions

Function	Frequency
Introducing a Lexical Item	309
Confirming	193
Answering a Question	149
Giving Instructions	134
Building Personal and Interpersonal Relations	76
Teaching Grammar Explicitly	61
Correcting Mistakes	58
Asking for Clarification	35
Using as a Humour Effect	22

3.1.1. Introducing a lexical item

Examples of introducing a lexical item are presented below:

T1: "Ekran means screen." [Screen means screen]
T2: "Resim nerede? picture" [where is picture? picture]
T2: "Müşteri neydi müşteri? Customer" [what's the meaning of customer? customer]
T3: "Mezuniyet yani graduation" [graduation, meaning graduation]
T3: "Yemek ne demek? Eat" [what does to eat mean? Eat?]
T4: "Arkadaşlar, bu harita. Map" [friends, this is a map. Map.]
T4: "Arkadaşlar ek, İngilizce suffix" [friends, this is suffix, in English suffix.]

This function displayed the highest frequency rate of the data. It was associated with connotations, literal translation of words to English, and differentiation of two words (i.e., dinle- [to listen] and dinlen- [to have a rest], çal- [to steal] and çalış- [to study]).

A similar function was defined as "lexical need" by Saville-Troike (2003), which can be associated with terms such as Turkish bagel for simit or Turkish pizza for pide. The function used in the present study differs from lexical need as the teachers in this study did not prefer to use translation while introducing cultural words. Lexical need was adapted as introducing a lexical item as it was in line with the data of the present research. Similarly, Hobbs et al. (2010) name translation as a function in their research. In the present research, however, translation was regarded not as a function but as a tool which serves to multiple functions. Polio and Duff (1994) examined thirteen different languages in thirteen different classes and stated that teachers may use translation for an unknown word, which supports the findings of the present research. Considering that the students were fresh beginners, and beginner levels form a basis for the intermediate and advanced levels, introducing a new lexical item has an important role among all functions.

3.1.2. Confirming

Examples of confirming are presented below:

T1: "*Kutu* ne demek?" [what does *box* mean?]
S3: "*Box*."
T1: "Evet *box*. *Kutu*." [yes, box, *box*]

T2: "Dolapta *elbise* yok. *Elbise*?" [there is no *cloth* at the wardrobe. *cloth*?]
S2: "Cloth, *clothes*."
T2: "*Clothes* evet." [clothes, yes]

T2: "Annem *ev hanımı*. *Ev hanımı*?" [My mother is a *housewife*. *Housewife*?]
S6: "*Housewife*"
T2: "*Housewife*, yani evde. O çalışmıyor." [*housewife*, meaning she is at home. She does not work]

T3: "Bu ne?" [what is this?]
S1: "*Peynir*." [*cheese*]
T3: "Evet, *cheese* yani *peynir*" [yes, *cheese*, meaning, *cheese*]

T3: "*Her ay* ne demek?" [what does *every month* mean?]
S10: "Every month"
T3: "Evet, every month. Ocak şubat mart nisan mayıs…" [yes, *every month*. January, February, March, April, May…]

Confirming displayed the second highest frequency rate of the data. It was observed in form of repetition of what the student said. By repeating the utterances of students, teachers in fact confirmed what was said. Considering that students were complete beginners, this could be interpreted as an act of boosting students' motivation and promoting their participation to the class by the teachers. Additionally, as inferred from the extracts, teachers' confirmation had a close relationship with introducing a lexical item function. Accordingly, it is possible to state that confirming uses introducing a lexical item function as a tool.

3.1.3. Answering a question

Examples of answering a question are displayed below:

T1: "Soru var mı?" [Is there any question?]
S6: "*Soru var mı?*" [Is there any question?]
T1: "*Soru var mı = Is there any question*?" [*is there any question?*]
S6: "No."

S1: "What does *senin öğretmenin* mean?" [what does *your teacher* mean?]
T1: "*Your teacher*."

S10: "*What is etmek?*" [researchers' note: no literal translation]
T2: "Etmek. *you think helper verb*. yardım *etmek*. dans *etmek*, kahvaltı *etmek*…" [(*no literal translation*). You think helper verb. To help, to dance, to (*have*) breakfast…]

T3: "A, e, ı, i, o, ö, u, ü. Bunlar *ünlü harfler*." [a, e, ı, i, o, ö, u, ü. those are *vowels*]
S7. "*Harfler?*" [*letters?*]

T3: "*Harf means letters.* These are vowels. Okay?"

