

Abstract

This paper reports on a study investigating code switching (CS henceforth) attempts of fifth grade EFL young learners in their interactive changes from English to Turkish in three classrooms in two different private schools. In accordance with this aim, three intermediate level EFL classes were recorded via a video camera, each for two class hours. The class recordings were transcribed and analysed to identify when learners attempted to switch codes; what types of CS took place; what functions these CSs embodied and if these CSs by learners were of any contributions to the learning environment. Face-to-face semi-structured interviews were carried out with 20 students for triangulation purposes. The analyses revealed that students used CS while greeting, doing warm-up, using student’s book, checking homework, announcing exam results, reviewing homework and a grammar topic, playing games, practicing vocabulary and a new topic, working on notebook, doing worksheet activities, assigning homework and closing-up. The most frequently used type of CS was found to be inter-sentential CS. Moreover, students made use of CS mainly for meta-language, giving equivalence, asking for clarification, unofficial talks and translation. The analyses of interviews demonstrated that students regard CS as useful strategy for learning English. The study provided essential pedagogical implications regarding the use of native language and the need to encourage target language use in the language classrooms.

Keywords: Code-switching, EFL, Young language learners, language teaching and learning, L1

Özet

Bu çalışma 2 farklı özel okulda 3 farklı sınıfta öğrenim gören 5. sınıf öğrencilerinin İngilizce’den Türkçe’ye düzenek değiştirme girişimlerini incelemektedir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, 3 orta seviye yabancı dil olarak İngilizce dersi ikişer ders saati boyunca video kamerayla kaydedilmiştir. Ders kayıtları çevriyazılmış ve öğrencilerin ne zaman düzenek değiştirdiği; ne tür düzenek değiştirmesinin ortaya çıktığını; bu düzenek değiştirmelerinin işlevlerinin neler olduğu; ve öğrencilerin düzenek değiştirme teşebbüslerinin öğrenme ortamına herhangi bir katkısının olup olmadığı incelenmiştir. Veri üçlemesi amacıyla, video kaydı ile elde edilen veriler 20 öğrenciyle yüz yüze yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmelerle desteklenmiştir. Veri analizi sonuçları, çalışmaya katılan öğrencilerin düzenek değiştirmeyi selamlaşma, derse ısınma/ön hazırlık, öğretmenin ödev kontrolü, sınav sonuçlarının ilan edilmesi, öğretmenin ödevleri ve daha önce işlenen dilbilgisi konusunu gözden geçirmesi, oyun oynanması, kelime alıştırmaları yapılması ve yeni konunun işlenmesi, çalışma kitabındaki alıştırmaların yapılması, çalışma yaprakları etkinlikleri, ve dersin bitirilmesi sırasında kullandıklarını ortaya çıkarmıştır. En sık kullanılan düzenek değiştirme türünün cümleler arası düzenek değiştirme olduğu görülmüştür. Bulgular, öğrencilerin düzenek değiştirmeden üst dil kullanımı, İngilizce ifadelerin anadildeki eşdeğer anlamını verme, açıklama talep etme, dersteki konunun dışında konuşma ve çeviri amaçlarıyla faydalandıklarını da göstermiştir. Görüşmelerden elde edilen bulgular, öğrencilerin düzenek değiştirmeyi yabancı dil öğrenme sürecinde faydalı bir strateji olarak gördüklerini

¹ Cukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi ABD

² Ege Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu

ortaya koymuştur. Çalışma, dil sınıflarında andil kullanımı ve yabancı dil kullanımını teşvik etme konularında önerilerde bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Düzenek değiştirme, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce, Çocuklar, Dil öğretimi ve öğrenimi, Anadil

Introduction

The presence of L1 use in EFL classrooms has highly been debated for decades. The debate specifically focuses on the dilemma as to whether the use of L1 in EFL classrooms should be totally banned or used judiciously (Al-Nofaie, 2010; Grimm, 2010; Meiring & Norman, 2002; Oguro, 2011). Although some claim that using target language (TL) only is ideal for optimal learning (Kraemer, 2006; Krashen, 2003; Moore, 2002; Polio & Duff, 1994; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002), others support the view that L1 is a natural language facilitator and learning strategy, therefore it should be used purposefully. So to speak, teachers should not use L1 at the expense of optimal TL use (Cook, 2001b; Çelik, 2008; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Polio & Duff, 1994; Raschka, Sercombe & Chi-Ling, 2009).

Those who are against the use of L1 ground their views in the fact that the teacher is the only source of comprehensible input in many EFL classrooms where the students and teacher share the same L1. In their view, teachers' and students' L1 should be avoided at all costs. This strong claim takes its source from several methods, specifically Direct Method, Audio-Lingual Method, Natural Approach, and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Bruhlman, 2012; Cook, 2001b; Çelik, 2008; Meiring & Norman, 2002). Apart from methods, there are hypotheses, methods, approaches, and theoretical orientations, namely interactionism and socio-culturalism (Bruhlman, 2012) which greatly contribute to the division between proponents and opponents of using L1 in EFL classrooms. While sociocultural framework regards L1 as a valuable source of background knowledge to prepare learners for L2 input (Anton & DiCamilla, 1998), interactionist framework treats L1 as interference and claims maximal use of TL is the key to acquiring L2. The debate concerning the use of L1 in EFL classrooms has influenced and encouraged the emergence of a closely related term, *code switching* which refers to the alternation between two languages within a single constituent or discourse (Poplack, 1980). CS in EFL classrooms has been on the research agenda of language teaching and learning since the 1990s. Despite relatively new compared to those carried out in ESL contexts and bilingual education, such as immersion classrooms, studies on this phenomenon in EFL classrooms are highly affected within the circles of classroom interaction, SLA, teacher talk, conversational analysis, pragmatics and the ethnography of communication studies (Qian, Tian, and Wang, 2009). The prominence that research into CS in EFL classrooms is attributed to the claim that the use of L1 could be beneficial to learn L2 since L1 can function as a cognitive tool which helps in second language learning (Cook, 2001b; Çelik, 2008; Littlewood and Yu, 2011; Macaro, 2001; Polio & Duff 1994) and to the reconceptualization of EFL as a bilingual environment and thinking of students and teachers as potential bilinguals (Dailey-O'Cain and Liebscher, 2009, p. 131).

Empirical studies from around the world have focused on a range of aspects of CS used both by the teachers and learners in adult EFL classrooms. Some studies investigated the occasions when and the reasons why CS occurs (e.g., Liu, Ahn, Baek & Han, 2004; Ustunel, 2004; Amorim, 2012; Chowdury, 2012; Lin, 2013;) while some others revealed types of CS and functions that these types serve in the language classroom (e.g., Ataş, 2012; Bensen and Cavusoglu, 2013; Liu, Ahn, Baek & Han, 2004). There are also studies which examine the perceptions and attitudes of teachers and learners towards the employment of CS (e.g., Jingxia, 2010; Macaro and Lee, 2013; Raman and Yigitoglu,

2016) and the relationship between learners' ability level and use of L1 (Sampson, 2012). Further studies looked into the contribution of CS to such different areas of language learning process as affective support that CS provides (Ahmad and Jusoff, 2009) and vocabulary learning (Celik, 2003). Unlike a multitude of studies investigating CS in adult EFL classrooms, the amount of research into the phenomenon in young EFL language classrooms is still sparse, and that there is limited knowledge in relation to the linguistic practices of language teachers, and their beliefs about and implementation of L1 in YLL classrooms (Inbar-Lourie, 2010).

Being one of the earliest studies carried out at primary schools, Oduol (1987) investigated and teachers' CS and elicitation techniques in primary schools in Kenya. The author found out that the teachers made use of CS to continue student involvement into communication, clarify and accentuate certain aspects, solve misunderstandings, translate their instructions, re-initiate communication, build rapport, triggering pupils' background information, and use it for pupils' lack of language proficiency.

Martin (1999), for example, focused on interactional practices which took place during the lessons in the two primary schools in Brunei Darussalam. In these schools, Malay is used as an institutionally-sanctioned language along with English which is employed to cover the lessons as well. The results revealed that the teachers' use of certain question types triggered the students' language choices. The teachers used CS to lessen discontinuation between home and school, create a synergy in learning, provide contexts for meaning making, and contribute to the flow of the lesson.

Kong (2008) aimed to showcase a non-native English teacher's practice of teaching English through English in an elementary classroom. As a case study of a Korean elementary school, the study investigated the use of English in a fifth-grade EFL classroom. Findings of the study revealed that the teacher employed four modes of teacher talk: total use of L1 and TL, the use of L1 followed by TL equivalents, and vice versa. Concerning the functions of these modes of talk, these switched served as a compensation for the students' lack of language proficiency, a strategy to express how to perform tasks, clarification of instructions, a technique for classroom management, and a means of sustaining students' interest and motivation.

Moreover, Qian, Tian and Wang (2009) examined CS attempts of EFL teachers in primary classrooms carried out to demonstrate the classroom interaction of YLLs. The results showed that teachers used more inter-sentential CS than inter-sentential or tag switching. The teachers' CSs served as a discourse strategy to promote classroom interaction and sustain efficient classroom management besides translation of unknown linguistic items, clarification of unclear points, establishment of certain relationships with students, building solidarity or demonstrating authority, encouraging or praising students.

Nagy and Robertson (2009) investigated how often the teachers used the TL (English) and the L1 (Hungarian), what functions the teachers' CS bore, what factors had an impact on the teachers' language choices and lastly how these factors acted upon each other. The analyses of classroom transcriptions demonstrated that the language choices of both teachers were influenced by a number of external and internal factors. Internal factors were divided into learner-related, teacher-related and context-related aspects. Learner-related factors were age, ability, proficiency level, motivation, attitude towards the TL whereas teacher-related ones were professional experience, training, proficiency in the TL, self-confidence, beliefs about and attitudes towards the TL. Furthermore, context-related factors were listed as the phases during the lesson and the essence of the task or activity. On the other hand, external factors were elaborated upon as the curriculum,

examination, and expectations in the school, the attitudes of the head-teacher, colleagues, parents and the political context.

Investigating the language patterns of EFL teachers with different language backgrounds, Inbar-Lourie (2010) examined the teachers' use of L1 in EFL YLL classrooms. The authors suggested that the teachers employed CS mainly in order to facilitate comprehension, deal with discipline problems, introduce new concepts, explain grammatical aspects, and encourage students. In addition, Lee (2010) investigated the attitudes of English language teachers working in secondary schools in Malaysia. The types and functions of CS appropriated by the teachers were determined via a survey questionnaire which required the teachers to indicate their attitudes, usage and opinions about CS. The findings revealed that most of the teachers favoured the use of CS in their classes. They employed CS in order to give instructions, give feedback, check comprehension, explain new words, explain grammar, help students feel confident and comfortable, explain the difference between L1 and L2, discuss assignments, tests and quizzes, save time, and explain administrative information.

One of the recent studies investigated EFL teachers' use of L1 at three secondary schools in Turkish context (Sali, 2014). The analyses revealed that the teachers used Turkish to release the content of the lesson, maintain the classroom interactions, change the focus of the lesson and encourage learners through building rapport. Also, teachers' CSs from English to Turkish demonstrated changes depending on the learners' language proficiency levels, nature of classroom activities, the emotional state of learners and the heavy focus on grammar in the language teaching system. A very recent study (Khaerunnisa, 2016) presented the findings of a single case study of an EFL teacher's code switching in Indonesia. Analyses of the data showed that all of the teachers switched languages for conversational purposes and types of these switches were inter-sentential, intra-sentential, and tag switching. The functions of these code switchings mainly comprised of material explanations and task instructions, as well as to encourage and maintain discipline among the students.

Although research into CS in young EFL classrooms has shed light onto the relevant literature, most research studies examine the phenomena from the perspective of teachers' accommodation of CS in the language classroom. Eldridge (1996) pioneered the research into CS used by young language learners in a secondary school in Turkey. The analysis of data showed that the students resorted to CS for procedural matters or questions about English which were not related to the tasks. Moreover, the students employed CS with the following motivations: equivalence, floor holding, meta- language, reiteration, group membership, conflict control, alignment and misalignment. With a view to contributing to the limited amount of research mainly concerned with CS in student talk, this paper explores the instances of CS (English, L2 and Turkish, L1) employed by Turkish EFL young learners in three secondary fifth-grade classrooms. The research attempts to determine what types of CS the learners use, when they resort to CS, what functions these alternations have, and if students' use of CS contributes to the learning and teaching environment or not.

Method

This study took place in the cities of Adana and Denizli during 2012-2013 Spring Semester. Two private secondary schools were determined, and permission to record classroom interactions and hold interviews with students was granted by these schools. In order to avoid ethical issues, teachers and parents' consent for video-recording were acquired by means of a letter of consent. The participants of this study were 75 fifth grade EFL students at two private secondary schools in which English is taught as a compulsory school subject starting from the first grade. The fifth grade learners were

chosen purposefully because it was assumed that they have sufficient experience and language proficiency to express themselves and interact in English in the classroom.

Acting on Patton (1999), data source triangulation was applied to develop a comprehensive understanding of CS phenomena in the study. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools, namely video-recordings of the lessons and interviews with the participant students respectively were used. Quantitative research design was adopted to count the students' CSs and qualitative research design was employed to analyse classroom interaction transcriptions and interview transcripts in minute details. The recordings consisted of 270 minutes from three classes in total. Following the analysis of recordings, semi-structured interviews were held with 20 students to support and validate data collected from the video-recordings. The questions quoted below were asked to elicit the participant students' perspectives on their use of CS in classroom interactions:

1. Do you code switch from English to Turkish in English classes?
2. Why do you feel the need for switching from English to Turkish?
3. Do these switches contribute to your learning English or hinder it?

Data Analysis

The video recordings were compiled and analysed in two phases. Firstly, the data obtained from video recordings, in other words, all the exchanges between students and teachers were mainly transcribed in compliance with Jefferson's transcription conventions in Atkinson and Heritage (1984). As the video recordings were transcribed without using a specific program designed to analyse the very details of interactions, pauses and silences were marked as (.) for short pauses and (...) for long pauses. Thus, the instances of CS were determined using Poplack's (1980) categories of the types of CSs first. Secondly, the functions of CSs used in learners' classroom discourse were explored. Following this, content analysis was applied to the data retrieved from students' semi-structured interviews. Similar stages were followed to transcribe the interview data as in the transcription of video recordings. Inductive qualitative content analysis was employed to examine the interview data. Preeminent themes arising from students' responses to the interview questions were identified with a view to the use of CS in L2 classes. Then, the answers were coded under these themes. After that, the analyses of video recordings were associated with these codes in order for demonstrating the opinions of learners about CS and its use in their L2 experiences.

Findings

The data collected via video-recordings were manually transcribed according to Jefferson's Transcription conventions (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984). Each transcribed lesson lasts approximately 45 minutes. Therefore, the transcribed data were received from six lessons in total: two lessons from three fifth grade EFL classrooms, added up to 270 minutes. In the data analysis process, the transcribed data were quantitatively and qualitatively examined. Statistical analyses of the transcriptions revealed that the students in each class benefited from CS to varying extents. Words in the transcripts were counted as an attempt to estimate the frequency of English and Turkish used by the students in each lesson. Even though the total speaking time might have been formed by the type of the activities, the frequency analysis was instrumental to have an insight into the learners' interactions. Table 1 shows the word counts of the Turkish EFL learners:

Table 1. Frequency Counts of Words Spoken by the Students

Students	TL	TL %	L1	L1 %	Total
Class 1	1791	73.3	650	26.7	2441
Class 2	925	54.0	781	46.0	1706
Class 3	862	53.0	767	47.0	1629

Among the three groups, students in Class 1 used more words in TL than the other groups. Table 1 also shows that the students in Class 3 did not use TL as much as the students in Class 2. However, when the total number of words is taken into account, this result might show that the nature of the interactions in Class 1 and Class 2 exhibited more interaction between the teacher and the students. Since the lessons video-recorded differed from one another in terms of the content and activities employed, the moments when CS was employed by learners were investigated by determining the structure of each lesson. This was done by referring to the video-recordings and transcriptions. First, the structure of each lesson was identified according to the activity type. Second, CS instances were tabulated for each teacher classroom by counting the number of words used by the students in English and Turkish. The purpose of this tabulation was to determine the amount of time spent for each type of activity and compare three classrooms in terms of CS moments. Table 2 demonstrates the frequency and percentage of TL and L1 used by the students in a detailed fashion.

Table 2. Students' Use of TL (English) and L1 (Turkish) According to Activity Types

Activity types	Teacher E's students				Teacher F' Students				Teacher S's students			
	TL	%	L1	%	TL	%	L1	%	TL	%	L1	%
Greeting	14	0.57	-	-	7	0.41	1	0.05	8	0.49	-	-
Warm-up	39	1.59	4	0.16	83	4.8	10	0.58	111	6.8	63	3.8
Use of students book	766	31.3	135	5.53	248	14.5	72	4.22	621	38.1	521	31.9
Homework check	-	-	-	-	7	0.41	108	6.3	-	-	-	-
Exam results announcement	-	-	-	-	4	0.23	44	2.5	-	-	-	-
Reviewing homework	-	-	-	-	384	22.5	201	11.7	-	-	-	-
Reviewing a grammar topic	-	-	-	-	90	5.2	32	1.8	-	-	-	-
Playing a game	-	-	-	-	2	0.11	32	1.8	46	2.8	151	9.2
Vocabulary practice on smart board	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37	2.2	8	0.49
Oral practice of new topic	532	21.7	159	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Work in Notebooks	165	6.7	99	4.0	6	0.35	53	3.1	-	-	-	-
Worksheet practice	301	12.3	219	8.9	87	5.0	164	9.6	39	2.3	4	0.24
Assigning homework	-	-	-	-	-	0.41	7	-	-	-	20	1.22
Close-up	4	0.16	4	0.16	7	0.41	57	3.34	-	-	-	-
Total	2441			100.0	1706			100.0	1629			100.0

Table 2 clearly shows that the majority of the interaction between the teacher and the students took place while doing the activities in student's book. The students in these three classrooms used English the most compared to the other activity moments. While

the students in Class 1 made use of it by 31.3%, the students in Class 2 resorted to TL by 38.1 %. However, what is striking in Table 1 is that although the use of TL by the students in Class 3 is higher than the other groups, the L1 proportion is extremely high as well (31.9%). Moreover, Table 1 illustrates that the students in Class 2 classroom spent a lot of time on speaking in Turkish during the homework review. Even though the students made use of TL by 22.5%, they resorted to Turkish by 11.7%. Additionally, while playing games, the students used more Turkish words than English ones. Therefore, it might be deduced from Table 1 that the students made use of L1 more than the TL on many occasions.

To illustrate, the students in Class 2 used Turkish by 6.3% and very few English words during homework check activities (0.41 %). In addition, the amount of Turkish words (5.0 %) used by those students during worksheet practices was almost two times higher than the amount of English words (9.6 %). However, this tendency was not observed in Class 1. The students in this class always tended to use TL during all the activities in contrast to the students in other classrooms. When the number of words spoken by the students in Class 1 is taken into consideration, it was observed that those students used Turkish more during worksheet practice in comparison with the other activities. In a similar vein, those same students resorted to Turkish while they were taking notes in their notebooks.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the high proportion of TL use during the student's book activities and homework reviews should not mislead us since those activities mainly involved questions and short answers. In other words, they were controlled activities of grammar and vocabulary; therefore, the students were not required to produce real communication among their peers and teacher. According to the transcripts the moments when CS took place, it was noticed that the activities which were carried out in the three classrooms did not trigger students' creativity since they were quite mechanical and controlled on many occasions. To conclude this section, the students used English only in those moments when they were required to complete a controlled activity, give short answers to the questions or responding to the greetings and farewells in the close-up section.

Types of CS

The current data were analysed by means of Poplack's (1980) typology: inter-sentential CS, intra-sentential CS, and tag-switching. First, the types of CSs were identified, and then the frequency of each CS type was calculated. It was observed that inter-sentential CS was most frequently used CS type found in the data, and the students used this type of CS during their interactive exchanges. Table 3 shows the frequency of inter-sentential CS employed by the students in three different classrooms:

Table 3. The Frequency of Inter-Sentential CS

Inter-sentential CS		
Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
81	177	116

As can be deduced from Table 3, in comparison with the other two classes, the students in Class 2 extensively used inter-sentential CS in their classroom discourse. While the students in Class 3 employed this type of CS 116 times, the students in Class 1 used it less compared to the students in other groups. An example of inter-sentential CS is the following:

Extract 1

121 T: you don't understand that part. ((She's checking the homework one by one)) OK, what about the other pages? (...) oki doki (...) I see some parts are missing.

122 →S: hocam?
teacher

123 T: yes? (.)

124 →S: burası da mı vardı?
was this part included, too?

125 →T: vardı. (.) 6. ünitenin hepsi vardı.
it was. the whole sixth unit was included

The extract is an example of inter-sentential CS between turns when the teacher of Class 2 checks homework, and one of the students is not sure which pages are included. In line 121, teacher speaks in English as the primary code, and then in line 122 the student initiates the turn by addressing her as 'Hocam' (Teacher). Though this attempt was not regarded as CS, it prepared the following extension by the same student. Not complying with this attempt, the teacher keeps on speaking in English. The student takes the turn again and asks his question in Turkish, and the teacher also responds to his question in Turkish.

Intra-sentential CS takes place within a clause or sentence. Poplack (1980) stated that intra-sentential CS requires a lot of integration of both languages. In other words, this is the integration of the matrix/base language, which is the dominant language in the environment in which the person lives and embedded language, which is English in this study. This requirement generally holds true for bilingual people, but this study shows that not only bilingual students but also FL learners could employ it too. Although intra-sentential CSs are not used as frequently and complex as bilingual speakers do, they are employed by young EFL students in EFL classrooms as well.

Table 4. The Frequency of Intra-Sentential CS

Intra-sentential CS		
Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
6	4	2

Table 4 illustrates the number of intra-sentential CSs occurring in the three classrooms. When the students in the three different groups are compared, the students in Class 2 used it more than the other groups. The following example shows how students ask for clarification about a grammar topic. Teacher of Class 1 asks the students to practice a 'have you ever...?' question. Then, a student self-selects and makes comments about lying in Turkish. After that, another student corrects her mistake by inserting an English clause in her sentence. The teacher gives feedback on her correction by repeating the correct answer, but then another student takes the next turn and tries to clarify a misunderstanding. St4 intervenes and explains what his friend means and this turn causes the teacher to switch code quickly from English to Turkish. However, she instantly switches to back English after listening to the student about what he had meant.

