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ABSTRACT

The alternating use of two or more languages or varieties of the same language in the course of a conversation is a linguistic phenomenon widely known as code-switching. It has traditionally been the subject matter of research in bilingual or multilingual settings but little has this phenomenon been investigated within the context of a Greek-English-language classroom.

Foreign language teaching is most usually undertaken not by a bilingual teacher but by a monolingual who is qualified to teach a language different from his own to other monolinguals. It seems plausible then to assume that the teacher in such a setting –at least in beginners’ classes – will switch to the mother tongue for various reasons. It is this assumption that the present study principally attempts to test by analysing the recordings from three different classes in a foreign language school (‘frontistirio’) in Greece. The results show that teachers indeed make greater use of the mother tongue in low-level classes and less in higher proficiency classes. The teachers’ switches carry out a variety of functions which will be investigated below.
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TRANSCRIPT NOTATION

A glossary of transcript symbols was initially developed by Gail Jefferson. For the purposes of the present thesis a combination\(^1\) with Schegloff’s version has been utilised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL – EXAMPLE</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Double brackets indicate overlapping utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>When utterances do not start at the same time, a single left-hand bracket is used at the point where the overlap begins in both utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>The end of the overlap is marked by a single right-hand bracket in both utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal signs indicate that there is no interval between two utterances by two different speakers, so that the one is latched onto the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>A period within parentheses is for a micropause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>Pauses and gaps are timed in seconds and are placed within parentheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li:ke</td>
<td>A colon indicates that the sound or syllable preceding it is stretched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li::ke</td>
<td>More than one colon prolong the extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like.</td>
<td>A period after a word indicates falling intonation. It is does not necessarily occur at the end of a sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like,</td>
<td>A comma stands for continuing intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like?</td>
<td>A question mark shows upward intonation. Not necessarily a question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like!</td>
<td>An exclamation mark stands for an animated tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-</td>
<td>A single dash indicates an abrupt cutoff of a syllable or word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like</td>
<td>Underlining indicates emphasis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKE</td>
<td>Capital letters indicate increased volume.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>°like°</td>
<td>Degree marks indicate that the utterance or word within them is produced in low voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hhh</td>
<td>Stands for audible aspiration, specifically exhaling or laughter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hhh</td>
<td>Stands for audible aspiration, specifically inhaling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li(hh)ke</td>
<td>h within parentheses indicates aspiration within the uttered word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Double parentheses are used to accommodate descriptions of external sounds and noises and occasionally laughter in the present study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he he</td>
<td>he he is an approximation to the sound of laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hmm</td>
<td>hmm stands for the sound made with a closed mouth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(like)</td>
<td>Single parentheses indicate the transcriptioner’s best guess as to the speech within them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>Empty parentheses mean that this part of speech was either inaudible or incomprehensible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; &lt;</td>
<td>“more than” &gt; and “less than” &lt; symbols indicate that the talk between them is compressed or rushed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑↓like</td>
<td>The &quot;more than&quot; symbol ↑ by itself indicates that the immediately following talk is &quot;jump-started,&quot; i.e., sounds like it starts with a rush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓↑like</td>
<td>Downward arrow ↓ shows falling intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>Upward arrow ↑ shows rising intonation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>The right pointing arrow → shows that the specific turn is of particular interest in the current analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The transcription of the total amount of the recorded data used for this study has been done by myself. Transcribed examples from other sources are adapted to the above transcript notation to the extent that this is permissible.
1. INTRODUCTION

It is a globalised world we live in whereby not only economies and technology but also the languages and cultures of countries around the world come together and interact. In this ‘melting-pot’ milieu, English has come to be ‘a common linguistic denominator’ since speakers from different linguistic backgrounds will probably use this language as a means to communicate. The very act of switching, then, from one language to another appears to be a common practice of anyone who wishes to communicate successfully using a language other than their own.

The subject matter that deals with this very ability of individuals to switch from one language to another – or from one variety of language to another – has been generally described with the title ‘code-switching’ and has been extensively discussed within the framework of bilingualism. But the present paper is not about bilingual speakers; rather, it is about monolinguals who, having themselves mastered a foreign language, have undertaken the task of teaching it to other monolinguals. Specifically, what this study investigates is the code-switching behaviour of three teachers of English in Greece and attempts to find the reasons for these teachers’ switches to their mother tongue which is also shared by the students.

1.1 Background of this study

Code-switching (henceforth CS) as a linguistic phenomenon had been initially ‘noticed’ in the speech of bilinguals as they used two languages or two varieties of the same language while interacting in their everyday lives. Since John Gumperz’s (Blom and Gumperz 1971) study of the alternating use of the standard language and the local dialect by the inhabitants of a Norwegian village, there has been an abundance of research that examined CS from many different perspectives. It was not until the beginning of the ‘80s,
however, that the use of CS in the setting of a language classroom started to attract researchers’ attention.

The first significant study was conducted by Milk (1981 as cited in Martin-Jones 1995) who investigated a class taught by a bilingual Mexican-American teacher in California. On the basis of the Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) model for analysing classroom talk in discourse acts, Milk discovered that the act of elicitation was performed in Spanish as frequently as it was performed in English (1981 as cited in Martin-Jones 1995: 93). In addition, English was the language most commonly used to provide directives and make metastatements. The former act lent an ‘air’ of authority to English whereas using this language for metastatements, “an act crucial to grasping the significance of a particular stretch of classroom discourse, put Spanish-dominant students at a disadvantage” (Martin-Jones 1995: 93).

Martin-Jones (1995: 93) also cites Guthrie’s (1984) comparative study of a bilingual and a monolingual teacher who taught English to Chinese students of different levels in California. The monolingual teacher’s effectiveness in teaching young Chinese students proved to be inadequate because of her inconsistent use of discourse acts; the bilingual teacher’s switches to to Chinese, though, were found to be used i) for translation, ii) as a ‘we code’, iii) for procedures and directions, iv) for clarification and v) to check understanding (Martin-Jones 1995: 94).

Although studies as the ones mentioned did provide significant insights as to what functions a teacher’s switches can possibly carry out, the issue of bilingualism was still central. A certain number of later studies focused on CS in a foreign language classroom but the emphasis was placed on different issues:

- Eldridge (1996) focused on the students’ and not the teachers’ language alternation functions,

A crucial point should be made here, though. The diversity observed both as to the foci of these studies and as to the results regarding teachers’ switches to the mother tongue, could well be the outcome of the specific teaching policy followed by the country or the institution where the study was carried out. As Macaro (2001) notes, “some national curricula appear to be quite assertive in their recommendations for the use of the L1” (2001: 532) and gives the example of England and Wales where it is required that the L2 be used by the teacher right from the beginning of the foreign language course. To my knowledge, the recently updated curriculum for teaching foreign languages in Greece (Government Gazette B 304/13.03.2003) gives no specific guidelines on the use of the L1 and the L2 in the language classroom. Thus, there appears to be a ‘gap’ with regard to a specific teaching procedure that teachers of foreign languages should follow.

Nevertheless, the owners of private language schools (‘frontistiria’) in Greece usually make concrete ‘demands’ of the teaching personnel. The present study was carried out in such a school where I have personally recorded three teachers teaching students of three different levels of proficiency in English. Only part of the results obtained regarding the amount of CS used in the three classrooms is supported by the results of other studies, again pointing to the diversity in perspective from which researchers have examined CS.

1.2 Structure of the thesis

The paper is organised in four main parts: initially a detailed background for the notion of code-switching is provided by thoroughly examining the views of three prominent researchers on the topic (John Gumperz, Carol Myers-Scotton and Peter Auer). Next Conversation Analysis is presented as a most significant ‘tool’ for analysing interaction and
the way this model is adjusted to fit the peculiarities of classroom talk is investigated. Then I
make an analysis of the transcribed authentic classroom data and present explanatory
examples as well as tables that summarise each teacher’s uses of CS. Finally, the last part
includes a discussion of the main issues that the present study set forth and the paper ends
with an acknowledgement of its limitations and some suggestions for further research.
2. CODE-SWITCHING

2.1 CODE-SWITCHING: PRELIMINARIES

Code-switching is a linguistic phenomenon which has been extensively discussed in connection with bilingualism within the fields of sociology (e.g. bilingual education) and sociolinguistics. Researchers have also viewed code-switching (henceforth CS) from the perspective of mainstream linguistics: syntax, psycholinguistics (acquisition) and neurolinguistics (neurolinguistic processing), adding new dimensions to its meaning. It is exactly because of this variety of perspectives that CS has been examined from, that some analysts do not even seem to agree on a single term to describe this phenomenon. Therefore, CS has been thus transformed to a “conceptually rich term” (Alvarez-Cáccamo 1998: 29) which needs to be treated carefully and prudently.

2.2 CS AS PERCEIVED BY GUMPERZ

The first discussion of the subject of CS from a sociolinguistic perspective was by Blom and Gumperz in their 1971 field study of the CS behaviour of the inhabitants in a Norwegian village. The two ‘codes’ that these people employed corresponded to “quite different varieties of the same language (comparable to […] Katharevousa versus Demotike Greek)” (Saville-Troike 2003: 48) –what Ferguson (1971/1959) described with the term ‘diglossia’–, though ‘codes’ could also refer to different languages altogether.

In Blom and Gumperz’s (1971) contribution, a crucial differentiation was made between situational and metaphorical switching. The former term describes the kind of CS that is caused due to a change in the participants’ definition of a particular setting. In other words, speakers might use two “distinct varieties” (Gumperz 1982: 60) depending on the topic discussed or the “extralinguistic context markers” (98) such as the activity carried out, the setting or the speakers taking part in the conversation. Thus, a “change in the
constellation” (Auer 2000: 176) “may be signalled among others by linguistic clues.” (Gumperz 1971: 294).

Metaphorical CS, as opposed to situational CS, can happen in one specific situation where no change in the topic takes place. Instead, Gumperz holds that the “signalling mechanism involved is a shift in contextualisation cues” (1982: 98), a term which needs to be clarified in order to perceive how metaphorical CS is meant by the analyst.

‘Contextualisation’ is used to refer to “speakers’ and listeners’ use of verbal and nonverbal signs to relate what is said at any one time and in any one place to knowledge acquired through past experience in order to retrieve the presuppositions they must rely on” so that they can ‘keep track’ of the conversation and understand the participants’ intentions (1997: 230).

Central to the notion of contextualisation are the situated interpretation of utterances, the process of inferencing (viz., making tentative hypotheses of other speakers’ communicative intentions) and the fact that the interpretations listeners make of what speakers wish to convey are “ecologically constrained by considerations of sequencing, conversational management, and negotiation of meaning, and […] are cooperatively made and validated.” (Gumperz 1997: 230). The cues, then, on which contextualisation is based can either be at the level of prosody i.e. intonation, stress or pitch or they can be ‘paralinguistic signs’, i.e. tempo, pausing and hesitation. The choice of code itself can be a contextualisation cue, whereas the use of particular lexical items or fixed expressions such as conversation openings or closings can contribute to the process of inferencing as well (1997: 231).

The phenomenon of metaphorical switching can be clarified if we think of the fact that whenever bilinguals choose to use one of the languages they speak in a particular situation they simultaneously identify themselves as members of a specific group, conveying
thus “the metaphorical meaning which goes along with such [a] choice as well as whatever denotative meaning is conveyed by the code itself.” (Saville-Troike 2003: 49).

Later on, Gumperz (1982) introduced the term ‘conversational code-switching’ and defined it as “the meaningful juxtaposition of what speakers must consciously or subconsciously process as strings formed according to the internal rules of two distinct grammatical systems” (1982: 66 original italics) or subsystems (:59). He went on to state that this alternation can either happen intersententially or intrasententially; intersentential alternation refers to the juxtaposition of codes between two subsequent sentences as in the following example:

(i) Chicano professionals in California, exchanging goodbyes (Sp-E).

   A. Well, I’m glad I met you.
   B. Andale pues. (O.K. swell). And do come again. Mm?

   (Gumperz 1982: 59)

Intrasentential switching, on the other hand, refers to cases where the juxtaposition occurs within one sentence only as in

(ii) Those are friends from Mexico que tienen chamaquitos (who have little children). (E – S)

   (Gumperz 1982: 60)

where two phrases that belong to two distinct languages (viz., English and Spanish) are put together in one sentence. With regard to the two ‘codes’ that bilingual speakers use, Gumperz (1982) maintained that they express the “contrasting cultural styles and standards of evaluation which they encounter in daily interaction.” (1982: 66). He thus employs the term ‘we code’ for the code used by minority group members in their informal everyday activities and opposes it to the “they code”, which is the language or variety used by majority group members in formal settings (op.cit.).
2.2.1 Gumperz’s view of CS functions

Gumperz (1982) defined CS as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (:59) and of particular interest for our present discussion is his typology of CS functions, which is nevertheless a ‘preliminary’ one and has certain shortcomings as the analyst himself states (: 75). Switches may thus serve:

(a) to quote someone else’s words either directly or as reported speech:

(iii) Spanish-English. From a conversation among two Chicano professionals.

The speaker is talking about her baby-sitter.

She doesn’t speak English, so, *dice que la reganan*: “*Si se les va olvidar el idioma a ala criaturas*” (she says that they would scold her: “the children are surely going to forget their language”).

(Gumperz 1982: 76),

(b) to address someone ‘outside’ the main group of speakers as in

(iv) A group of Hindi speaking graduate students are discussing the subject of Hindi-English code switching:

A: Sometimes you get excited and then you speak in Hindi, then again you go on to English.

B: No nonsense, it depends on your command of English.

B: [shortly thereafter turning to a third participant, who has just returned from answering the door bell] *Kon hai bai* (who is it)?

[note the discrepancy here between actual usage and *talk about* usage]

(Gumperz 1982: 77),
(c) as sentence fillers or interjections. Example (i) already provided in the beginning is illustrative of this function: in “Andale pues. (O.K. swell). And do come again. Mm?” an interjection is Spanish is included and then the speaker switches back to English, (d) to repeat something previously said in another code so as to place emphasis on it or exemplify it:

(v) Spanish-English. Chicano professionals:

A: The three old ones spoke nothing but Spanish. Nothing but Spanish. No hablaban inglés (they didn’t speak English). (Gumperz 1982: 78),

(e) to qualify the main message of what was said in the other language as in:

(vi) English-Spanish

We’ve got all . . . all these kids here right now. Los que estan ya criados aquí, no los que estan recien venidos de México. (those that have been born here, not the ones that have just arrived from Mexico). They all understood English. (Gumperz 1982: 79)

where Spanish is used to qualify the message which was previously delivered in English, and finally

(f) to grant objectivity and authority to statements or to show whether and how much a speaker is personally involved in the message delivered (: 80-81). The following is an example of the latter:

(vii) Spanish-English. Chicano professionals. A talks about her attempt to cut down on smoking:

A: …I’d smoke the rest of the pack myself in the other two weeks.
B: That’s all you smoke?
A: That’s all I smoked.
B: And how about now?
A: Estos … me los halle ... Estos Pall Malls me los hallaron (these...I found these Pall Malls they... these were found for me). No I mean that’s all the cigarettes … that’s all. They’re the ones I buy.

Later in the same conversation:
A: …They tell me: “How did you quit Mary?” I don’t quit I … I just stopped. I mean it wasn’t an effort that I made que voy a dejar de fumar por que me hace daño o (that I’m going to stop smoking because it’s harmful to me or) this or that uh-uh. It’s just that I used to pull butts out of the waste paper basket yeah. I used to go look in the … se me acababan los cogarros en la noche (my cigarettes would run out on me at night). I’d get desperate y ahi voy al basarero a buscar, a sacar (and there I go to the wastebasket to look for some, to get some), you know.

(Gumperz 1982: 81).

In this example the passages in Spanish are indicative of the speaker’s personal involvement; English, on the contrary, is used in a more ‘objective’ way, meaning that the speaker distances herself from the statements she makes.²

Immediately after providing us with these functions, Gumperz is quick to stress that this list is “by no means exhaustive” (1982: 81) and that the message conveyed in CS instances is shaped by the context, so that there is a considerable degree of variation observed. He goes on to recognise the problems that such a typology of CS can run in: in

² A distinction which presumably corresponds to the use of the ‘we code’ and the ‘they code’ respectively.
(iii), for instance, the speaker reports someone else’s words in Spanish – namely the code they were originally delivered so that this very fact could ‘obey’ a rule such as “A message is quoted in the code in which it was said” (: 82). It is not only the quoted passage that is in Spanish, though; this language is also used for the reported speech (“dice que la reganan” ('says that they would scold her’)), thus rendering the above rule impractical.

Additional problems arise as far as the function of ‘objectification and personalization’ is concerned. Gumperz points out that in examples such as (vii) cited before, it is not always the case that statements made in the ‘we code’ (viz. Spanish) are interpreted by participants as personalised and statements made in the ‘they code’ (viz. English) as objective ones. Such an interpretation, according to Gumperz, is the result of “the choice of code itself in a particular conversational context” (1982: 83 original italics). Finally, after acknowledging the diverseness of his classification of functions – namely that it includes both structurally-based categories and semantically-based ones –, Gumperz concludes that “a more semantic approach” (: 84) to data would probably be more helpful than providing functional categories for CS.

While Gumperz adopts a conversational approach according to which CS “signals contextual information” and “generates the presuppositions in terms of which the content of what is said is decoded” (Gumperz 1982: 98), another prominent researcher in the field – viz., Myers-Scotton – adopts a quite distinct view placing emphasis on the socio-psychological aspect of the phenomenon of CS. It is this theory that we now turn to.

2.3 Myers-Scotton’s ‘Markedness’ Model

Myers-Scotton set out to investigate the phenomenon of CS from a totally different perspective from the one adopted by Gumperz. She defines CS as “the term used to identify
alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation” (Myers-Scotton 1995: 1) and views it as “a type of skilled performance with communicative intent” (1995: 6). She too, like Gumperz (1982) makes the distinction between intersentential and intrasentential CS (1995: 4) and also stresses the differences between CS and borrowing. Myers-Scotton (1995) further distinguishes ‘cultural borrowings’ – names for objects or notions new to the culture they enter – from ‘core borrowings’ which are forms that are used in a language despite the fact that this language “already has lexemes of its own to encode the concepts or objects in question” (6).

The theoretical model she proposes is one which accounts for the “socio-psychological motivations behind CS” (3), in the sense that the use of a specific language in CS “has socio-psychological associations,” (7). Her so-called ‘markedness theory’ places emphasis on the interpretations that analysts give of participants’ intentions and, despite the fact that her data are drawn from the multilingual setting of Africa, she suggests that this model applies generally to all types of CS (113) since it “serves the same socio-psychological functions everywhere” (3).

Central to the markedness model is the concept that speakers as ‘creative actors’ are aware –though not always completely– of the fact that some languages are ‘marked’ –that is, less anticipated– for use in specific situations while others constitute the ‘unmarked choice’ (75). The latter, according to Myers-Scotton, is neutral and as such “it conveys no surprises because it indexes an expected interpersonal relationship” (75) among participants. Being aware of the effects that their linguistic choices may have, speakers go for one language rather than another after they have unconsciously estimated the possible ‘gains and losses’ that such a choice can bring about (75).

---

4 At least in her 1995 “Social Motivations for Codeswitching” book.
The notion of ‘indexicality’ is quite important for the markedness theory as it refers to a ‘property’ that linguistic signs have by being able to ‘point to’ their referents (Myers-Scotton 1995: 85). Specifically, each linguistic choice made by participants is indexical of or signifies a particular ‘rights-and-obligation set’ (henceforth RO set) that is in place among them in a certain interaction (: 84). The RO set is a theoretical concept referring to ‘situation factors’ which vary across communities and are representative of “the attitudes and expectations of participants towards one another” (: 85); it is from the relative prevalence of these factors in a particular community that the unmarked RO set is defined for this community and interactions taking place within its limits. Thus, the reason why speakers employ a specific code at the expense of another while taking part in one type of interaction is because they are willing to negotiate the prominence of those factors (: 85) before they ultimately commit themselves to a certain RO set.

As for ‘markedness’, Myers-Scotton stresses that the term does not refer to an ‘either-or’ situation; namely, the choice of code need not be strictly marked or unmarked. Rather, the case is that linguistic choices “fall along a continuum” ranging from less to more unmarked (: 82) while the “marked choice is not the absence of the unmarked choice. And the unmarked choice never stands for, or includes, the marked choice.” (: 81 original italics). Speakers, according to Myers-Scotton, possess an innate ‘markedness metric’ which is universal and which allows them to estimate whether one language is more or less marked. Thus, while there is no universality in the ‘amount of markedness’ each linguistic code may carry, “what is universal is the capacity of speakers to perceive linguistic choices as marked or unmarked” in relation with specific RO sets (: 90).

Significantly, the markedness theory does share some views with the interactional and conversation-analytic approaches –namely the ones proposed by Gumperz (1982) and Auer (1995, 1998) respectively– insofar as the individual interaction is not overstressed at the
expense of societal norms: in the same way as the ‘interactive’ approaches, the markedness model too, views the successiveness of turns in conversation as indicative of “whether an earlier turn succeeded in its negotiation concerning the interpersonal relationship” (Myers-Scotton 1995: 95). Equally important to the markedness model is the fact that for a conversation to be effective speakers and addressees have to cooperate. Finally, the sequentiality of conversation (as this is described by Auer 1995, 1998) is applicable to Myers-Scotton’s model for CS to the extent that switches are in juxtaposition with the previous as well as the following parts of a conversation (Myers-Scotton 1995: 95). If there is no contrast included in a switch, then “the particular code choice has little communicative intention of its own” (: 96).

If, however, too much emphasis is placed on the previously-mentioned ‘shared views’ resulting in social meaning being only ‘locally created’, then Myers-Scotton cannot see how “members of the same speech community interpret the same interaction as communicating more or less the same social intention.” (: 61). The markedness model crucially differs from the ‘interactive’ ones because its main principle is that speakers are placed at the very centre of it, making linguistic choices which are ‘goal-oriented’ or aiming at “communicating their own perceptions” (: 112).

Within the model of markedness lists of situational factors calling for a particular linguistic code are rejected (: 84). 5 However, Myers-Scotton specifies four types of CS which are included in the model: (a) sequential unmarked CS, (b) CS itself as the unmarked choice, (c) CS as a marked choice and (d) CS as an exploratory choice (: 114). Later however, these types were condensed to the three ‘main’ ones– viz., (a), (c) and (d) (Myers-Scotton 2000: 141). Out the four initial types, (a) refers to the case when there is a change in the ‘situational factors’ during a conversation so that a different unmarked RO set may be required. This is

---

5 Thus directly criticising Gumperz’s (1982) list of CS functions (see section 2.2.1).
what Gumperz calls ‘situational CS’ but Myers-Scotton adopts the description ‘CS as an unmarked choice’ because it is up to the speaker to choose a code, thus ‘reacting’ to the change in the situation. (Myers-Scotton 1995: 115). Myers-Scotton provides the following example (viii) of sequential unmarked CS between Swahili and English:

1. **SUBORDINATE** ((entering John M.’s office and speaking to Edward M. just after John M. has stepped out for a minute)). Where has this guy gone to?
2. **EDWARD** He’s just gone out. He will soon be back.
3. **JOHN** ((to subordinate when he returns)). Why did you change the plan of our stand at the showground? Who recommended the change?...
4. **SUBORDINATE** ((looking guilty)). Nobody told me.
5. **JOHN** Go and change it according to our previous plan. Also make sure that the painting is done properly.
6. **JOHN** ((to Edward when subordinate has left)). I’ve told this man how to build our stand, but he went and did a different thing. Ni mtu mjeuri sana. (‘He’s a stubborn person.’) I’ll make him pay for the paint he spoilt.
7. **JOHN** ((calling to receptionist)). Letea mgeni soda anywe. (‘Bring the guest a soda so that he may drink.’)
8. **RECEPTIONIST** ((to Edward)) Nikulatee soda gani? (‘What kind of soda should I bring you?)
9. **EDWARD** Nipe Pepsi. (‘Give me a Pepsi.)
10. **SALESMAN** ((entering)). Sikweza kufika kwa sababu nilikuwa mgonjwa. (‘I couldn’t come because I wasn’t well.’)
11. **JOHN** Well, I wanted you to explain something about one of your receipt books…There’s a mistake somewhere. Take it back and make the totals again.
12. **JOHN** ((to Edward when salesman leaves)). This one will not earn any money at the end of this month. He has a big shortage.


This exchange takes place in Nairobi; Edward pays a visit to John who is his relative and works in a bottling company as an executive. The two use mainly English but also Swahili – the unmarked choices in the context of the codes used in John’s office. What is remarkable, though, is that when the addressee changes, John speaks another language. He uses English to address his subordinate (turn 3),⁷ English and Swahili when he talks again with Edward (#6) but totally switches to Swahili when he orders a drink from the receptionist (#7). Switching back to English John goes on to ‘scold’ the salesman in #11, while in #12 John changes to English again to address his relative. As Myers-Scotton points out, “while John might speak

---

⁶ According to the transcription conventions that the present study adopts.
⁷ The word ‘turn’ will be henceforth replaced by the symbol #.
in either Swahili or English to his higher-level staff members, in this conversation the topic calls for him to express his authority; English is the more unmarked choice for this purpose.” (Myers-Scotton 1995: 115-116).

As for type (b), where the constant use of two languages within the same interaction can itself be the unmarked choice, it is a type of switching occurring in a limited number of communities and one in which switches do not need to index a specific RO set; in Myers-Scotton’s words “it is the overall pattern which carries the communicative intention” (1995: 7 original italics). An important difference of type (a) – sequential unmarked CS – and type (b) is one referring to their structure; i.e., type (a) takes the form of intersentential switches whereas (b) – unmarked CS – most usually takes the form of intrasentential switches where the “one of the two (or more) codes involved is the main or matrix language and the other is the embedded language” (Myers-Scotton 1995: 125). 8

An example of this second type of CS is the following exchange (example ix) between two university students in Nairobi:

1 Onyango (Luo; Swahili; English) Omera, unesoma katika papers kwamba government imekuwa frozen. (I say, have you read in the papers that the government is frozen? Meaning: there is a freeze on employment.)

2 Owino Kitambo sana. (Long ago.)

3 Onyango Na huoni kuna need ya kujaza zile forms za TSC badala ya kungojea zile za PSC? (And don’t you think there is a need to fill in the forms of the Teacher Service Commission rather than wait for those of the Public Service Commission?)

4 Owino Yea, you have a point there. Singeji kuwa part-time cheater. (I wouldn’t mind being a part-time teacher. [Note: cheater: ‘teacher’ in student word play.])

5 Onyango Hutaki kuwa full-time cheater. (You don’t want to be a full-time teacher.)

6 Owino No way. (adapted from Myers-Scotton 2000: 147-148)

The switching between Swahili and English is the CS type that peers typically engage in (viz. the unmarked choice) even in a case where the first language (Luo in the example above) is

---

8 A structural view of intrasentential CS and the role of the matrix language and the embedded one are the subject of Myers-Scotton’s 1997 volume.
common for both of them and even when the conversation takes place in the presence of people from other ethnic groups (Myers-Scotton 2000: 147).

Moving on to the third CS type (c) where CS is used as a marked choice, it is the case of speakers making a linguistic choice which is unexpected; instead of using the unmarked language, they ‘go against the norm’ and choose to make a marked choice dissociating themselves from the anticipated RO set (Myers-Scotton 1995: 131). Although the degree of markedness included in one such choice is “strictly relative” (: 132), the latter obtains meaning from two facts: “first, since it is not the unmarked choice, it is a negotiation against the unmarked RO set; and second, as ‘something else’, the marked choice is a call for another RO set in its place, that for which the speaker’s choice is the unmarked index” (: 131 original italics). Thus, what speakers do is negotiate the kind of relationship holding among them, though a marked choice could also point to speakers’ emotions ranging from anger to fondness (: 132). A representative example (x) is the following exchange in Nairobi in Kenya where a passenger on a crowded bus addresses the busy ticket inspector (CONDUCTOR) in English (#2). Both the passenger’s message and the fact that she uses the marked choice (English), make her utterance disturbing for the inspector (#3):

1 CONDUCTOR ((shouting in Swahili)). Fuguenu madirisha! ('Open the windows!')
2 → WELL-DRESSED PASSENGER (English). That is your job.
3 → CONDUCTOR (Swahili). Wewe mjinga sana. Kama wewe unaketi karibu na dirisha, mbona unataka mimi nije hapo kufungua hili dirisha? (‘You are a real fool! If you are seated near the window, why on earth do you want me to come to open this window?’)
   (adapted from Myers-Scotton 1995: 134)

The last CS type (d) is the use of CS as an exploratory device in interactions that are non-conventionalised. Given that in conventionalised exchanges the unmarked code is used (: 90), in non-conventionalised ones the situation is not clear, and “when an unmarked choice is not apparent, speakers nominate an exploratory choice as the basis for the exchange” (Myers-Scotton 2000: 159). This being the case, CS is used as a means of ‘testing the ground’ before
a particular linguistic choice is agreed upon or becomes clear. An exchange between a young man (his native language is Kikuyu (Myers-Scotton 2000: 160) ) and a young woman is an illuminating example of exploratory CS (xi):

(Kikuyu, English)

1 → HE Nisaidie na dance tafadhali.
('Please give me a dance.')

2 → SHE Nimechoka. Pengine nyimbo ifuatayo.
('I’m tired. Maybe the following song.')

3 HE Hii ndio nyimbo ninayopenda.
('This is the song which I like.('

4 SHE Nimechoka! ('I’m tired!')

5 HE Tafadhali – ('Please – ')

6 → SHE (interrupting) Ah, stop bugging me.

7 → HE I’m sorry. I didn’t mean to bug you, but I can’t help it if I like this song.

8 → SHE OK, then, in that case, we can dance.
(adapted from Myers-Scotton 1995: 146)

Unsure as to which language to use to achieve his aim –to dance with the woman– the man decides to start with a neutral choice, Swahili (#1). However the young woman does not respond positively (#2). The young man ultimately chooses to follow her linguistic choice (#6) and therefore uses English in #7 in reply to her complaint. Apparently this move is successful: “the negotiation of the RO set associated with English in this exchange wins a dance” (#8) (Myers-Scotton 1995: 146).

This sketch of Myers-Scotton’s markedness model of CS was meant to illustrate how her theory aims to find a link between “linguistic choices and their social consequences” (Myers-Scotton 2000: 162), rather than look for the local creation of meaning, as Gumperz did.

This argument of hers was robustly supported and indeed had many followers but it did not go without criticism. Auer (1998) notes that there are problems with the ‘broad descriptions’ that Myers-Scotton’s model indicates, since it analyses data “exclusively on the basis of conversation-external knowledge” (1998: 10). Meeuws and Blommaert (1998) hold that the identification of a language as a ‘code’ is very problematic, whereas Li Wei (1998) points out that the markedness theory is an ‘analyst-oriented approch’ in which CS meaning
is created and interpreted ‘mono-directionally’. The social indexicality of CS can be helpful for interpreting CS, but “it is hardly the way conversation participants themselves interpret each other’s linguistic choices and negotiate meaning” (Li Wei 1998: 159). Participants do bring along their background knowledge and schemata in a conversation but once they engage in it they tend to have on-line ‘reactions’ not only to what is said but also to non-verbal cues (Li Wei 1998).

It is in this respect that Myers-Scotton’s markedness model substantially departed from approaches taken by conversation-analytic researchers (Auer 1995, Li Wei and Milroy 1995 and the similarly-minded sociolinguists). Peter Auer’s theory, specifically, has been the ‘bedrock’ on which conversation-analytic approaches to CS have been founded and therefore requires special attention for the purposes of this contribution.

2.4 Auer’s theory of conversational CS

To begin with, Auer (1995) employs the term ‘code-alternation’ –not code-switching– and defines it as “a relationship of contiguous juxtaposition of semiotic systems, such that the appropriate recipients of the resulting complex sign are in a position to interpret this juxtaposition as such.” (: 116 original italics). For Auer ‘code-alternation’ is a blanket term covering both CS and the process of transfer; the latter is actually taken to refer to one aspect of code-alternation related to a specific conversational structure –a word or a sentence– while CS is another aspect of code-alternation that is related to a specific point in conversation (Auer 1988: 192).

Regarding the notion of ‘codes’, Auer claims that it is necessary that conversation participants –and not linguists– view two languages or varieties of a language as different codes and employ them in a meaningful way (1998: 13). A concise indication of the codes employed in CS “may be an interactional achievement” which does not pre-exist.
conversation but is something that interactants themselves negotiate and ultimately decide on (: 15); “it is not the existence of certain codes which takes priority, but the function of a certain transition in conversation”, Auer (op.cit.) points out. Thus, regarding CS as a language contact phenomenon not only linguists may take –mistakenly– two languages or varieties as different codes but also conversation participants might not perceive them as such. Apart from CS, ‘code-mixing’ is another example of language contact which may constantly include instances of code alternation (in the linguist’s mind). These, however, may well go unnoticed by the speakers –or even when noticed might not carry any meaning on their own (Auer 1998: 16).

Auer places this ‘code-mixing’ on the one end of a continuum which he takes to extend from “code-alternation to a mixed code [i.e. code-mixing]” (1998: 16). It is interesting to note that the case of borrowing as a language contact phenomenon ‘works’ towards the direction of such a mixed code, since it has been said to trigger “a switch from one language to another” (Clyne 2000 [1987]: 262). ‘Triggering’ is a psychological mechanism whereby “an item of ambiguous affiliation (that is, one belonging to the speaker’s two systems)” sets off the use of more language material that belong to the language of the trigger word (Clyne op.cit.).

For Auer then, as for Gumperz, code-alternation ought to be seen on the level of conversation as a contextualisation cue since it has the same characteristics as other contextualisation cues. Auer is quick, however, to state that conversational code-alternation does have a theory of its own, which he goes on to sketch on the basis of sequential patterns of language choice, initially four in number (1995: 124) and, later, condensed to three main ones plus the sequential pattern for language negotiation (1998: 4-9).

These patterns are taken to connect conversational structure with the “wider social and cultural context of an interactional episode” (1998: 4) and are the following:
(a) the pattern of ‘discourse-related’ CS, corresponding to

**Pattern Ia:** A1 A2 A1 A2 // B1 B2 B1 B2

(Auer 1995: 125)

where A is the language-of-interaction so far; speaker 1, though, changes to language B at a specific point and this new language seems to be ‘picked up’ also by speaker 2 so that from the switching point onwards, only language B is employed. Alternatively, it could be within a single speaker’s turn that language alternation occurs as in

**Pattern Ib:** A1 A2 A1 A2 A1 // B1 B2 B1 B2

(Auer 1995: 125)

‘Discourse-related’ CS, according to Auer, is used as a means to organise the conversation in a particular episode and to mark a change in the participant constellation, a change in topic, a change in the mode of interaction –formal versus casual–, etc. (Auer 1988: 199).

An illuminating example of discourse-related CS comes from unpublished data by Tilmann Altenberg (1992). This is a casual conversation between bilingual (Spanish-German) speakers of South American origin in Hamburg; W is female and M is male; italics stand for Spanish.

1   (25.0)  
2  W  qué hora es?  
     ('what time is it?')  
3  (2.0)  
4  →  W  Wie spät?  
     ('what time?')  
5  M  zwanzig nach elf;  
     ('twenty past eleven;')  
6  W  H (2.5)  
7  M  Wann muß du hoch?  
     ('When do you have to go?') ((i.e. to the university))  
8  W  nö – nich so früh. Ich hab erst um vier Uni.  
     ('no – not so early. I haven’t got classes until four.')  
     (Altenberg 1992, as cited in Auer 1998: 5)

CS here is related to discourse in the sense that it is caused by M’s non-response in #3; W interprets this as initiating a repair –an ‘indirect message’ that his choice of code has been unsuccessful for some reason or another– and in #4 W moves to “the repetition in the
other language of a first pair part which was not responded to” (Auer 1998: 4). In discourse-related switching a participant’s choice of a new language creates a new ‘frame’ (Goffman 1974) for the conversation. ‘Frames’ are described as “definitions of a situation […] built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern events […] and our subjective involvement in them” (1974: 10), that is they are structures which help us perceive reality.

A new frame in discourse-related switching is then created, since the linguistic choice made by one of the participants is ultimately adopted by the co-participants as well (Auer 1998: 8).

On the other hand, the pattern of (b) ‘participant- or preference-related’ CS may lead to sequences characterised by divergence of low or high degree:


(speakers’ language choices are consistently divergent) or


(language negotiation sequence: speakers’ initial language choices diverge but finally converge to language A)

(Auer 1998: 8).

Auer holds that this CS type is indexical of ‘extra-conversational knowledge’ (1998: 7) and that the term ‘preference’ should not be understood as a “psychological concept” (: 8); rather, what is at issue are the “interactional processes of displaying and ascribing predicates to individuals.” (Auer 1998: 8). This is what Sacks (1972a, 1972b) calls membership categorisation devices, namely groups of categories

“containing at least a category, that may be applied to some population, containing at least a Member, so as to provide, by the use of some rules of application, for the pairing of at least a population Member and a categorization device member.”

(1972a: 32).

While in discourse-related switching participants seek to find out why a particular language is used at a specific moment in the structure of the conversation, in preference- or participant-
related switching the answer to this question is found “within the individual who performs this switching, or his or her co-participants” (Auer op.cit.), and can be related to participants’ potential lack of confidence or competence to speak a particular language (Auer 1995).

Finally, the last type of switching that Auer (1995) mentions is ‘transfer’ or what he later (1998) calls ‘discourse-related insertion’. This corresponds to

\[ \text{Pattern IV: } \ldots \text{A1[B1]A1 } \ldots \]

(Auer 1998: 6)

where the switching point can occur in the middle of a speaker’s turn and can only have the form of a single lexical unit so that the language-of-interaction is not altered.

Discourse-related insertion generally gives rise to “episode-external (‘ethnographic’) knowledge about interaction histories and cultural contexts.” (op.cit.). The following extract illustrates four instances of insertion and comes from Giese’s (1992/93) unpublished data. This is a casual conversation (EXAMPLE 2) between Spanish-German bilingual speakers of South American origin in Hamburg; J and U host C; italics stand for German:

1  J  qué estás buscando? (from the distance)  
   (‘what are you looking for?’)
2  C  Cigarros  
   (‘cigarettes’)
3  J  ay por qué?  
   (‘oh why?’)
4  (1.0)
5  C  por qué?  
   (why?)
6  →  J  por qué por qué quieres ir al flur?  
   (‘why why do you want to go out in the corridor?’)
7  C  para fumar  
   (‘in order to smoke’)
8  J  Aha
9  →  L  a(h) [flur] [ah] [ah] [ah] [ah]  
   (‘to the corridor to the to the to the’)  
10 →  J  [y d’onde a(h)l al flur? h h]  
   (‘and where in the corridor?’)
11  A  he he he [he
12  U  [fuerte  
   (‘cool’)
13  (2.0)
14  L  ahí donde está la bicicleta [está  
   (‘there where the bike is’)  

9 The term was subsequently (Auer 1998) replaced by ‘insertion’; ‘transfer’ evoked a different meaning since it was used in the field of L2 acquisition.
The German word *Flur* (‘corridor’) that is used by J (twice) and by L (once) as well as the German *Nichtraucher* (‘no smoking’) are all analysed as insertions; according to Auer (1998) the repetition of *Flur* serves to lend textual coherence to the conversation and therefore has a discourse-related function. Importantly, however, it is the insertion of *Nichtraucher* that calls for our attention. It brings out a certain aspect of the German culture, one that demands that there are areas specifically made for smoking and which actually differs from the South-American way of treating smokers. Since the background of this conversation had already been smoking, we realise that “it is only on the basis of an analysis of the sequential position of the insertion together with this background knowledge […] that a full understanding of code-alternation can be reached” (Auer 1998: 7 original italics).

### 2.4.1 Functions of CS in Auer’s interactional approach

Since in the theoretical framework proposed by Auer (1995, 1998) the emphasis is placed on the conversational structure of CS, the understanding and interpretation of verbal actions is not supposed to be ‘coded’ and placed into a classification scheme. Thus followers of the interactional approach to CS do not adopt any of the ‘pre-established external categories’ (referring to changes in conversation participants, the topic or setting of the interactional episode) that Gumperz (1982) suggested and one that would allow for the possibility to predict the kind of activities during which bilinguals are most likely to codeswitch.

Auer (1995) however, adduces a number of ‘conversational loci’ (1995: 120) where one is mostly expected to encounter CS instances. These are:
a) reported speech,
b) change of participant constellation,
c) parentheses or side comments,
d) reiterations or (quasi-) translations as well as repetitions or recycling,
e) change of activity type (also ‘mode shift’ or ‘role shift’),
f) topic shift,
g) puns, language play, shift or ‘key’ and
h) topicalisation, topic/comment structure

(adapted from Auer 1995: 120).

Nevertheless, he instantly goes on to provide ample argumentation against such a typology for CS by stressing four points; firstly, such lists are not always clearly described in the sense that there is often an example for each category without it being analysed in depth (1995: 120). As a result, a precise substantiation of such categories is absent. Secondly, Auer argues that it is common for such CS classifications to ‘mix up’ functions that refer to the level of structure (e.g. ‘interjection’ or ‘filler’) with others that are strictly functions of CS (e.g. ‘emphasis’) (op.cit.). Thirdly, functional categories for CS do not provide an answer to the question why there is meaning in language switching. It is exactly because CS is a dynamic and creative mechanism, Auer asserts, that makes an exhaustive listing of CS functions impossible. The last but not least important argument that Auer brings forward is that a typology of CS functions would suggest that the direction of the switch has the same ‘conversational status’ whether it is from language X to language Y or the other way around (1995: 121). After providing a number of studies which show that the opposite is the case (i.e. that CS direction is meaningful), Auer concludes that such an approach to CS is not sufficient to address the phenomenon; on the one hand conversation activities and use of a
particular language are not so strongly linked so as to make predictions for language choice, and on the other hand the direction of the switches does carry a meaning.

As a way to account for this inefficiency, Auer (1995, 1998) sketched his conversational-analytic approach which is based on a sequential interpretation of CS data. For Auer then, CS—or, to use his own term ‘code-alternation’—is a contextualisation strategy (in the sense Gumperz uses the term) that participants employ in order to communicate a message during a conversation. Yet, it is also a phenomenon that has a theory of its own and that should be approached from a sequential-, conversation-analytic perspective. That is because the meaning of CS is inherent in the conversational process and it is only by analysing the ‘local functioning’ of code-alternation that participants’ understanding of the on-going interaction is possible (Auer 1988). By adopting a conversation-analytic approach to data, Auer (1998) does not wish to imply that a macro-sociolinguistic analysis of CS should be discarded. Rather, he stresses that a sequential approach to CS “serves to ground the former [i.e. conversation-analytic aspects] in the latter [i.e. wider, macroscopic structures]” (Auer 1998: 13).

The next chapter will be dedicated to Conversation Analysis as a most important tool which researchers employ to analyse conversation and which provides ways of describing such ‘on the spot’ or situated creation of meaning.

2.5 SUMMARY

This chapter has been an exposition of a basic concept that requires clarification for the present thesis. Code-switching as a sociolinguistic phenomenon was thoroughly presented as it has been viewed by the leading writers on the topic (namely Gumperz, Myers-Scotton and Auer). These researchers addressed CS basically within the framework of bilingualism and provided a variety of explanatory terms and labels that were representative of their
–oftentimes– contradictory points of view.
3. CONVERSATION ANALYSIS, INSTITUTIONAL TALK AND THE CLASSROOM

3.1 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Conversation analysis (hereafter CA) is a research tradition which has developed over the past forty years by some sociologists – known as ethnomethodologists – who have adopted “a new style, or styles, of sociology which rejects the positivistic and functionalist assumptions which have marred the development of a rigorous discipline” (Button and Lee 1987: 3). CA was initially designed by Harvey Sacks to “investigate the levels of social order that could be revealed in the everyday practice of talking” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 17 emphasis added). His basic assumption that natural, everyday talk is organized rather than random came at odds with sociological theories which regarded “society as a piece of machinery with relatively few orderly products, where, then, much of what else takes place is more or less random” (Sacks 1989: 21). In CA, the way to successfully tap into the phenomenon of ‘ordinary conversation’ where “there is order at all points” (: 22) is not to make hypotheses and assumptions about it – as social scientists do – but to describe the “details of actual occurrences” by means of transcribing them “in their actual sequence” (: 25).

3.1.1 Scope of CA

Because CA is primarily concerned with ‘talk-in-interaction’, that is with “the systematic analysis of the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 13), the raw materials of this approach are the transcribed recordings of ‘naturally occurring’ data\(^\text{10}\) (Heritage and Atkinson 1989: 4). These can actually include a great variety of forms of talk (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001); crucially, not only casual conversation is in the scope of CA, but also talk that takes place in institutional settings such as classrooms, court rooms, interviews or medical encounters (Heritage 1988:

\(^\text{10}\) Crucially, however, the data of CA is not transcripts alone; as Heritage and Atkinson (1989) point out “although the transcripts serve as an extremely convenient research tool, they are produced and designed for use in close conjunction with the tape-recorded materials that constitute the data base” (: 12 original italics).
The pattern of interaction that takes place in such settings is apparently different from the one we find in ordinary conversation; as Heritage notes “institutional interaction seems to involve specific and significant narrowings and respecifications of the range of options that are operative in conversational interaction” (1988: 34). Since the focus of this paper is placed on the interaction in the institutional setting of a classroom, our point of departure for the description of this kind of talk will be CA and a sketch of its fundamental approach to mundane conversation.

3.1.2 Turn-taking: organisation, components and principles

To begin with, the kernel concept in CA is the way turns are organised in interaction and the way participants orient towards organised turn-taking (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 38); importantly, when a cluster of turns is thought of in terms of an ‘action’, sequences refer to such courses of action “which have some shape or trajectory to them” (Schegloff 2007: 2). In other words, sequences are “courses of action implemented through talk” (: 3). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1978) propose that turn-taking as a mechanism is based on two components and a set of rules. First, there is the ‘turn constructional component’ referring to the unit-types (sentences, clauses, phrases) which speakers use to construct their turn, while “the first possible completion of a first such unit constitutes an initial transition-relevance place” (Sacks et al. 1978: 12). The shape of such unit-types allows for the ‘projectability’ or predictability of their end, at which place ‘transfer of speakership’ will presumably occur (: op.cit.). Second, there is the ‘turn-allocational component’ which arranges the distribution of turns; a turn can be allocated either by the current speaker who selects a next speaker, or by self-selection. What essentially governs turn-taking, however, is a set of rules “with ordered options which operates on a turn-by-turn basis, and can thus be termed a local management
system” (Levinson 1984: 297). This set was originally presented by Sacks et al. (: 13) but for
the purposes of the present paper a simplified version is preferred.

At the initial transition-relevance place of a turn:

**Rule 1**

(a) If the current speaker has identified, or selected, a particular

next speaker, then that speaker should take a turn at that place.

(b) If no such selection has been made, then any next speaker may (but need
not) self-select at that point. If self-selection occurs, then first speaker has
the right to the turn.

(c) If no next speaker has been selected, then alternatively the current speaker

may, but need not, continue talking with another turn-constructional unit,
unless another speaker has self-selected, in which case that speaker gains
the right to the turn.

**Rule 2** Whichever option has operated, then rules 1 a- c come into
play again for the next transition-relevance place.

(Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 49-50).

By providing this list, Sacks et al. (: 8-9) argued that there is a *systematic account* of
the organisation of turn taking in conversation, and this realisation was made obvious to them
from the recordings of natural conversation. It is important to clarify that turn-taking rules are
not prescriptive (in the sense that speakers are not obliged to ‘know’ them and apply them)
but they are descriptive; they only aim to “describe observed regularities and do not provide
for what is *constitutive* of the production of conversation” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 50
original italics). What the ‘local management’ of the turn-taking system means, is that “it
operates in such a way as to allow turn size and turn order\(^{11}\) to vary” (Sacks et al.: 41). The degree of the variation that turn size and turn order may have, depends on the participants’ ‘administration’ of conversation – therefore the characterisation of conversation as a ‘party-administered’ system (op.cit.), meaning that they are in control of it at all times –and on the ‘interactional control’ that all potential conversationalists have of any feature of the interaction (: 42). The term ‘recipient design’ is what Sacks et al. (1978) use to refer to a “multitude of respects in which the talk by a party in a conversation is constructed or designed in ways which display an orientation and sensitivity to the particular other(s) who are the coparticipants” (: 43).

Sacks (2004) stressed that “for conversation, preservation of ‘one party talking at a time’ is organisationally primary” (: 37), though the primacy of the ‘one-at-a-time’ principle in the system of turn taking is obvious not only in mundane conversations (Sacks et al. 1978: 45); rather, it is also predominantly used in other forms of interaction that take place in institutional settings such as courts, classrooms,\(^{12}\) conferences, interviews etc. The allocation of turns in these settings, however, does not follow exactly the same pattern used in casual interactions, and it is the very existence of such ‘alternative’ settings that seems to suggest that “turn-taking systems […] are, with respect to their allocational arrangements, \textit{linearly arrayed}” (: 46 emphasis added). Thus, types of interaction may range from the ones where the ‘one turn at a time’ principle applies to those where ‘preallocation of all turns’ is necessary (op.cit.). Cases in between these two ends “involve various mixes of preallocational and local allocational means” (op.cit.).

\(^{11}\) Sacks et al. point out that turn order does vary but not randomly, because of the turn-order bias whose operation is permitted by the rule-set itself (1978: 18-19). One example of such bias is that the speaker immediately preceding the current speaker may be selected as next speaker.

\(^{12}\) Studies pertaining to classroom interaction which is the focus of this thesis will be discussed in section 3.2.
3.1.3 Gaps, pauses, lapses and overlaps

Sacks et al. (also Sacks 2004: 37) stated that the ‘turn-allocational’ and turn-constructional’ components on which the turn-taking mechanism is based provide for “the allocation of a next turn to one party,” and organise the ‘transfer of speakership’ “so as to minimize gap and overlap” between turns (1978: 12). A gap refers to inter-turn silence after a possible point of turn completion and is to be minimised (Sacks et al. 1978: 54, footnote 29). A pause, on the other hand, corresponds to intra-turn silence and “initially not to be talked in by others” (op.cit.). Finally lapses are possible when there is prolonged silence at a transition relevant place (op.cit.), whereas overlaps occur when two or three or more speakers speak simultaneously. Let us provide an example where these notions are clearly presented ( (D) is the teacher of a class where English is taught as a foreign language to Greek students. P stands for ‘pupil’ and Proficiency is the highest level of attendance in English examinations):

(xii) Proficiency - (D) - 31’16”

1. P (m) (COVE)?
2. P ( ) ( )
3. D (m) ↑(COVE) hu:m, (1.0) ↑find it for me.
4. P (m) E: >πρώτη σειρά.
5. D (m) °(Hold on)° ΟΗ ↑yeah, I remember lying on the beach when the dolphins came to the-the e came into the ↑COVE. .hhh Y(hh)e↓ah.=
6. P (f) ↓Πριν απ’τo °( ).°
7. D (m) °Ποιό?°
8. P (f) (1.0)
9. D (m) Στη hu: -I can’t rem[ember the ]Greek word=
10. P (m) Στα ρηχά hu::, ↑yeah, στα ρηχά.

Turn 4 includes a pause, namely an intra-sentential silence timed in seconds (i.e. ‘1.0’). Turns 10 and 11 include an overlapping part of speech; (D) and (P) talk simultaneously at one point and the part of speech which is cooccurring is placed in brackets. Finally, #8 is followed by a type of gap specially termed as ‘significant or attributable silence’ (Levinson 1989: 299), because the absence of speech is attributed to the teacher (D) who is supposed to provide an answer to the student’s question in #8.
3.1.4 Adjacency pairs and back-channel responses

A significant aspect that characterises the sequential order of conversation is that “certain classes of utterances conventionally come in pairs. For instance, questions and answers; greetings and return greetings; or invitations and acceptances/declinations” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 39). Sacks et al. referred to these ‘paired utterances’ as ‘adjacency pairs’ (1978: 21) and went on to explain that the first parts of these pairs are used by speakers as a means to allocate turns:

When a speaker addresses a first pair part, such as a “question,” or a “complaint” to another, […] he [sic] selects the other as next speaker, and selects for him [sic] that he do a second part of the “adjacency pair” he has started, that is, to do an “answer” or an “apology” (among other possibilities), respectively (Sacks et al. 1978: 44).

Second parts, on the other hand, constitute a manifestation of the next speaker’s understanding of a prior turn’s talk (Sacks et al.: 44). This is described as a ‘next turn proof procedure’ and it is a fundamental mechanism employed by participants “to display to one another, and hence to the analyst also, their ongoing understanding and sense-making of one another’s talk” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 41).

A special kind of responses often used in conversation are the so-called ‘back-channel’ responses (Clyne 1994: 110). These take the form of minimal words such as ‘yes/yeah’, ‘mm’, ‘right’, ‘no’, ‘ok’ or ‘I know’ and are usually uttered by a conversation participant in overlap with the current speaker’s turn as a means to show that they are being attentive or encouraging to the latter’s sayings (Clyne 1994).
3.1.5 Preference

In addition to the above-mentioned aspects of the organisation of adjacency pairs, another significant notion that characterises them is ‘preference’; that is, when speakers make use of specific first pair parts (e.g. invitations, proposals or offers), then “particular dispreferred second actions (usually disagreements, rejections and refusals) are routinely avoided, withheld or delayed in many different types of social context involving a great variety of speakers” (Heritage 1988: 26). Just as some second parts are dispreferred, some others are preferred, as for instance acceptances to invitations or grantings to requests. Importantly, according to Sacks (1987) there is a general preference for agreement because both “answerers shape their answers to be in agreement […] with what the questioner seems to prefer” (1987: 63) and questioners construct their turns such that they will “end up with a form that can be agreed with” (1987: 64). In addition, the design of preferred second parts is structurally simpler than the one of dispreferred seconds; Pomerantz (1984) notes that the former are characterised by what she calls a ‘preferred-action turn shape’, which is structurally simpler, whereas the latter by a ‘dispreferred-action turn shape’ (1984: 64), which incorporates dispreference markers (as ‘uh’ or ‘well’ which are characteristic of dispreferred seconds (Levinson 1984: 334)).

3.1.6 The mechanism of repair

Participants’ orientation to the turn-taking rules we have previously mentioned is crucially demonstrated in yet another mechanism, the one of repair. Speakers use repair as a means to deal with “errors, violations, troubles” (Sacks et al. 1978: 39) that happen to come up in conversations. It is not necessary for repair to address only errors or mistakes by replacing them “by what is ‘correct’ ” since there are cases of repair “where there is no

---

13 The notion of ‘preference’ should not be related to speakers’ psychological mood and temper; rather it refers to the degree of structural markedness that some second pair parts are characterised by; preferred seconds are structurally unmarked, whereas dispreferred seconds are structurally marked (Levinson 1984: 333).
hearable error, mistake, or fault” (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977: 363) as in the example (xiii) [BA data 59 T3:SB:F:M]:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
1 & \rightarrow \quad C \\
2 & \quad A
\end{array}
\]

w-wu-what does that mean in layme(h)n’s te(h)rms [huhh
that’s fiftee-(H)hh fourteen forty five
is quarter to three

(adapted from Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 60)

In their question in turn 1, (C) initially makes an unsuccessful effort to utter the first word; “w-wu” sounds are not enough for us to make out the intended word but the final word “what” shows that (C) “has simply had three attempts at producing the same word” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 60). This example is illustrative of a repair case where there is no actual ‘error’ on the part of the speaker. As such, it is different from the instance of repair in (A)’s answer in #2, where erroneous “that’s fiftee-” is replaced by the correct expression “fourteen forty five”. In both cases the speakers perform what Schegloff et al. (1977: 364) termed ‘self-initiation of self-repair’.

Initiating a repair, according to Schegloff et al.’s description of the repair system, is a different action than the act of repairing itself (1977: 364). What is more, the initiation of a repair can be done in two ways; either by the speaker of the repairable item (‘self-initiation’) or by any other participant in the conversation except the speaker of the trouble source (‘other-initiation’) (: 364). Self-initiation and other-initiation of repair can be further distinguished in the following types:

1) self-initiated self-repair (as in the previous example),

2) other-initiated self-repair, as in example (xiv) [GTS: 5: 3]:
In this example, Roger’s question is a partial repeat of Dan’s trouble-source turn. Importantly, partial repeats, question words (e.g. *What? Who? Where? When?*) or a combination of both of them are some turn-construcional devices that are used to initiate other-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977: 367-368). This question in #4 is taken to initiate a repair of the trouble source included in a previous turn –this ‘invitation’ for repair in a next turn is called a ‘next turn repair initiator’ or NTRI (Levinson 1984: 339). Thus, #5 is a repair which is other-initiated and since it is completed by the speaker of the repairable item, it is a self-repair too.

Next comes

3) self-initiated other-repair, an example of which is example (xv) [BC: Green: 88]:

(adapted by Schegloff et al. 1977: 364).

(B), here, tries to remember the name of a person—and simultaneously refers to this trouble of his with “I can’t think of his first name”—initiating, thus, a repair which he does not ultimately perform himself. It is (A) who interrupts (B) and completes the repair; therefore the case is one of self-initiated other-repair. Finally, there is type

4) other-initiated other-repair as in (xvi) [GJ:FN]:

(adapted from Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 63).
In this repair type the speaker of the trouble source (Milly) is directly ‘corrected’ by Jean and this ‘explicit correction’ by the latter “is then acknowledged and accepted in the subsequent turn” (Hutchby and Wooffitt 2001: 63).

Schegloff et al.’s (1977) most crucial observation, however, refers to the role that preference has in the mechanism of repair. Specifically, they provide evidence suggesting that between self- and other-correction there is “a social-organizational preference for self-over other-correction, a preference exhibited empirically by the preponderance of self-over other-correction” (1977: 376). Yet, a notable exception is emphasised; adults’ talk towards children is typically characterised by other-correction because in this case the latter is “a device for dealing with those who are still learning or being taught to operate with a system which requires […] that they be adequate self-monitors and self-correctors as a condition of competence” (Schegloff et al. 1977: 381).

Interestingly enough, it is this latter case that classroom talk mostly corresponds to; that is, in a classroom setting the teachers are the adults who are entitled to “generally ask questions to which they already know the answers to test or extend students’ knowledge” (Drew and Heritage 1998: 41) while the students are the ones who “are still learning” in Schegloff et al.’s (1977: 381) words. Other-initiated other-correction, then, in such a setting is expected to be the most common type of repair; this, however, is a point we will address in the next section where the ‘peculiarities’ of classroom talk are presented and discussed with reference to the relevant literature written on the topic.

3.2 Classroom Interaction

The focus of this paper, as already stated, is on classroom interaction and specifically on the use of CS within the milieu of a language classroom. Given that education is a social institution (Heritage 2005: 105), the kind of talk occurring in it is expected to be more
‘formal’ in comparison with ordinary conversation (McHoul 1978: 183). But what is it that makes certain types of interactions institutional? Should they be analysed differently in comparison with everyday interactions? How is the CA approach adapted to their distinctive characteristics? These are the questions we are going to address in the remainder of this chapter by making a point of the language classroom in particular, as this is the context our paper deals with.

3.2.1 Institutional talk

There are three characteristics of talk that are particular to institutional interactions and distinguish it from mundane conversation (though no firm distinction is possible to be made between the two (Drew and Heritage 1998, Heritage 2005)):

a. The interaction normally involves the participants in specific goal orientations that are tied to their institution-relevant identities: doctor and patient, teacher and student, bride and groom, and so on.

b. The interaction involves special constraints on what will be treated as allowable contributions to the business at hand.

c. The interaction is associated with inferential frameworks and procedures that are particular to specific institutional settings.

(Heritage 2005: 106).

There seem to be, then, “specific and significant narrowings and respecifications” (Heritage 1988: 34) involved in institutional talk, although their ‘rigidity’ depends on the degree to which the above three criteria are ‘satisfied’. That is, the restrictions on participants’ goal orientations, contributions and inferences they are to make in particular contexts (Heritage 2005: 107).
3.2.2 The CA approach to institutional talk

CA set out to study institutional talk by actually keeping the same principles that apply to ordinary conversation; it maintained its status as a simultaneously ‘context-free’ and ‘context-sensitive’ mechanism (Sacks et al. 1978: 10) in the sense that utterances and actions within the CA framework have the potential to both shape the context and re-establish or renew it.¹⁴ Most importantly, the premium concern of the CA approach to institutional talk is to show how it is that participants themselves are oriented to it and how they go about constructing their conduct so that, in the end, the accomplished interaction will be characterised as an institutional one (Drew and Heritage 1998).

The institutionality of some interactions is substantiated foremostly through their ‘form’ (Drew and Heritage 1998: 25); that is through the turn-taking system, which was initially discussed by Sacks et al. (1978) and which studies in institutional talk have modified in order to describe the forms of turn-taking particular to news-interview, courtroom or classroom interaction (Heritage 1988).

3.2.3 CA adjusted to classroom interaction

One of the first studies dealing with the type of talk within the setting of a classroom is that of McHoul (1978) who presented a modified set of rules for turn-taking in classrooms. By doing this he provided evidence that corroborate the “‘feeling’ of formality” (McHoul 1978: 183) that both participants and researchers have of the type of interaction that takes place in a classroom.

In particular, McHoul (1978) drew on Sacks et al.’s observation that types of interaction may fall along a ‘continuum’ on the one end of which the ‘one-turn at a time’ principle applies whereas on the other end a ‘pre-allocation’ of all turns is needed, and

---

¹⁴ As Sacks et al. (1978) put it, CA has “an appropriate sort of general abstractness and local particularisation potential” (1978: 10).
claimed that classroom talk “as medial between local-allocation (conversation) and pre-allocation” (1978: 187) should be considered as ‘formal’. He additionally provided four alterations to the organisation of turn-taking in the classroom which actually impose significant limitations on the ‘open-endedness’ and ‘permutability’ of the Sacks et al. set of turn-taking rules (McHoul 1978: 187). The essence of these changes is that they allow for less permutability of turn-taking, maximisation of gaps and pauses while they preserve minimisation of overlap as is the case in conversation (189). The crux of the matter, McHoul stresses, is that in classrooms “only teachers can direct speakership in any creative way” (: 188 original italics).

In fact, the organisation of sequences in classroom clearly attests the above claim especially as far as Sacks et al.’s ‘question-answer’ adjacency pair is concerned. McHoul points out that such a pair turns into a ‘question-answer-comment’ triad (1978: 191), because it is entirely at the teacher’s discretion to judge whether a student’s answer is correct or not. Teachers have the “right and obligation to give –once an answer has been produced– a comment on the sufficiency of that answer” (: 190) and one example is the following:

(xvii) Csenior- (Pa) – 18’35”

1 → Pa (f) Ok. In ↑Greek, what is farm?
2 P (m) Οικόσιτα ζώα.
   (1.0)
3 → Pa (f) OK.
4 P (m) (Α ΚΥΡΙΑ ΑΓΡΟΚΘΗΜΑ)=
5 → Pa (f) =Yes, ΑΓΡΟΚΘΗΜΑ.

In this example taken from the present study data, (Pa) is the teacher who asks a question in #1 and after receiving a student’s answer, she makes an accepting comment on it in #3. Just after her comment, another student takes the floor and provides a variant of the previous student’s answer. (Pa)’s comment (#5) on this consists of an accepting “Yes,” followed by a repetition of the student’s answer so as to validate it. As Drew and Heritage note, the triad or
“three-part sequence is characteristic of the setting (classroom) only because it is generated out of the management of the activity (instruction) which is the institutionalised and recurrent activity in the setting” (1998: 40 original italics). The case then is that by evaluating students’ answers teachers assert “both the claim to superior knowledge and their role as testers\textsuperscript{15} of students” (41).

### 3.2.4 Repair organisation in classroom

Third-turn comments on the part of the teacher’s can also take the form of correction; McHoul (1990) investigated the quality of such forms on the basis of original classroom recordings and made a point of distinguishing between self-correction and other-correction (drawing on Schegloff et al.’s (1977) contribution), as well as of showing the peculiarities of repair sequences in classroom interaction.

In seeking to find not only who corrects repairable items but who it is that actually initiates the correction, McHoul (1990) departs from Schegloff et al.’s four-type set of repair sequences and identifies three main ‘repair-trajectories’ that are valid for classroom interaction: ‘self-correction within a single turn’, ‘other-initiated other-correction’ and ‘other-initiated self-correction’. The most important finding is that there is positive evidence for Schegloff et al.’s (1977) speculation that other-correction should be a prominent repair type in adult-child talk,\textsuperscript{16} although McHoul (1990) makes an important clarification; his data show that teachers do not tend to explicitly correct students immediately after a possible ‘error’ of theirs, but that they most readily go for correction-initiation (‘other-initiated self-correction’) waiting, thus, for students to self-correct.

\textsuperscript{15}Relevant to the ‘tester’ status of a teacher comes the fact that a comment like ‘oh’ is notably absent in their talk “as a routine third-turn receipt object” (Heritage 1989: 336). ‘Oh’ is a “change-of-state-token” which shows that its utterer “has undergone some kind of change in his or her locally current state of knowledge” (1989: 299).

\textsuperscript{16}As opposed to ordinary conversation where other-correction is significantly restricted (Schegloff et al. 1977).
Teachers initiate corrections by means of providing clues to help students, by recycling the repair-trajectory (i.e. by rephrasing their initial question) or by not even commenting at all\(^\text{17}\) on the student’s repairable turn. Other-initiations in classroom talk can also be modulated,\(^\text{18}\) in the sense that teachers’ third turns locate the trouble-source of the prior but either partially accept it and ask for a filling-out of the answer, or cast doubt on the total acceptability of it. An example corresponding to this case follows:

(xviii)

\[
\begin{array}{ccl}
1 & \rightarrow & E \quad \text{S’where is the desert region?} \\
2 & \rightarrow & T \quad \text{In the desert region? Well yes? Where in particular?} \\
3 & \quad & F \quad \text{Mount Tom Price} \\
4 & \quad & T \quad \text{Mount Tom Price, you’re reading. Where else?} \\
\end{array}
\]

(McHoul 1990: 362).

Teachers’ preference for self-correction by students is finally obvious in “the classroom version of what Schegloff et al. called the ‘withhold’ (McHoul 1990: 362). That is, they tend to withhold the performance of other-correction once they have received a repairable turn by students by redoing other-initiations, by rephrasing their question or by asking for a further completion of the student’s answer (: 363). Last but not least, other-correction in its explicit form does occur in classroom talk but it is an expedient teachers resort to after all efforts for self-repair by students have fallen short.

3.3 **Summary**

In this chapter we provided an overview of Conversation Analysis as an approach to analysing language-in-use and we described the basic premises and principles on which it is built. The particular “powerful and coherent perspective” (Drew and Heritage 1998: 53) from which CA studies conversation as a social action was actually shown in its potential to account for specialised types of talk that take place in institutional settings as the one of the

\(^{17}\) As McHoul (1978) stresses “a non-comment is itself a form of comment marking” (: 190, footnote 9).

\(^{18}\) Schegloff et al. (1977: 738-739) had initially made this point for casual conversations.
classroom. We pointed out that, in comparison with ordinary conversation, classroom interaction exhibits some differences in turn-taking and in the organisation of repair sequences which, after all, are the result of the role that participants assume so as to ‘attach an institutional character’ to such settings.
4. The Study

4.1 Aims of the Present Study

The aim of this paper is to look at the functions of code-switching in the context of an ELT (English Language Teaching) classroom, specifically in a Greek classroom where English is taught as a foreign language (FL). The issues of whether teachers should use only the target language in a FL classroom and how much of it they are to use proportionally to the mother tongue have been the subject of much debate; what the latter comes down to, however, is that by claiming that English should be the (main) means of instruction in such a class, one does not necessarily imply that the use of the mother tongue is to be totally discarded. Given that in the majority of ELT classrooms in Greece English is used along with the students’ language, it is interesting to analyse the functions that switches from English to Greek carry out as well as the role that Greek plays in a language teaching environment.

Importantly, however restricted the context of a classroom may seem, it is a part of a society and as such it shows a certain degree of diversity; it follows then, that adhering to a specific lesson plan –at least so far as a teacher’s choice of language is concerned– in such a dynamic context, can be a goal not so easily attained. Thus, in order to gain some insight into this situation and in particular into the specific functions that a change in the language of instruction may carry out, it will be the teachers’ talk and their switches to Greek that will be discussed here and not the students’.

4.2 Research Questions - Hypotheses

This paper will be dealing with three main questions for each of which we are going to make some hypotheses concerning the use of CS in the FL classroom. Particularly: in seeking to find out what the main functions of teachers’ code switching are, we expect them to switch from English to Greek, mostly when explaining various points to students as
well as when the topic shifts out of pedagogical concern. The reason for this postulation is that since Greek is the students’ and teachers’ L1, the latter should probably find it easier to switch to it in order to make sure that some points are clarified and are also expected to ‘yield’ to the mother tongue when having discussions of non-pedagogical interest with students. Second, regarding CS and students’ level, we hypothesise that there is indeed a link between the two and that the amount of CS instances will be greater in lower-level classes and less in high-level classes. As the level of competency on the students’ part rises, we anticipate that the teachers will be more likely to use the L2. Finally, as far as intersentential and intrasentential switches are concerned, we anticipate that teachers’ CS instances will most usually be of the intersentential form rather than the intrasentential one due to the grammatical or syntactical restrictions that come into play when a speaker is involved in the latter form (Gumperz 1982: 86-91, Poplack 2000: 254). Poplack, specifically, looked into the CS behaviour of twenty Puerto-Rican speakers in New York and her quantitative analysis of the data revealed that these speakers could be divided in two groups (2000: 240): those who opted for ‘extra-sentential switches’\(^\text{19}\) and those who favoured intrasentential ones –the latter characterised as “a more complex or ‘intimate’ type” of CS behaviour (: 230). Poplack found that the speakers who ‘preferred’ the latter CS type in which the switches within a sentence must obey certain syntactic constraints, were those “with the greatest degree of bilingual ability (‘true’ bilinguals)” (: 254).

When considering the kind of talk in a classroom, though, we should keep in mind that education is a social institution (Heritage 2005: 105-107) and the classroom is an institutional setting where talk has a certain degree of formality –the latter varying, however, from one classroom to another (McHoul 1978: 185).

\(^{19}\) What is termed ‘intersentential’ CS in this paper.
4.2.1 The Data

The data in our study are analysed from a conversation-analytic perspective, while the focus is placed on the teachers’ talk and their alternations from one language to another. In order to pursue the aims of this study, original data were collected from three English language classrooms of three different proficiency levels in a Greek foreign language school (‘frontistirio’). The choice of the specific sample was firstly made on the basis of a practical reason; as state schools at the time of the study were closed, the option of recording summer courses in a ‘frontistirio’ appeared as the only way to obtain data –the owner’s permission being, of course, more than a necessary prerequisite. Secondly and most importantly, I chose language classrooms of different levels because as they would provide us with interesting clues as to the teachers’ ‘linguistic behaviour’ and specifically as to the presence and use of CS that they made in relation to the class level and/or the teachers’ own competence.

The data were gathered by means of recording six lessons with a pocket-size digital recorder, which was placed on the desk closest to the teacher’s. The researcher (myself) was also present in all of the recordings, a fact that obviously influenced the behaviour of the whole class –the teacher’s foremostly– during the first minutes of the initial recorded lessons. As a result, this led to students’ and particularly teachers’ modified talk or “careful speech” in Labov’s (1972: 86) terms –making our study, thus, subject to the ‘Observer’s Paradox’: the fact that, on the one hand, we wish to “observe the way people use language when they are not being observed” (Labov 1972: 61) so as to get the ‘vernacular’, but on the other hand we cannot make participants neglect the fact that they are being recorded.
4.2.2 Selection of the Sample

Six recordings were made of the three different level classes: two recordings of an advanced class preparing for the C2 level\textsuperscript{20} examination (referred to as *Proficiency* from now on), two more of an upper-intermediate class preparing for the B2 level examination (henceforth named after the acronyms of the specific exams, *FCE-ECCE*), and finally another two recordings of a low-intermediate class which was not supposed to prepare students for any exams –at least for the next 2 years after the recordings. This class will be called *Csenior*, a label used almost conventionally in the context of foreign language schools in Greece to refer to students in their fourth or maybe fifth year of learning English.

The recordings were made during the summer period since the students of these classes had decided to attend an intensive summer language course –quite a common practice among foreign language students attending ‘frontistiria’ in Greece as they wish to gain time and sit the exams for specific language proficiency degrees the soonest possible. This very fact adds to our study some peculiar characteristics; to start with, these young students seemed more willing to pay attention to and participate in the lesson than ‘frontistiria’ young language learners typically are, perhaps because attending this summer course must have been their decision too, besides their parents’\textsuperscript{21}. Another peculiarity concerning the *Csenior* class is that it consisted only of two students (both male), whereas the other two classes were attended by seven or eight students.

As for the teachers, the subjects our study chooses to focus on, they were two women and one man. The women, (S) and (Pa), taught in both the *FCE-ECCE* and the *Csenior* classes; (D), the man, only taught in *Proficiency*. All of them are native speakers of Greek who have graduated from an English Department of a university in Greece and have also received postgraduate education (either abroad or at home) in English. They are in their late

\textsuperscript{20} According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).
\textsuperscript{21} Parents certainly play a role in making this decision, or even in suggesting a summer course as a possible option their children could have since they are the ones to carry the financial burden.
20s and early 30s with a teaching experience that ranges from three to eight years. When they asked about the purpose of the recordings, they were informed that they were meant as a part of a university assignment. By providing such a general answer, I hoped to anticipate any potential change in their speech as far as CS is concerned and the usual teaching procedure they followed. Nevertheless, I assume that systematic observation inevitably causes modifications on the subjects’ speech, since they tend to pay more attention to what they say and how they deliver it.

4.3 Description of the Data

The recordings comprise a sum of six hours and forty-five minutes of actual lesson time. These were listened to back and forth numerous times, transcribed and carefully studied in order to observe recurrent patterns in teachers’ speech and their use of CS. A broad distinction of CS instances was made between intersentential and intrasentential switches. The former refer to those examples that included an alternation in the “form of two subsequent sentences” (Gumperz 1982: 59) and the latter to cases where CS occurred within one sentence only (1982: 60). After studying the materials –both the recordings and the transcribed parts– twelve main functions of teachers’ switches to Greek (L1) were observed. The remainder of this chapter presents a close analysis of some data representative of the proposed functional categories they are taken to belong to. Finally, five summary tables of the functions will be presented and discussed.

4.3.1 Analysis of the Data

The analysis of the data has shown that CS is primarily employed to carry out the following functions:

---

22 The transcription of the total amount of the recorded data used for this study has been done by the researcher.
I. CS as feedback

Teachers choose to alter the language of instruction most frequently to provide students with feedback. For the present study, feedback includes explanations of difficult points or translation provision. The following extract comes from teacher (Pa) in the Csenior class:

(1) *Csenior* - (Pa) - 6’18”

1 Pa (f) = ( ). Yes. Do you know what is *↑*slavery?
2 P (m) "No, what is it?"
3 → Pa (f) *↑*Hu:::m: (.) >σκλαβιά.<

In #4 the teacher asks a question and when the student replies negatively, (Pa) provides the L1 equivalent after a prolonged hesitation marker *↑*Hu:::m: , which probably shows her initial effort to provide a gloss of the word in English and her on-the-spot decision not to do so either because she cannot come up with a definition or because she is aware of the students’ low level of competence so she finally opts for the Greek translation.

The next example is from class *FCE-ECCE* where teacher (S) provides feedback to the learners as to how a letter of advice is written:

(2) *FCE-ECCE*-(S)- 39’22”

1 S (f) *↑*Hu:::m(there are the)questions (.) what are you *↑*writing, ((noise from marker on the board)) (2.2) ↓what kind of langu*↑*age (.) (more (.) because we understand (.) you need to write or (.) question (.) two, ((noise from marker on the board)) (1.7) hm: (1.3) to whom (2.0) "are you writing" to, (2.0) hm:: (1.8) "what else (has it got.)" ((going towards the desk where her book is)) (3.5) hu:::m, (2.5) what’s the ↑purpose, ((writing on the board)) (4.0) and ↓how do (you) start, (2.0)

→ ↓and how do you close. (4.0) Πολύ απλά αν (κάτι δεν) πείτε μου. Ας μένουμε στο ότι έχουμε μια οικείωση: ( with this) from last year (1.0) >But if somebody has a. (2.0) –a question ↓let me know. So, WHAT what are you going to write. An email? An article? A report? An essay?=

2 P ( ) =[( )]
3 S (f) [W]hat kind of language will you use? Formal? Informal? Do you, (have) a name? or to Dear Sir Madam, or, to who. What is the purpose? To: *↑*ask for information? To ↓give information? To ↓invite somebody? To give advice? ↑HOW (do) we start? And how ↓do we
close? ("It.") Ok.>What are we writing?

((She realises that the board marker has no ink left and by changing it she also changes the colour; students grab the chance and initiate a chat on football teams.))

(Twenty-seven turns later the teacher manages to bring their attention back to the lesson))

What are we writing?

What language will we use?

What are we writing?

What language will we use?

What are we writing?

What is the purpose of the letter? <That you are going to to write.

Why are you writing (that)?

Why? What is the reason?
In this rather long extract (S) sets off to teach learners the way they should think before writing a letter. She writes on the board the questions students should ask themselves while simultaneously reading them to the class. When she finishes, and after a quite long pause (4.0) she switches to L1 (#1) in order to check whether students find things comprehensible. She uses both an intersentential switch - i.e. after a full sentence in L2 she utters a full sentence in L1: "Πολύ απλά αν (κάτι δεν πείτε μου” - and an intrasentential one (“Ας μείνουμε στο ότι έχουμε μια οικείωση: ( with this) from last year.”). Immediately after this short ‘parenthesis’, she turns back to L2 and repeats the main message of what was said in the L1 (“But if somebody has a. (2.0) –a question ↓let me know.”). Then, she starts (#3 and #31) addressing these questions one by one to the students to see if they understand the procedure.

In #41, however, a student asks her a question in L1 and the teacher answers in L1 as well (discourse-related switching in Auer’s terms) –switching, thus, from the L2 that she was using before the students’ question. In #44, #49 and #56 she goes on to provide some feedback to the student in order to answer his question. She explains to him what the context of the letter at hand is and whether formal or informal language is needed: “Είναι γιατί πρόκειται, -it’s about a column, in a newspaper, είναι σε μια στήλη εφημερίδας και είναι σε φιλικό τόνο γιατί δίνει μια συμβουλή, δεν μπορείς να είσαι formal όταν δίνεις συμβουλή. ↓How?”. The latter turn –an instance of intrasentential CS– shows that (S) continues (from #42) the provision of explanation in L1 but suddenly realises that English would be more ‘suitable’ in the classroom. So she self-repairs (Schegloff et al. 1977) and changes to L2 without, however, managing to finish her utterance in this language. She switches back to L1 to repeat the content of the brief L2 utterance and ‘enrich’ it with even more explanatory information. #49 is another intrasentential switch whereby (S) initially corrects in L2 the student’s erroneous answer in 48 and then she uses the L1 to further explain who the recipient
of the letter actually is. Finally, in #56 (S) uses solely the L1 to further explicate the matter, resolving, thus, the students’ query as to which ‘role’ they –as writers of the letter– are supposed to play.

II. CS as clarification (repetition / reiteration)

The next examples are representative of the second function that a switch in L1 may carry out, namely the one of emphasising or clarifying something previously said in the foreign language. The following sequence of turns comes from the Proficiency class where after seven turns of (D)’s speech overlapping with students’ laughters –due to a previous discussion they had about the L1 translation of the English verb ‘peep’ which students found funny–, he tries to get their attention back to the vocabulary issue at hand:

(3) Proficiency - (D) − 39’40”

1  P ( ) (( many students[ laughing and ]talking simultaneously ))
2  D (m) [HU:: THER[E] [( )]
3  P (f) [( )]
4  P ( ) ((laughter[s]))
5  D (m) [THERE ↑is, (0.5)]
6  P ( ) ( [there is, ( ) there is. such-hey!])
7  D (m) [there is, ( ) there is. such-hey!]
8  → D (m) =Hi! There is such a verb ↑like, hu-gs-sorry, hu τιτίζω.
9  P ( ) Hhhhh.
10  P ( ) Αν ↑ναι:. Τιτιβίζω μήπως?
11  P ( ) Οχι
12  → D (m) ♩Ωχι δεν είναι το ττίβιζω. Ττιβίζω is what we ↑call chirp.
13  P ( ) (“chirp?”)
14  → D (m) ♩Chirp, is ττιβίζω.

(D) here repeatedly (#2, #5, #7, #8) tries to take the floor and inform students about the existence of the Greek verb ‘ττιβίζω’. He ultimately uses an intrasentential switch to L1 in #8, while in #12 he totally alters the language he had been using to clarify for the student in #10 that ‘ττιβίζω’ is not the same as the verb ‘ττιβίζω’. #12, thus, contains both an intersentential switch and an intrasentential one: “↑Ωχι δεν είναι το ττιβίζω.” and “Ττιβίζω είναι is what
we call chirp.” respectively. Because of a student’s mishearing (“chirp?”) however, (D) has to repeat the message conveyed in #12, placing now more emphasis on his utterance by stressing the English verb. This final turn of his is again an intrasentential switch.

The next example of CS as clarification occurs after students of the FCE-ECCE class have heard a listening activity and teacher (Pa) starts checking their answers:

(4) FCE-ECCE – (Pa) – 57’10”

1  →  Pa  (f)  It’s B. It is (carried out in a different way), >δεν υπάρχει ένας< τρόπος μόνο, υπάρχουν διαφορετικοί (,) τρόποι(.). Εστι δεν είναι? Άλλοι (φτάνουν) στο: φεγγάρι, άλλοι στέλνουν ίσως ένα ροήματι και τα λοιπά.
2  P  (m)  [ ]
3  P  (m)  [Ακούγεται περιπλοκό αυτό το[.
4  P  (f)  [( ]
5  Pa  (f)  [Number TWO.

In the first turn (Pa) uses the L2 (“It’s B”) to correct the student’s wrong answer previously provided. She then goes on to read the exact phrase corresponding to the right choice (“It is (carried out in a different way),””) and without finishing her utterance, she switches to L1 – forming, thus, an intrasentential switch – reiterating the message just provided in the L2 in order to clarify the point to be made.

III. CS as a means to provide directions / instructions

Moving on to the next CS function, the one where altering a language is used as a means to give directions or instructions to students, we can look at the following examples all three extracted from (S)’s lesson in the Csenior class:

5) Csenior - (S) – 00’02”

1  →  S  (f)  (πάμε στην εβδομηνταπέντε,?) Θα κάνουμε, hm::: >τη D.< (.)
2  P  (m)  >Τηρήστε τη B.<
3  →  S  (f)  >Λιπά C τώρα δε τη θέλω οκ?.<Τη D. Ready?
In extract (5) the teacher uses the L1 from the very beginning of the lesson in order to give directions to students as to which exercise they are to start with. In the first turn she gives instructions regarding the page and the exercise they are to do. This is taken as an instance of intersentential CS from L2 to L1, since a teacher in a foreign language classroom is expected to use mainly the L2. In #3 she does the same thing, namely give directions as to which exercise they will not do and repeating the one they are going to do instead: “(>Άστη C τώρα δε τι θέλω ok?>).>Τη D.>↑Ready?” Again, this is an intersentential switch, whereby (S) ‘stays with’ the L1 in order to make the instructions clear and assure that learners follow the sequence of exercises she has picked out. “↑Ready?”, as pronounced with a rising intonation, is a presequence marking the onset of the exercise at hand.

The last example representative of the specific function that CS fulfills is the following:

(6) *Csenior* - (S) – 52’22”

1  →  S (f)  >Σελίδα τριάντα (τρία) πάμε να (συμπληρώσουμε) την ↑άσκηση B.<
2  →  P (m)  °( )°
3  →  P (m)  ( )
4  →  S (f)  Και θέλω- ε:: να: (.) κυκλώσουμε πρώτα (συμπληρώνον τις προτάσεις) βαζοντας present perfect simple, ↑βάλτε ένα κυκλάκι και (.) ή ↑past simple.

(S) uses the L1 in the first turn to give directions to learners as to what page they have to go to and which exercise they are to complete (“>Σελίδα τριάντα (τρία) πάμε να (συμπληρώσουμε) την ↑άσκηση B.<”). After two inaudible turns (2 and 3) produced by students, (S) goes on to provide further directions in #4: “Και θέλω- ε:: να: (.) κυκλώσουμε πρώτα (συμπληρώνον τις προτάσεις) βαζοντας present perfect simple, ↑βάλτε ένα κυκλάκι και (.) ή ↑past simple.”. This is an example of an intrasentential switch since within a single sentence, (S) has used both the L2 and the L1. She uses the L1 to give the instructions of the exercise at hand but switches back to the L2 to mention the name of two
grammatical tenses, that is ‘past simple’ and ‘present perfect simple’. What (S) obviously
does here is read the rubric of the specific exercise and simultaneously ‘translate’ it into
Greek. She maintains, however, the English names for the tenses maybe because students
have learned them as such and she does not want to further confuse them with the tenses in
Greek.

IV. CS as a means of repair

Moving on to the fourth function that CS carries out, the one of repair, it is important
that we look into the varieties that it has. To begin with, in extract (2), (S) in #42 (“Περίμενε.
Αυτό εδώ (που πρέπει να κάνουμε) είναι το γράμμα που δίνει μια συμβουλή, έτσι;”) uses the
L1 to invite repair of the student’s prior turn (Levinson 1984) and make him realise what
exactly it is that they are writing. (S) withholding the provision of a direct correction (this being
a dispreferred second) by the realisation of a next-turn repair initiator (Levinson 1984: 339).
In extract (3), the intersentential switch to Greek “↑Όχι δεν είναι το τττιβίζω.” is an
interesting case of CS, since (D) uses the L1 in order to explicitly correct the student’s
suggestion in #10. This is an instance of other-repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977)
done in L1.

In extract (2), (S)’s turn in #56 starts with a correction of the student’s answer in #55.
The very act of performing an other-repair (Schegloff et al. 1977) or other-correction
(McHoul 1990) in L1 is actually a strategy that all of the teachers in the present study
employ. Let us now consider (Pa)’s lesson in the FCE-ECCE class, the extract from which
contains another type of repair, namely self-repair:
In this example (Pa)’s advice to students in #1 not to panic is given because they have been worrying much about that day’s vocabulary test. Although her speech before the specific extract has been delivered entirely in the L2, (Pa) suddenly changes to L1 by making an intrasentential switch in #4. Her obvious intention is to gain back the floor because the students have started making comments about the test (incomprehensible #2 and #3); so not only does she interrupt the learner’s turn in 3 but she does so by speaking noticeably louder.

After a number of lines, a student comes up with an unknown word (#15) and in #17 he asks whether the word he has found is a noun. The timing (1.0) that follows is a silence attributable to (Pa) since it takes her one second before she answers the student’s question. She ultimately begins with a prolonged greek-sounding hesitation marker “Ε:” which we could take to be a preface to the provision of an answer in Greek. Indeed, she goes on in the L1 and produces a half-finished utterance (“(είναι ρή)”) in #19). She instantly, however,
This example is extracted from the beginning of (S)’s lesson in the FCE-ECCE class. The teacher has been checking whether students remember the meaning of some terms from the text of the previous lesson and this procedure takes place in the L2 until #15, where she repeats in the L1 the L2 explanation she just gave: “Ok.Pro:ps, ( ) in the text. means <everything that you do,> to stick something together. (2.0) Prop είναι –η (ύλη (. και) κολλάει συνάδεσμει με ((ποιείς)) ( ) κάτι. By reiterating her words in the L1 she places emphasis on the

23 In the sense that English, the L2, should be the language used by the teacher –as often as possible, at least.
meaning of the word and probably is surer that students have grasped it. Her utterance is interrupted by a knock on the door, which however does not seem to interrupt the flow of the lesson either. A student grabs the chance to take the floor (#17 latched onto (S)’s last word in #15) and he does an other-correction, which is modulated or “downgraded on a ‘confidence/uncertainty scale’ ” (Schegloff et al. 1977: 378) since it is in the form of a question: “=Άλλο υλικό?”. (S) also produces a latched utterance on the one of the student: “=Υλικό, που ’χει για να συνδέσει με ((noise)) ( ) κάτι.”, this rush showing her dispreferrence for and inappropriateness of such a move on the part of the student.

V. CS as Evaluation (Praise / Scolding)

CS can be used by the teachers as a means to evaluate students by either reprimanding them or by praising them. In example (7) already discussed, (Pa) had to cope with the fact that the learners went on talking (#2, #3) so she resolves on an intrasentential switch using “σουτ”, meaning “shush” (#4). This is, of course, a face-threatening reprimand, the power of which she tries to mitigate with use of particle the “βρε”. So, “ARE, σουτ [βρε” is an intrasentential switch that (Pa) makes to scold students, a function that the use of the L1 also carries out. Praising on the other hand, is shown in:

(9) Csenior – (Pa) – 47’00”

Here (Pa), after having used English throughout the task at hand, switches to the L1 to praise the student who has just produced a correctly formed sentence. Evaluating students –by either praising or reprimanding– the students is often done in the L1 by all of the teachers in the present study.
VI. CS to introduce a topic or as a closing remark

The following extract is representative of yet another function that CS fulfills:

(10) Csenior – (Pa) – 48’05’’

Here (Pa) praises students in #1 and #3 with “Μπράβο” and “Θαδωρή,” respectively. One second after the production of this latter phrase, (Pa) says “Πολύ ωραία.” and makes a short pause ( (. ) ). She then switches to the L2 to make a new question to the students: “(.)(Present perfect simple and continuous. (0.5) Do we understand the difference?”. “Πολύ ωραία.” is thus used as a closing remark to the ‘praising part’ and consequently to the use of the L1, since the teacher continues in the L2. Let us also look at:

(11) Csenior – (S) – 32’45’’

In #1 (S) uses the L1 seemingly to approve of the student’s correct conjugation of the negative form of the verb ‘finish’ in the present perfect by saying “Πάρα πολύ ωραία.”. Her use of L1 in this phrase, however, could equally function as a closing remark to the previous sequence in which (S) had asked the student to conjugate the aforementioned verb. After
“Πάρα πολύ ωραία.” she continues in the L1 in order to introduce a new topic, or rather a new exercise they have to deal with: “(πάμε τώρα) να κάνουμε ακόμα ένα.” In #1 and “Και θέλω πριν από (το πινακάκι επάνω), <να ↑κάνουμε απ’τη σελίδα τριάντα δύο,> το ↑ένα και το ↑δύο.”.

VII. CS as a Prompt

In the above extract, (Pa) allocates the turn to one of the students (#6) who is unsure as to what exactly to do ( “Το:-να το ↑πω?”), making (Pa) prompt him with the word “Πέστο.”. Teachers often do prompting in the L1 because the use of the mother tongue for such a cause obviously gives more courage to students to take the floor and say something they might not be so sure about.

VIII. CS to allocate turns

Turn allocation is one more function of CS illustrated in the following example:

(12) Csenior – (S) – 8’50”

1 → S (f)  Ηυ::m (;) >Λέει το επόμενον ο Θοδωρής.
2 P (m)  ((student reads the example from the exercise))

(S) here uses the L1 to allocate the turn to one of the students.

IX. CS to ask Questions (Exam / Comprehension)

In the following extract she switches to the L1 to check students’ knowledge as to the meaning of a word:

(13) Csenior – (S) – 24’46”

1 → S (f)  Τι είπαμε ότι σημαίνει το already?
2 (1.0)
3 P (m)  To already?
4 S (f)  ↓yeah.
In #1 (S) makes an intrasentential switch in order to elicit the answer to her question, the latter being an “exam question” (Levinson 1984: 327 and Heritage 2005: 125) or a “known answer” question (Heritage 2005: 125).

X. CS as an Intejection / Filler

The last example is one where the teacher switches to the mother tongue to “mark an interjection or a sentence filler” (Gumperz 1982: 77):

(14) Csenior – (S) – 00’ 02”

1 S (f) (πού είχαµε µείνει?) Θα ↑κάνουµε, hm::: <τη D. (<↑από τη D).
2 P (m) Τη C?,
3 S (f) (>Αστη C τώρα δε τη θέλω ok?).<Τη D. ↑Ready?
4 ()
5 S (f) Θυµίστε µου λίγο ( ) (1.0), πώς θα <πούµε:, σε κάποιον> πώς θα πούµε σε κάποιον >(κάτι για το µέλλον)-για παράδειγµα εύχοµαι να ’σουν εδώ.< (. ) Θεοδορή.
6 (1.0)
7 P (m) Το: (χρησιµοποιούµε) to wish, συν simple past.
8 S (f) Πολύ ωραία. Πες µου και το (ήθελα να ’σουν εδώ). ((simultaneously writing the student’s answer on the board))
9 (1.0)
10 P (m) Έχουµε, I wish,
11 S (f) Hm:,
12 P (m) you,
13 S (f) Hm,
14 (1.5)
15 P (m) to:;
16 ->S (f) µπει? ((hitting [the marker on the board where the student can find the answer]))
17 P (m) [ε-]↑I wish you= µπει?
18 S (f) =m?, (↓you see it), simple past=;
19 P (m) =Ναι.
20 S (f) You?
21 P (m) ↑Were.
22 S (f) Ωραία.
23 P (m) Here.
24 S (f) Αύριο.
(2.0)
25 S (f) ( , τι θα µπει?)
(S) uses the mother tongue from the beginning of the lesson at hand. She asks an exam question to one of the students (#5) who provides the correct answer (#7) and who then attempts to do the same for the teacher’s subsequent exam question: “Πολύ ωραία. Πες µου και το (ήθελα να 'σουν εδώ).” Lines 10 and 12 are showing the pupil’s step-by-step effort to form an answer, yet he eventually makes a mistake in #14. The teacher responds with an interjection in Greek -“τς!”-, which signals her annoyance at the student’s error since what he tries to produce is already written on the board – hence her knocking on the board with the marker.

Turns 20, 25 and 27 consist of further exam questions by (S) in order to elicit the rule for construing the verb to wish, while in #35 (an intrasentential switch) she goes on to explain that modals in English are followed by infinitives. (S) continues in L1 in #37 with the filler “Για να δούµε,. (. ) hm::,” which presumably allows the students some time to think of an answer for the exercise at hand. In the same turn she also produces a hesitation marker “hm::,” pretending that she, too, is contemplating as the learners are. A two-second gap follows and three turns later one of the students finally comes up with an answer: “↑A-I wish I would help E:: you (with your Italian lessons).”
XI. CS for back-channel responses

Back-channeling (Clyne 1994: 110) students’ contributions is another function that an alternation to the mother tongue carries out in the present data. In the previous extract, the student starts forming his answer (#10 and #12) while (S) gives back-channel “hm:” responses (#11 and #13). An other instance of back-channeling students’ responses is found in extract (7). Before (Pa) finishes her turn in L1 in #14, a student comes up with a word he needs to ask and interrupts her (“Estimates,” #15). She, then, produces a back-channel response “Ναι,” latched onto the student’s word, showing that she has been attentive and alert to any queries coming from the students. Back-channeling is frequently done by (Pa) in the specific class.

XII. CS for non-pedagogical issues

Teachers in the present study were also found to switch to the L1 when an issue out of pedagogical concerns arose. For example, in extract (7) and after (Pa)’s ‘outburst’ in L1, she continues in English until an issue out of the pedagogical frame arises (#14).24 In a long gap during which the teacher waits for learners to search through their notes and ask questions on unit four of their book (#13), (Pa) notices a problem with one of the students and changes to L1 to ask a question of real concern to her: “Δεν είχες πάρει προγράμματα τάκτι;” in #14. The use of the mother tongue by teachers signifies a digression –preferably short for them– from the pedagogical topic at hand either to talk about personal issues or to arrange matters regarding the timetable or the books.

All the above-mentioned examples of this section were considered as the most informative and characteristic ones of the CS functional categories they are taken to belong

24 ‘Frame’, as conceived by Goffman (1974), refers to participants’ characterisation of a specific activity they are engaged in. This can include the definitions that they give to a situation as well as the roles they are to assume. ‘Out-of-frame’ activities happen concurrently with framed activities and are “systematically disattended” (Goffman 1974: 210).
to. Nevertheless, we would not do justice to the matter under discussion if we did not also
look into some instances of CS for which we were unsure as to what function they fulfill. Let
us consider the following examples:

(15) Csenior – (Pa) – 1h 5’ 40”

1 Pa (f) We(‘ll) finish with our (. ) revision (. ) ok?
2 P (m) (Να γράφ[ ]
3 P (m) ](που σειράδ?)
4 → Pa (f) °Θα σας πω °(. ) For ↑homework,=
5 P (m) =τρίτη ↓σειρά.
6 (5.5)
7 → Pa (f) ((continues in English))

While giving instructions in the L2 as to what will be next in the lesson, (Pa) switches to the
L1 and says, sotto voce, “°Θα σας πω. °”. Apparently this utterance serves as an answer to the
student’s L1 question in #3 but there seems to be no other reason why (Pa) chose the mother
tongue in this turn than because the student used it himself in #3. We nevertheless need to
comment on the manner with which it is produced: on switching to Greek, (Pa), also lowers
her voice. Next comes an example from (S)’s FCE-ECCE class:

(16) FCE-ECCE – (S) – 57’ 35”

40 S (f) =( )paragraph, <από ΠΑΝΩ γράφ[οντε (main body)].>
41 P (m) [κυρίως σώµα? ]
42 (2.0)
43 S (f) “Υψηλα” (1.7) <την δεύτερη (0.5) και την τρίτη (.) δίπλα κάντε µου µία
σηκούλη (.) main part.>
44 (2.5)
45 → S (f) Ki éχετε και µία τελευταία?
46 P ( ) ”Ναι.”
47 S (f) ( [ ] and closing )

Extracted from a fairly long sequence consisting of ninety turns, this part shows (S) giving
directions to learners as to how to separate into paragraphs the letter they are analysing and
what subheadings they should give them (intrasentential switches in #40 and #43). #45,
however, is a total switch to the mother tongue whose function is arguable; it could belong to
the non-pedagogical frame and serve as a real question towards students or as a filler that (S)
uses in order to gain time to think. Alternatively, it could be an exam question aimed at checking whether students have been following the procedure. After this brief digression to the L1, there is a return to the pedagogic topic marked by the return to the use of L2 as well.

The following example comes again from (S) but this time from her lesson in the Csenior class. The teacher is explaining an exercise from the test she has just distributed to learners:

(17) Csenior – (S) - 12’48”

20 S (f) Έχει ένα αστεράκι. Δύο προτάσεις. Α και Β. (.) <Η ↑μια είναι λάθος, κι η ↑μια είναι σωστή.> Αισθάνεστε πολύ προσεκτικά και τις δύο, και κυκλώνετε ή το Α ή το Β, θέλοντας να μου πείτε ποιό είναι το σωστό. Ντάξει?
21 (1.0)
22 P (m) ( )
23 → S (f) [ (Ξεχάστηκα πάλι.) Σόρρυ-αχ ↑πες μου λιγότερο,.
24 (P) (m) ( )
25 S (f) Βασίλη (άμα:), Για παράδειγμα (το πρώτο παράδειγμα)( )Λέει. (1.0) ↑If you (will) put water in the freezer, it turns to ↑ice. Αυτό είναι το ↓A. Και το B είναι. If you ↑put water in the freezer, it turns to ↑ice. >(Ποιό είναι το σωστό και γιατί.)<

(S) chooses to provide the necessary feedback in the mother tongue (#20) and after the comprehension check “Ντάξει?”, an unintelligible utterance is made by one of the students upon the production of which (S) realises she has said or done something wrongly:

“(Ξεχάστηκα πάλι.) Σόρρυ-αχ ↑πες μου λιγότερο,” (#23). Obviously, this phrase is not part of the explanation that (S) is providing in #20; rather it digresses from the ‘explanation frame’ and the interpretations it can receive are actually dependent upon the content of the student’s #22. Judging solely, then, from its sequential position, it seems that this switch to the L1 has the form of a dispreferred second part of a purported adjacency pair: blame(#22)–admission (#23). (S) interrupts the student’s turn in order to admit her mistake “(Ξεχάστηκα πάλι.)” and to also apologise for it “Σόρρυ”25. The Greek ‘change-of-state token’ (Heritage 1989) “-αχ”

25 “Σόρρυ” is used in the Greek vernacular for trivial or ‘minor’ mistakes. “Συγγνώμη” for serious ones.
shows that she has just now become aware of her mistake while immediately after it, the question “πες μου λίγο,” is uttered showing (S)’s simultaneous confusion and nervousness at that time.

In the absence of an answer by the student in #24—though the “time-out” (McHoul 1978) that (S) gives to him is extremely short—the teacher returns to the ‘explanation frame’ and after an initial hesitation “Βασίλη (αμα:)” she goes on to provide the student with an example in order to clarify any ambiguities he might have had. In sum, then, this L1 phrase is a digression from the on-going pedagogic topic, which includes an other-initiated self-repair, a real question and an interjection—all in the form of a second part of an adjacency pair whose first part supposedly is a ‘blame’ from the part of the students.

In the remainder of this chapter I will present the functions that the teachers’ use of CS carry out in summary tables, each of which will be accompanied by a concise discussion of the results.

4.4 DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY TABLES

After having analysed a number of particular turn sequences in which the teachers of this study alternated between the L1 and the L2, we now turn to the classification of the totality of these instances of functions as they were observed in the data. There will be a cross-classification of functions, types of CS, teachers’ outputs and classes, resulting in a number of different tables.

The first table shows the types and functions of (Pa)’s switches to the L1 while teaching the low-intermediate level class (C-Senior):
The main reasons that (Pa) uses the mother tongue in the classroom are to provide learners with feedback in the form of an explanation (25.71%)  

to give instructions or directions (13.57%) and finally as a means of repair (10.71%) – the overwhelming majority of which being other-repair26.

Next comes (Pa)’s lesson in the FCE-ECCE class:

---

26 See Appendix 3.4a and 3.4b tables.
Importantly, the overall amount of CS instances in this lesson (127) is lower than the one (Pa) scored in class *Csenior* (140) and this confirms our initial hypothesis that switches are expected to be fewer in high-level classes. In *FCE-ECCE*, (Pa) mostly uses the L1 in order to explain various points of difficulty to students (26,77%), to evaluate them negatively (16,54%), to support students’ turns by giving back-channel responses (10,24%), and finally as a means of repair (8,66%) –with other-repair being, again, the main function.\(^27\) Equally significant is the fact that the percentage of this latter function is also observed in the use of the L1 as a means to praise students (i.e. 8,66%).

---

\(^27\) See Appendix 3.4a and 3.4b tables.
Moving on to teacher (S) and the analysis of her talk in the low-intermediate class Csenior, we come up with the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>CS TYPES</th>
<th>Intersentential</th>
<th>Intrasentential</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6,23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition/Reiteration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions/Instructions</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23,90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10,65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing/ Closing Topic</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9,61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise/Approval</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10,13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scolding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12,47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension/Procedural</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real questions / interpersonal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogical Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scolding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4,16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-channel Responses</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler/Interjection</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real questions / interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>100,00</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Teacher: (S), class: Csenior

This table shows that (S) performs a much greater amount of CS instances (454) than (Pa) does (141) in the same class (Csenior). (S) uses the L1 mostly to give directions and instructions to students (24,72%), to ask exam questions (12,36%), to explain things to them (10,82%) while she also switches to the mother tongue in order to repair. Here both other-repair and self-repair are very frequently used.²⁸

In the upper-intermediate class (FCE-ECCE), the use of CS by (S) shows roughly the same picture as the one in the low-intermediate class (Csenior), with an important difference as far as the amount of instances is concerned; in the higher level class of FCE-ECCE the number of switches (310) is significantly lower than the corresponding number (454) in the lower level class (Csenior), as seen in Table 4.

²⁸ See Appendix 3.4a and 3.4b tables.
Teacher (S) performs in FCE-ECCE much in the same way as in Csenior as far as the most frequent functions are concerned. This teacher alternates from the L2 to the L1 when she wants to explain things to learners (15.21%), when she gives directions and instructions to them (13.92%), when the topic shifts out of the pedagogical frame (13.59%), when there is use of repair\(^{29}\) (13.27%) and when she wants to elicit specific answers from the students (10.68%).

Last but not least, data from teacher (D)’s two lessons in the advanced level Proficiency class will be classified in Table 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>CS TYPES</th>
<th>Intersentential</th>
<th>Intrasentential</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition/Reiteration</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions/Instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing/ Closing Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scolding</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-pedagogical Frame</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real questions / interperson</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler/Interjection</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-channel Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Teacher: (S), class: FCE-ECCE

\(^{29}\) See Appendix 3.4a and 3.4b tables.
The amount of CS instances in both of (D)’s transcribed lessons is strikingly low in comparison with the numbers we have seen so far in (Pa)’s and (S)’s tables. Teacher (D) only changes language in forty-nine cases, the most usual of which are: the provision of explanation and repair (both 18.37%), the provision of translation (16.32%), the talk over non-pedagogical issues (14.3%) and finally the introduction of a new topic or the closing of an already discussed one (12.24%).

### 4.5 Summary

The general pattern that has so far emerged confirms our initial hypotheses: to begin with our last research question, the number of intersentential switches is higher than the number of intrasentential ones in all the lessons of (S), (Pa) and (D), probably due to the complexity that such alternations have and the additional linguistic virtuosity required by the speaker. As to the second of our hypotheses, we have found that teachers indeed codeswitch
more in low-level classes and less in high-level ones (cf. (Pa)’s and (S)’s Csenior and FCE-ECCE classes and (D)’s Proficiency). Finally –and most importantly– the case for the main functions in teachers’ speech seems to be the following: the number of switches is greater when the teachers of our study wish to explain issues that are problematic for learners, but it is not always the case that non-pedagogic topics will cause CS to occur –a finding that does not support our initial hypothesis. Rather, code alternation often assumes the function of repair –other-repair outnumbering the other types\(^{30}\) – as well as the one of instruction or direction provision. Table 6 summarises these conclusions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>TEACHERS</th>
<th>Teacher (S)</th>
<th>Teacher (Pa)</th>
<th>Teacher (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCE-ECCE</td>
<td>Csenior</td>
<td>Sub-average</td>
<td>FCE-ECCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition-Reiteration</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Directions/ Instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>24.78</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing/ Closing Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn Allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Praise/ Approval</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scolding</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension/ Procedural</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Real Questions/ Interpersonal</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filler-Interjection</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-channel Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Average CS of all Teachers

\(^{30}\) See Appendix 3.4a and 3.4b tables.
5. Discussion and Conclusions

Our study set out to investigate the use of CS in the institutional setting of a classroom where English is taught as a foreign language and this final chapter comprises a retrospective review of this process. First we will start with a summary of the findings of our study by revisiting the research questions that this thesis has posed and reflecting on the working hypotheses that we set out to explore. Whenever possible a comparative discussion of the present results and the ones that similar studies have reached will be made while we will also attempt to provide some explanations. Finally, we will present the limitations of this study and provide some suggestions for forthcoming research.

5.1 What are the Main Functions of Teachers’ Code-switching?

The results of our study showed that when teachers switched from L2 to L1 they did so in order to: provide students with feedback (either in the form of translation or in the form of explanatory remarks), repeat or reiterate a point so as to clarify it, give instructions and directions as to how specific tasks should be done, perform repair types such as other-repair (also termed other-correction) or self-repair, introduce a new topic to the class or conversely make a closing remark to a previously discussed subject, allocate students’ turns, evaluate students either by praising them or by scolding them, ask questions to check students’ knowledge or comprehension, digress from the pedagogical topic at hand to either ask students questions of real concern or to talk about matters irrelevant to the lesson, prompt students to talk, produce an interjection or a filler, and finally provide back-channel responses as a means of showing learners that their contributions are being listened to.

Out of this admittedly long list, teachers’ switches as appear in Table 6 most commonly serve as a means to provide learners with explanations for points difficult to understand (19.27%), to correct students’ repairable turns (‘other-repair’) (13.31%) and
finally to give them directions or instructions on how to proceed with certain activities (11.76%). Contrary to our expectations for frequent use of CS when there is discussion of non-pedagogic issues (involving teachers digressing from the lesson to ask learners questions of real concern or to talk about a topic irrelevant to the learning task at hand), the results show that this function is less common (9.52%) than repair, explanation or directions / instructions provision on the part of all the three teachers that we recorded. Only teacher (S) in her advanced level class (FCE-ECCE) had quite a lot of instances of such use of CS, as well as teacher (D) in his results from the Proficiency class switched to the L1 to digress from the pedagogical task at hand –though we should bear in mind that CS data from the two lessons that (D) delivered were ‘conflated’ due to the small number of instances.

All in all, then, our initial hypothesis concerning the main functions of CS in a language classroom was partially confirmed. With regard to the quite common use of the L1 as a means of correcting students, it is important to stress the fact that the lessons were particularly ‘exam-centred’ as they belonged to an intensive summer course which prepared students for specific language exams. This could be a possible explanation of the relatively high percentage of the CS function of repair.

Looking into the relevant literature, we realise that the overwhelming majority of studies have investigated CS within a bilingual framework. To mention some of them, Lin (1990) studied the use of CS by bilingual Cantonese-English teachers in Anglo-Chinese secondary classrooms in Hong Kong; Martin (1996) looked at CS in primary classrooms in Brunei where students are taught content subjects in Brunei Malay but from grade 4 onwards English becomes the language of instruction; Guthrie’s (1984 as cited in Martin-Jones 1995) study compared the use of CS by a monolingual and a bilingual teacher and discerned five functions\(^\text{31}\) that the latter’s switches carry out. This type of research cannot be taken into

\(^{31}\) These were: a) translation, b) as a ‘we code’, c) for procedures and directions, d) for clarification and e) to check for understanding (Martin-Jones 1995: 94).
consideration in relation to this study whose objectives are quite different. There is a study by Macaro (1997 as cited in Macaro 2005), however, which revealed that teachers of lower-secondary classes in England made use of the L1\textsuperscript{32} when they wanted to provide learners with ‘complex procedural instructions’ as well as with feedback on an exercise accomplished (Macaro 2005: 69). These results are in accordance with the ones of the present study – although the latter found the performance of repair to be quite common as a CS function, as well.

Another study by Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult (1999) looked into the ways CS is used in a language classroom where French was taught as a FL to Swedish students. The researchers set out by assuming that CS instances in the classroom would serve purposes similar to the ones CS serves in bilingual conversation. What they found out was that, with the exception of one function (namely the use of CS on the part of the teachers’ due to lack of adequate control of the FL), the rest of the teachers’ switches to the L1 served: a) to provide learners with explanations (by means of repeating or translating a point previously mentioned in the L2), b) to change the topic of discussion, c) to express sympathy or anger (affective functions) and finally d) to socialise with students, that is to be friendly or express solidarity (Flyman-Mattsson and Burenhult 1999). What this study shares with ours is that teachers mostly use the L1 to explain some points (grammatical or lexical ones) which are difficult for students to grasp.

5.2 IS THERE A CONNECTION BETWEEN TEACHERS’ USE OF CS AND THE STUDENTS’ LEVEL?

The second question that our thesis posed concerned the frequency of CS instances in relation with the students’ level. We anticipated that there is a connection between the two, and specifically that teachers will speak mostly in the L2 (therefore, switching less to the L1)

\textsuperscript{32} Unfortunately, no mention is made of what the L2 was in this classroom context.
when teaching high-level classes while in the low-level ones the switching to the L1 will be more frequent due to the students’ poor control of the target language. The findings of our study confirmed this hypothesis by revealing that the amount of CS instances used by teachers was indeed smaller in high-level classes and bigger in low-level classes.

This finding, however, requires a further analysis; we should point out that the highest of the levels we examined (Proficiency) was only instructed by one of the three teachers, that is (D), whereas in the FCE-ECCE class –which is the next lowest– we obtained data from two different teachers (S) and (Pa). So the case could either be that (D) purposefully switches rarely to the L1 because he teaches a high-level class where learners have a very good command of the L2, or that he generally follows this pattern of instructing in the L2. Obviously, there is no way to know as (D) does not teach any lower level classes.

As for the two other teachers, (Pa) and (S), they show quite distinct results. On the one hand, the general pattern that emerges from their data confirms our hypothesis about the reduction of CS instances from low-level to high-level classes; on the other hand, (S)’s data reveal a much greater use of CS in comparison with (Pa)’s (cf. (Pa)’s Table 1 with (S)’s Table 3 for the Csenior as well as (Pa)’s Table 2 and (S)’s Table 4 for the FCE-ECCE). This finding could be generally explained in terms of teachers’ personal beliefs about language teaching acquired through their university studies or in terms of their sheer (in)ability to handle the foreign language effectively. The general teaching policy of the foreign language school (‘frontistirio’) in question could also play a role in the instructors’ decision making as to if at all and how often L1 should be used in classroom, but this factor does not seem to come into play in our case, exactly because (Pa)’s and (S)’s use of the L1 is so quantitatively different.
Relative research concerning the amount of CS that is used in FL classrooms by teachers seems to be rare. Macaro (2001) investigated the quantity of L2 that six teachers\(^{33}\) of French in England used in their classes (the students’ level ranged from one to three years of studying French). The results showed a large degree of variability among teachers with the use of L1 ranging from 0% to 15.2% (Macaro 2001: 537) –importantly the two highest percentages (12.4% and 15.2%) were obtained from the low-level classes. But then again, two teachers\(^{34}\) made zero use of the L1 in the low-level classes and this makes it difficult to reach any generalisations. Macaro (2001) concludes that, despite the limitations of the study, the analysis showed that there was little L1 use by the 6 teachers since “only 4.8% (Mean) use of the L1 across the lessons was recorded as a proportion of total lesson time and only 6.9% (Mean) as a proportion of total talk” (2001: 537).

Macaro’s (2001) results are totally inconsistent with our results and this may be due to differences in language teaching policy. Macaro (2001) makes specific mention of the National Curriculum in England which strictly requires that the FL –and not English– should be the means of instruction from the very beginning. In a later contribution of his, Macaro (2005) notes that CS should be viewed as an asset to the teacher’s ability to handle languages and goes on to make a specific point of the L2 learning that CS may effect; the use of CS can indeed help students carry out an activity and can add up to the immediacy of interaction, yet “the user of the codeswitch should envisage that at some time in the longer term the codeswitch will not be necessary because the language store will have increased” (Macaro 2005: 81 original italics).

\(^{33}\) Four of them were English and two were French.

\(^{34}\) We want to assume that these two teachers were the French native speakers but Macaro (2001) does not specify whether this is the case.
5.3 What is the relation between intersentential and intrasentential switches?

The final hypothesis we made for the present study was that teachers would mostly ‘favour’ the use of intersentential switches rather than intrasentential ones, as the grammatical or syntactical constrains involved in the latter make intrasentential switching more ‘demanding’ (Gumperz 1982: 86-91, Poplack 2000: 254). The results we obtained after the quantitative analysis of the data corroborated our expectation. Specifically, to begin with the low-level Csenior class, the overwhelming majority of (Pa)’s and (S)’s switches were of the intersentential type; (Pa)’s intersentential switches to L1 were more or less double than her intrasentential ones, whereas (S)’s intersentential switches were almost six times as many as her intrasentential ones. Moving to the next classroom level, namely FCE-ECCE, (Pa) and (S) display more or less the same pattern –again (S)’s intersentential switches are much more than (Pa)’s–, while in the high-level class of Proficiency (D)’s results also exhibit the anticipated pattern (the amount of intersentential switches are more or less double than the intrasentential ones).

In trying to account for these results we run against the difficulty of finding some research conducted within an FL classroom setting. The case being such, we could tentatively rely on the findings of bilingualism research in order to explain the teachers’ ‘preference’ for intersentential CS rather than intrasentential one. Poplack’s (2000) study could be illuminating in this respect since she found that speakers who ‘preferred’ the latter CS type in which the switches within a sentence must follow specific restrictions, were those “with the greatest degree of bilingual ability (‘true’ bilinguals)” (: 254).

Commenting on this result, Muysken (2000) suggested that bilingual speakers need to have adequate command of both languages in order to be able to combine them in ‘intricate ways’ –although not all studies support such a result (: 225-226). Nevertheless, Poplack’s
(2000) findings connect with ours in that we had anticipated a greater proportion of intersentential switches by teachers, on the grounds that this CS type would be more ‘handy’ to them, in the sense that it would require less ‘linguistic effort’ – the latter presumably resulting from their relevant linguistic ability.

5.4 Concluding Remarks

Let us repeat that the purpose of this study has been to discover ‘what is going on’ in a language classroom with regard to the teachers’ code-switching between the foreign language and their mother tongue (the latter shared by the students too). Recorded data were transcribed and, after regular patterns were observed, they were analysed and subsequently categorised in terms of the switching functions involved in them. Data analysis was made within the conversation-analytic framework which requires that attention is paid to the sequential structure of classroom interaction and that the participants’—both the learners’ and the teachers’—contributions to the lesson are taken into account.

What might well comprise a serious shortcoming of this study is the fact that the data are not enough; the degree of generalisation that the present results can reach is quite limited since data come from one language school only and we studied the CS behaviour of only three teachers. What is more, these classes were part of an intensive summer English course aiming specifically at preparing Greek learners to sit specific exams; a fact that both accounts for some of our findings but that it most crucially makes these findings particular to the foreign language teaching setting in Greece (a traditionally ‘exam-focused’ country with students – or maybe students’ parents – conspicuously pursuing certificates in whatever skill possible). Finally, the general asymmetry observed both among studies and among their findings point to a clear implication; classrooms as areas of institutional interaction cannot be
characterised by balance exactly because this ‘institutionality’ of theirs is definitely subject to teaching policies and language curricula.

The above-mentioned limitations point to the fact that there is need for further research to be done concerning the ‘work’ that code-switching accomplishes within the setting of a foreign language –and not a bilingual– classroom. We believe that to carry out such a task, the value of Conversation Analysis as a most powerful and practical tool cannot be overemphasised. Future research on the topic should, thus, look into code-switching as it is employed in the foreign language classroom, by taking into account the peculiarities of the latter as an institutional environment and by shedding light on the ways teachers –or possibly even students– display an orientation to this special type of interactional setting.
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APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers / Classes</th>
<th>Varieties of Repair</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other-repair</td>
<td>Next-turn Repair initiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa) FCE-ECCE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa) Csenior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) FCE-ECCE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Csenior</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4a: Varieties of repair (Intersentential switches)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers / Classes</th>
<th>Varieties of Repair</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other-repair</td>
<td>Next-turn Repair initiator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Proficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa) FCE-ECCE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pa) Csenior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) FCE-ECCE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) Csenior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4b: Varieties of repair (Intrasentential switches)
APPENDIX II