

STUDIES ON SOCIAL AND EDUCATION SCIENCES 2022

EDITORS

**Dr. Suzanne El Takach
Dr. Omer Tayfur Ozturk**



www.istes.org

STUDIES ON SOCIAL AND EDUCATION SCIENCES 2022

EDITORS

**Dr. Suzanne El Takach
Dr. Omer Tayfur Ozturk**



www.istes.org



Studies on Social and Education Sciences 2022

Editors

Dr. Suzanne El Takach, Lebanese University Beirut, Lebanon

Dr. Omer Tayfur Ozturk, Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

ISBN: 978-1-952092-37-4

© 2022, ISTES Organization

The “*Studies on Social and Education Sciences 2022*” is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their papers. The Publisher, the ISTES Organization, shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.

Date of Publication

December, 2022

Publisher

ISTES Organization
Monument, CO, USA

Contact

International Society for Technology, Education and Science (ISTES)

www.istes.org

istesoffice@gmail.com

Citation

El Takach, S. & Ozturk, O. T. (Eds.). (2022). *Studies on Social and Education Sciences 2022*.
ISTES Organization.

Chapter 20 - Socio- and Applied Linguistic Peculiarities of Using L1 in Georgian Educational Discourse

Khatuna Buskivadze 

Chapter Highlights

- The present study aims to investigate the socio- and applied linguistic functions and frequency of lecturers' language behaviors (code-switching (CS), code-mixing (CM), and translanguaging) in Georgian educational discourse, namely, in teaching General English (EFL) at the university level.
- An examination of Georgian discursive peculiarities is a novel addition to this field of research, as there are very few studies focusing on Georgian lecturers' language behaviors in EFL.
- Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were employed to analyse lecturers' recorded lessons (100 hours of EFL).
- Surprisingly, in contrast to previous studies' findings, we found that the Georgian and English languages are equally used for informal/formal purposes.
- Both languages are used to express solidarity in the classroom conversations.
- The given study is a unique example, in which both, English and Georgian are used as marked/unmarked ("We-code", "They-code") choice, while in the previous studies L1 was only considered as "we-code" and a foreign language (English) was only regarded as "they code".
- Within 100 hours of recordings (EFL), 164 cases of code-switching, 20 cases of code-mixing, and 1 case of translanguaging, planned use of L1, were detected, generally used in teaching grammar.

Introduction

There are three major theoretical and conceptual frameworks for studying language behaviors in educational discourse: structural, sociolinguistic, and applied linguistics. Not many previous research studies have used the mixed approach model, which is a combination of sociolinguistic and applied linguistic methods of studying lecturers' language behaviors - namely code-switching, code-mixing, and translanguaging.

Thus, we reached the following research questions:

1. Which language behavior dominates in Georgian EFL context?
2. What are the sociolinguistic functions of code-switching, code-mixing and translanguaging in the Georgian educational discourse?
3. What are the applied linguistic functions of code-switching, code-mixing and translanguaging in the Georgian educational discourse?

Classroom language behaviours can be examined from various viewpoints such as form, location, patterns, and functions of code-switching, code-mixing, and translanguaging themselves. In this article, we aim to classify the sociolinguistic and applied linguistic functions of the above-mentioned language behaviours.

Background

This section covers and discusses the following theoretical basis: first, the difference between code-switching, code-mixing and translanguaging; secondly, two theoretical frameworks used in studying language behaviors; and, thirdly, the functions of classroom language behaviours.

The existing scholarly literature examines the definitions of code, code-switching, code-mixing; however, a more systematic and theoretical analysis is needed to underscore the difference between translanguaging and code-switching. Code-switching is an umbrella term, which covers code-mixing and translanguaging.

Table 1. Difference among the Following Terms:

Code-switching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Involves bilingual competence and switches between two different systems. •Situation when it happens arise naturally, perhaps inevitably. •The change of setting and context just as its functions. •“Between two or more languages simultaneously or interchangeably within one conversation” (Grosjean 1982: 145). •As a response to the difficulties met during teaching in a medium where students have imperfect control. •A speaker can replace words, chunks, or a whole sentence to keep the conversation flowing.
Code-mixing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“The process whereby speakers indulge in code-switching between languages of such rapidity and density, even within sentences and phrases that are not possible to say at any given time which language they are speaking” (Udoro 2008: 15). •Based on intra-sentential, contextual, and situational conversation, code-mixing is expressively purposing languages that are combined to increase social status or to keep the speaker’s prestige in the society (Muysken 2000: 1). •Code-mixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from a co-operative activity of the participants, to infer what is intended, the participants must reconcile what they hear with what they understand (Muysken 2000: 2).
Translanguaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The general communicative competence of multilinguals (Canagarajah 2011). •Planned and systematic use of two languages. •“The ability of multilingual speakers to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system” (Canagarajah 2011: 401-403). •As a tool to promote deeper understanding of content while developing the weaker language.

The term code refers to the language or a variety of language. In the present study it refers to English and Georgian languages. Classroom “code-switching” is used to refer to “the alternating use of more than one linguistic code in the classroom by any of the classroom participants (e.g., teacher, students, teacher aide)” (Lin 2013: 1–2). Thus, in this sense, the

term code-switching here can cover both “code-mixing (intra-clausal/sentential alternation) and code-switching (alternation at the inter-clausal/sentential level)” (Lin 2008).

The term “translanguaging” was first introduced by Williams (1994) to refer to a bilingual pedagogical practice that switches languages in the input and output. García extended the concept and defined it as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (García 2009: 45). The phenomenon of code-switching has been defined from two different perspectives: sociolinguistic and pedagogical; and as two separate kinds of talk: ordinary and classroom. From the sociolinguistic perspective, Blom and Gumperz (1972) study code-switching in terms of social relationships among speakers. They distinguish the roles of codeswitching in the shifts of role relationship and topics, markedness in identity, and the expression of solidarity or intimacy within the conversation. The above descriptions are related to bilingual settings, so how does this affect EFL classroom settings?

Conversational Analytic and Interactional Analytic Approaches

These two analytic approaches – conversational and interactional - are generally used to study sociolinguistic functions of teacher’s code-switching behaviour. They are barely used in combination but mostly on their own. Table 2 illustrates the differences and similarities between them as the paper aims to employ a combination of CA and IS analytic approaches. The CA and IS approaches share the same research method and object, while vary in their origins, research aims, and focuses.

Table 2. A Comparative Analysis of Interactional Sociolinguistic (IS) and Conversational Analytic Approaches (CA).

Characteristics:	Interactional Sociolinguistic Approach (IS) (Bailey 2015)	Conversational Analytic Approach (CA) (Auer 1988)
Research Method:	Voice and video recordings of naturally occurred talks, transcripts	Turn-taking and cooccurrence in the conversation
Research Object:	Interaction, conversation, communication	

Characteristics:	Interactional Sociolinguistic Approach (IS) (Bailey 2015)	Conversational Analytic Approach (CA) (Auer 1988)
Research Aim:	Interpretation of verbal and non-verbal interaction	Structure, occurrence, and sequence of interaction
Origins:	Dialectology/anthropology	Cultural differences and meanings are less interesting.
Focus:	Social and cultural diversity and meaning	Structure of the conversation (speakers systematically use specific structures), culturally stipulated meanings are regarded as subjective and inaccurate.

Functions of Classroom Code-switching

There are two approaches to EFL instruction, the Monolingual (English-Only Policy) and the Bilingual Approaches. The monolingual principle refers to the exclusive use of the second language (L2) as instructional language to enable learners to think in L2, with minimal interference from L1 (Howatt 1984). However, an unconscious, unplanned use of L1 takes place in the L2 classrooms. In terms of pedagogical functions, two broad categories can be distinguished: Canagarajah (1995), and Ferguson (2003). Canagarajah introduced two broad categories of classroom code switching:

Table 3. Micro Functions of Classroom CS introduced by Canagarajah (1995)

	Content Transmission	Classroom Management
Micro functions of classroom CS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review • Definition • Explanation • Negotiation cultural relevance • Parallel translation • Unofficial student collaboration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening the class • Negotiation directions • Requisition help • Managing discipline • Teacher encouragement • Teacher compliments • Teacher’s commands • Teacher admonitions • Mitigation • Pleading • Unofficial interactions

In Canagarajah's classification, Tamil is used for familiar, spontaneous, and informal conversations, while English is regarded as unfamiliar, formal language. In contrast to Canagarajah's classification, Ferguson, who explored the role of the code-switching across different classroom contexts (Hong-Kong Pennington 1995; Lin 1996; Jonson 1983, 1987; Brunei – Martin 1996, 1999; Sri Lanka – Canagarajah 1995; Malta – Camilleri 1996; Botswana – Arthur 1994, 1996; South Africa – Addendorf 1993; Kenya – Merritt et al. 1992), outlined three broad functional categories:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Code-switching for curriculum access. | To help pupils understand the subject matter of their lessons. |
| 2. Code-switching for classroom discourse management. | To motivate, discipline and praise pupils, and to signal a change of footing |
| 3. Code-switching for interpersonal relations | To humanize the affective climate of the classroom and to negotiate different identities. |

Ferguson (2003) documented and evaluated the already-conducted studies in the post-colonial countries. Canagarajah's classification is based on classroom observations. The qualitative study, which was conducted in Sri-Lanka, does not imply structural, but sociolinguistic and discursive functional analysis of CS behaviour. The teachers' and students' code-switching behaviours are merged. While Ferguson's classification is focused on the macro functions (language policy and language attitude).

Method

The qualitative study intends to collect, process, analyze, and present data objectively about occurrence of code-switching, code-mixing and translanguaging in teaching English to Georgian state university (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University and Ilia State University) students. The CA and IS approaches were used to study the lecturers' language behaviour examples.

The data was collected from 10 lecturers' (100 hours overall) and their students' (B1-B2 Level of English) interactions in the English language classroom. Recordings were done by the teachers to obtain data in the field. The procedure for collecting data was through

recordings, observation, and transcriptions. The steps to analyze data included creating categories of sociolinguistic and applied linguistic functions of lecturers' talk based on the various communicative situations between lecturers and students, and educators' monologues.

Results

Both quantitative and qualitative analysis were used to analyse the data from the classroom recordings. All the classroom recordings were transcribed and the moments of using Georgian (the L1) and English (the TL) by the lecturer were collected and classified by listening to the recordings. A starting point, where the instructor seemed to address the entire class, was chosen, and counted as 0:00. From then on, every switch from English to Georgian was noted. An utterance was determined by intonation contours. The measurement of code-switching, code-mixing and translanguaging was undertaken and emphasizes the lecturers' discourse including students' questions and answers.

Table 4. The Quantity of using Language Behaviors according to the Lesson Type

Lesson type:	Language behaviour and their quantity:
Grammar	Code-switching (117); Code-mixing (12); Translanguaging (-).
Vocabulary	Code-switching (26); Code-mixing (6); Translanguaging (1).
Listening skill	Code-switching (-); Code-mixing (6); Translanguaging (-).
Speaking skill	Code-switching (3); Code-mixing (-); Translanguaging (-).
Writing Skill	Code-switching (12); Code-mixing (-); Translanguaging (-).
Reading skill	Code-switching (6); Code-mixing (2); Translanguaging (-).
Functional Language	Code-switching (-); Code-mixing (-); Translanguaging (-).

The amount of lecturers' language behaviours are listed in the table according to the lesson type. It shows: (1) lecturers avoid switching from English into Georgian at the lesson of functional language; (2) code-switching was in majority at all lesson types except the listening skill; (3) translanguaging was detected only once, during a vocabulary lesson; (4) the highest number of CS behaviour is given during grammar lessons. According to the data shown in the table, grammar lessons are most likely characterised by the largest amount of teachers' code-switching behaviours from the TL into the L1. Speaking lessons are less loaded with the lecturers' language behaviours.

In terms of the functions of code-switching from English to Georgian, the results appear to support previous findings. This suggests that switching to L1 necessarily serves some basic functions, which may be beneficial in the foreign language learning environment (Macaro 2005). However, some new functions were also detected in the Georgian educational discourse, which will be illustrated below. There are three broad categories of applied linguistic functions of using CS, CM, and translanguaging in the Georgian educational discourse: lesson content, classroom management, and rapport.

Table 5. Functions of Lecturers' CS, CM, and Translanguaging Behaviours

Categories/language behaviours	Lesson content	Classroom management	Rapport
Code-switching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to show cultural aspects to define (e.g., term) to find Georgian equivalent to ask, inquire (to push students think and answer to the lecturers' question by themselves) to check students' understanding lecturers' input (e.g., grammatical issue) to emphasize the important aspects of the material (e.g., Grammar rules, context) to give a hint to explain the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to direct students' attention to another topic to grab students' attention to increase students' engagement to announce administrative issues lecturers' hesitation (to think, relax) (lecturers address themselves) to group students to solve the problems connected with the internet, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to show eagerness to praise to tell a joke to show emotions (e.g., surprise, embarrassment) to give feedback to calm students, reduce their stress to motivate students to make a remark to give some advice

Categories/language behaviours	Lesson content	Classroom management	Rapport
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> difficult topics to approve/disapprove and expand the already-said ideas; parallel translation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> zoom, etc. to inform students to give instructions. giving homework and classroom tasks; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to salute.
Code-mixing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to define (e.g., term) to find Georgian equivalent; parallel translation; to ask, inquire (to push students think and answer to the lecturers' question by themselves). 	-	-
Translanguaging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> parallel translation. 	-	-

Table 5 shows that the classroom management and rapport categories are not characterized by lecturers' code-mixing and translanguaging behaviours, while code-switching is functionally loaded in all three categories.

This next section will discuss examples of code-switching, code mixing and translanguaging. The examples are chosen in terms of showing the functions detected only in the Georgian educational discourse and are not found in Ferguson's and Canagarajah's classifications. Within the framework of the discourse analysis the above-discussed theoretical frames (CA and IS) were also incorporated:

- Turn-taking, language choice based on turn-taking (CA)
- Language Attitude: showing dominance, formality, and informality (CA)

- Change in register (IS)
- implicature (IS)
- Language choice determines speaker's identity (“we-code” and “they code”) (Contextualisation Cues)
- Change in frames (Contextualisation Cues).

Key:

// - Pause 0.5 second and more

= - direct link between sentences

[] – speeches are coincided

, - hesitation

? - rising tone

. - falling tone

— - Georgian sentences are highlighted

() - English Translation

Example 1/Lecturer 1 (Code-switching)

Topic: Family Life Vocabulary – (T's input) 02:20

Functions:

- **Rapport**/Lecturer's joke
- **Lesson Content**/to show cultural aspects; to define (e.g., term) to find Georgian equivalent;

T: The difference between these two words immediate and extended. Anybody got the idea?

S: Family you're living with and your whole family right, right? [your father...]

T: [Like, ყვავი მამიდას მამიდას/ყვავი chkhikvis mamidas] (the relative, with whom you no longer have contact with) =

=actually (smiles)

Ss: (smile)

T: no, no, no, no it's not like ყვავი მამიდას მამიდას/ყვავი chkhikvis mamidas, it's like your uncle and his family, your auntie and his family big family, you know. and your

immediate family is your father, mother sister brother.

Based on lecturer's emotions, intonation, and tone in the recorded lecture, the above-given example depicts the several functions of one phrase (ყვავი წბოჯვობ მამიდას/yvavi chkhikvis mamida). Firstly, it was used as a joke; Second usage was aimed to define the word – extended family and show the speaker's identity and negative attitude towards it. A co-occurrence also takes place in the conversation (e.g., S:[your father...] T: [Like, ყვავი წბოჯვობ მამიდას/yvavi chkhikvis mamidas]), which shows the unintended dominance of one speaker over another.

Example 2/Lecturer 2 (Code-switching)

Topic: Family – vocabulary, Future Forms – be going to, will, present continuous (52:01)

Functions:

- **Classroom management**/to direct students' attention to another topic; teacher directs students' attention to the scheme on the functions of the future forms (be going to, will, present continuous).

T: where does 'will' belong?

S: [1st one!]

T: [3rd one?]

S: 1st!

T: 1st one, people's programmes or arrangements, hm? Let me check it, let's leave 'will' like that, okay?=
 =ცოტა ხანი დავტოვოთ will-ი ეხე/tsoTakhani davtovot will-i ese (let's leave/forget about 'will' for a while)=

=Let's think about "to be going to".

The task presented in the example aims to group functions of the future forms. Students incorrect answer about the function of "will" form makes the lecturer direct students' attention to other forms. Lecturer's code-switching behaviour in this in this example is a kind of aid for the students to come to the correct answer by themselves, at the same time, this example serves to ease the situation and relieve tension for students, Georgian here serves as a close, familiar, informal language.

Example 3/Lecturer 2 (Code-mixing)

Topic: Family – vocabulary, Future Forms – be going to, will, present continuous (delayed error correction (01:16:00).

Functions:

- **Lesson content** - to ask, inquire (to push students think and answer to the lecturers' question by themselves).

S: I would like?

T: or I would like, that would be one of the options, that's it, I would like =

=კიდევ?/kidev? (what else?)

S: [or I am going to go]

T: [exactly] I am going to go to the café,=

=კიდევ?/kidev? (what else?) = directly present continuous.

S: [I am going]

T: [exactly]

Example 3 serves as an in-depth, interrogative function that helps students activate their schemata and maintain a lecture pace. Georgian is used as an informal language, and has a motivational function for students, it also expresses the identity of the lecturer.

Example 4 /Lecturer 4 (Code-switching)

Topic: Grammar - Past Forms – past simple, past continuous, past perfect, past perfect continuous (01:24:00).

Functions:

- **Lesson Content** - to emphasize the important aspects of the material (e.g., Grammar rules, context).

S: (is reading) They walked in the forest for hours before they realize they were lost.

T: Now, we're here, we're here, so, these are past tenses but what happened during=

= ნახე! სადამდე ესეიგი იარეს, იარეს მთელი 4 საათი იარეს რაღაც კონკრეტულ

მომენტამდე/nakhe! sadamde eseigi iares, iares mteli 4 saati iares haghac konkretul

momentamde. (Look, until when, so they had been walking, they had been walking for the whole 4 hours until the specific moment.)

S: they have had [to walk]

T: [had been walking] because you have for four hours, yes. ხანგრძლივობასთან ყოველთვის პროცესია ბავშვებო, თანაც პროცესი რაღაც წარსულ ქმედებამდე/khangrdzlivobastan yoveltvis procesia bavshvebo, tanac procesi raghac warsul qmedebamde (Guys, there is always a process with duration, moreover the process until the past action)=
=they had been walking, past perfect continuous, guys.

In the above example, the first code-switching behaviour explains and defines the grammatical context, while the second switching emphasizes the grammatical rule that the students were supposed to follow. The lecturer's register in Georgian and English languages are homogeneous, Georgian and English are equally informally used.

Example 5/Lecturer 5 (Code-switching)

Topic: Grammar - Past Forms – past simple, past continuous, past perfect, past perfect continuous (26:09).

Functions:

- **Classroom Management-** to solve the problems connected with the internet, zoom, etc.; to inform students.

T: Alright, so there are 14 of us=

=თოთხმეტი ვართ, ზუმი გაითიშება და შემოვიდეთ ხელახლა/14ni vart, zoomi gaitisheba da Semovidet khelakhla (there are 14 of us, Zoom will be over soon, please come back) = 99

=Okay?

S: okay.

The use of the Georgian language by the lecturer in the example 5 serves to eliminate the gaps in the lecture process. Due to a lack of time, they used Georgian to avoid uncertainty. The lecturer's code-switching behaviour serves to express identity. The change in frames (tracking students' attendance/organization of the zoom meeting).

Example 6/Lecturer 6 (Code-switching)

Topic: e-sport, free-diving, grammar: present simple, present continuous (21:58).

Functions:

- **Lesson content-** to approve/disapprove and expand the already-said ideas.

S1: Shelia is not understanding the exercise (reading the exercise (homework))

T: Okay, no, Why NO then?

S1: ისა/isa (so), Shelia does not understand the exercise.

T: Yes, but why?

S1: Ah because it's a general thing.

T: well, the idea behind it is that she doesn't understand it right now, so, it should be present continuous, but it is not present continuous and why is it present simple, can anybody help us?

S2: because understand doesn't, ანუ, არ გადადის მოკლედ/anu, ar gadadis mokled (isn't used in).

T: -ing ფორმაში/-ing formashi (in -ing form), yes, because it's a stative verb here and we do not use -ing form, however, as I have mentioned on our previous lessons a lot of things are changing and I have heard by native speakers that understand already has -ing form, mostly in American English, I've heard like I'm not understanding you or I'm not understanding this instead of I don't understand but I have told you before If it's an exam kind of situation stick to the conventional grammar whereas if it's like a colloquial, everyday speaking English situation then you can use the -ing form I guess. Okay, good, thank you.

The above example serves to expand and reinforce the opinion expressed by the student. It should be emphasized that the lecturer does not repeat what the student has said but continues his or her opinion. The choice of lecturer language is determined by the student's choice (CA).

Example 7/ Lecturer 7 (Code-switching)

Topic: grammar - past simple - weekend) (37:50-38:04)

Functions:

- **Rapport** - to show emotions (e.g., surprise, embarrassment);

T: Okay, now, read the text and answer the questions.//

S: //უკაცრავად, ტექსტი არ ჩანს და რომ გადავუღო ან რამე, რომ გამოაჩინოთ?/ukatsravad, teqsti ar chans da rom gadavugho an rame, rom gamochinot?

(Excuse me, I cannot see the text, may I take a screenshot, or could you please scroll up?)

T: არ ჩანს/ar chans? (isn't it visible?)

S: ანუ მარტო/anu marto... = (so, only)

T: =ანუ, ჯერ დაიწყეთ და მერე ჩავწევ/anu, jer daitsyet da mere chvwev (so, please first start reading then I will scroll down). =

S: = ანუ, ტექსტის მიხედვით ხომ უნდა ვუპასუხოთ/anu, teqstis mikhedvit khom unda vupasukhot (aren't we going to answer the questions according to the text)?=

T:= ხოდა, აქედან იწყება/khoda, aqedan itsyeba, [Next time a friend or colleague....]

(კითხულობს ტექსტის დასაწყისს გაოცებული) (yes, then it starts from here.)

S: [აა, კარგი, კი ბატონო/aa, kargi, ki batono.] (aham, okay, yes, for sure.)

Considering the video recordings, the given example describes lecturer's emotional state. The lecturer was upset because, despite giving instructions already, the student still was unable to find the beginning of the reading task. The teacher was forced to use L1 (Georgian). So, the register from informal to formal changed by the student supports to ease the situation (e.g., აა, კარგი, კი ბატონო/aa, kargi, ki batono (aham, okay, yes, for sure, absolutely!).

Example 8/Lecturer 8 (translanguaging)

Topic: grammar quantifiers, present perfect vs past simple - shopping) (previous vocabulary review) (0:29-02:23)

Functions:

- **Lesson Content-** parallel translation.

T: Okay now, now let's remind you about a previous lecture yeah so it was about present perfect and the vocabulary of housework, right? housework. Now, I will tell you check some words some housework, whereas in Georgia and you tell me in English, okay?

Tornike, how it's in English, ლოგინის ალაგება/loginis alageba (make the bed)?

S1: make a bed.

T: Make the bed, Saba, ჭურჭლის დარეცხვა/churchlis daretshkva (Do the washing up)?//

S2: Wash, ისა/isa (so to say), I forget.

S2: Do the washing up.

T: Do the washing up, yeah, do the washing up, okay Luka, ნაგვის გატანა/nagvis gatana (take out the rubbish)?

S3: Take the rubbish?

T: take out the rubbish, yes. Ani, სარეცხის რეცხვა/saretskhis retskhva (do washing)

S4: wash the clothes?

T: do washing, yeah?

S4: [do the washing up]

T: do the washing up is when you wash dishes, do the washing, Malvina, უთობა/utooba (do ironing)?

S5: ironing

T: [do ironing, yeah?]

S5: [do ironing]

T: Okay, Sergi, დალაგება ოთახის/dalageba otakhis (tidy the room)

S6: clean the room.

T: Aaa, and? ha?//

S4: Tidy it?

T: tidy the room, Ani, ტანსაცმელების შელაგება/tansatsmelebis shelageba (Put away your clothes)?

S: Ahh.

T: Put away your clothes, put away. Khatia, take clothes from the floor?

S7: იატაკიდან ალება ტანსაცმელების/iatakidan agheba tansatsmelebis? (Pick up clothes)

T: pick up dirty clothes, pick up dirty clothes, so, clean the floor and so on.

The given example illustrates the translanguaging, that the lecturer planned based on previous lecture material. The use of Georgian language expresses the identity of the lecturer.

Example 9/Lecturer 10 (Code-switching)

Topic: Writing – a paragraph, OC Feedback (32:46)

Functions:

- **Classroom management** - to grab students' attention; to increase students' engagement.

T: Right Okay, and there is also received one answer in the chat from Maria helpful tips for beginners who just started exercising=

=ნახეთ, წელან რაც ვთქვი, statement-ის ფორმა მივცეთ/nakhet, tseghan rats vtqvi, statement-is forma mivtset. (look, that's what I said before, give it a form of a statement)=

= there are lots of helpful tips or several helpful tips for beginners who just started exercising okay? So, try to Imagine that this is an opening sentence right, so you need it to be in the form of this statement, alright guys.

The purpose of switching codes in Example 9 is to mobilize students' attention, highlighting and reminding what has already been said by the lecturer. English language is used as informally as Georgian one. This example of the lecturer's language behaviour can have not only one but several functions, the context was taken into consideration in the interpretation process, without which the research becomes void. Watching the lecture recordings for several times, noting the examples down allowed us to interpret the examples accurately. Expression of power by the lecturer (ნახეთ, წელან რაც ვთქვი, statement-ის ფორმა მივცეთ/nakhet, tseghan rats vtqvi, statement-is forma mivtset. (look, that's what I said before, give it a form of a statement) in addition, the register alternates in both languages.

Conclusion

In the Georgian educational context, in 100 hours of recordings (EFL), 164 cases of code-switching, 20 cases of code-mixing, and 1 case of translanguaging were detected. In terms of the frequency of using language behaviours by the lecturer, grammar and vocabulary lectures are more loaded with them than lectures on language skills (writing, reading, listening, speaking). Moreover, the functions of Lecturer's language behaviours were broken down into three categories: syllabus, classroom management, rapport.

The analysis conducted within the qualitative research showed that functional classification of lecturers' CS behaviours differs from the classifications revealed in earlier studies. Namely, the following functions: **classroom management** (to direct students' attention to another topic), **lesson content** (to ask, inquire; to approve/disapprove and expand the already-

said ideas), rapport (to show emotions (e.g., surprise, embarrassment) were not detected in Ferguson's and Canagarajah's classifications.

Surprisingly, the given study in the Georgian educational context is a unique example, in which both, English and Georgian are used as marked/unmarked ("We-code", "They-code") choice, while in the previous studies L1 was only considered as "we-code" and a foreign language (English) was only regarded as "they code". In terms of the sociolinguistic functions, the examples show that register change, formality, informality, intimacy, and solidarity are equally presented by using both languages (Georgian and English). While the studies conducted by Canagarajah and Ferguson the native/first language is informal, and marked, "we-code", and the foreign language (English) is formal, unmarked "they-code", in the Georgian educational context, English is marked or unmarked as Georgian language. English as Georgian is characterized by the change in register. In the future, ten lecturers, who recorded the video lessons, should be interviewed.

References

- Adendorff, R. (1993). Codeswitching amongst Zulu-Speaking teachers and their pupils: Its functions and implications for teacher education. *Language and Education* 7(3): 141-161
- Arthur, J. (1994). English in Botswana primary classrooms: Functions and constraints. in C. Rubagumya (ed.), *Teaching and Researching Language in African Classrooms*, pp 63-78. Clevedon; Multilingual Matters.
- Arthur, J. (1996). Code-Switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 17-33.
- Auer, P. (1988). A Conversation Analytic Approach to Code-Switching and Transfer, In *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (Monica Heller, ed.), Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 187–213.
- Bailey, B. (2015). Interactional Sociolinguistics. In *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction* (eds K. Tracy, T. Sandel and C. Ilie). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi060>
- Blom, J. P., & Gumperz J. (1972). Social meaning in linguistic structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Camilleri, A. (1996). Language values and identities: Code-Switching in secondary classrooms in Malta. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 85-103.
- Canagarajah, S. (1995) Functions of Code Switching in ESL Classrooms: Socialising Bilingualism in Jaffna. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 16, 173-195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1995.9994599>
- Canagarajah, S. (2011), Codemeshing in Academic Writing: Identifying Teachable Strategies of Translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95: 401-417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01207.x>
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). *Sociolinguistic perspectives: papers on language in society, 1959-1994*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, G. (2003) Classroom Code-Switching in Post-Colonial Contexts: Functions, Attitudes and Policies. *AILA Review*, 16, 38-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/aila.16.05fer>
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Basil/Blackwell.
- Grosjean, F. (1982). *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.
- Gumperz J. J. (2002). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Johnson, R. K. (1983). Bilingual switching strategies: A study of the modes of teacher talk in bilingual secondary school classrooms in Hong Kong. *Language Learning and Communication* 2: 267-85.
- Johnson, R. K. and P. L. Lee. (1987). Modes of instruction: Teaching strategies and student responses. In R. Lord and H. Cheng (eds), *Language Education in Hong Kong*, pp 99-121. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (1996). Bilingualism or linguistic segregation? Symbolic domination, resistance and Code-Switching in Hong Kong schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8: 9-84.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. In K. A. King, & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2nd Edition, Volume 10: Research methods in language and education (pp. 273-286). New York: Springer Science.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2013). Critical discourse analysis: Overview. In Carol Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1466-1471). Oxford: Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1351

- Macaro, E. (2005) Codeswitching in the L2 Classroom: A Communication and Learning Strategy Non-Native Language Teachers, Volume 5, ISBN : 978-0-387-24566-9
- Martin, P. (1996). Code-Switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and unplanned language environment in Brunei. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 17 (2-4):128-144.
- Martin, P. (1999). Bilingual unpacking of monolingual texts in two primary classrooms in Brunei Darussalam. *Language and Education* 13(1): 38-58.
- Merritt, M. et al (1992). Socialising multilingualism; determinants of codeswitching in Kenyan primary classrooms. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13(1-2): 103-121.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Pp. xvi+306.
- Pennington, M. (1995). Pattern and variation in use of two languages in the Hong Kong secondary English class. *RELC Journal* 80-105.
- Pennington, M. (1996). Sensitising bilingual teachers to the use of two languages in the English class. In G. Sachs, M. Brock. and R. Lo (eds), *Directions in Second Language Teacher Education*. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.
- Udoro, B. (2008). *The Analysis of English Code Mixing Used in MTV Ampuh* Retrieved from: <http://etd.eprints.ums.ac.id/2173/1/A320040094.pdf>
- Williams, C. (1994) *Arfarniad o Ddulliau Dysgu ac Addysgu yng Nghyd-destun AddysgUwchradd Ddwyeithog*, [An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis (University of Wales, Bangor).

Author Information

Khatuna Buskivadze

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2187-1297>

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

Georgia

Contact email:

buskivadzekhatuna@gmail.com

Citation

Buskivadze, K. (2022). Socio- and Applied Linguistic Peculiarities of Using L1 in Georgian Educational Discourse. In S. El Takach & O. T. Ozturk (Eds.), *Studies on Social and Education Sciences 2022* (pp. 417-437). ISTES Organization.