Codeswitching in ESL Teaching

Niklas Berg

Stockholms universitet

Codeswitching in ESL Teaching

Niklas Berg

Abstract

Many studies have shown that use of the target language second and/ or foreign language (in this case English) teaching has greatly improved students' learning, albeit, not all teachers use the target language exclusively but rather switch between the first and target language. This particular study has shown that the teacher in compulsory school does alternate between the target language and the first language for various reasons, while teachers in upper secondary school exclusively use the target language both within and outside the classroom and there are rarely any occurrences of codeswitching among students and teachers. The reasons for this are, because the content which has been taught has been too difficult for the students to understand, or the students have refused to interact in English with both their teacher and fellow students. The teachers' view on the matter tells us that even though they have tried to exclusively use the target language in the English classroom, it has not been working in the manner they wanted it to have.

In order to gather data for this research, seven classroom observations have been carried out and to complement them interviews with three teachers have been conducted to get their view on the use of English in their own teaching and why they think codeswitching occurs among students and themselves.

Table of content

1. Introduction

Ever since English was introduced as a subject in school there have been arguments about whether the teacher should use English exclusively when teaching instead of the students' first language or switch between the two languages. As we now know, classes are often multi-cultural and there are thus more than one first language among the students. Logic tells us that by only using English when teaching, the students get more positive input and should learn by using the language. Lev Vygotskij stated that learning is a socio-cultural process, and by interacting with others, we learn (Lightbown & Spada 2006).

In 2012, the Swedish Schools Inspectorate carried out a research concerning the English education in Sweden, and one of the major points that was brought up was the fact that many English teachers in Swedish compulsory school spoke in Swedish during the main part of the lesson, and in some cases, English was not being spoken at all by teachers nor by students (Skolinspektionen 2011). What my study will reveal is how much English actually is being used in a few selected schools, and what view the teachers have on the use of English in the language classroom.

1.1. Aim and research questions

A report made by the Swedish Schools Inspectorate shows that English is used less than Swedish in a majority of compulsory schools in Sweden and that there are many cases of code-switching between the two languages in class. The syllabus for the compulsory school does not explicitly state that the teaching should be in English, but the syllabus for upper secondary school does. With this study I intend to observe English lessons as well as carry out interviews with English teachers with the aim to find out why this is a recurring phenomenon. This research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are the teachers' view on the use of the target language in English language education

2. What are the reasons for any codeswitching in ESL teaching according to the interviewed teachers and previous research?

2. Background

2.1. Theoretical background

2.1.1 Codeswitching

The concept of codeswitching is most commonly used within the sociolinguistic field of studies and it is commonly used by bilingual speakers often to signal two different identities at once (Trudgill, 2000: 106). This does not only apply to distinct languages, but is also true for dialects, then referred to as *bidialectism* as it is known to scholars of sociolinguistics (Trudgill p. 202). Although sociolinguistics is the most common field of linguistics in which studies of codeswitching is conducted, the phenomenon occurs in language education as well, usually by students who do not know a word they want to say when speaking freely.

There are three different types of codeswitching: tag-switching, inter-sentential switching and intra-sentential switching (Jingxia 2010).The author explains these as follows: t*ag-switching* is when a person inserts a tag phrase from one language into the second language, for instance greeting phrases and parting phrases. Inter-sentential codeswitching is when switching occurs at clause or sentence boundaries, i.e. the different sentences and/ or clauses are in one language or another. Intra-sentential switching occurs within clauses or sentences, and the author explains it as the most complex type of codeswitching (Jingxia p. 11).

2.1.2 Target language and L1

Previous research has shown that in order to learn a language, students need to be exposed to the language (Krashen 1982) although it is not definite how much exposure is optimal seen from a pedagogical and theoretical standpoint (Tornbull & Arnett 2002). As observed by Cook (2001) and van Lier (1995), teachers' interpretation of maximizing the use of the target language (TL) is to completely avoid the first language (L1) in foreign language classrooms. Cook (2001) also mentions that although use of the target language should be promoted, exclusive use of the target language limits the possibilities of language teaching, and the L1 should be considered and used as a helpful tool to help foreign language teachers create "authentic users of the TL" (Tornbull & Arnet 2002: 205).

Regarding switching languages or *codes* in the actual teaching of foreign languages, the L1 can and should be used as a resource in foreign language classrooms, albeit to varying degrees (Cook 2001; Tornbull 2001). According to Cook, instances in which the L1 should be considered being used are e.g. explaining grammar, task-organization, disciplining students and test implementation. Furthermore, Cook (2001, in Tornbull & Arnett 2002)) argues that "teachers should resort to the L1 if it is apparent that using the target language would be inefficient and/ or problematic for the learner" and when "the cost of the TL is too great" (2001: 418). Studies have shown that that the most common reason for teachers switching codes have been to contrast the target language and the L1 to hinder any possible negative transfer (Tornbull & Arnett 2002), and the type of codeswitching was of inter-sentential nature.

A study by Macaro (1997) as discussed in Tornbull & Arnett (2002), included teachers' beliefs and attitudes about the use of target language and L1. The results from this study showed that a majority of the participants said it to be "impossible and undesirable to use the target language exclusively with all but the most motivated classes". However, a majority of these teachers felt that the target language was an important component of the foreign language pedagogy (Macaro 1997). The L1 was preferred for disciplining, socializing and for explaining difficult grammar, in addition, the teachers gave an indication that the use of target language depends on the students' ability in the TL, which coincides with Cook's (2001) study where the target language should be avoided if it becomes problematic for the learners.

2.1.3 Vygotskij and socio-cultural theories

Social interaction has a central role in modern language teaching as well as learning. Many theories have shown positive outcomes of socially interacting with others when learning languages. Children learn their mother tongue by hearing people in their surroundings speak with each other and to some extent to the infant, however with some deviations to their "normal" language. This is the first step of language acquisition, which is when a person learns unconsciously, in difference to language learning, which is conscious learning (Lightbown & Spada 2006: 201-203). When one has mastered the basic skills of their language, they will continue to learn other skills e.g., conventions of conversations, writing etc. This also applies to older students learning a new language or expanding their knowledge of one they already know. When exposed to a language e.g. spoken and/ or written, the students have to adapt to that particular situation and use the target language, even though their proficiency is at a different level than what they encounter.

When learning languages with an interactive approach, there will always be cases where some students are weaker and stronger, however, the theory of socio-cultural learning is based on learning from and with others. Extending Vygotkij's theory to second language (L2) acquisition raises the interest of how L2 learners acquire language when interacting with others (Lightbown & Spada 2006), and by having education exclusively in English, the students will encounter the language in a different manner than if the teacher would approach his or her teaching with the majority of the lesson and material being in the L1.

According to Vygotskian theory, the teacher should assume the role as a mediator rather than as an organizer (Lindqvist 1999). Teachers are in many cases the most prominent source of the English language (Tornbull & Arnett 2002), and in order for students to learn, teachers must be their role model and encourage use of the target language for the students to learn how the language works in reality in contrast to the theories of e.g. grammar. With this said, learning is not controlled by the teacher, but the learner (Ellis 1993 in Tornberg (2009.) Furthermore, learners may learn and understand problems with the aid of teachers, which then would be a typical example of learning in a socio-interactive manner (Tornberg 2009)

2.2. Curriculum and syllabus

According to the National Agency for Education (Skolverket), the teaching of English should to a greater extent be conducted in English (Syllabus for English in upper secondary school, Skolverket

2011) where the students should be faced with the spoken and written language of different kinds. The students should also be given the opportunity to interact with these two skills on their own as well as together with others. This is of great importance to this study as it intends to find answers to research questions in which the core matter is if occurrences of code-switching appear in the teaching of English in Swedish schools.

The syllabus for the compulsory school does not explicitly mention that the teaching should be conducted in English, but the students should be given opportunity to develop their communicative competence through interaction, different media etc. (Skolverket 2011). For this essay, this difference between the two schools maintains a central standpoint for discussion, due to the fact that teachers are not forced to teach in the target language (TL), although theories and research prove that exclusive use of the target language gives greater results than when teaching in the first language (L1). Although teaching should be exclusively conducted in English, the syllabus also encourages students to "develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other" (Skolverket 2011: 1). Having this said, students and teachers should make use of their L1 and thus use an interlanguage to process and learn new language.

2.3 Swedish Schools Inspectorate's report

In the report from the Schools Inspectorate, the issue of having too much English teaching in Swedish is one of the matters observed and criticized. The English subject should, according to national steering documents be focused on communicative abilities, and in many schools, the people assigned to this investigation have seen that many teachers use every opportunity to maximize the amount of spoken English whether it be in whole class, small groups or in pairs. The School Inspectorate found that in nearly 50 percent of the observed lessons, activities which develop students' communicative abilities could exist to a greater extent. Furthermore, in some cases, neither students nor teachers spoke a single word in English. Albeit, it was most common that a combination of English and Swedish was used (Skolinspektionen 2011).

One core element of the syllabus for the English subject is that students should be given the opportunity to improve their communicative competence by interaction, various kinds of media among other sources (Skolverket 2011), and it is the teachers' job to choose material for this to be possible. With regards to this, the question whether students are given the opportunity and strategies to understand and be understood in English is raised (Skolinspektionen 2011). Due to the fact that the intended goal of English teaching is to improve communicative abilities, only assignments with connection to this goal should be given, which is not the case in many instances, where, for example, teachers give their students tasks without a clear connection to functional lingual competence.

In the observed classes, the classes in which the working language for both teachers and students is English, the participation among students is higher, and they switch to English as soon as they enter the classroom and interact with each other in the target language by automaticity (Skolinspektionen 2011: 13). In contrast to these observations, there are some students who in interviews or questionnaires have said that they are hesitant to speaking English because they are afraid that fellow students will mock them if they make mistakes (Skolinspektionen 2011: 14).

3. Method

For this study, the chosen method is qualitative rather than quantitative, because the quality of answers from the interviews is important in order to be able discuss the results with regards to syllabi, the report from the School Inspectorate as well as previous research results. The reason for choosing interviews as the main data source is to get concrete and personal opinions from the teachers, with rather open questions where the teachers get the chance to elaborate their answers rather than giving short answers to the questions, which is the purpose of a semi-structured interview (Johansson & Svedner 2010).

For the classroom observations, an observation scheme was written with different categories of interaction, length of the lesson, occurrence of codeswitching divided into two sub-categories: teacher and students, and reasons for codeswitching. These categories were chosen with considerations to the research questions. However, during the observations, these categories was rendered as not as valuable and reliable as they were thought to be, and being in the position of an observer, it was not possible to elicit relevant results that would fall into the chosen categories. What was done instead during the observations is that general comments on codeswitching were written, and these are further discussed in the result and discussion section of the essay.

3.1. Informants

The observations and interviews for this study have been carried out in 3 different schools: one upper secondary schools and one compulsory school. The students' age were ranging from 12-19 years old. The teachers who were interviewed and observed ranged their teaching experience from ten to one year. The students in the classes which were observed are not as relevant as the teachers, due to the research questions of this study where the teachers' view and opinion regarding a focus on the target language in class. However, if the students switched codes, it was included in the general comments.

3.2. Material

The data for this study is mainly the answers given in the interviews, where the teachers involved gave answers to their personal opinions on using English in their teaching, and reasons to why they or the students use their L1 in some cases. The interview did not contain a lot of questions as this would generate too much data that could be of no use for discussion. The teachers did not receive the question prior to the time of the interviews, and they were conducted in connection to one of their observed lessons. The interviews were conducted in Swedish in order to get the most elaborated answers which will be easier to discuss and compare with the other teachers' answers as well as the appropriate syllabi.

In total, seven lessons were observed; four lessons in compulsory school with 6th to 9th grade and 3 lessons in upper secondary school with students attending their third and final year. Three interviews

were conducted with the teachers of those lessons, where questions concerning their teaching experience, view on using the target language exclusively in their teaching and whether this was anchored in any theories of learning and if they had experienced codeswitching among the students and themselves when teaching. These questions are highly relevant in order to elicit valid results that could answer the research questions set for this study.

For the observations, an observation scheme was created where notes were to be taken. The scheme was heavily focused on what kind of interaction took place in the classroom, how much codeswitching occurred for students and teachers as well as reasons to why they switched codes. However, this also created some issues, seeing as it is not entirely plausible to predict what results the observations would generate. Most parts of the observation scheme could not be used, because the presumptions of what data the observations could not be seen in the classrooms. This left the reasons for codeswitching the only reliable and valid factor of the conducted observations.

3.3. Procedure

The data collection was carried out in early May 2013, and a cellphone was used to record the teacher interviews. For ethical reasons I did not record anything during classroom observations. When observing the lessons, I positioned myself with a distance to the group in order to get an overall view of the class so that nothing of value would be missed. Rather than using a complex observation scheme, general comments were written about the amount of codeswitching and use of the L1. With this said, having a pre-made scheme resulted in some major issues as discussed in section 3.2. Because this study is qualitative rather than a quantitative one, the quality of the results are more relevant rather than numbers showing how many occurrences there are of codeswitching and use of the L1. Proceeding the data collection, the interviews were transcribed (see appendix 2) in order to analyze the interviewees' answers to the given questions and to be able to discuss them with previous research.

3.4. Validity and reliability

The matter of validity and reliability concerns whether the collected material is useful. In terms of the validity of the study, the important aspect is to see whether it gives a clear picture of what has been studied. Reliability relates to how the material has been collected, for instance, if all interviews and observations were conducted in the same way (Johansson & Svedner (2010). With regards to this, all interviews were carried out using the exact questions, for instance, one of the major questions asked was concerning codeswitching, of which the teachers might not know the meaning of, and to make sure their answer would be reliable and valid an explanation was given, which according to Johansson & Svedner (2010) is important in order to make sure the results are valid, and for this study, the answers given by the teachers are crucial. The realization of the possible negative outcome from the observations had a great impact on the reliability of the research; would the data from the observations generate results that could be used in the discussion of the research questions? As mentioned in section 3.3, in order for the study to maintain its reliability, the data concerning reasons to eventual codeswitching is considered as means for discussion.

Regarding the data from observations; due to the fact that the observations were carried out in two different school forms: compulsory school and upper secondary school, the results cannot be compared in a similar fashion as the interviews. To ensure the reliability of the data analysis and discussion, the different school forms will be considered equals, because the study is more emphasized at what views the teachers have regarding the topic this study investigates.

3.5. Ethical considerations

For this study, I have carefully taken in consideration the Swedish board of Science Ethics' guidelines which include teachers and students whom are being observed and interviewed. Because the observations do not include any mentions of students, they were told that the observations are focused on codeswitching in general among students and teachers rather than explicit mentions of the informants involved in the study. The students were also informed about the premise of the research; that the observations were part of a degree project in English language education at Stockholm University. The interviewed teachers were told that absolute anonymity would be maintained in accordance to the principal of anonymity. They were also aware of that the interview had to be recorded according to instructions given by the institution of language education (Vetenskapsrådet 2013).

3.6. Methods of analysis

The results were compared with those found in the School Inspectorate's report to see any similar patterns, or if there were any deviations. Due to the nature of this essay, the results might not be eligible in order to make a general statement, but rather to get a sense of other schools and teachers that were not in the original study. The results are also put into a scientific perspective, where they are analyzed by applying previous research and hypotheses.

The interviews were also put against each other in order to see any recurring patterns, which in this case would be similar answers to the questions asked in the interviews. These will be discussed with the appropriate curriculum and syllabus as well as research done in the field. The comparison between the interviews and previous research is intended to show recurring patterns to why the teachers do as they say in the interview, and to relate to what ESL (English as a Second Language) teachers in other countries think concerning use of the L1 and TL in teaching.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Description of material

4.1.1. What are the teachers' view on the use of the target language in English language education

The teachers who were interviewed for this study seemed to share the same opinion concerning using English to the greater extent of their teaching. The interviews revealed that the two teachers in upper secondary school (T1 & T2) exclusively speak in English during their lessons but also outside of the classroom. The first teacher interviewed and observed explained that students do question why their teachers spoke in Swedish outside of classroom, which has led to their more exclusive look of themselves as teachers of the English language. The students in the classes of upper secondary school which were observed also spoke in English for the main part of their lessons which were roughly two and a half hours long, which indicates that speaking in the target language was not an issue for them. T2 mentioned that students who are weaker in English, in comparison to other students, interacted with the teacher in the L1, however with an agreement that the teacher would speak with them in English, and when the students felt safer and more ready they would speak in English.

Regarding the teacher in compulsory school (T3) who was interviewed and whose classes were observed, the results differed from upper secondary school. T3 said that while trying to have the lessons exclusively in English, the students often fall back to the L1, while T3 consistently asked questions in the target language, whilst getting responses in L1. However, when prompted by T3, the students would respond in the TL. T3's thoughts and opinion on why the students in compulsory school either switch codes frequently or do not communicate in the target language was depending on e.g. group dynamics, age and maturity.

Even though the report from the Schools Inspectorate did not focus on the Swedish upper secondary school, the results from the observation indicates a major difference to the interactive skills measured to what was said by T1 and T2 about the usage of the target language in their respective classes. According to T2, around 98% of his/her students speak in the target language with him/her, and have come to an agreement with T2 that the teacher speaks in the target language with weaker students while the students use the L1 until they feel more comfortable with the target language.

> Här är det kanske, 98% som pratar engelska med mig, och även i korridorerna för att jag pratar ju bara engelska med dem, för att jag har ju bara engelska just nu så de vet bara mig som det. Men jag har några elever som är lite svagare, och de vill gärna prata svenska, men jag brukar svara de på engelska och jag brukar fråga dem om det är OK, och det har de gjort så att vi har den överenskommelsen.[1]

---

[1]

Around 98% of the students here speak in English to me, in the corridors as well because I only speak English with them, they only know me like that, as I only teach English at the moment. Though I have a few weaker students and they more preferably speak Swedish, but I usually respond to them in English and I ask them if it is OK with them and it is so we have that agreement. (Appendix 2, author's translation)

T3's view on the use of target language in the teaching of English was similar to that of T1 and T2, however s/he felt that even though the majority of the lesson should be in English, it is difficult in certain situations and then switched to their L1. All three teachers involved in this study shared the opinion of teaching exclusively in English, and in order for this to happen, teachers must be consequent in their language use, otherwise the students would not be able to rely on them in a similar fashion that the teachers want to.

The difference between T1 and T2 in the upper secondary school and T3 in the compulsory school is that the syllabi for the courses English 5-7 justified their use of the target language in their teaching: "Teaching should as far as possible be conducted in English" (Skolverket 2011), while the compulsory school syllabus for English did not. However, the content of reception, production and interaction should be in English, and although it was not explicitly stated that the teaching should be conducted in English, the material used and the language of interaction should be English (Skolverket 2011). The syllabus stated that the teaching of English should develop a versatile communicative ability, and it is the teachers' responsibility to ensure that every student can communicate in English writing and speech (Skolinspektionen 2011; Skolverket 2011).

The School Inspectorate observed a few lessons in which there was no interaction in English at all, which in the schools visited for the present study was not the case. Although there was some hesitance to speak in the TL in the compulsory school, it did not hinder their teacher to attempt to make the students at least try to say what was asked of them in English, and so they did. T1 explained it as follows:

> [...]som du såg så svarar de ibland på svenska även när man ställer frågan på engelska så man behöver verkligen utmana och uppmuntra dem, för det ska ju ske på målspråket.[2]

Aside from students' own prerequisites, the important factor concerning learning among students was the teachers' style of teaching, which had the greatest impact on students' possibilities to learn (Skolinspektionen 2011), and what T3 said, is that teachers cannot give up if their students are reluctant to show their skills but rather challenge them and give encouragement, simply because the intended goal for teachers in general is to have as much, or all, teaching in English.

4.1.2. What are the reasons for any codeswitching in ESL teaching according to the interviewed teachers and previous research?

In the classes observed at upper secondary school, there were not that many cases of codeswitching (see appendix 3 for general comments from the observations), however when students switched to the L1, it was mostly due to lack of knowledge concerning vocabulary. During the third observed lesson, before the students switched code, the teacher would ask questions, and when a word that was not in their vocabulary was asked for, the students tried to find another word, but ended up saying the Swedish word instead. Following this, the teacher would ask if they could come up with any synonyms, which made the students realize that this was not that difficult and after this occurrence of

---

[2] *As you could see, they sometimes answer in Swedish, even though you ask the question in English, so you really need to challenge and encourage them, because it should done in the target language. (Appendix 2, author's translation)*

codeswitching, all students spoke in the target language for the entire lesson.

In student interviews from the Schools Inspectorate's report, one common answer to why students did not want to speak English is "eftersom de tror att kamraterna kommer att skratta om den som talar inte hittar rätt ord eller om uttalet blir fel"[3]. In contrast to this, there were many teachers who were encouraging the students to only talk for practice and not focus on form or the quality of their language. If there were mistakes, the teacher did not address them on the spot, but rather collected the errors and gave examples to all students in that class of how they could do it differently in order to make sure no student feels pointed out (Skolinspektionen 2011).

During the first observed lesson in upper secondary school, there were a few occurrences of codeswitching, both among the students and the teacher. In this lesson, the teacher handed out an article that the students would read together out loud and the teacher asked what some words mean, and these are the instances where codeswitching occurs: The teacher asked the students, who replied that they did not know followed by the teacher trying to use a strategy for explaining the word in English, however without a positive result, which lead to the teacher saying the word in Swedish. After the students had read the text, they were given the task to discuss the content, and this was also all in English.

This was a rather common scenario in which teachers and students switch codes, even though the teacher attempted to use an oral strategy in which s/he gave an explanation in English, the students did not know the English definition, leading to the teacher saying the word in the L1. A usual way for teachers to make sure the students comprehend what is said, was to switch to the L1 in order to clarify, which according to the School Inspectorate was a common pattern seen in compulsory school (p. 14), but naturally, it also applied to upper secondary school, which was the case in this observation.

The lessons which were observed in the compulsory school had a much higher codeswitching frequency among the students and the teacher. The majority of the students constantly spoke in the L1, and the teacher made attempts to manage this speaking in English; however it did not have a positive effect leading the teacher to manage the class in the L1. This was the case in most of the four lessons observed, with a few exceptions where the students would ask something in the L1 and then switched to target language when the teacher prompted them to repeat in English.

T3 did attempt to motivate the students who were reluctant to speak in the target language rather than what they were used to outside of the classroom (the L1). As written by the School Inspectorate, a teacher cannot do more than motivate and encourage the students to develop a proper communicative ability (p. 11). This could be discussed with teachers' use of the L1 to clarify what was being said in the target language to ensure comprehension, however from another perspective: students answering questions asked in English but answered in Swedish, following where the teacher encouraged the students to try and answer the question in English. Although it was not for the same reason as to why teachers use the L1 in order to clarify for comprehension, it had its similarities to each other.

After the observations, conclusions could be drawn indicating that one major issue among students is laziness and/ or unwillingness to speak in English due to the fact that they live in Sweden having Swedish as their mother tongue. In the interview with T3, it was mentioned that consistency is crucial

[3] *because they are afraid that fellow students might laugh at the student in focus if s/he cannot find the correct word for something or it is pronounced incorrectly" (Skolinspektionen 2011, author's translation)*

in order for the interaction to be completely in English, and if one as a teacher is not consequent in his/her language use, it may affect students' language of interaction.

4.2. Discussion

The most common type of codeswitching in all observed classes is intra-sentential and inter-sentential switching, in other words switching code in the middle of sentences/ clauses or in between sentences. The reason for this is as mentioned earlier, probably the result of a limited vocabulary knowledge or a lack of strategies to ease oral language production.

The first research question which concerns teachers' view on the use of target language in English education revealed a non-surprising pattern: as expected, there was an agreement on, that when in a language classroom, the target language should to be used by both students and teachers as means of communication. The three teachers who were interviewed agreed on that in order for students to be able to learn a foreign and/ or a second language, they need exposure to the target language according to Krashen (1982, in Tornbull & Arnett 2002). The received answers indicate a slight correlation with the study. Although the teachers could not specify that they had any theory of learning in mind when choosing to interact with their students in English, there are signs that corresponds to Vygotskij's theory of socio-cultural learning (Lightbown & Spada 2006).

The teachers' of this study share the opinion that when in English lessons the only language that should be spoken is the target language. In the case of the upper secondary school teachers, the observations made in their respective lessons correlate with their answers to the question regarding their view on English in the classroom, and in general, the students adapt to exclusive target language communication. T1 classified his/her teaching with the target language as the only language within the classroom as *immersion*[4]. However, there is a misunderstanding of the term, because in this teacher's case it is used to define the teaching as only using the target language during foreign language lessons instead of only for instructional purposes. However, in the syllabus for English courses in upper secondary school, it is clearly stated that teaching of English should be conducted in the target language as far as possible. Occurrences when the L1 is used instead are few in upper secondary and is limited to single words, mostly where there is a gap in students' vocabulary knowledge or the teacher clarifies the meaning of a word, in which, according to Arnett (2001), the L1 is a useful tool, and relating to T2, who mentioned that when the students hear the word in the L1, it becomes apparent to them that it in fact is simpler than anticipated.

In compulsory school, the classroom situations concerning language use among the students were very different to that of upper secondary school students. Although T3 interacts with the students mainly in English, the student-response was generally in the L1 with the exception of the students in 9th grade where students and T3 used the target language as the communicative language. Even though the lessons did not involve a great amount of teaching, there were many cases in which codeswitching as justified by Cook (2001) and van Lier (1995) occurred, which is classroom management. T3 also

---

4

"A form of bilingual education that aims for additive bilingualism by providing students with a sheltered environment in which they receive at least half of their subject-matter instruction through the medium of a language they they are learning as a second or foreign language" (Lyster 2007).

mentioned grammar lessons as a reason to not use the target language, because it might be too difficult for the students to comprehend what is being taught rather than leaving students' learning process inefficient due to an issue of proficiency (Castellotti & Moore 1997, in Tornbull & Arnet 2002).

The possible reasons for codeswitching among students and teachers are as mentioned laziness and lack of vocabulary skills. T1 specifically mentioned laziness as a factor for his/her own language use:

> Ibland så är jag himla pepp och konsekvent med att inte prata svenska även utanför klassrummet, men ibland så gör jag det, men jag vet det var en elev som tyckte att "ja men i min gamla skola så pratade läraren bara engelska utanför också" och då tänkte jag att det brukade jag också göra förut, så det är lite lathets-grej[5]

This indicates that the students themselves are aware of the importance of the target language in educational purposes, not only in classroom situations, but also regarding English as the communicative language outside of the classrooms. Students' motivation for using the target language may have an interactive effect which then triggers teachers' use of English as well (Polio & Duff 1994 in Rolin-Lanziti & Brownlie 2002), and the teachers knowledge and maximized usage of the target language might cause students to realize the importance of the target language (MacDonald 1993, in Tornbull and Arnett 2002).

T3 also mentions that in order for students to use the target language as the language for communication, due to the fact a teacher has to be consistent and aware of what language is supposed to be used. It is arguable that the teaching should be exclusively in English, mentioned in both syllabi (Skolverket 2011) as well as in scientific research (Tornbull & Arnett 2002; Cook 2001; van Lier 1995). However, exclusive use of the target language does not guarantee the input to be internalized (Ellis 1994), although Long (1996) argues that in order for the language input to be internalized, learners must be given the opportunity to interact with given input. In addition, opportunities to produce output related to the input because target language production is an aspect of great importance (Swain 1995). It is emphasized that second and foreign language teachers need to expose learners to as many language functions as possible in the target language (e.g. Ellis 1994; Wong-Fillmore 1985, in Jingxia 2010).

As mentioned in the interview with T3, the difficulty of teaching in the target language often lies within the students' and teachers' attitude towards actual usage of the target language. If teachers are not consistent in their language use and frequently switch between the target language and L1 students may experience that using the target language is unimportant in contrast to MacDonald's (1993) argument regarding student motivation through the target language. Wong-Fillmore (1985) believed that students develop a tendency to ignore the target language and does therefore not gain full benefits from the input. Other opponents to codeswitching in foreign language classrooms argue that students do not necessarily need to understand everything teachers say (Chambers 1991; Halliwell & Jones 1991; Macdonald 1993) and by teaching exclusively in the target language, the language gets real and allows for learners to develop their own language system.

While many researchers and teachers oppose codeswitching in second/ foreign language teaching,

---

[5] *Sometimes I'm very pep and consequent with not speaking Swedish, even outside of the classroom, but sometimes I do, however I had a student who thought that "but in my old school the teacher only spoke English outside as well" and that made me think that I used to do that before, so it's somewhat a matter of laziness. (Appendix 2, author's translation)*

Cook (2001) argues that by allowing the L1 in foreign language classrooms, students can use the mother tongue to say what they really want to say. Moreover, learners inevitably use the L1 as a point of reference, so by using the L1 as the interlanguage the learner facilitate learning through that medium and relate target language equivalents to the L1.

Even though the result the present study has shown is positive in relation to previous research, there was a major issue concerning the observations. Prior to the days of the observations, premade observation schemes had been made, in which there were explicit questions and categories which were be observed, however, at the time of the observations, it was apparent that these would not be appropriate to use and thus everything but the question "What reasons are there for codeswitching?" was rendered obsolete. Even though this created a problem at first, the outcome of the observations was good, and in retrospect, it would have been easier to only consider this question, as it is one of the research questions, and what type of interaction codeswitching occurred in was not.

The analysis of the results indicated similarities between the teachers' answers from the interview and what could be seen during their respective lessons, and the patterns which emerged could be discussed with previous knowledge without any major difficulties. The analysis and discussion of the material indicated a connection to what researchers in the field of language education has written prior to the present study. The method of analysis was well chosen, considering the data the study generated, and also for the purpose of the two research questions the essay attempts to answer. However, if the study would have turned out as it initially was supposed to, the method of analysis would have had to be more specific in regards of the many aspects included in the original observation scheme.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate three teachers in two different school forms in Sweden: compulsory school at which students from first to ninth grade attend, and upper secondary school for students aged from sixteen to nineteen. For this study there were two research questions aimed to be investigated. Firstly the phenomenon which was to be investigated was the sociolinguistic concept of codeswitching, which is when a person switch code, normally meaning the language spoken, but can also be used when identifying people switching between different dialects. However in this study this has been limited to when and why teachers of English and students switch between the L1 and the target language. Secondly, after having observed lessons in both compulsory school with students in sixth to ninth grade and three lessons in upper secondary school, the teachers who had those lessons were interviewed in order to give answer to the first research question: what are the teachers' views on the use of the target language in English education.

The major implication this study shows is that as a teacher of second and/ or foreign languages, the matter of being consequent in one's language use, and the realization that using a combination of both the target language and L1 might be a better solution than having some students not being able to comprehend the content of the lesson. The aim of the English education in school is to have it

exclusively in English, but being aware of that all content should not be taught in the target language, it is up to every teacher to decide whether to use the target language or the L1. The results the present study has shown is that the codeswitching that occurs in Swedish schools in the teaching of English are justified by previous research.

This study has opened other possible angles to investigate regarding what language the teacher use in the classroom as well as the students. Regarding the time frame for this project, only small scale observations could be carried out and the amount of teachers and lessons was limited for the same reason. An important factor which was not addressed in this study is the students' view on fellow students and their teacher communicating in the target language, and if any of the three types of codeswitching has an impact on their own language development. For further research on this issue, the number of participating schools and teachers should be higher and the procedure and material for data collection should be revised before conducting the material collection..

References

Arnett, K. (2001). *The accommodation of grade 9 students with learning disabilities in the applied core French classroom.* Unpublished master's thesis, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.

Cammarita, L & Tedick, D J. (2012). Balancing Content and Language in Instruction: The Experience of Immersion Teachers. *The Modern Language Journal,* 96, 251-269.

Castelotti, V. & Moore, D. (1997). Alterner pour apprendre, alterner pour enseigner, de nouveaux enjeux pour la classe de langue. In Castelotti, V & Moore, D. (eds.), *Études de Linguistique Appliquée,* 108, 401-410.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 57, 402-423.

Ellis, R. (1993). *Second language acquisition research: How does it help teachers? ELT Journal.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' code-switching to the L1 in the EFT classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, Vol. 3

Johansson, B. & Svedner, P-O. (2006). *Examensarbetet I lärarutbildningen. Undersökningsmetodet och språklig utformning.* Uppsala. Kunskapsföretaget.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York. Pergamon Press.

Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned* .Third Edition. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Lindqvist, G (ed.) (1999) *Vygotskij och skolan*. Lund. Studentlitteratur.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In Ritchie, W & Bhatia, T. (eds). *Handbook of second language acquisition*. (pp. 412-468). San Diego. Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach..* Philadelphia. Benjamins.

Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language, collaboratibe teaching and autonomy.* Cleavedon. Multilingual matters.

Macdonald, C. (1993). *Using the target language.* Cheltenham, UK. Mary Glasgow Publications.

Polio, C & Duff, P. (1994). Teachers' language use in university foreign language classrooms: Aqualitative analysis of English and target language alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78,

313-326.

Poplack, S. (1980) *Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y Termina en Espanol: Toward a typology of code-switching.* Linguistics, 18.

Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Brownlie, S. (2002) Teacher use of the learners' native language in the foreign language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(3):402-426.

Skolinspektionen. (2011). *Engelska I grundskolans årskurser 6-9.*

Skolverket (2011). *Kursplan I engelska för gymnasieskolan.*

Skolverket (2011). *Kursplan I engelska för grundskolan.*

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In Coock, G. & Seidlhofer (eds.). *Principles and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxforrd. Oxford University Press.

Tornberg, U. (2009). *Språkdidaktik*. Malmö. Glrreups AB.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics. An introduction to language and society. (4th ed.).* London. Penguin.

Turnbull, M. & Arnett, K. (2002) Teachers' use of the target and first languages in second and foreign language classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22

Turnbull, M. (2001. There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 57, 531-540.

Vetenskapsrådets Etiska Principer

van Lier, L. (1995). The use of the L1 in L2 classes.*Babylonia,* 2, 37-43.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In Gass, SM & Madden CG (eds.) *Input in second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Appendix 1

3 Hur länge har du undervisat?

4 Språklig bakgrund?

5 Utbildning

6 Vad är din syn på att använda engelska i klassrummet. Grund i någon teori om lärande

    1. Varför?

    2. Vad?

7 Till vilken utsträckning används engelska av:

    3. Elever

    4. Lärare

8 Förekommer "code-switching" ofta i dina klasser? (Hos dig och/eller elever), varför?

9 Önskemål för att förbättra/öka användandet av målspråket under lektionstid/utanför lektionsramarna?

Appendix 2

Interview teacher 1, upper secondary school (T1)

Hur länge har du undervisat?

Sedan 2002, tog jag examen.

Egen språklig bakgrund?

Jag har svenska som modersmål, men mina föräldrar är från Finland, så det har varit ganska språkmedvetet hemma kan man säga. Sen så har jag pluggat spanska som är mitt andra språk på folkhögskola och varit (?) med spansktalade, och så har jag gått två år på universitetet med spanska och så har jag pluggat två år engelska på universitetet, och så har jag bott tre år I USA.

Din syn på engelska i klassrummet?

Ja absolut, bara prata engelska i klassrummet hela tiden, och jag låtsas som att jag inte förstår när de pratar svenska, så säger jag "what" så börjar de prata engelska.

Har du någon speciell teori i åtanke, eller är det bara allmänt?

Kanske inte någon speciell teori, eller jag kommer inte ihåg vad teoretikerna heter, nu pratar jag om det här med "immersion", typ att så mycket språk som möjligt, så egentligen ska jag göra det på spanskan också, men nu gör jag inte det för det är lite krångligare men på engelska gör jag bara det. Och jag tycker inte om att undervisa med läroböcker för jag vill undervisa om sånt jag tycker är intressant, och då blir det väldigt mycket artiklar från BBC använder jag mycket. Så att så mycket som möjligt på originalspråk så att det inte är liksom tillrättalagt, och det kan man göra på gymnasiet, det kan man ju på grundskola också. Så när jag jobbat I grundskola har jag gjort det också.

Förekommer codeswitching ofta, dvs. Att eleverna byter till svenska när de försöker förklara något på engelska, alltså att det dyker upp svenska ord mitt i meningarna?

Ja det gör det, det kan hända för mig själv också, till exempel när jag ska säga betygskriterierna, så säger jag "Skolverket" istället för "The Swedish board of education". När jag inte riktigt kan, så använder jag inte någon strategi, utan då tar jag till det också. Och sen också att de, eller vissa elever har tendensen att ta till svenskan när de ska förklara något, att "nej men det går inte på engelska" säger de då, så låtsas jag som att jag inte förstår, ibland så försöker de ändå, men så säger de att det inte går, så säger jag att "tyvärr, då får du skylla dig själv", på engelska då, och då blir de bara tysta. Men då vet de kanske till nästa gång, att man måste förklara på engelska. Och en del som skyller på att de är dyslektiker och bara "men jag kan inte" så en del gömmer sig bakom sina diagnoser.

Har du några egna tankar eller önskemål för att kunna öka användandet av engelska under och utanför lektionsramarna?

Ibland så är jag himla pepp och konsekvent med att inte prata svenska även utanför klassrummet, men ibland så gör jag det, men jag vet det var en elev som tyckte att "ja men I min gamla skola så pratade läraren bara engelska utanför också" och då tänkte jag att det brukade jag också göra förut, så det är

lite lathets-grej. Så när jag träffar henne så pratar jag I stort sett antingen spanska eller engelska, för hon tyckte att du inte pratar engelska, men jo det gör jag ju hela tiden, "jo men nu menar jag utanför", och då tänkte jag att jag faktiskt kunde skärpa mig. Och sen så hade jag även en lärarstudent, och med henne bestämde vi att i vårat lärarrum skulle vi bara prata engelska, för att är ju engelskalärare i vårat rum, så då pratade vi bara engelska under de sex veckorna hon var här och det var ju skitbra för då blev det mycket bättre och mer bekvämt med just det.

Interview teacher 2, upper secondary school (T2)

Hur länge har du undervisat?

Sen i Augusti.

Språklig bakgrund?

Jag har bott en stor del av min uppväxt I USA, så jag bodde där i ungefär 5 år.

Vad har du för utbildning?

Ja, jag är lärarutbildad. Så jag är utbildad lärare för psykologi och engelska. Så har en, lärarexamen.

Din egen syn på att använda engelska I klassrummet, har du någon teori bakom det eller är det bara av ren princip?

Ja, under utbildningen fick man ju veta om en del teorier, men jag tror främst det min egen, liksom syn, för jag tycker att för att man ska kunna lära sig ett språk, så måste man bli bekantat med det, och det enklaste sättet är att man får höra det. Så det är min egna vilja att verkligen vilja ha det.

Känner du att du får hjälp av att alla elever också bara pratar engelska, eller är det vissa som gör det motsträvigt?

Alltså här är det kanske, 98% som pratar engelska med mig, och även i korridorerna för att jag pratar ju bara engelska med dem, för att jag har ju bara engelska just nu så de vet bara mig som det. Men jag har några elever som är lite svagare, och de vill gärna prata svenska, men jag brukar svara de på engelska och jag brukar fråga dem om det är OK, och de har de gjort så att vi har den överenskommelsen. När jag har frågat dem varför de inte gärna pratar engelska så säger de att det är stressigt, och då har jag sagt att de får komma till mig när de är redo.

Förekommer codeswitching ofta i klassrummet?

Inte vad jag spontant kan komma på, det skulle vara några av de svagare eleverna som inte vet ordet, så då säger de, till exempel nu när vi tränat inför nationella proven så säger det till exempel "yes it affects your blodomlopp". Men oftast så är enda gången de switchar till svenska när de frågar vad ett ord betyder, och ofta är de så drillade att de vill ha det svenska ordet eller något annat som är liknande, och så frågar de om det finns något annat ord på engelska och då finns det vissa som kan det. Det hände ju nu under lektionen och det är en sån vana att när man vill ha något ord förklarat så blir det på svenska. Ibland räcker det med att säga ja men vad heter det på engelska, men ibland får man även hjälpa dem, till exempel med en synonym

Interview teacher 3, compulsory school (T3)

Hur länge har du undervisat?

Jag har undervisat i tio år.

Egen språklig bakgrund?

Jag har ryska som modersmål, sen har jag fått lära mig engelska på universitetet.

Vad har du för utbildning?

Jag gjorde min lärarutbildning i Ryssland, blev klar 2002 som språklärare i engelska och tyska.

Din syn på engelska i klassrummet?

Ja, det är klart att undervisning ska vara på engelska, det är målet då, men det funkar inte alltid. Och det beror på gruppen, ålder, ja lite olika faktorer.

Hur ofta händer det att elever eller lärare byter till svenska mitt i meningar etc.?

Ja, det händer ju, och de som du såg så svarar de ibland på svenska även när man ställer frågan på engelska så man behöver verkligen utmana och uppmuntra dem, för det ska ju ske på målspråket.

Tänker du på teorier när du gör dina val att prata engelska i undervisningen?

Ja jag ställer in mig på att bara prata engelska, men ibland i vissa situationer så går man över till svenska men annars är det tanken att det är engelska som gäller.

Finns det någon tanke på hur man skulle kunna uppnå målet att bara prata engelska i klassrummet?

Det är ju bara en medvetenhet, att själv vara medveten om att "nu är det bara engelska som gäller" och försöka hålla i det och vara konsekvent.

Appendix 3

Comments from classroom observations

Compulsory school observations

In the first class observed (C1) was 8th grade, the teacher does generally use the targer language in class while students speak Swedish during the majority of the lesson. There are cases in which the teacher speak Swedish, mainly for classroom management as well as to make sure that the students have comprehended what they are supposed to do. The students do not seem eager to speak English throughout the entire lesson, and are thus speaking Swedish instead, however when prompted by the teacher with for example a question of some sort, they generally answer in English, although this is not always the case.

A case of combined classroom management and comprehension of what the teacher has said, s/he asks one student, whom is talking loudly and who seems to disturb the order of the classrom, to repeat what they are supposed to do. The last task the students are given forces them to speak English and use strategies to explain words for their partner for a crossword. This seems to be working rather well, which show that the students are able to use appropriate strategies to improve the communication between students.

Possible reasons for codeswitching among students are laziness, the feeling that they do not have to use English when they want to have the answer to their questions. For the latter, the teacher responded in English, and in some cases it affected the students response, using English for follow-up questions. Other reasons are

In the second observed class (C2) which is 9th grade, the students were supposed to read and write, causing the observations to be of very little use. Having this said, the students were still talking with each other as well as the teacher. When the students were interacting with other students, this was in Swedish in a majority of the cases although in some they were talking in English, however briefly. When talking to the teacher, they used English as means of communication.

The third compulsory school class which was observed (C3) was in 6th grade. The teacher started the lesson with English, and maintained it throughout the majority of the lesson, however switching codes for the same reasons as mentioned in the comments prior to this. The

majority of the interaction was between students, however it was mainly in Swedish. Similar to the other lessons, when the students asked the teacher questions, answers were given in English.

The final observation in compulsory school (C4) was with a class in 7th grade. There was a high frequency of Swedish use in this class as well, however there were discussions which to a greater extent was in the target language. The students read a text about teenage life in the UK, and following this they got some questions that opened for the group discussions mentioned. When they shared what they had discussed with the rest of the class, there were some cases of codeswitching, i.e. intra-sentential switching.

Upper secondary school observations

The first class observed (U1) showed very little use of Swedish, only a few cases of codeswitching among the students and the teacher, which were to say the meaning of some specific words from the article they were reading. The teacher tried to explain it in English, however after trying and the students did not fully understand the correct word was given in Swedish. After they had read the text together, the students were to discuss the text, and all groups talked exclusively English during these discussions as well. When the teacher decided that enough time had passed, the groups shared what they had discussed, again English was used exclusively. The remainder of the lesson was dedicated to do assignments the students had left to do or work more on, and they were not forced to stay in the classroom, and therefore concluded the observation for this time.

During the second class in upper secondary school (U2), there was not much to observe either. The teacher had private talks with the students concerning their final assignment, in which I sat in on these talks, and there were no codeswitching during these talks.

The third lesson (U3) had more student-teacher interaction. The teacher spoke in the target language at all times, and there were only a few occurrences of codeswitching among the students, mostly when a word was not known, and another student translated the word into the first language. Other than that, the lesson was in English only.