Friend or foe?: English As The Medium of Instruction Policy Versus Code Switching Practices

(Dost ya da düşman?: İngiliz Dilinde Öğretim Politikasına Karşı Dil Değişimi Uygulamaları)

Yagmur Raman[1]
Nur Yigitoglu[2]

Abstract

This study investigated the educational functions of code switching instances that occur during the classroom interactions of novice teachers who teach English at an English medium institution of higher education. The study also aimed to explore teachers' and their students' perceptions regarding CS in teachers' teaching practices and the role of the functions of CS in the classrooms. Three novice English language teachers and 12 of their students volunteered to take part in the study. A number of six pre-intermediate level preparatory school classes of an English medium university were observed, video recorded and fieldnotes were taken. Additionally stimulated recall interviews were conducted with the participants. Results indicated that CS served for variety of educational functions being but not limited to create a feeling of connectedness, to put forward teachers' inner voice and to express feelings emotions and abstract concepts. Finally, in contrast to what has been emphasized in English-only policy-related studies, the study revealed that both teacher and student participants perceived CS as a positive contributor to teaching and learning environment in the classrooms.

Keywords: Code switching, novice teachers, classroom interaction, educational policies

Özet

Bu çalışma mesleğin ilk yıllarında İngilizce dilinde öğretim yapan yüksek öğrenim kurumun çalışan İngilizce öğretmenleri tarafından sınıf etkileşimleri esnasında gerçekleştirilen dil değişimlerinin eğitimsel işlevlerini incelemiştir. Bu çalışma ayrıca öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin, öğretmenlerin öğretim uygulamaları esnasındaki dil değişimleri ve dildeğişiminin sınıflardaki işlevleri hakkındaki algılarını araştırmayı da amaçlamıştır.Araştırmaya katılımak üzere, mesleğinin ilk yıllarında ki üç öğretmen ve onların 12 öğrencisi gönüllü olmuştur. İngiliz dilince eğitim yapan bir üniversitenin hazırlık okulunun orta seviyedeki altı sınıfı gözlemlenmiş, videoya kayıt edilmiş ve alan notu alınmıştır. İlaveten, katılımcılar ile çağrışım tekniğine dayalı görüşme mülakatları yapılmıştır. Araştırma sonuçları, mesleğin ilk yılındaki öğretmenlerin sınıflarında dildeğişiminin bağlılık duygusu yaratmak, öğretmenlerin iç seslerini ortaya koymak, his ve duyguları ve soyut kavramları ifade etmek ile sınırlı olmayan çeşitli eğitimsel işlevlerinin olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Son olarak, bu araştırma İngilizce politikası odaklı araştırmalarda belirtilene tezat olarak, öğretmen katılımcılar ve onların öğrencilerinin dil değişiminin sınıf içerisindeki öğretim ve öğrenme alanına olumlu bir katkı olduğunu algıladıklarını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dil değişimi, mesleğin ilk yılındaki öğretmenler, sınıf iletişimi, eğitim politikaları.

[1] First author. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Program Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus yagmur.raman@metu.edu.tr
[2] Corresponding author. Teaching English as a Foreign Language Program Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus nyigit@metu.edu.tr

Introduction

It is by now well-known that the medium of instruction of higher education in many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts is in English. Especially in non-English speaking countries, many students enter preparatory schools in universities in order to have a good command of the language by mastering the four skills before commencing their studies in their respective academic programs. Considering that many universities welcome students coming from different nationalities, most universities have language policies which sometimes totally ban or minimally allow the usage of the first language (L1) during instruction. For some of the institutions, such policies are specified clearly by written documentation, however, for some they serve as (un)written, (un)spoken rules. As a reaction to these rules, sometimes teachers may use code switching (CS), which is "two or more languages in the same utterance or conversation" (Grosjean, 1982, p. 145) in their teaching practices. L1 use via CS practices may be inevitable in classes especially in which teachers share the same L1 background with their students. In an attempt to find the answers regarding teachers' CS and/or L1 usage in target language classrooms, a considerable amount of studies have been carried out (e.g., Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Anderson & Toribio, 2007; Ataş, 2012; Azlan & Narasuman 2013; Bahous, Nabhani, & Bacha, 2014; Barandagh, Zoghi, & Amini, 2013; Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013; Canagarajah, 1995; Greggio & Gil, 2007; Nordin, Ali, Zubir, & Sadjirin, 2013, Reini,2008; Schwartz & Asli, 2014; Hobbs, Matsuo, & Payne, 2004; Horasan, 2014; Jingxia, 2010; Lee, 2010; Lin,1996; Macaro, 2001; Sali, 2014; Seidlitz, 2003; Taşkın, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005,Yao, 2011; Yataganbaba & Yildirim, 2015 Yletyinen, 2004). Although all the above mentioned studies differ in their nature of investigation and methodology, the literature on CS and L1 usage in target language classrooms has become a two-edged sword. In other words, although the possible benefits (e.g., Cook, 1991, 2001; Flyman-Mattssson & Burenhult, 1999; Miles, 2004; Pachler & Field, 2001; Sert, 2005) and/or drawbacks of CS or L1 usage (e.g., Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1984; Levine, 2003; Prucha, 1983) are investigated and discussed, there is still lack of consensus regarding the application of CS or L1 usage in second / foreign language classrooms especially in English medium settings. In an attempt to address this issue in the literature, this study investigates the educational functions CS. For the purposes of the present study, educational functions of CS are conceptualized as functions which contribute to the teaching and learning of target language in the classrooms. The present study also aims to investigate teachers' and their students' perceptions regarding CS in their classrooms.

Literature Review

Although, research literature is replete with CS studies from diverse areas of research, some of the most commonly investigated areas about CS in educational environments can be grouped in three main categories: (1) functions of CS (e.g., Sali, 2014), (2) attitudes regarding CS (e.g.,Yavuz 2012) and (3) perceptions regarding CS (e.g., Horasan, 2014) . Indeed, most of these studies have been carried out in various contexts regarding teachers' CS and/or L1 usage in target language classrooms. Additionally, most of these studies were conducted either in English as a second language (ESL) contexts such as USA (Anderson & Toribio, 2007), Malaysia (Ahmad & Jusoff, 2009; Azlan & Narasuman 2013; Lee, 2010; Lin,1996; Nordin, Ali, Zubir, & Sadjirin, 2013), Sri Lanka (Canagarajah, 1995) or in EFL contexts such

as Brasilia (Greggio & Gil, 2007), China (Jingxia, 2010; Yao, 2011), Cyprus (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013), France (Macaro, 2001), Germany (Seidlitz, 2003), Finland (Yletyinen, 2004), Iran (Barandagh, Zoghi, & Amini, 2013; Reini,2008), Israel (Schwartz & Asli, 2014), Japan (Nishimura, 1995a, 1995b ; Hobbs, Matsuo, & Payne, 2004), Lebanon (Bahous, Nabhani, & Bacha, 2014), and Turkey (Ataş, 2012; Horasan, 2014; Sali, 2014; Taşkın, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005, Yataganbaba & Yildirim, 2015). Although these studies differ in their nature of investigation and methodology, the literature on CS and L1 usage in target language classrooms has become a two-edged sword. In other words, although the possible benefits (e.g., Cook, 1991, 2001; Flyman-Mattssson & Burenhult, 1999; Miles, 2004; Pachler & Field, 2001; Sert, 2005) and/or drawbacks of CS or L1 usage (e.g., Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1984; Levine, 2003; Prucha, 1983) are investigated, there is still a lack of consensus regarding the application of CS or L1 usage in second / foreign language classrooms.

