

Code Switching in ELT Classrooms: A Case Study

Nermin Ruso

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
January 2019
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Chair, Department of Foreign Language
Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in
scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language
Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Behbud Muhammedzade

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlkey Gilanlıođlu

ABSTRACT

The study is done to find out the functions of code switching and attitudes towards code switching of Turkish M.A. and PhD. students and teachers in ELT classrooms. More specifically, it aims to investigate what kinds of code switching students and teachers use in classrooms and what students and teachers' attitudes towards code switching in ELT classrooms are. The study was conducted at the department of Foreign Language Education (FLE), Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The participants of the study are, 15 M.A and PhD level Turkish ELT students in total and 3 Turkish speaking teachers who teach M.A and PhD level classes. There are 30 PhD and MA students in total who are from Turkey and North Cyprus. However, in the study 15 of them included because it was done on voluntary basis. There are 4 Turkish male and 11 Turkish female students in this study and they have been chosen according to their convenience, availability and their volunteering. These students are studying at Department of Foreign Language Education in the MA and PhD levels. 6 students are from PhD level and 9 students are from MA level. In addition to these, there are 5 Turkish speaking teachers who teach PhD and MA level classes in the Department of FLE, but only 3 of them can participate in this study because of their availability and volunteering. The mixed method was used to collect data for the study by using questionnaires for both students and teachers and semi-structured interview for instructors.

This case study demonstrates that students and instructors are using code switching to Turkish for various functions. These reasons were categorized under different functions by adopting code switching model which belongs to Apple and Muysken (2006). Based

on the results of the questionnaire and interview which are about functions of code switching, both students and teachers use code switching for expressive functions, poetic functions, directive functions and referential functions. On the other hand, the second questionnaire that is about attitudes of code switching, students have positive attitude while teachers have neutral attitude towards it.

Keywords: code switching, functions of code switching, ELT classrooms, attitude toward code-switching.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi Sınıflarındaki Türk, yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencilerinin ve öğretmenlerinin düzenek değiştirmedeki işlevlerini ve düzenek değiştirmeye karşı olan tutumlarını incelemektir. Daha belirgin olarak amaç, İngiliz Dili ve Eğitimi sınıflarındaki öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin ne tür düzenek değiştirme kullandıklarını ve düzenek değiştirmeye yönelik tutumlarının ne olduğunu araştırmaktır. Bu çalışma, Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü'nde yapılmıştır. Katılımcılar, toplamda 15 Türk yüksek lisans ve doktora öğrencisi ve yüksek lisans ve doktora sınıflarına eğitim veren, Türkçe konuşan 3 öğretmendir. Türkiye ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'tan olmak üzere toplam 30 doktora ve yüksek lisans öğrencisi vardır. Ancak, çalışma gönüllü olarak yapıldığı için 15 kişi katılmaya gönüllü olmuştur. Bu çalışmada 4 Türk erkek ve 11 Türk kız öğrenci bulunmaktadır ve uygunluk durumu ve gönüllülük esasına göre seçilmişlerdir. Bu öğrenciler Yüksek Lisans ve Doktora seviyelerinde Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümünde öğrenim görmektedir. 6 öğrenci doktora düzeyinde ve 9 öğrenci yüksek lisans düzeyindedir. Bunlara ek olarak, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümünde doktora ve yüksek lisans dersleri veren toplam 5 Türkçe konuşan öğretmen vardır, ancak, müsait olma durumu ve gönüllük esası nedeniyle bu çalışmaya yalnızca 3'ü katılabılmıştır. Gerekli bilgilerin toplanması için karma yöntem kullanılmış, öğretmenler için anket ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme, öğrenciler için ise yalnızca anket kullanılmıştır.

Bu örnek olay incelemesi, öğrencilerin ve öğretim elemanlarının farklı amaçlarla Türkçe'ye düzenek değiştirme yaptıklarını göstermektedir. Bu nedenler, Apple ve Muysken (2006) 'a ait düzenek değiştirme modelini benimseyerek farklı işlevler altında

kategorize edilmiştir. Düzenek deęiřtirme iřlevleri ile ilgili olan anket ve grüşme sonuçlarına dayanarak, hem ğretmenler hem de ğrenciler drt ana iřlev iin düzenek deęiřtirmeyi kullanırlar: anlatımsal, yazınsal, ynlendirici ve gnderge. te yandan, düzenek deęiřtirme tutumları ile ilgili ikinci ankette, ğrencilerin olumlu tutumları vardır, ğretmenler ise buna karřı tarafsız bir tutum sergilemektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: düzenek deęiřtirme, düzenek deęiřtirmenin iřlevleri, İngiliz Dili Eęitimi sınıfları, düzenek deęiřtirmeye ynelik tutumlar.

DEDICATION

To My Family, My Fiancé and My Beloved Ones

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev for his guidance, support and understanding throughout this research. Besides my supervisor, I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ülker Vancı Osam and Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan for their contributions.

Also I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Behbud Muhammadzade and Assist. Prof. Dr. İlkay Gilanlıoğlu for their support, motivation, feedback, and constructive contributions to my thesis as members of my examining committee.

My special thanks go to participants who contributed in this study voluntarily for their precious time and effort. Their contributions made it possible for me to complete this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT..... | iii |
| ÖZ..... | v |
| DEDICATION..... | vi |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT..... | vi |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | xii |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS..... | xiii |
| 1 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of Problem..... | 3 |
| 1.3 The Aim of the Study..... | 3 |
| 1.4 The Importance of the Study..... | 4 |
| 1.5 Definition of Key Terms..... | 4 |
| 2 LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 6 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2.2 Definition of Code switching..... | 6 |
| 2.2.1 Code Switching vs. Borrowing..... | 9 |
| 2.3 Functions of Code Switching..... | 10 |
| 2.3.1 Referential Function of Code Switching..... | 10 |
| 2.3.2 Expressive Function of Code Switching..... | 11 |
| 2.3.3 Poetic Function of Code Switching..... | 11 |
| 2.3.4 Directive Function of Code Switching..... | 11 |
| 2.3.5 Phatic Function of Code Switching..... | 12 |
| 2.3.6 Metalinguistic Function of Code Switching..... | 12 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.3.7 Functions of Code Switching in Classrooms..... | 12 |
| 2.3.8 Micro and Macro Functions of Code Switching..... | 13 |
| 2.4 Approach to the Study of Code Switching..... | 16 |
| 2.4.1 The Sociolinguistic Approach to Code Switching..... | 16 |
| 2.5 Attitudes toward Code Switching | 17 |
| 2.5.1 Positive Attitudes toward Code Switching | 17 |
| 2.5.2 Negative Attitudes toward Code Switching..... | 18 |
| 2.6 Studies on Code Switching | 19 |
| 2.6.1 Studies on Code Switching in Turkish Settings..... | 22 |
| 2.7 Conclusion | 23 |
| 3 METHOD..... | 25 |
| 3.1 Introduction..... | 25 |
| 3.2 Overview of Methodology | 25 |
| 3.3 Research Design..... | 26 |
| 3.4 Research Questions | 28 |
| 3.5 Research Setting..... | 28 |
| 3.6 Participants..... | 29 |
| 3.6.1 Students..... | 29 |
| 3.6.2 Teachers | 30 |
| 3.7 Data Collection Tools..... | 30 |
| 3.7.1 Student Questionnaires..... | 30 |
| 3.7.2 Teachers' Instrument..... | 31 |
| 3.8 Data Collection and Analyzing Procedures | 32 |
| 4 RESULTS | 34 |
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 4.2 Research Question 1: What Are the Functions of the Post Graduate Students' Code Switching in the Class?..... | 34 |
| 4.2.1 Students' Switching for Poetic Functions..... | 41 |
| 4.2.2 Students' Switching for Directive Functions..... | 41 |
| 4.2.3 Students' switching for Referential Functions..... | 42 |
| 4.2.4 Students' Switching for Expressive Functions..... | 43 |
| 4.3 Research Question 2: What Are the Functions of the Teachers' Code Switching in the Class?..... | 43 |
| 4.4 Research Question 3: What Are the Teachers' and Post Graduate Students' Attitudes towards Code Switching?..... | 50 |
| 4.4.1 Description and Translation of Items that is in the questionnaire about Attitudes towards Code Switching..... | 50 |
| 4.4.2 Results of the Teachers' Attitude Questionnaire..... | 51 |
| 4.4.3 Results of the Students' Attitude Questionnaire..... | 53 |
| 5 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 56 |
| 5.1 Introduction..... | 56 |
| 5.2 Discussion of the Results..... | 56 |
| 5.3 Pedagogical Implications of the Study..... | 58 |
| 5.4 Conclusion..... | 59 |
| 5.5 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research..... | 60 |
| REFERENCES..... | 63 |
| APPENDICES..... | 75 |
| Appendix A: Permission Letter..... | 76 |
| Appendix B: Consent Form for the Students Questionnaire..... | 77 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Appendix C: Student Questionnaire Items..... | 79 |
| Appendix D: Consent Form for the Teacher Questionnaire..... | 83 |
| Appendix E: Teacher Questionnaire Items..... | 85 |
| Appendix F: Consent Form for the Teacher Interview..... | 88 |
| Appendix G: Teacher Semi-Structured Interview Questions..... | 90 |
| Appendix H: Teachers' Interview Transcription..... | 91 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Ethnographic Description of the Students..... | 29 |
| Table 2: The Responses of Students' Questionnaire for Functions of Code Switching..... | 34 |
| Table 3: Results for Poetic Functions..... | 41 |
| Table 4: Results for Directive Functions..... | 41 |
| Table 5: Results for Referential Functions..... | 42 |
| Table 6: Results for Expressive Functions..... | 43 |
| Table 7: Results of the Teachers' Attitudes towards Code Switching..... | 51 |
| Table 8: Results of the Students' Attitude towards Code Switching..... | 53 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|------------|--|
| A. | Agree |
| D. | Disagree |
| EFL | English as a Foreign Language |
| ELT | English Language Teaching |
| EMU | Eastern Mediterranean University |
| FLE | Foreign Language Education |
| L1 | First language/ native language |
| L2 | Second language |
| MA | Master of Arts |
| Mmm | Long pause with hesitation |
| N.S. | Not sure |
| PhD | Doctoral Degree |
| S.A. | Strongly agree |
| S.D. | Strongly disagree |
| Std. D. | Standard deviation |
| T | Teacher |
| ... | Incomplete sentence |
| 1, 2, 3... | Indicate teacher' whose name is anonymous in the interview |

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, aim of the study, the importance of the study and the definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Currently, a big share of the world's population is bilingual or multilingual (Grosjean, 2010). For that reason, the word code switching is used to designate individuals that may use two or more language in an identical conversation and (Bentahila & Davies, 1992).

Weinreich (1953) defined code switching as starting with one language then moving onto the next with some reasonable changes in the discourse depending on the circumstance. This definition is one of the earliest definitions for code switching. Appropriately, code switching is the substitute utilization of at least two languages by bilinguals inside a similar discussion (Milroy and Muysken, 1995). Switching code is extremely typical in nations in which two languages are talked and in nations where there are such a large number of people coming from outside (Asali, 2011). As indicated by Wardhaugh (2006), code switching may mean mixing assortments of a similar language and this occurrence is acknowledged as diglossia. In general, some people mix code switching and code mixing. However, there is a distinction among both terms. Code mixing implies blend of various lexical units and syntax, while code switching implies blend of words from various languages in a single sentence

(Muysken, 2010). Many linguists (Gardner & Chloros, 1997; Wardhaugh, 2000; Holmes, 2001; Ayeomoni, 2006) think code switching is a mutual and unavoidable problem because in bilingual and multilingual societies, it is very natural that the humans regularly alternate between two or more languages starting with one language then onto the next in their everyday communications.

Since 1950 code switching has attracted researcher's attention (Ibrahim, Shah & Armia, 2013) and it has been largely investigated in EFL and ESL context since the 1990s. Researchers have examined code switching as of diverse perceptions. For instance; functions (e.g., Rose, 2006; Othman, 2015), attitudes toward it (e.g., Akın, 2016; Dykhanova, 2015) and educational benefits of code switching (e.g., Mokgwathi & Webb, 2013) in different countries such as Kazakhstan, Northern Cyprus, Turkey, China, Spain and many other countries have been searched for.

Code switching has been examined regarding several useful methodologies, for example, sociolinguistic (Boztepe, 2005), conversational (Auer, 1998) and discourse-related (Myers-Scotton, 1989). The sociolinguistic way of dealing with code switching reveals the reason as to why people code switch and what kinds of social changes occur in relation to these (Gardner and Chloros, 2009).

Certain thoughts or perceptions are just better stated and conveyed in the new language; Presenters might require to block up an etymological necessity for a term or an articulation; and they correspondingly apply switching codes as an educational or public system to display speakers connotation, spot the characteristics of the group, eliminate someone from the group and bring one's position to an upper level Grosjean (2010).

1.2 Statement of Problem

The main point of this investigation is to fill a remarkable hole in the writing composed on code switching. The examinations focused in ELT site are exceptionally restricted, especially in Turkish ELT settings. As per my own perception, in MA and PhD level ELT classes, at the Department of Foreign Language Education, at Eastern Mediterranean University, it was seen that students and teachers now and again code switch amongst English and Turkish languages.

This investigation wants to find out which meanings do the mentors and learners code change to Turkish in ELT setting and what their attitudes towards code switching are? To reach these goals, (i) relevant literature was searched and reviewed, (ii) a questionnaire was distributed to students online who study at the MA and PhD program, (iii) a survey and semi-structured interview was held with the teachers at FLE Department, (iv) the answers of both students and teachers were analyzed, (v) accordance with outcomes, proposals will be presented to the ELT educators and learners with respect to utilization of switching codes in ELT classes.

