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**Abstract**

In this paper, we reviewed the studies on code-switching practices (hereafter CS) in foreign (throughout the world) and Turkish EFL contexts. We analyzed and compared these studies with respect to its usage and pedagogical implications in the teaching and learning. Our review fundamentally revealed that there was a binarism on its usage in these contexts. The proponents of CS argue that its usage has positive implications, while the opponents are of the opinion that it prevents oral proficiency in L2 learning. The usage of CS has certain functions and advantages for both EFL instructors and learners in both contexts for the proponents. CS was mainly used by EFL learners subconsciously to keep their confidence and reliance; on the other hand, it was used consciously to maintain the flow of the conversation among their interlocutors. For EFL instructors, CS was mainly used to consolidate and transfer the intended meaning in their instructions in other words, for pedagogical purposes. The opponents, for both EFL instructors and learners, argued that the use CS in EFL contexts hinder the flow of communication and caused L1 interreference. This argument was posed based on the premises of Communicative Language Teaching Methodology which is still in progress in some EFL contexts. However, literature has provided evidence that the usage of CS had positive effects in both foreign (throughout the world) and Turkish EFL contexts.

Significant pedagogic implications were proposed for using CS in EFL contexts. Additionally, proposing a salient and explicit framework which specifies the methods and techniques in its usage is utmost high importance for further studies in this research paradigm.
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**Introduction**

Code-switching may simply be defined as a process used by bilinguals or multi-linguals to alternate two or more languages without changing the topic in their communication (Poplack, 1980). Hence, what we know about CS is largely derived from the studies conducted on the people who are bilinguals or multilinguals. They can switch from one language to the other(s) for the purpose of keeping the flow of their communication; therefore, CS plays a crucial role for their solidarity in their social and educational contexts (Crystal, 1987).

This case also drew the attention of the researchers in EFL contexts, and the main foci of these studies were mainly centered upon the argument whether CS has positive or negative impacts on teaching and learning English. With this respect, there has been a dichotomy which led these studies to ramify into two groups: the first one is the ‘’against’’ group which defends a strong opposition on its usage and the second one is the ‘’for’’ group which asserts that the usage of CS is a favorable tool to be used in EFL contexts.

Especially, with spread of Communicative Language Teaching starting from in the second half of the twentieth century (Larsen-Freeman,1986) and the impact of Common European Framework, there has been a strong opposition its usage since L1 interreference of EFL learners was taught to be hinder the speaking ability and fluency in the target language. Despite the strong oppositions, the studies, which support the idea that it has advantages in the use of CS in EFL classrooms, have outnumbered the opponents. The proponents argue that a judicious proportion of CS usage might help EFL learners to keep the flow of the interaction between their interlocutors.

Recently, research on CS have also provided important insights for the investigations in Turkish EFL contexts. Hence, several implications were also put forward regarding its usage in Turkish EFL contexts. To reach an understanding about the studies conducted in Turkish EFL contexts about CS, we will firstly review the studies on CS in EFL classrooms from different countries and then the studies on CS in EFL classrooms in Turkey. Rather than assigning criticism to these studies we aimed to provide an understanding whether they revealed the same results on the usage of CS as compared to those of EFL contexts throughout the world.

**Code switching in foreign EFL contexts**

After it was first mentioned by Weinreich in his book Languages in Contact (1953), CS has been extensively investigated by the researchers throughout the world. The main concern in these investigations was in what purpose it was used among bilinguals and multilinguals. This case was also attracted the researchers in the field of EFL contexts. They have mainly centered upon whether CS could be used as tool in enhancing language learners’ learning progress or not. To shed light in this research paradigm, we provided a literature review in EFL contexts. We followed a chronological order for the studies in both foreign and Turkish EFL contexts in our review. The following table illustrates CS studies conducted in foreign (throughout the world) contexts.

**Table 1.** *CS studies conducted in EFL contexts throughout the world.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Participants/Context** | **Methodology/Instrument** | **Main results** |
| Macaro (2001) | 6 student-teachers / England | Mixed methods/ Video recordings were used to gather data | Use of CS due to time constraints. A proposal for a framework when to use CS |
| Qian, Tian, & Wang (2009) | 1500 pupils & 30 primary teachers / China |  Conversation analysis / Video recordings were used to gather data | The cautious use of CS help and facilitate the foreign language learning in China. |
| Rahimi & Eftekhari (2011) | An EFL & ESP instructor / Iran | Qualitative method / Open-ended interview questions | Functional usage of CS in ESP classroom rather than in EFL classroom |
| Weng, (2012) | 36 non-English sophomore students / Taiwan | Mixed methods / Video recordings, questionnaire & post-interview | Functional usage for complex structures & strategic enhancement in teaching English |
| Amorim (2012) | 21 media studies undergraduates / Portugal | Conversation analysis / audio-recordings | Conscious and unconscious use of CS for pragmatic functions |
| Johnson (2013) | 5 EFL teachers & 96 EFL students / Sweden | Qualitative method/ interviews & questionnaire  | CS usage for important functions of language use |
| Gulzar and Asmari (2014) | 100 faculty members & 100 EFL university students | Quantitative method / cross sectional survey  | CS functions due poor linguistic competence |
| Simasiku, Kasanda & Smit (2015) | 12 ESL teachers / Namibia | Quantitative method / questionnaires and observationchecklists. | CS perceived as a tool for academic enhancement |
| Cancino & Díaz (2020) | 2 Female EFL teachers / Chile | Qualitative analysis / The FLAATT instrument | Observed CS usage as a hegemonic presence |
| Zainil & Safnili (2021) | 5 EFL teachers / Indonesia | Conversation analysis / video-recordings | Pedagogic and effective functions were identified for the use of CS. |

In his study Macaro (2001) analyzed CS usage with the contribution of 6 student teacher participants from the UK. He aimed to reveal how much CS is used by them, what makes them use and the reasons that influence their decision. Based on the framework of this case study, data was obtained from a quantitative analysis, an analysis of the interaction and a constructivist approach.

The starting point of why student teachers use L1, in other words CS, is their source of decision making which includes personal beliefs, knowledge acquired during training program and recommendations. After posing six arguments and counter arguments to consider and discuss, the basic factor that triggered the use of CS was time pressure for the participants. Additionally, due to some significant reasons, (e.g., whether to use CS or not when compared with the other teachers at school) the participants reflected that they faced difficulties during their experiences on their training course in England. As a result, the researcher propounded a framework that might help EFL student teachers when to use CS as a beneficial tool. Currently, this proposition is also a topical issue in this research paradigm under different concerns and approaches such as translanguaging.

In this longitudinal study (2006-2009 in Beijing, China), with the contributions of two teachers in the Primary English Curriculum Innovation project, Qian, Tian, and Wang, (2009) centered on the syntactical analysis of CS, then pedagogical and social functions of CS in the classroom contexts. Through transcribing the data from the observations, the researchers identified that inter-sentential CS is much more used than the other two types of CS (intra-sentential and tag switching). One of the significant data from the syntactical analysis of the study reflected that the drop off the amount of CS was observed especially in the first years of EFL students. The researchers finally concluded that the cautious use of CS help and facilitate the foreign language learning in China. However, it is a still contentious issue that to what extent its use is adequate for EFL classrooms.

According to Rahimi & Eftekhari (2011), the argument that insufficient exposure to English makes the students and teachers prone to using CS during their interactions in the class is perceived as a major problem in secondary schools in Iran. Therefore, they aimed to reveal underlying reasons of CS usage in Iranian secondary school context. In addition, for the purpose of exploring the trigger words which cause CS, the two classes one of which is a general English class, the other one is an ESP class were observed and the classroom instructors were also interviewed. The signs of trigger words are different with respect to both classrooms and most of the usages of CS is observed in ESP classroom rather than the general English classroom. Providing equivalents for the keywords, explaining grammatical structures, highlighting some lexical elements of vocabulary, inspiring students, expressing humor, and explaining next programs and assignments were accepted as the functions of Cs in Iranian EFL classrooms as a result of this study. Although this study held a psychologic perspective in revealing the underlying reasons of CS usage among EFL instructors and learners, the researchers did not implement any instrument that measure their feelings and opinions with this respect. The only criterion that was used to reach a conclusion were types of triggering corpus.

Weng (2012), aimed to find answers for the students’ and the teacher’s attitudes towards the use of CS. With its triple instruments to gather data from the participants, 36 of whom were sophomore students and an experienced English teacher in New Taipei in Taiwan. By adapting a framework (expressive function, directive function and meta-linguistic function) from Hymes’ studies (Hymes, 1962, pp. 15-53), the researcher analyzed the usages of CS in the classroom environment. He applied a questionnaire to students of which results revealed that the use CS enhanced the learning process of English effectively. On the other hand, the post-interview results also indicated that the use of CS in the class for complex concepts was helpful but if the aim was oral practice.

Another investigation conducted in Portugal as a qualitative study by Amorim (2012) reflected the functions and reasons of CS in students’ interaction and it also revealed whether these CS were done consciously or unconsciously. The participants of the study were 21 media studies undergraduates divided into three groups for a sixty-minute lesson. From this point of view, this should be separated from other studies under this title as it dealt with students’ perceptions on CS regarding to its conscious or unconscious usages. In one of the interviews held with the students, it was pointed out that as they were all Portuguese and competent in their MT, they could easily code switch whenever they needed it. Herewith, the usages CS was also a conscious process based on the students’ needs. The researcher also draws our attention to the relationship between students’ proficiency level and functions of their CS usage. Additionally, the students regarded CS as a strategy to reach their communication objectives. This study reflected students’ perceptions on CS by stating that they were regarded as a useful tool to perform students’ communicative activities in the classroom environment.

In his research, Johnson (2013) provides a very favorable interview questions on behalf of making a comparison of teachers and students CS preferences. The participants are not only the teachers (4 out of 5 are females and the other is male) but also 96 students. Qualitatively held in a medium-sized town in Sweden, this study also attracts our attention to the similarities of the grammar knowledge and terminology between English and Swedish. This situation is perceived as a strategy for Swedish students’ use of CS when learning English and Swedish share similar linguistic features. Even though students argue that CS is a strategy to understand the TL, they want their teachers to speak English more in the classroom environment. As a further study, the researcher proposes to investigate the amount of unintentional CS usage among the upper-secondary teachers of Sweden.

In their study, Gulzar and Asmari (2014) aimed to answer how Saudi EFL teachers and students decide on which reasons for CS were permissible or less permissible and how EFL teachers in Saudi university decided on the usage of its different functions in Saudi EFL classrooms. This cross-sectional survey study was carried out by the researchers with the contributions of 100 faculty members in TUELC (Taif University English Language Centre) and 100 EFL students at Taif University. The researchers focused on the awareness and use of CS as a strategy to teach English in Saudi EFL classrooms. The findings showed that, CS could be a beneficial strategy for EFL students in Saudi Arabia. However, when considered the first research question posed by the researchers, they did not provide clear-cut distinctions which types of CS were more permissible, or which were less.

Simasiku, Kasanda and Smit (2015) investigate whether CS has a contribution on the learners’ academic achievement or not. The research was conducted on 12 EFL teachers at 12 different schools in the Caprivi Educational Region in Namibia. The results of the research were subcategorized into three sections in order to reflect the participants view on CS usage. These are *(a)* the effects of CS on learners’ achievement, *(b)* teachers’ perceived advantages of CS and *(c)* learners and teachers’ preferred language for communication. The results obtained from these classified views of teachers, which were then analyzed by SPSS, revealed that CS enhanced the learning of English. What this study lacks on the efficiency of using CS in the classroom environment is that it did not put any emphasis on students’ perceptions.

Cancino and Díaz (2020) aimed to investigate what types and how frequent functional usage of CS were performed by EFL teachers and their hegemonic language use (L1 or L2). With these purposes, data were gathered from two female EFL teachers working at a high school in Chile. The researchers used the FLAATT (Functional Language Alternation Analysis of Teacher Talk) instrument which measured three classroom interaction units: core goals, framework goals and social goals. Their study revealed an inconsistency in the usage of CS practices for the language functions. According to them, this case was also an indication of subconscious CS usage in those classroom contexts.

Based on Conversation analysis (CA) and stimulated recall interview (SRI), Zainil and Safnili (2021) investigated why EFL teachers code-switched and revealing their perceptions regarding CS. Five EFL junior high school teachers participated in this study. The researchers gathered data from the transcriptions of video lesson recordings and SRI audio recordings. According to the result of the study, the researchers identified pedagogical and effective functions of CS in Indonesian EFL school contexts. Most of the pedagogical functions of CS were centered upon grammatical patterns; on the other hand, effective functions were centered upon compensating the inadequate language proficiency, giving feedback, and maintaining the flow of the course. Additionally, as was indicated in most of the studies in this research paradigm, time constraint on EFL teachers was another important factor that triggers the usage of CS. The findings of this study contribute a lot in framing CS usage and supports preparing an amenable program to use in EFL contexts.

**Code switching in EFL classrooms in Turkey**

Relevant to the studies that were conducted throughout the world, CS has also been as a concern for the researchers on the basis of whether it has contributions to the learning and acquiring of foreign languages in Turkey. The following table illustrates CS studies conducted in Turkish contexts. Our main purpose is to reveal whether CS was investigated for the same purposes and the same results were obtained from these studies.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Participants** | **Methodology/Instrument** | **Main results** |
| Üstünel & Seedhouse (2005) | 100 EFL university students | Conversation analysis / video and audio-recordings | The use of CS based on pedagogical focus and sequence in the talk-in-interaction  |
| Bensen & Cavusoglu (2013) | 4 EFL teachers / North Cyprus  | Qualitative study / audio-recordings | CS use was regarded as a useful tool when implemented carefully  |
| Horasan (2014) | 4 EFL instructors / 43 EFL learners | Mixed methods / classroom observations, questionnaires, & interviews | The use of CS at different levels and meta-language use of CS to teach grammatical patterns |
| Raman & Yigitoglu (2015) | 3 novice EFL teachers & 12 EFL students | Qualitative study / video recordings & stimulated recall interviews | Cs was perceived as a positive contributor in teaching and learning English |
| Ozdemir (2015)  | 34 university students | Action research / students written reports | Strategies used for preventing the use of CS were ineffective in EFL classroom  |
| Akkaya & Atar (2015) | Graduate EFL students | Conversation and Discourse analysis / video and audio-recordings | Thirteen different pedagogic functions of CS were identified |
| Yataganbaba & Yıldırım (2015) | 3 EFL teachers  | Mixed methods /  video recordings and semi-structured interviews | Beneficial effects of CS usage were emphasized |
| Bilgin (2016) | 5 Student teachers | Qualitative study / video-recordings, stimulated recall interviews | The importance of CS usage more than pedagogical factors was stressed and suggestion for the inclusion of CS into EFL teacher and mentor education programs  |
| Karakaya & Dikilitaş (2020) | 550 EFL university students / 50 EFL instructors | Mixed methods / Questionnaires and interviews  | Cautious use CS was suggested to facilitate the learning process |
| Ataş & Sağın (2021) | 5 EFL instructors / 150 university students | Qualitative case study research / video recordings, transcription software EXMARaLDA | Use of CS to perform better communicative functions in the classroom context. |

Üstünel and Seedhouse (2005) investigated the use of CS to reveal the sequential organization by implementing a conversation analysis perspective. The study was carried out at two different departments (modern languages and linguistics) of a state university. The participants were 100 EFL learners attending to these departments. As for data gathering instruments, video and audio recordings were used and data were transcribed based on the conversation analysis conventions. The researchers held two perspectives for EFL teacher’s pedagogic functional use of CS: teacher-initiated and teacher-induced. Hence, they identified pedagogical functions for teacher-initiated CS and teacher-induced. Their study revealed that there was a sequential order in the usage of CS in EFL classroom context. As a result, they proposed that the usage of CS was an interactional resource for both EFL teaching and learning, and further investigation needed to be carried out in different language teaching and learning contexts.

With its homogenous teacher participants, two bilinguals of English and Cypriot Turkish, one native speaker of English and a native speaker of Cypriot Turkish, this study was conducted in EFL classrooms in the English Preparatory School of a private university in North Cyprus (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013). As it was indicated in one of the similar studies, this study will also be reviewed in this section as the basic language of the participants are Turkish even their local language has some dialectic varieties. With the aim of answering the suggested questions the researchers apply a qualitative case study. The situations in which CS was used, the purposes of CS used by from different linguistic backgrounds and the positive and negative sides of CS in the classrooms were the main foci of this study. The results reflected that no matter what linguistic background an EFL teacher had, CS was used in the classrooms in order to provide clarifying meaning and saving time. However, when the purpose of the context was to pass a specific language proficiency exam focusing on grammatical points within a limited time, CS then may not be useful as the students were intrinsically motivated to communicative competence. Again, in this situation, it might be questioned whether it could be constituted such an environment in the classroom by decreasing the use of CS and augmenting the use of TL communicatively.

Horasan (2014) states in her study that the high percentage of CS depends on lack of motivation, and it is used not only consciously but also unconsciously for a number of functions whether they are linguistic or methodological. Data obtained from this mixed methods study with the contribution of 43 students at elementary level and four instructors at a public university reveals that CS use is also seen as a tool which helps both learning and teaching English. The question still remains to be answered is whether there is a criterion which we will decide on the amount of CS usage in the classroom or how a teacher should decide its amount. The researcher also presupposes a further longitudinal study on a larger scale with a larger sampling.

Raman and Yigitoglu (2015) evaluated the perceptions of the participants in their case study which was conducted to the novice teachers at the School of Foreign Languages in Northern Cyprus. Since the L1 of the participants in Northern Cyprus is Turkish, even it has some dialectic differences; this study is included in this section. This paper addresses the questions of what the functions of CS in novice teachers’ practices, their perceptions towards CS were and the students’ perceptions on the role of CS in the classroom. By using qualitative data analysis software MaxQDA11, the research presented the participants’ preferences on the usage of CS as: connectedness to classroom, to encourage learning, to connect L1 and L2, to reflect teachers’ inner voice, to define feelings, emotions, abstract concepts, to make easy comprehension for students and to keep the students in the language learning. The first criterion to be discussed in this study is that CS was chosen as the quickest way of checking understandings of the students. What factors forced the teachers to choose this quickest way or why they chose this easiest way are the other questions that may have been answered in this study. Furthermore, as a positive aspect of this study which the other studies did not propose is that the distribution of students’ level in an EFL classroom and the exam-oriented system in Turkish education system affects CS use and amount adversely. These factors were expressed by the students’ participants of the research; however, they also implied that they could easily understand when CS was used by their teachers. These results provided further support for the hypothesis that CS had both educational functions and teacher-student stated functions in EFL classrooms, which should also be investigated as a longitudinal study for the development of CS studies.

In his study, Ozdemir (2015) investigated CS with respect its negative consequences in an EFL classroom context where the main purpose is to enhance EFL learners’ communicative competence in the target language. The researcher’s action research centered on the group work activities as a favorable technique in which the students participate communicatively. The researcher aimed to answer whether the amount of speaking in group and pair work activities was sufficient or not, the reasons of CS and the measures that could prevent CS while increasing the quantity of speaking in English. Having been conducted on 34 elementary students in different departments of a state university, the researcher determined seven important strategies in order to decrease the use of CS usage in these activities. These are: *(1)* Explaining the aim of the activity clearly, *(2)* providing the language according to the students need, *(3)* making students work with a different partner, *(4)* punishment, *(5)* rewarding, *(6)* letting the students pre-plan, and *(7)* monitoring more closely. The researcher claimed that with the implementation of the strategies in this stud, the use of CS might be lessened in pair and group work activities. In order to apply these strategies, the researcher may take into consideration the proficiency level of EFL teachers, the language learning contexts and the importance given to EFL learning in the current National Education System in Turkey.

Akkaya and Atar (2015) investigated the usage of CS based on discourse analysis and conversation analysis. This study was conducted at a state university with the contribution of graduate EFL students. The data was collected in the listening and speaking classes of four different classes. Audio- recordings were used by the researchers to gather data and they identified 13 pedagogical functions that were attributed to teacher talk. The researchers also identified a systematic preference organization for specific functions. The researchers concluded that Cs was not a negative tool, in contrast; it could be a beneficial tool for EFL classrooms. However, the paper also fails to specify in what amount of CS is valid as a beneficial factor EFL classroom.

This research also emphasized the types of CS used in EFL classrooms, their functions and whether it had contributions or not in language learners’ learning process (Yataganbaba & Yıldırım, 2015). It was conducted in two different cities: Denizli and Adana in Turkey. Three EFL teachers and their classrooms were the participants of the study. The researchers applied a mixed methods research design in which quantitative design was used in order to count the occurrences of CSs by teachers; on the other hand, qualitative design was for to analyze classroom interaction transcriptions. The research questions of the study revealed that CS was a matter of fact, in EFL classrooms and the balance of the usage of CS was of high importance in order to prevent the participants resorting to overuse of it. It was also highlighted in this study that promoting risk-taking behavior among language learners, a professional community in which the EFL teachers could share their ideas about the usage of MT and TL in the classroom, adaptation of the EFL teachers’ own discourse to the pedagogic discourse and keeping journals may have been beneficial in decreasing CS use in schools.

This study handled CS and its effective factors by making a comparison between ELT teachers and five student teachers at a state university in Turkey with the help of a thematic analysis (Bilgin, 2016). Another point reflected in this study is how CS is used to understand the relationship between the interaction taking place in the class and their teacher identity. The data obtained from the transcriptions and stimulated interviews to the participants revealed that their CS use was mostly centered on the grammar teaching sessions. Here also it may be inferred from the study that there was a big gap between the student teacher and their supervisor on the understanding of CS usage in the classroom. In other words, the student teachers were not supportive on the over-usage of CS when compared their supervisors in the classroom. This study also argues whether CS could be inserted into education program as a strategy for effective language teaching. In addition, the most important aspect of this study was that it correlated the use CS with the teacher’s identity and characteristics by implying the incompetency of the teacher education programs in Turkey.

Karakaya and Dikilitaş (2020) investigated the perceptions of EFL teachers and students regarding the use of CS in their classrooms. With the participation of 550 EFL students and 50 EFL instructors at three different state universities, the researchers administered questionnaires and semi-structured interview based on a mixed methods perspective. This study revealed that both student and instructor participants regarded CS usage as beneficial tool in EFL classrooms. EFL instructors viewed CS as a tool which was used to cope with the pedagogical challenges in their classrooms. On the other hand, the EFL learners viewed CS usage positively especially, in enhancing their understanding, providing affective support such as encouraging participation, and improving their motivation in learning target language. The researchers argued that the usage of CS in EFL contexts should be taken into consideration when preparing educational policies. This results construe with the previous studies that were conducted in this research paradigm.

In their studies Ataş and Sağın-Simşek (2021) aimed to reveal discourse and educational functions of CS and how frequently it was used in the EFL classroom contexts based on a qualitative case study research paradigm. The participants of this study were 5 EFL instructors and 150 EFL students attending to school of foreign languages of a state university. The researchers identified fifteen educational functions and ten discourse functions of CS from their transcriptions of the video-recordings. Forms of CS were also identified as discourse markers, phrase-sentence level witches and other forms of switches. The researchers stressed the importance of a planned procedure of CS usage might be beneficial for the enhancement of EFL learners language learning. They also argued that since the usage of CS was a natural process all parties in the language learning field should benefit from its advantages.

**Conclusion**

The phenomenon CS in the field of language studies has always been a controversial concern especially Turkish EFL contexts (Üstünel & Seedhouse, 2004; Sert, 2005; Yatağanbaba & Yıldırım, 2015; Karakaya & Dikilitaş, 2020; Ataş & Sağın, 2021). When approached to this research paradigm in a figurative way *‘’To be, or not to be, that is the question’’ (Shakespeare, 1604, 3)* would be the best apothegm to reflect the fuzziness whether CS should be used or not in EFL classrooms. Even in most of the studies in this paper, the types of CS and the reasons prompting it have been significantly demarcated; few of them can clearly prove the distinction between CS emerging in bilinguals and in EFL learners as they detect bilinguals’ use of CS as a starting point for their studies. Another common point they argue is that it could be used as a helpful strategy in language teaching. However, there has been very little research directly differentiating the two parameters: *(1)* to understand and learn (learn means here to be able to grasp the linguistic features of English) the target language (hereafter TL) with the help of CS or *(2)* to communicate and transfer the meaning between interlocutors in TL with the help of CS. Finally, it should be taken into consideration in CS use is whether proficiency levels of EFL students have an effect on the amount and quality of CS or not.

One of the most important implications about the usage of CS in EFL classrooms is that since the very beginning of ELT in Turkey, there has always been an inconsistency among ELT teachers, whether it is a useful strategy or an obstacle hindering the effective and fluent communication in the TL. This may have been the outcome of the incessant changes in education policy, especially the school types in which EFL teaching hours are distributed among a deranged and inadequate manner, have negative effects on teaching English. In other words, the limited time for teaching a foreign language may lead EFL teachers to overuse CS in order to save time. The distribution of the students according to their levels in EFL classrooms is also another important issue in Turkey (Raman & Yigitoglu, 2015). As a consequence of this situation, when compared with the students competent in communicative activities, lower-level students may feel anxious about speaking in the TL. Therefore, CS may seem to them as a supportive tool which can affect this language learning process adversely.

The literature has provided significant contributions of CS practices in both Turkish and foreign EFL contexts. However, based on previous findings and as a means of further research, the researchers should focus on a tangible framework on the utility of CS practices in EFL contexts. In our review we aimed to reveal whether CS usage in foreign EFL and Turkish context yielded the same results. As for the results, the usage of CS served the same purposes with an exceptional result where CLT was used as a methodology to consolidate the flow of the communication in classroom context (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2013, Ozdemir, 2015). From the perspectives of EFL teachers, instructors, and students, it was mainly used for pedagogical and communicative aspects. Two important suggestions should be put forward from the studies rereviewed in this paper. The first one is to prepare a tangible educational policy which contains effective strategies based on the perceptions of EFL instructors, teachers and students regarding L1 usage in the classroom contexts, and the second one is to establish premises that identifies the use of CS with respect to its pedagogical functions and delimitations.
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