S4: "*Çocuk* ne demek?" [what does *a child* mean?]
T4: "Children"

T4: "Adam denize *bakıyor* arkadaşlar." [the man is *looking* at the sea, friends.]
S8: "*Bakıyor* means?" [*looking* means?]
T4: "Look, look…"

This function displayed the third highest frequency rate of the data. It was observed right after the students' questions. Regardless of the students' language choice, their questions initiated teachers' responses in English. As can be seen from the extracts, answering a question has a close relationship with introducing a lexical item function. Accordingly, it is possible to state that the answering a question function used the introducing a lexical item function as a tool in a similar way that confirming function did. In the findings of Hobbs et al. (2010), this function was observed at a relatively low rate. Questions are asked when more information is needed on the current topic. Accordingly, when students ask questions, it signals an incomprehensible situation. At this point, teachers' code-switching can be interpreted as an act to sustain the communication between the teacher and the students.

3.1.4. Giving instructions

Examples of giving instructions are presented below:

T1: "*Now just write. After five minutes, I will explain, okay*?"
T2: "*Fill in the blanks.*"
T3: "Peki arkadaşlar *the other page*. Diğer sayfa. çevirelim." [okay friends, the other page, *the other page*, *turn*]
T3: "*Use these words…You can write, then ask each other.*"
T4: "*Course book, open page 11*"
T4: "*Bir daha* söyle. *one more time*. bir daha söyle" [*say it one more time*. One more time. *Say it one more time.*]

Code-switching in the instructions that were necessary for the activities that the teachers planned was clustered under this function. This was observed in the instructions regarding time, starting, continuing, and ending activities that are planned by the teacher, presented in the book/worksheet and in web 2.0 tools. It was also observed that the teacher gave the remaining part of an activity as homework. It is important for all students to understand that the activity is given as an assignment. Therefore, the teachers switched to English in order to make sure that students have understood the assignment. Code-switching to give instructions was observed mostly at sentence level and partly at word level, therefore it differs from other categories examined. When task-based learning is considered, communicative purposes may become of a secondary importance. Cook (2001) states that code-switching can be intentionally and efficiently used in a classroom to provide a short-cut for giving instructions and explanations. Similarly, the findings of Canagarajah (1995) show that all pre-instructional instructions are expressed in students' native language, and the instruction or activity is in the TL. Both Cook's and Canagarajah's arguments support the findings of the present study.

3.1.5. Building personal and interpersonal relations

Examples of building personal and interpersonal relations are presented below:

T1: "*If you are cold, you can close door.*"
T2: "*Sorry I forgot your name.*"
T3: "*I will learn Arabic. My mother knows Arabic. So, I have to learn*"
T3: "Futbol oynuyor musun? Güzel oynuyor musun? *Are you playing football?*"
[*Do you play football? Do you play well?*]
T4: "Ben Bursalıyım. *Do you know Bursa? Next to Yalova*"
[*I am from Bursa.*]
T4: "*You miss your child?* Allah sabır versin. Senin çocuğun Türkiyeye gelecek mi?"
[*God may give you patience. Is your child coming to Turkey?*]

When teachers communicated with the students for extra-curricular purposes, they mostly code-switched at sentence level. Interaction at sentence level makes it easier for teachers and students to get to know each other. However, the interaction in question took very short time since they mostly occurred within the course of the lesson, which made it difficult for teachers and students to get to know each other. Cook (2001) states that teachers may code-switch to make personal remarks to a student. Ferguson (2003) argues almost the same that to build rapport with individual pupils, create greater personal warmth and encourage greater pupil involvement, the teacher might switch to the local language. Similarly, Macaro (2005) found that teachers code-switched in order to build personal relations with students. Canagarajah (1995) also found that teachers used L1 when they wanted to discuss extracurricular matters like happenings in the city or in person issues. The findings of the

present study have also revealed that to build strong relationships with the students, teachers code-switched to English in their extra-curricular talks with the students.

3.1.6. Teaching grammar explicitly

Examples of teaching grammar explicitly are given below:

T1: "*Bulunma durumu.* Suffix. İngilizce *in at on.* Türkçe -de, -da. -ta, -te." [*locative case.* In English, in on at. In Turkish -da, -de, -ta, te.]
T2: "Sınıfta kim*ler* var? *Plural.* Öğrenci*ler* var." [who *are* in the classroom? Plural. Student*s are* (in the classroom)]
T3: "*For example,* yumuşak g. Okay? *in Turkish we don't start with yumuşak g.* never" [for example soft g (Turkish letter, ğ). Okay. In Turkish we don't start with soft g. never]
T3: "*Negative.* Geç yat*mı*yorum." [*negative.* I am not sleeping late.]
T4: "Bu *singular*, yani *tekil.* Bu *plural*, yani *çoğul.*" [this is singular, meaning *singular*. This is plural meaning *plural*]
T4: "*Geniş zaman.* yani *present simple* arkadaşlar." [*present simple tense*, meaning present simple friends.]

Teachers code-switched to teach grammar explicitly, mostly at word level. Accordingly, instead of explaining Turkish grammar rules in English, teachers provided English equivalents of grammar rules. Thus, they used English to boost learning. Macaro (2005) found out that teachers code-switched in order to teach grammar explicitly. Polio and Duff (1994) pointed out participant teachers' unwillingness to teach grammar in the target language at the beginner level, because students would not understand a word. Krashen (1985) proposed comprehensible input and i+1 rule in a language education, which mainly stated that information regarding the language should be understandable, should start with something similar yet should be challenging for the child. In line with these arguments, considering that Turkish and its grammar together displayed a challenge to the students, it was a practical solution for teachers to explain a structure which students do not know by utilizing something that they were already familiar to. In this study, teachers switched to English from time to time in their explanations about grammar in order to make it comprehensible for students. Considering that students came across specific cases (i.e., sentence structure, pronunciation and spelling rules) of Turkish for the first time, it is an important result that teachers code-switched to English to facilitate students' learning by moving to a mutual area which is familiar to students.

3.1.7. Correcting mistakes

Examples of correcting mistakes are given below:

T1: "Kitapçı" [bookseller]
S6: "Aaaa library."
T1: "Not library. Library is kütüphane. Kitapçı is bookseller" [not library. Library is *library*. *Bookseller* is bookseller]

S3: "*Kurul*? what is the kurul?" [*council*, what is *council*?]
T2: "Hı? This is *kural. Rule.*" [hı? This is *rule*. Rule.]

T3: "Bu ne pillow?" [what is this? Pillow?]
S3: "Yatak?" [bed]
T3: "Yatak is bed. Pillow is yastık." [bed is bed. Pillow is pillow]

S13: "*Hafta içi ne yaparsın?*" [*what do you do on weekdays?*]
T3: "This is present simple tense. Present continuous *yapacaksın. Hafta içi ne yapıyorsun*?" [present continuous *you will do. What are you doing on weekdays?*]

T4: "Dizi ne demek dizi?" [what does *serial* mean?]
S4: "Film?"
T4: "Serial means *dizi.*" [serial means *serial*]

Teachers code-switched to correct students' mistakes mostly at word level. Observing the strong relationship between correcting mistakes and introducing a lexical item from the extracts, it is possible to regard this function as a continuation of introducing a lexical item. However, here the main focus is on students' mistakes. Teachers were observed to code-switch to correct students' mistakes at some points in order to prevent false acquisition. However, in some cases, teachers did not correct students' mistakes immediately, they tended to draw attention to the mistake first by repeating and emphasizing their error, and let the students correct themselves. If the students failed to do so, teachers corrected students' mistakes, eventually. Accordingly, code-switching was initiated by teachers in some cases, and by students in some other cases. Hobbs et al. (2010) showed that teachers code-switched to correct students' mistakes. Hence, it can be concluded that their findings support this research's results. Correcting mistakes is a defensive act of teachers against students' mistakes in order to prevent them to be permanent. It is of great importance in foreign language classrooms considering that the teacher is the role model and sometimes the only source of accurate information present at the classroom.

3.1.8. Asking for clarification

Examples of asking for clarification are presented below:

S5: "Pardon? Türkçe history book?" [pardon? Turkish history book?]
T1: "*Story or history*?"
S5: "Story book."

S8: "Vapur is different tekniye? tekniye?" [boat is different (an unknown word)]
T3: "*technique*?"
S8: "tekniye" (unknown word)
T3: "No this is this is *vapur*." [no this is this is *boat*.]

S5: "I will back to egypt and march"
T4: "*March?*"

In order to maintain the conversation, teachers asked for clarification at utterances that they did not understand at all, which were vague, misheard, or misunderstood. Teachers code-switched mostly at a word level for asking for clarification function. Yatağanbaba (2014) also found that English teachers code-switched to Turkish in order to ask for clarification, similar to our research. What was essential for this function was to check whether the statements made by the students were understood correctly by the teacher or not.

3.1.9. Using as a humour effect

Examples of using as a humour effect are presented below:

T2: "Turkish style." (teacher bites the battery of a remote control to make it work)
T3: "*Elma*. Iphone. Apple. Ha ha ha!" [*apple*]
T4: "I love you I love you. Do you love me yes I do. I love you I love you, do you love me… If you love me kiss me kiss me. If you want me tell me tell me." (lyrics of a very old English song of a Turkish singer)

Teachers code-switched to English to make jokes in the classroom. They code-switched both at word level and at sentence level for using as a humour effect function. Harbord (1992) investigated teachers' code-switching and stated that telling jokes in L1 could be used as a strategy to facilitate teacher-student relationship. Similarly, Liu, Ahn, Baek and Han (2004) investigated code-switching in teacher talk and mentioned humour as a function. Saville-Troike (2003) also found that teachers code-switched for humour. The findings of this study showed similarities with Liu et al. (2004) and Harbord (1992), and supported Saville-Troike's (2003) findings.

3.2. Teachers' Perceptions on Code-switching

The teachers were interviewed first, and then their responses were transcribed. Content analysis was later administered on the data. Below we present and discuss their answers to semi-structured interview questions (listed in 2.2.4).

1. All teachers stated that using English at the beginner level is more appropriate than using English at the intermediate and advanced levels since using English makes it easy for both teachers and students, and helps the teacher and student comprehend one another.

T1: "It is appropriate for beginner level because at this level students may encounter difficulties in understanding the target language."
T2: "I am for the view to limit the use of English to the beginner level; English makes it easy for both teachers and students."
T3: "Beginner level is suitable, because it helps teachers and students understand each other."
T4: "It is appropriate for basic levels. Instructions regarding the course can be explained."

2. In the opinions regarding the purpose of using English, to teach vocabulary is shared by all teachers and ranks at the first place. Following this, explaining grammar, and developing interpersonal communication are the objectives shared by two of four teachers. Additionally, correcting students' mistakes, answering their questions, give them moral support and motivation, encouraging peer-learning, saving time, and making announcements in class are other purposes to use English stated by the teachers. Teachers' views on the use of English are very similar to the functions identified in the observed practices. From this point of view, the opinions of teachers about code-switching are clustered around educational purposes and code-switching takes place in a pedagogical framework. Influencing the dynamics of the class in a communicative sense is considered as the purpose of code-switching use at an interpersonal dimension.

T1: "It should be used at a word level by conforming to the sentence syntax of Turkish. For instance, class+TA oturuyorum [I am sitting in the class] [+TA: Turkish locative case marker] when the meaning of class is asked. Using English at A1 and A2 levels outside the classroom may help develop communication between the teacher and students. English can be used when students need motivation. It can be used to save time in explaining a word, or to compare the grammatical structures of English and Turkish."

T2: "If teacher fails to explain them with body language, visual support etc., it can be used in expressing words. Sometimes most of the students understand an explanation without using English, but still one or two students may have difficulties. The teacher can then refer to English if it is blocking the lecture. Finally, at beginner levels, the teacher can use English to avoid misunderstandings while making a briefing in a classroom."

T3: "Teachers may use English at beginner levels to teach vocabulary."

T4: "Teachers can use English to teach vocabulary, to communicate, to let students help each other, to correct a misunderstood word, and when students do not understand the teacher."

3. Regarding how often English should be used in a lecture, three teachers stated that it should be used at a low frequency, and one teacher stated that it should be used more when compared to the other three teachers. One teacher stated that English should not be used very often and underlined that not using it at all would bring along its own negative consequences. Two teachers emphasized the importance of balancing the frequency of English use. From this point of view, it can be stated that the views of most teachers favour less use of English in TFL classes.

T1: "Not so frequently. Using English should be limited to minimum at A1 Level. But not using English at all may cause another problem. One should be very careful in maintaining a balance between English and Turkish."

T2: "A1 is a level where students push their limits on the teacher. Students' English translation request is linked to the frequency of teacher's English use. The teacher should pay attention to the limit. In my opinion, the frequency of using English should not exceed %10-15 of overall lecture.

T3: "40%. Because sometimes, no matter how hard you try, students do not understand. In such cases, English can be used."

T4: "It should not exceed %30 of overall lecture. Otherwise students will ask for English constantly."

4. Teachers believe that English should be used as short expressions rather than long sentences, and at word level as much as possible. It was stated that using long English sentences with students who have low proficiency in English or who do not speak English as a native language will affect students' language skills negatively. It is clearly mentioned that a language learning method, which proceeds through continuous sentence translation between two different grammatical structures such as Turkish and English, may cause problems for students later on at more advanced levels.

T1: "As short expressions. Because we should remain distant from other language mentalities as much as possible. We should minimize the relationship of students' mentality with other languages. It might be reduced to word level. We may use English words in Turkish sentences with Turkish suffixes i.e. "School+A gidiyorum." [I am going to school] [+A: Turkish dative case marker].

T2: "It should definitely be limited to teaching vocabulary. In the case of teaching with the translation of sentences, a student whose mother tongue is not English will think of the sentence first in his own language, then translate it into English and then express it in Turkish. Moreover, since Turkish has a reverse syntax structure in English, he will have to correct the sentence sequence when translating."

T3: "As short expressions. Because long ones may confuse students."

T4: "As short expressions, word or collocations at most. Because grammatical structure of Turkish and English is different. Additionally, if there are students with no English background, they may feel uncomfortable. Lastly, if a student begins to construct Turkish over English, it may result in confusion at intermediate or advanced levels."

5. When students' reaction to teacher's use of English in a classroom were asked to teachers, they claimed that students' responses might differ. All teachers stated that if the target audience speaks English, the English used in the classroom is welcomed. Three teachers added that if the target audience's English is insufficient, students might react to teachers' English use negatively.

T1: "Some students close themselves because they fear that they cannot understand a teacher who does not use a second language. Some do not prefer those who use a second language. If there are students who do not speak English in classes, the reason to speak English may be a reason of complaint."

T2: "Students who already know English want English translation. If majority of the class do not think so, they suppress their wish over time. Students who do not know English are not for the idea of teacher's English use. If the teacher claims that s/he knows very little English, students get scared first, but they get used to it later. Still, knowing that s/he can speak English with the teacher in an emergent situation is always welcomed by the student."

T3: "They are pretty satisfied. It is just that sometimes they get used to it and want English explanations all the time."

T4: "It depends on students. Some students are happy about it whereas some react negatively. Not all students know English."

6. Considering the attitudes and practices of teachers towards English that students use at A1 level, it is observed that teachers tend to not react negatively to students' use of English in compulsory situations. Despite not developing a negative reaction to this situation, it was emphasized that students' use of English was not encouraged. In addition, the necessity of integrating the target language to the maximum level possible was also emphasized in half of the teachers' comments. The first and most important compulsory situation to use English is when students do not understand a grammatical structure, which is common in all teachers' views. Other situations are exemplified by student's desire to confirm what s/he understands, extracurricular activities, strengthening interpersonal relationships, and asking for important information about the lecture.

T1: "They can use it when it comes to requests for personal help or what they don't understand in a grammar. However, the maximum amount of Turkish rule should always be maintained with the students..."

T2: "I am not for the idea of it unless he is stuck in a difficult situation or wants to get information about a subject. They can use it to get information about an extra-curricular and in-class (homework, exam time, etc.) situation, to ask a subject that he does not understand, and to clarify a word which he is not sure of. I try to prevent the use of English and other foreign languages over %10 in my class. I always prevent a student who understands from translating it to a student who does not understand. Because if the student mistranslates something, it will cause bad results."

T3: "It is not a big deal, on condition that it is not overused. They may use it when they have something to ask that they don't understand."

T4: "They may use it to express something that they don't fully comprehend. At this level, it is acceptable."

4. RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Code-switching is a discourse phenomenon which helps decipher and encode how languages function in human interaction. The present study has shown that teachers code-switched to English in their classrooms, and having looked at the extracts, it can be said that teachers benefited from their own and students' knowledge of English to teach another language which in this case was Turkish. Even though Turkish and English are two distant languages of different families, it can be interpreted as an exciting case in additional language teaching. Both students and teachers had a certain level of proficiency in English and teachers used it to extend their "professional repertoire" (Cahyani et al., 2018). We argue that students can be engaged and hence learning can be facilitated through intentional, controlled, and modified (institutional) code-switching on pedagogical and social grounds, on contrary to the beliefs regarding naturally occurring code-switching as a language deficit and positioning bilinguals at a disadvantaged position compared to monolinguals (for further discussion, see Wei, 2007). Bilingual environment can reinforce language learning, which will eventually lead to success on pedagogical and social forms. It should be recruited as an asset by language teachers, and bi/multilingual environment in language classrooms should be encouraged.

This study showed that teachers' code-switching behaviour served certain functions. Four out of the nine functions that were identified were student-initiated and were grounded on conversational basis, namely confirming, answering a question, correcting mistakes, asking for clarification. It showed that these functions arose with classroom dynamics. This also showed that code-switching did not follow a certain pattern (i.e., Q-A) but rather it was more interactional (i.e., Q1-Q2-A2-A1) and student-centred as it was supposed to be. In other words, teachers' code-switching was improvisational (Cahyani et al., 2018) which was an alternative and ingenious way of communication in a classroom setting. In addition to teachers' code-switching based on personal communication (i.e., humour and building inter/personal relations), it was observed that they mostly code-switched for educational purposes to boost students' learning. Educational purposes may be listed as but not limited to giving information, giving instructions, making explanations, asking questions, checking, and giving feedback, which showed diversity. At this point, interview findings supported the observation findings. According to teachers' perceptions, code-switching should be used for educational purposes mostly with these functions listed above. It is stated that communicative purposes are important, as well.

It was observed that teachers code-switched at word level generally for educational purposes, at sentence level generally for conversational purposes. Nevertheless, code-switching was used predominantly at word level. Accordingly, in addition to introducing a lexical item, which had the highest frequency rate, confirming, answering a question, correcting mistakes, and asking for clarification were also used at word level, mostly. Interview findings aligned with actual classroom practices, at this

point. Teachers believed that code-switching should be used at word level. Because students learned the TL at a beginner level, teachers tried to use the TL as much as possible, and the common language should be used minimum only in case of need and necessity. Or else the process of getting used to and learning the TL would be negatively affected. What significantly differed between classroom practices and teacher opinions was observed in building personal and interpersonal relations, giving instructions and using as a humour effect functions. According to classroom practices, teachers code-switched at sentence level for those functions; however, they did not make an exception in their comments, they all agreed to use English at word level. This exemplified a difference between theory and practice. However, it did not affect the result that they code-switched mostly at word level.

Research conducted in Turkey shows that code-switching to Turkish is observed in EFL classes for educational purposes with notable high frequency in introducing a lexical item function followed by answering a question, giving instructions, teaching grammar explicitly, giving feedback, etc. functions (Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013; Kayaoğlu, 2012; Şavlı & Kalafat 2014; Timuçin & Baytar, 2015; Ugurlu & Vardar, 2017; Yildiz & Yesilyurt, 2017), Code-switching on conversational grounds, however, remains in the background. Dominance of educational purposes and similarity of code-switching functions between TFL teaching and EFL teaching constitutes a partnership between those two areas in Turkey. Looking from the same perspective, this partnership allows the results of code-switching research in EFL classes to be applicable to TFL classes. Since there is no published research conducted on code-switching in TFL teaching, any transferrable result has great significance. The value of this study is therefore in its contribution to the literature and in its potential to set an example for further studies with which findings can be compared and further discussed.

According to the opinion of students who learn language at A1 (beginner) level, using a mutual language makes it easier to learn the target language, and code-switching boosts language learning (Mouhanna, 2009; Prodromou, 2000; Şavlı & Kalafat 2014). In the present study, teachers stated that their A1 level students wanted to benefit from English in the process of learning Turkish. At the same time, the teachers thought that A1 level was the most suitable level to use English as it facilitated understanding of and communicating in the target language. The fact that a considerable number of code-switching was applied for different functions in the classroom can be interpreted as a positive outcome, considering that the present study was restricted to A1 (beginner) level.

Teachers paid attention to the language repertoire of students and the dynamics of the classroom while code-switching. Accordingly, teachers used minimum amount of code-switching based on students' needs and allowed students to use English as well. In this regard, it can be stated that teachers had a student-centred understanding in code-switching and that although they limited the use in A1 level merely, they still regarded English as a supportive element of language teaching at specific situations.

It is very interesting for a language teacher switching to a mutual language which is neither teachers' nor students' native language. Studies investigating other possible language switches are highly recommended at this stage so that the findings and functions can be compared. In addition, this research is limited to A1 level only, examining code-switching at other levels is therefore recommended. Students' opinion on teachers' code-switching can be incorporated with teachers' pedagogical preferences. As Macaro (2005) argues, in contemporary approaches to foreign language teaching and learning, teachers endeavour to make the second language classroom a reflection of the outside world. Therefore, we should approach code-switching from a similar perspective in language classrooms. Foreign language policies should consider including code-switching which needs greater and immediate focus in foreign language teacher education curricula. Although code-switching is a natural phenomenon, it is observed to serve an educational purpose in a classroom setting. Therefore, both teachers and students should be trained about how to perform code-switching in a "systematic, principled and planned" (Macaro, 2005, p. 64) way. This research is a case study in its nature; therefore, it is limited to the cases it has investigated. What is suggested further is to observe more teachers and interview them about their perceptions in a comprehensive way. Lastly, other data collection tools (e.g., questionnaire, scale, etc.) are suggested to be used to support the data from different point of views.

Research and Publication Ethics Statement

We as the authors declare that our work is original and written by us, it has not been submitted any other journal; the data is our own; a written consent form from participants regarding observation, audio recording, and interviews, and from participant institution prior to the research is received; participation occurred on a voluntary basis and all participants had the right to comply with or refuse/terminate participation at any time during the research.

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

BB designed the research and OT edited the manuscript. FKT audio-recorded and transcribed the data, and prepared interview questions, then managed interviews. BB reviewed the existing journals' policy. FKT, BB and OT wrote and approved the final version of the manuscript. Percentage contributions are FKT: 40%, BB: 35%, OT: 25.

Acknowledgement

Statement of Interest

We as the authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

5. REFERENCES

Ataş, U. (2012). *Discourse functions of students' and teachers' code-switching: A case study in a Turkish university.* Unpublished MA Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences.

Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly, 27*(1), 9-32.

Biricik Deniz, E., Özkan, Y., & Bayyurt, Y. (2020). ELF-awareness in pre-service English language teacher education: A case study from Turkey. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 35*(2), 270-284. doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2019055867

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

Cahyani, H., de Courcy, M., & Barnett, J. (2018). Teachers' code-switching in bilingual classrooms: exploring pedagogical and sociocultural functions. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 21*(4), 465-479.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). Functions of codeswitching in ESL classrooms: Socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of multilingual & multicultural development, 16*(3), 173-195.

Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the Target Language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal, 4*(1), 27-31.

Coelho, E. (2006). Out of the box: Sharing space with English. *Essential Teacher, 3*(1), 28-31.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402-423.

Cook, V. (2005). *Basing Teaching on the L2 User. Non-Native Language Teachers. Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession.* ed. Llurda, Enric. USA: Springer. 47-61.

Coşkun, G. (2016). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin İngilizce derslerinde kod değiştirmeye ilişkin inançları ile İngilizce dersine ilişkin tutumları arasındaki ilişki.* Unpublished MA Thesis. Abant İzzet Baysal University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal.* c. 89. s.4: 585-592.

