

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Code switching in English language teaching (ELT) teaching practice in Turkey: Student teacher practices, beliefs and identity

Sezen Seymen Bilgin

Kocaeli University, Kocaeli, Turkey

Received 03 April, 2016; Accepted 14 April, 2016

Code switching involves the interplay of two languages and as well as serving linguistic functions, it has social and psychological implications. In the context of English language teaching, these psychological implications reveal themselves as teachers' thought processes. While the nature of code switching in language classrooms has been widely studied, as yet little if any attention has been paid to the relationship between such switching and the beliefs of the teachers involved. This study is designed to respond this gap in existing research. Five student teachers participated in the studies who were undertaking their teaching practicum at a private school in Turkey, aiming to investigate their thinking in relation to code switching in their classrooms by using the analysis of classroom interactions, individual interviews and stimulated recall interviews. The first step of the research involved video recording the lessons taught by the five student teachers within the framework of their university Teaching Practice course. This was followed by individual interviews with the student teachers focusing on their views of code switching during their teaching experience and their general views about language teaching. The last stage involved stimulated recall interviews with the student teachers based on selected extracts from their lessons chosen after an analysis of spoken interaction in their classes. The data were then analysed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed that code switching is more than merely a linguistic matter; it is also indicative of a number of other dimensions including how teachers define themselves professionally, teacher beliefs, teacher identity, affective factors influencing teachers and their relationships with supervisors. This study suggests that code switching could usefully be included as a topic in teacher education programmes and in supervisor/mentor training.

**Key words:** Code-switching, pre-service teachers, student teachers, beliefs, identity, teachers' thought processes.

## INTRODUCTION

Research on talk in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom has shifted from drawing conclusions on

E-mail: [sezenseymen@gmail.com](mailto:sezenseymen@gmail.com).

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

the basis of observations of teacher / learner classroom behaviours to an interest in the practices involved in their interaction (Lin, 2008; Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005). One of these practices is code switching and there is a growing body of research on the pedagogical implications of this in EFL classrooms (Auer, 1998). This study aims to approach the role of code switching from the perspective of how the phenomenon can help us to understand student teacher behaviour more meaningfully. At this point, the study had to consider three elements relevant to organizing this process: YÖK's (Higher Educational Council of Turkey), teacher training programme (which is mandatory), Ministry of Education's agenda in English teaching (which is followed by the school where student teachers are teaching), and the university's attitude. With all of these factors affecting the teaching process, none of them made reference to how to deal with code switching in a lesson context. Therefore, the present study aims to explore the interaction patterns between students and student teachers in EFL classrooms with a specific focus on code switching, and how it contributes to the interaction in the classroom. It also aims to investigate the relationship between their views of code switching and their more general beliefs about teaching methods and approaches. It is hoped that in addition to throwing light on an important area this might also have implications for approaches to teacher preparation in Turkey. For these purposes, the study will identify patterns of interaction that emerge from data from the student teachers' teaching sessions. In order to reveal the underlying thought processes of student teachers while teaching, the study also employ stimulated recall interviews in addition to individual interviews focusing on code switching and the student teachers' relationship with their supervisors and/or tutors.

### **The EFL teacher training setting in Turkey**

As a result of Turkey being a country located between Europe and the Middle East geographically, culturally and strategically, and seeking integration into the European Union, possessing a good command of English has become an invaluable asset for its citizens (Palfreyman, 2005; Atay and Kurt, 2006). Therefore, there has been a recent surge in demand for competent English teachers. Consequently, the status of English language teaching and training has expanded considerably in Turkey (Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005; Atay and Kurt, 2006; Deniz and Şahin, 2006; Atay and Ece, 2009; Coşkun, 2010; Ozturk and Atay, 2010).

Historically, following the introduction of English language into the Turkish education system during the Tanzimat Period (the Innovation Regulation which covered the era between 1839 and 1876) in the Ottoman era, the teaching of English has become a government driven policy since the 1950s reaching its peak after the

1980s (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998; Atay and Ece, 2009). The status of English in Turkey is now that of the main foreign language taught in most government and private sponsored schools at all levels. The new legislation offered in 1997 made English teaching in Turkish educational institutions obligatory starting from 4th grade on. In addition, within the scope of this new legislation, communicative language teaching approach was involved in the curriculum for the first time (Kırkgöz, 2005).

The curriculum of teacher education faculties in higher education was also reformed, with the amount of time dedicated to methodology and the teaching practice time in schools increased, along with the introduction of a Teaching English to Young Learners course for the first time (Kırkgöz, 2007). As a result of government policies and the demand from people because of the growing dominance of English all over the world, the number of the institutions in Turkey training English teacher candidates has increased. All of the programmes offer four year undergraduate programmes designed to train English language teachers, employing the same core course work regulated by Council of Higher Education, though with differences in the elective courses designed to meet the needs of the state and private sponsored schools, courses and language-teaching related initiatives in Turkey.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Code switching**

There is an established steadily growing body of research on code switching in language classrooms (Auer, 1988; Aendorff, 1996; Lawson and Sachdev, 2000; Macaro, 2001; Rolin-lanziti and Brownlie, 2002; Wei, 2002; Ferguson, 2003; Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2005; Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005; Lin, 2008; Xu, 2010). Early classroom code switching studies were mostly conducted in second language contexts (ESL classrooms) and bilingual education classrooms followed by quantitative approaches drawing on functional code analysis (Lin, 2008). Later studies on code switching in language classroom contexts, from the 1980s onwards, have drawn on more sociolinguistic research approaches such as interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication (Goffman, 1974; Gumperz, 1982) conversation analysis (Sacks, 1992) and interpretive research paradigms (Lin, 2008; Macaro, 2001). Sociolinguistic approaches relevant to code switching studies in EFL classrooms are closely related to target language and/or mother tongue usage, which are also referred to as L2 and L1 (Polio and Duff, 1994; Ferguson, 2003; Levine, 2003; Macaro, 2001, 2005; Üstünel and Seedhouse, 2005; Lin, 2008; Zabrodska, 2008).

This distinction has emerged as a result of several studies debating on the use of L1 and L2 in the

classroom. In the EFL classroom, the importance of using the target language is generally accepted (Krashen, 1982); however whether L1 should be used in EFL classrooms or not remains disputable. For instance, Krashen and Terrell (1983, 2000) suggest that communication-based approaches produced better results than traditional grammar-centred approaches; however, their view on the code choice in the classroom is in favour of the L2 in that “the instructor always uses the target language”. Despite their firm suggestion on the code choice of the teacher, they recommend that students should be allowed to use either the L1 or L2 until they feel comfortable using only the L2, which is the preferred output. Following the employment of these methods in language classrooms, the importance of the use of L1 started to receive more recognition from researchers. The L2-only tradition excluding the L1 has been argued to limit “the possibilities of language teaching” (Cook, 2001).

According to Liu et al. (2004) the views about the use of L1 in L2 teaching are grouped into two major strands: the first one consists of those studies opposing code switching to L1 and using L2 exclusively in classroom, and the second comprises studies supporting using L1 to some extent. According to Sert (2005), “Many teachers, who are in favour of the applications of communicative techniques in the language teaching environment, oppose any form of native language use during classroom instruction”.

Similarly, Auerbach (1993) and Izumi (1995) state that even though most language teachers feel that it is almost impossible to avoid using L1 in the classroom, they also have the feeling of ‘being ashamed of’ using L1 because of ‘English-only’ policies dominating the teachers. Another argument put forward by researchers opposing switching to L1 in EFL classrooms is based on the importance of “speaking and using English in the classroom as often as you possibly can” (Willis, 1981). This argument is also expressed as “maximizing the teacher’s use of the TL (target language) in the classroom” (Turnbull and Arnett, 2002). The maximization of target language in EFL classroom is regarded as a ‘reasonable’ practice because the teachers are “often the students’ primary source of linguistic input on the TL” (Turnbull and Arnett, 2002). However, what exactly counts as ‘maximization’ of the L2 has become a topic of discussion.

Nevertheless, more recent research reveals that switching to L1 could have benefits for language teaching (Atkinson, 1987; Eldridge, 1996; Macaro, 2001, 2005; Turnbull and Arnett, 2002; Rolin-lanziti and Brownlie, 2002; Levine, 2003; Xu, 2010; Levine, 2011; Levine, 2014; Debreli and Oyman, 2015). The claim of these researchers is that careful and limited use of the L1 should be carefully considered and instead of an either/or attitude to L1 use, the answers to more constructive questions such as ‘what for’, ‘when’ or ‘to what extent’

should be explored (Gabrielatos, 2001). In line with Gabrielatos’s (2001) suggestion, Cook (2001) favours incorporating ‘some form of code-switching’ - because he believes code switching is a natural phenomenon and teachers should not discourage students from using it. He argues that the maximization of L2 in the classroom should not be interpreted as meaning that the L1 should be avoided altogether and that, in fact, “the long-held tradition of discouraging the integration of the L1 in the TL (target language) classroom has sharply limited the possibilities of language teaching”.

Similarly, van Lier (1995) states that the encouragement for students’ L1 uses by teachers would provide more salient input for the learner. Levine (2011) also argues that the language classroom is a ‘multilingual environment’ because “for each learner, at least two languages are involved in the L2 learning process”. He further suggests that a substantial body of research increasingly accept the multilingual environment mentioned and a multilingual approach should be developed in order to examine language classroom communication. Macaro (1997, 2001, 2005) is one of the researchers who is opposed to L2-only classes on the basis that the use of the L1 is a natural practice in L2 learning and teaching as well as being a more time efficient strategy than using only the target language, which is a point also made by Atkinson (1987). Macaro (1997) explored teachers’ beliefs and attitudes on L1 and L2 use. He reported that most of the teachers believed that it was impossible to create a ‘L1-free’ classroom except with highly motivated classes. A majority of teachers also pointed out the usefulness and importance of the L2 for giving basic instructions and they used L1 for classroom management, covering grammatical rules and developing social relationship with the students. The use of interviews and stimulated recall in my own study will allow an exploration of teacher views as expressed in general terms and also as prompted by a consideration of aspects of their own pedagogic practice.

Overall, it is clear that there is no clear cut agreement on the advantages and/or disadvantages of switching to the L1 in EFL classrooms. However, my study does not directly rely on the benefits or problems of switching to the L1; it rather tries to reveal how switching to the L1 contributes to the pedagogic activity in the classroom, and how this might bear on aspects of the student teachers’ identities. In line with this, my standpoint is closer to the researchers who are in favour of code switching in EFL classrooms and regard it as a natural phenomenon to be benefited from for the sake of quality interaction in classroom and its potential implications to the teacher training curriculum.

### **Teacher beliefs**

Teacher beliefs and their effects on teaching practice is a

widely studied area in teacher cognition (Thompson, 1992; Calderhead, 1996). Richards (1998) notes that teachers' belief systems are primary sources of teachers' classroom practices as they represent the "information, attitudes, values, expectations, theories and assumptions about teaching and learning". Similarly, a study by Burns (1992) revealed that teachers' beliefs influence the approach to language teaching and their instructional practices with reference to the affective reasoning and their own image as teachers in the classrooms. The findings on research of teachers' beliefs has been considered an important aspect of constructing teacher education programmes as it is believed that these beliefs have a major role in the development of student teachers, pedagogically and professionally (Pajares, 1992; Woolfolk, Davis and Pape, 2006; Borg, 2009; Zheng, 2009; Debreli, 2016). Initial studies focusing on teachers' beliefs investigated various factors affecting teachers' decision making processes; however, the role of the different beliefs in teacher education required a more detailed network of beliefs that shaped the student teachers' future teaching practices (Shulman, 1986; Zheng, 2009). Research on student teacher beliefs indicates that these teachers bring particular beliefs and ideas into the teaching programme which has an effect on their knowledge construction and approach they follow during the teaching practice (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992; Holt-Reynolds, 1992; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Debreli, 2016).

The discussion of the issues earlier mentioned reveals that student teachers hold definite beliefs about teaching and learning. Their beliefs came from very different sources such as their own language learning experiences, the content they are supposed to teach, their supervisors, the actual teaching experience and so on. The important aspect focused in this study is the behaviour of student teachers as a result of these cognitions. These behaviours might not be same even though they are shared by individual student teachers. Especially in terms of code switching, the cognitions and the behaviours might show differences and may lead to a more detailed discussion of the way they see themselves in the classroom. Pittard (2003) argues that student teachers teach in the classroom during the teaching practice for the first time, and this is the first opportunity for them to realise and employ what they believe and become aware of their self-perceptions and identities as teachers. In the next sections the study discusses student teacher identity and self-image of student teachers in more detail.

### **Student teacher identity, knowledge and practice**

There is a recent body of research in teacher development recognising the importance of teacher identity (Korthagen et al., 2001; Sachs, 2005; Freese, 2006; Hoban, 2007; Olsen, 2008; Beauchamp and Thomas, 2009). Teacher identity is an inseparable

concept from teacher knowledge because "what teachers know and do is a part of their identity work, which is continuously performed and transformed through interaction in classrooms" (Miller, 2009). As discussed earlier, teacher thinking (cognition) and employing (practice) form a triangular network leads to the conclusions about the characterizations of the teachers and the lessons. Within this network, code switching plays a role that potentially enables us to understand how these systems work together. Miller (2009) quotes Cummins's (2000) observation that "all classroom interactions need to be understood in relation to the ways in which they generate knowledge". This is closely related to the aim of this study in that the study analyse the talk in the classroom by focusing on code switching in order to understand how the interaction relates to aspects of teacher identity.

Teacher identity primarily relates to the kind of teacher a (student) teacher wants to be in a particular context. According to Gee (2001), every teacher has a core identity and several sub-identities might emerge within particular contexts. These contexts are nature identity (one's own natural state), institution identity (the identity shaped according to authority), discourse identity (stemming from the discourse of others about one's self) and affinity-identity (derives from the practices of the teacher in relation to other groups involved in teaching). In line with this, Reves and Medgyes (1994) argue that linguistic competence is closely related to self-esteem and self-image, and might affect the attitudes of teachers towards work insofar as they are aware of their linguistic competence compared to native English teachers. This study aims to explore naturally occurring code switching practices and how they contribute to the interaction and consequently what they reveal about student teachers' identity in the context of classrooms where bilingual practices are not part of the pedagogic design.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Purpose of the study**

This study aims to explore the interaction in EFL classrooms with specific focus on code switching, and its relationship to student teachers' pedagogical decisions and the factors influencing these decisions in terms of their thinking. Within the scope of these broader aims, the study also addresses the following research questions:

1. For what stated purposes do student teachers switch codes and is there any connection between this and their beliefs about teaching?
2. What relationship, if any, is there between their views of code switching, their code switching behaviour and their identities as teachers?
3. In what ways does code switching relate to or throw light on relationships with the supervisor and/or tutor?

### **Research model**

The methods used consist of the analysis of lesson interactions in

order to inform the selection of extracts for use in stimulated recall, and the thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews (Boyatzis, 1998) with the participant student whose lessons the study video recorded. The study came to this approach with no pre-determined assumptions about the interactional patterns found or the student teachers' potential views on code switching and how it affected their decisions while teaching. In order to identify what code switching encapsulates in the teaching processes, the study first aim was to identify how interaction is built in lessons with a focus on code switching. For this purpose, the study drew on the aspects of conversation analysis, a method that aims to investigate naturally occurring talk in the classroom (Seedhouse, 2004; Ten Have, 2007). This broadly conversation analytic approach enabled the study to examine the patterns of code switching by both students teachers and their students not only for the immediate pedagogical functions they serve but also for the broader implications such as beliefs and identities of the student teachers. In order to identify the stated purposes and their own views of code switching, individual interviews and stimulated recall interviews (Gass and Mackey, 2000) were conducted with the student teachers. This process also aimed to explore their statements about the use of code switching with a view to shedding light on their beliefs and aspects of their professional identities. The final dimension of these networks of relationships is the influence of the supervisors and tutor on the teaching process of these student teachers and how this relates to their cognitions as teachers. Such data has to be gathered in a systematic and meaningful way and subjected to an appropriate analytical process. Analysis of the classroom data was used in order to provide the study with a clear picture of the nature of code switching in the classrooms studied in order to inform the study selection of appropriate extracts for use in the stimulated recall interviews. In order to identify and interpret the data the study obtained from the interviews and the stimulated recall, which form the basis of the study findings, the study employed thematic analysis, which has been widely used in the analysis of interview data and proved equally applicable to the stimulated recall data.

### Participants

A total of five participants took part in the study. The participants were all senior student teachers studying at a state university's English Language Teaching department. Once the permission of head of the department had been obtained, the lecturers teaching the 'Teaching Practice' class were asked if they wanted to take part in the study. One of the lecturers agreed to let me work with his group of students in his Teaching Practice group, which involved 22 student teachers. He introduced researcher to the students, who had been assigned to him randomly. In order to make sure that all participants fully understood the purposes and the procedures of the study, the study provided all participants with information sheets. The purposes of the study were explained to the student teachers and the tutor. Five student teachers agreed to participate in the study. This study employs multiple qualitative data collection and analysis methods which requires in depth analysis of the findings (Lee et al., 2002). Therefore, data obtained from five student teachers enabled the study to make in-depth exploration of the research objectives. The student teachers who wanted to take part in the study consented to be videotaped four times during the term, each recording covering a single complete lesson. One of the student teachers wanted an extra recording for her own personal records and she was videotaped five times.

All of the participants were born in Turkey and were native speakers of Turkish, and four out of the five students were female. The age range of the student teachers was from 22 to 24 and none of them had had school teaching experience before. The tutor of the students was a male, 48-year-old instructor who had been teaching for more than 20 years. He held an MA degree in ELT and

was writing his PhD dissertation during the time data collection procedure took place. The supervisors of the student teachers were among the most experienced teachers teaching at the private school where data collection took place with 10 to 25 years of experience. The contents of the lessons that student teachers taught varied. Student teacher 1 and 2 taught the same classes, namely 7th grades. The overall number of the student in these classes was 23. Student teachers 3 and 4 taught 5th and 6th grades with 21 students. All students at 5, 6 and 7th grade had been studying English since first grade. Some of them had been abroad during the summer holidays. The materials used in the lessons were the course book and the additional worksheets prepared by the student teachers according to the lesson plan. Lastly, student teacher 5 taught a 10th grade class with six students, all preparing for the linguistics departments of the universities in Turkey. Thus, their English proficiency was much higher than the other students. Most of the students in this class had been studying English for more than six years. Every student teacher participating in the study was recorded for four times, with the sole exception of student teacher 5, who requested that the researcher record an extra class for her own use. The amount of time they taught varied because of the time constraints put by the private school they taught and their supervisor teachers.

### Data collection procedure

The main data are taken from 21 lessons of EFL classrooms ranging from 5 to 10th grades taught by the five student teachers. All of the lessons were conducted at the same private school in İzmit, Kocaeli. All of the students studying at this private school are taught English at least six hours a week, starting at first grade. The researcher acted as a non-participant observer and did not participate in the lessons in any way. Thus, all of the materials and lesson procedures were prepared by the student teachers and their supervisor teachers at the school. During the observation/recording data collection procedure, a total of 21 videos were therefore collected. These 21 videos provided the basis for the stimulated recall interviews. Following the recordings of the lessons, stimulated recall interviews were conducted with each student teacher. The videos recorded for each student teacher were watched one by one and the recall of information regarding verbal and non-verbal actions contributing to code switching were identified. Stimulated recall interviews were conducted in order to provide one of the three fundamental points in the approach to conversational code switching, namely, the balance between social structure and conversational structure suggested by Wei (2002). At this point, stimulated recall interviews enabled me to elicit relevant descriptions and/or interpretations of the code switching occurring in the classroom at a particular time.

### Data analysis

Data analysis for this study includes transcriptions of lessons, stimulated recall interviews and individual interviews conducted with the student teachers. Lesson transcriptions consist of 21 classroom talks, four for each student teacher with the sole exception of one teacher (teacher 5) who was video recorded five times. Another data set consists of stimulated recall interviews conducted with the teachers individually after the whole teaching process. The last data set consists of interviews conducted with each student teacher which were videotaped. The conversational analytic transcription of the data confirmed the student teachers' statements in interviews in that code switching occurred most during grammar teaching sessions. However, bringing these findings together with the findings obtained from the stimulated recall interviews revealed that there is more involved than merely a relationship between code

switching and the topic of the lesson, and that this is related to the construction of the identities of these teachers. The rest of the themes, namely, affective factors, student teachers' selves, and the influence of the supervisors also provide instances of classroom interaction and student teacher discussions that suggest code switching might be a striking linguistic phenomenon pointing to aspects on teacher behaviour and the underlying reasons for them. In the next sections, the study present findings of each data set with the methods the study used.

## FINDINGS

### Grammar teaching

My starting point of dealing with grammar teaching as a theme was due to the fact that student teachers frequently expressed that they code switched while teaching grammar the most. For instance, student teacher one, two and three clearly expressed the fact that they switched into Turkish most while they were teaching grammar. ST1 expresses this as follows:

*The lessons I used most [Turkish] are most probably grammar lessons. I can frankly say that I use Turkish most while teaching grammar.*

ST2 has a similar attitude to Turkish usage while teaching grammar:

*We once had observed another teacher. It was fun but she also used Turkish a lot. I mean almost all teachers use Turkish while teaching grammar.*

ST3 also thinks that Turkish should be used while teaching grammar:

*I also had to use Turkish while teaching grammar because it's hard for them to grasp those items in English, maybe it's abstract.*

The most prominent themes emerging from these teachers' experiences while teaching grammar (obtained from the classroom extracts), and after teaching it (individual interviews and the stimulated recall interviews) are how the relationships with their supervisor teachers affect their approach to teaching grammar, how they relate this to their own teaching identity and their own language learning process, and how their own feelings about the process come into play.

One of the instances where ST1 expresses the strain on her relationship with her supervisor emerges even before she teaches grammar for the first time. ST1 mentions how confused she was when she was told to teach 'Adverbial Clauses of Manner and Time' by the supervisor teacher. She implies that presenting the form in a deductive way while introducing a grammatical structure is labelling. She further elaborates on this as follows:

*Then when I use labelling, students do not get it when*

*they encounter the same thing in different occasions. I remember teaching adverbs of manner and adverbs of time. In both cases, I can frankly tell you that before teaching these, when our supervisor teacher told me to teach them, I did not have the faintest idea what they were all about. Seriously. After thinking to myself, I do not remember such a thing, what the heck it is all about, I referred to a grammar book right away. I came across as if/as though in manner section. I thought to myself, oh that? I mean, when she said adverbs of manner, I did not know it was labelled such even after my four years at ELT department.*

ST1 claims that teaching grammar by 'labelling' grammatical items does not help the students' learning process. On the contrary, she says labelling is likely to confuse them. Even though she claims that she was asked not to use 'labelling' by her supervisor teacher, she points out the fact that the supervisor teacher assigned her the topic using labelling, to which she responded with frustration. In addition to this, her own knowledge of English grammar came into play and she had to refer to a grammar book herself to see what the label 'Adverbial Clauses of Manner and Time' meant. This frustration prompted ST1 to reflect on her approach to teaching and the relationship between her lack of comprehension and what was being expected of her students. In other words, the inadequacy of her own subject knowledge becomes a driving force to assess her teaching. Interestingly, even though ST1 does not agree with the way the supervisor introduces her topic, she does exactly the same thing as her supervisor does while teaching.

As seen in Table 1, the first thing ST1 does is to write on the board the label, Adverbial Clauses of Manner (line 22), which is followed by 'as if' and 'as though' (line 24). She starts explaining in English (lines 25 to 26) and yet switches to Turkish almost immediately (line 29). After introducing the topic, she continues with examples and starts explaining real situations in English first, again (line 32). At the example phase, she switches to Turkish once again for further explanation. Upon asking for clarification from the students on line 38, she does not receive a response. This means that ST1 observes her students and when she does not receive a response upon speaking English, she does not hesitate to switch to Turkish. ST1 discussed this event in her stimulated recall interview as shown in Table 2).

The extract in Table 2 reveals that even if ST1 does not agree with the supervisor's way of introducing the topic, she does it the way the supervisor does. Complying with the supervisor's instructions, albeit reluctantly, seems to give rise to a conflict within herself. It is important to note that even though these teachers have an approach to teaching that in general reflects their own beliefs. In this instance, ST1 is prepared to do something that she considers as 'garbage' in order to comply with the requirement of her supervisor.

The teaching of grammar also brings to the fore an

**Table 1.** Extract from ST1's third teaching session.

Line	Response
021	<b>T1: No, ok. Let's start then. Actually it is</b>
022	<i>Starts writing Adverbial Clauses of Manner on the</i>
023	<i>board.</i>
024	<b>T1: While I'm writing you can note down.</b>
025	<i>Writes as if-as though</i>
026	<b>T1: These two are same. OK? Same. Err ((clears her throat)) We use</b>
027	<b>as if and as though –err- while we are talking about the –err-</b>
028	<b>real situations and unreal situations and probable ones ok?</b>
029	<b>Means –err- sanki, -miş gibi [as if, so to say]ok? Let's start</b>
030	<b>with examples. First real examples, real situations.</b>
031	<i>Writes 'for real situations' and examples on the board</i>
032	<i>while uttering the examples at the same time.</i>
033	<b>T1: ok. Erm. There is a smell in the room. I think someone has been</b>
034	<b>cooking. Ok. There is a smell in the room. I think – there is</b>
035	<b>someone has been cooking. I just predict, I just think. I don't</b>
036	<b>know someone has been cooking or not, ok? And we change these</b>
037	<b>sentences we will connect with as if-as though. Errm. It smells</b>
038	<b>as if or as though someone has been cooking. Ok. It smells as</b>
039	<b>if or as though someone has been cooking. Sanki biri yemek</b>
040	<b>pişiriyormuş gibi kokuyor [It smells as if someone has been</b>
041	<b>cooking]ok? Is it clear?</b>
042	<i>No response</i>

**Table 2.** ST1's SR response to extract on Table 1.

Item
R: Here I thought you would write as if / as though on board right away
T: No I wrote this because, I wrote Adverbial Clauses of Manner, because I saw my supervisor teacher writing like this at previous lesson. I mean she wrote the title exactly like this.
R: For what purpose do you think?
T: It is garbage actually. I didn't like it at the time either

affective dimension in the understanding of the student teachers' approach to their work. They have concerns not only about their relationships with the supervisors but also about how they are affected by their own teaching. These concerns include confidence and emotional responses, which bear on their beliefs about teaching. In fact, this reveals a broader tension between the student teachers and their supervisors in terms of their own beliefs and what they expect from themselves for the future, what the supervisors expect of them and the actual expectations of the students they are teaching at the time. An example attitude can be observed for ST5's case in terms of the language choices of her own teachers:

*Well, to be honest I became aware of the importance of the use of English in the classroom after coming to the*

*university. At high school and before that my teachers used Turkish dominantly. It makes much better sense to me now.*

The extract earlier mentioned suggests that the fact that ST5's English teachers' dominant Turkish usage is not appreciated. Her late realisation of the importance of the use of English makes ST5 reluctant to switch to Turkish in class and she does not want to repeat her own teachers' reliance on their first language because it all 'makes sense' to her now.

The extracts and the discussions earlier mentioned reveal several important points that make grammar teaching a deviant case in terms of the relationship between the code switching and grammar teaching, and how these relate to the teachers beliefs and expectations of their own teaching. It is important to note that the

relationship between code switching and grammar teaching refer to a broader understanding of the student teachers' own self and beliefs on teaching. The approach to grammar teaching of these student teachers can be summed up in the following points that can be observed through the events:

1. Their relationship with the supervisor teacher (institutional aspect and tension between their beliefs and that of the supervisor's)
2. Their own language learning experience (contextual factor)
3. Their own feelings on teaching grammar and how they project these feelings towards the students they are teaching (affective factor).

The analysis shows that student teachers are heavily influenced by their supervisor teachers' suggestions. These suggestions sometimes cause a tension within their own projection of teaching grammar, which ideally in their view should not involve excessive Turkish use. One can conclude that code switching is more than exchanging between languages and grammar teaching is more than providing linguistic input for students. The relationship between code switching and grammar teaching might also be regarded as a process which includes indications of a bigger picture related to how a student teacher builds up his / her own self and beliefs on teaching. In the case of these student teachers, it includes internal and external factors. The external factors include the subject matter, their relationships with the supervisors and the contingencies in the classroom they meet. The internal ones include their own language learning experience, their own feelings about teaching grammar and how they respond to their supervisor's suggestions in light of these beliefs. It is interesting to observe that they express their dislike for teaching something considerably more where they feel the need to use Turkish when teaching other skills or content. Taking up some of the themes touched on this section, the following sections include more detailed analyses of the role of code switching on teachers' selves, affective factors and the supervisor's influence.

### **Student teachers' selves**

The study discusses intrinsic thoughts of the student teachers which can shed light on their projection of the teacher they would like to become. At this point, the data reveal that code switching has a significant role in the picture. It is more than the preference to use a language in a particular situation, but rather a result of a conscious or unconscious thought process on particular occasions which gives us hints about the potential existence of how the student teachers position themselves as teachers. For this reason, the classroom is where the student

teachers display their own self most clearly. For example, the first thing ST4 says when he starts his teaching session is related to the language choice in the classroom (Table 3).

The extract in Table 3 shows the first interaction ST4 has with the students he is teaching. He clearly states that he will not tolerate Turkish in his lessons. The first response he receives is, however, in Turkish. The immediate reaction coming from the student is that he does not 'get it'. The next prompt comes from another student; again in Turkish with a direct translation of what ST4 says, and the conversation between the students continue in Turkish. There are two interesting points here. Firstly, ST4 does not respond to these interactions at all, neither in English nor in Turkish. Secondly, student 3 asks a very relevant question, which is 'how are we going to communicate then?' (line 5). This question remains without a response from ST4. ST4 does not address these issues immediately when they occur; instead he asks another question related to the subject matter he is going to teach. It can be regarded as a consistent attitude now that he has stated that he does not want to use Turkish in the classroom at all. Another student (S4) asks a question next, now in English (line 7). This time ST4 responds to the prompt. It is clear that ST4 ignores a comment or a question coming from the students when it is in Turkish. Following ST4's response, another student (S5) makes a derogatory comment on a peer related to the conversation they are having. ST4 does not respond this either, because it is in Turkish. Instead, ST4 tries to draw attention to the subject matter that he is going to teach in course book. The students continue asking managerial questions (lines 16 and 17) in Turkish, still not receiving any response from ST4. Instead of answering ST4 reads out an instruction from the course book.

However, he is interrupted with another question in Turkish, this time about the subject matter. This time ST4 responds this interruption. At this point something interesting occurs: a student approaches ST4 in order to receive a response to his previous request to sit next to his friend, to which ST4 did not respond earlier. The mentioned sequence between ST4 and the students reveal that as much as ST4 insists on ignoring questions or requests in Turkish, the students behave the same in terms of asking questions in Turkish (Line 22). ST4 finally feels the need to repeat his attitude to encourage students to use English by clearly saying 'please in English' (line 24). The student's resistance to using English continues because instead of expressing a request in English, he simply points to the place he wants to sit. Following this event, another student (S8) says in English that they do not have a book. ST4 responds to this by simply saying 'OK' and asks the students to sit down, which is an indication that the students are not even sitting at their desks yet, let alone paying attention to what ST4 is trying to draw their attention to. ST4 discusses this event in stimulated recall interview as



**Table 3.** Extract from ST4's first teaching session.

Line	Action
001	T: First of all, I want to tell you that no Turkish is allowed
002	S1: Anlamadım [I don't get it]
003	<i>((students burst into laughter))</i>
004	S2: Türkçe konuşmak yasak diyor. [He says Turkish is forbidden]
005	S3: Ee nasıl anlaşacağız? [So how are we going to communicate then?]
006	T: Ufuk, please clean the black board. OK. Where are we?
007	S4: Teacher can I ask you a question?
008	T: OK.
009	S4: Teacher you can write very good
010	STS: Beautiful.
011	T: But not this time.
012	S5: Hocam kendisinde algılama eksikliği var [Sir, she is not able to
013	perceive information well enough]
014	S4: No, I am the best.
015	T: OK, listen please. Open the page 77 please.
016	S6: Kitabımı bulamıyorum [I can't seem to find my book]
017	S7: Hocam arkadaşımın yanına geçebilir miyim? [Sir, may I sit next to
018	my friend?]
019	T: He says use the prompts to find out-
020	S8: Hangi sayfa? [which page?]
021	T: 77.
022	S7: ((approaches to the teacher)) Teacher, arkadaşımın yanına geçebilir miyim? [Sir, may I move next to my
023	friend?]
024	T: Please, please. In English please
025	S7: <i>((shows the desk))</i>
026	T: Where, where?
027	S8: Teacher, he haven't got any book
028	T: OK sit please, ok

follows:

*R: The first thing you say is "No Turkish in the class".*

*T: Yes, that's a bit funny. I think I tried to show my attitude about using English in the classroom.*

ST4 reacts to this event describing it as 'funny' and clearly states that his aim was to show his attitude to the students. This reaction is significant in terms of the way it demonstrates what counts as a teacher with an attitude for ST4. The statement of 'no Turkish in the class' is not only uttered for linguistic purposes but also for establishing the image for the students ST4 taught. For his case, this is the way to make his attitude clear.

A similar approach is observed in ST1's case as follows:

*Yes, Turkish should be used but the first choice should always be English and the persistence of speaking English should never be dropped. ... Whenever they spoke Turkish, I always responded and warned [the students] in English to prompt them to speak English to*

*me. And from that moment on, they stopped using Turkish. They started using very little Turkish because that's the image they get from the teacher – thinking "teacher will ask me to respond in English".*

As can be seen in the extract above, ST1 also thinks that persistence to using English should always be a priority. She further discusses how her attitude affects her students' behaviour in time. She claims that her persistence in using English worked for her case and her students started responding to her in English, unlike what happened in ST4's case.

One of the important points for these two teachers (ST1 and ST4) is what they mean by attitude. ST1 suggests the underlying reason why she continues to insist on using English in the classroom when she mentions an 'image' of a teacher who uses English. This image is a reflection of the ideal teacher she wants to become: a teacher who does not respond to the students' Turkish utterances, which will allow her to establish a teacher 'self' in the students' minds with the expectation of

making students use English more. At times this image goes beyond linguistic interaction, as in S4's case:

*R: What about explaining meaning of a word?*

*T: I would keep doing it in English even if they respond me in Turkish. I would use facial expressions or body language as well.*

As seen in the extract, ST4 expresses his insistence on not using Turkish. He clearly states that he would rather make use of body language and facial expressions instead of responding to students in Turkish. This attitude is in line with the image of the teacher he wants to establish in his students' eyes. These comments by the teachers suggest they are involved in a process of constant self-evaluation and reflection. The data show that the content of the self-reflection goes beyond mere concerns about code switching but rather extends to more fundamental aspects of the teachers' identities. ST2, for instance, sees herself as someone who is 'easy-going', and then explains what the implications of this are for her approach:

*I am an easy-going teacher. I did not terrorize the students; I tried to encourage them to talk as much as possible. Maybe because of their own teacher's influence, they were very reluctant to take part in the lesson actively. I think I did my best. Thank you so much for this opportunity by the way. It gave me the chance to have self-reflection on myself, which is not a very integral part of this course.*

ST2 thinks that she should encourage her students to talk, linking this directly to the relationship she has with her students and indirectly to her own professional identity. According to her, being able to achieve something that her supervisor cannot do with her own students is very important. This suggestion is based on her observation that the students are reluctant to participate in the lesson due to her supervisor's implicated negative 'influence'. She clearly recognizes this as a flaw and tries to avoid it. She also mentions the importance of being given an opportunity to think about the process and analyse her own teaching experience.

One of the clearest results emerging from the data is the fact that a preference for using English as the medium of the classroom is not merely about the language choice - there is more to it than just linguistic concern. According to the student teachers, a competent teacher should be able to use English as the medium even though they argue that it is inevitable that they will need to switch to Turkish occasionally. The external factors affecting this attitude have been discussed earlier and yet there is a strong indication that the way student teachers project this attitude to their teaching is closely related to how they want to see themselves as teachers. They want to see themselves as the target language

provider in a way and think that maximum exposure is the best for the students. Therefore, they choose to ignore utterances from the students when they are in Turkish. They believe it is going to be difficult for the students at first but after a while they will learn to try to speak in English and this will be an achievement for the student teachers in terms of projecting a teacher who will not easily switch to Turkish in the students' eyes. It can also be inferred that a teacher should always be ready to ask questions and provide further explanations in English. In this way, they aim to encourage their students to try to speak English.

### **Affective factors**

The data strongly suggest that the student teachers' feelings influence their approaches in the lessons. These feelings emerge from the student teachers' own observations of the students while they are teaching as well as their own language competencies. For instance ST4 mentions the importance of the 'atmosphere' he should create in the classroom:

*But I think they [the students] get used to it [the extensive usage of English] after a while. I think the important thing is to provide a comfortable atmosphere*

The extract above reveals that ST4 cares about the feelings of the students and he aims to create a comfortable atmosphere. Another observation is expressed by ST2 during the stimulated recall interview as follows:

*I figured that my lessons are so dull. I could make it more fun, I mean, even I got bored watching these videos. I can't imagine how those poor students felt.*

It can be argued that ST2 also considers enjoyment as a factor that has to be involved in her lesson. She describes her own lessons as 'dull' and makes a deduction about how the students might have felt as well. She constructs empathy with her students and criticizes herself by expressing her own limitations. It is interesting to note that she puts herself in her students' shoes in terms of their feelings instead of only relating this reflection to the subject matter she was teaching at the time. The extract below illustrates an example of her changing approach to the choice of language due to ST2's observation of her students' reactions (Table 4).

As seen in Table 4, ST2 starts introducing the usage of will to refer to future actions in English and switches into Turkish while explaining the usage of it in more detail without a prompt from the students. Upon being asked in the stimulated recall interview why she switched to Turkish at that point, she points out the importance of the reactions of the students in her class along with the

**Table 4.** Extract and SR from ST2's first teaching session.

Item	Response
T: I think it's because I conditioned myself to use Turkish and then didn't find it logical to ask meanings over again. Along the way I think I gave up R: I wonder why you gave up.	T: And second usage of will. We use will when we talk about spontaneously. Anlık [Spontaneously]
T: Maybe because of time constraints or maybe I felt like they were following my point at the time R: Well, can you figure out if they got your point? T: I think it's the looks. Sometimes they look very confused, surprised. Sometimes they don't react, nod...etc. At those occasions, I feel like they are not following me. Of course this does not mean I am always fully aware of this situation	.... T: Anlık bir cümle, önceden düşünmediniz. Anında bir olay oldu, onun için söylüyorsunuz.[A spontaneous sentence, you did not think through before. Something happens all of a sudden and at that point you use will]. For example the phone is ringing. And you are the nearest person to it. And you say 'OK, I'll answer it'

possibility of time constraints. It is important for ST2 to make herself clear to the students and if she observes that students look 'surprised' or 'confused' she feels uncomfortable. She notes the importance of receiving a reaction from the students and yet adds that her recognition is not always enough to make clear judgements all the time. ST3 has a similar view on observing her students while teaching reported speech:

*It's like I understand that they don't get it when I try to elaborate on reported speech in English. The process works the other way around with my perception of their understanding when I use English for instructions, for example. I am also aware that no matter what I do, there will be couple of students who will not have an idea what I'm talking about.*

The extract above reveals that ST3 monitors her students and in the light of her observations, she can make deductions about her students' different reactions in different lessons. For instance, she observes that her students have comprehension problems when she teaches a grammar subject (reported speech) in English and yet, when it comes to giving instructions in English, her perception is that her students do not have such a problem. Her above statements also reveal that she has the realisation of her own limits as a teacher and regardless of the language she uses, there is an implication of disappointment in knowing that she will not be able to reach out to all of her students.

The extracts and the discussions earlier mentioned indicate how affective factors influence the student teachers and their code choice in the lessons. The student teachers constantly monitor the students not only in terms of the subject matter they are teaching but they also monitor how they feel, respond and react in particular situations. These observations are closely related to their code choice in lessons. Sometimes they

perform involuntary code switching as a result of these observations to make themselves clearer, but at the expense of feeling frustration.

However, the point is they are willing to be flexible and open to the verbal and/or non-verbal signals they are receiving from the students. They do not want their lessons to be boring. They do not want to get bored, either. Their affective well-being is also important for them. They are aware that affective interaction is not one-sided. They feel responsible as teachers to use English as much as possible to provide exposure. This responsibility resonates with their language learning experiences and that is why they become upset if they have to use Turkish in the classroom. They think that their lack of English competency is one of the reasons why they cannot make further explanations or clarifications to the students. They claim that they have to switch to Turkish to make themselves clear in spite of their wishes and this causes them frustration.

### Supervisor influence

One of the interesting points emerging from the data is related to how the student teachers feel about working with their supervisors. Their discussions reveal that the student teachers observe the supervisors quite carefully, and try to meet their expectations as much as they can, but also criticize and evaluate them. For instance, ST4 seems to be approving of his supervisor's teaching skills.

*Our supervisor at school was a very cheerful person. She also made some mistakes, some grammar mistakes or having problems with classroom management. Even so, I think she is a very competent teacher. She does not seem to have a good command in English but she is remarkable in the way she conveys her knowledge to the students, which is somehow the main point, isn't it? Otherwise any native speaker, for instance, from England*

would be a very good teacher but that's not the case.

As seen in the extract, ST4 is rather positive about the performance of his supervisor. However, it is still interesting to see that he mentions the supervisor's grammar mistakes and classroom management. It can be inferred that ST4 observed his supervisor carefully in terms of the subject matter (grammar in this case) and management skills in the classroom. Although he claims that the supervisor is not very competent in English, he appreciates her ability to convey her knowledge, which suggests a rather pragmatic approach on ST4's part. More interestingly, ST4 relates this to native English teachers' teaching skills. This discussion reveals that ST4 believes that a teacher does not have to be 'very competent' in order to teach in a desirable way. He believes that making mistakes is part of the job and the main point is not necessarily to know much, but to be able to convey what you know as a teacher well enough. ST3, on the other hand, has a slightly different impression of her supervisor's approach to her:

*She was...err.((exhales)) sometimes she is so nice and helpful but sometimes, I don't know, if you get cross with her she can be a bit upset. She even said 'you are boring me' once. However, overall she was a good guide, especially in terms of feedback.*

As seen in the extract, ST3 has a more distant relationship with her supervisor compared to ST4. It might be possible that ST3 compromises her own ideas in order not to make her supervisor upset. The fact that her supervisor tells her that she is boring is quite important in order to understand her further comments on her relationship with her. However, ST3 still considers the supervisor to be a good guide. She cares about the supervisor's feedback, even if her supervisor's feedback can be as blunt as 'boring'. This can be regarded as an indication that the student teachers are open to discussion and criticism. ST3 elaborates on her supervisor's behaviours and how she feels about them as follows:

*Well I can't talk for other people but I feel she did not pay attention to us the way she should have. She did not treat us as people who are going to be teachers next year. She mostly wanted us to be more passive in this process, you know, she wanted us to sit down and watch her teach instead of watching us teach.*

In this extract ST3 expresses her frustration about not being accepted as a professional by the supervisor. She contextualizes 'being paid attention to' as a sign of confirmation of her identity as a teacher. However, she observes that she did not get that rapport from the supervisor and relates this to the supervisor's unwillingness to give the student teachers responsibility.

This teacher clearly does not want to be passive during the course; however, she thinks that the supervisor actually does not want them to be active in the teaching process.

The discussion of the data reveals how the supervisors influence the teaching and the learning processes of the student teachers. This seems to be an inevitable consequence of the teaching practice course; however, it is important to note how the multiple correlations between the supervisors, the tutor and the student teachers play a role in influencing code switching in the classroom. These roles will be broader than one relating only to code switching; however, it is important to note that code switching enables us to recognise this influence in a wider context in which it is embedded.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study suggest a new dimension to an understanding of code switching, and how it affects interaction in the classroom. Code switching is more than a linguistic phenomenon that can be observed; it is also at least to some extent a reflection of fundamental beliefs about teaching. However, there is evidence of something even more interesting than this in the data: these teachers also appear to be motivated in their approach to code switching by how they would like to see themselves as teachers. The individual interviews and the stimulated recall interviews revealed that there are several factors influencing student teachers' code switching in the classroom.

### Factors influencing code switching

In the literature, the factors influencing code switching factors have been broadly discussed in terms of the functions they serve (Gumperz, 1982; Auer, 1998; Eldridge, 2006; Ayeomoni, 2006). In this study, the most frequently mentioned factor influencing student teachers' code switching is related to teaching grammar. All student teachers recognise and are very explicit about the fact that they code switch most while teaching grammar. What happened in teaching grammar was both observed by me and expressed by the student teachers in the interviews, who said that code switching was used in order to provide explanations and clarification. This is in line with Ferguson's (2003) categorization of code switching for curriculum access which involves the teachers' clarifying or negotiating meaning by using code switching.

As discussed in the grammar teaching section of the data analysis, the student teachers did indeed code switch to provide explanations of grammatical items for the students and they expressed the view that they had to code switch most during grammar instruction. This

finding is also in line with Numrich (1996), who claims that one of the most frequently mentioned cause of frustration for the student teachers is teaching grammar effectively.

This study sheds light on what 'effectively' involves in terms of code switching. It is clear from their comments that these student teachers want to teach in a way that maximises opportunities for interaction in the target language and is sensitive to the needs and classroom responses of their students, whether related to linguistic or affective aspects of the lesson and that the lesson content and the supervision affects them substantially, especially in terms of the teacher they would like to become. At this point code switching stands as a crucial factor in helping to understand how these factors relate to each other.

This is the general picture for grammar teaching; however, interview sessions brought up another dimension to an understanding of the student teachers' thoughts about their language choice. They did not oppose the idea of switching to Turkish during the lesson but did not feel very content when they had to do it. This idea is in line with Auerbach's (1993), Izumi's (1995), Sert's (2005), Sampson's (2012) and Debreli's (2016) statements about teachers' feeling 'ashamed' of using the L1 in the classroom and fits with Willis's (1981), Turnbull's (2001) and Cook's (2001) recommendation of maximizing the usage of the target language in EFL classroom.

Although the student teachers feel that they have to be the content provider in the classroom and have to respond to advice from the supervisor or the tutor, code switching is nevertheless a source of frustration for them. On one hand there is the notion of "speaking and using English in the classroom as often as you can" (Willis, 1981) but on the other hand the extent they should do it is an ambiguous area for them. Another factor influencing code switching is the student teachers' perceptions of their own language competence. The thought of not having adequate knowledge about the language compared with a native English speaker teacher haunts the perceptions of the student teachers and triggers code switching occasionally (Reves and Medgyes, 1994; Duff and Uchida, 1997; Varghese et al., 2005; Miller, 2007; Bukor, 2011).

Another factor influencing code switching is to provide further and clearer explanations to students. This is in accordance with the student teachers' constant monitoring of the students and the reactions of the latter to the instruction they are receiving. If the teachers observe that their students do not react to their prompts, they code switch deliberately and strongly believe that it is necessary in those situations. Subsequently, the themes are discussed based on the interviews and the stimulated recall interviews conducted in relation to the relevant classroom extracts that illustrated the patterns and the functions of code switching.

### Code switching and beliefs about teaching

Another result that the findings of this study indicate is that there are strong connections between the classroom experience and the beliefs the student teachers have. The findings of my study are closely related to Borg's (2009) statement in that the student teachers shared and discussed how the experience of teaching affected their thinking process and beliefs about teaching. However, the relevance of code switching on shaping these beliefs, especially in relation to supervision has not been brought to the surface in previous research. Projections of a teacher's self like this, when exposed to the actual contingencies in the classroom contribute to the frustration student teachers feel, especially when they do not agree with the suggestions of their supervisors. Wagner (1987) discusses these emotional thought processes entwined with professional concerns affecting the teachers' instructions as the "knots in teachers' thinking". These knots of "anxiety, anger, and stress, as well as attachment, desire, and identification, can be viewed as having one factor in common – they imply an imperative demand that something 'must' or 'must not' occur". For my student teachers, one of these 'must not occur' event is excessive code switching to Turkish. When it occurs, an affective conflict occurs because this does not match with the teacher they project themselves to be. When they have an inner conflict about this, the result can impact on their classroom performance, for example, in the form of a more tense behaviour such as ignoring attempts of students who would like to speak up (Wagner, 1987).

One of the areas that cause conflicts within student teachers' beliefs about code switching is teaching grammar. As stated by the student teachers, they have to switch to Turkish more frequently when teaching grammar than when teaching other aspects of language. The reason for the need to switch to Turkish stems partly from feelings of inadequacy in their content knowledge. The student teachers in my study expressed concerns about inadequacy in their knowledge of grammar, which led to further dislike of teaching grammar. This is not, however, a surprising finding as both native and non-native teachers reflect concern in terms of competencies in grammar knowledge (Andrews, 1994; Borg, 2006). In addition to these considerations, student teachers' beliefs about what constituted effective teaching, the suggestions they received from their supervisors and their own language learning experiences all contributed to a complex cognitive foundation for their approach to teaching grammar. They sometimes regarded grammar teaching as 'boring', echoing Farrell's (1999) findings, and expressed frustration regarding the decisions they were supposed to make.

The process of decision-making revealed a number of factors lying behind the act of code switching itself, that have been ignored in research on this topic, which has

tended to focus on either patterns of switching, its cultural context or the conversational mechanics involved. In my study, these factors appear to be bound up with the supervision process and the relationship with the supervisor, and with the student teachers' perceptions of their professional identity.

Apart from the beliefs discussed above, student teachers believe that their lessons should be enjoyable. This is an indication of their constant evaluation of their own teaching performance and consequently having concerns about how it must feel like to be a student in their own lessons. This is in line with Burns' (1992) suggestion that teacher beliefs influence the approach to language teaching and their instructional practices with reference to affective reasoning and their own image as teachers in the classrooms.

Student teachers' beliefs on their own teaching and how the approach in the classroom affects their students are related to their own understanding of being an effective teacher and the impact of this on their students' learning (Zheng, 2009). Their self-perception of being an effective teacher is also closely related to being an effective facilitator in the lesson (McLean and Bullard, 2000). They believe that they should provide exposure to English in the classroom.

### **Code switching and teacher identity**

The findings of this research reveal strong relationships between aspects of teacher identity and code switching. Student teachers make frequent references to their selves, professional development, and the image of the teacher they would like to become.

Johnson (2003) defines teacher identity as the constructed, altered and rational representation of one's self in relation to how a teacher sees himself/herself and how others see them within the teaching experience and negotiation of these positions. One of the most frequently mentioned issues in establishing an identity as a teacher is the kind of teacher student teachers would like to become. This involves taking decisions and adopting approaches according to how to be, how to act, and how to understand as a teacher (Sachs, 2005). One of the evidences elicited from the data is that student teachers' identity construction seems to be heavily influenced by their supervisors. Supervisors partly represent the institutional bodies in their evaluation of their teaching process. Gee (2001) touches on this issue by suggesting sub-identities are developed by student teachers, one of which is the institutional identity.

Miller (2009) has argued that attitudes and social capital are the factors that directly influence teacher identity and this combination, sometimes in opposition, seems to characterise aspects of identity construction in my context. Student teachers in my study mostly struggle with their supervisors especially with respect to their suggestions on language choice.

### **Supervision in teacher development in relation to code switching**

One of the most interesting findings of the analysis is what it reveals about the impact of the supervision on the student teachers' language choice. The most striking example of this in THE study involved teaching grammar using code switching, where a clear difference between what the student teachers and the supervisors believed to be right emerged. One of these differences involved how code switching should be embedded in the teaching process. The student teachers agree that code switching has to occur while teaching grammar; however, they make it very clear that they are not content with the fact that this is a necessity. This is one of the reasons why teaching grammar subjects emerges as the least enjoyable skill to teach. The interesting point here is the relationship between the student teachers' view of the topic and their approach to code switching. Whereas they regard code switching as undesirable in other contexts, here they see it as a practical necessity given the context in which they have to work.

The distinction may be associated with the fact that in this school grammar is approached as though it were a matter of transferring content rather than developing skills. This suggests that these student teachers make an implicit distinction between language teaching, which is essentially a matter of developing linguistic skills, and teaching about language, which involves the acquisition of knowledge. At this point, the disagreement with the supervisors comes to the fore. The findings of my study resonate with Levine's (2014) suggestions relating to the functions of code switching as he claims that code switching is used "for explicit focus on grammatical forms or vocabulary for comprehension and/or learning". In my study, student teachers make use of code switching while giving instructions. Schmidt (1993) states that merely focusing attention on forms and lexical items do not necessarily mean that acquisition of these items occurs; therefore, 'grammaring' should be meaningful (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). Although this is also my student teachers' position towards grammar instruction, this does not mean that they share the same ideals as their supervisors. This is a source of frustration for the student teachers. On the one hand, they have their own beliefs on how to be a competent teacher and on the other they feel obliged to follow their supervisor's suggestions.

### **Implications for teacher training and supervision**

The teacher learning process has been recognised as a socially negotiated entity based on the knowledge of the self, content, and the context (Cobb and Bowers, 1999; Johnson, 2009). Therefore, how student teachers learn and what learning involves in that context has been recognised to be significant. Seen from this perspective, code switching has also been through a similar journey:

earlier it was recognised as a mostly undesirable (Cook, 2001) “peculiar” act (Luckmann, 1983) but more recently its pedagogical underpinnings have attracted more interest with the result that predominantly socio-psycholinguistic aspects of code switching have been investigated (Martin-Jones, 1995; Flyman and Burenhult, 1999; Macaro, 2001; Seidlitz, 2003; Greggio and Gil, 2007).

These aspects involve investigating the function, reasons, motivations and interactional patterns of code switching; however, little if any research has been done on its contribution to teacher training programmes. In fact, Adendorff (1996) states that particular sensitivity towards code switching should be developed and this sensitivity should form a part of teacher training programmes. Moreover, he concludes that the acceptance of code switching as a sign of bilingual competence which offers speakers communicative power and hence social power should be encouraged.

The findings of this study also point to the importance of making use of code switching as a rich resource for investigation in the teacher training curriculum. The current body of research on code switching might lead to valuable conclusions about how it contributes to interaction in the EFL classrooms; however, code switching also needs to be studied in itself within the scope of teacher training research as well as the part of training during the teaching practice. This would be likely to promote better understanding of the different functions that code switching can serve in the classroom and would allow trainees to explore the thinking behind code choice in this context. They could even be encouraged to reflect on how their views on code switching relate to their wider beliefs about ELT.

The findings also reveal how the role of supervision or mentoring can have an important impact in terms of handling code switching in EFL classrooms, which also suggests important insights for teacher training programmes. The research into language teacher mentoring has mostly focused on generic issues (Brown, 2001). For instance, Brown discusses the clashes of two different approaches picked up by the students and their supervisors, which are traditional ways and communicative approaches. In my study, student teachers make reference to this clash of ideas which particularly occurs in the context of language choice. Student teachers claim that they aim to employ inductive and communicative methods while their supervisors sometimes urge them to do otherwise.

The findings of my study reveal that this sort of clash in matters of beliefs about teaching often crystallises in terms of issues of language choice, and yet little is known about the extent to which these clashes affect student teachers’ instructional decisions, cognitions, and thus, identities. These are issues that might be addressed in the process of teacher preparation for their teaching practice, but supervisors are making their contributions to

student teachers based on their own experiences and beliefs about teaching, so the inclusion of this topic in supervisor training could also be a valuable innovation. In practical terms the study have suggested that code switching as a topic can contribute to the preparation for teaching practice in two ways:

- 1) Teacher training programmes can include at the very least a discussion of code switching with a specific focus on its implementation in Teaching Practice. Ideally, it would form a part of the curriculum, perhaps within more practical modules such as those dealing with classroom management.
- 2) Supervisors/mentors training can at least be made aware of the importance of code switching in terms of its relationship to broader methodological issues and teacher beliefs.

The study claim that code switching is more than a linguistic matter and has a direct impact on a teacher’s decision making process, and more importantly this research suggests that attitudes to code switching and code switching practices in the classroom may be strongly indicative of individual teachers’ characteristics and identity. In short, code switching is closely related to how a teacher sees himself/herself. Even its absence offers an insight into a teacher’s professional self-perception and it is not merely related to the level of linguistics knowledge and/or maximization of the L2; it is connected how a teacher defines himself/herself as a teacher, the image they would like to show, and the role they would like to play as a teacher. The extent to which these findings reveal the relevance of code switching to the experiences of these student teachers suggests that the neglect of this topic in the teacher education programmes and the curriculum more generally needs to be reassessed. The discussion reveals that student teachers are in a position where they are not provided with an adequate foundation for negotiating their own beliefs about teaching, the expectations of the supervisor and the contingencies in the classroom as far as code switching is concerned. From this perspective the main role of code switching ceases to be merely a linguistic feature and turns into a tool to illuminate various aspects of teacher cognition. In teacher preparation and practicum supervision to date, its potential in this respect seems to have been neglected.

### **Conflict of Interests**

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This study is based on the PhD dissertation written by the author in 2015.