Extract 2

522 T: no, I have never told a lie before or (.) Yes, I have

523 →St1: bunu söyleyerek de yalan söylüyor. Herkes

she tells a lie by saying this, too everybody

524 T: yes, you are lying.

525 →St1: yalan söylüyor

everybody is lying

526 →St2: yes, I have diyecektim.

I was about to say: Yes, I have

527 T: yes, I have.

528 →St3: no, I never yazsak olmaz mı?

isn't it possible if we write: no, I never?

529 →St4: teacher siz orda "No I have never yazıyorsunuz ya!"

you are writing "No I have never there!"

530 T: efendim?

sorry?

531 →S: orda I haven't yazsak olmaz mı?

is it OK if we write I haven't there?

532 T: yep. it's OK (.) have or has plus

533 Ss: v3 ((in chorus))

534 T: great.

Tag switching defines the insertion of an item into a sentence or clause without violating any grammatical rules. According to Poplack (1980) this type necessitates the least competence in L2 in comparison with the first two types. It might be explained due to the fact that tags can be moved freely because they do not have any syntactical constraints.

Table 5. The Frequency of Tag Switching

Tag switching		
Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
40	7	11

Table 5 illustrates that the students in all groups made use of tag switching to a varying extent. The students in Class 1 classroom extensively used tag switching during their interactions. The majority of these tag switches involve the insertion of certain words, such as "Hocam" (Teacher), "Teacher," "yes", "no", or the insertion of an English word into a Turkish sentence while students were asking for the translation or equivalence of the word.

Extract 3

212 T: maybe he wants to play basketball. OK (.) what kind of room is that?
Is it in a mass? (...) it's in a mass. In a mass?

213 Ss: yes

214 T: it's really untidy, dirty. (.) what kind of room is that?

215 →St1: çatı katı.

attic

216 T: it's an attic maybe. Is it tidy or untidy?

217 Ss: untidy

218 →St1: teacher çatı katı değil mi?

isn't it attic?

219 T: maybe it's a garage.

220. Ss: yes.

In extract 3 the teacher of Class 1 and her students describe a picture in the student's book. The teacher asks students to guess what kind of room it is and whether the room is in a mess or not. St1 self-selects and takes the turn in order to make a guess about the room. The teacher gives feedback about the answer in English on the contrary to the student's code choice. Then, St1 inserts "Teacher" to have his answer confirmed by the teacher as to whether it is a correct guess. Once again, the teacher gives feedback on his initiation in English.

The examples above show that it is possible to come across Poplack's (1980) CS typology in this data. The examples also demonstrate that the structural design of the lessons, the participants' code choice whether they be learners or teachers, and the pauses are influential in identifying the occurrence of CS. Therefore, there is one more step left to analyse the acts of CS in young EFL classrooms within this study. The focus of the following section is to report the functions of CSs employed by the learners in their classroom discourse.

Functions of CS

This sub-section reports on the CS functions of the students in EFL YL classrooms within the current study. The CS functions of the students in three different fifth grade classrooms are illustrated in Table 6. Table 6 demonstrates the frequency and functions of CS in descending order.

Table 6. The Frequency of CS Functions by Students

CS Functions by Students					
Teacher E's students	Frequency	Teacher F's students	Frequency	Teacher S's students	Frequency
meta- language	28	meta-language	35	meta-language	29
giving equivalence	24	asking for clarification	16	unofficial interactions	14
asking for clarification	16	giving equivalence	15	translation	13
asking for grammar explanation	10	attracting attention	12	asking for permission	8
attracting attention	9	unofficial interactions	11	giving equivalence	8
asking for confirmation	4	lexical compensation	8	helping a peer	8
peer talk	4	showing disagreement	7	asking for performance notes	7
teasing a peer	4	making an excuse	5	peer talk	7
lexical compensation	3	requesting	5	making suggestion	6
asking for permission	2	peer talk	4	asking for help	4
requesting	2	asking for grammar explanation	3	asking for confirmation	3
showing disagreement	2	asking for permission	3	lexical compensation	3
asking for help	1	signalling a humorous situation	3	asking about a procedure	2
complaining	1	making a suggestion	3	asking equivalence	2
peer correction	1	asking about a procedure	2	attracting attention	2
giving an example	1	explaining grammar rules	2	showing disagreement	1
helping a peer	1	peer correction	2	asking for clarification	1
making a joke	1	self-correction	2	floor-holding	1
-	-	translation	2	signalling a humorous situation	1
-	-	volunteering	2	-	-
-	-	teasing a peer	1	-	-

According to Table 6, there are 30 CS functions used by the students in these groups. Although the majority of the functions are shared by the three groups, there are a few distinct functions, such as floor-holding, self-correction, explaining grammar rules, volunteering, and making a joke. Among the frequently employed functions, the most frequently used CS function was found to be meta-language which describes the talk in L1 while carrying out activities in TL (92 times in total). It was observed that the students

and teachers communicated among each other about how to do the tasks or exercises or simply to comment on the issues. In the extract below, for example, the students use L1 while commenting on the picture on the student's book:

Extract 6

748 T: so what is a space station? what is a space ship? alien? sleeping bed, plate, OK. are you ready?

749 →St1: çocuğa bak ((students look at the illustrations on student's book))

look at the child

750 T: are you ready?

751 →St2: hocam şurada çocuk takip ediyor, ayrılmış gibi görünüyor.

the child follows there teacher, it seems as if he left

752 T: ((she ignores the comments))

As can be seen in the extract, the picture catches St1's attention, and he shows it to his peer. Although in line 750 the teacher of Class 2 asks them if they are ready or not in the TL, St1 and St2 keep on making comments about the picture. St1's remarks are followed by St2's prophecies about the possible actions of the child in the picture. St2 wants to attract the teacher's attention, but the teacher does not pay any attention to the students and focuses on the following exercises. Extract 6 illustrates that the students in the current study tend to talk about the tasks, whether they be on worksheets or the student's book, in L1. This attempt is sometimes reciprocated by the teacher or sometimes not as in this example.

Giving equivalence is the second most frequent CS function used by the students (47 times). It should be noted here that this function is usually triggered by the questions of the teachers themselves. Since the students are asked the direct translation or the equivalents of words and phrases, they are accustomed and expected to giving the translations of the words in Turkish. For example;

Extract 7

27 T: OK (.) has anybody brought something home- made? (...) home- made?

28 → St1: şey (.) ıvır zıvır mı?

well snacks?

29 → St2: uhm (...)evle ilgili bir şeyler?

something to do with home?

30 → St3: ev yapımı

home-made

31 T: yes (.) home-made.

In extract 7, the teacher of Class 3 asks the students whether they brought something to eat for the picnic to be held in the afternoon. Then, he specifically asks if they have anything home-made. After waiting a couple of seconds, he realized that the students do not understand what he means by home-made food. This time, he asks the students to give the meaning of the word in Turkish. The students try to make some deductions with

reference to home. Finally, St3 finds the correct meaning, and his answer is confirmed by the teacher in TL.

A further frequently CS function employed by the students is clarification (33 times). As stated before, it is observed that the students in this study are inclined to use Turkish for almost all the initiations except for mechanical activities. Extract 8 illustrates how the students make use of CS even for simple classroom language phrases they must have learnt up to now:

Extract 8

143 T: no, OK good. do the third one. what did you have for the dinner?

144 → St1: yazacağız değil mi?

we are going to write it, aren't we?

145 → T: yazıyorsunuz çocuklar (.)write down (.) don't look at me (.) what did you have for the dinner?

you are writing guys read (.) read the answer please

In the example, the students go through the exercises in the workbook and check their answers. As part of their classroom routine, they are required to write the correct versions of their incorrect answers. St1 in Class 2 asks in Turkish whether they are required to *write* the correct versions onto their notebooks. The teacher responds to this CS in Turkish, but continues to give the same instruction in English subsequent to a very short pause.

The students in the study used CS for several other functions such as unofficial interactions (25 times) and attracting attention (23 times). Translation is a function which was used in all the classes under investigation in this study. There are 17 occasions observed on which this CS function occurred in the present data. In addition, the students switched from English into Turkish for lexical compensation 14 times whereas they were observed to employ CS for asking for grammar explanations and asking for permission 13 times each and for showing disagreement and requesting 10 times each in the present research. Furthermore, the participating students resorted to CS when helping a peer and making suggestions nine times.

Peer talk is one of the CS functions utilized by the students in this study. This function was observed eight times. Additionally, asking for performance grades and asking for confirmation are the CS functions found seven times in the current research. Also, the results produced by this study revealed that CS functions, such as teasing a peer, making an excuse, asking for help were observed five times. Furthermore, there were four instances illustrating students' CS for signalling a humorous situation, complaining, and asking about procedures. The students used CS for correcting their peers three times in the present research. Asking equivalence, explaining grammar rules, self-correction, and volunteering were found as CS functions twice each in this study. Finally, the least frequently used CS functions observed in the current data were floor-holding, giving an example, and making a joke. Each of these functions was employed by the students only once.

To reiterate, the data obtained from the video-recordings were supported with the semi-structured interviews which revealed the opinions of participant students about CS they have employed in the classroom and its potential contribution to their learning. The findings pertaining to this are presented below.

Findings acquired from the interviews

When the first interview question “Do you code switch from English to Turkish in English classes?” was asked to 20 students, 65% of the students said that they “sometimes” code switch from English to Turkish in the classroom (n=13). Also, 15% (n=3) of them said “yes, mostly”, 10% (2) said “yes, frequently”, 10% (2) said “yes, rarely”. Below are examples which can be representative for these responses:

Excerpt 81: “Yes, sometimes I do it when I don’t understand a word.”

Excerpt 82: “Sometimes. I speak Turkish if I don’t understand teacher.”

The second interview question “Why do you feel the need for switching from English to Turkish?” is more revealing in terms of identifying the reasons for CS by the students. As seen in Table 6, there are three main themes emerging from the current data.

Table 6. Students’ Views about the Need to Use CS

Themes	F	%
asking for clarification	22	81.5
asking questions	3	11
lack of TL proficiency	2	7.5
TOTAL	27	100

Supporting the finding acquired from the video-transcripts, students’ responses to this interview question indicated that the students code-switch when asking for clarification. Cited 22 times by the students, “asking for clarification” was evidenced to involve asking the meaning of an unknown word, understanding the teacher’s instructions, understanding sentence structure of English, and asking for correct pronunciation. The students claimed in the interviews that they also need to use L1 as a vehicle to ask questions to the teacher (three citations). The last theme pertaining the students’ need to use CS obtained from student interviews is lack of TL proficiency (two citations). The students stated that they feel the need to code switch if they cannot express themselves in the TL. Representative excerpts are the following:

Excerpt 83: “I code switch when I cannot express myself or what I mean in English.”

Excerpt 84: “I code switch from English to Turkish if I don’t know the equivalents of the words in English.”

Excerpt 85: “If I don’t understand my teacher, I use Turkish.”

When the third interview question “Do these switches contribute to your learning English or do they hinder it?” was asked to the students, 19 students regarded the use of CS as a contribution to their learning English whereas only one student clearly indicated that it is a hindrance. The students who stated that CS contributes to their learning English based their opinions on four themes. 52.6% of the students maintained that CS contributes to their vocabulary learning whereas 26.3% of them purported that their CSs help them understand their teacher much better. Additionally, 15.7% of the students claimed that CS enables them to compensate for their lack of TL proficiency.

Table 7. Students' Views about their own CS

Themes	<i>F</i>	%	Themes	<i>f</i>	%
Contribution			Hindrance		
vocabulary learning	10	52.6	thinking in Turkish	2	66.6
understanding teacher	5	26.3	risk of	1	33.4
much better			forgetting English		
compensation for the lack of TL proficiency	3	15.7	-	-	-
feeling better	1	5.4	-	-	-
TOTAL	19	100.0	-	3	100.0

On the other hand, two of the students who were among the ones regarding CS as a contribution their learning English, explained that although CS contributes to their learning, it might lead them to think in English. According to these students, "thinking in English" might undermine their English. The student who viewed CS as a hindrance stated that if he often code switches, he might forget English.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

The present study provided a large set of examples exploring that EFL young learners participating in this research employed the following CS types: inter-sentential CS, intra-sentential CS, and tag switching. Among these CS types, inter-sentential CS emerged as the most frequently used CS by the learners. When the three groups are compared, the most commonly used CS is the inter-sentential type. The present findings support previous research concerning that inter-sentential CS is a common type employed in EFL classroom both by the teachers and learners. For example, Rahimi and Jafari (2011) reported that inter-sentential CS was applied most frequently. The students and teachers used this type of CS for translating, giving equivalents of sentences, expressions and proverbs along with unofficial and humorous situations. It might be inferred from these findings that CSs generally occur across sentences and between turns. Also, it might be deduced from the findings that especially the students made use of inter-sentential CS because it is easier for them to express themselves or answer questions in their L1 when they cannot express themselves in the TL. In other words, inter-sentential CS might help them hold the floor. Another inference could be made about the relationship between the students' TL proficiency and type of CS. Poplack (1980) maintained that intra-sentential CS occurs when the speaker is not fluent in the TL because it requires the grammatical integration of both languages. On the other hand, inter-sentential CS and tag switching do not require TL proficiency since these types remain at clausal or lexical level. The findings of the present study are consistent with Poplack's (1980) claims in terms of the relationship between learner proficiency and the employment of inter-sentential CS.

Analyses of CS functions by the students revealed that they mainly code switched from English to Turkish for content-related issues, such as meta-language, giving equivalence, asking for clarification, translation, asking for grammar explanation, and lexical compensation. However, the students also used CS for other purposes like unofficial interactions, attracting attention, teasing a peer, signalling a humorous situation, complaining, helping a peer, peer correction, making a joke, showing disagreement and volunteering. The majority of the functions observed in the current study are consistent with the findings of earlier studies. For instance, Eldridge's (1996) study demonstrated that the students employed CS with the following motivations: equivalence, floor holding, meta-language, reiteration. As in Eldridge's (1996) study, the students in this study used CS primarily for equivalence of words and meta-language purposes. Yet, the dissimilarity

between these two studies is that while Eldridge (1996) found that the majority of the CSs were identified with the course content, the students in this study switched code more for social reasons than the course content. The functions found in this study accord with the research by Yletyinen (2004) who examined the CS functions of teachers and students in a Finnish context. The findings of the study showed that the students code switched to ask for equivalence in English, unofficial interactions, helping a peer and requesting help. Other previous findings (Greggio and Gil, 2007) also illustrated that the students used CS to fill a linguistic gap, and provide equivalent meanings in L1, translate vocabulary, ask about grammatical structures, and clarify understanding. Similarly, the students participating in this study used CS for these purposes.

In addition, the findings indicated that CS is a readily available and applied strategy for students in classroom interaction. This could be attributed to the fact that the students and teachers the EFL contexts under investigation share the same native language. The findings of the present study also suggest that CS is an acknowledged practice and not regarded as an undesirable attitude by the teachers. This can be deduced from the classroom practices of the teachers in this study. The teachers allowed their students to use CS and did not warn their students to use English only in the classroom. In addition, the findings showed that it was more common for the students to code switch from English to Turkish than the other way around. This might suggest that the teachers used English as a means of instruction, and the students used it during the activities. However, Turkish was used to overcome communication difficulties between the teacher and students. In sum, English and Turkish have different pedagogical and linguistic functions in EFL classrooms under the present investigation.

The findings pertaining to the students' opinions about the use of CS in the classroom revealed that the teachers' CS was considered by almost all participating students to contribute to language learning process rather than hinder it. CS by the teachers was found useful especially in explaining grammar rules, giving equivalents of new vocabulary, explaining sentence structures, and translating unknown vocabulary items or ambiguous sentences. These findings seem to support the findings acquired by previous research which investigated the attitudes of the students towards the use of CS in the classroom and concluded that the students hold positive attitudes towards CS because it facilitates learning (Ahmad, 2009; Amorim; 2012; Nordin, Ali, Zubir & Sadjirin, 2013).

This study confirms previous findings showing that use of L1 usually with its facilitative function manifests itself in EFL classrooms (Moore, 2002; Butzkam, 2003; Cook, 2001b). More importantly, the study provides additional evidence to the relatively small number of studies focusing on CS from the students' perspectives. Thus, the implication is that use of L1 and/or CS should not be considered as a taboo in the classroom. Yet, there should be enough room in the language classrooms for the students to participate in the language tasks which would enable them to use the TL for communication. They should be encouraged to play with the language (Scott and Ytreberg, 1991) which is very useful in L1 development and should also be triggered in L2 learning process. Lastly, this research supports the claim that L1 use or CS generally arises from lack of L2 proficiency. However, further research is needed to investigate if it is actually the case and if it is also related to other variables such as classroom context, sufficient exposure to L2, learners' motivation and predispositions, their willingness to participate in the activities, quality of materials, as well as EFL teachers' attitudes and their qualifications. Learners should be asked how they perceive total immersion in L2, and how they feel about it. These aspects could be investigated with different groups of the same level of proficiency longitudinally. Moreover, replication studies in other EFL contexts including

YLLs should be carried out in order to gain additional insights into the different aspects of CS.

References

- Ahmad, B. H. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom: Instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching*, 2(2), 49-55.
- Al-Nofaie, H. (2010). The attitudes of teachers and students towards using Arabic in EFL classrooms in Saudi public schools: a case study. *Novitas-Royal (Research on youth and language)*, 4(1), 64-95.
- Amorim, R. (2012). Code switching in student-student interaction; functions and reasons!, *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, 7, 177-195.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314-342.
- Ataş, U. (2012). *Discourse Functions of Students' and Teachers' Code Switching in EFL Classrooms: A Case Study in A Turkish University*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Atkinson, J.M., J. Heritage, eds. (1984) Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bensen, H., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2013). Reasons for the Teachers' Uses of Code switching in Adult EFL Classrooms*, *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20 (2), 70-82.
- Bruhlmann, A. (2012). Does the L1 have a role in the foreign language classroom? A review of the literature. *Tesolol web journal*, 12, 55-80.
- Chowdhury, N. (2013). Classroom Code Switching of English Language Teachers at Tertiary Level: A Bangladeshi Perspective. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 40-61. doi:10.3329/sje.v7i0.14462
- Cook, V. (2001b). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Çelik, M. (2003). Teaching vocabulary through code-mixing, *ELT Journal*, 57, 361- 369.
- Çelik, S. (2008). Opening the door: An examination of mother tongue use in foreign language classrooms. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34, 75-85.
- Dailey-O'Cain, J., & Liebscher, G. (2009). Teacher and student use of the first language in foreign language classroom interaction: Functions and applications. *First language use in second and foreign language learning*, 131-144.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 303-311.
- Greggio, S. & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English as a foreign language classroom: A qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 10(2), 371-393.
- Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 Classroom at the Secondary and College Levels : A Comparison of Functions and Use by Teachers. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(2), 193-209.
- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3(1), 10-23. doi:10.2174/1874913501003010010
- Kang, D. (2008). The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE, *Science Direct*, 36, 214-226. doi:10.1016/j.system.2007.10.005

- Khaerunnisa, L. (2016). An EFL Teacher's Code Switching in a Young Learners' Class. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 1(1).
- Kraemer, A. (2006). Teachers' use of English in communicative German language classrooms: A qualitative analysis. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(3), 435-450.
- Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use* (pp. 1-27). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Lee, W. (2010). *Codeswitching as a Communicative Strategy in a Korean Heritage Language Classroom*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. San Diego State University.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Classroom code switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195-218.
doi: 10.1515/applirev-2013-0009
- 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), 605-638.
- Inbar-Lourie, O. (2010). English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 351-367.
doi: 10.1177/1367006910367849
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing student teachers' code-switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Lee, J. H., & Macaro, E. (2013). Investigating age in the use of L1 or english-only instruction: Vocabulary acquisition by Korean EFL learners. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 887-901.
- Littlewood, W., & Yu, B. (2014). Teaching : First language and target language in the foreign language, *Language Teaching*, 44 (1)64-77.
doi:10.1017/S0261444809990310
- Martin, P. W. (1999). Close encounters of a bilingual kind: interactional practices in the primary classroom in Brunei. *Int. J. of Educational Development*, 19, 127-140.
- Meiring, L. & Norman, N. (2002). Back on target: repositioning the status of target language in MFL teaching and learning. *Language Learning Journal*, 26, 27-35.
- Moore, D. (2002). Case Study Code switching and Learning in the Classroom, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(5), 279-293.
- Nagy, K., & Robertson, D. (2009). Target Language Use in English Classes in Hungarian Primary Schools. In M. Turnbull & J. Dailey-O'Cain, *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning* (pp.66-86). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Nordin, N.,M., Ali, F.,D.,R., Zubir, S.,I.,S.,S., & Sadjirin, R. (2013). ESL Learners Reactions towards Code Switching in Classroom Settings. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 90, 478-487.
doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.07.117
- Oduol, C. B. (1987). *Some Evidence for the Role of Elicitation and Code switching in English in the Medium Schools in Kenya*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Aston, Birmingham.
- Oguro, S. (2011). Using the target language in beginner-level classrooms: The influence of learners' affective state on teachers' practice. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 6, 1-19.
- Patton, M. Q. (1999). Enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis. *Health services research*, 34(5 Pt 2), 1189.
- Polio, C., & 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 Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code switching. *Linguistics*, 18(7/8), 581-618.

- Raman, Y., & Yigitoglu, N. (2015). Friend or foe?: English as the medium of instruction policy versus code switching practices. *IJRTE - The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 6, 3, 1-23.
- Qian, X., Tian, G., & Wang, Q. (2009). Codeswitching in the primary EFL classroom in China – Two case studies. *System*, 37(4), 719–730.
doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.09.015
- Rahimi, A., & Jafari, Z. (2011). Iranian Students' Attitudes towards the Facilitative and Debilitative Role of Code switching ; Types and Moments of Code switching at EFL Classroom, *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 4, 15–28.
- 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.
doi:10.1080/13670050802153152
- Salı, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42(1), 308-318.
- Scott, W. & Ytreberg, L. (1991). *Teaching English to Children*. Harlow: Longman.
- Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 204-218.
- Üstünel, E. (2004). *The sequential organization of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code switching in a Turkish university EFL setting*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne.
- Yletyinen, H. (2004). *The functions of codeswitching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä.