

**UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ**

**THE FUNCTIONS OF TEACHERS' LANGUAGE CHOICE  
AND CODE-SWITCHING IN EFL CLASSROOM DISCOURSE**

**A Pro Gradu Thesis in English**

**by**

**Jemina Reini**

**Department of Languages  
2008**

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA  
KIELTEN LAITOS

Jemina Reini

The Functions of Teachers' Language Choice and Code-Switching  
in EFL Classroom Discourse

Pro gradu -työ  
Englannin kieli  
Toukokuu 2008

118 sivua + 1 liite

Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää, kuinka opettaja käyttää suomea ja englantia opettaessaan englantia vieraana kielenä Suomessa. Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan tätä aihetta kielivalinnan ja koodinvaihdon näkökulmasta. Aineisto koostuu kahdesta videoidusta vieraankielen kaksoistunnista, jotka on kerätty yläasteelta ja lukion koulusta. Analyysi tapahtuu kahdella tasolla keskittyen ensin laajempaan näkökulmaan kielivalinnoista ja sitten tarkkoihin paikkoihin, joissa kieli vaihtuu.

Tutkielman tavoitteiden saavuttamiseksi käytetään seuraavia tutkimuskysymyksiä: 1. Millainen työnjako englannin ja suomen käyttämisellä on opettajan vuoroissa? Käyttääkö opettaja aina samaa kieltä samantyyppisissä aktiviteeteissa? Kuinka paljon ja mihin tarkoituksiin englantia ja suomea käytetään luokkahuoneessa? 2. Onko kielivalinnoissa eroa yläasteen ja lukion tuntien välillä? 3. Millaisia diskurssifunktioita opettajan koodinvaihdolla on luokkahuoneessa? Tutkimus on laadullinen, mutta tutkimuksen osana tehdään huomioita kummankin kielen määrästä oppitunneilla. Näkökulma tutkielmassa on keskusteluanalyttinen ja aineistoa analysoidaan sen menetelmiä apuna käyttäen. Aineisto käsitellään yhtenä kokonaisuutena, mutta opettajien kielivalintoja vertaillaan. Kielenvaihtamisen yhteydessä myös käydään läpi oppituntien sisällöt. Diskurssifunktioiden tarkastelussa käydään läpi koodinvaihtotapauksia, jotka jaotellaan eri kategorioihin. Analyysi tapahtuu kuvailemalla tilanne, jossa koodinvaihto esiintyy ja tämän jälkeen käymällä esimerkkiä läpi sekvenssianalyysin avulla.

Tulokset osoittavat, että sekä englantia että suomea käytetään paljon näillä oppitunneilla. Yläasteen opettajan puheesta 60% on suomea ja lukion opettajan puheesta 51%. Molemmilla kielillä on joitakin omia tehtäviä ja tämän lisäksi on tilanteita, joissa opettaja saattaa käyttää kumpaa tahansa kieltä. Kieliopin opettamisessa käytettiin pelkästään suomea. Muissa aktiviteeteissa ohjeet annettiin usein englanniksi, yläasteen opettaja tosin käytti monesti myös suomea tämän lisäksi. Kun oppilaat työskentelivät itsenäisesti tehtävien parissa, esiintyi opettajien puheessa paljon koodinvaihtoa. Sekä englantia että suomea saatettiin käyttää puhuteltaessa koko ryhmää tai yksittäistä oppilasta. Tekstikappaleet käytiin yläasteella suomeksi, mutta lukiossa englanniksi.

Koodinvaihdolle löydettiin useita funktioita. Koodinvaihto saattoi liittyä muutokseen aiheessa tai osallistujakehikossa. Useissa koodinvaihtotapauksissa esiintyi käännoästä. Usein näillä oli tarkentava tai selventävä funktio. Tapauksissa oli myös materiaaliin sidottuja koodinvaihtotapauksia eli suoria sitaatteja oppikirjasta. Koodinvaihdolla luotiin lisäksi koherenssia vaihtamalla kieltä palautevuorossa vastaamaan oppilaan vastauksen kieltä. Lisäksi koodinvaihtoa esiintyi rutiininomaisen luokkahuonekielen ja muunlaisen keskustelun erottamisessa sekä aktiviteettiin liittymättömän sekvenssin erottamisessa varsinaisesta tehtävästä.

Tulokset osoittavat, että molemmilla kielillä on oma paikkansa vieraan kielen oppitunneilla. Olisi tärkeää jatkaa tutkimusta tästä aiheesta Suomessa sekä opettajan että oppilaan näkökulmista. Koodinvaihdon funktioita voisi olla mielenkiintoista vertailla luokkahuonekontekstin ja muiden kontekstien välillä.

Asiasanat: EFL classrooms, classroom discourse, conversation analysis, code-switching, language choice

# CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	2
CONTENTS.....	3
1 INTRODUCTION.....	4
2 LANGUAGE CHOICE.....	7
3 CODE-SWITCHING.....	11
3.1 Terminology and Definitional Issues.....	11
3.2 Views on Code-Switching.....	13
3.2.1 Sociolinguistic Approaches.....	13
3.2.2 Linguistic Approaches.....	15
3.2.3 Conversational Approaches.....	17
3.2.4 Other Views.....	19
3.3 Code-Switching in Language Classrooms.....	20
4 FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING.....	25
4.1 Functions of Code-Switching in Bilingual Interaction.....	25
4.2 Functions of Code-Switching in Language Classrooms.....	27
5 CLASSROOM INTERACTION.....	31
6 THE PRESENT STUDY: AIMS AND METHODS .....	35
6.1 Research Questions.....	35
6.2 Data.....	37
6.3 Method.....	38
7 TEACHERS' LANGUAGE CHOICE.....	42
7.1 Secondary School Lessons.....	42
7.2 Teacher's Language Choice in Secondary School Lessons.....	43
7.3 Upper Secondary School Lessons.....	50
7.4 Teacher's Language Choice in Upper Secondary School Lessons.....	51
7.5 Comparison and Contrast.....	58
8 FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING.....	61
8.1 Code-Switching and Topic Change.....	61
8.2 Feedback.....	65
8.3 Translation and Elaboration.....	72
8.4 Quotations.....	79
8.5 Dealing with Problems.....	83
8.6 Learner-induced Code-Switching .....	87
8.7 Switching in and out of Pedagogical Context .....	90
8.8 Shifts in the Participation Framework.....	95
8.9 Other Cases.....	100
9 CONCLUSION.....	105
9.1 Summary of Findings.....	105
9.2 Discussion and Implications.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	115
APPENDIX 1 .....	119

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Language classrooms are interactive by nature. Although interaction is usually part of every kind of education, in foreign language classrooms it has a particularly significant role. Edmonson (2004: 157) introduces two ways in which communication and acquisition of the language are related. Firstly, the acquisition of the target language aims at developing the ability to communicate with it. Secondly, communication is not only the target but also the means of acquisition. In other words, communication facilitates acquisitional processes which then enable communication in the foreign language. In foreign language classrooms the language to be learned is both the target and the means of instruction. However, in addition to the target language usually there is another language present in the language classroom as well, i.e. usually the native language of the learners and the teacher. Because two languages exist in the classroom, it leads to a situation in which codes are switched. Thus, code-switching is usually a natural part of language classroom interaction because the context is bilingual.

There has not been that much research on code-switching in EFL classrooms, because many researchers do not regard language switching in that context as genuine code-switching. Code-switching in foreign language classrooms has been regarded as the result of inadequate competence in the foreign language. Most definitions of code-switching include the concept ‘bilinguals’ or ‘competent bilinguals’ as employers of code-switching. The question of who counts as a competent bilingual can of course be debated. Can advanced learners or the teacher, who usually has a university degree on the language taught, count as one? Some researchers, e.g. Edmonson (2004) treat code-switching in the classroom as a ‘special case of code-switching’. Some do not consider it relevant to make even such a distinction. In any case, previous research (e.g. Söderberg Arnfast and Jørgensen, 2003) has shown that even at beginner levels of language learning there are more functions to code-switching than those caused by lack of language skills.

The topic of the present study is related to the functions of language choice and code-switching employed by the teacher in EFL classrooms. My interest in doing research

on foreign language classroom interaction springs from teacher training and the fact that my future profession will be related to teaching foreign languages. Research on classroom interaction can bring valuable information not only for researchers interested in this topic but also for professionals working in classrooms. Raising teachers' awareness of their use of the available languages can have a significant effect on the interaction in the classroom. In this study I will examine two teachers' language choices and code-switching in foreign language classrooms. The data consists of two double periods from a secondary and an upper secondary school. The aim of the present study is to examine the choices of language a teacher makes in EFL classroom and then specifically the points where the language is switched. This is done by examining which language the teacher uses and for what purpose (language choice) and what factors contribute to changing the language of interaction at a particular point (discourse functions of code-switching). References to the amounts of each language used are also made.

There is earlier research on code-switching and the choices of language in the classroom from both the teacher's and learners' perspectives. However, a lot of research on code-switching has been focused on contexts in which English is taught as a second language due to the attitude that has prevailed that code-switching in foreign language classrooms is not 'true' code-switching. Additionally, in Finland research on this topic has not yet been conducted extensively, although interest in this topic, as in many other topics related to classroom interaction, seems to be rising. Notable studies on this topic in Finland are the ones by Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988), Sundelin (2001) and Yletyinen (2004). The first study by Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988) concentrated on the teacher's language choices while code-switching was not examined. Sundelin's study focused on code-switching and the reasons why teacher's code-switch in foreign language classrooms. However, this study consisted of questionnaires to teachers and thus, it did not include data from interactional contexts. Yletyinen's study is nearest to the present study, because the focus was on actual interaction in classrooms. Yletyinen studied discourse functions of code-switching in EFL classrooms. This study was also the starting point of the present study.

The aim of this study is to expand the views on teachers' code-switching and choices of language in EFL classrooms in the Finnish context. This is done by close examination and detailed analysis of the data in context. I will first discuss previous research on language choice, code-switching and classroom interaction. Definitional issues as to code-switching and language choice are also discussed. The main focus is on conversational code-switching and the discourse functions of code-switching. As for classroom interaction, the Conversation Analytical views are taken into account. Then the aims and methods of the present study are introduced in more detail. This section also includes a detailed description of the data. After this the data are analysed, first by examining the teachers' language choices and then the points where the language is switched, i.e. the contexts of code-switching. The analysis of language choices includes description of how the lessons proceed. For the code-switching part, a description of the context is also included and then the extract is analysed based on the methods of Conversation Analysis. In this part there are also references to language choice of the teachers, although in some cases it is less significant than in others. Lastly, the results are combined together and discussed from the point of view of implications that can be made.

## 2 LANGUAGE CHOICE

This chapter will examine language choice and define how the term is used in this study in relation to code-switching. In research the terms language choice and code-switching are sometimes used to refer to similar kinds of phenomena and it can therefore be difficult to distinguish which phenomenon is meant. The trouble is that in interaction these two phenomena are intervened. When there is a switch in the language used the participant makes a choice to use another language. This decision is not necessarily a conscious one, though. Research on language choice has mostly been focused on either bilingual interaction or, in the classroom, the language choices of learners. In this study, these two concepts, language choice and code-switching are used to refer on two different perspectives of interaction. Language choice refers to the general choice of code for a classroom activity. Code-switching refers to the actual point at which a switch between two languages occurs. Code-switching may, thus, appear at the boundary of two activities, when the choice of language changes, too, or inside activities, when the choice of language basically remains the same while the other language is still used in-between. In practise, this division is not that clear-cut because in all the instances it is not always possible to distinguish which language is the actual “choice” if there is a lot of code-switching. In this chapter I will discuss language choice from the perspectives of bilingual interaction and classroom interaction.

Gafaranga (2005: 282) states that language choice acts are said to reflect social structure. This view is based on the ‘language-reflects-society’ idea of language alternation which is part of the sociolinguistic view. Gafaranga (2005: 284) continues that according to this view different languages are identified with different identities. Thus, bilinguals choose one or the other language to index e.g. ethnicity. In some cases speakers may also alternate frequently between the two languages to show affiliation with both identities at the same time. Li Wei (2005b: 381) notes that sociolinguistic approaches attribute specific meanings to choices of language and imply that these meanings are also intended to be understood by other participants. This is problematic because there is no way of knowing which meanings are intended

and which not. Thus, in conversational approaches to language alternation such generalization and simplification is not used.

Baker and Prys Jones (1998: 53) point out that in bilingual speech language choices may be affected by other participants in the conversation or different language domains or contexts. Additionally, individual preferences and attitudes may have an effect on the choice between available languages. This is especially true in bilingual settings but it applies to language classrooms as well because teachers have different kind of preferences how to use the target language. Language preference, therefore, affects language choices made. A bilingual person may prefer to use one of the available languages in certain contexts or may prefer to use one more than the other.

Auer (1998: 8) refers to two levels of language preference that have to do with competence and political consideration. Auer continues that preference for using one or the other language cannot be simplified to psychological issues. Rather, language preference involves “the interactional processes of displaying and ascribing predicates to individuals.” (Auer 1998: 8). Bani-Shoraka (2005: 187-188) notes that the influence of language preference may show either on the level of overall structures used or on the level of local organization of speech. In the Conversation Analytical use, the term ‘preference’ has nothing to do with liking or wanting. As Seedhouse (2004: 23) puts it, the concept of preference “involves issues of affiliation and disaffiliation, of seeing, noticeability, accountability, and sanctionability in relation to social actions”. Interactants are seen as social actors working towards social goals by the means of interaction part of which is the production of language. In this interaction certain actions are preferred, such as accepting an invitation, and some dispreferred, such as declining an invitation. In language alternation preference can be examined from two perspectives: as individual preference to use one or the other language, as discussed above, or as the preference for alignment in conversation. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) point out that, in relation to language choice, affiliation and disaffiliation in the language classroom are expressed with alignment. Thus, the preferred language for learners to use is “the one which aligns them with the teacher’s pedagogical focus” (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005: 321). This can be either the L1 or the L2 depending on the context and the pedagogical focus.



Cromdal (2005) studied the bilingual order during a collaborative learning task. In his study two children were working on a school project in which the task was to produce a presentation in English. The data consisted of the interaction between these two girls when working on a computer. One of the key findings of Cromdal's study was that there was a local distribution of the two codes, "a division of labor" between English and Swedish, which was established during the interaction. Both languages had specific roles in the activity: Swedish was the language of interaction whereas English was used for producing the actual text, including actions such as quoting the text. Cromdal points out that this kind of order between two languages is common in children's play, e.g. role plays in which the organization of the play is done in one language while the actual being in the role in the other. In addition, many more examples can be found in foreign language classrooms, where the two available languages have specific roles in completing tasks. He points out that children accomplish classroom tasks "in the midst of, or indeed by means of bilingual interaction" (Cromdal 2005: 334). The essential factor is that instead of following pre-existing norms of bilingual interaction, they establish the norms as part of their interactional organization. The organization of language choice is, thus, a local achievement. This local division of labour does not necessarily reveal anything about language preference. The girls in Cromdal's study used both languages for different purposes in different situations. The locally established norms of language use are, thus, context-dependent.

Language choice was also present in another study conducted by Canagarajah (1995). He studied the functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms in Sri Lanka. He does not refer to the term language choice, however, but his results show a similar division of labour between the two languages as reported by Cromdal (2005). Canagarajah reports in his study the purposes for which each language was used in classrooms, e.g. L1 was used for personal interaction and L2 for pedagogical purposes, and this falls into the category of language choice based on how it is defined in this study. The focus in this study was on teachers and their use of English and the native language in the classroom. Canagarajah states that in Sri Lanka English only is preferred in lessons but teachers still use L1 in the classroom and often without noticing it. Canagarajah points out on the basis of his study that there is a clear division of use between these two languages. English is clearly the

pedagogical, formal and official language used in the classroom. For purposes not related to pedagogical activities Tamil or Tamil mixed with English is preferred. According to Canagarajah, the English used in classrooms in Sri Lanka is quite ritualistic and pure, and the teachers do not actually encourage learners to interact in English. Additionally, he argues that both languages are important in the language classroom. In Canagarajah's study the presence of Tamil in the classroom made the environment more communicative, and it enabled connecting the activities done in the classroom with knowledge gained from the outside world.

Polio and Duff (1994) report findings that are similar to those by Canagarajah (1995). They studied the language uses of foreign language teachers at the university level. The teachers were native speakers of the languages they taught. Polio and Duff found various reasons for using the mother tongue in the foreign language classroom. The learners' L1 was used for classroom administrative purposes, for classroom management, for showing solidarity or empathy, for grammar instruction, in order to practise their own English, to offer a translation of a word or a phrase, and for aiding comprehension if there was some trouble in it.

In this study, the purpose is to find out what role each language has in the foreign language classroom, i.e. if English is mainly the target of instruction or if English is both the target and the medium of instruction. The focus is fixed on the purposes each language is used for. Due to the small amount of data in this study, it may be difficult to find out whether the two teachers have preference for using either of the two languages in particular contexts, e.g. does the teacher usually start the lesson with English or just this one time. Both Cromdal and Canagarajah found out a "division of labor" between the two available languages. The aim in this study, for the language choice part, is to find out whether similar kind of division can be found in the data. In the next chapter the focus is code-switching as I will introduce different definitions to this phenomenon and kinds of perspectives on it.

### **3 CODE-SWITCHING**

Code-switching is a common and frequent feature of bilingual interaction. In order that code-switching can exist, there must be more than one code, or style, that is switched. There have been a number of perspectives on code-switching some emphasizing the interactional side to it, as is the perspective of this study, and some more interested in the linguistic or sociological features. The focus of this chapter is to introduce different definitions of code-switching and discuss how different perspectives have been used to examine this phenomenon.

#### **3.1 Terminology and Definitional Issues**

Studying code-switching has sprung from the research on bilingual interaction. There are many ways in which bilingualism can exist but the essential point is that two or more languages are somehow related. The research on code-switching is diverse and thus, the terminology related is also very varied. All researchers do not even agree on the very term of code-switching. According to Boztepe (2003: 4) terms such as code-switching, code-mixing, borrowing and code-alternation are used to refer to more or less the same phenomenon. Milroy and Myusken (1995: 12) point out that in the research on code-switching the terminology sometimes overlaps and sometimes different researchers use the same terms differently. This creates confusion in this field of research.

Code-switching can be defined in many ways depending on which perspective the researcher chooses to use in examination of the language contact phenomena. Gumperz (1982: 66) refers to code-switching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems”. Milroy and Myusken (1995: 7) define the term as “the alternative use by bilinguals of two or more languages in the same conversation”. Cook’s (1991: 63) definition for code-switching: “going from one language to the other in midspeech when both speakers know the same two languages”. All of the previous definitions involve the idea of switching between two or more languages,

although Gumperz' definition also includes two grammatical subsystems. Nevertheless, as Romaine (1995: 170) points out, the term can also be used to cover switching between two different stylistic varieties, e.g. formal and informal language. This, however, again depends on the view the researcher takes on what code-switching is. All researchers do not use the term *language* in their definitions. For instance, Myers-Scotton defines code-switching as "the selection by bilinguals/multilinguals of forms from two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation" (Myers-Scotton 1993b: 480). Auer (1988: 1995) uses language alternation as a cover term for this phenomenon. He divides cases of language alternation into two categories: code-switching and transfer. Thus, in his terminology code-switching is a subcase of the cover term. Code-switching in this case refers to language alternation that is connected to a particular point in conversation whereas transfers are connected to particular conversational structures (Auer, 1988: 192).

According to Boztepe (2003: 4) some other researchers besides Auer also reserve the term *code-switching* to particular cases. Some use it only to cover inter-sentential switches, i.e. switches that occur between sentences. These researchers use the term *code-mixing* to refer to switches within the sentence, also known as intra-sentential switches. The reason for this division is that intra-sentential code-switching involves processes in which the rules of the two languages used are integrated to some degree. However, as Boztepe continues (2003: 5) this kind of use of the terms is mostly due to individual choices and preferences of researchers. Through code-switching and code-mixing language contacts of bilingual interaction also play a major role in language change. Romaine (1989: 39) argues that constant contact in the form of code-switching between two languages can also result in language shift, which may involve language death. However, in some cases such contact results in a mixed language in which the language switching appears so regular that the difference between the two languages becomes vaguer. As Eastman (1992: 1) points out, in some contexts this kind of mixed language can also represent the norm. According to Auer, code-switching is developed into a linguistic norm in a certain community if discourse factors fail to explain it (Auer as cited in Kovács 2003: 75).

There are also different views on whether borrowings count as instances of code-switching. According to Kovács (2001: 63) some researchers want to separate these

two terms from each other whereas others consider them being the different parts of the same continuum of phenomena. Borrowings are usually single lexical items. Winford (2003: 107) introduces two criteria according to which single-morpheme switching can be separated from borrowings: 1. the degree of use by monolinguals, and 2. the degree of morphophonemic integration. He continues that established loans are common in monolingual speech whereas code-switches are more often “transitory phenomena”. Additionally, established loans are more often integrated into the morphological and phonetical systems of the recipient language. However, this division is not clear-cut. For instance, the results of Myers-Scotton’s study (1993a) suggest that one word switches as well as borrowings can be phonologically and morphologically integrated in the recipient language.

## **3.2 Views on Code-Switching**

There are several different approaches from which the code-switching phenomenon has been studied, the main ones being the sociolinguistic, the linguistic/grammatical, and the conversational approach. Each approach has different kinds of orientations but in this chapter I will focus on introducing the main features of each approach. The main purpose of this section is to give an overview of the research done in the field previously, focusing specifically to the conversational approaches, and introduce the main theories and models of each approach.

### **3.2.1 Sociolinguistic Approaches**

The research on code-switching first began with sociolinguistic interest on the topic. The essential part of sociolinguistic interest in the topic is examining group membership and social identities of participants. The socio-cultural context provides a lot of information with which code-switching can be explained according to this view.

One of the pioneering researchers in this approach has been Gumperz. He first introduced the terms *we-code* and *they-code* which since have become an essential concepts in this view (see e.g. Gumperz 1982). This view of his also includes the notion of *identity* meaning in this case especially group identity: “The tendency is for the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as the ‘we-code’ and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the ‘they-code’ associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations” (Gumperz 1982: 66). In this Gumperz also brings out labels such as *majority* and *minority language* that play an important role in sociolinguistic examination of bilingual interaction. As Gumperz points out in the previous quotation the minority language is usually seen as the *we-code* used within a certain social group. Sebba and Wootton (1998: 263-264) point out that there may be problems in identifying who are “we” and “they”. They argue that in some cases more than one language may acquire some characteristics of the *we-code*, e.g. one is used to exclude outsiders but another code is still used at home. Their conclusion is that contrasting *we-* and *they-codes* is not as simple as suggested in many sociolinguistic studies.

Based on showing group membership and social identity Myers-Scotton has established the Markedness Model of code-switching. According to this model code-switches may be either ‘marked’ or ‘unmarked’ depending on the socio-cultural framework and the context of language use. Myers-Scotton (1993b: 478) argues that speakers possess what she calls a “Negotiation Principle”, that is people employ strategies of negotiation in interaction: “speakers use their linguistic choices as tools to index for others their perceptions of self, and of rights and obligations holding between self and others”. Additionally, “speakers pay attention to the relative markedness of code choices”. (Myers-Scotton, 1993b: 478.) Myers-Scotton argues that people have an innate sense of the markedness of each code in different contexts and different interactions. In other words, people know which choice of code is the expected one (the more unmarked one) in a certain context. Thus, this markedness of codes can be exploited in interaction to indicate e.g. social distance. Marked choices, the less expected choices of language, are often associated with increased social distance whereas unmarked code-switching appears mostly among in-group conversations. Different languages can be tied to different social identities and code-

switching is used to express and negotiate these identities. The theory by Myers-Scotton contains two levels: the normative framework, i.e. the supposed normative order of language use, and the speaker decision, i.e. speakers in interaction make their own decisions about language use. Thus, there is a social context working in the background but in the end it is the speaker who makes the decisions in interaction.

The sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching has been heavily based on pre-established social categories such as ethnicity, gender, minority and majority groups. This kind of straightforward labelling has been regarded as problematic by several researchers who have then adapted a different kind of view on bilingual interaction. The main problem is that a lot about participants' social identities and their willingness to show group membership is assumed by the outside researchers and their knowledge about e.g. the status of different languages and different social groups in society. This kind of information is then brought to the analysing situation. Auer (1991) states that this kind of "characterisation of languages" is "too far away from participants' situated, local practices in order to be able to capture the finer shades of social meaning attributed to the languages in a bilingual repertoire" (Auer as cited in Li Wei 2005a: 276). Due to the reasons explained here and due to the fact that this study focuses on the interaction which does not occur in a bilingual cultural context, socio-linguistic approaches were not chosen to be the focus of this study.

### **3.2.2 Linguistic Approaches**

Some researchers in the field have been interested in the linguistic features of code-switching. These approaches are based on examination of grammar. According to Myusken (1995) many grammatical models of code-switching are based on rules that govern the types of switches that are possible. For instance, Poplack (1980) introduces general rules which are valid in most cases. Other researchers are stricter. According to Myusken (1995: 184) attempts are made to move away from constraints restricting cases of code-switching towards describing the most frequent cases of switching. Such work has been done by e.g. Myers-Scotton (1992, 1993a).

Based on grammatical analysis the terms inter-, intra- and extrasentential switches have been taken into use (see e.g. Poplack 1980). Intra-sentential switches occur within the sentence, inter-sentential switches between sentences and extra-sentential switches are not tied to the sentence that is, they are tags or discourse markers (Milroy and Myusken 1995: 8).

Myers-Scotton, being one of the main researchers interested in this approach, has introduced a model with which grammatical features of code-switching can be examined. This is called the Matrix Language Frame Model. In this model the two languages engaged in code-switching are labelled as the Embedded Language - or EL - which is the donor language, and the Matrix Language - ML - which is the recipient language. Myers-Scotton (1992: 19-20) explains that the ML “sets the morphosyntactic frame for code-switching utterances” and the EL provides both “singly occurring lexemes in constituents otherwise in the ML, and also EL islands, constituents entirely in the EL”. In this model the Matrix Language is determined by frequency: “The ML in any CS utterance is the language of more morphemes in the type of discourse where the conversation in question occurs, if cultural borrowings for new objects or concepts are excluded from the morpheme count.” (Myers-Scotton, 1992: 20) According to this the ML is determined for each utterance based on the morpheme count. The problem of this theory is that although the determination of the ML is well explained, in practise it is not always as simple as it seems to be. For example, in cases of extensive code-mixing determining the ML may be impossible.

Code-switching and grammatical theory has also been studied by Muysken (1995). He reports on four different cases when code-switching is possible. 1. Switching is possible when there is no tight relation of government holding between two elements. Lexical items often require other elements in their environment and these requirements may be language-specific. Thus, if there are no such requirements that are different between the two languages, switching may occur. 2. Switching is possible under equivalence between patterns or elements of the languages involved. In other words, a noun phrase is replaced by another noun phrase in the other language. 3. Switching is possible when the switched element is “morphologically encapsulated”. This means that the element is “shielded off” by a functional element



that is part of the matrix language. 4. Switching is possible when at the point of the switch the element could belong to either of the languages.

One part of grammatical approach to code-switching is determining the division between code-switching and borrowings. As already mentioned, there are varying views on to which degree code-switching and borrowing should be treated as separate phenomena. Boztepe (2003: 5-6) points out that there are two approaches one can adopt to distinguishing code-switching and borrowing. Poplack (1980) argues that using single items from the other language is different from longer stretches of switching. On the other hand, Myers-Scotton's (1993a) view is that the distinction is not that essential to analysing bilingual interaction.

In conclusion, the linguistic approach has tried to identify where e.g. in a sentence code-switching may occur and what parts of language are easily subdued to code-switching. From an interactional point of view linguistic approaches to code-switching do not offer a lot of tools to work with. They provide interesting information on the linguistics of code-switching, e.g. what kind of structures can be subdued to code-switching, but from the point of view of interaction they lie in the background whereas the attention is paid on other features. Because the focus of this study is on discourse functions of code-switching, the grammatical features are not the target of investigation in this study.

### **3.2.3 Conversational Approaches**

Code-switching has also been studied from the interactional point of view and lately interest in this focus has increased. The studies vary from Conversation Analytic to pragmatic. In this chapter I will introduce some studies interested in the interactional features of code-switching, most of them CA or applied CA studies.

According to Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005: 307) CA approach to code-switching sprung from the tendency in sociolinguistic research on bilingualism to explain code-switching phenomena by giving certain meanings to switches, and by assuming that

bilingual speakers participating in the conversation also intend that their listeners perceive these meanings. Li Wei (2002: 177) points out that CA does not examine code-switching without its “natural site of occurrence” or bring interactional-external concepts, such as speakers’ rights and obligations, into the analysis. Instead, the focus is on the methods and procedures the conversation participants deploy in order to achieve understanding.

The pioneering researcher of conversational code-switching was Peter Auer. He created a conversation analytic model for language alternation. There are two basic category pairs that in Auer’s work provide the means for arriving at a local interpretation of language alternation: transfer vs. code-switching and participant- vs. discourse-related language alternation. The analyst must decide whether the language alternation in question is connected to a particular conversational structure (transfer) or to a particular point in conversation (code-switching), and whether the language alternation in question is providing cues for the organization of the ongoing interaction (discourse-related), or about attributes of the speaker (participant-related) (Auer 1988: 192). Auer points out, that these four categories should be used as generally available interpretative resources that aid in arriving at more detailed local interpretations of language use in context. According to Auer (1988), the aim of Conversation Analytic approach to code-switching is to examine the types of interaction which involve language alternation in close detail and by that examination then to establish the meaning of code-switching. The focus is on how the situated meaning of code-switching is constructed in interaction.

Li Wei (1998: 162) brings up three fundamental points about how to approach conversational code-switching: relevance, procedural consequentiality, and the balance between social structure and conversation structure. Firstly, the analyst must in the close examination of the data show how his or her findings, e.g. specific functions of code-switching, are demonstratively relevant to the participants themselves. Secondly, the analyst must show what gives a piece of interaction its specific nature or character, e.g. what features of interaction give institutional discourse its institutional character. Thirdly, the analyst must show how such things as identity, attitude and relationship are presented, understood, accepted or rejected, and changed in the process of interaction. Thus, from the CA point of view such a

feature as identity is not a permanent feature as is the view in many socio-linguistic studies. As Cashman (2005: 302) sums up, identity is not seen as something that people are but something that they do and show in interaction. It is constructed and shaped, “talked into being”, in the course of interaction. This implies that features such as identity can be negotiated in the course of interaction.

The sequentiality of interaction is one of the main ideas of CA guiding also the research on code-switching. According to Auer (1984, cited in Li Wei 1998: 157), “participants of conversational interaction continuously produce frames for subsequent activities, which in turn create new frames”. Auer also points out that whatever language a participant chooses in bilingual conversation has an effect on subsequent language choices by the same or other speakers. Thus, the organization of interaction is under constant change. In the same way that identity is negotiable, the organization of interaction is, too. The language of interaction can be negotiated. Sometimes this creates a dispute that can be won or lost. In the CA approach code-switching is seen as a resource for bilingual speakers which they may use for the organization of on-going talk. Cromdal (2005: 332) points out that participants in bilingual interaction make use of language alternation to accomplish a variety of interactional goals. Thus, choices of languages and code-switching are seen as meaningful and orderly activities in on which the context has an influence.

The approach on code-switching in this study follows the lines of Conversational Analytical views. The functions of code-switching examined from this perspective are related to the interaction, i.e. they are discourse functions. These functions are further discussed in Chapter 4.

### **3.2.4 Other Views**

There are also some other views on code-switching which will be shortly introduced here. Many researchers combine ideas from different approaches. Gumperz first focused on the socio-linguistic aspects of code-switching (we-code and they-code, Gumperz 1982) and then developed his views further on the discourse aspects of

code-switching (code-switching as a contextualization cue, Gumperz 1992). Auer started with the discourse perspective on code-switching and has later developed his conversation analytic model of code-switching by adding elements from linguistic approaches. Additionally, Myers-Scotton has worked on both linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches on code-switching. Other studies in which different aspects of code-switching are taken into account are for example Sebba and Wootton (1998), who studied the identity-related explanations of code-switching in relation to sequential explanation, Gafaranga (2005), who compared the views on social structure and sequential structure of code-switching, and Bailey (2000), who studied social and interactional functions of code-switching among Dominican Americans.

### **3.3 Code-Switching in Language Classrooms**

In this chapter I have mainly focused on code-switching as part of bilingual interaction and no attention has been paid to the type of interaction in question in this study, that is interaction taking place in the foreign language classroom. The context has a significant role, however. Firstly, speakers participating in discourse in a foreign language classroom are not bilingual in the way that the term usually defined in research. Teachers can often be seen as competent speakers of the target language but the learners have varying knowledge of L2, advanced learners being naturally more competent. However, in the case of this study the competence of learners is less relevant because this study focuses on the language use of teachers. Secondly, the context is institutional in its nature which has an effect on interaction, too. Classroom interaction and its features are discussed in Chapter 4. In this chapter I will introduce research done on code-switching or language-switching in classroom settings.

Most research on code-switching in the classroom has been cross-disciplinary in its nature. Martin-Jones (1995) says that the first studies examined code-switching from an educational point of view whereas the more recent research has concentrated on applying the principles of conversation analysis, pragmatics and ethnography. Furthermore, the research started out in bilingual settings and most of it has been done in areas where language education policy has caused a lot of debate. Thus, EFL

classroom environments have not been an object of researchers' interest until recently. The reason why EFL-classroom interaction was neglected for so long in this research is the fact that many researchers have not considered code-switching in an EFL- classroom environment as a "proper case of code-switching". Instead, it has been seen to be a result of a lack of competence in the foreign language.

Some foreign language teachers seem to think that using the learners' L1 in the classroom is a negative factor and thus, code-switching in the classroom should be avoided. Canagarajah (1995) reports in his study these kinds of opinions given by ESL teachers. However, many researchers, Canagarajah among others argue that code-switching is not bad for language teaching. According to Canagarajah (1995: 192) using learners' target language can make lessons more communicative. Cook (1991) has expressed similar views. She argues that the classroom is a natural context for code-switching and that there is nothing wrong with using it as an interactional resource as a part of teaching methodology. Additionally, she also mentions that it has a positive effect on the communicativeness in the classroom.

Edmonson (2004: 156) points out that shifting between the target language and the mother tongue is quite rarely called code-switching in the research on classroom interaction. For example, by examining the definitions of code-switching in Section 3.1 one can notice that in all of them it is defined as the language use of bilinguals/multilinguals. Indeed, the use of two languages among foreign language learners is distinct from that of competent bilinguals. According to Winford (2003: 108-109) the code-switching in language classrooms is commonly thought to be the result of incompetence, although advanced learners may use code-switching in a similar way as competent bilinguals. However, many studies have shown that lack of competence does not by far account for all the code-switching cases found in the foreign language classroom.

Due to the attitudes in previous research towards code-switching in foreign language classrooms, most studies on code-switching in classrooms have been conducted in bilingual settings, e.g. Canararajah, whose study will be discussed in Chapter 4, examined the functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms. Others such as Edmonson (2004), Üstunel and Seedhouse (2005) and Söderberg Arnfast and

Jørgensen (2003) have examined code-switching in foreign language classrooms. Some researchers, such as Turnbull and Arnett (2002) have taken both ESL and EFL settings into account.

Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) studied the relationship between pedagogical focus and language choice at a Turkish university. They concentrated on teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching. Teacher-initiated code-switching occurs when the teacher him/herself code-switches and teacher-induced code-switching is defined as teacher's use of one language to encourage learners to use the other language in their turns. According to the article, this was the first conversation analysis study which examined codes-switching in a foreign language classroom. The data consisted of six beginner level EFL lessons at a Turkish university. The central question in this study was "Why that, in that language, right now?" which is an adapted version of the basic CA question, and which can be used for interaction involving code-switching. Üstünel and Seedhouse identified three systematic preference organisation patterns: 1) pause length – which means here that if there's a lack of answer in the L2, the teacher switches to L1 after a pause of more than a second (typically after modification of the question), 2) encouraging learners to use L2 in their turns and 3) teacher-induced code-switching in which the teacher encourages learners to code-switch. Üstünel and Seedhouse also state that the preferred language, in the CA sense of the term, in the classroom is not always the L2. Instead, they suggest that "the preferred language for learners to use is the one which aligns with the teacher's pedagogical focus at that particular stage in the unfolding sequence" (Üstünel and Seedhouse 2005: 321). As "the generalisable point" this article suggests that at all points there is order in the code-switching activities taking place in classroom interaction. This follows the lines of Conversational Analytical perspective of interaction: there is order at all points in interaction.

Söderberg Arnfast and Jørgensen (2003) studied code-switching among first-year learners of Danish. They call for acknowledgement of code-switching as a language skill used at beginner levels of foreign language learning. They suggest code-switching is used to play with the languages included in the conversation. In their study they point out that no bilinguals receive any kind of instruction on using code-switching. Instead, it is a linguistic skill which is part of bilingualism, regardless of

how bilingualism is achieved. They also make clear that as bilinguals use code-switching for advanced purposes there is no reason to assume that learners use it only for simple purposes or when they lack language skills in the foreign language. They argue that the mechanisms of code-switching are not unfamiliar to monolinguals because they use the same mechanisms when they shift from one style to another in their own language. Söderberg Arnfast and Jørgensen even suggest that learners should be taught to make use of their ability to code-switch: they should be encouraged and trained in using these skills. The researchers report that in their own study they found cases in which code-switching served the purpose of filling a gap in the knowledge of the L2 as well as cases in which it served functions of negotiation in interaction. Thus, they conclude that they have not found significant difference between bilingual code-switching and foreign language classroom code-switching.

Macaro (2001) studied student teachers' code-switching in language classrooms. This study included quantitative analyses of the amounts of L1 used. The results in the study show that the student teachers used comparatively little L1 in the classroom. Macaro also reports that the quantity levels of the teacher's L1 and L2 use did not have a major effect on the amount of L2 used by learners. However, Macaro points out that in order to draw conclusions about the latter point a long-term observation and examination should be conducted. He suggests that after a certain threshold there could be a rise in the use of L2 by learners.

In Finland research on code-switching or language choice in EFL classrooms is limited to few studies. Myyryläinen and Pietikäinen (1988) studied teacher's reasons for using certain choice of a language in the classroom and teachers' assumptions about their own language use. This study included a questionnaire to teachers as well as recorded data from lessons. However, code-switching was not part of the focus of this study at all. Sundelin (2001) examined reasons for code-switching in foreign language classrooms and the issues that influence the choices of language that are made. The study did not, however, include any actual material from lessons, i.e. there were no recorded or transcribed lessons included. Thus, the study concentrates on the views of teachers but it does not reveal anything about what actually happens in the classroom. The most recent study on this topic is by Yletyinen (2004). Her focus was on the discourse functions of code-switching in EFL classrooms. In her study both

the teacher and learners, and code-switching employed by them, were taken into account. Her study was also based on data from actual foreign language lessons. Yletyinen's study is introduced in Chapter 4 in more detail.

As it can be noticed, both code-switching and language choice have been studied either as separate phenomena or as part of the same phenomenon. Sometimes researchers do not even make a difference between these two terms. In this study the term code-switching is used to refer to switching between the target language and the mother tongue. Although some researchers do not regard code-switching in the classroom as 'real code-switching', it can be argued that the two teachers this study mainly focuses on are quite competent users of English because in order to achieve qualifications to teach the foreign language they have to study it at the university level. It can be assumed that as a result of these studies they achieve a relatively high level of competence in the target language. Additionally, the context is, in fact, bilingual by nature because two languages are constantly present in the interaction. In the next chapter I will discuss the functions of code-switching found in previous research. There will also be more references to studies on code-switching in classrooms as the functions are examined as part of bilingual interaction as well as classroom interaction.



## 4 FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING

The different kinds of functions code-switching serves in communication have been mainly studied within the frames of socio-linguistic and pragmatic/conversational perspectives. The functions found differ according to the perspective. Sociolinguistics aims to find out the functions code-switching serves in relation to group-identity and group membership etc. This has also been called macro-level analysis by some researchers. The conversational approach is interested in finding out what kind of interactive or discourse functions code-switching has, that is how the interaction influences code-switching and how the code-switching affects interaction. This type of analysis is done on the micro-level as it involves thorough sequential analysis of the discourse in question. From the discourse point of view the switches themselves are important and meaningful and it is of less importance which language is the base language or which way the switch occurs. In this chapter I will mainly introduce the discourse functions of code-switching found in other research because this study focuses on them alone.

### 4.1 Functions of Code-Switching in Bilingual Interaction

In addition to examining code-switching from the point of view of group membership, Gumperz (1992) has also studied its use as a discourse device, *a contextualization cue*. Gumperz introduced the terms *situational* and *metaphorical* switching. Situational switching refers to code-switching in which there is a change in the situation during a conversation. In metaphorical switching a switch occurs in a situation in which no such change can be observed. (Gumperz 1992: 229-252.)

Romaine (1989: 161-166) introduces several discourse functions of code-switching found in research. The first is the distinction between direct and reported speech, i.e. quotations. The speech of another person is reported in different language than what is used for the rest of the conversation. Often it is not meaningful which language is used but the switch itself is, because the quotation is not always given in the same language that was originally used. Thus, the quotation is not necessarily a direct

quote including using the same language as the original speaker. The code-switch marks the quotation as separate from the rest of the conversation and from the thoughts and opinions of the speaker.

The second function Romaine brings up is reiteration. In this case the speaker uses another language to repeat what has just been said. The purpose is to clarify or emphasize the message. Here again the switch itself is important and not necessarily the “referential value of the utterance” because the same message is uttered in both languages (Romaine 1989: 163). The third point Romaine examines is the function of qualification. The idea is that “a topic will be introduced in one language and commented on or further qualified in the other“ (Romaine 1989: 163). Code-switching can also have the function of specifying an addressee as the recipient of the message. In bilingual communication this kind of switching is often an invitation for someone to participate in the on-going conversation. Additionally, similar kinds of switches often appear when monolingual speakers join a bilingual conversation. The monolingual will be addressed in his or her mother tongue to accommodate them to an exchange. However, in the case of bilingual speakers this kind of switching draws attention to welcoming the addressee to take part in the conversation.

Gumperz (1982: 80-81) has presented the function of marking *personalization* vs. *objectivization*. This function is involved with a speaker’s distance from the message and whether a speaker expresses personal opinions or knowledge or generally-known facts. Speakers may, thus, use code-switching to mark varying degrees of distance to the statements. In this case the language is significant as one of the languages is used to express personalization whereas the other marks distance to the message, i.e. *objectivization*. Under this function of code-switching a certain type of sub-function can be observed, that is using code-switching to mark different types of genres. The basic example of this is the code-switching used in lectures. In this case code-switching is used to differentiate the actual lecture from discussion. That is the lecture is conducted in one language whereas when the teacher wants to discuss something the language is switched. This has been also reported as a case of switches between standard language and a local dialect, the dialect in these cases being the language of personalization.

The concept of identity is also meaningful from the conversation analytic point of view. Cashman (2005) examined social identities and code-switching in bilingual talk-in-interaction. The data included conversations which took place in a senior citizens' program, the participants of which were of varying backgrounds. The concept of identity was dealt with from a conversation analytic perspective. As Cashman points out, in CA terms group membership is something that people do in interaction and not something they are. Participants use "a variety of resources [...] to ascribe and resist group membership and ethnic identity" (Cashman 2005: 305). In Cashman's study code-switching serves functions of showing group membership and either resisting or accepting group membership ascribed by some other participant. The identities in this study are either ethnic or related to one's position or role in the interaction. Cashman found that the participants talked into being social structures, social identities and linguistic identities. The social structures she found were e.g. the superiority of English and the lack of power and prestige of Spanish. Social identities were related to ethnic identity, e.g. Anglo, Chicana, or to the role a person takes in interaction, e.g. facilitator, which means a bilingual who helps monolingual English speakers to understand the Spanish remarks made by a bilingual. The third point, linguistic identities, is related to language competence, e.g. a person may ascribe him- or herself to be, for example a competent bilingual or user of two languages. Showing group membership by switching codes is the basic function of code-switching from the socio-linguistic perspective. However, this kind of switching can be seen to serve the discourse functions as well if one widens the perspective of identity from a permanent feature to something that the participants themselves do in interaction. In the classroom showing different kind of identities is a relevant function, too. The teacher may move in and out of the role of the teacher.

## **4.2 Functions of Code-Switching in Language Classrooms**

The discourse functions of code-switching in the classroom differ somewhat from the functions found in other types of interaction although many similarities can also be noticed. These differences are a result of the special nature of classroom interaction and the types of code-switching not found in other situations are mostly directly

related to classroom tasks. These are for example, the ones related to the distinction between routine classroom directions and interaction, e.g. giving routine commands and routine directions in the target language while the more complicated directions are given in L1, or the ones related to performing language learning tasks, e.g. learners using L1 to interact with each other about the task while performing the task itself in the target language. The functions of L2 as the language of routine activities is often more highlighted at the beginner levels as learners' language skills are then not yet developed enough for extended discourse in the target language. Additionally, this type of code-switching can be considered similar to switching between formal and informal variants of language. In both cases both languages have their own context of use.

Canagarajah (1995) studied the functions of code-switching in ESL classrooms in Jaffna, Sri Lanka. He found out that there was a clear division of use between the two available languages. English (L2) was clearly the pedagogical, formal and official language used while Tamil (L1) was the more affective, personal and informal language. The functions of code-switching were to some extent related to this division.

The functions Canagarajah (1995) found can be divided into two categories according to whether they were related to classroom management or content transmission. As for classroom management, the division between the formal and informal languages in classrooms was very clear. Tamil was used to prepare the class for the lesson and there was a switch to English when the lesson proper started. Similarly, Tamil was used for pre-instructional directions and English for the actual routine directions of activities. The switching also had a clear role in managing discipline and complimenting and encouraging learners. The teacher separated the disciplinary comments from the actual lesson contents by a switch to Tamil. Also, when learners were not responding to directives in English the teacher repeated them in Tamil. When expressing feelings or personal thoughts, the L1 was used. Thus, Canagarajah found out that the switch to L1 provided a stronger, more affective, and in the cases of disciplining and encouraging, also a more effective tone to the turns of the teacher. In relation to content transmission, English was the established code for direct, routine instructions. Code-switches were common in the cases of repetition,

reformulation, clarification, qualification and exemplification. These all served the purpose of explaining something in more detail and Canagarajah points out that in these cases both languages complement each other so that learners can achieve a better understanding of the lesson content.

Yletyinen (2004) has previously conducted a similar kind of study on code-switching in language classrooms to the present one. Her study was the starting point to this one, although there are some differences in the focuses of the studies. In her study the focus was on both the teacher and the learners. The functions of code-switching were studied according to the following research questions: 1. Who employs codeswitching in the classroom? 2. When is codeswitching employed, as part of which activity? 3. What types of codeswitching can be found in the classrooms? 4. What is accomplished by employing codeswitching? (Yletyinen 2004: 36.) The data in this study came from the same corpus as in the present study and the learning groups were also the same, but the lessons chosen for the present study are different. Yletyinen's study is discourse analytic. She used Poplack's categories of the types of code-switching (intra- or inter-sentential switching, and tag-switching) as her starting point and then moved on to analyse the functions of code-switching instances.

The functions Yletyinen (2004) found were mostly following the lines of Canagarajah, whose study was also a significant source in her work. The functions found were related to explanation, requesting for help, checking for understanding, admonitions. In addition, there were some functions which can be at least partly be seen as caused by the lack of language skills, such as not knowing the English counterpart, clearing misunderstandings and self-corrections. The difference between 'official' and 'unofficial' talk was also brought up as code-switching was used to separate such uses of language and also to bring up pupils' comments. Topic change has been said to be one common function of code-switching and Yletyinen also discusses that. As far as topics are concerned, code-switching during grammar instruction is discussed in detail.

Yletyinen's (2004) study was significant because the extent to which similar studies have been conducted in Finland is scarce. However, some points in this study could have been made clearer, e.g. the correlation between the focus of the study and some

aspects brought up. Poplack's categories of the types of code-switching, although they have their place in research on code-switching, are in this case somewhat away from the original point of Yletyinen's study, i.e. discourse functions of code-switching. Secondly, the field of code-switching research is certainly introduced profoundly, but it is not completely clear which approaches to code-switching, in addition to Poplack's, are the basis of this study. For example, Auer's discourse-related and participant related code-switching types are introduced quite thoroughly under the functions of code-switching. However, they are mainly not part of the actual analysis of discourse functions, as they are only referred to once as part of discussing the above-mentioned functions. Nevertheless, Yletyinen's study was an important piece of research due to the small amount in this field in Finland. Additionally, it was a significant springboard for the present study. The present study also tries to improve on the points mentioned above.

Although language choice as a term is not mentioned in either Canagarajah's (1995) or Yletyinen's (2004) study it seems to have been a factor in both of them anyway, since both comment on which of the two available languages was used and for what purposes. Yletyinen (2004: 100) summarizes that English was mostly used for interaction related to the materials and Finnish for pupil-to-pupil interaction, questions that pupils ask from the teacher, and in teacher admonitions. The results follow the lines of Canagarajah (1995: 190-191) as he concludes that English was used for interaction demanded by the textbook or the lesson and Tamil (L1) usually for other interactive purposes. All in all, the classroom context affects interaction significantly, as has been the case in these two studies as well. Thus, in the following chapter the features of classroom discourse are discussed generally from the Conversation Analytic point of view.

## 5 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Classroom interaction is a form of institutional interaction. The special environment affects the interaction so that it has some features not commonly found in other types of interaction. Because classroom interaction is also the context of this study, I will discuss some main features of it in this chapter. Due to the vast amount of research and perspectives on this topic, the discussion here is mostly limited to Conversation Analytical perspectives because they are the most relevant considering the focus of this study. The view on code-switching is conversational and the methods of applied Conversation Analysis are used in the study. Accordingly, classroom interaction is discussed from this perspective.

Research on classroom interaction has revealed specific patterns, one of the most famous being the IRF-sequence introduced by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975). The abbreviation stands for Initiation, Response and Follow-up. Initiation is the opening move and it is given by the teacher. It can be in the form of a question, a statement, or an imperative. Response is given by a pupil and the type varies according to the initiation. The pupil answers the question, reacts to the statement or acts according to the imperative. Feedback then follows and it may include accepting or rejecting, commenting or evaluating. Mehan (1979: 54-55) points out that often such a sequence is extended when a learner does not succeed in answering correctly to the question. In such cases the teacher often tries to get the correct answers from other learners. The IRF-pattern is a very common pattern of classroom discourse, but not the only one. Cazden (2001: 31) divides lessons into traditional and non-traditional ones according to the appearance of the IRF-sequence. According to her, traditional lessons are the ones where the teacher has the floor most of the time and interaction mostly follows the IRF-pattern. In non-traditional lessons interaction consists of more varying turns, with e.g. extended pupil responses.

Different kinds of asymmetries are characteristic of institutional discourse. One of the common ones, from the point of view of classroom discourse, is the asymmetry of participation, meaning that professionals are asking questions from the non-professionals. For example, in classrooms teachers are asking questions to which

they know the answer in order to check whether students know the answers or not. According to Cazden (2001: 46) these types of questions are called inauthentic questions or 'display' questions. The asymmetry of participation already hints that the distribution of power in the classroom is unequal. For example, in the IRF-pattern the pupil's role is only to give a response, whereas the teacher acts as the initiator and the evaluator and the teacher also usually decides who gets to give the response. Lörcher (1986: 14-15) points out that the teacher usually introduces new topics, has the right to speak whenever he or she wants to, decides the next speaker and automatically gains the right to speak again when a learner has had his or her turn. However, Thornborrow (2002) argues that the teacher is not automatically the one with the power. Instead, there is constant negotiation of power in the classroom between the teacher and the students. Thornborrow (2002: 108-131) adds that students may therefore negotiate themselves more powerful roles than merely listeners or repliers to teacher-questions. They may even have the possibility to self-select themselves as speakers, e.g. to give opinions. In addition to taking turns, the general structure of classroom interaction may be interrupted by students if they refuse to co-operate, i.e. they refuse to answer to a question. This kind of an instance will then also shatter the IRF-pattern because the learner response is missing. However, these instances are fairly rare and teachers solve them by nominating other students to answer.

The main goal of institutional talk in the language classroom is to teach learners the L2. Related to this main goal, Seedhouse (2004) has presented the following three characteristics of interaction that apply in this context:

1. Language is both the vehicle and object of instruction.
2. There is a reflexive relationship between pedagogy and interaction, and interactants constantly display their analyses of the evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction.
3. The linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce in the L2 are potentially subject to evaluation by the teacher in some way.

(Seedhouse 2004: 181-182)



Firstly, language is the object of instruction as the goal of foreign language lessons is to learn the foreign language. This is done by using both the mother tongue and the target language as instruments. For instance, in EFL classrooms, English is used to teach English, usually alongside the L1. Secondly, the reference to the relationship between pedagogy and interaction means that the main goal of interaction has a major effect on how the interaction in the classroom is organized. When the pedagogical focus changes, this change impacts the interaction, too. The focus may change, for example from structure to interaction. Thirdly, learners produce linguistic forms and patterns as they are performing tasks assigned by the teacher. These forms and patterns may be evaluated by the teacher.

The interaction in the classroom is connected to the pedagogical focus. As Seedhouse (2004) puts it there is a reflexive relationship between the pedagogy and interaction: the organization of turn and sequence change as the pedagogical focus changes. For example, in some contexts turn-taking can be managed by learners alone and in some contexts there is no turn-taking at all because the pedagogical focus demands a monologue. Usually there is a systematic relationship between the organization of interaction and the context where the interaction occurs. The teacher usually gives instructions in the form of a monologue, but when there is discussion about feelings, meanings and opinions the organization of interaction is more diverse. The most common contexts of classroom interaction are form-and-accuracy contexts, meaning-and-fluency contexts, task-oriented contexts and procedural contexts. In form-and-accuracy context the pedagogical focus is on the linguistic forms and the grammatical accuracy of speech. In meaning-and-fluency contexts the focus is on the fluency of communication. In task-oriented context focus is on completing a given task. The fourth context, procedural context, is present in every lesson, and the point is for the teacher to give information about the activities they do during the lesson.

Repair has a significant role in classroom interaction. According to Seedhouse (2004) the organization of repair also changes when the pedagogical focus changes. Thus, there is no single form of repair which is preferred in the classroom. Repair is defined as “the treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use”, trouble is “anything which participants judge to be impeding their communication”, and repairable item is “one which causes trouble for participants” (Seedhouse 2004: 143).

From the CA point of view there are four different types of repair in interaction as introduced by Seedhouse (2004: 34-35):

1. Self-initiated self-repair
2. Self-initiated other-repair
3. Other-initiated self-repair
4. Other-initiated other-repair

These types of repair have been divided according to who initiates and who performs the repair. As Seedhouse continues there is a clear preference order for repair in ordinary conversation: the self-initiated self-repair being the most preferred and other-initiated other-repair being the least preferred. This order of preference may not always apply in the classroom, however. In the classroom environment the focus of repair depends on the pedagogical focus as Seedhouse (2004) points out: In form-and-accuracy contexts repair is often of an overt type, it is initiated by the teacher and it focuses on the production of linguistic forms. In meaning-and-fluency contexts the repair is focused on giving learners the opportunity to communicate personal meanings and to help learners when there is a breakdown in communication. Less attention is then paid to the accuracy of linguistic forms, especially when they do not interrupt understanding. In task-oriented contexts the focus of repair is on the accomplishment of the task. In these contexts repair is generally conducted by the learners since most of the work is usually done in pairs or groups.

The purpose of this chapter was to introduce some typical features of classroom interaction from the point of view of Conversation Analysis. Although my focus in this study is not specifically on any of these features presented here, these factors have to be taken into account in the examination and analysis of the data, because the context of interaction is the classroom environment. Distribution of power, repair, and the types of sequence characteristic to classroom contexts all affect the interaction present in the classroom and thus, they have to be taken into account in the process of analysis. In the next chapter I will introduce the aims and methods of the present study.

## **6 THE PRESENT STUDY: AIMS AND METHODS**

In my thesis I aim to study language choice and the functions of code-switching in EFL classrooms. My main interest is in the teacher and how language choice and code-switching are present in his or her turns. The reason for the decision to concentrate on the teacher arises from the teacher training which I attended previously during my studies. It was brought up that language choice in the classroom should be well-thought beforehand and the use of the target and native languages should be logical and conscious. The question of which language to use in each situation should be thought of already when planning the lesson. However, the experiences that I had as a teacher trainee and later on as a substitute teacher have demonstrated that it is not always so easy to be aware of one's use or choice of a language. The classroom environment is dynamic and it is impossible to plan and predict everything beforehand. Nowadays, in Finland the teacher trainees are encouraged to use as much of the target language as possible. However, the mother tongue also has its place in the classroom. In this study I hope to find out more about the use of the two languages present in the classroom. This includes examining the teachers' choices of language and the cases of code-switching. As to code-switching, the Conversation Analytical view is adapted to examining the discourse functions of code-switching.

### **6.1 Research Questions**

In this study the following research questions are used as the focus of examining the data:

- 1 What kind of division of labour is there between Finnish and English in the foreign language classroom?
  - 1.1 Does the teacher have a preference for using either of the languages during certain pedagogical events?
  - 1.2 How much and for what purposes is English used in the classroom?

- 2 Are there differences in this division between secondary school and upper secondary school lessons?
- 3 What discourse functions does the teacher's code-switching serve in the classroom?

In this study there are two focuses: the teacher's language choice and the teacher's code-switching in the classroom. For the language choice part I will examine if the teacher has a preference for using a certain language in certain contexts, e.g. using either of the languages for grammar teaching. In other words, I will examine if there is a "division of labor" (cf. Cromdal 2005) between the two languages. I will also look at how much English is used in the classroom. This analysis is mostly qualitative although there is a quantitative element to it, too, since the amount of each language used is counted. However, this will only be an approximate estimation of the amounts. This was conducted by counting the words of each language used by the two teachers and then counting what proportion each language has of the overall talk of the teachers. As for language choice, comparison and contrast between findings of secondary and upper secondary school lessons are also included. As far as code-switching is concerned, the aim is to find and analyse the discourse functions found in interaction. The analysis of this part is qualitative. In this part, too, the examination focuses on the teacher, meaning that the code-switching found in learners' utterances will not be under examination although the learners' turns otherwise are often significant part of analysis as they provide the context for the examples.

Some researchers do not consider code-switching in the classroom context a case of real code-switching at all. It is true that there are some relevant differences between bilingual conversation and language use in the classroom. First of all, in foreign language classroom the participants usually have different levels of language skills in the two languages present in conversation. In other words, one of the languages is the participants' mother tongue while the other language for the most part is and has been learned in school. Secondly, the context in school differs quite significantly from ordinary every-day conversation because it is a case of institutional context which has special features. In language classrooms the use of target language and mother tongue may vary according to different institutional goals. The target

language is in some cases the language of conversation and on the other hand the target of learning. Edmonson (2005: 157) states that communication in the target language can be both the target and the means of instruction. In Seedhouse's (2004: 181-182) words, "language is both the vehicle and object of instruction". Seedhouse adds that this factor distinguishes language classroom interaction from any other classroom interaction.

As to code-switching in the classroom, Edmonson (2004: 157) regards it as "a special case of code-switching". According to him code-switching in the classroom is "any use of more than one language in a discourse segment or sequence of discourse segments by one or more classroom participants, either turn-internally or turn-sequentially" (Edmonson 2004: 157). This definition of language alternation is applied in the present study. However, in this case, because the focus is on the teacher, turn-internal code-switching is taken into account only when it is employed by the teacher.

## **6.2 Data**

The data consists of four 45-minute lessons recorded at Finnish schools. The lessons have been video-recorded and transcribed. The data comes from a corpus of video-recorded lessons that are also used for other research projects at the Department of Languages in the University of Jyväskylä. The lessons are from two different sources: 2 lessons from seventh form in secondary school and 2 lessons from upper secondary school. The lessons are double periods, meaning that they were held one after another during the same day. In secondary school they had a break in between the two lessons whereas there was no break during the upper secondary school lessons. The reason why I have chosen lessons from two different levels of schooling is to get a more varied view of language choice and code-switching in the classroom and to be able to compare and contrast the teachers' use of languages in these two levels.

The secondary school lessons were filmed in November 1996. The group consists of 7 learners: 3 girls and 4 boys. The learners are seventh graders and about 13 years old. This group had started learning English in the fifth grade, as their second foreign language, A2-language, meaning that they have begun some other foreign language in the third grade. While most pupils in Finland choose English to be their first foreign language, A1, and have by the seventh form learned it for four years, the year of filming the lessons was this group's third year of learning English. The popularity of English as the first foreign language to be learned also has an effect on the size of this group as it is smaller than an average English group. However, when compared to other A2-language learning groups, the size of the group is not exceptionally small. The upper secondary school lessons were filmed in January 2003. There are 14 learners present in the group: 6 girls and 8 boys. The group consists of first year students who are approximately 16 years old. I do not have any knowledge of the backgrounds of the teachers and the learners apart from the fact that none of them are native speakers of English. However, the name of one learner suggests that he may have a foreign background.

The themes and activities on these lessons vary. On both lessons there is grammar instruction and a text to work with. The grammar theme in the secondary school lessons is tense and aspect of verbs and the textbook theme is animals and film-making in Africa. In upper secondary school the grammar theme is adjectives and the text is related to working life. There are also different kinds of methods used in both double periods: teacher-led instruction, pair work and exercises done independently.

### **6.3 Method**

There are two focuses in the analysis of the data: language choice and code-switching. In both parts this study is mainly a qualitative one and the aim is not to give e.g. a numerical analysis of the occurrences of code-switching. Nevertheless, there is a quantitative element in the study concerning the language choice and more specifically the amount of each language used in the two double periods. This quantitative analysis is, however, very approximate because of the difficulty of

counting the amount of each language. In addition to the numerical analysis of language choice, I will analyse in what kind of situations and for what purposes the teachers use English and Finnish, respectively. Thus, the aim is to find out if there is a division of labour between the two languages. For the code-switching part, the analysis is purely qualitative. Ready transcripts were available for my use and they were used as a help already at the beginning stages of the analytical process in helping to find interesting cases. The transcripts have been somewhat modified for the purposes of this study meaning that only relevant features of interaction are included in the analysis section.

The focus of analysing language choice is on the amount of each language used and especially on what purposes they are used for. The amount of each language is based on a simple word-count method in which all the intelligible words of English and Finnish used by the teacher are counted. This includes grammatical words such as articles and prepositions. This leads to an obvious problem due to the different nature of the two languages in terms of how to express e.g. relations in a clause. Thus, strictly speaking this kind of word-count method is not accurate when comparing English and Finnish. However, since this is not the main focus of this study I find it accurate enough to give an image of the approximate proportion of each language.

In the word-counting methods applied here only whole words are taken into account. Half-started words and words, of which one cannot make out what word is in question, are left out of the count, as well as names of people and replies that cannot be distinguished to belong to either language, such as minimal responses “mm-m” “mm-hh”. Thus, in the excerpt “sen muo- sen mukaan mitä muotoa tarvitset” there are 6 words of Finnish. The English contracted forms “didn’t”, “we’re” are counted as single words as in Finnish two words written together, e.g. “sillei” meaning “sillä ei”.

The other part of language choice is based on the context, that is in which situation and during what kind of an activity the teacher uses English or Finnish. In the analysis the aim is to find out if there are general patterns of language choice and compare these between the secondary and upper secondary lessons. This is done by looking at which language the teacher chooses for each activity and task in the

classroom and then examining if there are such patterns, i.e. if the teacher chooses English for certain types of activities and Finnish for other types.

The findings of language choice are compared between the double periods. The purpose of this is to see to what extent the teachers' choices of language are similar and to point out possible differences in how much and for what purposes each language is used. The hypothesis is that the target language is used more and more when the learners' language skills develop further. Thus, the expected finding is that English is used more and in more varied situations in the upper secondary school than in the secondary school lessons.

Code-switching is the other focus of this study and it could be treated as the main focus to which the language choice part gives a background and context. The analysis of code-switching instances is based on applying the methods of Conversation Analysis. There were several different stages in the process of analysis. First, I have tried to recognize and separate different kinds of code-switching instances in the data. Basically, I first fixed my attention on all of the places where the language the teacher uses is switched. At this point, all such cases were included and the function of the switch was not yet under observation. After this a preliminary analysis of the cases found took place. I tried to identify if there was a discourse function in the switch and what it could be. I discarded cases where no discourse function was found, e.g. the uses of single English words in grammar instruction. After the preliminary analysis a more detailed examination of the excerpts took place. In the study, the examples are categorized according to the functions found. In some cases there are more than one possible functions to the switch. These cases are discussed in each of the different sections according to the function described in that section.

The basis of the analysing process has been founded on applying the principles of Conversation Analysis. This is apparent both in the transcription conventions and in the analysis process itself. The study is not a pure piece Conversation Analytic research because the first stages of analysis are somewhat different as this is not an entirely data driven study. However, the applied Conversation Analysis steps into the picture in the process of analysing the instances of code-switching found in the data



in addition to the views on code-switching and classroom interaction. In Seedhouse's (2004: 195) words: "The analyst follows exactly the same procedure as the participants and traces the evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction, using as evidence the analyses of this relationship which the participants display to each other in their own turns". Context is a very important factor in the analysing process and in reporting the findings. In the analysis I have included description of the situation in question, i.e. what the task is and what happens in the classroom before and after the example. The teacher's turns are the main focus of this study, but this does not mean that the learner's turns are insignificant as they are part of the interaction and the context in which the code-switches occur. In many cases the learner's turns are also meaningful when looking for possible reasons for the switch.

## **7 TEACHERS' LANGUAGE CHOICE**

In this chapter I will examine the teachers' language choices in the two double periods. Language choice here refers to the choices the teacher makes about which language, the L1 or the L2, to use to go through the tasks and the activities in the classroom. These choices may be pre-defined and conscious or not. In addition, it is not always possible to define which language the teacher has actually chosen because there is a lot of code-switching. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to examine how much the teacher uses the available languages in the classroom and for what purposes each language is used. In this chapter I will also introduce the tasks and activities done during the lessons. I will first go through the contents of each lesson and then concentrate on the teachers' choices of language. Each double period is discussed separately at first and then there is a section at the end of the chapter in which the findings are compared and contrasted. Secondary school lessons are discussed in the first section.

### **7.1 Secondary School Lessons**

To begin with, I will describe the secondary school double period and give some observations about the languages used. The group is learning English as an A2-language. Because English is mostly chosen as the first foreign language to be learned, this group is somewhat smaller than an average language learning group in secondary school.

The activities done on this double period revolve around two major themes: tense and aspect of English, more specifically the past simple and the present perfect, and a new text about filming with wild animals in Africa. Both of these themes include exercises which are teacher-led, done independently or done with a partner. The grammar theme has already been introduced to the group during previous lessons and it is, thus, not something completely new to them. As part of grammar learning there is a verb test about irregular verbs. This time the test includes forms in the present perfect. The text is a new one and they start by reading the new words out loud after

which they listen to the text. Then the teacher checks if the class has understood the text by asking a few questions and then there are exercises related to the text. At the end of the double period the group starts working on a project with a partner. The topics of the project relate to the text they have just started working with and the work itself may include e.g. developing a cross-word puzzle, inventing questions to a test for the rest of the group or making an interview. The group has some time to do the project before the double period ends.

## **7.2 Teacher's Language Choice in Secondary School Lessons**

The overall impression of the secondary school double period is that Finnish is used quite a lot by both the learners and the teacher. Finnish is the main language of interaction whereas English is for the most part the target of instruction, although there are cases in which it is also used as the medium of instruction. According to the word-count used in this study the result is that approximately 60 % of the teacher's speech is Finnish and 40% English during these two lessons. This amount includes example sentences, quotes of the materials and any single words of English the teacher may have used while instructing.

At the beginning of the lesson the teacher returns a verb test that was done in the previous lesson. She also goes through the answers with one of the learners. The lesson proper has not started yet, because one more learner enters the classroom and the teacher does not indicate that he was late. The teacher uses Finnish at this point, apart from the greeting to the learner entering the classroom. The actual lesson starts with homework checking. This activity is done orally in addition to making use of transparencies and the blackboard. The teacher uses mainly Finnish during the beginning of the lesson up until the group starts working with the text when about 25 minutes of the lesson have passed. The first part of the first lesson is used to learn grammar; the homework exercises also included grammar. It seems therefore that the teacher's choice of language for instructing grammar is Finnish. After this they talk about the past simple forms of the verb *to be* and do an exercise related to it. During

this part of the lessons English is used to refer to single lexical items such as *was* and *were*, or to example sentences from the materials.

Below is an example from doing a grammar exercise together. In this example the teacher is leading an exercise about the past simple forms of *to be*.

Example 1:

- 1 T poissa-sana on annettu siinä [(0.5) marginaalissa]  
 2 LM1 [ Jody was ]  
 3 LM1 [gone too ]  
 4 LM2 [ gone too]  
 5 LM2 [(xxx)]  
 6 LM3 [gone ] *also*  
 7 T tai **absent** jos halua käyttää sitä sanaa mikä on siinä  
 8 T (0.5) eli (0.5) kirjain on (2) aa eikö vaan (1) noni↑  
 9 (5)  
 10 T u:h (2) where were you yesterday, Jody was a:bsent as well.  
 11 T Jody was absent too.=  
 12 LM4 =hmh.  
 13 T allright↑ (1) näättekö=

The language of the exercise is Finnish. English is present mainly as the target of instruction. The teacher gives instructions for the learner's reply in line 1 by referring to a word that has been given in English in the learners' book. A learner answers to the question (lines 2-3). Two other learners contribute to the answer as well at the same time (lines 4-6). Lines 7 and 13 show how the teacher uses Finnish with English words in it. In line 7 the teacher gives an alternative word which could have been used in the answer. In lines 10-11 the teacher uses English to repeat the correct answer with the alternative word she gave in line 7. There is a long pause in line 9 during which the teacher adjusts the overhead projector. In line 11 the teacher repeats the correct answer with the word not used by the learners as she shows the correct answer on the transparency. Then in line 13 the teacher uses a discourse marker in English and returns to using Finnish. This discourse marker creates a link between what precedes and what follows, because the language is the same as in the teacher's previous turn while the discourse marker suggests beginning with something new that is, in this case a new sentence to be translated. Apart from this kind of use of English, that is to provide correct words or to read out loud examples

or correct answers, the use of English is scarce during the first 25 minutes of the lesson.

After talking about grammar the group starts working on a text and the choice of language for this activity is English: the teacher code-switches when the topic changes. To begin with, the teacher tells the class what the main task with the text is, i.e. to understand the main content of the text. Before working on it the class reads the new words out loud after which they listen to the text on the tape. In the example the teacher starts instructing on the listening activity. The teacher prepares the move to the next topic in line 1 and then introduces it in lines 5 and 10. The teacher uses only English at this stage.

Example 2:

1 T           okay, [let's go on with       ] your (.) textbook  
 2 LM2           [ (xx)                               ]  
 3 LF2           tossa (x)  
 4 LF           ai niin  
 5 T           an:d uh [here's a (.)] [quite an interesting story about]  
 6 LF2           [ did you       ]  
 7 LM2   [ otaksää nää                               ]  
 10 T           film-making (.) in Africa

After this the teacher gives the page number and introduces the name of the story in English. Finnish is, however, used a lot in the actual instructions to the task in this activity, as can be seen in the following example.

Example 3:

1 T           harjoittele (1)  
 2 T           [vieraskielisen tekstin (1)                               haloo       ]  
 3 LM3           [ joku Tarzan näyttelijä jäi Tarzaniks loppuiäkseen ]  
 4 LM3           kun sai jonkun vähän liian kovan [(x)                               ]  
 5 T   [harjoittele]  
 6 T           [vierastekstisen] (0.5) [VIERASKIELISEN (0.5) **Pekka**       ]  
 7 LM1           [nii (0.5)       ]       [se hyppii siellä vanhainkodissa (xx) ]  
 8 LM2           [ ((laughs))       ]  
 9 T           vieraskielisen [tekstin ymmärtämistä lue ] kertomus,  
 10 LM1   [ huutelee Tarzan-huutoja ]  
 11 T           **[kuinka paljon ]** ymmärrät siitä ensi lukemalla  
 12 LM2           [ ((laughs))       ]

- 13 T oheisen sanaluettelon [avulla]  
 14 LM1 [he:i ] missä mun-  
 15 LM1 (1) ai [tuossa ]  
 16 T [so you ] don't have to understand the whole story,  
 17 T not **every** word (0.5) just if you understand the idea.  
 18 T that's enough.

The teacher starts giving the actual instructions that is, what is to be done in this task (line 1). These instructions are written in the book and the teacher reads them out loud. Some learners are noisy and do not pay attention to which the teacher intervenes in line 2. She starts the instructions again in line 5 but the same learners are still concentrated on their own discussion and the teacher raises her voice and then calls one of the learners by his name to gain his attention. In line 9 the teacher goes on with the instructions although the learners still comment on their own discussion. In line 16 the teacher switches to English to give some additional instructions that further explain how the learners should deal with the task that is, they should try to understand the main ideas of the text. Thus, in this activity the teacher first uses English to introduce the topic, then she switches to Finnish to give detailed instructions on the task and then she adds to the instructions in English. The key information that has to be understood in order to be able to do the task was given in Finnish.

After listening to the text the teacher leads an activity in which they go through the essential contents of the text. In this activity he teacher asks questions the answers to which are found in the text. Both Finnish and English are used, as can be seen in the following example.

Example 4:

- 1 T [minkä takia] ne sitten päätti lähtee  
 2 LM2 [ stu:dio ]  
 3 T sillon (0.5) kakskytyhdeksän Afrikkaan tekemään  
 4 T kunnollisen (0.5) villieläinelokuvan.  
 5 L ((sniffs))  
 6 LM3 että ei tarvii sitte (1) n- no niin no emmää tiä  
 7 LM3 tuliks se niinku nii villimmän näkönen tosiaan=  
 8 T =joo [koska täällä sanottiin ] ihmiset oli kyllästyny  
 9 LM2 [ihmiset oli kyllästyny ]  
 10 T the au- audiences got fed up with studio jungles. (1)

- 11 T okay. (1) siellä oli aika paljon vaikeuksia siellä Afrikassa  
 12 T ne päätti lähtee ensinnäkin Keniaan

In the example, the teacher first poses a question in Finnish in lines 1 and 3-4. A learner provides an answer which he then doubts. The teacher confirms that he had it right and completes the answer first in Finnish and then by quoting the text in English. Then she moves on and prepares for the next question by explaining what happens next in the text (lines 11-12). This activity is bilingual as both Finnish and English are used. Both languages also seem to have specific roles. Finnish is used to pose questions and carry on with the actual exercise. English is present all the time as the teacher reads some passages of the text to aid answering the questions or as in line 10 confirming the correct answer by providing a passage of the text.

A couple of exercises related to the text follow. In this task, the learners first place five sentences in the correct order according to the text. The teacher uses English to give instructions, as can be seen in the following example. This time there are no additional instructions given in Finnish. However, there are presumably written instructions to the task in the exercise book.

#### Example 5:

- 1 T [and then you should uh] (1.5) put  
 2 LM1 [it's impossible to film ]  
 3 T these sentences in the right order. (2) according to  
 4 T the text. so t- (0.5) just try to fi:- find out<sup>↑</sup> (0.5) which is the  
 5 T first sentence, and how the story goes on. so that (0.5) you  
 6 T get the right order. with these (0.5) eight sentences. (1)  
 7 T so: (1) you can work (0.5) on **that** with your partner or  
 8 T [(1.5) ] by yourself  
 9 LM2 [((yawns)) ]  
 10 LM1 for homework  
 11 T let's do that, that's the last (0.5) then we have a  
 12 T break. (0.5) think about that, a little bit

During this exercise the teacher uses very little Finnish. She gives the instructions only in English and she also helps the learners to complete the task in English. There is only one comment in Finnish during this last part of the first lesson. The class has

just checked the exercise and a learner is complaining that he did not get to answer, although he had known the correct answer. It seems that he has not done the exercise, however, and the teacher comments that he should get on with the exercises then. The teacher then gives some instructions to the whole group about checking the answers and then she announces that they are going to have a break. This ends the first part of the double period.

The second lesson of the double period starts with the verb test. The teacher uses Finnish during the whole test to give instructions and to answer questions by learners. After the time for the test is over the teacher collects the papers and they check the right answers on the blackboard. The whole activity takes about 15 minutes. To end the activity the teacher tells the learners which verbs they should study for the following lesson. After the verb test they start an activity related to the text they have been talking about. They do a quiz about animals. The language of this activity is English. Finnish is present in this activity, too, as the teacher translates most of the questions into Finnish. The teacher also provides some of the instructions in Finnish, because a learner asks for clarification of an English word. In the following example the teacher starts the exercise and asks the first question.

Example 6:

- |    |     |   |
|----|-----|---|
| 1  | T   | and please take your notebook Samuli↑                   |
| 2  | T   | (1) [an:d you need a pencil] (0.5) so, number one.      |
| 3  | LM4 | [ mikä on sper::m ]                                     |
| 4  | LM1 | [ (xx) keski-aika ]                                     |
| 5  | LM2 | ((xx))  |
| 6  | T   | [how many bones does the giraffe have in its neck,]     |
| 7  | LM2 | [ ((xx)) ]  |
| 8  | LM1 | [ (xxx) ]   |
| 9  | T   | and now you [(0.5) just put] your own [(0.5) guess.]    |
| 10 | LM2 | [((xx)) ]   |
| 11 | LM3 | [liro, minne] sää                                       |
| 12 | LM3 | heitit taas sen kynän.                                  |
| 13 | LF3 | bones   |
| 14 | T   | kuinka monta: luuta.(0.5) kirahvilla on täällä niskassa |

The teacher has just given the instructions to the task and in line 1 she asks the learners to take out their notebooks. A learner is not paying attention and the teachers



tries to get his attention by calling him by his name. In line 2 she reminds the learners that they also need a pencil and then she moves on to the exercise itself. Some learners talk to each other silently and ask for some words in the exercise. In line 6 the teacher reads the first question out loud and then instructs the learners to answer (line 7). There is some talk in the classroom in between and then after a few seconds the teacher translates the question she just read into Finnish (line 14). In this exercise English is the main language of the activity and Finnish has the role of helping the learners to understand the question. However, in addition to translating, the teacher gives some instructions in Finnish, too, during the actual activity because it is taking too long for some learners to start with it, as can be seen in the following example.

Example 7:

1	T	tohon laitat nopeesti oikeet vastaukset,[ teillä menee ]
2	LM	[ (xx) ]
3	LM4	[ kato ]
4	T	(0.5) menee vähän liian kauan näissä hommissa yleensä=
5	LM2	[ mikä sivu se on ]=
6	LM1	[ mä en löydä mun ]
7	T	=[viiskytneijä] (1) [and number two↑ ]
10	LM1	[ vihkoo ]
11	LF2	[ eiks tossa on ne vastaukset ]
12	LM1	[ hei, ]
13	LM3	[ ((laughs)) ]
14	T	niistä valitset niist vastauksista yhden. [(0.5) so you (0.5) ]
15	L	[(xxx) ]
16	LM4	[ (xxx) ]
17	T	choose one of the answers, what you think it's right

The teacher disciplines some learners in Finnish (lines 1 and 4) as it is taking too long for them to answer because they are not fully concentrated on the task. One learner is still confused about what page they are on and the teacher gives the page number in Finnish in line 7. Then she switches to English to go on with the exercise. There is still some confusion among the learners about answering and the teacher switches back to Finnish in line 14 to instruct a learner how to answer. Then she immediately switches to English and repeats the instructions (lines 14 and 17). Thus, English is the main language of carrying through the exercise and Finnish is used to

help learners by either translating the questions or by giving instructions. Disciplinary comments were also given in Finnish.

After the learners have answered the questions, the correct answers are checked by listening to the tape. The teacher gives instructions to this activity in English and then after the listening also checks if they got the questions right in English. Then they start with the project which the teacher instructs first in English and then in Finnish. The organization of the work then happens in Finnish, i.e. who works with whom and what their topic will be.

To sum up, when looking at the amount of each language used in this secondary school double period it seems that Finnish is a slightly more dominant language used for interaction. During grammar instruction English is mainly the target of instruction. During other kinds of activities English is used alongside Finnish to give instructions. English was the dominant language when working with the text. That includes instructing the listening activity as well as most of the tasks related to the text. The only part of working with the text that took place mainly in Finnish was the activity in which the teacher checked if the learners had understood the text. Code-switching was more present when the teacher's language choice was English. Thus, the teacher seemed to switch more often from English to Finnish, when English was the choice of language for the activity, than the other way around.

### **7.3 Upper Secondary School Lessons**

The other double period on my data is from the third English course in Upper secondary school. The third course is taken during the first year and the group is learning English as an A1-language. The size of the group, as it is, is probably a little smaller than the average upper secondary school English groups.

The double period consists of two major themes: grammar about adjectives and a text and exercises related to the theme of working life. The lesson starts with checking the homework. After this there is a short oral presentation by a group of four boys,

which is then evaluated orally by the rest of the group. Then they move on working with the new text called *Step up to the working world*. Before listening to the text the group does an exercise in which the meaning of some words related to the text is explained. The text is then listened to twice and there is an exercise with questions related to the text. In addition to this text, the group listens to another one about how to make a good CV. They also practise writing their own CV's at the end of the double period.

Around the middle of the double period they move on to grammar. The grammar theme of this lesson is related to adjectives. First they talk about the right order of adjectives when there are several with the same referent, then using adjectives in the place of nouns and finally about adjectives referring to nationalities. The teacher gives grammar exercises as homework. Then they move back to the working life – theme and into making their own CV's. The double period ends, and the teacher tells the class what they are going to do the next time.

#### **7.4 Teacher's Language Choice in Upper Secondary School Lessons**

When examining how the teacher uses the two available languages one would assume that English is the prevailing language in this double period. The first impression was that this teacher uses a lot more English than the secondary school teacher. However, the result is that 51% of the speech of the upper secondary school teacher is, in fact, Finnish and only 49% English. This means that Finnish is used less than in the secondary school lesson but the amount of Finnish is still somewhat surprising. Finnish is used extensively during grammar instruction and there are long sequences of Finnish towards the end of the lessons when the learners are working individually and writing their CV's.

As the first lesson starts one learner still enters the classroom. He is late and the teacher admonishes him about it. Then there is some small talk about the weather. The language used is English. However, the teacher uses some Finnish during the

beginning of the class too, as a response to some learners' turns as in this example, when the teacher is responding to a learner's statement.

Example 8:

- |   |     |                                     |
|---|-----|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | LM9 | jäi reppuki vielä (en) (xx)         |
| 2 | T   | jäikö?                              |
| 3 | LM9 | °no jäi°                            |
| 4 | LM9 | se o Heinolassa                     |
| 5 | T   | huh (1) £ sulla menee aika heikosti |

The first actual activity is checking the homework which entails grammar exercises which are checked from the transparency. During this they also listen to a song. The teacher uses mostly English in this activity, although there are some reproachful comments in Finnish, for example when a learner does not do anything. These comments are not, thus, directly related to the exercises, but to the overall performance of this one learner in the language lesson. In the following example, the teacher reacts to the fact that this learner is not doing anything. This starts a sequence in Finnish between the teacher and the student, too, in which they argue whether or not the learner should study and whether or not the vocabulary learner in the lessons is useful or not.

Example 9:

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | T   | °(etköhän) sää Timo vähä <b>jotain</b> voisit tehdä° |
| 2 |     | (1)  |
| 3 | LM5 | hmmm (1) ehhhh                                       |
| 4 | T   | ei tuo sun sanakoe ainakaan vakuuttanu               |
| 5 | LM5 | eikö   |
| 6 | T   | @ <b>ei todellakaan</b> @                            |

In line 1 the teacher comments that the learner could in fact do something. The others are checking the exercise and this particular student just sits there. The learner then says no (line 3). The teacher says that a previous vocabulary test was not particularly convincing of the learner's skills (line 4). The learner asks for confirmation of the previous (line 5) by saying *eikö* (*wasn't it?*) to which the teacher responds in line 6 with some exaggeration or animation in her tone of voice that it surely was not. After

this the reprimand goes on for some time. The student does not accept it which can be observed that he comments on everything the teacher says. The sequence ends as the teacher is ready to move on to check another exercise. At this point she switches to English and asks if the class is done checking the previous exercise.

Next the teacher wants to go through one of the exercises orally. In this exercise there are multiple possible answers. The teacher asks the learners questions in English. She gets some answers but the learners seem a little reluctant to participate in this and the teacher stops after two questions after which they move on to the next activity which is an oral presentation by a group of boys. This presentation is naturally held in English and the teacher also uses English in this apart from a few comments in Finnish. After the presentation they do an oral evaluation of it in English. In the following example the boys' presentation has just ended. The teacher then starts the evaluative part and asks for comments from the other learners.

Example 10:

- 1 T OKAY YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE  
 2 LM oliha  
 3 T [(x) ]  
 4 LM(5) [(x) sul oli] vielä yks juttu=  
 5 LM(1) =nii oliki  
 6 T SHUT UP YOU GUYS THERE  
 ((T points at students))  
 ((T gaze at the boys at the right side of the class))  
 7 T your comments please  
 8 LM(5) (m[itähä tuo yks] (x)  
 9 T [LISTEN ]  
 ((T points with left at the boys gaze at them))  
 10 T listen (1)  
 ((T points with left towards the girls sitting at the back of class,  
 gaze towards the same direction))  
 11 T Eveliina what- what do you say about it

The teacher asks for comments in line 1. However, there is some noise and restlessness in the classroom. The boys that held the presentation are still talking and the teacher asks them to shut up (line 6). The teacher's gestures and expression show that although she surely means that the learners should be quiet this strong expression is also meant somewhat humorous. This activity moves on as the teacher

asks for individual learners to say their comments. There are no volunteers to speak so the teacher gives out the turns.

After this the group starts working with a text the theme of which is *Step up to the working world*. First, they go through some words and phrases which the teacher asks the class to translate into Finnish. This is done in English. The teacher uses single words of Finnish.

Example 11:

- |   |       |                                    |
|---|-------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | T     | Jukka? (.) what's an applicant (.) |
| 2 | T     | any idea?                          |
| 3 | LM7   | se on se hakemus °tai (x)°         |
| 4 | T     | no:                                |
| 5 | T     | it's not [hake]mus                 |
| 6 | LM(7) | [(x) ]                             |
| 7 | LF    | hakija                             |
| 8 | T     | hakija (.)                         |
| 9 | T     | APPLICATION (1) <is hakemus> (1)   |

In this example the teacher asks for the Finnish translation of the word *an applicant*. She names the learners she wants to answer. A learner answers in line 3 but the answer, although it is close, is not correct. The teacher refuses the answer (line 4) and states that it is not *hakemus*. Another learner gives it a go (line 7). The teacher repeats the answer in line 8, which is a sign that it was correct. She then also gives the English word for the incorrect answer given by the first learner. As can be seen, the language of this activity is English. There are some Finnish words, which is natural because the activity is translation. The interaction itself, however, is done entirely in English.

After this they listen to the text twice during which the learners are supposed to find answers to some questions, which are probably in English, in their book. The teacher uses some Finnish in this point, because she is having some trouble with the CD-player (This example is discussed in Chapter 8.5, Example 16). After the listening they go through the answers to these questions in English. Then they listen to another text which entail instructions how to make a good CV. Before listening the teacher again asks for the translation of some phrases and words in English. The language of

interaction is English all the way through these two activities. There are again some single words of Finnish as the activities include translating. The teacher may either give the correct answers, when there are none from the learners, or verify the correct answers by repeating the correct Finnish translations, in the similar way as in Example 11.

Then the group starts with the other major theme of this double period: adjectives. Grammar instruction is done in Finnish, apart from the necessary English examples. The adjectives are talked about from three perspectives: the order of several adjectives before a noun, using adjectives as nouns and the use of nationality words. First, they do an exercise related to the correct adjective order together, teacher leading the task. After this the teacher makes use of the overhead projector and introduces the topic of adjectives as nouns. They go through some important points and examples after which they talk about some basics of words related to nationalities. The teacher still uses Finnish only for interaction. The following example is from an exercise in which the learners should place the adjectives in the correct order. The exercise is teacher-led and done orally.

Example 12:

- |   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| 1 | LM3 | =no (.) big modern (0.5) /keramik veis/         |
| 2 | T   | mm big modern ceramic (1) vase (0.5)            |
| 3 | T   | that's it                                       |
| 4 |     | (1)   |
| 5 | T   | oisitteko toiset tehny sama järjestyksen (1)    |
| 6 | T   | (ne on vaan) kolme .hh                          |
| 7 | T   | mites eh kolmosta kokeillaan (1.5)              |
| 8 | T   | mites tästä (.) tässä pitää vähä järjestää sitä |
| 9 | T   | six chairs nii vähä mu-                         |

In line 1 a learner gives an answer to the task. There pronunciation of *ceramic vase* is not quite correct. The teacher repeats the answer in line 2 with the correct pronunciation. This already verifies that the answer was correct but there is also a more apparent verification in line 3. The teacher uses English at this point but then returns to Finnish in line 5 to ask if the other learners would have used the same order. Then the teacher moves to the next point (line 7) and comments on that point. She refers to the part of the sentence the learners should pay attention to by reading

the words out loud in line 9. Thus, English is present all the time as it is the target of learning. Finnish is, however, the language of interaction for the most part, apart from very few exceptions such as line 3 of the previous example.

Next, the teacher suggests that they have a quiz in the following lesson about nationalities. One learner opposes the suggestion and he for his part then suggests that they should have a quiz that would last 30 minutes during which the learners were to write every word they know beginning with a certain letter. That is not a very serious suggestion and the teacher does not also treat it as one. After this the teacher switches to English to give instructions to the next task.

The last part of the double period is writing a CV. There is a lot of code-switching in this last part of the double period. The teacher starts with English and uses more and more Finnish towards the end of the lesson. To start with, the instructions to the activity are given in English. Later on some additional instructions are given in either Finnish or English. Thus, this activity could be treated as a bilingual one. As the teacher is circling around in the classroom and helping the learners she switches codes quite often. The teacher may address the whole class as well as individual learners in either Finnish or English.

Example 13:

- |    |       |   |
|----|-------|---|
| 1  | T     | an if you s- uhh intend to spend some time <b>abroa::d</b>  |
| 2  | T     | maybe you can pick up an exotic language (0.5)              |
| 3  | T     | to your list of languages                                   |
| 4  | LM(5) | (se oli kaikki[en] (xx)=                                    |
| 5  | T     | [an so on   |
| 6  | LM(1) | [=(xxx) [mikä on (xx ((ENG))) (too much space of publising) |
| 7  | LM(5) | (x) xx ((FIN)) (peesmäkkiä)                                 |
| 8  | LM(5) | sit se haluu kahen tomnose                                  |
| 9  | LM1   | /ekse/  |
| 10 | LM1   | mitä o <excellent>  |
| 11 | LM    | ((laughter))  |
| 12 | LM5   | lue lehteä  |
| 13 | T     | täs on- a dictionary  |

In this example the class is working on writing their own CV's. In line 1 the teacher addresses the whole group and gives some advice in English on what they can write



in them. There is a lot of talk going on in the classroom during this activity as the learners talk to each other and help each other. A learner asks for the Finnish translation of a word. The teacher hands out a dictionary to the learner and in line 13 one can see that she starts in Finnish and then in mid-sentence she switches to English and ends the sentence.

The following example is from a later point in this activity. The teacher circles around and helps the learners. She then realizes that the learners probably do not know the English words for, e.g. different kinds of university degrees and such. She, thus, gives some words in English that the learners can use under the headline education in their CV's. She addresses the whole class and she uses Finnish apart from the English terms.

Example 14:

- |   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| 1 | T  | nii et SINNE EDUCATION voi laittaa sitte (0.5) nää yliopistot ja |
| 2 | T  | (0.5) polytechnic ja   |
| 3 | LF | jos [(joskus) (xx) (lapset)                                      |
| 4 | T  | [tutkinnot ja tällasta   |

One more example is from the same activity and it takes place after the previous example. The teacher is helping a learner who has trouble with the vocabulary.

Example 15:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | T | or picking [up strawberries                |
| 2 |   | (5) ((there's lots of quiet talk))         |
| 3 | T | pick up                                    |
| 4 | T | strawberries                               |
| 5 | T | (blueberries)                              |
| 6 |   | (1.5) ((there's lots of overlapping talk)) |
| 7 | T | stuff like that                            |

The teacher gives the English translations to the words the learner asked in line 1. She repeats it in line 3 as the learner is writing it down. In this example the teacher uses English to address a single learner. After this there comes another question from another learner and the teacher switches to Finnish to help him with his problem. All

in all, there is no clear division of labour in this exercise between the two languages. The teacher code-switches a lot and she may use either of the two languages to address the whole group as well as individual learners.

The CV writing is the final activity of the double period. To end the lesson the teacher tells the learners what they are going to do in the following lesson.

Example 16:

1	T	no nii ens kerran ohjelmahan on kaikilla selvillä
2		elikkä (.) jatketaa (1) tuo
3		application (0.5) letters that <b>work</b> (.)
4		nii kattelkaa se teksti siel↑tä
5		me vähän käsitellään sitä mut ei me nyt enää mitää hakemuskirjettä
6		ruveta kirjottaa (0.5) ja koska meillä o studiovuoro
7		nii tässä sopii erittäin hyvin täällä on semmone (1) interaktiivinen harjotus että
8		sielä on pauseja ja ja (.)
9		te reagoitte ja me voiaa nauhottaa sit et me voiaa ottaa pariin kertaan
10		ku meillä on kielistudiovuo↑ro (0.5)
11		ja ne kielioppitehtävät eikä muuta (.)
12	T	ja ens (0.5) maanantain tunnille
13		new lines of work
14		jatketaan työteemalla
15		<kappale kahdeksan> jos mä en muista sanoo tuola studiossa
16		(1) ((there's lots of talk))
17	T	ja (.) hei tehkää lo- nämä loppuun nää äsken mitä alotettiin
18		nii luetaan niitä toinen toisillemme minkälaisia (1.5)
19		minkälaisia teistä [oli tullu siihen] mennessä ja=

The teacher uses English in this example only to refer to the English names of two texts (lines 3 and 13). Otherwise the language she uses to end the lesson is Finnish.

## 7.5 Comparison and Contrast

Making a comparison between these two lessons is rather easy because similar kind of activities were included in the both lessons. There is grammar instruction and textbook work with activities. Additionally, many tasks are similar as in both double periods there are teacher-led tasks as well as individually performed tasks during which the teacher circles around to help the learners.

Firstly, when examining the amount of each language used during the lessons the result is rather surprising compared to the expectations. It was to be expected that Finnish is present quite extensively in the secondary school lesson. The surprising element was that the difference between upper secondary school is not so great. The result based on the word-count method used was that the teacher used Finnish in the secondary school lessons 60% of the time and in the upper secondary school lessons 51% of the time. When comparing how long the learners have learned English, there is a significant difference. The secondary school class has learned it for less than 3 years whereas the upper secondary school group has learned English for seven years.

When looking at the language choice of these two teachers in more detail there are some significant differences as well as there are several similarities. In starting the lesson there are both similarities and differences in the teachers' language choices. In the secondary school lesson there is actually no clear start to the lesson in the traditional sense. The teacher does not greet the whole group at all. There is, however, the possibility that this has happened before the recording started. The upper secondary school teacher uses mainly English to start the lesson, e.g. there is small talk in English. The secondary school teacher uses Finnish apart from greeting the one learner entering the classroom a bit later than the other. This difference can be explained when examining what actions take place at the beginning of each lesson. The secondary school teacher talks about the verb test which is a grammar topic. The upper secondary school teacher starts with small talk. Both teachers use English in greetings, however. Additionally, the upper secondary school teacher also uses English at the beginning when addressing a single learner as does the secondary school teacher when talking about the verb test with a single learner.

The main difference in the two teachers' language choices is in giving instructions to tasks. In secondary school the teacher often uses both languages either so that she repeats the instructions or adds to them. There are cases in which instructions are given only in Finnish but only few cases in which the instructions are given only in English. In the upper secondary school the instructions are mostly given in one language, either Finnish or English. There is only one case in which both languages are used and in that situation they are moving from one activity to another, i.e. from working with a text to grammar, and the teacher's choice of language is different for

these two activities. I will return to this case in the code-switching chapter, in Section 8.1. Secondly, checking if the learners have understood e.g. the text is done in Finnish in secondary school. In upper secondary school a similar kind of an exercise was gone through in English.

There are many similarities in the language choice of these two teachers. Firstly, grammar is taught only in Finnish. The role of English is the target of instruction. There may be some comments in English, such as short feedback or discourse markers, but other than that the language of interaction is Finnish. Secondly, the textbook work is done in English in both classes. The teacher gives instructions to listening, doing exercises etc. in English. However, when checking understanding of the text the upper secondary school teacher uses English whereas the secondary school teacher uses Finnish. Thirdly, there is no clear difference when the teacher is helping learners to do exercises and activities in both lessons. There is a lot of code-switching and the teachers may in different situations reply to questions by learners either in English or in Finnish. This chapter provided some insight into the language use of the two teachers. In the following chapter the different cases of code-switching are discussed in more detail.

## 8 FUNCTIONS OF CODE-SWITCHING

In this chapter I will examine the functions of code-switching in both double periods. The analysis is divided into sections according to the types of code-switching cases found. In these sections the function of each code-switching case is discussed. In this part of analysis the data are treated as a whole meaning that there is no comparison between the two double periods.

### 8.1 Code-Switching and Topic Change

One of the most examined features of code-switching is its relation to topic. In the classroom topic change can signal the change of activity or pedagogical focus. This kind of change in the focus is a potential place for changing the language used. In other words, the language choice changes, too. Auer (1988: 199) refers to topic change as part of discourse-related switching, i.e. code-switching that provides cues for the organization of on-going talk. Cases in which code-switching relates to a change in topic are discussed in this section.

The first example is from upper secondary school. The sequence occurs around the middle of the double period and the group has just finished talking about the new text they have read and listened to. The teacher says that they are going to do their own CV's at some point possibly during this lesson but first they are going to talk about grammar. The example takes place at the boundary of two different activities and pedagogical focuses and the code-switch also reflects that change.

Example 1:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | T | but so you <b>MAY</b> have time to do this during this lesson |
| 2 | T | too but FIRST (.) WE HAVE TO CONTINUE (0.5)                   |
| 3 | T | WITH GRAMMAR BECAUSE I THINK WE ARE IN A                      |
| 4 | T | (.) BIT OF A HURRY we don't have so many                      |
| 5 | T | LESSONS left okay we'll take some grammar                     |
| 6 | T | first an then continue with your cee vees                     |
| 7 |   | (3) ((there's talk))  |
| 8 | T | otetaan tähän väliin siis kielioppia ja sitte lopputunnista   |

9 T jos jää aikaa niin saatte aloittaa niitä ceeveetä että  
 10 T ceeveitä (1) adjektiivin paik↑ka

In lines 1-3 the teacher introduces the next focus of the lesson which is related to grammar. Then she explains the group's situation in this course and the reason for hurrying up with this topic, i.e. that they do not have that many lessons left. Then in lines 5-6 she repeats that they will first take some grammar and then continue with the working life theme by writing CV's. During her turn in these lines the teacher first places the CD they have just listened to back to its case and then she takes an empty transparency and places it on the overhead projector. There is also some talk in the classroom during the teacher's instructions. There is a small pause after the English instructions during which some learners still talk in the classroom. The teacher switches to Finnish in line 8 and she repeats in Finnish what she has just said in English.

The language choices of the two activities, talking about a text and talking about grammar, are different in this case. The situation, thus, creates a boundary not only between two different topics and activities, but also between the language choices of these two topics. As already pointed out, topic change is a very common place for a code-switch to occur. However, what makes this case interesting is the repetition of the message in both languages. Repetition as part of code-switching is used quite a lot in the secondary school double period, this is discussed further in Section 8.3, but in the upper secondary school lessons it is much rarer. In fact, this is the only case in the upper secondary lessons of this data when the teacher repeats exactly the same message in both languages one after another. The function of repetition in this case is not to elaborate the message by translating it, because there is no reason to assume that the students did not understand the English message. Instead, the function of repetition seems to be more tied to the topic change. This extract occurs at the boundary of two different activities and two different choices of language. Repetition here provides a transition from one activity to another as the language changes at the same time, too. After the example the teacher introduces the grammar topic and tells what they are going to do. So the actual lead-in to the new topic begins with the

announcement of the topic in line 10. The language is all Finnish from there on with the exception of providing examples.

The next example is also from upper secondary school. In this situation the group has just finished the grammar topic and they are about to move on to writing their CV's. The last part of grammar has been nationality words and the teacher suggests that they should have a quiz the next time. Some learners disagree with this suggestion and one learner has a suggestion of his own which actually cannot be taken seriously, i.e. that is that they should spend half an hour thinking of words and writing down all the words in English they know beginning with a certain letter. There is nothing wrong with the activity itself but the suggestion of spending half an hour with it indicates that this is not a serious suggestion. The teacher comments the suggestion very briefly and announces that they should start with the next activity.

Example 2:

- |   |    |   |                  |
|---|----|---|------------------|
| 1 | T  | no katotaan ny  |                  |
| 2 | T  | [(minkäläinen tässä se on) ]                              |                  |
| 3 | LM | [mulla menee viessä minu]utissa kaikki=                   |                  |
| 4 | T  | =NO NIIN JA SITTE ALOTETAAN SITÄ CEEVEETÄ                 | ((there's talk)) |
| 5 | T  | the cee vee your passport to the world of work (1.5)      |                  |
| 6 | T  | a:nd (.) so (.) you have to (0.5) imagine something       |                  |
| 7 | T  | >you h-< if you haven't <b>worked</b> very much an if you |                  |
| 8 | T  | don't have any qualifications so you can (1) imagine      |                  |
| 9 | T  | yourself as   |                  |

The teacher's comment to the learner's suggestion is in lines 1-2 (*We'll see what it'll be like*). In line 4 the teacher introduces the next task which she has already talked about before talking about the grammar and she browses the book at the same time and turns to a new page. The code-switch occurs in line 5 as the teacher announces the topic in English. At that time she looks at the book in front of her and it is possible and even probable that she is citing the book by reading the topic out loud in line 5. In lines 6-9 she then continues by giving instructions on what should be done in English and while talking she turns the overhead projector off during line 6. This example is quite similar to the previous one. This case, too, occurs at the boundary of two pedagogical focuses as well as two different choices of language. The last line in

Finnish, that is line 4, orients the students to a change in topic and it creates a link between the two activities as the language changes.

The final example of code-switching related to topic change is from secondary school. In this case the class has listened to a text about film-making in Africa after which the teacher has posed some questions about the contents of it in Finnish. The last question is posed in lines 1-2 of this example. Then they move on to do other exercises related to the text and the teacher starts giving instructions for this in English at the end of the example.

Example 3:

1	T	elikkä siitä oli seurauksena että (1) seuraava filmiryhmä
2	T	lähti vasta millonka [Afrikkaan ]
3	LM4	[uh parin ] kahenkymmenen
4	LM1	[kahenkymmenen] vuoden päästä
5	LM3	<b>kahenkymmenen</b>
6	T	kahdenkymmenen [vuoden päästä]
7	LM1	[mää sanoinkin ] kahenkymmenen
8	LM1	[vuoden päästä]
9	LM3	[ai jaa ] mää [kuulin että] parin vuoden päästä=
10	T	[ okay ]
11	LM1	=jaa.
12	T	very good indeed
13	T	there are a couple of exercises about this story (0.5)
14	T	in your (1) work books

In line 10 the teacher switches codes first by using the discourse marker *okay*. Then in line 12 the teacher makes an evaluating comment during which she looks at her book. This gesture and the fact that a task has been completed indicate that this comment is not targeted to any specific learner. It can, thus, be interpreted as an overall evaluation of the previous task. In lines 13 and 14 the teacher starts giving instructions on what to do next.

Similar to the previous examples, in this case there is a connection between the code-switch and a change in topic and the choice of language. The evaluative turn in line 12 puts an end to the previous task and offers a transition to the next one. There is no indication of topic change before the code-switch and the actual switch occurs right



before introducing the next topic and the evaluation links it to the previous task. The switch itself is a cue that a new topic is likely to be introduced and the discourse marker in line 10 at the point of the switch reinforces this presumption about a new task which is then proved to be right in line 13.

In all of the cases where code-switching is involved in moving on to another topic there is some indication of beginning a new task either before the switch or at the point of the switch. In both examples from upper secondary school the following task is already introduced in the language used during the previous task. Thus, the switch occurs after the new topic has already been introduced. In the last example there is no hint about topic change before the code-switch but the actual switch then provides the hint according to which the following topic change can be predicted. Code-switching can be used as a tool to indicate topic change because it creates quite a clear boundary between the two activities. In the data code-switching appeared at the boundary of two activities only when the teacher's language choices of the two activities were different. If there was no change in the choice of language when moving on from one topic to another, no code-switching occurred either. Next, cases of code-switching related to evaluation are examined.

## **8.2 Feedback**

Giving feedback is a significant feature of classroom interaction. It is an essential part of the IRF-sequence. In the data there were some cases in which the function of code-switching was related to evaluation either as a part of the IRF-sequence or in some other way, e.g. giving feedback to the whole group at the end of an activity. In this section I will discuss these cases.

This first example from secondary school includes code-switching cases related to evaluation given by the teacher as part of the IRF-sequence. The group is checking a homework exercise in which the learners had to form sentences with the past simple form. The teacher mostly uses Finnish in this activity. This sequence occurs around

the middle of the checking activity and a few learners have already answered. The teacher assigns the turn to the next learner in line 1.

Example 4:

- 1 T okay↑ (0.5) no sit, Samuli.  
 2 (3)  
 3 LM3 mikä se oli, [ page viiskytviis]  
 4 T [ fifty-five ]  
 5 T mm  
 6 (2)  
 7 LM3 [mikä se oli ]  
 8 LM [(x) kaksnelonen]  
 9 LM4 kaksnelonen  
 10 LM4 se neljäs  
 11 LM3 mm. (0.5) they didn't speak Finnish, they only (0.5) s- (0.5)  
 12 LM3 **spoke** English=  
 13 T =mm-h↑ (0.5) right↑ (0.5) sitte=  
 14 LM2 =u:h (0.5) I didn't make coffee I: **made** tea=  
 15 T =good.  
 16 LM1 we didn't eat anything in: the morning we only:  
 17 LM1 (0.5) ate in the afternoon.=  
 18 T =mm-h↑ seven (1) mites:=  
 19 LF3 =I didn't meet any people, I only met my old °friends°  
 20 T any new people I only met nonni↑ ei yhtään hassumpaa.

The next learner in line has been doing something else while the other learners have taken their turns to answer. The learner is confused about which page the exercise is found in, and in line 3 as he asks for the page number. He looks at the board, sees the page number there and then immediately answers himself. The teacher already answers to him, too, by providing the page number in English at the same time. There is still some confusion about which exercise they are talking about and which sentence he should read as he asks *mikä se oli* (*which one was it again*) in line 7. Another learner tells him the number of the exercise and the sentence number (lines 9 and 10) and then he finally reads the answer out loud in lines 11 and 12. An evaluative turn by the teacher then follows in line 13. The teacher confirms that the answer is correct first with a minimal response which is then immediately followed by a more explicit evaluation, *right*. During this turn the teacher writes the correct verb form on the board. Then the teacher continues by starting to assign the next turn to another learner. She indicates who should be next by looking at the learner. The

learner immediately produces an answer which is confirmed as correct by the teacher's feedback in line 15. The exercise goes on as another learner produces an answer right after that in lines 16 and 17. The teacher accepts the answer with a minimal response in line 18. Then in the same line she continues in English by pointing out the number of the next sentence after which she starts to assign the turn to the next learner in Finnish by saying *mites (how about)*. The next learner produces an answer in line 19. There was a word missing in the answer and the teacher completes it and then gives feedback in Finnish in line 20. This feedback is not part of the IRF-sequence, because the teacher implies that she is ending the task as she says *nonni (alright)* which is followed by the feedback. The evaluation seems to have the function of ending the task and giving feedback to the group

In this example there are three feedback turns which include explicit evaluation (lines 13, 15 and 20) and some others with minimal responses. The teacher uses Finnish to assign turns and to help the learners. However, the activity is bilingual because English is used for other purposes besides repeating or providing the correct answers. Before the evaluations in lines 13 and 15 the teacher has already used English in line 4 when answering the question about the page number. On the one hand the code-switches in lines 13 and 15 can be seen as part of classroom routine talk, since giving feedback is definitely part of classroom routines and this can easily be done in the target language. However, there is no reason why the teacher could not use English in this exercise when assigning turns to learners or use Finnish to give feedback. On the other hand, then, code-switching gives the evaluation certain emphasis as those turns stand out from the rest of the interaction. Additionally, as the answers given are in English the teacher's use of English aligns with the language of the response turns. Üstunel and Seedhouse (2005: 321) point out that affiliation and disaffiliation in the language classroom are expressed with alignment. For example learners can show alignment with the teacher's pedagogical focus by answering with the language demanded by the task. In this case, the teacher's language choices (lines 13 and 15) shows sequential alignment with the previous turn as there is no turn-sequential code-switch between the teacher's and the learner's turns. In line 13 there is a turn-internal code-switch, which appears after the evaluation, as the teacher assigns the next turn. Considering the whole activity, Finnish is mainly used for assigning turns and thus the evaluative turn in line 15 deviates from the teacher's

main language choice for the activity. However, when looking at the subsequent turns there is neither turn-internal nor turn-sequential code-switch in line 15 as both the previous and the following turns are in alignment with the teacher's language choice.

The second example is also from the secondary school lessons. The class has checked the homework after which the teacher has brought up the past tense forms of the verb *to be*. After they have gone through the forms together, they do an exercise in which the learners have to choose the correct form from four alternatives marked by letters a-d. The teacher has already asked some questions and in this example the teacher asks another question from the exercise and a learner answers. The teacher expects the learners to produce a translation of each sentence instead of just saying the correct letter as can be noticed in the example.

Example 5:

1	T	oliko opettaja vihainen
2		(1)
3	LM2	ainahan se
4	LF2	°siihen tulee (1) aa°
5	T	yes↑ niin tulee aa mutta mites sä tekisit lauseen

The question to be answered is quoted in Finnish in line 1. In line 3 a learner treats the question as a real one instead of the meaning intended by the teacher, that is he answers to the actual question of whether the teacher was angry or not. The learner, whose turn it is, answers with a letter, to which the teacher responds with *yes* and thus, verifies the answer to be correct in line 5. However, the teacher continues in Finnish by requesting for the expected answer, i.e. the translation for the sentence. The teacher has previously asked for the correct letter after a learner has translated the sentence which could be the reason why the learner assumes in line 4 that she should answer by providing the correct letter.

In this activity the language choice of the teacher is Finnish. The question to be answered is posed in Finnish and most of the reply to the learner is in Finnish. However, the first feedback given to the learner who answered the question is in

English after which the teacher then verifies also in Finnish that the letter was correct. However, the answer was not exactly correct in this case because that was not the answer the teacher expected. In previous research on classroom interaction it has been found out that in the case of learner answer being incorrect the teacher rarely says that directly. In this case, the answer as such is not incorrect. The teacher first acknowledges that the learner does not have it wrong and only after that reveals what she is after. Code-switching in this case, too, gives a certain emphasis to the feedback. In addition, the verification of the correct answer comes twice in this case, first in English and then in Finnish. This gives a smooth ground to revealing that the answer, in fact, was not correct in the sense that it was not the answer the teacher was looking for.

The next example is from the same activity in the secondary school. The class is still talking about the past tense forms of *to be* and the teacher still uses mostly Finnish to carry on the activity.

Example 6:

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | T   | olivatko he [sairaita ]                          |
| 3 | LM2 | [ ((laughs)) ]                                   |
| 4 | LM2 | mm ((laughs))                                    |
| 5 | T   | olivatko <b>he</b>                               |
| 6 | LM2 | (x), >eiku< (.) mm (.) <was <i>they</i> >        |
| 7 | T   | mutta <i>they</i> -sanon kanssa                  |
| 8 | LM2 | nii↑ were <i>they</i> (.) sick=                  |
| 9 | T   | =yeah, tai ill. were they sick or were they ill. |

The teacher poses the question to be answered, i.e. translated, in line 1. The learner whose turn it is does not answer immediately so the teacher repeats the start of the sentence in line 5. This also provides a cue of what the learner should pay attention to. The learner then begins his answer in line 6 which he immediately self-corrects. However, the verb form is not correct and the teacher initiates another repair in line 7 by reminding that the subject is *they*. The learner then produces the correct answer in line 8. This is then accepted by the teacher with the English feedback, *yeah*. After this the teacher adds to the answer by providing another word that could be used and then repeats both possible answers. In line 9 the teacher uses mostly English but

there is a code-switch to Finnish, too. The feedback is given in English. Then the teacher switches to Finnish with the word *tai* (*or*) and then provides the alternative word in English. In this example, too, the teacher has used her choice of language consistently, i.e. Finnish has been her choice for interaction. The code-switch in line 9 also implies that the teacher's main language choice for the activity is Finnish because the functional morpheme *or* is in Finnish whereas the rest of the turn is in English. However, in this last turn English is also used for evaluation, i.e. English is mainly but not exclusively the target of instruction.

In the following example the feedback turn is somewhat different from the previous cases discussed, although similar kind of feedback was present in line 20 of example 4. Example 7 is also from secondary school but from a different activity. This example has already been discussed in the previous section in relation to topic change, example 3 in Section 8.1. In this situation the group has moved on to work with the text. They have listened to it and the current activity is to talk about the text with the help of some questions. The teacher asks for the questions in Finnish and the learners have to either remember the answers or to refresh their memories by finding the answers in the text. In this example the teacher poses the final question of the task after which the group moves on to a new activity.

Example 7:

1	T	elikkä siitä oli seurauksena että (1) seuraava filmiryhmä
2	T	lähti vasta millonka [Afrikkaan ]
3	LM4	[uh parin ] kahenkymmenen
4	LM1	[kahenkymmenen] vuoden päästä
5	LM3	<b>kahenkymmenen</b>
6	T	kahdenkymmenen [vuoden päästä]
7	LM1	[mää sanoinkin ] kahenkymmenen
8	LM1	[vuoden päästä]
9	LM3	[ai jaa ] mää [kuulin että] parin vuoden päästä=
10	T	[ okay ]
11	LM1	=jaa.
12	T	very good indeed
13	T	there are a couple of exercises about this story (0.5)
14	T	in your (1) work books

In line 1 the teacher poses the question which is to be answered according to the text. The first answer is provided immediately after the question. This is then followed by two other answers with the same contents. The teacher verifies all of the answers as correct by repeating the correct answer in line 6. After this two learners negotiate their answers because one of the two learners who were first to answer the previous question seems to want to justify that he had the correct answer from the beginning. One of the learners (LM3) then explains that he thought the other one had said something else. The teacher's next turn in English in line 10 is signalling that they are moving on. This could mean either another question in the same activity or starting a new activity. In this case this turns out to be a new activity which is to do some written exercises. Yet, the teacher returns to the previous activity by giving feedback in line 12. This feedback is not targeted at any specific learner and thus, it can be interpreted to mean evaluation of the group's performance in the previous task. Thus, this feedback also functions as a closure to the questioning sequence. After this the teacher continues in English to announce the next activity.

The teacher switches her choice of language in this situation as they are to move on to another topic. Before moving on the teacher concludes the previous activity with an evaluation. This is done in English although the language choice for the previous activity was Finnish. In this case, the code-switching related to evaluation does not seem to function to emphasize a correct answer since it is not feedback to any answer, and thus, not part of an IRF-sequence. Instead, this is likely to be feedback to the whole group's performance in the previous task. At the same time this functions as the concluding remark of the task and a transition to the next as the teacher intends to use English in the next task. Thus, there is only one switch unlike in the previous examples of code-switching related to evaluation and feedback. In this case the teacher does not switch back to Finnish after the feedback. This case appears at the boundary of two different language choices and it could have an effect on the choice of code for the evaluative comment.

There were two types of evaluation discussed within this section, firstly evaluation as part of the IRF-sequence and secondly, evaluation as feedback to the whole group of learners. In each case code-switching gave the feedback somewhat more emphasized status as it distinguished the feedback from the rest of the interaction in

the activity. As part of the IRF-sequence, the feedback turns also created coherence when they were uttered in the same language as the answers. Thus, the teacher's choices of language were in alignment with the language used in the response turn. In cases where the feedback was not part of the IRF-sequence it often had the function of closing an activity. This kind of feedback may or may not include code-switching. In Example 7 a code-switching appeared in this kind of context because the teacher's language choice for the following activity was different from the previous one. In the next section the connection between code-switching and translation is examined.

### **8.3 Translation and Elaboration**

One common function of code-switching is related to clarifying or elaborating a message. One way to do this is translation, which can be employed either to translate the whole message or some parts of it. In the language classroom translation is present quite often. The teacher may translate words or sentences into the target language or into L1, either in response to learners' requests or as an additional help when doing a task. Translation, in both written and spoken forms, is also a very common type of exercise in learning foreign languages. Canagarajah (1995: 186) reports on some strategies that can be employed to elaborate a message. In addition to translation, strategies such as repetition, reformulation and exemplification may be used. Repetition may be used for example in the case when the message is first heard incorrectly or the message does not receive the expected reaction right away, e.g. pupils do not react to a teacher's directive. As to code-switching, repetition and translation cannot necessarily be separated because if a code-switch combined with repetition usually also results in translation of the message. Additionally, through code-switching it can be used to emphasise the content of message as the same message is repeated in both languages. The repeated message can also be reformulated meaning that the content is not exactly in the same form although the key information of the message remains the same. Exemplification, on the other hand, means that the message is elaborated by providing examples. As far as code-switching is concerned, these other strategies are distinctive from translation because



the direction of the code-switch in these cases is most commonly from the target language to L1. Translation as part of code-switching may, however, occur in either of the two directions. In all cases the actual function of translation is not necessarily elaborative, especially when it comes to translating from the L1 into the target language. In this section the various cases of code-switching related to translation and elaboration are discussed.

This first example from secondary school is a case of quite a long sequence of translation. It is near the end of the double period and the teacher is instructing the final activity of the lesson, a project which is to be continued in the following lessons. Right before this the class has done a quiz about animals and checked the answers for that. The teacher gives instructions to the last activity in both languages.

Example 8:

- 1 T so we are going to start with the project today↑  
 2 T and you will have uh (1) ] *((there's talk in the classroom))*  
 3 T two: lessons next friday. so you can you can work  
 4 T on this project (.) next friday as well↑ and there are (.)  
 5 T eight different alternatives which (.) u:h (0.5) you  
 6 T can read through↑ and then choose one of these (.)  
 7 T **things** what you would like to do. (.) and you will  
 8 T have (.) how m- what time is it.  
 9 LF3 [Tiinan kello oli kahtakytä vaille]  
 10 LM4 [ what ti:me is it ]  
 11 T almost u:h uh (.) two lessons time to do the project.  
 12 T and here you have the (.) u:h (1) you have it in english↑  
 13 T (.) and if you look at your uh exercise book you have  
 14 T some more. so- **more** instructions (.) for there (.)  
 15 T they see for further instructions, see the exercise book.  
 16 T and you can decide (.) if you want to work (0.5) all by  
 17 T yourself↑ or (.) with a partner. it doesn't mat- matter.  
 18 LM2 [ with a partner ]  
 19 LM4 [ with ] [ a partner ] ootsää mun partneri  
 20 T [ eli, ] (1)  
 21 T [tässä ]on tämmönen [pieni menu↑] lista↑ josta valitsette  
 22 LM3 [ joo ]  
 23 LM1 [ partner ]  
 24 T yhden tehtävän↑ (0.5) alotetaan tänään↑ (0.5) ens (.)  
 25 T viikolla voidaan tehdä (0.5) katotaan tarvitaanko  
 26 T molempia tunteja sitä varten. (0.5) ja tota v- voitte *((there's talk in the classroom))*  
 27 T valita teettekö sen tehtävän yksin vai (.) pareittain.



tape. There is a lot of code-switching during this activity, although the teacher mainly gives instructions in English. The teacher has already given some instructions and in this example she is explaining how the learners should answer the questions, i.e. they should write the correct answers in their notebooks. This springs a question by one of the learners, which leads to translating some of the instructions.

Example 9:

- 1 T don't answer them here in your book because  
 2 T there are (.) others who are going to  
 3 T use the same book after you, so please (.) uh write  
 4 T the answers in your notebook.  
 5 LM1 notebook. [(xx) ]  
 6 T [ you need your notebook.]  
 7 LM4 mikä on notebook.  
 8 T vihko. (.) eli laitetaan vastaukset vihkoon ei  
 9 T tähän kirjaan

The teacher is giving instructions in lines 1-4 explaining that the learners should write the answers in their notebooks. In line 5 a learner initiates a turn by repeating the word notebook. This same learner has done the same, that is, repeated some English words the teacher has used, throughout the instructions and neither the teacher or the learner seem to adjust to this as a question for elaboration. The teacher continues by repeating that the learners need their notebooks (line 6). The word notebook has been repeated several times during the instructions. Another learner then brings up a question asking what a notebook is in Finnish. The teacher answers the question by giving the Finnish word for notebook, the beginning of line 8. The teacher continues by explaining the part of the instructions including the word notebook in Finnish once more, that is, she translates where the answers should be written into Finnish.

This case of translation is also a case of helping the learners understand the instructions. However, this is different from the first example. The key element that can be seen as the cause of the code-switch is the question by the learner. There are two basic ways in which a teacher can handle these kinds of questions in the classroom, either by giving the word in the L1 or by explaining the word in L2. In this case the teacher chose to give the Finnish equivalent. This then induces the rest

of the translation in which the teacher translates the previously given part of the instructions to Finnish.

Here is another example from the same activity as the previous one. In this situation the teacher has given the instructions to the exercise and she is now reading out loud some of the questions. In the example the first sentence is a direct quotation from the exercise book. The code-switch is then a direct translation of the question.

Example 10:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | T | how many species of insects are there      |
| 2 | T | in the world today. (0.5) kuinka monta (.) |
| 3 | T | hyönteislajia on maailmassa.               |

In this case the code-switch, which includes the translation, provides a help for understanding. Before this example the learners had asked many questions about the task, e.g. meaning of words and the teacher also has already asked for the meaning of some words. Thus, the teacher did not automatically provide the translation from the first question on but the learners started asking for clarification. Because there was something about every question the learners wanted translated or clarified, the teacher seems to want to speed things up and, thus, she quickly reads out loud the rest of the questions and gives the Finnish translations to them as in this case. In other words, although the learner inducement is not present in this example, it is likely to be a strong motive in this switch because of the numerous questions asked before.

The next example is quite different from the two previous ones because the actual function of the code-switch is not to help the learners to understand the message. The example is from the same activity, though. In this situation the teacher has read the first question and is about to read the second. In the example she is giving additional instructions to the task because there seems to be some confusion. She explains that the learners should select one of the given alternatives, that is the one that they think is correct.

Example 11:

- |   |    |  |
|---|----|--|
| 1 | T  | niistä valitset niist vastauksista yhden. (0.5) so you (.) |
| 2 | T  | [choose one of the answers, what you] [think it's right]   |
| 3 | LM | [ (xxx) ]  |
| 4 | LM | [number two. ]   |
| 5 | T  | what you think is right.                                   |

In line 1 the teacher explains that the learners should choose one of the answers. She then immediately continues by repeating the same in English in lines 1-2 and adds that they should choose the one they think is the correct answer. There was some confusion about the instructions in the classroom when the group was starting the task. Some learners asked for clarification, as in Example 9, where a learner asked for the Finnish word for notebook. Thus, the teacher has already repeated some of the instructions in Finnish before this extract. In this example the group has not yet gotten very far with the exercise and some learners are still a bit confused. Thus, the teacher gives some additional instructions first in Finnish in line 1. Then she translates them into English in lines 1-2 and also adds to the English instructions. There is still some confusion in the classroom and the teacher repeats the last part of instructions again in English in line 5. This example is exceptional in the way that often the examples of code-switching with translation appear in the opposite direction. That is, translation is used to clarify the message expressed in the target language. In this case, however, the teacher uses the L1 first after which the same message is translated to the L2. The teacher has used English to go through the exercise itself, although there is a lot of code-switching during this activity. The function of code-switching and translation in this case is not to help understanding or to clarify instructions or anything related to that kind of function. It seems to be more likely that the translation here is used as a link to return to the previously set order of language choice which was interrupted by confusion and slow reaction among some of the learners.

The next example is from the upper secondary school lesson. It has already been discussed from the point of view of topic change in Section 8.1, Example 1, and now I will take another perspective on it, i.e. by looking it as an example of code-switching and translation. The example is from around the middle of the double

period. The class has been working with the text about working-life and they are about to move on to talk about grammar. The teacher explains here what they are going to do next. She has said that the learners are going to write their own CV's and they may have time to do this during the current lesson but first they are going to do something else.

Example 12:

1	T	but FIRST (.) WE HAVE TO CONTINUE (0.5)	<i>((There's talk in the classroom throughout the teacher's instructions))</i>
2	T	WITH GRAMMAR BECAUSE	
3	T	I THINK WE ARE IN A (.) BIT OF A	
4	T	HURRY we don't have so many	
5	T	LESSONS left	
6	T	okay we'll take some grammar first	
7	T	an then continue with your cee vees	
8		(3) <i>((there's talk))</i>	
9	T	otetaan tähän väliin siis kielioppia ja sitte	
10	T	loputunnista jos jää aikaa niin saatte aloittaa	
11	T	niitä ceeveetä että	

In lines 1-3 the teacher explains what they are going to do next, which is to talk about grammar, and she further explains that they should hurry because they are running out of lessons. In lines 4-5 she again repeats that they are going to deal with grammar and then work on the CV's. There is a pause after which the teacher switches to Finnish and conveys the same message again in Finnish in lines 7-8. In this case the translation of the message is quite accurate in the sense that the same message is conveyed in both languages and the direction is from the L2 to L1.

As in the previous example, in this case, too, the function of translation is not actually to help understanding the message, although the direction of the translation could suggest that. It is not likely that the learners did not understand what the teacher has said in English because there are a lot of cases in this double period in which the language of instruction is solely English. The learners may ask for clarification but mostly the teacher still replies in English. Additionally, none of the learners show any signs of not understanding. In the situation the group is, in fact, moving on to a new activity and the teacher's choice of language is different for those two activities. The code-switch is related to the topic switch and the translation

links these activities together. Thus, the translation provides a smooth transition from one activity to another and from one language to another.

In the data there were many cases of translation which were one-word translations from one language to another meaning for example that a learner asked for Finnish or English equivalent of a word. These cases are not, however, further discussed in this study because from the interactional point of view it is difficult to find a function to the code-switch apart from providing the translation to the word. As the examples discussed in this section show, the code-switching cases of translation can be roughly divided into two different types: The ones, where the translation serves the purpose of helping understanding, and the ones, where the translation is actually tied to some other function of code-switching. When translation is used for the purpose of elaboration the direction of the switch seems to be from English to Finnish. In cases where translation had some other function, e.g. to provide a transition from topic to another or to restore the previously set order of language choice, the direction of the switch was not that meaningful. In those cases the switch itself functions as an important cue. Thus, code-switching and translation may also serve other functions apart from elaboration. Some code-switching cases may also include more than one function, e.g. a message can be partially translated, i.e. repeated or reiterated, and then further explained or elaborated. In the following section I will discuss code-switching and quotations.

## **8.4 Quotations**

Quotations often appear in interaction in which code-switching is present. It can serve as a discourse function but often it is used as a device for another function of code-switching as was the case with translations, too. According to Romaine (1989: 148) code-switching can be used to separate the quoted message from the rest of talk. This does not mean, however, that the language of the switch is the same that was used in the original situation. Code-switching simply offers a tool to distinguish a speaker's thoughts from those quoted. In the classroom quoting is mostly related to the materials used, i.e. sentences from the textbook or exercise are quoted by the

teacher or learners. In this section I will examine three cases of quotation which all spring from written materials. All of the examples are from the same activity during which the secondary school class is going through the text about film-making in Africa.

In the first example the teacher is asking questions about the contents of the text. As a help to perform this task, the teacher translates some parts of the text. In addition to translations this task involves quoting the text directly.

Example 13:

- |    |     |   |
|----|-----|---|
| 1  | T   | ei voitukaan kuvata. elikkä ne ajatteli et no okei huomenna |
| 2  | T   | sitte. (0.5) mutta siin oli vaikeuksia niitten krokotiilien |
| 3  | T   | kans koska  |
| 4  | LM3 | sinne tuli pari sataa krokotiilia, e:iku e:iku e:i=         |
| 5  | LF3 | =ne- ne tota: (0.5) [um     ]                               |
| 6  | LM3 | [hyökkäs]   |
| 7  | T   | they were very hungry and angry=                            |
| 8  | LF3 | =ai: nälkäsia ja [(0.5) ] [vihasia ]                        |
| 9  | LF2 | [vihasia]   |
| 10 | T   | [ vihasia] aivan oikein                                     |

In lines 1-3 the teacher first explains in Finnish some parts of the text which is not related to any of the actual questions. The teacher uses the Finnish discourse marker *elikkä* signalling explanation. The part that follows is not actual translation of the text but rather paraphrasing the content of the text. This is to give background to the question which she poses in line 3. The question is not in fact in the form of a question but it is presented in the form of a sentence to be continued. The teacher's turn ends with the word *koska* (*because*) which is a cue that the task is to explain why the filming group had trouble with the crocodiles. In line 4 a learner starts to produce an answer which he already himself rejects by initiating self-repair at the end of line 4. Then, in line 5, another learner starts her turn but she hesitates and cannot produce an actual answer. The first learner to answer then continues from what the second one has said. This is, however, not the answer the teacher is looking for which can be interpreted from what she says in line 7, that is that she does not evaluate the answer or give any kind of verification of the answer being correct. Instead, the teacher quotes a line from the text which the learners interpret to be



translated as can be seen on the translation suggestions in lines 8-9. The teacher accepts the answer as correct in line 10 by saying that it was correct in Finnish. This quotation which in this case includes a code-switch functions here as a help when the learners have shown signs of trouble in finding the correct answer. Thus, the teacher uses the quotation as a device to direct the learners towards the correct answer.

Here is another example that is quite similar to the first one. It is from the same activity in the secondary school lesson. The teacher poses the question to be answered in the form of a quotation.

Example 14:

1	T	ja sit siellä oli vielä (.) tämmönen et- että
2	T	[everybody] caught tropical diseases=
3	LM	[ (x) ]
4	LM2	=no kaikki sai trooppisia [semmosia tropikaalisia]=
5	LM3	[no tropikaalisia ]
6	T	=sairauksia joo

The teacher's choice of language is Finnish which can be seen in line 1 as she prepares for the part of the text that she wants the learners to focus on. She then provides the clause to be translated in line 2. In this case, too, there is no actual question or task stated. However, the learners interpret that the task is to translate the clause, which is a quotation from the text. Two learners start producing the same answer in lines 4-5. The teacher completes the answer and verifies it as correct by saying *sairauksia joo* (*diseases yes*). This also confirms that the learners' interpretation of the task was correct.

One more example from the secondary school lessons is discussed here. The group is getting ready to listen to the text about film-making in Africa. The teacher is giving instructions to listening.

## Example 15:

- 1 T harjoittele (1)  
 2 T [vieraskielisen tekstin (1) haloo ]  
 3 LM3 [ joku Tarzan näyttelijä jäi Tarzaniks loppuiäkseen ]  
 4 LM3 kun sai jonkun vähän liian kovan [(x) ]  
 5 T [harjoittele]  
 6 T [vierastekstisen] (0.5) [VIERASKIELISEN (0.5) Pekka ]  
 7 LM1 [nii (0.5) ] [se hyppii siellä vanhainkodissa (xx) ]  
 8 LM2 [ ((laughs) ) ]  
 9 T vieraskielisen [tekstin ymmärtämistä lue ] kertomus,  
 10 LM1 [ huutelee Tarzan-huutoja ]  
 11 T [kuinka paljon ] ymmärrät siitä ensi lukemalla  
 12 LM2 [((laughs) ) ]  
 13 T oheisen sanaluettelon [avulla]  
 14 LM1 [he:i ] missä mun-  
 15 LM1 (1) ai [tuossa ]  
 16 T [so you ] don't have to understand the whole story,  
 17 T not **every** word (0.5) just if you understand the idea.  
 18 T that's enough.

The teacher has used English to begin this task. Then she switches to Finnish to read out loud the Finnish instructions given in the book (line 1). The instructions are to practise understanding a text in the foreign language. The task is to read, or in this case also listen to, the text and find out how much one can understand of it with the help of a vocabulary list provided next to the text. When the quotation ends the teacher switches back to English (line 16) and she adds to the instructions. This case is exceptional because the language of the quotation is Finnish. The main reason for using Finnish in this case is the fact that the original message is in Finnish and it is quoted directly that is, the teacher reads it out loud. By doing this the teacher helps the learners to understand what the task is and the function of the quotation is to give instructions to the task. The code-switch in this case also emphasizes the message, because it is separated from the surrounding instructions. The Finnish instructions also entail the most essential part of the instructions. In a case like this the code-switch is caused by the different choices of language made by the teacher and the writers of the study book. The teacher uses English to give instructions and the writers have decided to use Finnish.

In the cases of quotation and code-switching presented here the quotations were related to a task in which the teacher either provided help for the learners in the form

of a quoted clause of the text, or she presented the actual task or the question to be answered in the form of a quotation. Thus, the quotations were used as part of performing tasks. In the upper secondary school there were no similar cases. This may be due to the fact that activities in which quotations were used in the secondary school lessons were carried out in English in the upper secondary school lessons. Thus, because the language of interaction is already English the quoted English text is not separated from the rest of interaction. Additionally, the instructions in the materials in upper secondary school are mostly in English, so cases as in Example 15 are probably rare as well. The next section will deal with code-switching cases related to solving problems of different kind.

## 8.5 Dealing with Problems

In this section I will discuss some code-switching cases in which the switch is related to a situation which is problematic in some way. The problems may be discourse related or they may be related to some other kind of trouble in the classroom, which then leads to code-switching.

The first example is from upper secondary school and related to the activity of listening to the text about working life. The teacher has introduced their topic and the group has gone through a lead-in exercise in which the meaning of some words in the text was explained. The current task is to listen to the text and then answer some questions in the book. The teacher should play the CD now, but they cannot start yet, because she has some trouble with the CD player.

Example 16:

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | T   | OKAY WE'LL LISTEN                                  |
| 2 |     | (3.5) <i>((there's quiet talk))</i>                |
| 3 | T   | and you will a- (.) answer in (.) English          |
| 4 |     | (5)  |
| 5 | T   | °okay° (1.5)                                       |
| 6 | T   | I don't have (luck this morning) I have to change= |
| 7 | LM5 | = <i>((yawning))</i>                               |
| 8 | T   | change   |
| 9 |     | (2.5)  |

10 T °(xx)°  
 11 (3) ((*there's quiet talk*))  
 12 T °mun täytyy vaihtaa [tuo°  
 13 LM5 [hei mikä sivu tää nyt o  
 14 LM (ykköne [on tehtävä)  
 15 T [<°kuus seittemä°>  
 16 T täytyy vaihtaa tää nauha

In line 1 the teacher advises the learners to listen. There is a pause during which the teacher looks for the correct CD. After this the teacher gives some additional instructions on which language the learners should use in their answers (line 3). Again there is a notable pause while the teacher is trying to play the CD. She seems to have trouble with it as indicated by the pauses and the next comment in line 6 in which the teacher states that she has no luck and that she has to change something. There is another lengthy pause during which there is quiet talk in the classroom and the teacher seems to mumble something. After this the teacher switches to Finnish and she repeats in a quiet voice that she has to change something (line 12). A learner asks the teacher for the page-number of the task (line 13). Another learner answers by telling him the exercise number and the teacher tells him the page number in line 14. Then in line 15 the teacher says that she has to change the CD. The trouble here is thus with the equipment which can already be observed in the previous turns: the fact that she is trying to play the CD and it does not start, and she makes comments such as *I don't have any luck*, and there are also notable pauses. The situation then finally leads to a code-switch in which she repeats her earlier statement. She then changes the CD and they listen to the text.

The teacher's turns in this example, apart from the first one in line 1 and the answer to a learner in line 14, are not specifically targeted at anyone. She uses quite a quiet voice and she looks at the tape recorder and her desk while speaking. The code-switch does not have any role in solving the problem but having trouble seems to be a factor in this code-switching case. In interaction participants may feel the need to avoid long pauses and often such pauses may signal trouble. In this case the teacher has just started a new activity which they are then unable to perform because of the trouble with the CD player. It seems that in this case the teacher treats long pauses as problematic as well because she keeps talking instead of silently solving the problem.

The attention of the group is fixed on the teacher because the instructions have been given and this is the point when the actual exercise should start. The fact that there is a delay in the progress of the lesson makes this situation problematic. In this case the trouble is not interactional, as in the teacher is not searching for a word or a way to express her thoughts. Nevertheless, the trouble she is having with the tape recorder and the long pauses in interaction caused by this trouble seemingly contribute to the code-switch that follows. Additionally, the teacher switches away from the language of the activity while the talk is not related to the actual task. Thus, this creates a contrast between the task that was already initiated and the sequence during which the teacher then solves the problem.

This is another example is from the same activity. The class has listened to the text once and the teacher asks if anyone feels the need to listen to it another time. One learner expresses the wish to listen to it once more and the teacher says that they are going to do that then.

Example 17:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | T | okay we'll do it °another time°                      |
| 2 |   | (5) (( <i>there's whispering in the classroom</i> )) |
| 3 | T | tää ei taas vaiha tätä <b>raitaa</b>                 |
| 4 | T | täs on tää ongelma taas (yhen)                       |

In line 1 the teacher announces that they are going to listen to it another time and she tries to play the CD. There is a very long pause lasting several seconds during which the learners talk quietly. The teacher says something to herself, too, but it is unintelligible. Then she indicates the source of trouble in line 3 which is the CD player again. She switches to Finnish to indicate the problem which is solved in a few seconds after this and they listen to the text again. Thus, in this example the problem is the same as in the previous one. However, the difference is that in this example there is no extended sequence of the teacher explaining the problem and filling in the gaps. There is one long pause, during which the teacher murmurs to herself, which is then followed by the code-switch. Again the trouble with the CD player and the delay in the progress of the lesson contribute to the code-switch and with the code-switch, the problem-solving sequence is separated from the actual task.

The third example is also from upper secondary school but the situation and the apparent problem is different than in the first two examples. In this case the trouble seems to be in deciding how to express something, which then leads to code-switching. The group is checking homework and the exercise in question is related to adjectives. The teacher first explains what the learners were supposed to do in the exercise and then she initiates the actual activity.

Example 18:

- 1 T <an then uhh> exercise **six** you were supposed to (1.5)  
 2 T find your own adjectives (°there°)=  
 3 LM =nyt vedetään niin monta sillä (putkeen) [(xx)  
 4 LM [(describe)  
 5 LM [(x) ]  
 6 T [this one]  
 7 T okay  
 8 (1.5)  
 9 LM täs ei oo mitää loppua) (x[x)  
 10 T [so what  
 11 (4.5) ((there's talk))  
 12 T (jossa) minun pitää olla **millainen**  
 13 ((points at the transparency))  
 14 T so what did you write here?

The lines 1-7 show the lead-in to checking the exercise. There are pauses in between during which some learners talk in the classroom. Before the teacher asks the first question about the exercise there is also a pause (line 8). The teacher looks at the exercise in the book and on the transparency. She then starts to ask the question in line 10 but stops in mid-sentence. There is quite a long pause after that during which some learners again are talking. The teacher takes another look at the transparency and her book. Then the code-switch appears and she poses a question in Finnish (line 12). This is not, in fact, the actual question to be answered. Instead, this seems to be some sort of aid for the learners or to herself to clear up what was supposed to be filled-in in the exercise, i.e. adjectives that describe what something is like. In line 14 the teacher poses the actual question to the learners as she wants to know what kind of answers they have.

In this example the long pauses are again indication of trouble of some sort. The teacher also starts one sentence which she does not finish and which is then followed by the code-switch. The trouble the teacher is having here does not actually indicate trouble in communication. She does not seem to be seeking for the right word. Additionally, the initiation for the switch does not come from the learners so that they would want the teacher to clarify something. During the pauses the teacher seems to be thinking about something, e.g. how to start the exercise or how to clarify what is supposed to be filled-in, because the turn with the switch then clarifies what the exercise is about or the first sentence of it at least. The way this code-switched sentence is formed is another source for the switch. This kind of sentence would be quite difficult to form in English in this same way and code-switching to Finnish then solves the problem.

Dealing with problems in interaction is a possible source for code-switching. In the first two examples the trouble was not in interaction but with something else. The third one is more close to dealing with interactive problems. However, other kinds of trouble may have its effect on the interaction and in the examples the teacher showed the need to fill the long gaps in interaction with something. This then contributed to code-switching. Next, teachers' code-switching is discussed in relation to the context of interaction, i.e. if the interaction in question is related to the pedagogical focus or not.

## **8.6 Learner-induced Code-Switching**

There were some cases of code-switching in the data that can be seen as influenced by learner's turns. The function of these switches is then to adjust to the learner's choice of code. For example, the learner may ask a question and in the reply the teacher switches to another language. Üstunel and Seedhouse (2005) use the term teacher-induced code-switching to refer to cases where the teacher's language use induces learners to switch codes. In this section I will discuss some cases where learner inducement is apparent.

First, one previous example, Example 9 (Chapter 8.3) is discussed again. In this example the group is about to start the animal quiz and the teacher is giving instructions. The teacher has just said that the learners are supposed to write the answers in their notebooks.

Example 19:

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | T   | you need your notebook.                        |
| 2 | LM4 | mikä on notebook.                              |
| 3 | T   | vihko. (.) eli laitetaan vastaukset vihkoon ei |
| 4 | T   | tähän kirjaan                                  |

In line 1 the teacher instructs one more time that the learners need their notebooks. A learner asks what a notebook is (line 2). The teacher switches to Finnish in line 3 to answer the question and she continues with the instructions in Finnish. After this the teacher continues in English to instruct that the learners should try to guess the answers and then they begin the task. The teacher switches codes to answer to the question. Thus, the switch is induced by the learner's question. The teacher continues by translating a part of the instructions into Finnish. This switch has an elaborative function.

The second example is from the upper secondary school lesson. This is the very beginning of the double period and the group is about to begin to check homework. The teacher has just said the page number and the learners are talking to each other and taking out their books.

Example 20:

- |    |       |                                     |
|----|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | T     | [do you have something to ask       |
| 2  |       | ((there's talk))                    |
| 3  | LM    | melekee=                            |
| 4  | LM(1) | =OO HILJAA [(ettei saa) (xx)        |
| 5  | LM    | [(ei se sitä ole) (xxx)             |
| 6  | LM(5) | no ei ees tullu                     |
| 7  |       | (7) ((there's talk))                |
| 8  | LM9   | jäi reppuki vielä (en) (xx)         |
| 9  | T     | jäikö?                              |
| 10 | LM9   | °no jäi°                            |
| 11 |       | se o Heinolassa                     |
| 12 | T     | huh (1) £ sulla menee aika heikosti |



13 LM (häly)  
 14 (2.5) ((*there's talk*))  
 15 LM(1) joo tästä ei pääse (x[x] )  
 16 T [°aika] hei[kosti°]  
 17 LM(5) [fuck ]  
 18 (1)  
 19 T okay today Jukka?

In line 1 the teacher wonders if a learner has something to ask but no question follows. There is a lot of talk in the classroom while the learners are talking to each other, as can be seen in lines 3-6. The teacher is silent for about ten seconds. Then in line 8 a learner announces in Finnish that he left his backpack somewhere. The teacher, who has used English until this point, switches to Finnish to ask for verification with *jäikö* (*did you* [really leave your backpack]?). The learner answers in the affirmative and specifies that it is in Heinola. The teacher then comments with a smile that he is not doing very well, this being said with an amused tone. The side-sequence ends, and the teacher returns to her previous choice of language to ask how another learner is doing (line 19). In this case the learner-inducement is not a question of not understanding, e.g. the learner does not ask the teacher to clarify anything. Instead, the learner makes an announcement to which the teacher reacts. This reaction then follows the learner's choice of language. The code-switching contributes to separating this side-sequence from the actual carrying on the lesson plan or the pedagogical activities.

In sum, learner-inducement means ways in which learners induce teacher to switch codes. There are two ways in which learners can do this: either by asking for clarification or by using a language choice that contradicts with that of the teacher. However, the latter case does not always lead to code-switching as the teacher may continue with her choice of code. This creates misalignment in the language choices of interaction as the participants use different languages. Thus, to show alignment to the language choice of the learner, the teacher may choose to code-switch, as in Example 20. In the following section code-switching is discussed from the perspective of language classroom routines and discourse that can be considered part of classroom routines.

## 8.7 Switching in and out of Pedagogical Context

There were some cases of code-switching in which the function can be seen as related to the distinction between what could be described as routine classroom talk and other kind of interaction. In this case routine classroom talk is used to refer to interaction directly related to pedagogical tasks, for instance giving instructions to or performing a task. One of Canagarajah's (1995: 189-190) findings was that when performing a task learners used L1 to talk about and to organize the task and L2 then to go through the task. In this section I will present some cases of teachers' code-switching in which some kind of distinction with the pedagogical vs. other kind of interaction can be made.

The first example is from upper secondary school. In this example there is a distinction between talk related to the task and a comment not related to the task itself. The class is about to listen to an oral presentation a group of four boys has prepared. The teacher first brings up that they had the presentation due today and asks if they have prepared for it. All of this is done in English. The boys offer to do it at that point. The teacher then welcomes them to the front of the classroom to hold the presentation while she steps away and takes a seat at an empty desk. While the boys are preparing in the front of the class the teacher gives the other students some instructions on what they are supposed to do, that is, to listen to the presentation and then comment on it afterwards.

Example 21:

- |    |       |   |
|----|-------|---|
| 1  | T     | AND THE- THE REST <b>THE</b> AUDIENCE YOU ARE SUPPOSE |
| 2  | T     | TO TO COMMENT ON THEIR PRESENTATION                   |
| 3  | T     | I WILL ASK YOU TO COMMENT                             |
| 4  | LM(2) | (no mee eka tohon)                                    |
| 5  | LM5   | [(meet vaan sinne iha taakse)]                        |
| 6  | LM    | [(xx) (sinne nii)                                     |
| 7  | LM    | eiku [(eiku mee) (xx)]                                |
| 8  | LM    | [(xx) (iha etu) ]                                     |
| 9  | LM5   | mee siihen vaa etee vaan                              |
| 10 | LM    | (x)   |
| 11 |       | (2) (( <i>there's noise as the boys' get ready</i> )) |
| 12 | LM(5) | (siirrä tota kassia)                                  |
| 13 |       | (2) (( <i>there's noise</i> ))                        |
| 14 | LM    | (xx) (johonki vaa)                                    |

15 T            voit panna lattialle sen kassi (0.5)  
 16 T            putoo siitä pia  
 17 LM           ehh  
 18 LM           (xx)  
 19               (2)  
 20 LM           ((laughs))  
 21 LM           okay  
 22 LM(1)       pitääks meä kertoo (ensi)  
 23 LM5         joo [(kyllä varmaa)]  
 24 T            [IN        ENG ] LISH

In lines 1-3 the teacher gives the instructions in English to the rest of the class. The boys are a little disorganized while getting ready to hold the presentation and they talk about where each one of them should sit, which can be seen in lines 4-10. There is a backpack in the way and in line 12 one of the boys asks another to move it away. The learner does not know where to put it and the other student says that he should just move it somewhere. The learner places it on the narrow table beside the blackboard. At this point the teacher intervenes and instructs to put the backpack on the floor as it might fall from the table. The teacher also switches to Finnish to say this. The learner takes her advice and then sits down. As all of the boys are seated they think about how they should start the presentation and whether they should tell something first. The boys talk in Finnish and the teacher demands that they should use English as can be seen in line 24.

In this example the turns the teacher uses to carry out the actual task, e.g. instructions given what should be done and instructing to use English, are all in English (lines 1-3). There is a sequence which leads her to switch to Finnish starting in line 12 as one of the boys asks another student to move the backpack. This sequence has nothing to do with the task itself. As the boys reorient to the task itself, starting in line 21, and think about how to start the presentation, the teacher switches back to English in line 24 to remind them that they should talk in English, too. At the same time the teacher herself returns to previous order of language choice as she is carrying on with the actual task. The line 24 can be seen also regarded as teacher inducement. Üstunel and Seedhouse (2005) define teacher-induced code-switching as having the target of encouraging learners to code-switch. In this case, the teacher induces the learners to code-switch by uttering the request that they should use

English. Thus, the teacher's code-switch has two functions here: to return to the previous order of language choice, and at the same time to separate the side-sequence from the actual pedagogical activity, and to induce learners to use English.

The second example is also from the upper secondary school lessons. In this example the pedagogical context is not related to performing a task but to other kinds of classroom routines. This is from the beginning of the double period and the group is about to start the lesson but at this point they have not done any tasks or exercises yet. The teacher has suggested that they should first check grammar exercises, which probably has been homework. The learners seem to react slowly and the teacher mentions that too. She has used English to start the lesson. Then the teacher has some exchanges with a couple of learners, some in Finnish and some in English. Part of this example has already been discussed in the previous section: Example 20, Section 8.6.

Example 22:

1	T	huh (1) £ sulla menee aika heikosti
2	LM	(häly)
3		(2.5) (( <i>there's talk</i> ))
4	LM(1)	joo tästä ei pääse (x[x] )
5	T	[°aika] hei[kosti°]
6	LM(5)	[fuck ]
7		(1)
8	T	okay today Jukka?
9		(1) (( <i>there's little talk</i> ))
10	LM7	(pardon?)
11	T	okay? (0.5)
12	T	[feeling] well
13	LM7	[yeah ]
14	LM7	°yeah° (0.5) I had dentist °yesterday°
15	T	↑o↓hh (0.5) <I- I thought> you had a <b>flu</b> or something

The teacher has just had exchange with a learner in Finnish (Example 20). The final comments that end this sequence can be seen in lines 1 and 5 of this example. In that exchange the teacher responds to a learner's statement. The participants of this exchange limit to the teacher and the single learner. Next the teacher talks to another learner but she switches to English this time (line 12). The teacher asks if the learner is okay today. The learner does not know what the teacher means and he produces a

repair initiator (line 14). The teacher clarifies by asking if he is feeling well (lines 15-16). After this the learner answers the question and adds that he had a dentist's appointment. In line 19 the teacher shows some surprise and then comments that she thought the learner had been ill or something like that.

In this example there are two exchanges which both occur between the teacher and a single learner. Although neither of these exchanges is related to any actual pedagogical tasks, they are not similar. In the situation the teacher is waiting for the learners to get their books out. Then a learner tells the teacher about his backpack and the teacher responds. She adjusts to the learner's choice of language which is Finnish. Then the teacher switches to English to have another exchange with another learner. In this second exchange a pedagogical goal, or actually two, can be seen to influence the interaction and the code-switch. She is, in fact, inquiring why the learner was absent the previous day. She does not ask that directly but the learner treats the teacher's question of his well-being as such a question and he accounts for his absence in line 18. The teacher then confirms that it was what she really wanted to know by responding with *ohh* which can in this case signal realisation of something, i.e. the reason why the learner was absent. The teacher continues in the same line (line 18) that she thought he had been ill. Keeping track of learners' absence is a part of school and classroom routines. There is no reason why this could not have been done in Finnish. However, the teacher puts her inquiry in the form of a question which is common in everyday talk in English that is, inquiring how someone is doing. That kind of inquiries are also common starters for language lessons as the goal is to learn to interact in the target language.

The following example is from secondary school. This is the very beginning of the first lesson. Some learners are already sitting behind their desks. In this example one of the learners enters the classroom while the teacher is preparing to start the lesson.

Example 23:

- |   |     |                                |
|---|-----|--------------------------------|
| 1 | T   | good morning                   |
| 2 | LM2 | siis oot (.) lukenu            |
| 3 | T   | kasteletko tätä vielä [(xxx) ] |
| 4 | LM2 | [ vai ,] hä                    |
| 5 | LM3 | mitä mä oon tehny              |

6	LM2	et oot tehny läksyt mutta et lukenu verbikokeisiin
7	LM3	ai minä
8	LM2	nii
9		(1)
10	T	kiitos.

In line 1 the teacher greets a learner who is entering the classroom. Right after that she asks another learner to wet the sponge (line 3). At the same time two learners are talking about whether they have done homework or not. The teacher gets the sponge back and in line 10 she thanks the learner who wet it. The teacher is using mostly Finnish to prepare for the actual lesson. She has used some English words when explaining the results of a verb test to a learner, but this is the only time she uses English at this point of the lesson. The nature of the turn in line 1 can be seen as belonging to the language classroom routine. In most cases language lessons start with greetings in the target language. In this case the greeting is not targeted at the whole group but to a single learner. Thus, that turn can be seen as part of classroom interactive routines. Next the teacher asks for a favour from another learner. That part of this example is not routine language classroom interaction in the same way as the teacher's previous turn.

In the next section I will discuss code-switching in relation to participation frameworks in the classroom. It is actually somewhat overlapping with the functions of routine classroom talk as participation framework can in some cases have an effect on the type of interaction, i.e. if the interaction is related to a pedagogical activity or not. For example, the teacher may switch from pedagogical interaction to other type while she at the same time changes the participation framework from talking to the whole class to interacting with a single learner.

## 8.8 Shifts in the Participation Framework

Participants in discourse may have different kinds of roles in interaction and these roles also change in the course of interaction. The term participation framework is used to refer to these different kinds of discourse identities that participants may take. Seppänen (1997) points out that in interactional contexts there is usually one participant who has the floor at a time, i.e. that participant is the ‘current speaker’ in interaction. Others may participate by listening, which means that they are also actively part of the participation framework. Sometimes in the context there are others who may e.g. overhear the message although it is not targeted at them. In some situations the message is addressed to a specific participant but also targeted at others too. (Seppänen 1997: 156-160.)

In classrooms there are always multiple hearers of interaction. The teacher or a learner may target an utterance to a specific participant but there are always others who can overhear it too. The teacher and other participants of classroom discourse switch between different participant frameworks as a turn can be targeted at a single participant, a small group of participants or to the whole group. Goodwin and Goodwin (1990) also report that it is possible to work within several participant frameworks at the same time. In this section I will discuss some cases of code-switching in which switches between different participant frameworks are significant.

The following example is from the beginning of the secondary school lessons. The lesson is about to begin, the door to the classroom is still open and one more learner enters the classroom. The teacher is explaining the score of a previous verb test to a learner (lines 1-4).

Example 24:

- |   |     |  |
|---|-----|--|
| 1 | T   | sillon se tulis given ja (.) toi menikin ihan oikein ↑ |
| 2 | T   | siit sä oot saanu kaks pistettä tonne se ois pitäny    |
| 3 | T   | olla eaten ↑ mut sä oot saanu siitä kuitenkin yhen.    |
| 4 | T   | forgotten. et se jäi nyt sitten. (0.5) alright         |
| 5 |     | (2)  |
| 6 | LM2 | Samuli (.) SAMULI ((snorts)) anna ku mää arvaan,       |

7	LM2	sä oot tehny läksyt, muttet lukenu verbikokeeseen.
8	LM3	oon
9	T	good morning
10	LM2	siis oot (.) lukenu
11	T	kasteletko tätä vielä

In line 4 the teacher finishes the explanation and uses the discourse marker *alright* in English which could signal the beginning of something. Two learners are talking about whether they have done their homework or not and whether or not they have studied for the verb test as they take out their English books (lines 6-8). A learner enters the classroom and the teacher greets him with *good morning* in line 9. The teacher takes the sponge and asks another learner to wet it (line 11).

In this example the teacher switches the participant framework she operates in twice. First, she addresses a single learner when talking about the previous verb test. Then the teacher switches to English and uses the discourse marker *alright* which could be a cue that the teacher is about to start the actual lesson. However, the teacher does not start with it yet properly. Another learner enters the classroom and the teacher uses English in the greeting which is targeted at this single learner. Then she switches back to Finnish to address yet another learner in the request that she makes in line 11. Thus, in the example the teacher addresses three different learners. Interestingly every time the addressee is switched the language changes, too. The discourse marker in line 4 signals a possible change of addressees to cover the whole class because it is not actually targeted at any specific learner. One of Canagarajah's findings was that the teacher used the L1 to prepare for the lesson and switched to the target language when the lesson proper began. The greeting in line 9 can be seen to belong to the classroom routines as the target language is often used in greetings.

The following example is from the beginning of the upper secondary school lessons. The teacher has started the lesson with English. One learner was late and she admonishes him a bit about that. Then there is some small talk about the weather and the teacher asks how one learner is doing. Before this example the teacher has already once asked the learners to take out their books and she has also said the page



number. Some learners are slow to react and the teacher asks them again to take out their books.

Example 25:

1	T	take your books please
2	T	OPEN the books
3		(1)
4	LM	oh (x)
5	LM	yes
6	T	reACT
7		(12.5) (( <i>there's quiet talk</i> ))
8	T	vähä hidasta tällai aamusin
9	??	(ky-yllä)
10		(2.5)
11	LM	ne on sinun)
12	LM	(aijaa) (xx[x)
13	T	[teitsä Kari ne harjotukset
14	LM8	eh
15	LM5	eh[heh
16	T	[mikset

In lines 1 and 2 the teacher requests the learners to take out their books. Some learners react slowly and nothing seems to happen. The teacher thus asks for some kind of reaction (line 6). There is a pause after which the teacher switches to Finnish to make a comment on the class's behaviour by saying that they are a little slow in the morning. While she says this she seems to look at her side towards the other camera and it is not clear whether she is saying this to the person who is operating the camera or to a learner. However, it is clear that this comment was not meant for the whole group as the teacher's voice is quieter and she is somewhat turned away from the group. After this the teacher addresses a learner (line 13) and asks if he has done some exercises they have apparently talked about previously. The learner says that he has not done them (line 14) and the teacher asks for a reason for this in line 16.

In this example the teacher uses English to address the whole class as she asks them to take out their books and asks them to react (lines 1, 2 and 6). Then she addresses only one person or possibly a smaller group of people. Thus, the participation framework is different and there is also a switch to Finnish. The teacher continues

with Finnish while she addresses a learner in line 13, as well. The teacher later switches back to English when she returns to talk to the whole group and carries on with the pedagogical activities. Thus, in this example the change in the participation framework is marked by a code-switch: when the teacher addresses only one learner or a small group of learners (or the person operating the camera) she uses Finnish and when the message is targeted at the whole group English is used.

In the following example the upper secondary school group is working on writing their own CV's. The teacher circles around in the classroom and helps the learners to perform this activity. The activity involves a lot of code-switching and the teacher also constantly moves between different participation frameworks as she talks to individual learners or a few learners or addresses the whole group.

Example 26:

- |   |       |   |
|---|-------|---|
| 1 | T     | onko kynää=                               |
| 2 | LM(9) | [oh]                                      |
| 3 | T     | =e[i o] tietenkää                         |
| 4 |       | (5) (( <i>there's talk</i> ))             |
| 5 | T     | a:nd if you have words an phrases         |
| 6 | T     | you don't know or you want to know so (.) |
| 7 | T     | you can always ask (but)                  |

The teacher asks a learner if he has a pencil (line 1) and then announces that of course he does not have one (line 3). These turns are thus targeted at a single learner. The teacher uses Finnish but then switches to English to address the whole group as she gives instructions to the whole group about the activity. Similarly in the next example from the same activity the teacher changes between languages and the participant frameworks.

Example 27:

- |   |     |   |
|---|-----|---|
| 1 | T   | no nii hommii=  |
| 2 |     | (( <i>points at boys with right hand; standing beside LM8's desk</i> )) |
| 3 | LM1 | =oliko fluent oliko se semmone <hyvä>                                   |
| 4 | LM5 | (no) hei ki=  |
| 5 | T   | =joo hy[vä kielitai]to  |
| 6 | LM5 | [hei Ville ]  |
| 7 | LM5 | kysyppä (.) tota niinnii  |

8 T I think you [all=  
 9 LM5 [kuinka paljo]  
 10 T =all of you] can put  
 11 T [(fluent) English for instance

In line 1 the teacher demands that a small group of learners gets on with the task. A learner has a question as he wants to check the meaning of the word *fluent* (line 3). The teacher confirms that the word is correct and can be used in the context (line 5). Then in line 8 the teacher switches to English and addresses the whole group by saying that all of them can write fluent English in their CV's. In this case, the change in the participation framework springs from the question by a learner. The teacher has used Finnish to communicate with individual learners (lines 1 and 5) but then she switches to English as she talks to the whole group. There is, thus, a change in both the language used and the addressees of the message.

It is not, however, always the case that the teacher would code-switch in such a way: that is use one language to address the whole group and the other to address individual learners. In the following example there is no switch in the code, although there is a change in the participant framework. In this context the class is also working on writing their CV's. The teacher addresses several individual learners.

Example 28:

1 T but you can always ask  
 2 LM5 ope mihin tätä käytetään?  
 3 LM2 ehhehheh .hh  
 4 T if there happens to be a word you don't know hh  
 5 LM5 °yes well° JUST in case  
 6 T just in case  
 7 LM5 ♪ Justin in a ca::se  
 8 T hm↑m  
 .  
 .  
 .  
 (20) ((there is talk in the classroom))  
 22 LF mikä on syksy?  
 23 LM(1) mikä o se (x)= =emmää tiä [(°sitä°)  
 24 T [autumn

The teacher hands out dictionaries that the learners can use while doing the writing task. The teacher says that the learners can also always ask, meaning if they do not e.g. know a word (line 1). A learner asks as a joke what the dictionary is used for (line 2). The teacher then repeats in line 4 that if there just happens to be a word the learner does not know. The learner agrees in line 5. This turn seems to be a humorous comment in the form of a partial repetition of the teacher's turn. This humorous effect is added by the learner's turn in line 7 as he turns the line into a tune. 20 seconds pass as the learners work on the task. There is quiet talk in the classroom. A learner then asks what the English word for *syksy* (*autumn*) is. It is not clear if this question is targeted at the teacher or at another learner. However, the teacher treats it as a request for help and answers the question by providing the English word in line 24. As can be seen in the example, the teacher addresses the whole group (line 1) and also two different individual learners (lines 4 and 24). Although the participation framework changes the language remains the same.

As the previous examples show, code-switching can be used as a tool to separating different participation frameworks from each other. A switch in the participation framework can be signalled by a switch of code. This is not of course always the case, but it can function as a good signalling device and it can be also used to draw attention. Next, miscellaneous code-switching cases, which did not fit into any of the previous categories, are discussed.

## 8.9 Other Cases

In this section I will discuss some other interesting cases of code-switching which did not fit into any of the previous categories. The first example is from the upper secondary school lessons. It is the very end of the double period. The group has had some time left to write their own CV's and they are doing that task in this example, too. The teacher circles around in the classroom and helps the learners in their task. The teacher reads what the learners have written. Then by one learner she stops and wonders what a word the learner has written in his CV means. This leads to a discussion between the teacher and two of the boys in which the boys explain what

that something, which turns out to be capoeira, is. One of the boys is sure that the teacher has seen it somewhere too and tells her that many films have been made about it. The teacher then asks who the leading actors in some film were; this question is in line 1 in this example. The whole discussion has been gone through in Finnish.

Example 29:

- |   |       |   |
|---|-------|---|
| 1 | T     | ketä on pääosissa siinä (x)                       |
| 2 | LM(2) | (ne oli tullu sitte niinku) (x{xx)                |
| 3 | LM(9) | [emmä tiiä jotai rastatukkasias neekereitä        |
| 4 |       | ((there's talk and laughter among the boys))      |
| 5 | LM    | hmm   |
| 6 | T     | might not be my cup of tea                        |
| 7 |       | (4.5) ((there's talk and laughter))               |
| 8 | T     | no nii ens kerran ohjelmahan on kaikilla selvillä |

One of the learners answers to the teacher's question in line 3. There are some further comments by learners to this topic but they are unintelligible. Then in line 6 the teacher switches to English to make a final statement that ends the discussion on that topic. There is a pause after which the teacher prepares to end the lesson, talking about what they are going to do in the following lesson and continuing again in Finnish (line 8). In this case the teacher code-switches to English to use an idiom. Drew and Holt (1995: 117) describe idioms as phrases that are "relatively fixed in composition". They may therefore be learned as separate units of language. They continue that the meaning of an idiom cannot be directly derived from the words which are part of it. Idioms may serve different functions in conversation. Drew and Holt (1995: 126) argue that idioms may serve the function of summarizing and thus work as devices of ending a topic. In this example, the idiom is used in this particular function as the sequence ends with the idiom. Another function for an idiom is an assessment of what has been talked about (Drew and Holt 1995: 125). In this case the teacher while ending the sequence also gives an assessment which reveals her opinion about the movies that they have talked about. She refers to them as *not her cup of tea*, in other words as something that she would not be likely to enjoy. In this case, the function of the idiom reveals the function of the code-switch.

The following example is from the secondary school lessons. The group is reading the questions of the animal quiz. There is one question about the dromedary and the teacher wonders what kind of an animal that is and she is not also sure how to pronounce the word. Right before this extract the teacher checks something in the vocabulary behind the English study book. The actual question to be answered is how many humps a dromedary has. During this activity the teacher has used mostly English to give instructions, but there has been a lot of code-switching, because she has translated parts of the instructions and also all of the questions in the exercise into Finnish.

Example 30:

1	T	[se on jonkun sortin kameli]
2	LM2	<u>humps</u>
3	LM3	[(xx) ]
4	T	[varmaan.]=
5	LM3	[(xx) ]
6	LM2	=se on yksi (.) kyyträinen kameli [on se dromedaari. ]
7	T	[aha. okei, no ]
8	T	sä (.) you know the answer then.

In lines 1 and 4 the teacher suspects that the animal is some sort of camel. A learner then in line 6 knows that the animal in question is a camel with one hump. The teacher replies with uh-huh and okay with Finnish pronunciation. The teacher starts the next utterance in Finnish (lines 7 and 8) but then in mid-sentence she switches to English and starts again. After this the teacher quickly reads through the rest of the questions in English and then the learners work on them silently. The teacher initiates a self-repair, in line 8, because she stops and starts the utterance again, but the repair in this case does not involve the content of the message or e.g. a wrong word. Instead, the repair is related to the choice of language. The teacher has used English to carry on the activity and thus, she now returns to this choice of code.

In the data there were many cases in which discourse markers were used either as the code-switching or as starting the switch. Discourse markers were the so-called extra-sentential switches which are not tightly related to any sentence. There are two examples from the secondary school lessons here. The first one is from the beginning

of the second lesson that is the group has just had break. They are about to start with the verb test. There is a lot of talk in the classroom.

Example 31:

- |    |     |  |
|----|-----|--|
| 1  | LM3 | tää on joku: (.) tää on \$ihan (xx)\$=       |
| 2  | LM2 | =(( <i>laughs</i> )) \$ruotsin koe\$         |
| 3  | LM3 | nii onki.                                    |
| 4  | LM4 | [hurriin kokeet]                             |
| 5  | T   | [°all right° ]                               |
| 6  | LM1 | mil- kuinka vanha.                           |
| 7  | LM3 | hurrikoe=                                    |
| 8  | LM2 | viitosella ensimmäisestä jaksosta=           |
| 9  | LM1 | (( <i>laughs</i> )) [mitäs- ]                |
| 10 | LF1 | [paljon ] sää sait siitä                     |
| 11 | LM3 | kasi miikan.                                 |
| 12 | T   | o:kay=                                       |
| 13 | LM1 | =määki sain mää sain [jonku kasin tai (xx) ] |
| 14 | LF3 | [määki sain kasin ]                          |
| 15 | T   | laitetaas ne kirjat kiinni                   |

In lines 1-4 a group of boys are talking about a paper one of the boys has found which turns out to be a Swedish exam. The teacher seems to get ready to start the test. She quietly says *all right* and puts her book on the overhead projector which also seems to work as the teacher's desk in this classroom. The boys go on about the exam paper and the teacher then says *okay* with a slightly louder voice. In line 15 the teacher asks the learners to close their books and at the same time she gets ready to hand out empty papers for them to write on. The teacher uses two discourse markers in this example (lines 5 and 12). Both of them are in English although she does not otherwise use English here or right after this. The recording begins at this point so it cannot be confirmed what has happened right before this. The discourse markers in this example have the function of raising attention as the teacher wants to orient to the lesson content and start the verb test.

Another example of the use of discourse markers follows here. In this example too, the discourse marker is present at the point of a code-switch. The example is from the first secondary school lesson. The group is doing a grammar exercise about the past forms of *to be*. The teacher uses mostly Finnish in this activity apart from the English examples.

## Example 32:

- 1 T kirjain on (2) aa eikö vaan (1) noni↑  
 2 (5)  
 3 T u:h (2) where were you yesterday, Jody was a:bsent as well.  
 4 T Jody was absent too.=  
 5 LM4 =hnh.  
 6 T all right↑(1) näättekö

In line 1 the teacher responds to a previous answer by a learner. She has just turned on the overhead projector and she shows the answer on a transparency and reads it out loud in English in lines 3 and 4. In line 6 the teacher uses the discourse marker *all right* after which she switches back to Finnish to ask whether the learners can see the transparency or not, and after that they move on to the next sentence. As mentioned, the teacher uses mainly Finnish in this activity. However, the discourse marker is in English. The discourse marker functions in a way as a transition point ending the English language choice used for reading the answer out loud. At the same time it functions as a cue that they are moving on to the next example.



## 9 CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to find out more about teachers' use of the native and target languages in the foreign language classroom. This was done by examining the language choices and code-switches of two different teachers in two double periods: one from secondary school and one from upper secondary school. The focus was on finding the lines according to which the teachers use both available languages. First, the amounts of each language used by each teacher were counted. Second, the contexts of using English and Finnish were analysed and then compared. Third, the cases of code-switching were examined and categorized according to the discourse functions found. The analysis of language choices made by the two teachers provided background for the examination of the code-switching cases.

### 9.1 Summary of Findings

As the amount of Finnish and English used by the teacher in each lesson was counted, it was revealed that the difference in that is not quite as significant as one might have imagined. Based on counting the words of English and Finnish used by the teacher the results were: 60% of the words used by the secondary school teacher were English and as for the upper secondary school teacher the corresponding amount is 51%. The difference is smaller than expected, only 9 percentage points, because the first impression was that the upper secondary school teacher used a lot more English in for example instructions. When examining the teachers' language choices more carefully it was revealed that both of them used English in instructions, but the secondary school teacher often used also Finnish alongside English.

There were not many significant differences in the language choices made by the two teachers. The most significant one is probably the fact that the secondary school teacher used often both languages when giving instructions whereas the upper secondary school teacher used mainly one language at a time. The secondary school teacher often either translated parts of the instructions into Finnish or added to them. Sometimes learners specifically requested for Finnish clarification, e.g. the

instructions may have included a word that was unfamiliar to some. However, there were also cases in which the teacher used Finnish. This signals that the teacher has seen the need for clarification in Finnish. There were many similarities in the language choices. Both teachers used Finnish only for grammar instruction. During activities that entailed grammar, English was mainly the target of instruction. Additionally, both used English in instructions the difference being, as mentioned above, that the secondary school teacher used Finnish, too.

As to language choice, there were some trends which could be found in both the secondary school and the upper secondary school lessons. First and foremost, grammar was always taught in Finnish. There seems to be some consensus about that in Finnish schools because based on my previous experience there are not many teachers who are willing to teach grammar in the target language. Some teachers have justified that with the fact that grammar instruction provides tools for learners with which they can systematically practise producing sentences in the foreign languages. In order to be able to use these tools, i.e. the ‘grammar rules’ or regularities, it is important that one can comprehend them. This is best guaranteed by using learners’ native language.

Secondly, a text in the textbook was discussed at least partially in English. In both the secondary and the upper secondary lessons the teacher gave instructions to reading or listening to the text in English. There were some differences in further discussions about the text: in the upper secondary school lessons the teacher used only English for this and in the secondary school lessons the teacher used Finnish in elaborating the contents of the text but then again English in instructions to further tasks.

In other activities there was no clear division of labour between the two languages. The teacher used English in some contexts and Finnish in others, but no general conclusions can be drawn from those apart from turns that are part of everyday routines, e.g. greetings or small talk in the beginning of a lesson. Additionally, almost all teacher admonitions were in Finnish. Otherwise the teacher used either of the two languages in many different contexts to address both the whole class and individual learners.

The results show that both languages, Finnish and English, have their place in the foreign language classroom, also in upper secondary school. Both languages are used extensively. The contexts of using either Finnish or English are partially different, but there were also contexts in which either of the languages or both of them is and can be used. The language choices made by the two teachers show that they do not regard Finnish as a language that should be avoided in the foreign language classroom, or at least they themselves do not avoid using it. The various cases of code-switching also show that there are different contexts and functions for switching from one language to another. The findings also support the results of previous studies, for example those by Yletyinen (2004) and Canagarajah (1995).

As to code-switching, several discourse functions were identified. The findings confirm those made in previous research on this topic. Some of the functions are also found in bilingual interaction outside the classroom, e.g. functions that concern changes in topic or participant constellation (or the participant framework). Some functions were more classroom context related, e.g. switching in and out of talk related to the pedagogy.

The first function examined was changes of topic. In the classroom context topic change means the change of activity. The change of activity creates a natural point of code-change. Code-switching appeared at the boundary of two different activities when the teacher's language choice for the two consequent activities was different. In some cases there was a lead-in for the new activity before the code-switch. The teacher may have given more or less explicit cues of topic change before switching the language. Additionally, there were cases in which a code-switch at the boundary of two activities entailed translation that is, the message was first conveyed in the previous choice of language and then repeated in the other one.

Another function for code-switching found was evaluation, either as part of the IRF-sequence or not. Mostly the feedback turns were code-switches from Finnish to English especially when they were a part of the IRF-sequence, i.e. the teacher's language choice for an activity was Finnish and the evaluative turn was given in English. Three consequences for such use of code-switching can be found. Firstly, the code-switch separates the feedback turn from the rest of the talk by creating

contrast between the teacher's choices of language. Thus, the feedback turn is emphasized. Secondly, such feedback turns work as part of the institutional context of foreign language use. Thirdly and most importantly, these feedback turns created alignment in the overall language choices of the sequence as the language of the feedback turn was the same as used in the response turn of the IRF-sequence. Thus, although the teacher switched her choice of language for the activity for the feedback turn, the choice of language for the turn followed that of the previous turn in the sequence. This adds to coherence in discourse. As to evaluation and code-switching, there were also cases that were not part of the IRF-sequence. In these cases there was usually some other function for the switch, such as ending an activity and beginning with a new one. In such a case the evaluation put an end to the activity as the teacher gave the group feedback on their performance in the activity.

Translation was one common context for code-switching. The cases of translation had different kinds of functions. The most common ones were elaboration or clarification. This kind of code-switching was sometimes but not always induced by one or more learners. For instance, a learner may have asked for clarification of instructions in English. However, sometimes the teacher code-switched to elaborate or clarify a point without any explicit inducement by the learners. This suggests that the teacher had picked some cues that learners might benefit from such an aid. For instance, the learners might have been concentrating on something else than the activity in which case the code-switch also served as a device to catch their attention. All cases of translation were not direct translations. Actually, most often only some part of the message was translated. In most cases the translation resembled more paraphrasing or summing up the contents of the message. There were also some cases in which the translation did not actually have an elaborative function. For instance, there was one example from the upper secondary school lessons in which the translation occurred at the boundary of two different activities and language choices. Thus, in that case the function of the code-switch was more related to the topic change than elaborating the message. Whenever the switch did have an elaborative function it occurred from English to Finnish. When the switch occurred in the opposite direction the translation had some other function than elaboration. For instance, in one case the teacher's choice of language was English and there was a side-sequence for which she switched to Finnish. When the teacher switched back to

English, translation took place. In that case the switch served the function of returning to the previous order of language choice.

Using code-switching in quotation is one commonly researched function. There were cases of quotation in these data, too. In this context all the quotations were related to the materials, i.e. the teacher cited the materials or read a passage out loud. Mostly these cases were switches from Finnish to English but there was also one case in the secondary school lessons in which the teacher quoted a Finnish line from the book. The teacher's language choice for that task was English which then contributed to the fact that a switch could occur. In that case the Finnish quotation of the materials provided help for understanding the instructions.

There were also some cases in which the code-switch was caused by or at least affected by a problematic situation of some kind. In the upper secondary school lessons the teacher had some problems with the CD player. She had just started a new activity and the learners were waiting for it to begin but the teacher could not play the CD. In the course of solving the problem the teacher switched from English to Finnish. This talk was not targeted specifically to anyone because mostly she used a rather quiet voice. However, the teacher filled the long gaps that would have otherwise come into being with talk. In that case the switch separated the problem-solving sequence from the talk related to the actual activity. In another case the upper secondary school teacher code-switched when there was a point in an exercise she wanted to clarify. The sentence she used would have been difficult to express in English in that same way. Thus, a problem of expressing a meaning in the target language contributed to the switch in that case.

In some cases of code-switching the difference between foreign language classroom routines, i.e. routines related to using the target language, and other kinds of interaction had an effect on the switch that occurred. For example, the teacher used English to carry out a task and switched to Finnish for a sequence that was not directly related to the task. This could have been for example to reproach a learner. In cases like this there often was a shift of participation framework, too. For instance, the teacher first addressed the whole group and a couple of learners or a single learner. Some cases of code-switching related to a change in the participation

framework were examined in another chapter. According to the data it seems that code-switching can be used as a device to separate interaction between different participation frameworks. The context of the interaction was very meaningful. For instance, in one case the teacher discussed a grammar topic with a learner and then she greeted another learner. The greeting contained a code-switch. Thus, the teacher's language choices, i.e. grammar instruction in Finnish, and the foreign language classroom routines, e.g. greetings in English, affected the cases in which the participation framework had a role. However, there were also some cases of code-switching related to this framework in which no explanation could be found in the context or the contents of the teacher's turns. In the upper secondary school lessons the teacher used a lot of code-switching during the activity of writing CV's. She used both Finnish and English to address both the whole group and individual learners. Thus, in that task there was no clear division of labour in the use of the two languages and code-switching was used extensively.

There were cases of code-switching in which the switch was in some way induced by one or more learners. This inducement was either explicit, e.g. a question by a learner, or implicit, e.g. noise or distractions in the classroom. The cases in which a learner posed a question the function of the code-switching was usually elaboration. In other cases the teacher code-switched to e.g. reprimand or admonish a learner or learners. This reprimand was caused by e.g. disturbance or ignorance to the teacher's instructions, for instance by ignoring the tasks that should have been done.

In some cases code-switching was related to discourse markers (also known as tag-switching). In some cases these switches had the function of drawing attention. For example, the teacher was ending an activity and beginning with a new one or the teacher was ready to examine the next point in an exercise. In the secondary school lessons the teacher also used discourse markers at the beginning of both lessons when she was ready to start the lesson proper. Otherwise she used mostly Finnish at that point. One interesting case was also the upper secondary school teacher's use of an English idiom in a sequence that was otherwise carried out in Finnish. In that case the code-switched idiom was a device for ending the sequence and for assessing the topic they had just talked about.

As the results show, there were many different functions of code-switching found in the data. Some of the functions were closely related to the classroom context while the others were not explicitly influenced by the institutional context. For example, topic change is a common function for code-switching found in contexts outside the classroom, too. Code-switching related to changes in the participation framework has also been researched in other contexts. On the other hand, the code-switching cases in which the foreign language classroom routines had an effect are characteristic for this type of context only. Such are for example the code-switches in which the routine classroom interaction was part of the switching, or the code-switching was related translation. Translation or elaboration can of course be found in bilingual interaction too, but perhaps not in the same scale. Additionally, in the foreign language classroom the elaborative function of translation works in one direction only: from the target language to the native one.

The direction of the switch is not considered meaningful in the CA perspective to code-switching. In this study the direction was often not meaningful but the switch itself provided cues for the ongoing interaction. However, there were some cases in which the teacher's language choice directly contributed to the switch, i.e. there had been no code-switching if the teacher's language choice had been different. Additionally, it can be argued that in EFL classrooms the direction of switching is significant in elaborative functions of code-switching because elaboration in the language classroom context often means that the message in the target language is either translated into or explained further in the mother tongue.

## **9.2 Discussion and Implications**

When in teacher training, I was encouraged to think carefully which language I was going to use for each activity I had planned to do on a certain lesson. By experience I know that often language choices are conscious decisions and it seems that many choices in the data are such, too, as for example grammar is on both lessons discussed only in Finnish. However, the classroom context is very dynamic and it is impossible to predict everything that is going to happen. The choices teachers make

about language use can change, too. Thus, it cannot be said that every choice a teacher makes is a conscious one. For example, a teacher may have planned to instruct a certain task in the target language but then the learners do not seem to understand the instructions. In such a case the teacher would often switch to using the native language of the learners. To find out more about teachers' thoughts of their own language use and code-switching, this topic could be further examined by interviewing teachers or perhaps learners, too. This kind of approach would bring out evidence on how conscious the decisions made on which language to use in classrooms are. To study that, interviews before as well as after the lessons to be analysed should be done. Canagarajah (1995) used interviews as part of his study and this kind of study would bring a new insight into this topic in Finland as well. Additionally, it is also important to furthermore examine both the teachers' and the pupils' language use in the classroom and the use of the mother tongue and the target language. Research on code-switching and language choice in EFL classrooms in Finland has not been very extensive and thus, more studies are needed.

So on the one hand, the topic could be expanded so that more aspects would be taken into account or the amount of data would be larger. On the other hand, the topic could also be narrowed down so that the focus would be even more specific than in this study. In the results of this study many different functions examined. However, it would be interesting to really look into some specific functions of code-switching and how they are employed in the language classroom. Code-switching as part of the IRF-sequence is one of them. It was found out in this study that the teacher sometimes code-switched in the feedback turn of the sequence to align with the language of the response turn. This topic could be further studied from the point of view of the whole IRF-sequence taking into account the different kinds of initiations (also those by learners) and responses. In addition, the elaborative functions and their different subcategories, e.g. repetition, reiteration, explanation and exemplification, could be further studied. One focus could be for instance comparing the contexts of elaboration and examining in which contexts code-switching occurs and in which not.

In this study the focus was entirely on the teachers' language use and code-switching. However, it is important that the learners' perspective is also further



examined, as was done for example in Yletyinen's study (2004). Both sides offer valuable information for language teaching professionals as well as for researchers interested in classroom discourse. Finding more out about this topic can help teachers to examine and analyse their own choices in the classroom and perhaps also help them to make more conscious choices about their language use. Some teachers are at least in theory very supportive of using as little Finnish as possible in foreign language lessons. However, some argue that Finnish can actually have positive effects on learning in the language classroom. It is important to notice that both languages, Finnish and English, have special functions in the language classroom. Partially, they share some of the functions but for some only either Finnish or English can be used.

In future research the primary school lessons would also be an interesting target of examination in this field, because I have the impression that there has been less research on that level of education. This may be partially due to the fact that pupils' code-switching at the beginner levels is considered to be caused by lack of language skills. However, the context is still bilingual because two languages are present and the teacher is a competent speaker of the two languages. Of course the teacher adjusts the language used according to the level of the learners' skills. Nevertheless, studies on code-switching at beginner level have been conducted at least among adult learners so primary schools are by all means a possible context for a study, too. Additionally, it has been shown in previous research that there are many functions for code-switches that even beginner learners employ and that they are by no means all the result of poor command of the target language (See e.g. Söderberg Arnfast and Jørgensen, 2003).

In this study the functions of teachers' language choices and code-switching were examined in EFL classrooms in Finland. The data consisted of video-recorded lessons from two levels of education: the secondary school and the upper secondary school lessons. As part of forming the background for the study the main definitions and approaches to language choice and code-switching were introduced. Classroom interaction was also discussed from the point of view of Conversation Analysis. This study adopted the CA approach to code-switching as well as the method of analysing the data.

The results show that many different discourse functions were identified. Additionally, the language choices of the teachers were categorized and compared. It can be argued that the aims of this study were mostly met. However, there were some points in which the analysis is not as accurate as possible. For example, the actual amount of each language used is based on approximate quantitative analysis. Thus, the results are also only approximate. Additionally, no conclusions can be made about the teachers' language preference apart from the local context. The local distribution of labour of the two languages was established as well as it was possible, however. The results can be considered generalizable from the point of view that they follow the previous findings on this topic. More attention could be paid to comparing and contrasting the functions of code-switching in the classroom versus the functions found in other forms of discourse. This kind of detailed analysis could further support the view that lack of language skills is not the only cause for code-switching in foreign language classrooms. All in all, more research on code-switching in foreign language classrooms is needed in Finland because this topic has not yet been studied here extensively.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Auer, P. 1988. A Conversation Analytic Approach to Code-Switching and Transfer. In M. Heller (ed.), *Codeswitching. Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 187-213.
- Auer, P. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 115-135.
- Auer, P. (ed.) 1998. *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, P. 1998. Introduction: Bilingual Conversation revisited. In P. Auer (ed.), 1-24.
- Bailey, B. 2000. Social/Interactional Functions of Code Switching among Dominican Americans. *Pragmatics* 10 (2), 165-193.
- Baker, C. and S. Prys Jones 1998. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bani-Shoraka, H. 2005. Code-switching and Preference Marking: Disagreement in Persian/Azerbaijani Bilingual Conversation. In: J. Cohen, K. T. McAlister, K. Rolstad, and J. MacSwan (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 186-198.
- Botztepe, E. 2003. Issues in Code-Switching: Competing Theories and Models. *Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics* 3 (2), 1-27.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 1995. Functions of Codeswitching in ESL Classrooms: Socialising Bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 16 (3), 173-195.
- Cashman, H. R. 2005. Identities at play: language preference and group membership in bilingual talk in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (3), 301-315.
- Cazden, C. B. 2001. *Classroom discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. 2nd edition. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Cook, V. 1991. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Arnold
- Cromdal, J. 2005. Bilingual order in collaborative word processing: on creating an English text in Swedish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (3), 329-353.

- Drew, P. and E. Holt 1995. Idiomatic Expressions and Their role in the Organization of Topic Transition in Conversation. In M. Everaert, E. Van Der Linden, A. Schenk and R. Schreuder (eds.), *Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates, 117-132.
- Edmonson, W. 2004. Code-switching and word switching in foreign language classroom discourse. In J. House & J. Rehbein (eds.), *Multilingual Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Co, 155-178.
- Gafaranga, J. 2005. Demythologising language alternation studies: conversational structure vs. social structure in bilingual interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (3), 281-300.
- Goodwin, C. and M. Goodwin 1990. Context, activity and participation. In P. Auer and A. di Luzo (eds.), *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 77-99.
- Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. 1992. Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti and C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 229-252.
- Kovács, M. 2001. *Code-Switching and Language Shift in Australian Finnish in Comparison with Australian Hungarian*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Li Wei 1998. The 'why' and 'how' questions in the analysis of conversational code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.), 156-174.
- Li Wei 2002. 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society* 31 (2), 159-180.
- Li Wei 2005a. Starting from the right place: introduction to the special issue on Conversational Code-Switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (3), 275-279.
- Li Wei 2005b. "How can you tell?" Towards a common sense explanation of conversational code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (3), 375-389.
- Lörscher, W. 1986. Conversational Structures in the Foreign Language Classroom. In G. Kasper (ed.), *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 11-22.
- Macaro, E. 2001. Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 (4), 531-548.

- Martin-Jones, M. 1995. Codeswitching in the Classroom: Two Decades of Research. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 90-111.
- Mehan, H. 1979. *Learning Lessons: Social Organization in the Classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Milroy, L. and P. Muysken (eds.) 1995. *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Research on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milroy, L. and P. Muysken 1995. Introduction: Code-Switching and Bilingualism Research. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 1-14.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1992. Comparing codeswitching and borrowing. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1-2), 19-40.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993a. *Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. 1993b. Common and uncommon ground: Social and structural factors in codeswitching. *Language in Society* 22 (4), 475-503.
- Muysken, P. 1995. Code-switching and grammatical theory. In L. Milroy and P. Muysken (eds.), 177-198.
- Myyryläinen, K. and M. Pietikäinen 1988. *Teacher Input and the Use of the Mother Tongue in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä.
- Polio, C. G. and P. A. Duff 1994. Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation. *The Modern Language Journal* 78 (3), 313-326.
- Poplack, S. 1980. Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO ESPAÑOL: Toward a Typology of Code-switching. *Linguistics* 18 (7-8), 581-618.
- Romaine, S. 1989. *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sebba, M. and T. Wootton 1998. We, they and identity. Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.), 262-286.
- Seedhouse, P. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom : a Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Seppänen, E. 1997. Osallistumiskehikko. In L. Tainio (ed.), *Keskusteluanalyysin perusteet*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 156- 176.
- Sinclair, J. McH. and R. M. Coulthard 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse. The English used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Sundelin, M. 2001. *Could someone please close the window...ja Pekka istuu alas ja riisuu lakin päästään!": Reasons for Language Switching in Teaching English as a Second Language*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Helsinki.
- Söderberg Arnfast, J. and J. N. Jørgensen 2003. Code-switching as a communication, learning, and social negotiation strategy in first-year learners of Danish. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 13 (1), 23-53.
- Thornborrow, J. 2002. *Power Talk. Language and Interaction in Institutional Discourse*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Turnbull, M. and K. Arnett 2002. Teachers' Uses of the Target Language and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 204-218.
- Üstunel, E. and P. Seedhouse 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (3), 302-325.
- Yletyinen, H. 2004. *The Functions of Codeswitching in EFL Classroom Discourse*. Unpublished Pro Gradu Thesis. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

## APPENDIX 1

### TRANSCRIPTION SYMBOLS

te[xt1] [te]xt2	overlapping utterances
text1= =text2	latching utterances
(.)	a pause, shorter than 0.5 seconds
(4)	a pause, measured in seconds
(x)	unintelligible items, probably one word
(xx)	unintelligible items of phrase length
(xxx)	unintelligible items beyond phrase length
(text)	uncertain transcription
((text))	other actions besides speaking; transcriber's comments
<b>bold font</b>	prominence/stressed sounds
<b>CAPITALS</b>	loud speech
<i>italics</i>	mispronunciation
<u>text</u>	marked (Finnish) pronunciation
:	lengthened sound
.	falling intonation
↑	rising intonation
?	rising intonation in a question
,	continuing intonation
°text°	whispering utterance, soft speech
£text£	utterance said with a smiling expression
\$text\$	laughing utterance
cutoff w-	cutoff word
<text>	slow speech
>text<	fast speech
@text@	animated speech / altered tone of voice

### SYMBOLS TO IDENTIFY WHO IS SPEAKING

T	teacher
LM1	identified male learner, using numbers (M1, M2, etc)
LF1	identified female learner, using numbers (F1, F2, etc.)
LM	unidentified male learner
LF	unidentified female learner
LF(3)	uncertain identification of speaker
LL	unidentified subgroup of class
Ls	learners
LMS	male learners
LFs	female learners
??	unidentified speaker