Moving onto the context of the present study, until today, research studies conducted in the Turkish context (Ataş, 2012; Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013; Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013; Şen, 2010; Sali, 2014; Taşkın 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Yataganbaba & Yildirim, 2015) mainly examined the reasons of teachers' CS or L1 usage during second language (L2) instruction and/or the attitudes of teachers and students towards CS or L1 usage in L2 classroom. For instance, Sali (2014) investigated the functions of L1 usage in three EFL secondary classrooms in Turkey. The data was collected via observations, fieldnotes, audio recordings and stimulated recall interviews (SRIs) were conducted with three experienced English teachers working at a preparatory school. Each participant was observed 15 times and the data was analyzed by categorizing the utterances according to the previously reported schemes in some related studies (e.g., Canagarajah, 1995; Macaro, 2001; Pennington, 1995). The results were consistent with the previously mentioned studies, since they revealed that teachers used L1 for explanation, eliciting, checking for comprehension, prompting, monitoring, giving instructions, establishing rapport, praising, and for cultural expressions.

Among the studies which investigated the attitudes, Yavuz (2012) was interested in the teachers' attitudes towards L1 usage in the English classroom by tapping into their thoughts regarding the place of the first language in their classrooms. The participants were 12 primary school teachers working at 12 different institutions. Participants commented on the factors behind their L1 usage in the classrooms as being crowded classes, exam oriented system, students who were not interested in the lessons, lack of self-esteem on side of the learners and difficulty of teaching abstract vocabulary.

Among the studies which focused on perceptions, in a recent study, Horasan (2014) investigated students' and teachers' perceptions regarding CS practices in a preparatory school of a public university in Turkey. The participants were 43 students studying and four teachers working at the preparatory school. Horasan made use of a mixed method approach in an attempt to unfold the sentential levels of CS, discourse functions of CS and the way in which the participants perceived CS. The data were collected though questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews. It was found that students' excessive CS in the class as well as their teachers and inter-sentential CS was slightly more common than intra-sentential CS. Results indicated that teachers mostly used CS to increase the interaction, to draw the attentions and to manage the class and to making joke. On the other hand, the

students code switched for ''floor holding, sense of humor or making learning easier'' (p.41). The data also revealed students' and teachers' perceptions towards their own CS to be positive as it eases learning and speaking. However, the interview data revealed that the students' perceptions towards their teachers' CS was negative as they preferred their teachers to speak only in English in the classroom.

All of these studies have contributed to our understanding of CS practices in English language classrooms. There seems to exist, however, a considerable amount of studies dedicated to teachers' functions of CS. At the same time, given the differences of the contexts of CS instances, it may be useful to investigate the instances why, when and where CS takes place (within the levels of different languages such as first, second and foreign) as well as the differences in the L1-related policies of educational institutions. Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the literature on CS and discussions on English as a medium of instruction by providing insights regarding the novice teachers' CS practices within the foreign language classrooms. More specifically, the study aims to answer the following questions:

- What are the educational functions of code switching in novice teachers' classroom practices at an English medium institution of higher education?
- What are the perceptions of teachers regarding code switching in their teaching practices?
- What are the perceptions of students' regarding the role of code switching in the classroom?

Method

The case study approach was adopted in the present study. According to Mackey and Gass (2005) "case studies generally aim to provide a holistic description of language learning or use within a specific population and setting" (p.171).Therefore, case study approach was adopted in order to have an in-depth investigation of the functions of CS (i.e. language use), served by Turkish novice teachers who teach English (i.e. specific population), who are working at an English medium institution of higher education (i.e. setting).

Context of the study

The study was conducted at the English language preparatory school, the School of Foreign Languages (SFL), of an English medium university in Northern Cyprus. Before beginning their studies at the university, students are required to demonstrate a certificate based on their English proficiency or take the English proficiency exam organized by the university. If students fail to pass the exam, they are distributed to the classes of beginner (BEG), elementary (ELEM), pre-intermediate (PIN) and intermediate (INT) in the first semester being the Fall (September-January) and based on theiy progression they are distributed to three levels; pre-intermediate, intermediate and upper-intermediate (UINT) in the second semester being the Spring (February-June). There is also an extended semester for PIN students (June-July) and summer school for INT and UINT students (July). Each year five proficiency exams are held in total (in September, October, January, June and July) and based on their scores taken from the two mid-term examinations during the first and second semesters, SFL students qualify to take the proficiency exam.

Participants

Novice teacher as a term have been a controversial term to define as many researchers use and define in different ways. Farrell (2012) suggests that novice teachers can be defined as teachers who completed pre-service teacher education and the ones with no more than three years of experience. For the purposes of the present study, this definition is adopted and three novice teachers with no more than three years of experience and ones who completed pre-service English teacher education were asked to take part in the study. All of the participant teachers' first language was Turkish and they were partially uninformed regarding the aims of the study given that knowing the real purpose of the study might have resulted in change in teachers' CS practices. When the data collection started, first novice teacher (NTP1) was in her first year of teaching at SFL and prior to her experience at SFL, she worked as a teaching assistant in Portugal for 35 weeks. Second novice teacher, (NTP2), was in her second year and had no prior teaching experience in another context whereas third novice teacher was in her second year in teaching at SFL and prior to her experience at SFL, she worked at a private teaching institution and lectured adults on the university entrance exam in Turkey for one year. All the participants attended the ICELT course that was required by the institution during their first year of teaching and had completed it with success. In addition to three novice teachers, 12 students of the participating teachers' volunteered to take part in the research. Since there were not any international students in any of the classes, participating students were all native speakers of Turkish. In order to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, initials indicating novice teachers as NTP1, NTP2, NTP3 and their students as NTP1's/NTP2's/NTP3's Student S1/S2/S3 are used in this paper.

Data collection and analysis

The data was collected through in-class observations, field notes and stimulated recall interviews with teachers and 12 of their students. The classroom data was collected as six pre-intermediate level classes of three novice teachers' were observed and the lessons were recorded using a video camera. In total 72 hours of classroom interaction was recorded and the instances of CS were transcribed. Firstly, the classroom data was coded based on the categories previously set in the literature using qualitative analysis software, the MaxQDA11. The categories taken from the literature were academic functions, social/ cultural functions and managerial functions. Some of the subcategories of academic, social and managerial functions were also made use of and they provided a basis for the emerging themes. Teachers' perceptions regarding each CS instance and students' perceptions regarding their teachers' CS instances were investigated through stimulated-recall interviews. Given that the extended semester was limited to one month period and teachers had 20 hours of teaching schedule and extra duties assigned by the administration, in total 17 hours of interview was recorded. Due to the time constraints, it was not possible to discuss each and every CS instances which were identified during the interactions between the teachers and their students. From the total number of 2005 CS instances, only randomly chosen 700 were discussed during the stimulated recall interviews with the teachers. The data from the coded CS instances observed in the classrooms and teachers' own perceptions on CS functions were than compared and new main categories for the educational functions of CS were created. Therefore, the categories of the previous literature acted as the subcategories of the main educational

functions used for the purposes of this study. However, there were some overlaps in the subcategories.

