UNIVERSITY OF TARTU

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES

PEDAGOGIC FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER-INITIATED CODE-SWITCHING IN A LOWER-SECONDARY ESTONIAN EFL CLASSROOM: A CASE STUDY

MA thesis

SANDRA SAKS
SUPERVISOR: *Asst. Lect.* NATALJA ZAGURA

TARTU

2016

ABSTRACT

Code-switching, in other words alternating between the target language and the first language of the students in a foreign language classroom is an issue that causes great debate. Its proponents hail its usefulness as an additional teaching resource and an effective communicative strategy, while some of its strongest opponents see it as an inhibiting factor to language acquisition. It has been widely cited that the negative stance towards classroom code-switching is ideological rather than based on empirical findings (Cummins 2007; Howatt 2004; Levine 2011; Wei & Martin 2009). In order to gain a thorough understanding of classroom code-switching, the aim of this thesis is to investigate the pedagogic role of teacher code-switching in a lower-secondary Estonian English as a Foreign Language classroom, taking a case-study approach. The main research question the thesis sets out to answer is what pedagogic and interactional functions the teacher-initiated code-switching serves in the particular classroom context.

The Introduction of this thesis gives an overview of the structure of the paper, providing a brief insight into the topic of code-switching and presents the rationale for the research. The first chapter of the thesis consists of a literature review covering recent and seminal studies pertaining to the topic of code-switching in connection with pedagogic functions. In addition, relevant concepts and notions such as code-switching, language acquisition, and language policies among others, are explored. The first chapter concludes with describing the chosen methodology of Conversation Analysis and discusses its suitability for the research project. The second chapter of the thesis focuses on reporting on the data gathered via audio-recording of authentic English classes. An overview of the participating teacher and students is given, research methodology and transcription conventions are described and case-by-case analysis of particular code-switching examples is carried out. In the discussion section, findings and limitations of the study are also addressed. The Conclusion summarises the findings of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA – Conversation Analysis

CS – code-switching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

FL – foreign language

L1 – first language

L2 – second language

SLA – Second Language Acquisition

TL – target language

INTRODUCTION

One of the topics that causes great debate in the field of second language acquisition (hereafter SLA) and foreign language teaching, is the question of if, and to what extent can or should the first language of the students (hereafter L1) be used in the foreign language classroom. The prevailing stance towards foreign language teaching still seems to be that the target language (hereafter TL)[1] is best taught without the use of the L1 (Cummins 2007; Inbar-Lourie 2010). Moreover, using L1 has often been seen as an inhibiting factor to language acquisition or even as a sign of incompetence, which has led to (and perhaps been endorsed by) rigid language policies banning it from language classrooms (Ferguson 2009; Kang 2008). The expectations of language policy makers, however, are not always reflected in teaching practices and research reveals that teachers have continued to employ L1 in foreign and second language classrooms to varying degrees (Ferguson 2003; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009; Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; Kang 2008; Polio & Duff 1994; etc.). Contrary to the dominant paradigm, the proponents of using L1 for language teaching (Levine 2011, Cook 2001) see it as a useful language learning tool that serves different communicative and pedagogic functions such as pedagogic scaffolding and classroom management (a more specific overview of these functions is provided in section 1.1 Code-switching).

The dispute about classroom code-switching, in other words alternating between the L1 of the students and the TL, can be traced back to the theoretical beliefs about language learning as such. Sociolinguistic and ecological approach see language learning as a collaborative process that happens among individuals. This entails learners using all of their linguistic resources, implying that both the L1 and the TL would be considered beneficial for language

---

[1] TL or target language is considered to be an umbrella term covering both second (L2) and foreign language (FL), whereas L2 is used specifically when referring to a language context in which that language is used by the community, and FL to refer to a language that is not in general use and that is largely restricted to language classrooms. When referring to other studies, their own terminology was adopted.

learning (Levine 2011; Seedhouse 2005). Psycholinguistic and innatist approaches, which focus more on the individual and their cognitive skills rather than on the interactional side of language, often see L1 as interference and something that impedes TL acquisition (Levine 2011).

Consequently, the language teaching methods based on different theories have different perspectives when it comes to the use of L1 in the classroom. The exclusion of L1 from FL teaching began in the 19th century with the Direct Method, which encouraged using only the target language in FL teaching and advocated refraining from L1 of the students. This mentality was further induced by behaviourism and ideas of habit formation in the 1960s and 70s (Brooks-Lewis 2009) and the spread of negative attitudes towards grammar translation method and other language teaching methods that were excessively relying on L1 (Howatt 2004). The prevailing methodologies of this day and age are based on the Communicative Approach and emphasise comprehensible TL input and TL practice as the main factors in language acquisition, which inevitably leads to a conclusion that L1 use in class should be minimised (although arguably this stance has recently softened) (Levine 2011). Some of the newer language teaching methods, such as the New Concurrent Method[2] and Community Language Learning[3] have recognized the role of L1 in language teaching and adopted multilingual teaching practices but they remain marginal compared to other more widespread methods such as the Communicative Approach. The multitude of SLA theories and language teaching methodologies and the lack of clear-cut answers when it comes to L1's beneficial effects to

---

[2] New Concurrent Method is a language teaching method which calls for a balanced use of L1 and L2 in the FL classroom. The language switches are based on real-life code-switching practices and follow certain rules. For example, the L1 of the students can be used for explaining concepts, praising or disciplining students, reviewing previous lessons or when students get distracted. (Cook 2001)

[3] Community Language Learning or Counselling-Learning is a L2 teaching methodology in which the teacher acts as a counsellor to the students. In Community Language Learning the students express the topics or sentences they want to learn in their L1 and the teacher provides the L2 translation. This reflects the idea that L2 learning happens initially through the L1 of the students. (Richards & Rogers 2001)

language learning have ensured that code-switching in language classrooms has remained a controversial issue.

In the last few decades, language alternation in the foreign and second language classroom has received considerable amount of attention and increasingly more researchers argue that instead of being an impediment to SLA, L1 can be a beneficial factor to language acquisition as a communicative tool and an additional linguistic resource (Levine 2011, Üstunel & Seedhouse 2005, Cook 2001). Descriptive studies taking a conversation analytic approach and focusing on interaction have also succeeded in showing that its use in the classroom is in fact orderly and purposeful, and not disorganised as popularly presumed (Daily-O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; Üstünel & Seedhouse 2005). Although the debate over the fact whether language instruction is more effective monolingually or interlingually is far from being over, the negativity surrounding the use of L1 for TL teaching has started to decrease and new research issues have surfaced, such as what could be the optimal use of L1 in the language classroom and what specific purpose it serves and what its functions are (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; Levine 2011; Macaro 2009, etc.). Furthermore, some researchers have started to see language learners and teachers in essence as bilinguals, which in turn means that code-switching or alternating between languages is not deviating from the norm but on the contrary, completely natural since it is a characteristic feature of bilingual communication (Cook 2001; Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; Levine 2011).

Based on the aforementioned, it is clear then that classroom code-switching remains a relevant topic in need of more research. It is proposed here that stigmatising L1 use or disregarding it *a priori* as something negative is unwarranted; instead classroom CS should be more thoroughly investigated so as to uncover its regularities and the purpose underlying its use. Although bilingualism and CS in L2 classrooms has been researched in Estonia[4], studies

---

[4] See Baškirova (2006) and Zabrodskaja (2005), for example.

on CS in FL contexts are rare, bordering on non-exitent, a fact which partly motivates this study. While acknowledging the importance of investigating the effect of L1 on SLA, this thesis takes another approach and intends to highlight its communicative significance, using the method of Conversation Analysis (the reasons for which are discussed in subsection 1.2.4). It should be noted, however, that this thesis is not concerned with evaluating the teacher and her code-switching practices in terms of whether they are good or bad, nor is any attempt made to prescribe an ideal model of classroom code-switching. Bearing that in mind, the main aim of this study is thus to investigate classroom code-switching in a lower-secondary Estonian English as a foreign language classroom (EFL) in order to examine how L1 is used as a conversational strategy oriented towards achieving pedagogic goals. Therefore, the research question of this thesis is formulated as follows: what pedagogic and interactional functions does the teacher initiated code-switching serve in the particular classroom context?

Structurally, this research paper is divided into two main chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of literature pertaining to the topic of code-switching. The phenomenon of classroom code-switching is discussed in detail, the views of its proponents and opponents are presented and the concept of optimal L1 use is examined. Chapter 1 also provides insight into Conversation Analysis (CA) as a research methodology and expands upon the connection between code-switching and CA. At the end of Chapter 1, reasons for choosing CA for the particular study are addressed.

The second chapter of this paper reports on the empirical findings of this study. The research method and procedure are described in detail and collected data is presented and analysed. Chapter 2 ends with a discussion of results in light of other studies and is followed by Conclusion, in which the research findings are summarised. The thesis ends with a collection of Appendices, including the transcription conventions, a consent form for the participants, and transcribed data.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

1.1 CODE-SWITCHING

This section examines the background of code-switching and reviews studies on the topic of code-switching in different research contexts. In addition, special attention is given to classroom code-switching and arguments for and against it are presented. At the end of the first section, the concept of optimal L1 use in the classroom is discussed.

1.1.1 BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Since the 1960s, code-switching has been widely researched among bilingual communities and is now considered to be a naturally occurring phenomenon among bilingual speakers (Wei & Martin 2009*).* As a characteristic feature of bilingual talk, code-switching has been defined as "systematic, alternating use of two or more languages or dialects within a single conversation or utterance" (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher 2009). Code-switching (hereafter CS) has been further divided into different subcategories, such as intra-sentential CS and inter-sentential CS (Poplack 1980) or code-mixing and code-switching respectively (Lin 2013). Intra-sentential CS takes place within the boundaries of one utterance or clause, whereas inter-sentential CS means that switches happen at the level of clause or utterance (e. g. first clause is in L1 and second clause in L2).

Initially seen by some as a deficiency, CS is nowadays seen as natural bilingual behaviour, although some would even go as far as to describe it as a sign of bilingual superiority (Tian & Macaro 2012), since bilinguals are proficient (at least to some degree) in two or more languages. CS has also been widely researched in the context of ESL and immersion classrooms since the 1980s (Turnbull & Arnett 2002), while studies on CS in FL classrooms are more recent (Lin 2013). The naturalness of code-switching is not that self-evident in the

language classroom as researchers have not reached a consensus in terms of its positive role or beneficial effects. Most of the research on classroom CS has been largely descriptive, less research has been experimental and investigated L1's role in TL acquisition (Macaro 2009 and Tian & Macaro 2012 among few). Tian and Macaro (2012), for example, investigated the effect of teacher CS on students' vocabulary acquisition (vs English-only approach) and found no differences in long-term results. In line with other similar research results, they concluded that using L1 for translating TL words has no detrimental effect to language acquisition.

Earlier research on CS was particularly interested in quantifying CS and dealt with the question of how much time in the classroom was taken up by L1 use – a question which continues to fascinate researchers nowadays (e. g. Lin 2013; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009; Polio & Duff 1994). A research direction that continues to be popular is functional coding, in essence dividing instances of CS into categories according to their (pedagogic) function. The number of categories has been varying from 8 (Polio & Duff 1994) and 14 (de la Campa & Nassaji 2009) to only 3 categories (Ferguson 2009). In one of the first of such studies, Polio and Duff (1994: 317-319) analysed interaction in six foreign language classrooms and attributed 8 pedagogic functions to the teachers' CS: administrative vocabulary, grammar instruction, classroom management, empathy/solidarity, teacher practicing L1, translation, reacting to the lack of student comprehension of L2, and interactive effect involving students' use of L2. De la Campa and Nassaji (2009: 747-748) recorded two German as FL classrooms and came up with 14 categories after coding the data: translation, contrasting L1 and L2, evaluation, activity instruction, activity objective, elicitation of student contribution, personal comment, confirmation checks, classroom equipment, administrative issues, repetition of student L1 utterance, reaction to student question, humour, and instructor acting as a bilingual.

The studies carried out currently are more detailed, looking into themes like social and affective aspects of CS and make use of different methods such as CA, critical social theory,

and the like (Ferguson 2009, Lin 2013). Among those studies are also the ones dealing with teachers' and students' perceptions of the use of L1 in L2 classrooms (Brooks-Lewis 2009; Bateman 2008; Chiou 2014; Edstrom 2006; Storch & Wigglesworth 2003), which will be further analysed in the following section. An aspect that has drawn criticism when researching CS is that it has often been seen as a linguistically homogenous phenomenon, although in reality it varies a great deal in terms of intensity, context, and other factors (Ferguson 2009).

1.1.2 CODE-SWITCHING IN THE CLASSROOM: FOR AND AGAINST

When discussing the legitimacy of classroom code-switching, there are several factors that often surface and leave researchers divided, such as top-down institutional policies and language ideologies, teachers' perceptions of CS, theoretical disagreements about language learning, and prevailing teaching practices. A closer look at these factors will be given below.

As was briefly mentioned in the introduction of this thesis, it is often cited that the prevailing institutional policies somehow impose monolingual ideology on language teachers and students. The foreign language curricula at universities and schools often strictly recommend using only TL when teaching it (Brooks-Lewis 2009; Cummins 2007; Levine 2011; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002, etc.), while internationally published course books and teaching manuals take the monolingual approach for granted (in turn influencing teacher training programmes and beliefs about language teaching) (Inbar-Lourie 2010). This is often explicitly stated or sometimes only implied, but a common belief of top-level educators seems to be that L1 use in the classroom should be avoided (Wei & Martin 2009; Lin & Martin 2005; Moodley 2007). The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, for example, states this quite explicitly and advocates the use of TL "as exclusively as possible" (Levine 2011: 14).

The Estonian national curricula for basic and upper-secondary schools are perhaps less prescriptive, yet the topic does not go unmentioned. The basic school curriculum for teaching and learning foreign languages states that "during lessons, students and teachers communicate mainly in the studied foreign language" and teachers should aim to encourage students to communicate in the TL (Ministry of Education and Research 2011a: 12). The upper-secondary school curriculum makes a similar claim: "the language of instruction in language lessons at upper secondary school is mainly the foreign language which the students are studying" (Ministry of Education and Research 2011b: 17). Both of the curricula assert that communication [*sic*] competence is the central competence in teaching FL and that the instruction should follow the principles of communicative language teaching. It is thus implied that use of L1 be restricted to a minimum since the communication here signifies communication in the TL. The national curricula take a stricter stance when it comes to Estonian as L2 as the upper-secondary school curriculum laconically states that "language lessons in upper secondary school are carried out in Estonian" (Ministry of Education and Research 2011b: 7). In the case of basic schools, a concession is made and "explanations may be given in the school's language of instruction if necessary" (Ministry of Education and Research 2011a: 19)

Some researchers have pointed out that more often than not, the rigid stance on using L1 in foreign language teaching rests not on evidence but rather on a *belief* that language is best taught monolingually, since there is no empirical data that supports the supremacy of L2-only teaching (Cummins 2007; Howatt 2004; Levine 2011; Macaro 2001; Wei & Martin 2009). The issue, therefore, is not only pedagogical but an ideological one. Despite language policy makers advocating for the opposite, descriptive research has shown that in reality, teachers and students both code-switch in language classrooms, even when the language policies have banned it (Kang 2008; Üstunel & Seedhouse 2005; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009; Polio & Duff

1994, etc.). This incompatibility often leads to teachers' conflictive attitudes and teacher or student guilt and anxiety, as research on perceptions of CS has revealed (Bateman 2008; Copland and Neokleos 2010; Edstrom 2006; Turnbull & Dailey O'Cain 2009; Probyn 2009).

This kind of research has also tapped into the reasons as to why teachers code-switch according to themselves (since code-switching is to a large degree considered to be subconscious). Edstrom (2006) recorded and reflected on her own teaching practice and came up with three reasons why she code-switched. First, for moral obligation to students, by which she means treating them as human beings and caring about their feelings, not only being concerned with their language acquisition. Others have expressed similar reasons for CS, such as building rapport or showing solidarity (Polio & Duff 1994). Her second reason for CS was explaining the target culture and avoiding stereotypical understandings of what it represented. The third reason Edstrom mentions is taking the easy way out or saving time, which she herself calls "laziness".

Stimulated recall sessions from de la Campa and Nassaji's study (2009) further revealed that teachers find CS necessary due to a number of practical reasons, such as learners' low proficiency, acoustic layout of the classroom, time restraints and university curriculum, amongst others. Studies on students' perceptions of using L1 in foreign language teaching have revealed mainly positive attitudes towards incorporating L1 into language teaching (Brooks-Lewis 2009; Chiou 2014; Storch & Wigglesworth 2003). Chiou's (2014) quantitative study at a university in Taiwan showed that, regardless of their language level, most students did not oppose using L1 for FL teaching, while lower-level students found it even helpful or necessary.

Although language policy makers seem to remain sceptical about CS in the classroom and teachers often feel that using L1 in language teaching is unavoidable, the researchers themselves are left divided. The theoretical disagreement revolves around balancing the negative and positive effects of L1 to language acquisition. Perhaps the strongest and most

frequently stated negative effect of using L1 in the classroom is that it inevitably reduces TL input (Kang 2008, Turnbull & Arnett 2002; Polio & Duff 1994), a factor which few would argue is of little importance when it comes to SLA. The idea that TL use should be maximised in the classroom has in turn led to an (erroneous) belief that L1 should be completely avoided (Turnbull & Arnett 2002). Another concern that has been mentoned is that allowing CS in the classroom would lead to fossilised language patterns and learners would end up speaking a mixed pidgin language instead of the "pure" TL (Levine 2011). Furthermore, many researchers, while acknowledging the possible beneficial effects of CS, fear that officially allowing teachers to use L1 would lead to its overuse (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain 2009; Polio & Duff 1994).

On the other hand, it has been argued that instead of inhibiting linguistic development, CS promotes it since using L1 can help engage learners and aid TL comprehension (Dailey-O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; DiCamilla et al 2012; Rolin-Ianziti & Brownlie 2002). Rolin-Ianziti and Brownlie (2002), for example, investigated four beginner French as FL university classes and hypothesised that teachers' CS helped modify the TL output in a manner that affected TL learning positively. The results of their study indicated that L1 translation was helpful in TL comprehension and L1-TL contrasting was beneficial for comparing two linguistic systems and thus helpful for avoiding negative transfer. In terms of CS fossilising, Levine (2011) insists that language users are perfectly capable of accommodating to their co-conversationalist's language preference and skills.

In addition to language acquisition itself, CS has been found to be helpful in classroom management (de la Campa & Nassaji 2009), strengthening student-teacher relationships (Brooks-Lewis 2009), and increasing solidarity as it adds an element of informality to the situation (Wei & Martin 2009, Lin 1996, Edstrom 2006). Numerous other functions have been ascribed to classroom CS; for example, it is widely used by the teachers to mark a switch of topic, to repeat material, to contextualise TL terms, etc. (Ferguson 2009). It could be argued

then that L1 is an asset in the language classroom that should be employed instead of being ignored, or worse yet – discouraged. Butzkamm (2003: 31) even goes as far as to state that "the mother tongue is the master key to foreign languages, the tool which gives us the fastest, surest, most precise, and most complete means of accessing a foreign language." His stance rests on the idea that it is through their L1 that people learn to think, communicate, and understand grammar (Butzkamm 2003). From that point of view, learning a foreign language is inevitably influenced by L1 and it would be somewhat artificial to exclude it from the FL classroom.

Proponents of sociocultural end ethnographic SLA theories emphasise the importance of L1 to students' identity development and point out that students will inevitably use L1, either chatting among themselves or, if not any other way, then in private speech (Levine 2011). Levine (2011) also points out that we live in a multilingual world; therefore, banning L1 from language classrooms is not justified. Cook (2011) affirms this point by adding that language teaching should not be understood in terms of native speaker norms, rather a multilingual approach should be adopted. If the speakers share two or more languages, then alternating between those languages is a natural thing to do. Moreover, he claims that using L1 in the classroom makes the context even more authentic than using TL alone because it replicates the real (multilingual) world context (Cook 2001). It has been suggested that the roots of negativity towards L1 use in FL and L2 classrooms, especially in the case of English, can be traced back to colonialism and standard language ideology, according to which the standard language is superior to others and its purity should be upheld (Ferguson 2003).

1.1.3 OPTIMAL USE OF L1

As seen from above, there are many reasons not to ban L1 from the classrooms, although TL use should remain the focus of the lesson. Many researchers have set out to establish a framework or a principled language alternation model in the classroom that could

help raise awareness of the issue and provide some guidance. The need for such framework has stemmed from the fact that teachers' L1 use has varied immensely across studies (from around 10% of the lesson up to almost the entire lesson being conducted in L1) (Polio & Duff 1994; Ferguson 2003). Turnbull and Dailey O'Cain (2009: 181) approach using L1 in the classroom with caution and point out the difficulty of answering the question of what is the optimal use of L1 and how could it be applied in different teaching contexts. There is no consensus in terms of the meaning of "optimal L1 use", but Turnbull and Dailey O'Cain themselves define it as something that promotes TL acquisition and "recognizes the benefits of the learner's first language as a cognitive and meta-cognitive tool, as a strategic organizer, and as a scaffold for language development" (2009: 183). They caution that optimal use means that neither the teacher nor the students become too reliant on it and also emphasise the role that L1 has in assisting the learner in becoming a bilingual. Macaro (2009: 38) offers another definition: optimal use of L1 is when CS enhances second language acquisition more than second language alone. Levine (2014) finds having a principled approach to code-choice important, but he raises a concern of how much conscious control can the teachers really wield over the L1 use in the classroom.

What is clear is that excluding L1 from L2 and FL classrooms does not necessarily equal good teaching practices (or vice versa) and the approach to L1 use in classrooms should become more flexible. Furthermore, it is argued here that the discussion of optimal L1 use should be preceded by an in-depth understanding of classroom code-switching, its functions and purpose, whereby weighing its positive and negative effects to language acquisition is only one approach to this issue. Another approach, which is also adopted in this thesis, is to view CS not just as inhibiting or promoting SLA but to investigate its role in classroom interaction in general. The method commonly used for studying everyday as well as institutional interaction is Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA). As this method was also chosen for this

thesis, an overview of CA is given and reasons for its application are discussed in the following section.

1.2 CONVERSATION ANALYSIS

Section 1.2 provides insight into Conversation Analysis as a research methodology, develops a connection between CA and CS, and addresses its suitability for the particular study.

1.2.1 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Conversation Analysis, which grew out from Ethnomethodology and the works of Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff, and Harold Garfinkel, is a research methodology that provides meticulous analysis of naturally occurring conversation (or as conversation analysists like to refer to it: talk-in-interaction). A unique trait for that methodology (which often draws critique) is that it does not consist of a strict set of principles but is rather a mentality of doing things or a way of approaching data (Seedhouse 2004). According to CA, oral interaction is seen as a highly orderly and methodical activity through which speakers accomplish things (Schegloff 1986). One of the principles CA abides by is its clean sheet approach: it avoids approaching data with pre-existing theoretical framework, instead, the researcher works bottom-up, trying to avail the organisational structure of the interaction and see how the participants themselves interpret each other's actions (Schegloff 1986).

Interaction is generally described through different conversational practices, such as turn-taking, sequencing, organizational practices, and repair strategies (Wong & Waring 2010). A turn is considered to be a basic unit of conversation and turn-taking, which signifies a change of speaker, ensures the fluidity of conversation, rendering gaps and overlaps meaningful since they deviate from the default position (Liddicoat 2007). Sequencing refers to the connection between different turns as usually turns are not independent of each other but used together in

order to perform a particular social action, such as telling a story, giving advice, etc. (Wong & Waring 2010). A common way of sequencing interaction is through adjacency pairs which are commonly paired utterances, such as question-answer and greeting-greeting pairings (Liddicoat 2007). Many adjacency pairs, however, have alternative responses, for example invitation could be answered with an acceptance (preferred action) or rejection (dispreferred action). This is referred to as preference organization (Seedhouse 2004). As the name indicates, organizational practices make up the general organisation of talk-in-interaction, including openings and closings (Wong & Waring 2007). Repair practices comprise the different ways of dealing with difficulties, including, but not limited to, error correction (Liddicoat 2007).

Although it is often used in linguistics, it is important to note that CA does not see language as structural linguistic units and is not concerned with language *per se* (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998). What it is concerned with is how interlocutors achieve their communicative goals through speech acts that are operated through language. CA also emphasises the uniqueness of each context and refrains from broad generalisations (which may be considered a weakness). That is why single-case analysis, in which particular extracts are analysed to uncover various strategies used by participants to achieve their communicative goals, is at the heart of CA (Schegloff 1986). CA strives for an emic perspective of interaction and posits that interactions are context-shaped and context-renewing, in other words, utterances can only be understood by referencing to their sequential location (Seedhouse 2007; Liddicoat 2007).

1.2.2 CLASSROOM INTERACTION

When investigating classroom discourse from the point of view of CA, one has to distinguish regular talk-in-interaction from institutional discourse such as the language classroom. Conversation analysts point out several factors (e. g. turn-taking organisation and lexical choice) that differentiate classroom interaction from ordinary talk. The main feature of

classroom talk (or any institutional talk) is that the participants are oriented to a particular goal (Seedhouse 2004). In the case of FL classroom, that goal is, of course, language learning.

Deriving from that goal, Seedhouse (2004) lists three aspects that influence that interaction: first, language is both the medium of instruction and the subject matter. Second, there is an evolving relationship between pedagogy and interaction, so change in the pedagogic focus also brings along change in the organisation of the interaction. And third, the L2 utterances that learners produce are potentially evaluated by the teacher.

As it is the teacher who frequently dominates classroom interaction (Johnson 1998), it can also be described by four features that illustrate classroom discourse from the point of view of the teacher (as listed by Walsh 2006). First, the teacher has control over patterns of communication. This control, for example, is established by choosing the topic of conversation and through a particular kind of sequence organisation that is often referred to as the IRE/IRF cycles (Walsh 2006). The IRE/IRF cycle consists of three components: teacher initiation, learner response, and teacher feedback or evaluation, and it is seen as the most common pattern of classroom interaction (Seedhouse 2004). The second feature that describes classroom conversation from the point of view of the teacher is that the teacher controls discourse through employing elicitation techniques (question-answer routines, whereas most of the questions are asked by the teacher) (Walsh 2006). This is affected by the asymmetrical or unequal power-relations between the teacher and students. In a classroom, teachers have the right to ask questions and students have the obligation to answer them (Markee 2015). The third feature that describes teacher talk is using repair strategies and providing corrective feedback, and the forth characteristic is modifying speech to learners (Walsh 2006). These characteristics, which are shaped by multiple other factors, such as the expectations of the teacher and the students, time constraints on teaching, illustrate the distinctiveness of classroom context from regular talk-in-interaction (Walsh 2006).

1.2.3 CA AND CODE-SWITCHING

In-depth analysis of classroom communication has shown that just as everyday conversation in which interlocutors strategically try to accomplish particular actions is highly orderly and meaningful, so is code-switching in the classroom (Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; Üstünel & Seedhouse 2005; Wei 2002; Wei & Martin 2009). When investigating code-switching, the guiding question of conversation analysists – *why that, in that way, right now?* – becomes *why this, in this language, right now?* (as so aptly put by Üstünel and Seedhouse in their article of the same name in 2005). From the point of view of CA, code-switching in the classroom is a communicative strategy used by teachers to achieve pedagogic goals and by students to orient to those goals rather than something that takes place due to laziness or inadequacy. Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) used CA to investigate the relationship between language choice and pedagogical focus in six Turkish EFL classrooms and revealed three recurring patterns. First, teachers code-switch when there is no response from students. Second, teachers code-switch to encourage learners to use TL (elicit target language) and third, to induce learners to code-switch. CS in the classroom therefore serves important pedagogic functions (e. g. retrieving the meaning of a word, explaining grammar rules, etc.). They conclude that TL is not always the preferred language of foreign language classrooms (in terms of CA and preference organisation). Dailey O'Cain and Liebscher (2009) investigated discourse-related functions of student and teacher CS through CA and concluded that the functions of classroom CS are similar to non-classroom ones: helping to structure discourse, support learning through scaffolding, and promote inter-subjectivity. They also demonstrated that although the teacher can model CS and thus affect students, it is not the only source of student CS.

As seen from above, classroom CS is a purposeful activity and just another communicative resource used by the participants to achieve their interactional goals. At the

core of CA lies the notion of sequentiality, which means that what is said before heavily influences our interpretation of what follows. This means that the interactional context is constantly renewed (Auer 1984). In terms of CS, the language choice of the participants influences their subsequent language choices and is also influenced by the preceding ones (Wei 2002). In bilingual talk, once an utterance has occurred in one language, the preferred choice of the conversation partner would be to respond in the same language (Auer 1995).

CA sees CS only gaining meaning through interaction and many proponents of CA sustain that CS is best understood by analysis of that interaction rather than methods that emphasise external factors (e. g. symbolic values of different languages, etc.) (Wei 2002; Auer 1984). It is important to note that CA does not see CS just as a linguistic code, it is the interaction and the communicative purpose of CS that matters.

1.2.4 REASONS FOR ADOPTING CA

As seen from the overview of studies on CS (in section 1.1 Code-switching), the two main methods used for investigating classroom code-switching have been CA and functional coding, i. e. assigning different codes and categories to data. This research paper has decided in favour of CA, which was thought to be better equipped for investigating classroom interaction as it offers more intricate insight into the phenomenon. As argued by Seedhouse (2007), the main limitation of using functional coding when investigating talk-in-interaction is that it assumes that the interactant makes one communicative or pedagogic move at a time. Through coding and assigning each utterance only one functional category, the interaction is overly simplified and our understanding of communication remains superficial. CA, on the other hand, sees that a single utterance can perform multiple speech acts and language alternation can be (and usually is) multifunctional (Levinson 1983). Therefore, dividing instances of CS into finite number of categories or quantifying them can lead to inaccurate

results. Another methodological issue raised by Ferguson (2009) is the lack of agreed taxonomy when it comes to pedagogic functions. As a result, comparisons between studies and generalising their results is difficult, if not impossible.

Seedhouse (2004) has exemplified the point in question by showing in his analysis that language teachers operate on many levels through their interactional turns. In the course of only one episode, the teacher fulfils five different actions: orienting to an overall pedagogical plan, responding to learner's ideas, responding to linguistic (in)correctness, orienting to other learners, and balancing focus and form (Seedhouse 2004). The weakness of analysing data through traditional IRF cycles is that in reality IRFs have more than one focus. That is especially true in the context of L2 and FL classrooms where language serves as means of communication as well as the object of study, making these contexts even more complex.

Another reason for CA not to determine a fixed number of functions or provide statistical quantification is the uniqueness of context. As CA places great emphasis on real-world context in which the talk happens, it is the particular context that matters not generalisations of that context (Liddicoat 2007). Conversation analysts are thus concerned with forming collections of particular instances rather than treating them as occurrences of only one phenomenon (Schegloff 1993). These collections make it possible to analyse them systematically, yet do not oversimplify them as in the case of forming strictly set categories.

Since this thesis aims to provide a rich account of classroom interaction with all its complexity, then quantifying classroom CS or merely compressing it into fixed categories were not considered to be sufficient for this study. It is sustained here that CA provides for a more nuanced account of CS because it is concerned with specific cases rather than the categories they represent. For the very same reason of providing a fine-tuned and thorough account of teacher CS did this thesis take the form of a case-study.

2. PEDAGOGIC FUNCTIONS OF TEACHER-INITIATED CODE-SWITCHING IN A LOWER-SECONDARY ESTONIAN EFL CLASSROOM

This chapter is dedicated to presenting and analysing teacher-initiated CS in a FL classroom with an overall aim of showing the orderly nature of classroom CS and revealing its pedagogic and interactional functions. First, an overview of the participants, research method and procedure is given, after which a case-by-case analysis of relevant examples of teacher CS is carried out. Chapter 2 ends with the discussion of findings in light of other research results.

2.1 PARTICIPANTS

As a case study, this thesis focuses on the code-switching practices of one female teacher who teaches English as a foreign language at lower-secondary level in a state school in Lääne-Virumaa, Estonia. In addition to the teacher, the pupils of the 9th grade whose classes were recorded also participated in the study. The teacher and the pupils were selected based on their willingness to participate in the study and the consent of all parties was obtained. In the case of pupils who were underage the consent of their parents in the form of signature was required (see Appendix 1 for the consent form). The students and the teacher were informed that the recordings were for a research project on the topic of classroom communication and teacher-student interaction; no further details were enclosed so as not to prime them and affect the results (another reason being that the research project was data-driven). The language group participating was at intermediate level and consisted of 11 students, aged 14-15 years. The L1 of the participants was Estonian. By the time of the recording, the teacher had had considerable English teaching experience having worked at school since 2006 (a total of 9 years).

2.2 METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The data for this thesis was collected via audio-recordings of authentic EFL classes during the course of two weeks in May 2015. A total of 5 classes were recorded, amounting to 208 minutes and 51 seconds of data. The teacher was given a tape recorder and she herself turned it on at the beginning of the class and turned it off at the end. The researcher was not present at the recordings nor had any contact with the students. Initially "unmotivated" looking was employed and bottom-up approach was adapted, in other words, the topic of the research surfaced from the data itself.

For reasons mentioned in section 1.2, the method chosen for analysing the data was Conversation Analysis (CA). Instances containing teacher code-switching were then transcribed using the transcription system initially developed by Gail Jefferson (2004), which was adapted for this study to include the level of detail necessary for the aim of this research (see Appendix 2 for the transcription conventions). Different punctuation marks and tokens were used to mark important features of interaction (and not the grammaticality of the utterances), such as pitch, pauses, laughter, cut-offs, etc. The names of all participants were changed according to CA conventions maintaining the syllable length and stress pattern of the names. To avoid possible confusion with terms L1 and L2, which signify first and second language respectively, the students were marked with letter S (Sx indicating a particular student) and the teacher with T. Parts of speech relevant for this study (utterances containing teacher code-switching), were marked in bold and the arrow symbol was used to draw attention to lines of interest. The analysis itself was based on relevant CA concepts defined earlier in section 1.2., such as turn-taking, sequentiality, preference organisation, etc. It is important to take note that a transcript is not a neutral presentation of data as it is the researcher who decides beforehand what and how to transcribe. Strictly speaking, it is the recordings that form the corpus and the transcripts are used to facilitate the analysis of that corpus.

A total of 59 cases of teacher-initiated code-switching were identified and form the corpus of this study, whereby one case of CS is not equalled to one utterance nor instance of CS but rather a particular context in which the CS took place. In other words, one case of teacher CS could (and often did) include several episodes of language alternation (with varying functions). Arbitrary CS, such as saying *jah* instead of *yes* was not included in the corpus unless longer episodes of CS followed as these on their own did not serve any pedagogic function, which is what this study was concerned with (CS in connection with discourse markers could be a topic of research in its own right)[5]. Due to space restrictions, it was deemed impossible to perform a case-by-case analysis on all the extracts and a selection for in-depth analysis had to be made.

As CA accentuates the uniqueness of each context and does not particularly favour using finite number of categories, organising data was somewhat difficult. However, for a logical and accessible presentation of data, some type of grouping was inevitably necessary. For that end, three broad categories put forth by Ferguson (2003; 2009) were adopted (and slightly adapted) for this study: subject matter (everything to do with constructing and transmitting knowledge of the language), classroom management (from administrative issues to modifying student behaviour), and interpersonal relations (showing solidarity, humanising classroom climate, etc.). As very general categories, they enabled to analyse the data in an organised manner yet retaining their individuality and multi-functionality. It is acknowledged here that even those three categories are relatively fluid and occasionally overlap; therefore, their function is to serve as guidance rather than provide a rigid framework. In many of the cases, the teacher initially code-switched for one reason and gradually moved on to another, for example, she would explain a grammar rule which triggered her to make reference to the

---

[5] Due to poor sound quality and occasional increase in noise level (as different grades have recess at different times) it is possible that some instances of CS went unnoticed as the speech was inaudible and it was impossible to make out what language was used.

impending exam. Such cases could be included in both subject matter as well as classroom management category. In case of CS serving multiple pedagogic functions, the initial and primary pedagogic function was the basis for categorisation, although secondary pedagogic functions were marked in parenthesis marked in the corpus.

As a result of categorisation, the 59 cases of teacher initiated code-switching were classified according to their primary function as follows: 28 instances related to the subject matter; 21 to classroom management and 10 to interpersonal relations. A selection of each category was subjected to case-by-case analysis, making sure that the collection was representative of the whole data. The single case selection was influenced by proportionality in terms of the size of the category, relevance and novelty of the case, and space limitations. Consequently, 12 cases of CS were analysed in detail (five, four and three examples from each category, respectively). Since many of the cases were near-identical in content and context (e. g. those related to grammar explanation often followed the same CS pattern), it is plausible to maintain that the analysis of this study did not suffer and the findings reflect the data accurately, especially so because the aim of this study was not to quantify CS but to analyse its occurrences in detail to answer why CS took place in those particular contexts. Furthermore, the whole corpus of this study is listed in Appendix 3 of this thesis.

Before case-by-case analysis, it is important to understand the broader context in which the recordings took place. Since the data was collected in May and the target group was 9th graders, some of whom were facing a high-stakes final exam in English[6], it is safe to presume that more emphasis was put on grammar and exam preparation than usual. When drawing conclusions about the teacher's code-switching practice it is important to take this factor into account as it is likely that this put extra time restraints on teaching and affected the overall

---

[6] At the basic school level in Estonia, the final exam in English is optional for students; however, once chosen, passing the exam is crucial for graduation.

pedagogic orientation of the lessons. As seen in the corpus, the teacher also made reference to the impending exam in several occasions (see extracts 5, 6, 8, 38, 45) indicating that although language learning remained the aim of the lessons, exam preparation was also a concern.

2.3 DATA ANALYSIS

This section provides a description of the selected categories and offers a closer look at the examples of each category, revealing their pedagogic function as well as their communicative significance.

2.3.1 SUBJECT MATTER (CONSTRUCTING AND TRANSMITTING KNOWLEDGE)

This category entails everything that has to do with teaching the subject matter (the English language), including pedagogic scaffolding[7], reformulating TL utterances in L1, L1 translation, grammar explanation and metalinguistic information, corrective feedback, commentary on content or cultural background, etc. The following examples (from Example 1 to Example 5) represent instances of teacher CS that serve this kind of pedagogic function.

In Example 1, the students are working individually on exercises related to linking words, which is the grammar topic of that lesson. While filling in the gaps with correct linking words, one of the students encounters a term she is not familiar with.

Example 1 (extract 39)
```
1          S1: aaa must puding,
2          S2: (1.0) °mis see on°
3          S1: sa ei tea v (0.5) puding (.) tead (asi on) puding
4          S2: (0.5) °mis see must puding on°
5 →        T: (1.0) mis on black pudding v?
6          S2: jah
7 →        T: ee inglastel (.) selline tüüpiline jõulu (.) jõulu söök black pudding
8          S2: (1.5) siin on nagu et eesti (.) eesti toit=
9 →        T: =jaa (.) ja tihtipeale (.) ee seda ee selle <verivorsti> tähenduses kasutatakse ka
```

[7] A Vygotskian term which signifies assisting the learner in reaching their potential development level (from the actual development level) (Wood et al 1976).

10 →	black pudding. **kuigi ta tegelikult ei anna nagu- (.) noh päris seda vere- verivorsti**
11 →	(.) **noh olemust ikkagi edasi et**,
12	S1?. ma olen kuulnud black pudding sauseages
13 →	T: **jah et kui siis peaks lisama kindlasti see** sausage **sinna lõppu (.) sest et- sest et**
14 →	**muidu jah meil on ta nagu teise teise kujuga ta ei ole nagu vorsti kujuga et**
15 →	**enamasti ongi siuke** (.) **nagu** (.) **noh** ( ) (2.0) mhmh
16	S2: °mis asi ( ) musta värvi puding°
17	Ss. ((noise))
18	S?: °eino ongi ma mõtlesingi et see ei ole et see tähendabki ( ) °
19 →	T: **jah ja paljudes õpikutes jah kus on** (.) **siis need siis juttu** (.) **ka eesti jõulu**
20 →	**toitudest et siis on on küll tõlgitud selle verivorsti** (.) **asemel kasutatud** black
21	pudding, (1.0)

Two learners, S1 and S2 start a discussion in Estonian on the meaning of the term *black pudding*. As the degree signs indicate, S2 is expressing her puzzlement by whispering to S1 and asking for its meaning. T overhears their discussion and, recognizing the learners' language preference, also code-switches to Estonian when joining in (line 5). First, T uses a confirmation check to make sure that she had heard correctly and the students are wondering about the meaning of *black pudding.* After receiving confirmation that this indeed is the case, in line 7 she annotates the term *black pudding* by explaining its meaning, at the same time providing information on the cultural background of the term by saying it is a typical English Christmas dish. In line 8, S2 seems to not to accept that definition as in the text a reference is made to Estonian and not English cuisine. In line 9, T acknowledges S2's scepticism and provides an L1 translation equivalent (*verivorst*) of what is meant in the text. She immediately continues the switch in Estonian in lines 10-11 and 13-15, using CS to contrast the TL term *black pudding* to the L1 term *verivorst,* pointing out the difference in their meaning despite the two terms often being equated in translation. In line 16, S2 still continues to express her puzzlement with the dish, as literally translated into Estonian, *black pudding* would be a dessert that is black in colour. This motivates T to continue her explanation in L1, providing information of L1 translation conventions in lines 19-21.

Although the overall pedagogic focus here is using linking words correctly, the students encounter trouble when stumbling upon a term they are not familiar with, therefore the focus switches from linking words to TL comprehension. T reacts to this trouble by CS, possibly recognizing S1 and S2's language preference, but at the same time signalling a change of focus from the initial task, in other words, a shift of frame from the language itself to talking about the language. CS serves multiple purposes here: to react to the students' confusion and make a clarification request, to annotate a TL term and to provide cultural background information on the term, to provide an L1 translation, and to contrast L1-TL terms with regards to translation accuracy. In sum, T uses L1 to mediate TL learning.

Example 2 includes a grammar presentation by the teacher. The teacher-fronted lesson was predominantly dedicated to revising different future tenses for the impending exam.

Example 2 (extract 46)

1	T: and then present <u>perfect</u> and present perfect <u>contin:uous</u> (1.5) so:: (.) present perfect
2	i:s (0.5) is related to <u>present</u> (.) as (.) as the name also indicates. in Estonian we say (.)
3 →	**täisminevik** (.) **eesti keeles kasutame seal sõna minevik** (.) **aga inglise keeles**
4 →	**tegelikult siin (.) näete see termin see on see** present (.) **sees et tegelikult on seotud**
5 →	(.) **ee seotud ikkagi** (.) **olevikuga. ee ta algas minevikus (.) jah** it is an action which
6	<u>started</u> in the past but ee:: continuous up to, (.) the recent (.) ee <u>but</u> (.) when you use
7 →	present perfect <u>continuous</u> (.) **siin on ka selle moodustamine seda: väga palju** (1.0)
8 →	**ee väga palju harjutusi meil selle peale sel aastal ei ole olnud eelmine aasta ka vist**
9 →	**põgusalt seal kaheksanda klassi õpikus teile seda tutvustati** .hh (.) ing. (.) could it
10	be (.) yes. (.) continuous so have has plus been (.) plus ing (.) ee:: does anyone
11	remember the difference

In lines 1-2, T starts explaining the usage of present perfect and present perfect continuous tense and states that that name of the tense gives a hint to its use. In line 3, she code-switches into L1 as she provides an L1 translation of the tense name and immediately annotates its meaning by comparing the L1 and TL terms since the Estonian term refers to the past and the English one to the present (lines 3-4). In lines 4-6 she continues to explain its use in the L1 but switches to the TL mid-turn (line 5) as CS is no longer necessary because the focus has shifted from translation and contrasting L1-TL to explaining when to use the tenses. She repeats

the L1 utterance in the TL (lines 5-6) as a way of reinforcement. When reaching the tense present perfect continuous in line 7, the explanation in English comes to an abrupt halt as she starts reflecting on when and how much they have talked about that particular tense overall during the past few years in Estonian. In this occasion, L1 demarcates "off-topic" remarks. In line 9, she switches back to the TL as the pedagogic focus shifts from reflecting on the curriculum back to tense formation.

In Example 2, the teacher CS is not a reaction to the students (and their misalignment with the pedagogic focus), instead it is tightly connected with the teacher's evolving pedagogic aims. She code-switches into L1 twice during her grammar presentation but for different reasons. As she gives an overview of the two tenses, she uses CS for L1 translation as well as contrasting TL to L1 in order to prevent misunderstandings. As the focus changes back to explaining the usage, she also switches back to the TL (line 5) until the focus changes once more from explaining the usage to reflecting on the curriculum (in line 7). And again, in line 9 she switches back to the TL as the pedagogic focus turns from reflection to subject matter (explaining the usage of tenses). TL in this context is the default language of explanation, whereas L1 signals digression (shifting the frame "off topic"), in the first case from talking about the tenses to providing commentary on the term itself and in the second case from talking about the tenses to administrative matters. This CS example includes elements of both subject matter and classroom management, but as the initial function was to annotate a TL term, it was categorised under subject matter. In addition, it also illustrates the teacher's control over interactional patterns of classroom discourse as she can take long turns and dominate the interaction (apart from choosing the topic of conversation).

In Example 3, the students are working individually on grammar exercises while the teacher walks around monitoring the students and giving them feedback on their progress.

Example 3 (extract 4)

```
1 →    T: sa mõtle mida see eesti keeles võiks (.) tähendada (.)
2      S1: Ma ei kujuta ette ka =
3 →    T: =kui sa vaatad seda (.) seda poolt (3.0)
4      S1: (    ) oo::ta nüüd (.)
5 →    T: mõtle mida see eesti keeles võiks tähendada (1.0)
6      S1: ( )
7 →    T: see on passive'i vorm eks ole (1.0) et midagi tehakse. (1.0) kolmas
8 →    põhivorm on see
9      S1: (1.0) ma tean et see sõna algab täishäälikuga
10     T: (1.0) mhmh jah.
11     S1: aga ma mõtlen siis (1.0)
12     T: what kind of play
13     S1: ee::: mis tähega (.) mis (.)
14 →   T: täishäälikuga (hh)
15     S1: (        )
16     S2: (2.0) Mis see viies on
17     Ss: (                  )
18 →   T: (4.0) jäta mõni (.) siis vahele vaata edasi võib-olla pärast pärast tuleb
19 →   meelde eksju mõtle (6.0) see viimane ülesanne- on eksju need sõnad mis olid teil
20 →   teemal film (0.5) and performing arts, so think about those words (1.0)
```

T stops at S1 and, when noticing he is having trouble with an activity, she code-switches into L1 to provide some pedagogic scaffolding. In line 1, she encourages S1 to think of the L1 meaning of the words in the activity. In line 2, S1 expresses his inability of doing so, to which T offers some more guidance in telling him to look at some other examples (in line 3). After a pause of three seconds, S1 still shows signs of trouble with the activity in line 4, indicating his disaffiliation with T's pedagogic focus at that moment: translating the words into L1 to retrieve the meaning of the sentence (in order to do the activity). As S1 did not comply with T's request, she repeats her initial utterance of line 1 in line 5, so as to emphasise the solution to S1's problem. After still no success, T now provides metalinguistic feedback in L1 on the language items causing trouble (lines 7-8). With no sign of resolve, T code-switches into TL along with word emphasis to offer a different cue for the learner (in line 12). In line 9, S1 indicates that he knows the word starts with a vowel and requests for the first letter of the word in line 13. In line 14, T responds to the learner in L1 by not complying with his request as she only affirms

that it starts with a vowel. As S1 fails to retrieve the word or its meaning, T finally advises him to skip the part and come back to it later (lines 18-19). After a long pause of six seconds, T reminds the whole class that the vocabulary is related to a topic they recently covered, while code-mixing (intra-sentential CS) as she starts her utterance in L1 and switches to TL mid-clause. It seems to be the topic (film and performing arts) that triggers the code-mixing back to the TL as she is addressing the whole class again.

In terms of preference organisation, the whole interaction between S1 and T revolves around T eliciting the meaning of the TL word that causes trouble for S1, whereas the student responds with a series of dispreferred actions characterised by hesitation and pauses (with the preferred action being TL comprehension and/or L1 translation). As the overall pedagogic aim here is TL comprehension, T uses CS for several scaffolding techniques such as eliciting L1 meaning of the word and offering metalinguistic information to lead S1 in the desired direction. With no effect, T switches into the TL as an alternative way of providing scaffolding. It is noteworthy that instead of complying with S1's request (providing the first letter of the word), she instead offers advice on how to proceed. This example highlights the prevailing power relations in the classroom, whereby the teacher is executing her right to ignore the student's question (while the students are expected, even obliged, to answer the teacher's questions).

In Example 4, the teacher is talking about present simple tense used for the future and tries to elicit its uses from the students.

Example 4 (extract 35)
```
1        T: okay and you can also use present simple (1.0) for future (.) in what kind of situations
2        can you use present simple (3.0)
3        S1: when you are doing something (.)
4        S2: yes
5        S3: ye:::ah
6 →      T: (1.0) when you think about future (.) just mõeldes sellele tuleviku tähenduses
7 →      muidugi (.) present simple kasutad kui sa räägid igapäevaselt et mida sa iga päev
8 →      teed ja nii edasi aga just nagu tuleviku tähenduses (0.5) et,
9        S1: (0.5) I will eat a parrot ve
10 →     T: (0.5) (hh) ei present simple (.) jah present simple
```

11   S2: (   ) it is being increased
12 →   T: **Jah** <u>time</u>tables (.) **a-ainus-** (.) **jah** (.) **mis see** timetables **on**
13   S3: (0.5) aja<lauad>
14 →   T: **need igasugused [aja-(.) kavad]**=
15   Ss: [(hhh)]
16 →   T: **=sõiduplaanid** (.) **et kui sa räägid sellest** (.) **mis kell sinu rong** (.) **homme saabub**
17 →   **või mis kell sinu rong homme väljub** (.) **see on tulevik** (.) **eee aga sa kasutad seda**
18   present simple'**it** (.) my train leaves (.) at (.) five o'clock tomorrow or (.) my plane
/…/

In line 1, T asks the class when present simple is used but gets the wrong answer as S1 responds using present continuous tense while other students indicate agreement. After a pause in line 6, T emphasises that they are talking about future in the TL and then repeats that utterance in the L1. In lines 7-8, she expands upon S1's response, affirming that present simple usually indeed refers to present, but insists on the future aspect by repeating the utterance of line 6. In line 9, S1 responds by using future simple, continuing to misalign herself with the pedagogic focus of T. In line 10, T starts repair by rejecting S1's guess and offers metalinguistic corrective feedback (repeating *present simple*). As in the next turn S2 formulates a sentence using present continuous (line 11), T continues with the repair in line 12 by offering *timetables* as a key word for when present simple is used for future. While doing so, she induces student CS as she asks for an L1 translation of *timetables.* In line 13, S3 offers a literal L1 equivalent (perhaps using humour to relieve the situation), provoking laughs from other students. In lines 14 and 16, T offers a suitable L1 translation and continues in the L1 as she explains when present simple is used for future. In line 18, she switches back to the TL to offer example sentences.

In Example 4, T code-switches to repair communicative trouble as students persistently keep misaligning themselves with T's pedagogic focus of using TL correctly or explaining its use. All the while, T seems to perceive the communicative trouble stemming from Ss not being able to provide TL examples rather than Ss not understanding the term *present simple*.

In Example 5, students are checking answers of an exercise on linking words.

Example 5 (extract 15)

1	S1: called a cuc<u>koo</u> fair (1.0) although /ɔːlˈðruː/ it [a (.) dates]
2	T: [wa- what] was the word
3	S1: although / ɔːlˈðruː/
4	S2: [although /ɔːlˈðəʊ/]
5	T: [al<u>though</u> /ɔːl<u>ˈðəʊ</u>/] **jah** al<u>though</u> /ɔːl<u>ˈðəʊ</u>/
6	S1: although /ɔːlˈ<u>ðəʊ</u>/ it dates back to the (.) 16th century (.) people (called) it- as the
7	beginning (.) of spring.
8	S2: ( )
9	T: yeah (.) that's right so- ää although? (.) what could be the E<u>stonian</u> (0.5) meaning
10	of [this word] the translation
11	S1: [kuigi]
12	S?: [kuigi]=
12	S?: [kuigi]=
13 →	T: =**kuigi (.) jah seda te [saate kasutada]**=
14	S3: [( )]
15 →	T: =**kuidas**?
16	S3: see ei ole ju loogiline
17 →	T: **noh et- kui (.) selles mõttes on et kuigi ee:: ta on nii vana (.) pärit 16. sajandist**
18 →	**eks ole (.) sellegipoolest- (0.5) isegi praegu igal kevadel seda tähistatakse. et selles**
19 →	**mõttes ta sobib sobib siia kenasti.** (1.0) okay (.) what about then the next (1.0) ee

S1 is reading sentences from an exercise out loud as she mispronounces the word *although*. T initiates repair immediately in line 2 (overlapping with S1's turn) with a clarification request, giving S1 a chance to self-correct. As S1 mispronounces the word again in line 3, S2 and T simultaneously provide repair in the form of a recast (lines 4 and 5). S1 finishes reading the sentence and T confirms its linguistic correctness in line 9. It is likely that the mispronunciation leads T to presume that the students are not familiar with the word, therefore she induces student CS by asking for its L1 translation in lines 9-10. Two students align with T's pedagogic focus and provide an L1 translation equivalent, which is echoed by T in line 13 as a sign of approval. She is about to explain its usage in the L1 when she is overlapped by S3 in line 14. T reacts with a clarification request to which S3 replies by disagreeing with the suitability of the particular linking word in the sentence. In lines 17-19, T reformulates the sentence in the L1 and explains why it is a suitable option. After a pause, she switches back to the TL as a way shifting focus back to the exercise (with the particle *okay* signalling the shift).

In this example, CS seems to stem from a student mispronouncing a word. This leads T to induce student CS, which in turn leads to her own code-switching. The primary pedagogic focus here is TL comprehension and as the mispronunciation signals a problem, T switches to the L1 to repair the trouble with translation and reformulation of the TL sentence. Switching back to the TL indicates a shift of frame back to the exercise.

2.3.2 CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

Class and lesson management refers to functions that are related to managing student learning and often include contextualisation cues[8] which signal some sort of a shift of frame[9] from the subject matter to other issues (or signal moving on to another activity). These have often to do with student behaviour, e.g. disciplining students or focusing students' attention to something; or serve administrative and procedural purpose such as giving task instructions or fixing trouble with classroom equipment. Examples 6 to 9 illustrate teacher CS for this purpose.

In Example 6, the students are playing a game on tenses in smaller groups. As the end of the lesson approaches, the students become restless and start packing up their things.

Example 6 (extract 49)

```
1 →    T: nii (.) Marina kord

2      S1: meil ei ole mõtet teha seda ju=
3 →    T: =nelikümmend lõppeb tund ((strict tone))
4      S1: aga meil [ei ole mõtet teha seda]
5      S?:          [meil hakkab söögivahetund]
6 →    T: ↑miks ei ole mõtet.
7      Ss: ((noise))
8 →    T: ↓nii. siis hakkame töövihikut kontrollima kui ei ole mõtet rohkem teha.
9      okay
10     Ss: [((noise))]
11     S2: [teeme ikka mängu]
12     T: so (.) open. your workbooks then.
13     S2: siis mängime mängu
14     Ss: ((noise))
```

---

[8] The term was originally used by Gumperz (1982)
[9] A concept put forth by Goffman (1974)

15 →   T: ↑**mida te mõtlete et kui tunni lõpuni on viis minutit aega eelmine kord oli täpselt**
16 →   **samamoodi** (.) **Ragnar jälle pakib oma asjad kokku lihtsalt**
17 →   **tõuseb püsti ja kõnnib klassiruumist välja** ((agitated voice))
18   S3: (   ) teeb seda kord aastas (1.0)
19   S4: (   ) saab jälle süüa
20   T: (1.0) okay ee but then: let's continue with ee (.) this exercise

In line 1, T code-switches for procedural purpose in order to signal one of the students that it is her turn. The students however, are uncooperative since the lesson is about to end (as seen in lines 2, 4, 5). In line 3, T's CS into L1 acquires another function, which is to maintain discipline in class as she reminds them the lesson lasts for another five minutes. The switch is accompanied by stressing each word and using a strict tone. As the students continue to express their dissatisfaction with continuing the activity, T reacts to S1's repeated utterance (lines 2 and 4) by asking why she thinks there is no point in continuing (line 6). This probably is not a real question but rather a sign of disagreement, as indicated by the high pitch. As seen from the extract, there is a lot of background noise and overlapping talk by several students at this point. In line 8, T continues in the L1, lowering her pitch and informing the students of substituting the game with checking workbook exercises. At the end of her utterance (line 9) she switches to the TL with discourse particle *okay*, indicating a shift of frame from classroom management issues to subject matter. In her next turn in line 12, she uses TL to enforce this switch. The students do not align with the pedagogic focus of the moment (opening their workbooks) and S2 starts bargaining, although her requests go unanswered (lines 11 and 13). This, along with no reduction of background noise prompts T to switch back to the L1 in lines 15-17, indicating a shift of frame back to classroom management issues. The disciplinary session is also accompanied by a change into a higher pitch and an adoption of an agitated tone to give it more potency. The gravity of what T says is also visible in the fact that she barely pauses in between utterances in a relatively long turn (lines 15-17). In line 20, T code-switches into the TL as means of shifting back to the task and putting the disciplinary matter at rest.

Example 6 exemplifies CS as a strategy for modifying student behaviour, in this case to discipline students as they digress off course. Alternating between the L1 and the TL gives clear indication of what is at the centre of attention at any given moment. As the pedagogic focus changes, so does the language. When T is reprimanding the students she switches to L1 and when she wants to emphasise that the debate of whether to finish class early or continue with the game is over she switches to the TL.

Example 7 (extract 53) revolves around a guessing game the students are playing. One of the students is explaining the sentence and others have to guess it.

Example 7 (extract 53)

```
1          S1: aa are you asking me to do dance (.) are you (0.5) asking for dance (.) asks for
2          dance
3 →        T: and it is a sentence now yes (.) present simple (.) NO- YOU CAN'T WRITE any
4          words (.) you can write symbols (.) or or draw something you can draw some symbols
5          (.) maybe?
6          S2: aa oota ma pidin siis  [(                )]
7          T:                          [you can draw] a symbol
8          S3: (0.5) viis sekundit (.) sa saad viie sekundiga teha midagi
9          S1: ei ma ei [(      )]
10         S2:          [ask] for dance
11         T: (1.0) mhm
12         S2: aga täp täp [kas ta peab täpselt selle ütlema]
13 →       T:            [aga see peab olema see peab] olema nüüd lau- lause eks ju jah
14         S1: he asks for dance (.) he::
15         T: (2.0) mhmh
16         S2: kas peab täpselt sama selle ütlema
17 →       T: ja (.) ja nüüd- aga kuidas sa annaksid talle vihje, (.) mis: sorti lause see on (0.5)
18 →       näiteks vaata siin sa saaksid tahvlile- (0.5) mhmh
19         S1: aa: are you asking for (.) me for a dance
20 →       T: mhmh (.) ja nüüd formuleeri see lause
/…/
```

One of the students (S1) keeps actively guessing the sentence but she does not formulate it correctly so T reminds her in the TL that it has to be a sentence (line 3). In the same turn, she points out how the explaining student (S2) can use the blackboard in lines 1-3 and 5. The student explaining the sentence still seems to be confused (lines 6 and 9) while S1 still keeps formulating her guesses as phrases and not as sentences (line 10). In line 7, T responds to S2's plight in the TL, advising him to draw a symbol on the board, even though S2 had expressed

himself in the L1 (so T is not aligning with S2's language preference). To repair the communication trouble with S1 (her not understanding she has to form a sentence), T code-switches into L1 to reformulate her initial TL utterance of line 3, so as to draw S1's attention to it (in line 13). Trouble is successfully repaired as in the next turn S1 formulates a sentence, which T affirms in line 15. As S2 keeps seeking reassurance in terms of the rules of the game, T attempts to repair the trouble by using L1 to provide him some procedural scaffolding (lines 17-18). S1 makes another go at guessing the sentence in line 19, but it still lacks the target form, therefore T encourages her once more (again in L1) to (properly) formulate the sentence.

In terms of preference organisation, the students are not affiliating with the pedagogic focus of T and she is forced to simultaneously deal with S1's trouble of formulating a sentence and S2's procedural trouble. In both cases, she initially uses TL to address these concerns (line 3 and lines 3-5 respectively). As there is no repair by S1 nor S2 and the communication breakdown continues, in the following lines T code-switches into L1 to repeat and reformulate her utterances. It is unlikely that the students did not understand her, rather they did not hear her (or pay attention as they were playing). Therefore, CS functions here as an attention-drawing device in service of the twofold pedagogic aim of the moment: provide procedural scaffolding to S2 and instruct S1 to form a correct TL sentence.

The next CS occurrence (Example 8) takes place at the end of a lesson after checking the answers of a listening task.

Example 8 (extract 11)

```
1        T: okay. ee we shall: e (0.5) have the next less:- listening tasks in the next (.) lesson
2        then=
3        Ss: [yes]
4        T: =because we only have (.) one more minute eee (0.5) lepime siis kokku et (.)
5 →      järgmise nädala esmaspäevast on kõik koolis et ma saan selgitada teile seda
6 →      paaristööd et te saate valida omale teemad (.) et pärast on jälle natukene
7 →      keerulisem >keda ei ole<=
8        S1: =sorry ee (.) which (.) lesson we have (.) like
9 →      T: (0.5) esmaspäeval on niiviisi et me oleme seal (0.5)=
```

10   S2: [jaa aktusel]

11→   **T=[kogunemisel] aga see kestab vist ainult kakskümmend minutit vähemalt oli** (.)

12→   **jah** (.) **nii et peale seda on meil täpselt piisavalt aega et selgitada** (0.5) **mida tegema**

13→   **peab kes kellega koos** (.) **töötab ja nii edasi** (.) **aga=**

14   S2: =next week will be <u>really</u> weird (.) because we have all these events (.) and (I think)

15   that o::n Wednesday (.) me and Marvin and (   ) will be missing because (.) <we

16   ha::ve practice (.) for our choir (.) performance>

17→   **T:** (1.0) **jah, täpselt no aga siis võib-olla olekski hea et me saame esmaspäeval need**

18→   **asjad ära selgitada need teemad välja otsida** (.) **ja siis on teil paar tundi aega**

19→   **niimoodi omas tempos siis töötada**, **et kes on proovis peavad natuke tihedamalt**

20→   **siis tegema** (.) goodbye

This extract illustrates the procedural function of teacher CS. As T indicates in line 4 that there is only one minute left until the end of the class, she switches to L1 (in lines 4-7) to make some administrative arrangements and explain the topic for the next class. L1 here functions as an attention-drawing device. In lines 9 and 11-13 she continues her CS turn while elaborating on the administrative issue of balancing class time with a gathering in the main hall. Despite S2 addressing T in TL when showing doubts about the productivity of the next week, T continues in L1 (lines 17-20) when providing reasoning for the choice of activity for the next lesson. In line 20, T switches back to TL when saying goodbye to the students, which signals the end of the lesson (the end of the "class mode"). In this example, the trigger for CS seems to be the need to optimise time, as the teacher makes explicit reference to the lesson ending in one minute. At the same time, CS also functions here as a frame-shift from doing and checking the listening tasks to talking about strictly administrative issues. Although it is unusual for interlocutors to speak in different languages, when S1 and S2 express their preference for TL in lines 8 and 14-16 respectively, T responds in L1. This might be so because she is aligning with the pedagogic aim of dealing with classroom management and ensuring universal comprehension rather than orienting to the language preference of S1 and S2.

In Example 9, the lesson has just started and the teacher is explaining the grading principles of a previous assignment (class presentations).

Example 9 (extract 44)

1→   T: **kes tahab seda ru::brikut vaadata jah et mille eest need punktid täpselt olid**

2→   **eksju** co::ntent (.) vocabulary (.) grammar ee then (0.5) the fluency (.) and the visual

3   props (4.0)

4   S1: ee kas meil on hinded ka sees juba

5   T: would you like to have a look at this

6   S1: yes

7   T: (0.5) mhmh (.) **nii** (.) Evelin (2.0) these were (.) for you Alari (.) comments

8   from other students

9   S2: (   )

10→   T: (1.0) **ja:: no ma ütlengi et (.) et igal sellel ettekandel tegelikult olid omad ee (.)**

11→   **tugevused (.) ee ja seetõttu meil ongi see** <u>marking</u> scale **sest muidu oleks nagu väga**

12→   **raske (.) objektiivselt hinnata (.) mina muidu vastasel juhul panekski kõigile** (0.5)

13→   **enam-vähem viied sest ee** (0.5) **tõepoolest** (1.0) **Ragnari ja Samueli puhul** (.)

14→   **mulle näiteks meeldis väga see intervjuu** (4.0) **Alari puhul oli see et Alari pidi**

15→   **üksi tegema sest ta (.) oli oluliselt jälle keerulisem võib-olla kui neil kes said**

16→   <u>**kahe**</u>**kesi olla**=

17   S3: =viie minutiga kodus tegin ära selle

18   S4: ei jõudnud midagi=

19→   T: **=viie minutiga. mulle just tundus et sa nägid tunnis** (.) **palju rohkem vaeva kui**

20→   <u>**mõned**</u> **mõned teised eks ole et-**

21   S?: (   )

22   S5: I didn't do <u>anything</u> at the lesson (h) (.) because I wasn't in the lesson

23   T: yes (   ) makes sense

In line 1, T employs L1 to make a reference to the marking scale used for grading, however reading out the criteria out loud (in line 2) prompts her to continue in TL as the criteria is written in TL. In lines 10-12, she code-switches back to L1 to explain why the marking scale is used. She provides reasoning for using the marking scale and at the same time builds rapport with the students as she expresses her desire to give everyone good grades in lines 12-13. In lines 13-16 T continues on in L1 by giving praise to some students and their presentations (simultaneously justifying the grading). In line 17, S3 downplays some of the praise by claiming it took him very little time, to which T replies in line 19 with a confirmation check and by rejecting S3's modesty (lines 19-20). In line 23, T switches back to TL as recognizing S5's preference for TL. Perhaps even more than in the other examples, it is evidenced in this one that T seems to recognize the language preference of the students to some extent, as S-T turns in lines 17-19 (L1-L1) and 22-23 (TL-TL) indicate. The only discordance in terms of CS

appears in lines 4-5, when S1 poses a question in L1 and T replies in TL. However, at a closer look it is visible that T actually does not respond to S1's question about the grades, but nominates a counter question instead (to look at the marking scale). This exchange also exemplifies yet again the asymmetric power roles in the classroom, whereby T has the "right" to ignore S1's question and start a new topic instead, although it is difficult to say whether S1's request goes unregistered or his question as well as language preference rejected. It is noteworthy, though, that in line 6, S1 recognizes TL as the language preference of T as he responds in TL. The primary function of CS here is procedural, because the pedagogic aim of T is to explain the grading criteria. As grading can be a sensitive topic in a classroom (also signalled by the numerous and relatively long pauses in T's turn), using L1 also serves as means of reducing social distance. Giving praise to students in L1 seems to be a continuation of mitigating the sensitive issue that is dealing with grading, however it could be claimed that praise in L1 can be perceived by students as more genuine compared to TL which is often seen as more formal (as proposed by Cook 2001 and Lin 1996).

2.3.3 INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

This category has to do with negotiating different identities of the teacher (teacher as a friend, as an authority figure, etc.) and reducing social distance and formality. As Ferguson (2003) points out, L2 or FL is often associated with formality and distance, whereas L1 is associated with closeness and warmth. Lin (1996) adds that praise might often be considered to be more genuine in L1. Therefore, in order to show empathy and solidarity to students the teacher might switch to L1. This category can also include instances of humour, building rapport, etc. Examples 10 to 12 demonstrate the category of interpersonal relations.

In Example 10 the teacher has just started the lesson and introduced the topic of the lesson (sentence structures and linking words) when she is interrupted by a student being late.

Example 10 (extract 12)

1	T: OK so:: our plans for today then- eee let's have a look at the (.) some:: (.) exercises
2	related to <u>sentence</u> structures so how to <u>avoid</u> too simple sentence constructions how
3	to make a little bit more complicated sentences what kind of linking words to use and
4	ee (0.5) yes (.) and also (.)
5	S1: tere
6	T: hello (.) welcome=
7	S1: =õpetaja mul on vaja ära minna
8 →	T: (1.0) **ee ütleb Kasper** ja (h) **is**(h)**istub kohale** [(hhh)] (4.0)
9	Ss: [(hhh)]
10 →	T: **mis toimub**
11	S?: pea valutab tahan (tabletti)
12	S1: [eee..(1.0)]
13	S?: kutid
14	S1: ee::=
15 →	T: =**mis on Kasper**
16	S1: ma lähen isale app::i
17	S?: aaah koolist ( )
18	Ss: ( )
19	S2: kõik on [korras või]
20 →	T: [**õpetaja kas**] **teil on midagi selle vastu et ma lähen ↑isale appi**?=
21	S1: =õpetaja, kas teil on midagi selle vastu, et ma lähen isale appi=
22 →	T: =**sul on väga vaja minna jah**
23	S3: in [English please]
24	S1: [Jah]
25 →	T: **niisiis vaata e-koolist** (.) **mis me täna teeme** (.) **Evert õpetab sulle kodus**
26 →	**teeb eratunni**
27	S1: head aega
28	T: goodbye.

In line 6, T initially reacts to S1 being late by greeting him in TL as means of signalling that

class has started. In line 7, however, S1 demonstrates some ambiguity by going to his seat yet

saying that he needs to leave. In line 8, T expresses her confusion by code-switching into L1

and describing the actions of the student. There is a relatively long pause of one second before

her utterance and a particle *ee* at the beginning of her turn which signals a search for words.

Another characteristic feature of her utterance is that it is permeated with tokens of laughter.

All of these features: the pause, searching for words, and chuckle, indicate her perplexity about

the student's behaviour. After a long pause (4.0 seconds) and a universal giggle, with no

additional information from S1, T adapts a slightly serious tone and continues in L1 asking

what is going on in line 10. S1's utterances in lines 12 and 14 are hesitant, including only a pause and a search for words. There is an interruption in the communication, because S1 does not follow standard preference organization, in this case a question-answer adjacency pair, since there is no answer. The lack of response from S1 triggers T to rephrase her question and allocate the turn directly to S1 (line 15), using his name to ask if something is wrong. In line 16, S1 finally responds and says he will go help his father. In her turn (line 20), T does two things while continuing CS into L1: first, she responds to the student and acknowledges his response, and second, she reformulates his utterance into a polite question, modelling the expected or appropriate response. In line 21, S1 immediately aligns himself with T's focus to modify his utterance and diligently repeats the reformulation. After a confirmation check in line 22 (still in L1), T finishes her CS turn (lines 25-26) with reminding S1 to make sure to be up to date with what was done in class and humorously saying that another student will help him out by giving him a private lesson. In line 28, T switches back to TL as an indication that off-topic interaction is over. An interesting feature, albeit not relevant for this particular study, is line 23, where another student urges the interlocutors to speak in English and not in L1.

This example could have also been categorised as CS for classroom management, since T is dealing with a student being late and gives him instructions to catch-up with the rest of the class. At the same time, the serious tone and L1 use as T enquires if something had happened and if the student really had to leave indicate empathy and concern for the student (initially due to his lack of response). As seen in line 19, other students also seem to show concern. After several turns, the situation is resolved by a humorous remark from T to lighten the situation. Overall, while classroom management issues are present in the example, it is reducing formality while expressing genuine concern for S1 that is the primary focus of the teacher code-switching, as she suspends her institutional role as a teacher.

Example 11 is from an episode in which the teacher uses slides to explain grammar.

Example 11 (extract 36)

1   T: maybe booked ee (1.0) the band and and found (.) catering [and so on]
2   S1:   [a miks seal] (s) lõpus on
3   T: (1.0) I <u>told</u> you that õ (.) it's (0.5) a small error.
4   S1: sodige selle punasega üle
5 →   T: (1.0) (hh) no I won't do that (.) **ma olen vist teile kunagi (.) rääkinud kuidas meil**
6 →   **üks (.) õppejõud lasi ee selle (0.5) valge seina peale- noh vist (.) tookord siis veel**
7 →   **kilede pealt.** ((35 words omitted)) **aga ta oli eelmises ruumis harjunud et kui ta kile**
8 →   **pealt lasi ee tahvlile siis tegi nagu märkmeid juurde**. (.) **aga tal läks seal teises**
9 →   **klassis meelest ära see.** (h) **ja siis võttis ka seina peal või noh kirjutas valge seina**
10 → **peale** (h) (.) **juurde ühe sõna** (.) **ta oli väga ehmatanud just oli** (.) **remont tehtud ja**
11 → (.) ((location omitted)) **seal kuskil neljanda korruse klassides**=
12   S1: =visati visati välja kohe jah ah
13 → T: **ei loomulikult ei visatud aga lihtsalt meie jaoks oli see nii naljakas** (.) **et me ei**
14 → **suutnud kuidagi viisakalt** (.) **naeru** (.) **tagasi hoida samas tema läks ise väga ähmi**
15 → **täis** (.) **ja** (0.5) **tõttas otsima koristajat ja neid neid vahendeid** (.) **et**, (.)
16   S?: (   ) [olekski keemiaklassis]
17   S2:   [oleks võind pildi panna]
18   Ss: (h)
19 → T: **kuidas?**
20   S2: oleks võind pildi panna lihtsalt selle seina peale=
21 → T: =↑**noh täpselt eksju pildi asemele et**
22   S3: nii kurb. (0.5)
23 → T: **no tegelikult ma arvan et ee et see oli selles mõttes päris hu<u>moorikas</u> et ega keegi**
24 → **talle midagi halvasti ei öelnud ja see** (.) **naer oli ka pigem selline** (.) **heatahtlik.**
25   S?: ei usu
26 → T: **nii et ühesõnaga** (.) **tänan pakkumast** (h) (.) **aga ma ei kavatse** (hh) **siia ekraani**
27 → **peale midagi ee: joonistada** (0.5) okay and one more (.) example look at the clouds

In line 1, T is amidst explaining grammar when S1 asks about a sentence on the slide (line 2). In line 3, T explains that it is a mistake (line 3), to which S1 suggests that the teacher crossed it through with a marker (line 4). T declines this suggestion in line 5, but the situation makes her recall an anecdote from her past and, code-switching to L1, she shares a personal story in lines 5-11 and 13-15 about her own lecturer. Students take interest in the story and respond in L1 in different ways. In line 12, S1 asks a question to which T replies and continues to elaborate on the anecdote. In lines 17 and 20, S2 makes a suggestion of what the lecturer could have done, to which T replies with a clarification check (line 19) and agreement with S2's suggestion (line 21). In line 22, S3 makes an empathic statement about the lecturer to which T replies with a softening statement, indicating that S3 slightly misunderstood the

situation (lines 23-24). In line 25, a student (S1?) makes a humorous remark about the previous T's utterance which does not get a direct reply. Instead, in line 26 T concludes the interchange on the anecdote by backtracking, in other words responding to S1's initial utterance from line 4 as she provides a reason for declining S1's suggestion to cross through the mistake. In line 27, T switches back to TL to signal a shift back to the initial grammar topic. CS in this situation signals a suspension of T's role of a teacher as she builds rapport with the students by sharing a personal anecdote, in other words, switches to a "friend mode" as the story seems to convey the idea that she herself was once a student. With the humorous story, T is creating solidarity as well as responding to S1's input. All the student turns alternate with the T's turns, indicating a genuine communication, with students taking interest in the story and T valuing their input.

Example 12 is taken from mid-lesson, after a series of student presentations and before a form-focused activity.

Example 12 (extract 33)

1		S1: Ma ei jaksa õpetaja <u>mitte</u> midagi teha lihtsalt uni on
2	→	T: **No::** (.) **katsu ennast kokku võtta enam ei ole palju jäänud** (0.5)
3		S2: Täiega mõttetu päev on noh
4	→	**Ei ole mõttetu päev me hakkame- esiteks** (.) **sa said näha suurepärast ettekannet**
5	→	(.) **eee Mozartist ee** (.) **teiseks sa saad** <u>kohe</u> **hakata kordama seda** (.) **kuidas inglise**
6	→	**keeles** (.) **väljendada tulevikku erinevates olukordades**
7		Ss: ((noise))
8		T: So you <u>can't</u> say that this day is <u>point</u>less (.) definitely not
9		S3: This lesson makes my day every day ((very excited voice))
10		T: (hh) I'm happy to hear that (2.0) and of course you didn't (.) use any i::rony when
11		you said that

In line 1, S1 uses L1 to express the fact that he is tired and sleepy, prompting T to code-switch and respond in line 2 with an empathic encouragement to hang on. This is followed by S2's remark of how pointless the day is, which gets another empathic response from T in L1 as in lines 4-6 she provides all the reasons why the day has been (and continues to be) useful, in other words, tries to motivate the students. In both cases T's CS serves the purpose of showing empathy and humanising the classroom atmosphere as she recognizes the students are tired. In

line 8, she switches back to TL as an indication of shifting back to the lesson. The warm atmosphere of the class is also visible in lines 10-11 when she responds to S3's ironic remark with humour and laughter. Like in other examples, T recognizes the language preference of the learners, as S1 and S2 who address her in L1 get a response in L1, and S3 who turns to her in TL gets a response in TL.

2.4 DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

The aim of this section is to discuss the significance of the findings presented in section 2.3 and to compare them to previous studies on the topic of teacher code-switching.

The contextual and sequential analysis of previous examples of teacher-initiated code-switching and the preliminary analysis of the whole corpus showed that it served several pedagogic functions in the classroom and was instrumental in achieving the teacher's interactional aims (that were tightly intertwined with the pedagogic goals). Some significant interactional patterns were also revealed. First, the pedagogic functions of CS are discussed in light of other studies, which is followed by reporting on the CS patterns that emerged.

The most common reason for the teacher to code-switch was related to facilitating the acquisition and comprehension of the subject matter. Five examples analysed in detail from the category of subject matter showed that the teacher switched to L1 to aid TL comprehension. She did so through annotating a TL term by providing cultural background information (Example 1), contrasting L1-TL terms (Examples 1 and 2), L1 translation (Examples 1, 2, 4), eliciting L1 meaning (Example 3) and reformulation of TL utterances (Example 5). In addition, she provided pedagogic scaffolding in the form of metalinguistic feedback (Examples 3 and 4) to promote the understanding of TL grammar. These results are in line with previous studies which have also found the pedagogic functions related to facilitating TL acquisition to be the most common ones (Polio & Duff 1994; De la Campa & Nassaji 2009). De la Campa and

Nassaji (2009), for example, found translation alone to account for 32.3% of L1 use in the two classrooms they analysed in depth. In a similar manner, studies investigating form-focused episodes have found L1 use to be quite widespread (e. g. Nakatsukasa & Loewen 2015).

It is likely that vocabulary and grammar related CS prevails in the classroom because they enable the teacher to ensure that everyone understands what is being communicated, a factor that was probably even more important in the particular classroom due to the impending exam. By looking at the examples (and the whole corpus), it was evident that the teacher seemed to deem L1 helpful for providing contrast to TL in order to avoid potential errors or misunderstandings. This is visible in Example 1 where she seems to presume that only translation is not sufficient for comprehension and in Example 2 where she contrasts present perfect to *täisminevik* to anticipate possible confusion. Teacher CS served a similar function in Liebscher & Dailey O'Cain's study (2009) where the teacher annotated an L2 term that she anticipated to be problematic. Another feature that surfaced was that the teacher seemed to believe that TL acquisition happens through L1. This appeared to be the case in Example 3 and 5 where she induced student CS (asked to think of the L1 meaning of the words) to enhance TL comprehension.

Code-switching in the particular classroom also served as communicative means of dealing with classroom management issues. Four examples analysed in detail (Examples 6 to 9) showed that the teacher used L1 to discipline students (Example 6), give task instructions, ensure a smooth continuation of the activity by providing procedural scaffolding (Example 7) and by allocating turns (Example 6), sort out administrative issues (Example 8), and to explain grading criteria (Example 9). CS for procedural reasons has also been evidenced in other studies (Macaro 2001; Polio & Duff 1994; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009). One of the aspects that has been widely remarked on is the fact that reprimanding students appears to often happen in L1 as it can be perceived as a sign of seriousness (Lin 1996; Cook 2001; Macaro 2001) This

was also the case in Example 6 of this study (and extracts 7, 42, 50, 52 in the corpus), where L1 seemed to send a clear message of teacher's discontent with the student behaviour. As discussed by Cook (2001), students themselves seem to perceive the connection between L1 and "something bad". In some of the examples related to classroom management, the teacher initially used TL and only resorted to CS when communicative trouble occurred (Example 7), which shows that CS for procedural purposes does not necessarily happen by default but depends on the specific context and unfolding situation. In one analysed example (Example 8), time constraints seemed to play a role in teacher's CS decision, which has been mentioned by teachers in other studies (Edstrom 2006; de la Campa & Nassji 2009). In Example 9, where grading criteria was explained in L1, CS seemed to be warranted for three reasons: to make sure everyone understands the criteria, to mitigate a sensitive issue that is grading, and to praise students. As Lin (1996) has suggested, praising in L1 can be perceived by students as being more authentic as opposed to more automatic appraisal such as "well done".

In addition to the previous pedagogic functions, the teacher also occasionally code-switched for reasons not specifically related to the subject matter itself but for maintaining positive relations and atmosphere in the classroom (Examples 10, 11 and 12). The teacher code-switched into L1 to show empathy and genuine concern for a student (10), reduce social distance through humour (Examples 10 and 11), and for humanising classroom climate (12), although humour was not monopolised by L1 as seen in Example 12. In accord with this research, other studies have also commented on L1 being used for personal contact. Edstrom (2006) reported using L1 to show concern for students as individuals and fellow human beings and Polio and Duff (1994) reported on teachers using L1 for personal remarks. Cook suggests that this is likely because it is more natural and indicates teacher treating the students as "their real selves rather than dealing with assumed L2 personas" (2001: 416).

Along with revealing the pedagogic functions of teacher CS, the analysis also unveiled some important interactional patterns of CS related to achieving the pedagogic aims of the teacher. From the analysis it appeared that it was common for the teacher to code-switch in order to repair communicative trouble that had occurred. In terms of preference organisation, if the students did not respond to the teacher's interactional turns with the preferred action (e. g. there was silence after a question) then the teacher code-switched into L1 to repair trouble. This was the case in Example 10 in which the student was hesitant in answering the teacher's question and did not affiliate with the standard question-answer adjacency pair. Repair of communicative trouble was also evident when students did not align with the pedagogic focus of the teacher (e. g. they did not do what the teacher requested from them), as shown in Examples 3, 4, and 7. L1 proved to be a useful resource for repairing the trouble. This was evidenced in other studies looking at CS from the perspective of CA. For example, Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005), who investigated the sequential organisation of teacher CS in a Turkish university, formed a connection between the pause length between teacher and student turns and teacher's choice of language, as a longer pause than one second led to teacher CS.

Another feature that emerged from the analysis was that language choice seemed to be an indicator of shifts in the pedagogic focus of the teacher. Typically, switching to L1 showed digression from the topic at hand to an "off-topic" matter and TL signalled going back to the initial topic or "class mode". This can be illustrated by Example 2 in which the teacher shifts from grammar explanation in TL to annotate a TL term in L1. From there she goes back to grammar explanation in TL and then shifts again to an off-topic matter in L1, in this case to briefly reflect on the curriculum. Frame shifts indicating change in pedagogic focus were also visible in Examples 6, 11, and 12. A common cue of shifting back to "doing the lesson" was the particle *okay* that the teacher used in Examples 5, 6 (twice) and 11 (and extracts 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 26, 51, 57 among many others in the corpus). Language choice reflecting frame-shifting

was also noticeable in the way the teacher started and ended the lessons when greeting and saying goodbye to students, which was without exception in TL, even if the preceding talk had been in L1, as seen in Examples 8 and 10 (and extracts 1, 30, and 52 in the corpus).

The analysis of classroom CS also indicated that the teacher CS might be influenced by the language choice of the students. It was common for the teacher to code-switch as a response to student CS (Examples 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12); however, equally as often it was not the case (Examples 7, 8, 9, 10, 11). As pointed out by Auer (1995), the preferred choice in bilingual talk is to respond in the same language and not recognizing the language choice of the conversation partner is atypical. Dailey O'Cain and Liebscher (2009), however, point out that in a language classroom it sends a signal of preference. In their study, which partly dealt with investigating the source of student CS, they pointed out that by recognizing or rejecting students' language preference, the teacher provides a model for student CS.

In the current study, recognizing the language preference of the learners seemed to take place in the absence of a conflicting pedagogic aim. In Example 12, S1 and S2 address the teacher in the L1 and both get a response in the L1; moreover, when S3 turns to the teacher in the TL, she responds in the TL, suggesting that code-switching is an accepted practice in the particular classroom. The cases in which the teacher did not recognize the language preference of the students were likely because the teacher was orienting to a pedagogic aim that was incompatible with the learner's language choice. For instance, in Example 10, the teacher did not align with the language preference of S1 who greeted her in the L1, because the student was late and the teacher, when responding in the TL, was implicitly signalling that the class had started. The same can be said about Example 8, in which the teacher continues on in the L1 despite the fact that two students respond to her in the TL. It could be presumed that in that case the teacher was orienting to time constraints and administrative issues rather than the learners' language choice.

Overall, the analysis showed that CS does provide an additional resource for the teacher to achieve interactional goals that are tightly related to TL pedagogy. The teacher code-switched for several pedagogic reasons such as facilitating TL learning, managing the classroom, and maintaining good relations with the students. In addition to the pedagogic functions, an interactional pattern of CS also emerged. It appeared that CS depended on the particular pedagogic aim the teacher was orienting to and alternating between the TL and the L1 reflected a shift of focus. CS was also used to repair communicative trouble that surfaced in the classroom and there was some evidence that the language choice of students had some effect on the teacher's CS. in that particular classroom, CS seemed to be an accepted practice.

Albeit providing some deep insight into the CS practices of one teacher, there are some limitations to this study. First and foremost, as it is a case study, no grounding conclusions or generalisations can be made in reference to the CS practices of other teachers in Estonia. Also, it should be remembered that the study was short-term and the audio-recordings were collected shortly before a final exam, a factor which very likely had an effect on the teacher's CS practice. Nonetheless, it is maintained here that although CA deals with the micro level of interaction and single-case analysis, its aim of unveiling the universal pattern and orderly nature of interaction means that this study is not completely without a component of generalisation.

The study has provided an alternative perspective on classroom code-switching and has hopefully indicated that L1 should not necessarily be disregarded as something negative in a lower-secondary EFL classroom. The prevalence of code-switching, as shown in Chapter 1 of this thesis, and lack of agreement with regards to its role and functions indicate that it is a topic in need of more research, especially so in the context of Estonia. In addition to teacher code-switching, it would be worthwhile to also investigate students and their code-switching practices.

CONCLUSION

Bilingual people, that is people who are proficient to some degree in two or more languages, often alternate between those languages in the course of interaction. This is referred to as code-switching and it is considered to be a natural bilingual behaviour. Code-switching in a language classroom, however, is a topic of dispute as opinions about its beneficial and detrimental effects diverge. The question therefore arises whether teachers should be recommended or even permitted to use the students' L1 to teach the target language.

Increasingly more researchers claim that code-switching in a language classroom can have a positive effect to TL learning because it is an additional resource that the teachers can use in order to achieve their pedagogic aims (Levine 2011; Cook 2001; Ferguson 2009). Several studies have shown that teachers use L1 for varying purposes, such as annotating TL terms, maintaining good relations with the students, and addressing several administrative issues among many others (Polio & Duff 1994; de la Campa & Nassaji 2009; Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009; etc.). At the same time, it is feared that some teachers might become over-dependant on using the L1, as a result of which the students would be less exposed to the TL (Kang 2008, Turnbull & Arnett 2002). It is largely for this reason that classroom CS has acquired a negative reputation and language policies often advise against it. It has been noted, however, that the negative stance rests more on ideological grounds than empirical evidence (Cummins 2007; Howatt 2004; Levine 2011; Macaro 2001; Wei & Martin 2009). In sum, CS has been shown to serve important pedagogic functions, while the detrimental effect of CS on TL learning remains to be empirically proven.

In addition to serving various pedagogic functions, CS has been shown to be an additional communicative strategy for the teachers to use (Üstunel & Seedhouse 2005; Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009). In the language classroom, the interlocutors are orienting to a

common goal, which is language learning (and teaching). Deriving from that broad goal, there are several pedagogic aims that the teacher is orienting to throughout the lesson. These pedagogic aims, in turn, are achieved through different communicative moves and interactional strategies, one of which is code-switching. Research has shown, for example, that CS is used by teachers to repair communicative trouble (Üstünel & Seedhouse 2005) or by students and teachers to structure discourse (Dailey O'Cain & Liebscher 2009).

Drawing on previous studies that have shown CS in the classroom to be an asset rather than a hindrance and the premature negative reputation of teacher CS, this study set out to investigate the role of teacher-initiated CS in a lower-secondary Estonian EFL classroom context. Consequently, the research question of the thesis was formulated as follows: what pedagogic and interactional functions does the teacher-initiated code-switching serve in the particular classroom context?

In order to obtain an in-depth understanding of classroom CS and its interactional and pedagogic functions, the thesis took a case-study approach and focused on one teacher. The data for this thesis was gathered via audio-recordings and relevant parts were transcribed according to the conventions of Conversation Analysis (CA), which was chosen as a method for this study. CA was deemed an adequate and suitable method due to its emphasis on case-by-case analysis and a detailed transcription system that provides a nuanced account of code-switching and allows us to see the interaction unfold in a particular context rather than providing a superficial view of the phenomenon. As CA considers context and the sequence of utterances to be highly relevant, the data was approached through single-case analysis.

The whole corpus of this study consisted of 59 instances of teacher-initiated code-switching, which were divided into three broad categories according to their pedagogic function, following the division put forth by Ferguson (2003; 2009): subject matter (28

occurrences), classroom management (21 occurrences), and interpersonal relations (10 occurrences). After the preliminary categorisation, a representable selection of examples from each category was subjected to an in-detail analysis, which in this case amounted to 12 single cases. The analysis of single cases was carried out through notions of turn-taking, preference organization, repair, and other relevant CA concepts, and focused on identifying the primary pedagogic function of teacher CS as well as unveiling its underlying interactional pattern.

The preliminary analysis of the corpus revealed several pedagogic functions in connection with the teacher CS, which the case-by-case analysis further shed some light on. The most common reason for the teacher to code-switch was related to the subject matter and promoting TL learning and comprehension. This included annotating a TL term, providing cultural background information, contrasting L1-TL terms, L1 translation, eliciting L1 meaning, reformulation of TL utterances, and metalinguistic feedback. In addition, it was typical for the teacher to code-switch also for reasons related to classroom management, such as disciplining students, giving task instructions, ensuring a smooth continuation of the activity (providing procedural scaffolding and allocating turns), sorting out administrative issues, and explaining grading criteria. It was less common for the teacher to CS for interpersonal reasons such as maintaining good relations with the students; however, this too did occasionally happen. In those occasions, the teacher code-switched to reduce social distance through humour, to show empathy and concern for students and to humanise classroom atmosphere.

Furthermore, the analysis also revealed some prevalent code-switching patterns. First, the teacher resorted to L1 use in order to repair communicative trouble in cases in which the students did not respond to the teacher with the preferred action or did not align themselves with the teacher's pedagogic aim. Second, the teacher's code-switching often reflected frame-shifts and changes in pedagogic focus, whereby TL frequently signalled class-mode and switching to L1 off-topic matters. It was also remarked that starting and ending the lesson

happened predominantly in the TL. Third, there was some indication, that the teacher recognized the language preference of the students, unless the pedagogic focus at hand was in conflict with that preference.

Overall, the study managed to show that teacher CS serves numerous pedagogic functions in the classroom and it is an alternative communicative strategy that the teacher can use in order to achieve the established pedagogic aims. Moreover, a notable connection was formed between the language choice and the shifting pedagogic focus of the teacher, indicating an orderly nature of code-switching. It was concluded that L1 in the foreign language classroom should not necessarily be disregarded as a negative phenomenon, and more research is needed into student and teacher code-switching along with its functions in the context of Estonia.

REFERENCES

Auer, Peter. 1984. *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Auer, Peter. 1995. The pragmatics of code-switching: A sequential approach. In Lesley Milroy and Pjeter Muysken (eds.). *One Speaker Two Languages: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*, 115-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bateman, Blair E. 2008. Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target language in the Classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41: 1, 11-28.

Baškirova, Tatjana. 2006. *Koodivahetus eesti keele kui teise keele tunnis.* MA thesis. School of Humanities, Tallinn University.

Brooks-Lewis, Kimberly Anne. 2009. Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30: 2: 216–235.

Butzkamm, Wolfgang. 2003. We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, 28:1, 29–39.

Ciou, Bella 2014. Rethinking the role of L1 in the EFL Classroom. *English Teaching & Learning*. 38: 4, 53-78.

Cook, Vivian. 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57: 3, 402-423.

Copland, Fiona and Georgious Neokleous. 2011. L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal,* 65: 3, 270-280.

Cummins, Jim. 2007. Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10: 2, 221–240.

Dailey O'Cain, Jennifer and Grit Liebscher. 2009. Teacher and Student Use of the First Language in Foreign Language Classroom Interaction: Functions and Applications. In Miles Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, 131-144. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

De la Campa, Juliane. C. and Hossein Nassaji. 2009. The Amount, purpose and reasons for using L1 in L2 classrooms. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42: 4, 742–759.

DiCamilla, Frederick J. and Marta Anton. 2012. Functions of L1 in the collaborative interaction of beginning and advanced second language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22: 2, 160-188.

Edstrom, Anne. 2006. L1 use in the L2 classroom: One teacher's self-evaluation. *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 63: 2, 275–292.

Ferguson, Gibson. 2003. Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts: Functions, attitudes and policies, *AILA Review*, 16, 38-51.

Ferguson, Gibson. 2009. What next? Towards an agenda for classroom code-switching research. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12: 2, 231 – 241.

Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: CUP

Goffman, Erving Manual. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Howatt, Anthony P. R. 2004. *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Inbar-Lourie, Ofra. 2010. English only? The linguistic choices of teachers of young EFL learners. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14: 3, 351-367

Jefferson, Gail. 2004. Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Gene H. Lerner (ed). *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation.* 13–31. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Johnson, Karen E. 1998. *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kang, Dae-Min. 2008. The classroom language use of a Korean elementary school EFL teacher: Another look at TETE. *System*, 36, 214–226.

Levine, Glenn S. 2011. *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Levine, Glenn S. 2014. Principles for code choice in the foreign language classroom: A focus on grammaring. *Language Teaching*, 47: 3, 332–348.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London, New York: Continuum.

Lin, Angel M.Y., and Peter. W. Martin (eds). 2005. *Decolonisation, Globalisation. Language-in Education Policy and Practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Lin, Angel M. Y. 2013. Classroom code-switching: three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review,* 4: 1, 195 – 218.

Lin, Angel M. Y. 1996. Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and Code-Switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education,* 8, 9–84.

Macaro, Ernesto. 2001. Analysing student teachers' codeswitching in foreign language classrooms: Theories and decision making. *The Modern Language Journal*. 85: 4. 531-548.

Macaro, Ernesto. 2009. Teacher use of codeswitching in the second language classroom: Exploring 'optimal' use. In Miles Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, 35–49. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Markee, Numa and Silvia Kunitz. 2015. CA-for-SLA studies of classroom interaction: Quo vadis? In Numa Markee (ed.). *The Handbook of Classroom Discourse and Interaction*, 425-439. Oxford: Wiley/Blackwell.

Moodley, Visvaganthie. 2007. Codeswitching in the multilingual English first language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10: 6, 707-722.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2011a. National Curriculum for Basic Schools (subject field: foreign languages). Available at https://www.hm.ee/en/national-curricula, accessed 16 March, 2016.

Ministry of Education and Research. 2011b. National Curriculum for Upper Secondary Schools (subject field: foreign languages). Available at https://www.hm.ee/en/national-curricula, accessed 16 March, 2016.

Nakatsukasa, Kimi and Shawn Loewen. 2015. A teacher's first language use in form-focused episodes in Spanish as a foreign language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 19: 2, 133-149.

Polio, Charlene G. and Patricia A. Duff. 1994. Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: a qualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *Modern Language Journal,* 78: 3, 313–326.

Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics,* 7: 8, 581-618.

Probyn, Margie. 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.

Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rolin-Ianziti, Jeanne and Siobhan Brownlie. 2002. Teacher use of learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58: 3, 402-426.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1986. The routine of achievement. *Human Studies,* 9, 111-151.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1993. Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26: 1, 99-128.

Seedhouse, Paul. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Seedhouse, Paul. 2005. Conversation Analysis and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 38: 4, 165 – 187.

Seedhouse, Paul. 2007. Interaction and constructs. In Zhu Hua, Paul Seedhouse, Vivian Cook and Li Wei (eds). *Language Learning and Teaching as Social Inter-Action*, 9-22. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Storch, Naomi and Gillian Wigglesworth. 2003. Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, 37: 4, 760–770.

Tian, Lili and Ernesto Macaro. 2012. Comparing the effect of teacher codeswitching with English-only explanations on the vocabulary acquisition of Chinese university students: A lexical focus-on-form study. *Language Teaching Research*, 16: 3, 367–391.

Turnbull, Miles and Katy Arnett. 2002. Teacher's uses of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 22, 204–218.

Turnbull, M. and J. Dailey-O' Cain. 2009. Concluding reflections: Moving forward. In Miles Turnbull and J. Dailey-O'Cain (eds). *First Language Use in Second and Foreign Language Learning*, 182-186. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Üstünel, Eda and Paul Seedhouse. 2005. Why that, in that language, right now? Codeswitching and pedagogical focus. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15: 3, 302–325.

Wei, Li. 2002. 'What do you want me to say?' On the Conversation Analysis approach to bilingual interaction. *Language in Society,* 31: 2, 159–180.

Wei, Li and Peter Martin. 2009. Conflicts and tensions in classroom codeswitching: an introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12: 2, 117-122.

Wood, David, Jerome S. Bruner and Gail Ross. 1976. The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17: 2, 89–100.

Zabrodskaja, Anastassija. 2005. *Vene-eesti koodivahetus Kohtla-Järve vene emakeelega algkoolilastel.* Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikooli Kirjastus.

APPENDIX 1: Parental consent form

Lugupeetud lapsevanem,

Palume nõusolekut inglise keele tundide lindistamiseks, millest võtab osa ka Teie laps. Uurimuse eesmärgiks on analüüsida õpetaja ja õpilaste vahelist suhtlust võõrkeele tunnis. Tegemist on teadusliku uurimusega, mille käigus analüüsitakse põhikooli inglise keele tunde. Uurimuse läbiviija ise tundides ei viibi ning analüüsib ainult lindistatud materjali. Ligipääs lapse isikuandmetele uurimuse läbiviijal puudub ning lindistusest saadud andmete anonüümsus on garanteeritud.

Uuringut viib läbi Tartu Ülikooli inglise filoloogia osakonna magistrant Sandra Saks. Uuring toimub ajavahemikus aprill-mai 2015.

Täname Teid koostöö eest!

Lugupidamisega,

Natalja Zagura

TÜ inglise filoloogia osakonna didaktik

natalja.zagura@ut.ee

Olen nõus

Lapsevanema allkiri

_____

APPENDIX 2: Transcription conventions

Based on Jefferson (2004) and Markee (2015)

Identification of speakers[10]:

T: teacher
S1: identified learner (Student 1)
S: unidentified learner
S2?: probably Student 2
Ss: several learners simultaneously

Characteristics of speech delivery

<u>word</u>	underscoring indicates word stress
WORD	upper case indicates especially loud sounds
°word°	degree signs indicate that the utterance or word is quieter than the surrounding talk
<word>	indicate slowing down
>word<	inequality signs indicate speeding up
.hhh	in breathing (number of h's indicating the duration of breathing)
hhh	out breathing
::	colons indicate the prolongation of the preceding sound. The longer the colon row the greater the extent of prolongation.
.	a full stop indicates a falling intonation (but not necessarily the end of a sentence)
?	a question mark indicates a rising intonation (but not necessarily a question)
,	a comma indicates a slightly rising intonation suggesting continuation
↓↑	arrows indicate shift into especially high or low pitch
(hhh)	laughter

---

[10] The learners are usually marked with letter L (e. g. L1, L2, LL), but since in this thesis the abbreviation of L1 and L2 are used for marking the first and the second language it was thought best to use S to mark students to avoid confusion in the analysis.

Simultaneous and contiguous utterances

(.)   a dot in parentheses indicates a short interval within or between utterances

(2.0)   numbers in parentheses indicate a longer pause in seconds

–   a dash indicates a cut-off or self-interruption

=   equal sign indicates no break or gap between units of talk

[a left bracket indicates the start of overlapping (along with aligning the overlapping part in the transcript)

]   a right bracket indicates the end of overlapping

Commentary

((cough))   doubled parentheses contain transcriber's comments and descriptions

( )   empty parentheses indicate that the part of talk is unintelligible to the analyst with the length of space indicating the length of speech

(word)   single parentheses indicate the part of speech that is unclear or dubious

word   speech in bold indicates Estonian

→   an arrow in transcript draws attention to a particular phenomenon the analyst wishes to discuss

/…/   indicates that code-switching continues but in a very similar manner

APPENDIX 3: Transcribed data

Extract 1 IR[11]

    1   S1: <u>täiesti</u> [mõttetu]

    2   SS: [(   )]

    3   T: [(hh) **sa vist mõtlesid seda** (hhh)] okay, (.) so:: (.) let's start then

    4   (5.0)

    5   T: ↑Good morning, (.)

    6   SS: Good morning (.)

    7   T: Nice to see you have a seat <u>plea:se</u> (4.0) okay so let's do the <u>test</u> first (.) and then

    8   we'll have one more listening task related to this culture topic (.) and then (0.5) yes

Extract 2 SM

    1   T: could you translate <u>these</u> ones as well (.) **ilukirjandus aimekirjandus** (1.0) so when

    2   you have a look at the- this first exercise (1.0) the subtopic of <u>literature</u> then (.) translate

    3   also these words (.) **ilukirjandus aimekirjandus** (.) mhmh

    4   S1: (1.0) I don't know that's why ( ),

    5   T: You definitely know if you know the first one (.) it's logical

Extract 3 IR

    1   T: **mida sa enne ütlesid et sa kindlasti kirjutad valesti**

    2   S1: (1.0) only one word

    3   S2: jah(h) sellepärast et ma [enne ütlesin et] ma kindlasti kirjutan selle valesti

    4   T: [only one word]

    5   (2.0)

    6   S1: (   )

    7   S2: (see) pastakas kuidagi ma tegin harilikuga,

Extract 4 SM

    1   T: **sa mõtle mida see eesti keeles võiks** (.) **tähendada** (.)

    2   S1: Ma ei kujuta ette ka =

    3   T: =**kui sa vaatad seda** (.) **seda poolt** (3.0)

    4   S1: (   ) oo::ta nüüd (.)

    5   T: **mõtle mida see eesti keeles võiks tähendada** (1.0)

    6   S1: ( )

    7   T: **see on** <u>passive</u>'**i vorm eks ole** (1.0) **et midagi** <u>tehakse</u>. (1.0) **kolmas**

    8   **põhivorm on see**

    9   S1: (1.0) ma tean et see sõna algab täishäälikuga

    10   T: (1.0) mhmh **jah.**

    11   S1: aga ma mõtlen siis (1.0)

    12   T: what <u>kind</u> of play

    13   S1: ee::: mis tähega (.) mis (.)

    14   T: **täishäälikuga** (hh)

---

[11] The letters next to the extracts indicate the allocated category: SM – subject matter, CM – classroom management, IR – interpersonal relations. Letters in parenthesis (SM) indicate secondary pedagogic functions, in other words, a possible other way of categorising the extracts.

15   S1: (   )

16   S2: (2.0) Mis see viies on

17   SS: (   )

18   **T: (4.0) jäta mõni (.) siis vahele vaata edasi võib-olla pärast pärast tuleb**

19   **meelde eksju mõtle (6.0) see viimane ülesanne- on eksju need sõnad mis olid**

20   **teil teemal** film (0.5) and performing arts, so think about those words (1.0)

Extract 5 CM

1   T: **Ma arvan et me võtame siis siit selle** key revisioni (.) **sest et selle puhul tegelikult**

2   **vastu**sed **on siin töövihikus olemas (.) et siis ongi (.) et need kes puuduvad saavad**

3   **siis ka isesesivalt kirjutada (.) teha ja kontrollida (.) et siin (   )**

4   S1: aga kuidas ma (   )

5   T: (hhh) (0.5) **noh (.) see tähendab seda et ega sa ei pea kohe (.) ju tegema sa lihtsalt**

6   **(.) kasvõi noh tagantjärgi et (.) ee enne eksamit kasvõi võid läbi teha et see ei**

7   **tähenda et (.) sa olid kaks päeva olümpiaadil et sa pead hakkama nüüd (.) neid**

8   **tegema lihtsalt põhi**mõtteliselt **sul on nagu võimalik need (.) järgi teha ja ka**

9   **kergesti kontrollida vastuseid siit tagant**

Extract 6 CM

1   S1: õpetaja (.) kuidas ma seda teen

2   T: **see-** (.)this is just listening task let's: ee (.) leave it (.) for a moment (.) until everyone

3   has finished (1.0) (   ) **siit tagant neid kordamisülesandeid et hakkame siis vaikselt**

4   **neid** (.) **teemasid uuesti läbi kordama enne eksamit**

Extract 7 CM

1   S1: ((doing grammar exercises)) õõõ üldse ei viitsi

2   T: (4.0) **kas sa ei viitsi** (.) **või sa ei** <u>oska</u>**?** ((strict tone))

3   S1: Mõlemat =

4   S2: = Mõlemat jah. (1.0) mul on sama lugu

Extract 8 CM (SM)

1   T: And ee now you can also check the answers of these exercises that you have finished

2   ee when you look at- (.) ee page (1.0) two hundred and thirty-five (.) then you can check

3   the answers of those exercises (.) both of you have finished the first (0.5) five six seven

4   S1: (1.0) eight=

5   T: = eight already (.) okay well done (1.0) so you can check your answers and ask if

6   you if you have any doubts (0.5) or questions (3.0) **selles ülesandes kus on need**

7   <u>ees</u>**sõnad et kui te kuskil eksite et siis tõesti märkige see eessõna endal värviliselt**

8   **ära enne eksamit vaatate veel üle õpite selle väljendi väljendi selgeks et siin ei olegi**

9   **midagi nende eessõnade puhul kui lihtsalt ära- (.) õppida kuidas see väljend on.**

10   S2: õpetaja (0.5) mis see give in on (.) kas siin on give up

11   T: (0.5) **ee noh väike vahe on sees** give up **on nagu rohkem-** <u>alla</u> **andma aga** give in

12   on- **noh järele andma et seal on nagu väike see:** (   ) **vahe**

13   S2: kas siia võib mõlemad panna siis=

14   T: = **nohjah siin ei ole nüüd jah seda** (0.5) <u>kon</u>**teksti eks ju** (0.5) **et põhimõtteliselt**

15   **võib pigem (.) jah kui ta ütleb et mitte nii kergesti ma ei anna alla ma ei anna**

16   **järele nii kergesti tegelikult võivad mõlemad olla**

/…/

Extract 9 CM

1   T: mhmh yeah exactly (.) here are quite enough (.) printing mistakes

2   S1: mul läks kõik jumala pekki ju

3   Ss: ((noise))

4   T: **jah** <u>her</u>self so they mean (.) yeah (.) as if it was the answer

5   S2: (3.0) again some mistake=

6   T: **=aga siis oleks võinud siin olla need jutumärgid ka eksju et on aru saada et see**

7   **on vastus et kellega James räägib kas iseendaga või oma<u>ette</u>**

8   S2: (0.5) again

9   T: mhmh (.) **just** (.) yeah

Exctract 10 SM

1   S1: kas see cheer up oli julgustama või.

2   T: **jah** (.) **täpselt** [**või-** mhmh]=

3   S?:   [cheer you up]

4   T: **=või samamoodi nagu kellelegi <u>tuju heaks</u> tegema eks ole et** (.) how can I cheer

5   you up:: **kuidas ma saan sul** (.) **meele heaks teha** (1.0) OK now we can then start

6   with:: those listening tasks (.) eee:: <u>it's</u> then:: (1.0) or actually jah (.) three different

7   listening tasks

Exctract 11 CM

1   T: okay. ee we shall: e (0.5) have the next less:- listening tasks in the next (.) lesson

2   [then]=

3   Ss: [yes]

4   T: =because we only have (.) one more minute eee (0.5) **lepime siis kokku et (.)**

5 →   **järgmise nädala esmaspäevast on kõik koolis et ma saan selgitada teile seda**

6 →   **paaristööd et te saate valida omale teemad** (.) **et pärast on jälle natukene**

7 →   **keerulisem** >**keda ei ole**<=

8   S1: =sorry ee (.) which (.) lesson we have (.) like

9 →   T: (0.5) **esmaspäeval on niiviisi et me oleme seal** (0.5)=

10   S2: [jaa aktusel]

11→   T=[**kogunemisel**] **aga see kestab vist ainult kakskümmend minutit vähemalt oli** (.)

12→   **jah** (.) **nii et peale seda on meil täpselt piisavalt aega et selgitada** (0.5) **mida tegema**

13 →   **peab kes kellega koos** (.) **töötab ja nii edasi** (.) **aga=**

14   S2: =next week will be <u>really</u> weird (.) because we have all these events (.) and (I think)

15   that o::n Wednesday (.) me and Lauri and (   ) will be missing because (.) <we

16   ha::ve practice (.) for our choir (.) performance>

17 →   T: (1.0) **jah, täpselt no aga siis võib-olla olekski hea et me saame esmaspäeval need**

18 →   **asjad ära selgitada need teemad välja otsida** (.) **ja siis on teil paar tundi aega**

19 →   **niimoodi omas tempos siis töötada**, **et kes on proovis peavad natuke tihedamalt**

20 →   **siis tegema** (.) goodbye

Extract 12 IR

1   T: okay so:: our plans for today then- eee let's have a look at the (.) some:: (.)

2   exercises related to <u>sentence</u> structures so how to <u>avoid</u> too simple sentence

3   constructions how to make a little bit more complicated sentences what kind of

4   linking words to use and ee (0.5) yes (.) and also (.)

5   S1: tere

6   T: hello (.) welcome=
7   S1: =õpetaja mul on vaja ära minna
8   T: (1.0) **ee ütleb Kasper** ja (h) **is**(h)**istub kohale** [(hhh)] (4.0)
9   SS: [(hhh)]
10   T: **mis toimub**
11   S?: pea valutab tahan (tabletti)
12   S1: [Eee..(1.0)]
13   S?: kutid
14   S1: ee::=
15   T: =**Mis on Kasper**
16   S1: ma lähen isale app::i
17   S?: aaah koolist (   )
18   SS: (   )
19   S2: Kõik on [korras või]
20   T: **[õpetaja kas] teil on midagi seSse vastu et ma lähen ↑isale appi**?=
21   S1: =õpetaja, kas teil on midagi seSse vastu, et ma lähen isale appi=
22   T: =**sul on väga vaja minna jah**
23   S3: in [English] please
24   S1:   [Jah]
25   T: **Niisiis vaata e-koolist** (.) **mis me täna teeme** (.) **Evert õpetab suSse kodus**
26   **teeb eratunni**
27   S1: Head aega
28   T: Goodbye.

Extract 13 SM (IR)
1   S1: kas siin taga pole vastuseid (0.5)
2   T: ↑**on küll aga ära neid praegu ↑<u>vaata.</u> veel**,
3   S1: ( ) aga ma ei oska ju=
4   T: = **proovi nii palju kui oskad siis me kohe hakkame neid arutama** (.) **vaatame et**
5   **mi- millal** (1.0) (võib) **neid sõnu kasutada** (2.0) **no kõik ei sobi kindlasti esimesse**
6   (0.5) **kui sa- vaatad nüüd neid tähendusi** (.) **ins**<u>tead</u> **on eks ju selle asemel et** (.) **noh**
7   (0.5) **ta ei saa** [**alustada ju lauset**]
8   S1:   [because sobib]
9   S1: (0.5) (   ) sobib
10   T: (1.0) **ei** (.) because **on ju eksju on see millega sa** <u>seod</u> **lauseid ta peab olema siis**
11   **seal** (.) **keskel sellepärast et kõigepealt tood põhjuse ja siis** because

Extract 14 SM
1   S1: eee:: (0.5) is it OK? (6.0) like that (.) it's (given) here close (.) at (0.5) ro-route as
2   well as=
3   T: =**jah siis siis võiks olla näiteks as well as** (.) about to (.) **et vaata et ta on** (.)
4   **populaarne kelle hulgas ee külaelanike** (.) **ja külastajate hulgas ja nüüd on siin**=
5   SS: [( ) tagant ju]
6   T: =[as well as] **siis oleks samuti eksju siis sa peaksid veel loetlama mingi kolmanda**
7   **grupi kelle hulgas ta on populaarne** (0.5).
8   S1: I still wouldn't use because here (.) I would use (1.0) both eee villagers and visitors
9   (1.0) ee and about 2000 visitors who come to the fair to buy (1.0) I think it's <u>weird</u>

10   T: **vaata nad siin toovad ära justkui selle põhjuse-** (.) **et miks ta on populaarne nad**

11   **selgitavad nagu seda** (0.5) **sellega**

12   (4.0)

13   T: I think so (.) yes let's have a look at that let's let's discuss ee:: s::ome of those (.) a

14   little bit more- complicated cases may<u>be</u> so:: (0.5) you probably have also ee checked

14   your answers but- let's just read (.) this lett:er ((reading out responses))

Extract 15 SM

1   S1: called a cuc<u>koo</u> fair (1.0) although /ɔːlˈðru:/ it [a (.) dates]

2   T: [wa- what] was the word

3   S1: although / ɔːlˈðru:/

4   S2: [although /ɔːlˈðəʊ/]

5   T: [al<u>though</u> /ɔːl<u>ˈðəʊ</u>/] **jah** al<u>though</u> /ɔːlˈðəʊ/

6   S1: although /ɔːl<u>ˈðəʊ</u>/ it dates back to the (.) 16th century (.) people (called) it- as the

7   beginning (.) of spring.

8   S2: ( )

9   T: yeah (.) that's right so- ää although? (.) what could be the E<u>stonian</u> (0.5) meaning

10   of [this word] the translation

11   S1: [kuigi]

12   S?: [kuigi]=

13 →   T: **=kuigi (.) jah seda te [saate kasutada]**=

14   S3:   [( )]

15 →   T: **=kuidas**?

16   S3: see ei ole ju loogiline

17 →   T: **noh et- kui** (.) **selles mõttes on et kuigi ee:: ta on nii vana** (.) **pärit 16. sajandist**

18 →   **eks ole** (.) **sellegipoolest-** (0.5) **isegi praegu igal kevadel seda tähistatakse. et selles**

19 →   **mõttes ta sobib sobib siia kenasti.** (1.0) okay (.) what about then the next (1.0) ee

Extract 16 SM

1   S1: It's popular with both village- villagers a:nd visitors because about (.) 20 000

2   people come to the fair (.) to buy (.) either loc:al products (.) or handmade crafts. (0.5)

3   [also]

4   T: [mhm] okay let's make a stop here (.) so: ee yes this word (.) <u>because.</u> (0.5) was the

5   one that-

6   S2: yeah

7   T: mhm so (0.5) they (.) it's like the <u>reason</u> (1.0) why is it so popular (.) with (.) both

8   (.) villagers and visitors (.) and now they explain it [using because]

9   S2:   [It's popular with] villagers and

10   visitors because (.) about (.) 20 000 people °come° (.) that's the <u>reason</u>?

11   T: **no nagu no see on nagu nii-öelda jah tõestus või või põhjus** (.) **jah**=

12   S2: =<u>That</u>'s weird

13   T: mhmh bu-but I (.) actually I understand ee (.) why you think that it i (.) that it can

14   be a little bit weird I agree

Extract 17 SM

1   S1: can ee (2.0) as well as ee (2.0) can there be instead (.) of (0.5) could I also use

2   instead (.) in the last [ee (0.5) gap]

3   S?:   [siis see peaks olema of siis]

4   T: (0.5) instead of: **oleks meil siis vaja** (0.5) **jaa sellisel juhul peab** (1.0) **muidu**

5   tähenduse vahe on neil ka eks ole et sellisel juhul muudaks ta lause tähendust et

6   **nad** <u>kuula</u>**vad või**=

7   S2: =but we don't know [what's the meaning of the sentence]

8   T: [yeah yes but-]

9   S3: oota mis see viimane oli siis (1.0)

10   Ss: [as well as]

11   T: [as well as] **samuti jah** (2.0) okay and finally the last passage (1.0) ee Samuel

Extract 18 SM

1   T: That's right. so ou this <u>however</u> is:: quite difficult to (.) translate (2.0)

2   S1: [kui te]

3   T: [do you understand] the meaning yes

4   S2: kuid

5   T: **kuigi** (0.5) **sellegi**<u>poolest</u> (.) **jälle sõltub sõltub** <u>kontekstist</u>=

6   S3: =niisiis või (.)

7   T: **mhmh jah ja seesama see** <u>so</u> **eksju ka tegelikult väga lihtne lihtne ee** (.) **lihtne**

8   **väike sõna** (.) **millega te jälle saaksite ka oma kirjutisi- noh natuke huvitavamaks**

9   **teha et võtad kokku midagi et SEEGA** (.) so (0.5)

10   S1?: see however on vist nagu rohkem nagu et kui sa oled kuhugile natuke uitama

11   läinud ja siis ütled et (.) ah however (.) nagu tuled nagu tuled teema juurde tagasi

12   T: **j::ah:: ta võib isegi ka selles olukorras olla jah sellises situatsioonis**

13   S3?: however minu meelest ei sobi üldse siia

14   T: **jah** (h) **ja üldse jah selliseid ülesandeid tegelikult** (.) **ee** (0.5) **ku-kus peaks**

15   **kasutama neid** (.) **selliseid sõnu nagu siin teil see** linking words **on ka** <u>üsna</u> **raske** (.)

16   **i**s**e koostada sest-** (.) **ikkagi lauses teinekord võib olla mitu erinevat võimalust** (.)

17   **me: tõlgendame neid neid lauseid erinevalt aga noh- enam-vähem siin see**

18   **ülesanne nagu toimis**. okay let's now try to play (.) Kahoot on those linking words

Extract 19 CM

1   T: Is there anyone who (1.0) would like to have <u>my</u> mobile phone

2   S1: I will (.) teacher can I have your (.) mobile phone if if you take away the sceen (.)

3   (lock)

4   T: Eee (.) yes I think that (.) it's better <u>now</u> (1.0)

5   Ss: (   ) ((noise))

6   T: **ta peaks kauem- ta peaks kauem o: olema nüüd ma nagu** (1.0) **et viimane**

7   viimased korrad kui keegi on laenanud siis ei ole kurtnud enam selle üle (.) **et ma**

8   **panin nagu pikemaks selle aja**

9   (9.0) ((everyone's finding their phones to log in))

10   T: just a second

11   (6.0)

12   S?: mille kohta me teeme

13   T: linking words

Extract 20 SM

1   S2: aga seal ei saa kaks of-i- inspite of of this (.) ei saa olla ju ( )
2   S?: saab küll ju
3   S2: ei saa ju
4   S3: inspite
5   T: **ei saa jah tegelikult** (hhh)
6   S3: ma vaatasin selle järgi ju
7   T: **jah** (.) **samas** however of **eks ole** although of **ka ei saa olla.**
8   S3: ongi ma paningi <u>however</u> noh (0.5)
9   T: (hhh)
10   S3: ma ei <u>mängi</u> enam seda
11   T: okay what's the difference between (.) inspite of and despite
12   S4: despite (0.5) ee (1.0) [grammar   (   )]
13   S?:   [(   ) see on nagu]
14   T: **tegelikult nad mõlemad tähendavad seda et vaatamata millelegi** (.) **lihtsalt et**
15   **ongi vaja meeles pidada et** (.) <u>despite</u> (.) **on ilma nende eessõnadeta eksju** in spite
16   of (.) **aga lihtsalt** despite **vahel õpilased panevad kokku et** despite of **ja nii edasi et**
17   **nagu** (.) so (.) yes
/…/
18   T: ee you can't use inspite here because (.) ee this of is missing now. but you can use
19   despite (.) and despite always requires this <u>-ing</u> form despite doing something
20   L: mis nende vahe uuesti oli mis vahe neil on
21   T: they mean the same thing actually (.) but what students sometimes tend to confuse
22   which one takes <u>of</u> and which one not so

Extract 21 CM (SM)

1   S1: misasi see whereas /weræss/ on?
2   S? : isegi kui tema töötab siis (   )
3   T: okay (.) whereas /weərˈæz/ **jah** whereas? (0.5)
4   S1?: It's the first time when I hear that word
5   T: ↑okay yes, (.) but it's good to (.) to remember it **jah** whereas **samal ajal kui** (.) **jah**
6   (.) <u>samal</u> **ajal kui** (.) whereas (.) Tim works hard [whereas his brother Tom doesn't]
7   S2:   [esimest korda kuulen sellist]
8   T: **noh** (.) ↑**väga hea** (.) **siis saadki ära õppida**
9   S2: this is <u>so</u> booring
10   S3: absoluutselt
11   T: Alari (.) **selle** <u>mõte</u> **ongi see et sa õpiksid uusi asju. praegu sul ongi see võimalus**.
12   S2: [(   )]
13   S3: [mida see tähendab]
14   T: **samal ajal** (.) **samal ajal** (.) **kui noh** (.) mhmh **selles mõttes et kui sa** (0.5) **räägid**
15   S3: pole elu sees sellist sõna näinud=
16   S2: =ongi
17   Ss: (   )
18   T: **siis nüüd nägid**

Extract 22 SM

1   T: however (.) is the correct one the man fell off the ladder however he wasn't hurt.
2   S1: ma olen kolmas
3   T: (0.5) what's the: (.) this on the other <u>hand</u> (.) **jah seda sa saad siis kui sa kui sa**
4   **võrdled et** (.) **et ühest küljest teisest küljest** (.) **ja**h (.)
5   S2: Ma olen neljas (.) ma olen neljas
6   S1?: (0.5) ma <u>kuuls</u>in juba
7   S1: (0.5) ma tean ma olen neljas

Extract 23 SM

1   S1: oo::jee::
2   Ss: ((noise))
3   T: (3.0) although **jah** (.) **kuigi**
4   S1: (0.5) as well as it was summer (   )
5   T: **jah** although

Extract 24 SM

1   S1: seal võib kaks tükki olla ju (.) while või until (1.0) vist
2   S2: ma panin valesti
3   S3?: yes::
4   Ss: ((making singing sounds))
5   S?: [<u>viiendale</u> kohale]
6   T: [mhmh no] only until is possible (.) **jah** <u>enne</u> **ta ei asutanud oma** (.) **äri kui ta**
7   tundis et (.) **ta on selleks valmis**
8   S?: (   ) keegi kolmas olla
9   T: okay some more questions to go

Extract 25 SM

1   T: what [yes what's the meaning of this in case]
2   S2:   [a miks ta võttis ta võttis] kaasa krediitkaardi juhul kui ta peaks (.) raha otsa
3   saama või
4   T: **jah** (.) **juhuks kui tal peaks raha otsa saama jah** in <u>case</u> (0.5) as soon as **eksju**
5   **tähendab nii pea kui** (.) **et siis peaks olema ta võttis kaasa krediitkaardi niipea kui**
6   **ta kuulis et kaubamajas on soodukad** (.) <u>siis</u> **võiks kasutada näiteks seda** as soon
7   as=
8   S3: =aga mis vahe on in case ja in case of
9   S?: ma ei tea mul on (   )
10   T: ee (.) **siis peaks järgnema nimisõna näiteks** (.) in case of emergency (.) **et**
11   **hädaolukord** (3.0) and the last one then

Extract 26 CM

1   S1: keegi on kadunud
2   S2: ei sinna ei mahu lihtsalt
3   Ss: ((noise))
4   S3: õpetaja palju kräsu punkte sai
5   **T: jah ta näitab alati jah** (.) **seda esimest viite paraku et ta võiks rohkemaid**
6   **näidata** (.) okay
7   Ss: ((noise))

8   T: **mhmh jah nii et siit see uus sõna siis see** <u>whereas (.)</u> jah (.)=
9   Ss: ((background noise))
10   T: =[**see** (.) **võib ka tähendada samas eksju et see-**] **hea sõna mida selgeks õppida**
11   (.) **et ega nende-** (1.0) **SEE** LINKING WORDS **ONGI selline**=
12   S?: =**minu** (   ) **istub siin**
13   T: (hh) (0.5) okay now you can (.) now you can take your (0.5) old seats (5.0) **see**
14   linking words **ongi ongi selline teema et et seda** (.) **seda ongi kõige lihtsam** (0.5)
15   **omandada läbi** <u>harjutamise</u> **mida rohkem sa üritad oma kirjutistes neid sõnu**
16   **kasutada või- samamoodi kui sa loed mingeid tekste et pöörad tähelepanu** (.)
17   **kuidas neid lauseid on omavahel ühendatud või kuidas seda teksti on** (.) **sidusaks**
18   **muudetud** (.) **et siis need hakkavadki tulema loomulikult. et üsna raske on neid**
19   **lihtsalt niimoodi tuimalt pähe tuupida et** (.) however **tähendab seda** although
20   **tähendab seda ja** (.) **ja nii edasi**. (0.5) okay (.) ee now the next task (.) eee just a
21   moment please

Extract 27 IR
1   T: Evert (.) **kas see on** (.) **okei et su pildi kirjeldus on** (   )
2   S1: ye::s (   )
3   T: (4.0) okay so first I'll (   ) you to pick one of the pictures

Extract 28 CM
1   S1: aa kas ma pean rewrite'ima või lihtsalt <u>add</u>'ima (.) words
2   T: No you have to <u>rewrite</u> (.) the sentence
3   S2: ((makes a sound of dislike))
4   T: **sest sul on vaja ju** (.) **vahepeal teha kahest lühikesest lausest üks pikem lause**
5   **näiteks**
6   S2: aa

Extract 29 SM
1   T: okay so (.) what did we agree on?
2   S1: (1.0) ee (4.0) on everything
3   T: (hhhh) okay you have to now summarise (.) all the points that we agreed on
4   S1: (1.0) mm (0.5)
5   T: **lihtsalt nagu korda üle eks ju et me leppisime kokku**
6   S1: [aaa]
7   T: [mhmh]
8   S1: we agreed on (.) Eiffel tower (2.0) eee bus:: trip (0.5) a::nd ee biology and (.) theatre
9   (.) biology museum and theatre and ee (1.0) art gallery
10   T: that's sounds like a plan (.) thank you

Extract 30 CM
1   T: so have a nice weekend goodbye
2   S?: (   ) sööma
3   S1: bye
4   T: ee (0.5) **Evert kas sa** (.) **saad veel minutiks jääda** (.) **vaatame paar su viga ka üle**
5   S2: Jah

Extract 31 CM

1   T: okay (.) but then let's start with the last presentation so (.) the floor is (.) is yours

2   (2.0) and your topic was (.) music

3   S1: Kas ma hindan mõlemat ve

4   T: (0.5) **nojah jällegi sa ei pea paneme neile ühesugust arvu punkte (.) et sa võid**

5   **ka kirjutada ma võin ka paberit sulle juurde anda eksju et kui (.) kui nende (.)**

6   **kõne on erineva kvaliteediga siis (.) siis ei pea panema ühepalju**

7   S1: põhjuseid ei pea panema

8   T: (0.5) **kuidas**?

9   S1: põhjuseid ei pea panema v

10   T: (0.5) **hea oleks kui sa mõne kommentaari ka ikkagi paneksid**

11   S1: ( ) piirduda ainult punktidega

12   T: **ma arvan et kommentaarid on palju kasulikumad eks (.) et sa põhjendad ära**

13   **et miks sa siis kolm panid näiteks (.) ütle neile mis sinu meelest valesti oli** okay (.)

14   so (0.5) let's listen

Extract 32 CM

1   S4: cancer vist

2   Ss: ((noise))

3   S2: tal ei olnud vähki

4   S1: Ma kuulsin et tal oli tuberkuloos ei olnud v,

5   S2: ei olnd [ei olnd]

6   S?:   [võis küll olla]

7   S?: see on ju loodus

8   Ss: (hh)

9   T: **selle (.) selle aja (.) kohta** (1.0) **tuberkuloos sellel ajal ometi liikus (.) aga jah mis**

10   **mis see täpne diagnoos nüüd nüüd on**

11   S2: no seal oligi kirjas et nagu (.) spekuleeritakse:: (.) paljude võimaluste üle kuidas ta

12   võis surra aga (.) jah et mis see kõige tõenäolisem oli (1.0)

13   T: **noh** you can maybe you can read it and you can tell us (.) tomorrow?

Extract 33 IR

1   S1: Ma ei jaksa õpetaja <u>mitte</u> midagi teha lihtsalt uni on

2   T: **No:: (.) katsu ennast kokku võtta enam ei ole palju jäänud** (0.5)

3   S2: Täiega mõttetu päev on noh

4   T: **Ei ole mõttetu päev me hakkame- esiteks (.) sa said näha suurepärast ettekannet**

5   **(.) eee Mozartist ee (.) teiseks sa saad <u>kohe</u> hakata kordama seda (.) kuidas inglise**

6   **keeles (.) väljendada tulevikku erinevates olukordades**

7   Ss: ((noise))

8   T: So you <u>can't</u> say that this day is <u>point</u>less (.) definitely not

9   S2: This lesson makes my day every day ((very excited voice))

10   T: (hh) I'm happy to hear that (2.0) and of course you didn't (.) use any i::rony when

11   you said that

Extract 34 SM

1   T: So (.) future simple yes is then one (0.5) eee (.) tense that we can use for future forms

2   (.) for expressing (.) future

3   S?: oiiii ((sighing as if in pain))

4   T: (1.0) **tulevad tuttavad ette need reeglid**?
5   Ss: Ye::s
6   T: Mhmh so (.) ee what kind of other tenses (2.0) could we use?
7   S1: (3.0) will (.) would (1.0) ei
8   S2: °what was the question° ((whispering))
9   T: **mhmh mis ae-aegu veel saaks kasutada tuleviku väljendamiseks üks on see will**
10   **eks aga seda saab ainult nendes olukordades kasutada mis ee** (0.5) **mida siis**
11   **kasutada kui meil on**:: (1.0) **mingi kindel plaan** <**näiteks**> (.) **sa oled juba kindlalt**
12   **paika pannud mida sa** (.) **homme teed mingid kohtumised kokku leppinud**
13   S3?: continuous ve?
14   S1: (0.5) continuous ei saa olla
15   T: **jah** what kind of- continuous
16   S1: Ei saa olla
17   T: (hhh) **saab küll olla kui sa paned <u>õige</u>** continuouse **sinna eks ju** (hhh) (1.0) **jah**
18   **tegelikult** future continuous **on ka olemas aga ma lihtsalt ei aja teid praegu sellega**
19   **segadusse seda te hakkate järgmine** (.) **või ülejärgmine aasta** (.) **õppima aga aga**
20   <u>present</u> continuous **on on**
/…/

Extract 35 SM
1   T: okay and you can also use present simple (1.0) for future (.) in what kind of situations
2   can you use present simple (3.0)
3   S1: when you are doing something (.)
4   S2: yes
5   S3: ye:::ah
6   T: (1.0) when you think about <u>future</u> (.) **just mõeldes sellele tuleviku tähenduses**
7   **muidugi** (.) present simple **kasutad kui sa räägid igapäevaselt et mida sa iga päev**
8   **teed ja nii edasi aga just nagu <u>tuleviku</u> tähenduses** (0.5) **et**,
9   S1: (0.5) I will eat a parrot ve
10   T: (0.5) (hh) **ei** present simple (.) **jah** present simple
11   S2: (   ) it is being increased
12   T: **jah** <u>time</u>tables (.) **a-ainus-** (.) **jah** (.) **mis see** timetables **on**
13   S3: (0.5) aja<lauad>
14   T: **need igasugused [aja-(.) kavad]**=
15   Ss: [(hhh)]
16   T: =**sõiduplaanid** (.) **et kui sa räägid sellest** (.) **mis kell sinu rong** (.) **homme saabub**
17   **või mis kell sinu rong homme väljub** (.) **see on tulevik** (.) **eee aga sa kasutad seda**
18   present simple'**it** (.) my train leaves (.) at (.) five o'clock tomorrow or (.) my plane
/…/

Extract 36 IR
1   T: maybe booked ee (1.0) the band and and found (.) catering [and so on]
2   S1:   [a miks seal] (s) lõpus on
3   T: (1.0) I <u>told</u> you that õ (.) it's (0.5) a small error.
4   S1: sodige selle punasega üle
5   T: (1.0) (hh) no I won't do that (.) **ma olen vist teile kunagi** (.) **rääkinud kuidas meil**
6   **üks** (.) **õppejõud lasi ee selle** (0.5) **valge seina peale- noh vist** (.) **tookord siis veel**
7   **kilede pealt.** ((35 words omitted)) **aga ta oli eelmises ruumis harjunud et kui ta**

8   **kile pealt lasi ee tahvlile siis tegi nagu märkmeid juurde**. (.) **aga tal läks seal teises**

9   **klassis meelest ära see.** (h) **ja siis võttis ka seina peal või noh kirjutas valge seina**

10   **peale** (h) (.) **juurde ühe sõna** (.) **ta oli väga ehmatanud just oli** (.) **remont tehtud ja**

11   (.) ((location omitted)) **seal kuskil neljanda korruse klassides**=

12   S1: =visati visati välja kohe jah ah

13   T: **ei loomulikult ei visatud aga lihtsalt meie jaoks oli see nii naljakas** (.) **et me ei**

14   **suutnud kuidagi viisakalt** (.) **naeru** (.) **tagasi hoida samas tema läks ise väga ähmi**

15   **täis** (.) **ja** (0.5) **tõttas otsima koristajat ja neid neid vahendeid** (.) **et,** (.)

16   S?: (   ) [olekski keemiaklassis]

17   S2:   [oleks võind pildi panna]

18   Ss: (h)

19   T: **kuidas?**

20   S2: oleks võind pildi panna lihtsalt selle seina peale=

21   T: =↑**noh täpselt eksju pildi asemele et**

22   S3: nii kurb. (0.5)

23   T: **no tegelikult ma arvan et ee et see oli selles mõttes päris hu**<u>**moorikas**</u> **et ega keegi**

24   **talle midagi halvasti ei öelnud ja see** (.) **naer oli ka pigem selline** (.) **heatahtlik.**

25   S1?: ei usu

26   T: **nii et ühesõnaga** (.) **tänan pakkumast** (h) (.) **aga ma ei kavatse** (hh) **siia ekraani**

27   **peale midagi ee: joonistada** (0.5) okay and one more (.) example

Extract 37 SM

1   T: okay, so look at the last one.

2   (8.0)

3   S1: will

4   S2: would be või will

5   T: mhm why will Evert?

6   S1: That I will meet (   )

7   T: mhmh

8   S3: and why?

9   S1: because you <u>will.</u>

10   T: (0.5) **jah miks miks** will **miks mitte** I am <u>meeting</u> **või** I am <u>going</u> to meet

11   S2: minu meelest would äkki ve

12   T: **ei** will **sobib küll**.

13   S1: (1.0) No:: lihtsalt on nii.

14   T: **mis reegliga ta kokku läheb. millal sa kasutasid seda** will'i

15   S1: future simple reegel ve

16   T: (0.5) **kui** <u>horoskoop</u> (0.5) **on eks ole** (.) <u>ennustus</u> (.) **jah**? **sa ei saa olla sada**

17   **protsenti kindel et horoskoop ei ütle sulle ette mida sa kavatsed teha** (.) **jah ta see**

18   **on see on nagu en-ennustus** so yes it is then (.) future simple (.) I <u>will</u> meet (0.5) okay?

19   (.) and now the last (.) I think these are the last ones

/…/

Extract 38 CM

1   T: let's start with (.) exercise three so let's leave one and two (.) a::nd (4.0) let's have

2   a look at exercises three four and five (.) first of all (7.0) **harjutused kolm ja neli on**

3   **küll eesti keele põhised et et eksamites tulevikus teil selliseid** (.) **ülesandeid ei ole**.
4   **aga noh alustuseks** (.) **soojenduseks** (0.5) **ee sobivad küll** (.) **edasi juba viies** (.) **ja**
5   **mida me homme vaatame on siis** (0.5) **seda tüüpi nagu te hiljem erinevates testides**
6   **tulevikus** (1.0) **la-lahendama peate**
7   (14.0)
8   T: **jah ja see on ju sinu töövihik eksju sinna võid sa julgelt kirjutada Mati**
9   S1: (1.0) jah (0.5) ma tean (2.0) ma ei taha tinti kulutada (2.0) eksamid on tulemas

Extract 39 SM
1   S1: aaa must puding,
2   S2: (1.0) °mis see on°
3   S1: sa ei tea v (0.5) puding (.) tead (asi on) puding
4   S2: (0.5) °mis see must puding on°
5 → T: (1.0) **mis on** black pudding **v**?
6   S2: jah
7 → T: **ee inglastel** (.) **selline tüüpiline jõulu** (.) **jõulu söök** black pudding
8   S2: (1.5) siin on nagu et eesti (.) eesti toit=
9 → T: =**jaa** (.) **ja tihtipeale** (.) **ee seda ee selle** <verivorsti> **tähenduses kasutatakse ka**
10 → black pudding. **kuigi ta tegelikult ei anna nagu-** (.) **noh päris seda vere- verivorsti**
11 → (.) **noh olemust ikkagi edasi et**,
12   S1?. ma olen kuulnud black pudding sauseages
13 → T: **jah et kui siis peaks lisama kindlasti see** sausage **sinna lõppu** (.) **sest et- sest et**
14 → **muidu jah meil on ta nagu teise teise kujuga ta ei ole nagu vorsti kujuga et**
15 → **enamasti ongi siuke** (.) **nagu** (.) **noh** (   ) (2.0) mhmh
16   S2: °mis asi (   ) musta värvi puding°
17   Ls. ((noise))
18   L?: °eino ongi ma mõtlesingi et see ei ole et see tähendabki (   ) °
19 → T: **jah ja paljudes õpikutes jah kus on** (.) **siis need siis juttu** (.) **ka eesti jõulu**
20 → **toitudest et siis on on küll tõlgitud selle verivorsti** (.) **asemel kasutatud** black
21   pudding, (1.0)

Extract 40 SM
1   L: I'm looking forward to seeing some (friends) and surfers there (.) love from Pamela
2   T: mhmh and ee when you look at the last (.) gap this number twelve (.) here you have
3   two possibilities (0.5) **kaks võimalust mäletate kui me harjutasime seda kirja**
4   **kirjutamist** (.) **sa võid öelda** (.) I <u>look</u> (.) forward (.) to **või** I am looking forward to
5   **mõlemad on lubatud aga aga et edasi kindlasti oleks see ing vorm** (.) I look forward
6   to seeing or I am looking forward to seeing (.) that's right (.) well done Ragnar

Extract 41 SM
1   S3: I'm an exchange student from Montreal. (1.0) I come to Estonia (.) in August
2   T: **Ah- vaata** <u>in</u> August (.) **jah**
3   S3: I <u>came</u>
4   T: **ma <u>tulin</u> Eestisse jah** (.) I <u>came</u> to Estonia in August
5   S1: Can I ask a (.) question
6   S3: No. (.) an:d (.) I:
7   Ss: (hhh)
8   S3: will leave in June

9   S1: ahh ((sighing))
10   T: You can ask your question soon (.) let's:: just (.) check the beginning of this exercise
11   (0.5) okay I will (.) leave in June- (.) any other possibilities here
12   S3: (0.5) no
13   S4: I'm go::ing to leave
14   S?: (.) >mida sa ajad< jälle noh=
15   T: =**siin on nüüd tõesti** (.) **palju** (.) **palju variante** (.) **kui tal on juba** (0.5)
16   **lennupiletid olemas näiteks broneeritud võiks ka kasutada** and I'm leaving (.) **et**
17   **(.0.5) tõepoolest siin kontekstist me ei saa aru et võib olla mitmeid variante** I will
18   leave (.) I'm leaving,
19   S5: (0.5) siin on ju kaks seda kriipsu siis on vist kaks sõna
20   T: **jah kui nüüd need kriipsud nüüd on selle järgi** (0.5) (hh) **jah** (2.0) **jah siis oleks**
21   will (.) leave (.) **jah**
22   S?: (3.0) teacher?
/…/

Extract 42 CM
1   T: **nii vaatame kümnenda lüngangi ära siis ülejäänu jätame homseks jah**?
2   S?: (   ) one of the friends
3   T: ↓**vaatame** kümnenda **lüngangi ära palun** ((insisting)) (2.0) **meil on veel aega** (.)
4   **täpselt kaks minutit oota palun Alari las Ragnar võtab oma töövihiku uuesti lahti**
5   Ss: (hhh)
6   (3.0)
7   S1: teacher (.) can I ask you now=
8   T: =no. (.) first of all we have to (.) ee check half of this exercise
9   S2: (1.0) kas ma alustan kümnendast või
10   S1: jah:: ((sighing))
11   T: ↓**palun alusta sealt kust pooleli jäi** ((insisting)) (0.5) well one of my friends **oli ve**
12   (.) **jah**
13   S2: (1.0) kas Ragnaril on õpik
14   T: **jah. Ragnaril on nüüd töövihik lahti** (.) **niimoodi kõik kuulavad sind**

Exctract 43 CM
1   T: so first of all (.) ee I would like to collect your descriptions because oth- othwerwise
2   maybe we (.) forget later=
3   S1: =<kodutöö on tegemata>
4   T: so Irina and Lauri and Marina,
5   S2: (0.5) ma kirjutan selle ümber kähku sest mul on nii (.) soditud
6   T: (0.5) **aga mitte praegu tunni ajal**=
7   S3: mul tuli kaheksakümmend kolm sõna
8   T: =**siis tood** (.) **pärast**
9   S4: mul tuli viiskümmend seitse (.) pluss
10   S5: mul tuli (.) täpselt parajalt
11   T: **viiskümmend seitse pluss** (.) **kakskümend viis** (.) **jah**
12   S?: ma ei tea veel ma ei ole [(   )]
13   S5:   [mul oli esialgses] versioonis sada üks sõna ja ma jõudsin
14   selleni et mul oli kuuskümmend (.) midagi (.) mingi kuuskümmend üheksa sõna

15   T: (0.5) **ee täpselt need kes on head kirjutajad kellel tekst voolab on päris raske**
16   **selle seitsekümmend viis sõnaga** (.) **ee valmis saada kui eriti veel** [**kui sa pead**]=
17   S?:   [nii raske]
18   T: = **kõik need kolm punkti läbi kirjutama eksju ma kujutan ette et** (.) **mõned siin**
19   **kirjutaksid sellest ühest** (.) **punktist ainuüksi** (.) **eee selle** (.) **sõnadearvu täis**
20   S?: e-eriti mul oli:: see (.) oma lemmik (.) teema see Lõuna-Korea (   )
21   seitsekümmend viis sõna täis ((very excitedly))
22   T: okay. so:: (.) right. (.) ee first of all before we continue with ee grammar and tenses

Extract 44 CM (IR)
1→   T: **kes tahab seda ru::brikut vaadata jah et mille eest need punktid täpselt olid**
2→   **eksju** co::ntent (.) vocabulary (.) grammar ee then (0.5) the fluency (.) and the visual
3   props (4.0)
4   S1: ee kas meil on hinded ka sees juba
5   T: would you like to have a look at this
6   S1: yes
7   T: (0.5) mhmh (.) **nii** (.) Evelin (2.0) these were (.) for you Alari (.) comments
8   from other students
9   S2: (   )
10→ T: (1.0) **ja:: no ma ütlengi et** (.) **et igal sellel ettekandel tegelikult olid omad ee** (.)
11→ **tugevused** (.) **ee ja seetõttu meil ongi see** <u>marking</u> scale **sest muidu oleks nagu väga**
12→ **raske** (.) **objektiivselt hinnata** (.) **mina muidu vastasel juhul panekski kõigile** (0.5)
13→ **enam-vähem viied sest ee** (0.5) **tõepoolest** (1.0) **Ragnari ja Samueli puhul** (.)
14→ **mulle näiteks meeldis väga see intervjuu** (4.0) **Alari puhul oli see et Alari pidi**
15→ **üksi tegema sest ta** (.) **oli oluliselt jälle keerulisem võib-olla kui neil kes said**
16→ <u>**kahekesi olla**</u>=
17   S3: =viie minutiga kodus tegin ära selle
18   S4: ei jõudnud midagi=
19→ T: =**viie minutiga, mulle just tundus et sa nägid tunnis** (.) **palju rohkem vaeva kui**
20→ <u>**mõned**</u> **mõned teised eks ole et-**
21   S?: (   )
22   S5: I didn't do <u>anything</u> at the lesson (h) (.) because I wasn't in the lesson
23   T: yes (   ) makes sense

Extract 45 SM
1   T: and now (.) when you look ee (.) at the rules related to present <u>continuous</u> (.) then
2   we use it (.) when we want to talk about (.) actions that ee (0.5) take place or (.) that
3   are taking place right now or (.) <u>around</u> now and also temporary actions (.) mm **seal**
4   **suulises** (.) **eksami osas päris mitu teist kui: rääkisite oma perekonnast et mida te**
5   **perega teete või mis teie hobid on** (.) **siis hakkasite kasutama seda** present
6   continuoust. we are going fishing together (.) **ja ja** (.) **see oli päris mitmel käis see**
7   **läbi et kui te räägite sellest mida te perega teete igapäevaselt või oma hobidest**
8   **mida te regulaarselt teete siis siis ärge kasutage seda** present continuoust, (.) **vaid**
9   **ikka** present simple'it. (.) **et seda kasutad siis kui sa tõesti räägid** (.) **millestki mis**
10   **toimub** <u>**praegu**</u> (1.0) **või siis praeguse het:ke** (1.5) mm (.) **praeguse hetke kus** around
11   now **noh kuidas me ütleme eesti keeles** (hh) (0.5) **ühesõnaga lähi ee lähiajal niiviisi**
12   **lähitulevikus ja ja ka võib-olla eile noh** (.) **nii.** ee let's have a look at those

Extract 46 SM (CM)

   1   T: and then present <u>perfect</u> and present perfect <u>contin:uous</u> (1.5) so:: (.) present perfect

   2   i:s (0.5) is related to <u>present</u> (.) as (.) as the name also indicates. in Estonian we say (.)

   3 →   **<u>täisminevik</u> (.) eesti keeles kasutame seal sõna minevik (.) aga inglise keeles**

   4 →   **tegelikult siin (.) näete see termin see on see** present (.) **sees et tegelikult on seotud**

   5 →   **(.) ee seotud ikkagi (.) olevikuga. ee ta algas minevikus (.) jah** it is an action which

   6   <u>started</u> in the past but ee:: continuous up to, (.) the recent (.) ee <u>but</u> (.) when you use

   7 →   present perfect <u>continuous</u> (.) **siin on ka selle moodustamine seda: väga palju** (1.0)

   8 →   **ee väga palju harjutusi meil selle peale sel aastal ei ole olnud eelmine aasta ka vist**

   9 →   **põgusalt seal kaheksanda klassi õpikus teile seda tutvustati** .hh (.) ing. (.) could it

  10   be (.) yes. (.) continuous so have has plus been (.) plus ing (.) ee:: does anyone

  11   remember the difference

Extract 47 SM

   1   T: **aga kui sa tahad <u>rõhutada</u> (.) et see tegevus ikka veel (.) toimub siis siis kasutad**

   2   **seda** present continous't **et see** continuous **alati nagu näiteb et (.) tegevus on pooleli**

   3   **eksju** present (.) continuous **on ka et tegevus toimub just praegu** (.) present perfect

   4   continuous (.) **sa-samamoodi tegevus on pooleli** (2.0) is it (1.0) understandable?

   5   S1: jah. but those explanations are (0.5) quite hard it would be easy (.) if you just gave

   6   (.) two (0.5) sentences (0.5) and then explained (hh)

   7   T: okay (.) ee and finally then, (.) what Annabella asked yesterday (.) present <u>perfect</u>

   8   (.) ee the difference between present perfect and past perfect (0.5) **eesti keeles siis**

   9   **<u>täis</u>minevik ja <u>enne</u>minevik** (1.0) **moodustamise**, (1.0)

  10   S?: has been done

  11   T: **jah eksju täpselt et see** present **näitab seda et sa kasutad** have has (.) **mis on**

  12   **olevikuvormid aga** past (.) **viitab siis sellele et (.) sa kasutad** <u>had</u>'i **mis on**

  13   **minevikuvorm** (.) had **ja kolmas põhivorm** (0.5) so and again as I already mentioned

  14   before present perfect is related to eee present somehow

       /…/

Extract 48 CM

   1   T: **mhmh tule ka Alari**

   2   S?: (   )

   3   S2: mul ei ole kahte unimütsi vaja

   4   T: **kas Lauri on ka unimüts v**

   5   S2: Ja::: ta magab

   6   T: (   ) **mhmh Annabella saab on Samueli ja** [(   )]

   7   S3:   [eiiiiiiii]

   8   Ss: ((noise))

   9   T: **no näed** (.) **nüüd kui-**

  10   Ss: (   )

  11   T: (hh) **eriti keeruline nii** (.) ee (.) **te näete ühte lauset, ee see võib olla** (0.5**) jaatav**

  12   **lause see võib olla küsimus ma mõtlen kas mõni <u>eitus</u> oli ka** (.) **eitust vist isegi ei**

  13   **olnud siin** (.) **nii**, **ee sa**: **mida sa ainus asi mida sa võid sõnadega öelda** (.) **on siis see**

  14   **et sa void öelda mis ajaga on tegemist**. (.) **sa võ-võid öeld**a (.) it is (0.5) present

  15   simple tense or it is past simple tense **ehk siis**

  16   Ss: ((noise))

17   S?: (   ) tee sinna tahvli peale siis me teame kuidas peab ütlema
18   **T: ausalt öeldes mm (.) jah need ajad on isegi siia taha kirjutatud muidu hea mõte**
19   **järgmine kord ma tõmban need maha=**
20   S?: ei:::
21   **T: =sest et ikka õpilane ise mõtleks et mis ajaga on tegemist nii et sa võid öelda**
22   **selle aja siis arvajad (.) teavad et (.) kui sa arvad ära selle tegevuse mida ta teeb (.)**
23   **et et siis te teate et mis- ku- kui te seda lauset moodustate (.) et mis <u>aega</u> te peate**
24   **siis kasutama eksju et sa sa võib-olla arvad ära et ta näitab sulle (.) <u>söömist</u>, ja**
25   **näitab ka <u>kes</u> sööb aga nüüd ongi see et kas sa siis ütled et (.) ma sõin või ma**
26   **parasjagu söön ja ja nii edasi. ee <u>võib</u> (.) ee kasutada ka tahvlit /…/**

Extract 49 CM

1   **T: nii (.) Marina kord**

2   S1: meil ei ole mõtet teha seda ju=
3   **T: =<u>nelikümmend lõppeb tund</u>** ((strict tone))
4   S1: aga meil [ei ole mõtet teha seda]
5   S?:   [meil hakkab söögivahetund]
6   **T: ↑miks ei ole mõtet**
7   Ss: ((noise))
8   **T: ↓nii. siis hakkame töövihikut kontrollima kui ei ole mõtet rohkem teha.**
9   okay
10   Ss: [((noise))]
11   S2: [teeme ikka mängu]
12   T: so (.) <u>open.</u> your workbooks then.
13   S2: siis mängime mängu
14   Ss: ((noise))
15   **T: ↑mida te mõtlete et kui tunni lõpuni on viis minutit aega eelmine kord oli täpselt**
16   **samamoodi (.) Ragnar jälle pakib oma asjad kokku lihtsalt**
17   **tõuseb püsti ja kõnnib klassiruumist välja** ((agitated voice))
18   S3: (   ) teeb seda kord aastas (1.0)
19   S4: (   ) saab jälle süüa
20   T: (1.0) okay ee but then: let's continue with ee (.) this exercise (0.5)

Extract 50 SM (CM)

1   T: mhmh that's right (0.5) **jällegi- (.) Annabella**
2   S1: jah
3   **T: ära sega (.) jällegi see on seotud olevikuga eksju** present perfect (.) okay katariina
4   take the second one
5   S1: (0.5) ee it's raining nearly every day on our holiday and we were (.) pleased to get
6   back home again
7   T: mhmh so here are two possibilities (.) it <u>rained</u> and we <u>were</u> (.) **võiks ka kasutada**
8   **(0.5) võiks ka kasutada ka seda et praegu neil <u>on</u> puhkus (.) ja et <u>on</u> sadanud**
9   **peaaegu iga päev puhkuse ajal (.) ja ja meil oleks hea meel kui me juba saaksime**
10   **koju (.) kas keegi kasutas se- (.) seal** (0.5) Evelin? yes,
11   S2: et it has rained nearly every day on out holiday and we <u>are</u> (.) pleased to get home
12   again

13   T: e **jah** or or we <u>will</u> be pleased (.) **jah et kui nad on praegu puhkusel ja** (.) **ootavad**
14   **et saaks juba koju et saaks sellest vihma** (.) **sajust ära siis pigem kasutada siis** (.)
15   **olevikku jah** (.) **it has rained and we will be pleased** (.) **ja siis on see esimene**
16   **variant mida** (0.5) **kes see luges Annabella luges** (.) **et kasutas** <u>**minevikku**</u> **jah** (.)
17   okay.
18   S3: I was really nervous (.) because (.) I have never flied before=
19   T: =**aga vaata sul on lause alguses** [**jälle minevik**]
20   S4:   [flew (.) flew]
21   S5:   [flown] flown
22   S4: flown
23   T: I <u>was</u> really nervous **ma** <u>**olin**</u> (.) **närvis** (0.5) **mis meil oli minevikuga seotud**
24   S3: I never had
/…/

Extract 51 CM (SM)
1   T: **vaata** (.) **nüüd ongi see** past- (.) >**Annabella kas sa ei arva et sa se-segad**< <u>**mind**</u>
2   (.) **ja** <u>**teisi**</u>
3   S1: (2.0) arvan
4   T: (0.5) **jah** (.) **aga miks sa teed siis seda sellepärast** (.) **teedki et** (.) **et siis on** (.)
5   [**on lahe**]
6   S1: [tund on läbi] tegelikult
7   T: **nii** (.) **aga mina** <u>**lõpetan**</u> **tunni**
8   S2: tegelt ve (.)see on seaduse vastane
9   T: (0.5) **näed-** (.) **meil oleks ammu juba seletatud** (.) **ja need laused kontrollitud**
10   **kui ma ei peaks vahepeal siin** (.) **mingeid selliseid** (.) **e- ebameeldivaid** (h) (0.5)
11   S?: ei tea küll milliseid
12   T: **ko- kommentaare eks ole** (h) (.) **jagama või kedagi korrale** <u>**kutsuma**</u> (.) **nii** (.) **ee**
13   **Evelin küsis** (.) **miks ei sobi** left (0.5) I <u>had</u> left **ma** <u>**olin**</u> **jätnud oma aadressi** (.) **koju**
14   **ta jättis selle aadressi koju enne kui ta reisile** (.) **juba läks ja see oligi see** past
15   perfect'i **reegel et** (.) **tegevus mis toimus enne mingi teist tegevust minevikus** (0.5)
16   **et te peategi vaatama et** (.) **et milline tegevus nendest toimus kõige esimesena.**
17   **kõige esimesena juhtuski see et ta jättis** (.) **selle aadressi raamatu** (.) **koju** (.) **ja siis**
18   (.) **läks reisile ja ei saanud osta postkaarte.** (0.5) okay and let's take the last one

Extract 52 IR
1   T: so: (.) have a nice day and then (.) see you
2   S1: continue (.) tomorrow
3   T: yes (.) I know
4   S2: tomorrow (   )
5   T: no (.) not tomorrow but on Monday
6   S3: (0.5) on Monday we won't be
7   Ss: ((noise))
8   S?: ( ) oleme [Riigikogus]
9   T: [aa (.) **jaa**] (.) **esmaspäeval te olete Riigikogus** (.) **ärge unustage siis**
10   **seda õpetajate palgateemat tõstatada**
11   S?: bye
12   T: **jah** (hh) okay bye

Extract 53 CM

    1   S1: aa are you asking me to do dance (.) are you (0.5) asking for dance (.) asks for
    2   dance
    3 → T: and it is a <u>sentence</u> now yes (.) present simple (.) NO- YOU CAN'T WRITE any
    4   words (.) you can write symbols (.) or or draw something you can draw some symbols
    5   (.) maybe?
    6   S2: aa oota ma pidin siis [(   )]
    7   T: [you can draw] a symbol
    8   S3: (0.5) viis sekundit (.) sa saad viie sekundiga teha midagi
    9   S1: ei ma ei [(   )]
    10   S2:   [ask] for dance
    11   T: (1.0) mhm
    12   S2: aga täp täp [kas ta peab täpselt selle ütlema]
    13 → T: [**aga see peab olema see peab**] **olema nüüd lau- lause eks ju jah**
    14   S1: he asks for dance (.) he::
    15   T: (2.0) mhmh
    16   S2: kas peab täpselt sama selle ütlema
    17 → T: **ja (.) ja nüüd- aga kuidas sa annaksid talle vihje, (.) mis: sorti lause see on** (0.5)
    18 → **näiteks vaata siin sa saaksid tahvlile-** (0.5) mhmh
    19   S1: aa: are you asking for (.) me for a dance
    20 → T: mhmh (.) **ja nüüd <u>formuleeri</u> see lause**
    /…/

Extract 54 IR

    1   S1: mulle tegelt üldse ei meeldi väljend all (.) in (.) all (0.5) maitea see ajab mind närvi
    2   T: (hhhhh) **küll on hirmus kui üks väljend sind närvi ajab aga noh** (.) **katsu siis**
    3   **seda võimalikult vähe kasutada**=
    4   S1: =ei tegelikult ma kasutan seda küll aga see lihtsalt- kui ma hakkan mõtlema see
    5   ajab mind närvi
    6   S2: mis asi
    7   S1: all in all

Extract 55 SM

    1   T: okay (.) a:nd now (.) let's have a look at this task <u>four</u> here again you had ee some
    2   clue ee clues given in Estonian, (0.5) eee so, (0.5)
    3   S1: (   ) mis see üksteist on
    4   T: (.) ee number eleven
    5   S2: eee going
    6   T: mhm is going (.) to take **jah kavatsema**, (.) **kui on kavatsema** (.) **siis on kindlasti**
    7   **see** be going to (.) **vorm** (.) mhmh any other questions [related to number three]
    8   Ss: [((noise))]

Extract 56 SM

    1   T: look at the clouds (.) it's going to rain, (1.0) so:: what kind of ee (.) future form is
    2   used here
    3   S1: see on see going (   )
    4   T mhmh be going to? **ja ja see on nüüd see (.) ku- kui sa <u>näed</u> et midagi hakkab**
    5   **juhtuma eksju. näed et pilved on taevas (.) eee et vaatad neid pilvi et et hakkab**
    6   **sadama et kui sul on olemas see tõestus- tõestusmaterjal et midagi hakkab**
    7   **juhtuma siis kasutad seda** be going to.

8   S2?: oi oi oi
9   T: okay. have a look at one exercise
/…/
10   S1: what <u>will</u> <u>you</u> wear
11   Ss: ((noise))
12   T: mhmh or what are you <u>going to</u> (.) wear at the party tonight (.) **sobiks võib-olla**
13   **parem- mida sa** <u>kavatsed</u> **täna (.) ee selga panna ee täna õhtul people võiks isegi**
14   **küsida** (.) what are you ee wearing at a party tonight (.) **kui kui me teame et ta on**
15   **juba kindlasti (.) ee (.)** <u>välja valinud</u> **(.) mingisugused riided**
16   S2: aga siin on ju what will you be wearing at a party tonight
17   T: (3.0**) tahaksid kasutada, no no seda** willi **nagu jah hästi siin** (.) **et pigem nagu**
18   **mida sa kavatsed (.) kanda. (0.5)** okay (0.5) have a look at the last one.
19   S1: I [will find]
20   S3:   [could] (0.5) could
21   S1: will (.) will (.) (   )
22   S3: °I could find (   )°
23   S?: (   )
24   T: (0.5) no (.) **jah põhimõtteliselt** could find **võiks ka olla jah et ma et ma saaksin**
25   (.) **saak- võiksin leida aga aga jah kui me nüüd** (.) **vaatame eksju neid mis sul sinna**
26   **on antud** will going to (.) ee present simple or present progressive, ee then: (.) I think
27   (.) I (.) will find mhmh.
28   S1: yes:
29   T: okay. look at (.) ee the next sentences
30   S1: (1.0) we will (.) jälle.
31   (5.0)
32   S?: I go (   )
33   T: mhmh so: what- what do you think about the first one,
34   Ss: (3.0) ((quiet background noise))
35   T: yes Annabella
36   S: I am going v
37   S2: I am going
38   T: mhmh I am I am going back to England tomorrow (.) **ta teab (.) kindlasti ütleb et**
39   **see on minu** <u>viimane</u> **(.) päev siin** (.) **ma lähen homme** (.) **tagasi järelikult ilmselt**
40   **tal on siis (.) juba mingid piletid (.) ja asjad olemas transport millega ta siis tagasi**
/…/

Extract 57 IR (CM)
1   T: **nii et nojah (2.0) et natukene läksidki alla sealt need (0.5) mõned eksju just selle**
2   <u>hääl</u>**duse kohapealt (.) et kas tekst oli ettekanne oli maha loetud või mitte** (1.0)
3   **Lauri sinuga ma mõtlesin nüüd niimoodi et (.) et niimoodi et kuna paljudel just**
4   **läksi see viis kaduma selle suulise esituse tõttu et kui ma sulle panen selle (.) viie**
5   **see on natukene noh (.) see tundus ebaõiglane ma mõtlesin et ma panen sulle selle**
6   **hinde siis mitte nagu arvesusliku hindena vaid sulle panen lihtsalt tavalise hinde**
7   **sulle nii-öelda selle kirjaliku osa eest (.) teistele ma panen selle nagu arvestusliku**
8   **hindena et on nagu natukene tähtsam sest et noh (.) muidu tõesti (.) näiteks kui (.)**
9   **ee poised oleksid ka selle ainult kirjalikult esitanud siis ma arvan et nad oleksid**
10   **ka (.) noh saanud viied et et selles suhtes on see siis natukene võib-olla siis (.)**
11   **ebaõiglane**

12   S1: (0.5) sa saad tunnihinde viie v

13   S?: noh

14   T: **et saad tunnihindena selle kirja et siis siis peaks vast õiglane olema** (.) **või** (.)

15   **õigla- õiglasem**

16   Ss: ((noise))

17   T: (2.0) okay any questions or comments? (0.5) which presentations did <u>you</u> like best?

Extract 58 SM

1   T: so one of them is (.) ↑pneumonia what is it (2.5) <u>**ko::psupõletik**</u>.

2   S1: ↑wo[::::w]

3   T: [and the] second one (.) is that he was <u>poiso</u>ned

Extract 59 IR

1   S4: täna oli jälle see (.) mis kotlet meil oli nüüd

2   Ss: ((noise))

3   S4: kalkunikotlet täna söögiks

4   S?: (   )

5   T: (hh) **sa juba unistad kalkunikotletist**

6   S1: sometimes you <u>spoke</u>

7   S4: mul:: vahet ei ole

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
INGLISE FILOLOOGIA OSAKOND

Sandra Saks

Pedagogic functions of teacher-initiated code-switching in a lower-secondary Estonian EFL classroom: a case study

Õpetajapoolse koodivahetuse pedagoogilised funktsioonid põhikooli inglise keele tunnis. Juhtumiuuring

Magistritöö

2016

Lehekülgede arv: 84

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva magistritöö eesmärk on uurida õpetajapoolse koodivahetuse pedagoogilisi funktsioone põhikooli astmes inglise keele tunnis. Koodivahetus ehk kahe või enama keele vahelduv kasutamine on kakskeelsete inimeste seas loomulik nähtus, kuid keeleõppes suhtutakse sellesse mitmeti. Töö sissejuhatavas osas antakse ülevaade kahetisest suhtumisest koodivahetusse ning analüüsitakse lühidalt selle põhjusi. Koodivahetust tihtipeale saatev negatiivne hoiak oli üheks töö ajendiks.

Töö esimeses peatükis selgitatakse koodivahetuse mõistet täpsemalt ning antakse ülevaade asjasse puutuvast kirjandusest. Sealjuures kaalutakse koodivahetuse rolli keeletunnis nii selle pooldajate kui ka vastaste vaatepunktist ning arutletakse optimaalse koodivahetuse mudeli üle. Töö meetodiks valiti vestlusanalüüs, mistõttu keskendub esimese peatüki teine osa valitud meetodi põhiprintsiipide ning mõistete tutvustamisele, pannes erilist rõhku keeletunni erilisele kontekstile võrreldes tavavestlusega. Lisaks vaadeldakse erinevaid uurimusi, mis on koodivahetust vestlusanalüüsi kaudu uurinud, ning põhjendatakse meetodi valikut.

Töö teine peatükk on pühendatud empiirilisele uurimusele ning selle all antakse ülevaade osalejatest, andmete kogumisviisist ning analüüsist. Töö korpuse moodustanud 57 koodivahetuse episoodi jagatakse pedagoogilise funktsiooni alusel kolme kategooriasse: ainealased teadmised, kasvatustegevused ning isikutevahelised suhted. Kogu korpusest analüüsitakse vestlusanalüüsi kasutades detailselt 12 episoodi, kus tuuakse välja keelte vahelduva kasutamise seos õpetaja pedagoogiliste eesmärkidega. Uuringust nähtub kaks olulist asjaolu: esiteks täidab koodivahetus olulist rolli suhtlusstrateegiana, mida õpetaja kasutab oma pedagoogiliste eesmärkide täitmiseks, ning teiseks, koodivahetus ei ole kaootiline, vaid selle aluseks on teatud suhtlemismustrid.

Märksõnad: koodivahetus, emakeele kasutamine võõrkeeletunnis, vestlusanalüüs

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Sandra Saks (17.04.1988),

1.   annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose
Pedagogic functions of teacher-initiated code-switching in a lower-secondary Estonian EFL classroom: a case study

mille juhendaja on Natalja Zagura

1.1. reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;
1.2. üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.

2.   olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.

3.   kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Tartus 20. mai 2016

Sandra Saks