An examination of teachers' language policing in EFL young learner classrooms in Turkey

Esra Yatağanbaba (ID)
Ege University, School of Foreign Languages, Izmir, Turkey, esra.yataganbaba@ege.edu.tr
Alia Amir (ID)
Mid-Sweden University, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Stockholm, Sweden,
alia.amir@miun.se
Rana Yıldırım (ID)
Cukurova University, Department of Foreign Languages, Adana, Turkey, ranayil@cu.edu.tr

Check for updates

ABSTRACT   This study explores the instances when teachers employ language policing (Amir, 2013) in the Turkish EFL young learners' context. Language policing studies are scarce in EFL young learners' classrooms. Hence, this study is an attempt to address the gap in the literature concerning EFL young learners' contexts from the expanding circle and contribute to the code switching literature. Data consists of 270-minute video recordings from three different classes in two private schools in Turkey and it was analysed using Conversation Analysis. Results show the presence of Turkish, English, as well as a bilingual medium before and after the policing was initiated through formulaic expressions. Unlike some secondary school contexts where the English-only policy is enforced with a strict rewards and punishment policy (Amir & Musk, 2013), speaking Turkish and the bilingual medium for the most part of the lessons was not corrected by the teachers in the current study. These findings have implications for teaching EFL to young learners, language policing and code switching in secondary contexts.

Keywords: *Code switching, Conversation analysis, EFL, Language policing, Young language learners*

Türkiye'de İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarında öğretmenlerin gerçekleştirdiği dil polisliği incelemesi

ÖZ   Bu çalışmada, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarında öğretmenler tarafından uygulanan dil polisliği uygulamaları incelenmektedir. İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarında gerçekleştirilen dil polisliği çalışmaları oldukça sınırlıdır. Böylece, bu çalışmayla genişleyen çevreden İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarıyla alanyazındaki ilgili boşluğu ele alma ve düzenek değiştirme alanyazınına katkıda bulunma hedeflenmiştir. Veriler, Türkiye'deki iki özel okulda üç farklı sınıftan alınan 270 dakikalık video kayıtlarından oluşmaktadır ve söz konusu veriler, Konuşma Analizi yöntemiyle incelenmiştir. Sonuçlar, sadece Türkçe ve sadece İngilizcenin kullanılmasının yanı sıra kalıplaşmış ifadeler yoluyla da dil polisliğin başlatılmasından önce ve sonra iki dilli bir ortamın varlığını göstermiştir. Sınıfta yalnızca-İngilizce politikasının katı bir ödül ve ceza politikasıyla uygulandığı bazı ortaokul bağlamlarının aksine (Amir & Musk, 2013), kaydedilen derslerin çoğunda ana dil ve ikinci dil sorunsuz bir şekilde kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen bulgular doğrultusunda, çocuklara İngilizce öğretimi, dil polisliği ve ortaokul seviyesinde düzenek değiştirme konularında çeşitli çıkarımlar sunulmaktadır.

Anahtar   *Çocuk öğrenici, Dil polisliği, Düzenek değiştirme, Konuşma çözümlemesi, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce*
Sözcükler: *öğretimi*

183

INTRODUCTION

In the last four decades, bilingual talk has been the center of focus for a large and growing body of scientific work. Our understanding of bilingual talk has been broadened by research on code switching (hereafter CS) from syntactic (e.g., Poplack, 1980), sociolinguistic (e.g., Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Myers-Scotton, 1993), and interactional (e.g., Auer, 1984; Amir, 2013; Gafaranga & Torras, 2001; Üstünel, 2004) lenses. In language teaching scholarship focusing on bilingual contexts, there has been an inconclusive debate about whether the first language (hereafter L1) has a role in the L2 classroom (cf. Turnbull & Daily-O'Cain, 2009). There are varying degrees of support for both arguments - the use of L1 and a strict L2 only policy. However, there is ample support in many recent conversation-analytic studies that have shown the positive role of L1 (Amir, 2015; Lin, 2013; Sert, 2015; Üstünel, 2004, 2016;; Waer, 2012; Yatağanbaba, 2014) in an L2 learning environment.

In bilingual English classroom studies, there are many studies focusing on ELT in the context of Anglophone countries (see Lin, 2013, for a fuller review) as well as from the outer circle of English, but a few studies from the expanding circle (Kachru, 1992) in the primary school contexts of young learners (hereafter YLs). Similarly, earlier studies (Eldridge, 1996; Yatağanbaba, 2014; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015) have pointed to the scarcity of studies in literature concerning Turkish primary and secondary English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. In the adult context, there are many studies from the Turkish context studying the phenomena of CS and English teaching (Ataş, 2012; Ataş & Sağın-Şimşek, 2021; Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013; Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013; Horasan, 2014; Köylü, 2018; Üstünel, 2004). However, a previous study conducted in a university setting also revealed a significant research gap in the lack of consistency between English-Turkish CS and EFL studies (Üstünel, 2004). Moreover, in direct relation to the CS literature, the use of L1 in foreign language classrooms has demonstrated a great amount of evidence for advantages and disadvantages of using L1 (Alshammari, 2011; Carson & Kashihara, 2012; Cook; 2008; Edstrom, 2006; Inbar-Lourie, 2010; Kayaoğlu, 2012; Krashen, 2003; Lee & Macaro, 2013; Levine, 2003; Littlewood & Yu, 2011; Rolin-Lanziti, 2002; Turnbull & Arnett, 2002; Warford, 2007; Yıldırım & Mersinligil, 2000). Still the number of studies carried out in primary and secondary EFL YLs contexts are quite limited (aus der Wieschen & Sert, 2021; Yatağanbaba, 2015). Henceforth, this study is an attempt to address the gap in the literature in ELT in bilingual YLs classes from the expanding circle and contribute to the CS literature Turkish bilinguals (Backus, 2002; Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013; Türker, 2005).

This study draws on research conducted within the conversation-analytic (hereafter CA) framework to provide a fine-grained analysis of grassroots practices of language choices in an L2 classroom. Our research aims at analyzing the sequential environment of the mechanism of language policing and expanding on the results obtained by Amir (2013).

Therefore, this research attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What does the sequential environment of teachers' language policing in the EFL young learners' classrooms from two secondary schools in Turkey look like?
2. What are the methods of teachers' language policing in the EFL YLs context?

Medium of Classroom Interaction in Bilingual Classrooms

With a turn of the organizational approach (Auer, 1984) in CS studies, CS was considered an organized and structured activity where the participants could themselves orient to both the languages as a norm or deviating from the norm. From an emic perspective, thus, 'medium of interaction' refers to speakers' understanding of the communicative code (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001) Any CS occurance might be regarded as either rigorous attachement to the norm or a divergence from it (Gafaranga & Torras, 2001).

Research on conversational mediums shows that the availability of two languages in classrooms is exploited by the participants in and through mundane activities (Huq, 2020), and three mediums are used depending on the pedagogical focus i.e,. a monolingual L1, a monolingual L2, and a bilingual medium (Amir, 2013). In contrast to the policy-mandated medium of interaction, the medium of classroom interaction (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011) is 'the linguistic code' that classroom participants align with while conversing (Amir, 2013). However, the medium of interaction prescribed by the policy is not the default mode of interaction of the participants, and neither are the deviations always oriented as deviations (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011). Participants can employ a bilingual medium (Huq, 2018) or L1 as an interactional resource suited for the pedagogic focus of the situation (Waer, 2011). In light of these findings, CS by both instructors and students may enhance learning through scaffolding or encouragement of intersubjectivity (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009), which is the backbone of classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2006).

Language Policing and The Normativity of Language Choice

In this part, the organizational take on the focus of this study i.e. the action of policing and related research on language choice in bilingual classrooms is covered. CA-based language policing studies rely on an organizational interpretation of CS (Auer, 1984, Bonacina, 2010; Gafaranga, 2000), and can be defined as a mechanism used by the participants to (re-)establish the prescription of target language as a classroom interaction mode (Amir, 2013; Amir & Musk, 2013). Language policing in action in the bilingual classroom context has been studied with several foci, in subtle implicit ways (Amir, 2013; Hazel, 2015), and in explicit multimodal or verbal directives (Amir & Musk, 2013, 2014; Mökkönen, 2012) as well as norm vs. rule policing (Sert & Balaman, 2018). The following characteristics are used to categorize policing: initiator strategies, modulation, the kind and distribution of members' policing methods, and the classroom environment of the police act (Amir & Musk, 2014).

The pioneering study on language policing (Amir, 2013; Amir & Musk, 2013) explored teachers' publicly available language policing directives and found three different categories of teachers' explicit policing in the context of English classes of grades 7-9 in the Swedish context i.e., a public address, specific address to a pupil and point deduction. The study was conducted in an international school where the teacher followed a strict point-based teacher versus pupils' system that was used to enforce English-only. Only nine occurrences of explicit teacher commands to speak English were found, but the participants only aligned and maintained English without expressing anything about it. It is the case in most multilingual circumstances, according to Auer (1984) and Gafaranga (2000). Furthermore, empirical investigations on language policing have discovered a three-step prototype language policing trajectory (Amir, 2013, p. 46; Amir & Musk, 2013), and these are target-language-only prescription, doing language policing and aligning with language policing and switching to L2. However, the shift to L2 may be temporary.

However, research has shown that the prescribed L2 policy may or may not be translated in interaction in its pure and strict form all the time (Amir, 2013), and may be manifested implicitly as in the case of a study from Greece, which showcases the interactions of children during free play (Papageorgiou, 2009, 2011) or occasions of medium suspension by participants may come for intersubjectivity (Huq, 2020). According to Sert (2005), using CS in an EFL classroom is a method that is effective in social interaction, has functional utility in both teachers and learners and is a component of classroom interactional competence (Walsh, 2006). Furthermore, Sert (2015) demonstrated that in a bilingual context where all participants mediate the language/code in a teacher-fronted classroom context. He found three types of CS in which teachers managed students' CS: designedly incomplete utterance (Koshik, 2002), displaying L2 compliance with an L1 request, embedded repair. On the other hand, as an example from the Swedish context, Cromdal (2005) discovered that participants may not necessarily orient to utilizing the alternative code as a dispreferred activity. Another study at a Turkish university focused on language choice and pedagogical focus in the EFL context showed three types of CS: teacher-initiated, teacher-induced, and student-initiated (Üstünel, 2004; Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2005). They demonstrated that teacher CS has a reflexive relationship with the pedagogical foci (Seedhouse, 2004)

185

whereas students could align or disalign with the pedagogical focus through their language choices. Similarly, it has been demonstrated that the organization of turn-taking and sequence is reflexively related to the pedagogical focus (Seedhouse 2004, p. 101) in conversation analytic classroom interaction studies. Fine-grained details from several studies have confirmed the presence of parallel mediums and the use of L1 by the students which also suggests their agency to subvert the teachers' English-only work plan (Banda, 2009; Jakonen, 2016; Lehti-Eklund, 2012; Probyn, 2009, 2019; Slotte-Luttge, 2007). Copp- Jinkerson (2011) investigated how to maintain the monolingual norm in an English-language school in Finland, where the teachers and students undertake language policing on the moments which English-only language policy is contested by the students.

To sum up, language choice in a bilingual context is co-constructed, negotiated and contested minute by minute in classroom interaction. Both explicit directives to language policing and subtle ways to uphold L2 are embedded in the activities and shift with the pedagogical focus.

METHOD

English in Turkey

English is a global language. English does not have an official status in Turkey, as it has in other countries in the expanding circle, but it is not only popular but also serves various functions in different domains in the country (İnal et al.,, 2020). Similarly, it has become a vital tool for young people in Turkey not to miss out the latest global developments (Küçükoğlu, 2013). Similarly, each successive Turkish government has implemented language programs to expand and improve English learning and instruction (Yıldırım & Okan, 2007), resulting in English becoming Turkey's most popular foreign language (Doğançay-Aktuna, 1998; Sarıçoban & Sarıçoban, 2012). However, when it comes to actual teaching practices, teaching methodologies vary vastly in different types of schools. For example, English is taught in public schools beginning in the second grade (age 8) and continuing until the senior year of high school. When compared to private schools, which begin teaching English in kindergarten and have two or three English classes on their schedules, the amount of course hours allocated to teaching English in public schools is relatively limited (Gürsoy et al., 2016; Kılınç, 2016; Mutlu, 2017; Seçkin, 2011; Yıldıran & Tanrıseven, 2015).

Context and Participants

The data of this study was collected by video recording three secondary EFL classrooms in two different private schools in Turkey. The participants were 11 years old 5th grade students (approximately 25 in each classroom) and three Turkish EFL teachers. The teachers were graduates of ELT and had more than ten years of English teaching experience, and at least four years of experience of teaching young learners.

Prior to undertaking the investigation, school administration and the teachers were informed about the purpose of the research and procedure of data collection. After reaching an agreement, informed consent forms were signed by the participating teachers and parents of the young learners. Once the permission was granted, the following stages (Richards, 2003) were followed. First, the purpose for recording the lessons was explained to the teachers without going into too much detail about the emphasis of study so as not to distort the reliability of the data. Second, the teachers were given the option of seeing transcripts of videotaped lessons if they desired to do. Finally, they were offered the option of learning about the findings of the study after publication. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics in Social and Human Sciences Committee of Cukurova University (06.09.2021, decision number 3).

A camcorder was used to collect empirical data for the investigation. To capture the classroom

186

interactions, a camcorder on a tripod was positioned in one corner of the classroom. The video recordings consist of 270 minutes from three different classes in total. The context of the study is a bilingual EFL context where our focus is on the sequentiality of teachers' explicit language policing. In these sequences, upon hearing L1 the teachers and sometimes the students initiate an utterance to enforce a switch to L2. The focus of the study is on how those micro contexts are organized when the pedagogical focus is on eliciting responses of the students in L2 and when speaking L1 is not allowed. In the video recorded data, the participants use L1 frequently, but the teachers do not enforce L2 all the time.

To keep the anonymity of the classroom participants in the transcripts, T was used to address the teachers and students were numbered according to their turn-taking order (S1, S2, S3 etc.). SS indicates multiple students whose identities cannot be detected when talking in unison. Pseudonyms were used for the students' names on the occasions when their teachers addressed them with their names. The exact location of the initiation of language policing (i.e. 'in English') is marked with an arrow, which is the object of this study in its sequentiality. The translations from Turkish to English are marked in italics and Turkish sentences are in bold.

Analytic Procedures

This study employed Conversation Analysis (CA), an ethnomethodological method of inquiry and a collection of tools for dealing with audio and video recordings of speaking and social interaction (Sidnell, 2010). The focus of systematic analysis of CA is on the talk produced in everyday situations of human interaction i.e., talk-in-interaction (Hutchby & Woffitt, 2008) including non-verbal embodied actions (Mondada, 2014). Thus, transcribed naturally occurring actual talk-in-interaction is the object of study which enables the analyst to view the details of the social world under study with an emic perspective. According to Seedhouse (2005), the analyst's responsibility is to disclose and describe this arrangement and structure from an emic' perspective. Taking the understandings stated above into consideration, CA was employed due to the nature of the data acquired for this study which required a qualitative approach providing fine-grained analysis.

By focusing on the sequential organization, it can be seen how the interaction unfolds (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973) as an orderly accomplishment and how participants share interactional work (Nakamura, 2010). Following the methodological procedure of CA (Seedhouse, 2014; Sidnell, 2010) the data was closely screened for any "directly observable" (ten Have, 2007, p. 27) aspect of social interaction. One phenomenon i.e., language policing stood out in the data (Amir, 2013; Yatağanbaba, 2014), and after a thorough investigation of the data, several instances of teacher's reminders to pupils to switch to English were identified. The examples of the phenomenon in the video recordings were, therefore, transcribed in line with Jefferson's transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) by using Transana software. It helps integrate the video data and the transcription text in a single file. The transcriptions were then translated by the first and revised for further scrutiny by the third author who are native speakers of Turkish. The transcribed extracts showed the following pattern under analysis in this study: 1. Utterance in Turkish (i.e., L1) by a student, 2. Teacher-initiated language policing, 3. Switch to English by that particular student.

FINDINGS

In the following part, we present Extracts 1-4 which demonstrate the bilingual environment of the data under study and shed light on the examples of teacher's explicit language policing (Amir & Musk, 2013). Moreover, our focus is on the situated nature of these incidences, and how these social actions are accomplished.

Each description of the extract begins with the details of the classroom setting and the task in hand of

187

the classroom participants. Our focus is on the teacher's verbal directive to use L2 only i.e., language policing to enforce English-only in a bilingual context. However, our study also confirms frequent suspension of L1, mono-L2 usage, and a mixed medium (e.g., Huq, 2020).

The following extracts are used to demonstrate the participants' in situ language choices and how different mediums of classroom interaction operate in an L2 classroom (Amir & Musk, 2013). In Extract 1 we show how English-only is oriented to without topicalizing their language choice (Huq, 2020) confirming the overwhelming pattern found in other bilingual contexts (Auer, 1984; Gafaranga, 2000). Extract 1 occurs in the procedural context (Seedhouse, 2004) and it shows the beginning of a lesson.

Extract 1: What does börek mean?

```
1    T    good morning class
2    SS   GOOD MORNING TEACHER
3    T    how is it going?
4    SS   FI:NE THA:NKS AND YOU:
5    T    fine (.) OK (.) sit down
6    S2   ((walks towards his desk and shuffles pages))
7         (6.0)
8    S1   TEACHER
9         (3.0)
10   T    OK (.) who said teacher
11   S1   ((raises his hand))
12   S2   ((walks towards the teacher and gives him a notebook))
13   T    you take it and bring it at the end of the class (0.2) I'll
          check it at the end of the class
14        (3.0)
15   T    ↑OK (.) yes how is it going?
16        (1.0)
17   T    yeah (0.3) what have you got for the picnic
18        (2.0)
19   S1   ermm
20        (1.0)
21   S1   Chips
22   T    ↑chips for the picnic (0.3)↑you what have you got for the picnic
          +points at S1
23        (1.0)
24   S1    ermm: börek ne demekti
           what does börek mean
25   T     bun
26        (1.0)
27   S1   [↑bun]
28   T    [you] brought bun to the picnic (.) OK
1    T    good morning class
2    SS   GOOD MORNING TEACHER
3    T    how is it going?
4    SS   FI:NE THA:NKS AND YOU:
5    T    fine (.) OK (.) sit down
6    S2   ((walks towards his desk and shuffles pages))
7         (6.0)
8    S1   TEACHER
9         (3.0)
10   T    OK (.) who said teacher
11   S1   ((raises his hand))
12   S2   ((walks towards the teacher and gives him a notebook))
13   T    you take it and bring it at the end of the class (0.2) I'll
          check it at the end of the class
14        (3.0)
15   T    ↑OK (.) yes how is it going?
16        (1.0)
```

In this extract, we find only English being used as the medium of classroom interaction among the classroom participants until line 11. The teacher's greeting in English is officially inaugurating the English lesson (line 1), and consistently speaking in English whereas the lesson proper has not started

188

yet (lines 1-4). All replies to the teacher's initiation and questions are met with a reply in English by students until S (in line 24) gets stuck. Furthermore, there is no medium switching or difficulty orientation to either their own or the other person's medium of communication during the dialogue between the teacher and the students. Therefore, during this extract until line 23, the classroom participants have monolingual English as their medium of interaction. Turning to S1's medium of interaction (line 24) who also had English as his medium of interaction up until (line 24). S1 switches medium (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002) which is characterized by the stretching of erm (line 24). What Extract 1 sheds light on is that the medium of S's turn (line 24) is a temporary suspension as in the case for Slotte-Lüttge's (2007) study in a Swedish-medium classroom in Finland found that when students had difficulty in expressing themselves in Swedish, they temporarily halted the operating language.

To illustrate further how mediums of classroom interaction operate, it would be useful to consider the details of Extract 2 with the teacher F. In this context, the teacher was checking the students' homework individually.

Extract 2: You don't understand that part

```
1   T   you don't understand that part
2       ((she's checking the homework one by one))
3       OK, what about the other pages?
4       (5.0)
5       oki doki
6       (7.0)
7       I see some parts are missing.
8   S   hocam
        Teacher
9   T   yes? (.)
10  S   burası da mı vardı
        was this part included too
11  T   vardı (0.4) 6. ünitenin hepsi vardı
        yes it was  all the parts in unit 6 were included
```

In contrast to the previous extract, here there are two mediums of classroom interaction i.e., monolingual English (lines 1 & 9) and monolingual Turkish both by the teacher and the student (line 8, 10 & line 11). The call to the teacher in Turkish (line 8) is followed by the teacher's alignment. The next turn by the student is a good example of teacher-induced CS (Üstünel, 2004). In brief, the upshot is that the English-only rule can be suspended even by the teacher and the prescribed medium of classroom interaction can be subverted for several purposes. In this extract, it is to provide answer to S (line 11).

Extract 3 demonstrates how interaction proceeds in a bilingual medium without any explicit policing directives to switch to English and the participants attend to locally produced interaction.

Extract 3: Would you like to eat space food?

```
1   T    biscuits (.) OK space food (…) would you like to eat space food?
2   SS   no:::
3   T    [nooo]
4   S1   ne güzeldir
         how nice it must be
5   S2   şey (0.5) yıldız tozu
         well star dust
6   T    yıldız tozu (.) maybe
         star dust
7   S3   uuhhhm(3.0))şey star:: star salad
                     well
8   T    star salad (.) OK. so?
9   S4   sand (.)eehhmm (2.0) sand rice
10  T    sand rice (.) OK (.) interesting.
```

189

This sequence is analyzed by using Gafaranga & Torras' (2002) conceptualization of CS. In lines 1-3 the interaction moves among the participants in English followed by S1 and S2's utterances in Turkish. In line 6 the teacher utters, "yıldız tozu, maybe" (translation: star dust, maybe). To which S3 utters: "şey star:: star salad" (translation: well, star, star salad). It is this utterance that gets repaired in English with "star" (line 7) and switches the medium in the coming lines. This repair is signaled by the trouble markers (Gafaranga, 2000) when S3 uses star:: in line 7. These markers are a characteristic of medium switching (Gafaranga & Torras, 2002).

In this extract, both monolingual mediums and one bilingual medium are present in response to teacher's question in English. The conversation here continues with student inputs in Turkish which clearly demonstrates that while a student might have switched in Turkish for various purposes in lines 4 & 5 (i.e., lack of verbal competence either in pronunciation or the lack of lexical item etc.), there are no signs of lack of comprehension and intelligibility. Therefore, for pedagogical purposes, teacher's question is a success in terms of eliciting student's responses.

Teacher's Language Policing

The analysis in the previous section shows general practices prevalent in a bilingual classroom i.e., moments when the teacher does not enforce strict explicit policing (see in Amir, 2013). Our findings also confirm the findings of previous studies (see for example Üstünel, 2004; Yatağanbaba, 2014) that more than one medium of classroom interaction is in action and a continuum of practices are used as follows:

1. L1 used by the students for clarification questions
2. L1 used by the teacher to orient to student's utterance in L1
3. Suspension of L2 mid-utterance and switch to L1 by the teacher
4. L1 initiated by the teacher to explain a task.

The following extracts show the mechanism of teachers' language policing which is an explicit way to orient to the normative policy prescribed medium i.e., L2. Extract 4 is an example of teacher-initiated language policing. In this example, the teacher organizes an act it out activity to practice daily classroom routines. The activity requires students to act-out the pictures displayed on the smart board, and the teacher calls S1 in line 1.

Extract 4: Taking a shower

```
1    T:    talha (.) go over there ((multiple students talk))
2          (3.0)
3          ((S1 comes to the black board with a book))
4    S2:   hocam yanınıza getirdi hah hah!
           teacher he brought it to you. hah hah
5    T:    ↑Talha
6          (2.0)
7          let's ta:ke (0.5) taking a shower
8    S1:   ((imitates reading a book))
9    S3:   HOCAM OKUYOR
           teacher he is reading ((other students are laughing and murmuring))
10   T:    talha, what are you doing you are not taking a shower talha
11         (3.0) ((students keep murmuring))
12   S3:   TALHA TALHA ((acts out taking a shower))
13   T:    talha
14         (5.0)   ((teacher looks around for another student))
15         omer kaan
16         (1.0)
17         what are you doing?
18   S4:   uhm
19         (2.0)
20   S3:   TEACHER TEACHER
```

```
21   T:    what are you doing?
22   SS:   DUŞ ALMAK DUŞ ALMAK
           taking a shower taking a shower
23         (2.5)
24   S4    i'm taking (.) a shower ((he acts it out))
25   T:    yes just watch omer kaan (.) do it again yes, do it again
26   S3:   bak şimdi başına döküyor sonra=
           look he is pouring water over his head now
27→  T:    =[hush↑in english]
28   S3:   [ovalıyor ovalıyor]
           scrubbing scrubbing
29   S4:   [I'm ((inaudible))]
30         (1.5)
31   T     so what is it
32         (1.5)
33   S4    ((inaudible but he acts it out))
34   S3    sonra yıkanıyor (1.0)
           (Then he is taking a shower)
35   T     taking a shower (.) yes
```

More than one medium of classroom interaction, as well as animated answers by the participants, can be found here (Bonacina & Gafaranga, 2011, p. 331). When the teacher summons S1 (line 1) "Talha, go over there", S1 goes to the board with a book. The teacher addresses the student with his first name again and allocates the turn by a statement 'let's take' which she repairs by uttering, 'taking a shower' (lines 5- 6). S1 instead acts out as if he was reading a book. The teacher does not get the right answer in the next turn (Seedhouse, 2004, p.18) but in line 12, S3 self-selects and acts out taking a shower. During the project of eliciting the right answer by the teacher, two utterances in Turkish are uttered by S2 (line 4) and by S3 (line 9), but the teacher takes the floor again in English without replying to the student's utterances uttered in Turkish or policing them (lines 5 & 10).

The teacher restarts the project of getting the right animated responses and allocates the turn to S4 by addressing him (line 15). S4 displays hesitation (line 18) and is disrupted by S3 (line 20) in English to capture the teacher's attention. The teacher restates his question (line 21), but students respond to the correct answer in chorus in Turkish (line 22). After a short pause, S4 gives the correct answer both by an animated response (Nakamura, 2010) and answering verbally in English (line 24). The teacher utters a confirmation token (yes) and requests him to do it (line 25). S3 draws the attention of the class in Turkish "Bak şimdi başına döküyor sonra" (translation: look now he is pouring water on his head) (line 26). During this extract, S3 have had both Turkish (line 7) and English (line 10) as his mediums of interaction. He had also uttered S4's name (line 12) which can be considered an utterance both in Turkish and English. However, it is in line 27 that the teacher initiates the language policing by first a "hush" and then by getting louder in an imperative "in English". S3 aligns with the teacher's agenda with an animated response and continues with his performance of "scrubbing, scrubbing" but in Turkish (line 28). Although S4 utters in English (line 29) after teacher's policing, S3 uses Turkish before and after the act of language policing (see lines 26 & 29).

This extract shows us that in a classroom where the target-language rule is broken, a teacher can ignore a student's attempts in L1 several times and uphold the L2 policy in subtle discreet ways without any direct or formulative statements. When language policing is initiated in the public space to a specific student, all students still do not necessarily align to the teacher's requested medium uttered to a specific student and may still continue to go off-track from the desired and requested medium by the teacher. The teacher explicitly polices first (line 27) but in a parallel medium still responds to S3's utterance in Turkish without policing. Thereby, she allows the use of L1 by not sanctioning it. At the same time, keeping her utterance in English and therefore in a subtle way reminding that it is still the English class. Thus, parallel mediums of classroom interaction can exist even after language policing.

Negotiation of Norms and Deviation from The Norms

Our second example of teacher-initiated language policing comes from the same animated activity as in

191

the previous example. In extract 2, the teacher shows pictures of household chores on the smart board to the students and asks them to say what people do in these pictures. This activity is carried out to consolidate previously learnt phrases. In this extract, the teacher not only corrects a pronunciation, he continues to stick to an English-only policy with language policing.

Extract 5: In Turkish! no!

```
 1   T    ↑alright
 2        (2.0)
 3        ((points at S1))
 4   S2   i:ro::n the tʃouldes= ((he mispronounces clothes))
 5   S3   =[IRON IRON]
 6   S4   [iron the kloʊtəs]
 7   T    OKAY. WHAT I::S SHE DOING
 8   S5   IRONING THE CLOTHES
 9   T    hush::
10        (1.0)
11        what is it
12   Ss   Iro:n
13   T    if you want to say something you should raise your hand (1.0) stop the
          talk
14        ↑ alright
15   S5   parmak kaldırmazsan sus
          (shut up if you don't raise finger)
17   S6   i::n Turkish [no::]
18   T    [yes exactly] ((walks around the class and looks
19        at S1
20   S1   ütü yapıyor
          (she is ironing)
21  →T    in English?
22   S1   ironiŋ clo:thes=
23   T    =it i:s written ↑here((shows the written form on smart board))
24        (1.0) bu:t you should say she i:s (.)[aɪərnɪŋ the:(.) clothes]
25   Ss   [ɪroniŋ the clothes]
```

The teacher invites S1 to look at the picture. However, S1 does not take the floor until line 19 due to interventions by the other students (S2, S3, S4, S5, S6). By self-selecting, S2 gives the correct answer but incorrectly pronounces the word "clothes" (line 4). This utterance is followed by S3's repetition of the word "iron" (line 5). S4 gives the right answer with the incorrect pronunciation (line 5). The teacher takes the conversational floor back and asks, "what is she doing?" (line 7). Since the teacher's question is open to the whole class at this point, S5 (in line 8) answers by taking the floor with the correct answer. This gets hushed by the teacher even though the answer is correct. She asks again, 'what is it' (line 11) to which several students answer "iron".

Finally, in lines 13, the teacher puts an end to other students' self-selections by laying the rule clearly, "if you want to say something you should raise your hand", and then commands them to "stop the talk". The teacher's warning is repeated in Turkish by S5 to the fellow students. The utterance in Turkish is not only a semi-translation of the teachers' moral code, but also contextualizes the code with the utterance "parmak kaldırmazsan, sus" which means "if you don't raise your finger, shut up!" Since Turkish is an agglutinative language, the teacher's utterance gets recycled into a different form where the suffix "ma" is added to the verb "kaldır" making it a conditional negative sentence with a harsh "shut up" at the end. Switching from S5's rule policing, S6 initiates a formulaic way of policing by saying "in Turkish, no" (Amir & Musk, 2014). The teacher's turn is an overlap mid-way where she affiliates with S6 and utters "yes exactly" while gazing at S1. Finally, S1 provides the right answer but in Turkish (in line 20) even when the language norms have been invoked by S6 (in line 17). Classroom rules, according to Jakonen (2016), can be accepted, rejected, or submitted in a variety of ways. This is the case for our data as well as the teacher finally invokes the use of L2 by uttering "in English" even though there have been breaches of English before (line 20). In the subsequent turns, S1 utters the right response in the right medium requested by the teacher (line 21). However, in lines 23-24, the teacher carries out a

192

pedagogical correction by pronouncing correctly in English and referring to the sentence on the board. Thus, submitting the rule in another way. It could be gathered from extract 6 that although in the next turn of teacher's language policing (line 20) S1 produces the correct answer in the desired medium, it is problematic in terms of pronunciation. This is ignored both by the students and the teacher. Students respond in chorus repeating in English (ironing the clothes) (line 25), and thereby aligning with teacher's explicit directive to speak in English.

In the following extract, the teacher checks the workbook assignment given to the students in the previous lesson. The teacher and the students disagree about the assigned pages (lines 1 to 15) where the teacher declares "fifty-one" (line 1), "fifty-two, fifty-three" (line 4) to which S1 does not agree (lines 2 and 4) whereas S2 agrees (line 6).

Extract 6: Tell me! tell me in English!

```
1    T     okay fifty: fifty ↑one ((turning the pages over))
2    S1    ↑hocam burası yoktu
           teacher this part was not included
3    T     fifty two:: (.) fifty three
4    S1    yoktu hocam sadece burası vardı
           teacher not this but only that part was included
5    T     ↑okay okay(.) no problem.(0.5)
6    S2    °hocam sayfa 53 de vardı°
           teacher page 53 was also included
7    T     okay no problem okay no problem (.) ↑ so: number 50
8          (2.0)
9    T     *who::* didn't do the homework
10         (1.0)
11         who: didn't do the homework
12   S1    hocam ben yaptım da dolabının anahtarı evde kaldığı
13         için (inaudible)
           teacher i did it but because I left my locker's key
           at home
14   S4    hocam 52 53 var mıydı
           teacher were pages 52 and 53 included
15→  T     ↑so (.) in English. tell me tell me in English
16         (1.0)
17   S4    er::
18   Ss    ((chuckles))
19   T     ↑I di::d (0.3)
20   S2    hocam ben 51 diye biliyordum=
           teacher I thought we were going to cover page fifty-one
21   T     =I ↑di:d
22   S2    er: I did
23         (1.0)
24   T     My
25         (1.0)
26   S2    my ((looks at teacher))
27         (1.0)
28   T     *homewo::rk*
29         (1.0)
30   T     but=
31   S2    =but (0.5) er::=
32   T     =huh
```

The teacher settles the disagreement about the homework with the acknowledgement token "okay, okay" and shifts the pedagogical focus by asking the question: "who didn't do the homework?" (line 9). In line 12, S1 utters "hocam ben yaptım" (translation: teacher, I did), which is followed by S4 "hocam 52 53 var mıydı" (translation: teacher, were pages 52 and 53 included" (line 14). These utterances by two students in Turkish are followed by the teacher's policing turn asking them directly to switch to L2, "in English, tell me tell me in English" (line 15). After a long pause, S4 utters "err". Even with the teacher's explicit prompt, 'in English' S4 demonstrates hesitance or lack of skills in English to complete the teacher's request.

193

Next, the teacher takes the floor in English again and models the correct answer, "I did" (line 19). Next, S2 declares the correct page of the assignment in Turkish as "hocam ben 51 diye biliyordum (translation: teacher I thought we were going to cover page fifty-one" (line 20). There is no uptake on S2's information by the teacher and she repeats "I did" (line 21). Finally, S4 mimics the teacher in the right medium and orients to the L2 policy uttering by uttering "er: I did" (line 22). To which the teacher provides the next word to be repeated, "my" (line 24) which S4 repeats as "my" (line 26). After this, the teacher utters "homework" (line 28). To which, S4 utters "my homework" (line 31).

The more subtle and indirect implicit policing occurs from lines 20-28 when the teacher utters words in English without explicit instructions to the students and the student repeats line by line after her. In this less explicit way, the teacher makes the student to repeat after her in English. Teacher's scaffolding to help the student utter the modelled response by the teacher keeps the conversational floor in English.

To sum up, even before teacher's explicit policing (line 15) there can be several breaches (e.g. in Turkish in lines 2, 4, 6, 12, 13, 14). Our example also demonstrates that the teachers used the formulaic directives 'in English' to elicit responses from students in English, but most of the time, there can be other ways to make students speak English. As demonstrated above multiple mediums (i.e. Turkish, English, bilingual medium) can exist in parallel prior to language policing, but explicit directives shift the medium to L2 even though it might not last for a long time.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper gives an account of the ways in which EFL teachers engage in language policing in three YLs EFL classrooms from two private schools in Turkey. The study focused on how EFL teachers organize their language policing, and how they use the target language as the medium of classroom interaction. Our interest lies in how the teacher directs EFL YLs to use the target language by analyzing the environment of examples where the teachers explicitly ask for speaking in English. Our criterion for going in depth in the examples is, therefore, based on, a) what mediums are spoken by whom before teacher's act of language policing, b) what mediums are spoken by whom after teacher's act of language policing, c) which medium is established after language policing and d) what are the similarities and differences in each example.

This study found out that generally a parallel mode of bilingual medium exists (see extracts 1-6) where some students routinely use L1 even though the teacher explicitly enforces English-only on three occasions. The results showed that the teachers maintain the L2-only policy and do implicit language policing by aligning with L2-only turns mainly. However, they did not prevent students from speaking in L1 all the time (cf. some strict explicit policing examples in Amir, 2013; Balaman, 2016), and they often accept students' responses in L1 as valid (ex. 4, lines 1-25). The findings also revealed that the teachers do not explicitly and verbally tell them to use English all the time, but for the parts where English is used, it is implicitly upheld, even though the normative language outside the classroom is not English (i.e. Turkish and other languages). This is also substantiated by the number of occasions on which the teachers use language policing in the transcripts.

The evidence from this study suggests that in a classroom where the English-only rule is broken, students' attempts in L1 may get ignored by the teacher. Yet, this could also be another way of not allowing students to use L1 and take the next turns and the conversational floor. By not policing and by not responding to the students' utterances in L1 on many occasions, the teachers make a point that English gets the interactional space. On the other hand, when a teacher polices a specific student in the public space of the classroom, parallel mediums can exist (see extracts 1-4).

The results of this research also support the idea that language policing sequences emerge when L1 (Turkish) is spoken. Detailed analyses showed that the teachers' policing is always characterized by

194

using formulaic expressions i.e. in English. In the third step of language policing i.e. when policing has been initiated by the teacher, there is always an immediate compliance even if it might be short term (see extracts 5-7). The above example does not necessarily mean the switch to L2 occurs in the immediate turns after language policing. The overall structure of the data is teacher-fronted teaching, but the results are bound to change from one activity to another activity. Moreover, in the public space of the classroom several interactional projects can be competing when, for instance, the students want to take the floor and respond to the teacher (see extract 6). Even if the answer is in the correct medium, the teacher ignores the student and does not allocate him a turn.

Another interesting finding from the study is that students might also engage in rule policing (Balaman, 2016; Sert & Balaman, 2018), which appears when the students address the use of L1 as a language breach (see extract 5). This extract is in line with their findings in terms of using rule policing as an extension to language policing, but it differs regarding the use of rule policing as a breach of task-rule which is completing it in English. Therefore, this study strengthens the idea that both students and teachers have an agency in the language choice.

These findings contribute to the understanding of ELT professionals by providing evidence from actual YL classrooms. The findings will also be of interest to pre-service EFL teachers who might not yet have the opportunity to be in a real classroom. While theoretically pre-service EFLs teacher might have an understanding of an array of different possibilities in classrooms, examples and research from classrooms can help them improve their teaching practices. As for in-service teachers, the challenges they might face and the decisions they need to make in terms of language use provide a basis for developing appropriate pedagogical methodologies.

The findings have significant implications for teaching English to YLs in Turkey and national policymakers and teachers' micro language policies. Because there is so little evidence-based research on YLs in Turkey (Eldridge, 1996; Yatağanbaba, 2014; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015), a micro-analysis like this one allows all stakeholders to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how language policy practices feed macro educational policies and teachers' planning in order to improve YLs' language teaching opportunities. This research contributes to the ongoing discussion about when and how much L1 should be utilized in bilingual EFL settings. Teachers must guarantee that the use of CS in the classroom is systematic, appropriate, and suitable, as indicated by Ye (2021), and they must think proactively about the objectives that CS serves. In line with these suggestions, this study does not seek to quantify the appropriate amount of L1, but rather to raise awareness among EFL teachers about the need of creating language learning opportunities by enforcing language policing as needed and employing L1 (using for task instruction clarification, orienting to learner contributions and so on) to maintain purposeful interaction.

Furthermore, the findings may help EFL teachers become more conscious of classroom interactional competence, which locates interaction in the center of all learning and teaching organization (Walsh, 2011). EFL teachers can analyze their L1 use and its potential for providing or blocking language learning opportunities by concentrating on their own classroom practices. Teachers, according to Farrell and Ives (2015), must rigorously collect their own classroom data and dwell upon their assumptions and practices to understand the rationale behind their classroom practices. As a result, careful consideration and articulation of classroom interactional practices may either affirm or challenge teachers' current perspectives. To put it another way, EFL teachers could begin utilizing a learner-oriented language by deploying a more efficient use of L1, after recording, transcribing, and reflecting on their own experience, providing proof of improvement in their classroom interactional practice. To conclude, we can say that language policing is an essential mechanism of an L2 classroom where the classroom participants are constantly shifting and oscillating the micro-level policy in practice (c.f. Amir & Musk, 2013; Seedhouse, 2004) in parallel to the pedagogical focus. The metaphor of 'racetrack' used by Stokoe (2014) can be useful here to understand that the racetrack or that the workplan is English, whereas the pupils' use of L1 is the deviation and brings them off track. Policing is the mechanism through which the students are brought back on the track of L2. However, the process of socialization into a foreign

195

language and the interactional competence of YLs has a great bearing on how far the young pupils can uphold the target language (or stay on track), which is also the case in our study.

Although the above claims are empirically grounded, we also acknowledge the limited nature of data from two secondary schools which were filmed for one school term but not daily and from a limited set of classroom context and activities. Moreover, camera angles of the current data also limit us to fully incorporate multimodal analyses, but as much as the video data could provide the information, it has been added in the analysis. Furthermore, the findings of this study are limited to the L2 classroom context in which it was conducted. As a result, more data from diverse L1s and varied L2 classroom situations should be collected. To understand the interactional features of rules introductions to a new class, a longitudinal analysis of the beginning of the term is required. Another caveat is the limited number of language policing sequences captured on camera in the data; however, our focus is not on generalization but on the fine-grained details of teachers' directives after students' breaches, and the aftermath of language policing. Further research in the secondary contexts is crucial specifically to understand the socialization aspects of English-only rule in secondary schools when the pupils are initially exposed to English in the classroom context. Finally, more studies should be carried out on the sequentiality of language policing and CS in a longitudinal manner, and specifically from a varied context outside the Anglophone context.

REFERENCES

Amir, A. (2013) *Doing language policy: A Micro-Interactional Study of Policy Practices in English as a Foreign Language Classes*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Linköpings Universitet. https://doi.org/10.3384/diss.diva-100202

Amir, A. & Musk, N. (2013). Language policing: micro-level language policy-in-process in the foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse 4*(2), 151-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2013.783500

Amir, A. & Musk, N. (2014). Pupils *Doing language policy*: Micro-interactional insights from the English as a foreign language classroom. *Apples: Journal of Applied Language Studies, 8*(2), 93-113.

Ataş, U. (2012). *Discourse functions of students' and teachers' code switching in EFL classrooms: a case study in a Turkish University*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University.

Ataş, U., & Sağın-Şimşek, Ç. (2021). Discourse and educational functions of students' and teachers' code-switching in EFL classrooms in Turkey. *Linguistics and Education, 65*, 100981. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2021.100981

Auer, P. (1984). *Bilingual Conversation*. John Benjamins.

Aus der Wieschen, M. V., & Sert, O. (2021). Divergent language choices and maintenance of intersubjectivity: the case of Danish EFL young learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 24*(1), 107-123. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1447544

Balaman, U. (2016). *A conversation analytic study on the development of interactional competence in English in an online task-oriented environment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University.

Bensen, H., & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2013) Reasons for the teachers' uses of code switching in adult EFL classrooms. *Hasan Ali Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 20*(2), 70-82.

Bilgin, G.P., & Rahimi, A. (2013). EFL Teachers' Attitude toward Code Switching: A Turkish Setting. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i5.4043

Blom, J. P., & Gumperz, J. J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 407-434). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bonacina, F. (2010). *A conversation analytic approach to practiced language policies: The example of an induction classroom for newly-arrived immigrant children in France*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Edinburgh.

Bonacina, F. & Gafaranga, J. (2011). 'Medium of instruction' vs. 'medium of classroom interaction': Language choice in a French complementary school classroom in Scotland. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14,* 319-334. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.502222

Copp-Jinkerson, A. (2011). Interpreting and managing a monolingual norm in an English- speaking class in Finland: When first and second graders contest the norm. *Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5, 27-48.

Cromdal, J. (2005). "Bilingual Order in Collaborative Word Processing: On Creating an English Text in Swedish." *Journal of Pragmatics 37*(3), 329-353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2004.10.006

196

Doğancay-Aktuna, S. (1998). The Spread of English in Turkey and its Current Sociolinguistic Profile. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 19*(1), 24-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434639808666340

Eldridge, J (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 303-311. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Gafaranga, J. (2000). Medium repair vs. other-language repair: Telling the medium of a bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 4*(3), 327-350. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069000040030301

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2001). Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *5*(2), 195-219. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069010050020401

Gafaranga, J., & Torras, M. C. (2002). Interactional otherness: Towards a redefinition of codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *6*(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069020060010101

Garfinkel, H. (1967 [1994]). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.

Gürsoy, E., Korkmaz, S. C., & Damar, E. A. (2017). English Language Teaching within the New Educational Policy of Turkey: Views of Stakeholders. *International Education Studies*, *10*(4), 18-30. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n4p18

Hazel, S. (2015). Identities at odds: embedded and implicit language policing in the internationalized workplace. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 15*(1), 141-160. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2014.985311

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

Huq, R. (2018). Doing English-only instructions. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 33*, 278-297. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018038807

Huq, R. U. (2020). *Monolingual Policy, Bilingual Interaction: English-taught Education in Bangladesh* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Linköping University. https://doi.org/10.3384/diss.diva-172149

Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (2008). *Conversation analysis: Principles, practices and applications*. Polity Press.

İnal, D., Bayyurt, Y., Özturhan, M., & Bektaş, S. (2020). Multilingualism in the linguistic landscape of Istanbul. *World Englishes, 40*(2), 280-289. https://doi.org/10.1111/weng.12514

Jakonen, T. (2016). Managing multiple normativities in classroom interaction: Student responses to teacher reproaches for inappropriate language choice in a bilingual classroom. *Linguistics and Education,33*, 14-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.11.003

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. (pp. 13-31). John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.125.02jef

Kachru, B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Kılınç, H. H. (2016). Teachers' perception of 2nd grade English curriculum of primary school in Turkey. *The Anthropologist, 23*(1-2), 251-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2016.11891949

Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language & Social Interaction, 35*(3), 277-230. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327973RLSI3503_2

Köylü, Z. (2018). The use of L1 in the tertiary L2 classroom: Code-switching factors, functions, and attitudes in Turkey. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *15*(2), 271-289.

Küçükoğlu, B. (2013). The history of foreign language policies in Turkey. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 70, 1090-1094. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.162

Lehti-Eklund, H. (2012). Code-switching to first language in repair- A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(2), 132-152. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006912441416

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). Language attitudes in interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 13*(2), 195-222. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2009.00404.x

Lin, A. M. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *4*(1), 195-218. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0009

Mondada, L. (2014). The local constitution of multimodal resources for social interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *65*, 137-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.04.004

Mutlu, V. (2017). Problems of primary school teachers and their solution in English courses: Effects and benefits of "Teaching English to Children" course. *The Journal of International Social Research, 10*(54), 747-756. http://dx.doi.org/10.17719/jisr.20175434641

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Clarendon Press.

Nakamura, I. (2010). Formulation as evidence of understanding in teacher–student talk. *ELT Journal*, *64*(2), 125-134. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp050

Papageorgiou, I. (2012). *When language policy and pedagogy conflict: Pupils' and educators' 'practiced language policies' in an English-medium kindergarten classroom in Greece*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Edinburgh University.

197

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish Y Termino En Español: Toward a Typology of Code Switching. *Linguistics 18* (7-8),581-618. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1980.18.7-8.581

Probyn, M. (2009). 'Smuggling the vernacular into the classroom': Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching in township/rural schools in South Africa. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *12*(2), 123-136. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153137

Richards, K (2003). *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 696-735. https://doi.org/412243

Sarıçoban, G. and Sarıçoban, E. (2012). Atatürk and the History of Foreign Language Education in Turkey. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies 8*(1), 24-49.

Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, *8*(4), 289-327. https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1973.8.4.289

Seçkin, H. (2011). İlköğretim 4. sınıf İngilizce dersi öğretim programına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, *8*(2), 550-577.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective*. Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami048

Sert, O. (2005). The functions of code switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal, 10*(8).

Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh University Press.

Sert, O., Balaman, U., Daşkın, N. C., Büyükgüzel, S., & Ergül, H. (2015). Conversation Analysis Methodology. *Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, *12*(2), 1-43.

Sert, O., & Balaman, U. (2018). Orientations to negotiated language and task rules in online L2 interaction. *ReCALL (Cambridge, England), 30*(3), 355-374. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344017000325

Sidnell, J. (2010). *Conversation analysis: An introduction.* Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12010

Shohamy, E. (2003). Implications of Language Education Policies for Language Study in Schools and Universities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 278-286. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200802139604

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Routledge.

Slotte-Lüttge, A. (2007). Making Use of Bilingualism: The Construction of a Monolingual Classroom, and Its Consequences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *187*(188), 103-128. https://doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2007.052

Stokoe, E. (2014). The Conversation Analytic Role-play Method (CARM): A Method for Training Communication Skills as an Alternative to Simulated Role-play. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 47*(3), 255-265. https://doi.org/10.1080/08351813.2014.925663

Ten Have, P. (2007). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Sage. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428108325127

Turnbull, M. and J. Daily-O'Cain. (2009). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning.* Multilingual Matters.

Türker, E. (2005). Resisting the grammatical change: Nominal groups in Turkish-Norwegian codeswitching. *The International Journal of Bilingualism: Cross-Disciplinary, Cross-Linguistic Studies of Language Behavior, 9*(3-4), 453-476. https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069050090030801

Üstünel, E. (2004) *The sequential organisation of teacher-initiated and teacher-induced code-switching in a Turkish university EFL setting*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Üstünel, E., & Seedhouse, P. (2005). Why that, in that language, right now? Code-switching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 302-325. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00093.x

Üstünel, E. (2016). *EFL Classroom code-switching*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Waer, H.H.E. (2012). *Why that language, in that context, right now?: The use of the L1 in L2 classroom interaction in an Egyptian setting*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New Castle University.

Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.

Yatağanbaba, E. (2014). *An investigation of code switching into EFL young language learner classrooms* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Çukurova University.

Yatağanbaba, E., & Yıldırım, R. (2015). EFL Teachers' Code Switching in Turkish Secondary EFL Young Language Learner Classrooms. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 7(1), 82. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v7i1.6750

Yıldıran C., & Tanrıseven, I. (2015). Teachers' opinion on the English curriculum of 2nd grade primary education. *International Journal of Language Academy, 3*(1), 210-223. https://doi.org/10.18033/ijla.139

Ye, X. (2021). Code-switching in Chinese junior secondary school EFL classes: functions and student preferences. *The Language Learning Journal,* 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1998196

Yıldırım, R. & Okan, Z. (2007). The question of global English language teaching: A Turkish perspective. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 9*(2), 54-66.

198

TÜRKÇE GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıfında öğretmenler tarafından gerçekleştirilen dil polisliği uygulamaları incelenmiştir. Araştırma, dil polisliği mekanizmasının ne amaçla ve nasıl kullanıldığını analiz etmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla çalışmamızda, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin dil polisliğini nasıl organize ettiğine ve sınıf etkileşimi aracı olarak hedef dili nasıl kullandıklarına odaklanmıştır. Çalışmada odak nokta, öğretmenlerin İngilizce konuşmayı direk olarak talep ettiği örneklerin bulunduğu sınıf ortamını analiz ederek, öğrencilerin hedef dili kullanmak için nasıl yönlendirdiğini ortaya çıkarmaktır. Bu nedenle, örnekleri derinlemesine incelerken belirlediğimiz kriterler ise a) öğretmenin dil polisliği eyleminden önce hangi dillerin kim tarafından konuşulduğu, b) öğretmenin dil polisliği eyleminden sonra hangi dillerin kim tarafından konuşulduğu, c) dil polisliğinden sonra hangi dilin konuşulduğu ve d) her örnekteki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar nelerdir olduğu şeklindedir.

Dil polisliği, sınıf etkileşimleri sırasında hem öğrenci hem de öğretmen tarafından birden fazla dilin kullanılması durumunda genellikle öğretmenin yalnızca hedef dilin konuşulması adına uygulanan bir eylemdir (Amir, 2013). Bu bağlamda incelenen düzenek değiştirme çalışmaları gerek ülkemizde (Ataş, 2012; Ataş & Sağın-Şimşek, 2021; Bensen & Çavuşoğlu, 2013; Bilgin & Rahimi, 2013; Horasan, 2014; Köylü, 2018; Üstünel, 2004) gerekse dünyada (Auer, 1984; Blom & Gumperz, 1972; Gafaranga & Torras, 2001; Myers-Scotton, 1993; Poplack, 1980; Üstünel, 2004) alanyazında uzun yıllardır çalışılmaktadır. Ancak, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarında gerçekleştirilen düzenek değiştirme ve dil polisliğiyle ilgili alanyazının oldukça kısıtlıdır. Ülkemizde İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıfında düzenek değiştirmeyle ilgili kısıtlı çalışmalar mevcut olsa da (Eldridge, 1996; Yatağanbaba, 2014; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015), Türkiye'de İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen çocukların sınıflarında gerçekleştirilen dil polisliği çalışması bulunmamaktadır.

Çalışma kapsamında, 2 farklı şehirde bulunan 3 farklı 5. sınıftan sesli ve görüntülü veri toplanmıştır. Çalışmaya, İngilizce öğretmenliği mezunu, en az 4 yılı çocuklara olmak üzere, 10 yıldan fazla İngilizce öğretme deneyimine sahip olan 3 öğretmen ve her sınıfta yaklaşık 25 kişi (3 sınıf) olmak üzere 70'ten fazla 5. sınıf öğrencisi katılmıştır. Özel okulda okuyan bu öğrenciler, 1. sınıftan itibaren İngilizce öğrenmektedirler.

Veri toplamadan önce, öğretmenler, okul yönetimi, öğrenciler ve velileri çalışmanın kapsamıyla ilgili bilgilendirilmiştir. Katılımcılar ve yasal temsilcilerinden bilgilendirilmiş onam alındıktan sonra, 3 farklı sınıftan toplamda 270 dakikalık sesli ve görüntülü kayıt alınmıştır. Elde edilen sınıf verileri, Konuşma Çözümlemesi metotuyla analiz edilmiştir. Bu metotta, sınıf içi verileri "eksiksiz, eklentisiz, birebir ve ortaya çıktığı şekliyle" yazıya dökülmüştür (Sert vd., 2015, p.9). Bu metota göre, veriyi incelemeden önce, araştırmacının herhangi bir hipotezi yoktur; inceleme sırasında ortaya çıkan olgular incelenir, bu olguların bulunduğu kesitler aralarındaki benzerlikler, farklılıklar ve katılımcıların kullandıkları yöntemler bakımından incelenir ve ilgili tüm kesitlerden bir koleksiyon oluşturulur. Bu çalışmada da bahsedilen aşamalar uygulanmış olup, öğretmen tarafından uygulanan dil polisliğine odaklanılmıştır.

Bu çalışma, öğretmenin yalnızca üç kez açıkça sınıf içi etkileşimde İngilizce kullanılmasını zorlamasına rağmen, bazı öğrencilerin rutin olarak tek dili (Türkçe) kullandığını, iki dilli ortamda ise genellikle paralel bir modun var olduğunu (bkz. 1-6. alıntılar) bulmuştur. Yani, İngilizce konuşulan anlarda bile öğrenciler sınıf içi etkileşimde ana dillerini kullanmışlardır. Ayrıca, sonuçlar, öğretmenlerin yalnızca ikinci dil politikasını sürdürdüklerini ve esas olarak yalnızca ikinci dil dönüşlerine uyum sağlayarak örtük dil polisliği yaptıklarını göstermiştir. Ancak öğretmenler, öğrencilerin Türkçeyi kullanmalarını engellememişler (bkz. Amir, 2013; Balaman, 2016'daki bazı katı açık polislik örnekleri) ve genellikle öğrencilerin ana dildeki yanıtlarını geçerli olarak kabul etmişlerdir (örn. 4, satır 1-25). Bu bulgulara ek olarak, çalışmadan elde edilen kanıtlar, yalnızca-İngilizce kuralının çiğnendiği bir sınıfta, öğrencilerin ana dilde gerçekleştirdikleri söz alma veya cevap verme girişimlerinin öğretmen tarafından göz ardı

199

edilebileceğini göstermektedir. Yine de bu, öğrencilerin ana dili kullanmalarına ve sonraki dönüşleri ve söz almalarına izin vermemenin başka bir yolu olabilir. Veriye göre, öğretmenler, polislik yapmayarak ve birçok durumda öğrencilerin Türkçe ifadelerine yanıt vermeyerek, İngilizce'nin etkileşimsel alan kazandığına dikkat çekmektedirler. Araştırmanın bir diğer sonucu ise, Türkçe konuşulduğunda dil polisliği dizilerinin ortaya çıkmasıdır. Detaylı analizler öğretmenlerin dil polisliğini her zaman kalıplaşmış ifadeler aracılığıyla (in English) gerçekleştirdiklerini göstermektedir.

Çalışmadan elde edilen diğer bir ilginç sonuç ise, öğretmenlerin gerçekleştirdiği dil polisliğine ek olarak sınıfta Türkçe konuşulduğunda öğrenciler kural polisliği (Balaman 2016; Sert & Balaman, 2018) uygulamışlardır. Bu örnek bize Türkçe konuşmayı bir kural ihlali olarak gördüklerini ve bu ihlale dikkat çekmek için İngilizce kullandıklarını göstermektedir (örn. 5, in Turkish no). Dolayısıyla bu çalışma, hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretmenlerin sınıf içi etkileşimde dil seçimi konusunda bir sorumluluğa (agency) sahip oldukları fikrini güçlendirmektedir.

Bu araştırma, İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğretildiği ortamlarda ana dilin ne zaman ve ne kadar kullanılması gerektiğine dair devam eden tartışmaya katkıda bulunmaktadır. Buna göre, öğretmenler düzenek değiştirme uygulamalarının sistematik, düzenli, ve gerekli olduğunda yapılmasına dikkat etmelidir (Ye, 2021). Bu öneriler doğrultusunda, çalışmamız ana dilin kullanılmasında uygun miktarı belirlemeyi hedeflemese de, gerektiğinde dil polisliğini uygulayarak ve ana dili kullanarak (örneğin, verilen yönergeleri netleştirmek, öğrencinin ihtiyaçlarına cevap vermek amacıyla) İngilizce öğretmenlerinin dil sınıflarında daha etkili ve verimli öğrenme ortamı yaratmaları için farkındalık oluşturmaktadır. Çalışma kapsamında elde edilen bulgular, Türkiye'de çocuklara İngilizce öğretilmesi alanında İngilizce öğretmenlerinin sınıf içinde uyguladıkları mikro dil ve ulusal çapta karar vericilerin uyguladıkları makro dil eğitimi politikalarının belirlenmesine ışık tutması açısından önemlidir.