1.3 The Aim of the Study

The goal of this research is to reveal which functions of alternating between these two languages do Turkish ELT MA and PhD students and teachers use and what are their attitudes toward the use of code switching.

In order to reveal these aims three research questions were directed throughout the investigation:

1. What are the functions of the post graduate students' using code-switching in the class?

2. What are the functions of the teachers' using code-switching in the class?
3. What are the teachers' and post graduate students' attitudes towards the use of code-switching?

1.4 The Importance of the Study

Various works are done about code switching in EFL or ESL context and there are a few studies that conducted in ELT setting. For instance, Üstünel and Seedhouse in 2005 conduct a study about code switching in EFL context at a Turkish University and their study reveal that code- switching in L2 classrooms is organized and identified with the development of pedagogical focus and arrangement. However, this research will focus around code switching in an ELT setting in Eastern Mediterranean University as a result of the growing eagerness for the investigations done in ELT settings about code switching. For example, Othman in 2015 made an investigation about code switching in ELT context at Eastern Mediterranean University and his work demonstrates that both learners and educators use code switching into Turkish in ELT classrooms for different reasons. Due to these kinds of reasons this case study will be a trial to fill this major and important gap in the related field.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

Code switching: Code switching is the swing between two languages within a solitary speech or conversation (Poplack, 1980).

Code mixing: Code mixing is cases when verbal components and linguistic highlights from many dialects are used in a similar sentence (Muysken, 2000).

Attitude: Attitude is a preference to reply positively or negatively towards an assigned class of incentives, for example, a national or racial gathering, a custom or an establishment (Anastasi, 1990).

First Language (L1)/Native Language: First language or native language is language that is picked up since birth or among the certain time frame, a dialect that an individual consults the best (Bloomfield, 1994). Several people think idea local dialect/native language as ID of origin, whereas some may have a few local languages by having two languages or having local dialect that is unique in relation to her/his society (Davies, 2003).

Second Language: A second language can be said to be any language learned not withstanding one's local language (Mitchell and Myles, 2004).

Foreign Language: This is a dialect that is not being used in an exact motherland or by a community that you live in (Cristal, 2003).

Bilingualism: Bilingualism is the use of dual tongues in a country or by the community (Appel & Muysken, 1987).

Multilingualism: Multilingualism means the use of more than two languages in a motherland or community Aitken, 1992).

Monolingual: Monolingual is the condition of being able to speak only a single language (Romaine, 1995).

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section presents the definition of code switching, gives different functions of code switching, define sociolinguistic approach on code switching, demonstrates attitudes toward code switching, displays studies on code switching and reflects on studies done on code switching in Turkish setting with the functions and conclusion of the chapter.

2.2 Definition of Code switching

Knowing the definition of code switching is important, but before this, knowing the definition of code is more crucial. According to Ataş (2012) the term code is used as a general word for different dialects in the world and the same word was used by a lot of people in various areas. Also, the same term was presented for the first time by Bernstein in 1962 and in his study ‘code’ was used to point to the languages. Moreover, he put forward a sociolinguistic code theory which later changed into social theory and studied the relations amongst family, social class and the meaning system. The code in this theory specified the main principles adaptable to meaning systems. Currently, the word is acting as an umbrella term for languages; dialects, styles and registers.

Weinreich (1953) described it as general public communicating in two languages; a person swapping from one dialect to the other as a result of feeling the need to shift

in discourse. Switching codes can be mostly simplified as the practice of two dialects in the same dialogue (Valdes & Fallis, 1977). Similarly, Heller (1989) indicated that it is the application of additional dialect in an identical talk. In addition, the term can be outlined as shift between languages. This means, when speakers know more than one language in the middle of the speech, the other language interferes if the situation allows (Cook, 2011). Also, Myers and Scotton (1993) stated it as structure being chosen from binary or supplementary dialectal variant in the identical discussion by a person fluent in two languages and polyglot people.

Variation between languages as code switching is a broadly detected event in remote language lessons. Numan and Carter (2001) rapidly illustrate the word as "a phenomenon of converting languages, starting with one language then onto the next in a similar talk".

Trudgill (2000) pointed out that, one of the essentials of switching codes is "to control or influence or describe the situation as presenters' desire and to make refinements after establishing an individual goal". Based on this definition, it might be anticipated that code swapping can be used for self-articulation.

Alternative role of code switching is that it might be utilized with a specific end goal to bring together relational connections among individuals from a bilingual network. In this regard, it might be guaranteed that it is a device for making semantic harmony particularly among people who share the similar ethno-social character (Sert 2005). Backing up the help of alternating between two dialects in language classrooms, Skiba (1997) proposes that in such circumstances in which code switching is utilized as a result of an incapability of manifestation, it occurs there to help for stability in

discourse as a substitute of offering intrusion in dialect. In this regard, switching code is a critical constituent in the discourse of data and in shared interface.

Code mixing is another term that is special for bilingualism and multilingualism. In many studies mixing code and switching code denote to the similar concept while in other studies they state dissimilar notions (Asali, 2011). Bhatita and Ritchie (2004) defined mixing code as blending of different grammatical systems in a sentence. Muysken (2000) identified code mixing as illustrations within the verbal components and linguistic features from diverse dialects that are complete in the same sentence.

Another term that confuses everyone's mind is copying, but there is a difference between these terms. The difference among these two terms is that copying can be used by speakers of two languages or more, but code switching can be used only by bilingual or polyglot utterers (Poplack 1988). Furthermore, Myers and Scotton (1993) stated that code switching involves bilingualism, but borrowing does not involve bilingualism.

One more term for linguistic analyses of code switching is diglossia. Diglossia means languages that are codified and engaged in a particular event (Ferguson 1959). Diglossia is a state in which two dissimilar assortments of a dialect are articulated within the community that the speech is alike. Bilingual diglossia is a kind of situation wherein single dialect variety is used for inscription and the other for chatting. For instance, in Northern Cyprus our native language is Turkish, but when we speak we use Turkish Cypriot dialect but when we write we use standard Turkish.

2.2.1 Code switching vs. Borrowing

The contrast concerning Code switching and borrowing should be identified to comprehend the goal of this investigation better. Bullock and Toribio (2010) expresses verbal copying as “the morphological and phonological integration of single lexeme which is fully established in language”. Gumperz, 1982 stated that these disputes and expressions are integrated into the linguistic organization of the language that is being copied. Therefore, language users might not see them as negatively as code switching. Several scholars similar to Myers-Scotton (1992) indicated that by repeated progressively code switching forms become borrowed forms and borrowing forms are first code switching forms.

The primary alteration among them is the terms copied from another language that generally adjust to the guidelines of phonology of the main discourse. Poplack, 1980 indicated that code switching forms infrequently participate into phonological rules of the target language. Similarly, combination of morphology is more unfinished on code switching than copied procedures (Myers-Scotton, 1992), since, copied procedures are the lexicon part of the target language, and procedures of code switching are still exposed to the processes of morphology of the discourse being subscribed. Finally, regularity of existence is another different characteristic among them. Borrowed words are frequently occurs in the target language but code switching forms do not have any regularity of existence. Thus, Myers-Scotton, 1992 claimed that while borrowed forms are accessible to monolinguals, code switching forms are not accessible to monolinguals.

2.3 Functions of Code Switching

Code-switching is usually anticipated to be a sign of language knowledge insufficiency in bilingual speakers. Nevertheless, many researchers have argued that CS is usually utilized by bilingual speakers to accomplish specific communicative intentions in their conversations with others (Shin, 2010). Functions of code switching can be understood within the framework of three major functions. These functions revolve around the social, linguistic and psychological motivations. Auer (2013) explain that the social motivations are the main cause for CS. Speakers code-switch because they negotiate a change in social distance between themselves and other participants in a conversation. So the social conditions determine the use of certain languages in certain communities (Myers-Scotton, 1997).

Code switching was reviewed from its conversational perspectives and proposed a special system by Jacobson (1960) and Halliday et al. (1964). After this specialized framework, six functions of code switching were presented by Mühlhäusler (1981). These are; referential, expressive, poetic, directive, phatic and metalinguistic. After that, Appel and Muysken (1987; 2006) connected these code switching elements to conversation.

2.3.1 Referential Function of Code Switching

As shown by Chen (2007), referential functions vary according to the following: speakers might want to switch when terms lack availability in the other language. Besides, when terms lack semantically appropriate words in the other language, speakers refer to the language in which such words are available. Last, when speakers are more familiar with their first language, rather than the target language, then they may resort to it.

Karras (1995) expressed that, Code switching for referential functions involves lack of knowledge or facility in a language, and failure of lexical retrieval. Language choice is also determined when it is more suitable or appropriate to be used for a particular topic

2.3.2 Expressive Function of Code Switching

Expressive functions suggest that speakers code switch to express emotions or true feelings to others such as happiness, anger, sadness, etc. In addition, speakers' code switching in the same conversation to express self-identity or mixed identity. This involves switching to make oneself understood or avoid unnecessary misunderstanding. This function allows the speakers to switch their language in utterances to share feelings or self-identity. In addition, code switching in this function also can be a tool to make one language more accessible at that moment.

2.3.3 Poetic Function of Code Switching

For poetic functions, bilingual speakers involve switched puns, jokes, stories, and poetic quotations into English for the purpose of entertainment or amusement and adding a sense of humor. In addition, language can be used in a creative way (rhymes, similes, metaphors).

2.3.4 Directive Function of Code Switching

Generally speaking, the directive function is employed in situations where a speaker wants to direct someone. This function, including the hearer directly, aims at including or excluding someone or a group from the conversations by using a language that is familiar or unfamiliar to the hearers. It also serves as technique for getting the listeners' attention.

2.3.5 Phatic Function of Code Switching

According to Appel & Muysken (2006), in phatic functions, speakers' switch signals emphasis on parts of a conversation which are important. This type of language alternation can be found in when a stand-up comedian tells the whole joke in the standard variety, yet brings the last line of a joke that provides the humor or climax in vernacular types of speech

2.3.6 Metalinguistic Functions of Code Switching

In metalinguistic function, speakers switch when commenting on directly or indirectly on a specific feature of a language by the use of the other language. Furthermore, metalinguistic switching occurs when speakers want to impress others with a show of linguistic skills.

2.3.7 Functions of Code Switching in Classrooms

Polio and Duff (1994) conduct a study which is about the classroom function of code switching in a university. In their study, there are English native language teachers who teach foreign language to learners and also they are native speakers of the target language as well. In addition, Polio and Duff (1994) revealed that foreign language teachers use learners' native language while teaching for these purposes: classroom management, administration, giving grammar instructions, showing empathy and translation if their students have difficulty in understanding them.

Uys (2010) examined if teachers use code switching in classroom and if they do which functions of code switching do they use? They found that, instructors' code switch in classrooms and they use these functions of code switching: for clarification, describing topics and for making students understand the giving topics better,

making them involve in debates, cracking a joke, giving instructions and for managing the organization of classes.

Other study was done by Eldridge and Turkish secondary school in 1996 was investigated and found that, learners use code switching in classrooms for eight functions: controlling fights, dis-alignment or alignment, creating group membership, floor holding, metalanguage, restatement and correspondence.

Lee (2010) conduct a study which examine instructors' approaches toward code switching and functions of code switching in secondary school and found out that, there are eight functions of code switching that teachers use. These are when giving feedback and instructions, identifying learners' understanding, explaining new vocabulary and grammar points, making students more relaxed, categorizing variances among mother tongue and target language, discussing assignments and explaining administrative matters.

Myers-Scotton's (1993) code switching in the classrooms study was classified to Markedness model and he declared five items. These items are: elucidation and description of the topics, testing of understanding, reinforcement for contribution, class administration and joking.

2.3.8 Micro and Macro Functions of Code Switching

Canagarajah (1995), identified two functions of code switching in classes The first function is micro-function and the second function is macro-function. Also, two categories were specified in micro-function. These are: classroom management and content -transmission functions. Managing classroom function encompasses code

switching which instructors and learners practice in class to make lesson easily understandable when they give instructions, orders and commands. Canagarajah (1995) put forward the idea that classroom management functions are good to use in class for many different things. As well as they are being good to control class management, they are also good to give compliments, orders, to help students comprehend things better, to greet and to encourage instructors for unauthorized interfaces.

The function related to the content transmission in regard to code switching is beneficial when trying to establish an effective communication in classroom concerning the skills of the language. Clarifying, paraphrasing, defining, agreeing in social suitability and setting unauthorized learner communications are the content transmission functions according to Canagarajah (1995).

Conversely, the macro-functions deal with educational and social aspects and prepare students for the real life interactions which could take place outside the institute. As sometimes using English could be more demanding for instructors and learners when debating on private or personal matters.

To conclude, micro-functions contend with teaching space concerns whereas macro-functions are related with the issues outside the lecture hall.

2.4 Approach to the Study of Code Switching

Myers-Scotton (1993) proposed one of the major sociolinguistic methodologies that is called Markedness Model. The model proposes that presenters resolve on their choices amongst checked and plain codes according to their mixed requirements,

destinations, and social powers in their area. This analysis creates doubts in respect to Markedness Model by Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) controlled by Elster's (1989) Rational Choice prove. As conveyed, Rational Choice consents that presenters plan their actions to reveal intentions or mindsets in accordance with their stable assessments. Researchers of this Markedness Model stipulate an individual engineering, named 'notability evaluator' which all speakers are stated have it everywhere. Particularity assessor is an empirical tool allocating with the money saving benefit inquiries among numerous selections to settle on the most cooperative decision for the presenter. The main feature in this context is wisdom, performing as a constituent and as a justification.

