Breaking Linguistic boundaries

A Case Study on Teachers' Code-switching in the SFI Classroom for Adults

Lina Micoogullari

ENGK06 B. A. Course Degree Project

Panos Athanasopoulos

Spring 2024

Table of Contents

Abstract

In recent years, researchers worldwide have become increasingly interested in the phenomenon of code-switching in the multilingual classroom. The paper aims to try to understand when and why teachers in Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) schools code-switch in their classrooms. It analyses the methods and reasons for teachers' code-switching in the SFI classroom. A case study was conducted by means of an observation and a semi-structured interview. The results from the observation showed that the teacher on whom the case study was conducted code-switched from Swedish to English and that explanation and reiteration were the main two reasons for code-switching. The primary findings in the interview illustrated that the teacher was aware of her code-switching when explaining certain rules of Swedish grammar in order to facilitate the learning process for the students. Conclusively, the results show that code-switching occurs during SFI classes for adults rather often and is frequently used by teachers with the purpose of facilitating teaching in the SFI classroom. This can provide a new perspective on using code-switching as a tool in the educational process in the multilingual classroom.

1. Introduction

Code-switching is a phenomenon that occurs in bilingual and multilingual spheres (Myers-Scotton, 1998, p. 224; MacSwan, 2019, p. 28). The alternation of two languages that can occur between or within sentences is defined as code-switching (Levine, 2011, p. 10). Troike (2008) underscores that there are three main perspectives of code-switching: grammatical, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic (p. 143). These perspectives aim to understand why and how code-switching occurs and what factors influence the code-switching speakers' choice (Troike, 2008, p. 143).

In recent years, scholars have become increasingly interested in the topic of code-switching in multilingual classrooms (Garcia Cortés & Parks, 2019, p. 24; Gynne, 2019, pp. 347-348; Henderson & Sayer, 2019, p. 208). Martin & Wei (2009) explain that code-switching (CS) within a community is more acceptable and is seen as natural compared to CS in educational contexts where teachers who code-switch have been criticised for preventing students from learning and for trying to intrude their vernacular on their students (p. 117). However, recent studies suggest that the idea of CS in the classroom is considered positive and beneficial (Martin & Wei, 2009, p. 118; Henderson & Sayer, 2019, p. 207). Krulatz & Christison (2023) point out that over the decades, different views on multilingualism in relation to pedagogical practices have been accepted; students have been more encouraged to utilise their linguistic repertoire in the classroom (chap. 1). Levine (2011) argues that a language class is a multilingual environment and teachers who do not want to recognise this are insufficient or deficient (p. 127).

Concerning Sweden and its geopolitical space, academic scholars and the public discourse have expressed interest in bilingual and multilingual classrooms with a specific focus on newly arrived immigrants (Gynne, 2019, p. 348). There has been a drastic increase in the number of students who study at SFI schools, as shown in a report by [The Swedish National Agency for Education] Skolverket (2016), which shows an annual increase of 100,000 people from 1997 to 2015 (p. 2). Gynne (2019) points out that the Swedish educational system has gained a positive attitude in taking advantage of both the students' and the teachers' linguistic repertoire to improve the students' education (p. 353). The studies conducted on newly arrived immigrants in multilingual classrooms in Sweden have mainly focused on younger students, such as those in upper secondary or high school. There has barely been any research on how

students and teachers use their linguistic repertoire in the SFI classroom for adults. In order to try to fill this gap, this paper explores how teachers utilise their linguistic repertoire to communicate with their students in their SFI lessons for adults. The purpose of this paper is to try to understand when and why teachers who work in Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) schools code-switch in their classrooms. I am particularly interested in analysing the methods and reasons for teachers' code-switching from Swedish to English in the SFI classroom. My research questions are:

- When do teachers code-switch from Swedish to English and vice versa in the SFI classroom for adults?
- Why do teachers code-switch from Swedish to English and vice versa in the SFI classroom for adults?

Before moving on to the methodologies chosen to address my research questions, it is important to discuss some specific terminology and relevant literature to grasp the essence of this paper. The structure of the paper is as follows: first, a literature review will be presented in the background section; second, the methods used to conduct the research will be explained. The results will then be presented and analysed, followed by a brief discussion of the findings and discoveries.

2. Background

2.1. Code-Switching

Levine (2011) mentions that historically the term codeswitching has been defined in numerous ways, depending on the context in which it is discussed. Therefore, the idea of 'code-switching' varies in meaning because it can be defined differently depending on the researchers' aim of their study (p. 49). While some linguists have tried to recognise the constraints of CS, others have looked at CS in relation to its social terms, trying to understand the reasons behind people's choices when they alternate between speaking two languages. Furthermore, some

linguists only focus on the conversational aspect, analysing the micro-interactional features of a conversation (Levine, 2011, p. 49). Nevertheless, Levine (2011) concludes that every definition shares one common understanding of the systematic nature of CS and that several researchers within the field of linguistics can agree that CS can be defined in two ways: (1) ''Code-switching is the systematic, alternating use of two or more languages in a single utterance or conversational exchange …'' or (2) ''Code-switching is the systematic use of linguistic material from two or more languages in the same sentence or conversation …'' (p. 50). Both definitions convey that CS can occur in a single oral expression, between some sentences or within the same sentence. Faltis (2019) describes code-switching in similar manners but stresses that CS can or cannot follow the grammatical regulations in the titled language (p. 52). MacSwan (2019) defines CS simply by explaining that it can occur intrasententially (within sentences) or intersentientially (between sentences) and that CS can appear as a single word or as a group of words (p. 3). It can be seen that both Levine (2011) and MacSwan (2019) define CS similarly: CS can occur as a single utterance or several utterances within or between sentences. This definition of CS will be referred to when mentioning and discussing CS in this paper.

Baker & Wright (2021) mention that individuals can code-switch intentionally or subconsciously to match the perceived preference of the other person in the conversation. Although the terms unconscious CS and subconscious CS are often used within the research field of sociolinguistics, the meaning of unconscious or subconscious code-switching can be challenging to define. It could be noticed that the main reason for the confusion of the terms lies within the definition of the words unconscious and subconscious. Thus, it can be necessary to discuss briefly the meaning of unconsciousness and subconsciousness to understand unconscious and subconscious CS better. Moreover, defining the terms can prevent unclearness and misinterpretations when discussing potential cases and analyses in this paper.

Originally the discussion of the unconscious and subconscious mind was mentioned by Freud (1911/2005) who in the end excluded the use of the term 'subconscious' and used the term 'unconscious' to refer to both the unconscious and subconscious mind. According to Freud (1926/1969) the subconscious mind represents the 'id' (instincts) and it is constantly repressed by the conscious mind; the subconscious mind can mostly be seen in the actions of the individual and the individual can often reflect on these subconscious actions. The unconscious mind is explained by Freud (1926/1969) as the ego (conscience) and can often be noticed in

the individual's language and speech, and the individual cannot reflect on their own unconscious mind (pp. 21-22). Freud (1911/2005) underlines that the subconscious can easily be confused with the unconscious and vice versa, hence, it is better to adhere only to the use of the term 'unconscious'. Miller (2010) mentions that today both two terms are still not concretely defined and can have various meanings depending on the research field they are used in or how theorists and scientists define them.

Within the field of sociolinguistics, it can be observed that subconscious is the preferred term as opposed to the term unconscious when referring to situations when individuals code-switch without deliberately paying notice to it (Baker & Wright, 2021; MacSwan, 2016, p. 200; Wardaugh, 1998, p. 200). Therefore, in this paper subconscious code-switching will be used when the individual code-switches without noticing it. The following section will discuss the difference between the essence of code-switching and translanguaging – the term that has recently become popular among researchers in the field of sociolinguistics.

2.2. Code-Switching and Translanguaging

Recently, the term translanguaging has been encountered in several studies on language use in bilingual and multilingual classrooms; thus, I find it important to discuss the difference between code-switching and translanguaging. MacSwan (2019) explains that several alternative terms have been made up for language mixing in the educational environment, such as heteroglossia, hybrid language practices, polylingual languaging, translanguaging, codemeshing, translingual practice, multilanguaging and that all these terms fall under one and the same category – code-switching (p. 23). Translanguaging was first introduced by William (1994), who defined the term as organised and methodical use of two languages during the same lesson.

In recent years, scholars have viewed translanguaging as a more complex phenomenon. According to MacSwan (2019), translanguaging encloses a holistic perspective on bilingualism, supports the idea of bilingual teaching without strict language separation, and challenges the concept of distinct languages while addressing related theories such as multilingualism and language rights (p. 24). It was García (2009) who borrowed the term from

William (1994) and developed the term translanguaging to something with a different meaning (p. 45). García (2007) stresses that bilingualism should not be viewed as two separate languages, as linguistics looked at it before; instead, it should be viewed as a monoglossic entity (p. 55). From a translanguaging perspective, Orellana & García (2014) explain that bilingual children do not switch from one code to another instead, children make use of one unitary linguistic repertoire (p. 387). Thus, it can be understood that translanguaging is based on the idea that bilinguals have one single language system. Meanwhile, code-switching is based on the theory that people alternate between codes when speaking two or more languages, which can occur both intersentientially and intrasententially, as was explained in the section above.

García et al. (2017) mention that implanting translanguaging into the bilingual classroom is mainly aimed at teachers who educate students in grades 4-12 and explain that teachers who practice translanguaging in the classroom allow and encourage their bilingual students to use both of their practised languages while giving them the opportunity to make progress in both L1 and L2 (p. 154). Orellana & García (2014) point out that translanguaging is not only a way to learn but also an opportunity to expand the practised language in class (p. 388). However, it is noticed that translanguaging is not necessarily a replacement for bilingual education, especially when discussing cases when bilingual education is possible to carry out. Instead, it is stressed that it is especially important to teach children how to use their languages to their own advantage while developing their cognitive abilities and, at the same time, adapting to some social norms (Orellana & García, 2014, pp. 388-389; García, 2011, p. 45). Additionally, García (2011) underlines that translanguaging encourages teachers to take into consideration the way children communicate using their linguistic repertoire, which the educational system often overlooks (p. 40). However, Orellana & García (2014) mention that the pedagogical aspects of translanguaging are still in development because it has not until recently been legitimised in both literature and educational practices globally and therefore, translanguaging pedagogy does not have a reliable description yet (p. 91).

According to the presented reviewed literature, I have decided to base my research on code-switching for the reason, that translanguaging is a rather new concept of looking at language learning as it was mentioned above. Furthermore, it can be analysed that translanguaging is mainly used and discussed while examining a specific age group, such as children or teenagers, because, as mentioned by Orellana & García (2014), children learn languages unconsciously

using their cognitive abilities. In this case, my research will be conducted on teachers who educate adults in the Swedish for Immigrant classroom. Thus, it can be rather confusing to use the term translanguaging in my research because teachers at an SFI school teach Swedish to newly arrived immigrants who do not need to develop their L1 (first language). It is possible that the teacher and/or the students on whom I will conduct my research have English as a second language. However, at the same time, it is also possible that they have English as a foreign language as well, and perhaps they have another L2 (second language). Due to the limitations of my research and the aim of this paper, I will limit my research to observing the code-switching between two languages, which, as mentioned, are Swedish and English. Swedish for Immigrants focuses on teaching newly arrived immigrants Swedish to help them integrate into Swedish society more quickly and effectively. The last section of this paper's background will explain SFI's plans and aims more thoroughly.

2.3.   Code-Switching in the Classroom

Interest in researching code-switching in the bilingual classroom occurred when linguistic researchers became curious about examining its pedagogical aspects. At the beginning of the 1900s, Büttner (1910) opposed the idea supported by several linguistic researchers that the first language (L1) should be forbidden in the foreign language classroom (p. 2). However, according to Levine (2011), Büttner's idea was not popular among linguistic scholars until the late 1900s, when studies and discussions on code choice in the classroom emerged and got attention (pp. 71-72). Jacobson (1990) started to develop a framework called the New Concurrent Approach, where CS should work as a structural strategy where teachers deciding when to use CS in the classroom follow a few sets of rules, supporting the idea that CS is a possible approach to bilingual teaching (p. 4). In addition, Faltis (1989) promoted that idea and stressed that educators who do not understand the benefits of CS in the bilingual classroom lack the comprehension of how code-switching works in communities (p. 125).

An early study that was made on code choice in the foreign classroom was conducted by Wing (1980), who studied different teachers' code choices in 15 Spanish high schools by observing how teachers alternate between L1 and L2, the difference of use between linguistic and communicative functions and the overall classroom verbal patterns (as cited in Levine, 2011,

p. 72). The linguistic functions reflect the morphological, lexical, structural and phonological system of a language when teachers try to explain and reinforce responses. Meanwhile, the communicative functions are reflected when the language is mainly used for transmitting and receiving speech that contains information, opinions, feelings, commands and desires (Wing, 1980, as cited in Levine, 2011, p. 72). The results showed that the foreign language teachers used the L2 somewhat more than half of the time while speaking in the Communicative Function. It was also found that teachers who had a low L2 use in class talked more about the language (linguistic function) and were prone to use the L1 in the communicative function (Wing, 1980, as cited in Levine, 2011, pp. 72-73).

Newer studies follow patterns similar to those of Wing's (1980) study when conducting research on code-switching in the foreign language classroom. Sadiq (2022) made a case study on what functions motivated teachers' code-switching from English to Kurdish in the EFL classroom, which showed that the teachers code-switched subconsciously to enhance the teaching for the students in situations such as checking for clarification and comprehension (p. 227). Another similar case study done by Itmeizeh et al. (2017) demonstrated that the three main reasons for teachers' code-switching in the EFL classroom were giving information, asking questions and giving instructions (p. 267). Based on these studies, it can be understood that teachers who alternate between the target language and the native language in the classroom code-switch for similar reasons.

Littlewood & Shufang (2022) mention that the reasons for teachers' CS in foreign classrooms are based on three key elements concerning pedagogical communication: establishing good relationships, ensuring understanding and discipline. Therefore, it is not surprising that teachers engage these elements by using the students' L1 (Littlewood & Shufang, 2022, p. 177). Moreover, another observation that can be considered interesting mentioned by Littlewood & Shufang (2022) is that teachers often code-switch from L2 to the students' L1 because of students' low language proficiency in L2 (Littlewood & Shufang, 2022, p. 178). These aspects, along with the literature that has been presented in this section, correlate with my own hypotheses regarding the outcome result of my case study. The overall hypotheses concerning my study will be presented and motivated in the following section.

2.4.   Swedish for Immigrants (SFI)

To comprehend the essence of my thesis, I find it important for the readers of my paper to grasp the structure and objectives of Swedish for Immigrants schools. Initially, according to [Regulation for Swedish Education for Immigrants] Förordning om svenskundervisning för invandrare (SFS1994:895), SFI aims to provide students with basic knowledge and proficiency in the Swedish language, simultaneously sharing essential knowledge about Swedish society - a fundamental right for newly arrived immigrants. [The Swedish Parliament Department of Education] Skolverket (2015) states that the national standard for the extent of education within SFI is 525 hours (Regeringens proposition 1993/94:126, p. 4). Consequently, newly arrived immigrants are afforded approximately two years of educational opportunity to try to integrate into Swedish society after their arrival. All schools in Sweden follow an official curriculum where teachers in SFI schools are entitled to do *kartläggning* 'mapping' on students to understand what educational plan is ideal for each student (Skolverket, 2003, p. 7).

It can be important to note that code-switching in an SFI classroom differs from that in an EFL classroom due to the fact that the target language in SFI school is Swedish. Additionally, it is typical that students who attend SFI classes have diverse mother tongues, which results in variations of their first language (L1). Furthermore, it is noteworthy to underline that teaching styles in different SFI classrooms for both teenagers and adults may vary due to the life experiences of the learners. Therefore, it can be assumed that it is common for adults to utilise a third language (L3) during Swedish for Immigrants classes. Håkansson (1986) did a study on teachers' talk in Swedish for Immigrant classrooms, which illustrated that the teachers had a tendency to adapt their level of Swedish to the learners (p. 96). For the reason that the learners were teenagers and inexperienced students, they could not speak another language, i.e. a lingua franca for the teacher and their students did not exist. As a result, the teacher adapted their Swedish to match the students' proficiency (Håkansson, 1986, p. 96). Even though the teacher did not necessarily code-switch, the teacher tried to find a common ground for communicating with her students, which is also something I assume the teacher in my study will do. The only difference in my hypothesis is that the teacher will code-switch to try to communicate with the students.

Based on the literature presented in the background, my belief is that the teachers will code-switch from Swedish to English and perhaps from English to Swedish because teachers' CS can help the students understand the material better. Even though the studies done by Wing (1980), Sadiq (2022), and Itmeizeh et al. (2017) are grounded in code-switching in EFL classrooms, it is possible that similar CS patterns, such as giving information and reinforcing, will be found in my case study as well. Moreover, Littlewood and Shufang (2022) mention that teachers often code-switched to L1 because of students' low proficiency in L2. In my case, it is possible that teachers also code-switch because of the students' low language proficiency in Swedish and CS to English could provide clearer communication.

3. Method

A case study based on two qualitative methods was conducted to try to understand when and why teachers in SFI-class code-switch from Swedish to English and vice versa. I chose to focus on one case because such a case study could possibly give a better understanding of when and why teachers code-switch in the SFI classroom. Duff (2020) pinpoints that an individual study offers heuristic features when analysing cases in a more detailed and contextualised way and from different perspectives (p. 173). Moreover, case studies can furnish analyses of a case that can hardly be put into singular or static variables (Duff, 2020, p. 173). Furthermore, as mentioned by Duff (2020) a study focused on the individual could provide more specific and detailed data. It is also highlighted that case studies have important pedagogical missions in educational contexts to teach the regulations of applied linguistics or to form the description of learners or contexts that can help the public grasp points more deeply than other kinds of research could (Duff, 2020, p. 173). The main reason for conducting a case study is that it can provide in-depth insight when analysing the case. Consequently, the case study can provide broader perspectives on why teachers code-switch in the SFI classroom for adults.

A classroom observation study was conducted because, as stated by Dörnyei (2007), it is a common approach when researching educational environments due to its advanced data collection (p. 176). In addition, I found it appropriate to conduct an observation as it could possibly bring the most precise results in comprehending the functions of code-switching

within the SFI classroom, as opposed to solely relying on interviews or other methods. Secondly, a semi-structured interview was undertaken because I believed that, together with the results of the observational study, it could provide more in-depth and comprehensive information for understanding when and why teachers CS from Swedish to English in their SFI lessons.

In the following sections, I will try to provide a thorough discussion of the observation and interview methodologies, as well as the ethical considerations which were adhered to during the procedure of the cases in both chosen practices. Before moving on to the sections discussing the observation and interview, I will introduce the teacher who participated in the case study.

3.1. The Participant

In order to get a picture of the participant who was engaged in the case study, I will provide the information on how the participant was chosen and then I will give a short presentation of the teacher who was observed and interviewed. The participant was not chosen on any specific basis. Before conducting my case study, I sent several emails to different SFI schools in the province of Skåne in Sweden asking them if they were willing to participate in my case study. The SFI school that responded to my email referred me to one teacher who could participate. Information about the teacher was obtained by meeting and interviewing. In addition, for anonymity and integrity reasons, which are explained in more detail later in this section, the teacher's name will not be mentioned; instead, the teacher will be referred to as Teacher A. Teacher A was a 42-year-old female. In the interview, she explained that she had been working as an SFI teacher for approximately one and a half years. Before that, she had experience working in a school similar to SFI schools, where the students were newly arrived immigrants. She mentioned that essentially she has an education as an Italian gymnasium (high school) teacher.

Before moving on to the observation studies, I want to discuss some considerations on the ethical aspects behind my case study. First, the main ethical aspects which were taken into consideration when conducting my case study were the guidelines provided by the Bachelor's Programme in English Studies of Lund University. Moreover, Dörnyei (2007) points out that

researchers who carry out qualitative methods should consider ethical dilemmas more than those who only use a quantitative method because in such research the relationship between the researcher and the participant is closer (p. 67). Some important ethical aspects which should be taken into consideration by a researcher are as follows: not manipulating the data, not using the role of a researcher for deceptive purposes, not trying to share the findings of the research with every collaborator or only showing selective findings (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 67). These aspects were taken into consideration when I carried out my observation and interview.

3.2.   Observation study

The observation study mainly aimed to examine when teachers code-switch in the SFI classroom for adults. Observing different functions could give a clearer picture of when the teacher code-switches in the classroom. All functions will be motivated in the following paragraph. The observation study was approximately three and a half hours, with a 30-minute break in the middle of the lesson. One issue that arose when collecting the data was that it was originally planned to observe two lessons of Teacher A. However, after the first observation, I was informed that another observation was not possible because the school was under construction. Thus, I gathered the data from the one lesson I observed. During the observation, I wrote down every code-switching instance (CsI) and its corresponding function using a pen and a notepad. Moreover, practical examples of when the teacher code-switched were also written down because giving examples alongside the presented CsI will give more context to the observation. Hence, it could give a clearer picture of the teacher's CS behaviour in the SFI classroom.

When thinking about an efficient way to observe the classroom, I was interested in observing a selected number of functions in order to see when the teacher code-switched in the SFI classroom for adults. The chosen observation checklist was originally made by Eldrige (1996) but later modified by Horasan (2014) to suit his own study. As can be seen in the section below, the chosen functions are a combination of Eldridge's (1996) and Horasan's (2014) checklists. I will integrate both of their observation frameworks into my own research. It should be noted that not every CS function mentioned by Eldridge (1996) and Horasan (2014) will be included in my own checklist. The main reason for this is that some of the suggested functions can be

applied only to students, which is not a focus area in my own observation. Additionally, one more function, Empathy and Solidarity, introduced by Jingxia (2010) will be included into my research because, as motivated by Jingxia (2010), several teachers think that assisting the students when they encounter difficulties in grasping the material and showing empathy and solidarity toward students is important within the foreign language classroom (p. 18). The functions will be presented in the subheading below.

3.2.1. Code-switching Functions

1. **Floor holding:** refers to the situations where teachers try to keep the interaction going in class (Eldridge, 1996, p. 306)

2. **Meta language:** refers to the situations when teachers talk about the tasks, overall comments and evaluation, explaining grammar (Eldridge, 1996, p. 306).

3. **Reiteration:** refers to the situations when teachers reinforce, clarify, and repeat meaning to students (Eldridge, 1996, p. 306). For example, Vad betyder det här? What does this mean?

4. **Classroom routine:** refers to the situations when teachers talk about current assignments and classroom routines, which usually occurs at the beginning or at the end of classes (Horasan, 2014, p. 37). For example, Glöm inte er läxa tills imorgon. Don't forget your assignment/homework for tomorrow.

5. **Explanation:** refers to the situations when teachers try to explain a difficult topic or unfamiliar vocabulary by means of L2 or L3 language (in my case it is English) to help the students understand it better (Horasan, 2014, p. 37).

6. **Classroom management:** refers to the situations when the teacher needs to interact with the students for example, to gain their attention or to keep discipline (Horasan, 2014, p. 37).

7. **Empathy and solidarity:** refers to the situations when a teacher tries to indicate an attitude of empathy towards or solidarity with the students, for example, if they experience difficulties with a certain question or task (Jingxia, 2010, p. 18). There are two examples which illustrate such a situation: Vad menas (X)? Try to think it over or Take your time answering.

3.3. Some Considerations of the Observation Data

When a teacher code-switches, several functions, such as reiteration and explanation, can be observed. However, this could cause misleading results because several functions can be found within one instance of code-switching. For this reason, I will present all the code-switching instances by including the information in one and the same table where the different CsI of the CS functions will be demonstrated. This approach could provide additional clarity to the readers. The overall results of code-switching instances of the teacher, both in numbers and percentage, can be rather misleading because these results do not reflect the teacher's code-switching exactly. Thus, it is possible that the teacher's code-switching can be dominated within one category, for example, meta-language. Additionally, I will provide some examples of situations where Teacher A's code-switching serves several functions categorised in the previous section within the running text of the result section.

3.4. The Semi-structured Interview

I chose to conduct a semi-structured interview because it could offer personal insight into the interviewee, allowing them to share their thoughts and experiences. Moreover, a semi-structured interview can be regarded as more open compared to a structured interview and could allow me to ask the interviewee follow-up questions. Hence, it could help me get broader answers from the teacher.

Dörnyei (2007) points out that semi-structured interviews provide direction and autonomy for teachers when discussing their own CS (p. 14). The questions I prepared for the semi-structured interview were intended to provide more insight into the teacher's code-switching practices. The first question aimed to understand the teacher's CS experience in the SFI classroom and how self-conscious she is about her CS. Hence, the next question aimed to understand the underlying factors of the teacher's CS in the SFI classroom, such as linguistic or pedagogical ones, from the teacher's point of view. To get a clearer picture of how the CS factors are implemented in the classroom, I created the next two questions which mainly aimed to get some practical examples of when the teacher code-switches in the classroom. These questions

also focused on understanding the teacher's idea of CS's efficiency in those practical situations. The fifth question aimed to understand the teacher's reflection on her own language abilities in the SFI classroom in relation to the school's curriculum. Lastly, the sixth question focused on understanding the teacher's ideas and perspective on how the teacher code-switches according to students' language proficiency and if the teacher adapts her teaching in accordance with the class she is teaching.

The interview was conducted live and lasted for approximately 50 minutes. In addition, the teacher chose to be interviewed in Swedish. The interview questions were initially prepared in both Swedish and English, allowing the teacher to choose the language she felt most comfortable with (see Appendix A). All answers were transcribed using a pen and a notepad. The original answers in Swedish were also transcribed in English for the purpose of this paper (see Appendix B). I summarised the answers from the teacher into a running text; the summary of the interview in both Swedish and English translation can be found in Appendix B. Before presenting the interview results, I will go through the results obtained from the observation.

4. Results

The aim of this paper was to try to understand when and why teachers who work in Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) school code-switch in their classrooms. I was especially interested in analysing the reasons behind teachers' code-switching from Swedish to English and vice versa in the SFI classroom for adults. By looking at the results from the observation, it could be noticed that Teacher A code-switched for various reasons in her SFI classroom. Moreover, it could be noticed that the interview with the teacher gave insight into why teachers code-switch in the SFI classroom for adults. I will present the results chronologically according to how the case study was conducted. First the results from the observation and then the results from the interview will be presented.

4.1.   Results from the observation

The observation study intended to explore when the teacher code-switched from Swedish to English and English to Swedish in the SFI classroom for adults. Seven CS functions were

chosen to observe when Teacher A code-switched in the classroom: keeping interaction, floor holding, meta language, reiteration, classroom routine, explanation, empathy, and solidarity. These functions and their meaning were explained in the method section. The results from the observation of Teacher A's CS will be presented and analysed in the following paragraphs.

The results obtained from the observation will be presented in the table below. Table 1 presents an overview of the number of instances when Teacher A code-switched from Swedish to English or from English to Swedish. Moreover, Table 1 illustrates the number of observed instances of code-switching in separate categories, the meaning of which was explained in the method section of this paper.

Table 1: *Code-switching Functions of Teacher A's Code-switching Instances (CsI) in the SFI Classroom.*

The Participant	Teacher A	
	CsI in Numbers	**CsI in Percentage (%)**
Function		
Floor holding	1	1%
Meta Language	3	2,9%
Reiteration	39	37,8%
Classroom routine	1	1%
Explanation	47	45,6%
Classroom management	2	1,9%
Empathy and Solidarity	10	9,8%
Total CsI	103	100%

Teacher A is categorised as the subject in Table 1 above, and all functions are shown beneath the subject. On the right side of the functions, the number of instances for each function can be found, except the last two horizontal cells, which, in the form of numbers, illustrate an overview of the total of instances Teacher A code-switched in her lesson. Presenting the data also in percentages can facilitate the readers' understanding of the results and see them as a whole.

As shown in Table 1, the total CsI which were observed in Teacher A's SFI adult classroom was a total of 103 instances (100%). The two dominating CsI functions in Teacher A's code-switching were the function of explanation, which occurred 47 times (45.6%), and the function of reiteration, which had a frequency of 39 (37.8%). The third dominating CsI function was empathy and solidarity with a frequency of 10 (9.8%), which is low compared to the frequencies of the functions of explanation and reiteration. The frequency of the remaining CsI functions was considerably low compared to the three dominating ones, where the function of meta language occurred 3 times (2.9%), the function of keeping interaction had a frequency of 2 (1.9%), and the functions of floor holding and classroom routine both occurred 1 time (1%). In the following paragraphs, the result for each CsI function will be analysed and several examples that were observed in Teacher A's lesson will be given. However, before analysing the results from the observation, a short overview of the lesson will be given to get a full picture of Teacher A's lesson.

The lesson was divided into two halves with a half-hour break in between. The first part commenced with a review of previously covered material, followed by a discussion of the topics addressed in the previous lesson. Subsequently, the teacher utilised the whiteboard to deliver new content, followed by providing the students with their own materials to work on in small groups. During this time, the teacher also met the students individually outside the classroom to discuss their graded assignments. The latter half of the lesson involved continued group work, with Teacher A going around to offer assistance if needed. Finally, the teacher concluded the lesson with a summary of its key points.

At the beginning of Teacher A's lesson, where she used the whiteboard to teach Swedish phrases while interacting with the students at the same time, she mostly code-switched from Swedish to English when she used a word which the students could not understand, such as 'feedback' for *återkoppling* or 'emphasise' for *betona*. One interesting observation is that after showing a short film in Swedish, the teacher began to explain two Swedish phrases mentioned in the movie: *Ingen ko på isen* and *lathund*. The first phrase, *ingen ko på isen*, translated into English word by word, is 'no slippery cow on the ice', but it actually means 'No need to worry'. The word *lathund* is directly translated as 'lazy dog', but in Swedish, it refers to a quick reference guide which is typically found in workplaces. While trying to explain these phrases, the teacher code-switched to English an translated the phrases word by word to help the students understand that the separate words mean something else, but they have an entirely

different meaning when put together. While teaching the students the phrases, the teacher tried to get the students to be engaged in and often code-switched to repeat and clarify the meaning in one single phrase: ''*Vad betyder det här? What does it mean?*''. More CsI concerning difficult grammatical structures could be noticed when Teacher A talked individually with the students about their graded assignments.

Several CsI were noticed when the teacher tried to explain complex Swedish grammar structures to students individually. One instance was when the teacher tried to explain the difference between the Swedish infinitive marker *att* 'to' and the Swedish adverb *om* 'if' and how to use them correctly because the student could not comprehend the difference. After the teacher explained the distinction, the student said she could grasp the difference. Moreover, several instances were noticed when the teacher explained the intended meaning of what the students wanted to convey in their assignments in Swedish: ''*Pretty much satisfied. Jag är ganska nöjd.*'' and ''*Det här är adjektiv. You can choose one of these.*''. It could be seen that the first instance, when the teacher switched from English to Swedish, occurred because the teacher wanted the student to understand how to write the Swedish phrase *jag är ganska nöjd* correctly, because the student had written the phrase in an incorrect grammatical order; here it could also be observed that the teacher's code-switching served both functions of reiteration and explanation when the teacher tried to repeat the meaning to the student who found the topic somewhat difficult. Additionally, it could be noticed that Teacher A gave a similar example in English (pretty much satisfied) because the teacher wanted the student to understand the Swedish phrase and why it should be written grammatically correctly.

Another interesting observation was when the teacher tried to explain some theoretical grammar to the students, she often code-switched to English intersentially (within sentences), when the students could not understand the meaning. Two instances were when she said: ''*Substantiv. Noun.*'' and ''*Main clauses. Huvudsatser. Bisats. Continuous clauses.*''. These two examples showed that Teacher A probably code-switched when the student could not understand the Swedish meaning of grammatical terms. Another interesting instance was noticed when the students asked for clarification in English while conducting the individual talks, and the teacher usually responded in English and switched to Swedish later.

In the second part of the lesson, Teacher A went around and looked at the groups' assignments and asked if the students had any questions about the material. In this session of the lesson,

code-switching mostly occurred when the teacher was trying to explain grammar or repeat the meaning of the words and phrases. Another case was when Teacher A tried to explain to one group how tenses work and how they are used in Swedish grammar. One instance was when the teacher said: ''*Jag har bråttom. I'm in a hurry.*''. The teacher specifically focused on explaining the past tense and used English phrases, probably in order to help the students understand the structure and meaning of the whole sentence.

As indicated in Table 1 and discussed in the first part of this section, instances of switching from Swedish to English and vice versa, categorised as classroom routine, floor holding, and meta language, were scarce in Teacher A's class. Specifically, a mix of classroom routine and meta language occurred when the teacher talked about an assignment in Swedish at the end of the class. During this discussion, a student asked a question about the assignment, and the teacher replied ''*Yes. One hundred percent.*''. Overall, the result of observing Teacher A's lesson suggests that her code-switching in the SFI classroom was mainly conducted by explaining grammar in different ways and clarifying and repeating meaning to the students. The interview with Teacher A will be presented and analysed in the next section.

4.2.   Results from the semi-structured interviews

The purpose of the semi-structured interview in this paper was to try to understand more about why teachers who work in an SFI school code-switch from Swedish to English and vice versa. However, the results from the interview not only gave possible reasons for why SFI teachers code-switch but also illustrated when Teacher A code-switched. This will be analysed more thoroughly in this section. Overall, the results from the interviews gave several possible answers to the question of why SFI teachers code-switch in the classroom, both consciously and subconsciously.

Teacher A answered that she is aware of her code-switching from Swedish to English when she is teaching using the whiteboard. Moreover, she stressed that she code-switches specifically when talking about set phrases because it facilitates her teaching. She also explained that there are situations when code-switching does not work, such as explaining transitive and intransitive verbs in Swedish because the grammatical rule is not the same in English. Thus, it can be

analysed that Teacher A is somewhat highly aware when she code-switches and can understand when CS is a useful tool in her classroom and when CS does not work. The teacher expressed that she tries to work constructively and adapt her teaching to the students and that several students comprehend English and learn Swedish using the English language as a tool.

One interesting thing the teacher said was that she noticed some students follow and apply English grammatical patterns in Swedish grammar, and if she did not understand English, it would be difficult to notice these details while teaching the students. She stressed that a teacher who does not have proficiency in some languages misses the opportunity to understand the student's learning process. For example, she explains that some students do not understand *nutiden* 'present tense'. As mentioned in the observation of Teacher A's code-switching, such CsI was found when the teacher code-switched explaining to the students difficult grammar concerning tenses.

Teacher A conveyed that there are disadvantages and advantages of teachers' code-switching in the classroom and that she, as a language teacher, tries to balance the use of CS from Swedish to English for the reason that she thinks that students should try to use their language abilities in Swedish disregarding their language proficiency in Swedish. The reason for this, Teacher A explains as follows:

(3) It's beneficial (for students) to gain immediate understanding, but it doesn't work well when it comes to complex phrases because students who know English directly try to translate word for word from English to Swedish, which creates frustration among the students. This occurs because their cognitive level is highly developed while their linguistic skills are less developed. I try to help them understand that developing their Swedish takes time but that it's beneficial to use their current Swedish language skills and proceed slowly (…)

It can be understood that Teacher A tries to limit her CS in certain situations where it may lead to confusion or, in some way, restrain the student's learning process when studying Swedish. Teacher A also highlighted that she tries to make the students understand that development will happen over time. That is why it is important for students to use Swedish even if their proficiency is low and learning takes time.

At the end of the interview, Teacher A mentioned that all teachers do *kartläggning* 'mapping' on the students to create an education based on their proficiency and needs. CS from Swedish to English or from English to Swedish cannot always be used because there are students who do not understand English. Thus, CS occurs individually, when giving students feedback or instructions to the students who comprehend English.

Taken together, these results illustrate that Teacher A consciously code-switches from Swedish to English when teaching certain Swedish phrases using the whiteboard or when talking to students individually. Moreover, Teacher A adapts her code-switching to the class she is teaching, demonstrating her awareness and understanding of her own methods and reasons for code-switching in the SFI classroom. The following section discusses the results from both the observation and the semi-structured interview.

3. Discussion

This study aimed to explore how teachers utilise their linguistic repertoire to communicate with their students in their Swedish for Immigrant classrooms for adults and to try to understand when and why teachers who work in SFI schools code-switch in their classrooms. It was hypothesised that the teacher would code-switch to make the students understand the material better. Furthermore, in relation to the reviewed literature, it was assumed that some code-switching patterns introduced by Wing (1980), Itmeizeh et al. (2017), and Sadiq (2022) would be found when analysing the teacher's CS, such as reinforcing or giving information. Lastly, these hypotheses were also solely based on Littlewood & Shufang's (2022) reflection that teachers in the EFL classroom often code-switch to students' L1 because of students' low proficiency in L2. In my case, I wanted to observe if the teacher code-switched to English because of students' possible low proficiency in Swedish. It could be said that all the hypotheses were supported to some extent by the findings of my case study.

Several interesting findings from the case study could explain when and why teachers code-switch in the SFI classroom for adults. Perhaps the most significant result is that the teacher in the SFI classroom for adults code-switched consciously to explain Swedish grammar and clarify instructions. Thus, it can be understood that CS can enhance understanding, especially for those students who are less proficient in the target language (Swedish). Another discovery

that was made from the case study was that despite Swedish being the target language code-switching to English could provide necessary support without disrupting language learning goals. On the basis of this discovery, it could be assumed that teachers' CS in the SFI classroom can facilitate students' learning Swedish process. Moreover, the teacher's regulation of her code-switching in the SFI classroom for adults, especially for explaining grammar, can showcase the importance of adapting to individual learning needs and cultivating a more inclusive and effective educational environment. These aspects were also touched upon by the teacher in the interview.

The observation results showed that CsI occurred mostly in the functions of explanation and reiteration, where it was noticed that the teacher code-switched both consciously and subconsciously. Thus, I find it important to touch upon the function of empathy and solidarity, which was the third most frequent case of CS, because, as opposed to the functions of explanation and reiteration, the teacher code-switched only subconsciously to show empathy or solidarity. Despite it was not discussed deeply during the interview, it can be significant to mention there were situations when the teacher code-switched to establish good relationships with her students because, as previously mentioned by Littlewood & Shufang (2022), teachers in multilingual classrooms code-switch on the reason based on the aspects concerning pedagogical communication.

4. Conclusion

The research aimed to answer the question of when and why teachers who teach Swedish in SFI schools for adults code-switch during their classes. A case study consisting of an observation and a semi-structured interview were chosen to conduct the research. Through a comprehensive analysis of the observation made during Teacher A's lesson and the interview of Teacher A several findings emerged. Firstly, the results of this study indicated that CS mostly occurred when Teacher A explained grammar or the meaning of the words and phrases to the students. This discovery highlights the importance of understanding in what situations teachers code-switch from Swedish to English during their SFI classes. It provides a new perspective on using CS as a tool in the SFI classrooms for adults. Secondly, it was found during the interview that Teacher A often code-switches consciously in order to facilitate the

process of learning Swedish. This aspect underlines that CS can be a tool in teaching foreign languages (Swedish in this case). These findings enhance the theoretical understanding of code-switching from Swedish to English in the SFI classroom for adults. However, it should be highlighted that this paper had several limitations. One of the limitations was the insufficient amount of data gathered for the paper. With the limited time for collecting data for this, more observations and interviews could not be carried out, which certainly influenced the results' accuracy. The investigation of teachers' code-switching in the SFI classrooms for adults can be suggested for further study and more detailed analysis involving extended research in this field. In conclusion, this research could provide insights of some value and become the basis for further research and practical application.

References

Baker, C. & Wright, E. W. (2021). Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (7th edition). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/BAKER9899

Duff, P. A. (2020). Case Study Research: Making Language Learning Complexities Visible. In H. Rose, & J. McKinley (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 173-182). Routledge.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press.

Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *Oxford ELT Journal, 50*(4), pp. 303-311. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.4.303

Faltis, J. C. (2019). Pedagogical Codeswitching and Translanguaging in Bilingual Schooling Contexts: Critical Practices for Bilingual Teacher Education. In J. MacSwan & C.J Faltis (Eds.) *Codeswitching in the Classroom: Critical Perspectives on Teaching, Learning, Policy, and Ideology* (1st ed.) (pp. 39-62). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315401102

Freud, S. (1969). *The Question of Lay Analysis: Conversations with an Impartial Person*. (J. Strachey, Trans.). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1926)

Freud, S. (2005). *The Unconscious.* (G. Frankland, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Originally published 1915)

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., Ibarra Johnson, S. & Seltzer, K. (2017). *The Translanguaging Classroom: Leveraging Student Bilingualism for Learning*. Caslon.

Garcia Cortés, O. M., & Parks, S. (2019). Teacher's Perceptions and Use of Code-Switching in Core ESL Classes in Quebec Elementary Schools. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 75*(1), pp. 23-39. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.se/10.3138/cmlr.2017.0099

Gynne, A. (2019). English or Swedish please, no Dari!' – (trans)languaging and language policing in upper secondary school's language introduction programme in Sweden. *Classroom Discourse, 10*(3-4), pp. 347-368. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19463014.2019.1628791

Håkansson, G. (1986). Quantitative Aspects of Teacher Talk. *Learning, Teaching and Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom* (pp. 83-98).

Itmeizeh, M., Ibnian, S. S. & Sha'fout, M. (2017). Code-Switching among Teachers of English Language Service Courses at PAUC: Types and Functions. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies 5*(4), pp. 262-269. https://ajouronline.com/index.php/AJHSS/article/view/4892

Jingxia, L. (2010). Teachers' Code-Switching to the L1 in EFL Classroom. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal 3*(1), pp. 10-23.

Krualtz, A & Christison, M (2023). *Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE) [eBook edition]*. Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

Levine, G. S. (2011). Code Choice in the Language Classroom. Short Run Press Ltd.

MacSwan, J., & Faltis, C.J. (Eds.). (2019). Codeswitching in the Classroom: Critical Perspectives on Teaching, Learning, Policy, and Ideology (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315401102

MacSwan, J. (2016). Code-switching in adulthood. In E. Nicoladis & S. Montanari (Eds.), *Bilingualism across the lifespan: Factors moderating language proficiency* (pp. 183–200). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/14939-011

MacSwan, J. (2019). Sociolinguistic and Linguistic Foundations of Codeswitching Research. In J. MacSwan & C.J Faltis (Eds.) *Codeswitching in the Classroom: Critical*

Perspectives on Teaching, Learning, Policy, and Ideology (1st ed.) (pp. 3-38).
Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315401102

Miller, C. M. (2010, August 2). *Unconscious or Subconscious?* Harvard Health Publishing.
https://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/unconscious-or-subconscious-20100801255

Myers-Scotton, C. (1998). Code-switching. In F. Coulmas (ed.) *The Handbook of
Sociolinguistics* (pp. 217-237). Blackwell Publishers.

Orellana, M. F. & García, O. (2014). Conversations currents: Language brokering and
Translanguaging in school. *Language Arts, 91*(5), pp. 386–392.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/24575550

Prop. 1993/94:126. *Svenskundervisning för invandrare (SFI).*
https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-och-
lagar/dokument/proposition/svenskundervisning-for-invandrare-sfi_gh03126/

Sadiq, A. D. (2022). The Functions of Code-Switching in EFL Classroom at Tishk
International University. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational
Studies 9*(2), pp. 219–229.

Skolverket. (2003). *Sfi – Kartläggning och studieplanering*. Skolverket.se.
https://www.skolverket.se/download/18.6bfaca41169863e6a655680/155

Skolverket. (2016). *PM – Elever och studieresultat i utbildning i svenska för invandrare
2015*. Skolverket.se. https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/beskrivande-
statistik/2016/pm---elever-och-studieresultat-i-utbildning-i-svenska-for-invandrare-
2015

Troike, R. C. (2008). Code Switching. In J. M. González (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Bilingual
Education* (Vol. 2, pp. 143-147). SAGE Publications.
https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963985

Wardaugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (3rd ed.). Blackwell Publishers.

Wei, L. & Martin, P. (2009). Conflicts and tension in classroom codeswitching: an introduction. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism 12*(2), pp. 117-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050802153111

Williams, C. (1994). Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Bangor University.

SFS1994:895. *Förordning om svenskundervisning för invandrare*. https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-och-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattningssamling/forordning-1994895-om-svenskundervisning-for_sfs-1994-895/

Appendix A

Interview questions in Swedish

1. Kan du beskriva dina erfarenheter av kodväxling mellan svenska och engelska i SFI klassrummet? Hur ofta finner du dig själv naturligt kodväxla under lektionerna?

2. Enligt dig vilka faktorer påverkar ditt beslut att använda kodväxling under lektionerna? Finns det specifika språkliga eller pedagogiska överväganden som övervägs?

3. Hur upplever du påverkan av kodväxling på elevernas språkinlärning och förståelse i SFI-klassrummet? Tror du att det underlättar deras inlärningsprocess? Finns det möjliga nackdelar att ha i åtanke?

4. Kan du komma ihåg några tillfällen där du medvetet använde kodväxling som ett pedagogiskt verktyg för att förbättra elevernas förståelse med materialet? Tyckte du det var effektivt? (Varför? Varför inte?)

5. Om du reflekterar över hur du utövar vissa språkpraktiker i klassrummet brukar du medvetet tänka på hur du kodväxlar? Finns det kanske specifika strategier du använder som också reflekterar läroplanen och elevernas behov?

6. Slutligen, med tanke på de olika språkliga bakgrunderna hos invandrareleverna i SFI-skolor, hur ser du på kodväxling apropå elevernas individuella inlärningsförmågor (och språkförmåga)? Anpassar du din undervisning utifrån varje klass du undervisar?

Interview questions in English.

1. Could you describe your experiences with code-switching between Swedish and English in the SFI (Swedish for Immigrants) classroom? How often do you find yourself naturally code-switching during teaching sessions?

2. In your opinion, what factors affect your decision to code-switch during your lesson? Are there specific linguistic or pedagogical considerations that come into play?

3. How do you experience the impact of code-switching on students' language acquisition in the SFI classroom? Do you believe it facilitates their learning process? Are there potential drawbacks to consider?

4. Can you remember any situations where you intentionally used code-switching as a pedagogical tool to enhance students' understanding of the material? Did you think it was efficient? (Why? Why not?)

5. Reflecting on your own language practices in class, do you consciously think about your code-switching behaviour? Are there perhaps particular strategies you use to ensure that they go hand in hand with the curriculum and the needs of the students?

6. Lastly, considering the diverse linguistic backgrounds of immigrant students in SFI schools, how do you look at code-switching in relation to students' individual learning processes (and language abilities)? Do you adjust your teaching based on the specific class you are teaching?

Appendix B

Interview answers from teacher A (Swedish transcription)

(I)   Jag kodväxlar mest från svenska till engelska när jag ska undervisa om fasta fraser till mina elever eftersom det underlättar undervisningen. Det blir enklare för elever att förstå om de får exempel på engelska. Det finns andra gånger det inte funkar (pratar om kodväxlingen från svenska till engelska) så som positiva och negativa transverb på svenska för det inte är samma på engelska (menar de grammatiska strukturerna i meningen)

(II)   Jag försöker jobba konstruktivt och många elever förstår och lär sig när man förklarar på engelska. En intressant sak är jag också möter många elever som har tydliga engelska drag (menar i sin svenska) och det blir svårt att undervisa de om vissa saker så som nutiden på svenska exempel som "to be''. De översätter varje ord direkt från engelska och om jag inte begrepp engelska skulle det varit svårt för mig att veta vad de här dragen kom ifrån. Man missar möjligheten att se de här mönstren (som eleverna har) om man inte har kunskap i vissa språk.

(III)   Det finns både fördelar och nackdelar med kodväxling. Det är bra för att (eleverna ska) få direkt förståelse men det passar inte när det kommer till komplexa fraser eftersom eleverna som kan engelska försöker direkt översätta ord för ord från engelska till svenska och det skapar frustration hos eleverna. Det händer eftersom deras kognitiva nivå är högt utvecklad medan deras språkliga färdigheter är lågt utvecklad. Jag försöker få de förstå att det kommer sakta (utvecklingen av deras svenska) och därför är det bra att använda sig av de nuvarande svenska språkfärdigheterna och gå sakta och göra det enkelt.

(IV)   Ja, det är svårt att komma på men ett exempel var på den förra lektionen (menar den lektionen jag observerat) när jag försökte förklara svenska uttryck som ko på isen eller lathund och när jag översätter orden direkt och samtidigt försöker förklara meningen så förstår de bättre. Detta ger de också bekräftelse (när det nämns på engelska) när de är osäkra på meningen (ord eller grammatik).

(V)   Kanske både och. När jag har genomgång på tavlan kodväxlar jag medvetet. I klassrummet identifierar jag elever som behöver hjälp på båda språken (svenska och engelska). En sak jag gör medvetet också är att när jag skriver något på tavlan så skriver jag fel ibland (på svenska) och då brukar eleverna reagera (…) då vet jag att de är uppmärksamma.

(VI)   Vi gör kartläggning på elever – alltså skapar vi undervisningen enligt elevernas språkliga nivå och behov. (…) Man kan inte använda kodväxling hela tiden

eftersom ibland finns det elever som inte heller förstår engelska. Då blir det att kodväxling från svenska till engelska sker individuellt där man kodväxlar med de elever som förstår engelska som återkoppling eller att ge instruktioner.

(VII)   Först och främst vill vi att eleverna ska prata svenska och vi (lärare) försöker prata svenska först och främst. Att använda engelska är som ett hjälpmedel. Ibland blir elever bekväma med engelska och jag svarar de på svenska när de pratar engelska och försöker uppmuntra de att använda sig av sina språkkunskaper i svenska.

Interview answers from Teacher A translated into English

(1) I code-switch mostly from Swedish to English when I teach fixed expressions to my students because it facilitates the teaching. It becomes easier for students to understand the phrase if they receive examples in English. There are other situations when it doesn't work (talking about code-switching from Swedish to English) such as with positive and negative transitive verbs in Swedish because it's not the same in English (referring to the grammatical structures in the sentence).

(2) I try to work constructively, and many students understand and learn when something is explained in English. The interesting thing is that I also encounter many students who exhibit clear English characteristics (meaning in their Swedish), and it becomes difficult to teach them certain things, such as the present tense in Swedish, for example, 'to be'. They translated each word directly from English, and if I didn't understand English, it would have been difficult for me to know where these characteristics came from. One misses the opportunity to see these patterns (that the students have) if one does not have knowledge of certain languages.

(3) There are both advantages and disadvantages of code-switching. It's beneficial (for students) to gain immediate understanding, but it doesn't work well when it comes to complex phrases because students who know English directly try to translate word for word from English to Swedish, which creates frustration among the students. This occurs because their cognitive level is highly developed while their linguistic skills are less developed. I try to help them understand that developing their Swedish takes time but that it's beneficial to use their current Swedish language skills and proceed slowly.

(4) Yes, it's difficult to come up with, but one example was in the previous lesson (referring to the lesson I observed) when I tried to explain Swedish expressions like 'ko på isen' (literally 'cow on the ice') or 'lathund' (literally 'cheat sheet') and when I translate the words directly and simultaneously trie to explain the meaning, they understand better. This also provides them with confirmation (when mentioned in English) when they are uncertain about the meaning (of words or grammar).

(5) Perhaps both. During my presentations on the board, I intentionally code-switch. In the classroom, I identify students who need assistance in both languages (Swedish and English). Another deliberate action I take is that when I write something on the board, I make occasional mistakes (in Swedish), and then the students usually react (...) which lets me know that they are attentive.

(6) We conduct mapping, it means that we create teaching according to the student's linguistic level and needs. (...) Code-switching cannot be used all the time because sometimes there are students who do not understand English either. In such cases, code-switching from Swedish to English occurs individually, where we code-switch with the students who understand English to give feedback or instructions.

(7) First and foremost, we want the students to speak Swedish, and we (teachers) attempt to speak Swedish primarily. Using English is like a tool. Sometimes students become comfortable with English, and I respond to them in Swedish when they speak English trying to encourage them to utilize their language skills in Swedish.