Demirci, K. (2014). *The role of code switching in English as a foreign language classes: A case study at a private k-8 school.* Unpublished MA Thesis. Bahçeşehir University, Institute of Educational Sciences.

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.

Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies. *AILA review, 16*(1), 38-51.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press.

Hall, G., & Cook, G. (2012). Own-language use in language teaching and learning. *Language teaching, 45*(3), 271-308.

Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT journal, 46*(4), 350-355.

Hobbs, V., Matsuo, A., & Payne, M. (2010). Code-switching in Japanese language classrooms: An exploratory investigation of native vs. non-native speaker teacher practice. *Linguistics and education, 21*(1), 44-59.

Horasan, S. (2013). *Code-switching in EFL classrooms: A case study on discourse functions, switch types, initiation patterns, and perceptions.* Middle East Technical University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Jacobson, R. (1976, October). Social Implications of Intra-Sentential Code-Switching. *Paper presented at annual meeting of South Central Modern Language Association.* Dallas, Texas.

Jenkins, J., Baker, W., & Dewey, M. (Eds.). (2018*). The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca.* Routledge.

Kavak, V. İ. (2016). *A conversation analytic approach to the functions of learner code-switching in a university level EFL classroom in Turkey.* Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Institute of Educational Sciences. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Kayaoğlu, M. N. (2012). The use of mother tongue in foreign language teaching from teachers" practice and perspective. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education, 32*(2), 25-35.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* Addison-Wesley Longman Ltd.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Liu, D., Ahn, G.-S., Baek, K.-S., & Han, N.-O. (2004). South Korean High School English Teachers' Code Switching: Questions and Challenges in the Drive for Maximal Use of English in Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 605. doi:10.2307/3588282

Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, J., & Bracken, C. C. (2002). Content analysis in mass communication: Assessment and reporting of intercoder reliability. *Human communication research, 28*(4), 587-604.

Macaro, E. (2005). *Codeswitching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy.* In Non-native language teachers (pp. 63-84). Springer, Boston, MA.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.

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

Momenian, M., & Samar, R. G. (2011). Functions of code-switching among Iranian advanced and elementary teachers and students. *Educational Research and Reviews, 6*(13), 769-777.

Mouhanna, M. (2009). Re-examining the role of L1 in the EFL classroom. *UGRU Journal, 8,* 1-19.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2005). *Dueling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Code-Switching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Thousand Oaks. Cal.: Sage Publications.

Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(3), 313-326.

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in English y termino en espafiol. *Linguistics, 18,* 581-618.

Prodromou, L. (2000). From mother tongue to other tongue. *TESOL Greece Newsletter, 67*, 7-8.

Raman, Y. (2015). *The origami of identities: Novice teachers' negotiation of identities through code switching.* Middle East Technical University, METU Northern Cyprus Campus-Institute of Educational Sciences. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge university press.

Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication* (3rd Ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Şavlı, F., & Kalafat, S. (2014). Opinions of Teachers and Students About the Use of Mother Tongue in Foreign Language Classes. *Turkish Studies, 9*(3), 1367-1385.

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 10*(8), 1-6.

Sert, O. (2007*). Code-Switching to English in the German as a Second Foreign Language Classroom: The Case of Turkish Learners.* Online Submission.

Timuçin, M., & Baytar, İ. (2015). The functions of the use of L1: Insights from an EFL classroom. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 23*(1), 241-252.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but…. *Canadian modern language review, 57*(4), 531-540.

Ugurlu, F., & Vardar, A. K. (2017). The Case of Instructors Using Mother Tongue in English Prep Classes. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8,* 30-39.

Ustaoğlu, Ç. (2015). *Teachers' code switching in English foreign language classrooms.* Çağ University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Wei, L. (Ed.). (2007). *The bilingualism reader*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Yatağanbaba, E. (2014). *An investigation of code switching into EFL young language learner classrooms.* Çukurova University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished MA Thesis.

Yildiz, M., & Yesilyurt, S. (2017). Use or Avoid? The Perceptions of Prospective English Teachers in Turkey about L1 Use in English Classes. *English Language Teaching, 10*(1), 84-96.