Myers-Scotton and Bolonyai (2001) recommends a few principles that could be identified with Markedness Model. The ones that elucidate why Markedness Model was chosen as the premises of the worries will be talked about. It is crucial to keep in mind that the final goals to authorize the notability assessor, presenters need to open to both stamped and plain alternatives in an honest talk. These decisions, made by particularity assessor, frame a 'Rights and Obligations' set between members. Rights and Obligations sets are the file of the plain decisions speakers make. The particularity of a Rights and Obligations set changes as specified by numerous settings, talks and members' arrangement. The point of the presenters is for the most part to choose the plainer Rights and Obligations set. Be that as it may, there is no all-around plain Rights and Obligations set among various settings. One Rights and Obligations setting that is set apart for most of the general public could be plain in another particular gathering of individuals in a similar society. Beyond any doubt presenters choose among their selections as people, yet they perform like gathering beings concerning similar semantic conclusions (Myers-Scotton, 1998). As it is

conveyed, this analysis accomplishes three separate assemblies of members, as it were three exclusive settings or dialogues. In this way, their settings may surround various Rights and Obligations sets and may as requirements are rapid distinctive mindsets towards a similar code swapping articulations. In this way, to evaluate their dispositions towards code switching, the distinctive settings which they have a place with ought to be thought about.

To sum up, there are three striking points of view surrounding the methodologies of code switching; auxiliary, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic methodologies. One of the sociolinguistic methodologies, Markedness Model, was comprised as the reason for the doubts in this search since it revolves around reasonability to clarify the decisions and the mentalities of the speakers. Furthermore, it considers the diverse particularity levels among people and assemblies. Due to every one of these reasons, Markedness Model gives the important construction to the ideas of this examination.

2.4.1 The Sociolinguistic Approach to Code Switching

When we look at the literature we can see that many investigators explore why speakers have a tendency to utilize a certain code; what kind of thoughts do they have in their minds to cause shifts starting with one code then onto the next and why individuals as a rule desire to use a recently enhanced code from two different codes by switching codes forward and backward concerning the two.

As sociolinguists claim, the examination of code switching drives past the ascents of code switching as to why it happens and restrictions lying behind its usage. Scientists discover why individuals code switch and which social purpose of perspectives prompt code switching in accordance with sociolinguistic approach (Gardner &

Choloros, 2009). The question ‘why people code switch while speaking?’ is the motivation for Myers-Scotton and Ury’s (1977) studies. Grosjean (2010) covers the reasons why individuals code switch: it is on account of specific ideas or thoughts which can basically be better communicated and comprehended in the other dialect; speakers may require likewise filling a philological hole for an articulation or an expression.

2.5 Attitudes toward Code Switching

There are two attitudes toward code switching. The first attitude is positive and the second one is negative. Several researchers sustains the usage of first language in class and prove its paybacks whereas other scholars support only the use of target language in classroom and they expound this idea in their studies (Krashen & Terrel, 1988; Duff & Polio, 1990; Auerbach, 1993).

2.5.1 Positive Attitudes toward Code Switching

According to Macaro (2001) there is no study to justify using first language improves second language learning. In addition, Qing (2010) stated that teachers’ code switching is done unconsciously during their speech and it is mandatory. Hughes et al. (2006) claims that code switching is a “sign of giftedness” when speakers use code switching. Code switching is not an indication of low semantic proficiency; rather it is an indicator of very thorough proficiency (Trudgill, 1984). Simon (2001) found that students code switch to their native language because their proficiency level of the second language might not be equal to their native language proficiency level and they may not feel comfortable while using the target language.

Many researchers support using code switching in class and they retained the spot that this swapping technique should not be viewed as educator’s weak point (Chick

& McKay, 1999; Schweers, 1999; Burden, 2001; Dash, 2002; Tang, 2002). Moreover, Lucas & Katz (1994) stated that the consumption of learners' first language in class help them learn better because they feel that their L1 identities are respected. Moreover, Cook (2002) pointed out that most of the teachers found it very difficult to teach target language in target language. Code switching has some advantages such as; it reduces students' anxiety level and provide effective learning environment, it forges a link between students' experience and life and it advances a student learner centered curriculum improvement (Auer, 1993). Teachers ought not to discourage students to code switching in classroom because code switching is very natural case where two languages are common to the speakers (Cook, 2001). Overall, investigators consider code switching as smoothing relaxing and warm atmosphere in the class.

2.5.2 Negative Attitudes toward Code Switching

Although there are lots of positive attitudes toward code switching, a large number of researchers think negatively toward code switching. According to Appel & Muysken's (1988) findings, EFL teachers consider code switching as a negative issue to their students' second language learning and these researchers suggested that code switching ought to be taboo by teachers. Similarly, most of the instructors regard code switching negative and they think code switching has bad effects on their students' checking and comprising abilities and it is preventing the security of the students' second language (Olmo-castillo, 2014).

Turnbull (2001) anticipates that learners will be presented to main discourse as plentiful as they could reasonably be expected since the educator is the main wellspring of the noteworthy information in a dialect. He comprises that "it is significant for instructors to apply the target language as much as they could in

reasonable and expected settings thus, understudies suggest that just brief times of energy in class once a day, while having less interaction with the main discourse outside the class helps language learning better".

Also, Macdonald (1993) underpins that the misuse of first language may meddle with students' dialect learning as there are very few encounters and circumstances in which they can make sense of how the dialect framework functions and what the message is. Therefore, educators should give students a few chances to enable them to acknowledge how the dialect functions. Shifting to the L1 to shed light on what the educator has said to students is "meaningless and demoralizes the learning process" (referred to in Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005, p.305)

Correspondingly, Duff and Polio (1990) trust that greatest thrilling degree of L2 ought to be used in the classrooms as classrooms are the main places where students benefit from as far as information and the language they want to get including that "the amount of L2 input is mainly authoritative". They contend that the level of foreign language in classrooms depend upon instructors' experience and capability. The more the educator utilizes L1 in exercises, the more students tend to make use of it.

2.6 Studies on Code Switching

Throughout the decades, code switching has been an important topic in many studies, articles, dissertations, theses and with ELT setting (Sert, 2005; Amorim, 2012; Yatağanbaba, 2014; Othman, 2015) and both ESL and EFL context (Ahmad & Jusoff 2009; Anderson & Toribio, 2007; Ataş, 2012; Azlan & Narasuman 2013; Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013; Canagarajah, 1995; Greggio & Gil, 2007; Horasan, 2014; Jingxia,

2010; Lee, 2010; Lin,1996; Macaro, 2001; Nordin et al., 2013; Reini, 2008; Sali, 2014; Schwartz & Asli, 2014; Seidlitz, 2003; Taşkın, 2011; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005; Yletyinen, 2004).

According to Yletyinen's (2004) research about code switching functions in EFL class which was conducted in Finland in year two, teachers used code switching in order to assist non-competent learners to spot an alteration in the lesson, to transfer from one topic to the next and to teach language rules because learners do not have enough knowledge about English terminology. She pointed out that code switching is timesaving in the classroom. Though, the investigator remarked that if she uses code switching at a great deal, students always expect Finish translation of the sentences or words and they don't pay attention to the English instruction, sentences and words.

Another study about functions of code switching is Eldridge's (1996) study. His work intended to find the functions of student's code switching in one of the secondary school in Turkey. Eldridge (1996) found that students use code switching to show that they understand the word by giving the Turkish equivalence and asking for clarification in lessons. Generally, he found the following functions of code switching: group membership, similarity, meta-language, floor holding, conflict control, repetition, placement and displacement.

In Anderson and Toribio's (2007) study, they tended to the Spanish-English bilinguals' mentalities towards contact wonders, for example, lexical obtaining and code switching in Spanish setting in the US. Fifty-three Spanish-English bilinguals from an American college took an interest in the examination. As well as the

accompanying instruments used, a three-section battery was also used in the investigation: five dialect messages, states of mind study, and a dialect history survey. In regards to each member, they results were more positive towards single-thing additions than code switching. From the results of the members it can be seen that fitting versus improper code switching and substance versus work words while assessing the things. In this manner, the examination maintained the view that lexical input is not so much noticeable, but somewhat more generally recognized in the general public.

Yao (2011) took a gander at the matter from two viewpoints. In the first place, the states of mind of the instructors towards educators' code switching to the first language (Chinese) were examined. Secondly, the demeanors of the understudies on the road to educators' code swapping to the first language were analyzed. The focus was on 52 English educators and 100 understudies from two senior classes of those instructors in a nearby auxiliary school in China. A four-section 20-thing Likert Scale poll was used. Additionally, every educator came across with their instructive history, showing logic, a few perspectives in regards to code switching to Chinese in EFL classroom, and school guidelines and techniques. By and large instructors had an encouraging outlook towards code switching. They felt that instructors who performed code switching could convey what needs be completely and distinctly. This backups the general expression about code switching which recommends that code switching is a verbal gift that requires an abnormal state of semantic capability in excess of one dialect, as opposed to an inadequacy coming about because of absence of information of either (Poplack, 1980). At long last, the greater part of the instructors likewise couldn't help contradicting the announcement that code switching prompts dialect deviation. In relation to understudies' states of mind, they

have the comparable disposition with the educators headed for instructors' code swapping to L1 in class.

2.6.1 Studies on Code Switching in Turkish Settings

Code switching also draws great attention in the Turkish settings. Many articles, thesis, dissertations and academic papers took code switching as their subjects and investigate this subject.

Bensen and Çavuşoğlu (2013) examining teachers' demonstrations of code switching in the EFL English Preparatory classrooms in one of the private universities in Northern Cyprus. The outcomes of the examination demonstrate that every one of the instructors' code exchanged in their day by day life for many different purposes. Similarly teachers believed that if code switching is done accurately, it would be exciting to keep in mind the end goal to enhance learning.

Akın (2016), aimed to investigate the attitudes of L2 English speaking university students, faculty members and business people towards code-switching from Turkish to English. The outcomes of the study revealed that the contributors have mostly positive and neutral attitudes towards code switching. It is also revealed that there is a substantial dissimilarity concerning these groups. Faculty members have positive attitudes, while undergraduate students have the most negative attitudes towards code switching. Finally, it is found out that being exposed to English in social and professional environment, the effectiveness of code switching and lack of some Turkish expressions are the most prominent reasons regarding performance of code switching.

Another study is an examining interactive change of code switching among educators and secondary EFL learners. This study was directed in two different private secondary institutions in Turkey. The results revealed that both teachers and students found code switching useful and beneficial for learning (Yatağanbaba, 2014).

In the study of Eldridge (1996) which is about functions of code switching, he found different functions. He did his research on youthful students in a Turkish secondary school and found that, switching for the most part utilized in classroom is exceptionally deliberate and identified with academic objectives and suggested that limiting the utilization of the primary language would not really improve learning,

The purpose of Üstünel & Seedhouse's (2005) research was to find out code switching utterances of Turkish learners. The results demonstrated that students' decision on language was identified with their level of arrangement or misalignment with the instructor's instructional method.

2.7 Conclusion

To sum up, this chapter covered code switching from lots of perspectives from earliest studies to recent studies. It explains what does code switching means, shows positive and negative attitudes towards code switching from different scholars' perspectives. Also this chapter explained the six functions of code switching and examined variety of studies from different contexts.

As you can see, many studies about code switching are in EFL or ESL context and there are a few studies that conducted in ELT setting. For instance, Üstünel and Seedhouse in 2005 conduct a study about code switching in EFL context at a Turkish

University and their study reveal that code- switching in L2 classrooms is organized and identified with the development of pedagogical focus and arrangement. However, this research will focus around code switching in an ELT setting in Eastern Mediterranean University as a result of the growing eagerness for the investigations done in ELT settings about code switching. For example, Othman in 2015 made an investigation about code switching in ELT context at Eastern Mediterranean University and his research illustrates that both learners and educators use code switching into Turkish in ELT classrooms for different reasons. Due to these kinds of reasons this case study will be a trial to fill this major and important gap in the related field.

Chapter 3

METHOD

3.1 Introduction

This part offers the design of the research, methodology, research questions, research setting, participants, data collection instruments, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.2 Overview of Methodology

This research is a case study and in this study both quantitative and qualitative methods was used in order to collect data. This research is conducted at the Department of Foreign Language Education, Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). There are 30 PhD and MA students in total who are from Turkey and North Cyprus. However, in the study 15 of them included because it was done on voluntary basis. There are 4 Turkish male and 11 Turkish female students in this study and they have been chosen according to their convenience, availability and their volunteering. These students are studying at Department of Foreign Language Education in the MA and PhD levels. 6 students are from PhD level and 9 students are from MA level. In addition to these there are 5 Turkish speaking teachers who teach PhD and MA level classes in the Department of FLE, but only 3 of them can participate in this study because of their availability and volunteering.

All participants are anonymous in this study and they were informed about privacy before contributing in this research and also they were told about the intentions of the research and the contribution was done on voluntary basis with consent forms (see appendix).

In order to answer research questions, one five Likert-scale questionnaire was used for finding the functions of code switching in ELT classrooms and one 5-point Likert-scale opinion poll was used to see their attitudes towards code switching. In five Likert-scale opinion poll, learners will choose answers ranging from *Strongly Disagree/ Disagree/Not Sure/ Agree/ Strongly Agree* and this questionnaire was adopted from Othman's (2015) study that is about the functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. Other questionnaire for answer the research questions is 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire. Each participant was asked about their opinions on a scale from 1 (very positive) to 5 (very negative) about 16 specific examples of code switching from Turkish to English and this questionnaire was adopted from Akin (2016) which is about attitudes towards code switching. Besides, teachers also answered this 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire which is about attitudes towards code switching and they were interviewed about functions of code switching in classrooms. The semi-structured interview was adopted from Othman's (2015) study that is about the functions of code switching in ELT classrooms.

The purposes offered by the students were requested after Appel and Muysken's (2006) demonstrate for functions of code switching. The information of the surveys were examined by ascertaining rates and information which assembled from semi-structured interview were ordered through a procedure of subjective examination.

3.3 Research Design

The aim of this study is to find reasons as to why learners and educators use code switch to Turkish in ELT context, which functions of code switching do they use and what are their attitudes towards code switching. The mixed method was used in this study in order to provide validity and reliability of the study.

According to Dörnyei (2007) in order to provide a bigger validity of multi-level inquiry of complex matters, mixed method research is a usual design that is used.

Firstly, quantitative research method is used for data which could be denoted statistically (Tracy, 2012). Numerical enquiry technique breaks down the information and gives the outcomes in light of measurements. Typically, quantitative research begins with painstakingly characterized explore questions which direct the procedure of information gathering and investigation. In this study quantitative data was collected through students' and teachers' questionnaires.

Mackey & Gass (2005) stated that the most used qualitative data collection methods are; 'interviews, ethnographies, diaries case studies, journals and observational techniques.' In this study qualitative data was collected through teacher's semi-structured interview.

Mackey & Gass (2005) explained that the goal of the case studies are giving a comprehensive portrayal of language utilize or learning inside a particular setting. In the case study, the characteristics of participants and their relationship were being investigated and involved in this research.

3.4 Research Questions

The aim of this research is to reveal which functions of code switching do Turkish ELT MA and PhD students and teachers and EMU use and what are their attitudes toward the use of code switching.

To reveal these aims there are three questions to be examined in this research:

1. What are the functions of the post graduate students' code-switching in the class?
2. What are the functions of the teachers' code-switching in the class?
3. What are the teachers' and post graduate students' attitudes toward use of code-switching?

3.5 Research Setting

The study was done in the Department of Foreign Language Education, at Eastern Mediterranean University, Famagusta, and Northern Cyprus. The language of the greater part of the departments in EMU is in English just couple of departments' language is in Turkish. The Department of Foreign Language Education is the most established and the Education Faculty was established; between the years 1999-2000 the Department was assumed to be a contributory part in the foundation of the Education Faculty at EMU. Since its foundation from 1995 the division has created more than 1.000 BA, MA and PhD comes from 14 countries. The Department's central goal is to give up-to-date instruction, in accordance with the University statement of purpose, to keep up quality models in educating and research at the undergrad and postgraduate levels, to stay up to date with the scholarly improvements and expert developments, and to address the instructive difficulties in the globalizing scene. The Department of Foreign Language Education has

dependably been focused on keeping up and creating universal models of value in instructing and research at both undergrad and postgraduate levels, to prepare autonomous, innovative, sure and skillful experts who will assume vital instructive parts in the present globalized world. In February 2014 the BA program of the Foreign Language Education Department was certified by AQAS-Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programs situated in Germany (Emuedutr).

3.6 Participants

3.6.1 Students

Table 1: Ethnographic Description of the Students

| Level | |
|------------------|----------------|
| MA (60%) | PhD (40%) |
| Gender | |
| Females (73%) | Males (27%) |

As indicated in Table 1, the irregularity in the students' number as per gender also, their levels did not depend on the selectivity of the researcher; rather, it depends on the accessibility of the members in their classes.

The total number of MA and PhD students who are studying at the FLE department were 80 and this number include international students coming from different

countries. The number of students who are Turkish was 30 in total but only 15 of them could participate in this study according to their availability and volunteering. Almost all of the students who are in this program have high proficiency level of English and if someone's proficiency is low, he/she should take English courses before starting the MA and PhD ELT programs.

3.6.2 Teachers

The entire number of lecturers who teach MA and PhD level classes is 5 but according to their availability and volunteering 3 of them could participate in the study. 3 Turkish speaking teachers took part in the semi-structured interview and 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire.

3.7 Data Collection Tools

3.7.1 Student Questionnaires

Questionnaires are one of the utmost communal methods for data collection. They are used for collecting attitudes, perceptions and information from a large group of participants.

In this study, two questionnaires were used for students. First one is about functions of code switching and it includes 22 items. These items based on a Likert-scale with 5 prompts. These 5 prompts are; *Strongly Disagree/ Disagree/Not Sure/ Agree/ Strongly Agree*. Learners should select one of these stimuli to express their ideas. The questionnaire was adopted from Othman's (2015) study that is about the functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. Second questionnaire is about attitudes towards code switching which contains the questions about specific code switching examples. It includes 5-point Likert Scale test with common code switching examples. In this questionnaire, each participant was asked about their

opinions on a scale from 1 (very positive) to 5 (very negative). This questionnaire was adopted from Akin (2016) which is about attitudes towards code switching.

3.7.2 Teachers' Instrument

Saldana, Leavy & Beretvas (2011) said that one of the most common qualitative data collections is interviews. Interviews give chance to researchers to gather perspectives, opinions, idea, attitudes, and experience of individuals. Semi-structured interviews are conducted in that they utilize a scheduled arrangement of inquiries and subjects to which the candidates are to answer. Nonetheless, the questioner may in any case make more inquiries relying upon the stream of the meeting (Mackey and Gass, 2005). In this case study two types of methods were used for gathering information from teachers. First instrument is semi-structured interview. This interview contains 14 questions to obtain information about functions of code switching in classrooms. The semi-structured interview was adopted from Othman's (2015) study that is about the functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. Second one is questionnaire which is about attitudes towards code switching which comprises the enquiries about precise code switching samples. It embraces 5-point Likert Scale test with common code switching examples. In this questionnaire, each contributor was asked about their thoughts on a scale from 1 (very positive) to 5 (very negative). This questionnaire was adopted from Akin (2016) which is about attitudes towards code switching.

3.8 Data Collection and Analyzing Procedures

If we concern about the student questionnaires and teacher questionnaire, students were informed about the purpose of the code switching. In addition, both learners and educators were informed about the goal of the study and given information about how they will answer the questionnaires and they know that they can ask any

question related to the questionnaires by given e-mail address of researcher. The students' questionnaires were conducted online by using Google forms. The teachers' questionnaire was done in teachers' private offices by getting appointment from teachers.

Concerning semi-structured interview two educators were asked to recite the consultation enquiries in advance and then they were informed about that if they give permission, the researcher will audio-taped the interview and they were also told about the goal of the study. The teachers' semi-structured interview was done in teachers' private offices by getting appointment from teachers. Just a single of the educators liked to reply to the inquiries by answering in a composed form because of the heavy duties, teacher could not give appointment for the interview.

Before beginning the study permission was taken from the chair of the FLE department. Also before using the questionnaires and interviews permission was granted from the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research at EMU. Moreover, both students and teachers were informed that participation is on voluntary basis and they were also told that there is no punishment for not participating and they have the right to withdraw from the study at any time if they do not want to continue.

The responses of the both students' and teacher's questionnaires were analyzed quantitatively by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 24. In this SPSS program the data was processed statistically and percentages were obtained. Besides, the responses of the teachers' semi structured interview were analyzed qualitatively by deductive approach content analysis. The interviews were

transcribed in audio-taped semi-structured way and the causes for code switching were categorized by Appel & Muysken's (2006) model to reveal its functions.

3.8.1 Reliability and Validity

The student questionnaire which is about functions of code switching has been adopted from Othman M. M. (2015) study on the functions of code switching. Othman (2015) adapted questionnaire from Machaal B. (2012) and he did some insignificant changes only. The semi-structured interview questions for teachers have been also adopted from Othman M. M. (2015) and in order to validate the questions he piloted the questions and also obtained experts' opinions. The second questionnaire for both students and teachers, which is about attitudes toward code switching, has been adopted from Akın (2016), who validated it and measured its reliability by using Cronbach's alpha, ANOVA, Shapiro-Wilk and Levene Tests.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This section exposes the findings and gives the examination of the collected data through students' and teachers' questionnaires and teachers' semi-structured interview that examined the functions of code switching in the classrooms and attitudes towards code switching.

4.2 Research Question 1: What Are the Functions of the Post Graduate Students' Code-Switching in the Class?

The answers of the students on the questionnaire will be shown in the table below to reply to the first investigation question.

Table 2: The Responses of Learners' Questionnaire for Functions of Code Switching

| No | Item Description | S.A % | A % | N.S % | D % | S.D % | Mean | Std. D. |
|----|---------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|---------|
| 1 | To discuss personal issues | 33.4 | 46.6 | 6.6 | 13.4 | 0 | 2.0 | 17.38 |
| 2 | To avoid misunderstanding | 40 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 25.29 |
| 3 | To make others understand what I mean | 27 | 33 | 13 | 27 | 0 | 2.4 | 11.92 |
| 4 | To attract attention | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 13 | 3.46 | 13.33 |
| 5 | To quote something said by others | 20 | 33 | 7 | 40 | 0 | 2.67 | 15.20 |
| 6 | To express loyalty to my culture | 6.6 | 26.7 | 13.4 | 46.7 | 6.6 | 3.2 | 15.20 |
| 7 | To create a sense of belonging | 0 | 33 | 20 | 40 | 7 | 3.2 | 15.20 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 8 | To persuade others | 0 | 20 | 13 | 60 | 7 | 3.54 | 21.08 |
| 9 | To discuss certain subjects which can be more suitable to debate in Turkish | 13.4 | 60 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 0 | 2.26 | 20.65 |
| 10 | To make the lesson more enjoyable | 7 | 33 | 20 | 40 | 0 | 2.93 | 15.20 |
| 11 | To crack jokes | 20 | 33.3 | 13.4 | 33.3 | 0 | 2.6 | 12.64 |
| 12 | To express myself easily | 0 | 33.3 | 13.4 | 40 | 13.3 | 3.33 | 14.6 |
| 13 | To express personal feelings (anger, sadness, happiness, etc.). | 13.4 | 33.3 | 13.4 | 33.3 | 6.6 | 2.86 | 11.15 |
| 14 | Because I feel at ease in using more than one language when speaking | 13 | 27 | 13 | 27 | 20 | 3.13 | 5.96 |
| 15 | Because it helps explain difficult concepts | 7 | 60 | 13 | 13 | 7 | 2.53 | 20.22 |
| 16 | Because it helps make learning English easier | 6.6 | 33.3 | 13.4 | 33.3 | 13.4 | 3.13 | 11.15 |
| 17 | Because it helps carrying out responsibilities easily | 0 | 27 | 20 | 40 | 13 | 3.4 | 13.33 |
| 18 | Because it decreases my anxiety when speaking | 0 | 20 | 20 | 27 | 33 | 3.73 | 11.15 |
| 19 | Because it is tough to discover accurate English equivalents | 0 | 40 | 33 | 20 | 7 | 2.93 | 15.20 |
| 20 | Because there are no comparable words in English | 13.3 | 40 | 13.4 | 20 | 13.3 | 2.8 | 10.32 |
| 21 | Because I think sometimes in Turkish | 7 | 33 | 33 | 27 | 0 | 2.8 | 13.98 |
| 22 | For habitual expressions | 27 | 33 | 6 | 27 | 7 | 2.53 | 11.15 |

According to Table 2, for the first item total 80% of students have agreement that they use code switching when discussing personal issues in classroom. 33.4% students strongly agreed while 46.6% of students agreed. On the other hand, only 13.4% said that they disagreed for this item and 6.6% of students were not sure about if they code switch for personal issues or not. None of the participants strongly disagreed for this item. With 80% students' agreement on their code switching while debating individual concerns, it can be understood that participants would fancy keeping these delicate disputes in secret or would not like to share what they think is personal with other foreign learners.

The outcomes of the item 2 have shown that all of the learners have agreement that they use code switching in class to avoid misunderstandings. 40% of students strongly agreed and 60% of students agreed on this function. None of the students not sure, disagreed or strongly disagreed that using code switching to avoid misunderstandings. By these results it can be understood that all of the students want to be understandable by their teachers or classmates and they therefore, switch to their L1 when they feel that they could be misunderstood by their teachers or their peers.

The percentages of the item 3 shows that students use code switching to make others comprehend what they mean. 27% of the participants strongly agreed and 33% of them agreed that they code switch in order to make others understand what they mean. But, 27% of the students disagreed and 13% of them were not sure if they code switch for this function. None of the students strongly disagreed on that item. Most of the students (60%) would like express themselves well and this is done so by means of resorting to their native language when needed.

As shown in item 4, 40% of the participants disagreed and 13% of them strongly disagreed on the use of code switching to attract attention. However 20% of the students agreed on the use of code switching in order to attract attention and 27% of students were not sure about whether they code switched or not. None of the participants strongly agreed on that item. 53% of disagreement shows that students does not want to attract attention and does not use code switching for the purpose of attracting attention.

Results of the item 5 demonstrate that 40% of students disagreed on code switching to quote something said by others. On the other hand, %53 of pupils approved code switching plus 20% who strongly agreed. Only 7% of students were not sure if they use this function of code switching.

As seen in item 6, most of the participants 53.3% of participant disagreed that they use code switching to express loyalty to their culture including 6.7% who strongly disagreed. On the other hand, 6.6% of participants were strongly agreed and 26.7% of them were agreed that they use code switching in order to express loyalty to their culture. The remaining 13.4% of pupils were not sure about code switching for this purpose.

Based on the results of item 7, 33% agreed on use of code switching to generate a sense of belonging with others and none of the participants strongly agreed on this issue. Besides, most of the students which is 47% of students disagreed on using code switch to create a sense of belonging. 20% of learners stated that they are not sure whether using this item in code switching.

As indicated in item 8, most of the students do not code switch to persuade others, with 67% who disagreed on switching for this purpose, including 7% who strongly disagreed. Nonetheless, 20% of students agreed and 13% of them were not sure if they code switch for this purpose or not. None of the students were strongly agreed on this item.

According to the percentages in item 9, students code switch to Turkish when their discussion on certain topics can be more appropriate to debate in their native language. A large number of participants, 60% stated their agreement and 13.4% expressed their strong agreement on using native language for this function. Only 13.3% disagreed on code switching for the same reasons and none of them expressed their strong disagreement and 13.3% stated their uncertainty about code switching for this item.

As seen in item 10, 40% percent of participants disagreed on the use of code switching to Turkish in order to make lessons more enjoyable. 20% of students were not sure, 33% agreed and only 7% of pupils strongly agreed. None of the participants expressed that they are strongly disagreed on this item.

As indicated in item 11 we can see that the percentage of the students who agreed and disagreed on code switching to the native language when cracking jokes were equal (33.3%). 20% of students strongly agreed on this item and 13.4% of them were not sure about this issue. Almost all of the languages jokes are related to cultural aspects and it is not easy to tell jokes by using other language.

Based on the percentages of item 12, majority of the students, 53.3% showed their disagreement that they code switching to express themselves easily as well as 13.3% who strongly disagreed. However, 33.3% agreed on code switching for this purpose, 13.4% were not sure about their code switching for this purpose. None of the students reported strongly agreed on this issue.

Based on the results of item 13 and 14, we can see that the percentages of pupils who were agreed and disagreed on code switching to express personal emotions and make them feel more comfortable while speaking is equal. For item 13 this percentage is 33.3% for agreeing and disagreeing and for item 14 this percentage is 27% for agreeing and disagreeing. Again, the percentage of the students who were strongly agreed and students who were not sure was approximately same in these two items as well with 13%. In the item 13, 6.6% of students were strongly disagreed on code switching to express personal emotions and in item 14, 20% of participants were strongly disagreed on code switching into Turkish because it makes them feel more comfortable while speaking.

According to the indicated results in item 15, the great number of participants express agreement on code switching into Turkish as it helps them clarify problematic notions (67%). 13% of students were skeptical about switching or not. Nevertheless, 13% of respondents disagreed and 7% strongly disagreed on code switching for this function.

Item 16th results revealed those learners' code switching benefits learning and makes things easier for them was equally agreed and disagreed. 6.6% of students strongly agreed, 13.4% of students were not sure and 13.4% of students strongly disagreed.

Most of the students according to item 17 have disagreement on that code switching help them accomplish tasks effectively (53%). None of the students strongly agreed on this item while 27% of them agreed on this purpose. In addition, 20% of respondents were not sure about this item.

It is evident in item18 that 60% of participants have disagreement about code switching as a method to decrease anxiety when speaking including 33% of strongly disagreed and 27% disagreed. However, 20% of participants agreed on this issue while none of them strongly agreed on it. 20% of respondents were not sure whether they agree or not.

According to 19, 20 the percentages of disagree and agree are equal. And also results of items 21 and 22 the percentages of disagree and agree are equal. For items 19 and 20 the students were agreed 40% and 20% disagree about these items. For items 21 and 22 the participants were agreed 33% and disagreed 27%. For item 19, 7% of students strongly disagreed on that it is solid for them to find appropriate English equivalents. 33% of students were not sure and none of them were strongly agreed on this item. For item 20, 13% of students were strongly agreed, not sure and strongly disagreed on using code switching because they believed that there are no similar words in English in equal percentage. For item 21, 7% of students strongly agreed that they use code switching because they think sometimes in Turkish. None of the students strongly disagreed on this item and 33% were not sure if they code switch for this purpose or not.

According to Appel & Muysken's (2006) model for functions of code switching, all of the learners confirm that they code switch in their ELT MA and PhD classrooms.

The tables which are above indicated the students' general agreement and disagreement of the reasons for which they code switch in class and what are the functions of these items.

4.2.1 Students' Switching for Poetic Functions

Table 3: Results for Poetic Functions

| | Agreement | Disagreement | Not Sure |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Poetic Functions | 48.77% | 37.77% | 13.46% |
| to quote something said by others | 53% | 40% | 7% |
| to crack jokes | 53.3% | 33.3% | 13.4% |
| to make the lessons more enjoyable | 40% | 40% | 20% |

According to the results of Table 3, 48.77% of participants have agreement on switching for poetic functions. 37.77% of students expressed disagreement on this function and 13.46% of students were not sure about if they code switching for poetic functions or not.

4.2.2 Students' Switching for Directive Functions

Table 4: Results for Directive Functions

| | Agreement | Disagreement | Not Sure |
|----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Directive Functions | 40% | 44.47% | 15.53% |
| To discuss personal issues | 80% | 13.4% | 6.6% |
| To persuade others | 20% | 67% | 13% |
| To attract attention | 20% | 53% | 27% |

Table 3.2 shows that 44.47% of students were disagreed on switching for directive functions while 40% of participants were agreed on switching for directive functions. 15.53% of the students were not sure about this function.

4.2.3 Students' switching for Referential Functions

Table 5: Results for Referential Functions

| | Agreement | Disagreement | Not Sure |
|--|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Referential Functions | 48.67% | 31.47% | 19.86% |
| To discuss certain subjects which can be more suitable to debate in Turkish | 73.4% | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| Students code switch because it helps them to explain problematic notions | 67% | 20% | 13% |
| Students code switch because it helps simplifies learning for them | 40% | 46.7% | 13.4% |
| Students code switch because it helps them deliberate tasks at ease | 27% | 53% | 20% |
| Students code switch because it is hard for them to find proper English equivalent | 40% | 27% | 33% |
| Students code switch because there are no similar words in English | 53.3% | 33.3% | 13.4% |
| Students code switch because they sometimes think in Turkish | 40% | 27% | 33% |

Based on the results gathered from Table 3.3, most of the students, 48.67% have agreement on code switching in their classes for referential functions. Yet, 31.47% of the participants disagree on this function and 19.86% of the respondents were not sure if they code switch for referential function or not.

4.2.4 Students' Switching for Expressive Functions

Table 6: Results for Expressive Functions

| | Agreement | Disagreement | Not sure |
|---|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Expressive Functions | 47.36% | 40.17% | 12.47% |
| To avoid misunderstandings | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| To make others understand what they mean | 60% | 27% | 13% |
| To express loyalty to their culture | 33.3% | 53.3% | 13.4% |
| To create a sense of belonging | 33% | 47% | 20% |
| To express themselves easily | 33.3% | 53.3% | 13.4% |
| To express personal emotions | 46.6% | 40% | 13.4% |
| Students code switch because they feel more comfortable in using more than one language when speaking | 40% | 47% | 13% |
| Students code switch because it decreases their anxiety when speaking | 20% | 60% | 20% |
| Students code switch for habitual expressions | 60% | 34% | 6% |

As shown in Table 3.4, 47.36% of the students were agreed that they code switched into their native language for expressive functions while 40.17% expressed the opposite. Only 12.47% of them were uncertain about if they use this function or not.

4.3 Research Question 2: What Are the Functions of the Teachers' Code-Switching in the Class?

In order to respond to this question the teachers' interviews were evaluated and they generally stated that they prefer not to code switch in classroom because there are many students from different countries in the MA and PhD level ELT classrooms.

The following are some of the teachers' answers to the interview:

T1

It depends on the nature of the ELT classroom. So, if it is a multicultural context mmm... I don't think it is a good idea to use mmm... code switching, it's not possible. If I think about our ELT classrooms it's not possible because we have students from many different L1 background. So in this case it's not mmm... suitable, it's not a good idea to use code switching but if all the students in the ELT classroom share the same L1, time to time or let's say very rarely code switching can be used if this will make things easier in terms of students learning. But in our context it's not possible.

T2

I didn't like the word 'should be'. It shouldn't start with 'should be'. It can be used, it may be used, if needed, but don't forget that we may have international classrooms, we may have students from different cultures so that's why if we have international classrooms, we cannot speak, we cannot code switch but if it's a Turkish classroom what I mean here is only Turkish students so then if needed you can do that but 'not should', may, you can if needed.

As mentioned before only 3 (out of 5) of the teachers were participated in this interview and these results indicate these 3 teachers' responses and ideas.

According to the analyzed interview teachers stated that they do not talk personal issues in the classroom and they discuss this kind of issues out of the class, in break time or in their office. Also they said that they prefer using native language of the students when discussing personal issues out of the classroom because they think that students' feel more comfortable and relax if they talk in their native language when discussing personal issues with teacher. Moreover, one of the teachers expressed that using code switch for drawing the attention of the students. This means that these 3

teachers use directive functions of code switching in and out of the classroom. Also, they use expressive function code switching while discussing personal issues because they want their students to belong to one culture by speaking in their native language.

Following are examples:

T1

Of course I do not discuss personal issues in the classroom, so, if a student comes to my office and wants to share a personal issue and if the student is a Turkish speaking student okay? ... in this case I use Turkish. Okay?

T2

If a student asks me a question in the classroom about the topic, for example, subject matter topic, even though the question is in Turkish I prefer using English but I change some words or wordings or I can simply but again I will use that language but if the student comes to my office or in the corridor to ask about... to ask something concerning not classroom issues or subject matter issues I usually use the language that students use, the variety. If they use Turkish I... my answer is in Turkish, if Russian, my answer is in Russian. In other words, it depends which language they use but if it's not about classroom discourse.

T2

The students' native language. If I know that language, for example, with my Turkish students and they come to my office I speak Turkish. If I know the student's native language I prefer using it because language is a psychological construct at the same time. With a Russian student comes to your office to speak something personal, if you use the same language so the fact is absolutely different and when you speak Turkish

to a Turkish student about personal affairs, the student considers you as a part of that culture. So they feel more comfortable. So that's why, why not to use native language of the student.

T3

Of course L1, assuming that both speakers share the same L1.

T2

For example; once it happen, I saw that my Turkish student was sleeping, I just came up and said 'uyan oğlum!' It changed the situation. I don't think that... yes he smiled, he said sorry and we continued. In other words, I didn't do that just purpose for saying I will do that.

T3

It can be both an asset or a deficiency. Due to differences in two languages, bilingual people may have to use code switching in order to be able to express themselves more precisely. Yet, sometimes, overusing code switching may indicate the lack of proficiency in either languages. Sociologically, it may also be regarded as a negative behavior, as if the speaker is showing off. When we come to the ELT classrooms, it depends on your students' proficiency level. When the level gets higher, codes witching should get lesser

Based on the interview's responses, teachers claimed that in the classroom sometimes they code switch for making jokes but they indicate that they give English translation of the joke immediately because teachers do not want other students feel

bad because they do not know Turkish. This is the poetic function of code switching and teachers use this function in the classroom. Following are examples:

T1

You know, very rarely just a couple of words. When we are having a break like, you know, if you work very hard and if I see the students are bored and very tired just for maximum one minute if I am making a joke, okay? ... so maybe one or two words Turkish but immediately I give the English translation as well, okay?... because we have students from different L1 background so I have to do it... non-academic. To change the atmosphere, to relax students.

T1

As I told you, you know, mmm... I do not use code switching in my classes because of the reasons I have just explained, because of the multicultural, multilingual nature of the classrooms. Okay? So, mmm... just you know, few words in Turkish just for joking and even though it's for joking I always translate in English so that everyone understands what we are talking about.

T1

I don't use L1, just for jokes as I said, a few words but English translation is always given.

T2

Sometimes there can be some socio-pragmatic reasons for that, to express my solidarity with the jokes or something like that, I may code switch.

T3

Since I'm teaching MA and PhD students in the ELT program, I don't/shouldn't code switch at all, because my students are international and also they're highly competent. Yet, sometimes my students talk to each other in their own language to clarify some points or make jokes, and they immediately translate it into English so that others in the class don't feel alien. They are sensitive enough about this.

Considering the referential function of switching, teachers said that even if there is no equivalent or proper English equivalent they try to use L2 in classroom because of many international students. They also stated that if there is a need for Turkish code switching they use Turkish word as a last chance. In addition, they said that their students' proficiency is far enough to understand advanced English because the level of the class is MA and PhD. Following are examples:

T1

So when you say ELT classrooms, you mean our situation not EFL. Mmm... So these people, they are going to be English teachers, so in my opinion Turkish should not be used at all in the ELT classrooms.

T1

In my ELT classrooms, I do not err... I haven't observed such a difficulty in understanding such things okay? ... So, because our students generally their English level is good okay? ... So, they can understand all these things so, mmm I didn't feel the need to use Turkish. Okay? Again even though I had recognized such a thing I wouldn't have use Turkish because we have non-Turkish speaking students.

T2

Code switching can be used in the classrooms if needed. It depends on the need. If you need to do that, you have to do it. You know, the thing that I have to use, I have to code switch, no. If there is need for that, you have to do that.

T2

It depends on lots of things. Mmm... I may code switch if I see that, it is time consuming. It's not... for example, I explain, explain, explain, again and again but the student may not answer me and the level and other issues, that case I may use the student's native language. I will save time in that case.

T2

I wouldn't use their native language again because; first I will try explaining by paraphrasing, by simplifying or by doing something. I don't believe that it will be a problem for them to understand me and if I see that nothing works, in that case I will do it but generally speaking I may repeat not the same thing, the same content with different wordings and level. I believe they will understand me.

T3

It can be both an asset or a deficiency. Due to differences in two languages, bilingual people may have to use code switching in order to be able to express themselves more precisely. Yet, sometimes, overusing code switching may indicate the lack of proficiency in either language. Sociologically, it may also be regarded as a negative behavior, as if the speaker is showing off. When we come to the ELT classrooms, it depends on your students' proficiency level. When the level gets higher, codeswitching should get lesser.

T3

If your students are looking for a word but cannot remember it, they should be allowed to say it in their L1 and continue their communication so that their fluency is not broken. In other words, he or she may be more willing to participate. The teacher can also code switching while teaching an abstract or complicated concept, or giving some instructions. It saves time.

4.4 Research Question 3: What Are the Teachers' and Post Graduate Students' Attitudes toward Use of Code-Switching?

4.4.1 Description and Translation of Items that is in the Questionnaire about Attitudes towards Code Switching

Item1: "Projeyi save etmeden bilgisayarı kapattım" (I shut down the computer without saving the project)

Item2: "Sample size çok yetersiz" (Sample size is not enough)

Item3: "Son model çok user friendly bir interface'e sahip" (The most recent version has very user friendly interface)

Item4: "Onun bu meseleyi çok iyi handle edebildiğini düşünmüyorum" (I don't think that he/she can handle this issue)

Item5: "By the way, toplantı iptal oldu" (By the way the gathering was negated)

Item6: "Açıkçası burada neye refer ettiğini anlayamadım" (I couldn't understand what it refers here)

Item7: "Pazartesiye deadline var, bugün çıkamam." (I have a time limit by Monday, I can't go out)

Item8: "Fotoğrafın baya bir like almış." (Your photo has been liked a lot)

Item9: "Bu maili bana da forward'lar mısınız?" (Could you forward that email to me too?)

Item10: "Game of Thrones'un son bölümünü download ettim, bugün izleriz" (I downloaded the last episode of the Game of Thrones, we can watch today)

Item11: "Otelden en gec saat 2'de check out yapmamız lazım" (We should do check out from hotel latest 2 o'clock)

Item12: "Uçuşta en az 3 saat delay var" (There is a delay in flight at least 3 hours)

Item13: "Grubun vokalisti gerçekten cool'mus" (The vocalist of the bans is really cool)

Item14: "Telefona update gelmiş yine." (There is a new update for the phone)

Item 15: "Resmi buraya copy-paste yap." (Copy and paste the picture here)

4.4.2 Results of the Teachers' Attitude Questionnaire

Table 7: Results of the Teachers' Attitude towards Code Switching

| Items | 1 (very positive) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (very negative) |
|--------|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------|
| Item 1 | | 33.33% | 66.67% | | |
| Item 2 | | 33.33% | 66.67% | | |
| Item 3 | | 33.33% | 66.67% | | |
| Item 4 | | | 33.33% | 66.67% | |
| Item 5 | | | 100% | | |
| Item 6 | | 33.33% | 66.77% | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
| Item 7 | | 33.33% | 66.77% | | |
| Item 8 | 33.33% | | 33.33% | 33.33% | |
| Item 9 | | 33.33% | 66.77% | | |
| Item 10 | | | 100% | | |
| Item 11 | | 33.33% | 66.77% | | |
| Item 12 | | | 33.33% | 66.77% | |
| Item 13 | | | 33.33% | 66.77% | |
| Item 14 | 33.33% | | 33.33% | 33.33% | |
| Item 15 | | 33.33% | 66.67% | | |
| Total | 4.44% | 17.77% | 60% | 17.77% | 0% |

Based on the results most of the teachers' attitudes towards code switching were neutral with 60%. 60% of teachers feel natural towards code switching. On the other hand, on the table we can see that positive attitudes and negative attitudes are equal number (17.77%). Only 4.44% of teachers' attitude towards code switching was very positive and none of the teachers' attitude towards code switching was very negative.

4.4.3 Results of the Students' Attitude Questionnaire

Table 8: Results of the Students' Attitudes towards Code Switching

| Items | 1 (very positive) | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 (very negative) |
|---------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| Item 1 | 20% | 26.7% | 26.7% | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| Item 2 | 13.3% | 13.3% | 20% | 20% | 33.3% |
| Item 3 | 6.7% | 0% | 20% | 26.7% | 46.7% |
| Item 4 | 0% | 13.3% | 33.3% | 20% | 33.3% |
| Item 5 | 26.7% | 20% | 13.3% | 13.3% | 26.7% |
| Item 6 | 13.3% | 40% | 13.3% | 13.3% | 20% |
| Item 7 | 26.7% | 46.7% | 13.3% | 0% | 13.3% |
| Item 8 | 46.7% | 20% | 6.7% | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| Item 9 | 40% | 33.3% | 13.3% | 0% | 13.3% |
| Item 10 | 40% | 13.3% | 20% | 0% | 26.7% |
| Item 11 | 33.3% | 33.3% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 20% |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| Item 12 | 13.3% | 13.3% | 33.3% | 6.7% | 33.3% |
| Item 13 | 26.7% | 26.7% | 20% | 0% | 26.7% |
| Item 14 | 46.7% | 20% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 20% |
| Item 15 | 46.7% | 26.7% | 13.3% | 0% | 13.3% |
| Total | 26.67% | 23.1% | 18.21% | 9.33% | 23.54% |

According to table 5, generally students have very positive attitude towards code switching with 26.67%. On the contrary, 23.54% students have very negative attitude towards code switching. 23.1% of students expressed their positive attitudes towards code switching while 9.33% of participants have negative attitude. If we look at the total of positive attitude and negative attitude together it is obvious that most of the students' attitudes were positive toward code switching with 49.77% while negative attitude were 26.87% in total. Only 18.21% of respondents' attitudes were neutral towards code switching.

In conclusion, the purpose of this study is to investigate the functions of code switching and attitudes towards code switching of Turkish M.A. and PhD. students and teachers in ELT classrooms. Based on the results of the questionnaire and interview which are about functions of code switching, both teachers and student's code switching was done for four major functions: expressive, poetic, directive and

referential. On the other hand, the second questionnaire that is about attitudes of code switching, students have positive attitude while teachers have neutral attitude towards it.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This part includes the results of the discussion by considering research questions and relevant literature, conclusion of the current research and pedagogical implications and proposals for an advance research.

5.2 Discussion of the Results

Based on the outcomes of the study, both educators and learners utilize code switching in their ELT classrooms. This case study took place in ELT context and its results are matched with various studies which have accepted the code alternation that is used in ELT classrooms and on different proficiency levels (Sert, 2005; Amorim, 2012; Yatağanbaba, 2014).

According to the gathered data from students' questionnaire and teachers' semi-structured interview that is about functions of code switching, teachers accept the use of code switching in the classrooms, but they all agreed that code switching should be used only if there is a need for it because majority of students come from different countries and it will be impolite, if they use code switching to Turkish all the time in the ELT classrooms. Also, they think that because of the expertise level of the MA and PhD level Turkish students there is not much need for using code switching in class.

Similarly students accept that they use code switching in the class for some reasons such as to avoid misunderstandings, to discuss personal issues, and to understand difficult concepts better and etc. Based upon the Appel and Muysken's (2006) model on functions of code switching, results reveal that both teachers and students use code switching for these following functions: directive, referential, poetic and expressive.

According to the analyzed interview teachers stated that they do not talk personal issues in the classroom and they discuss these kinds of issues out of the class, in the break time or in their offices. Also they said that they prefer using native language of the students when discussing personal issues out of the classroom because they think that students' feel more comfortable and relax if they talk in their native language when discussing personal issues with their teacher. Moreover, one of the teachers expressed that using code switch for drawing students' attention. This means that these 3 teachers use directive functions of code switching in and out of the classroom. Also, they use expressive function code switching while discussing personal issues because they want their students to belong to one culture by speaking in their native language.

Furthermore, teachers claimed that in the classroom sometimes they code switch for making jokes, but indicate that they give English translation of the joke immediately because teachers do not want other students to feel bad because they do not know Turkish. This is the poetic function of code switching and teachers use this function mostly in the classroom.

Besides, considering the referential function of switching, teachers said that even if there is no equivalent or proper English equivalent they try to use L2 in classroom because of many international students. They also stated that if there is an urgent need for Turkish code switching they use Turkish word as a last chance. In addition, they said that their students' proficiency is far enough to understand advanced English because the level of the class is MA and PhD.

The finding of the teachers' questionnaire which is about attitudes towards the use of code switching in the class is neutral. They are not opposed or against the use of code switching, but because of the international students and language of the department is English (should be in English) they do not prefer using code switching if there is no need for it. For example, Chowdhury (2012) found that even though the students' attitudes toward code switching is positive, the teachers did not prefer using code switch in the classroom. On the other hand students' attitudes towards the use of code switching in class is positive. They do not see any drawback of using code switching in the classroom.

5.3 Possible Implications of the Study

By analyzing the results of this case study in detailed, the following pedagogical implications can be inferred:

- 1) The language of communication and lessons should be in English as much as possible.
- 2) Teachers should exhibit in the classroom mainly to communicate in English and if there is no need to code switch they should not code switch in the classroom.
- 3) Teachers should warn students if there is overuse of Turkish in the class.

- 4) Teachers may use code switching into Turkish if code switching will save their class time.
- 5) Teachers' code switching into Turkish could be a good strategy in order to draw attention to students and makes them focus on lessons.
- 6) The use of Turkish is something that should be avoided as much as possible if the class is multicultural context.

5.4 Conclusion

Considering the functions observed in this case study, it is stable with the previous studies in the literature on using code switch. This affirms Sert's (2005) conviction that "in ELT classrooms, code switching comes into utilization either in the instructors' or the understudies' talk" (p.1). This present-day research is in accordance with the discoveries of Borlongan (2009). He focused on that in the classroom setting, code switching gives off an impression of being utilized both by understudies and instructors. By contrasting the discoveries of this examination and past examinations on code switching from alternative points of view (Boztepe, 2009; Yletyinen, 2004) there seems, by all accounts, to be a typical end: code switching is fundamental and is utilized intentionally more often than not in the classroom.

Thusly, as investigated in this examination, considering the information acquired on the elements of code switching, it could be well proposed that code switching is anything, but a tiny difference or application of at least two languages (Grosjean 2010; Hymes, 1977). Or maybe, it is the sudden decision of language use which improves the classroom condition on numerous sides and conveys the message superior to anything one could do in another language. It may be interpreted from this examination that the instructors know about the way that conveying any message

in English exclusively with the understudies is certainly not a characteristic procedure in the classroom since each switch has a particular capacity that is purposefully filling a need.

Accordingly, in connection to the writing, code switching shows an assortment of positive attitudes in the classroom setting. Regardless of whether code switching has any negative attitudes, or on the other hand its utilization ought to be prohibited in class or permitted. Zentella (1981) communicates that "it appears to be untimely to restrict code switching from the classroom when we don't realize what we are forbidding alongside it" (p.130).

5.5 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

It is important to mention that this study has limitations that can be addressed in future students. The findings of the study cannot be generalized to other contexts. It is so because of the limited number of participants.

One more lack of the present study is that it utilized a student questionnaire and teachers interviews, with no observations conducted. More insightful conclusions towards code switching in ELT classes would be drawn if observations were made and the data triangulated, so that more validation of data would be obtained.

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.
- Aitken, A. (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akın Ş, (2016). *Attitudes of L2 English Speakers in Turkey Towards Turkish English Code Switching in University And Business Setting*. Bahçeşehir University.
- Anastasi, A. (1990). *Psychological Testing*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Anderson, T. K., & Toribio, A. J. (2007). Attitudes towards lexical borrowing and Intra-sentential code switching among Spanish-English bilinguals. *Spanish in Context*, 4(2), 217-240.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (2006). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Asali, S. (2011). *Attitudes of Arab American Speakers in the USA towards English Arabic Code-switching* (Master thesis). Middle East University. Amman, Jordan.

- 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.
- Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: Bilingual conversation revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1-24). London: Routledge.
- Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Ayeomoni, M. O. (2006). Code-switching and code-mixing: Style of language use in childhood in Yoruba speech community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(1), 90-99.
- 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.
- Bensen, H. & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2014). Reasons for the teachers' uses of code switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(20), 69-82.
- Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1992). Code-switching and language dominance. *Advances in Psychology*, 83, 443-458.

- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1, Theoretical studies toward a sociology of education*. London: Paladin.
- Bhatita, T., & Rihchie, W. (2004). Social and psychological in language mixing. In Ritchie, W., & Bhatia, T (eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism* (pp. 226-352). Blackwell Publishing.
- Bloomfield, L. (1994). *Language*. India: Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.
- Boztepe, E. (2005). *Issues in code-switching: competing theories and models*. Teachers College. Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 3.2.
- Boztepe, E., (2003). Issues in Code-switching: Competing Theories and Models. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*. 3, 2, 1-27.
- Canagarajah, S. (1995). Functions of code switching in ESL classrooms: socializing bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(3), pp. 173-95.
- Chen, S. Y. (2007). Code-switching between English and Mandarin Chinese on postings in a college-affiliated bulletin board system in Taiwan: A functional approach. *Papers from LAEL PG*, 1.

- Chowdhury, N. (2012). Classroom Code Switching of English Language Teachers at Tertiary Level: *A Bangladeshi Perspective*. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 40-61.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Language: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Cook, V. (2002). *Portraits of the L2 user*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th ed.). London: Blackwell.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The Native Speaker in Applied Linguistics*. New York: Blackwell.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duff, P. A. & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom ?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 74 (2), 154-166.
- Dykhonova, A. (2015). *Functions of Code-Switching and Attitudes toward Them: A Case Study* (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ)).

- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50, 4, 303-311.
- Elster, J. (1989). *The cement of society: A survey of social order*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gardener - Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gardner-Chloros, P. (1997). Code-switching: Language selection in three Strasbourg department stores. In *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 361 – 375). Palgrave, London.
- 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.
- Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: life and reality*. Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1964). Comparison and translation. In M. A. K. Halliday & P.
- Heller, M. 1990. *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Longman.
- Holmes, W. (2001). *Speech synthesis and recognition*. CRC press

- 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.
- Hughes, C. E., Shaunessy, E. S., Brice, A. R., Ratliff, M. A., & McHatton, P. A. (2006). Code switching among bilingual and limited proficient students: Possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(1), 7-28.
- Ibrahim, E., Shah, M., & Armia, N. (2013). *Code-switching in English as a Foreign Language Classroom: Teachers' Attitudes*. *English Language Teaching*, 6, 7, 139-150.
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In A. S. Thomas (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350-377). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, 3, pp. 10-23.
- Karras, J. (1995) *Greek - English code - switching*. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics*, 17, 57- 63.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T.D. (1988). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Prentice Hall Europe, Herfordshire.

- Lee, W. (2010). *Codeswitching as a Communicative Strategy in a Korean Heritage Language Classroom*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. San Diego State University.
- 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 student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 531-548.
- Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: theories and decision - making. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), pp. 531-548.
- Macdonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language*. Mary Glasgow.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New Jersey: Routledge.
- Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (1995). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on code - switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mokgwathi, T., & Webb, V. (2013). The educational effects of code-switching in the classroom – benefits and setbacks: A case of selected senior secondary schools in Botswana. *Language Matters: in the Languages of Africa*, 44, 3, 108-125.

- Mühlhäusler, P. (1981). Structural expansion and the process of creolization. In A. Valdman & A. Highfield (Eds.), *Theoretical orientations in Creole studies* (pp.19-56). New York: Academic Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers - Scotton, C. (1989). Codeswitching with English: types of switching, types of communities. *World Englishes*, 8(3), 333-346.
- Myers - Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers - Scotton, C. (1998). A theoretical introduction to the Markedness Model. In Carol Myers – Scotton (ed.), *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties*, 18–38. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers - Scotton, C., & Bolonyai, A. (2001). Calculating speakers: Code-switching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society*, 30 (01), 1 - 28.
- Myles, F., & Mitchell, R. (2004). Using information technology to support empirical SLA research. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(2).
- 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.

- Olmo - castillo, W. N. (2014).Teachers' attitudes towards code switching within a bilingual classroom. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1394&context=ehdtheses>
- Othman M. M, (2015). *Functions of Code Switching: A Case Study* (Master's thesis, Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU)-Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi (DAÜ).
- Poplack, S., & Sankoff, D. (1988). Code switching. In A. Ulrich, et al. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik* (pp. 1174—1180). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Poplack, Sh. (1980). Sometimes I'll start sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: Toward a typology of code - switching. *Linguistics*, 18 (233-234), 581-618.
- Qing, X. (2010). To switch or not to switch: Examine the code-switching practices of teachers of non - English majors. *Canadian Social Science*, 6(4), 109-113. Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/5372>
- Reini, J. (2008). *The functions of teachers' language choice and code switching in EFL classroom discourse*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of Jyväskylä
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Rose, S. (2006). *The Function of Code – switching in Multicultural high school* (M. Phil dissertation). Stellenbosch University. Maitland, South Africa.

- Saldaña, J., Leavy, P., & Beretvas, N. (2011). *Fundamentals of qualitative research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sali, P. (2014). An analysis of the teachers' use of L1 in Turkish EFL classrooms. *System*, 42(2014), pp. 308-318
- 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.
- Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social functions of code switching. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 1977(13), 5-20.
- Seidlitz, L. M. (2003). *Functions of codeswitching 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*, 11(8). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/SertCode\nSwitching.htm>
- Simon, D. (2001). Towards a new understanding of codeswitching in the foreign language classroom. In R. Jacobson (Ed.), *Codeswitching worldwide II*. (pp. 311-342). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stevens (Eds.), *The linguistic sciences and language teaching* (pp. 200-222). London: Longman.

- 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.
- Toribio, A. J., & Bullock, B. E. (Eds.). (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tracy, S. J. (2012). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Trudgill, P. (1984). *Applied sociolinguistics*. Academic Press: London.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but . . . *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(4), 531-540.
- Uys, D. (2010). The functions of teachers code switching in multilingual and multicultural high school classrooms in the Siyanda District of the Northern Cape Province. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch.
- Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? CS and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15 (3), 302-325.
- Valdes, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and Testing: A special Case of Bias*. Norwood: NJ: Ablex.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Language in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Weng, P. (2012). Code-Switching as a Strategy Use in an EFL Classroom in Taiwan. *US-China Foreign Language*, 10, 10, 1669-1675.

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

Yatağanbaba, E. (2014). *An investigation of code switching into EFL young language learner classrooms*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Permission Letter

To: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shiblivey

Chair, Department of Foreign Language Education

From: Nermin Ruso

Date: 06.03.2018

Permission Request

I am a M.A. candidate and I am doing my thesis research on the '*Code Switching in ELT Classrooms: A Case Study*'. I would like to conduct my research in the English Language Teaching Classes at Eastern Mediterranean University. I will collect my data through student and teacher's questionnaires and teachers' semi-structured interview questions. The participants of my study will be the Turkish M.A. and Ph.D. students and teachers.

Therefore, I need your approval of my request so I can do my research study in ELT classes at Eastern Mediterranean University.

Sincerely yours,

Nermin Ruso

M.A. candidate

nermin.ruso@hotmail.com

Appendix B: Consent Form for the Students Questionnaire

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear students,

This questionnaire has been designed as one of the data collection tools of my MA thesis which is about the functions of code switching and attitudes toward code switching in ELT classes of Turkish M.A. and PhD. students. The aim of this questionnaire is to identify your attitudes toward code switching in ELT classes as well as the functions of code switching in these classes.

No risks and no direct benefits are anticipated as a result of your participation in this study. Your participation is purely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

At all times, your identity will be kept confidential. Also your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for research purposes. For further information you can contact me or my supervisor.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Nermin Ruso

M.A. student

E-mail: nermin.ruso@hotmail.com

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

M.A. Thesis Supervisor

E-mail: javanshir.shibliyev@emu.edu.tr

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.

I would like to take part in the questionnaire:

Participant Name Surname: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix C: Student Questionnaire Items

Student Questionnaire Items

Part 1: Background Information

Instruction: Please provide the necessary information.

1) Gender: F M

2) Age: _____

3) What is your level?

M.A. student

P.h.D. students

Part 2: Questionnaire about Functions of Code Switching

Please read each of the following items carefully and tick the answer which best describes your degree of agreement or disagreement. The information you provide will not be disclosed to anyone and will only be used for research purposes. The following degrees are used: strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree, and strongly disagree.

If you code switch to Turkish in classroom, you do so for the following reasons:

| No | Item Description | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | To discuss personal issues | | | | | |
| 2 | To avoid misunderstanding | | | | | |
| 3 | To make others understand what I mean | | | | | |
| 4 | To attract attention | | | | | |
| 5 | To quote something said by others | | | | | |
| 6 | To express loyalty to my culture | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 7 | To create a sense of belonging | | | | | |
| 8 | To persuade others | | | | | |
| 9 | To discuss certain topics which can be more appropriate to discuss in Turkish | | | | | |
| 10 | To make the lesson more enjoyable | | | | | |
| 11 | To crack jokes | | | | | |
| 12 | To express myself easily | | | | | |
| 13 | To express personal emotions (anger, sadness, happiness, etc.). | | | | | |
| 14 | Because I feel comfortable in using more than one language when speaking | | | | | |
| 15 | Because it helps explain difficult concepts | | | | | |
| 16 | Because it helps make learning English easier | | | | | |
| 17 | Because it helps carry out tasks easily | | | | | |
| 18 | Because it decreases my anxiety when speaking | | | | | |
| 19 | Because it is hard to find proper English equivalents | | | | | |
| 20 | Because there are no similar words in English | | | | | |
| 21 | Because I think sometimes in Turkish | | | | | |
| 22 | For habitual expressions | | | | | |

Part 3: Questionnaire about Attitudes toward Code Switching

Please read each of the following items carefully. Please circle your answer. The answers will be range from 1 to 5. 1 means very positive and 5 means very negative.

1) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Projeyi save etmeden bilgisayarı kapattım”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

2) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Sample size çok yetersiz”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

3) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Son model çok user friendly bir interface'e sahip”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

4) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Onun bu meseleyi çok iyi handle edebildiğini düşünmüyorum”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

5) What do you think about the sentence below?

“By the way, toplantı iptal oldu”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

6) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Açıkçası burada neye refer ettiğini anlayamadım”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

7) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Pazartesiye deadline var, bugün çıkamam.”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

8) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Fotoğrafın baya bir like almış."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

9) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Bu maili bana da forward'lar mısınız?"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

10) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Game of Thrones'un son bölümünü download ettim, bugün izleriz"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

11) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Otelden en gec saat 2'de check out yapmamız lazım"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

12) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Uçuşta en az 3 saat delay var"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

13) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Grubun vokalisti gerçekten cool'mus"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

14) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Telefona update gelmiş yine."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

15) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Resmi buraya copy-paste yap."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

Appendix D: Consent Form for the Teacher Questionnaire

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Dear instructors,

This questionnaire has been designed as one of the data collection tools of my MA thesis which is about the functions of code switching and attitudes toward code switching in ELT classes of Turkish M.A. and PhD. students. The aim of this questionnaire is to identify your attitudes toward code switching in ELT classes as well as the functions of code switching in these classes.

No risks and no direct benefits are anticipated as a result of your participation in this study. Your participation is purely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

At all times, your identity will be kept confidential. Also your responses will be kept strictly confidential and used only for research purposes. For further information you can contact me or my supervisor.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Nermin Ruso

M.A. student

E-mail: nermin.ruso@hotmail.com

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

M.A. Thesis Supervisor

E-mail: javanshir.shibliyev@emu.edu.tr

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.

I would like to take part in the questionnaire:

Participant Name Surname: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix E: Teacher Questionnaire Items

Questionnaire about Attitudes toward Code Switching

Please read each of the following items carefully. Please circle your answer. The answers will be range from 1 to 5. 1 means very positive and 5 means very negative.

1) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Projeyi save etmeden bilgisayarı kapattım”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

2) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Sample size çok yetersiz”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

3) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Son model çok user friendly bir interface'e sahip”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

4) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Onun bu meseleyi çok iyi handle edebildiğini düşünmüyorum”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

5) What do you think about the sentence below?

“By the way, toplantı iptal oldu”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

6) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Açıkçası burada neye refer ettiğini anlayamadım”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

7) What do you think about the sentence below?

“Pazartesiye deadline var, bugün çıkamam.”

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

8) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Fotoğrafın baya bir like almış."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

9) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Bu maili bana da forward'lar mısınız?"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

10) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Game of Thrones'un son bölümünü download ettim, bugün izleriz"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

11) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Otelden en gec saat 2'de check out yapmamız lazım"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

12) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Uçuşta en az 3 saat delay var"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

13) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Grubun vokalisti gerçekten cool'mus"

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

14) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Telefona update gelmiş yine."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

15) What do you think about the sentence below?

"Resmi buraya copy-paste yap."

Very Positive 1 2 3 4 5 Very Negative

Appendix F: Consent Form for the Teacher Interview

CONSENT FORM

Dear instructors,

This semi-structured interview questions is designed as one of the data collection tools of my MA thesis which is about the functions of code switching and attitudes toward code switching in ELT classes of Turkish M.A. and PhD. instructors.

No risks and no direct benefits are anticipated as a result of your participation in this study. Your participation is purely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

At all times, your identity will be kept confidential. Your name will be coded with numbers in the transcriptions of the observations and in the interviews. The recordings will only be used for scientific purposes. Therefore, the recordings will only be available to the researcher and her supervisor.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Nermin Ruso

M.A. student

E-mail: nermin.ruso@hotmail.com

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

M.A. Thesis Supervisor

E-mail: javanshir.shibliyev@emu.edu.tr

Department of Foreign Language, Education Faculty

Agreement: I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure.

I would like to take part in the questionnaire:

Participant Name Surname: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Appendix G: Teacher Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Teacher Semi-Structured Interview Questions

- 1) What do you think about the use of code switching in ELT classrooms?
- 2) How often should Turkish be used in ELT classrooms?
- 3) If you code switch in your classroom, when and why do you do so?
- 4) Do you see any advantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?
- 5) Do you see any disadvantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?
- 6) If a student speaks to you in L 1, which code would you employ to reply? And why?
- 7) If your students find difficulty understanding what you are talking about, say, explaining a grammar point, assigning a homework or an activity, would you employ our L 1 in this case? If not why?
- 8) Could you please explain why your code switching contributes to or hinders learners' language learning?
- 9) You taught several classes, did you code switch in all of the classes? If not, why?
- 10) When discussing personal issues, which code do you think is more appropriate to use and why?
- 11) Do you use English when discussing all kinds of topics? Or you employ L 1 for specific topics? Like what?
- 12) When explaining unfamiliar concepts, or when there are no similar words in English, which code do you employ? And why?
- 13) According to your experience, which code would maintain your students' interest and keep the lesson more enjoyable, L1 or L2 or an adherence of both, and why?

14) Do you think there is a relationship between your choice of the code and your affective situation (whether anxious, comfortable, uncomfortable, etc.)? Explain please.

Appendix H: Teachers' Interview Transcription

T1

1) What do you think about the use of code switching in ELT classrooms?

It depends on the nature of the ELT classroom. So, if it is a multicultural context mmm... I don't think it is a good idea to use mmm... code switching, it's not possible. If I think about our ELT classrooms it's not possible because we have students from many different L1 background. So in this case it's not mmm... suitable, it's not a good idea to use code switching but if all the students in the ELT classroom share the same L1, time to time or let's say very rarely code switching can be used if this will make things easier in terms of students learning. But in our context it's not possible. expressive

2) How often should Turkish be used in ELT classrooms?

So when you say ELT classrooms, you mean our situation not EFL. Mmm... So these people, they are going to be English teachers, so in my opinion Turkish should not be used at all in the ELT classrooms.

3) If you code switch in your classroom, when and why do you do so?

You know, very rarely just a couple of words. When we are having a break like, you know, if you work very hard and if I see the students are bored and very tired just for maximum one minute if I am making a joke, okay? ... so maybe one or two words Turkish but immediately I give the English translation as well, okay?... because we have students from different L1 background so I have to do it... non-academic. To change the atmosphere, to relaxed students.

4) Do you see any advantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

As I told you, you know, I don't use it in my classrooms but in EFL classes whereas students have the same L1 sometimes code switching can save time and also energy in the classroom. But not much code switching again. expressive

5) Do you see any disadvantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

Of course in our classrooms it's a very big disadvantage, especially for those students whose native language is not the language we switch to. Okay? in this case Turkish okay?... so it's a very big disadvantage academically because when you explain a topic in Turkish, only Turkish students will be understand and this will be an advantage for them over the other students and also, or psychologically it's a disadvantage because people are talking about something and you don't understand maybe they are laughing and I don't think people are affected positively.

6) If a student speaks to you in L 1, which code would you employ to reply? And why?

In my classes I reply in English, in L2, okay? ... to give the message that the medium of an instruction, the medium of communication is English okay? ... and time to time I openly tell them, you know, we have students who do not understand Turkish so it's not even polite to speak in Turkish in class.

7) If your students find difficulty understanding what you are talking about, say, explaining a grammar point, assigning homework or an activity, would you employ our L 1 in this case? If not, why?

In my ELT classrooms, I do not err... I haven't observe such a difficulty in understanding such things okay? ... so, because our students generally their English level is good okay? ... so, they can understand all these things so, mmm I didn't feel the need to use Turkish. Okay? Again even though I had recognized such a thing I wouldn't have use Turkish because we have non-Turkish speaking students.

8) Could you please explain why your code switching contributes to or hinders learners' language learning?

If we think about language learning, yes it hinders language learning because, as you know, as everyone knows, students or learners should be exposed to as much input as possible, so, if you are exposing them to Turkish how are they going to learn English? So, mmm... in my opinion it really hinders language learning. The more they are exposed to L2, it's better for their acquisition or learning.

9) You taught several classes, did you code switch in all of the classes? If not, why?

As I told you, you know, mmm... I do not use code switching in my classes because of the reasons I have just explained, because of the multicultural, multilingual nature of the classrooms. Okay? So, mmm... just you know, few words in Turkish just for joking and even though it's for joking I always translate in English so that everyone understands what we are talking about.

10) When discussing personal issues, which code do you think is more appropriate to use and why?

Of course I do not discuss personal issues in the classroom, so, if a student comes to my office and wants to share a personal issue and if the student is a Turkish speaking student okay?... in this case I use Turkish. Okay?

11) Do you use English when discussing all kinds of topics? Or you employ L 1 for specific topics? Like what?

I don't use L1, just for jokes as I said, a few words but English translation is always given.

12) When explaining unfamiliar concepts, or when there are no similar words in English, which code do you employ? And why?

Always English. No Turkish because there are people who do not understand Turkish.

13) According to your experience, which code would maintain your students' interest and keep the lesson more enjoyable, L1 or L2 or an adherence of both, and why?

You must have asked this question to my students. But it must be L2 okay? Because this is the lingua franca, this is the language that everyone can understand in the classroom. Okay?

14) Do you think there is a relationship between your choice of the code and your affective situation (whether anxious, comfortable, uncomfortable, etc.)? Explain please.

No, because I always... if I am in the classroom, if I am teaching I always use mmm... L2

T2

1) What do you think about the use of code switching in ELT classrooms?

Code switching can be used in the classrooms if needed. It depends on the need. If you need to do that, you have to do it. You know, the thing that I have to use, I have to code switch, no. If there is need for that, you have to do that.

2) How often should Turkish be used in ELT classrooms?

I didn't like the word 'should be'. It shouldn't start with 'should be'. It can be used, it may be used, if needed, but don't forget that we may have international classrooms, we may have students from different cultures so that's why if we have international classrooms, we cannot speak, we cannot code switch but if it's a Turkish classroom what I mean here is only Turkish students so then if needed you can do that but 'not should', may, you can if needed.

3) If you code switch in your classroom, when and why do you do so?

It depends on lots of things. Mmm... I may code switch if I see that, it is time consuming. It's not... for example, I explain, explain, explain, again and again but the student may not answer me and the level and other issues, that case I may use the student's native language. I will save time in that case. Or sometimes there can be some socio-pragmatic reasons for that, to express my solidarity with the jokes or something like that, I may code switch.

4) Do you see any advantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

Advantage? I wouldn't say, use the word 'advantage', 'disadvantage'. It depends if you need, you will use it but it may have certain advantages because some students may not due to vocabulary problems or proficiency level or very authentic materials, in that case the student may not understand so that's why we may use some words and the student's native language and at the same time they can be socio-pragmatic reasons for that as well to use. In other words language is not only use for explaining or for rendering information is also used to express your attitude towards people.so that's why in some cases I think that, it has advantages but disadvantages... yes, next question.

5) Do you see any disadvantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

I don't think that we shouldn't code switch if it's not needed. It depends on the context. In other words if you need do it, if there is no need why to code switch and the other thing is, it's very difficult for us to code switch in our classrooms because we have students from more than 25 countries. In other words, we have students from different language backgrounds and in most cases they do not understand each other's language so, it is not ethical to code switch in that case so, that's why I think that we should avoid code switching, if we have students from other language backgrounds because these students may misunderstand us.

6) If a student speaks to you in L 1, which code would you employ to reply? And why?

If a student asks me a question in the classroom about the topic, for example, subject matter topic, even though the question is in Turkish I prefer using English but I change some words or wordings or I can simply but again I will use that language but if the student comes to my office or in the corridor to ask about... to ask something concerning not classroom issues or subject matter issues I usually use the language that students use, the variety. If they use Turkish I... my answer is in Turkish, if Russian, my answer is in Russian. In other words, it depends which language they use but if it's not about classroom discourse.

7) If your students find difficulty understanding what you are talking about, say, explaining a grammar point, assigning homework or an activity, would you employ our L 1 in this case? If not, why?

I wouldn't use their native language again because, first I will try explain by paraphrasing, by simplifying or by doing something. I don't believe that it will be a problem for them to understand me and if I see that nothing works, in that case I will

do it but generally speaking I may repeat not the same thing, the same content with different wordings and level. I believe they will understand me.

8) Could you please explain why your code switching contributes to or hinders learners' language learning?

I don't believe that code switching may contribute or hinder because it is... you code switch if you have 15 minutes or 20 minutes for discussion you use only a few words in a different language. So I don't believe it plays any role in language acquisition.

9) You taught several classes, did you code switch in all of the classes? If not, why?

Now, it depends what the subject matter is. When teaching grammar, when I used to teach grammar, I never code switch. I use only English but when I teach language and society sometimes I code switch when I provide examples from different cultures.

10) When discussing personal issues, which code do you think is more appropriate to use and why?

The students' native language. If I know that language, for example, with my Turkish students and they come to my office I speak Turkish. If I know the student's native language I prefer using it because language is a psychological construct at the same time. With a Russian student comes to your office to speak something personal, if you use the same language so the fact is absolutely different and when you speak Turkish to a Turkish student about personal affairs, the student considers you as a part of that culture. So they feel more comfortable. So that's why, why not to use native language of the student.

11) Do you use English when discussing all kinds of topics? Or you employ L 1 for specific topics? Like what?

If it's about subject matter courses, I prefer using English only but if needed for some purposes I use Turkish as well, if needed. For example; for providing example or to clarify something or to say something simply. I may use that but if it concerns something for example, that is directly related to the subject matter issues I may code switch. In other words, it depends on the formality, the degree of formality. With non-formal issues I may use any language. I feel free to code switch. I don't think how I would say this word in Turkish. So if I don't know the word in Turkish, I use... usually in English.

12) When explaining unfamiliar concepts, or when there are no similar words in English, which code do you employ? And why?

So, if, for example, there is not direct equivalent of the word in English, I try to explain it to give definitions. In other words, I prefer using English again but by choosing different moods, explaining, drawing or showing or miming. I try to do that. If it's an English class, if it's an international classroom I don't code switch. I prefer using language and instruction.

13) According to your experience, which code would maintain your students' interest and keep the lesson more enjoyable, L1 or L2 or an adherence of both, and why?

I don't believe that the language that I use makes the language enjoyable. It is not our issue to make it enjoyable or not. Because it's a classroom and we have a certain aim. You go into the classroom to teach or to discuss something. So your main aim is that. But in order to decrease anxiety level, you can use some means. Among them can be some, for example, some words that use in the students' native language. For example; once it happen, I saw that my Turkish student was sleeping, I just came up and said 'uyan oğlum!' It changed the situation. I don't think that... yes he smiled, he said sorry and we continued. In other words, I didn't do that just purpose for saying I will do that. So, in other words, my point is classroom is not a place for entertainment. If your aim is to go to the classroom to teach, just do it. But, don't forget that if student's level of anxiety will be high, it will be difficult to teach. So that's why you create an atmosphere that will be fair able. Otherwise, it will be very difficult but it is not directly related to code switching.

14) Do you think there is a relationship between your choice of the code and your affective situation (whether anxious, comfortable, uncomfortable, etc.)? Explain please.

Yes. It depends. You know, language is depend on the context of the situation, on the relationship of the interlocutors, so, there are so many factors that contribute your choice and affective or let's say that anxiety and other things are very important so if you believe that your preference will create a fair able atmosphere in the classroom why not to do that. In other words, language is not your aim. It's just means to. So that's why you can easily do that and language is very important. In other words, when use the students' native language if needed, just a word, a very simple thing. The attitude will be different. So that's why we have to that powerful weapon as language to create a fair able atmosphere in the classroom.

T3

1) What do you think about the use of code switching in ELT classrooms?

It can be both an asset or a deficiency. Due to differences in two languages, bilingual people may have to use code switching in order to be able to express themselves more precisely. Yet, sometimes, overusing code switching may indicate the lack of proficiency in either languages. Sociologically, it may also be regarded as a negative behavior, as if the speaker is showing off. When we come to the ELT classrooms, it depends on your students' proficiency level. When the level gets higher, codes witching should get lesser.

2) How often should Turkish be used in ELT classrooms?

I repeat what I've just said. When the level of your students gets higher, code switching should be used lesser. Upper level students should be encouraged to use only English.

3) If you code switch in your classroom, when and why do you do so?

Since I'm teaching MA and PhD students in the ELT program, I don't/shouldn't code switch at all, because my students are international and also they're highly competent. Yet, sometimes my students talk to each other in their own language to clarify some points or make jokes, and they immediately translate it into English so that others in the class don't feel alien. They are sensitive enough about this.

4) Do you see any advantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

If your students are looking for a word but cannot remember it, they should be allowed to say it in their L1 and continue their communication so that their fluency is not broken. In other words, he or she may be more willing to participate. The teacher can also code switching while teaching an abstract or complicated concept, or giving some instructions. It saves time

5) Do you see any disadvantages in your code switching in classrooms, and why?

As I said before, it can be taken as a deficiency, lack of proficiency in the target language. This may affect student's self-confidence. Another disadvantage could be that student may not show enough effort to improve his/her L2 proficiency.

6) If a student speaks to you in L 1, which code would you employ to reply? And why?

Purposefully, I would employ L2 in order to encourage the students to switch back to English, if I am in the class. Outside the class, I may answer in L1.

7) If your students find difficulty understanding what you are talking about, say, explaining a grammar point, assigning homework or an activity, would you employ our L 1 in this case? If not, why?

It depends. If explaining something very difficult or abstract to my lower level students, I may switch to L1 (provided that all students share the same L1). Yet, in MA or PhD classes, we cannot talk about this.

8) Could you please explain why your code switching contributes to or hinders learners' language learning?

I think I've already answered this question. It may contribute to student's fluency (and thus desire to communicate), but also may prevent student's motivation to develop his/her proficiency, leading to laziness.

9) You taught several classes, did you code switch in all of the classes? If not, why?

No. Not at the ELT department.

10) When discussing personal issues, which code do you think is more appropriate to use and why?

Of course L1, assuming that both speakers share the same L1.

11) Do you use English when discussing all kinds of topics? Or you employ L 1 for specific topics? Like what?

This question does not sound relevant to my teaching contexts.

12) When explaining unfamiliar concepts, or when there are no similar words in English, which code do you employ? And why?

This question does not sound relevant to my teaching contexts.

13) According to your experience, which code would maintain your students' interest and keep the lesson more enjoyable, L1 or L2 or an adherence of both, and why?

It depends. From time to time, especially in social talk, L1 may help a lot to create a more comfortable and enjoyable environment.

14) Do you think there is a relationship between your choice of the code and your affective situation (whether anxious, comfortable, uncomfortable, etc.)? Explain please.

Sometimes, the mood of the person may cause him to change the code, usually to their L1. But some people feel more comfortable when they swear in L2. It depends.