Findings and Discussion

Educational functions of code switching in novice teachers' classroom practices at an English medium institution of higher education

The first research question investigated the educational functions of CS. Based on the classroom interactions and SRIs with the teachers, the results related to the first research question indicated that CS served for variety of educational functions and they were in the form of consistent classroom routines. The comparative content analysis of the video recorded classroom observations as well as SRIs revealed the main educational functions were as follows: to create a feeling of connectedness, to foster learning, to form a bridge between L1 and L2, to put forward teacher's inner voice, to express feelings, emotions, abstract concepts, to facilitate comprehension, to keep students engaged in class and other. The educational functions are presented with examples from classroom data in excerpts, related CS instances are in bold and English translations are provided in square brackets ([ ]). The parts which NTPs were reading from a handout or a book are indicated in the excerpts with a star (e.g. *Reads from the text) and written in italic.

To create a feeling of connectedness

Results indicated that one of the educational functions was *to create a feeling of connectedness*. Teachers' CS in the aim of drawing upon shared and/or cultural expressions, explaining to make the meaning clear, encouraging and establishing rapport were the underlying categories of CS that led to the emergence of this function. Additionally, the data emerged from the SRIs revealed that NTPs use CS as a tool to create a feeling of positive classroom environment for the students and to build rapport. NTPs stated that students bring with them barriers related to the English language and most of the time they act according to those barriers. In order to eliminate those barriers and make students open to learning, teachers make use of the first language, switch back and forth to create familiarity and have a sense of connectedness. NTPs thought that if students feel familiar with what is being discussed and feel appreciated, this creates a feeling of connectedness in the classroom. All the novice teacher participants mentioned that students understand better and feel more comfortable and participative as language learners when they code switch to Turkish because in a way it helps them to ''get the big picture'' (NTP2, SRI). During their classroom interactions, two of the novice teacher participants used the term *arkadaşlar* [friends] when referring to their students and continued their sentences in English because ''it is more comfortable for students in the same classroom maybe they have feeling like connection or something'' (NTP1, SRI). When the students were asked to comment on the underlying reason behind their teachers' usage of the term *arkadaşlar* [friends], they said that it was out of habit. Another common instance that occurred was when the teachers code switched in order to draw upon cultural expressions. As I observed the classrooms, I noticed that NTPs constantly code switched when they were giving the answers of the multiple choice questions. While doing so, the teachers referred to city and district names located in Turkey; while referring to the options a, b, c, d, e they used *Adana*, *Bursa*, *Ceyhan*, *Denizli* and *Edirne*. When the teachers were asked to state their reasons for using these city names, both NTP2

and NTP3 mentioned that this was something that they and also the students were used to from their schools, given that they and most of the students are from Turkey and ''in Turkey everything is a test. Every exam is a test. So we are the monsters of tests. So I think they are familiar with it too because we do not have a huge generation gap between us'' (NTP2, SRI). They also stated that most of the time the students confused the options b and d and that using city names that the students are familiar with saves time, making things clear for the students.

To foster learning

Another educational function of teachers' CS was *to foster learning*. During the classroom observations, we realized that the teachers were switching to Turkish while giving clues, giving the answer of a question, repeating for other students to hear, recasting, verifying students' answer, rejecting students' answer, while marking mutually shared knowledge, while requesting for elaboration as well as clarification and with the aim of eliciting response from the students. Teachers' code switched while giving clues, giving the answer of a question and recasting especially while students ''insist on not understanding'' (NTP2 and NTP3, SRIs).

Additionally, NTPs stated that when their students gave their answers in Turkish, they had a tendency to reply back in the same language either to verify or to reject the students' answers. Interestingly, the participating students were aware of the tendency of their teachers as they explained this issue as follows: "if you constantly try to communicate with a teacher in Turkish then she would respond to you in Turkish'' (Students, SRI).

During their classroom interactions, we also observed that NTPs code switched to promote participation in the classroom. In this regard, NTPs code switched to Turkish in order to elicit response, request elaboration as well as clarification. When needed, NTPs also gave clues to students in Turkish or translated some parts in an attempt to help them find the answer. When reflecting on such instances, NTPs mentioned that students sometimes did not respond to their questions asked in English, thinking that they were expected to answer in English. Thus, noticing that students sometimes felt insecure to speak in English or that they lacked the necessary grammar knowledge to answer the question, NTPs code switched and asked the same question in Turkish in order to elicit the answer and sometimes to guide the students to find the answer.

To form a bridge between L1 and L2

While observing the classroom practices of the novice teachers, we noticed that the NTPs were making use of CS to contribute to their students' language learning experiences by *forming a bridge between L1 and L2*, in other words using the known to create a link in students mind in order to teach the unknown. More specifically, NTPs switched to Turkish by translating the sentences to make the meaning clear, by translating to elicit response from students, by explaining to make the meaning clear and when explaining the aspects of English. NTPs also made use of CS while emphasizing and exemplifying. When we asked teachers why they made use of such CS and how they decided on the most appropriate moment to code switch, they stated various reasons. One of the NTPs, for instance, explained that sometimes some words, sentences or metaphors cannot be explained by another English word or sentence and that it may at times be difficult and time consuming to do so. She stated

that it was necessary to translate those words or sentences ''because they have some connotation or some cultural points to be explained to the students'' (NTP1, SRI). In her classroom routines, NTP1 preferred to use the word *gecekondu* instead of shanty house or suburbs because she believed that shanty house or suburbs did not have a negative connotation like *gecekondu*. In Turkish, *Gecekondu* means poor housing which is built very quickly, without proper permissions taken from the government. Suburb did not seem like an ideal equivalent while referring to the word *gecekondu* and hence, the teacher was unable to decide how to translate it without attributing a negative connotation to the actual source word. The teacher explains the situation as follows:

> It made sense to me because some cultural events or cultural vocabulary cannot be translated. I think they shouldn't be translated because it doesn't give the same feeling that you feel in your own language or on your native language (NTP1, SRI).

NTPs believe that majority of the students do not have the language knowledge or the required proficiency to keep up with the lesson. Accordingly, it may sometimes be difficult for the said students to comprehend and to give the required answer or express their ideas in English. When ways of communication is hindered in the classroom, teachers make use of CS to elicit responses from students in order to make sure that the text being read or the topic being discussed is comprehended. The following excerpt is an example of such CS usage.

Excerpt: *Translating to elicit response*

Teacher: What happened to the boy and the chocolates? Was he found guilty? Think about the boy who stole the chocolates. Was he found guilty? **Suçlu bulundu mu?**[8] [Was he found guilty?]

In the excerpt above, the teacher and students are working on a reading exercise and teacher is asking comprehension questions to her students. After asking the same question second time in English and not getting any response, teacher translates her question into Turkish and asks the same question once again, this time in Turkish.