## REFERENCES

- Adendorff RD (1996). The functions of code switching among high school teachers and students in KwaZulu and implications for teacher education. In Kathleen M. Bailey and David Nunan, (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative Research in Second Language Education* New York: Cambridge UP. pp. 388-406.
- Andrews S (1994). The Grammatical Knowledge/Awareness of Native Speaker EFL Teachers: What the Trainers Say. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn and Williams (eds.), *Grammar and The Language Teacher*, London: Prentice Hall International. pp. 69-89.
- Atay D, Ece A (2009). Multiple identities as reflected in English-language education: The Turkish perspective. *J. Lang. Identity Educ.* 8(21):21-34.
- Atay D, Kurt G (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL J.* 8(4):100-117.
- Atkinson D (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT J.* 41(4):241-247.
- Auer P (1988). A conversational analytic approach to code-switching and transfer. In Monica Heller (ed.), *Code switching: Anthropological and sociolinguistic perspectives*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 187-213.
- Auer P (1998). *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction, and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auerbach ER (1993). Reexamining English only in the classroom. *TESOL Q.* 27:9-32.
- Ayeomoni M (2006). Code-switching and code-mixing: Style of language use in childhood in Yoruba speech community. *Nordic J. Afr. Stud.* 15(1):90-99.
- Beauchamp C, Thomas L (2009). Understanding teacher identity: an overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge J. Educ.* 39(2):175-189.
- Borg S (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Lang. Teach. Res.* 10(1):3-31.
- Borg S (2009). *English Language Teachers' Conceptions of Research*. *Appl. Ling.* 30(3):355-388.
- Boyatzis RE (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Sage 200 p.
- Brown K (2001). Mentoring and the retention of newly qualified language teachers. *Cambridge J. Educ.* 31(1):69-88.
- Bukor E (2011). *Exploring Teacher Identity: Teachers' Transformative Experiences of Re-Constructing and Re-Connecting Personal and Professional Selves*. Published Doctorate Thesis. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education: University of Toronto.
- Burns A (1992). Teacher beliefs and their influence on classroom practice. *Prospect* 7(3):56-66.
- Calderhead J (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. Berliner and R. C. Caffee (eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Cobb P, Bowers J (1999). Cognitive and Situated Learning Perspectives in Theory and Practice. *Educ. Res.* 28(2):4-15.
- Cook V (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Can. Mod. Lang. Rev.* 57(3):402-423.
- Coşkun A (2010). Whose English should we teach? Reflections from Turkey. *ESP World* 1(27):1-20.
- Debreli E (2016). Perceptions of non-native EFL teachers' on L1 use in L2 classrooms: Implications for language program development. *Engl. Lang. Teach.* 9(3):24-32.
- Debreli E (2016). Pre-service Teachers' Belief Change and Practical Knowledge Development during the Course of Practicum. *J. Educ. Train. Stud.* 4(7):37-46.
- Debreli E, Oyman N (2015). Students' preferences on the use of mother tongue in English as a foreign language classrooms: Is it the time to re-examine English-only policies? *Engl. Lang. Teach.* 9(1):148-162.
- Deniz S, Şahin N (2006). The restructuring process of teacher training system in Turkey: A modal of teacher training based on post-graduate education (PGCE). *J. Soc. Sci.* 2(1):21-26.
- Doğançay-Aktuna S (1998). The spread of English in Turkey and its current sociolinguistic profile. *J. Multiling. Multicult. Dev.* 19(1):24-39.
- Duff PA, Polio CG (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: A qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Lang. J.* 78(iii):313-326.
- Duff P, Uchida Y (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Q.* 31:451-486.
- Farrell TSC (1999). The reflective assignment: unlocking pre-service teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC J.* 30(2):1-17.
- Ferguson G (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts. *AILA Rev.* 16:38-51.
- Flyman A, Burenhult N (1999). *Code switching in second language teaching of French*. Lund University, Department of Linguistics 1. Work. Pap. 47:59-72.
- Freese A (2006). Reframing one's teaching: Discovering our teacher selves through reflection and inquiry. *Teach. Teacher Educ.* 22:110-119.
- Eldridge J (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT J.* 50(4):303-311.
- Gabrielatos C (2001). LI use in ELT: Not a skeleton, but a bone of contention. *Brihes*. P 6.
- Gass SM, Mackey A (2000). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. London: Routledge.
- Gee JP (2001). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Rev. Res. Educ.* 25:99-125.
- Goffman E (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper and Row.
- 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):371-393.
- Gumperz J (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoban G (2007). Considerations for designing coherent teacher education programs. In J. Butcher and L. McDonald (Eds.), *Making a difference: Challenges for teachers, teaching and teacher education* (pp. 173-187). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Holt-Reynolds D (1992). Personal history-based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 29(2):325-349.
- Izumi K (1995). Translation-aided approach in second language acquisition. *JALT J.* 17(2):225-237.
- Johnson, K.E. (2003). Rethinking knowledge, knowing, and knowers. In J. Sharkey, C. Layzer & K.E. Johnson (Eds.) *TESOL Quarterly Dialogues: Rethinking Issues of Language, Culture, and Power*, Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. pp. 1-5.
- Johnson KE (2009). Trends in Second Language Teacher Education. In *Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*, (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kagan DM (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 62:129-169.
- Kırkgöz Y (2007). English language teaching in Turkey: Policy changes and their implementations. *RELC J.* 38 (2):216-228.
- Korthagen F, Kessels J, Koster B, Lagerwerf B, Wubbels T (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Krashen S (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press. Available at: [http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles\\_and\\_practice.pdf](http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf)
- Krashen SD, Terrell TD (1983). *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. New York: Pergamon Press. Available at: <https://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/www/LAU/ICLangLit/NaturalApproach.htm>.
- Krashen SD, Terrell TD (2000). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Essex, England: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman D (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Thomson Heinle.
- Lawson S, Sachdev I (2000). Code switching in Tunisia: Attitudinal and behavioural dimensions. *J. Pragmat.* 32:1343-1361.
- Lee Diane TF, Woo Jean, Mackenzie, Ann E. (2002). The cultural context of adjusting to nursing home life: Chinese elders' perspectives. *Gerontol.* 42(5):667-675.
- Levine GS (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about target language use, first language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Lang. J.* 87(3):343-364.
- Levine GS (2011). *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.



- Levine GS (2014). Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Lang. Teach.* 47:332-348.
- Liebscher G, Dailey-O'Cain J (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *Modern Lang. J.* 89(2):234-247.
- Lin AMY (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. K. A. and N. H. Hornberger (eds), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume 10: Research Methods in Language and Education. pp. 273-286.
- Liu D, Ahn G, Baek K, Han N (2004). South Korean High school English teachers' code switching: Questions and challenges in the drive for maximal use of English in teaching. *TESOL Q.* 38(4):605-638.
- Macaro E (1997). Target language, collaborative learning, and autonomy. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Macaro E (2001). Analysing student teachers' code switching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *Modern Lang. J.* 85(4):531-548.
- Macaro E (2005). Code switching in the L2 classroom: A communication and learning strategy. In Llorca (ed) *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. Springer. pp. 63-84.
- Martin-Jones M (1995). Code-switching in the classrooms: Two decades of research. In Milroy, L. And Muysken, P. (eds.) *One speaker Two languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 90-112.
- Mattheoudakis M (2007). Tracking Changes in Pre-Service EFL Teacher Beliefs in Greece: A Longitudinal Study. *Eric*. P 17.
- McLean M, Bullard JE (2000). Becoming a University Teacher: evidence from teaching portfolios (How academics learn to teach), *Teacher Dev.* 4(1):79-101.
- Miller J (2009). Teacher identity, In Burns, A. and Richards, J. C. (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 172-181.
- Numrich C (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Q.* 30(1):131-153.
- Olsen B (2008). *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Ozturk U, Atay D (2010). Challenges of being a non-native English teacher. *Educ. Res.* 1(2):135-139.
- Pajares, MF (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Rev. Educ. Res.* 62(3):307-332.
- Palfreyman D (2005). Othering in an English language program. *TESOL Q.* 39(2):311-233.
- Pittard M (2003). *Developing identity: The transition from student to teachers*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 21-25).
- Reves T, Medgyes P (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System* 22:353-367.
- Rolin-Ianziti J, Brownlie S (2002). Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *Can. Mod. Lang. Rev.* 58(3):402-426.
- Richards JK (1998). *Beyond Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sachs J (2005). Teacher education and the development of professional identity: Learning to be a teacher. In P. Denicolo and M. Kompf (Eds.), *Connecting policy and practice: Challenges for teaching and learning in schools and universities*. Oxford: Routledge. pp. 5-21.
- Sacks H (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. 2 vols. Edited by Gail Jefferson with introductions by Emanuel A. Schegloff. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Sampson A (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT J.* 66:293-303.
- Schmidt RR (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Ann. Rev. Appl. Linguist.* 13:206-226.
- Seedhouse P (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Seidlitz LM (2003). Functions of Code switching in Classes of German as a Foreign Language. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin.
- Sert O (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *Internet TESL J.* 11(8).
- Seymen Bilgin S (2015). Code switching in ELT Teaching Practice in Turkey: Teacher practices, beliefs and identity Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Warwick, UK.
- Shulman LS (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educ. Res.* 15(2):4-14.
- Ten Have P (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage Publications. P 264.
- Thompson AG (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning*. pp. 127-146.
- Turnbull M (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Can. Mod. Lang. Rev.* pp. 531-540.
- Turnbull M, Arnett K (2002). Teachers' uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist.* 22:204-218.
- Üstünel E, Seedhouse P (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *Int. J. Appl. Linguist.* 15(3):302-325.
- van Lier L (1995). The use of L1 in L2 classes. *Babylonia* 2:37-43.
- Varghese M, Morgan B, Johnston B, Johnson K (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *J. Lang. Identity Educ.* 4:21-44.
- Wagner AC (1987). 'Knots in teachers' Thinking. In Calderhead (ed.) *Exploring Teachers' Thinking*. Cassell Educational Limited, Wiltshire.
- Wei L (2002). 'What Do You Want Me to Say?' On the conversation analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Lang. Soc.* 31:159-180.
- Willis J (1981). *Teaching English through English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Woolfolk Hoy A, Davis H, Pape SJ (2006). Teacher knowledge and beliefs. In P. A. Alexander and P. H. Winne (eds.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Xu Q (2010). To switch or not to switch: Examine the code-switching practices of teachers of non-English majors. *Can. Soc. Sci.* 6:109-113.
- Zabrodskaja A (2008). Code-switching and L2 students in the university: Bilingualism as an enriching resource. *JoLIE* 1:99-114.
- Zheng H (2009). A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and actives. *J. Cambridge Stud.* 4(1):73-81.