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Preface
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1. Introduction

“Jag blir så.arg att jag till och med glömmer bort att prata engelska!” [I get so angry that I even forget to speak English!] was something that my teacher trainee supervisor said when he had some disciplinary problems with a class in progress. The phenomenon of teachers using their first language (L1) when teaching a second language (L2) is a form of code-switching and it is common to occur in situations where the teacher and the students share the same mother tongue (Cook 2008:179). This was also the case in the situation mentioned above where the use of Swedish was common among both the teacher and the students (during the English lessons I observed). This came as a surprise to me, since I strongly believed that the use of English in the English classroom would be more beneficial to the students’ language development. However, in my trainee period I found that this was hard to maintain and that it sometimes actually seemed to benefit the students more to use Swedish instead of English. These experiences were new to me and I started to wonder if, when and how other English teachers in Sweden actually use the L1 in their teaching and how much they reflect on their choice of language. Are there, for example, any similarities/differences in teachers’ choice of language (L1 or L2) when it comes to their interaction with groups of students compared with individual students? Do teachers plan their choice of language or is it improvised? And do teachers see the L1 as a useful tool in their teaching or do they think that the L2 should be used as much as possible?

1.2 Aim and research questions

This paper will focus on the code-switching practices of some teachers in the classroom and will attempt to determine when and why such code-switching occurs. The research questions for my investigation will therefore be:

1) When do my informants use their L1 in their L2 teaching?
2) What are their reasons for using the L1 in their L2 teaching?
3) What are their opinions of code-switching and using the L1 in L2 teaching?
2. Background

In this section I will discuss the concept of code-switching as well as several language learning theories regarding the effects of including or excluding L1 in L2 teaching.

2.1 What is code-switching?

Code-switching is a term that refers to the use of two different languages within the same conversational episode (Halmari 2004:115). Ever since the term code-switching became a widely used term in linguistics, there have been several attempts among researchers to classify and define the linguistic meaning of the term (Heller & Paff W. 1996:598). This has however proved to be difficult since code-switching is a broad concept that represents both the insertion of single words from another language in sentences and the alteration of language between larger segments of utterances (Bullock & Torribo 2009:2). The term is also difficult to define since code-switching can often occur together with other language phenomena such as borrowing and interference and therefore be confused with those. (Heller & Paff W. 1996:598).

The difficulties of defining code-switching had as a result that a number of researchers have established different definitions of the term. One of the most general ways of defining the term is presented by Valdés-Fallis (1978:2) who states that there are two features that can be used for identifying the process of code-switching. The first feature is that each switch to the other language includes one or several unchanged words from the first language and the second feature is that these words are used and pronounced as a native speaker of that language would use and pronounce them. One example of code-switching given by Valdés-Fallis (1978:2) can be seen in the following sentence, *Me tomé toda la cafetera, the whole coffee pot*, ‘I drank the whole coffee pot, the whole coffee pot’, where the speaker uses both Spanish and English in the same sentence. The two features mentioned above distinguish code-switching from the following example of *borrowing*: *Los muchachos están puchando la troca*, ‘they are pushing the truck’ (Valdés-Fallis 1978:2), where the word *puchando* has changed its morphology (it has the stem from the English word *push* with the Spanish inflection *ando*) and the word *troca*, which comes from the English word *truck*, has been assimilated into the Spanish pronunciation system (Valdés-Fallis 1978:2). Code-switching also differs from *interference*, which is another language phenomenon where the speaker
transfers certain elements of the language to the other, which can be seen in the example *Goes the class to the library* (Valdés-Fallis 1978:6), where the word order in the sentence has been influenced by the speaker’s first language, which in this case is Spanish.

Code-switching can also be referred to by more specific terms. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching* the authors differentiate between *style shifting*, which refers to monolingual changing between different styles of dialects and *language shifting*, which refers to bilinguals’ shifts between different languages in different contexts. Among other distinctions that have been made is that between *intra-sentential code switching*, which refers to code-switching that occurs in a sentence but does not violate the grammar of either language and *inter-sentential code-switching*, which refers to the alteration that can occur on clause level (Bullock & Toribio 2009:2).

### 2.2 When and why does code-switching occur?

Code-switching occurs in environments where bilingual speakers, who are speakers that speak two or more languages, can be found (Cook 2008:175). There are several reasons why speakers in bilingual environments code-switch. In the book *Second language learning and language teaching*, Vivian Cook brings up some of the most common reasons for code-switching among bilinguals, which according to Cook are when speakers want to report what another person said (in the language that the other person used), when speakers want to highlight certain information or when speakers feel that one of the languages is more appropriate to use when speaking about certain topics than the other. The choice of language can also be a way for the speaker to show his or her social role (Cook 2008:175, 176), or a way of showing membership and solidarity to a group (Bullock & Toribio 2009:10). Another reason for code-switching can be that the bilingual speaker is weaker in one of the languages and switches to the stronger language to add colour or emphasise certain things that have been said (Valdés-Fallis 1987:12). Code-switching is not, however, always deliberate since in many cases it is an unconscious action which bilinguals perform simply because they can (Bullock & Toribio 2009:11). Code-switching can occur at word, phrase, clause or sentence level (Valdés-Fallis 1978:2, 12). According to Cook’s findings the most common switches, about 84%, occur within sentences and are isolated words. 10% of the switches are phrases and the remaining 6% are switches for whole clauses (Cook 2008:176).
2.3 Code-switching in second language classrooms

Most of the research that has been done on code-switching has focused on what functions code-switching can have in bilingual discourse. However, code-switching is a phenomenon that occurs not only in settings where the speakers use several different languages on a daily basis, but also in second language classrooms (Halmari 2004:116), where it is likely to occur if the teacher and students share the same mother tongue (Cook 2008:179).

Code-switching in second language classrooms differs from multilingual community code-switching. In multilingual communities speakers code-switch on a daily basis, making their code-switching a very natural part of their conversation strategies (Valdés-Fallis 1978:8). Second language learners and teachers, on the other hand, generally share the same first language, which is also often the language of the community, while the second language is something that both students and teachers are obliged to use in the second language classroom. Learners in a second language classroom also generally have an unequal command of their native language, which is the language they mostly use in school and feel most comfortable using, and of their second language, which they are required to use during their second language lessons and often have a limited knowledge of. In addition, the fact that the social roles in the second language classroom are predetermined, where the teacher is the master that provides the students with knowledge (Simon 2001:316), differs from bilingual settings where the relationship between bilingual speakers is more equal. An additional feature that makes code-switching and conversation in second language classrooms even more complex is that the conversation works on several different levels, since the communication in a second language classroom is normally about communication. Communication in the second language classroom is therefore not only used for exchanging ideas but also for exchanging information about the language that is learned (Simon 2001:317). Another important reason why code-switching occurs in the second language classroom is of course that the monolingual L2 situation, which is often a situation aimed for in the second language classroom, is not a “real situation”. It is very common for teachers and students to share the same L1 and both teachers and students know that they do not have to speak the L2 to be able to communicate with each other. They also know that they have the choice to resort to the first language if they have to (Cook 2008:179).
2.4 Reasons for teachers’ code-switching in second language classrooms

There are several reasons for teachers’ code-switching and the switches between the L1 and the L2 can be done both on a conscious and an unconscious level (Sert 2005). In his article “Using the First Language in the Classroom” Cook (2001) discusses several different occasions where teachers switch from the L2 to the L1. One reason for teachers’ code-switching has to do with understanding, such as when teachers want to convey or check the meaning of words or sentences, or when explaining grammar. Another occasion when teachers code-switch to the L1 is when they are giving instructions and organizing tasks. A third occasion is where the L1 feels more ‘real’ than the L2. An example of this can be when the teacher is dealing with disciplinary problems in the classroom, and chooses to give reprimands in the L1 since it often seems more serious than if the reprimand is given in the L2. Another example might be when the teacher wants to establish personal contact with a student or praise a student’s work, since the praise often seems more real when it is said in the L1 instead of the L2 (Cook 2001b:403-423). In Macaro (1997:80) additional reasons for code-switching and using the L1 in the L2 classroom are mentioned. Some of these reasons are the teachers’ tiredness or stress (Macaro 1997:80). Another important reason that can have a great impact on teachers’ language choice in the L2 classroom is the students’ proficiency level in the L2 and the teachers’ desire to provide the learners with as comprehensible input as possible (Macaro 1997:82). Other reasons for the teachers’ choice of language could also be when the teacher wants to give individual comments to students (Cook 2001:416) or time pressure, when the teacher uses the L1 to speed things up (Song & Andrew 2009:59).

2.6 Opinions of the appropriateness of using the L1 in the L2 classroom

Despite the fact that code-switching is a typical feature that can be found in bilingual or multilingual classrooms, it has “long been considered if not a forbidden practice in foreign language classrooms, then at least a practice to be avoided at all costs” (Simon 2001:312). In recent years this opinion has, however, been questioned and some researchers today claim that code-switching and using the L1 in the L2 classroom can actually have a positive influence on language teaching instead of the other way around (Cook 2001).

The role of the L1 in the L2 classroom has been one of the long-lived controversies in the history of language pedagogy and in Issues and options in Language Teaching Stern (1992:277) refers to the different opinions of the appropriateness of using the L1 in the L2 classroom as belonging to either the intralingual strategy or the crosslingual strategy. The
intralingual strategy refers to teaching strategies that stay in the L2 and use the L2 as the only framework for language teaching while the crosslingual strategy refers to teaching techniques that use the L1 to compare with the L2 or as a reference when learning the L2. The crosslingual strategy has often been used, even if unconsciously, by second language teachers in the history of language teaching. Despite this, most teaching methodologists and researchers have advocated techniques belonging to the intralingual strategy as the best way of teaching a second or foreign language, and in the most extreme cases it has even been claimed that the L1 should be completely banned in the L2 classroom. The opposition to using crosslingual strategies increased among theorists until the mid 1960s and almost became the universal opinion (Stern 1992:280). As a result nearly all methods promoted during the twentieth century, although very different, tried to avoid the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom as much as possible.

Another way of classifying the positions for or against the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom is the one used in a study performed by Macaro (1997) where he investigates student teachers’ beliefs and use of the L1 in the L2 classroom. These positions are referred to as the Virtual position, the Maximal position and the Optimal position and can be summarised as follows:

- **The Virtual position**—where the classroom is perceived as the second language country, which implies total avoidance of the L1 with the belief that the L1 can be excluded as long as the teacher has enough knowledge in the L2.

- **The Maximal position**—where the L1 is perceived as not having any pedagogical value, but is used anyway, since there can be no perfect teaching or learning conditions for learning a L2 in a L2 classroom.

- **The Optimal position**—where the L1 is perceived as having some pedagogical value and can actually can facilitate some of the aspects of learning the L2, which makes it important to explore when and where the use of the L1 in the L2 can be justified (Macaro 2001:535).
2.7 Arguments for avoiding the L1 in the L2 classroom

As we have seen, there are different opinions on the appropriateness of using the L1 in the L2 classroom. In *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*, Cook (Cook 2008:181-182) presents arguments both for using and for avoiding the L1 in the L2 classroom. One of the arguments for avoiding the L1 is supported by the view that the acquisition of a L2 is similar to the acquisition of the L1, i.e., that children acquiring a first language do not have an earlier language to fall back on and that the ideal way of learning a second language, therefore, must be to learn a new language with no reference to another language. Another argument is that the goal for a second language learner is to be able to use the L2 independently of the L1 and that the two languages therefore should be kept separate in the mind. A third argument for avoiding the L1 in the L2 classroom is that the teacher’s second language use often is the primary model for the students’ true communicative use in the second language, and a fourth that the second language classroom is the only place where students can get a genuine experience of conversation in the L2, and that the L1 therefore should be used as little as possible.

2.8 Arguments for using the L1 in the L2 classroom

The most common argument mentioned in favour of *crosslingual strategies* or using the L1 in the L2 classroom is that it is an inevitable fact that students, when learning a second language, always set out from the language that they already know and that the L1, therefore, could be used to help students learn the new language. Advocates of the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom believe that the L2 is learned on the basis of the L1, which is already acquired, and that the L1 therefore can be seen as a resource and a useful reference system when students are learning a new language (Stern 1992:282-284). Another argument for using the L1 in the L2 classroom is that the skills that are practised when using the L1, such as translating or interpreting, are skills that can be both useful to master and offer attractive knowledge for students to attain (Stern 1992:286). Another important point is that the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom is intimately connected with the age of the learners and the differences in learning situations (Cook 2008:182). In the early stages of second language learning when the students’ proficiency in the L1 is high while the proficiency in the L2 is close to zero the use of the L1 is of course very important, while the importance of the L1 in the L2 classroom changes throughout the learning process when the students’ proficiency in the L2 increases (Stern 1992:282).
2.9 Methods that advocate the avoidance of the L1 in the L2 teaching
Arguments in support of avoidance of the L1 in the L2 teaching have served as the basis of several different teaching methods in second language teaching. In Song & Andrews’s *The L1 in L2 learning - teachers' beliefs and practices* (2009), the authors present several different methods for using the L1 in the L2 classroom. Below I will summarise the methods mentioned by Song & Andrews and their views on the use of code-switching.

*The Direct Method*

One of the earliest methods that employed a “mono-lingual” approach to second language learning was the direct method (Stern 1992:289). The direct method was a result of several different researchers’ and theorists’ attempts, during the end of the nineteenth century, to create a second language teaching method that was similar to how children acquire their L1. The foremost principle of the Direct method is that learning the L2 should be as similar to acquiring a first language as possible, which means that the L2 should be taught without translation or use of the learners’ first language and that meaning therefore should be conveyed through action and demonstration. Oral proficiency and pronunciation are important parts in the Direct method with emphasis on correct pronunciation and grammar as well as speech and listening comprehension (Richards & Rodgers 2001:12). Here, the L2 is used exclusively as the instruction medium in the classroom (Richards & Rodgers 2001:12), while the use of the L1 is forbidden and excluded (Stern 1983:460). The Direct method was a popular method in its time, but there were also some difficulties with the method. The teacher had to have a native-like fluency in the foreign language and the rigid view on the exclusion of the L1 in the teaching often made the teacher use long explanations in the L2 when “a simple, brief explanation in the student’s native language would have been a more efficient route to comprehension” (Richards & Rodgers 2001:13).

*The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching/The Audiolingual Method*

The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching and The Audiolingual Method were methods that became popular in the second half of the twentieth century, the former in Britain and the latter in the US. The core of the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching is the importance of sentence patterns and basic structures. The method requires that these patterns be taught in activities that are meaningful and natural and that learners of a foreign
language learn the language through drills (Song & Andrews 2009:33). According to The Audiolingual Method, learning a language has to do with learning the elements or building blocks of a language and learning the rules that determine how these elements should be combined, from the smallest morpheme to the sentence moving from the simple to the more complex (Richards & Rodgers 2001:55). The Audiolingual approach also assumes that language is a set of habits that learners learn by hours of practising (Yule 2010:190). In the Audiolingual method, speaking is perceived as very important, while the written word is of less priority since it can distract the learners’ attention from the aural input (Richards & Rodgers 2001:63). In The Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching/The Audiolingual Method the learners’ oral proficiency is the most important part. All these methods are based on the belief that the L2 should be the medium of instruction, and that the L1 should be excluded from the second language classroom (Song & Andrews 2009:34).

**The Natural Approach**

The Natural Approach, created and presented by Krashen and Terrell in the 1970s, focuses on comprehension and communication. According to the theory, it is very important that the learners of a second or foreign language receive the right kind of comprehensible input in the second language to be able to achieve successful L2 acquisition (Richards & Rodgers 2001:130). Since the main focus in the Natural approach is on giving the learners comprehensible input in the L2, the L1 is avoided in the classroom. According to Krashen and Terrell, the L1 is acknowledged to have an expedient role for second language learners but the instructions by the teacher are always given in the L2 (Song & Andrews 2009:35).

**Communicative Language Teaching**

Communicative Language Teaching is a method that has become one of the most widely adopted methods in second language teaching around the world today. The important thing in Communicative Language Teaching is that the method focuses on teaching the language as communication in order to develop the students’ ability to communicate in the L2 rather than mastering language forms (Richards & Rodgers 2001:76). In terms of the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom the method does not completely avoid the L1, and the L1 may be used, but sparingly, when it can facilitate L2 learning (Song & Andrews 2009:35).
2.10 Methods that advocate the use of the L1 in the L2 teaching

The Grammar-Translation Method

The Grammar-Translation Method dominated foreign language teaching from the 1840s to the 1940s and is, in modified ways, widely used today. The main goal of The Grammar-Translation Method is to teach and develop the students’ ability to read and write in the L2. Most of the focus is on grammar rules, vocabulary and sentence structure. Another thing that is important is translation and much of the lesson time is devoted to translating sentences both from the L1 into the L2 and the other way around. In the Grammar-Translation Method, instructions and explanations are given in the L1 (Richards & Rodgers 2001:4) and the L1 is also maintained as a reference system when learning the new language (Stern 1983:455). As mentioned in the beginning of this section, the Grammar-Translation Method, or modifications of it, is widely used also today but often in an unconscious manner (Stern 1992:280).

Cognitive-Code Learning

Cognitive-Code Learning was a response to the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching and the Audiolingual Method. The aim of the Cognitive-Code Learning is for the learner to understand the grammatical rules of a language, to see how they are used and then to practise them in meaningful contexts. Grammar is important in Cognitive-Code Learning and it allows the use of the L1 as a reference system (Song & Andrews 2009:38).

Other teaching methods.

Cook mentions four additional teaching methods that also use the L1. These four methods are Alternating Language Approaches, The New Concurrent Method, Community Language Learning and Dodson’s Bilingual Method. These four methods all assume the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom to be something positive, but, according to Cook, they have never been very popular or used on a large scale (Cook 2008:183-184).
2.11 Teachers’ own thoughts and beliefs

Earlier research has shown that teachers’ own thoughts and beliefs are important for their choice of language in the classroom. Macaro, when investigating a number of modern language teachers’ use of the L1 and the L2, found that many teachers thought that to only use the L2 when teaching the L2 was something that was hard to do even with the most motivated classes. Some of the teachers stated that they often felt guilty when having to resort to the L1, but then found, after trying to teach the L2 through the L2 only that it was very difficult (Macaro 1997:82). In the study The L1 in L2 learning - teachers’ beliefs and practices by Song & Andrews (2009), the authors refer to the teachers’ attitudes towards using the L1 in the L2 classroom as either “anti-L1”, which represents the opinion that avoiding the L1 is the best thing for the students or “pro-L1”, which represents teachers who believe that using the L1 can be beneficial for the students. In their research, the authors found that different teachers had different opinions about using the L1 in the L2 classroom and belonged more or less either to the “anti-L1” view or the “pro-L1” view, but they also found that teachers could have different attitudes towards the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom depending on what they were teaching at the moment. For example, some teachers’ views on the use of the L1 in the L2 classroom were closely related to the students’ proficiency in the L2. They also found that some teachers did not reflect very much on their use of the L1 in the L2 classroom (Song & Andrews 2009: 64-65, 92-95, 98-99, 127-128, 131, 160-161, 164-165, 186-187).

3. Methods

The following section will describe with how the data used in this investigation were collected and who the informants were. Both observations and qualitative interviews were chosen as methods for my investigation. Six teachers from four different schools in a small town in Sweden, teaching students from grade 6 to grade 9 in English, were first observed in the classroom and then interviewed.

3.1. Participants

The participants in this study were, as mentioned above, six English teachers from four different secondary schools. The reasons why only teachers from secondary school participated in this study were partly because I had to limit my research and partly because
teachers working at the same level would be a good basis for comparison and discussion. To find teachers who wanted to participate, I contacted two headmasters at two different schools by e-mail. I described the topic of my study and asked them if they knew any teachers at their schools who would be interested in participating in my investigation. This request resulted in two teachers who were willing to participate in my investigation. The reason why I did not ask the teachers first was that I wanted the headmasters’ consent to conduct the interviews, since they would be performed during the teachers’ working hours. The third teacher who participated in this study was my former teacher trainee supervisor who I had been in contact with before. Another teacher was a colleague of one my friends and the two remaining teachers I contacted by e-mail after receiving e-mail addresses from one of the headmasters. Hence, the teachers who participated in this investigation were self-selected volunteers rather than being selected by me.

Four of the six teachers taught only in secondary school and also taught other subjects, such as French, music, German and Spanish. Two of the teachers also taught their subjects at upper secondary school. Five of the six teachers had Swedish as their mother tongue, whereas one of the teachers was a native American but had lived in Sweden for 22 years. Four of the teachers were women and two of the teachers were men.

3.2 Classroom observations
One of the methods in this investigation was classroom observation. The reason for choosing to do observations was that I wanted the teachers not only to give examples of situations when they tended to code-switch (in the interviews) but also through observing one of their lessons see when and if they actually code-switched. All six teachers were observed during one lesson which was between 40 and 50 minutes long. The group sizes during these lessons were between 14 and 26.

Before the observations were made, I constructed an observation scheme with different categories of situations in which teachers might code-switch. The chosen situations were based on the results of previous research, that is, situations where it has been shown that teachers tend to code-switch. To see if these categories were feasible I also chose to do a few pilot observations before my real investigation, which resulted in the deletion of some categories. The observation scheme that was used during the observation can be found in Appendix 1.
3.3 Interviews

The other main part of this investigation was the interviews with the six teachers. These were qualitative interviews that were made directly after the observations, a couple of hours later or another day. The reason why the interviews were made after the observations was that I did not want my questions, which dealt with the teachers’ code-switching habits, to influence the teachers’ code-switching behaviour in the classroom. At the beginning of the interview the teachers were asked if it was okay that the interview was recorded. I explained the reason for my study, that I was the only one who was going to listen to the recording and that it would be destroyed after my paper was finished. All respondents answered that it was okay and none of them seemed to feel, during the interview, uncomfortable that the interview was being recorded. The interviews were then transcribed and listened to several times. The questions that the teachers were asked dealt with their code-switching habits and opinions of code-switching in the classroom (see Appendix 2). The length of the interviews was about 20 to 40 minutes.

Also before my interviews I decided to do a pilot interview, both to see what associations and answers my questions would give and also to see how long the interview would take. The pilot interview resulted in the deletion of some of the questions; others were rephrased and some new questions were added.

The interviews were conducted in Swedish for the purpose of letting the teachers respond in their native language and, thereby, letting them express their thoughts as freely and comfortably as possible. The choice of language also gave me the opportunity to express my questions with the exact nuances I wanted. One of the respondents was native American and since English was her native language, she was asked if she wanted to do the interview in English instead, but also she chose to do it in Swedish.

3.4 Delimitations

During the observation, I chose to take notes and use my observation scheme instead of making recordings, since recordings would mean that I would have had to ask all the students for their parents’ permission, which probably would have been a hard and time-consuming undertaking. One disadvantage of not recording these observation is of course that it was
sometimes hard for me to be able to catch everything that happened during the lessons and that there was no possibility for me to go back and listen to what had been said, which is possible when an observation is recorded. Without recordings it is also not possible for a reader to double-check my data and see if they agree with my classifications, which also is a disadvantage. Another disadvantage with the observation and the observation scheme that I constructed was that it sometimes was hard for me to categorise all the instances when the teacher code-switched. In those cases I chose to take down what the teacher said so I could read and categorise it later. A third disadvantage was that the classifications of the instances when teachers code-switched were done by me and are therefore subjective.

4. Results

4.1. Classroom observations

In this section I will present the results of my classroom observations. The categories I used for my observations, based on Cook and Macaro (see section 2.3), as follows:

1. Task instructions: the teacher uses Swedish to explain what the students are going to do.
2. Grammar instructions: the teacher uses Swedish to talk about and explain grammar to students.
3. Help-switching: the teacher uses Swedish to explain certain phrases or words.
4. Disciplinary problems: the teacher uses Swedish to give a student/students reprimands.
5. Feedback/praise–the teacher uses Swedish to praise a student’s work or to give feedback.
6. Social reasons: the teacher uses Swedish to show emotions or to reduce the social distance to a student/students or to establish personal contact.
7. General school information: the teacher uses Swedish when talking about things that do not foremost concern English, such as up-coming school trips, school material or other general school information.
8. Time pressure: the teacher uses Swedish when he or she is time pressured to speed things up.

Table 1 below shows the total number of code-switching occasions and their category distribution.
Table 1. The total number of code-switching occasions for each category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of switches (108)</th>
<th>Task instructions</th>
<th>Grammar instructions</th>
<th>Help-switching</th>
<th>Disciplinary problems</th>
<th>Feedback/praise</th>
<th>Social reasons</th>
<th>General school information</th>
<th>Time pressure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In my observations I found that the most common situation when the teachers tended to code-switch was when they were help-switching, for instance, translating certain expressions, sentences or words into Swedish. The second most common situation was giving task instructions, closely followed by grammar instruction. Code-switching due to time pressure only occurred once. Help-switching was used by all teachers except one, and occurred in total 32 times during the lessons. Examples of this kind of code-switching can be seen below.

Teacher A: “*The aim of this, syftet alltså*”
[The aim of this, which means the aim]

Teacher B: “*Peacock, a påfågel*”
[Peacock, a peacock]

Teacher C: “*Accident- olycka va?*”
[Accident- accident]

Teacher D: “*Jag känner inte dig- I don’t know you*”
[I don’t know you- I don’t know you]

Teacher F: "*You know the difference between true and false, sant och falskt*”
[You know the difference between true and false, true and false]

Another common circumstance when the teachers tended to code-switch was when giving instructions about tasks that the students were going to perform or were working with. All teachers except one code-switched during the lessons I observed while giving instructions. In most cases, the teachers gave their instructions in English first and then repeated them in Swedish. Task instructions occurred in total 22 times during the observed lessons. Examples of switching when giving task instructions can be seen below.

Teacher B: “*Ni ska alltså spåna ihop situationer när dessa uttryck dyker upp*”
[Your are supposed to come up with situations where these expressions occur]

Teacher D: "*Så ska ni komma på den tredje repliken*”
[Then you should try to figure out the 3rd line]
Teacher E: “Ni svarar på frågan i boken”
[You answer the question in the book]

Teacher F: “Ja, du tar dom och så skriver du en mening för varje bild”
[Yes, you take them and write a sentence for each picture]

Teaching grammar was another code-switching situation; here it was common for the teachers to speak only Swedish during longer sections of the lesson dealing with grammar. Code-switching for grammar was used 19 times during the observed lessons.

Teacher A: “En kvinna heter ju woman, men om det är fler kvinnor heter det women”
[One woman is called woman, but if there are several women it is called women]

A fourth area when the teachers tended to code-switch involved giving reprimands and praise. Three out of the six teachers used Swedish when giving reprimands and maintaining order in the classroom. Code-switching for discipline was used 7 times during the observed lessons. Examples of the use of Swedish for maintaining order in the classroom can be seen below:

Teacher D: “Nej! Ni ska stänga där!”
[No! You should close that door]

Teacher E: “Kepsarna ska av”
[Take your caps off]

Teacher F: “Ni måste faktiskt ha med er pennor”
[You have to bring your pencils]

Maintaining order was, however, also done in English by two of the teachers.

Teacher E: “Put away your cell phone”

Teacher F: “Sit properly”

Three out of six teachers used code-switching when giving feedback or when praising students’ work. This was done 11 times in total and examples can be seen in the following sentences:

Teacher C: “Looks good, jättebra, perfect”
[Looks very good, very good, perfect]
Teacher F: “Ja men det funkar ju jättebra”
[Yes, this works very good]

Code-switching was also used when showing emotions or reducing social distance, such as joking with students, giving comfort or when trying to get students to work or cooperate. Code-switching for social reasons was used 12 times.

Teacher E: “Haha, men det kunde ju lika gärna ha stått Lars-Inger”
[Haha, but it could just as well have been Lars-Inger]

[Are you hurt? Come here and I’ll give you a plaster.]

Teacher D: “[Student’s name] du måste också försöka, ni ska ju ha betyg i detta”.
[You have to try too, you will get a grade in this]

As shown in Table 1, a few utterances concerned general school information, that is, information that cannot be categorised as task or grammar instructions, such as information about an upcoming test, when telling a student to go and get their working material and so on. Some of the utterances that I did put into this category were:

Teacher E: “Vill ni helst att jag läser uppsatserna, eller rättar proven till nästa vecka?”
[Would you like me to read your essays, or correct your tests until next week?]

Teacher D: “jaha, du menar papper”.
[Ok, you want paper.]

The last category that I used in my observation scheme was code-switching due to time pressure. In this category I only placed one utterance, and the reason for this was that it was very hard for me to know if and when the teachers’ choice for switching into Swedish was due to time pressure. The utterance that I did categorise as switching because of time pressure can be read below, and the situation where this switch took place was at the end of a lesson when the students were already on their way out.

Teacher F: “Är det någon nu som inte lämnat in sin uppsats?”
[Is there someone who hasn’t handed in their essay yet?]
Although code-switching occurred during all the lessons that I observed the six teachers had different ways of using it, which probably depended both on their personality and on what they were teaching at the moment. For instance, grammar was only taught in one of the lessons I observed. Situations in the classroom where each teacher tended to code-switch can be seen in Table 2 below. Note that this table does not say anything about how much English or Swedish was used in the classrooms but rather, how many times the teachers code-switched.

Table 2. The teachers’ code-switching during the observed lesson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Teacher C</th>
<th>Teacher D</th>
<th>Teacher E</th>
<th>Teacher F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task inst.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar inst.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-switching</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/praise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social reasons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General school info.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time pressure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (108)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher B, who was a native speaker of English, stands out both in terms of the lowest number of switches and the lowest number of categories (with the exception of help-switching). As mentioned above, the teachers’ code-switching habits probably depended on their different personalities as well as the content they were teaching when I observed. Teacher C, for example, was teaching grammar during the observed lesson and, accordingly, code-switched 11 times, while Teacher F was doing listening exercises and code-switched a lot when giving instructions.

Regarding differences in code-switching when addressing groups or individuals, the teachers tended to code-switch more when walking around in the classroom and talking to individual
students than when addressing the whole group. In Table 3 we can see how many of the code-switches were addressed to the whole group and how many of them were addressed to individuals, within the 8 categories of the observation scheme presented at the beginning of this section.

Table 3. Frequencies of code-switching the when addressing the whole group and individual students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Task instructions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grammar instructions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help-switching</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discipline</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback/praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotional reasons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. General school info.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Time pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, code-switching occurred most frequently when the teachers addressed individuals. The most common situations on the inter-personal level were situations of explanation and social or evaluative response.

4.2 Interviews

In this section I will present the results of the interviews with the six teachers. The main purpose of the interviews was to investigate the teachers’ own thoughts about code-switching and also to find out when they code-switched and their reasons for doing so. The teachers’ answers to my questions can be divided into two main areas: the teachers’ thoughts about their own code-switching habits and the teachers’ opinions about code-switching and use of Swedish.

4.2.1 Teachers’ own thoughts about their code-switching habits.

Some of the questions in the interviews dealt with the teachers’ own thoughts about their code-switching habits (see Appendix 2), and in the section below I will give an account of the situations where the teachers mentioned that they code-switched and their reasons for it.
4.2.1.1 Teaching Grammar

All of the six teachers said that code-switching was something that they used in their teaching and the situation that very often came up first as an example of situations in which they tended to code-switch was when teaching grammar (5 out of 6 teachers). The main reason for this was that they felt that the grammar part was too complicated to teach in English and that doing it in English would mean that too many of the students would lose their concentration or have trouble understanding. Four of the teachers said that they always used Swedish when they explained grammar. Teacher A put it like this:

1. “If it is grammar I usually do it in Swedish or else they won’t get it”

Teacher E argued along similar lines:

2. “Besides they think grammar is hard and then there are two hard parts, partly to understand what I’m saying, but also to understand what I’m saying about such a hard subject, and then I actually think it is totally okay to use Swedish and I think that most teachers also probably do”.

Teacher F said:

3. “When teaching grammar for example, it is partly another language, maybe we have to make sure that everyone knows what the present form is, what the past tense is if we are talking about verbs. And then I can’t, I can’t keep speaking English because then there are so many who don’t know and don’t have the energy to sit and listen.”

Teacher C also uses Swedish when teaching grammar since he feels that he really wants the students to understand. Teacher C also said that he had tried to teach grammar in English but that he felt that teaching it in Swedish would facilitate the students’ understanding. He also mentioned that he thought that some of the nuances disappeared when using English and that he therefore used Swedish when he really wanted the students to understand.

4. “When we are going through grammar, then I switch to Swedish. Because then I really want them to understand, I want them to understand all the nuances and that they then maybe dare to ask, why is it like that or why is it called like that, and then I feel, I have tried to, you get more... I feel that I reach the students better in regard to strictly grammatical things”
Teacher D was the only teacher who did not mention grammar at all as a situation calling for code-switching and Teacher B stated that she sometimes used Swedish when teaching grammar.

Although teaching grammar was the situation that first came to mind for most of my respondents, it was not the most common situation for code-switching found during my observations. Both help-switching (used 32 times altogether) and task instructions (used 22 times) were used more times during the observations than code-switching for explaining grammar, which was used 19 times. One reason for this is that only three of the teachers were explicitly teaching grammar during the lessons that I observed. But also the fact that code-switching when teaching grammar often meant that the teachers switched from English to Swedish and continued to teach only in Swedish for a longer period of time during the lesson (which results in fewer instances of code-switching than if a teacher used a lot English and only help-switched, for example) could be a reason why I found more examples of help-switching and switching when giving task instructions than code-switching for grammar instructions. The teachers were, as can be seen above, often very aware of their code-switching habits when teaching grammar, which can also be seen in one of the utterances by Teacher C when he introduced the grammar part of the lesson by saying:

Teacher C: "We can take this in Swedish so we get the meaning of it"

4.2.1.2 Code-switching for understanding

One situation of code-switching that the teachers mentioned was code-switching to make sure that the students understood.

Teacher A states that she uses Swedish sometimes when giving instructions given in English. Teacher E says that she uses Swedish when giving instructions that she really wants the students to understand, as can be seen in following quote:

5. “Maybe when I go through what the students are supposed to read up on before a test, then you don’t want that information to be misunderstood because of communication problems.”

However, she also stated that she uses both Swedish and English when giving other instructions to make as many students as possible understand. Teacher C said that he uses
Swedish as a last resort when explaining words if the students do not understand after trying to explain it to them in several different ways. Teacher F says that the use of Swedish has to do with what the group she is teaching is like. The fact that students sometimes have a very hard time to concentrating makes her feel that she sometimes has to give the information in Swedish:

7. “...almost every lesson after I have told them what to do I have people that still say, what are we supposed to do and then I often feel that I have been clear enough, maybe I have first said it in English and then in Swedish and still there are people who ask.”

Making sure that the students understand seems to be very important for all of the teachers.

4.2.1.3 Code-switching for social reasons

To make the input as comprehensible as possible for the students was something that seemed important also for Teachers B, D and F, but these teachers also mentioned that they code-switch and use Swedish because of the social environment in the classroom. I have chosen to categorise the answers below as code-switching for social reasons. It should, however, be noted that also some of these examples also could belong to other categorise, such as code-switching for understanding.

Teacher D felt that using Swedish could help him make better contact with the weaker students and stated that he often speaks Swedish with the aim to make them start working.

6. “What you really want is to only speak English, but I have noticed especially if you have weak students, those who are not that talented, they just stop listening when I talk English. So we never get started, and then I sort of have to help them...you get a little bit closer to some students by speaking a little bit Swedish sometimes”

Also, Teacher B mentions that social factors can be reasons for her code-switching and mentions that she has a student who is very insecure and has social problems in the classroom, which makes Teacher B often give that specific student instructions in Swedish.

In answer to the question if they felt that there were any specific situations when English was not possible to use, Teachers C, E and F mentioned that they also code-switch in situations
when they had to step out of the English teacher role and into the role of an ordinary teacher, mentor or just an adult person because the focus was not on the subject being taught but on social factors in the classroom. Situations mentioned in this context were disciplinary situations. This is evident in Teacher C’s reasoning below:

8. “Yes well it could maybe be in disciplinary situations in a classroom when something happens... because then I don’t think that it has to do with the lesson, then it is a totally different matter. Then it might have to do with my role as a mentor or teacher responsible for the class as the form-master. I mean, then I leave the English teacher role and I have more of an adult role to the students and then I don’t think that it would feel very natural because it does not have to do with the lesson or English”.

Teacher E also reasons along the same lines and says that she speaks Swedish in situations that do not have to do with the subject or her role as English teacher.

9. “Yes if something should happen, and now I’m not talking about the subject but if something should happen, as for example if I have my own class who I’m mentor for and this or that happens that doesn’t have to do with the subject, something more serious that I have to deal with during the English lesson, then I speak Swedish.”

Teacher F states that she would not use English when giving reprimands. She does not, however, refer to the different social roles mentioned above, but rather to her lack of ability in actually giving reprimands in English since she states that she does not know the right words for doing it. Teacher F and Teacher D state that they sometimes use Swedish when they want to reduce the social distance between themselves and the students. Teacher D mentions that he feels that Swedish brings him closer to some students and Teacher F that Swedish feels more real and honest to use in some situations instead of English. Teacher F:

10. “It becomes more heart to heart somehow. It is important that there is not some sort of wall between us, the student must feel that he or she.... Or maybe, I must feel that they understand what I’m saying and what I mean so there is no misunderstanding.”

None of the other teachers stated that they were using code-switching to reduce social distance or to get closer to students. Teacher C stated that he might do it but that it was
nothing that he was aware of or did consciously. In my observations I found for all teachers, except Teacher A and Teacher B, reasons for using L1 which I categorised as reducing social distance.

4.2.1.4 Time pressure and teachers’ tiredness or frustration as reasons for code-switching

Three of the six teachers mentioned that time pressure can be a reason for their code-switching. Teacher D often feels that the lessons are short and that he wants the students to start working as soon as possible, which sometimes makes him use Swedish instead of English. Also Teacher A admits that time pressure affects her choice of language and that she sometimes, when she has several students talking with her at the same time, uses Swedish to answer questions fast.

Teacher F says that time pressure is something that affects her very much and that the students listen better if she uses Swedish:

11. “Yes time pressure is without doubt the thing that most often is the reason for using Swedish... yes because it is our mother tongue we imagine that the students listen better and understand more.”

Teacher E states that time pressure could possibly be something that affects her in her choice of language. Teacher C states that time pressure is not a factor that affects him in his choice of language as can be seen in the following quote:

12. “I never choose not to speak English because of time pressure, but I’m not a very time pressured teacher, I try to see some sort of totality, I mean the world doesn’t go under only because you missed that part of the text, you have perhaps done something that is worth more.”

Teacher F mentions one reason for code-switching that can be categorised as code-switching because of tiredness and frustration. These situations occur when she has classes that have a very hard time concentrating and she feels that using Swedish might help them to at least listen. She also mentions the students’ attitudes as a factor that affects her in her choice of language.
Teacher D also states that the amount of English that he uses has to do with his energy and the shape he is in but that also the content taught during the lesson affects him in his choice of language.

14. “It is a question about energy... but sometimes you are, I feel, but it also depends on what we are doing.”

4.3 The teachers’ opinions about code-switching

The teachers all said that their teaching goal was to use as much English as possible and that it was very important for an English teacher to speak English as much as possible during the English lessons. In response to the question to what degree they thought it possible to keep to English during the lessons, five of the teachers stated that they felt that it was practicable to maintain English during the lessons, but some of them also stated that there could be several factors affecting the possibility of speaking English during the whole lesson. One of these factors mentioned by Teacher A is the sharing of the same first language as their students which makes it easy to switch to Swedish without being aware of it, since Swedish is the most natural language to use for both the teacher and the students.

15. “You have to be aware of it as a teacher, because is so easy to forget and give a little too much help in Swedish. You have to be very aware of that. Some things take much less time if you say it in Swedish... “

Teacher F also points to the fact that there is a clear risk in using Swedish because it is the language that she and the students share and can communicate in at ease, which makes her forget to answer questions in English.
Teacher B and Teacher E think that it is possible to use English a lot during the lessons but that the teacher’s own proficiency level is a factor that can affect the aim of maintaining English in the classroom. As Teacher E puts it:

16. “But then it has to do with how used you are to it and how fluent so to speak, how, how confident you are sort of.”

Teacher C suggests that it has to do with making the students used to hearing English and able to understand instructions in English, while Teacher F states that it has to do with the content of the lesson.

The advantages of using the L1 in the L2 teaching were, according to the teachers, mostly that it could help the students understand. In this regard all teachers but one, once again, gave grammar as an example of a situation when using Swedish could be beneficial for the students’ language learning. Teacher D also mentioned that it could be useful to use Swedish when working with difficult language examples to make sure that everyone had understood them and was able to discuss them, but otherwise the teachers mostly thought that code-switching into Swedish had disadvantages. One disadvantage mentioned was, for example, that the use of Swedish could confuse the students since it is important for students who are learning a language to really get into the language, which they do not do if the teacher keeps switching between the two (Teacher B), while Teachers C, D and F thought that the major disadvantage was that the students would not get as much input of the English language as possible. Teacher E seemed to think that she only switched languages when teaching grammar and could not therefore see any disadvantage with changing languages in the classroom, since it would then only benefit the students.

4.3.1 The teachers’ awareness of their own code-switching

All teachers said that their code-switching was improvised rather than planned. Teachers A, C, D and F said that it depended very much on the different situations, and that they code-switched if they felt that the situation required it. The only code-switching situation they were very aware of and actually planned was teaching grammar.

Although all of the teachers in the interviews seemed to think that they knew when they tended to code-switch, most of them actually code-switched in more situations during the
observations than they mentioned in the interviews. The reason for this can partly be that the teachers’ code-switching mostly was, as mentioned above, improvised and as some of the teachers said, very dependent on the situation. Using English was the common goal, but at least two out of the six teachers mentioned that the important thing for them as teachers was not to speak English at any cost or on principle but to make sure that the students understood. This suggests that the teachers’ willingness to provide comprehensible information is an important reason for code-switching and that teachers’ ability to adapt to different situations in the classroom is important to them.

4.3.2 Code-switching and feelings of guilt

The belief in the appropriateness of avoiding Swedish seems to colour some of the teachers’ opinions about code-switching and at least two of the teachers indicated that they feel like it is a failing to use when using Swedish instead of English. Teacher D mentions that he feels bad when he is using Swedish:

17. “I think it is bad that I’m standing there talking Swedish, I always think it is. I don’t have any problem speaking English.”

Teacher F does not state that she is failure when using Swedish in her teaching, but during the interview, after having mentioned situations in which she uses Swedish, she stated that this is probably not the right way to do it and also started to discuss if she should change her ways and try to have a whole lesson without using Swedish at all.

Teacher C, on the other hand, does not see his use of Swedish as a failure. He tries to use English as much as possible but also believes that comparing the languages can be helpful for the students when acquiring English. His reasoning can be seen in the sentences below.

18. “I think that using English can in fact facilitate sometimes, when you point out similarities and opposites...because somewhere you want them to understand what you mean and then I don’t think that my prestige rests on only having used 5 Swedish words...you have the duty to meet them too...on the other hand I think it’s important to try to teach them to feel that English is the language that we are working with. But it’s not like I’m yelling at them if they use a Swedish word.”
Also Teacher E states that it is more important that the students understand than that she at any price speaks English, which can be seen in the quotation below:

19. “If someone really doesn’t understand anything then it’s my duty to make that person understand so he or she can progress from that point, not for me at any price to speak English, then it’s more important that I stop and explain more carefully in Swedish to make sure that the student understand so he or she can, okay I understand and continue in English.”

4.3.4 Code-switching and methods
My last question to the teachers was if they, with code-switching and their attitudes towards it in mind, were inspired by any pedagogical theory or method. To this question Teachers A, B and C answered that they did not work according to any special method, but that their methods were the result of years of practice and experience. For Teacher C, the most important thing was to find the teaching methods that best suited each individual teacher, while Teacher A said that she drew on her own experience and had picked things she thought were useful from different people and methods. Teachers D, E and F mentioned some methods that they were inspired by. Teacher D, for example, mentioned the “top bottom method”, Teacher E mentioned “learning by doing”, and Teacher F had recently read a book by Vygotskij and thought that it is important to use all of the different senses when learning something and to give students the opportunity to learn in different ways.

5. Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate when six teachers code-switch, their opinions about it and reasons for it. The results cannot be seen as representing the general views on code-switching among all teachers of English in Swedish secondary schools but rather reflect practice at the individual level.

5.1 When do the teachers code-switch?
This study shows that code-switching is something that is used by all teachers in the investigation and that code-switching is used in several different ways. Five out of six
teachers (see Table 2) used code-switching in at least three different ways (see the different categories in section 2.3) during the lessons I observed. The most common situation was when the teachers were help-switching, followed by task and grammar instructions. One teacher acted a little bit differently from the other and only used one type of code-switching during the lesson I observed. The five teachers that used code-switching in three or more ways were all native speakers of Swedish while the one teacher that only used code-switching when help-switching was a native American. The fact that the Swedish teachers code-switched more than the native American teacher can be explained by Cook’s (2008) observation that code-switching is a very common and natural occurrence in situations where the teacher and the students share the same mother tongue. Using the L1 in the L2 classroom is common and sometimes hard to avoid, since the L2 classroom, according to Cook, often can be seen as a ‘pretence situation’. This is also something that can be seen in some of the teachers’ comments in the interviews, where at least three of the six teachers mention that it is easy to give the students too much help in Swedish, since it is the language they share, and that sometimes, when students address them in Swedish, they forget to speak English and answer in Swedish instead.

The different categories of code-switching that I used during my observations can be divided into two main areas: code-switching that has to do with instruction and understanding (grammar instructions, task instructions, and help-switching) and code-switching that has to do with the social environment in the classroom (discipline, giving feedback/praise and code-switching for social reasons). The remaining categories can be seen as a third smaller area, which I choose to call other information (which includes general school information and time pressure.)

The division between code-switching for understanding and code-switching for social reasons can also be tied to the different roles that a teacher has in the classroom. The English teacher is not only a teacher in the subject he or she is teaching, but also has a role of a mentor, the one responsible for the class or of adult person in relation to the students. Since the teachers worked on the assumption that speaking English as much as possible was a desirable goal for language acquisition but felt that interaction at the personal level was more effective in the shared mother tongue, the roles conflicted and this is reflected in the teachers’ code-switching practice. When they code-switch for understanding, the code-switching is tightly tied to the teaching and the role as an English teacher, whereas the teachers’ code-switching for
discipline, feedback, praise or showing emotions in many cases is done in the role as the mentor, the teacher responsible for the class or as the adult in the room. That teachers have different roles is also explicitly expressed by especially one teacher, who states that he does not use English in situations where he feels that he is not foremost an English teacher. Examples of such situations can be when something has happened outside the classroom that he has to deal with during the English lesson, since he, in those situations, thinks that he is more in the role as a mentor, an adult person or sometimes just a social human being.

The code-switching that the teachers seemed to be most aware of was in situations when they were teaching grammar or giving instructions, which are situations that are tied to teaching the subject and also code-switching that belongs to the ‘English teacher role’. Code-switching in situations that dealt with discipline, feedback or praise, were situations that few of the teachers mentioned in the interviews as situations for code-switching, though they still occurred during the lessons observed. The reasons why the teachers did not mention these occasions can be several. One reason could be that this kind of code-switching did not occur as many times as the code-switching that was connected to understanding. A second reason could be that this kind of code-switching is improvised and that the teachers in most of these cases were not aware of switching. A third reason could be that code-switching for social reasons is not acknowledged by the teachers since these were performed in their roles as ‘ordinary teachers’ or adults rather than in their role as English teachers.

As can be seen in the result chapter, all teachers claimed that their code-switching in most of the cases was improvised and that it was something that was tied to the situation. The fact that it was improvised is something that also can be seen in their teaching which, in comparison to the interviews, often contained switches for other reasons than they were aware of. That code-switching can be done both on a conscious and an unconscious level (Cook 2001b) can also be the reason why the teachers mentioned fewer code-switching situations than they experienced in reality, since they simply were not aware of the fact that they were code-switching.

The students’ understanding seemed to be something that was very important for all of the teachers, since the main reason they gave for their code-switching was that they wanted to provide as comprehensible input for their students as possible. This concern for weak students is an influential factor in the teachers’ code-switching. Other reasons mentioned by some
teachers were the need to get the students started on a task or when teachers felt that the students were not listening. In such cases, the teachers felt that the students took it more seriously or understood better if they talked Swedish instead of English, which supports one of the claims made by Cook (2008) that the first language is often used in situations when the teacher feels that the L1 would be more real or serious. Also tiredness, stress and time pressure were mentioned by some teachers as reasons for code-switching, which are reasons also shown in Macaro’s (1997) investigation.

During the observations the teachers tended to code-switch more times when addressing individuals than when addressing the whole group. The reason for this could be that they were helping students with instructions or the meaning of lexical items, which then has to do with the teachers’ willingness to help the students to understand. But it could also point to another reason for code-switching mentioned by Cook (2008), which is code-switching for reducing social distance or establishing personal contact, since using the L1 is often perceived as more sincere than using the L2.

My impression of the lessons I observed was that the amount of English and Swedish that was used depended a lot on the teacher, his or her personality and also on the kind of environment the teacher had been able to create in the classroom. During my observations I experienced that there were especially two teachers that managed to use a lot of English in their teaching and who had also created an environment in the classroom where the students spoke a lot of English. The first of these teachers was Teacher B, the native American, who code-switched the fewest times of all teachers and only used help-switching. The second teacher was Teacher C who actually was the one who code-switched the most times of all the six teachers. That the teachers who code-switched the most and the least times had the students who (in my experience) spoke the most English is of course very interesting. One important point that could be made is that the amount of code-switching does not reflect the amount of Swedish spoken in the classroom and that the focus for language teaching perhaps should not be on avoiding or using code-switching but on how and for what purposes the L1 could be used in the L2 teaching. I experienced that some of the teachers that code-switched fewer times spoke more Swedish than some who code-switched a lot, which probably had to do with the fact that they, once they code-switched, stayed in the L1 for a longer period time. The code-switching that Teacher B used a lot was for example help-switching, which was translating and conveying meaning only for certain words, while Teacher C used code-switching for
explaining grammar but also for giving praise and encouraging students and maybe also for creating a positive feeling in the classroom. For some of the other teachers who used more Swedish in their teaching, their beliefs and probably experiences were as well affected them in their choice of language; they felt that they had to use Swedish because some students actually lost concentration and sometimes gave up if they did not understand.

5.2 The teachers’ opinions about code-switching

The goal mentioned for all of the teachers was that they wanted to keep to English as much as possible during the lessons, but stated at the same time that they used code-switching in their teaching and that Swedish, in some situations, was more beneficial to use than English. These situations dealt with understanding and were first and foremost situations when teaching grammar, explaining words or when giving instructions. On the one hand, the teacher wants most of the instructions and the conversations to be in English in the belief that the more the students hear English the better it is for their language development; on the other, the teacher feels that it is important that the students understand, which in many situations makes them use Swedish instead. The conflict between these two factors is something that all teachers have to deal with, and the teachers that I interviewed seemed to have different ways of dealing with it. Some of them felt that they had to use Swedish to a high degree when teaching weak students, to make sure that they understood and did not lose their concentration. These teachers did indeed use Swedish frequently in their teaching. Others spoke a lot of English during the lessons and claimed that the students must be trained in hearing English. These teachers had, accordingly, established an environment in the classroom where English was used by both teachers and students.

Placing the teachers in my study in either of the categories ‘L1 should not be used’ or ‘L1 could be used’ presented in my background section, is difficult since the teachers seem to be somewhere in between. No one stated that the first language should be completely avoided, but at the same time it was taken for granted that using English as much as possible is a desirable goal. In some situations Swedish was perceived as having a pedagogical value, while in other situations it was perceived as an obstacle since the first language often was too easy for both the students and teachers to resort to. When analysing the teachers’ opinions according to Macaro’s positions (Macaro 2001), mentioned in section 2.6, most of the teachers seem to belong more or less to The Optimal position, where the L1 is perceived as having some pedagogical value, and actually can facilitate some of the aspects of learning the
L2. The unexamined assumption that English should be used as much as possible was reflected in the fact that at least one teacher explicitly stated that he felt guilty whenever he spoke Swedish instead of English. Three of the teachers did not seem to think that their opinions were based on any certain method or theory but that their use of code-switching and opinions about it came from years of experience. The other three teachers also mentioned methods but did not really seem to follow them. Instead, they claimed that their code-switching habits depended upon the actual situations that occurred in the classroom.

6. Conclusion
The results of this study show that the most common code-switching occasion among the teachers I observed had to do with understanding, such as help-switching, task instructions and teaching grammar. However, code-switching was also sometimes done for social reasons such as maintaining the order in the classroom or reducing social distance between students and the teacher.

The study also reveals that the teachers are not always aware of their own code-switching and that code-switching (when not dealing with grammar, help-switching or instructions) was often done on an unconscious level. This also can be seen when comparing the results of the observations and the answers that the teachers gave in their interviews, where the teacher mentioned fewer instances for code-switching than I observed during their lessons.

That English should be used as much as possible in the classroom was taken for granted by all teachers, but they also stated that there where situations, such as when teaching grammar, where using Swedish had a pedagogical value. Further, the teachers stated that there could be several factors that affected them in their choice of language. One of the most important factors mentioned was the students’ understanding, also other factors like time pressure or situations that did not have to do with the subject were also mentioned.

The area of code-switching among teachers could very well be studied further. The conflict between speaking as much English as possible and making sure that the students understand is an important area and it would be interesting to investigate what methods teachers have when dealing with this issue. It would also be interesting to investigate if there are any differences both in code-switching habits and in opinions about code-switching among teachers teaching
in different age groups, and not least, how the students, especially the weak ones, perceive the issue.

My survey of previous research pointed to a lack of consensus in the field regarding the effectiveness of avoiding or employing L1 in L2 teaching and learning. My study shows that this ambiguity is a reality in the classrooms observed. Teachers are torn between conflicting roles—professional and personal, between conflicting goals—speaking English and supporting weak students, between conflicting pedagogical interests—providing exposure to English and avoiding alienating weak students. In the last analysis, it would seem that the key factor to successful English-speaking practice in Swedish classroom lies with more knowledge about student needs, their capacities and methods to overcome resistance to partake in decoding English communication and to normalise the artificial ‘pretended monolingual L2 situation’.
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### Appendix 1

**Observation scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help-switching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback/Praise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional reasons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General school information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Interview questions

Background questions: (How old are you?) (For how long have you been working as a teacher?)


2. Använder du dig av språkväxling mellan engelska och svenska i din undervisning? [Do you code-switch between English and Swedish in your teaching?]

3. Om detta är fallet när växlar du i så fall språk? Och vilka anledningar finns till att du växlar språk? [If this is the case, when do you code-switch? And what are your reasons for your code-switching?]

4. Om du använder dig av språkväxling skulle du säga att den är planerad eller improviserad? [If you use code-switching would you say that it is planned or improvised?]

5. Lektionen, som jag har observerat, skulle du säga att den ur språkväxlingssynpunkt var en normal lektion, eller brukar du språkväxla mer eller mindre? [The lesson, which I observed, would you say that from a code-switching point of view it was a normal lesson, or do you usually code-switch more or less?]

6. Hur viktigt anser du det är för läraren att hålla sig till engelska så mycket som möjligt under lektionen? [How important do you think it is for the teacher to stick to English as much as possible during the lessons?]

7. Hur möjligt anser du att det är för läraren att prata engelska så mycket som möjligt i klassrummet? [How realistic do you think it is, for the teacher to stick to English as much as possible during the lessons?]
8. Finns det några specifika situationer när du anser att det inte går att använda engelska? [Are there any specific situations when you think that it is not possible to use English?]

9. Känner du att ditt val av språk påverkar elevernas val av språk? [Do you feel that your choice of language affect the students’ choice of language?]

10. Påverkar dina elevers språkfärdighet ditt val av språk i undervisningen? [Do the learners’ proficiency level affect your choice of language in the classroom?]

11. Anser du att det finns fördelar med att byta språk till svenska i undervisningen och i så fall varför? [Do you think there are advantages to changing the language to Swedish in your teaching and if that is the case, why?]

12. Anser du att det finns det nackdelar med att byta språk i klassrummet och i så fall varför? [Do you think there are disadvantages to changing language to Swedish in your teaching, and if that is the case why?]

13. Skulle du säga att svenskan står i vägen för eller underlättar för elevernas engelska inlärning? [Would you say that Swedish stands in the way of or facilitates the students’ acquisition of English?]

14. När jag har läst om språkväxling så har jag hittat exempel på flera tillfällen när lärare tenderar att byta språk, så jag skulle bara vilja berätta för dig vilka exempel jag har funnit och så kan du berätta för mig om det är någon av dessa tillfällen som du känner igen. [When I have read about code-switching I have found examples of a lot of different situations when teachers tend to code-switch so I would just like to tell you these examples and then you can tell me if there are any of these occasions that you recognise.]

15. Om man tänker på språkväxling, dina åsikter om det och hur du använder det, skulle du säga att den är baserad på någon speciell pedagogisk metod? [If one thinks about... ]
your code-switching and your opinions about it and how you use it, would you say that it is based on any special pedagogical method?]
Appendix 3

1. "Jag brukar göra så att är det grammatik så tar jag det på svenska annars får dom inte med det."

2. "Dessutom tycker dom grammatik är svårt och då blir det ju två svåra moment, dels förstå vad jag säger men också förstå vad jag säger om en sånt svårt ämne, så där tycker jag faktiskt att det bör vara helt okej att använda svenska och jag tror nog att dom flesta gör det också”

3. "i grammatikgenomgångar till exempel så är det dels ett annorlunda språk, vi måste göra klart kanske vad presens är, vad imperfekt är om vi nu pratar om verb. Och då kan jag inte, jag kan inte hålla på att prata engelska då för då är det så pass många som inte vet och som inte orkar lyssna helt enkelt”

4. "när vi går igenom rena grammatiksaker, då går jag över till svenska. För där tycker jag, där vill jag att dom verkligen ska förstå, alltså då vill jag att dom ska förstå nyanserna och att dom då kanske vågar fråga varför blir det sådär fortfarande heter det så, och då känner jag, det har jag testat asså man får mer. jag känner att jag når fram mer just när det gäller rena grammatiksaker.”

5. “När jag går igenom kanske vad dom ska läsa på inför prov och så, så vill man ju inte heller att det ska missförstås på grund av språkkonflikter”

6. ”man vill ju egentligen bara prata engelska, men jag märker att det är, framförallt om det är svaga elever, dom som inte riktigt är så duktiga, dom stänger av, när jag pratar engelska. Så att då kommer vi aldrig igång och såhär, så att jag måste liksom hjälpa dom på traven...man kommer lite närmare en del elever genom att prata lite svenska ibland.”

7. "...nästan varje lektion efter en genomgång så har jag folk som säger, vad ska vi göra och då tycker jag att jag har varit tydlig, jag kanske både har pratat först på engelska och sen på svenska och ändå finns det folk som frågar”.

8. "Ja asså det skulle kanske kunna vara i disciplinära situationer i ett klassrum när det händer något...för då tycker ju liksom inte jag att det har med lektionen att göra riktigt utan då är det ju liksom en helt annan sak. Då kanske det är min roll som mentor eller klassföreståndare. Jag menar då få mer att verkligen känn tid på och sätta på att prata liksom att det känns inte så naturligt asså då har det ju inte med lektionen eller engelska att göra”.

9. "Ja det är om det skulle hända något liksom, nu pratar inte jag om ämnet då men om det skulle hända något liksom till exempel, om jag har min klass till exempel, som jag är mentor för och det och det dyker upp något annat som inte har med ämnet att göra av allvarligare art till exempel som jag måste ta itu med direkt på engelska lektionen då pratar jag ju svenska.”

10. "Det blir lite mera förtroligt på nått vis. Det får ju liksom inte bli vad ska vi säga en sorts vägg emellan oss heller utan att eleven måste känna att han eller hon... eller jag
måste kanske känna att dom förstår vad jag säger och vad jag menar så att det inte blir nått missförstånd där”.

11. "Ja tidspress är väl utan tvetecken den som är oftast anledningen till att man tar det på svenska... ja eftersom vi har det som vårt modersmål så inbillar man väl sig då att det går in bättre på svenska”.

12. "Jag väljer aldrig bort engelska för liksom tidspress, men jag är ju inte en sån där tidspressad lärare, asså jag försöker se en slags helhet, jag menar världen går inte under för att man har missat det där stycket, kanske man har gjort något annat som är värt mer”.

13. "...känner jag att dom lyssnar, vi säger att har jag en sån situation där det är tyst så och jag känner att dom lyssnar och jag har dom med mig, då känner jag också att jag får lusten att prata. men är det stöktigt så blir jag själv frustrerad.”

14. “Det är lite en fråga om ork... Men ibland är man, känner jag mig , fast det beror lite på vad man ska göra också.”

15. “Man måste vara medveten om det som lärare för att det är så lätt att man ramlar dit och ger lite för mycket hjälp på svenska. Det måste man vara väldigt medveten om. Vissa saker det gör ju fortare att ta det på svenska ”.

16. “Men sen är det ju olika hur van man är och hur fluent så att säga hur man, hur själv...självsäker man är själv liksom”.

17. "Jag tycker ju det är misslyckat att jag står där och pratar svenska, jag tycker att hela tiden att det är det. Jag har liksom inga problem med att prata engelska.”

18. “Jag kan tänka att det snarare kan underlätta ibland, att man kan peka på likheter och motsatser... för nånstans vill man ju ändå att dom liksom ska förstå vad man menar och då tycker inte jag liksom att prestigen ligger inte till mig i att nu har jag använt 5 svenska ord... man har ju en skyldighet att möta dom också...däremot tycker jag att man försöker skola dom i att känna att engelska är språket som vi ska jobba med och att.. men det är ju inte så att jag står och skäller på någon som räkar säga ett svenskt ord.”

19. “...om någon verkligligen inte förstår någonting då, då är ju mitt mål att den ska förstår så att den ska komma vidare därifrån, inte att jag ska till vilket pris som helst prata engelska, utan då , då är det ju viktigare att jag bryter och förklarar kanske lite mer noggrant på svenska för att se att jag har med mig eleven så att den kan, jaha men då förstår jag och så går vi vidare på engelska”