NTPs also mentioned that CS was the safest, easiest and quickest way in the classroom in achieving such aims. Apart from these functions, NTPs code switched especially when students were presented with a new topic or a vocabulary item. One of the teachers, for instance, mentioned that she never code switches to Turkish when teaching a new grammar topic "because this is the real teaching and it should be in real language so for example this is my barrier. Never use never use Turkish in grammar teaching'' (NTP1, SRI). While this was the case for one of the participating teachers, the others stated the opposite. According to other two teachers, understanding newly presented grammar rules were important for students and in order to make sure that all the students understood what was being taught they switched to Turkish**.**The following excerpt, is an example of such usage:

Excerpt: *Aspects of English*

Teacher: What is the answer? Two of?

Ss1: Whose değil mi? [Isn't it whose?]

Teacher: Whose. Yes That's it. Whose because?

Ss2: Çünkü noun geldi sonrasında. [Because there is a noun afterwards]

Teacher: Çok güzel[15] [Very good]. That's it. Two of whose most famous works. Aslında here instead of whose in fact it is Orwell's diil mi [16] [Actually here instead of whose in fact it is Orwell's, isn't it?]? However I cannot say his. I cannot say Orwell's. Why because it's a relative clause because it starts with comma which shows it is a non-defined relative clause. So we should use a pronoun for this **burda bir possessionlık var, o zaman** whose[17] [here is a kind of 'being a possession', than whose]. Okay?

In the excerpt above, the teacher and students are working on a cloze test exercise which is about George Orwell. Teacher is asking for the correct word to fill the given gap and one of the students provides the correct answer. When the teacher asks for the reasons of such answer, the student manages to specify the reason. However, teacher continues to explain and while doing so she sometimes switches to Turkish and uses some Turkish words or sentences to explain the rules related to pronouns and relative clauses.

To put forward teacher's inner voice

Another category emerging from the data was related to *teachers' inner voice*. As we observed participants over one month period, we noticed that one of the educational functions of CS was to put forward the teachers' inner voice. In other words, NTPs seemed to switch to Turkish as if they were talking to themselves or thinking aloud. Such CS instances sometimes resembled to a strategy that these teachers follow to teach their own strategies about the aspects of English and sometimes it seemed unconscious as a reflection of teachers' inner monologues. We were interested in finding out the underlying reasons behind such switches and what really was going on in these teachers' minds.

During stimulated recall sessions, NTPs stated that they sometimes felt the need to think about their students' questions and that in order to gain time to think about the questions they code switched to Turkish. They used Turkish in order to make it seem as if they were discussing the topic with their students. They also mentioned that as a natural reaction they sometimes code switched to Turkish and talk to themselves when an unexpected question or response came from the students.

To express feelings, emotions, abstract concepts

Another educational function of CS was *to express feelings, emotions and abstract concepts*. During our observations of the classroom practices of novice teachers, we noticed that all the novice teacher participants code switched when giving advice, when they were angry especially while managing the classroom discipline and when praising. After observing such CS instances, we wanted to reveal whether such switches were conscious or unconscious. NTPs stated that they were unconsciously switching to Turkish at such times.

NTP2, for instance, explained this issue as follows: "After I watched those videos I saw that when I got angry I switch to Turkish directly" (SRI). Similarly, other NTPs were also aware that such code switches when expressing feelings and emotions were "more natural" (NTP3, SRI) and "much more effective on the students" (NTP2, SRI). NTP3 also stated that ''when I become too natural I switch to Turkish. And I correct myself. NTP3 speak in English. At least my feedback words can be in English all of them'' (NTP3, SRI). As a result, all NTPs mentioned that Turkish - their mother tongue - was more intimate when compared with English.

In sum, it appears that the teachers were having second thoughts about expressing their feelings and emotions in Turkish even though it felt more natural to them and that they were aware of its positive effects in the classroom. When the students were asked to comment on the prospective teachers' CS when praising students or when angry, they evaluated their teachers' CS at such instances as much more effective. They also stated that teachers ''express themselves better'' when they express their emotions and they switch to Turkish because it is easy to do so at such times. NTPs also seem to have a tendency to switch to Turkish while explaining an abstract concept. Teachers mentioned that they have difficulties in explaining such concepts and accordingly, they switch to Turkish.For instance, one of the NTPs explained the issue as follows:

> Sometimes I just feel like hindered or stopped like this unexplainable vocabulary items and sometimes I'm using Turkish for that reason. Especially for the abstract things that I cannot explain. So I'm just trying to do my best but sometimes it's just easier to give it in Turkish or just keep it short (NTP1, SRI).

To facilitate comprehension

Results revealed that another educational function of teachers' CS was *to facilitate comprehension*. In their classroom practices, NTPs used CS to check for understanding, mark mutually shared knowledge regarding the aspects of English and to assign homework. Comprehension checking was preferred especially during the reading and listening practices. NTPs stated that students' comprehension of the text or the question was much more important than sharing the correct answers. NTPs also code switched to mark mutually shared knowledge regarding the aspects of English, such as vocabulary or grammar structures they had covered during the previous lessons. NTPs also seemed to code switch while assigning homework. We observed that, most of the time NTPs gave the instructions of a homework in English first and then switched to Turkish immediately afterwards and gave the instructions once again in Turkish. Teachers sometimes made use of CS to check their students' comprehension of the instructions and below excerpt is an example of such CS usage.

Excerpt: *Checking students' comprehension of the instructions*

Teacher: This time I want you to form your own groups. Okay? And I want to have a look at the categories here. We are going to find some words that are suitable for these categories from the text. For example we are looking for vocabulary items, we are looking for words about crime or law. Okay? The second category is technology. We are looking

for some words related to technology. Okay. And then we are going to find some words about money and business. **Peki nerden bulucaz bunları**? [6] [Okay, from where will we find these?] (Wait time: four seconds). From the text. Okay. But trust me there are lots of words okay? You need time for it. So please form your own groups. This is not an individual study. You are going to find them together. Okay?

In excerpt above, after writing some categories on the board, teacher asks students some find some related words which can be put under those categories from the text that they read. After giving the instructions, teacher switches to Turkish and checks students' comprehension of the instructions by asking them where to find those words. After observing such CS, we asked the participating teachers to explain the underlying reasons behind their use of CS in such instances. NTP3 stated that she checks her students' comprehension of the instructions with CS, in order to make sure that they understand what is required from them since she thinks ''it is the quickest way and it is the safest way to do so'' (SRI).

To keep students engaged in class

Another educational function of CS was *to keep students engaged in class*. In this regard, NTPs code switched while giving the objectives of the lesson, giving students advice in general for the exercises and with the aim of drawing their students' attention. When NTP1 was asked to explain why she was giving advice by switching back and forth between both languages she replied:

> I think I use it because I'm sure that they can understand my sentences. I don't want to seem bossy. Because when I do it in only in my own language it looks like I'm older than them I don't want to look like a snob teacher maybe that's my opinion. So rather than just using Turkish or English only, I think it looks more professional to give this advice part in both languages (NTP1, SRI).

