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Abstract

Even though English should mainly be used in the EFL-classroom according to the Swedish national curriculum, some recent scholars have argued that a judicious use of the students’ L1 by the teachers in some particular situations may benefit the learning environment there. From this context, this thesis examines what research says about in what particular situations the L1 is used by teachers in upper secondary EFL-classrooms as well as the teachers’ and the students’ attitudes towards this practice. The method used was a systematic literature review, where seven articles from all across the globe were analyzed, compared and synthesized. The results show that the L1 was mainly used by the teachers when managing discipline, when explaining grammar and when teaching vocabulary. However, the articles did not conclude how the L1 could be used strategically by the teachers. Concerning the teachers’ and students’ attitudes, the majority of these were positive towards L1 use by the teacher in the above mentioned situations. However, the teachers were not aware of how the L1 could be used by them in a judicious and a strategic way. Lastly, it can be concluded that more research is needed on how the L1 can be used more strategically by the teachers as well as on the students’ perspective on this.
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1. Introduction

Many English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers around the world tend to think that English is the only language that should be used in the EFL-classroom. Cook (2001, p.403-404) points out that this is because they believe that the use of the L1 here would be harmful for the students’ development in English. This discourse among teachers is also evident in the Swedish upper secondary school today. I experienced this the first time I taught English in this context as some fellow teachers criticized me when I used Swedish when explaining grammar to my students. As they did this, some questions arose inside of me. Should only English be used in the EFL-classroom? Or can the students’ L1 (in this case Swedish) help them to enhance their competence in the English language as well?

The syllabus for English in the Swedish upper-secondary school (Lgy11, p.53) says that the English language should be used to the maximum in the classroom. This claim is also backed up by a number of researchers (Cook, 2001, p.405; Turnbull, 2001, p.535; Voicu, 2012, p.214) who all point out that this should be the case as well. Nevertheless, Cook (2001, p.410, 414-419) and Voicu (2012, p.214-215) also claim that the teacher’s use of the students’ L1 in the EFL-classroom, in some particular situations, can be beneficial for the students’ language development. In relation to this, Creese and Blackledge (2010, p.108-109) argue that the use of both the L1 and the L2 by the teacher can have different functions in the language classroom. As all these claims highlight the question as to whether English is the only language that should be used in the EFL-classroom, it is clear that this matter is of great academic interest.

As a number of scholars have already investigated what functions the teacher’s use of the students’ L1 can have in the EFL, or language classroom, in general, it is interesting to know what recent research says about this in the upper secondary EFL-classroom in particular. By examining seven articles from all across the world, this thesis will investigate how the L1\(^1\) can be used by the teacher in the EFL-classroom and what attitudes the teachers and the students have towards this in the particular situations in which the L1 was used.

1.1 Aim

The aim of this thesis is to examine what research says about what role teachers’ use of the L1 has in upper secondary EFL-classrooms and what attitudes teachers’ and students’ have towards...
teachers’ use of this language in this context. The aim is specified by the following research questions:

- In what particular situations is the L1 used by teachers in EFL-classrooms?
- What are teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the teachers’ use of the L1 in these particular situations?

2. Background

In this section, some of the key terms in this thesis are introduced. These are all relevant as they deal with the practice of alternation between two languages. Hence, it is of great importance to define and to achieve a proper understanding of these terms.

2.1 Code-switching

Gumperz (1982, p.59) defines code-switching as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems”. Hence, this may include when a speaker utters one sentence in one language in order to then say another sentence in another language. Garcia (2009, p.49) here points out that code-switching is limited to one speech act and one specific context in which this takes place. In this sense, she explains that the term is very narrow when talking about alternation between two languages.

2.2 Code choice

According to Levine (2011, p.3-4), the term code choice is synonymous with code-switching as the speaker here switches between two languages in one given situation. However, he (2011, p.4) points out that the terms differ in that in code choice the speaker, as the word indicates, has made an active choice what code (or language) that is to be used. This is not the case in code-switching, where the speaker unintentionally switches between two languages.

2.3 Translanguaging

According to García (2009) translanguaging deals with the language practices by bilinguals in different contexts. She defines the term as “multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds” (2009, p.45). Furthermore, García (2009, p.45) explains that the term, in this sense, “goes beyond what has been termed code-switching,

2 Skutnabb-Kangas (1981, p.70) defines a bilingual person as both one who has “learned to speak more than one language as a child” and one who can simply “speak more than one language”. In this respect, the term bilingual can be applied to all language learners.
although it includes it, as well as other kinds of bilingual language use and bilingual contact”.

Hence, translanguaging is a much broader term than code-switching as it is not just reduced to a specific context where two or more speakers alternate between two languages. Instead, it is about how bilinguals practice their language use in different contexts, or discourses³. In this respect, García (2012, p.1) means that bilinguals can use their linguistic repertoire in these contexts in order to enhance their communication. Thus, she argues that the term translanguaging is preferable to use over code-switching (2012, p.1). In this respect, translanguaging is also the term that is used for this phenomenon in this thesis.

3. Theoretical perspectives

The different theoretical perspectives that are used in this thesis will be presented in this section. These are all relevant as they, in some way, examine how the phenomenon of translanguaging⁴ can be practiced by teachers in the language classroom (although some of the researchers do not specifically use the term translanguaging, but rather “L1 use in the FL-classroom”) as well as some benefits of it.

3.1 Translanguaging in the language classroom

According to Cook (2001, 403-404), the use of the students’ L1 in the FL-classroom has been avoided through the years as it was assumed that this would hinder the development of their L2. However, she argues that a judicious use of their L1 can, conversely, be beneficial for the students’ L2 development (2001, p.410). Cook (2001, p.414-419) brings up some particular instances when the teacher’s use of the students’ L1 can be helpful for the students in the EFL-classroom. One of these is when conveying and checking meaning of words and sentences (2001, p.410). Moreover, she points out that this can be useful when explaining grammar (2001, p.414-415). Cook also writes that the L1 can effectively be used in classroom management including when organizing tasks and managing discipline in the classroom (2001, p.415-416). According to her, the students listen more carefully if the teacher for example says “shut up!” in their L1 than if she would say this in English.

García, Flores and Woodley (2012, p.58-60) present some functions that the teacher’s practice of translanguaging can have in the FL-classroom. For instance, they point out that this may help contextualizing the different key words and concepts that are used. The teacher may here, for

³ Although Garcia (2012, p.1) says that translanguaging mainly is practiced among people who have another first language than the language that is spoken in the region in which they live, she claims that the notion can, however, be applied to all language learners as well.

⁴ According to Garcia (2012, p.2), the notion of translanguaging can both be a concept and a theoretical framework.
example, explain one English word in this language in order to then explain it in the students’ L1 (2012, p.58-59). Moreover, García et al. (2012, p.59-60) explain that the teacher’s translanguaging may enhance the development of the students’ metalinguistic awareness. As, for instance, the English word in the former example is explained to the students in their L1, they may easier learn the exact meaning of this word and in which contexts it is used.

Creese and Blackledge (2010, p.107 ff.) have examined how a strategic and flexible practice of translanguaging can be a pedagogical resource for the teacher in the language classroom. In ethnographic studies of Gujarati and Chinese complementary schools\(^5\) in Britain, they found, for instance, that both Gujarati (the students’ mother tongue) and English (the students’ second language) could function in different ways in the Gujarati classroom (2010, p.108-109). For example, Gujarati was used by the teacher when saying some specific utterances while English was used when saying others. In this respect, the two languages complemented each other in order to convey information to the students. Creese and Blackledge (2010, p.111-112) also found that a word in Chinese could first be pronounced and explained in this language in order to then be explained in English (see also Garcia et al. 2012, p.58-59). This translation of the word into the other language helped, in turn, the students to understand the word better. In short, the two examples above show that a strategic and flexible practice of translanguaging in the bilingual classroom can be seen as a pedagogical resource for the teacher. This is because both the students’ first and second languages can complement each other in different situations in order to make meaning.

Nevertheless, Cook (2001, p.405), Turnbull (2001, p.535) and Voicu (2012, p.214) all point out that the students’ L2 should be used as much as possible in the FL-classroom. They all emphasize the fact that the L1 should never be used at the expense of the L2. Turnbull (2001, p.535) draws here on the importance of input from the L2 in order to develop this language and on the fact that students do not always receive so much input from this language outside school. In this respect, they need to be exposed to their L2 in the EFL-classroom as much as possible.

In sum, the theoretical perspectives that will be used in this thesis are Cook’s (2001, p.414-419) ideas on how the teacher’s use of the L1, in some instances (as when teaching vocabulary, when explaining grammar and in classroom management (including when managing discipline)), is

---

\(^5\) According to Languages Sheffield, complementary schools are schools where mother tongue teaching takes place and where the students have a chance to develop their mother tongue.
useful in the EFL-classroom, as well as García et al.’s (2012, p.58-60) ideas on how translanguaging may help contextualize the words and develop the students’ metalinguistic awareness when teaching vocabulary. Additionally, Creese and Blackledge’s (2010, p.107 ff.) theory on how a flexible practice of translanguaging (including how two languages may complement each other in some situations) may be a pedagogical resource in the language classroom will be applied. Lastly, Cook’s (2001, p.405, Turnbull’s (2001, 535) and Voicu’s (2012, p.214) ideas on that the L2 should mainly be used in the FL-classroom will also be used.

4. Method and material

In this section, the design of the systematic literature review (the method that was used in this thesis) will be presented. Additionally, there will be a presentation of the selection strategies that were applied in the search for material in the form of scholarly articles about L1 use in the EFL-classroom. The analyzed material will also, in turn, be accounted for here. Finally, this section also deals with how the material was analyzed and some ethical aspects that were considered.

4.1 Design

The method used in this thesis is a systematic literature review. According to Eriksson Barajas, Forsberg and Wengström (2013, p.31), this means that the researcher first systematically searches for relevant literature in a certain area of research in order to then critically examine and compile the found literature within this field. In this respect, the systematic literature review summarizes the previous research that already exists about a phenomenon. Eriksson Barajas et al. (2013, p.31) point out that such a review may give rise to new research needs or produce new important school-related knowledge is produced. Hence, this may be of great use in the area of educational science. Finally, Eriksson Barajas et al. (2013, p.31) claim that the number of studies that should be included in the systematic literature review is decided by how many studies of good quality can be found within the particular research area.

4.2 Selection strategies

Both manual searches and searches in different databases were carried out in order to find articles. In the manual searching process, some reference lists from different interesting papers and articles were looked through. The searches in the databases included searches in Summon, Google Scholar, Language and Linguistic Behaviour (LLBA) and MLA International Bibliography. Four articles were found as a result of the manual searches and three of the searches in the databases. The articles are presented in detail in a table in the next subsection.
In order to search for articles in the databases, six different search words were used. These were all related to the phenomenon of translanguaging in the EFL-classroom. The different search words that were used were “use of l1 + efl classroom”, “mother tongue + efl classroom”, “use of l1 + english language classroom”, “mother tongue + english language classroom”, “translanguaging + efl classroom” and “code-switching + efl classroom”.

Both Summon and Google Scholar tended to give too many irrelevant hits on the used search words. Hence, only a few of the titles of the obtained articles were read. MLA International Bibliography, on the other hand, gave very few hits on the search words used, which, accordingly, resulted in only a few articles. LLBA was the used database that gave best results and most relevant hits. However, as in Summon and MLA International Bibliography, only one article from this database was used in the study. Thus, as in total only three articles from the databases were chosen, it can be said that the manual searches were more efficient in this case.

The searches were delimited to include studies publicized between 2005 and 2015. They also had to address translanguaging in the EFL-classroom at upper secondary (or corresponding) level in particular. More information about the searches in the databases is described in detail in five different tables in the appendix of this thesis.

There were several reasons why some articles were excluded. For instance, they addressed translanguaging in the EFL-classroom at either elementary or university level instead of secondary level. Moreover, the quality of some of the articles was too low as these, for example, were too short or contained a number of grammatical errors (it is unclear whether these articles were peer-reviewed or not). Lastly, some of the analyzed articles only addressed the students’ translanguaging and not the teachers, which also resulted in exclusion.

4.3 Material

In total, seven articles from all across the globe were analyzed. The reason why these articles were chosen is because they all in some way are related to the research questions of this thesis. They all examine some aspects of the phenomenon of translanguaging in the EFL-classroom. The articles are presented in Table 1 below with all of their details.
Table 1: An overview of the analyzed articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of used articles</th>
<th>Pub. year</th>
<th>Coun try</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Method and analysis</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Theoretical perspective</th>
<th>Use of key terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copland, F &amp; Neokleous, G. (2014). L1 to Teach L2: Complexities and Contradictions.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>7-9&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Observations, audio and video recordings, interviews with teachers. Qualitative and quantitative (observations).</td>
<td>Explore the different functions of L1 use by teachers in Cypriot EFL-classrooms and some contradictions with the L1 use.</td>
<td>Theories on L1 use in the FL-classroom.</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoudi, L &amp; Amirkhiz, S. (2011). The Use of Persian in the EFL Classroom – The Case of English Teaching and Learning at Pre-university Level in Iran.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Pre-university&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Observations, interviews with both teachers and students. Qualitative.</td>
<td>Examine how the L1 is used in EFL-classrooms in Iran and teachers and students attitudes towards this.</td>
<td>Theories on L1 use in the FL-classroom.</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>6</sup> Even though this study does not take place in a secondary classroom, it can still be useful for this thesis project as it is a Swedish study that deals with language alternation and as the level on EFL in grade 7-9 is right under the secondary level.

<sup>7</sup> The sociocultural perspective is a theoretical perspective in which one of the basic ideas is, according to Lantolf and Thorne (2007, p.201), that learning always takes place within a specific context.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote 6.

<sup>9</sup> Corresponds to upper secondary level in Iran.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Method and Analysis</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Theoretical Perspective</th>
<th>Key Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sali, P.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>Observations, audio and video recording, interviews with teachers. Qualitative and quantitative (observations).</td>
<td>Explore the functions of teachers’ use of L1 in Turkish EFL-classrooms and teachers’ perceptions of this practice.</td>
<td>Theories on L1 use in the FL-classroom.</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, K.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>Questionnaires, observations, audio and video recordings. Qualitative and quantitative (observations).</td>
<td>Investigate how the L1 is used by teachers and students in EFL-classrooms in Nepal and what attitudes they have towards the use of L1.</td>
<td>Theories on L1 use in the FL-classroom.</td>
<td>L1 use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows a detailed description of the analyzed studies including their name, year of publication, country, level, method and analysis, aim, theoretical perspective and use of key terms.

### 4.4 Analysis

The model of analysis that was used in this thesis was a content analysis. Eriksson Barajas et al. (2013, p.147) point out that the aim of this model is to “systematically and stepwise classify data, in order to easier identify patterns and themes, where the goal is to describe and quantify some specific phenomena”. The first step in the analysis process was that the different articles were carefully read through. These were here compared to each other in terms of, for example, content, theoretical perspectives or use of terms. Subsequently, the articles were divided into separate codes (e.g. uses the L1 in the EFL-classroom when explaining different words in English, uses the L1 in the EFL-classroom when translating English words). Later on, these codes were divided into different categories (e.g. uses the L1 in the EFL-classroom when explaining vocabulary). After this, an attempt was made to identify specific patterns in these categories (e.g. several teachers use the L1 in the EFL-classroom when explaining vocabulary). Lastly, these patterns were analysed and discussed in the light of the theoretical perspectives of this thesis.

### 4.5 Ethical aspects

Even though the systematic literature review does not directly involve human subjects, there are, according to Eriksson Barajas et al. (2013, p.69-70), some ethical aspects that must be considered when performing this. They point out that the researcher must only include studies in which clear ethical considerations have been made, and that he needs to present all of the included studies.
and subsequently archive these for a period of ten years as well as all of the results of the study (not only those that supports his opinions or hypothesis) (2013, p.70). If these aspects are not considered, Eriksson Barajas et al. (2013, p.70) explain that the researcher may be accused of academic dishonesty. In this respect, all of these aspects have carefully been taken into account in the process of searching for articles and when the material was analysed.

5. Results

In this section, the main findings from the analysed articles are presented. Three particular types of different situations in which the teachers used the L1 in the EFL-classroom together with the teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards this could be derived from the data. These were 1) use of the L1 when managing discipline, 2) use of the L1 when explaining grammar and 3) use of the L1 when teaching vocabulary. Of course, there were also other instances when the teachers in the studies used the L1 (this will be discussed in the discussion section). However, in order to delimit the thesis, it was only possible to analyse the most salient categories.

5.1 Use of the L1 when managing discipline

The first of the aspects that were analysed were the teacher’s use of L1 when managing discipline in the classroom. This section presents what the articles say about how this was practiced by the teachers and what attitudes the teachers and students had towards this.

5.1.1 How was the L1 used by the teachers?

Three of the analysed articles have quantified the number of occasions in which the L1 was used by the teachers to manage discipline. These are accounted for in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of occasions</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copland &amp; Neokleous</td>
<td>69 out of 1191 (6%)</td>
<td>Reprimands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sali</td>
<td>51 out of 683 (8%)</td>
<td>Managing discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>13 out of 43 (30%)</td>
<td>Give instructions (including managing discipline)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 2, 6% of the occasions of teachers’ L1 use in Copland and Neokleous’ study, 8% in Sali’s study and 30% in Sharma’s study concerned managing discipline. Nevertheless, the

---

10 Only teachers’ oral communication in the L1 is studied in the articles. Textbooks and other bilingual/L1-based teaching material are therefore not included.
term “give instructions” in Sharma’s study did not only include managing discipline but also, for example, instructions for assignments.

There are a number of specific examples in the articles of how the teacher used the L1 in order to manage discipline in the classroom. For example, Beers Fägersten (2012, p.91) observed that the teacher in her study used the L1 when disciplining her students. She addressed the noisy classroom when one student was about to answer a question in English, saying: “Ah men tyst! Jag hör inte vad Rasmus säger” (“Oh be quiet! I can’t hear what Rasmus is saying.”). In addition, the same teacher said to one student “Pratar du hela tiden David? Du måste försöka vara tyst för jag hör inte vad de andra säger” (“Do you talk all the time David? You have to try to be quiet because I cannot hear what the others are saying”) (Beers Fägersten 2012, p.92). Beers Fägersten (2012, p.93-94) argues that the reason for the teacher’s code choice of Swedish when managing discipline was because the L1 here served as a specific discourse in the classroom. While English was the language that was used almost all the time by the teacher, Swedish was only used when she tried to get her students to keep quiet during the lesson activities. In a similar manner, Degi (2014) identifies how the students’ L1 is used by the teacher when disciplining her students. After she had explained some grammatical features in English to the class, she code-switched to Romanian and used the word “liniste!” (“keep quiet!” in Romanian) as the students were talking to each other when she was teaching (Degi 2014, p.739). Furthermore, Sali (2014, p.313-314) observed a Turkish teacher saying “Kim o mir mir konusuyo orada? Senin sesin mi o?” (“Who is taking over here? Is it you?”) when one of her students complained in Turkish about the homework he had to do. As the teacher rebuked the students by using Turkish, Sali argues that the teacher’s words in the L1 had much more power and authority than if English had been used instead (2014, p.313). Likewise, Sharma (2006, p.83) writes that one of his four observed teachers initially attempted to tell the class to keep quiet in English. As he noticed that they didn’t listen to him when doing this, he switched language to Nepali and did this a second time in an angry tone (Sharma 2006, p.83).

5.1.2 Teachers’ and students’ attitudes
Both Kim and Petraki (2009, p.67-68) and Sharma (2006, p.89) have carried out a questionnaire about the teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the use of L1. Table 3 below shows the results of this concerning managing discipline.
Table 3: The teachers’ and students’ attitudes (expressed in proportions) towards using the L1 when managing discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>% Positive Teachers</th>
<th>% Positive Students</th>
<th>% Negative Teachers</th>
<th>% Negative Students</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Petraki(^{11})</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Classroom management including students’ discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>4(^{12})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Give instructions (including managing discipline)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 indicates that a somewhat high percentage of the teachers and students in Kim and Petraki’s study were positive towards the teachers use of the L1 in classroom management. However, it also says that very few of these in Sharma’s study were positive towards this. Hence, there are some contradictions between the articles as to this.

Regarding the teachers’ attitudes, Sali (2014, p.316) concludes that there was a lack of awareness among her interviewed teachers on how much and when the L1 should be used overall in the classroom (including when managing discipline), even though they all were positive towards this practice. Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.139) state that these attitudes were evident in their study as well.

### 5.2 Use of the L1 when explaining grammar

The teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining grammar was the second aspect that was analysed. This section presents the results on how this was practiced by the teachers in the articles, together with the teachers’ and students’ attitudes on this.

#### 5.2.1 How was the L1 used by the teachers?

Table 4 below accounts for how many times the L1 was used by the teachers when explaining grammar in three of the analysed studies.

---

\(^{11}\) Kim and Petraki’s study only shows how many of the teachers and the students who were overtly positive respective negative towards the use of L1. Thus, those who did not belong to any of these two categories (e.g. those who did not have any opinion on this) were not included in the presentation of the results.  

\(^{12}\) Sharma’s study did only examine how many of the teachers and the students who were positive towards the use of L1. Hence, the “-” sign is used under the columns “negative teachers” and “negative students” which indicates that there was no data on this.
Table 4: Number of occasions of using the L1 when explaining grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of occasions</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copland &amp; Neokleous</td>
<td>94 out of 1191 (8%)</td>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sali</td>
<td>135 out of 683 (20%)</td>
<td>Explaining aspects of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>7 out of 43 (16%)</td>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that 8% of the occasions of teachers’ use of L1 in Copland and Neokleous’ study, 20% in Sali’s study and 16% in Sharma’s study were, in some way, related to grammar explanations (even though “explaining aspects of English” in Sali’s article concerned vocabulary explanations as well).

Some examples of the teachers’ use of L1 when explaining grammar were also found in the articles. For instance Copland and Neokleous (2011) write that one of their four observed teachers almost only used Greek when explaining some English verb tenses to the class. They also claim that this practice was evident regarding two of the other teachers in their study (2001, p.276). Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.137) also say that one out of two observed teachers used the L1 when explaining syntactical features of English to her students.

In contrast to the examples above, Degi (2014, p.739) observed that one out of three observed teachers used English only when explaining grammar to her students. Although she claims that the L1 was used by her on other occasions in the classroom, she did not use it in grammar teaching (2014, p.738-740). Additionally, Degi (2014, p.738) states that one other teacher (out of three observed teachers) only used English in the classroom. Moreover, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.277) point out that one teacher in their study also did this when teaching grammar. Furthermore, as mentioned before, Beers Fägersten (2012, p.91) writes that her observed teacher (only one teacher was observed in Beers Fägersten’s study) only used English in the classroom as well, with the exception of managing discipline.

5.2.2 Teachers’ and students’ attitudes

Table 5 below shows the attitudes towards the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining grammar.
Table 5: The teachers’ and students’ attitudes (expressed in proportions) towards using the L1 when explaining grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>% Positive Teachers</th>
<th>% Positive Students</th>
<th>% Negative Teachers</th>
<th>% Negative Students</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Petraki</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Explaining grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teaching grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A very high percentage of the teachers and students (especially of the teachers) in Sharma’s study believe that the use of the L1 when explaining grammar is necessary. This is in contrast to Kim and Petraki’s study where only a few of the students (and not too many of the teachers) were positive and a quite large number of the teachers were negative towards this. Thus, the results from the two studies differ from each other concerning the attitudes towards the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining grammar.

When Copland and Neokleous (2011) interviewed the three teachers who used the L1 in grammar teaching about their attitudes, the teachers claimed that this was more time saving, that it enhanced the classroom environment including the students’ learning and decreased the stress among the students (p.276). In relation to this, Sali (2014, p.316) writes that all of the three interviewed teachers in her study had a positive attitude toward the use of Turkish when teaching grammar to their classes. She points out that they claimed that this would enhance the students understanding of the specific grammatical features that they are going to learn (2014, p.316). The reasons for this were, for instance, that this would decrease stress among them and that it had to be ensured that they would fully understand the grammatical features (which is best done by using the L1 when explaining these to them) (Sali 2014, p.316). Nevertheless, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.276) say that the remaining teacher claimed that using Greek when teaching grammar would diminish the students’ critical thinking in English, which, according to her, was the reason why she did not use the L2 when doing this.

One out of five interviewed students in Kim and Petraki’s (2009, p.68) claimed that the teacher’s use of Korean when explaining grammar is beneficial for her language development because this enhances her understanding of the different grammatical features of English. She also said that this is the classroom activity in which the use of the L1 by the teacher is most useful. Kim and Petraki (2009, p.68) claim that these beliefs were also confirmed in the interviews with the other four students. In a similar way, Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.139) point out that one of the
three interviewed students in their study said that the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining grammar was beneficial for her grammar development in English. The student claimed that a comparison between the grammatical rules of this language and English would be easier to understand in her L1.

5.3 Use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary

The third analysed aspect in this thesis was the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary. How this was practiced and what attitudes the teachers and students had towards this are presented below.

5.3.1 How was the L1 used by the teachers?

In Table 6 below, the number of occasions when the teachers used the L1 when explaining vocabulary in three of the articles is presented.

Table 6: Number of occasions of using the L1 when explaining vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Number of occasions</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copland &amp; Neokleous</td>
<td>152 out of 1191 (13%)</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sali</td>
<td>135 out of 683 (explaining aspects of English) (20%), 44 out of 683 (translation) (7%)</td>
<td>Explaining aspects of English, Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>14 out of 43 (33%)</td>
<td>Explaining the meaning of words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 indicates that 13% of the occasions of L1 use by teachers in Copland and Neokleous’s study, 27% (20+7) in Sali’s study and 33% in Sharma’s study were related to vocabulary teaching. However, as mentioned before, the term “explaining aspects of English” in Sali’s article did not only include vocabulary explanations (but also grammar explanations).

There are a number of examples of L1 use by the teacher when explaining vocabulary from the different studies that highlight this practice in the EFL-classroom. For instance, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.272-273) point out that two of their four observed teachers gave the equivalent of the English word in the L1 when explaining vocabulary. They mention, for example, that one of them mentioned the Greek words for “well-built” and “overweight” after she had said these in English to her students (2011, p.273). Similarly, Sali (2014, p.312-313) writes that one of her three observed teachers gave the Turkish equivalent for “regret” when explaining this word to the class. She also claims that this translation practice by the teachers also enhanced the students learning as they could acquire a direct comprehension of the words as they already knew their meaning in their L1 (2014, p.312). Moreover, Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.137)
also found that one of their two observed teachers gave the equivalent and an explanation of the English word in the students’ L1 when teaching advanced vocabulary to the class. Additionally, Degi (2014, p.738) explains that one of her observed teachers used the L1 when explaining some vocabulary items. After first having tried to explain the word “triple jump” to them in English, she code-switched to Romanian when she noticed that they still had problems of understanding it (Degi 2014, p.738). Furthermore, Sharma (2006, p.83) mentions one specific example when the teacher explained the words “horoscope”, “anxious” and “pessimistic” in Nepali the class. After he had done this, the students signaled to the teacher that they had understood the meaning of these words. Finally, Sali (2014, p.312) points out that the teacher on one occasion explained in the L1 in what specific contexts the words “please” and “ask” are used in English. Hence, the L1 can also be used to teach the students about how these words are used in the L2.

However, there are some contradictions in some of the studies regarding the teacher’s use of L1 when explaining vocabulary. For example, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.273) point out that two of their four observed teachers seldom translated the English words to the L1. Moreover, both Degi (2014, p.738) and Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.138) write that one of their three (Degi) respective two (Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz) observed teachers only used English when explaining the meaning of words. Additionally, as stated above, Beers Fägersten (2012, p.91) claims that her observed teacher only used the L1 when disciplining her students.

### 5.3.2 Teachers’ and students’ attitudes

In Table 7 below, the results from Kim and Petraki’s and Sharma’s questionnaires are presented as to the teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the use of the L1 by the teacher when explaining vocabulary.
Table 7: The teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards using the L1 when explaining vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>% Positive Teachers</th>
<th>% Positive students</th>
<th>% of Students who believe that this would enhance their understanding of the English words</th>
<th>% Negative Teachers</th>
<th>% Negative Students</th>
<th>Use of terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim &amp; Petraki</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Explaining the meaning of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Explaining the meaning of words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from both of the above studies show that a large percentage of both the students and the teachers have positive attitudes towards the teacher’s L1 use when explaining vocabulary. Regarding Kim and Petraki’s study, it is interesting that a significantly higher percentage of both the teachers and the students believe that the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary is useful in the classroom than when managing discipline or when explaining grammar. In this sense, they seem to highly support this practice in this area.

According to Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.273), one of their four interviewed teachers in their study claimed that the L1 use in translating the English words into Greek was useful for the students’ language development. They point out that the reason for this was that the students would not be motivated to learn the English words if these were not translated to or explained to them in the L1 (2011, p.273). Furthermore, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.273) write that this view was also confirmed by another teacher who explained that this would enhance the students’ understanding of the English words. Moreover, Sali (2014, p.315-316) claims that all three of the interviewed teachers in her study believed that their use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary would be beneficial for their students’ language development as this would enhance their understanding of the English words. According to her, this was also in line with the results of her observations (2014, p.316). Additionally, Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.138) state that their observations of the teacher who used the L1 when teaching vocabulary were in line with the interview with her. This is because the teacher said that she only uses the L1 when for example explaining difficult linguistic phenomena in English in order to help her students to understand this properly. However, Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.273-274) point out that two of their four interviewed teachers did not support the idea of using Greek when teaching new words to
the class (which is in contrast to the views of the two other teachers in their study). They said that the reason for this was because this would diminish their ability to think critically in English.

6. Discussion
This section consists of both a discussion of the results and of the method used in this thesis.

6.1 Results discussion
Below, the results are discussed and tied to the theoretical perspectives of this thesis. This section is divided into the same three parts as the results section, which are 1) use of the L1 when managing discipline, 2) use of the L1 when explaining grammar and 3) use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary.

6.1.1 Use of the L1 when managing discipline
The fact that quite a large number of occasions of the teacher’s L1 use when managing discipline in the classroom could be seen in Copland and Neokleous’ (2011), Sali’s (2014) and Sharma’s (2006) studies indicates that this is a common area in which the teacher uses the L1 in the EFL-classroom. Regarding Sharma’s study, the term “give instructions” does not, however, only relate to managing discipline but also, for example, to giving instructions for specific assignments. Hence, it cannot be said that all of his observed occasions of giving instructions did involve L1 use when disciplining students. This may also explain that there were more occasions of the observed phenomenon in his article than in the others. Moreover, Sharma (2006, p.83) claims that only four 45-minutes lessons were observed which, in this sense, may affect the generalizability of his study.

In relation to Cook’s (2001, p.415-416) theory on how disciplining students in the L1 can be useful in the FL-classroom, the examples from Beers Fägersten’s (2012, p.91-92), Degi’s (2014, p.739), Sali’s (2014, p.313-314) and Sharma’s (2006, p.83) articles may indicate that the teachers see their translanguging when managing discipline as a tool that can improve the working atmosphere in the classroom and thus also enhance the learning environment there. As mentioned above, Sali (2014, p.313) also argues that this was the case in her study. It is also interesting that Beers Fägersten (2012, p.91-92), Degi (2014, p.739) and Sharma (2006, p.83) all observed teachers switching language from English to the L1 when disciplining students. In this respect, one might get the impression that the teachers use this language strategically when doing this. Yet, this cannot be verified since the studies are delimited in the way that no interviews have
been made with the teachers about this in specific. The researchers have just observed that this practice occurs in the EFL-classroom. In addition, it must be said that neither Degi nor Sharma make any conclusions or tie their examples to any specific theory about how the teacher can use the L1 as a tool with which she can create a good working atmosphere in the classroom. As the results of their observations may show that this is the case, their articles would have benefited from doing this.

Regarding the use of terms, it is interesting that only Beers Fägersten (2012, p.94) uses the term code choice, while, for instance, Degi (2014, p.739) uses the term code-switching. As mentioned earlier, code choice is a broader term than code-switching in the sense that the teacher chooses her code (or language) rather than randomly switches to another language (see Levine 2011, p.4). However, both Beers Fägersten’s (2012, p.91-92) and Degi’s (2014, p.739) examples may indicate that the teacher chooses to use her translanguaging as a tool in order to manage discipline among the students in the classroom. As regards to translanguaging, it must be noted that the authors neither use this term nor a theoretical perspective that is based on this. Instead, they used the terms “code choice”, “code-switching” and L1 use when teachers switched between the L1 and the L1 in the classroom.

Moreover, it is interesting that Beers Fägersten’s (2012, p.91) study is solely based on a sociocultural perspective while the others are based on theories about L1 use in the FL-classroom in general. In this sense, she (2012, p.91) does not directly point out how the teacher’s translanguaging can be beneficial for the working atmosphere in the classroom (although this may be the case). Hence, it would have been interesting to see the outcome of her study if it had been based on theories on L1 use or translanguaging in the EFL-classroom (see e.g. Cook 2001, p.415-416; Creese & Blackledge 2010, p.108-109). This can, in turn, also be said about the other studies if they were based on a sociocultural perspective.

In relation to this, it is interesting that Beers Fägersten (2012, p.93-94) concludes that the L1 served as a specific discourse in the classroom as it was only used by the teacher when managing discipline. Even though Creese and Blackledge (2010, p.108-109) do not address managing discipline in specific, this can be related to their theory on how both the L1 and the L2 can have different functions in the language classroom (as, for example, the L1 could be used for some utterances while the L2 could be used for others). In the sense that the teacher in Beers
Fägersten’s study only used the L1 when disciplining her students, it can be said that this language was functioned for doing this.

The somewhat high percentage teachers and students in Kim and Petraki’s study (2009, p.67-68) who were positive towards the teachers use of the L1 in classroom management (including when managing discipline) can be tied to Cook’s (2001, p.415-416) theory on this. However, it is interesting that this is in sharp contrast to the results of Sharma’s questionnaire (2006, p.89) where very few of the teachers and the students claimed that this was a good idea. Yet, the terms “classroom management” and “give instructions” may include, for example, the teacher giving instructions to her students and is thus not only limited to include managing discipline. In this respect, the students’ and the teachers’ attitudes towards using the L1 when managing discipline have not been studied specifically in either Kim and Petraki’s or in Sharma’s study.

In addition, as stated above, none of the articles possess any qualitative data on the teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the teacher’s use of the L1 when managing discipline in particular. It would have been interesting if, for example, the observed teacher in Beers Fägersten’s study had developed her thoughts about how this could be a strategy to use in order to create a good working atmosphere in the classroom. And, conversely, how would the students in the analysed articles have reasoned about how this affected their behaviour? (See also Cook 2001, p.415-416)

Furthermore, the fact that the teachers in Sali’s (2014, p.316) and Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz’s studies (2011, p.139) were not aware of how much the L1 should be used (neither when managing discipline, nor when explaining grammar or vocabulary) can be discussed critically. This is because research says that English should be used most of the time in the EFL-classroom (Cook, 2001, p.405; Turnbull, 2001, p.535; Voicu, 2012, p.214) but that a judicious and a flexible use of the L1 in some situations may be beneficial for the students’ language development (Cook 2001, p.410; Creese & Blackledge 2010, p.107 ff.). In this respect, it can be said that more research is needed on teachers’ awareness on how the L1 can be used more strategically and judiciously in the EFL-classroom including when managing discipline, when explaining grammar and when explaining vocabulary.
6.1.2 Use of the L1 when explaining grammar

The fact that there were a large number of instances of L1 use by the teachers in Copland and Neokleous’s (2011), Sali’s (2014) and Sharma’s (2006) studies when explaining grammar shows that this is another common area for L1 use in the EFL-classroom. Regarding use of terms, however, it must be noted that Sali’s term explaining aspects of English does not only include grammar explanation but also, for instance, explanations of the meaning of words. This may explain why there are more occasions of this in her study than in the others.

Multiple instances of teachers' use of the L1 to explain grammar was reported in the studies analysed (Copland & Neokleous 2011, 2011, p.276; Mahmoudi & Amirkhiz 2011, p.137) This shows that grammar explanation is another common area for the use of the L1 in the EFL classroom (see also Cook 2001, p. 414-415). However, this is not the case regarding two of the teachers in Degi’s study (2014, p.738-740), one teacher in Copland and Neokleous’ (2011, p.277) respective Beers Fagersten’s study (2012, p.91). This contrast indicate that the practice of translanguaging when teaching grammar could differ between the teachers and their cultures or traditions etc.

Nevertheless, none of the articles state anything about how the teacher strategically and judiciously uses the L1 when explaining grammar (Cook, 2001, p.410; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p.107 ff.). They just gives examples of teachers who either uses this language when doing this or not. Hence, as none of the authors claim anything regarding whether these examples were strategic or judicious, it can be said that more research is needed in this area.

Overall, there seems to be a consensus in the articles between the teachers’ and the students’ view of the use of the L1 for grammar explanations. This is because the majority of the informants (both in questionnaires (Kim & Petraki, 2009, p.67-68; Sharma 2006, p.89) and in interviews (Copland & Neokleous, 2011, p.276; Sali, 2014, p.316) expressed positive attitudes towards this use. Their reasons included, for example, that students would understand the different grammatical features if these were explained in the L1, that this was time saving or that this would release stress from the students. These attitudes can, in turn, also be related to Cook’s (2001, p.414-415) ideas on how teaching grammar in the L1 (if this language is used judiciously) can be beneficial for the students.
In relation to this, one may get the impression from the articles that the teachers are aware of how their translanguaging when teaching grammar may be beneficial for the students’ development. This is because some of Copland and Neokleous’ (2011, p.276) and Sali’s (2014, p.316) interviewed teachers explained why this would be the case. However, only one student in the articles (Mahmoudi & Amirkhiz, 2011, p.137) explained how this would develop her grammar proficiency in English. Hence, there seems to be a lack of awareness among the students regarding this area.

6.1.3 Use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary

As there were a large number of occasions of L1 use by teachers when explaining vocabulary (Copland & Neokleous, 2011; Sali, 2014; Sharma 2006), it can be said that this is yet another common area in the EFL-classroom in which they used this language. It is also interesting to analyse what terms the authors use for explaining vocabulary. The fact that Copland and Neokleous use the term translation indicates that they have merely counted the instances where a word was translated to the L1 and not when the teacher, for example, explicitly explained the meaning of the word. Concerning Sali’s study, she counted both the instances of translanguaging when explaining aspects of English and translation of English words. As mentioned above, the former term does not, however, only include vocabulary teaching but, for instance, grammar teaching as well.

As in the cases when managing discipline and teaching grammar, the examples from Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.272-273), Degi (2014, p.738), Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz (2011, p.137), Sali (2014, p.312) and Sharma (2006, p.83) all specifically illustrate how the teacher’s use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary is evident in the EFL-classroom. In this respect, they can all be related to Cook’s (2001, p.414) and Garcia et al.’s (2012, p.58-60) ideas of how teachers’ L1 use when teaching vocabulary may enhance the students’ vocabulary development in the L2. Regarding translation, the examples from Copland and Neokleous and Sali are not precisely in line with Creese and Blackledge’s (2012, p.111-112) theory in the way that the teacher only gave the equivalents of the words in the L1 without explaining the meaning of them (neither in English nor in the L1). Sali’s example of the teacher explaining in Turkish contexts in which some English words are used can be connected to Garcia et al.’s (2012, p.59-60) ideas about this practice and how it may develop the students’ metalinguistic awareness. The example from Degi’s study is also in line with Garcia et al’s (2012, p.60-61) theory on how the teacher’s
translanguaging may help the students to understand the words better if they first did not understand the L2 explanations.

Nevertheless, the examples of the observed teachers that did not use the L1 (Copland & Neokleous, 2011, p.273; Degi, 2014, p.738; Mahmoudi & Amirkhiz, 2011, p.138; Beers Fägersten, 2012, p.91) indicate that there are EFL-teachers who do not practice this phenomenon. The two teachers who did not use the L1 here in Copland and Neokleous’ (2011, p.273-274) study also explained why they did not do this, which is also discussed below. In this respect, it can be said that there are some contradictions between the teachers as to whether the L1 should be used by them or not when explaining vocabulary.

Likewise, as in the case with explaining grammar, none of the studies explicitly express anything about how the teachers’ translanguaging was used as a strategic tool within a fixed framework to develop the students’ vocabulary or how the L1 was used judiciously (Cook, 2001, p.410; Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p.107 ff.). Rather, the examples in the articles seem to indicate that the L1 was used spontaneously by the teachers (perhaps with the exception of Degi’s article (2014, p.738) where the teacher used the L1 when the students had problems understanding the words). Thus, this is another area in which a strategic and judicious use of the L1 by the teachers is not evident in the analysed articles.

The results of Kim and Petrakis’s (2009, p.67-68) and Sharma’s (2006, p.89) questionnaires, the two first examples from Copland and Neokleous (2011, p.273-274) interviews and the interviews from Sali’s (2014, p.315-316) and Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz’s (2011, p.138) studies highlight the different teachers’ positive attitudes towards their use of L1 when translating words and explaining vocabulary. This can be tied to Cook’s (2001, p.414) and García et al’s (2012, p.58-60) theories on how teachers’ use of the L1 when explaining vocabulary may develop the students’ vocabulary in the L2.

Moreover, Copland and Neokleous’ (2011, p.273-274) examples illustrate how the teachers think their students’ vocabulary development would benefit from translations to the L1 as this would motivate them to learn new English words (see also Cook 2001, p.414). Nevertheless, this is not the case concerning Sali’s (2014, p.315-316) or Mahmoudi and Amirkhiz’s (2011, p.138) studies. How do the teachers here reason about how their use of the L1 would develop their students’ vocabulary (cf. Garcia et al. 2012, 58-60)? Apparently, they just claim that this would be the case.
It is also interesting that the data from the qualitative interviews in the articles does not reveal what the students think of this practice by the teacher.

The fact that Copland and Neokleous’ (2011, p.273-274) study illustrates some contradictions among the teachers’ attitudes as regards translating English words to the L1 (i.e. the students would not think critically if the words were translated into Greek) shows that there are some EFL-teachers that do not embrace Cook’s (2001, p.414, García et al’s (2012, p.57-60) and Creese and Blackledge’s (2010, p.111-112) ideas about translanguaging as a tool to enhance the students’ vocabulary development.

6.2 Method discussion

As for the selection strategies, a limitation of this thesis is that the level of English in some of the analysed articles differ to varying degrees. For instance, this is because the articles are from different places all across the globe where the level of English between the countries may vary. This is, for example, manifested in the fact that a significantly higher percentage of the teachers and the students in Sharma’s study (2006, p.84) were positive towards the use of the L1 in the classroom than those in Kim and Petraki’s study (2009, p.69). Moreover, the articles also differ as to the students’ age and level of education. As stated in Table A1 in the appendix, two studies from grade 7-9 level, one from pre-university level (although this corresponds to upper secondary level in Iran) and four from upper secondary level were included in this thesis. This may imply, for example, that the level of English among the students in the upper secondary articles may be higher than among those in the grade 7-9 studies.

From a Swedish perspective, the thesis is also limited in the way that only one Swedish article was included. Although the intention was to analyse more Swedish studies, this could not be done due to the fact that no more of these were found. In this respect, the thesis provides the reader with limited information about the teachers’ translanguaging in the Swedish EFL-classroom.

Additionally, the fact that only three occasions of when the L1 was used by the teachers in the EFL-classroom were examined is another aspect that limits this thesis. When analysing the articles, it was very evident that they also used the L1 in other instances, as for example when giving instructions for specific tasks, when answering students’ questions that were posed in the L1 or when sharing common cultural stories with the students (like jokes). However, because of space constraints, only the three clearest, visible and prominent (including most frequently
occurring) features of L1 use by the teacher were chosen to be analysed. In this respect, the thesis leaves out some information on how this practice could be seen on other occasions in the articles. Furthermore, the thesis only examines the teacher’s translanguage in the EFL-classroom. As several of the articles indicate that the L1 was used by the students as well, this study is limited in that it does not analyse how this language was used by them. Even though it would have been interesting to also include students’ use of the L1 (as the concept of translanguage includes that bilinguals (including language learners) should actively switch between two or more languages (García 2009, p.45)), it was necessary (due to scope constraints) to limit the aim of the thesis to only include teachers’ translanguage.

7. Conclusion

The research questions of this thesis were to examine in what particular situations the L1 is used by teachers in EFL-classrooms and what teachers’ and students’ attitudes are towards the teachers’ use of the L1 in these particular situations. Regarding the particular situations in which the L1 was used by teachers, it can be said that the most common of these were when managing discipline, when explaining grammar or when explaining vocabulary. All these three situations of L1 use were approximately as much occurring in the classroom. However, there were some teachers who did not use this language in these situations. Nevertheless, as the majority of the observed teachers in the articles actually used the L1 here, it can be said that these exceptions were of somewhat less significance. Moreover, the studies did not say very much about how the L1 was used strategically by the teachers in the above situations. Furthermore, the articles differed as to the use of terms and (in one case) to the theoretical approaches.

As for teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards the teachers’ use of the L1 in the particular situations, it can be concluded that the majority of these were positive towards this practice (even though there were some contradictions). However, the studies did not conclude anything on the teachers’ awareness of how the L1 could be used strategically in these situations. Moreover, the articles said very little about what the students think of the teachers’ L1 use in the classroom. In sum, the answers to the two research questions of this thesis have together fulfilled the aim, which is to examine what research says about what role teachers’ use of the L1 has in upper secondary EFL-classrooms and what attitudes teachers’ and students’ have towards teachers’ use of this language in this context.
7.1 Further research

The results of this study indicate that more research is needed on how the teachers can use the L1 when explaining grammar or vocabulary in a strategic, flexible and judicious way. Since none of the studies indicated that this was the case, it is clear that this needs to be investigated further.

In relation to this, further research is also needed on how the teachers think on this subject, as they were not aware of how the L1 could be used strategically in the above situations.

Additionally, this is also the case regarding managing discipline as there was a lack of qualitative data in the articles on this.

Moreover, more research needs to be carried out on the students’ perspective on how the teacher’s translanguaging may affect their behaviour when she is managing discipline, alternatively their grammar or vocabulary development when she is teaching these aspects to them. This is because almost none of the interviewed students in the articles expressed anything on the student perspective, since the focus tended to be on the teachers’ perspective instead.

Thus, qualitative interviews with both teachers and students can fill the need for research in these questions.
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Appendix

Tables on the details of the searches in the databases and the manual searches

The following tables present detailed information on the analyzed articles, the searches in the databases and the manual searches.

Table A1: Searches in Summon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search words</th>
<th>Delimits</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Read titles</th>
<th>Read abstracts</th>
<th>Analyzed articles</th>
<th>Used articles</th>
<th>Name of used articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>Mother tongue + Efl classroom</td>
<td>Full text, peer-review, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>Use of L1 + English language classroom</td>
<td>Full text, peer-review, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>4430</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>Mother tongue + english language classroom</td>
<td>Full text, peer-review, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>4354</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>Translanguaging + efl classroom</td>
<td>Full text, peer-review, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>Code-switching + efl classroom</td>
<td>Full text, peer-review, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Search words</td>
<td>Delimits</td>
<td>Hits</td>
<td>Read titles</td>
<td>Read abstracts</td>
<td>Analyzed articles</td>
<td>Used articles</td>
<td>Name of used articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Use of L1 + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>17200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Mother tongue + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>15600</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Use of L1 + English language classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>18900</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Mother tongue + English language classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>20400</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Translanguaging + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google scholar</td>
<td>Code-switching + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>Search words</td>
<td>Delimits</td>
<td>Hits</td>
<td>Read titles</td>
<td>Read abstracts</td>
<td>Analyzed articles</td>
<td>Used articles</td>
<td>Name of used articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA</td>
<td>Mother tongue + efl classroom</td>
<td>Scholarly journals, peer-reviewed, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA</td>
<td>Use of L1 + english language classroom</td>
<td>Scholarly journals, peer-reviewed, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA</td>
<td>Mother tongue + english language classroom</td>
<td>Scholarly journals, peer-reviewed, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA</td>
<td>Translanguaging + efl classroom</td>
<td>Scholarly journals, peer-reviewed, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLBA</td>
<td>Code-switching + efl classroom</td>
<td>Scholarly journals, peer-reviewed, published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A4: Searches in MLA International Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search words</th>
<th>Delimits</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Read titles</th>
<th>Read abstracts</th>
<th>Analyzed articles</th>
<th>Used articles</th>
<th>Name of used articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>Mother tongue + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>Use of L1 + English language classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>Mother tongue + English language classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>Translanguaging + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA International Bibliography</td>
<td>Code-switching + efl classroom</td>
<td>Published between 2005-2015</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5: Manual searches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of search</th>
<th>Found in</th>
<th>Name of used articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>