Code-switching inside and outside the EFL classroom

Lower secondary pupils’ experiences and attitudes
Abstract
Previous research claims that studies on pupil code-switching are lacking in number. Therefore, this study aimed to provide a picture of how lower secondary students in Sweden perceive code-switching inside and outside the Swedish EFL classroom, how the interlocutor affects the pupils’ code-switching as well as the pupils’ attitudes to the phenomenon. The material consists of semi-structured interviews with seven pupils at a lower secondary school. Qualitative content analysis was used as a method to process the interview data. The results show that code-switching occurs in relation to language proficiency in order to explain, annotate and exemplify second language content in the pupils’ first language and in this way enhance learning. This is done by the teachers when leading the class or by the pupils themselves in group discussions or during exercises. Furthermore, results show that interlocutors could be both enablers and be enabled to code-switch during discussions. In addition, the pupils had varied attitudes to code-switching where it was either seen as a mistake to code-switch, or that the pupils code-switched to add effect to their language. The pupils claimed to have different proficiency of the English language and spoke a varied amount of L1 during the lessons. However, all pupils agreed that English should be the primary language in the Swedish EFL classroom. The study concluded with a discussion on the pedagogical implications of the study where it could be used by teachers as a communicative resource.
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1 Introduction

Language switching, referring to the practice of alternating between languages in a sentence or conversation, is one linguistic practice that teachers encounter in the Swedish EFL classroom. In today’s Swedish schools, pupils have diverse language backgrounds, which means that they have some level of proficiency in more than two different languages. This might not be a phenomenon that is exclusive to a specific subject as it permeates the modern Swedish school system and is connected to the developing multicultural society. These diverse language backgrounds connect with Amorim (2012) who wrote that: ”Most studies on code-switching, or at least those involving English, relate to bilingual communities, as this is a natural phenomenon among immigrant groups, particularly in the second generation” (Amorim, 2012, p.179). This implies that some form of language switching happens because of the additional multilingual speakers in the Swedish EFL classroom. By studying this phenomenon, teachers would be able to prepare themselves more in depth for the influx of additional languages in the classroom, not just Swedish or English.

Pupils of different language backgrounds are found in the Swedish EFL classrooms in a greater amount than in earlier times. The probability of finding several different spoken languages in one classroom is high and therefore the possibility of several different languages being used at once is possible. The year 7-9 syllabus aims constitute that: ”Communication skills also cover confidence in using the [English] language and the ability to use different strategies to support communication and solve problems when language skills by themselves are not sufficient” (Natl. Ag. F. Ed. 2011, p.32). This indirectly relates to the multicultural view towards the classroom as newer speakers of English might struggle to stay in the second/target language (L2), thus creating a situation where they employ language switching strategies to solve problems.

The term code-switching used interchangeably with the term language switching (in this study), has gone from being viewed as being bad for the bilingual speakers in the first parts of the 20th century, to something that is seen as beneficial today. According to Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012), the term went from being thought of as a mental confusion to something that could benefit language capability (Lewis et al., 2012, pp.642-643). Because code-switching is now considered beneficial to learning, an interest in this study lies in the pupils’ language switching in and outside the Swedish EFL classroom environment. In addition, the study is relevant because it gives an insight into the pupils’ view of their language usage. The outcome of their own perception is important as it could help us understand the minds of the pupils and
why they might go back and forth between one or more languages. The study aims to help expand the knowledge of the pupils’ code-switching. The research that is already done is lacking in that area. Most research regarding code-switching is conducted in a cross-sectional way or as a one-shot study (for example, case study) and tends to focus on the teachers’ code-switching instead of the pupils’ own occurring code-switching. This has created a scarcity in the amount of research that encompasses the pupils’ code-switching (Lin, 2013, p.209).

2 Aims and research questions
The aim of this study is to investigate year 7-9 pupils’ language switching in the Swedish EFL-classroom. The focus is put on the pupils’ perceptions of their own language switching, if they switch depending on the interlocutors in conversation as well as how they perceive language switching in the EFL-classroom. The research questions are as follows:

1. In what way does code-switching occur inside and outside the Swedish EFL classroom according to the pupils?
2. In what ways do the interlocutors affect the pupils’ code-switching?
3. What are the pupils’ perceptions of code-switching?

3 Background
Swedish pupils are multilingual. For example, a fifth of all pupils in primary school and in pre-school in Sweden have backgrounds that are either foreign (which implies second generation immigrants) or have immigrated to the country in recent times (Torpsten, 2018, p.104). Further statistics from 2012 show that roughly 20.7% of all pupils have a mother tongue other than Swedish (Gunnarsson et al., 2015, p.3). This is supported in statistics from 2018 that show that 27.1% of all pupils in mandatory education have the right to education in their first language, which implies multilingualism among the pupils (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2018, p.8). This implies that there is a significant number of pupils in the Swedish schools that speak or have some form of connection to languages other than Swedish. These pupils must then be given opportunity to develop their language proficiency in these languages and specifically in English as the different syllabi say. This study relates to several parts of the year 7-9 syllabus. The most clear reference can be found in the aims of the 7-9 syllabus: ”Teaching in English should essentially give pupils the opportunities to develop their ability to: express themselves and communicate in speech and writing” as well as ”adapt language
for different purposes, recipients and contexts” (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2011, p.32). These two aims show us that pupils need to be able to express themselves and adapt their language to whomever they are talking with. This could imply using language strategies to speak with different interlocutors and could also be interpreted as occasionally switching between languages in order to achieve this.

Moreover, as part of the pupils having to express themselves, the phenomenon of code-switching might be explained in several different ways. One way to view it is that code-switching is useful because it helps the pupils both adapt and express themselves to the interlocutor. This could be in terms of helping each other with other languages and therefore gaining a stronger language proficiency. On the other hand, code-switching could be viewed negatively. Considering that the pupils are in an English classroom, it would be more beneficial for them to speak in English as they are there to practice their language skills. This is also supported in the year 7-9 syllabus where the teaching is formulated as “Teaching in English” (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2011, p.32) when connected to the aims.

While not explicitly stating that the pupils should code-switch, the English 6 syllabus mentions how: “Teaching should encourage students’ curiosity in language and culture, and give them the opportunity to develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other.” (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2011, pp.1-2). This ties in with the perceived notion of using different languages to further enhance the abilities in the L2. Code-switching between languages might be a part of this area that occurs because of the pupils’ conversations with each other and the teacher.

4 Literature review

In this chapter, terms and concepts are defined for the study. Focus is put on code-switching and history of its research, as well as different studies that have investigated the phenomenon and how teachers as well as pupils code-switch.

4.1 Code-switching

Code-switching (CS) is defined as using different dialects or languages in the same sentence or conversation when used by people proficient in several languages (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p.4). Languages such as Swenglish, Tex-Mex, Spanglish or BBC Grenglish are examples of languages that have occurring code-switching as they alternate between languages in phrases
or conversations (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p.4). For example, code-switching in a conversation
between two students in the classroom could look like this:

(1) Student A: Idag ska jag besegra spelets boss.
[Today I am going to defeat the boss of the game.]
Student B: Ska du verkligen göra det? That is awesome.
[Are you really going to do that? That is awesome.]

In Example 1, Student B switched into English to emphasize that they enjoyed Student A’s
statement. Therefore, they performed one form of CS.

Language switching builds upon syntactic functions, discourse, speech functions as well as
the properties of the sentence (Cook, 2001, pp.407-408). From these four components, speech
functions are present in Example 1 as Student B follows up with an expressive speech
function (an emotional form of statement) in response to Student A’s statement. This implies
that CS is dependent on the situation and context of the conversation it is used in. For
example, one might be more inclined to avoid CS when participating in formal activities with
an employer than in informal activities like small talk with friends. This shows us that CS also
depends on the discourse as the conversation around the dinner table would be different than a
formal interview at work. In addition, CS could be phrases or entire explanations of a topic in
the EFL classroom as CS is not purely single words being switched out all the time.

Therefore, in this study, I define code-switching as alternating between different languages,
just as Example 1 showed us.

The definition of CS is set, but there is also the issue of first language (L1) and second/target
language (L2). When it comes to the EFL classroom that is in focus in this study, the English-
only hegemony is strong and creates what Cook (2001) calls a practical necessity to avoid the
L1 (pp.405-406). The practical necessity of using English-only comes from the fact that EFL
teachers have not always spoken the same language as the pupils. There was also a belief that
if L2-only has been successful for so long, there is no reason to change how the system works
(Cook, 2001, p.405). On the other hand, the usage of an L2 in the EFL classroom is
considered the norm since using any other language than the L2 becomes a form of CS.

According to Cook (2001), CS occurs mostly outside the classroom. However, switching
between languages becomes the norm in the EFL classroom when using the concurrent
language method. This method is used to switch to L1 at key points, when a concept is
difficult or when a pupil is being reprimanded or being distracted. This is useful because it
makes the classroom become what Cook (2001) describes as a real-life situation and not a situation where the pupils pretend to be monolingual (Cook, 2001, p.412). This is supported in the Swedish syllabus for year 7-9 where it says: “Through teaching, pupils should be given the opportunity to develop all-round communicative skills” (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2011, p.32). We want the pupils to use their language skills in their real lives and not just to pretend that they are speaking English inside the classroom. The teacher needs to be able to use any method necessary to teach the pupils what they need to learn in order to develop their language proficiency.

Another similar area that could be discussed is the idea of the general L1 and L2 usage in the EFL classroom. The argument that L1 usage is a negative occurrence is according to Cook (2001) worth discussing. She gives arguments how we could utilize the L1 while still focusing on the importance of English language learning. The negative view to L1 has been to avoid using it, while the positive view has been to enhance L2 usage instead. Furthermore, Cook (2001) describes how people that have argued for a mix between L1 and L2 are few, which evolved into a situation where it is now seen as negative to use the L1 (Cook, 2001, pp.403-404). The majority of the teaching methods describe the classroom as having as little L1 as possible and they almost create the norm of avoiding it (2001, p.404). However, using L1 in the classroom is probably not harmful to the pupils’ learning as Macaro concluded (2009, p.43), but because it has been a core belief for over 100 years to avoid the L1, it has become a practical necessity to avoid it (Cook, 2001, p.405). Now that the L1 has been reported as something that could be used in the classroom, we need to examine the teacher role in CS.

4.2 Code-switching and teachers
Teachers have been the primary focus in most completed research and they are therefore highly relevant to discuss in relation to CS (Lin, 2013, p.209). There are many reasons as to why CS occurs in the EFL classroom. Lin delineates three different functions in code-switching based on Halliday’s framework. The framework could be applied to many different areas of linguistics and CS is one of them (Lin, 2013, p.202). The framework signifies a communicative resource that could be used by the classroom participants. Albeit, it is primarily used by teachers, but it could also be used by pupils (Lin, 2013, p.202). These functions are the ideational functions, textual functions and the interpersonal functions.

4.2.1 Ideational functions
The first function encompasses the ideational functions. This function is defined as Halliday's term referring to the idea or content of an utterance (spoken word or statement) (Chandler &
Munday, 2011 p.196). Teachers help the acquisition of the L2 by using the pupils’ L1 to annotate or translate the difficult key terms of the L2 as well as elaborating, exemplifying and explaining the L2 academic content. This is to help with mediating the meaning of the L2 texts for the pupils. In other words, the teachers are using the pupils’ L1 to make them understand the L2 material (Lin, 2013, p.202).

The ideational functions are found in studies on teacher CS. Macaro (2009) studied the optimal usage of teacher CS. He limited himself to looking at acquisition of vocabulary as CS is a complex issue. What Macaro (2009) wanted to achieve was the pupils’ shared understanding of a text in their second language. It was the text’s meaning that was put into focus while trying to make the pupils understand the difficult lexical parts of the text and acquire the set vocabulary. CS occurred to facilitate the last two objectives while not affecting the first. While there is no conclusive evidence that CS is more useful than using L2 only, the result did show that CS is not detrimental to the pupils (Macaro, 2009, pp.48-49). Macaro (2009) concluded that there might be no harm to use a minor amount of L1 when working with vocabulary, as it helps the long-term acquisition of the L2 vocabulary itself (2009, p.43). By fully leaving out the L1, it reduces the pupils’ cognitive and metacognitive abilities (2009, p.49). In addition, Macaro (2009) noticed how the pupils’ response to the L1 versions of difficult L2 words showed a deeper form of cognitive processing compared to using only L2 definitions. From his results, he inferred that the processing is increased and not decreased when pupils were shown L1 forms of unfamiliar L2 words (Macaro, 2009, p.47).

4.2.2 Textual functions
The second function is the textual function. It is defined as a linguistic function where the language makes references to itself and encompasses both given and new information (Chandler & Munday, 2011, p.431). The teachers mark transitions between different types of activities (such as switching into another exercise), different views that are either focusing on technical definitions of words and texts (what the words or texts mean) versus exemplifying the words in connection with the pupils’ everyday life, as well as highlighting topic shifts (Lin, 2013, p.202). This happens when the teachers go from one form of activity to another while switching into L1 (Swedish).

4.2.3 Interpersonal functions
The third function is the interpersonal function that signifies shifts in areas such as the relationships between teacher and student, social distance, cultural values and closeness (Lin, 2013, p.202). This function is personal and shows us the closer relations in the classroom on a
one-on-one basis. If related to the definition of CS in this study, switching between languages helps overcome barriers in learning and reinforce individual connections between the teachers and pupils in the classroom.

Interpersonal functions are seen in several studies. Lin (2013) looked at one of Johnson’s (1985) cases where a teacher from Hong Kong switched to Cantonese to make sure that his or her pupils would sit down and listen (Johnson, 1985, p.47). This is according to Lin (2013) more than the teacher deliberately switching from English. In Hong Kong Cantonese it is implied that earnest and important messages to another person are spoken in Cantonese instead of the target language of the classroom. Therefore, when the teachers want to talk in a less formal manner and make the pupil understand what they mean, they switch to the native language instead (Lin, 2013, p.201).

The pupils’ CS also depends on the context of the teaching. In an early American study that looked at L2 usage in French classrooms, ”researchers noted that students generally used the target language only while the teacher exercised control over classroom activities” (Lin, 2013, pp.197-198). In another study, researchers found how the L1 usage varied depending on the individual interaction between the pupil and the teacher. The teacher in the second study spoke less L1 when in front of the class and more L1 when interacting with the pupils themselves (Lin, 2013, p.197). The teacher used the target language when teaching the full class since it was a language lesson and part of learning. However, the teacher switched to the L1 in a presumed effort to connect on an individual basis with the pupils and therefore help them understand.

4.3 Code-Switching and student interaction
Moreover, we need to look at the CS from a student-student perspective and not only the teacher-based perspective that Lin (2013) has discussed.

4.3.1 Student attitudes to CS
The connection between the pupils’ attitudes to CS and their actual code-switching is complex. Amorim (2012) looked at different pupils’ CS when doing group work and interacting with each other, as well as their attitudes to CS. Some of the more advanced participants held a more negative view on CS since they did not code-switch themselves. However, their opinions were divided. In another group it was the weaker students that excused their switching and the stronger who forgave it. One of the participants reported that since they were Portuguese and understood the language, it should be natural for them to
speak that language if they do not know the words in English (Amorim, 2012, pp.183-185). This shows us how the attitude to CS is divided among these participants. The stronger learners held a negative, as well as an accepted view, of the occurring CS in Amorim’s (2012) study. The participant opinions could therefore not tell us anything concrete about CS and how it relates to their language proficiency levels. The participants had mixed-feelings about CS, but according to Amorim (2012), it was not enough to find any clear connections between frequency of the switching and the positive or negative view the participants had. This implies that the pupils who code-switched more might not actually believe that CS is very useful and vice versa (Amorim, 2012, pp.187-188).

4.3.2 Student use of CS
The pupils themselves have occurring CS in the classroom. Results from older studies showed that the pupils spoke more L1 in the seatwork interaction than in full class situations, which implies that less formal interactions might bring out more L1 and CS (Lin, 2013, p.197). In an American study, the pupils spoke the target language only when the teacher was leading the class (2013, p.198). This is similar to Liebscher and Dailey–O’Cain (2005) who looked at code-switching in a German advanced level foreign language class. They found that the CS that occurred was either participant-related, which meant that it was student-student and teacher-student related, as well as the context of teaching being important, therefore showing that the usage of CS is contextually based and happens more frequently in less formal teaching. CS was also discourse-related which is explained as normally being a part of teacher talk and conversations that cover non-institutional topics such as everyday life. This implies that it resembled bilingual practices outside the classroom, such as people speaking different languages with each other (Liebscher & Dailey–O’Cain, 2005, p.245).

Furthermore, Amorim (2012) noted that CS occurred to fill in gaps in grammatical or lexical areas connected with the target language of the students and helped carry out different pragmatic functions in the task that they were working on, such as negotiating meaning or managing each other’s activity in the group (Amorim, 2012, pp.187-188). However, there was a connection between the language level of the participants and the function of their switches. The weaker learners code-switch to counterbalance their language deficiencies while the stronger learners code-switched to help their peers (Amorim, 2012, pp.187-188). “Students’ interactions and their voices reveal that CS is a strategy that learners resort to, intentionally or unconsciously, to achieve their communicative objectives” (Amorim, 2012, p.178). This
result means that CS shows us the strengths and weaknesses of a pupil’s language level since CS is used as a strategy in communication with their peers.

Furthermore, Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005) reports that the pupils make the classroom into a bilingual space through their occurring CS. In their study, the pupils had the permission to code-switch, but they simply did not fall back on using only their L1 when their L2 had problems. This was not a result of the teacher intervening as the teacher rarely used English with the pupils. This was instead achieved because of the shared membership in the community of practice and it allowed “shared understandings about the purpose of the interaction to enter into the language practice” (Liebscher & Dailey–O’Cain, 2005, p.245). When this shared interaction is reached within the group, the fear that surrounds usage of L1 is lowered and the concern of jeopardizing the learning is mitigated. If a shared understanding (a view accepted by the collective group) between L1 and L2 is reached, that would imply that the pupils could behave closer to fluent bilingual speakers (Liebscher & Dailey–O’Cain, 2005, p.245). It would be close to finding a common ground where teaching L2 while not discriminating against using L1 in the same EFL classroom would be the ideal situation. The question according to Liebscher and Dailey O’Cain (2005) is if this will be achieved by the teacher using L1 systematically and deliberately as an integrated part of the L2 teaching or if it will be achieved by letting the pupils use their own mix of L1 and L2 that would aim to develop their bilingual interaction (Liebscher & Dailey–O’Cain, 2005, p.245). With the previous research discussed, the study explains the methods used in Section 5.
5 Method

In this chapter, the method used for the study is explained in detail. The participants are presented in section 5.1. Furthermore, the interview questions as well as the analysis of this material is explained in 5.2 so that future research should be able to duplicate the study if needed. The chapter also explains how the data collected was analysed (Section 5.3). The limitations are discussed in 5.4.

5.1 Participants

The participants in this study were seven pupils at a lower secondary school in Sweden.

Table 1. Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil C</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two of them were from grade seven, three pupils were from grade eight and the last two participants were from grade nine. In total there were six boys and one girl (see Table 1). The school housed only students from these three years. The school is one of the bigger lower secondary schools in the city it is located in. The study includes students in different grades. This implies age differences and different levels of familiarity with the school. The older pupils have attended the school one or two years longer than the younger pupils and could therefore have a closer connection with their peers, while the younger pupils were new to the school. The pupils in year 7 might not be as close with their peers as year 9 pupils and that is important to take into consideration. It is appropriate to focus on pupils of these ages as their English proficiency is on a lower level than upper secondary pupils and therefore this creates more opportunity for CS to occur during the lessons.

The participants consented to participate in the study by signing a consent form that is available in Appendix 1. Their parents had to sign it as well, as lower secondary school students needed their guardian’s permission to participate in this study. The consent form
explained the aims of the study, stated their right to drop out of the study at any time, and explained that this project would not affect their schoolwork or grades at all. The participants consented to have the interview recorded. They were informed of this in advance.

5.2 Interviews
This study collected data based on interviews. The research was small-scale and therefore it was beneficial to use interviews. The interview itself was a mix between a structured and a semi-structured interview as the questions aimed to be open ended. This was done in order to have the interviewed pupils in focus and in order to have them elaborate on their answers if possible (Denscombe, 2017, p.202). Not every question was open ended, but they were constructed to avoid being yes or no questions. The interview questions are found in Appendix 2. The questions have been drafted to help answer the research questions that were established in Section 2. The questions covered the theme of using different languages in the Swedish EFL classroom.

The interviews were conducted in a lower secondary school. They were 10-20-minute long and they were recorded using a mobile phone. The interviews were conducted in Swedish and transcribed as well as translated into English by the interviewer. The interviews were one-on-one and conducted in a group room close to the pupils’ normal classroom. These types of interviews were beneficial because they are easier to arrange than group interviews. They focus on the interviewee and all thoughts and words stem from that person. These interviews are easier to control as the researcher only has to take into account the person being interviewed (Denscombe, 2017, pp.202-205).

5.3 Analysis of data
The data presented in this study was based on qualitative material. The material was interviews as explained in Section 5.2. First the data was transcribed. The transcription was thorough and only omitted unnecessary sounds such as interjections or laughter. This was done in order to keep the important parts of the interview while omitting unimportant sounds such as someone saying *uhh* while thinking (Denscombe, 2017, pp.306-307).

The study used a qualitative content analysis in order to analyse the seven interviews. However, this study did not quantify results and only discussed qualitative results. Qualitative content analysis is used with any form of text and it follows a logical and straightforward procedure of work. First you choose an appropriate sample that you use for the analysis. This could be transcribed interview material such as in this study. Focus would be put on the
content of the interviews and what was said during them (Denscombe, 2017, p.312). You then proceed to break the interview into smaller components. These components could be single words, phrases or entire questions that are divided and analysed as separate entities. Furthermore, you need to identify themes and group the material in accordance with thematic categories relevant for the study. After that, coding was done to find and mark the relevant sentences or words (Denscombe, 2017, p.313).

This form of analysis reveals what is relevant in the text by looking at what it contains. It shows whatever priorities are seen through the text. In addition, it gives us the text’s inherent values and how the ideas are related. This form of analysis works better with simple straightforward texts and does not work as well with material that would require more in-depth analysis (Denscombe, 2017, pp.313-314). However, it is beneficial for this study because it helps unravel what the pupils meant during the interviews as the questions were straightforward and easy to understand. In addition, constant comparison is important between the interviews to see similarities and differences in the material. No additional material was added during the analysis process which meant that the original data was re-evaluated several times during the process of coding and analysis.

5.4 Limitations
Whenever you design research based on classroom code-switching it is important to acknowledge the fact that it could be solely descriptive and not design-interventionist. Studies describe the code-switching practices instead of innovating and experimenting with them. This implies that we do not find new innovative ways of incorporating CS into our L2 (Lin, 2013, p.208). This study was different from many previous studies of CS, which have focused on classroom observations. Instead of using an experimental design, it was limited to describing the pupils’ experiences or attitudes.

Furthermore, this study was only able to look at a small sample-size and not able to follow an extended period of language-switching. The material collected thus cannot tell us anything about future prolonged occurrence of CS in relation to these pupils, but it can explain their attitudes towards their CS instead. This study did not use any observations as a part of the research. This implies not knowing how the actual Swedish EFL classroom CS looks like. Even if the study did not focus on observations, the study was still informative since it gave other perspectives such as the pupils’ attitudes, thoughts and beliefs on the topic.
6 Results and analysis

In this chapter, the results from the study are presented. Furthermore, examples from the interviews are shown in quotes and discussed in relation to the literature review in order to explain the findings and make conclusions from the material. All quotes that are used have been translated into English from Swedish. The translations are kept as true to the original as possible and therefore minor grammar or language errors may appear in the examples. The original Swedish quotes are found in Appendix 4.

6.1 Code-Switching outside the EFL classroom

Pupils switch both in and outside the classroom. A few of the pupils discussed their code-switching outside the classroom when asked about their attitudes towards CS. The pupils use English words to create effects on their speech and their conversations. Pupil E and G both reported how they code-switch to make the English language sound better. For example, Pupil E explained how he sometimes switches into English words in his sentences in and outside the classroom to create an added effect to his speech as part of his mixing between languages, much like Example 1 in the Literature review.

(2) [I switch] during lessons and sometimes at home. Certain words that sound better in English. Certain expressions that sound better in English. (Pupil E)

What this implies is that CS does not always occur for learning purposes, but also for achieving different effects on the language. This is in social relation to this pupil’s friends or family. Pupil G had a similar reason for this way of code-switching. He mentions how it is connected to his interests. According to Pupil G, ice hockey is a sport where most of the relevant words used are in English and that makes him switch between the languages when he is talking about that sport. This connects with Amorim (2012) who mentions that this is a way for pupils to achieve their communicative objectives with their classmates, friends or family. For example, if Pupil E’s usage of a better sounding English word helped achieve an objective with an interlocutor, then he has succeeded in completing his communicative objective even if it was not used for learning in that instance.

Moreover, CS occurs when the pupils play video games with foreign people or when they are on vacation abroad. Both Pupil C and F report how they tend to speak the native language or code-switch when going abroad. Pupil A and B both use English frequently when playing games at home. Pupil A even explains how he switches between Swedish and English with a Finnish friend.
(3) I have a friend I usually play with. He is Finnish, so he knows some Swedish and it happens that we speak some Swedish with each other, but mostly English. (Pupil A)

The pupils seem to be more aware of CS outside of the classroom and while the pupils’ code-switching inside the classroom is the primary focus on what will be discussed in Section 6.2, it confirms Cook’s (2001) claim that CS mostly occurs outside the classroom. However, that is not fully supported by all the pupils in the study. Both Pupil D and E speak the majority of their English in the classroom and not outside of it.

(4) Spanish and English I only use in school and Swedish I use at home and everywhere else. (Pupil D)

As these two pupils also reported that their English proficiency was low, then this could be used as an argument that the proficiency levels of the pupils affect their code-switching in and outside the classroom.

Moreover, in connection with Pupil C’s view of teacher CS, ethnicity seems to be an important part of CS and how it occurs. Pupil C’s grandmother is from Macedonia and because of that, Pupil C has developed the ability to understand that language and speak a few words of it when it is necessary needed.

(5) My grandma is from Macedonia, but I do not speak Macedonian. I understand, but I do not speak it. (Pupil C)

Pupil C further elaborates at the end of the interview on the topic of the grandmother. She reports how she uses certain Macedonian words to help make her speech clear so that her grandmother fully understands what Pupil C is trying to say when they are conversing. It makes it easier to have implied meanings being understood as the Swedish conversation could be confusing for the grandmother.

(6) To make it easier for her. Because she has lived there for most of her life, it becomes easier for her if I try to speak as much Macedonian with her as possible. (Pupil C)

This implies that in her case, CS has a pragmatic function, because she helps her grandmother to understand what she means, which is then connected with Amorim (2012) who reports the connection between different pragmatic functions and CS in terms of negotiating meaning.

In summary, pupils reported how they code-switch to make the language sound better in order to create added effect to their sentences, phrases or words. They also code-switch when playing games with friends that have different language backgrounds. One of the pupils also
code-switch to her native Macedonian in order to help her grandma understand what she means in conversations. These answers came up naturally during the interviews and are therefore relevant to contrast with code-switching that happens inside the EFL classroom.

6.2 Code-switching in the EFL classroom

All seven pupils that were interviewed had similar thoughts on the occurrence of CS in the EFL classroom. CS in the EFL classroom is tied very closely with the level of language proficiency, peers code-switching to help each other with learning, as well as describing words or texts to each other. This appears during teacher-led class, regular schoolwork, group work or in discussion between the pupils themselves. Language proficiency appears to be central to CS, as it seems to dictate the amount of switching or the perception of it. CS is shown to be happening in the classroom primarily as a part of learning and not as a fun activity that is done sporadically.

The pupils all agree that they have witnessed both their teacher and their peers code-switching at some point during the lessons. The pupils report that it had to do with understanding the content and material. All pupils reported that CS primarily occurred to make the pupils understand the material from the lesson. When a peer does not understand, all of them agreed that it is beneficial to switch into Swedish so that everyone understands. This fits in well with the syllabus and the idea of languages supporting each other to build upon the language levels of the pupils (Natl. Ag. F. Ed, 2011). This is shown in Quote 7.

(7) Because if the person really does not understand, it could be an important part of an assignment that is very important that it is understood. Then it could feel very good for that person to understand what it means, a word might gain a new meaning for the text. (Pupil F)

If the pupils acquire the assistance they need, they will not have to ask for extra help or delay the class because they are unsure of what to do. This is in accordance with Amorim’s (2012) conclusion that the pupils use CS to fill in gaps in both their lexical and grammatical areas of English.

Pupil F in Quote 7 touches upon how a text’s meaning could rapidly change to a new one if you properly understand its contents instead of doing nothing and therefore feeling confused. The pupil’s report is also in connection with Macaro (2009) and his research regarding the acquisition of L1 and L2 vocabulary. Therefore, using a few words in L1 could be very beneficial for the pupil to acquire the L2 content. This also shows how the shared interaction between L1 and L2 that Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain (2005) speak about is used to facilitate
resourceful switching into the L1. If a combination of L1 and L2 is useful for learning, the pupils have no qualms about switching between the languages to achieve it:

(8) I could have probably done well by only speaking English in an English lesson. It could be good to have a little Swedish if someone does not understand, but I am fine with using English only. (Pupil A)

Even Pupil A who seemed adamant about wanting to use as much English as possible in the EFL classroom, does not consider switching a negative occurrence if used for the right purpose. However, Pupil D thought that there could be a disadvantage with this:

(9) That you might get used to it. So, if you speak Swedish or English, you start to speak Swedish just because you do not understand. (Pupil D)

Too much switching into Swedish could according to him be harmful as the pupils might forego using the target language as much as they could do.

CS during class usually occurs whenever the teacher is leading the class or when the pupils are engaged in group activities or discussions. CS in the Swedish EFL classroom is tied very closely to the teacher’s CS. The teacher annotates, exemplifies or explains the material for the pupils in their L1 so that they are following the content during the lesson. This connects to the Halliday framework that was discussed by Lin (2013). The teacher draws upon ideational functions of language by using words or phrases of L1 to help the pupils understand the L2 material that has been presented during class:

(10) For example, when the teacher explains what you are supposed to do during an exercise in English and then there may be someone who does not understand. Then you might explain to them in Swedish to those that have it a little harder in English, so they understand what you are supposed to do and then you have the discussion in English. (Pupil F)

Quote 10 is also connected with the textual functions of Halliday’s framework such as topic shifts or switching between exercises. The functions could intertwine and appear together when the teacher is using the L1 for the pupils. The goal when using L1 in this way is to aid the pupils in their learning so that the material that the pupils work with does not hinder them if they do not understand it. This is also related to Cook (2001) and the concurrent language method. The teacher switches to the pupils’ L1 at very specific moments to achieve learning.

In addition, Pupil G says that switching between languages is a good thing because you appear more serious, funny and that you are able to learn more by doing it. He explains that if
the conversation could benefit from using English that should be a good thing and therefore English should be used. However, people might consider it “weird” if you start speaking English in everyday conversations in Sweden without a base to do it.

(11) If people cannot follow the conversation because they do not understand English, then it becomes a disadvantage. Because then everyone might not be able to participate in it. . . It could become a bit weird and people start wondering why you are speaking in English. (Pupil G)

Furthermore, there was one occurrence of CS that only Pupil B and A reported about. It was about how the teacher sometimes enables the pupils to use Swedish when they answer. Pupil B, when asked about in what situation he switches between languages, reports how the other pupils in his class sometimes answer in Swedish when asked by the teacher to do that:

(12) [I switch between languages] when I have the possibility to answer in English during an English lesson. Then it is a little better if you answer in English unless you are asked to say it in Swedish. Then you have to say it in Swedish. (Pupil B)

This most likely occurs during translation or when something difficult is being explained in order to not confuse all the other pupils in the classroom. Pupil B did not further elaborate on it, but it does contradict the older research that Lin (2013) said primarily found the pupils using L2 when the teacher was in control of the class. This could just be an outlier in the classroom or a special method employed by the teacher of that class, but it shows that even the teacher might expect usage of L1 from the pupils if needed. We do not know why the teacher would do this or for what pedagogical reasons it is used. However, if we interviewed teachers about this, we would be able to find out if this is used by more teachers. Answering in Swedish could possibly be used to overcome speaking anxiety or when the pupils are having difficulties with the target language(s).

In summary, switching occurs in the classroom mainly as a way to help the pupils understand whatever is going on during the lessons and to scaffold their learning. The teachers used CS to help explain assignments and questions while the pupils help each other with difficult parts during group work or discussion in order to make sure that the activities can continue. The pupils interviewed show an attitude that, as evident in the seven interviews, their peers or teachers code-switching is acceptable if it assists learning.
6.3 Interlocutors
The interlocutors very clearly affect CS of the interviewed pupils much and in different ways. This is shown in relation to their family, friends, classmates and the teacher. Whoever is part of the conversation helps dictate in what way and direction the conversation will work. For example, Pupil G mentions that:

(13) English, I use mostly abroad because it is the language everyone understands. To get by you need to be able to talk with everyone. (Pupil G)

Depending on the recipient in the conversation, you would need to adapt your language to the receiver of the statement or question in and outside the classroom. The interlocutors affect the switching inside the classroom as well. Pupil B explains how he switches between Swedish and Spanish with his friend during their Spanish lessons.

(14) One of my friends also takes Spanish lessons and you might want to see so that you understand each other. (Pupil B)

He uses his friend’s help to check their language proficiency in the Spanish language when they are present at school. While Pupil B’s quotes does not portray the Swedish EFL classroom, Quote 14 still shows some form of CS in relation to language learning at school.

CS occurs regularly in group work where the pupils have discussions with their classmates. The interlocutors also affect what language is being spoken in the classroom. Pupil A reports how someone answering him in Swedish could make him switch to that language as well:

(15) I would not say that it has happened often, but it happened that there was a sentence or so in Swedish. I started saying something, sure, I thought I should finish it, but what happens is that you speak some Swedish. If someone answers in Swedish, then it happens that you speak some more Swedish. (Pupil A)

This was not further elaborated on, but it shows how an interlocutor’s answer affected Pupil A and made him use a different language than he had intended as part of an exercise or something similar.

Teacher CS in relation to the pupils is natural. Pupil G reports what she thinks of the teacher CS. She reports that it is acceptable for the teacher to use code-switching methods as well as not caring much about the teacher’s CS since it is natural for the teacher to do it in a learning context. This is related to the interpersonal function of CS Lin (2013) presented where the one-on-one relationship between pupils and the teacher is in focus. Pupil C does not seem to mind what method the teacher employs to achieve learning.
(16) Yes, but it is not like I am bothered by [the teacher switching] either. It is so that everyone will understand. (Pupil C)

Establishing who the interlocutors are is important when you forward your message. Pupil G has thus identified that the interlocutor’s effect on speech could be tied to individuals or groups depending on where you are at the point and time of the conversation. On the other hand, there is Pupil F who does not believe there are special people he switches with. If he finds himself in the situation where he needs to switch, he will do it.

(17) No, I would not say that [I switch with anyone special]. If I find myself in a situation where I need to switch between languages, it does not matter who I do it with. (Pupil F)

He reports that if the exercise or lesson requires him to code-switch into Swedish when speaking with his classmates, he will do that as the situation with his interlocutors requires it. Thus, CS seems to be contextually based in the majority of the scenarios that had been reported by the pupils. This ties with Liebscher and Dailey O’cain’s (2005) claim that CS was based on the participants within the study and how their presence affected the code-switching.

In summary, interlocutors affect the code-switching in some ways. Reports from the pupils say that interlocutors can both enable CS and be enabled to code-switch by other pupils. Furthermore, as reported in Section 6.1, the interlocutors play a vital role in language proficiency where if someone does not understand the language during the conversation, code-switching could occur because of that. In addition, one of the pupils reported how it is not important who the interlocutor is as he will code-switch if the situation demands it, which implies CS is contextually based.

6.4 Attitudes to code-switching
All pupils answered that they used either English or Swedish during the lessons. They did use other languages that occurs in other classrooms such as Spanish or German or in the case of Pupil C, Macedonian, but during the English lessons, they used their native language and English. However, the pupils did not all use Swedish to the same extent. Both Pupil A and B try to use as little Swedish as possible during the lessons as they enjoy speaking English more than the other pupils in the classroom. Pupil C and G reported that they spoke more Swedish than English during an English lesson. Pupil D, E and F never specified how much Swedish they use except that it was based on what they were doing during the lesson.

The pupils have clear attitudes to their CS. Pupil B usually only switched as a mistake and tried to limit his usage of Swedish.
Here he implies that he prefers to use the target language in the classroom and that he views it as a negative or rare occurrence that he switches between the languages. He considers it better to speak mainly English as this is a language “you can speak with almost everyone” (19, Pupil B). This is compared with Pupil G that explicitly mentions how his switching in his last English lesson went.

(20) When I switched between the languages? It was somewhere at the beginning of the exercise that I started speaking Swedish, but when the actual exercise started, then I began to speak English. The majority of the lesson you easily speak in Swedish. (Pupil G)

These quotes show that the pupils are divided in their view of how much Swedish is supposed to be spoken or code-switched into during the lessons, much like Amorim’s (2012) participants were divided in their attitudes to CS.

The pupils’ proficiency seems to be connected to their occurring CS. Pupil G tends to only use the target language (English) whenever the assignment calls for it and sticks to Swedish otherwise, even though he considers himself a good English speaker. This could be tied to the pupils’ proficiency levels as Pupils A and B found themselves to be “decent” or “good” speakers of English. They both report that they use the language often while Pupil B reports how he finds English easier than Swedish at times:

(21) Personally, I believe I speak very good English. I almost find it easier than speaking Swedish at times. I speak it so often and have [English class] so often. (Pupil B)

This is in contrast with Pupil C and F who found themselves to be “adequate” at speaking English. Pupil C reports that she is “decent” at English while Pupil F reports how he considers himself “mediocre” at it. Pupil D and E found themselves to be on the weaker side of speaking English as they repeatedly explain how much Swedish they use during English lessons. The attitude differences seem to tie in with the idea of the pupils having different ages. The reason for this could be the familiarity with the school or classmates, but that does not have to be the only reason. If you compare the results to Amorim’s (2012) study, the participant’s language proficiency does affect their frequency of switching as the stronger pupils seem less inclined to code-switch into Swedish. There might be a connection between the pupils’ perceived proficiency level and their use of code-switching to Swedish. However, no evidence suggests that younger pupils code-switch more into Swedish, which could have
been expected, compared to the more experienced, older pupils who share more familiarity with the school.

However, the pupils’ proficiency levels do not only imply that they believe that you should speak primarily Swedish in the EFL classroom. Pupil G, who reported how he spoke Swedish a majority during the English lesson, as well as Pupil D, who also spoke a great amount of Swedish, still consider it important that English is the primary language during the English lessons. They both mention how that is the main way to develop their English proficiency. When Pupil D was asked why he was using English and Swedish he answered:

(22) Because if it is an English lesson, you are supposed to speak English. (Pupil D)

This shows that even for the weaker pupils, it is still beneficial for them to work on their level of English. The pupils will not acquire better English proficiency unless they put in some form of effort to achieve that. This connects with the 7-9 syllabus (2011) where it is written that English lessons should be primarily conducted in English.

In summary, the pupils have divided attitudes to their occurring CS. The students who consider their proficiency in English to be good also report using less code switching into Swedish. For example, Pupil B who deems himself to have good knowledge of English, reports how his switching is primarily done by mistake and that he finds it easier to speak in English. This is contrast to Pupil E and D who both say that they are weaker speakers, and who speak more Swedish during the lessons. However, all pupils report that English lessons should primarily be spoken in the target language as that is the best way of becoming better at the language.

7 Conclusion and pedagogical implications

The aim of this study was to investigate lower-secondary pupils’ language switching in and outside the Swedish EFL classroom. To investigate this, the study focused on three research questions that encompassed the occurrence of CS in the EFL classroom according to the pupils, how the interlocutors affected their code-switching as well as their attitudes towards CS. To achieve the aims, interviews were conducted with seven different pupils at a lower secondary school in Sweden. Only pupils from one school was included in the study which was a result of other schools not answering the proposed emails about possible interviews with their pupils. The results confirmed much of the previous research while also showing a few interesting deviations.
According to the pupils, CS occurs outside the classroom to create added effect to their language or when playing games with friends. CS seems to occur in the classroom when pupils do not understand the content or when they need help from either the teacher or another peer. The teachers help the pupils by code-switching into Swedish to annotate, explain or exemplify the L2 material while the pupils switch when speaking with each other in order to achieve similar results. The pupils seem to accept CS if it enhances and helps achieve learning. Interlocutors affect CS; the pupils switch language instinctively or code-switch pragmatically: they help each other to achieve learning, and to work their way through exercises and assignments. The pupils had divided attitudes to CS where a few of the pupils thought of it as a mistake or a negative occurrence while others thought of it as natural to switch into Swedish during an English lesson. However, they all agreed that the primary language during an English lesson should be English.

This study is relevant for teachers because it has given an insight into how lower secondary pupils see CS in the Swedish EFL classroom. These results should be viewed as a small addition to the already existing pool of research that could possibly be a useful resource for teachers. The results should be used to enhance learning. The occurring code-switching reported by the pupils both in pupil and in teacher CS appeared to be perceived by the pupils as a positive and natural part of the learning environment CS could therefore be a useful method for teaching if done in a well-thought out manner and with clear planning. When writing the syllabus for lower secondary school, it would be worth mentioning that the pupils’ L1 could be an asset towards achieving L2-acquisiton. However, that does not mean that L1 should the primary focus, but instead be used as a communicative resource by the participants in the classroom.

This study could also be used by other lower secondary teachers as a resource to see if their pupils have similar attitudes as the pupils interviewed. It would be possible to ask if the pupils feel that it is easier to learn or if they feel that alternating between languages is redundant. An individual one-on-one discussion on CS with each pupil is a very difficult task to find time to work with, but teachers could still use these results as a resource, discuss the topic in groups or in full class during a lesson to see what works best for each class. Teaching should be adapted to the pupils, and that includes adapting when teachers code-switch or when they encourage or discourage students from CS. One way to achieve this would be to have a meta discussion about what languages could be used for what purpose in the classroom instead of focusing solely on English-only.
Future research should focus on collecting more data in the form of not only interviews, but also observations. More interviews would be beneficial to acquire a greater amount of data to work with and thus achieve more in-depth results. Then the results could be quantified and analysed to see if the results are supported by the numbers. Further exploring these pupils in connection with their classrooms is another way of adding to the result. Furthermore, observations would be informative, and they would help show if the pupils’ answers reflect reality in some way. Observations would show more than just pupil’s perception, but actual occurring CS in the classroom. One particular issue that would be worth researching is what Pupil B reported. He reported that he and his peers are sometimes offered to answer in Swedish during the English lessons. Interviewing teachers and asking them about such methods could be a starting point for discussion and research into whether that is a widespread phenomenon, or a localized method employed by the teacher of this particular pupil.
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Appendix 1 – Student consent forms

Student consent form

Contact information
Jesper Grenander
Linnéus University (Växjö)
Jg222rc@student.lnu.se

The aim of this study is to look at different pupils’ view on switching between different languages in the EFL-classroom while speaking. Therefore, this project aims to interview pupils.

Any participation in this interview projects is voluntary, and you are allowed to leave and cancel whenever you want to. This means that you are allowed to participate for how long you want and can stop at any moment. You will be anonymous and have the highest amount of confidentiality. There should be no possibilities of you being recognised in this study. The material used in the study will be used in a way to make it unidentifiable which person it is that has participated. All data and material collected will only be used for this study.

Furthermore, there are no right or wrong answers to any questions, and nothing you do in this interview will be assessed or affect your grade in school in any way. I hope you will answer the way you feel about the questions truthfully. Your answers will be very important to the study and highly appreciated.

By signing here, I hereby choose to take part in this study and the interview material will be used in the study. I have received both written and oral information about the purpose of the interview and I have read and accepted the information mentioned above.

____________________  __________________
City                  Date

________________________
Signature

Clarification of signature
Målet med denna studie är att titta på olika elevers syn på att använda olika språk i engelska klassrummet när de pratar. Därmed är tanken att intervjua elever som en del av projektet.


Det finns inga fel eller rätt svar till några av frågorna och inget som du gör kommer bli bedömt eller påverka ditt betyg i ämnet. Jag hoppas att du svarar sanningsenligt på frågorna då svaren betyder mycket för mig och min studie.

Genom att signera här så väljer jag att delta i denna studie och att intervjumaterialet kan användas i studien. Jag har tagit del av både skriftlig och muntlig information om syftet för intervjun samt jag har läst och accepterat information som beskrivits ovan.

__________________________   ________________________
Ort                          Datum

______________________________________________
Namnteckning

______________________________________________
Namnförtydligande
Appendix 2 - Interview Questions

Interview questions:

1. Vilka språk talar du och vilket var ditt modersmål? (What languages do you speak and what was your first language(s)?)
   Hur bra tycker du att du pratar detta språk? (How good do you believe you speak this language?)

2. Tycker du om att prata de språken? (Do you enjoy speaking those languages?)

3. Varför använder du de språken (Why do you use those languages?)

4. När använder du de språken (When do you use those languages?)

5. Hur ofta använder du de språken? (How often do you use those languages?)

6. Vilka språk talar du under engelskalektionerna? (What languages do you speak during English class?)
   Hur kommer det säg att du använder dessa språken? (How come you use these languages?)
   Varför använder du bara engelska? (Why do you only use English?)

7. Mixar du Engelska och Svenska något? Ja/nej, varför? (Do you ever mix English and Swedish? Yes/no, why?)

8. Mixar du/mixar du inte olika språk? (Do you mix/do you not mix different languages?)
   I vilka situationer väljer du att prata/använda/byta mellan x? (In what situations do you choose to speak/use/switch between X?)

9. Om du tänker tillbaka till din senaste engelskalektion. Bytte du något mellan språk då? (If you think back on your last English lesson, did you switch between languages then?)

10. Varför gör du det? (Why do you do it?)

11. Varför gör du inte det? (Why do you not do it?)

12. När gör du det? (When do you do it?)

13. Anser du att du borde göra detta mer eller mindre? Ja/Nej, Varför? (Do you think you should do this more or less? Yes/No, Why?)

14. Vilka fördelar eller nackdelar tror du det finns med att byta mellan språk? (What advantages or disadvantages do you see in switching languages?)
15. Varför är X en fördel/nackdel? (Why is X an advantage or disadvantage?) – Repeat as needed

16. Har du någon gång märkt av om dina klasskamrater byter mellan språk? (Have you ever noticed if your classmates switch between languages?)

17. Har du någon gång märkt av om dina lärare byter mellan språk? (Have you ever noticed if your classmates switch between languages?)

18. Vad tycker du om det här? (What do you think of this?)

19. Finns det några specifika personer du byter språk med? (Are there any specific people you switch languages with?)

20. Varför byter du språk med denna personen/dessa personer? (Why do you switch languages with these people/this person?)

21. Varför byter du inte språk med denna personen/dessa personer? (Why do you not switch languages with these people/this person?)
Appendix 3 - Emails

Email draft:

Hi

My name is Jesper Grenander and I am studying the teacher program at Linnaeus University in Växjö. Currently, I am writing a bachelors essay in the subject of English. I am interested in how English and other languages are used by the pupils. To complete this essay, I need you and your pupils’ help. This would imply that I need to observe a few lessons and hold interviews with a few of your pupils to create my material. Would it be possible for me to come and talk with a few of your pupils? It would only take a few minutes and I would give them the necessary information required for the interview as well.

Best Regards Jesper
Email draft (Swedish)

Hej.


Med vänliga hälsningar Jesper
Appendix 4 – Quotes from participants in Swedish

(2) Under lektioner och ibland hemma. Vissa ord som låter bättre på engelska. Vissa uttryck som låter bättre på engelska. (Elev E)

(3) Jag har en kompis jag brukar spela med. Han är ju finsk så han kan ju lite svenska och då blir det ibland att man pratar lite svenska med varandra, men mest engelska (Elev A)

(4) Spanska och engelska använder jag bara i skolan och svenska använder jag hemma och överallt. (Elev D)

(5) Min Farmor är från makedonien, men jag pratar inte makedonska. Jag förstår, men jag pratar inte. (Elev C)

(6) För att göra det lättare för henne. Eftersom hon har levt där ganska mycket av sitt liv så blir det lättare för henne om jag försöker prata så mycket makedonska med henne som möjligt. (Elev C)

(7) För att om personen verkligen inte fattar så kan det vara ett viktigt moment i en övning som är väldigt viktig att man förstår. Då kan det vara väldigt skönt för den att veta vad det betyder, ett ord kan få en helt ny mening för en text. (Elev F)

(8) Jag hade nog kunnat klara mig att bara köra engelska på en engelskalektion. Det kan vara bra att ha med lite svenska i fall nån inte förstår, men jag klarar mig då med engelska. (Elev A)

(9) Att man kanske vänjer sig vid det. Så om när man pratar svenska så eller engelska så börjar man prata svenska för att man inte kan. (Elev D)

(10) Till exempel när läraren kan förklara vad man ska göra en uppgift på engelska och då kanske det är någon som inte förstår. Då kanske man kan förklara för dem på svenska för dem som kanske har det lite svårare för engelska så förstår dem vad man ska göra och sen tar man diskussionen på engelska efter det. (Elev F)

(11) Om inte folk kan liksom följa med i samtalen för att de ej kan engelska då blir ju det en nackdel. För då kan inte alla delta kanske. . . Det kan ju bli lite konstigt då och folk kanske bara undrar varför du pratar engelska. (Elev G)

(12) Det är väl just i fall jag har möjligheten att svara i engelska i fall under en engelskalektion just. Då är det ju lite bättre om man svara engelska i fall man inte då blir tillsagd att säga det på svenska. Då får man säga det på svenska. (Elev B)

(13) Engelska använder jag då utomlands för det är språket alla kan. För att klara mig måste man kunna prata med alla liksom. (Elev G)
(14) En av mina kompisar tar också spanskalektioner och så då kanske man vill se. Så man förstår varandra. (Elev B)

(15) Jag skulle inte säga att det hänt ofta, men det kan vara att det blev någon mening eller så på svenska. Man började säga någonting, visst man tyckte man borde avsluta det, men blir det att man pratar lite svenska o så. Svarar någon på svenska då så blir det att man pratar lite mer svenska. (Elev A)

(16) Ja, men inte så att jag stör mig på det heller. Det är för att alla ska förstå (Elev C)

(17) Nej, det skulle jag inte säga. Finner jag mig i den situation att jag måste byta språk så spelar det ingen roll vem jag gör det med utan. (Elev F)

(18) Kan av misstag, men jag försöker inte göra det. (Elev B)

(19) man kan prata med nästan alla. (Elev B)

(20) När jag switcha mellan språken då eller? Det var väl någonstans när uppgiften började så började jag prata svenska men när själva uppgiften kom in så det var då man började prata engelska. Majoriteten pratar man ju lätt svenska under en engelskalektion. (Elev G)


(22) För att om det är engelskalektion så ska man prata engelska. (Elev D)