During the warm-up session, the objectives were given in Turkish. Teacher participants stated that the students have the right to know what was going to be covered during the lesson and prepare themselves accordingly. Below is an excerpt illustrating this function:

Excerpt: *To take attention*

Teacher: In this occasion or in this situation. Okay? So this guy is doing this all the time in several occasions. So this rudeness is hardly surprising. Hardly? Hardly ne demek?[1] [What does hardly mean?] (Wait time: 4 seconds). **Çok çıkar karşınıza**[2] [You come across with it a lot]. Neredeyse hiç[3] [Hardly ever]. Okay?

In the excerpt above, the teacher is giving the answer of a listening comprehension question. After talking about the answer and asking students a question about a word in the indicated sentence, teacher switches to Turkish and asks about the meaning of a word. The teacher waits for four minutes for students to respond but when she does not receive an answer she tries to take students attention on what is being taught by telling students that they may come across with such words and gives the meaning of it.

As can be seen from the excerpt above, in order to draw students' attention on the topic being taught and also for managerial purposes, teachers switched to Turkish during instruction.

Other

During the observations, there were some further educational functions of CS. For example, most of the time two of the teacher participants made use of Turkish discourse particles *peki, tamam, işte, yani* within English sentences. They even used those discourse particles during the SRIs. When asked to explain the reason for using the above mentioned words, NTP2 stated that her aim was to draw the students' attention, whereas NTP3 consulted the said words in order to gain time to think about the topic being discussed.

Additionally, among the less common educational functions of CS, teachers switched to Turkish when correcting their students' pronunciation as presented in the excerpt below.

Excerpt: *Correcting pronunciation*

Teacher: What about sixth one? Processing plant'**lere yollanır ki buralar bla blah dır** [6] [It is being send to processing plants and those are blah blah]. So this is a relative clause and we are referring to the previous noun as a place.

Ss1: Where.

Teacher: Where. Where. Sir. Where. **Açık e** [7] [Open e]. Where. Smile when you say where.

In the excerpt above, teacher asks about for the correct answer of the cloze test question. Noticing that the student who gave the answer had pronunciation problem, teacher immediately repeat the word with the correct pronunciation and code switches to tell the student how to pronounce the related word correctly.

Apart from such functions, teachers also made use of CS to give additional information. The below excerpt is an example of such function:

Excerpt: *Giving additional information*

Teacher: And the eleventh one. This was a phrasal verb.

Ss: Made up

Teacher: That's it. Made up of something. What about the synonymies? Made of something **de diyebilirdik**[17] [We could have also said made of something].

Ss1: Consist of.

Teacher: Consist of something **diyebilirdik**[18] [we could have also said consits of something]. Involved something **diyebilirdik**[19] [we could have also said involved somethinhg]. We are thing about to make up of synonymies. Başka kaldı mı? [20] [Anything left?] Okay. I think all was that. That's all

---

In the excerpt above, teacher and students are working on a cloze test exercise and teacher asks for the answer of the eleventh question. After eliciting the correct answer teacher

tells her students about the other possible answers and while doing so she inserts some Turkish words to her sentences.

The last but not least, teachers code switched for the purposes of self-repair. Below is an excerpt illustrating this function:

Excerpt: *Self-repair*

Teacher: Next one. Ss? Could you do it? Okay. Here. Relative clause. Is there a relative clause? And it modifies the date. Two-thousand-and-three **hayır** sorry one-thousand-and-three-hundred-eighty[4]. It modifies the date. When? The date. When a near group of I ask her so. I'd like to hear her. When a group of people arrived from..

Ss1: Cevap nedir? [What is the answer?]

Teacher: When. Okay.

In the example of excerpt above, the teacher and students are working on a cloze test exercise and teacher tries to give the answer by explaining the reasons. As the teacher reads the question, she tells the date incorrectly and code switches immediately afterwards to correct herself. After such CS, she again uses English and tells the date correctly.

In a nutshell, first research question aimed to investigate the educational functions of CS in novice teachers' classroom practices. The results revealed the educational functions of CS as the following: to create a feeling of connectedness by making students feel comfortable, to foster learning, to form a bridge between L1 and L2, to put forward teacher's inner voice, to express feelings, emotions, abstract concepts, to facilitate comprehension, to keep students engaged in class and other.

Teachers' perceptions of the code switching in their teaching practices

The second research question aimed to investigate teachers' perceptions regarding CS in their teaching practices. The data yielded by the SRIs suggest that NTPs experienced changes in their perceptions and practices through CS and they started to perceive CS as beneficial and as a positive contributor to students learning, in achieving their teaching aims in the classrooms. When we asked them to elaborate on the changes they had in their perceptions, one area which NTPs mentioned was about their methodology courses in pre-service education which they constantly read and were told by their teachers that they ''need to use English as much as possible'' (NTP2, SRI). Therefore, NTPs stated that they thought they ''needed to do this to help the students to understand much better'' (NTP2, SRI). Although NTPs' pre-service teacher education had an impact on their perceptions based on L1 usage in the classroom, NTPs explained that as they started the profession they gained awareness and ''saw that using English did not work all the time'' (NTP1, SRI). NTPs became aware of the fact that theory and practice were not the same things, and that theories may not be valid in the real classroom environment. NTP2 explained the situation and said ''Students need to be exposed to the language to learn it well. I learned like this and I wanted to apply this in my teaching. But then in the first and second semester I saw that this didn't work'' (NTP2, SRI).

Accordingly, NTP1 said that if the theoretical part is not applicable in their classrooms, and ''if the main objective is teaching then methods are not that important or not that unchangeable or just like a taboo or something'' (NTP1, SRI). When we wanted to tap into their thoughts about how such awareness affected their teaching and classroom discourse, NTPs explained that they became more flexible in their language usage and achieved most of their teaching aims in the classroom through CS. NTP3 said ''the real thing that changed my mind was my experiences in the classroom in real classrooms'' (NTP3, SRI). In addition, NTPs mentioned that the ICELT training also had an effect on their perceptions towards L1 usage in the classroom given that NTPs' teacher trainer did not discourage the usage of mother tongue when it was necessary in the classroom. One of the participants mentioned that as she read articles on EFL in some journals, and through her ICELT courses, she noticed that L1 is no longer considered as a taboo in foreign language classrooms. NTP1 also commented on the dynamicity of the language teaching and elaborated on the changing methods in English language teaching. NTP1 further commented as follows:

> Everything is changing, so in my ICELT courses people are not very strict on using only one language or using the mixed language they also agree that if you can teach it some way you can use any way. So I think ICELT also affected me because I saw that code switching or using L1 is also rightful in some part (NTP1, SRI).

The stimulated recall sessions also revealed that NTPs formed a community of practice (CoP) which is defined as ''groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis'' (Wenger, 2002, p.4), in order to share their language teaching practices as well as the ways in which they choose to interact with their students. Sharing their experiences about CS with their colleagues guided NTPs in relating to each other's classroom practices. Being informed about their colleagues CS practices in classrooms through CoP, NTPs mentioned that they learned to overcome the difficulty of keeping the balance between the administration, that is to say instructional policies, their colleagues and their students.

