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## Abstract

Many studies show that language learners see the benefits of using their first language in order to learn second or subsequent languages, while they also see some disadvantages. This reflects dominant ideas in language learning about the importance of keeping languages separate. The present study examines translanguaging, a strategy in which learners are encouraged to use their entire linguistic repertoires during language learning. To this aim, data are examined from Swedish learners ( $n=168$ ) in grades 79 to investigate their attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging in the EFL classroom, and to shed light on the roles of age and proficiency in constraining them. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire and a proficiency test in order to measure the participants' proficiency in English. Unlike the mixed views reported in previous studies, the learners investigated here had a positive view of translanguaging and perceived it as beneficial to their learning. Furthermore, the findings suggest that learners often used Swedish for specific functions, especially explaining grammar and vocabulary, clarifying tasks and instructions, comparing the languages and asking questions. This was even more so for low proficiency learners, who used translanguaging more for both practical and social purposes. On the other hand, higher proficiency learners used less Swedish and viewed translanguaging as less helpful. These learners also reported that their teachers used more Swedish in the classroom compared with their less proficient peers. It was also found that learners showed a greater tendency to use translanguaging with increasing age, although this might have been due to differences between teachers and their individual practices.
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## Svensk sammanfattning

Många studier visar att elever ser fördelarna med att använda sitt förstaspråk för att lära sig andra eller efterföljande språk, medan de också ser några nackdelar. Detta återspeglar dominerande idéer i språkinlärningen om vikten av att hålla språken åtskilda. I den här studien undersöks transspråkande (translanguaging), en strategi där eleven uppmuntras att använda hela sin språkliga repertoar under språkinlärningen. För detta ändamål undersöks data från svenska elever $(\mathrm{n}=168)$ i årskurs 7-9 för att undersöka deras attityder och uppfattningar kring transspråkande i det EFL-klassrummet och för att belysa hur faktorerna ålder och färdighet påverkar dem. Uppgifterna samlades in med hjälp av en enkät och ett färdighetstest för att mäta deltagarnas färdigheter på engelska. Till skillnad från de blandade åsikter som rapporterats i tidigare studier hade de studenter som undersöktes i denna studien en positiv syn på transspråkande och uppfattade det som fördelaktigt för deras lärande. Dessutom tyder resultaten på att eleverna ofta använde svenska för specifika funktioner; särskilt att förklara grammatik och nya ord, klargöra uppgifter och instruktioner, jämföra språk och ställa frågor. Detta var ännu mer för elever med låg färdighet, som använde transspråkande mer för både praktiska och sociala ändamål. Å andra sidan använde elever med högre kompetens mindre svenska och betraktade transspråkande som mindre användbart. Dessa elever rapporterade också att deras lärare använde mer svenska i klassrummet jämfört med sina kamrater med lägre färdighet. Studien pekar också på att eleverna visade en större tendens att använda transspråkande med ökande ålder, även om detta kan ha berott på skillnader mellan lärare och deras individuella metoder.

## Nyckelord
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## Definition of terms

The following abbreviations will be used throughout this study.
EFL classroom: English as a foreign language classroom
L1: Learners first language
L2: Learners second or additional language
ZPD: Zone of proximal development

## 1. Introduction

An idea that is dominant within language teaching is that the target language should be used as much as possible in classroom settings. However, we also know that Swedish is used for both practical and social reasons in the EFL classroom by both teachers and learners. One way to ensure learners are offered the optimal learning conditions to develop their language skills is to encourage them to use all of their linguistic resources. Translanguaging, which encourages the use of several languages, has gained popularity in the literature on language learning in recent times. It is argued by its proponents that this strategy enables learners to develop a deeper knowledge of the target language by taking help of the established language (Garcia \& Wei, 2014). This strategy stands in contrast with ideas that promote the exclusive use of the target language during language instruction.

It is important for teachers to work actively to design teaching that gives learners the possibility to develop their language skills. According to The Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket), the school has the responsibility to ensure pupils can communicate in both written and spoken English. Importance is placed on English since it "increases learners' opportunities to participate in different social and cultural contexts, as well as in international studies and working life" (Skolverket, 2011a:34). Furthermore, teaching should aim to help pupils develop their ability to "adapt language use for different situations, purposes and recipients and use strategies to support communication to solve problems when language skills by themselves are not sufficient" (Skolverkert, 34). Within the national curriculum, there is a strong emphasis on the communicative aspect of language teaching. However, there are no specific instructions on how lessons should be conducted in the lower secondary school level, unlike the upper secondary level, where "teaching should as far as possible be conducted in English" (Skolverket, 2011b:1).

In recent years, the concept of translanguaging (transspråkande) has been taken up in Swedish research on language teaching, and while the current curricula and syllabi do not explicitly mention translanguaging in the EFL classroom, the Swedish National Agency for Education has more recently published supplementary material highlighting the importance of translanguaging in regard to language teaching (Skolverket, 2018). Using a translanguaging perspective to analyse language ideologies within the Swedish curriculum, Rosén (2017) highlights that within the current curriculum language has different meanings. On the one hand, the curriculum is based on ideas that languages are separate, as they are organised into different subjects with their own goals and objectives. Moreover, they are also separated by time, classroom and teacher. On the other hand, within the curriculum there
are diverse uses of language that reflect a socio-cultural understanding of language. It is seen as a skill, a mediating tool, identity building, as a resource and as an important part of culture and heritage. (Rosén, 2017:51-52). This understanding of language also highlights the importance of adapting teaching to the needs, experiences and previous knowledge of learners. It is assumed that learners come to the classroom with a wide range of linguistic backgrounds, and importance must be placed on acknowledging and promoting these in order to develop further linguistic knowledge.

Because of the ideas about languages being separate underlying the curricula and syllabi, there are few opportunities for translanguaging outlined by these steering documents. However, because the steering documents also express contrasting ideas about language learning being interlinked with identity and participation, we should find spaces for learning how to translanguage in schools, as Rosén (2017) proposes. She argues for the need to examine translanguaging in everyday school practices, because national education policies and the ideas that guide them are sometimes resisted by the actors within educational settings.

While the attitudes and practices of teachers and older learners regarding translanguaging have been explored more thoroughly, the attitudes of younger learners have been much less investigated. To fill this gap, this study addresses what lower secondary learners' attitudes are regarding translanguaging in their English classrooms. This is important because attitudes can impact on how useful translanguaging is as a strategy. By the same token, learners' own perspectives should be taken into account when assessing the effectiveness of translanguaging.

## 2. Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework for this study is presented in this section. The concept of translanguaging will be introduced, followed by a description of sociocultural theory and the zone of proximal development and how this perspective has been applied to translanguaging. Then a review of previous research on students' attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging will be presented.

### 2.1 Translanguaging

Translanguaging is a teaching strategy in which learners are encouraged to use all their languages when learning the target language. The concept of translanguaging was first used by Welsh teacher Cen Williams (1994), when he referred to the practice of alternating between English and Welsh
during language lessons. Williams asked his students to use their full knowledge of both languages to deepen their knowledge of both languages. Baker (2011) first translated this term into English, defining it as 'the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through use of two languages.' (Baker, 2011:288). This definition has since been expanded on by scholars who recognise the ability of multilingual speakers to switch between languages, treating them as if they were an integrated system (Canagarajah, 2011:401; Garcia, 2009; Garcia \& Li Wei, 2014; Lewis, Jones \& Baker, 2012).

Translanguaging can be understood as a pedagogical practice that encourages the natural practices of bilinguals (Garcia, 2009; Garcia \&Wei, 2014; Williams, 2012). Research has found that the translanguaging that occurs in classrooms is mainly learner directed in that it occurs as a natural and spontaneous practise by multilingual learners (Cook 2001; Garcia 2009; Lewis, Jones and Baker, 2012; Williams 2012). Researchers describe translanguaging practices as often occurring despite policies against translanguaging because it is an unavoidable consequence of communication between multilinguals in multilingual communities (Cook, 2008; Rosiers 2017; Rivera \& Mazak, 2017). This is because L2 acquisition is not equivalent to L1 acquisition and the L1 cannot be ignored (McLachlan, 201:71).

There is a debate in the literature on how and whether the L1 should be used by teachers and learners in the EFL classroom. On one hand, the findings support using the target language exclusively, or as much as possible in EFL classrooms, as this gives learners more opportunity for input in the target language and encourages production. Krashen (1985) and Lightbown \& Spada (2006) argue that the learners acquire language through exposure. Maximum exposure to the target language is important and lessons exclusively in the target language are seen as having the most positive outcomes while learning a language. According to this view, teachers should encourage learners to use the target language as it encourages learners to become confident in using English and practice for situations in which they will need to use it (Krashen, 1985; Lightbown \& Spada, 2006; Gibbons, 2015; Lundberg, 2016). Promoting exclusive English use within the EFL classroom takes the learners outside their comfort zone, creates a need to use the TL and encourages them to take risks with the TL. This echoes early literature on bilingualism that emphasises a need to 'keep the languages separate' (García \& Li, 2014:12).

However, some research highlights the importance of including the L1 in the EFL classroom as doing so benefits the learner in developing their TL. Use of the L1 by teachers helps ensure tasks are understood correctly and carried out correctly (Horasan, 2014; Masood, 2019; Sa'd \& Qadermazi, 2015; Rajendram, 2019; Rasman, 2018; Scopich, 2018; Turnbull, 2018). It is also helpful in the teaching of elements such as vocabulary and grammar, therefore giving more opportunities for
metathinking about language (Horasan, 2014; Neokleous, 2017; Masood, 2019; Sa’d \& Qadermazi, 2015; Rajendram, 2019; Rasman, 2018; Scopich, 2018; Turnbull, 2018). This is especially in the case of learners with a low proficiency (Masood, 2019; Scopich, 2018). It is also helpful to allow learners to use their L1 as a social and cognitive tool while acquiring their L2 as using both languages could help the learners acquire languages faster (Cook, 2001 \& 2008; Cummings, 2007 \& 2009; García, 2007 \& 2015; McLachlan, 2018; Rasman, 2018). Learners also adopt translanguaging to help interpersonal relationships, highlighting the social benefits of translanguaging. For example, when they face problems with the TL, translanguaging occurs as a scaffolding practice where learners help each other (Rosiers, 2017:166, Rasman, 2018).

To summarise the findings, it is important that learners have as much input as possible in the target language, especially those who have low exposure outside of English classes, although the L1 can be useful in the EFL classroom. The teacher must always be reflecting on how they use language in the classroom and be using translanguaging practices strategically (Rivera and Mazak, 2017; Turnbull, 2001:534-535).

### 2.2 Sociocultural perspective \& the zone of proximal development

Many theorists who study translanguaging do so within a socio-cultural framework. According to the sociocultural perspective, language and learning are closely linked to each other and social interaction has a key role in the teaching and learning of language (Säljö, 2010). The sociocultural perspective is grounded in Lev Vygotski's (1978) understanding of learning and development. According to him, a central issue is that learning happens in interactions and cooperation with others in a social environment. Language and communication are what links the learner to its surroundings and language in particular can be seen as a culturally learnt tool that is used to communicate with others and convey knowledge. Using language, we both learn from others and pass on this knowledge to others, avoiding the need to 'reinvent the wheel repeatedly' (Säljö, 2010:37-38).

A central consideration within the sociocultural perspective is the concept of the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978:85-86). This refers to the boundaries between what a learner can do unassisted and what they can achieve with the help and guidance (scaffolding) from a knowledgeable other. As a consequence, learners can learn and develop by being stimulated to move further into their zone of proximal development which then becomes wider. The teacher must find the right level of support for the learner and this support should be situated just outside the learners' zone of ability in order to challenge and motivate the learner.

Translanguaging as a strategy could help teachers create an environment in which the appropriate level of stimulation is encouraged for learners. Within the sociocultural framework, Garcia \& Li Wei (2014 \& 2018) looking at translanguaging using a socio-cultural perspective, highlight that because translanguaging occurs through interaction with others, not only can teachers provide scaffolding for learners, but also learners of different abilities can work together and more advanced learners can scaffold the weaker learners. Translanguaging as a teaching strategy can be seen as a tool for the teacher to give learners the possibility to extend their zone of proximal development and therefore develop their language abilities (Garcia \& Wei, 2018:116). Hence, translanguaging can be seen as a process of co-learning, in which individual as well as collective learning and meaning making takes place in classroom environments as learners form a community of practice. By doing so, learners can provide each other with various forms of support, such as cognitive support, linguistic support, and social emotional support. Rajendram argues that translanguaging emphasises the key elements of sociocultural theory in that "learners are able to expand their individual and collective learning through collaborative interactions in the classroom... Learners are able to draw upon their shared knowledge, experiences and linguistic repertoires to scaffold each other cognitively, socially and linguistically which expands their individual and group learning." (Rajendram, 2019:52).

### 2.3 Previous research on attitudes towards translanguaging in the foreign language classroom

While translanguaging perspectives have gained attention in language research in Sweden, they are often applied in the contexts of heritage language learning, modern foreign languages and Swedish as a second language (Paulsrud et al., 2018). There has also been research undertaken that examines translanguaging practices in international schools with English speaking profiles (Jonsson, 2018; Toth, 2018). However, there has been little focus on translanguaging in EFL classrooms in Sweden, especially at the lower secondary level. Furthermore, there has been a large focus on attitudes and perceptions of translanguaging from the teachers perspective (among others Baker, 2011; Canagarajah, 2011; Nambisan, 2014; Williams, 2012). However, there has been less of a focus from the learners perspective. Most research on the learner's attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging has focused on adult language learners, with few studies focusing on younger learners.

Research in learners' attitudes towards L1 use in L2 learning has shown that learners tend to hold mixed views on translanguaging (Horasan, 2014; Masood, 2019; MacLachlan, 2018, Neokleous, 2017;

Sa'd \& Qadermazi, 2015; Rasman 2018; Scopich, 2018). Despite that both teachers and learners report that translanguaging occurs naturally and spontaneously inside the EFL classroom, findings regarding learners' attitudes towards translanguaging practices show that learners are often sceptical towards using their entire linguistic repertoire. This is because they believe that languages should be kept separate during English lessons and see use of their L1 as a hindrance in learning the target language (Rivera \& Mazak, 2017, Rosiers 2017; Cummins: 2007\& 2015; Turnbull 2018; Rasman, 2018). This distrust of L 1 in L 2 learning is perhaps based on an idea that using the L 1 during EFL classes is lazy and counteractive to modern language learning methods (Horasan, 2014; MacLachlan, 2018, , 2015; Rasman 2018; Scopich, 2018).

Studies show that learners have a positive view of translanguaging practice when it comes to helping them understand new vocabulary and grammar, comparing languages and also understanding tasks and instructions (Turnbull, 2018; Masood, 2019; Scopich, 2018; Neokleous, 2017; Rivera \& Mazak, 2017; Rosiers, 2017; Scopich, 2018; Turnbull, 2018). For example, a study by Turnbull (2018) found that Japanese tertiary students at mixed proficiency levels (ages 18-20) studying English in Japan viewed translanguaging mostly positively. Data was collected by means of a questionnaire, and it was found that the participants used translanguaging widely during their English lessons. They reported mainly using Japanese to understand grammar and vocabulary. Besides, they also perceived it as being helpful to compare the two languages, ask questions, understand English dialogues and texts, and make study notes.

In a study with older teenagers, Neokleous (2017) studied the attitudes of high school students aged between 15-17 who attended private language schools in Cyprus. It was found that participants thought using their L1 was helpful in three main areas. First, they perceived it as helpful to enhance learning, in the sense that using their L1 was needed to deepen their understanding and ensure comprehension. It was also particularly helpful for grammar lessons, learning new vocabulary and comparing the languages. Second, they perceived it as helping to improve the classroom atmosphere, making the classroom feel more relaxed and friendly. Likewise, the use of the L1 helped to increase participation and to promote a feeling of inclusion for all learners, who claimed their L1 helped to make them feel part of a group. Finally, they reported that using their L1 helped to increase their confidence and security. In this study, the participants did not want their L1 to be off limits in the classroom and wished to use it if needed. To be more precise, they thought their use of Greek was essential in learning English, even though they expressed a concern about their L1 use limiting their opportunities for using English. It seemed that ideally, learners wanted a classroom in which L1 is used appropriately, not excluded altogether but only used when needed to fulfil a function.

These findings are echoed in studies conducted by Sa'd \& Qadermazi, (2015) in Iran, and Scopich (2018) in Croatia on secondary school students' attitudes (these studies are explained in more detail in the following section). These studies also found that participants had positive attitudes and used translanguaging for many practical purposes during language lessons. However, the participants investigated also considered that use of their L1 should be only when absolutely necessary, in particular when explaining vocabulary and grammar and giving instructions. The participants in these studies were aware of the conflict between the benefits of translanguaging and the missed opportunities for using English. Participants in many of the studies appeared to be guided by an internal dominant ideology and discourse about avoiding L1 in L2 instruction (MacLachlan, 2018; Masood, 2019; Rasman, 2018; Rajendram, 2019).

Findings suggest that learners are aware of the conflict between the benefits of translanguaging and using the target language as much as possible in EFL classes. Many studies have looked at attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging in different countries and found that learners could foresee the benefits of translanguaging yet also expressed a strong desire to minimise their use of their L1 (Horasan, 2014; Neokleous, 2017; Rasman 2018; Scopich, 2018; Turnbull, 2018). Studies on university learners' attitudes towards translanguaging conducted by Rivera and Mazak (2017) in Puerto Rico, Turnbull (2018) in Japan and Kaufhold (2018) in Sweden found that learners could be opposed or feel conflicted using the strategy despite recognising its benefits, because they had been informed by the discourse that languages should be kept separate in the classroom. By way of contrast, Masood (2019) in Bangladesh found that tertiary students were positive towards translanguaging practices by students, however preferred the teacher to use English (the target language) as it was perceived to be more professional.

These studies also highlighted an important social aspect of translanguaging. They found that learners enjoyed translanguaging practices in the classroom as they created a more social and pleasant atmosphere in the classroom and increased the enjoyment and confidence of learners which led to more participation by students (Neokleous, 2017; Sa’d \& Qadermazi, 2015). This suggests that using both languages as needed creates a more comfortable learning atmosphere in the classroom. Studying the attitudes of young learners in Malaysia, Rajendram (2019) found that the main reason why participants reported used translanguaging was to support each other's learning and to build a good social environment with their classmates (This study is also examined in more detail in the following section as this study has a focus on proficiency). This increased the cohesion with their peers and led to a non-hierarchical collaboration structure in which all group members were able to contribute to
tasks despite potential differences in their abilities (Rajendram, 2019:146). However, perceptions towards translanguaging were influenced and sometimes constrained by teacher's language policies and practices (Rajendram, 2019:151). This social aspect of translanguaging and how it was important to younger learners was also emphasised in the findings of Rosiers (2017) in Belgium, Scopich (2018), Horasan (2014) (These are examined more in the next section). Learners felt included, relaxed, and this led to higher motivations and facilitated collaboration between learners. These studies will be examined in further detail in the forthcoming section.

Examining learners' perspectives on translanguaging is important because learners' attitudes towards it impact on how effective it is as a strategy for language learning (Rivera and Mazak, 2017; Kaufhold, 2018). If learners are not convinced that translanguaging is indeed a legitimate learning strategy, then teachers attempts to use translanguaging might be counterproductive. Learners' perceptions of how language classes should be can enable or restrict their abilities to use their entire language repertoire during lessons (Turnbull, 2018; Rasman, 2018; Rajendram, 2019; Rivera \& Mazak, 2017).

To summarise, recent research into translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom show that learners' attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging are both positive and cautious. Learners usually identify benefits of translanguaging practices and percieve that they facilitate learning, especially when it comes to explaining vocabulary and grammar and also helping with classroom management. At the same time, the research reviewed here reveals that while aware of the benefits of translanguaging, learners often have negative perspectives towards this practice due to the influence of a predominant monolingual mindset. As a result, they use of their L1 as being a barrier to the acquisition of the target language (Rasman, 2018). In addition to this, they consider that teachers if adopting translanguaging practices would need to use the languages strategically and appropriately during instruction (Masood, 2019; Rivera \& Mazak, 2018; Scopich, 2018, Turnbull, 2018).

### 2.4 Previous research on translanguaging with different age and proficiency of populations

The young age of learners along with disparities in proficiency are often identified as reasons to explain why translanguaging occurs spontaneously in language learning situations. In spite of this, there has been little research that has specifically addressed learners' attitudes towards translanguaging practices according to different ages or proficiency levels. Studies in the preceding sections have reported the general attitudes of learners with no specific focus on age or proficiency. This section will focus specifically on studies where age or proficiency was looked at in more detail.

When studying the attitudes of teenage learners (14-19 years) in Croatian High Schools, Scopich (2018) found that they were positive towards translanguaging strategies in the EFL classroom as they considered it useful for their learning of English, a majority (77\%) of participants thought that the L1 should be present in the EFL classroom. A questionnaire and observations were used to gather data on their attitudes and self-reported practices. Participants reported that their teachers used translanguaging in the classroom sometimes, especially to introduce new material, emphasise important points, make sure everyone understood instructions and give extra explanations. Similar to the studies mentioned above, the majority of participants stated that it was easier and more effective to use their L1, and regarded translanguaging acceptable when explaining new vocabulary and grammar, one-to-one conversations with others in the classroom, and classroom management. The participants believed this was especially important to help learners with a lower proficiency.

Similar to previous studies, the participants in Scopichs study reported feeling that translanguaging contributed to a more comfortable learning environment that made them feel more relaxed and increased motivation to learn English. The participants often switched to their L1 during informal situations, and they emphasised the importance of using their L1 to be able to collaborate with peers during activities and have informal conversations with others in the class. However, it was also found that some participants preferred to keep translanguaging to a minimum to maximise the use of the TL, stating that it should only be used in situations where necessary. More precisely, $23 \%$ of participants thought that the L1 should be avoided completely in the classroom because it would be detrimental for English learning. Their view was that the L1 should be avoided during English lesson due to their perceived high level of proficiency. The participants believed that they were at a high level in their English learning and that they should not need to resort to English. It is important to note that in this study, a correlation between attitudes and proficiency was not investigated because the participants proficiency was not determined for the study. This study was primarily focused on attitudes and experiences of translanguaging, and participants expressed attitudes and perceptions that related to proficiency. Therefore, because proficiency was not determined for participants, it can be said that attitudes were found about proficiency, but not according to proficiency.

In a study with somewhat young adults, Horasan (2014) studied the attitudes of L1 language use in the EFL classroom among English learners aged between 17-22 in Turkey. The study mentions that the participants had 'low proficiency' but no proficiency level is specified and participants are not classified into different proficiency groups for the sake of the study. This study was conducted using questionnaires, observation and interviews, and found that participants used translanguaging for speaking about grammar and tasks but also for social reasons such as speaking up in groups and expressing their sense of humour and collaboration between learners, which made learning easier.

They also mentioned that translanguaging was important for building relations with the teacher and other learners. The participants reported that using the L1 was seen to increase motivation and interest in learning English (Horasan, 2014:41). The participants were positive towards translanguaging because they were at the beginner level, but they did not approve of the idea of being allowed to use the L1 when they were to reach upper levels. The participants believed that translanguaging was acceptable at lower levels but should be decreased as they reach higher proficiency. Likewise, the participants believed that translanguaging was a tool that helped learning at beginner levels insofar as it had an important social function, namely, to build relations with others. However, they considered, it should be abolished as they increase their proficiency.

Another study that has addressed the role of proficiency in translanguaging is Affrin \& Hussin (2011). The authors studied tertiary students (aged 18-22) in Malaysia and found that participants attitudes on translanguaging were influenced by their proficiency level. This study used questionnaires and interviews and proficiency level was determined by which class they had been placed in. The study found that most participants perceived translanguaging to promote a better understanding of their course material because they could use both languages to understand the content. Less proficient learners had more positive attitudes towards L1 use because it was seen as necessary to ensure understanding (Ariffin \& Hussin, 2011:237) On the other hand, participants with a higher English proficiency found using the L1 off-putting and not helpful in improving their competence in English.

Another study with tertiary level students is Rivera \& Mazak (2017), who studied students in Puerto Rico (aged 20-25). In this study, the proficiency level was self-reported by participants themselves. They found that the participants were slightly positive in their attitudes towards translanguaging when they perceived the teacher's practice to be appropriate in regards to using both languages. This study, based on questionnaires, found a high level of neutral responses towards translanguaging, irrespective of proficiency level. Due to the high number of neutral responses to translanguaging practices, it was hard to know whether proficiency had an impact on their attitude to translanguaging. Hence, proficiency level did not seem to have an impact on attitudes towards translanguaging, but rather attitudes towards translanguaging were seen to be shaped by learner's previous educational experiences, and by language attitudes that have been formed during a learner's previous language education (Rivera \& Mazak, 2017:137).

Somewhat younger learners were investigated by Sád \& Qadermazi (2015), who studied Iranian learners of English at an educational institute that promoted an English only policy. Participants in this study were all males aged 14-22, and they were selected because their schools' English only policy
was a focus of the study. Proficiency was not objectively measured in the study, but the participants were divided into various proficiency levels. Data was gathered through observations, questionnaires and interviews. The authors found that learner's attitudes towards L1 use in the EFL classroom were positive and they believed it should be used to improve the classroom environment and to explain vocabulary and grammar, especially for learners who had a low proficiency. However, there was unanimous consensus among the majority of participants that L1 use should be discouraged or abolished completely at higher levels of proficiency. The participants concluded that use of the L1 by both the learners and teachers should only occur when absolutely necessary and as a last resort (Sa'd \& Qadermazi, 2015:170).

Another study with a similar age group is Masood (2019), which examined attitudes towards translanguaging practices of tertiary learners (aged 18-25) in Bangladesh. In this study, all the participants were assumed to have the same proficiency level, due to the specific courses the participants were enrolled in. In this study, based on questionnaires and interviews, it was found that the participants perceived translanguaging to be helpful to understand vocabulary and grammar and to assist learners with lower proficiency. Participants responded that even though translanguaging would make their lectures easier to understand, they preferred their teachers to use only the target language as they perceived this to be more professional.

A study with much younger and less proficient learners is that of Rajendram (2018). In a study based on observations and interviews, the translanguaging practices of young multilingual learners (aged 1011) in Malaysia were investigated. One class had a higher proficiency level and had an English only policy, details of how the proficiency level was assessed are not revealed in the study, but it is assumed that the children were sorted into different classes by the school according to proficiency level. The other class was of lower proficiency where the teacher encouraged translanguaging practices. Translanguaging was found to play an important role in the learner's collaboration work in both classes, and participants used their L1 regardless of proficiency level or classroom language policy. Not only did translanguaging seem to help the learners support each other's learning when it came to learning grammar and vocabulary increasing their metalinguistic awareness, but it also played an important role in social interactions. They were able to express opinions and emotions, joke with each other, affirm and agree with each other's ideas and work and motivate and help each other during their tasks.

Due to translanguaging practices, all learners in Rajendrams study were able to contribute to tasks and support each other's learning. Importantly, the socio-cultural context in which the learners are situated was seen to impact their attitudes towards translanguaging when different languages are associated
with different types of linguistic, socio-economic and cultural capital. For example, the younger learners could be influenced by their parent's attitudes and teacher policy towards language use, which could be seen to act as a barrier to translanguaging in the classroom. In the class which had an English only policy, learners, who had a higher proficiency, used their L1 to a significantly lesser extent in comparison with English. Both classes and all proficiency levels used L2 for task planning, and for social purposes such as supporting each other's learning, building relationships with peers, and resolving conflicts. Learners with higher English proficiency used English more often to discuss linguistic concepts, while those with lower proficiency used the L1 to discuss these concepts. All learners irrespective of proficiency level reported using their L1 in order to make their classroom environment more friendly, making learning more enjoyable and easier to work together on tasks, thereby increasing group participation (Rajendram, 2018:118). Those learners who had an English only policy reported feeling frustrated that their ideas were ignored if they could not express those ideas in English, which led to learners not contributing to group work and missing out on all the intellectual and creative resources of group members (Rajendram, 2018:119).

From the evidence reviewed so far, the general picture is that younger learners appear to resort to translanguaging more than older learners, and to be more accepting of the strategy. Using the L1 during L2 instruction is often seen as a means to an end in which younger and less proficient learners are allowed to use L1 until they reach higher proficiency levels. In the studies by Ariffin \& Hussin, (2011), Scopich, (2018), \& Horasan, (2014) the common findings were that young learners reported that they believed that translanguaging at younger ages and proficiency levels was acceptable, but opportunities for translanguaging should be decreased as learners get older and more proficient (Ariffin \& Hussin, 2011;237; Scopich, 2018:49; Horasan, 2014:41). However, some researchers who promote translanguaging argue that translanguaging should not be seen as a temporary bridge to proficiency, then removed when no longer needed (Rajendram 2018; Rivera \& Mazak, 2017). Instead, they regard it as beneficial to continue the strategy with older learners and those with a higher proficiency.

At higher proficiency levels, Rivera and Mazak (2018) found that with tertiary learners, proficiency did not appear to influence attitudes towards translanguaging practices. Moreover, the authors came to the conclusion that a learner's attitudes towards translanguaging practices are more likely informed by language attitudes grounded on cultural norms regarding language learning rather than proficiency. Similarly, $\mathrm{Sa}^{\prime} \mathrm{d}$ \& Qadermazi and Rasman (2018) found that although attitudes towards language use might be shaped by proficiency at lower levels, at higher levels it might be more shaped by dominant ideas about language learning.

In addition to translanguaging at high and low proficiency levels, other studies have investigated proficiency also in terms of translanguaging in mixed proficiency groups, suggesting that in these scenarios translanguaging is beneficial because it enables learners of all proficiencies to develop if the L1 is allowed to be used alongside English in the classroom. According to Masood (2019), for instance, mixed-proficiency classrooms help weaker learners feel more confident and included in learning (Masood, 2019). This suggests that translanguaging occurs due to disparities in learner's English proficiency, but this could be seen as an advantage because it leads to learners helping their peers during activities (Rajendram, 2019; Rosiers, 2017; MacLachlan, 2018; Masood, 2019). The translanguaging strategy helps to break down the hierarchy between languages and creates an uncompetitive environment in which learners can have equal opportunities to use all the languages depending on the needs of each individual learner (Turnbull, 2018). Therefore, learners at all proficiency levels benefit from interactions between groups. Importantly, learners of all proficiency levels are seen to benefit from translanguaging because learners at different levels have different strengths and weaknesses and the interactions are always dynamic (Rasman, 2018). Both low and high proficiency learners provide opportunities for learning during collaborative work because the scaffolding that learners provide during collaborative work helps to move them through their Zone of Proximal Development and develop their L2 (Ammar \& Hassan, 2018; Rasman, 2018; Rajendram, 2018).

In sum, the findings of the empirical studies reviewed in this section highlight that learners of all ages and proficiencies seem to have mixed feelings towards translanguaging, as they see both benefits to learning as well as social benefits, but at the same time feel like their L1 use should be minimised in order to facilitate learning. In view of the lack of consensus among researchers in the fields, further research is necessary to shed light on the roles played by age and proficiency in shaping learners' attitudes towards translanguaging in the foreign language classroom. Furthermore, it is necessary to carry out more methodologically rigorous studies where the proficiency of the participants is more properly assessed.

## 3. The present study

In light of the line of investigation outline in the preceding section, the purpose of the present study is study is to examine the attitudes and perceptions of Swedish learners in years 7-9 in regards to translanguaging practices in the English classroom. While the attitudes of teachers and tertiary learners
have been more thoroughly investigated, there is an empirical gap that needs to be addressed with younger learners, especially younger learners in a Swedish context. This will be investigated through data collected from questionnaires that were answered by 176 learners at an elementary school (equivalent to lower secondary level).

## 4. Research questions

The study aims to answer the following research questions. The first question focuses specifically on young learners' attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging practices in the English classroom. Next, the second and third research questions ask whether the factors age and proficiency may constrain these learners' attitudes and perceptions.
$R \mathrm{Q}(1)$ : What are the attitudes and perceptions of Swedish adolescent learners of English (13-16 year olds) towards the use of 'translanguaging' in the English classroom?
$\mathrm{RQ}(2)$ : Does age affect their attitudes and perceptions?
$R Q(3)$ : Does proficiency level in English affect their attitudes and perceptions?

## 5. Participants

In order to answer the research questions in this study, data was collected from learners $(n=168)$ at an elementary school in Stockholm. The learners who participated in this study were ages 13-16, who were enrolled in grades 7-9. In total, nine classes of students participated in this study, three at each grade. The classes were not differentiated according to ability, and were rather mixed proficiency classes. There were two teachers for each grade, and most teachers taught several grades. Very few participants $(n=8)$ had a mother tongue that was not Swedish. Table 1 offers an overview of the participants, where they classified according to gender, age and proficiency. Further details on how proficiency was calculated are offered in Section 7.2.

Table 1. Overview of the participants

| Participants |  | Freq. | \% |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| GENDER | Girl | 80 | $47,6 \%$ |
|  | Boy | 85 | $50,6 \%$ |
|  | Not binary | 3 | $1,8 \%$ |
| AGE | Grade 7 | 45 | $26,8 \%$ |
|  | Grade 8 | 64 | $38,1 \%$ |
|  | Grade 9 | 59 | $35,1 \%$ |
| PROFICIENCY | Low | 54 | $32,1 \%$ |
|  | High | 114 | $67,9 \%$ |

For this study, the participants were divided into high and low proficiency groups. Table 2 shows their distribution according to proficiency. As can be seen in the figures in this table, there was no overlap between age and proficiency. In other words, younger learners were not less proficient than older learners or vice versa. From a methodological perspective this makes it possible to confidently tease apart the effects of age from those of proficiency in the analysis, results and interpretation of these results.

Table 2. Crosstabulation of participants according to age and proficiency

| AGE | PROFICIENCY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | High |
| Grade 7 | $13(28,9 \%)$ | $32(71,1 \%)$ |
| Grade 8 | $28(43,8 \%)$ | $36(56,3 \%)$ |
| Grade 9 | $13(22 \%)$ | $46(78 \%)$ |

## 6. Instruments

The data for this study were gathered using two instruments. Firstly, a questionnaire (see Appendix A) was administered to the participants in order to examine their attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging. Secondly, a cloze test (see Appendix C) was employed to determine their proficiency in English. These two instruments are described in Sections 6.1 and 6.2, respectively.

### 6.1 Questionnaire

The questionnaire to survey learners' attitudes and perceptions consisted of 9 questions, and it was adapted from already existing questionnaires used by McLachlan (2018), Turnbull (2018) and Scopich (2018) in their studies on learners' attitudes towards translanguaging. The questions have therefore been validated by earlier published studies on the topic. The decision to use a questionnaire was because questionnaires such as these are often used in research on translanguaging, and it is an effective way to collect data from many participants. The questionnaire contained 8 closed questions and one open question in which the participant was encouraged to reflect on and disclose their own attitudes towards translanguaging practices in the English classroom. As for the 8 closed questions, all of them were based on a multiple-choice format. However, in most of them the participants were expected to choose one possible option, such as a binary 'yes vs. no' format (e.g., Q7), or frequency questions (e.g. always, often, sometimes, rarely, never in Q3 or Q5). In another set of questions, the range of possible answers was larger, and the participants were allowed to choose more than 1 option (e.g. Q4 or Q6).

### 6.2 Cloze Test

The cloze test employed in order to measure the participants' proficiency in English was 'Little Red Riding Hood'. This test was adapted from BAF Project (Barcelona Age Factor) in the GRAL research group, of which the supervisor of this degree project is a member. The rationale behind the choice of a cloze test was the belief that it is an indicator of overall proficiency in a foreign language (e.g. Hanzeli, 1977; Katona \& Dörnyei, 1993; Sánchez, 2020). In addition to this, the specific cloze test employed here, which consisted of 25 items, had been validated in previous studies (see Muñoz, 2006).

### 6.3 Ethical Considerations

The ethical guidelines from the Swedish Board of Science (Vetenskapsrådets riktlinjer) have been taken into consideration in this study. According to these guidelines, participants must be informed of the premise of the study and informed consent must be given, data must be only used for the purposes of this study, and anonymity must be ensured (Vetenskapsrådet 2019). All guidelines have been taken into account when collecting data for this study The following steps were taken when collecting data. First, both the learners and the parents of the younger learners were informed about the topic of the study. Second, consent forms (Appendix C) were sent to all parents of participants who were under the age of 15 , and only those who gave consent were included in this study. Thirdly, the learners signed a consent form (Appendix D) before they completed the questionnaires and cloze tests. They were
informed that the questionnaire would be anonymised, and that it was optional to participate in such a way that they could withdraw from the study at any time. In order to ensure anonymity, the questionnaires were given a number and the consent form with the name was removed (Vetenskapsrådet 2018). Criteria on information, consent and anonymity were fulfilled. Finally, the data will be destroyed when this study is complete.

## 7. Methodology

This section offers a detailed insight into the methodology employed in the present study. First the procedure followed in the process of data collection is described (Section 7.1). This is followed by an exhaustive description of how the data collected were analysed. In the present study, accounting for the data analysis involves a description of how the data elicited through the questionnaire were coded, how proficiency in English was measured and calculated, and how the statistical treatment of the data was conducted. This is done in Section 7.2.

### 7.1 Procedure

The questionnaire and the cloze test were administered to 9 groups of participants at one elementary school in a suburb of Stockholm in the Autumn term of 2020. The learners completed the questionnaire during class time under guidance of their class teacher. The author was present for some, but not all of these classes, as groups in the same year had these classes at parallel times. The participants had approximately 15 minutes to complete both tests, but most completed it within 10 minutes. Some participants had a teacher read the questions aloud in order to ensure comprehension. The participants were not allowed to ask questions in relation to the contents of the cloze test, in order to avoid extra scaffolding on the part of the teacher to bias the results.

### 7.2 Data analysis

The research software used for the quantitative analysis of the data was the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 26). The appropriacy of this software for research within social sciences is defended in handbooks on quantitative analysis such as Larson-Hall (2010). For the data analysis, the data from the questionnaires was entered into a data matrix in SPSS for statistical treatment. The answers to the first 8 items in the questionnaire were transferred to a data matrix.

In order to explore the answers to the final open-ended question, the data was qualitatively analysed with the purpose of identifying recurring patterns and later create categories.

In order to assess and determine the proficiency level of the participants, the raw scores of the cloze test were employed. Specifically, the raw scores were transformed into Z-scores. By so doing, it was possible to have a numerical measurement that would describe the value of each participant in relation to the entire sample. The next step was to compute T-scores on the Z-scores, so as to appraise the size of the difference relative to the variation of the sample. This guaranteed that the subsequent classification of the participants into proficiency groups was not arbitrary. The resulting classification of participants into low and high proficiency groups was presented in Table 2.

### 7.3 Validity and reliability

In order to ensure data collected for this study was reliable, a questionnaire was created based on three questionnaires that had already been used in previous studies, which enhanced its validity as a research instrument. Furthermore, the questionnaire was written in Swedish in order to ensure the participants understood the questions and could give well informed answers. Likewise, the cloze test had also been validated, as explained in detail in the description of this instrument. On the other hand, it is important to mention that the findings of this study do not claim to be representative of all learners in EFL classrooms. In a study consisting of only 9 classes, it is difficult to make generalisations and draw conclusions, however the purpose of this study is not to generalise the attitudes of all young learners of English in Sweden, but rather identify the patterns in relation to attitudes and practices of this group of participants.

## 8. Results

The results of the study are presented in this section, following the order of the three research questions that guide the study, and are organised as follows. The quantitative results are presented first (Sections 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3), followed by the qualitative results (Section 8.4). First of all, Section 8.1 offers a general overview of the data, describing the learners' perceptions about their teachers' translanguaging practices and then their own (RQ1) and the congruence between both of them. Secondly, Section 8.2 splits the sample into three groups according to the participants' age (Grade 7, Grade 8, Grade 9), and describes how age affects their perceptions about translanguaging (RQ2). Next, Section 8.3 splits the sample into two groups according to the participants' proficiency level (calculated on the basis of the results of the cloze test, as explained in the section on data analysis),
and describes how age affects their perceptions about translanguaging (RQ3). Finally, Section 8.4 presents the qualitative analysis of the data, which explores the reasons given by the participants as to why translanguaging is or is not beneficial.

### 8.1. Learners' perceptions about translanguaging in the English classroom

In this section, responses to the questions which address the learners' attitudes and perceptions of translanguaging in the English classroom will be presented. First, the results corresponding to the teachers (Q3-Q5) will be offered, followed by the results corresponding to the learners (Q6-Q8).

### 8.1.1 Learners' perceptions about their teachers' translanguaging

This section presents the learners' perceptions regarding their teachers translanguaging practices. Table 3 shows the frequency of the teachers use of Swedish during English lessons (question 3). As can be seen in the table, the majority of learners perceived that their teacher uses Swedish sometimes ( $51.2 \%$ ) or seldom ( $28 \%$ ) during English lessons.

Table 3. Frequency of teacher's use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q3)

|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 7 | $\mathbf{4 , 2} \%$ |
| Often | 25 | $\mathbf{1 4 , 9} \%$ |
| Sometimes | 86 | $\mathbf{5 1 , 2} \%$ |
| Seldom | 47 | $\mathbf{2 8} \%$ |
| Never | 3 | $\mathbf{1 , 8} \%$ |

Question 4 in the questionnaire, let us remember, inquired into what the learners perceive as the reasons for translanguaging on the part of the teacher. The answers to this question are gathered in Table 4. The learners report that the main reasons why the teacher uses Swedish during English lessons is for the purposes of explaining English grammar and vocabulary ( $63.5 \%$ and $62.5 \%$, respectively).

Other purposes for the teacher's use of Swedish in the English classroom repeated something in Swedish after saying it in English (54.8\%) and giving explanations (54.6\%). The participants report that the teachers use English rather than Swedish to engage in small talk with students ( $76.8 \%$ ), and they tend to use English to ask and answer questions $(88.7 \%$ \& $80.4 \%)$, and to open and close lessons $(82.1 \%$ \& $72.6 \%)$. Participants reported that their teachers do not use Swedish in order to save time
( $92.9 \%$ ). According to the participants, their teachers do not use Swedish to explain English texts $(71,4 \%)$ or give advice on study methods (76.2\%), indicating that these are carried out in English during lessons.

Table 4. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the teacher (Q4)

|  | YES |  | NO |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq | Perc | Freq | Perc |
| Explaining English grammar | 106 | 63,5\% | 61 | 36,5\% |
| Explaining English vocabulary | 105 | 62,5\% | 63 | 37,5\% |
| Explaining English texts | 48 | 28,6\% | 120 | 71,4\% |
| Explaining English listening passages | 55 | 32,7\% | 113 | 67,3\% |
| Making comparisons | 70 | 41,7\% | 98 | $\mathbf{5 8 , 3} \%$ |
| Repeating something in Swedish after saying it in English | 92 | 54,8\% | 76 | 45,2\% |
| Engaging in small-talk with the students | 39 | 23,2\% | 129 | 76,8\% |
| Saving time | 12 | 7,1\% | 156 | 92,9\% |
| Giving instructions | 67 | 39,9\% | 101 | 60,1\% |
| Giving explanations | 90 | 54,6\% | 78 | 46,4\% |
| Giving feedback | 69 | 41,1\% | 99 | $\mathbf{5 8 , 9} \%$ |
| Giving advice on study methods | 40 | 23,8\% | 128 | 76,2\% |
| Classroom management | 65 | 38,6\% | 103 | 61,3\% |
| Behavioural management | 64 | 38,1\% | 104 | 61,9\% |
| Task management | 72 | 42,9\% | 96 | 57,1\% |
| Asking questions | 19 | 11,3\% | 149 | 88,7\% |
| Answering students' questions | 33 | 19,6\% | 135 | 80,4\% |
| Summarising the lesson | 24 | 14,3\% | 144 | 85,7\% |
| Opening the lesson | 30 | 17,9\% | 138 | 82,1\% |
| Closing the lesson | 46 | 27,4\% | 122 | 72,6\% |

The results so far have focused on the learners' perceptions about teachers. In sum, they show a moderate to high percentage of Swedish use for explanations related to grammar and vocabulary.
Likewise, teachers are also reported to use Swedish in order to repeat things and give instructions, while they use English to ask and answer questions, open and close lessons, and small talk with students. In the next section the results are offered of learners' report of their own language use in the English classroom.

### 8.1.2 Learners' self-reports on their translanguaging practices

In this section the results of the learners translanguaging practices will be presented. Table 5 shows the frequency of the learner's use of Swedish during English lessons. The results are evenly distributed around sometimes ( $39.3 \%$ ), with few participants reporting that they always or never use Swedish in the English classroom ( $7,1 \%$ and $4,8 \%$, respectively). On the other hand, when considering together learners who report to use Swedish often or sometimes, the percentage accounts for more than half sample, namely, a $65.5 \%$.

Table 5. Frequency of learner's use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q5)

|  | FREQUENCY | PERCENT. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 12 | $\mathbf{7 , 1} \%$ |
| Often | 44 | $\mathbf{2 6 , 2} \%$ |
| Sometimes | 66 | $\mathbf{3 9 , 3} \%$ |
| Seldom | 38 | $\mathbf{2 2 , 6} \%$ |
| Never | 8 | $\mathbf{4 , 8} \%$ |

As for what the learners perceive as their own reasons for translanguaging in the English classroom, the results are shown in Table 6. The learners report that the main reasons why they use Swedish are to translate and understand new vocabulary ( $64.3 \%$ ), and also to understand difficult concepts ( $51.2 \%$ ), followed by understanding grammar, reading texts, comparing the languages and asking the teacher questions. In turn, the majority of learners do not report to use Swedish to plan writing tasks, save time, or make study notes. It seems that the majority of learners do not resort to Swedish in order to better express themselves.

Table 6. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the learner (Q6)

|  | YES |  | NO |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Freq | Perc | Freq | Perc |
|  | 108 | $\mathbf{6 4 , 3} \%$ | 60 | $\mathbf{3 5 , 7} \%$ |
|  | 82 | $\mathbf{4 8 , 8} \%$ | 86 | $\mathbf{5 1 , 2} \%$ |
| Better understanding difficult concepts | 86 | $\mathbf{5 1 , 2} \%$ | 82 | $\mathbf{4 8 , 8} \%$ |
| Better understanding when reading texts | 75 | $\mathbf{4 4 , 6} \%$ | 93 | $\mathbf{5 5 , 4} \%$ |
| Better understanding listening passages | 44 | $\mathbf{2 6 , 2} \%$ | 124 | $\mathbf{7 3 , 8} \%$ |
| Comparing English and Swedish | 72 | $\mathbf{4 2 , 9} \%$ | 96 | $\mathbf{5 7 , 1} \%$ |


| Planning my essays | 32 | $\mathbf{1 9} \%$ | 136 | $\mathbf{8 1} \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Better understanding what I hear | 26 | $\mathbf{1 5 , 5} \%$ | 142 | $\mathbf{8 4 , 5} \%$ |
| Saving time | 29 | $\mathbf{1 7 , 3} \%$ | 139 | $\mathbf{8 2 , 7} \%$ |
| Asking the teacher's questions | 75 | $\mathbf{4 4 , 6} \%$ | 93 | $\mathbf{5 5 , 4} \%$ |
| Answer the teacher's questions | 39 | $\mathbf{2 3 , 2} \%$ | 129 | $\mathbf{7 6 , 8} \%$ |
| Discussing with friends about our English class | 57 | $\mathbf{3 3 , 9} \%$ | 111 | $\mathbf{6 6 , 1} \%$ |
| Easily making study notes | 41 | $\mathbf{2 4 , 4} \%$ | 127 | $\mathbf{7 5 , 6} \%$ |
| Better expressing myself | 45 | $\mathbf{2 6 , 8} \%$ | 123 | $\mathbf{7 3 , 2} \%$ |
| Others |  | $\mathbf{l}$ |  |  |

Table 7 shows the learners' attitudes towards whether they feel comfortable translanguaging in the classroom. Most participants ( $92.9 \%$ ) reported that they liked using both English and Swedish in the English classroom, with only a small group of participants (6.6\%) reporting that they did not like using both languages and preferred to stick only to English.

Table 7. Attitude towards translanguaging in the classroom (Q7)

|  | I like using both English and Swedish in English lessons |
| :--- | :---: |
| YES | $156(\mathbf{9 2 , 9 \%})$ |
| NO | $11(\mathbf{6 , 6 \%})$ |

In addition to the learners' attitudes towards the use of translanguaging, presented in the preceding section, they were also asked about the usefulness of doing so. As Table 8 shows, a majority of learners perceive the option of translanguaging as either very helpful (39.2\%) or somewhat helpful (57.2\%), with a very small number of participants (3.6\%) not seeing it as helpful at all.

Table 8. Perceived benefits of translanguaging (Q8)

|  | Switching between English and Swedish is beneficial for <br> students who are learning English as a second language |
| :--- | :---: |
| Very helpful | $65(\mathbf{3 9 , 2} \%)$ |
| Somewhat helpful | $95(\mathbf{5 7 , 2 \%})$ |


| Not helpful | $6(\mathbf{3 , 6 \%})$ |
| :--- | :--- |

The report of the results so far has focused on the participants' perceptions as to if, when and how much their teachers resort to translanguaging, and then also to their self-reported practices for teachers and learners separately. However, to have a more comprehensive view of the picture, it is also helpful to examine the correlation in translanguaging practices between teachers and learners. This is done in Section 8.1.3.

### 8.1.3 Congruence between teachers and learners' translanguaging practices

With the purpose of exploring the results further, data was crosstabulated and crosschecked to ascertain whether teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices were associated to each other. In order to examine this association, the statistic Somers' D (i.e., Somer's delta) was used. Somer's D is an ordinal measure of the strength and direction of association between two variables. Table 9 shows a comparison of teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices. The results show that such a relationship exists between them, in that teachers and learners do indeed use Swedish and English for the same purposes, above all when it comes to explaining grammar ( $65,1 \%$ of learners who used Swedish to clarify grammar also found their teacher to do this) and to clarifying vocabulary $(72,2 \%$ of learners who used Swedish to understand vocabulary also found their teacher to do this), where this relationship turned out to be statistically significant ( $\mathrm{p}=.000$ in both comparisons). In addition to these parts, the teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices were also congruent in other functions, though to a somewhat lesser extent, as for example for making comparisons between English and Swedish ( $55,7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.014$ ), saving time ( $38,5 \% \mathrm{p}=.013$ ), asking questions ( $66,7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.007$ ), answering questions ( $42,6 \%, \mathrm{p}=.001$ ). Likewise, there was a relationship when it comes to explicating passages from texts learners listen to, but in the opposite direction given that neither teachers nor learners seemed to used Swedish to this aim $(66,1 \%, p=.001)$.

Table 9. Congruence between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices

| TEACHER |  | LEARNER |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Grammar |  | Yes | Yes |
|  | No | $69(\mathbf{6 5 , 1} \%)$ | $37(\mathbf{3 4 , 9} \%)$ |
| Vocabulary | Yes | $23(\mathbf{3 7 , 7 \%})$ | $38(\mathbf{6 2 , 3} \%)$ |
|  | No | $57(\mathbf{7 2 , 2} \%)$ | $22(\mathbf{2 7 , 8} \%)$ |
|  | Yes | $40(\mathbf{4 4 , 9 \%} \%)$ | $49(\mathbf{5 5 , 1 \%})$ |


|  | No | 36 (36,7\%) | 62 (63,3\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Save Time | Yes | 10 (38,5\%) | 16 (61,5\%) |
|  | No | 17 (12\%) | 125 (88\%) |
| Ask Questions | Yes | 24 (66,7\%) | 12 (33,3\%) |
|  | No | 55 (41,7\%) | 77 (58,3\%) |
| Answer Questions | Yes | 20 (42,6\%) | 27 (57,4\%) |
|  | No | 19 (15,7\%) | 102 (84,3\%) |
| Explicate Written Text | Yes | 19 (35,9\%) | 34 (64,2\%) |
|  | No | 41 (35,7\%) | 74 (64,3\%) |
| Explicate Heard Text | Yes | 20 (33,9\%) | 39 (66,1\%) |
|  | No | 12 (11\%) | 97 (89\%) |

Section 8.1 has offered an overall view of the picture as to how learners perceived themselves and their teachers to use the strategy of translanguaging in the English classroom. In what follows, the sample is split according to age in order to examine possible effects of this factor on learners' perceptions, and then according to proficiency.

### 8.2. Age effects on learners' perceptions about translanguaging

In this section the results corresponding to whether age affects the learners' perceptions about translanguaging in the English classroom will be described. Data regarding both the frequency of translanguaging occurrence and the reasons for translanguaging will be presented and compared from the participants in the different age groups, namely, Grade 7, Grade 8, and Grade 9.

### 8.2.1 Age effects on learners' perceptions about their teacher's translanguaging

Here, the results relating to age effects on learners' perceptions of teachers' translanguaging will be presented. Table 10 shows the frequency of translanguaging according to different age groups. In all age groups, the majority of participants reported that their English teacher sometimes spoke Swedish during lessons. However, there are differences when it comes to frequency categories between grades. In grade 7, a higher percentage of participants $(35,6 \%)$ reported their teacher seldom used Swedish during the lessons compared with the participants in grade 8 and 9 ( $23.4 \%$ and $27.1 \%$ respectively). When we look at how many participants reported that their teacher often uses Swedish during English lessons the number is higher for the participants in grades 8 and $9(17.2 \%$ and $15.3 \%$ respectively) compared with the younger learners in grade $7(11.1 \%)$. This indicates that the Swedish use on part of the teacher is highest in the older grades (esp. grade 8) and lower at the grade 7 . This difference is
even more salient when looking at the number of participants who report that their teacher always uses Swedish during English lessons. While no participants reported this in grade 7, 6.3\% and 5.1\% reported this in the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ grades.

Table 10. Frequency of teacher's use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q3) at different ages

|  | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | - | $4(\mathbf{6 , 3} \%)$ | $3(\mathbf{5 , 1} \%)$ |
| Often | $5(\mathbf{1 1 , 1 \%})$ | $11(\mathbf{1 7 , 2} \%)$ | $9(\mathbf{1 5 , 3} \%)$ |
| Sometimes | $22(\mathbf{4 8 , 9} \%)$ | $34(\mathbf{5 3 , 1} \%)$ | $30(\mathbf{5 0 , 8 \%})$ |
| Seldom | $16(\mathbf{3 5 , 6} \%)$ | $15(\mathbf{2 3 , 4} \%)$ | $16(\mathbf{2 7 , 1} \%)$ |
| Never | $2(\mathbf{4 , 4 \%})$ | - | $1(\mathbf{1 , 7 \%})$ |

As for the purposes for translanguaging on part of the teacher, Table 11 shows that these purposes differ across the different age groups. Most salient are the higher percentages in grade 8 compared with grade 7 for all categories (except for behaviour management). There are noticeably higher percentages in grade 8 when it comes to explaining grammar and listening passages, engaging in small talk, giving feedback and giving advice on study methods. There are also lower percentages in all categories in grade 9 than grade 8, with the exception of behaviour management and classroom management. More precisely, there were also lower percentages in grade 9 for making comparisons and saving time, though these differences are smaller in comparison.

Table 11. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the teacher (Q4) at different ages

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grade } 7 \\ & (n=45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grade } 8 \\ & (n=64) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grade } 9 \\ & (n=59) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explaining English grammar | 21 (46,7\%) | 48 (76,2\%) | 37 (62,7\%) |
| Explaining English vocabulary | 28 (62,2\%) | 47 (73,4\%) | 30 (50,8\%) |
| Explaining English texts | 10 (22,2\%) | 21 (32,8\%) | 17 (28,8\%) |
| Explaining English listening passages | 4 (8,9\%) | 30 (46,9\%) | 21 (35,6\%) |
| Making comparisons | 18 (40\%) | 27 (42,2\%) | 25 (42,4\%) |
| Repeating something in Swedish after saying in in English | 22 (48,9\%) | 37 (57,8\%) | 33 (55,9\%) |
| Engaging in small-talk with the students | 5 (11,1\%) | 20 (31,3\%) | 14 (23,7\%) |
| Saving time | - | 6 (9,4\%) | 6 (10,2\%) |
| Giving instructions | 13 (28,9\%) | 27 (42,2\%) | 27 (45,8\%) |


| Giving explanations | 23 (51,1\%) | 36 (56,3\%) | 31 (52,5\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Giving feedback | 9 (20\%) | 32 (50\%) | 28 (47,5\%) |
| Giving advice on study methods | 6 (13,3\%) | 20 (31,3\%) | 14 (23,7\%) |
| Classroom management | 11 (24,4\%) | 26 (40,6\%) | 28 (47,5\%) |
| Behavioural management | 18 (40\%) | 22 (34,4\%) | 24 (40,7\%) |
| Task management | 11 (24,4\%) | 34 (53,1\%) | 27 (45,8\%) |
| Asking questions | 2 (4,4\%) | 10 (15,6\%) | 7 (11,9\%) |
| Answering students' questions | 5 (11,1\%) | 18 (28,1\%) | 10 (16,9\%) |
| Summarising the lesson | 3 (6,7\%) | 13 (20,3\%) | 8 (13,6\%) |
| Opening the lesson | 7 (15,6\%) | 13 (20,3\%) | 10 (16,9\%) |
| Closing the lesson | 6 (13,3\%) | 22 (34,4\%) | 18 (30,5\%) |

In order to find out whether the association between age and the learners' perceptions about their teachers' translanguaging practices, Somer's D was calculated for each age group separately. The results suggest an age effect on these perceptions, indicating a greater tendency to resort to translanguaging with increasing age. Notwithstanding, the examination of age here might have been compromised by individual differences between the teachers, as will be argued in more detail in the discussion section. As shown in the percentages in the table 10, Grade 8 learners found their teacher to resort to translanguaging to a greater extent than $7^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ graders. On the one hand, when comparing $7^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ graders, younger learners perceived that their teacher used translanguaging more for certain purposes than their older peers, and many of the comparisons turned out to be statistically significant. On the other hand, when comparing $8^{\text {th }}$ graders with the other age groups, differences were also found, especially between $7^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ graders, with younger learners again perceiving a higher incidence of translanguaging on the part of their teachers for certain functions. The difference between $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ graders was much smaller, as only one statistically significant difference was found (in vocabulary). For the sake of clarity in the presentation of results, the comparisons between age groups that reached statistical significance are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12. Significant differences between age groups: translanguaging in teachers

|  | GRADE 7 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 9 | GRADE 7 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 8 | GRADE 8 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 9 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explaining English grammar | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ | ns |
| Explaining English vocabulary | ns | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.008$ |


| Explaining English texts | ns | ns | ns |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explaining English listening passages | $\mathrm{p}=.000$ | $\mathrm{p}=.000$ | ns |
| Making comparisons | ns | ns | ns |
| Repeating something in Swedish after saying in in English | ns | ns | ns |
| Engaging in small-talk with the students | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.007$ | ns |
| Saving time | $\mathrm{p}=.010$ | $\mathrm{p}=.010$ | ns |
| Giving instructions | ns | ns | ns |
| Giving explanations | ns | ns | ns |
| Giving feedback | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.002$ | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ |
| Giving advice on study methods | $\mathrm{p}=.013$ | ns | ns |
| Classroom management | ns | ns | ns |
| Behavioural management | $\mathrm{p}=020$ | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ | ns |
| Task management | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.042$ | ns |
| Asking questions | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.020$ | ns |
| Answering students' questions | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.030$ | ns |
| Summarising the lesson | ns | ns | ns |
| Opening the lesson | $\mathrm{p}=.029$ | $\mathrm{p}=.007$ | ns |
| Closing the lesson |  |  |  |

### 8.2.2 Age effects on learners' self-reports on their translanguaging practices

Here, the results relating to age effects on learners' self-reports of translanguaging will be presented.
Table 13 shows the frequency of the learners' own translanguaging according to the different age groups. In all age groups, the majority of participants reported that they sometimes spoke Swedish during English lessons, $35.6 \%$ in grade $7,35.9 \%$ in grade 8 and $45.8 \%$ in grade 9 . However, as is also the case in results offered in previous sections regarding the perceived teachers translanguaging practices, there are differences when it comes to frequency categories between the grades. In grade 7 a higher percentage of participants ( $31.1 \%$ ) reported they seldom used Swedish during English lessons, compared with the participants in grade $8(21.9 \%)$ and grade $9(16.9 \%)$. When it came to the number of participants who reported often using Swedish during English lessons, once again the participants in grade 7 had lower instances of translanguaging ( $17.8 \%$ ) whereas higher instances were reported in grade $8(31.3 \%)$ and grade $9(27.1 \%)$. This pattern of younger participants using English in the classroom is further illustrated when we look at the categories of always and never. Specifically, $13.3 \%$ of participants in grade 7 reported never using Swedish during English lessons, compared with
$1.6 \%$ of participants in grade 8 and $1.7 \%$ in grade 9 . In grade 7 , only a small number of participants ( $2.2 \%$ ) reported they always used Swedish during English lessons, compared with participants in grade $8(9.4 \%)$ and grade $9(8.5 \%)$. This indicates that the Swedish use on part of the learners is higher at the higher levels and lowest at grade 7 .

Table 13. Frequency of learner's use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q5) at different ages

|  | Grade 7 <br> $(n=45)$ | Grade 8 <br> $(n=64)$ | Grade 9 <br> $(n=59)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | $1(\mathbf{2 , 2 \% )}$ | $6(\mathbf{( 9 , 4 \% )}$ | $5(\mathbf{8 , 5} \%)$ |
| Often | $8(\mathbf{1 7 , 8} \%)$ | $20(\mathbf{3 1 , 3} \%)$ | $16(\mathbf{2 7 , 1 \% )}$ |
| Sometimes | $16(\mathbf{3 5 , 6 \%})$ | $23(\mathbf{3 5 , 9 \%})$ | $27(\mathbf{4 5 , 8} \%)$ |
| Seldom | $14(\mathbf{3 1 , 1 \%})$ | $14(\mathbf{2 1 , 9} \%)$ | $10(\mathbf{1 6 , 9} \%)$ |
| Never | $6(\mathbf{1 3 , 3} \%)$ | $1(\mathbf{1 , 6 \% )}$ | $1(\mathbf{1 , 7 \%})$ |

As far as the learners' own translanguaging is concerned, Table 14 shows that patterns differ across age groups. Like with the teachers' translanguaging, higher percentages for all categories are reported at grade 8 , illustrating that translanguaging is used more in the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade than in the $7^{\text {th }}$ grade and $9^{\text {th }}$ grade. Higher percentages are reported for some categories at grade 9 than at grade 8, such as learning new vocabulary, planning essays, understanding what is heard, saving time, discussing with friends, and expressing oneself. All age groups used Swedish predominantly for translating and better understanding new vocabulary, and this was the case for grammar in the $8^{\text {th }}$ and $9^{\text {th }}$ grades, but less so for grade 7. It appears that $9^{\text {th }}$ graders are less likely to translanguage in order to understand difficult concepts and are slightly less likely to translanguage to compare the languages than $7^{\text {th }}$ graders.

Table 14. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the learner (Q6) at different ages

|  | Grade 7 <br> $(n=45)$ | Grade 8 <br> $(n=64)$ | Grade 9 <br> $(n=59)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Translating and better understand new words | $24(\mathbf{5 3 , 3} \%)$ | $41(\mathbf{6 4 , 1 \% )}$ | $43(\mathbf{7 2 , 9} \%)$ |
| Translating and better understand new grammar | $12(\mathbf{2 6 , 7 \%})$ | $37(\mathbf{5 7 , 8} \%)$ | $33(\mathbf{5 5 , 9} \%)$ |
| Better understanding difficult concepts | $22(\mathbf{4 8 , 9 \%})$ | $37(\mathbf{5 7 , 8} \%)$ | $27(\mathbf{4 5 , 8} \%)$ |
| Better understanding when reading texts | $9(\mathbf{2 0} \%)$ | $37(\mathbf{5 7 , 8} \%)$ | $29(\mathbf{4 9 , 2} \%)$ |
| Better understanding listening passages | $6(\mathbf{1 3 , 3} \%)$ | $22(\mathbf{3 4 , 4 \%})$ | $16(\mathbf{2 7 , 1} \%)$ |
| Comparing English and Swedish | $17(\mathbf{3 7 , 8} \%)$ | $34(\mathbf{5 3 , 1 \% )}$ | $21(\mathbf{3 5 , 6} \%)$ |


| Planning my essays | 5 (11,1\%) | 12 (18,8\%) | 15 (25,4\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Better understanding what I hear | 5 (11,1\%) | 9 (14,1\%) | 12 (20,3\%) |
| Saving time | 4 (8,9\%) | 8 (12,5\%) | 17 (28,8\%) |
| Asking the teacher's questions | 14 (31,1\%) | 32 (50\%) | 29 (49,2\%) |
| Answer the teacher's questions | 14 (23,7\%) | 44 (31,3\%) | 14 (23,7\%) |
| Discussing with friends about our English class | 10 (22,2\%) | 23 (35,9\%) | 24 (40,7\%) |
| Easily making study notes | 7 (15,6\%) | 20 (31,3\%) | 14 (23,7\%) |
| Better expressing myself | 11 (24,4\%) | 16 (25\%) | 18 (30,5\%) |

In order to find out whether the association between age and the learners' self-reported perceptions on their own translanguaging practices, Somer's D was calculated for each age group separately. Here again the results suggest an age effect on these perceptions, indicating a greater tendency to resort to translanguaging with increasing age. The significant differences obtained in the comparisons across age groups are gathered in Table 15.

Table 15. Significant differences between age groups: translanguaging in learners

|  | GRADE 7 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 9 | GRADE 7 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 8 | GRADE 8 <br> vs. <br> GRADE 9 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Translating and better understand new words | $\mathrm{p}=.038$ | ns | ns |
| Translating and better understand new grammar | $\mathrm{p}=.022$ | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ | ns |
| Better understanding difficult concepts | ns | ns | ns |
| Better understanding when reading texts | $\mathrm{p}=.001$ | $\mathrm{p}=.000$ | ns |
| Better understanding listening passages | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.007$ | ns |
| Comparing English and Swedish | ns | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.047$ |
| Planning my essays | ns | ns | ns |
| Better understanding what I hear | $\mathrm{p}=.006$ | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.024$ |
| Saving time | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.043$ | ns |
| Asking the teacher's questions | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.007$ | ns |
| Answer the teacher's questions | $\mathrm{p}=.039$ | ns | ns |
| Discussing with friends about our English class | ns | $\mathrm{p}=.048$ | ns |
| Easily making study notes | ns | ns | ns |
| Better expressing myself |  |  |  |

Table 16 shows the attitudes towards translanguaging at different ages, or more specifically whether they like using both languages during English lessons. The numbers in this table show a highly positive attitude towards translanguaging on the part of the learners in all age groups. Likewise, it can also be observed that $8^{\text {th }}$ graders exhibit a more positive attitude than $7^{\text {th }}$ graders. In turn, $9^{\text {th }}$ graders are somewhat less positive than $8^{\text {th }}$ graders, and in fact this fall is statistically significant $(\mathrm{p}=.043)$.

Table 16. Attitude towards translanguaging in the classroom (Q7) at different ages

|  | Grade 7 <br> $(n=45)$ | Grade 8 <br> $(n=64)$ | Grade 9 <br> $(n=59)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I like using both English and Swedish in English lessons | $41(\mathbf{9 1 , 1 \%})$ | $62(\mathbf{9 6 , 9 \%})$ | $53(\mathbf{8 9 , 8} \%)$ |

As for the benefits of translanguaging, Table 17 shows that the participants consider translanguaging to be beneficial in their learning. The majority of participants at all levels perceived translanguaging to be either very helpful or somewhat helpful, with higher instances of positive views in grades 8 and 9 compared with grade 7 participants. The differences between somewhat helpful and very helpful are greater in the grade 7 level. In particularly, slightly more ( $6.8 \%$ ) participants at grade 9 perceived translanguaging to be unhelpful in the English classroom.

Table 17. Perceived benefits of translanguaging at different ages

|  | Switching between English and Swedish is beneficial for students who are learning English as a second language |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grade } 7 \\ & (n=45) \end{aligned}$ | Grade 8 $(n=64)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Grade } 9 \\ & (n=59) \end{aligned}$ |
| Very helpful | 15 (33,3\%) | 27 (42,2\%) | 23 (39\%) |
| Somewhat helpful | 29 (64,4\%) | 35 (54,7\%) | 31 (52,5\%) |
| Not helpful | 1 (2,2\%) | 1 (1,6\%) | 4 (6,8\%) |

### 8.2.3 Age effects on teacher-learner congruence

This section examines the relationship between teacher' and learners' translanguaging practices across different age groups. Data from the learners' perceptions of teachers' translanguaging practices was crosstabulated with data on the learners self-reported translanguaging practices to check the degree of association between them. In order to find out whether this relationship between teachers and learners' translanguaging practices was constrained by age, Somer's D was calculated for each age group separately. Table 18 shows the congruence between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices at the different grades. The results yielded no significant difference in Grade 7. In Grades 8 and 9 , however, the association turned out to be statistically significant in the categories vocabulary ( $66.7 \%$, $\mathrm{p}=.023$ and $86.7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.011$, for each grade, respectively), save time ( $97.7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.026$ and $67.4 \%$, $\mathrm{p}=.022$, respectively) and explicating listening texts ( $77.1 \%, \mathrm{p}=.005$ and $58.8 \%, \mathrm{p}=.012$, respectively). Besides, in the case of Grade 8 , the category answer questions ( $66.7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.004$ ). As for Grade 9 , the following categories were also significant: grammar ( $73 \%, \mathrm{p}=.001$ ), compare ( $76.5 \%$, $\mathrm{p}=.022$ ), and ask questions ( $85.7 \%, \mathrm{p}=.034$ ). The results show that there is a relation between teachers' and learners' practices and that they tend to use the same language for the same functions.

Table 18. Congruence between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices at different ages

| TEACHER |  | LEARNER |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Grade 7 |  | Grade 8 |  | Grade 9 |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Grammar | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (23,8 \%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 16 (76,2\%) | 37 (77,1\%) | 11 (22,9\%) | 27 (73\%) | 10 (27\%) |
|  | No | 7 (29,2\%) | 17 (70,8\%) | 10 (66,7\%) | 5 (33,3\%) | 6 (27,3\%) | 16 (72,7\%) |
| Vocabulary | Yes | 17 (60,7\%) | 11 (39,3\%) | 14 (66,7\%) | 7 (33,3\%) | 26 (86,7\%) | 4 (13,3\%) |
|  | No | 7 (41,2\%) | 10 (58,8\%) | 16 (37,2\%) | 27 (62,8\%) | 17 (58,6\%) | 12 (41,4\%) |
| Comparison | Yes | 9 (50\%) | 9 (50\%) | 17 (63\%) | 10 (37\%) | 13 (52\%) | 12 (48\%) |
|  | No | 8 (29,6\%) | 19 (79,4\%) | 20 (54,1\%) | 17 (45,9\%) | 8 (23,5\%) | 26 (76,5\%) |
| Save Time | Yes | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (\mathbf{8 , 9}, \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (\mathbf{9 1 , 1} \%) \end{gathered}$ | 5 (25\%) | 15 (75,5\%) | 5 (83,3\%) | 1 (16,7\%) |
|  | No | $4(8,9, \%)$ | 41 (91,1\%) | 1 (2,3\%) | 43 (97,7\%) | 12 (22,6\%) | 41 (77,4\%) |
| Ask Questions | Yes | - | 2 (100\%) | 17 (66,7\%) | 9 (33,3\%) | 6 (85,7\%) | 1 (14,3\%) |
|  | No | 14 (32,6\%) | 29 (67,4\%) | 18 (48,6\%) | 19 (51,4\%) | 23 (44,2\%) | 29 (55,8\%) |
| Answer Questions | Yes | 1 (20\%) | 4 (80\%) | 15 (46,9\%) | 17 (53,1\%) | 4 (40\%) | 6 (60\%) |
|  | No | 4 (10\%) | 36 (90\%) | 5 (15,6\%) | 27 (84,4\%) | 10 (20,4\%) | 39 (79,6\%) |
| Expl. Written Text | Yes | 1 (10\%) | 9 (90\%) | 8 (30,8\%) | 18 (69,2\%) | 10 (58,8\%) | 7 (41,2\%) |
|  | No | 8 (22,9\%) | 27 (77,1\%) | 14 (36,8\%) | 24 (63,2\%) | 19 (45,2\%) | 23 (54,8\%) |
| Expl. Heard Text | Yes | 1 (10\%) | 9 (90\%) | 9 (26,5\%) | 25 (73,5\%) | 10 (47,6\%) | 11 (52,4\%) |


|  | No | $8(\mathbf{2 2 , 9} \%)$ | $27(\mathbf{7 7 , 1 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{3 , 3} \%)$ | $54(\mathbf{8 4 , 4 \%})$ | $6(\mathbf{1 5 , 8} \%)$ | $32(\mathbf{8 4 , 2 \%})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

### 8.3. Proficiency effects on learners' perceptions about translanguaging

In this section the question of whether proficiency affects learners perceptions of translanguaging $(\mathrm{RQ}(3)$ will be investigated. The results regarding both frequency of translanguaging and the purposes for translanguaging will be presented and compared between participants of high ( $n=114$ ) and low proficiency $(n=54)$, calculated based on the results of their performance in the cloze test. The rationale for examining perceptions about translanguaging practices in teachers is to find out whether they adapt in any way their use of the L1 Swedish to the proficiency level of their learners. In turn, the rationale for examining translanguaging practices in learners is to determine whether proficiency has any effect on the type or amount of their translanguaging practices.

### 8.3.1 Proficiency effects on learners' perceptions about their teacher's translanguaging

The report of the effects of the proficiency factor starts with an account of how learners at different proficiency levels perceive their teachers to use translanguaging. Table 19 shows the frequency of translanguaging across proficiency levels. The participants spread their answers over a wide range of categories. Whereas the majority of high proficiency participants reported that their teacher sometimes used Swedish during English lessons, low proficiency participants reported that their teacher used Swedish both seldom and often (and also always and never) more often than the high proficiency participants. When we consider the categories often and sometimes together, the picture that emerges is that high proficiency learners perceive their teachers to use more Swedish $(71.1 \%)$ than their less proficient peers (55.5\%).

Table 19. Frequency of teacher's use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q3) at different prof. levels

|  | LOW Proficiency | HIGH Proficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Always | $4(7,4 \%)$ | $3(\mathbf{2 , 6 \%})$ |
| Often | $10(\mathbf{1 8 , 5} \%)$ | $15(\mathbf{1 3 , 2} \%)$ |
| Sometimes | $20(\mathbf{3 7 \%})$ | $66(\mathbf{5 7 , 9} \%)$ |
| Seldom | $18(\mathbf{3 3 , 3} \%)$ | $29(\mathbf{2 5 , 4 \%})$ |
| Never | $2(\mathbf{3 , 7 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{0 , 9} \%)$ |

Table 20 shows the teachers reasons for translanguaging as perceived by the participants of different proficiency levels. The overall picture that emerges from the percentages in the data is that the learners' perceptions about their teachers' translanguaging practices vary according to proficiency. More precisely, learners at higher proficiency level perceived their teachers to resort to translanguaging more frequently. In general, the high proficiency learners report higher instances of Swedish use than their less proficient peers in all categories except giving instructions, giving advice on study methods, behaviour management, asking and answering questions and summarising the lesson. Furthermore, some of the differences between lower and higher proficiency learners are statistically significant. This is the case of teachers' translanguaging for giving instructions ( $\mathrm{p}=.042$ ), for behavioural management ( $\mathrm{p}=.040$ ), and for answering questions $(\mathrm{p}=.041)$.

Table 20. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the teacher (Q4) at different proficiency levels

|  | LOW Proficiency $(n=54)$ | HIGH Proficiency $(n=114)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Explaining English grammar | 33 (61,1\%) | 73 (64\%) |
| Explaining English vocabulary | 33 (61,1\%) | 72 (63,2\%) |
| Explaining English texts | 12 (22,2\%) | 36 (31,6\%) |
| Explaining English listening passages | 16 (29,6\%) | 39 (34,2\%) |
| Making comparisons | 20 (37\%) | 50 (43,9\%) |
| Repeating something in Swedish after saying in in English | 26 (48,1\%) | 66 (57,9\%) |
| Engaging in small-talk with the students | 11 (20,4\%) | 28 (24,6\%) |
| Saving time | 3 (5,6\%) | 9 (7,9\%) |
| Giving instructions | 23 (42,6\%) | 44 (38,6\%) |
| Giving explanations | 27 (50\%) | 63 (55,3\%) |
| Giving feedback | 23 (42,6\%) | 46 (40,4\%) |
| Giving advice on study methods | 13 (24,1,\%) | 27 (23,7\%) |
| Classroom management | 18 (33,3\%) | 47 (41,2\%) |
| Behavioural management | 24 (44,4\%) | 40 (35,1\%) |
| Task management | 22 (40,7\%) | 50 (43,9\%) |
| Asking questions | 9 (16,7\%) | 10 (8,8\%) |
| Answering students' questions | 13 (24,1\%) | 20 (17,5\%) |
| Summarising the lesson | 10 (18,5\%) | 14 (12,3\%) |
| Opening the lesson | 9 (16,7\%) | 21 (18,4\%) |
| Closing the lesson | 17 (31,5\%) | 29 (25,4\%) |

### 8.3.2 Proficiency effects on learners' perceptions on learners' selfreports on translanguaging

Here, the results relating to proficiency effects on learners' self-reports of translanguaging will be presented. Table 21 shows the frequency of the learners own translanguaging according to the different proficiency groups. In both proficiency groups, the majority of the participants report that they use Swedish sometimes during English class, with a slightly larger group of high proficiency learners claiming they seldom use Swedish. Overall, both groups of learners seem to resort to translanguaging to the same extent when considering the categories of often and sometimes together ( $64.8 \%$ and $65.8 \%$ respectively). On the other hand, when we look at the categories of sometimes and seldom together, the high proficiency learners report using Swedish slightly less than low proficiency learners $(57.4 \%)$. Moreover, the low proficiency group reports to use Swedish slightly more as when we consider their neutral to negative answers (sometimes, seldom and never), which are slightly lower ( $64.8 \%$ ) than their high proficiency peers ( $67.7 \%$ ). However, when we combine the neutral to positive answers (sometimes, often and always) these are slightly lower for the high proficiency group (70.2\%) compared with the low proficiency group (77.8\%), indicating that low proficiency group resorts to Swedish slightly more during lessons.

Table 21. Frequency of learners' use of Swedish in the English language classroom' (Q5) at different prof. levels

|  | LOW Proficiency | HIGH Proficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Always | $7(\mathbf{1 3} \%)$ | $5(\mathbf{4 , 4 \%})$ |
| Often | $12(\mathbf{2 2 , 2} \%)$ | $32(\mathbf{2 8 , 1} \%)$ |
| Sometimes | $23(\mathbf{4 2 , 6} \%)$ | $43(\mathbf{3 7 , 7 \%})$ |
| Seldom | $8(\mathbf{1 4 , 8} \%)$ | $30(\mathbf{2 6 , 3} \%)$ |
| Never | $4(\mathbf{7 , 4 \%})$ | $4(\mathbf{3 , 5} \%)$ |

Notwithstanding, upon a closer inspection of the purposes, a more fine-grained analysis is presented in in Table 22. The results suggest that both low and high proficiency participants use translanguaging predominantly for learning new vocabulary, grammar and concepts, as well as comparing the languages and asking questions, however, lower proficiency learners do that consistently to a greater extent. The analysis of the learners' self-reports on their translanguaging practices indicates that, in general, higher proficiency learners resort to it less frequently than their less proficient peers.

Moreover, many of the comparisons across proficiency levels are statistically significant, as in the case
of the use of translanguaging for practical purposes such as clarifying grammar ( $\mathrm{p}=.041$ ), comparing English and Swedish ( $\mathrm{p}=.015$ ), to answering questions ( $\mathrm{p}=.024$ ).

The lower proficiency group had a higher tendency for using Swedish in order to fulfil the social functions of discussing with peers $(\mathrm{p}=.023)$, and to better express themselves $(\mathrm{p}=.007)$.

Table 22. Purposes of translanguaging on the part of the learner (Q6) at different proficiency levels

|  | LOW Proficiency ( $n=54$ ) | HIGH Proficiency $(n=114)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Translating and better understand new words | 37 (68,5\%) | 71 (62,3\%) |
| Translating and better understand new grammar | 29 (53,7\%) | 53 (46,5\%) |
| Better understanding difficult concepts | 33 (61,1\%) | 53 (46,5\%) |
| Better understanding when reading texts | 24 (44,4\%) | 51 (44,7\%) |
| Better understanding listening passages | 17 (31,5\%) | 27 (23,7\%) |
| Comparing English and Swedish | 25 (46,3\%) | 47 (41,2\%) |
| Planning my essays | 10 (18,5\%) | 22 (19,3\%) |
| Better understanding what I hear | 10 (18,5\%) | 16 (14\%) |
| Saving time | 10 (18,5\%) | 19 (16,7\%) |
| Asking the teacher's questions | 28 (51,9\%) | 47 (41,2\%) |
| Answer the teacher's questions | 15 (27,8\%) | 24 (21,1\%) |
| Discussing with friends about our English class | 23 (42,6\%) | 34 (29,8\%) |
| Easily making study notes | 15 (27,8\%) | 26 (22,8\%) |
| Better expressing myself | 18 (33,3\%) | 27 (23,7\%) |

The participants' attitudes towards translanguaging were addressed in question 7. Their answers, shown in Table 23, indicate a very positive attitude in both proficiency groups, as can be seen in the high percentages for the low $(96,2 \%)$ and high $(91,2 \%)$ proficiency groups, respectively. In spite of this general positive attitude, learners in the low proficiency group were significantly more positive than high proficiency learners $(\mathrm{p}=.002)$.

Table 23. Attitude towards translanguaging in the classroom (Q7) at different proficiency levels

|  | LOW Proficiency | HIGH Proficiency |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I like using both English and Swedish in English lessons | $52(\mathbf{9 6 , 2} \%)$ | $104(\mathbf{9 1 , 2} \%)$ |

The participants in both proficiency groups generally perceived that there were benefits when using the translanguaging strategy in the English classroom, with most of them reporting that it was either very helpful or somewhat helpful for learning. However, there are differences between the proficiency groups, with the low proficiency group perceiving translanguaging to be more helpful than the high proficiency group. Hence, at higher proficiency levels, learners perceived translanguaging as less useful.

Table 24. Perceived benefits of translanguaging at different proficiency levels

|  | Switching between English and Swedish is beneficial for students who are learning <br> English as a second language |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | LOW Proficiency | HIGH Proficiency |
|  | $24(\mathbf{4 4 , 4 \%})$ | $41(\mathbf{3 6 , 6 \%})$ |
|  | $30(\mathbf{5 5 , 6 \%})$ | $65(\mathbf{5 8 \%} \%)$ |
| Not helpful | - | $6(\mathbf{5 , 4 \%})$ |

### 8.3.3 Proficiency effects on teacher-learner congruence

Table 25 presents the association between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices as perceived by the learners at different proficiency levels separately. The results show a consistent pattern in translanguaging practices in relation to proficiency, in that the translanguaging of both teachers and learners diminishes with increasing proficiency. To be more precise, in the low proficiency level group only one significant association turned out to be statistically significant, this was in regards to answering questions, both learners and teachers used English for this purpose. On the contrary, at higher proficiency levels there was a strong association between teachers' and learners to use English to explain grammar ( $\mathrm{p}=.000$ ), , ask questions ( $\mathrm{p}=.018$ ), answer questions ( $\mathrm{p}=.015$ ) and explicate heard text ( $\mathrm{p}=.004$ ) but using Swedish to clarify vocabulary ( $\mathrm{p}=001$ ). Both learners and teachers did not resort to Swedish to save time ( $\mathrm{p}=018$ ), compare the languages ( $\mathrm{p}=.017$ ), or during listening exercises. There is a conspicuous difference between the groups as for which language is used to talk about grammar. In the high proficiency group this seems to be discussed in English by both teachers and learners, whereas in the low proficiency group this appears to be discussed in Swedish by both of them.

Table 25. Congruence between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices at different proficiency levels

| TEACHER |  | LEARNER |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LOW Proficiency |  | HIGH Proficiency |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Grammar | Yes | 21 (63,6\%) | 12 (36,4\%) | 48 (65,8\%) | 25 (34,2\%) |
|  | No | 12 (57,1\%) | 9 (42,9\%) | 11 (27,5\%) | 29 (72,5\%) |
| Vocabulary | Yes | 12 (72,7\%) | 5 (27,8\%) | 44 (72,1\%) | 17 (27,9\%) |
|  | No | 17 (47,2\%) | 19 (52,8\%) | 23 (43,4\%) | 30 (56,6\%) |
| Comparison | Yes | 10 (50\%) | 10 (50\%) | 29 (58\%) | 21 (42\%) |
|  | No | 13 (38,2\%) | 21 (61,8\%) | 23 (35,9\%) | 41 (64,1\%) |
| Save Time | Yes | 2 (28,6\%) | 5 (71,4\%) | 8 (42,1\%) | 11 (57,9\%) |
|  | No | 6 (12,8\%) | 41 (87,2\%) | 11 (11,6\%) | 84 (88,4\%) |
| Ask Questions | Yes | 10 (66,7\%) | 5 (33,3\%) | 14 (66,7\%) | 7 (33,3\%) |
|  | No | 19 (48,7\%) | 20 (51,3\%) | 36 (38,7\%) | 57 (61,3\%) |
| Answer Questions | Yes | 8 (47,1\%) | 9 (52,9\%) | 12 (40\%) | 18/60\%) |
|  | No | 5 (13,5\%) | 32 (86,5\%) | 14 (16,7\%) | 70 (83,3\%) |
| Expl. Written Text | Yes | 6 (35,3\%) | 11 (64,7\%) | 13 (36,1\%) | 23 (63,9\%) |
|  | No | 12 (32,4\%) | 25 (67,6\%) | 29 (37,2\%) | 49 (62,8\%) |
| Expl. Heard Text | Yes | 7 (38,9\%) | 11 (61,1\%) | 13 (31,7\%) | 28 (68,3\%) |
|  | No | 6 (16,7\%) | $30(83,3 \%)$ | 6 (8,2\%) | 67 (91,8\%) |

### 8.4. Learners' perceptions about the benefits of translanguaging in the English classroom

This section addresses the qualitative analysis of the data, by examining the participants' answers to an open-ended question that asked them about the reasons why they believed that translanguaging was beneficial. This corresponded to the second part of Question 8. A qualitative analysis of the data identified 17 categories that participants reported as having importance regarding why translanguaging was (un)helpful. As can be seen in Table 26, the responses to this question showed positive responses to translanguaging as a strategy. The most common reason why translanguaging is seen as important is for comprehension purposes (47.5\%). This was followed by a need for expressing oneself.

Table 26. Reasons given as to why translanguaging is beneficial

| REASON | Frequency | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Linguistic Shortcomings in English | 3 | $2,2 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| For Comprehension Purposes | 66 | $47,5 \%$ |
| Appropriacy of Using 2 lgs When Sarting to Learn a New Lg. | 1 | $0,07 \%$ |
| Insecurity | 2 | $1,4 \%$ |
| For Asking Questions | 5 | $5 \%$ |
| To Make Connections \& Associations | 6 | $4,3 \%$ |
| To Help Others | 5 | $3,6 \%$ |
| Willingness to Use Both \&/or Switch | 4 | $2,9 \%$ |
| For Expressing Oneself | 11 | $7,9 \%$ |
| To Enhance Communication with Others | 2 | $1,4 \%$ |
| For Avoiding Misunderstanding | 1 | $0,7 \%$ |
| For Ease or Flexibility | 8 | $5,8 \%$ |
| For Clarification | 1 | $0,7 \%$ |
| To Save Time | 9 | $2,2 \%$ |
| For Translation Purposes | 1 | $6,5 \%$ |
| Speed in Note-Taking | 7 | $0,7 \%$ |
| To Enhance Learning | 2 | $1,4 \%$ |
| For Necessity |  |  |

### 8.4.1 Age

Table 27 offers an overview of how the different categories patterned according to age. In the 7th grade, the most common reasons were comprehension purposes ( $38.5 \%$ ), followed by asking questions $(15.4 \%)$, and then expressing oneself ( $10.3 \%$ ). However, in the 8th grade, besides comprehension purposes ( $55.8 \%$ ) there were no other categories that had a particularly high frequency. As for the 9th grade, comprehension ( $45.8 \%$ ) was followed by ease or flexibility ( $12.5 \%$ ), then expressing oneself $(10.4 \%)$. Comprehension was the reason most often stated for why translanguaging was beneficial across all age groups. However, there are differences between the age groups with the highest in the 8th grade, and lowest in the 7th grade.

Table 27. Reasons given as to why translanguaging is beneficial across age groups

| REASON | GRADE 7 | GRADE 8 | GRADE 9 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linguistic Shortcomings in English | - | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Comprehension Purposes | $15(\mathbf{3 8 . 5 \%})$ | $29(\mathbf{5 8 . 8 \%})$ | $22(\mathbf{4 5 . 8 \%})$ |
| Appropriacy of using 2 languages. | - | - | - |
| Insecurity | - | $1(\mathbf{1 . 9 \% )}$ | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Asking Questions | - | $1(\mathbf{1 . 9 \%})$ | - |
| To Make Connections \& Associations | $3(\mathbf{7 . 7 \%})$ | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |


| To Help Others | $1(\mathbf{2 . 6 \%})$ | $3(\mathbf{5 . 8 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Willingness to Use Both \&/or Switch | $1(\mathbf{2 . 6 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{1 . 9 \%})$ | $2(\mathbf{4 . 2 \%})$ |
| For Expressing Oneself | $4(\mathbf{1 0 . 3 \%})$ | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | $5(\mathbf{1 0 . 4 \% )}$ |
| To Enhance Communication with Others | - | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | - |
| For Avoiding Misunderstanding | - | - | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Ease or Flexibility | $2 \mathbf{( 5 . 1 \% )}$ | - | $6(\mathbf{1 2 . 5 \%})$ |
| For Clarification | - | - | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| To Save Time | - | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{2 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Translation Purposes | $3(\mathbf{7 . 7 \%})$ | $2(\mathbf{3 . 8 \%})$ | $4(\mathbf{8 . 1 \%})$ |
| Speed in Note-Taking | $1(\mathbf{2 . 6 \%})$ | - | - |
| To Enhance Learning | $2(\mathbf{5 . 1 \%})$ | $7(\mathbf{7 . 7 \% )}$ | $2(\mathbf{4 . 2 \% )}$ |
| For Necessity | $1(\mathbf{2 . 6 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{1 . 9 \% )}$ | - |

### 8.4.2 Proficiency

As shown in Table 28, there are some differences between the proficiency groups as to why translanguaging is important. Comprehension was the reason given by both low and high proficiency participants ( $45.0 \%$ and $48.5 \%$ ), suggesting that this reason had a similar importance for both groups. However, low proficiency participants reported more reasons related to their lack of proficiency in English, such as linguistic shortcomings (7.5\%), insecurity ( $5.0 \%$ ), and also social reasons, such as expressing oneself (5\%), enhancing communication with others ( $2.5 \%$ ) and avoiding misunderstandings ( $2.5 \%$ ). On the other hand, the high proficiency participants were more likely to report practical reasons such as saving time (3.0\%), note-taking (7.1\%) and enhancing learning (7.1\%).

Table 28. Reasons given as to why translanguaging is beneficial across proficiency groups

| REASON | LOW PROFICIENCY | HIGH PROFICIENCY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Linguistic Shortcomings in English | $3(\mathbf{7 . 5 \% )}$ | - |
| For Comprehension Purposes | $18(\mathbf{4 5 . 0 \%})$ | $48(\mathbf{4 8 . 5 \%})$ |
| Appropriacy of Using 2 lgs. | $1(\mathbf{2 . 5 \%})$ | - |
| Insecurity | $2(\mathbf{5 . 0 \%})$ | - |
| For Asking Questions | $3(\mathbf{7 . 5 \%})$ | $4(\mathbf{4 . 0 \%})$ |
| To Make Connections \& Associations | $1(\mathbf{2 . 5 \%})$ | $5(\mathbf{5 . 1 \%})$ |
| To Help Others | $2(\mathbf{5 . 0 \%})$ | $3(\mathbf{3 . 0 \%})$ |
| Willingness to Use Both \&/or Switch | $3(\mathbf{7 . 5 \%})$ | $1(\mathbf{1 . 0 \%})$ |
| For Expressing Oneself | $2(\mathbf{5 . 0 \%})$ | - |
| To Enhance Communication with Others | $1(\mathbf{2 . 5 \%})$ | - |
| For Avoiding Misunderstanding | $1(\mathbf{2 . 5 \%})$ | - |
| For Ease or Flexibility | $1(\mathbf{2 . 5 \%})$ | $7(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Clarification | - | $1(\mathbf{1 . 0 \%})$ |


| To Save Time | - | $3(\mathbf{3 . 0 \%})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| For Translation Purposes | $2(\mathbf{5 . 0 \%})$ | $7(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%})$ |
| Speed in Note-Taking | - | $1(\mathbf{1 . 0 \%})$ |
| To Enhance Learning | - | $7(\mathbf{7 . 1 \%})$ |
| For Necessity | - | $2(\mathbf{2 . 0 \%})$ |

The results of the study have been presented in this section, corresponding to the order of the three research questions that guide the study. The quantitative results found that there indeed differences in learners' perceptions about their teachers' translanguaging practices as well as their own. Results showed how both age and proficiency affected learners' perceptions of translanguaging.

## 9. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes and perceptions that adolescent Swedish learners in the grades 7-9 have towards translanguaging practices in the English classroom. In this section the results that were reported in the preceding section will be discussed in the light of the theoretical framework that has been chosen for this study, as well as earlier empirical research in this field. First, a summary of the main findings of this study will be given. Then, the findings will be compared with previous findings and discussed in light of these. Next, whether attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging are constrained by age (Section 9.1) or proficiency (Section 9.2) will be discussed, corresponding to $\mathrm{RQ}(2)$ and $\mathrm{RQ}(3)$, respectively. The discussion concludes with some pedagogical implications for language teachers.

The findings of this study suggest that Swedish adolescent learners of English have positive attitudes towards translanguaging in the EFL classroom. They like to use their L1 during English lessons and see it beneficial to learning. The analysis of their self-reports indicates that they use Swedish for certain purposes in the classroom such as explaining vocabulary and grammar, comparing the languages, understanding tasks and instructions, and asking questions. It was found that learners showed a greater tendency to use translanguaging with increasing age. However, age was difficult to examine due to individual differences between teachers' practices at the different grades. On the other hand, it was shown that participants at higher proficiency levels used Swedish to a lesser extent in the English classroom, and perceived it to be less helpful. In turn, lower proficiency learners used more Swedish for practical and for social purposes. They also reported their teachers used English more
often in class in comparison to their more proficient peers. We now move on to compare and discuss these results in light of previous studies on translanguaging, starting with positive attitudes.

One of the main findings in this study was the positive attitude towards translanguaging by the participants in terms of both enjoyment and seeing the benefits of the strategy. Participants in this study enjoyed using their L1 when learning English, which reflects the attitudes of participants in other studies (Horasan, 2014; Neokleous, 2017; Rajendram, 2019; Rosiers, 2017; Sa’d \& Qadermazi, 2015; Scopich, 2018). Additionally, participants perceived benefits of using both languages during language learning, which reflects findings in previous studies (Horasan, 2014; Neokleous, 2017; Rasman, 2018; Scopich, 2018; Sád \& Qadermazi, 2015; Turnbull, 2018). However, in contrast to previous studies, only a few participants expressed a conflict regarding translanguaging. More specifically, only a small number of participants expressed the importance of using English as much as possible, and only very few participants supported the idea of using the target language exclusively.

Overall, unlike some previous studies, the participants did not report that they wanted the use of their L1 to be reduced or abolished completely in the English classroom. Likewise, they did not express the importance of keeping the languages separate. Rather, on the whole, they preferred the option of using both languages during English lessons. The view that translanguaging was good but 'only when necessary' that was expressed by younger learners in studies by Neokleous (2017), Scopich, (2018) and $S a^{\prime} \mathrm{d}$ \& Qadermazi (2015) was not found among participants in this study.

Since most of the participants in this study did not perceive exclusive use of the target language English to be beneficial to their learning, this could indicate that they did not believe it was helpful for taking them into their zone of proximal development. Rather it is likely that this might be achieved with the use of both English and Swedish instead. It could also indicate they feel a sense of security using Swedish, and although exclusive use of English may guide them further into their ZDP, this should be done with caution since it could also push them out of their comfort zone, and risk impacting motivation levels in a negative manner. These results seem to suggest that using the L1 enables learners to scaffold each other and teachers could more appropriately, using both languages, guide the learner further into their ZDP. More importantly, allowing the L1 appropriately within the EFL classroom could help to create a classroom environment in which learners feel secure and understand all tasks and instructions. This, in turn, would contribute to a higher level of participation on the part of the learners.

Another important finding was that participants liked to use Swedish for certain purposes in the EFL classroom. This finding highlighted the relevance of translanguaging for certain purposes, primarily, to explain vocabulary and grammar. This finding echoed the findings by Neokleous (2017), Turnbull
(2018), Scopich (2018), Horasan (2014), Sád \& Qadermazi (2015) and Masood (2019). Moreover, findings in this study indicated that it was important to allow translanguaging for the purposes of comparing languages, similar to findings reported in previous studies (e.g. Neokleous, 2017; Turnbull, 2018), to ensure comprehension of tasks and instructions, and to be able to ask questions (among others, Affrin \& Hussin, 2011; Horasan, 2014; Masood, 2019; Sád \& Qadermazi, 2015, Scopich, 2018). This indicates that these are the purposes for which the L1 is used, and that allowing translanguaging for these purposes is perceived as beneficial by the learners. The responses showed there was a relationship between vocabulary and grammar, with results for these purposes often similar to each other for both of these, suggesting that participants preferred to use the same language, either English or Swedish, for both of these, and reported their teachers doing this as well.

As a matter of fact, when congruence between teachers' and learners' translanguaging practices was examined, it was found that there was a relationship between their respective practices, particularly for the purposes of explaining grammar and vocabulary, and also asking and answering questions. The interpretation of this finding is two-fold. On the one hand, it highlights that both learners and teachers often use the same language for the same functions. This indicates that the more the teacher resorts to translanguaging, the more the learners do this too. On the other hand, it is difficult to know exactly why this relationship occurs, it could also mean that in some situations the learners' translanguaging has an effect on the teachers' own language practices.

This highlights that the learners and the teachers often use the same language for the same functions. This could indicate that the more the teacher resorts to translanguaging, the more the learners do too. On the other hand, it is difficult to know exactly why this relationship occurs, it may also indicate that the learners translanguaging has an effect on the teachers' language practices.

### 9.1 Age effects

Earlier studies by Scopich (2018), Horasan (2014), Sád \& Qadermazi (2015) and Masood (2019) suggest that learners are less positive towards translanguaging at older ages, and at higher proficiency levels. It is important to note that in these studies, participants were not grouped according to age, but rather they expressed attitudes that translanguaging should decrease with age and proficiency. The finding in this study that reflected these earlier studies was that within the older participants in the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade, there was a slightly larger group of participants who were sceptical towards the benefits of translanguaging, seeing it as unhelpful. This finding is consistent with earlier studies in that as learners get older they are less positive towards translanguaging. While earlier studies imply that translanguaging practices might reduce with age, the results in this study indicated the opposite, that is, there was a greater tendency to resort to translanguaging with increasing age. At the same time, age did seem to influence attitudes towards translanguaging and translanguaging practices, but it is
difficult to unambiguously interpret it as an age effect, given that individual teachers' practices might have caused learners in some groups to resort to translanguaging more frequently. Specifically, this effect is most salient among $8^{\text {th }}$ graders, who report the highest instances of translanguaging on part of the teacher, and also of themselves. This particular group of learners also has the most positive attitudes and see the most benefits of translanguaging. The youngest participants in grade 7 reported the least translanguaging on the teacher's part, indicating that translanguaging was seldom used in these classrooms by these teachers. This, in turn, was reflected in their own practices and slightly less positive attitudes toward translanguaging. Younger learners also perceived their teacher to use translanguaging for explaining vocabulary and behaviour management more than their older peers, suggesting that the two languages are used differently for different purposes at different ages.

It seems that there was a higher tendency for learners to use translanguaging at higher grades, but they also report that translanguaging is used for different functions in these grades. The $9^{\text {th }}$ graders' lower use of English may indicate they have a higher confidence and do not feel the need to use it during class, or have less motivation to use English because they have more demanding tasks that require a higher quality and quantity of output. These older learners may use translanguaging in order to help with the increased workload at this level. Using the L1 might be more practical and efficient for the types of tasks they are given in the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade, such as more complex listening exercises, reading more difficult texts and writing more complex essays. Hence, learners in this grade may be more aware that it is production that is assessed rather than their language practices in the classroom. Interestingly, even though the older learners should be better equipped to use English than their younger peers, the participants in this grade were more likely to report using Swedish in order to save time, discuss with peers and express oneself, indicating that perhaps English assessments are taken more seriously at the higher levels and learners feel like they should be more efficient. Furthermore, this also may point to the increased importance of the social benefits of translanguaging and need for easily communicating with classmates in the L1 in the higher grades. Similarly, it might also be an indication of a higher level of self-consciousness within the older adolescent age group and an unwillingness to use the language they are least proficient in.

There was also a higher congruence at higher ages, indicating a clearer pattern of teachers and learners using the same language for the same purposes as they reach higher grades. Overall, in regard to the effects of age on translanguaging, the results of this study did not reflect previous findings. There were increases and decreases between the different age groups, yet no overall pattern of decreasing translanguaging was revealed in the results with increasing age. However, this was difficult to examine due to the different practices of the teachers, as pointed out above.

### 9.2 Proficiency effects

When it comes to proficiency, earlier findings suggest that learners with a higher proficiency use their L1 less in the classroom (Rajendram 2018). Equally, it has also been found that learners' attitudes are less positive towards translanguaging at higher proficiency levels in that learners believe that opportunities for translanguaging should be decreased with increasing proficiency (Ariffin \& Hussin, 2011; Horasan, 2014; Scopich, 2018). As far as this is concerned, the results here lend support to claims in earlier studies that proficiency level does indeed influence attitudes towards translanguaging and translanguaging practices. When it came to self-reported practices, low proficiency learners reported they used Swedish more than their high proficiency peers. To be more precise, lower proficiency learners consistently used Swedish to a higher extent to learn new vocabulary, understand grammar and difficult concepts, as well as asking questions. Conversely, high proficiency learners reported that they resorted to Swedish less frequently for all purposes in the classroom. Furthermore, low proficiency learners were much more positive towards translanguaging and perceived it to be more helpful than high proficiency learners. Likewise, at higher proficiency levels, participants used Swedish less, and perceived it to be less helpful. These findings seem to be consistent with the attitudes of participants in earlier studies.

When it came to congruence between teachers' and learners' practices, the results showed that translanguaging seemed to decrease with increased proficiency. When the high proficiency group did not use Swedish the teachers did not either, indicating the practices of teachers and learners influenced each other. However, high proficiency learners perceived their teachers to use more Swedish than their less proficient peers for many purposes. The reason why, nonetheless, it is unclear and further research may shed light on this. Perhaps these learners perceive their teachers to use Swedish often when they believed they did not need to, whereas low proficiency learners benefit more from translanguaging and it is less noticeable for them. The purposes for which low proficiency learners perceived more translanguaging on the teachers' part were for giving instructions, advising on study methods and asking and answering questions. This indicates the teacher may adapt their language use according to proficiency, thereby using Swedish for practical reasons in order to make sure less proficient learners understand instructions. In addition to this, teachers also use Swedish more than English in conversations in which there are question and answer exchanges between themselves and learners. This supports the finding in Masood (2019) that translanguaging is helpful to assist low proficiency learners, in particular within mixed proficiency classrooms. Thus, low proficiency learners used more Swedish for practical purposes, and they also used more Swedish for the social purposes of discussing with peers and expressing themselves.

The attitudes and practices of lower proficiency learners suggest that using the L1 enables teachers to scaffold learners more effectively, while also enabling learners to scaffold each other. More precisely,
the learner can be guided further into their ZDP by teachers and other learners of different proficiency levels. Allowing the use of the L1 can help to create an environment in which the appropriate level of stimulation is available for each learner despite proficiency level.

While this study did not ask participants specifically about interactions with other learners of mixed proficiency levels, it might be assumed from the participants' responses that teachers do adapt their translanguaging practices to learners of different proficiency levels and design tasks that encourage mixed proficiency collaboration. According to previous studies, translanguaging in mixed proficiency groups is beneficial because it enables learners of mixed proficiency levels to develop when the L1 is used in the EFL classroom. The findings in these studies suggested that translanguaging in mixed proficiency classrooms helped less proficient learners feel more confident and included in the classroom, encouraged higher levels of participation and could be advantageous because it encourages learners to collaborate and help peers through activities, creating an environment in which all learners have opportunities to use language depending on the needs of the learner (MacLachlan, 2018; Masood, 2019; Rajendram, 2019; Rosiers, 2017; Turnbull, 2018). Since learners come to a classroom with a wide range of skills and areas in need of development, they are seen to benefit from interactions that are dynamic, and through collaborative work, both low and high proficiency learners provide opportunities for learning and teaching their classmates, leading them further into their ZPD (Ammar \& Hassan, 2018;; Rajendram, 2018; Rasman, 2018).

## 9. Conclusions

The aim of this study was to investigate the attitudes and perceptions that Swedish learners in years 79 have in regards to translanguaging practices in the EFL classroom. This study shows that the participants in this study, adolescent Swedish learners, had a positive view of translanguaging, and did not consider the use of their L1 as a barrier to learning in the EFL classroom. While it was difficult to draw conclusions on attitudes and perceptions towards translanguaging and translanguaging practices according to age, clearer results were obtained for proficiency. More precisely, that lower proficiency learners differed somewhat from their high proficiency peers regarding these attitudes and perceptions, and have a different set of needs in the classroom that can be addressed more appropriately where a translanguaging strategy is used.

The method used in this study had several benefits. The questionnaire was quick to administer yet the data extracted from it offered a comprehensive view of the attitudes the participants had. Moreover,
the open-ended question enabled a deeper insight into what thoughts regarding translanguaging the participants had. However, this study was limited in several ways. The study consisted of only three classes at each grade level at one school in Stockholm. Hence, it is difficult to generalise the findings in this study and the attitudes expressed by these participants are by no means representative of all learners in this age range in Sweden. For further research on this topic, then, it would be good to investigate participants of different ages who had the same teachers in order to check the effects of age more accurately.

In addition to this, results could be more reliable if interviews with learners were conducted. In interviews participants would be more able to describe in detail their attitudes, and being acquainted with the rationale behind their reasoning would be valuable in triangulating data and obtaining a more complex picture. Another thing to consider is the fact that participants were given a time limit to complete the questionnaire and cloze test, which may have had impacted on the performance of some participants proficiency levels, in particular those who had a low proficiency. Furthermore, from a methodological point of view it seems likely that the instrument employed to measure the participants' proficiency (i.e., the cloze test) was perhaps somewhat easy for the learners investigated in the present study. This would have caused a ceiling effect that made it difficult to clearly discriminate between proficiency levels.

From the findings discussed here some pedagogical implications can be drawn. Above all, teachers should consider using translanguaging strategically in their classroom in order to meet the needs of mixed proficiency learners. In addition to this, they should promote interactive and collaborative tasks between mixed proficiency learners to ensure higher levels of participation. This study has opened up other possible angles to investigate regarding learners' attitudes towards translanguaging. For a start, further investigation in this field could examine why high proficiency learners perceived their teachers to use more Swedish than their low proficiency peers. Additionally, further studies may focus on whether opportunities to use English outside of class may have an influence on attitudes towards translanguaging. Perhaps those learners who lack opportunities to use English extramurally might place a higher importance on increasing English use within school. Last but not least, another area that could be looked at more specifically is whether learners perceive translanguaging to be beneficial during collaborative work.
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## Appendix

## Questionnaire

1. Vilken klass går du i? $\qquad$
2. Har du ett annat modersmål som inte är engelska eller svenska?
3. Hur ofta använder din engelskalärare svenska under engelska lektioner? $\square$ Alltid

Oftast $\square$ Ibland $\square$ Sällan $\square$ Aldrig
4. Av vilka anledningar använder din lärare svenska under engelskalektioner?
förklara engelsk grammatik
$\square$ förklara engelska ord
$\square$ förklara engelska texter
$\square$ förklara engelska hörövningar
$\square$ jämföra svenska och engelska ordföljd

- läraren repeterar något på Svenska efter hen har sagt det på engelska
$\square$ läraren pratar vardagliga saker med eleverna
$\square$ för att spara tid
$\square$ för att ge instruktioner
$\square$ för att ge en förklaring
$\square$ för att ge feedback/återkoppling
$\square$ för att ge råd om studieteknik
$\square$ för att få ordning I klassrummet
$\square$ för att prata om saker som händer som är inte relaterad till engelska ämnet
$\square$ för att hjälpa eleverna med uppgifter
$\square$ för att ställa frågor till eleverna
$\square$ för att svara på elevernas frågor
$\square$ för att sammanfatta lektionen
$\square$ för att börja en lektion
$\square$ för att sluta en lektion

5. Hur ofta får du använda svenska under engelskalektioner?
6. Av vilka anledningar använder du svenska under engelskalektioner?
för att översätta och förstå nya ord på engelska
$\square$ för att översätta och förstå grammatik
$\square$ för att förstå begrepp

- för att översätta och förstår när jag läser texter på engelska
$\square$ för att översätta och förstå hörövningar
$\square$ för att jämföra engelska och svenska
$\square$ för att planera mina skrivuppgifter
$\square$ för att översätta och förstå det som hörs i lektionen
$\square$ att spara tid
$\square$ att ställa frågor till läraren
$\square$ att svara på lärarens frågor
$\square$ att diskutera engelska lektioner med kompisar
$\square$ att skriva anteckningar
$\square$ att kunna bättre uttrycka mig själv
$\square$ Något annat $\qquad$

7. Tycker du att det är bra att du får använda både engelska och svenska under engelskalektionerna?
$\square \mathrm{Ja} \square \mathrm{Nej}$
8. Tycker du att det är en fördel att kunna växla mellan svenska och engelska när man studera engelska i skolan?
$\square$ mycket hjälpsamt $\square$ något hjälpsamt $\square$ inte alls hjälpsamt
Varför?
9. Jag identifiera som $\square$ pojke $\square$ flicka $\square$ icke binär

## Cloze test

## LITTLE RED RIDING HOOD

A
Once upon a time, there was a little girl. She was a very good girl. Her grandmother loved the $\operatorname{girl}(1)$ $\qquad$ lot and she often gave her presents. One day Little Red Riding Hood's (2) $\qquad$ made her a beautiful red cape and hood. The little (3) $\qquad$ liked it a lot and she always wore (4) $\qquad$ cape and hood.

Little Red Riding Hood lived with her mother and father (5) $\qquad$ a village near a large forest. Her mother worked at home and her (6) $\qquad$ worked in the forest. He was a woodcutter.

Little Red Riding Hood's grandmother lived a kilometre away. She lived alone in a little (7)
$\qquad$ inside the forest. Little Red Riding Hood loved her grandmother and every day she went to visit her.

B

One day her mother called her (8) $\qquad$ said, "Little Red Riding Hood, There (9) ___ a cake and a bottle of milk in this basket. I (10) $\qquad$ like you to take it to your grandmother. She (11) $\qquad$ ill this morning and she needs to eat".

Before the (12) $\qquad$ left, her mother told her "Be careful and (13) $\qquad$ stop to play in the forest. And walk carefully. Don't run or you (14) break the bottle. Then you will have no milk for your (15) $\qquad$ ." Little Red Riding Hood took the basket. Then she (16) goodbye to her mother and started to walk to her grandmother's $\qquad$ .

Ten minutes later, Little Red Riding Hood (18) a wolf. She had never seen a wolf before and she (19) $\qquad$ not know he was a bad creature. She thought he (20) $\qquad$ a large dog and she was not afraid of (21) $\qquad$ .
"Good morning, Little Rd Riding Hood. Where are you going so early (22)
$\qquad$ the morning?" asked the wolf. "To my grandmother's house", she answered.

## Consent form for caregivers

Samtycke för deltagande i studie om hur språk används under engelska undervisning.

Jag heter Krystal Harris och studerar till lärare vid Stockholms universitet. Som en del av min utbildning ska jag genomföra ett självständigt arbete, vilket innebär en språkdidaktisk studie med relevans för undervisningen.
Syftet med min studie är att undersöka om elevers attityder och uppfattningar till översättningsmetoder i klassrummet.

För att jag ska kunna undersöka detta behöver eleverna svara på en enkät med frågor. Med mitt arbete vill jag bidra till att öka kunskapen om lärares planeringsarbete. Endast jag och min handledare på Stockholms universitet kommer att ha tillgång till enkätsvaren. Datamaterialet kommer enbart att användas för mitt självständiga arbete och enkäten kommer förstöras efter min studie.

Med vänlig hälsningar
Krystal Harris
Ämneslärare 7-9, gymnasiet och komplettering pedagogisk utbildning (KPU).
Jag ger samtycke att mitt barn ska delta i en studie om hur språk används under engelska undervisning.

$$
\mathrm{Ja} \quad \mathrm{Nej}
$$

## Consent form for participants

Samtycke för deltagande i studie om hur språk används under engelska undervisning.

Jag heter Krystal Harris och studerar till lärare vid Stockholms universitet. Som en del av min utbildning ska jag genomföra ett självständigt arbete, vilket innebär en språkdidaktisk studie med relevans för undervisningen.

Syftet med min studie är att undersöka vad elever tycker om hur språk används under engelska lektioner.

För att undersöka detta behöver jag att du svarar en enkät med frågor. Med mitt arbete vill jag bidra till att öka kunskapen om lärares planeringsarbete.

Endast jag och min handledare på Stockholms universitet kommer att ha tillgång till enkäter. Datamaterialet kommer enbart att användas för mitt självständiga arbete och enkäter kommer förstöras efter min studie.

Med vänlig hälsningar<br>Krystal Harris<br>Ämneslärare 7-9, gymnasiet och komplettering pedagogisk utbildning (KPU).

Elevers samtycke för deltagande i studie om hur språk används under engelska lektioner.

Jag vill delta i studien
Ja
Nej

Namn.
Datum och
underskrift:

