

Breaking Language Barriers

*Swedish Upper Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Towards and Use of Swedish in the
EFL Classroom*



LUND
UNIVERSITY

Author: Caroline Tiihonen

Supervisor: Dr. Eric Pudney

Term: Spring 2023

Course: ÄENM02

Individual Research Project (30 hp)

English Teacher Education

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate Swedish upper secondary English teachers' attitudes towards and use of Swedish in the EFL classroom. In addition to examining teachers' attitudes, the study investigated when teachers feel it is beneficial to use Swedish and why in these specific situations. Five upper secondary English teachers participated in the study. The study was conducted by observing two English lessons per teacher, followed by qualitative semi-structured interviews. The result of this study shows that teachers have a generally accepting, but not necessarily positive, attitude towards the use of Swedish in the EFL classroom. There are several instances where they believe Swedish is beneficial, such as when teaching grammar, translating difficult words, giving feedback, and bonding with and disciplining students. However, most teachers feel that it is crucial to limit the use of Swedish as it can have a negative effect on the students' language learning. During the observations, the teachers mainly used English. The observation and following interviews showed that teachers may not always be aware of what language they are speaking and might speak Swedish, even if they afterwards perceive the situation as having been handled in English.

Keywords: EFL teaching, Translanguaging, Codeswitching, L1 in L2 classroom, Teacher attitudes

Table of contents

Introduction	1
<i>Aim and Research Questions</i>	<i>4</i>
Background	5
<i>Historical Approaches to Language Teaching</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Previous Research</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>A Monolingual or Multilingual Approach</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>The Role of English in Sweden</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>Teachers' Attitudes Towards and Use of Swedish in the English Classroom</i>	<i>10</i>
Method	13
<i>Participants</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Ethical consideration</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Observations</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Interviews</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Limitations</i>	<i>18</i>
Results and Discussion	19
<i>The Teachers' Attitudes and Opinions</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>The Teachers' General Attitudes Towards Using Swedish When Teaching English</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Assumptions of Language Use Before or Directly After Graduation</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Teachers' Thoughts on the Requirements of the Steering Documents</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Teachers' Opinions on Limiting the Use of Swedish</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Situations When the Teachers Use Swedish Instead of English</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Translating into Swedish or Definition in English</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Grammar</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Feedback and Assessment</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Bonding With Students</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Discipline in the Classroom</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Communication in the Classroom</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Teacher 1</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Teacher 2</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Teacher 3</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Teacher 4</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Teacher 5</i>	<i>39</i>
Conclusion	42
<i>Suggestions for Further Research</i>	<i>44</i>
Reference List	45
Appendix A	49
Appendix B	50
Appendix C	51

Introduction

Language acquisition is a well-researched and debated topic, especially second language acquisition. One of the topics of interest is how students use their linguistic repertoire and the role of students' first language, L1, when learning another language; In other words, whether one should utilise a monolingual or multilingual approach. While there has been a lot of research to determine whether or not educators should include students' first language, researchers are divided, and there has been no conclusive evidence for either stance. While some researchers believe that teachers should only speak and accept the target language, others find that using a combination of students' first language and the target language is beneficial for their learning (see, e.g., Garcia & Wei, 2018; Harmer, 2015; Cook, 2022).

While researching second language acquisition, many have investigated the role of the L1 when teaching English. The reason why English language teaching is usually researched is due to the fact that English is taught, more or less, worldwide. English is by far one of the most spoken languages and there are more second language, L2, speakers than native speakers (Lundahl, 2019, p. 59). This is not surprising, considering English is the most common second or foreign language taught in the world (Cenoz & Gorter, 2015, p. 2). In Swedish schools, English is an important and mandatory core subject all students must take. In upper secondary school, one English course is mandatory for vocational programs and two English courses for college preparatory programs (Hult, 2012; Hult, 2017, p. 267). Sweden is a diverse country with several languages spoken, and not everyone has Swedish as their mother tongue. Since Swedish is not all students' or teachers' mother tongue, they may all have different proficiencies and relations to the Swedish language, which may have an effect on their experience. However, everyone must learn Swedish in school, either as their first or second language. Furthermore, based on previous research, it seems that Swedish is the most commonly used L1 or language used in addition to English when teaching English in Sweden. Therefore, this study is only

investigating the use of Swedish in the English classroom as Swedish is the official language of Sweden and the language everyone in the classroom has in common. While it would be interesting to also include other possible languages in addition to Swedish and how students with another L1 perceive the use of Swedish, it is not possible for this study.

No matter the teaching approach used, the students will encounter language input, either provided by the teacher, the peers, or the material. The difficulty level of the language input varies depending on the origin and the intended purpose of the input. Teachers will most likely adjust their language to accommodate their students and their proficiency, known as teacher talk, while something intended for a native audience will be adjusted for that level of proficiency (Abrahamsson, 2009, pp. 188-189).

Studies on bilinguals' speech patterns have shown that they tend to mix their languages when interacting with people and will often mix languages even within a single sentence (Cantone, 2007, p. 55). In the same way that all languages in common are used outside of the classroom in the multilingual world, a language that everyone in the classroom has in common will be used, even when teaching another language. In this case, Swedish would be used to some extent, even in the English classroom, as it is the language everyone has in common.

During the last few decades, translanguaging has increased in popularity and is more widely used when researching language use, both in the classroom and outside of it. Translanguaging entails that a person's linguistic repertoire is not divided into different systems for each language but is, instead, one big combined system where every language known is always active (Garcia & Wei, 2018). In the case of this study, this means that every language that students know is active, regardless of whatever subject they are studying; therefore, Swedish is activated during their English lessons. Of course, other languages that students know, in addition to Swedish, would also be active during their English lessons. Another important theory on language use is codeswitching which, unlike translanguaging, divides languages into separate

systems. This means that one language at a time is active, but it is possible to switch between them, either in a sentence or between sentences (MacSwan, 2022, p. 83; Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2022, p. 173). For this study, codeswitching entails that a teacher can switch between Swedish and English as necessary during a lesson, but it is not believed that both languages are active at the same time.

While some researchers in Sweden have previously investigated upper secondary teachers' attitudes towards using the L1 in English teaching, few have looked at how teachers actually use Swedish and, more importantly, why they use Swedish when teaching English. The previous studies have mainly been based on interviews, and there is, therefore, not much research on teachers' actions and language use in the classroom, not based on their own perception. This study will bridge this gap by conducting both interviews and observations to get more objective data on teachers' language use in the classroom. The present study will provide another perspective on Swedish English teachers' thought processes and actions regarding L1 use with the help of the concepts of translanguaging and codeswitching. It is essential to investigate teachers' opinions and practices as they do not have strict instructions from The Swedish National Agency for Education on how to conduct their teaching regarding language use.

In this study, five teachers will be interviewed to give their opinions on the topic and to add why and how they utilise the students' L1. During my teaching practice, some teachers talked about a form of stigma regarding using Swedish in the English classroom, and due to this, only conducting interviews might not give the full picture; Therefore, observations of the teachers will be conducted in addition to the interviews. Hopefully, the teachers will be more focused on their teachings and their students rather than being observed during the lessons, and therefore, not carefully consider their language use which would negate the possible stigma. Garcia and Wei (2018) discuss how it is the norm for second and foreign language teaching to

be conducted in the target language, and switching between languages is considered illegitimate and stigmatised. Whether this is true in Sweden is not certain, but hopefully, this study can shine some light on a few teachers' perceptions of it.

Aim and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to investigate Swedish upper secondary English teachers' attitudes towards and use of Swedish in the EFL classroom. The focus of this study is to explore what teachers think about using Swedish in addition to English in the EFL classroom, if they think teachers should do it, and their arguments for their stance by doing qualitative semi-structured interviews. Furthermore, two lessons per participant were observed to examine if and how they use Swedish in their lessons, which can lead to a discussion during the interviews on why they use it in those situations. The following research questions have been formulated to investigate this topic:

- What are the participating English teachers' attitudes towards using Swedish in the EFL classroom?
- When do the participating English teachers feel it is beneficial to use Swedish?
- In which situations do the participating English teachers use Swedish in the EFL classroom?

Background

This chapter presents the history of English teaching in Sweden, previous research on translanguaging, codeswitching, monolingual and multilingual approaches, and studies investigating Swedish English teachers' opinions on using the L1 in the EFL classroom.

Historical Approaches to Language Teaching

Ideas about and approaches to teaching languages have changed significantly during the last century. In the 1970s, the most popular approach was grammar-translation, where the L1 was mainly used as the students worked with translation. Moreover, the students were supposed to learn the target language by comparing it to their L1 (Lundalh, 2019, p. 313). As a reaction to this approach, another approach known as the direct method came about. When following the direct method, teaching should solely focus on teaching the learner the target language by using it and not letting the L1 interfere. In the direct method, students are no longer explicitly instructed on, for example, grammar rules but are supposed to discover them on their own when using the language (Harmer, 2015, p. 56).

Today, the communicative language teaching approach is more common worldwide and has been since the late 1980s. The communicative language teaching approach entails that the focus has shifted from concentrating on the form of the language, with the aim being to acquire vocabulary and grammar, to focusing on how to use the language and what it is used for. Students are supposed to interact with the teacher and each other through discussions, role-playing or simulating situations they will encounter in their daily lives (Harmer, 2015, pp. 56-58). Sweden also aspires to use the communicative language teaching approach due to following the Common European Framework for Reference for Languages, CEFR, which concentrates on actions and using the language to learn it (Lundahl, 2019). We can find this communicative language teaching approach in the syllabuses for upper secondary English. The

main purpose of English education in Swedish upper secondary schools, which incorporates reception and production, is for the students to “develop all-round communicative skills” and gain “strategies to support communication and to solve problems when language skills are inadequate” (Skolverket, 2022a). In other words, the students not only have to understand the English language, but there is a significant focus on being able to communicate in English. Since students are supposed to be able to communicate well in English, they have to be taught how to do that, which might be best in English during class to allow them time to practice.

Previous Research

A Monolingual or Multilingual Approach

Translanguaging is a theory and way of looking at language knowledge and acquisition where one views a person’s language skills as their complete linguistic repertoire that is not divided into separate systems but one big system where languages are divided into sections (Garcia & Wei, 2018, pp. 36,45). These sections of languages are active more or less all the time, depending on the situation. When speaking a language, the section for that specific language is active, but all the other known languages are active in the background to a lesser degree (Cook, 2022, p. 52). Cantone (2007) states that a language can never be fully deactivated in a bilingual brain (p. 55). Because of this, researchers standing by translanguaging believe that excluding students’ first language is questionable as their L1 can be an advantage when acquiring another language (Auer, 2022, p. 126). Moreover, disregarding the L1 creates a monolingual environment that does not align with the multilingual reality (Cook, 2022, p. 58).

Another theory of language knowledge is codeswitching, which also deals with bilingual speakers who use more than one language in a specific situation, either in a sentence or between sentences. Unlike translanguaging, codeswitching considers languages as two, or more,

separate systems that do not intermingle but that bilingual speakers switch between the systems when they are codeswitching (MacSwan, 2022, p. 83; Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2022, p. 173).

Garcia (2009, quoted in Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2022, p. 166) considers codeswitching to be a part of translanguaging but also concludes that translanguaging “goes beyond what has been termed codeswitching”. In this case, Swedish students learning English will have the part responsible for their Swedish language knowledge activated while learning and speaking English and vice versa. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study, translanguaging and codeswitching will be considered two separate concepts to differentiate the teachers’ use and reported use of the L1.

Researchers have concluded that using students’ L1 to teach them other languages is beneficial as it enables teachers to create bonds with the students, give complex information, maintain discipline in the classroom, translate between languages to ensure understanding and teach grammar (Garcia & Wei, 2018, p. 97; Ellis & Shintani, 2014, pp. 234-235). Furthermore, it can add a more humoristic atmosphere that makes the classroom environment friendlier and can even help students feel included and part of a group which in turn can lead to more student involvement (Rubdy, 2007 as cited in Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 128).

Previously, many researchers have been sceptical about the benefits of utilising students’ L1 as they have been afraid of interference, also known as negative transfer, which entails that their L1 leads to errors in their use of their L2 by doing something that is correct in their L1 but incorrect in their L2. These kinds of differences may lead to learners avoiding some things as they are not present in their L1. For example, if their L1 does not include articles, they will not include articles in their L2, even if they are supposed to do so. There is, however, also something known as positive transfer, which is when something is transferred from the L1 to the L2 that is correct in both languages; in other words, the L1 helps the acquisition of the L2 (Ellis, 1997, pp. 51-52; Abrahamsson, 2009, p. 21).

When teaching a language, the students must encounter spoken and written language, also known as input. Abrahamsson (2009) explains that Krashen's input hypothesis is one way of viewing how input affects a student's learning. According to the hypothesis, a student will acquire a language when the input is comprehensible, in other words, when they understand what is being said. Even if the input is complex, it will be considered comprehensible if the student can discern the meaning by utilising gesticulation, knowledge of the world, and the semantic, grammatical, and situational context to understand it. The input also must be interesting to the student as well as not too limited in terms of quantity. However, it is important to note that the input cannot be too difficult, but it must be just slightly above the student's level of proficiency, which Krashen called $i + 1$, where i is the learner's proficiency level, and $+1$ denotes the level above the learning which the teacher should aim for (Abrahamsson, 2009, pp. 120-121; Ellis, 1997, p. 47; Lundahl, 2019, p. 118). According to Krashen, this $i + 1$ method is the only force driving language acquisition. The input students get from teachers is known as teacher talk, which is adjusted to fit students' proficiency level and needs. Despite teachers lowering their output level to adjust for the learner, they still use correct grammatical structures even if the language in itself is very simplified. Moreover, the teacher's language must be natural and communicative. Even if this comprehensible input and students being able to interact are necessary to acquire a language, it does not guarantee that the student is successful in language acquisition as several factors on an individual level, as well as on a group and societal level, can affect it (Abrahamsson, 2009, p. 179, 188-189, 197; Lundahl, 2019, p. 119). For this to be helpful when learning English, the input, of course, must be in English and not the students' L1.

While the research shows both positive and negative aspects of incorporating students' L1 when teaching the L2, according to Harmer (2019) and Lundahl (2019), it is clear that regardless

of whether teachers are positive or negative towards the use of the L1, it has to be used sparingly as the students might otherwise completely disregard the L2 and solely use their L1.

The Role of English in Sweden

With globalisation and the spread of English, more and more people have to, or at least try to, learn English to be able to communicate with people outside of their country. This has led to English becoming a lingua franca where people who do not have the same mother tongue communicate by speaking or writing in English. In other words, when learning English, we no longer do it only to communicate with native speakers of English and try to become more native-like ourselves but discover other social environments for and uses of English, including our own local version (Hult, 2012). However, while English has become an important global language and is widely used, it is still considered a foreign language in Sweden as it does not have an official role (Lundahl, 2019, p. 61). Therefore, English education in Sweden is considered as teaching English as a foreign language, EFL. Despite this, due to the terms commonly used in language acquisition research, English will be known as the second language, L2, in this study.

In Sweden, students start learning English in elementary school and continue taking English courses through compulsory school. Moreover, English is a required subject in upper secondary school as well. Depending on the program the students are studying, they have to take more or fewer English courses (Skolverket, 2011b, pp. 4-5). Furthermore, even if taking more English courses than the mandatory ones is not required, students should always have the possibility to take all the required courses needed to be eligible for higher studies, with English 6 being one of those courses (Utbildningsguiden, 2023).

In the syllabus for upper secondary English, there is some contradictory information given about how much teachers should include Swedish in their teaching. On the one hand, education

should “as far as possible be conducted in English”, but at the same time, the teachers should make the students curious and develop their language skills and plurilingualism to learn how “different languages interact and support each other” (Skolverket, 2011a/2022a). According to Skolverket (2022b), teachers should use the target language as much as possible to ensure that the students get enough appropriate input which will, in turn, encourage the students to speak more of the target language. However, they are aware that all other languages cannot be excluded, and the teachers must use their professional judgement to decide when and how much they should use other languages, most likely Swedish, when teaching English (Skolverket, 2022b, p. 10).

Teachers’ Attitudes Towards and Use of Swedish in the English Classroom

In Sweden, few studies have investigated teachers’ attitudes towards using the L1 in the upper secondary English classroom, and none about using a monolingual approach in Sweden (Källkvist et al., 2022b, p. 106). Primarily, these studies have been written by bachelor students or as degree projects and are, therefore, relatively small research projects. However, they have given an insight into the realities of Swedish EFL teachers and their teachings. Seeing as there are so many student projects on this topic goes to show that teacher students and newly graduated teachers find this an interesting and relevant area to investigate and consider. Overall, the research has indicated that most teachers, if not all of them, who were interviewed, use Swedish in some capacity in addition to the target language, English.

Teachers interviewed about their attitudes and use of Swedish in the English classroom in Swedish upper secondary schools mention several instances where they use Swedish instead of English for their students’ language acquisition. These teachers use Swedish to translate words, explain difficult concepts, teach and compare grammar and clarify things that the students do not understand in English (Ekman, 2015; Andersson, 2018; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Kizil,

2017; Nilsson, 2015; Torvaldsdotter, 2020). Ekman (2015) also found that some teachers utilised the L1 in order to bond with their students.

Some of the participating teachers, however, explained that the students' language proficiency affected their language use in the classroom. The teachers said they did not use Swedish when teaching the higher courses as they believed that the students should be proficient enough not to need the Swedish clarification that less proficient students in the lower courses need (Ekman, 2015; Nilsson, 2019). Students with lower L2 proficiency tend to use their L1 more than students with higher proficiency. They use the L1 not only because they are unsure but also to understand the information and concept and reach a more complex understanding (Gunnarsson et al., 2015). According to teachers interviewed, this, in turn, might make some teachers more prone to use the L1 with these students as they want them to understand the instructions. However, while some teachers try to clarify the information using English, some immediately switch to Swedish as they believe that works best with some students (Torvaldsdotter, 2020; Nilsson, 2015; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Andersson, 2018).

Nearly all teachers interviewed for studies about the use of Swedish mention that they believe there are advantages to using Swedish during English lessons. These advantages are, for example, making the students comfortable in the learning environment, getting the students to listen to them and pay attention to the assignment, enhancing students' understanding of the topic at hand, encouraging students to be active, and making sure that they understand feedback (Ekman, 2015; Nilsson, 2015). However, according to the same teachers, there are also disadvantages, such as students becoming comfortable and relying too much on their L1 instead of trying to speak the target language, which can be devastating for their language learning if they do not practice English outside the classroom. If they do not use the target language, they will not be able to expand their vocabulary as they otherwise would be able to do (Nilsson, 2015, 2019; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010).

It is important to note that most of these studies are interview-based, and the researchers have not actually observed lessons with these teachers. There is, as previously mentioned, a possible stigma regarding using L1 in the L2 classroom, which might make interviews on the topic problematic. This possible stigma might make teachers appear more negative towards the multilingual approach than they really are since they do not want to admit to doing it.

Furthermore, some studies have been conducted in Swedish secondary schools and found similar results to those in upper secondary schools. Skolinspektionen (2010) investigated 22 schools, and in nearly half of them, the teachers did not have enough focus on the communicative aspect with a focus on the English language. In some cases, they arrived at this conclusion due to the fact that the teacher did not allow the students to try to understand the instructions but immediately switched to Swedish to clarify or explain and in a few cases, they even observed lessons where neither the students nor the teachers used English at all (Skolinspektionen, 2010, pp. 13-15). Källkvist and her colleagues investigated the language practices of a Swedish year 8 English class. They found that the teacher saw Swedish as a resource and utilised it to help students learn vocabulary and grammar, get their attention, and present the relevant assessment criteria for the area they were working with. It was also used to ensure that all students understood what they were talking about. This was well received by the students, even those whose mother tongue was not Swedish (Källkvist et al., 2022a; Källkvist et al., 2022b).

Method

The method used for this research project is presented in this section. To reach the aim of this essay, semi-structured qualitative interviews and observations have been conducted. There are sub-sections discussing the participants, the observations, the interviews, and the limitations of this project.

Participants

The participants are English teachers, currently teaching at least one course of English, working at different upper secondary schools in the south of Sweden. The participants were found by looking at all websites for schools in the south of Sweden. All English teachers whose email could be found were contacted and invited to participate in the study. Moreover, English teachers at my practice school were contacted and invited to participate as well. Five of the contacted teachers agreed to participate.

Teacher	Their mother tongue	Years they have worked	Which subjects they teach	Courses observed
T1	Swedish	4	English & religion	English 5 & 7
T2	Swedish	9	English & French	English 6 & 7
T3	English	10	English, biology, social sciences, sociology & sustainability	English 7
T4	Swedish	14	English & Swedish	English 6
T5	Swedish	6	English & Swedish	English 6 & 7

Ethical consideration

For this study, the ethical considerations have been considered to be in accordance with The Swedish Research Council's principles for conducting research. In the information sheet and accompanying consent form (see Appendix C) that all participating teachers were given and asked to sign, they were informed of the study's purpose as well as what their participation entailed. They were also informed that their participation was not mandatory, and they were allowed to withdraw from the study at any time. The participants have been anonymised and given a pseudonym, and no identifying information, such as their name or workplace, has remained. In addition to including this information in the information sheet, it was also reiterated at the start of the observation and interview so that the teachers could withdraw if they were no longer comfortable with participating.

Observations

The first part of the gathered empirical evidence was observations of English lessons. These observations were done with all participating teachers. Two classes per teacher were observed to gather as much material as possible and to ensure that a variety of lesson plans and activities were observed to get an accurate view of how the teachers use Swedish in the English classroom and in which situations they use it. The observations were non-participant, meaning that I did not participate in the lessons in any way, and only observed what happened. The reason for not participating in the lesson and only observing is to minimise the risk of altering the behaviour of the teacher and the students (Nunan, 1992, pp. 140-141). Since everyone could see me sitting in the classroom, I was introduced to the students at the beginning of each lesson. However, only the teacher knew the purpose of the observation, as the students might have, consciously or unconsciously, modified their behaviour otherwise, which would affect the study.

Nevertheless, the students and teacher could still have modified their behaviour as they were aware that they were being observed (Repstad, 2007, p. 54). The observations were, in other words, open observations, as the participants, and the students, were aware that they were being observed, even if the students were not aware of the true focus of the study (Repstad, 2007, p. 41).

When observing the lessons, a simple observation scheme (see appendix A) was used. The observation scheme was based on Källkvist and her colleagues' (2022b) observation scheme, which they used to investigate the use of Swedish in a secondary school English classroom. The observation scheme was modified also to include in which situation Swedish was used as that is relevant for this study. In addition to the observation scheme, field notes were taken to capture everything that happened during the lessons in an efficient and thorough manner. The field notes include every important detail, no matter how small. In addition to notes on what happened during the lessons, my first impression was also included so as not to forget it. The field notes were then rewritten in a more concise manner the same day (Bryman, 2018, pp. 533, 536). The lessons were not recorded because of ethical considerations as the students are minors, and therefore, the observation scheme and field notes were even more critical.

I observed two lessons per teacher to get two sets of data per participant. This gave the teacher a chance to relax and forget that I was there observing them, which was done in an effort to improve the reliability of the study. If the teacher thought about being observed, they might have acted differently than they usually would have done, for example, by using Swedish more or less than they usually do during a lesson. Moreover, the students might act differently when another person in the classroom observes the lesson, which in turn, might make the teacher act in a different way to accommodate the students' behaviour.

Interviews

When deciding on a means of collecting data on teachers' attitudes and reasons for their use of the L1, the choice was either questionnaires or interviews. While questionnaires could gather data from more teachers than if one is conducting interviews, questionnaires are relatively rigid and limited if one wants them to be fairly easy to quantify (Nunan, 1992, p. 143). While one can include only open questions in the questionnaire (Nunan, 1992, p. 143), it runs the risk of teachers hesitating to answer as it takes more time than they are ready to spend on a questionnaire. Furthermore, it would not be possible to ask the teachers about specifics on the observed lessons if the questionnaires took place before the observation. Interviews were, therefore, chosen due to the ability to ask more in-depth questions and the opportunity to ask specific questions regarding the observed lessons as well as follow-up questions when necessary to get the full picture.

The individual qualitative interviews were semi-structured to allow the teachers to focus on what they find interesting regarding the topic (Nunan, 1992, p. 149), which lead to some recurring patterns. The teachers got to decide whether they wanted to conduct the interview in Swedish or English to ensure they were comfortable in case Swedish was not their mother tongue. However, all chose to speak Swedish during the interview. The interviews were based on an interview guide (see appendix B) with general topics as well as a few pre-determined questions to give the interviews some structure so that it was possible to compare the participating teachers' answers as opposed to an unstructured interview. While there are specific questions in the interview guide, not all questions had to be asked in the same order, nor were they the only questions asked during the interview (Bryman, 2018, pp. 564-565; Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2015, pp. 84-85). However, the interviews were quite open so that the teachers were able to expand on what they think is the most important or interesting, and the researcher followed up with any additional questions, when necessary, to get the

necessary detailed answers (Bryman, 2018, pp. 562-563; Nunan, 1992, pp. 149-150). The interviews took place after the observations as the teachers should be able to discuss and give examples from the observed lessons and, therefore, not be restricted to only talking about using Swedish during English lessons in general.

After the interviews and observations with each teacher were conducted, the interviews were transcribed and then coded using NVivo. Analysing the materials was done using qualitative content analysis focusing on finding patterns and themes (Bryman, 2018, p. 685). The patterns were thematically coded and analysed to answer the study's research questions. The codes were created as I reviewed the material and found themes and things in common between the teachers. These themes were generally quite broad, such as using the L1 when teaching grammar, and they subsequently became the different subsections found in the results and discussion section. The results of the interviews were then compared to the field notes and observation schemes. If anything needed to be clarified or explained, the teacher was contacted to ask any necessary follow-up questions. Finally, all the empirical evidence was examined to find patterns between the different teachers' interviews and observed lessons.

To guarantee the study's dependability, a peer researcher, who is not involved in the study, looked over some of the material and drew a conclusion from it. This way, one can compare the different interpretations to ensure that the conclusions are reliable (Bryman, 2018, pp. 466-469). This could be considered a form of inter-rater reliability (American Psychology Association, 2010). The peer researcher's conclusion aligned with the conclusion that had already been made, which showed that the analysis and accompanying conclusions were reliable. It is important to ensure that the conclusions are reliable as the study is subjective, as it is only my interpretation of the interviews and observations. Furthermore, the interview questions were piloted on a peer researcher to ensure that the questions were clear and worked for the intended purpose. This also helped determine if any other questions should be added to

the basic interview guide. Even though follow-up questions could not be anticipated, the general open questions that all teachers were asked were clarified where necessary.

Limitations

Because of the qualitative nature of the study and the fact that only five teachers participated in the study, the study is not generalisable. Another researcher doing the same study might get completely different results. The result may indicate teachers' attitudes and use of Swedish in the English classroom in this area of Sweden, but it might also be completely different from other teachers in the area. The result is based on a few teachers' opinions and practices and does not speak for a larger group of teachers.

A risk with doing the interviews after the observation is that the teachers only focus on the observed lessons and less on other instances where they use English. It is important to remember that English lessons can be wholly different depending on the topic, the day-to-day life of the teacher and also the day-to-day life of the students, which will affect how the lesson is conducted.

The possible stigma mentioned previously may affect what the teachers say in the interviews and how they act when being observed. If teachers feel that it is wrong of them to use their first language when teaching English, they might not want to admit that they are using Swedish or to what extent. This had to be taken into account when conducting the interviews. To try to find the way teachers use Swedish in the English classroom despite the possible stigma, a triangulation of methods has been used to not only listen to what the teachers say but also to observe it. This triangulation has been done to look at the topic from different perspectives.

Results and Discussion

This chapter will present and discuss the results of the interviews and observations based on previous research and the steering documents. The chapter is divided into three main parts: The teachers' attitudes towards using Swedish when teaching English, situations when the teachers use Swedish instead of English, and finally, communication in the classroom. The first part is based on the interviews, while the second part is mainly based on the interviews with elements of the observations and the third part is mainly based on the observations while also including comparisons between what was observed and what the teachers said during their interviews. A few themes were found in most, or all, of the interviews, and those are the following: the teachers' attitudes towards the use of Swedish, translating or giving the English definition, grammar, feedback and assessment, and bonding with students as well as the language used for communication in the classroom. A few of these themes, but not all of them, were also found in the observed lessons. The theoretical framework of translanguaging and codeswitching will be interwoven in the chapter to show situations and opinions that are more in line with one theory or the other.

The Teachers' Attitudes and Opinions

The Teachers' General Attitudes Towards Using Swedish When Teaching English

The participating teachers all mentioned that while Swedish should not be the primary medium of communication, using Swedish at well-picked times could be beneficial for students' language learning. All participating teachers mentioned that Swedish was, and can be, used to ensure that the students understand everything related to the subject, whether it is instructions, material, or something else entirely. If the students do not understand, for example, a concept after it has been clarified and further explained in English, it may be beneficial to explain it using Swedish instead. This can be interpreted as the teachers having an overall acceptance of

using Swedish when necessary. Their acceptance of the use of Swedish is fairly similar to what previous research has concluded, where most teachers believe that the L1 can be beneficial at times (Ekman, 2015; Andersson, 2018; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Nilsson, 2019; Källkvist et al., 2022a). In contrast, Nilsson (2015) found that most teachers were generally negative towards using Swedish when teaching English, even if they admitted that there are some advantages. Perhaps the aversion to the use of Swedish that the teachers participating in Nilsson's study showed may be due to the aforementioned possible stigma relating to L1 use in the L2 classroom, or it was just based on normative expectations and they did not perceive any stigma.

While teacher 3, henceforth known as T3, agreed that using English as much as possible is good, he also highlighted that it should not hinder students' language learning. He said that you cannot hold on to the principle that everything should be in English but instead listen to the students and, if necessary, use Swedish to ensure they understand what they need to. He finished his thought on why you cannot only use English all the time by saying: "The goal is that the students learn something. It doesn't matter what I know; they have to know it. It is important to think about what tools can help the students develop, and that might be something in Swedish and then you use that." (T3). In other words, T3 prioritises the students' acquisition of knowledge higher than only teaching them in English.

Assumptions of Language Use Before or Directly After Graduation

When studying to become teachers at university, some of the teachers mentioned that they had been taught to limit the amount of Swedish used in the classroom. Teacher 1, henceforth known as T1, said, "at the university, I learned that we should use Swedish as little as possible because of... immersion in the target language. That is the most important thing.". This coincides with his statement of only trying to use Swedish if he has to translate difficult words or give the

students important information from the school. This was also observed during the two lessons with T1 when he talked about breaks or any school activities that led to changes in their schedule with the students. T1 follows what he has been taught in a sense; he tries to speak English as much as possible so that the students are given enough input in English to further their L2 acquisition.

Teacher 2, henceforth known as T2, even mentioned that “when I had just graduated, I imagined I would never speak any Swedish ever”. She quickly changed her attitude towards the use of Swedish when she started working as a teacher as she noticed how students were uncomfortable speaking English and did not answer when they were asked questions, nor did they ask questions even if they did not understand the material. This change of opinion shows a division between how she was taught and the reality of her first teaching job. This could be due to her teacher training not covering potential difficulties that may be present in some classrooms where students are not comfortable speaking English or her teacher training taking place at a school where speaking only English was not a problem. In the cases of T1 and T2, it seems that the teacher training programs have prepared them for an ideal scenario where all students are proficient in English and will understand most of what they encounter in the upper secondary English classes. However, both T1 and T2 have had to include more Swedish than they imagined, especially T2, and one might question if their teacher training programs have included enough of the reality of English language teaching and not only the end goal. Torvaldsdotter (2020) interviewed one teacher who came to the same conclusion as T2, when you only speak English, the students will not be comfortable. They, therefore, will not ask questions which will lead to bigger issues as they have not understood the material.

Teachers' Thoughts on the Requirements of the Steering Documents

All teachers should follow the guidelines and requirements provided by Skolverket. However, as discussed in previous chapters, it is not clear how teachers should prioritise when it comes to the use of English or Swedish. Teachers 1, 2 and 3 all mentioned that they felt that they had a basic understanding of Skolverket's view on using Swedish in the English classroom and felt that they followed that to the best of their abilities, even though it was not something they reflected on most of the time. Teacher 5, henceforth known as T5, mentioned that he did not know what Skolverket said about language use in the classroom, specifically how much Swedish is allowed. However, he would not be averse to them being more specific and deciding that English should be the primary language. He said that he felt that it is most reasonable as that is how he was taught English and how he tries to teach his students. While there are no clear rules on how much Swedish is allowed, the syllabus does encourage that English should be used "as far as possible" (Skolverket, 2022a), much like T5 wishes.

Teacher 4, henceforth known as T4, on the other hand, said that while it is a nice thought that English should be primarily taught in English, it is an impossible task. She said that she "noticed that it doesn't work as it was supposed to and therefore you can't reach the same abstract level and instead have to use a more simplified language" (T4). Because of this, she feels it is better to switch to Swedish in some instances and use English in other situations when possible. T4's statement on the requirement as being impossible does feel somewhat extreme as she, during the rest of the interview, expresses that she mainly uses English in the classroom, except in some instances when explaining something complex, giving significant feedback, discussing criteria, or wanting to ensure that the students understand the material. This might be due to the possible stigma mentioned earlier, where teachers feel they should avoid Swedish as much as possible. T4 explains that there are two camps at her workplace where one group advocates that English should be the only language used while the other group advocates for

the use of Swedish and the accompanying benefits. This might have led to the extreme and somewhat contradictory opinions she expresses.

In the English courses in upper secondary school, the students are supposed to be able to understand and communicate complex concepts, and here T4 brings up the issue of it not being realistic to teach that in English. This does raise the question of what the purpose of English education is. Is the purpose that the students should gain knowledge to be able to communicate with people in English no matter the language used to teach them this, or should teachers prioritise using English regardless of students' proficiency, therefore, hindering students' language acquisition in the long run? Some of the teachers in previous studies even went as far as saying it was inevitable to use codeswitching in the classroom as it is very much necessary (Torvaldsdotter, 2020), much like T4 suggests.

The use of Swedish could be condoned by the commentary material for English provided by Skolverket (2022b), which states that teachers should use their professional judgement to decide when it is necessary to use Swedish. According to T4's professional judgement, Swedish is a necessary complement to a greater extent than the normative expectation of primarily using English that can be found at schools and somewhat in the syllabus as well. It might be that T4 has worked with students with a lower language proficiency than the other participating teachers have, and for the students to be able to work with complex concepts, they might need to utilise the L1 more (Gunnarsson et al., 2015).

Teachers' Opinions on Limiting the Use of Swedish

While the teachers all mentioned how Swedish could be a useful tool for language learning, it should not be the only language used. Teachers 1, 2, 3 and 5 pointed out that using Swedish can have adverse effects on students' language acquisition. This is mainly because English is a subject based on skills in a language, where you have to be active and use the language to learn

it, which is not possible if they speak too much Swedish. T5 compares not using English during English lessons to not using any math during math lessons. Teachers 1 and 5 also point out that if they do not practice during class, the students might have difficulties later in their lives when they have to speak English but do not have any strategies if they should forget a word in English as they have always talked to a Swedish speaker and been able to slip in a Swedish word. These strategies mentioned are important for the students to learn as they are useful later in life when communicating with others, and they are also supposed to acquire these through English education, according to Skolverket (2022a). The teachers also agree that the students will not expand their vocabulary as much if they do not speak English during the lessons.

On the contrary, T4 said that she found no disadvantages to speaking Swedish when teaching English, except that one might get stuck only speaking Swedish and forgetting to use English. Teachers who have been interviewed in previous research have generally found the use of the L1 to be something that has to be limited (Nilsson, 2015; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Torvaldsdotter, 2020). In his study, Nilsson (2019) concluded that many teachers are mostly negative towards using L1 and only see it as a last resort when all else fails. This is also the case for this study, where the teachers are mainly negative but accepting of the use of Swedish. While they believe that Swedish can be beneficial and therefore accept the use of it, they also agree that English should be used as much as possible.

T4 clearly views the use of Swedish differently than the other teachers, even though she admitted that there is a risk that they only use Swedish if it is used too much in the classroom. Based on this, one can guess that she sees a stronger connection between the use of Swedish and English and that they work together instead of working against each other. She might view this connection differently from the other teachers because she has a lot of experience teaching both Swedish and English parallel, or because her method of allowing Swedish has worked and works for her specific students.

One can wonder why the teachers have such differing opinions on how much Swedish one should use when teaching English. These differences may be connected to a myriad of different reasons. It may be connected to how and what they were taught when studying to become teachers, like T4, who was taught all grammar in Swedish. Perhaps it is because of the school they are teaching at, like T5, who had discussions with all English teachers at the school that they should mainly use English. Their personal opinion or teaching style, like T3, who considered it given that one should use English as much as possible. Perhaps it is due to the students they are teaching and have taught previously, like T2 who had to include more Swedish than she ever imagined when she was a new teacher, and her students would not speak English.

Situations When the Teachers Use Swedish Instead of English

Translating into Swedish or Definition in English

The participating teachers have different ways of approaching difficult words, either by giving definitions in English or by translating words into Swedish. T1 sometimes translates words if there is a good equivalent in Swedish; otherwise, he gives the English definition. He may also translate texts that are in Swedish as he reads them out loud so that the students get the Swedish version by reading and the English one by listening. In this case, T1 seems to use a translanguaging approach where both Swedish and English are accessed simultaneously.

T2 may translate words in some cases and gives the English definition in others. She also has exercises when the students should translate; however, not as often as she might want as not all students have Swedish as their L1. During the observed lessons, however, she mainly gave the students the definitions in English and only translated a difficult word in one instance. Based on the observations, it seems that she prefers giving the English definition, which is more or less what she said during the interview.

If T3 notices that his students are not following along, he might translate and discuss a word in Swedish, for example, syllable. However, he rarely gives assignments where the students are supposed to translate as he believes translation is a difficult skill and not always necessary, unless as a way to work with vocabulary. Furthermore, he tries to avoid it as the students might miss nuances and a chance to analyse the language as it can get lost in translation. In other words, T3 tries to continuously use English when teaching to avoid confusing the students by involving other languages.

T4 mentioned that she uses the method that first comes to mind if students need clarification on a word, which might be by translating it or giving the definition in English. However, she also said that she does not hand out as many translation exercises for the students as she might have otherwise had, since not all of the students have Swedish as their L1. T4 accommodates students' different first languages by not having them translate into Swedish too often, which might be because she is mindful of them not being comfortable using Swedish or that it is not as useful for them since they are not proficient enough to make these connections. She does not, however, include translation exercises where the students should translate to their L1, which she is regretful about. T4's way of choosing whichever method first comes to mind in the moment, be it translating something or giving a definition, does give some evidence to her having an approach more in line with translanguaging, as both Swedish and English are seen as important tools to help the students learn and does not seem to separate them into a more acceptable language during the lesson, English, and something to be avoided as much as possible, Swedish.

T5 mentioned how he often translates difficult words, no matter the course, as not to lose the students' attention when it is as simple and quick as just giving the Swedish translation and then continuing in English. As T5 only translates difficult words here and there and not entire paragraphs, one can surmise that he does not see switching back and forth between Swedish

and English as difficult for the students to follow or as having a detrimental effect. One could interpret this as an example of codeswitching, where the teacher first uses one language, one code, and then switches to another without necessarily considering both languages active at one time (MacSwan, 2022, p. 83; Bhatt & Bolonyai, 2022, p. 173).

That the teachers translate words when necessary to ensure comprehension seems to be a common theme in previous research as well, where most of the participating teachers also translated words into Swedish (Ekman, 2015; Andersson, 2018; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Kizil, 2017; Torvaldsdotter, 2020). Teachers prioritise comprehension, so if there is an equivalent word in the students' L1, it must be more time efficient to translate than having to give a more extended definition and make sure that the students understand the explanation.

Grammar

When teaching grammar, all teachers mentioned that they are prepared to use, or do use, Swedish as a tool for learning. T1 mentions how he makes connections between Swedish and English, partly by giving them the translation of grammatical terms, especially those that they already know, such as verbs, but also by comparing the structure of the languages, such as sentence structure, and how they differ. This is partly to connect it to knowledge that they already have. T2 rarely uses Swedish when teaching grammar; she does translate the terms so that the students make the connection with their previous grammatical knowledge, but otherwise, she mostly uses English. While T3 does not use Swedish to translate grammatical terms, he may use it to illustrate patterns and similarities, but also differences, between Swedish and English. He does this to anchor this new knowledge to previous knowledge that the students have and to make sure that they do not make mistakes by transferring Swedish grammar into incorrect English.

T4, on the other hand, incorporates a lot of Swedish when teaching grammar. In some cases, she only makes comparisons to Swedish to help the students understand, but in other instances, especially when it is more complex, she switches over to Swedish completely. According to T4, this is partly to ensure understanding but also because she was taught English grammar in Swedish and therefore does not feel the need to teach it in English. T2 mentioned a previous colleague that conducted all grammar teaching in Swedish as well, which shows that it is not an entirely rare occurrence. T5 also compares to Swedish and, if necessary, completely switches to Swedish as the students cannot be expected to have the metalanguage necessary to discuss complex grammar in English. However, all the teachers made sure to point out that they did not plan to use Swedish when teaching grammar but use it if they feel that it is necessary for students' understanding.

While the teachers are speaking Swedish when teaching these different aspects of grammar, they facilitate the acquisition of the L2 as the students can utilise this knowledge to understand the language better and use it correctly. Using the L1 to further second language acquisition shows that they can see how the students' L1 is connected to the L2 and how they cooperate in one big language repertoire. Hence, this shows an approach in line with translanguaging where they might have a discussion in Swedish, but the English section is activated simultaneously.

According to previous research, it is common to use the students' L1 in an effort to teach grammar as grammar is rather complex and therefore might be difficult to teach in English as students do not always have the necessary metalanguage to discuss it in English (Garcia & Wei, 2018, p. 97; Ellis & Shintani, 2014, pp. 234-235). Previous studies on teachers' perceptions on using the L1 also showed that many teachers use Swedish to teach grammar (Ekman, 2015; Andersson, 2018; Ahlberg & Bogunic, 2010; Kizil, 2017; Nilsson, 2015; Torvaldsdotter, 2020).

T3 was the only teacher who raised the issue of interference where the students' L1 could have a negative effect on their English acquisition. A negative effect that, according to Ellis

(1997), has been thoroughly discussed in second language acquisition research. The other teachers talked about how they would illuminate the similarities and work with positive transfer when we have similar grammar in Swedish and English. It is interesting that none of the other teachers mentioned negative transfer, as they probably encounter it sometimes with their students as well, either in the form of incorrect grammar, avoidance, or Swedish words that they have made to sound English. Especially with two languages with several grammatical similarities, students may be inclined to transfer incorrect grammatical structures because others have been correct in the past. Both negative and positive transfer may have an effect when working with grammar. Hence, it is important to be prepared to discuss the differences between the languages and their grammatical structures to avoid negative transfer when possible.

Feedback and Assessment

Feedback is a widely researched field, and in the case of the participating teachers, they seem to utilise the students' L1 and the target language in different ways. Teachers 2 and 4 explain that they do most of their more extensive feedback and assessment in Swedish as it can be sensitive and emotional for the students. Moreover, they want to ensure the students understand their feedback so they can improve even further. Therefore, they prioritise that the students understand what they have done well and what can be improved. Using a student's L1 while having these emotional discussions with students can possibly have a calming effect, as they might feel more in control if they understand every part of the conversation.

Both teacher 2 and 4 mention how the grading criteria from Skolverket is in Swedish and sees that as an encouragement to present the Swedish version and discuss it in Swedish with the students. During one of the observed lessons with T2, she presented and discussed the grading criteria for the speaking part of the national exam, all in Swedish. During this part, while speaking Swedish, she also showed the grading criteria from Skolverket, which is in

Swedish. As the grading criteria are in Swedish, it is not surprising that these two teachers have decided to view that as permission to conduct this part in Swedish and as it otherwise requires students to have an advanced metalanguage in English, it might be for the best for some students. The teachers know their students and may feel that they are not equipped to handle that discussion in English. T2 and T4 clearly show that Swedish can be a handy tool when teaching English and should be used as such. The two teachers seem to view Swedish and English as two complements to help their students develop.

During one of the observed lessons, T2 does make a clear distinction between when they are supposed to talk Swedish and when they should switch back to English and plans accordingly so that the transition flows smoothly. This clear distinction shows a more divided view of the languages more in line with the codeswitching approach, where you have one language and then switch without considering it as two languages working together to further learning, unlike a translanguaging approach. While the information discussed in Swedish will help their education and perhaps their performance when producing English in school, it will not further their language acquisition.

In contrast, T1 also shows the students the Swedish grading criteria, but he translates the text and reads it aloud in English while the students look at the Swedish version simultaneously. According to T1, he does this because the students get the information in both Swedish and English and therefore do not miss anything, which lessens the risk of misunderstandings. During the observed lessons with T1, he used this same method where he wrote the Swedish word on the whiteboard and then translated it himself and said it in English. This seems to be a method that works well for the teacher where he can ensure that the students will understand the information, either by him telling them in English or by reading it and seeing the Swedish words. In this case, T1 seems to have an approach that aligns well with translanguaging, where both Swedish and English are used simultaneously.

Teachers 1, 3 and 5 all give English versions of grading criteria and give feedback in English. However, T5 does give the students feedback in Swedish if it is not during a lesson, and they ask for it in Swedish, but during lessons, they only discuss it in English. T1 mentioned how he would discuss assessment in Swedish if the student gets visibly upset in an effort to calm the student, much like T2 and T4.

Previous research on using the L1 to give feedback is fairly limited and only Nilsson (2015) interviewed teachers who found using the L1 was beneficial when giving students feedback. With that said, only two teachers in this study mostly give feedback in Swedish, T2 and T4, and one does it outside of class, T5; otherwise, teachers seem to stick to English when giving feedback. That might be because they have the possibility to further explain and clarify their instructions, either by discussing them or writing comprehensive comments.

Bonding With Students

Some of the teachers mentioned that Swedish might be better to use when trying to bond with students. Teacher 2 said that depending on the class, the use of Swedish can be crucial when trying to bond with the students or even to get them to do what they are supposed to. She believes bonding with students is invaluable and must be prioritised over only using English. She also mentioned how if it is not related to English or their education, it is better to use Swedish as it creates a better connection. Whether students that do not have Swedish as their L1 feel that bonding is better in Swedish is not clear, but it is the teacher's perception of these events.

T4 does make a point of explaining how different the bonding experience is with students she has in Swedish class and students in English class. According to T4, "there is another distance to the students" when only teaching them English and this distance makes it difficult to bond with the students. She does not experience this distance when teaching Swedish and

cannot explain why there is a distance when teaching English. She theorises that it is related to the fact that English is a very formal language. Due to the formal language and the following distance, it is difficult to get personal or bond in the same way you can in Swedish. While English is not necessarily more formal than any other language, students are supposed to be taught a more formal version of the language that they might not encounter outside the classroom, which may lead to this experience for the teacher.

The fact that some teachers perceive that they cannot bond as well in English as in Swedish might be that it does not feel as natural for those involved. In the words of T1, it might feel a bit “try-hard” to speak English when it is not necessary, as they all know Swedish. Especially the students may be more uncomfortable talking about educational and personal matters, as they usually are not as proficient in English as the teacher since they are still students. T5 also emphasises that when it is not an educational matter, it is better to use Swedish, as it is unnecessary to use English. He also believes it to be easier to reach the student and bond that way. However, T5 believes it is possible to bond with the students in English during the lessons, though it takes more time. T1, in turn, also concedes that Swedish is the language to use as soon as the lesson is over, but he will talk about all matters, even more personal ones, in English.

One can interpret this division between languages when trying to bond as the teachers agreeing that English is the medium of teaching and English education but not more than that. When not connected to students’ education, it is better to use Swedish to bond with the students. Since everyone has Swedish in common, even if it is not their mother tongue, it is not surprising that they wish to switch to it when English is no longer necessary or required. As T5 explained, “You have to be able to be yourself sometimes too, ” which is not the same in English. That might entail that some students do not switch over to Swedish from English if they are not as proficient or comfortable using Swedish, much like T3’s students.

However, not all teachers seem to use Swedish to bond with their students. For example, when observing a lesson with T3, he talked about vacations and generally bonded with students in English, even before the lesson started. That T3 talked about this in English is as anticipated, partly because English is his mother tongue, and the students are aware of this, and partly because many of his students are not as confident in their Swedish knowledge yet. Moreover, since English is the common language, even if he might have them in other subjects where they speak Swedish, T3 believes many of his students are more comfortable speaking English. Therefore, it is understandable that this interaction differs from the other classroom interactions where Swedish is the mother tongue of the teachers and most of the students.

In previous studies that have investigated the use of Swedish in the English classroom, bonding with students has rarely been discussed. However, Ekman (2015) found that the participating teachers in her study utilised Swedish to bond with their students, much like teachers 1, 2, 4 and 5 in this study said that they do. The reason that bonding with students has not been approached more in previous research might be that it was not a topic of conversation in the other studies, or other teachers generally have the same approach as T3 and bond with students in English.

Discipline in the Classroom

Discipline in the classroom was not generally discussed in the interviews, but it was, however, observed during two of the lessons. In these situations, both teachers spoke Swedish to discipline the students. However, the two teachers had different reasons for using Swedish instead of English.

During the second observed lesson with T1, two students were roughhousing as they were leaving the classroom to go on a short break. T1 then used Swedish to tell them to stop fighting immediately. During the following interview, T1 explained that he used Swedish as they were

on a break, and he makes a point of only using English during class and Swedish when class is over. So even though it happened in the classroom, it was during their break, so the teacher used English, just as he would have if it had happened in the corridors.

Two students were play fighting during one of T2's lessons, and T2 told them to stop misbehaving in Swedish. During the interview afterwards, she could not remember which language she used to tell them to behave and knew that she might think one thing, but that might not be the objective truth. In this case, she believed she was using English as it is her "default language" in the classroom. When she was told that she used Swedish, she was somewhat surprised as it happened in English when she tried to remember it. She said she was not always aware of what language she was using as they are all natural to her, and she might have used Swedish instinctually as she feels that she can reach the students better than if she only uses English in these types of situations. This does seem to indicate that teachers might use Swedish more than they initially believe, as they might act on instinct. Moreover, suppose they act on instinct and speak Swedish. In that case, it is not impossible that they forget themselves and speak Swedish without being aware of it and believe they have only communicated in English when thinking back on it, much like T2 did when asked about it during the interview. This is not negative, but it does raise the question if teachers are always aware of their language use in the classroom and if only conducting interviews is a reliable way of collecting the empirical material.

Communication in the Classroom

The communication in the different classrooms varied greatly, in terms of the teachers communicating with the entire class but also with individual students. Overall, when the teachers addressed the entire class almost all the time, except in one instance, English was the language used. However, the language the teachers used differed greatly when communicating

with groups or individual students. Due to the fact that the lessons were so different from each other, it was not possible to find themes in common for all relevant information found in the observations. Therefore, this section includes everything relevant from the observations as well as comparisons between the observed lessons and the teachers' opinions and perceived actions and use of Swedish in the English classroom.

Teacher 1

T1 primarily wrote and spoke English during the observed lessons. He used English to give instructions, to talk with the students and to help them when they asked for it. He did, however, use Swedish when writing some words that he believed the students only knew in Swedish, such as "påsklov", easter break, on the board. In addition, he used Swedish when translating a difficult word for a student, when discussing a serious matter with a student, as well as the time around a break when he disciplined some students who were roughhousing, as previously discussed. Throughout the lesson, the students mainly spoke Swedish amongst each other and when asking the teacher questions. As T1 explained in the interview, he tries to avoid Swedish as much as possible to immerse the students in the target language, and if he does not speak English, the students will not do it either. However, the students did not speak English during the lesson, despite T1 almost exclusively speaking English. What they did get during this lesson was comprehensible input in English, hopefully leading to them gaining incidental acquisition of the English language (Ellis, 1999, p. 4).

During the interview, T1 was generally quite negative towards the use of Swedish in the classroom. While he admitted that using Swedish can be beneficial and even necessary, he explained that he avoids it as much as possible. This was something he adhered to during the observed lessons as well. During the lessons, he barely spoke Swedish, and when he did, it was mainly to ensure that the students understood something important.

Teacher 2

During T2's lessons, she only addressed the class in English, no matter the purpose, except when discussing the grading criteria, as previously discussed. When helping individual students, she used both English and Swedish, depending on what they needed help with. If it was not connected to the subject, she used Swedish. Otherwise, she primarily used English unless she was translating a difficult word here and there. At the same time, the students mainly spoke Swedish with each other, and when asking the teacher questions, some spoke Swedish, and some spoke English. The students used English when asking questions if it was in front of the entire class and usually used Swedish if they were talking individually with the teacher. The learning environment does share many similarities with T1's, where the students speak Swedish throughout the class. However, in this case, the students did ask questions in English, especially if it was in front of the entire class, indicating that English is the primary language. T2 using Swedish when it was not related to the English subject might help significantly with bonding with her students as they can be themselves, much like T5 said.

During the observed lessons, T2 mostly adhered to what she said during the interviews. She mainly spoke English and only spoke Swedish when either translating difficult words or to ensure that the students had understood the assignment. She only switched to Swedish to address the entire class when they discussed the grading criteria for a part of the national test, much like she said she did during the interviews. One significant thing that differed between the interviews and the observations was the situation with disciplining students, which has been discussed previously. Her way of handling the situation and the perceived experience she discussed during the interview did not match, raising some doubt on whether the teachers are fully aware of what language they have used during their lessons. Many teachers explained how they perceived it to be just as natural to speak English as Swedish, and that might lead to them

using Swedish more than they might think as they perceive both languages more or less the same way.

Teacher 3

T3, who only taught students studying English 7, never uttered a single word of Swedish during the observed lessons. If a problem arose or a student had a question, T3 used English and, when needed, rephrased an answer in English if the student did not understand. This, in turn, seemed to have fostered an environment where all students spoke English most of the time, even with each other, despite the teacher not being nearby. During one of T3's lessons, one student asked another student who spoke Swedish to say it "in English, please".

Much like what was said during the interview about primarily using English, T3 did not use Swedish at all during the observed lessons. That could have been different, perhaps if they had worked on something else during the lessons or if a student had not understood the material, but that was not the case. As such, T3 did just as he described during the interview, using English as long as Swedish was not necessary for any reason.

The learning environment that T3 has created is probably what many people advocating for a more English-only approach are envisioning, where the teacher's use of mainly English encourages the students also only to use English during class. However, several other teachers also used English mainly, or almost exclusively, English when presenting information and material in front of the entire class or while discussing something with individual students. However, the students chose to speak Swedish with each other, unlike T3's students. When a teacher uses mainly English, it might lead to the students adapting and speaking mainly English themselves as well, much like Skolverket (2022b) mentions, but as one can see from the other teachers, it does not have to be the case.

Since English is T3's mother tongue, that may greatly impact the language used in the classroom and facilitate the use of English to the point that the students enforce the use of English as well. However, other factors may also have had an impact here. First and foremost is that it is an English 7 course, and the students are expected to and are more likely to have the ability to express themselves solely in English, unlike students studying English 5, for example. Another factor may be that the students' L1 is not Swedish in most cases, and they are relieved that they are allowed to speak English, unlike their other classes where they have to speak Swedish. These factors have likely influenced the mostly or perhaps only, as in the case of the two observed lessons, use of English during the lessons.

Teacher 4

During T4's lessons, she exclusively used English when addressing the entire class. Even if the students asked questions in Swedish in front of the class, she answered in English. When walking around the classroom, when the students were working in groups, she switched between Swedish and English, both between groups, and when the topic changed in a discussion with the same students. The students primarily spoke Swedish with her, and sometimes she followed and answered in Swedish and sometimes she stuck to English and encouraged them also to speak English. The students spoke almost exclusively Swedish with each other, except when doing assignments that required them to speak English, like giving a small presentation on an important individual.

The classroom climate during these lessons was very relaxed and comfortable, much like Rubdy (as cited in Kamwangamalu, 2010, p. 128) mentioned being possible if the students were allowed to use their L1. The students were very comfortable with the teacher, which is unsurprising as she is their mentor and Swedish teacher, as well as their English teacher. Since they usually speak Swedish with her, it might lead to them speaking Swedish with her during

English lessons as well, which they did during the two observed lessons. While T4 does lose some opportunities for comprehensible input when speaking Swedish with them, a great bond with the students and them being comfortable may have a bigger impact on their language acquisition in the end, as they are never scared to ask questions (Torvaldsdotter, 2020). T4 was the teacher speaking Swedish the most when walking around and talking with individual students, but her students did not speak more Swedish than the students in the other observed classes, except for T3's students. This does indicate a trend that no matter the language spoken by the teacher, the students will still speak Swedish during class amongst themselves.

As T4 is the teacher most positive towards using Swedish, it is not surprising that her observed lessons also included the most extensive use of Swedish, even though it was not much more than several of the other teachers. During the interview, she consistently highlighted the positive consequences of using Swedish in the classroom. She mentioned several situations when using Swedish is beneficial, one of which was bonding with students. During the observed lessons, she also used Swedish to bond with her students. However, English was the language she used the most during the lesson.

Teacher 5

T5 consistently spoke English during the two observed lessons. Before the lessons started, he would speak Swedish with the students, ensuring they had the necessary material for the lesson and generally bonding with them. Still, as soon as the lessons started, he switched to English. As the lesson went on, he only spoke Swedish when translating difficult words, both in front of the entire class and if a student asked what something meant. Much like T1, he did use some Swedish words that do not have a precise translation or that the students might not know in English, such as "samhällselever", civics students, or "FN-rollspel", UN roleplay. However, unlike T1, he also said the Swedish word and did not translate it when speaking. During the

interview, he said that he used the Swedish terms as it was easier not to confuse the students with the term unknown to them in English, which would only take more time. During the lessons, the students mainly spoke Swedish, and when asking questions, they often used English, but some students still used Swedish. In the case of the students asking questions in Swedish, T5 did not seem to think anything of it and answered them in English. During the interview, T5 said that he answered the students before his brain had reacted to them speaking Swedish, as he usually does not allow them to do so. This could be connected to the situation T2 encountered with disciplining students in Swedish while not being aware of it. T5 did not notice the students speaking Swedish, and that could potentially imply that he would not be aware if he himself switched to Swedish sometimes.

T5 adhered to what he said in the interview during the observed lessons. He primarily used English and only used Swedish to translate words the students probably would not know in English. Much like he said in the interview, he did not speak English before or after the lesson since that is strictly used for lesson time. Even when he spoke about things that related to the students' education, which normally meant using English, he spoke Swedish with the students since the lesson had not started yet.

In the interview, T5 said that he tried to encourage students to ask questions in English, and more often than not, he pretends not to understand what they are saying when they speak Swedish to force them to ask their questions in English to get used to communicating in English. Pretending not to understand Swedish, much like T3 said that he does, which was discussed previously, seems to be a method some teachers use to ensure that the students do not rely on the other person speaking Swedish, but instead use English or explain what they mean if they are uncertain about a specific word. Forcing them to disregard Swedish in conversation completely is done to prepare them for future conversations in English where the person they are speaking with might not know Swedish.

During the lessons, the students mainly spoke Swedish amongst each other, and even sometimes when talking with the teacher. Apart from T3's classroom, it seems that most learning environments or classroom climates that have been observed in this study include a great amount of Swedish being spoken, at least by the students, instead of English. It seems that the students are not motivated to use the target language, despite the teachers primarily using it. This might be because they do not feel like themselves, as T5 said, when speaking English, or they might feel that speaking English is unnecessary when they know that the other person can speak Swedish. However, it does lead to the students not utilising entire lessons to practice speaking English, which all the interviewed teachers agree is the most important thing to acquire English.

Conclusion

The participating teachers all had a somewhat accepting, but not necessarily positive, attitude towards using Swedish in the English classroom. They believed it to be a necessary complement or tool that there was a time and a place for, but that it should be used sparingly. Although the participating teachers used Swedish differently from each other during the observed lessons, both in terms of time and situations, they do have several situations, according to what they said during the interviews, where they use Swedish such as when teaching grammar, translating difficult or specific words, to bond with their students and when discussing things that are not relevant to their English education.

The teachers' reasons for using Swedish were mostly to ensure comprehension. This could be by having a discussion in Swedish with individual students, presenting something in front of the entire class in Swedish, or translating difficult words, terms, and concepts to avoid getting stuck or risk the students tuning out because they do not understand. Another reason given by T4, was that it was sometimes not necessary for the students to use English to acquire knowledge, especially in the case of grammar teaching, as they still furthered their language knowledge, despite learning it in Swedish.

One especially interesting situation occurred during one of the observed lessons with T2. She disciplined students playfighting in Swedish, but when asked about it during the interview, she was confident that she had done so in English and was unaware of the language that she had actually used. This brings into question whether English teachers whose L1 is not English are fully aware of when they use Swedish and when they use English. While they perceive their lessons as only including English, they may speak Swedish without thinking about it. In other words, just interviewing and trusting teachers to describe their experiences may not uncover the entire truth.

Overall, the teachers, except for T4 somewhat, seem to have a general approach to Swedish and English that is more in accordance with codeswitching, where the languages are separate and not as interconnected as in translanguaging. While the teachers find Swedish beneficial in some cases and as a necessary tool, they express a way of seeing English and Swedish where it is a clear divide between the languages. While they might use Swedish, they quickly switch over to English when done with that part. In contrast, T4 seem to find and utilise more connections between Swedish and English and did not see any significant disadvantages to using Swedish as the languages cooperate, which is more in accordance with translanguaging. She believes they will learn just as much while using some Swedish, though not all the time, as they would if they exclusively spoke English. However, this is contradictory since she still believes that Swedish should only be a complement, and she mainly used English during the observed lesson.

While none of the teachers mentioned any stigma regarding using Swedish when teaching English, there does seem to be some normative expectations on the teachers to primarily use English and try to avoid Swedish as much as possible. T4 talks about two camps where one side wants to avoid Swedish as much as possible while the other side, which consists mainly of teachers of both Swedish and English, highlights the usefulness of Swedish in English education. These teachers may use more Swedish as they are more comfortable with Swedish since they also teach it. T5, in turn, explains that they have had discussions with all English teachers working at his school, where they have decided to use English as far as possible. In other words, other teachers at the schools expect their colleagues to refrain from using Swedish when it is not necessary to use it. Based on this, there seems to be a normative expectation, at least at some schools, that teachers should avoid using Swedish as much as possible, which in turn could discourage some teachers from using Swedish when it might be beneficial as they do not want to be judged by their colleagues. In the end, while teachers should use their

professional judgement and decide what is best for their students, they may also be influenced by the culture at the school they are working at.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study has contributed to second language education research in Sweden by examining upper secondary teachers' attitudes towards and use of Swedish in the EFL classroom. However, since this study has only investigated five teachers' attitudes and use of Swedish, further studies could involve more participating teachers to be able to generalise the results. Moreover, the teachers participating in this study all work at college preparatory programs, which may have skewed the results. Students studying vocational programs may have different needs and motivations, which may affect the teaching and use of Swedish in the English classroom. Furthermore, investigating if, and how, teachers include all first languages that the students may have could give a fascinating insight into how to face a multilingual reality. Another interesting area of research would be to examine students' attitudes towards L1 use in L2 education.

Reference List

Abrahamsson, N. (2009). *Andraspråksinlärning* [Second language acquisition].

Studentlitteratur

Andersson, O. (2018). *First language use in EFL - teaching in Sweden: Teachers' use of and beliefs about language of instruction* (Bachelor essay).

Ahlberg, A., & Bogunic, A. (2010). *A study of teachers' code-switching in six Swedish EFL classrooms* (Bachelor essay). Malmö university.

American Psychology Association. (2010) *Using the global assessment of functioning scale to demonstrate the importance of inter-rater reliability*.

<https://www.apa.org/ed/precollege/undergrad/ptacc/inter-rater-reliability>

Auer, P. (2022). 'Translanguaging' or 'doing languages'?: Multilingual practices and the notion of 'codes'. In J. MacSwan (ed.) *Multilingual perspectives on translanguaging* (pp. 126-153). Multilingual matters.

Bhatt, R. M., & Bolonyai, A. (2022). Codeswitching and its terminological other: translanguaging. In J. MacSwan (ed.) *Multilingual perspectives on translanguaging* (pp. 154-180). Multilingual matters.

Bryman, A. (2018). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder* [Social research methods] (3 ed.). Liber.

Cantone, K. F. (2007). *Code-switching in bilingual children*. Springer.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2015) Towards a holistic approach in the study of multilingual education. In J. Cenoz & D. Gorter (eds.) *Multilingual education: Between language learning and translanguaging* (1-15). Cambridge University Press.

Christoffersen, L., & Johannessen, A. (2015). *Forskningsmetoder för lärarstudenter* [Research methods for teacher students]. Studentlitteratur.

Cook, V. (2022). Multi-competence and translanguaging. In J. MacSwan (ed.) *Multilingual perspectives on translanguaging* (pp. 45-65). Multilingual matters.

- Ekman, S. (2015) *Teacher beliefs on using Swedish in the teaching of English: An interview-based study of three upper secondary teachers in the south of Sweden* (Bachelor project).
- Ellis, R. (1997). Theoretical perspectives on interaction and language learning. In R. Ellis (ed.) *Learning a second language through interaction* (pp. 3-31). John Benjamins B.V.
- Ellis, R. (1999). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford university press.
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2018) *Translanguaging: Flerspråkighet som resurs i lärandet* [Translanguaging: Multilingualism as a resource in the learning]. Natur & Kultur.
- Gunnarsson, T., Housen, A., van de Weijer, J., & Källkvist, M. (2015). Multilingual students' self-reported use of their language repertoires when writing in English. *Apples: Journal of applied linguistics*, 9(1), 1-21
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5 ed.). Pearson.
- Hult, F. (2012). English as a transcultural language in Swedish policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(2), 230-257.
- Hult, F. (17) More than a lingua franca: Functions of English in a globalised educational language policy. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 30(3), 265–282, DOI: 10.1080/07908318.2017.1321008
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Multilingualism and codeswitching in education. In N. M. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 116-142). Multilingual matters.
- Kizil, F. (2017). *Using Swedish in the ESL Classroom: An interview study about students and teachers use of Swedish in the ESL classroom* (Bachelor essay).

- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2022a). Towards an in-depth understanding of English- Swedish translanguaging pedagogy in multilingual EFL classrooms.
- Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2022b). Språkpraktiker som didaktiskt kontrakt i skolämnet engelska [Language practices as a didactic contract in the English school subject]. I A. Nordin & M. Uljens (eds.) *Didaktikens språk: om skolundervisningens mål, innehåll och form* [The language of didactics: The goals, content and form of school education] (pp. 103-120). Gleerups
- Lundahl, B. Engelsk språkidaktik: Texter, kommunikation, språkutveckling [English language didactics: Texts, communication and language development]. Studentlitteratur.
- Nilsson, R. (2015) *Teachers codeswitching to L1 in the EFL classroom: A comparative study of Chinese and Swedish teachers' beliefs and practice* (Bachelor essay).
- Nilsson, R. (2019). *Codeswitching in the Swedish EFL classroom - A comparative study of teachers' views and practices regarding first language use and related guidelines* (Degree project).
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge university press.
- Repstad, P. (2007) Närhet och distans: Kvalitativa metoder i samhällsvetenskap [Proximity and distance: Qualitative methods in social science] (4 ed.). Studentlitteratur
- Swedish School Inspectorate. (2010). *Engelska i grundskolans årskurser 6–9* [English in compulsory school's grades 6–9].
<https://www.skolinspektionen.se/beslut-rapporter-statistik/publikationer/kvalitetsgranskning/2011/engelska-i-grundskolans-arskurser-69/>
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011a). *English*.
<https://www.skolverket.se/download/18.4fc05a3f164131a74181056/1535372297288/English-swedish-school.pdf>

- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011b). *Gymnasiegemensamma ämnen: gymnasieskola 2011* [upper secondary common subjects: upper secondary school 2011]. <https://www.skolverket.se/download/18.6bfaca41169863e6a65761f/1553960756863/pdf2583.pdf>
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2022a). *Ämne: Engelska* [Subject: English]. <https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/gymnasieskolan/laroplan-program-och-amnen-i-gymnasieskolan/gymnasieprogrammen/amne?url=-996270488%2Fsyllabuscw%2Fjsp%2Fsubject.htm%3FsubjectCode%3DENG%26version%3D6%26tos%3Dgy&sv.url=12.5dfce44715d35a5cdfa92a3>
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2022b). *Kommentarmaterial till ämnesplanerna i moderna språk och engelska* [Commentary material to syllabuses in modern languages and English]. <https://www.skolverket.se/getFile?file=9918>
- Torvaldsdotter, M. (2020). *Code-Switching in the upper secondary school EFL classroom in Sweden* (Degree project).
- Utbildningsguiden. (2023). *Så här fungerar gymnasieskolan* [This is how upper secondary school works]. Skolverket. <https://utbildningsguiden.skolverket.se/gymnasieskolan/om-gymnasieskolan/sa-har-fungerar-gymnasieskolan> [2023-04-10]

Appendix A

Observations scheme

Förekomst av svenska	När/I vilken situation används svenska?	Vem använder svenska?	Syftet med användning av svenska (enligt mig)

Based on the observation scheme used by Källkvist, Gyllstad, Sandlund, and Sundqvist in “Språkpraktiker som didaktiskt kontrakt” in A. Nordin & M. Uljens (red.) *Didaktikens språk: om skolundervisningens mål, innehåll och form*. It was then modified and expanded to include the situation Swedish was used as well. The observation scheme was used in combination with extensive fieldnotes.

Appendix B

Interview questions

1. Vad är din åsikt om att använda svenska i engelskundervisningen?
2. Använder du svenska när du undervisar i engelska?
3. Om ja, när och varför använder du svenska?
4. Använder du samma mängd svenska i alla kurser?
5. Vilka fördelar ser du med att använda svenska?
6. Vilka nackdelar ser du med att använda svenska?
7. Planerar du i förväg att du ska använda svenska eller händer det spontant?

Appendix C

Samtyckesblankett

Samtycke till att delta i studien: Användning av svenska i engelskundervisningen på gymnasiet

Jag har skriftligen informerats om studien och samtycker att delta.

Jag är medveten om att mitt deltagande är helt frivilligt och att jag kan avbryta mitt deltagande i studien utan att ange någon orsak.

Jag har fått möjlighet att ställa frågor och få svar från forskaren.

Min underskrift nedan betyder att jag väljer att delta i studien och godkänner att mina personuppgifter behandlas i enlighet med gällande dataskyddslagstiftning och lämnad information.

Underskrift

Namnförtydligande

Ort och datum

Informationsbrev

Studie: Användning av svenska i engelskundervisningen på gymnasiet

Forskare: Caroline Tiihonen

Introduktion

Studien är ett examensarbete och del av ämneslärarutbildningen vid Lunds universitet. Du är härmed inbjuden att delta i denna studie. Studien genomförs med intervjuer och observationer som sker under februari-mars 2023. Intervjun kommer beröra din erfarenhet av användning av svenska i engelskundervisningen och observationerna kommer undersöka detsamma praktiskt. Intervjun beräknas ta 30–60 minuter och kommer spelas in och skrivas ut i text. Du är tillfrågad att delta eftersom du arbetar som lärare på en gymnasieskola och som för tillfället undervisar i minst en kurs i engelska.

Beskrivning av studien

Syftet med studien är att belysa lärares språkanvändning i svensk engelskundervisning. Ämnesplanen för engelska ger inga exakt besked utan det är upp till varje lärare att göra en professionell bedömning om och när man behöver använda svenska i undervisningen. Enligt Skolverket ska undervisningen i all väsentlighet bedrivas på engelska men samtidigt ska elevers nyfikenhet kring språk väckas och de ska utveckla sin flerspråkighet och förstå hur språk samverkar.

Jag är intresserad av att höra om dina åsikter om att använda svenska i undervisningen och även få veta när du använder det och varför det är fördelaktigt att använda det i de situationerna. Jag är även intresserad av att observera två av dina engelsklektioner för att se om och i så fall hur du använder dig av svenska i engelskundervisningen i praktiken och under intervjun sedan diskutera varför det är fördelaktigt att använda svenska i de situationerna i stället för engelska. Du kommer delta i detta projekt tillsammans med 3 andra engelsklärare på gymnasieskolor i södra Sverige.

Denna studie beräknas vara färdig i juni 2022. Studien kommer publiceras på LUP-student papers där du kan få tillgång till den. Du kan även skicka ett email till mig och få tillgång till den färdiga uppsatsen.

Konfidentialitet

Alla personliga uppgifter kommer vara konfidentiella. Ditt deltagande kommer vara anonymiserat och du kommer få ett pseudonym. Informationen om din arbetsplats kommer begränsas så att ingen kan identifiera dig utifrån din arbetsplats utan endast beskrivas som en gymnasieskola i södra Sverige. De enda personliga uppgifterna som kommer samlas in om dig är ditt namn, men det kommer inte användas i studien. All information kommer sparas på forskarens dator, som endast forskaren har tillgång till.

Som deltagare är du medveten om att du deltar frivilligt och har rätt att avbryta ditt deltagande när du vill utan att ange någon orsak. Om du inte vill delta så kontakta forskaren.

Om du har några frågor eller problem är du välkommen att kontakta mig.