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Abstract

This paper investigates and identifies patterns of classroom languages use by both learners and teachers in the English learning classroom.

In order to answer the research questions guiding the present study, data were collected both from learners (n= 36) and their teachers (n= 3).

The instruments employed in the data collection were two, namely a questionnaire (administered to the learners), and a classroom observation grid (used with the teachers). The questionnaire is a survey, and as such a quantitative method. And, the observations are however qualitative.

One of the main findings in the study was the correlation in pattern of language use between the teacher’s and the learners. More precisely, it was found that a high percentage of English use on the part of the teacher resulted in a high percentage of this language also in the learners. It was also found that the teachers’ use of both Swedish and English in instruction giving resulted in a higher use of English by the learners, perhaps because the learners were able to understand the instructions better if translanguaging occurred. Another important finding of the study is that learners reported not to be allowed nor encouraged to use their mother tongue as a resource. Besides, most of the learners did not think that using all of their languages would be an advantage in L3 learning English.
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1. Introduction

In Sweden, almost a fifth of all learners have a mother tongue other than Swedish, including learners who are either born in Sweden or abroad (Skolverket, 2008). Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the school to make the learners’ languages valuable, above all because it is a part of shaping the learners’ identity. In this sense, guaranteeing language development in Swedish bilingual learners is an important commitment to teaching (Skolverket, 2011a). Hence, as the guidelines in Skolverket (2011b:1) indicate, “Having access to their mother tongue facilitates language development and learning in different areas”. Claims such as this one are inspired by pedagogical recommendations derived from empirical evidence reported, above all, in research on translinguaging and mother tongue instruction. Among these recommendations, particularly outstanding for the present självståndigsarbete is the view of the mother tongue as a resource in learning an additional language (e.g. Cenoz, 2000; Cummins, 1979, 1980, 1981; Jonsson, 2012; Todeva & Cenoz, 2009, among others).

With this as starting point, the aim of the study presented here was to identify patterns of classroom language use by young bilingual Swedish learners and the teachers when learning English as a third language. By so doing, it was also possible to explore whether the learners’ choices in language use and alternation in the L2 classroom may correlate in any way with teachers’ patterns of language use in different situations and for different functions and communicative purposes, as reflected in the research questions guiding the study. Before posing these questions, Section 2 presents and critically discusses the findings in previous studies on mother tongue instruction, bilingual education, classroom language use. The latter includes different ways to use language as a form of scaffolding, and translinguaging. To this aim, data from 36 young bilingual learners was collected by means of a questionnaire, and 3 three teachers in grade 2 and 3 were observed during their English lessons.
2. Theoretical Review

This section starts by discussing key terminology related to the field of study, and moves on to offer a brief review of previous work conducted in the investigation of language use in bi- and multilingual classrooms, both from the learner’s and the teacher’s perspective. Next, recent theories that have been proposed in order to explain these perspectives are presented and discussed. Furthermore, empirical gaps in previous work outlined at the end of each subsection in relation to the main issues brought up in each of them.

2.1. Mother Tongue Instruction & Bilingual Education

In the literature on second language acquisition, the terms ‘bilingualism’ and ‘multilingualism’ relate to the ability to use two or more languages, often assuming different abilities for different skills (Herdina and Jessner, 2002; Munoz, 2006), i.e. listening, speaking, writing and reading. Notwithstanding, the term ‘multilingualism’ is sometimes subsumed in the term bilingualism (Baker, 2011; García & Wei, 2014). In consistence with this convention, bilingualism in this study refers to both bilingualism and multilingualism after briefly defining both of them separately. However, in research on multilingualism, the most generally accepted view is that bilingualism and multilingualism are indeed distinct linguistic phenomena, above all because they rely on different learning and psycholinguistic mechanisms (e.g. see Hammarberg, 2009 and Bardel, Falk & Lindqvist, 2016). Hence, a bilingual person is commonly seen as an individual who has the skills to use two languages, whereas a multilingual person has the ability to use three or more languages (Baker, 2011; García, 2009), even if these languages can be used with different levels of ability and for different functional purposes (Coste, 1997; Herdina & Jessner, 2002), as acknowledged by the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2001). Therefore, it is difficult to define what level of proficiency a bilingual or multilingual person needs in their languages to be called bilingual or multilingual. In conclusion, defining who is bilingual or multilingual is difficult and somewhat problematic.

Because bilinguals are assumed to have different proficiency levels in each language of their linguistic background (Baker, 2011; García, 2009; Hammarberg, 2014; Sánchez & Bardel, 2017), some bilingual and multilingual speakers may be equally proficient in all of their languages, and some have a higher level in one or two languages and lower level in the other languages. Other bilinguals might still be in earlier stages of learning a second or third language and have low proficiency in the language that is being learnt, the target language. By contrast, bilinguals are often more dominant in
one language, their language abilities in their two languages are rarely equal, and they use their languages separately in different situations and with different people (Baker, 2011; Gunnarsson & Källqvist, 2016; Håkansson, 2003).

A person’s first language (L1) is called *mother tongue*, a term which is difficult to define, especially as it pertains to its identification in bilingual learners who are exposed to two languages in a language contact situation. In such situations, the language spoken in the community co-exists with a minority language. Conventionally, the learners’ L1 is their *heritage language* (henceforth, HL), that is, their home language, whereas the L2 corresponds to the *language spoken in the society* and is the dominant language in school settings (Polinsky, 2015: 165). In compliance with prior research, this will be the terminology employed in this Självständigt arbete.

As regards the teaching of the learners’ HL, a report from Skolverket (2008) claims that instruction in the learners’ HL is beneficial in learning within different subjects, and that having access to their mother tongue facilitates their linguistic development. This claim is compatible with Cummins’ *developmental interdependence* hypotheses (1979, 1980, 1981). The first hypothesis proposes that a minimum threshold of language proficiency in the L1 needs to be reached before learners can use it as a tenet in L2 learning. Similarly, the second hypothesis proficiency in the L1 and the L2 is interconnected, in such a way that gains in proficiency in one of them goes hand in gains in proficiency in the other language. Some authors suggest that these hypotheses may also be extended to the contexts of multilingual learning, because “different degrees of proficiency in the first and second languages would affect the acquisition of the third (or fourth) language” (Cenoz, 2000; see also Jonsson, 2012; Todeva & Cenoz, 2009). Thus, the primary aim of HL instruction is for learners to develop knowledge about their mother tongue, both linguistic and cultural, supported by empirical findings in research that highlight the importance of mother tongue education and its influence on language development (Lundberg, 2011). Likewise, the learners’ mother tongue should be seen as a linguistic resource rather than a barrier to learning a third (or fourth) language. Along similar lines, and recent research shows that multilingualism increases the development of linguistic proficiency (Cummins, 2007; Lundberg, 2011).

Further support motivating HL instruction can be found in studies such as Philipson & Skutnabb-Kangas (2009; Jonsson, 2012), according to whom encouraging the pupils to use their mother tongue when learning an additional language is a form of *scaffolding*, that is, a form of support that aims to assist the learners when they are unable to, for example, understand a word or phrase but also carrying
out tasks. By the same token, these authors also argue that using the target language is another form of scaffolding. In relation to this, Garcia (2009) claims that it is important for bilingual pedagogy, and especially for bilinguals who are at the beginning stages of learning a language.

2.2. Bilingual education and classroom language use

From a pedagogical point of view, the use of the HL for instruction has been described as bilingual education, and regarded as a complex phenomenon and an umbrella term (Baker, 2011; García, 2009). According to Baker (2011:207), the term has been used to refer to “(1) education that uses and promotes two languages and (2) relatively monolingual education in second language, typically for language minority children”. At the same time, these uses of the term “(1) a classroom where formal instruction fosters bilingualism and (2) a classroom where bilingual children are present, but bilingualism is not promoted in the curriculum” (Baker, 2011:207; see also García, 2009).

Yet, there are different types of bilingual education (see Table 1) depending on the language of instruction, the composition of the learners in the second language classroom, as well as sociocultural and linguistic outcomes of the education are the basis when classifying them (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 1996; Garcia, 2009; Tuomela, 2001). Starting by separating monolingual and bilingual education, a monolingual education strictly uses the majority language as the language of instruction, while the minority language is rarely used. In a bilingual education context two languages are used, facilitated by the fact that the learners in the classroom usually have the same mother tongue. MP1 takes a starting point in the language majority pupils’ knowledge requirements, which leads to a monolingual language outcome. MP2 is very unusual in that the learners use their mother tongue as a means to be segregated from the culture of the majority language.

Table 1. Types of bilingual education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Brief definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority language</td>
<td>MP1</td>
<td>Only the majority language is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority language</td>
<td>MP2</td>
<td>Unusual. The minority language is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same mother tongue</td>
<td>BP1</td>
<td>All learners have the same mother tongue and limited proficiency in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In BP1 the learners have one common mother tongue, and they have a limited proficiency in the majority language. The aim is to use the mother tongue to help learners achieve knowledge in every school subject. On the other hand, the BP2 has both the majority language and the learners’ mother tongue as the language of instruction. Hence, in the class there can be pupils with the same two languages or 50% with majority language as mother tongue and 50% with minority language as mother tongue (Tuomela, 2001). The minority language can be different, but it is usually the same for all learners. This aims for the learners to have the same knowledge as majority language pupils, but also to have knowledge in their mother tongue. BP3 is similar to BP2, but the aim is for both groups of learners to be bilingual and bicultural (Tuomela, 2001).

Previous research on these different types of educational programs seems to suggest that the most effective one for the linguistic development of bilinguals is a program with more than one language that pursues the bilingual learners’ development in both their first and second language (Tuomela, 2001). This development, in turn, would be consistent with the proposals of common underlying proficiency and interrelated language development discussed above (Cenoz, 2000, Cummins, 1980; Todeva & Cenoz, 2009). In this sense, it is worth mentioning some empirical evidence in the Swedish context only a few number of learners with a mother tongue other than Swedish do indeed receive bilingual education, and they are educated by means of MP1 instead (Tuomela, 2001; Skolverket, 2008).

Another important principle of bilingual education is at a social level, namely, social justice and social practice, both of which principles need to be combined for a good pedagogical practice to be effective (Garcia, 2009). First of all, the meaning of social justice is for the pupils’ identities to not be threatening in a learning context. It should aim for an education that builds equality for all pupils’ languages, linguistic identities and cultures. This is consistent with the importance given to languages in the construction of to our identity (Baker, 2011; Norén, 2010). In this line of investigation, Norén (2010) conducted a study on multilingual classrooms with bilingual mathematical education. It was
found that the learners who participated in the study reported to feel more secure and develop a deeper knowledge when they were allowed to use all of their languages during math class.

Secondly, in social practises it is important for the teacher to create meaningful contexts where his or her learners are allowed to use all of their languages with a linguistic focus (García, 2009). The teacher, though, does not have to know all of the languages, but his or her attitude towards using the learners’ mother tongue as a resource reflects on how the learners feel in the classroom (García, 2009; Norén 2010). García (2009; Lorin, 2015; Williams, 2012) argues that the learners should not be given times when they are allowed to use the languages, but instead, the teacher should plan to integrate the languages in the classroom. Furthermore, it is important that the teacher creates a good and secure climate for language learning in the classroom, and to this aim he or she is an important exemplary model for language development (Lundberg, 2011).

Further, bilingualism is often seen as a norm in Scandinavia (Baker, 2011). Still, research shows that bilingual HL learners with a lower proficiency in Swedish are impeded by a monolingual education, which, in turn, benefits fluent Swedish speaking pupils (Wedin, 2011). These are the conclusions reached in a case study with learners in a multicultural classroom. One of them had Swedish as mother tongue, while the other two had a mother tongue other than Swedish. These two learners with Swedish as their second language relied on the oral input of Swedish from teachers and other learners. Yet, the study showed that the teacher and the other learners spoke a longer amount of time only at a few situations. In addition, the opportunities for output were few for the learners. The learners who finished with the tasks were allowed to speak about something in front of the class, this often were the monolingual learners (Wedin, 2011).

In a larger scale with 180 bilingual learners in Swedish schools (mother tongue Finnish), Tuomela (2001) investigated three different types of educations, namely bilingual (Swedish and Finnish both medium of instruction), monolingual with mother tongue support (Swedish as the language of instruction) and a private school with bilingual education (both Swedish and Finnish as the language of instruction). The author found different results for each type of education, with all learners (regardless of education program) having a high level of proficiency in both languages. And the differences between the learners’ linguistic complexity in the different educations systems were minor. For example, the learners in the monolingual school made double the amount of grammatical wrongs in Finnish as the learners in the bilingual school made in Swedish. Besides, the study showed that the learners in the monolingual classroom had a lower proficiency in Finnish, whereas in the bilingual classroom they had a lower proficiency in Swedish. These findings supports Baker’s (2011) studies
about bilinguals often being dominant in one language. The difference between the Wedin and Tuomela studies is; in Tuomelas monolingual classroom all learners had the same mother tongue while in Wedins multicultural classroom the learners had different mother tongues.

The evidence discussed in the Swedish context relates so far to the learning of Swedish (L2) and the learners’ HL (L1). The picture becomes more complicated when a third language comes into play in this scenario, in this case, English. Hence, the studies cited above show different results of how bilingual pupils learn Swedish, but they make no predictions as to whether the same theoretical considerations could also apply to the learning of English as a third language. As far as L3 English is concerned, Ladberg (2003) claims that English as a subject is a more difficult-to-learn subject for learners with a mother tongue other than Swedish. The reason for this, he claims, is not the amount of languages to be learnt, but rather the language being used to teach English, often Swedish. In this case, the learners need to make double translations between English, Swedish and their mother tongue. It has to be noted that the scarce evidence of research in this direction calls for the need to investigate the roles played by the Swedish and HLs in English language classrooms, with a special focus on linguistic development.

Another empirical study on functional multilingualism involving Swedish and English is the one presented in Björklund & Suni (2000), who investigated learners’ use of both their languages (Finnish, Swedish) and their L3 languages (English and German) in an immersion program. In an immersion program the target language is used as the medium of instruction because the learners are learning in another language, not about it. Thus, they are encouraged to use the target language but allowed to use his or her mother tongue with the purpose of becoming fluent and active language users in the target language, not translators. The analysis of the data in their study, gathered by means of a questionnaire, showed that 67% of the learners in grade three used Finnish and Swedish in the classroom, while only 20% reported to use Finnish, Swedish and English. When asked about in which language they thought, the majority of them answered Finnish, with Swedish coming in second place. Importantly, this pattern of language use seems to be unrelated to the typological relations perceived to exist between the languages involved. This was true both of learners and their teachers, who perceived more similarities between Swedish (their second language) and the target languages English and German than with Finnish. On the other hand, the teachers considered that claimed their learners were linguistically overloaded, and pointed at possible disadvantages of using the learners’ mother tongue (Finnish), second language (Swedish) and English as languages of instruction.
To summarise this section, the research on second language learning reviewed here seem to point out that mother tongue instruction possibly has benefits for the learners’ linguistic development in all of his or her background languages, and also for academic achievements in other school subjects such as mathematics. At the same time, and compared to the literature on second language learning, there is only a small amount of research on mother tongue as a resource in third language learning. In this sense, an empirical gap that needs to be addressed is the role played by the mother tongue and the second language in bilingual learners, and how these languages (and their monolingual or bilingual use in the classroom) could be used as a resource in third language learning. As regards the use of these languages in the Swedish context, mixed results have been obtained in that teachers in Swedish schools let and do not let learners use their mother tongue as a resource, despite it is an important part of the construction of their identities and a potential form of successful scaffolding for learning.

2.3. Translanguaging

In recent approaches to classroom language use, the alternation between languages of the kind described in the preceding section is referred to as translanguaging. The concept of ‘translanguaging’ relates to a new pedagogical practice referring to the natural language practices of bilinguals (García, 2009; García & Wei, 2014; Yoons, 2014; Håkansson, 2003; Ladberg, 2003; Williams, 2012). Notwithstanding, translanguaging is not limited to the alternation or code-switching between languages. In fact, there is a difference epistemologically between code switching and translanguaging that is important to acknowledge (García & Lin, 2016; Lewis, Jones & Baker, 2012). García (2009:51) explains translanguaging as “intermingle linguistic features” in bilingual communities. Therefore, translanguaging and code switching should not be compared, for code switching is a monolingual use of languages. In addition, García (2009) argues that the concept of translanguaging is not to look at the languages as two or three monolingual languages (Grosjean, 1992) but without clear-cut boundaries. In consonance with the remarks here, García & Wei’s (2014: 22) definition of the construct emphasizes that “[t]ranslanguaging differs from the notion of code-switching in that it refers not simply to a shift or a shuttle between two languages, but to the speakers’ construction and use of original and complex interrelated discursive practices that cannot be easily assigned to one or another traditional definition of a language, but that make up the speakers’ complete language repertoire”.

Although translanguaging is a complex and fluid practice, previous studies (Baker, 2011; García, 2009; Jonsson, 2012; Lorin, 2015) suggest that it helps learners to gain understanding and develop a
deeper knowledge. Even though translanguaging is not only an oral practice (Garcia & Wei, 2014), most contemporary research addresses this modality (but see evidence of translanguaging in written modality in Gunnarsson & Källkvist, 2016; Gunnarsson, Housen, van de Weijer & Källkvist, 2015). For example, Muhonen (2012) observed a teacher performing translanguaging in an English classroom in a bilingual school in Sweden, with Swedish and Finnish as the languages of instruction. The learners are 13 to 14 years old. The teacher asked a question about how a word was spelled, in English followed by asking the same question in Swedish afterwards. The learner answered in English and the teacher gave supportive feedback in Finnish. The teacher used translanguaging in this situation to play with the learners’ linguistic repertoire. (Muhonen, 2012).

An important but often underestimated issue when it comes to teachers’ use of translanguaging in the classroom is that teachers do not have to share the same languages as the learners for it to be successful, and that monolingual teachers can then use translanguaging as well (Garcia & Wei, 2014). Hence, in a multicultural classroom it would be impossible for the teacher to know all the languages, but on the other hand, the teacher should be interested and take risks with saying words in his and her learners’ languages, as it would make learners comfortable to take risk in English as well as showing them an open mind towards different languages and cultures (Garcia & Wei, 2014). An example of translanguaging for monolingual teachers could be dividing the pupils in to homogeneous groups based of mother tongue. As a matter of fact, this teacher practice is welcome and encouraged in the Swedish context, where the fundamental values at school are to help the pupils to be aware of their own culture to provide an identity along with developing an understanding and empathy towards others’ culture (Skolverket, 2011a). From this it follows that for translanguaging to be successful, the teacher has to plan for the use of two languages. To be consistent with this, the task for the teacher is to plan how the learners are going to use their different languages in the classroom for it to be cognitively stimulating for the pupils (Baker C., 2001). To this aim, Baker (2001: 281-282) proposes the following potential advantages of translanguaging:

A. “It may promote a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter”

The author argues that, in a monolingual teaching situation, learners can possibly produce a text without understanding, whereas if they have an understanding about something in two languages they have really understood it. If the pupils receive input in one language (e.g. reading) and then produce output (e.g. discussion or write about it) in another language, then they have to process and it benefits for a deeper understanding.

B. “Develop skills in their weaker language”
In translanguaging, learners get to develop their bi- and multilingualism and also academic languages skills in all of their languages. In so doing, they tend to use their stronger language in more difficult tasks, and their weaker language only in tasks that are less challenging.

C. “Home-school cooperation”

Translanguaging can be facilitating for the communication of a learner and his or hers minority language parents, who in turn, can support their child with his or her school work.

D. “Develop their second language ability concurrently with content learning”

Translanguaging is promoted if second language learners are integrated with fluent speakers of the language. Consequently, the use of both the languages should be made strategic and sensitively by the teacher.

Lorin’s (2015) study of translanguaging with several languages in a multilingual classroom support these advantages. Especially, potential advantage C and D. However, the other two advantages did not show as much of advantages in her study.

The counterargument to the use of translanguaging in the second or foreign language classroom is, it might be argued, that only the target language should be used, and there should be no translation between the pupil’s first language and the target language, as proposed in (Cummins, 2007), thereby keeping each language separate. In this line of reasoning, Lundberg (2011) and Ladberg (2003) warn about the harm for language learning of learning English via Swedish to learn English. The point made by these authors is that having to make double translations between three or more languages may prevent learners with a mother tongue other than Swedish to learn English. This is the underlying rationale for their proposal to use only the target language in the English classroom. These considerations go against Cummins (2007), according to whom these assumptions are not supported by empirical evidence and do not conform to current understandings of bilingual pupils minds. Instead, he suggests, learners in bilingual programs that get the opportunity to focus on both similarities and differences in all of their languages spontaneously in the school are likely to benefit from them and contribute to developing their language awareness. This view is also shared by Lundberg (2011), who advocates for the advantages that the use of the mother tongue when learning an additional language brings to bilingual learners. Hence, the kind of translanguaging portrayed here would raise learners’ psychotypology (i.e., learners’ perceived typology relatedness between languages, Kellerman, 1983) and stimulate the development of their metalinguistic awareness (Bardel & Sánchez, 2017).
It is common and natural for bilingual or multilingual speakers to switch between languages when communicating in different social situations (Baker, 2011; García, 2009; Ladberg, 2003). Young children do it subconsciously and when they get older they switch between their languages purposely (Ladberg, 2003). According to Ladberg (2003), one reason why bilingual learners switch between languages are lack of words or phrases in one language. To put it another way, they use words or phrases from their other language or languages to communicate with others. Yet, it is common for monolingual adults to become worried when a bilingual learner switches between their languages because they think he or she will be confused and not learn the languages. Some authors such as Ladberg (2003) disagree with this belief, and suggest that if the learners’ surroundings encourage bilingualism and view it as valuable, then it will become natural for them to use all of their languages. This is consistent with García’s (2009; Håkansson, 2003) claim that translanguaging is a natural practice of bilinguals when communicating with each other, and that therefore they should not be ashamed of.

In conclusion the evidence discussed in this section reveal mixed results as regards background language use in the second or foreign language classroom. Hence, further research is necessary in order to confirm or disconfirm the conflicting views presented here, and to find evidence for the (dis)advantages in learners using all of their languages when learning English as a third language. On the one hand, bilingual education and translanguaging practices where bilingual learners are allowed to use all of their languages are advocated for by some authors (e.g. Baker, 2011; García, 2009) who see both the mother tongue and the second language as feasible resources in language learning. On the other hand, authors highlight the use of the target language as a form of , acknowledge the importance learners concede to the oral input received by teachers, and see potential dangers in the systematic translation occurring between the second language and the target language (e.g. Ladberg, 2003; Lundberg, 2011; Philipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009; Wedin, 2011). Furthermore, a note of caution is also necessary in relation to the role of (psycho)typology in the benefits of the mother tongue and the second language as resources when learning an additional language (e.g. Björklund & Suni, 2000; Yoxsimer, 2014).
The literature reviewed in the preceding suggests that there is no consensus as regards the benefits of the mother tongue and the second language as resources in the second or foreign language classroom. The study presented is a contribution in this line of investigation, by examining translanguaging patterns in young learners of L3 English that are bilingual in Swedish and their HL. In other words, the study had the purpose of identify patterns of classroom language use (L1 HL, L2 Swedish, L3 English), based on learners’ and teachers’ self-reported usage and perceived use by others (see more details in section 5 below). As such, the purpose of the study was two-fold. First and foremost, the primary aim was to identify patterns of classroom language use (L1 HL, L2 Swedish, L3 English), based on learners’ and teachers’ self-reported usage and perceived use by others (see more details in section 5 below). Secondly, the study set out to find out whether language choice and use on the part of the teacher had any effect on the language(s) used by the learners. Specifically, the study was guided by the following research questions:

**RQ(1):** Which language(s) do young Swedish bilingual learners use during their L3 English lessons?

**RQ(2):** Which language(s) do their teachers use to scaffold them?

**RQ(3):** Is there any relationship between the teacher input the learners receive (with and without translanguaging) and the language(s) they used in the classroom for different functional and communicative situations?
4. Participants

In order to answer the RQs guiding the present study, data were collected both from learners ($n=36$) and their teachers ($n=3$). All in all, a total amount of 39 participants took part in the study, and they are described in the forthcoming paragraphs.

4.1. Learners

The 36 learners who participated in this study were in grades 2 and 3, which mean they were between the ages 8 and 10, almost evenly distributed between boys and girls. Learners from three different classes in grade 2 and one class from grade 3 participated. All of them were bilingual in Swedish and another language (their heritage language), and were learning English as a third language. Altogether, 24 different languages were represented in the sample of learners investigated (see figure 1).

Figure 1. Learners’ heritage languages

The selection criterion for inclusion in the study was for the learner to be bilingual in Swedish and another language. This other language was their heritage language (as defined in Section 2.1), and therefore the language spoken at home with their parents and siblings. Notwithstanding, the learners did not necessarily perceive Swedish as their L2, and this language had the status of L1 or L2 depending on the learner. The learners’ self-reported L1 and L2 are presented in Table 2 and 3. They
all attended the same multicultural school, a school with learners from several cultures under the same roof, with mother tongue support. The mother tongue education was at the same time once a week for all the learners who were bilingual in Swedish and their heritage language. The school is a public school with approximately 400 learners, located in the suburb of Stockholm; the majority of the learners are bilingual but it is a monolingual school.

Table 2: Learners’ self-reported L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Learners’ self-reported L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Teachers

As indicated in the opening of this section, three teachers participated in the study. All three teachers have legitimation for teaching. However they differ in age and teaching experience. Two of them are around 27 years old and have been teaching a year and the third are forty years old and have been teaching a longer time. One of these three teachers works at the same school as the learners investigated. In turn, the other two works at the same school. It is a monolingual school, which means that the majority of learners are monolingual, with support with mother tongue instruction after school. All three of the participants were Swedish native speakers. The participants have in common that they teaches English as an additional language in the early years in Swedish school.
5. Instruments

The instruments employed in the data collection were two, namely a questionnaire (administered to the learners), and a classroom observation grid (used with the teachers). The questionnaire (see Appendix 1) consisted of 18 items, and it was informed by questions that have been already used in existing questionnaires and which have, therefore, undergone the necessary validation processes. In particular, question 2,3,4,9,10,15 and 16 are borrowed from questionnaire employed in Lorin (2015). In addition to these, and in order to control for the potential interfering effects of psychotypology, item 6 and item 7 were included that asked questions inquiring into the learners’ perceptions about the typological relations between the L3 English and their L1 and L2, and about the similarity between the different language pairs (L1-L2, L1-L3, L2-L3). These questions were adapted from those employed by Hall, Newbrand, Ecke, Sperr, Marchand & Hayes (2009).

The decision to use the questionnaire was motivated by the fact that it a good way to collect data from a larger amount of the population (Hjerm et.al, 2014), and also because it is a common instrument in research on translanguaging. The questionnaire included two forms of questions, i.e. open and closed. Open questions are questions that allow the respondent to write the answer in their own words; these types of questions are rare because they are more difficult to interpret, and they might compromise the reliability of the results (Hjerm et.al, 2014). In contrast, close questions, believed to have a higher reliability, only a limited range of possible answers that the respondent can choose from.

The first items in the questionnaire aimed at singling out the L1 and L2 of the learners, by asking them which was their mother tongue. The next questions deepened information of the status each language represented in the linguistic repertoire of the learners, by asking them which language(s) they thought they knew best and in which order, in which language(s) the thought, and the learners’ psychotypological perceptions. The next items addressed questions specific to classroom language use, starting with a question on the language(s) spoken by the learners during English lessons, and whether they were or not allowed to use their mother tongue. In connection with this, they were asked whether they thought that using their mother tongue would be a learning aid in the development of their L1 literacy and also in their L3 learning, and if they felt that instruction in their mother tongue was as important as Swedish and English in the school. This was followed by a set of more fine-tuned questions that asked about the language(s) that they and their teachers used during classroom activities in English lessons, which language they used when they could not answer questions in English, and how they made themselves understood when they wanted to make themselves understood with their
teachers or other peers. Likewise, they were asked which language(s) their teachers used in order to give instructions during English lessons, and to scaffold them, for example which strategies their teachers used in order to convey the meaning of isolated words and longer syntactic units (sentences), etc.

The classroom observation grid (see Appendix 2) was adapted from the one in Lorin’s (2015) study. The main advantages of using already tested questions are that they have already been tested. However, it can be good to test new questions or formulations because it is not a guarantee that the questions are good just because someone else used them in a research or study (Hjerm, Lindgren, & Nilsson, 2014). Second, an open observation is when the participant knows when he or she a part of a study. For example, it can be used to see how they work at a school. The observation should be done following an observation grid. Observation is a research method where ethical conditions need to be especially considered (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011). Ethical considerations with the data collection will be presented in the Procedure section.

6. Methodology

In this study two methods were used combined in order to answer the research questions. On the one hand, the questionnaire is a survey, and as such a quantitative method, which involves putting, numbers on the data that is going to be analysed (Hjerm et.al, 2014). On the other hand, the observations are however qualitative, which means that the data that is going to be analysed are in the shape of words and not numbers (Hjerm et.al, 2014).

As described in the preceding section, the instruments employed in the data collection of this study were a questionnaire and a classroom observation grid.

The procedure followed in the data collection and the steps in the data analysis are explained in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, respectively. The research software employed for the quantitative analysis of the data was the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), Version 23. This is the most well-known and commonly employed software used in empirical studies on second language teaching and learning.

6.1. Procedure

The questionnaires were administered to the learners in class-time, and in presence of their teacher and of the researcher (in this case, the author of the present Självständigt arbete), in case questions would arise during task completion. The participants filled out the questionnaire after the researcher briefly
explained the questions in it. The questionnaires were filled out in two different occasions; 16 participants from the three different classes of grade 2 answered the questionnaire the same day as one of the observation was done. Next, the rest of the participants (20), in grade 3, answered it another day. Likewise, the two remaining observations were done on two separated days.

The participants were observed during an English lesson. The purpose was to see which language or languages they used in different situations during the lesson, and which languages they used to scaffold the pupils.

6.1.1. Ethical considerations
According to the assistant principal at the school, the parents of the participants did not have to approve their child’s participation because the questionnaire is anonymous. However, both the learners and the teachers who participated in the study were informed that it was optional to participate, which means the codex about information and approval are fulfilled (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011).

To make it anonymous means that nobody, including the researcher, can see who answered what among the participants (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011). This is fulfilled with the participants not writing their identity on the questionnaire. In addition, the name of the schools participating in in the study is not mentioned.

Also, ethical considerations are important while doing the teachers’ observations because the participant’s identity was not going to be revealed (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011). Thus, the teachers names were not written, neither the name of school or grade they teach in on the observation grid.

6.2. Data analysis
The participants were observed during an English lesson. The purpose was to see which language or languages they used in different situations during the lesson, and which languages they used to scaffold the pupils.

The data from the questionnaires were transferred to a data matrix in SPSS for its statistical treatment, guided by the assistance of my supervisor and the recommendations in Larson-Hall (2010) on how to use statistics in second language research using SPSS. The first five items and also items 12 to 14 were open, and the participants had to write the name of the language or languages they identified as their mother tongue, the language they thought in, etc. To this aim, string variables were initially created so as to keep track of the entire repertoire of background languages represented in the study. Later on, these variables were recoded into categorical variables, so that they could be manipulated in
subsequent analyses. These were either ‘dichotomous’ variables with two values (English and Swedish, Swedish and mother tongue), or ‘nominal’ variables with three values (English, Swedish and mother tongue), depending on each question. Items 6 to 11, however, were already categorical from the beginning, as the formulation in the questionnaire asked participants to choose between yes-no or between the three languages investigated in the study.

Next, in the last four items of the questionnaire (15 to 18) the participants had to write somewhat longer responses, as they had to explain a series of communicative strategies either they or their teachers used in different moments of the English lesson to understand or make themselves understood. Here again the participants’ responses were originally coded in string variables and then recoded into categorical variables. To do so, a qualitative breakdown of the responses was done, with the purpose of identifying keywords and information that would make it possible to classify them, assign them a label, and code them accordingly into different analytical categories. The categories resulting from the in-depth qualitative analysis carried out on these data are presented in the results section.

Once the data from the questionnaire was transferred to SPSS and qualitatively manipulated, it was inspected in search for the patterns of language use and translanguaging necessary to answer RQ(1) and RQ(2). In addition to this, in order to answer RQ(3), the values in the categorical variables were **crosstabulated**, which is a very frequent technique employed in survey research, as is the case of the present study, and useful for the qualitative classifications required in finding out the association or interrelation between variables, and the interaction between them. Hence, contingency tables were created, so as to display the frequency distribution between the dichotomous variables. Subsequently, the degree of association between the crosstabulated variables was assessed using Cramer’s V test.

In turn, the analysis of the data gathered in the classroom observations was two-fold. On the one hand, the information registered in the grid was broken down into different units of analysis, described, and compared across the three teachers that took part in the study. On the other hand, the notes token by the researcher in attempting to determine what the teachers investigated did when a learner tried to explain or clarify something using his or her mother tongue were described in detail, and again cross-compared across the three teachers. Finally, the patterns of language use and translanguaging identified during the classroom observations were compared with the patterns reported by the learners in the questionnaire in relation to the languages used by their teachers.
7. Results

The results of the various analyses carried out on the data gathered by means of the questionnaire and the classroom observation grids are presented in this section. For organization purposes, the report of the results is divided in four sections. First of all is presented the descriptive statistics corresponding to the answers by the learners in the questionnaire (Section 7.1). This information is necessary to answer RQ(1) and RQ(2), which inquired into the languages they and their teachers used during English lessons. The inferential statistics used in order to answer RQ(3) is presented next (Section 7.2). After that is described the teachers’ performance, as assembled in the classroom observation grid (7.3), followed by a comparison of the language use observed in the teachers and the learners’ perception of the languages used by their teachers (7.4).

7.1. Questionnaire: Descriptive statistics

The learners’ responses to the items in the questionnaire are presented in the forthcoming paragraphs. To this aim, the tables below summarize the raw frequency of choice in the closed questions, and the percentage each frequency represents for each item. For ease of understanding, learners’ self-reported language use and their perception of their teachers’ language use are presented separately.

7.1.1. Learners’ self-reported language use

Item 4 (Table 4) asked which language the learners thought in. The vast majority of the participants responded to think in Swedish (58.3 %), from the remaining participants 22.2 % responded to think in their mother tongue and 19.4 % to think in both their mother tongue and Swedish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 5 (Table 5) in the questionnaire asked participants in which language or languages they spoke during English lessons. The responses here suggest that the vast majority of them reported to use only English (77.1 %). From the remaining participants, 14.3 % reported to use both English and Swedish.
Table 5. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 5’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>77,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish &amp; English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next two items addressed the learners’ psychotypological beliefs as regards the relationship they believed to exist between English and their other languages (Item 6), and then between the different language pairs (Item 7).

The responses to item 6 (Table 6) suggest that the vast majority of them reported to see a relationship between English and Swedish (80,6%). The remaining 19,4% believed there to be a relationship between English and their mother tongue.

Table 6. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 6’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 7 in the questionnaire asked which language pair they believed to be closer related. The vast majority responded it to be Swedish and English (66,7%). Out of the remaining responses 22,2% believed Mother tongue and English to have the closest relationship.

Table 7. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 7’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue &amp; English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish &amp; English</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what follows the learners’ self-reported language use in different situations described, together with their related beliefs and preferences. For a start, item 8 (Table 8) asked whether they were allowed to use their heritage language (mother tongue) during English lessons. The vast majority responded that they were not allowed to use their mother tongue (94,4%), and the remaining 5,6% responded to be allowed to use it.
Table 8. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 8’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 9 asked about the benefits for mother tongue if used during English lessons. The vast majority responded to not believe it would be beneficial (51.4 %). However, the remaining 48.6 % believed of advantages for their mother tongue if they used it during English lessons.

Table 9. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 9’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 10 asked if the participants thought it would be benefited for learning English if they were allowed to use both their mother tongue and Swedish. Out of the responses 61.1 responded it to not have any advantages, the remaining 38.9 % responded to see the benefits.

Table 10. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 10’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 11 in the questionnaire asked the participants if they felt like their mother tongue was as important as Swedish and English in school (Table 11). The vast majority of the responses suggest it to be equalled important (83.3 %), the remaining participants responded it not to be as important (16.7 %).

Table 11. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 11’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, in item 12 the participants were questioned which language or languages they used during classroom activities and games during English lessons. The vast majority of the responses suggest to
speak only English (82.9%). 11.4% of the remaining participants responded to use both Swedish and English.

Table 12. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 12’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two following tables the responses to Item 15 and item 16 will be presented. The responses to these questions have been analysed and out of the participants responses analytical categories were identified. An inventory of the participants’ full responses can be found in Appendix 3.

Item 15 (Table 13) asked the participants what they do if they cannot answer in English during the English lessons. 10 analytical categorise were identified. Out of these 7 categorise involved language use, two of these 7 are definitely involving only Swedish while the others it is unclear which language is used. The vast majority responded to say, “I don’t know” when struggling to answer in English (27.3%). In addition, 14 of the 36 participants did not answer this question.

Table 13. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 15’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Says I don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise my hand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Raise my hand” &amp;/ or “says I don’t know”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer in Swedish</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says that I don’t understand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says I need help</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask in Swedish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We use our Swedish flags</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask a friend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table (Table 14) show the responses to item 16. Item 16 in the questionnaire asked what they do if they use words from their mother tongue and the teacher or the other classmates do not understand. 4 categorise were identified and all of them involved language use. The vast majority responded that they say it in Swedish instead (38.9%). Out of the remaining participants 27.8% responded to use English instead and 11.1% to ask someone who speaks the same language. 22.2%
responded to paraphrase, it is not clear in which language. Also, 18 of 36 the participants did not answer.

Table 14. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 16’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use English instead</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I say it in Swedish</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask someone who speaks the same language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2. Learners’ perception of teachers’ language use

The report of the results so far has focused on the description of the learners’ responses when it comes to their own reported use of language. This section is concerned with how they perceived their teachers to use language in the classroom.

Item 13 in the questionnaire asked which language or languages the teacher used in activities during the English lessons. The responses suggest that the vast majority of them reported to only English (74,3 %). From the remaining participants 20 % responded that the teacher used both Swedish and English. In addition, one of the 36 participants has not answered this item.

Table 15. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 13’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next item (14) the participants were asked which language the teacher used to give instructions in. 51,4 % responded it to be only English and among the remaining 28,6 of the participants responded that the teacher use both English and Swedish. The respond from one of the 36 participants are missing.

Table 16. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 14’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the following two tables the learners’ responses has been analysed and resulted in categories, the same as in table 13 and 14 (7.1.1).

First of all, item 17 questioned the participants about which strategies the teacher use to explain a word in English. 7 categories were identified, 4 of them involve language use. Non-verbal language refers to using the body to explain, same as dramatize. The responses suggest that the vast majority of them reported the teacher to say the word in Swedish (37,5 %). From the remaining participants 9,4 % reported the teachers to use non-verbal language. In addition, 8 participants have not answered this item.

Table 17. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 17’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Says the word in Swedish</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show pictures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Says the beginning of the word</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, item 18 asked the participants about the teachers’ strategies when explaining a phrase. Out of the 7 identified categorise, 2 of them do not involve oral language use. 38,7 % of the participants reported that the teacher use non-verbal language and 3,2 % of them reported that the teacher used pictures to explain. In the remaining categorise, 38,7 % reported that the teacher says the phrase in Swedish. Also, 5 participants’ responses are missing.

Table 18. Learners’ responses to ‘Item 18’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Says the phrase in Swedish</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show pictures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We repeat the phrase at the beginning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal language</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain (or try to explain in another way)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She says you can say I don't know and then someone else can say what it means</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She writes it on the whiteboard and then she teaches me how to write it.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2. Questionnaire: Inferential statistics

In the preceding section (7.1), the focus on the report of the results has been on presenting the descriptive statistics corresponding to each item in the questionnaire. In the present section a more detailed account of the results is given, with the aim to present the inferential statistics run on the quantitative data from the questionnaire. As anticipated in the explanation of the data analysis (Section 6.2), in order to explore whether the teachers’ patterns of language use might have an effect on the languages employed by the learners in the classroom, different dependent variables were crosstabulated. More precisely, data from the variables registering the learners’ self-reported language use were crosstabulated with data in the dependent variables on learners’ perceptions of teachers’ language use. This section offers the results of this exploration, by presenting a series of contingency tables showing the interrelation between variables and the degree of association between them. In cases where the association was statistically significant, as (assessed by Cramer’s V correlation coefficient), the level of significance is reported.

In order to be able to crosstabulate the data and construct the corresponding contingency tables that displayed the frequency distribution of the variables, it was necessary to use dichotomic data (i.e. variables that had two levels). To this aim, categorical variables that originally had three levels were recoded and transformed into dichotomic variables. In turn, this would make it possible to find out whether using only the target language English or translanguaging was related to with a higher or lower use of English on the part of the learners.

Learners’ self-reported language use was registered primarily by a variable that coded which language or languages they used during classroom activities, and two variables on their communicative strategy use to make themselves understood and/or to solve breakdowns in communicating when unable to answer a question. To begin with, the variable coding learners’ language use during classroom activities was crosstabulated with perceived teachers’ language use in different situations and with different functions (7.2.1). After that, the variables coding teachers’ language use are crosstabulated with learners’ language in communicative strategies, first those employed to make themselves understood or for solving breakdowns in communication when/ unable to answer a question (7.2.2).

7.2.1. Crosstabulations involving learners’ use during classroom activities

The first crosstabulation involved the variables coding language use during classroom activities, both as reported by the learners and as perceived by the learners in relation to the teachers (Table 19).
Crucially, Cramer’s V revealed that the association between the two variables was statistically significant ($\nu=.542, p=.006$).

Moreover, the table show that when teachers use only the target language almost 89% of the learners do the same. On the other hand, when the teacher resorts to translanguaging, 66,7% of the learners use English and 33,3 % do the same as the teacher.

Table 19. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners & teachers in classroom activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner's language use</th>
<th>Teacher's language use</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish or mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88,5%</td>
<td>11,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and Swedish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66,7%</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the variable of learners’ language use during classroom was crosstabulated with the language or languages used by the teacher in scaffolding the learners by means of clarifications involving vocabulary items (Table 20) and longer syntactic units (Table 21).

Table 20 indicates that when the teacher explain words in English, 63 % of the learners use English in classroom activities. However, when the teacher resorts to translanguaging 60 % of the learners do the same.

Table 20. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners in classroom activities & by teachers in word clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner's language use</th>
<th>Teacher's language use</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish or mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,2%</td>
<td>36,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English and Swedish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,0%</td>
<td>60,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirdly, the variable of learners’ language used during classroom activities with the language used by the teacher in sentence clarifications. When the teacher used English, 94,7 % of the participants did the same and 5,3 % used Swedish and English or only Swedish in classroom activities. In contrast, when the teacher used English and Swedish 80 % of the participants responded to use only English, and the remaining 20 % to use Swedish and English or only Swedish.
Table 21. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners in classroom activities & by teachers in sentence clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher's language use</th>
<th>Learners’s language use</th>
<th>Swedish or mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>English/Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94,7%</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80,0%</td>
<td>20,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the variable of learners’ language use during classroom activities was crosstabulated with the language or languages used by the teacher in instruction giving (Table 22). The table indicate that when the teacher give instructions in English, almost 43 % of the learners use only English. On the contrary, when the teacher resorts to translanguage, 66,7 % of the learners use English.

Table 22. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners in classroom activities & by teachers in instruction giving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language use</th>
<th>Learner’s language use</th>
<th>Swedish or mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English/Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42,9%</td>
<td>57,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,7%</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2. Crosstabulations involving learners’ language use in comprehension strategy use

First of all, in table 23 the variable of the language used by the learners to make themselves understood and language used by the teachers in classroom activities is crosstabulated. Nearly 56 % of the learners reported to use English to make themselves understood if the teacher use English in classroom activities. However, when the teacher resorts to translanguage 100 % of the learners used only English.
Table 23. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners to make themselves understood & by teachers in classroom activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language use</th>
<th>Learner’s language use</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, Table 24 show that when the teacher use English when explaining words, 60 % of the learners use only English to make themselves understood. On the other hand, when the teacher translanguages, 50% of learners use only English.

Table 24. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners to make themselves understood & by teachers in word clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language use</th>
<th>Learner’s language use</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next table show the crosstabualtion of the variables of the language used by the learners when trying to make themselves understood and the languages used by the teachers in sentence clarification. When the teachers used only English in sentence clarifications the crosstabulation indicate that 88,9 % of the learners do the same when making themselves understood. But, when the teacher used both English and Swedish only 60 % of the learners used only English to make themselves understood.

Table 25. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners to make themselves understood & by teachers in sentence clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language use</th>
<th>Learner’s language use</th>
<th>Only English</th>
<th>Only Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, Table 26 indicate that when the teacher use English to give instructions, 20 % of learners use only English to make themselves understood. However, when the teacher resorts to translanguaging in giving instructions, 80 % of the learners use only English to make themselves understood.

Moreover, the coefficien in Cramer’s V turned out to be statistically significant (w=.577, p=.025)
Table 26. Crosstabulation: Language use by learners to make themselves understood & by teachers in instruction giving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s language use</th>
<th>Learner’s language use</th>
<th>Only English</th>
<th>Only Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; Swedish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3. **Classroom observation grid**

The results so far have addressed the information from the learners gathered in the questionnaire. In this section the information is presented on the teachers’ behaviours and practices registered in the classroom observation grid. After that, a detailed description is offered of the notes taken by the researcher in observing what the teachers did when a learner tried to explain or clarify something using his or her heritage language (that is, the mother tongue).

Table 27 the observed strategies the teachers used to help learners understand a word in English. All teachers used both English and Swedish to help learners understand. Also, common for all teachers was that they first said the word in English, followed by the word in Swedish and then English again. Teacher 1 also used non-verbal language to explain. For example, to explain ”shoes” she/he pointed at her/his shoes.

Table 27. Strategy 1: How the teachers help learners to understand a word in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/Allow their L1/Mother tongue</th>
<th>Use L2/Swedish</th>
<th>Use L3/English</th>
<th>Other (eg. Pictures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, table 28 includes the strategies used by the teachers when offering explanations. Teacher 2 and 3 used both English and Swedish to explain while Teacher 1 used only English and non-verbal language. The teachers who used both English and Swedish made the same type of translation as described in previous table.
Table 28. Strategy 2: Language or languages used by the teachers when offering explanations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use/Allow their L1/Mother tongue</th>
<th>Use L2/Swedish</th>
<th>Use L3/English</th>
<th>Other (eg. Pictures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Non-verbal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Non-verbal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third strategy observed was the strategies made by the teachers to make the learners understand a sentence in English. First of all, in the observed lesson of teacher 2 there were no sentence explanations. However, teacher 1 explained "point at your leg" using English and using non-verbal language by pointing at her/his leg, also she/he wrote it on the whiteboard. Teacher 3 used both English and Swedish to explain, in the same way as explained in Table 27.

Table 29. Strategy 3: What teachers do to make learners understand a sentence in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use/Allow their L1/Mother tongue</th>
<th>Use L2/Swedish</th>
<th>Use L3/English</th>
<th>Other (eg. Pictures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Write on the Whiteboard and non-verbal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next table the fourth strategy is presented. It is the strategies all of the teachers’ used to give instructions. All of the teachers’ used both English and Swedish to give instructions but in different ways. Teacher 1 and 3 used the same strategy between English and Swedish as in the previous tables, explained in table 27. However, teacher 2 used only English but asked the learners to translate to Swedish if anyone did not understand the instructions in English. In addition, teacher 1 used pictures in the workbook to give instructions.

Table 30. Strategy 4: Language or languages used by the teachers in instruction giving
Lastly, the language or languages used by the teachers in classroom activities and games. Both Teacher 1 and 2 used only English. However, teacher 3 used both English and Swedish. The same strategy of going back and forth between the languages were used, but starting with Swedish, then English and back to Swedish.

Table 31. Strategy 5: Language or languages used by the teachers in classroom activities and games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Use/Allow their L1/Mother tongue</th>
<th>Use L2/Swedish</th>
<th>Use L3/English</th>
<th>Other (eg. Pictures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• What does the teacher do when a learner try to explain something by using their HL?

During the three observed lessons there was not a situation of this kind.

7.4. Comparative language use in questionnaire and classroom observation

Here follows a comparison of the teacher’s language use, which were observed and the learners’ response on the teachers language use.

Table 32 below show the strategies made by the teacher during the observation compared with the learners’ responses in the questionnaire. The categories from the learners reported language use by the teachers with the highest percentage are presented.
The table shows the language used by the teachers, if all of them used both English and Swedish it will say “Both English and Swedish x3”. Non-verbal language is labelled NoVL.

First of all, the reported language use by the teacher to explain words is the same as the language use observed. However, it is unclear in which language the explanation was, reported by learners. Secondly, the learners reported language uses for the teachers while explaining sentences are not the same as observed. Thirdly, the observed language use of teachers when giving instructions does not correspond with the language use reported by the learners. All three teachers used both English and Swedish in instruction giving but 51.4% of the learners reported the teachers’ to use only English. Lastly, there is a pattern between what was reported and what was observed regarding the teachers’ language use during activities.

Table 32. Comparison of the teacher’s language use- observed and reported by learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Observed language use</th>
<th>Reported language use by learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain words</td>
<td>Both English and Swedish x3 NoVL x1</td>
<td>34.4 % &quot;Says the word in Swedish&quot; 18.8 % &quot;Explain&quot; 9.4 % &quot;NoVL&quot; (see Table 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain and explain sentences</td>
<td>English x1 Both English and Swedish x2 NoVL x1</td>
<td>35.5 % &quot;Says the phrase in Swedish&quot; 38.7 % NoVL (see Table 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving instructions</td>
<td>Both English and Swedish x3</td>
<td>28.6 % Both English and Swedish 20 % Swedish 51.4 % English (see Table 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During activities</td>
<td>English x2 Both English and Swedish x1</td>
<td>74.3 % English 20 % Both English and Swedish (see Table 15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion

The results reported in the preceding section are explained here in some more depth, and discussed in relation to the most critical issues raised in the review of the literature (Section 2) regarding the use of translanguaging in the second language classroom. In terms of organization, the discussion will proceed as follows. First of all, Section 8.1 offers an overview of how the learners portrayed themselves as language users in terms of the languages they identified as their L1, their L2, and the typological relationship believed to exist between them. This will be considered along with the learners’ beliefs in relation to the importance of L1 instruction for their linguistic development in all of their languages. Next, in Section 8.2 the patterns of classroom language use identified will be discussed, both for learners and for teachers. In the case of the teachers, these data will be checked against the patterns resulting from the classroom observation.

8.1. The learners’ L1, L2, and the HL as a form of scaffolding

The joined consideration of different questions in which the participants where asked about their L1 and their L2 (items 1 to 4 in the questionnaire) indicated that most of them considered themselves to be Swedish-dominant. To this speaks the fact that 75 % of them singled out Swedish as their mother tongue or L1. Regrettably, this finding (i.e. the unbalanced distribution) made impossible a more insightful analysis breaking down the sample into Swedish-dominant and HL-dominant learners to investigate differences in their perceptions and patterns or language use. Furthermore, this unbalanced distribution also had consequences for the kinds of data crosstabulation and statistical testing that could have been performed on the data.

The same pattern was identified when they were asked about their stronger or more proficient language, as shown by the fact that the same percentage was obtained (75% for Swedish). In addition to this, nearly 68 % of the learners considered their HL to be their L2. To further inquire into the status of each language in the background language of the participants, they were asked in which language they used to think (item 4). In overall terms, the participants’ responses were compatible as regards the language they had selected as their L1. Notwithstanding, two remarks need to make. Even though 75% of them identified Swedish as their L1, only 58.3% reported to think in this language. Notwithstanding, from the remaining participants (see Table 3), 19.4% of them reported to engage
both Swedish and their HL in their thinking processes. From this it follows that despite considering themselves Swedish-dominant, a number of participants also relied on their HL when thinking. On the other hand, the percentage of participants who reported to think in the two languages is relatively low.

It is perhaps due to this dominance of Swedish over their HL that the participants hardly considered their HL as a useful resource in their language learning. Hence, when they were asked if they thought that using their HL in the English classroom would help them achieve a higher proficiency level in their HL, less than half of the sample (48%) thought so. This percentage was even lower (38.9%) when they were asked whether using their HL in the English classroom would be an aid for their proficiency in this language. These low percentages would suggest that the bilingual learners investigated in the present study are not aware of the potential benefits of their HL as a tool that may contribute to enhance both their L1/L2 literacy and their foreign language learning (see Cenoz, 2000; Cummins, 2007; Jonsson, 2012; Lundberg, 2011; Skolverket, 2011b; Todeva & Cenoz, 2009).

An explanation worth exploring is that this lack of awareness might be encouraged by teachers’ practices in the classroom, if one considers the finding in the present study that 94.4% of the participants reported that the use of the HL was prohibited during English lessons (item 8). In spite of this, 83.3% of them thought that HL instruction at school was as equally important as Swedish and English (item 11). These findings were corroborated in the classroom observations, as the teacher showed no encouragement for the learners to use their HL. In spite of this, the fact that almost half the learners investigated perceived the benefits in the use of HL in the classroom as a resource lends support to its use as a form of scaffolding (see Cummins, 2007; García, 2009; Lundberg, 2011; Philipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2009).

To understand these findings it is useful to understand how the participants’ perceptions of the typological relationship between the languages. First of all, almost 81% of them considered that the most similar language to English was Swedish (item 6), and this was so irrespective of the large variation in the HL background of the participants (20 languages in total). Secondly, nearly 67% of them considered the language pair English-Swedish to be the closest (item 7), in contrast to the pairs HL-English and HL-Swedish. Again, the unbalanced distribution in the sample, especially as regards the responses to item 6 did not make further analyses possible, and excluded the possibility of using statistical analysis to analyse the finding according to the participants’ psychotyology. Thus, these results, together with the fact that only 22.2% of them perceived the pair HL-English as the closest (see Table 6) might have discouraged the use of the HL in some of the participants. Therefore, the 49% of participants who perceived benefits in the use of the HL for scaffolding purposes might have also perceived the advantages of using L1 and L2 in L3 learning to stimulate the development of their metalinguistic awareness because of the similarities between the languages (see Bardel & Sánchez, 2017; Kellerman, 1938; Lundberg, 2011).
8.2. Patterns of classroom language use

This section addresses the patterns of classroom language use identified in the various analyses of the data. When the learners were asked about the languages they used in the English classroom during activities and games, an overwhelming majority of them (nearly 83%) reported to use only English, which can be considered a success from a pedagogical point of view. In turn, from the remaining learners, only 11.4% reported to use both English and Swedish. If these results are compared with the teachers’ patterns of language use and alternation as perceived by the learners in this same situation (i.e. during activities, see Table 13), the picture that emerges is the following. On the one hand, 74.3% of the learners reported the teachers to use only English. This percentage is high, but lower in comparison with the English used by the participants (see Table 11). On the other hand, 20% of the learners reported teachers to translanguage between English and Swedish. Irrespective of the representativity of this percentage, it is double as much as the one observed in learners (11% vs. 20%, respectively). More importantly, when crosstabulating learners’ and teachers’ language use during classroom activities, the statistical test used in order to measure the degree of association of the two variables (Cramer’s V) turned out to be significant. This is an important finding, and should be seen as evidence of the effect of teachers’ input language on the learners’ output language. More specifically, this pattern suggests that a higher use of English on the part of the teachers may also promote a higher use in the learners. In addition, two of the observed teachers used only English and the last teacher used both Swedish and English, 74.3% of the learners reported the teachers’ language use in activities to be English and the remaining 20% reported it to be both Swedish and English.

The percentage of teachers’ language use was different in other communicative situations and moments of the classroom (Yoxsimer, 2014). For example, when it comes to instruction giving, only half the learners considered that their teachers provided instructions in English (51.4%). This percentage is much lower than that of the use of English perceived during classroom activities (74.3%, let us recall). In contrast, the percentage of language alternation between English and Swedish was higher in this case (28.6% against the 20% pointed out above). This suggests a higher use of translanguaging on the part of the teacher for this form of scaffolding. It is possible that teachers use more Swedish in this case because they want to make sure that their learners understand the instructions, procedure and goals of an activity when presenting it. This assumption, however, should be further investigated, preferably in studies using methodological designs based on retrospective interviews and classroom observation. Moreover, in general terms the data gathered in the classroom observation were consistent with those in the questionnaire, in that only one of the three teacher use only English when giving instructions, the other two use both Swedish and English. This
interpretation of these findings is supported by the fact that when the teacher gave instructions in English, only 43% of the learners use only English in activities, whereas when the teacher resorted to translanguaging nearly 67% of the learners used only English.

A reasonable explanation might be that if learners could not understand the ‘English-only’ explanations, they might use both Swedish and English in an attempt to compensate this lack of understanding. In contrast, if the teacher also used English when giving instructions, learners would understand better what they had to do and would have been better prepared to confront the task. This suggests that learners felt supported by the teachers’ translanguaging, which is compatible with previous research (see Baker, 2001; Baker, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Jonsson, 2012; Lorin, 2015). Furthermore, the pattern in these findings proves that for translanguaging to be successful, the teacher has to plan the use of two languages, as discussed in the literature review. Further support for this explanation is that when the teacher used translanguaging during classroom activities, 100% of the learners’ use only English to make themselves understood. On the other hand, from the observation results it can be seen that only one of the teachers used translanguaging in classroom activities.

The pattern that emerged when the patterns of language use examined had to with strategies used in order to solve breakdowns in communication showed, in general, a lower use of English. Among other things, this might be due to the fact that the items in the questionnaire were open-ended. In this sense, the qualitative analysis of the response revealed not only a variety in the repertoire of strategies use (some of them non-verbal), but also different extents of language use. This variation reduced the number of participants that could be analyzed in this case, because those who reported to use a non-verbal strategy had to be removed from the working sample. Unfortunately, this reduction might have compromised, at least to a certain extent, the validity of the results. In turn, when considering only the responses of participants who relied on linguistic strategies, the results were also similar for teachers (16 and 17) and learners (Tables 12 and 13). In the case of learners, if one considers together the different strategies relying on only English or Swedish, the percentages are roughly 60% and 40%, respectively. These were the patterns of language use identified when they were not able to answer the questions posed by their teachers, or when they needed to clarify words from their HL. In turn, for word clarification teachers were also reported to use more English than Swedish (56% vs. 44%). The percentage of English use, though, was higher in longer units (ex. sentences). In this case the percentage was very similar to that of learners (63.3%).

These results were supported when the data were crosstabulated (see Tables 18 and 19), even if the association between variables did not reach statistical significance. For example, when the teacher used only English in sentence clarifications, nearly 95% of the learners reported to use only English in classroom activities. Again, it seems that the higher use of English by the teachers correlates with a higher use of English by the learners, as has been suggested for language use during classroom activities. However, when the teacher used both English and Swedish, the percentage of
learners who use only English was reduced to only 33 %, which supports the correlation just stated. The results from the observation showed that two of the teachers use only English in classroom activities, and one used both Swedish and English. Hence, the findings reported here can be seen as evidence in support of the view of the target language as a form of scaffolding (Ladberg, 2003; Lundberg, 2011; Wedin, 2011), primarily because the learners rely on the oral input from the teacher.

9. Conclusions

The study conducted here aimed at investigating patterns of classroom language use in learners and teachers. One of the main findings in the study was the correlation in pattern of language use between the teacher’s and the learners. More precisely, it was found that a high percentage of English use on the part of the teacher resulted in a high percentage of this language also in the learners. Nonetheless, these results are limited by the fact that observation was only made of the teacher. On the other hand, the teachers’ patterns of language use identified during classroom observation were not enough so as to determine whether the teacher who made the highest use of English used only the target language as a form of scaffolding. Hence, the recommendation here is to complement this information with teacher interviews. In addition to this, it was also found that the teachers’ use of both Swedish and English in instruction giving resulted in a higher use of English by the learners, perhaps because the learners were able to understand the instructions better if translanguaging occurred. This interpretation of the findings, though, needs to be future investigated. Another important finding of the study is that learners reported not to be allowed nor encouraged to use their mother tongue as a resource. Besides, most of the learners did not think that using all of their languages would be an advantage in L3 learning English.

In general terms, a limitation of the study is that the survey with the questionnaire was conducted only in one school, and therefore the results are not generalizable. In this sense, it would be necessary to replicate the study administering the questionnaire to other schools. Likewise, it would be necessary to increase the number and type of the participants. Among other things, this is due to the fact that the great majority of learners reported their L1 to be Swedish. Thus, for comparative purposes future studies should be more selective in the recruitment of participating learners, by selecting bilingual learners who perceive their heritage language as their mother tongue.
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Appendices

Appendix 1- Questionnaire

1. Vilket/Vilka är dina modersmål?

2. Vilket språk tycker du att du kan bäst?

3. Vilket språk tycker du att du kan näst bäst?

4. På vilket/vilka språk tänker du?

5. På vilket/vilka språk pratar du på engelska lektionen?

6. Vilket av språken är mer likt engelska?
   Modersmål             Svenska

7. Vilka språk liknar mest varandra?
   Modersmål och Engelska
   Svenska och Engelska
   Modersmål och Svenska

8. Får du använda ditt modersmål under engelsklektionerna?
   JA                  NEJ

9. Tror du att du blir bättre på ditt modersmål om/när du får använda det på engelsklektionen?
   JA                  NEJ

10. Tror du att du blir bättre på engelska om/när du får använda alla dina språk på engelsklektionen?
    JA                  NEJ

11. Känner du att ditt modersmål är lika viktigt som svenska och engelska i skolan?
    JA                  NEJ

12. Vilket/Vilka språk pratar du när ni har lekar eller aktiviteter på engelsklektionen?

13. Vilket/Vilka språk pratar läraren när ni har lekar och aktiviteter på engelsklektionen?

14. Vilket/Vilka språk ger din lärare instruktioner på under engelsklektionen?
15. Vad gör du under engelsklectionen om du inte kan svara det du vill på engelska?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

16. Om du använder ord från ditt modersmål när du pratar på engelskan, hur gör du om läraren eller dina klasskamrater inte förstår vad du menar?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________


____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________


____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
### Appendix 2- Observation grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Använder/Tillåter deras L1/modersmål</th>
<th>Använder sig av L2/Svenska</th>
<th>Använder sig av L3/Engelska</th>
<th>Annat (ex.bilder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hur hjälper läraren för att eleven ska förstå ord på engelska?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilket/Vilka språk förklarar läraren på?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vad gör läraren för att eleven ska förstå en fras på engelska?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilket/Vilka språk använder läraren när hen ger instruktioner?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Om lektionen innehåller lekar eller aktiviteter:</strong> Vilket/Vilka språk använder läraren under lekar och aktiviteter?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Vad gör läraren om en elev försöker förklara något genom att använda sitt/sina modersmål (inte svenska eller engelska)?

**Ringa in svaret:**
- Tillåts eleverna att använda sina modersmål? JA NEJ VET INTE
Appendix 3- Full inventory of participants responses to item 15-18

Item 15

Räcker upp handen eller säger jag vet inte  
Jag säger jag vet inte eller så räcker jag inte upp handen  
Säger jag vet inte  
Vet ej  
Vet ej  
Svarar på svenska  
Vet inte  
Jag säger jag inte förstår  
Säger att jag behöver hjälp  
Frågar på svenska  
Antingen frågar jag läraren eller så tänker jag vad det finns för spanska ord och skriver den engelska versionen.

Jag säger det på svenska  
Vi tar våra svenska flaggor  
Då tar vår svenska flaggor och då pratar man Svenska  
Jag lyfter upp en liten svenskaflagga och svarar på svenska  
Vi säger jag vet inte på engelska  
Jag tar upp svenska flaggan och pratar svenska. Jag tar upp flaggan för att andra ska förstå  
Jag räcker upp handen  
Jag säger det på svenska så säger läraren det på engelska och jag kan få hjälp av kompisarna.  
Då frågar jag en kompis eller tänker efter lite eller frågar jag om jag kan få tid att tänka.  
Då säger jag det på svenska  
Vet ej  
Pratar svenska  
Jag säger pass  
Jag vet inte  
Vet ej  
Vi har flaggor som vi tar upp den och säger ordet på svenska  
Säger på svenska  
Vi säger I don't know yet och tar hjälp av en kompis  
Vi tar en Sverige flagga  
Då tar vi upp svenska flaggan  
Jag svarar på svenska.  
Jag säger I don't know yet eller pratar jag med en svensk flagga i handen  
Jag brukar visa upp en svensk flagga och säger det på svenska

Item 16

Jag använder engelska istället  
Jag säger på svenska  
Jag säger på svenska  
Jag brukar inte använda ord från spanskan men om det skulle hända så skulle jag berätta på svenska.  
Jag skulle förklara på svenska.  
Då tänker jag på Spanska då kan jag på Engelska
Nej jag använder inte ord från mitt modersmål
Nej jag använder inte modersmål i engelska.
Jag säger vad det betyder om jag inte vet så låter jag någon annan som kan språket mer än mig ta över.
Jag gör det inte me
Jag pratar aldrig mitt språk
Då säger jag det på svenska eller engelska men förklarar vad som hände.
Då försöker jag att säga vad jag menar eller frågar jag min lärare om hon kan säga det på engelska. Jag säger det på sve
Då säger jag det på svenska om dom inte förstår
Jag säger på svenska
Ej
Vet ej
Nej jag använder inte mitt modersmål
Försöker på Engelska
Nej jag använder inte mitt modersmål
Jag vet inte så jag förklarar på svenska
Då förklarar jag men om jag inte vet frågar jag nånn annan som pratar samma språk.
När jag svarar på mitt modersmål så svarar jag sen på Engelska
Jag förklarar vad jag säger
Jag kan förklara på svenska

Item 17

Säger orden på svenska
Han skulle nog säga det på svenska istället
Vet inte
Hon säger på svenska
Säger på svenska
Säger ordet på svenska
Hon visar bilder eller försöker förklara på annat sätt
Bilder
Hon pratar på svenska
Hon pratar på svenska
Översätter
Vi brukar gå igenom orden i början och säga orden på engelska och svenska.
Hon säger början av ordet
Min lärare brukar säga första bokstaven
Då använder hon teckenspråk
Hon ljudar fram det eller förklarar
Hon säger första bokstaven.
Hon säger första bokstaven på ordet och efter så kan jag säga det
Hon förklarar
Då frågar hon någon annan och använder teckenspråk.
Hon skriver en sida på engelska och en annan sida på svenskasom betyder samma sakoch vi repeterar det om och om igen, Sen vet vi
Då frågar jag på svenska och sen hjälper hon mig och säger det på engelska
Hon säger det på svenska
Vet inte
Säger på svenska
Säger på svenska
Upprepar samma ord
Hon säger början av ordet
Hon använder teckenspråk
Hon säger först första bokstaven och sen fortsätter
Vi tar fram vår Sverige flagga eller frågar en kompis
Då förklarar hon om ordet. Använder tecken.
Hon förlarar på ett annat sätt
Min lärare säger första bokstaven, hon använder tecken. Hon skriver sånger så att vi kommer ihåg.
Hon förklarar för mig.

Item 18

Säger på svenska
Han skulle nog säga det på svenska istället
Jag vet inte
Hon säger på svenska
Säger på svenska
Säger frasen på svenska
Hon visar bilder eller försöker förklara på annat sätt
Svenska
Hon pratar på svenska
Hon säger på svenska
Översätter
Som sagt brukar vi gå igenom orden i början, men annars går vi igenom ett ord i taget.
Hon leker som om hon gjorde illa sig.
Hon dramatiserar så att vi förstår enklare
Min fröken dramatiserar.
Hon använder tecken
Hon visar med tecken.
Hon visar med tecken, med dramatisering.
Hon förklarar
Då förklarar hon till mig så läser jag vidare. Eller så frågar jag en kompis.
Hon säger att man ska säga I don't know och då får någon annan säga vad det betyder.
Då skriver hon det på tavlan och sen lär hon mig skriva.
Hon säger vad det betyder på svenska
Vet inte
Hon säger på svenska
Säger på svenska
Jag säger jag vet inte
Hon gör ett tecken.
Hon börjar med att säga början av en fras
Hon gör tecken, drama, använder andra ord, säger första bokstaven, klappar ut ordet och repeterar.
Då brukar hon visa på teckenspråk
Dramatiserar, repeterar med andra ord.
Visar med tecken, drama, andra ord, klappar ut och repetera.
Hon använder drama, tecken, klappa ut, andra ord och repeterar ordet.
Hon klappar ut.