A closer look at the data indicated that one of the most perceived beneficial side of CS was revealed to be its usage in terms of building rapport and consequently creating a positive learning environment in the classroom. NTPs indicated that the ways in which they choose to interact with their students and teach English language affect the atmosphere in the classroom and their relationship with their students. To have a positive teaching and learning environment in the classroom, CS was perceived as important and necessary. NTP2 explained this issue as follows:

> When I code switch in class I generally have better relations with the students because they like it and they try to discuss the things with me in class and they respond me when I ask something.Students feel closer and relaxed and code switching helps me in this way. Even the silent students speak when I code switch (NTP2, SRI).

As non-native teachers of English, NTPs they also perceived some advantages of using CS in their classroom practices. To illustrate, NTP3 explained some of these advantages as follows:

> If I speak English all the time I am not sure but I hear from the other students that for example with the native teachers they cannot communicate they cannot build very healthy bonds. I think it may help in this way. Also sometimes while I am explaining some grammar points it may help me too.Because if I am insecure if I am not sure about a thing I switch to Turkish. So it helps me and my psychology unconsciously I don't know (NTP3, SRI).

Apart from these, although NTPs mentioned the above benefits, they also argued that CS in a classroom is more like a momentarily help and in the long run it may not be as beneficial. The following quote from one of the NTPs is an example of such concern:

> Sometimes I just I just feel this need in the class because they are not the same level students. Some of them are better some of them are weaker. I think this is just for like five or ten students at most. But because they don't have a transcription they don't have this chance also to work on it or comment on it because this is what the exam is going to be like. So this is just like a momentarily help but in the long term it may not work (NTP1, SRI)

Another theme emerging from the data was about the institutional policy at SFL. According to NTPs, although they code switched at times, they did not want to ''ruin the policy of institution'' (NTP1, SRI). Therefore, NTPs stated that most of the time they try to keep their code switched sentences as short as possible. When asked if an English-only policy is imposed on the teachers, NTPs' responses diversified. As reported by NTP1, ''SFL doesn't have a strict idea or strict opposition about L1 but they know that we should use it as little as possible'' (SRI). NTP1, also indicated that the authorities are aware that using only English in foreign language classrooms, especially with beginners, is not possible. However, keeping the balance is not an easy task and in order to encourage students to use the language ''the institution is encouraging us to use English most of the time'' (NTP3, SRI).When we wanted to reveal whether there was a consequence for using Turkish in the classroom, NTP1 said: ''they don't interrupt this or they don't bother people for this but in general they have a tendency to make us use English as much as possible'' (NTP1, SRI).When we asked whether such ''encouragement'' was directly told to NTPs, NTP2 replied as follows: ''No but in the teacher evaluation forms there is a question ''how often does the teacher use Turkish or English''. This shows that we need to use English but if I believe I need to use Turkish I use it'' (NTP2, SRI). Therefore, teachers admitted that although they weren't directly told to use English only, they felt the pressure to do so due to being evaluated by students through evaluation forms, in terms of their language use in the classroom. The usage of such forms may be arguable regarding their role on getting feedback from students and implementing the necessary chances in the institution, however possible influences of such forms on teachers and their teaching practices should be considered beforehand. Additionally, this finding indicates the need of guidance on side of the novice teachers. It seems that they need to be

provided with clear cut explanations regarding the policies of the institutions. Indeed, with such guidance novice teachers eliminate the dilemmas or feeling guilty when they switch to L1 in their classrooms.

The findings indicated that NTPs perceived CS as to play various roles on their teaching practices within one year (for NTP1), two years (for NTP2) and three years (for NTP3). Based on the results, teachers experienced a change in their perceptions and practices in order words instead of seeing L1 usage a taboo in their classrooms they started to include L1 in the form of switches to their language usage. Teachers admitted that while doing so, they managed to achieve their teaching aims in the classroom. Additionally, the findings also revealed that as teachers started the profession, they started to notice that the theories they studied and read about were not applicable at times in their classrooms. Such finding is an indicator that NTPs became aware of the practice versus theory dichotomy in the real classroom environment. Here, it might be reasonable to mention that, to date most of the methods and approaches in English language teacher education mostly disregarded the realities of the classroom because in the books teachers are mostly presented with a perfect classroom environment and with motivated learners. This can be interpreted as the reason of NPTs to experience such discrepancy in the first place. As these teachers experienced such dichotomy, they became much more flexible in their teaching as well as CS in their classrooms. Such finding might also be and indicator of NTPs noticing the importance of the 'context' that the learners are in when teaching a language. Therefore, it appears that since teaching is something dynamic, these teachers found their own ways of teaching instead of choosing a method or approach to use. As a result, teachers might have found a way to answer their students' needs and implement the necessary changes in their teaching practices and language choices accordingly. Indeed, the findings also indicated that by including CS in their classroom discourse, these teachers learned the importance and how to be consistent about their classroom routines as well as their CS instances in the classroom.

Students' perceptions regarding the role of functions of code switching in the classroom

The third research question focused on students' perceptions regarding the role of functions of CS in classrooms. The data revealed that, when presented with stimuli based on their teachers' CS practices, student participants' (SPs) responses were mostly in line with their teachers' stated functions of CS. In other words, when we asked students about their teachers' CS instances, their interpretations regarding educational functions of CS matched with their teachers' explanations. Such finding would be an indicator that there were great awareness on side of the students regarding their teachers' CS practices. Apart from SPs' interpretations, their perceptions were also consistent with their teachers'. All the SPs mentioned that their teachers' CS practices were effective, helpful and beneficial as long as they are balanced and the teachers' are consistent.

The participating students believed that their teachers switch to Turkish because it is easy for them to do so and that this helps them gain time. According to the SPs, their teacher code switches unconsciously ''because for example they sometimes use English articulations while saying Turkish words and stuff'' (NTP3's Student S2). They also highlighted that their teachers' get used to switching back and forth between languages and after a while they ''instinctively and automatically talk that way'' (NTP1's Student S1, SRI).

In addition to the above mentioned points, the SRIs with the participating students also revealed that, when their teachers code switch the SPs think the teacher is saying something important and pay even more attention. One of NTP1's student said ''when the teacher sometimes blend Turkish and English together or uses Turkish while talking about important things I pay attention to the lesson even more. I mean when I am lost in thought I regain my consciousness'' (NTP1's Student S1, SRI). In contradistinction to the other participating students, only one of NTP2's students said that when NTP2 code switches it distracts her attention. When asked to elaborate on her point of view, she explained this issue in the following way: ''you completely focus on English when it suddenly becomes Turkish then you take the easy way out and you say well okay she can just explain things this way it is even better you say'' (NTP2's Student S2,SRI). All the remaining SPs mentioned that they understand better when their teacher code switches in the classroom. Another important point revealed by the SRIs is that, when praised in Turkish or when their teachers' expresses their emotions and feelings in Turkish, it is more effective for the SPs. However, students' perceptions based on CS differed as they consider it as positive learning opportunity in short term and as negative in long term.

Participating students stated that the non-nativeness of their teachers' is the reason behind their CS practices. When asked to elaborate on this perception, one of NTP1's students said ''it just comes out like that because she is used to it because she is Turkish she is not an American or anything'' (NTP1's Student S1, SRI). SPs also highlighted the dichotomy of native teacher and non-native teacher of English and they were in favor of having non-native teachers in classroom for various reasons. Emphasizing the fact that none of the students in the classroom are native speakers of English, SPs stated that ''Turkish must be used during the lesson in this way or the other'' (NTP2's Student S1, SRI). NTP3's students said that sometimes when their teacher code switches it is habitual because ''in the end the teacher is also a Turk herself. I mean I would have experienced the same thing if I was her'' (NTP3's Student S1, SRI).

When we wanted to learn their thoughts about native teachers and whether they attended classes of a native speaker teacher, S3 explained her comments as follows:

> I attended both. I mean it was very difficult to get on with the native. While we are doing a writing task for example a non-native teacher makes it easier. I mean we think in Turkish to a large extent and that is why we make mistakes but a non-native teacher understands us and says 'this is what it actually says here' but a foreign teacher is a stranger and she wouldn't understand what is being said and we cannot get efficiency to be honest (NTP2's Student S3, SRI).

In sum, the results revealed students preferences for non-native teachers given that such teachers were perceived to understand what they want to say or write even if they make mistakes in the ways they express themselves when using English.

Results indicated that there were also other factors mentioned by the students. During the SRIs, SPs complained about the distribution of levels at the preparatory school as well as the exam oriented system. Students mentioned that such factors would be among the underlying reasons of their teachers' CS practices. Thus, in the SRIs, students mentioned the

need for the classes to be ''re-organized according to the students attending to the extended semester'' (NTP1's Student S1, SRI). Another student said ''extended semester is messed up, the classes are disorder and this is bad'' (NTP2's Student S2, SRI). Majority of the student participants mentioned that they started to lose their motivation in the classrooms.

The participating students were also aware that although their teachers were CS in the classrooms, they wanted this to be minimized. Apart from that, pointing out to the forthcoming exam, the students stated that this may be one of the motivations for their teachers to code switch and/or use L1 in the extended semester. When asked to compare their teachers' CS practices in the extended semester with the previous ones, the students asserted that they hear more CS in extended semester.

The last research question aimed to explore the students' perceptions regarding the role of CS in the classrooms. The data revealed that, students' interpretation of CS functions were mostly in line with their teachers' stated functions. Similar to their teachers SPs perceived CS to be beneficial, helpful and effective in their classrooms however as negative in terms of their language learning in the long run. They also emphasized the importance of have a consistency and balance in CS practices in the classrooms. Students also attributed some CS practices of their teachers' to the fact that their teachers were non-native teachers of English and to contextual factors such as the forthcoming exam and the distribution of levels in PIN classes in the second and extended semesters. Students also mentioned the dichotomy of native teacher and non-native teacher of English and, in contrast to what has been reported in studies regarding students' perceptions of native-English speaking teachers, the students in this study were mostly in favor of having non-native teachers in classroom for various reasons.

Conclusion

The present study investigates the educational functions of CS in novice teachers' classroom practices at an English medium institution of higher education and sheds light on the perceptions of teachers regarding CS in their teaching practices as well as the perceptions of students' regarding the role of CS in the classrooms. Through case study approach, the results of the present study revealed a variety of educational functions of CS in novice teachers' classrooms being; to create a feeling of connectedness, to foster learning, to form a bridge between L1 and L2, to put forward teacher's inner voice, to express feelings, emotions, abstract concepts, to facilitate comprehension, to keep students engaged in class and other.

These findings regarding teachers' stated functions were in line with functions of CS mentioned in the literature, which similarly revealed CS to function for the purposes of asking for clarification, elaboration, explanation, eliciting, encouraging, checking for comprehension, establishing rapport, giving instructions, making the meaning clear by translating it, managing the classroom, praising, self-repairing, to take attention and for cultural expressions (Ataş, 2012; Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013; Sali, 2014; Horasan, 2014; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). Given that the mentioned studies were also conducted in Turkish contexts, this may suggest that such usage of CS might be considered as a pattern preferred by Turkish English teachers in their teaching practices. One of the most significant findings of the study was about the fact that CS was used to express emotions and feelings of teachers. In other words, teachers switched to Turkish whenever they wanted to express their appreciation as well as anger.

Teachers stated that Turkish was more intimate than English and this was one of the reasons why they code switched. Such finding was in line Ervin-Tripp's (1974) study, who claimed that once a bilingual and/or multilingual code switches this may show the emotional representation of particular code (in other words, language) s/he have in his/her access. This finding of the present study was also reported in the literature which focused on the emotional representations of bilinguals and/or multilinguals and revealed first language usage to be more emotional (Derne, 1994; Dewaele, 2006, 2008; Ekman 1972; Kitayama et al., 1995; Panayiotou, 2004; Wallbott & Scherer 1995; Wilkins & Gareirs, 2006). This may suggest that "every language imposes its own classification upon human emotional experiences" (Wierzbicka, 1995, p.546). Further implication of such finding would be that it may be considered as an indicator of a dichotomy of seeing Turkish as the most intimate language in an English medium system. Such dichotomy might be a key driver in teachers' dilemmas regarding CS. The underlying factor regarding teachers' conceptualization of such dilemmas could be behind the reality of the teaching context. In other words, teachers might be influenced from the fact that they were teaching in an English medium university.

Results also indicated that, in contrast to what has been emphasized in English-only policy-related studies, NTPs and some of their students perceived CS as a positive contributor to teaching and learning environment in the classrooms. However, teachers and students considered CS practices as a hindrance to students' language learning progress in the long run. Although this finding of the present study was not consistent with Taskin's (2011) study which revealed teachers' perceptions towards first language usage in English language classrooms to be neutral, it was consistent with the study of Bilgin and Rahimi (2013) which revealed that teachers' regarded CS as a positive teaching aid and that teachers made use of CS for a positive learning environment. However, such finding was not consistent with Horasan's (2014) study, in which CS was perceived to be negative on side of the students. Apart from these, the data revealed the concern of students regarding the exam oriented system as well as the distribution of levels in the classes.

Students also perceived such factors to be underlying reasons of their teachers' CS practices. Indeed, in his study Yavuz (2012) also mentioned the exam-oriented system as being among the underlying reasons for teachers CS practices. The data from the present study also revealed that students were in favor of non-native teachers in their classrooms. Based on such finding, it may be suggested that program coordinators encourage non-native teachers to collaborate with native teachers within the same institution. Such collaboration may vary from CoP, to co-teaching and would increase the quality of teaching in the classrooms.In addition, it seems essential for in-service teacher trainers and program coordinators as well as pre-service teacher education programs to raise pre-service and/or prospective teachers' awareness regarding CS as well as context-sensitive approach to CS practices. Additionally, instead of imposing policies in the forms of (un)written or (un)spoken rules, program coordinators, administrative teachers and/or policy makers need to encourage CoP, reflective practice and action research in order to improve the teaching learning process. With such practices, both pre-service teachers and in service teachers would have a chance to get feedback as well as the required guidance and reflect and build upon each other's experiences.

Finally, caution need to be sounded regarding the limitations of the present study. It is important to acknowledge that since this study focused only on three novice teachers working at an English medium institution of higher education over one semester only, results reported here are constrained. Further research studies can be conducted on CS instances in different educational English medium instruction contexts to shed light on our understanding of the possible differences or similarities about teachers' classroom discourse and language teaching practices.Future research studies can also take a longitudinal approach on the development of CS practices of beginning teachers over time. Through such a study, it would be possible to explore the changes which take place regarding CS practices. In addition, it is important to note that, as the agents of the learning act, students are as important as teachers in the language classrooms. A survey study might also reveal students' thoughts, attitudes or perceptions regarding their teachers' CS practices and contribute to the discussions on English medium instruction, CS and/or L1 usage in language classrooms.

References

Ahmad, B. H., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Teachers' code switching in classroom instructions for low English proficient learners. *English Language Teaching, 2(2),* pp.49-55.

Anderson K. T., & Toribio, J. A. (2007). Attitudes towards lexical borrowing and intra-sentential code switching among Spanish-English bilinguals. *Spanish in Context 4*(2), pp. 217–240.

Ataş, U. (2012). *Discourse functions of students' and teachers' code switching in EFL classrooms:a case study in a Turkish university.* Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Ankara Turkey: Middle East Technical University.

Azlan, N. M. N. I., & Narasuman, S. (2013). The role of code switching as a communicative tool in an ESL teacher education classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *90*(2013), pp. 458-467.

Bahous, N. R., Nabhani, B. M., & Bacha, N. N. (2014). Code switching in higher education in a multilingual environment: a Lebanese exploratory study. *Language Awareness*, *23*(4), pp. 353-368.

Barandagh, S. G., Zoghi, M., & Amini, D. (2013). An investigation of teachers and learners' use of English-Persian code switching in Iranian intermediate EFL classrooms. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research, 3*(7), pp. 876-883.

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), pp. 70-82.

Canagarajah, S. (1995). Functions of code switching in ESL classrooms: socialising bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(3), pp. 173-95.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classroom: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Melbourne: Edward Arnold/Hodder Headline Group.

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

Derne, S. (1994) Structural realities, persistent dilemmas, and the construction of emotional paradigms: Love in three cultures. In W.Wentworth and J.Ryan (Eds), *Social Perspectives on Emotion*, 2, (pp. 281-308) Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Dewaele, J. M. (2006). Expressing anger in multiple languages. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation* (pp. 118–151). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dewaele, J. M. (2008). The emotional weight of I love you in multilinguals' languages. *Journal of Pragmatics, 40*(10), pp. 1753-1780.

Ekman, P. (1972). Universals and cultural differences in facial expression of emotion. In J. K. Cole (Ed.) *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 19* (pp.207-283). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

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

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1974). Emotion in Bilingualism. In K. Hakuta (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Bilingualism Conference*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Ateneo Puertorriqueno. Retrieved on May 9, 2014 from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:_j8ZoZ-XfgAJ:ihd.berkeley.edu/ErvTripp%2520Bilingualism/Emotion%2520in%2520Bilingualism.pdf+&cd=1&hl=tr&ct=clnk&gl=cy

Farrell, T. S. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: bridging the gap between presrvice and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quartely*, *46*(3), pp. 435-449.

Flyman-Mattsson, A., & Burenhult, N. (1999). Code switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers in Linguistics, 47*(1999), pp. 59-72. Retrieved on 12 May 2014, from http://journals.lub.lu.se/index.php/LWPL/article/ viewFile/2322/1897

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

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), pp. 44-59.

Horasan, S. (2014). Code switching in EFL classrooms and the perceptions of the students and teachers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *10*(1), pp. 31-45.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, *3*, pp. 10-23.

Kidner, K. (2010). *Power and identity: negotiation through code switching in the Swiss German classroom*. Unpublished Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics Thesis. Alberta: University of Alberta.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Matsumoto, H. (1995). Culture, self, and emotion: A cultural perspective on "self-conscious" emotions. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions. The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 439–464). New York: Guilford.

Lee, W. (2010). *Codeswitching as a Communicative Strategy in a Korean Heritage Language Classroom.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. San Diego State University.

Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(3), pp. 343-364.

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

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: theories and decision-making. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(4), pp. 531-548.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design.* New Jersey: Routledge.

Mattsson, A., & Burenhult-Mattsson, N. (1999). Code switching in second language teaching of French. *Working Papers, 47*(1), pp. 59-72.

Miles, R. (2004). *Evaluating the use of L1 in the English language classroom.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Nishimura, M. (1995a). A functional analysis of Japanese/English code switching. *Journal of pragmatics*, *23*(2), pp. 157-181.

Nishimura, M. (1995b). Varietal conditioning in Japanese/English code switching. *Language sciences*, *17*(2), pp. 123-145.

Nordin, M. N., Ali, R. D. F., Zubir, S. S. I. S., & Sadjirin, R. (2013). ESL learners' reactions towards code switching in classroom settings. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90*(2013), pp. 478-487.

Pachler, N., & Field, K. (2001). *Learning to Teach Modern Foreign Languages in the Secondary School*. Routledge: London.

Panayiotou, A. (2004). Switching codes, switching code: Bilinguals' emotional responses in English and Greek. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(2-3), pp. 126- 139.

Prucha, J. (1983). Using language: A Sociofunctional Approach. In Bin,B. (Eds).*The sociogenesis of language and human conduct*. New York: Plenum Press.

Reini, J. (2008). *The functions of teachers' language choice and code switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.

Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System, 42*(2014), pp. 308-318.

Seidlitz, L. M. (2003). *Functions of code switching in classes of German as a foreign language*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Austin: The University of Texas.

Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code switching in ELT Classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 10*(8). Retrieved on May 12, 2014, from http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html

Schwartz, M., & Asli, A. (2014). Bilingual teachers' language strategies: The case of an Arabic–Hebrew kindergarten in Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *38*(2014), pp. 22-32.

Taşkın, A. (2011). *Perceptions on using L1 in language classrooms: A case study in a Turkish private university.* Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Ankara Turkey: Middle East Technical University.

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

Wallbott, H. G., & Scherer, K. R. (1995). Cultural determinants in experiencing shame and guilt. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (Eds.), *Self-conscious emotions. The psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride* (pp. 465–487). New York: Guilford.

Wenger, E. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilkins, R., & Gareirs, E. (2006). Emotional expression and the locution 'I love you': a cross cultural study. *Intercultural Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(1), pp. 51-75.

Wierzbicka, A. (1995). Emotion and facial expression: a semantic perspective. *Culture Psychology, 1*(2), pp. 227-258.

Yao, M. (2011). On attitudes to teachers' code switching in EFL classes. *World Journal of English Language*, *1*(1), pp. 19-28.

Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2015). EFL teachers' code switching in Turkish secondary EFL young language learner classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *7*(1), pp. 82-101.

Yavuz, F. (2012). The Attitudes of English Teachers about the Use of L1 in the Teaching of L2. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*(2012), pp. 4339-4344

Yletyinen, H. (2004). *The functions of code switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyvaskyla.