

Attitudes and awareness around codeswitching

*What are teachers' and students' attitudes
towards codeswitching in the English learner
classroom in Norway, and what can
influence the teachers' utilization of it?*

Tonje Haugen Mehl



Mastergradsavhandling ved Institutt for lærerutdanning
og skoleforskning, Engelsk fagdidaktikk

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Våren 2014

© Tonje Haugen Mehl

2014

Attitudes and awareness around codeswitching: what are teachers' and students' attitudes towards codeswitching in the English learner classroom in Norway, and what can influence the teachers' utilization of it?

Tonje Haugen Mehl

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Trykk: Reprocentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

The present qualitative study investigates what attitudes and opinions can influence the teachers' decision to either utilize or avoid codeswitching in the English learner classrooms in Norwegian schools. The study is based on observations and semi-structured interviews of three 10th grade teachers and three VG1 teachers in the counties Oslo, Akershus and Buskerud. In addition to this, two group interviews with VG1 students were conducted to scrutinize their opinions on the issue.

The theoretical framework is based on different theories about how codeswitching is either helpful or damaging for the students' degree of input and language learning. This was viewed in light of the terms plurilingualism and English as an International Language.

The interviews were conducted to investigate whether the teachers had different attitudes and opinions about language choice in the classroom and to determine what factors could explain their attitudes towards codeswitching. During the observations the codeswitching situations were coded and analyzed, but were essentially made to check whether the teachers' opinions coincide with their utilization. The findings between the two levels were then compared.

The findings of this study demonstrate that there is great variation between the individual teachers' attitudes, opinions and utilization of codeswitching. The variation is first and foremost found between the individual teachers and not between the levels. Factors influencing the teachers' language choice seem to be connected to their perceptions of the students' proficiency level and the teachers' teaching philosophy and their own experiences from teaching languages.

In the discussion I argue that if codeswitching is used ineffectively and unsystematically it can prevent teachers from demonstrating other useful communication strategies that the students need to acquire in an increasingly globalized world. However, using codeswitching as a learning tool can be beneficial for the students' language learning as long as it is not overused. Codeswitching used systematically is therefore not necessarily a sign of low proficiency level, but rather a tool to enhance learning.

Sammendrag

Målet med denne kvalitative studien er å undersøke hvilke faktorer som kan påvirke meningene, holdningene og bruken av kodeveksling i engelskundervisningen på ungdomsskolen og i den videregående skolen i Norge. Undersøkelsen er basert på observasjoner og halv-strukturerte intervju med tre lærere på 10.trinn og tre lærere fra VG1, og gruppeintervju med til sammen åtte elever fra VG1.

Denne studien er basert på ulike teorier om kodeveksling er en støtte eller et hinder for elevenes språkinnputt og språklæring. Dette ble sett i lys av begrepene plurilingualisme og Engelsk som et internasjonalt språk.

Intervjuene gjorde det mulig å undersøke om lærerne hadde ulike holdninger til bruken av engelsk og norsk, og gjorde det mulig å undersøke hvilke faktorer som kunne ligge bak de ulike holdningene. Observasjonene ble kodet og analysert, men var i utgangspunktet utført for å se om lærerens holdninger sammenfalt med selve utførelsen i klasserommet. Funnene fra de ulike trinnene ble dermed sammenlignet.

Funnene fra denne studien indikerer at det er stor variasjon mellom de ulike lærernes holdninger, meninger og utførelse av kodeveksling i klasserommet. Variasjonene er først og fremst funnet mellom de individuelle lærerne og ikke mellom de ulike trinnene. Faktorer som spiller inn på lærernes holdninger til L1/L2 virker å være forbundet med lærernes opplevelse av elevenes forståelse og kompetanse i Engelsk og lærernes erfaringer fra å lære bort et språk.

I diskusjonen argumenterer jeg for at dersom kodeveksling blir brukt usystematisk kan det hindre lærerne i å demonstrere andre nyttige kommunikasjonsstrategier som elevene trenger å lære i en stadig mer globalisert verden. Kodeveksling kan likevel være nyttig for elevenes språklæring så lenge det blir brukt systematisk som et læringsverktøy og ikke overbrukt. Systematisk kodeveksling er derfor ikke nødvendigvis en indikasjon på lavt ferdighetsnivå i Engelsk, men heller et læringsverktøy brukt av lærere for å fremme språklæring.

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to thank my excellent supervisor, Philip Grey, PhD. Thank you for invaluable and constructive feedback, and for your support and guidance throughout this process. This project would not have finished without your support, and for that I am grateful.

I would also like to express my gratitude towards my informants for taking the time to help me, and for letting me conduct observations and interviews. Without your help this thesis would simply not have materialised.

I also wish to thank my amazing friends in Norway and abroad. Thank you for always believing in me, for giving me support, for forcing me to take breaks and for showing me patience throughout this process – you are truly the best and most amazing friends someone could wish for.

A special thanks goes out to my loving brothers, Sindre and Yngve. Thank you for always giving me a reason to laugh, for always pushing me to do better and for being there for me no matter what.

Last, but not least I want to thank my mum and dad, Laila and Hallgeir. Thank you for listening to me, for having faith in me and for encouraging me when writing this thesis almost seemed impossible. You are both my role-models, and I can only hope to become half the teachers you are.

Oslo, May 2014.

Tonje Haugen Mehl

Table of Contents

1 Introduction	1
1.1 Codeswitching	2
1.2 The status of English in Norway	3
1.2.1 Codeswitching in bilingual classrooms.....	4
1.2.2 Norwegian students' proficiency level in English	5
1.3 The importance of language choice in the classroom	6
1.3.1 LK 06.....	6
1.3.2 The importance of the teachers' language choice in the classroom.....	7
1.4 Research statement	8
1.5 Outline of the thesis	9
1.6 Definitions	9
2 Theoretical Framework	11
2.1 Teaching perspectives	11
2.2 Language learning	13
2.2.1 Input and output in the language learning classroom.....	13
2.3 Communicative competence	15
CLT in EFL and ESL contexts	16
2.3.1 Communicative competence in LK06.....	17
2.3.2 Communication strategies	18
2.3.3 Codeswitching as a communication strategy	18
2.4 Codeswitching as support in the language learner classroom	20
2.4.1 Codeswitching functions	20
2.4.2 Teachers' use of codeswitching functions	23
2.5 Negative impacts of codeswitching	24
2.6 English as an international language	27
2.6.1 Multilingualism versus plurilingualism	27
2.6.2 Plurilingualism in an educational context	29
2.6.3 The question of intelligibility	30
3 Methodology	31
3.1 Research design	31
3.1.1 Preliminary considerations	31

3.1.2	Methods	32
3.1.3	Observation Categories	33
3.1.4	The interview guides	33
3.1.5	Participants	33
3.2	Gathering the data	34
3.2.1	The observations	34
3.2.2	The teacher interviews	35
3.2.3	The student interviews	36
3.2.4	The informants	37
3.3	Analysing the data	38
3.3.1	Analysing the observations	38
3.3.2	Analysing the teacher interviews	39
3.3.3	Analysing the student interviews	40
3.4	Reliability	40
3.5	Validity	43
3.6	Transferability	45
4	Results and analysis	47
4.1	Upper secondary level – VG1	47
4.1.1	The teachers' use of codeswitching – the observations	47
The setting	47	
The quantity of codeswitching	48	
The different types of codeswitching	48	
Hannah – occasional use of codeswitching	50	
Penny – infrequent use of codeswitching	51	
Nicola – occasional use of codeswitching	52	
4.1.2	The teachers' attitudes – interviews	53
Teaching philosophy	54	
What can trigger the use of codeswitching?	54	
When is codeswitching appropriate?	56	
Is codeswitching more present when teaching lower levels?	57	
4.1.3	The student interviews	58
Attitudes towards English	58	
Differences in the teaching of English from lower till upper secondary	58	

The students' oral participation.....	59
The teacher's use of codeswitching	60
When is codeswitching appropriate and why?.....	61
4.2 Lower secondary level – 10th grade.....	61
4.2.1 The teachers' use of codeswitching – the observations	61
The setting.....	62
The quantity of codeswitching	62
The different types of codeswitching	62
Daniel – high frequency of codeswitching.....	64
Emma – occasional use of codeswitching.....	65
Laura – low frequency of codeswitching	66
4.2.2 The teachers' attitudes – interviews	67
Teaching philosophy	67
What can trigger the use of codeswitching?.....	69
When is codeswitching appropriate?.....	70
Is codeswitching more present when teaching lower levels?.....	71
4.3 Comparison	71
4.3.1 Comparison of the quantity of codeswitching.....	71
4.3.2 Comparison of the different types of codeswitching	72
4.3.3 Comparison of the teachers' attitudes and opinions.....	73
5 Discussion.....	76
5.1 Research statement.....	76
5.2 Attitudes and opinions.....	77
5.2.1 The teachers' teaching philosophy	77
5.2.2 Perception of the students' proficiency	79
5.2.3 The teachers' ability to adjust their L2.....	81
5.2.4 Adjustment of codeswitching from lower to higher levels	82
5.2.5 Grammar and translation	84
5.2.6 Organization of class, discipline and solidarity	85
5.2.7 Multilingual classrooms	86
5.2.8 Towards the teaching of EIL?	87

5.3 What are teachers' and students' attitudes towards codeswitching in the English learner classroom in Norway, and what can influence the teachers' utilization of it?.....	90
6 Conclusion.....	91
6.1 Implications of the findings	91
6.2 Suggestions for further research	93
6.3 Concluding remarks	93
References.....	95
Appendices.....	97
Appendix 1: The interview guide - students.....	98
Appendix 2: Observation categories.....	99
Appendix 3: The interview guide - teachers.....	100

List of tables

Table 4.1 Number of codeswitching situations counted:	
Upper secondary school.....	48
Table 4.2 Types of codeswitching situations counted:	
Upper secondary school.....	49
Table 4.3 Types of codeswitching situations percentages:	
Upper secondary school.....	49
Table 4.4 Number of codeswitching situations counted:	
Lower secondary school.....	62
Table 4.5 Types of codeswitching situations counted:	
Lower secondary school.....	63
Table 4.6 Types of codeswitching situations percentages:	
Lower secondary school.....	63
Table 4.7 Comparison of the quantity of codeswitching.....	72
Table 4.8 Comparison of the codeswitching function.....	73

1 Introduction

Ever since lower secondary school I have been fascinated by the teachers' language choice in the classroom. As a student at lower secondary school I experienced several English teachers with different teaching principles regarding which language to apply in different situations in the classroom. Some of them seemed to have a strict rule about only using the second language (L2), others used the first language (L1) quite frequently, and others again used L2 for most of their teaching but sometimes supplemented with L1 words and phrases. I was intrigued and confused; why did they have such distinctive approaches when it came to language choice in the classroom?

Nonetheless, when I started upper secondary school this was all of a sudden forgotten. In those three years I had teachers who almost without exception used L2 and expected us students to use L2 in all situations as well. I assumed that this was how it was supposed to be, and expected that the teachers in lower secondary school used L1 because they did not know better. However, when I started studying at University of Oslo I took an introductory course in NOAS called *Introduction to Norwegian as a second language*¹, and in that course I heard the term codeswitching for the first time. As I learned more about codeswitching it made me re-think my previous assumption that my lower secondary school teachers' L1-use was merely a result of lack of knowledge. Furthermore, it made me think that using L1 when teaching an L2 probably was useful as well, and not just a hindrance to L2 learning as I believed as a student myself. But why did it seem like the teachers had such different attitudes towards the use of codeswitching in the classroom? Were they even aware that they switched languages? And why did the upper secondary school teachers not seem to allow L1 use at all? Was their decision based on research? Was it informed by theory?

The interest for this particular concept grew further and in 2013 I wrote a research paper on the subject. The research statement was as follows: "To what extent is code-switching a part of English lessons in the 8th grade in a Norwegian school?" However, as the scope of that study was relatively small I only employed observations as a method and that generated a lot of questions about the teachers' and the students' opinions about language choice in the classroom. In addition to this I became aware of Marie Sjasmin Hoff's (2013)

¹ Translation made by the author.

thesis : “L1 use in EFL instruction” (Hoff, 2013). Her thesis investigates how L1 is used in EFL instruction in 8th grade at lower secondary and VG3 at upper secondary school. In her suggestions for further research she proposed that more research should be done at other levels of teaching, particularly 10th grade level at lower secondary and VG1 at upper secondary to study what happens in the process. In addition to this she suggested to interview students as well to consider their opinions on L1 use in the classroom (Hoff, 2013, p. 84).

Whereas Hoff’s thesis aims to compare the teachers’ L1 use and the different functions of it, the thesis at hand does not aspire to merely quantify the teachers’ use of codeswitching. Its main objective is rather to investigate the teachers’ opinions and awareness of language choice in the classroom. The observations are made to be able to compare what the teachers say in the interviews with what they actually do in practice. The research question will be accounted for in greater detail below.

In the following, an explanation of the term codeswitching will be given, and then I will give a brief account of the status of English in Norway. As will be illustrated in detail in this thesis, the status of English in Norway is shifting and has changed the way we look upon the English language and is consequently changing our perspective on how we should teach it. This is, as will be discussed later, particularly important for the discussion of language choice in the classroom. Furthermore, Norwegian students’ proficiency level in English will be briefly accounted for, after that I will illustrate why the teachers’ language choice in the classroom is important, which will be seen in light of our current syllabus, followed by an outline of the thesis, and finally important terms and concepts will be explained.

1.1 Codeswitching

One can find numerous definitions of the concept codeswitching. According to Cook (2008) codeswitching is “going from one language to the other in mid-speech when both speakers know the same two languages” (p.174). Simensen (2007) on the other hand views codeswitching as an L2 communication achievement strategy and states: “[codeswitching] means borrowing one or more words from L1, for instance *knallert*, a Danish as well as a Norwegian word for “moped”” (p.95). A third definition has been provided by McKay (2002):

This term refers to the change of language or a language variety by a speaker or writer. Such shifts in language or language variety can occur within a sentence or at a sentence boundary and can also occur when one speaker uses one language and the other uses another (p. 131).

McKay's definition can seem more thorough than the other two as it also includes switches between a language and a language variety. By language variety McKay (2002) refers to languages that have developed and evolved as a result of the spread of a language that meets and takes up features from another language (p. 126). For example a creole language like "Singlish" spoken in Singapore, or English varieties like Nigerian English or Indian English (McKay, 2002, pp. 58-60). Therefore, McKay's characterization of codeswitching is the definition that this thesis will be based upon.

1.2 The status of English in Norway

According to McKay (2002) the number of L2 users of English will in the years to come probably grow far beyond the number of native speakers (p.27). Considering globalization and how much English is present in our everyday life this is not very surprising. In Norway we are constantly exposed to the English language through television and internet for example, and at the age of six students start their English language education. Crystal (1997) argues that for a language to achieve global status it needs to develop a "special role that is recognized in every country" (Crystal, 1997, ac cited in McKay, 2002, p. 5). In his opinion English can achieve this status by making it an official language, or by giving English special priority by making it a required foreign language (Crystal, 1997, as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 5). There is little doubt that English has a status as a global language today with over seventy-five areas in which English holds a special place as an official language and many more countries where English is an obligatory foreign language (Crystal, 1997, p. 60).

Braj Kachru (1989) has made a categorization of English speaking countries and divided them into the *Inner Circle*, the *Outer Circle* and the *Expanding circle* (Kachru, 1989, as cited in McKay, 2002, pp. 6-11). He claims that in the *Inner circle* English is the primary language of the country, in the *Outer Circle* English "serves as a second language in a multilingual country" (McKay, 2002, p. 9), and in the *Expanding circle* English is studied as a

foreign language (McKay, 2002, p. 9). By this definition Norway would be placed in the expanding circle as English traditionally has been studied as a foreign language here. Both McKay (2002) and Crystal (1997) argue that this labeling is quite ambiguous because today a lot of the countries in the *Expanding circle*, where English has traditionally been taught as a foreign language, actually have a higher number of English-speaking bilinguals than countries in the *Outer Circle* where English functions as an official language (McKay, 2002, p. 9 & 38 and Crystal, 1997, p.67). Because Norwegians learn English from a very early age and because English is such a big part of our everyday life one can argue that it might serve as a second language and therefore belong in the *Outer Circle* like McKay (2002) also suggests (pp.9 and 38).

Furthermore, if one chooses to maintain that English functions as a second language in Norway, one can also argue that Norwegians in a sense are bilinguals. McKay (2002) defines bilingual users of English as “(...) individuals who use English as a second language alongside one or more other languages they speak” (p.27). Because her definition covers “a wide range of English proficiency” (McKay, 2002, p. 27) as well, most Norwegian students will therefore be qualified to call themselves ‘bilingual users of English’ because her definition do not include or exclude either people with “native-like” proficiency or proficiency that only meet certain communicative needs (McKay, 2002, p. 27).

Within the educational context in Norway today, English has its own curriculum that does not belong to the foreign languages curriculum which other traditional foreign languages like French, German and Spanish do. This proves that the status of English in Norway definitely is leaning away from the status as a foreign language.

1.2.1 Codeswitching in bilingual classrooms

According to Cook (2008) codeswitching is most common in multilingual and bilingual societies where inhabitants speak two (in the bilingual society) or more (in the multilingual society) languages (p.175). With the definition of the English classroom in Norway as a bilingual society in mind, codeswitching can therefore be seen as quite common in the English learner classroom in Norway. Cook (2008) agrees with this and claims that codeswitching is more or less inevitable in a classroom when the teacher, regardless of whether he/she is a native speaker, has knowledge of the students' L1 and then “the classroom itself often becomes a codeswitching situation” (Cook, 2008, p. 179). Sridhar (1996) supports the view that codeswitching naturally occurs when two or more languages exist in a speech

community and argues that this is a common phenomenon in Norway as well (p. 56). Thus, one can argue that if codeswitching is apparent in the classroom, the speakers within are in a sense bilinguals (Mehl, 2013, p. 5).

However, the Norwegian immigration policy and an increasingly globalized world have led language learner classrooms in Norway to be more heterogeneous. This is evident in language learner classrooms worldwide today (Sampson, 2011, p. 302; Sridhar, 1996, p.62). A significant effect of this is that the languages within the classrooms are usually more diverse than previously, and there are few classrooms today where all the students and the teacher share the same L1. Consequences of this in relation to codeswitching and language teaching will be elaborated in chapter 2 and discussed in chapter five.

1.2.2 Norwegian students' proficiency level in English

According to Bonnet (2004) Scandinavians are well-known for their fluency in English (as cited in Hellekjær, 2009, p. 198). However, several studies have challenged this view (Hellekjær, 2005; Lehmann, 1999, as cited in Hellekjær, 2009, p. 198) and claimed that whereas the oral English proficiency in Norway seems to be rather good, the academic English proficiency required for the academic milieu at university level is not satisfactory (Hellekjær, 2005). Hellekjær's (2005) doctoral thesis suggests that Norwegian students graduating from upper secondary school lack the proper reading proficiency in English they will need for higher education (Hellekjær, 2005, p. 246).

His results illustrate that not even students that choose the Advanced English course at VG2 and VG3 levels seem to be sufficiently equipped with effective reading strategies or vocabulary knowledge to be able function in the increasingly international environment at universities and thus many of them actually drop out (Hellekjær, 2005, pp. 247-248). In his opinion one of the explanations for this is negative selection. The reality is often that less capable students choose to take the Advanced English course at upper secondary schools (Hellekjær, 2005, p. 247; Skarpaas, 2011, p.97). In addition to this Hellekjær (2005) maintains that “neither the syllabi for the first year, upper secondary English Foundation Course or for the other upper secondary EFL courses require sufficient reading to accustom students to using a variety of reading strategies instead of careful reading for details understanding only, and not to mention to effectively develop vocabulary knowledge” (Hellekjær, 2005, p. 247).

1.3 The importance of language choice in the classroom

The National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion (LK06) does not provide teachers with guidelines as to what language to apply in the English classrooms like preceding curricula such as Læreplanverket for den 10-årige grunnskolen 1997 (L97) and Mønsterplanen for grunnskolen 1974 (M74) have (Bollerud, 2002, as cited in Hoff, 2013, pp. 2-3). This gives the individual schools, language departments or teachers freedom to include, exclude or combine L1 use with L2 usage in the classrooms.

1.3.1 LK 06

In the newest regulation for the English subject curriculum the very first sentence states: “English is a universal language” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013). This statement emphasizes how English today does not exclusively belong to the native speakers as has been the traditional assumption (Gnutzmann & Intemann, 2005, as cited in Dürmüller, 2008, p. 239). As mentioned above Norway has traditionally been seen as one of the countries in the expanding circle because we have taught English as a foreign language. According to Urs Dürmüller (2008) there is a consciousness of the difference between English as a first language (EL1), English as a second language (ESL), English as a foreign language (EFL), and English as a Language for Wider Communication (lingua franca, ELF) in teaching communities today (p. 239). However, as Dürmüller (2008) further maintains, educators today have begun to question the dominant belief that the native language-speaker is the ultimate goal for ESL and EFL teaching (p.239). The assumption that language competence, access to culture and knowledge about literature is more important than acquiring native-like proficiency is according to Dürmüller established across continental Europe today (2008, p. 239). This is reflected in the English subject curriculum in LK06 in Norway as well, with substantial emphasis on communicative competence as will be accounted for in detail in chapter two.

1.3.2 The importance of the teachers' language choice in the classroom

Scholars have discussed language choice in the language learner classroom for many years. Different teaching methods that have influenced foreign language teaching have also tried to either incorporate L1 use in the L2 classroom or completely ban it. This will be addressed in greater detail in chapter 3. However, Cook (2008) argues that “the purpose of language teaching in one sense is to provide optimal samples of language for the learner to profit from – the best ‘input’ to the process of language learning” (p. 162), thus emphasising the importance of the teachers’ language choice in the classroom.

According to Rod Ellis (1997) input is “the samples of language to which a learner is exposed” (Ellis, 1997, p. 5). In a language classroom the students receive input from their peers in the class as well as the teacher (Cook, 2008, p. 162). Hoff (2013) asserts that empirical research maintains that “teacher talk makes up between 69 and 75 per cent of the classroom language” (Cook, 2001, Ellis, 1994, Levine, 2011 as cited in Hoff, 2013, p. 3). This definitely illustrates that the teachers’ language choice in the classroom is significant in classroom communication.

The discussions regarding L1 use in the foreign/second language classroom are extensive and diverse. Whether L1 use affects language learning is beyond the scope of this thesis, and is in fact almost impossible to answer without conducting pre- and post-tests to measure the learning outcome of the students (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011, pp. 476-479) or investigating the issue over a longer period of time in a longitudinal study (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 266). However, as Hoff (2013) points out in her thesis, the issue is important to take cognizance of because it provides the setting for the entire discussion.

Internationally, Duff and Polio have conducted several studies of importance regarding L1 use in a foreign language context, and especially two of their studies have proven to be particularly significant (Levine, 2011, as cited in Hoff, 2013). In the first study they investigated the ratio of teachers’ English use (English as an L1) and target language use in the language learning classroom (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 154). The results yielded from their study showed that there was a range from ten to 100 % foreign language use by their sample of twenty-six foreign language classes (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 163). The same researchers also examined in what situations the teachers used English rather than the target language and for what purpose (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 314). Their findings revealed that the

teachers did not possess pertinent knowledge of how L1 use could be used appropriately, and they suggested a consciousness-raising among teachers (p.323). Andrew Sampson (2011) also conducted an important study. He investigated the functions of codeswitching in an EFL class in Colombia. Results yielded from his study indicate that banning L1 in an EFL context is imprudent and that the mother tongue can be used in a favourable manner in such contexts (Sampson, 2011, p. 293).

In addition to this, as proposed by Hoff (2013), especially two studies are important in relation to comparison of L1 use in FL teaching at different school levels (Hoff, 2013, p. 5). Both Thompson's (2006) study and Grim's (2010) study illustrate inconsistent amounts of L1 use but more consistent results in relation to the situations L1 is used in (Hoff, 2013, p. 5). Furthermore, Thompson (2006) suggests that the level of instruction possibly influenced the type of L1 use (Thompson, 2006, p. 228).

In a Norwegian context Bollerud (2002) and Hoff (2013) are the only two researchers who have investigated whether L1 is present in the English teaching in Norwegian schools. Bollerud (2002) investigated this issue in Norwegian primary schools, whereas Hoff (2013) as mentioned earlier examined the issue at 8th grade at lower secondary school comparing it with VG3 at upper secondary school. The results yielded in Bollerud's (2002) thesis show that Norwegian is used quite frequently in English teaching in Norwegian primary schools and "this is first and foremost because of a high percentage of unqualified English teachers (Bollerud, 2002, as cited in Hoff, 2013, p. 5). Hoff's (2013) results show that: "the teachers' L1 use varies from almost zero to 50 per cent" (p.83) and she argues that this can hardly be tolerable (Hoff, 2013, p. 83). This study will address the topics mentioned above, and in chapter three a more thorough discussion of the research will be provided.

1.4 Research statement

The purpose of this study is to shed light on both the students' and the teacher's attitudes towards codeswitching, and also to investigate whether there are differences in their use of codeswitching from lower secondary school till upper secondary school. This will be seen in light of the quantity and functions of the codeswitching used in order to scrutinize if and why the teachers have different attitudes towards the use of codeswitching and whether their opinions coincides with their implementation. My research statement is therefore as follows:

“What are teachers’ and students’ attitudes towards codeswitching in the English learner classroom in Norway, and what can influence the teachers’ utilization of it?”

1.5 Outline of the thesis

This study contains six chapters. After the introduction, chapter 2 contains a presentation of the relevant theoretical framework for this particular thesis, with regards to both relevant literature and empirical research. The methodology will be accounted for in chapter 3, there I will present the procedures and methods used for this study. The results and analysis will be presented in chapter 4, and discussed in relation to the relevant theory in chapter 5. Chapter 6 is the concluding chapter and gives an account of the implications for the study’s findings and also includes suggestions for further research. In the Appendices all the material used for this study will be found.

1.6 Definitions

Various concepts and terms that will be used in the thesis will be explained in the section below.

First language (L1) will in this study be used interchangeably with the term mother tongue and refers to the first language one learns (Cook, 2008, p. 5). Second language (L2) refers to “a language acquired by a person in addition to his mother tongue” (UNESCO as cited in Cook, 2008, p. 2). Target language (TL) will also be used to refer to the language the learners aim to acquire. As touched upon previously it would be more natural to say that we teach English as a second language (ESL) than English as a foreign language (EFL) in Norway today. However, the concept EFL in a Norwegian context is quite prevalent, and because this issue is not the core question of this thesis both concepts will be used. However, as argued above, English does not exclusively belong to the native speakers anymore (Gnutzmann & Intemann, 2005, as cited in Dürmüller, 2008, p. 239), therefore the term international language will be used to describe a language “that is no longer linked to a single culture or nation but serves both global and local needs as a language of wider communication (McKay, 2002, p. 24). The abbreviation EIL will be used when referring to the characteristics of English as an international language. The term lingua franca will be used and for this thesis the term “describe a language that is widely used by speakers of different

languages to communicate" (McKay, 2002, p. 133). Other significant concepts will be explained consecutively in the text.

2 Theoretical Framework

In the following chapter the theoretical framework that this study is based upon will be presented. I will begin with an outline of different teaching perspectives that have influenced teacher training programs and eventually English teachers in Norway over the years. Then I will continue with an elaboration of the language learning process with emphasis on the importance of input and output. Next, the term communicative competence will be introduced, followed by a presentation of codeswitching as a communication strategy. An elaboration of codeswitching functions will thereafter be presented as well as negative impacts of codeswitching in an educational context. Finally, a brief account of English as an International language (EIL) will be given, and impacts of the teaching of EIL will be elaborated on in light of the concepts plurilingualism and intelligibility.

2.1 Teaching perspectives

Different teaching perspectives have influenced foreign language teaching in Europe from early on (Simensen, 2007, pp. 24-25). Most teaching principles that have developed through the years have seen ‘the monolingual method’ as superior to teaching methods which allow L1-interference. According to Simensen (2007) monolingual teaching requires “(...) that the teaching itself, as well as the organization of work in the classroom, should take place in the target language” (p.236). The principle of monolingual teaching was especially prominent in the years from 1900 – 1925 when the Reform Movement discarded the grammar-translation method and established the Direct Method as a teaching principle (Simensen, 2007, p. 27). The grammar-translation method favoured teaching the students grammatical rules, and undertaking translational exercises both from L1 to L2 and from L2 to L1 thus embracing reliance on L1 (Simensen, 2007, p. 27). The reformers however, supported the leading idea in psychology at that time, the idea of “learning by establishing associations”(Simensen, 2007, p. 26). For language teaching this meant “(...) that teaching in the target language itself would establish direct associations or links between the L2 items and the things, actions, and states talked about”(Simensen, 2007, p. 26). Therefore, the reformers profoundly believed that use of L1 in the foreign language classroom was a hindrance “to establishing favorable associations”(Simensen, 2007, p. 27).

In the years to come, monolingual teaching remained an important teaching principle.

A monolingual methodology was preferred in the oral method, the audio-lingual method and also the newer task-based learning method (Cook, 2008, p. 180). Immersion teaching is also a well-known monolingual teaching principle best known from experiences in Canada, and requires that the whole curriculum is taught through the second language (Cook, 2008, p. 147). Nonetheless, a few teaching methods in the twentieth century also tried to incorporate the use of L1 in the classroom. One of these methods is the “New Concurrent Method” developed by Rodolpho Jacobson in 1990 (Cook, 2008, p. 179 & 183). This teaching method allows both the students and the teacher to systematically use codeswitching in the classroom. However, this is only allowed at certain points and under the teacher’s strict control, for example codeswitching is allowed when certain concepts are to be stressed, or when reprimanding the students or praising them (Jacobsen and Faltis, 1990, as cited in Cook, 2008, p. 179 & 183). This method recognizes that codeswitching is normal in L2 contexts, and “encourages the students to see themselves as true L2 users, at home in both languages” (Cook, 2001, p. 412). According to Cook (2001) this approach allows the language learner classroom to become an authentic L2 use situation where both languages are coexisting and not a constructed imitation of an L2 monolingual situation (Cook, 2001, p. 412).

As mentioned in chapter one, LK06 does not state a preferred language the teachers should employ in their English teaching. In addition to this LK06 also opens up for individual freedom when it comes to teaching methods and teaching style as it offers no recommendation for a teaching approach as preceding syllabuses have had for the previously mentioned teaching methods (Simensen, 2007, pp. 122-123). Instead, the current syllabus is in accordance with important principles developed by the Council of Europe in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Simensen, 2007, p. 123). The aim with CEFR is to provide “a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe’ (Council of Europe, 2001, as cited in Little, 2006, p. 169).

David Little (2006) argues that “in keeping with the Council of Europe’s non-directive ethos, the CEFR refrains from saying how languages should actually be taught” (p.169). According to Neus Figueras (2012) the CEFR was an attempt to define what students should learn in a language and to describe it in a manner that would be useful and understandable for students, teachers and the government (p.477). Thus the CEFR introduced different levels of mastery on the global scale. They define six common reference levels: A1 and A2 characterizations of the basic user, B1 and B2 characterisations of the independent

user and C1 and C2 characterizing the proficient user (Figueras, 2012, p. 478). These are defined as “can do”-descriptions and attempt to characterize the learner’s degree of proficiency at each level (Little, 2006, p. 168). The competence aims in our own syllabus are designed in keeping with the Council of Europe’s global scale they are designed as can-do-descriptions of what the studies aims for the students are.

2.2 Language learning

According to Cook (2008) learning a second language is very important as it may affect people’s careers, identities, personal life and ultimately their future (p.1). Therefore how to acquire a second language more effectively is a significant task for the twenty-first century (Cook, 2008, p. 1).

Second language acquisition (SLA) refers to the study of how people learn a language other than their mother tongue, whether it is inside or outside the classroom (Ellis, 1997, p. 3). How to acquire a new language is relevant for language learning, and SLA in an educational context often aims to examine the process of this. According to Ellis (1997) one of the goals of SLA is to describe L2 acquisition but also to explain it with regards to external factors and internal factors (p.4). External factors can for instance be in which social environment learning takes place or the input the learners receive (Ellis, 1997, pp. 4-5). Input is according to Ellis (1997) “the samples of language to which a learner is exposed” (p.5). Language learning can in Ellis’ (1997) opinion not occur without some input (p.5). Internal factors on the other hand, refers to the cognitive mechanisms the learners possess, for example the knowledge the learners draw on from learning their L1, the knowledge learners possess about the world which can help them understand L2 input, the learners language aptitude, which refers to the learners “natural disposition for learning an L2” (Ellis, 1997, p. 5), and finally the learners’ knowledge of communication strategies (Ellis, 1997, pp. 4-6).

2.2.1 Input and output in the language learning classroom

As mentioned above Ellis (1997) claims that language learning cannot occur without some input. However, what role output plays for language acquisition is in Ellis’ opinion (1997) highly debatable (p.49). Output is defined as “making meaning and producing messages” (Ortega, 2009, as cited in Hoff, 2013, p. 9).

Simensen (2007) emphasizes the role of output and states that “practice in the

production skills, speaking and writing, has been considered vital for learning in most L2 learning theories and teaching methods” (p.178). Merrill Swain also asserts that comprehensible output is significant for language learning to take place (as cited in Ellis, 1997, p. 49). She proposes three different ways we can learn from our own output. Initially, she claims that output can be a consciousness-raising function because it can help learners to uncover gaps in their own language. Secondly, she proposes that output can help learners to test hypotheses. Learners can for instance employ a grammatical rule in a conversation and check whether it leads to a successful conversation or not. Finally, she claims that learners occasionally talk about their own output, “identifying problems with it and discussing ways in which they can be put right” (Ellis, 1997, p. 49). Krashen, on the other hand, maintains that learners can only learn from output if they treat it as auto-input because “speaking is the result of acquisition not its cause” (Krashen, as cited in Ellis, 1997, p. 49). Thus, Krashen does to some extent invalidate the belief that many language teachers maintain, that one of the best ways to learn a language is to practice it (Ellis, 1997, p. 49).

Even though there is a certain agreement among researchers that input is fundamental for language learning to transpire, there is according to Hoff (2013) little agreement about what type of input that is optimal for language learning (p.9). As mentioned in the introduction the learners receive input from both their peers and the teacher, therefore the language classroom is a significant source of input for language learners. Krashen’s (1981) input hypothesis suggests that language can only be acquired when comprehensible input is provided (p.132). Comprehensible input means that learners must to some degree understand the essence of the input presented to them, and the language presented to them should be slightly more difficult than the learner’s current level of competence (Krashen, 1981, p. 132). In other words, this is allowing learners to develop the competence and knowledge they already possess, but the input will still be advanced enough to facilitate new learning.

Furthermore, Michael Long’s interaction hypothesis also highlights the significance of comprehensible input. However, he claims that “it is most effective when it is modified through the negotiation of meaning” (Ellis, 1997, p. 47). Negotiation of meaning often happens when a misunderstanding occurs in a conversation between two speakers and they undertake interactive work and modifications to understand one another i.e. to negotiate meaning (Ellis, 1997, p. 141). In this negotiation of meaning, speakers often receive negative evidence if their interlocutor does not understand them, and in some instances the speaker will be presented with the correct target-language form which may facilitate L2 acquisition (Ellis,

1997, p. 47). However, Ellis (1997) further asserts that sometimes the learner can be overloaded with input as well (p.48). This can happen if a speaker produces long paraphrases or complex and extensive definitions of words unknown to the learner. In these instances, acquisition may in Ellis' (1997) opinion be hindered rather than facilitated (p.48). Thus teachers need to balance the language samples they present to the students. The input should be slightly more difficult than the students' current level, but the input should not overload the students either.

As Grim (2010) points out, a general belief among researchers has been that using L1 in the language learning classroom can hinder L2 acquisition because it reduces the L2 input and output the learners are exposed to (Krashen, 1981; Long, 1991, as cited in Grim, 2010, p. 194). However, Grim (2010) maintains that many language teachers do occasionally use L1 in the classroom to facilitate L2 acquisition, and presents that L1 can in fact be useful for L2 learning (p.194). This can for example be done by negotiating the meaning of something the students find difficult, and in that sense the modifications that are made can be in the learners L1. Grim is thus highlighting that switching between L1 and L2 may in fact be a support in the language classroom and not necessarily an impediment.

2.3 Communicative competence

In addition to a focus on the process of how to acquire a new language, there is according to Hoff (2013) also a widespread interest in the results of the language learning process (Hoff, 2013, p. 8). Language teaching has many goals, often specified directly in a country's curricula, and in Norway further specified in the competence aims as mentioned in the introduction. One of the main objectives of language learning worldwide today is the focus on communicative competence (Hoff, 2013, p. 8).

David Hymes (1972) was the one who introduced the term communicative competence and explained the term as knowledge of "when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner"(as cited in Simensen, 2007, p. 72). Brown (1994) argues that today the focus and emphasis have shifted from the previously mentioned teaching methods to a strong reliance on communicative language teaching (CLT) (as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 107). CLT was developed by people who disagreed with the behaviourist view of language learning that the audio-lingual method encouraged (McKay, 2002, p. 108). The objective of CLT is according to Simensen (2007) to focus on

comprehension and meaning rather than linguistic form which the audio-lingual method had emphasized (pp.116-117). According to McKay (2002) CLT is often considered as “the ideal methodology for English language teaching” (p.107). Nonetheless, McKay (2002) also points out that this approach is not suitable in a lot of countries where the culture of learning endorses more mechanical teaching and lack a teaching culture that promotes individualism and creative thinking (p.107).

Michael Swan (1985) has also criticized CLT. He is especially questioning that CLT does not acknowledge that the students actually bring valuable resources into the classroom, especially their fluency in their mother tongue in which they have already learnt effective communication strategies and skills (as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 112). Swan (1985) further asserts that this is especially problematic where English is being learnt in bilingual contexts as it completely ignores the useful ways the mother tongue can be used inside the classrooms (as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 112). Thus for this particular thesis it will be valuable to assess whether English teachers in Norway are implementing this proscription of the mother tongue in their teaching or whether they are implementing their own version of CLT with a more positive attitude towards L1 use.

CLT in EFL and ESL contexts

Defeng Li (1998) argues that CLT teaching in ESL countries has generally been quite effortless, but introducing CLT in EFL countries has been seen as challenging (p.667). Li conducted interviews with Korean teachers in secondary school and asked them questions regarding the difficulties with CLT in their classrooms. One of the major findings from these interviews was that the teachers' own problems hindered them from implementing CLT successfully in the classrooms (Li, 1998, p. 668). The teachers stated that they were very proficient in English grammar, reading and writing but they did not believe that their listening and speaking skills were adequate to teach their students the communicative skill that CLT naturally involves (Li, 1998, p. 686). In addition to this they also mentioned that the students were not especially motivated to learn to achieve communicative competence. The teachers reported that the students still wanted to learn more grammar since the entry exam for universities in Korea is grammar-based (Li, 1998, p. 690). The Korean teachers also mentioned that the students' low proficiency was a difficulty to CLT. Students in Korea start to learn English from grade 7, and they only have four 1-hour English lessons per week, thus

their progress in English is extremely slow (Li, 1998, p. 690). Because their vocabulary is not particularly advanced and they have maintained little knowledge of syntax and language structures in English, the secondary school teachers reported that it was extremely problematic to engage the students to work with oral tasks and communicative activities (Li, 1998, pp. 690-691).

Li's interviews also revealed the teachers' frustration with CLT itself. The Korean teachers reported that the research community developing CLT has not differentiated CLT in ESL to EFL countries, and they believe that teaching in EFL countries is very different from teaching in ESL countries (Li, 1998, p. 694). Therefore, they maintained that the significant features of teaching in EFL countries should be taken into consideration when developing CLT. For instance the fact that most teachers of EFL are not native speakers of the language and their overall language proficiency may not be as adequate as for teachers in ESL countries where native speakers usually teach the ESL classes (Li, 1998, pp. 693-694). In addition to this, the teachers claimed that another distinctive feature of teaching in EFL countries is that the exposure of the language is more limited than it is in ESL countries where English is used more outside the classrooms. Since the only authentic material available for the teachers is the textbook, it makes even harder for the students to receive the proper input in EFL countries (Li, 1998, p. 694).

2.3.1 Communicative competence in LK06

Our current English syllabus focuses a great deal on communicative competence and oral communicative goals. For instance it states that "to succeed in a world where English is used for international communication, it is necessary to be able to use the English language and to have knowledge of how it is used in different contexts" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013). This emphasises that English is used to communicate internationally and that today the aim is no longer to be able to communicate solely with native speakers, but to use the language as a lingua franca or a language for wider communication. The syllabus also put emphasis on the "development of communicative language skills" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013) and stresses that being able to communicate and acquire insight about culture "can promote interaction, understanding and respect between persons with different cultural backgrounds" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

Especially oral interaction is thus highlighted, which is also made explicitly in the competence aims. For example after year 10 it states that the aim of the studies are for

instance to enable pupils to “choose and use different listening and speaking strategies that are suitable for the purpose” and “listen to and understand variations of English from different authentic situations”(Ministry of Education and Research, 2013). The latter is again an example of how we now choose to stress the importance that English is used everywhere and that to communicate in English means that one needs to able to understand other variations of English than the standard American English or British English. The competence aims after VG1 general studies/VG2 vocational studies highlight the very same things although in a more advanced manner as the pupils should be able to “evaluate and use suitable listening and speaking strategies adapted for the purpose and the situation” and “listen to and understand social and geographic variations of English from authentic situations”(Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

2.3.2 Communication strategies

Communicative competence involves not only mastering grammatical and lexical structures of the language but taking cultural norms into consideration and mastering turn taking strategies in authentic conversations for instance. As shown above our own English syllabus focuses a great deal on oral communication and stresses that learners must develop appropriate communicative language skills (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

Communication strategies can be explained as “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” (Faerch and Kasper, 1983, as cited in Zagura, 2012, p. 277). According to Ellis (1997) such strategies are part of the planning phase and “are called upon when learners experience some kind of problem with an initial plan which prevents them for executing it” (Ellis, 1997, p. 60). Communication strategies are usually divided into achievement strategies and reduction strategies (Ellis, 1997, p.61; Simensen, 2007, p.95, and Zagura, 2012, p. 278). Reduction strategies often result “in a reduction of the initial communicative intention of the learner” (Simensen, 2007, p. 96), whereas achievement strategies often help the learner to convey his or her intended message (Simensen, 2007, p. 96).

2.3.3 Codeswitching as a communication strategy

Zagura (2012) conducted a study with English learner students in Estonia. She wanted to study the speech of non-native speakers of English and examine the communication strategies

they used and the effectiveness of them (p.275). In her results she found instances of codeswitching to L1 as a communication strategy (Zagura, 2012, pp. 279 - 280). She suggests that using codeswitching as a communication strategy is used far too frequently in the language classroom (pp.279-280). She claims that even though the strategy can seem quite effective as the speaker right away acquires the suitable word or phrase by switching to L1, this is only beneficial when communicating with people who share the same L1 as the speaker (p.280). Thus, she suggests that other communication strategies like paraphrasing or approximation (use of a related term) would be more suitable as you will often need communication strategies when speaking with people with a different L1 than yourself (Zagura, 2012, p. 280). Teachers therefore need to provide a model for the students of how to paraphrase, in doing so the learners will acquire this competence through exposure and thus developing an important communication strategy. Zagura believes that speakers who turn to codeswitching often do it because it may seem like “the easiest way to get the right word” (Zagura, 2012, p. 280). She also suggests that speakers may turn to codeswitching because they have too little knowledge and practice of using the other communication strategies (Zagura, 2012, p. 280). Hence in this study it would be fruitful to ascertain whether the teachers are using, modeling and teaching communication strategies to the students.

In Zagura’s study, the student who turned to codeswitching is characterized as a “diligent student and a successful language learner at school” (Zagura, 2012, p. 280). However, she turned to codeswitching regardless, which may suggest that using codeswitching as a communication strategy may not necessarily have something to do with a speakers’ level of proficiency. Nonetheless, according to Zagura (2012), there is some disagreement when it comes to this as some researchers claim that highly proficient students use fewer communication strategies because their high proficiency involves well-developed linguistic and sociolinguistic knowledge and that they do not need communication strategies for that reason (p.278). She further asserts that other scholars again propose that high-level learners still use communication strategies but they prefer the achievement strategies, and less proficient students tend to use reduction strategies more (Zagura, 2012, p. 278). In this particular example Zagura (2012) maintains that codeswitching also was a result of the learners’ nervousness and the speakers “limited experience of real-life interaction in English” (Zagura, 2012, p. 281). In Zagura’s opinion this lack of experience may result in turning to codeswitching which according to her is one of the communication strategies most frequently used in a classroom setting (Zagura, 2012, p. 281).

2.4 Codeswitching as support in the language learner classroom

L1 is undoubtedly evident in the teachers' and the students' discourse in the language learner classroom, not just at the lower levels and not just exclusively a feature tied to student or teachers with low language self-esteem or language proficiency (Antón and DiCamilla, 1999; Bollerud, 2002; Eldridge, 1996; Duff and Polio, 1990; Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Sampson, 2011; Thompson, 2006; Polio and Duff, 1994; Zagura, 2012).

Grosjean (1989) asserts that codeswitching is a highly skilled activity because two languages are used simultaneously according to the different rules of discourse, syntactic properties of the sentence and the speech function (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 408). Andrew Sampson (2011) conducted a study of codeswitching in EFL classes at a Colombian language school and his results indicate that codeswitching is not directly linked to proficiency level and that switching rarely demonstrates "an unwillingness to communicate in L2" (Sampson, 2011, p. 302). He maintains that codeswitching can function as support, as it can serve "multiple communicative and learning purposes" (Sampson, 2011, p. 293). Thus, in his opinion total avoidance of L1 in the language learner classroom is not just imprudent, but switching between the target language and the mother tongue can in fact facilitate learning (Sampson, 2011, p. 293). Sampson's belief is thus in great opposition to the monolingual teaching method and immersion thinking mentioned in 2.1. As Simensen (2007) puts forward (2007) immersion teaching has proven to be very successful when implemented for language majority children having English as their L1 receiving immersion education in their L2, French (Simensen, 2007, pp. 103-104). As this approach has proven to be extremely successful in terms of L2 level attained (Simensen, 2007, pp. 103-104) Sampson's contribution is thus highly controversial. Therefore, it would be valuable for this study to determine whether the teachers and the students view codeswitching as language support, or whether they see it as a hindrance to L2 acquisition.

2.4.1 Codeswitching functions

Codeswitching can serve many functions in a language learner classroom. In addition to functioning as a communication strategy as presented in 2.3.3, it can also be used to express "meaning, identity and humour" (Carless, 2007, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 234) for instance. As codeswitching is something that typically identifies a bilingual speaker, both the

teacher and the learners tend to codeswitch within an L2 learner classroom (Sert, 2005).

Cenoz (2007) suggests that since bilinguals have a more developed metalinguistic awareness than monolinguals, teachers should be encouraged to exploit the students' L1 knowledge in order to perform contrastive analysis between L1 and English for example (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Moreover, Macaro (2005) supports this view and maintains that to proscribe L1 completely will limit the repertoire of language learning activities available to the teachers (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Thus, as an example, he emphasizes that the students will benefit from developing the ability to translate because that is a competence that learners will be needing outside a typical language learning context as well (Macaro, 2005, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). In addition to this, Cook (2002) asserts that language learners are aiming to become competent L2 users and not native speakers (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Therefore, codeswitching should not be banned as L2 users codeswitch on a daily basis and he suggests that language teachers should "develop the systematic use of the L1 in the classroom alongside the L2... as an aid to learning and as a model for the world outside" (Cook, 2002, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Hence in the present study it will be essential to establish whether the teachers who use codeswitching use it systematically or whether they have a more unconscious and uncritical utilization of it.

Furthermore, Lantolf (2000) also considers that L1 can be used as support in the language learner classroom. He asserts that several researchers have attested that L1 is used in the language learner classroom as language mediation (Antón and DiCamilla, 1998; Brooks and Donato, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 1999; Villamil and de Guerrero, 1996, as cited in Lantolf, 2000, pp. 86-88). Brooks and Donato's study showed that students tended to codeswitch to their L1 during classrooms tasks. However, L1 was not necessarily used to encode and decode messages about the topic but it was used to figure out exactly what the task was about, and used to guide both themselves and each other through the task at hand (Brooks and Donato, 1994, as cited in Lantolf, 2000, p. 86). Antón and DiCamilla (1998) on the other hand, suggest that L1 is also used as a means of scaffolding learning. Scaffolding "serves as a metaphor for the interaction between an expert and a novice engaged in a problem-solving task" (Antón & Dicamilla, 1999, p. 235). As in Brooks and Donato's work, L1 does in the study of Antón and DiCamilla (1999) also serve as a metafunction as the learners used it to talk about both the task and the language (as cited in Lantolf, 2000, p. 87).

According to Stone (1993) the communicative mechanisms involved in the scaffolding

are essential to Vygotsky's theoretical framework (as cited in Antón & Dicamilla, 1999, p. 235). The term zone of proximal development was introduced by Vygotsky, who argued that children learn through interpersonal activity for instance by playing with adults (Ellis, 1997, pp. 48-49). By playing or speaking with more knowledgeable others, learners thus ascertain and form words, phrases and concepts that would be beyond them if they were operating alone (Ellis, 1997, pp. 48-49). According to Stone (1993) it is within the zone of proximal development that scaffolding transpires, "or that semiotically mediated interactions lead to development" (as cited in Antón & Dicamilla, 1999, pp. 235-236). However as Lantolf (2000) points out it would be counterproductive to permit learners to use L1 for all communicative functions, but it is important to recognize that L1 plays an essential role in helping learners mediate each other and themselves (Lantolf, 2000, pp. 87-88).

According to Lantolf (2000), all the researchers who have investigated the mediating function of L1 concur that it plays an essential role in learning a second language (p.87). However he further asserts that no researchers within this field have managed to fully explain why learners choose to rely on their mother tongue, even in instances where they evidently have the proficiency to do otherwise (Lantolf, 2000, p. 87). Consequently, he maintains that our language is "strongly implicated in our identity as thinking beings and therefore proficiency alone does not determine use of our native language to mediate ourselves, others, and the interrelationship between the two" (Lantolf, 2000, p. 87).

In addition to this, Atkinson (1987) suggests that codeswitching offers all students a chance of success in the language learner classroom (Atkinson, 1987, p. 242). It offers all students, regardless of proficiency level and how comfortable they are uttering themselves in L2, a chance to participate in classroom interaction which may provide a safe environment for students that are anxious about expressing themselves in L2 (Levine, 2003, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Bolitho (1983) proposes that switching to L1 offers the students an opportunity to say precisely what they want to say as well (as cited in Atkinson, 1987, p. 242). Once it has been established what the learners want to say the teacher can encourage or even help the learners to express themselves in an appropriate manner in L2 (as cited in Atkinson, 1987, p. 242). Hence in the present study it will be fruitful to ascertain the students' attitudes towards codeswitching as well, and not just the teachers'.

2.4.2 Teachers' use of codeswitching functions

Sert (2005) proposes that neither the students nor the teachers always use codeswitching consciously. In his opinion the teachers are not always aware of the possible beneficial outcomes that codeswitching can provide (Sert, 2005). However as Eldridge (1996) asserts, teachers are usually very attentive and concerned about the negative consequences of consistent L1 usage (Eldridge, 1996, p. 303). Thus, codeswitching may therefore in some situations be regarded “as an automatic and unconscious behaviour” (Sert, 2005). Hence, in this study it would be valuable to ascertain whether the teachers are aware of their utilization of codeswitching or whether it happens unconsciously.

Sert (2005) maintains that teachers’ use of codeswitching serves some basic functions which in his opinion can be valuable in a language learner classroom. Mattson and Burenhult (1999) propose that three of these functions are codeswitching for repetitive functions, codeswitching for affective functions and topic switch (as cited in Sert, 2005). Topic switch is according to Sert (2005) often observed in grammar instruction and occurs when the teacher adjusts his language in accordance to the topic. The teachers then switch to L1 when dealing with certain grammatical points in order to direct the students’ attention to the new knowledge. Sert (2005) suggests that this can be done to build a bridge, from something known in the students’ mother tongue to something unknown in form of the new target language code. The bridge is created in order to transfer the new content and according to Sert (2005) meaning is made clear by switching to L1. Cole (1998) also agrees with this and highlights that “a teacher can exploit students’ previous L1 learning experience to increase their understanding of L2” (as cited in Sert, 2005).

Another purpose of codeswitching is for affective functions and express of emotions (Sert, 2005). The teacher can use codeswitching to build positive relations and solidarity in the classroom. In a way this utilization of codeswitching can, according to Sert (2005), help the teacher to create a supportive language environment in the classroom. Repetitive function is the last function of codeswitching that Mattson and Burenhult (1999) presents (as cited in Sert, 2005). In such instances the teacher might be clarifying a phrase or a concept by switching to L1 “in order to transfer the necessary knowledge” (Sert, 2005). An instruction in the target language may then be followed by a repetition in the students’ L1 and “in this way stresses importance on the foreign language content for efficient comprehension” (Sert,

2005).

Codeswitching can also be justified because it can make learning more efficient (Cook, 2001, p. 413). As Atkinson (1987) proposes “techniques involving use of the mother tongue can be very efficient as regards the amount of time needed to achieve a specific aim” (p. 242). It is a well known fact that many teachers are pressed for time and in some instances teachers may therefore turn to codeswitching in order to save time and achieve some competence aims more quickly (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 162). According to Atkinson (1987) such techniques often require little preparation as long as the teacher shares the same L1 as the students or has adequate competence in it (Atkinson, 1987, p. 243).

2.5 Negative impacts of codeswitching

As mentioned above, teachers are usually much more aware of the negative consequences L1 use may serve, than the beneficial functions it may provide (Eldridge, 1996, p. 303).

According to Cook (2001) the systematic use of the first language has been strongly discouraged for over 100 years, and most teaching methods since the 1880s as presented in 2.1 have adopted the Direct Method’s approach to avoid L1 as much as possible (pp. 403-404).

Cook (2001) thus asserts that a part of the language learning tradition has been an antagonism towards L1 usage in the classroom which rarely has been discussed with new teachers but rather taken for granted (p. 404). A general belief among teachers is therefore that using as much target language as possible is important for language teaching (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 324). Halliwell and Jones (1991) assert that avoidance of L1 is so widespread and is so well established in many teaching techniques that in most teaching manuals use of L1 is not even mentioned, unless it is mentioned as interference (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 404). Mitchell (1998) reports that teachers who resort to L1 frequently, often feel guilty and from interviews he conducted he reported that the teachers “seemed almost to feel they were making an admission of professional misconduct in ‘confessing’ to low levels of FL use” (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 405). Thus for the present study it is vital to establish whether the teachers view codeswitching as interference, and whether they have any guidelines at their schools regarding language choice in the English learner classrooms.

A prevailing belief among many language teachers is thus that using L2 for all purposes in the language classrooms will maximize the target language exposure of the

learners, and hence maximize learning (Sampson, 2011, p. 293). There is little doubt that a strict policy about L2-only will maximize both the students' language input and language output, and one should not neglect the fact that a learner needs to encounter a language to learn it properly (Cook, 2001, p. 408). In addition to this, as Ellis (1997) points out, sometimes L1 is a source of error when acquiring a new language (Ellis, 1997, p. 51). Too much exposure to L1 in the L2 classroom and allowing codeswitching as an achievement strategy may therefore lead to negative transfer if a student is transferring grammatical forms from their mother tongue into the new language for instance. Often these languages are very different and the grammatical rules very diverse which may lead to negative transfer (Ellis, 1997, p. 51).

Another important argument from supporters of strict L2 usage is that L2 classrooms today tend to be more heterogeneous in terms of L1 languages represented (Sridhar, 1996, p. 62). Classrooms today usually consist of students with multiple L1's and it is not a given that all the students share the same L1 (Atkinson, 1993, as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 405). Thus, as Sampson (2011) points out it is especially in multilingual classes important that the teachers encourage the student to develop alternative strategies than codeswitching, and obviously important that the teachers stick mostly to the TL themselves because switching to the majority students' L1 would not be beneficial for all students for their L2 learning (p. 302). However, because the majority students' L1 often is an additional target language for these students, codeswitching can be beneficial for language learning in general, and help them acquire the majority students' L1 faster.

Consequently, in a multicultural classroom, if the teacher utilizes codeswitching as a permanent strategy some students will be neglected and will possibly not benefit from this type of codeswitching as their L2 may in fact be stronger than the majority students' L1 (Cook, 2002, as cited in Sert, 2005). Nevertheless, as Moodley (2007) claims, educators have not been properly trained to face these increasingly multilingual and multiethnic classrooms and thus Moodley asserts that "learners become victims of the 'swim or drown' syndrome" (Moodley, 2007, p. 708).

As previously presented, codeswitching is often used for repetitive functions (Mattson and Burenhult, 1999, as cited in Sert, 2005). A clear drawback of using this as a permanent strategy is that language learners can detect and familiarize themselves with this strategy and ultimately decide to only pay attention to the repeated L1 explanation and ignore the explanation in L2 (Sert, 2005). This will limit the students' exposure to L2 discourse, and can

possibly influence them negatively and prevent them from acquiring the necessary language competence to pass the exam for instance (Sert, 2005).

As Sridhar (1996) points out, codeswitching has traditionally been seen as a sign of “laziness or mental sloppiness and inadequate command of language” (Sridhar, 1996, p. 59). And it is important to consider that some students may use codeswitching as a strategy to avoid speaking L2 (Sampson, 2011, p. 300). If the students are under the impression that codeswitching is allowed for all communicative functions, they can decide to overuse codeswitching and use it even in situations where they have the proper linguistic resources to utter themselves in L2 (Sampson, 2011, p. 300). Atkinson (1987) also points out the dangers of overusing codeswitching and asserts that the drawbacks of overuse should not be ignored (Atkinson, 1987, p. 246). Macaro (2005) reports that in some instances codeswitching can go past what he calls the ‘threshold’ (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 301). In such instances L1 has ceased to be a communicative or learning strategy and interaction has become “simply a discourse carried out entirely in L1 with only a marginal reference to L2” (Macaro, 2005, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 301).

Codeswitching is often used in the language learner classrooms both by proficient and less proficient language users (Zagura, 2012, pp. 279-280). Codeswitching is frequently used to repair breaks in communication, alongside another popular strategy; asking the teacher or a peer for assistance (Zagura, 2012, pp. 279-280). Because these strategies are commonly used in the language learner classroom, it will be beneficial to teach the students alternative strategies to handle such breaks in communication (Cook, 2001, p.409; Sampson, 2011, p.302; Zagura, 2012, p. 280). Learners of an L2 will definitely encounter speakers that do not share or understand their L1, therefore alternative strategies should be both learnt and encouraged by the teachers in language learner classrooms (Sampson, 2011, p. 302). As Sampson (2011) further asserts, these strategies should be taught to students at lower levels as well, because their “limited linguistic resources require them to make greater use of repair strategies when in non-L1-speaking contexts” (Sampson, 2011, p. 302).

A study conducted by Duff and Polio (1990) reports that students participating in their questionnaire were generally happy with the amount of L2 use the teachers utilized in class, “regardless of what the amount actually was” (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 158). They thus suggest that more use of target language does not seem to distress the students as very few students requested more use of L1 (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 158). This view can probably be connected with students’ opinions about their own language choice as well. Levine (2003) presents that

even students that were apprehensive about strict L2 use felt that to communicate in L2 “is a rewarding and worthwhile challenge” (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Thus in this study it will be valuable to determine how the students view the amount of codeswitching used, and whether they want more use of codeswitching or less use of codeswitching.

In Duff and Polio’s study (1990) they also point out that even though the students’ attitudes and opinions seemed to concur, the teachers’ attitudes and opinions differed greatly (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 163). For example they report that the teachers who favoured more TL had different reasons for doing so. Some teachers claimed reliance on TL had been important in their teacher training and they were thus convinced that this approach was effective, two of the teachers had training in applied linguistics and had theoretical convictions for using as much TL as possible (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 162). One of the teachers who had training in applied linguistics uttered that, based on her experience, to get optimal exposure to L2 is both challenging and enjoyable for language learners. (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 162). Hence in the present study it will be fruitful to ascertain whether teachers make deliberate choices about when to switch and whether it is used systematically to support language learning.

2.6 English as an international language

As both Sridhar (1996) and McKay (2002) point out, English is today increasingly taught as an international language (EIL), and the English language is used more and more in non-native contexts (McKay, 2002, p.5-11; Sridhar, 1996, p. 65). In such contexts, English is used by native speakers to communicate with non-native speakers and non-native speakers use it to communicate with each other as a lingua franca. Smith and Sridhar (1993) therefore suggest that the traditional paradigm of second language teaching that presupposed that learners were acquiring English to communicate with a native speaker of English, no longer depict the predominant context of the use of English today (as cited in Sridhar, 1996, p. 65). They call this shift a multilingual paradigm shift and this shift is also highlighted and recognized by the Council of Europe, as will be presented below.

2.6.1 Multilingualism versus plurilingualism

Our own syllabus states that “learning English will contribute to multilingualism and can be an important part of our personal development” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

Cook (2008) defines multilingualism as “countries or situations where more than one language is used for everyday purposes” (Cook, 2008, p. 195). Thus, one of the purposes of the English teaching in Norway is to become multilingual language speakers where English is used alongside our L1 or other potential languages.

However, the Council of Europe (CoE) defines multilingualism as “the knowledge of a number of languages, or the co-existence of different languages in a given society” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). Furthermore they present that multilingualism can be accomplished by “diversifying the languages on offer in a particular school or educational system, or by encouraging pupils to learn more than one foreign language, or reducing the dominant position of English in international communication” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). In their view, multilingualism promotes a certain division of the languages, and the CoE has therefore presented the term plurilingualism which in their opinion provides an extra understanding and a development of the concept multilingualism. A plurilingual approach establishes that an individual’s understanding of language in its cultural context increases “from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). Moreover, this approach also highlights that these languages and cultures are not kept strictly separated in different mental compartments, instead they develop a communicative competence “to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). Thus, a plurilingual language user can take advantage of different elements of this competence to successfully engage in communication with a particular interlocutor (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4).

The Council of Europe presents specific instances where such interaction of languages or cultures may be valuable. Interlocutors may for example codeswitch between languages or dialects to take advantage of the ability they both possess to express themselves in one language and to comprehend the other (p. 4). In addition to this, a language user can also utilize his or her knowledge in different languages to make sense of both written and spoken texts in a language that previously was unknown, by identifying words “from a common international store in a new guise” (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). Individuals with some knowledge may also use this plurilingual language competence to assist people by mediating between others with no common language (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 4). However, they also stress that it is possible to achieve some level of communication without a mediator as well, this can for instance be accomplished if the speakers take advantage of their entire

linguistic equipment and experiment with other forms of expression either in different languages or dialects or by using paralinguistic competence such as mimes, gestures and facial expressions and by this simplifying their use of language (Council of Europe, 2001, pp. 4-5).

This view of language education alters the assumption that to achieve ‘mastery’ of languages means mastering them isolated from each other, and that complete ‘mastery’ of a language means to have an ultimate language model in form of a native-speaker as a goal (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 5). This plurilingual approach rather encourages the development of a common linguistic repertory, in which all linguistic abilities take place.

2.6.2 Plurilingualism in an educational context

The CoE maintains that in an educational context the learners must be given the opportunity to develop this plurilingual competence by diversifying the languages offered in the educational institutions (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 5). However, the CoE asserts that implications of this paradigm shift are yet to be worked and rendered into action, but that their developments in the language programme have been constructed to provide both teachers and learners with tools to promote plurilingualism (p. 5).

According to Sridhar (1996), teachers of English must be cognizant of this paradigm shift and shape the curriculum accordingly, especially Sridhar (1996) established that “this involves sensitivity to the variations in lexical, pragmatic, and other norms resulting from the fact that users of the English language interact with an enormous range of verbal repertoires and cultural contexts around the world” (p. 65). This is almost impossible to achieve without altering the teacher training programs completely and incorporating this plurilingual approach in such courses (Sridhar, 1996, p. 65). Sridhar (1996) maintains that teachers need an attitude change and that language teachers need to value that the learners’ other languages play important roles in the learner community (Sridhar, 1996, p. 63).

L2 teachers who were trained in a monocultural and monolingual paradigm have traditionally been overly harsh towards minority students who switch and mix languages (Sridhar, 1996, p. 64). Sridhar (1996) thus calls for “an enlightened and informed approach to language teaching” (p.64). And further asserts that such an approach to L2 would promote a tolerant and relativistic attitude instead of an exclusionary one (Sridhar, 1996, p. 64). Thus in this thesis it will be important to establish whether teachers have this prevailing monolingual paradigm integrated in their teaching or whether they have the enlightened approach that

Sridhar (1996) calls for.

English undoubtedly plays an important role in EIL teaching, but it should not be neglected that language learners possibly have more than English in their language repertoire and according to Sridhar (1996) “teachers need to recognize that children and adults are capable of adding languages to their existing repertoires” (Sridhar, 1996, p. 63). Furthermore, as McKay (2002) points out, “the growing number of bilingual users suggests that a productive theory of EIL teaching and learning must recognize the various ways in which English is used within multilingual communities” (McKay, 2002, p. 125). In light of this, it is evident that EIL belongs to its users, and thus there is according to McKay (2003) no reason why some users of English should provide standards for others (pp. 18-19).

2.6.3 The question of intelligibility

If one chooses to maintain that EIL belongs to its speakers and that no speaker has the right to provide grammatical standards, phonological patterns and discourse competence for other users to aim for, misunderstanding and lack of comprehension may occur as a result (McKay, 2003, p. 52). The rise of EIL has made the supporters of the native-speaker model argue that loss of intelligibility will be a result if a standard is not upheld (McKay, 2002, p. 78).

Intelligibility refers to recognition of an utterance or a word, and if a listener for instance recognizes that the word spoon is an English word rather than a Norwegian one, English is then intelligible to the speaker (McKay, 2002, p. 52). If all users of EIL take their own native words, concepts, utterances, grammatical and lexical variations into an EIL discourse it is quite possible that speakers will end up having trouble understanding each other (McKay, 2002, pp. 52-53). It can seem like a set of rules is necessary to be able to communicate across boundaries. For example, in the purpose section of the English subject curriculum in Norway it states that “the subject shall help build up general language proficiency through listening, speaking, reading and writing” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013). Additionally, in the competence aims after year 10 it states that one of the aims for the students is to be able to “use the central patterns for pronunciation, intonation, word inflection and different types of sentences in communication” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013). Thus, our current subject curriculum emphasises that we need a certain foundation or a set of central patterns universal to all of us, to be able to use the English language to communicate with each other.

3 Methodology

In this section the methodology will be presented. For this study I chose to observe six English teachers, three at the 10th grade lower secondary school and three at VG1 level at upper secondary school. In addition to this I interview them afterwards and conducted two group interviews with students at the VG1 level. In the sections below I will present the procedures and methods used for this particular study.

3.1 Research design

Research design can be described as a researcher's plan for conducting the study (Creswell, 2013, p. 49). To begin with, my preliminary considerations and how I chose my data and my methods will be presented. Subsequently, issues concerning validity, reliability and transferability will be addressed.

3.1.1 Preliminary considerations

The preliminary considerations a researcher needs to consider before conducting a study are in Creswell's opinion much comparable to the phases and processes of the scientific method, which is similar whether you are writing quantitatively or qualitatively (Creswell, 2013, p. 50). The scientific method involves a problem, a hypothesis (or questions), the data collection, the results, and the discussion (Creswell, 2013, p. 50). In his opinion all researchers usually start with an issue, then they review the literature that can relate to the problem, then pose questions, gather the data before analyzing it properly, and finally write up the report (Creswell, 2013, p. 50). This is to some extent the same order I decided to employ for my study in the preliminary considerations-phase.

As mentioned in the introduction I did a pilot study on this topic in 2013, and I found the topic very interesting and wanted to dive further into both the literature and apply interview as a method as well as observing to find out more. Thus, I quickly found the issue I wanted to investigate for my master's thesis. The research question is further accounted for in chapter 1. I had examined some of the literature in 2013, nevertheless one of my preliminary thoughts was that I wanted to gather my data before writing up and reading all the theory I had at hand, because I did not know exactly what I was going to find and which theories that would prove to be most valuable. Therefore, my data collection would come before my

systematical review of the literature, which according to Creswell (2013) also is a common way of doing it (pp.50-51). All the pertinent literature is reviewed in chapter 2. After my data collection I intended to analyze all my data, examine the literature and then write up my final report. I also kept in mind what Morse and Richards (2002) referred to in Creswell (2013) argue, that in order for the study to not appear as fragmented and secluded parts, the purposes, questions and methods should be seen as an interconnected and interrelated process (p.50). Therefore I constantly tried to connect everything I did to the other components of my study.

In Creswell's (2013) perspective to it is also of importance to assuredly identify that the issue you want to investigate actually do exist (p.51). Considering both my pilot study and Marie Sjasmin Tobru Hoff's master's thesis L1 use in EFL instruction, it became evident that the issue was worth addressing. From Hoff's suggestions for further research I got the idea to investigate and compare codeswitching at 10th grade at lower secondary level and VG1 at upper secondary level to try to understand what happens in the process (Hoff, 2013, p. 84).

3.1.2 Methods

In this study both observations and semi-structured post-interviews are employed. For my pilot project I used observations as the only method, and I realized that interviews with the teachers would be insightful to comprehend the reasons for the codeswitching and also their attitudes and awareness towards it. Observations are insightful if the researcher wants to study something that is happening in a social situation, and are especially valuable if the researcher wants to study behaviours or qualities in a social situation (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 456). Also, as Robson (2002) claims observations allow a “reality check”, because what informants say may contradict what they actually do (as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 456). Walford (2011) agrees with this and argues that interviewees “may be providing misinformation, telling lies, evading the issue [...]” (as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 422) (p.422). Therefore observing lessons in addition to interviewing teachers could in this sense work as a means of triangulation. Cohen et al. (2011) describe triangulation as “[...] the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behaviour” (p.195).

In addition to observing and interviewing teachers I also wanted to investigate the students' attitudes towards codeswitching, and decided to conduct semi-structured group interviews as well. My main goal for this was initially for triangulation purposes, because interviewing students could in a sense verify or refute whether the lesson observed was representative for the EFL teaching in that class in general. However, because of the limited

scope of this project I did not interview students in all the classes I observed. Because I wanted to avoid an intricate and time-consuming process with the students needing consent from their parents to participate, I decided to only interview students in upper secondary school where the students are old enough to decide on participation themselves.

3.1.3 Observation Categories

The observation categories used for this study were developed by Hoff (2013) and are used with her consent. However, a few modifications were made throughout the process in line with the research statement and the findings from the observations. The observation categories were put in a form, with a column for time, initial coding and an empty space where the situation could be described in greater detail. The observation categories used are presented in appendix 2.

3.1.4 The interview guides

The interview guides for the teachers were also developed by Hoff (2013) and used with her permission. However, some of the questions were discarded because they were viewed as less important for this particular study. The interview guide developed for the teachers can be found in appendix 3.

The interview guide for the students was initially developed with open-ended questions without any thematically organized structure. Later in the process, when the answers were analysed, the questions were organized thematically. This final edition of the students' interview guide is the one found in appendix 1.

3.1.5 Participants

The sample for this particular study is six teachers and eight students. I wanted to observe and interview three teachers at upper secondary school and three teachers at lower secondary school as well as conducting group interviews with two groups of students. An information e-mail was sent out to almost all the university schools connected to the University of Oslo, situated in both Oslo and the Akershus area. This e-mail contained basic information about the project, without revealing the exact topic, as well as informing potential participants that they were assured anonymity and that all the material would be deleted when the thesis was submitted.

As I had difficulties getting a response from some of the schools, in addition to some schools declining, I also sent out an e-mail to two schools where I had contacts. In the end I managed to find six willing informants, and one of the teachers was also willing to let me organize student interviews as well. Thus both my group interviews are from the same school (school A – Hannah’s school). Due to the same complications, three of the teachers are from the same school (school C). In addition to this, Laura from school C was teaching a group of 10th graders that were reading English at VG1 level. After consulting my supervisor I still decided to use her as one of my informants for lower secondary school as the students age-wise belong in that group. The sampling strategy used for this study is therefore a convenience sample. According to Cohen et al. (2011) this is a sampling strategy used when you choose the most available informants and continue that process until the desirable sampling size is obtained (p.155).

3.2 Gathering the data

In this section I will address how I gathered my data, how the observations and interviews were conducted, and important characteristics of my informants.

3.2.1 The observations

None of the informants were told that my topic was codeswitching prior to my school visit. This was done to ensure that their teaching would be as authentic as possible. They were informed that I wanted to observe “communication in the classroom”, and because of their tight schedule and my tight schedule they suggested dates that would suit them and their teaching best. It was also desirable for me that the teachers had a free period after the observation lesson so I could conduct the interview directly afterwards.

The number of students in each class varied from approximately nine to 30 students. The observations were not recorded, however extensive notes were taking during the lessons. Issues regarding this will be discussed in section 3.3.1. I met all the teachers before the lesson began and answered questions regarding the observation and the interview. I was in five out of six observations placed at the back of the classroom. In Hannah’s class (school A), I was placed upfront because of space issues. In the first few minutes most teachers introduced me and told the students that I would be observing him or her and not the students, therefore they should act as natural as possible. They seemed aware of my presence at first, but my

impression was that they forgot about me after a few minutes.

During the observation I took extensive notes and coded all the codeswitching situations that came up with the observation categories, which can be found in appendix 2. This was done to make the analysing process afterwards easier, and also to be properly prepared for the interviews. Nevertheless, not all the codeswitching situations were easy to classify, and some of them were analysed and put in a different category in the analysing process afterwards.

3.2.2 The teacher interviews

In four out of six occasions the teacher interviews were conducted directly after the observations. Hannah's interview was conducted after the two student group interviews and Laura's interview was conducted a few hours later as she had another lesson directly after my observation. However, all interviews were conducted the same day as the observations. The interviews were audio-recorded, and conducted either in a quiet part of the teachers' lounge or in a classroom. In addition to the audio-recording, handwritten notes were taken during the interview as well.

The interview guide was used as an outline, however sometimes the teachers answered questions or topics originally structured later in the interview, so the interviews ended up with somewhat different structures as semi-structured interviews often do (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 413). The interviews were conducted in Norwegian to make sure that all the teachers were comfortable and could answer the questions as truthfully and thoroughly as possible. Furthermore, the concept codeswitching was not used in the interview, instead I asked about the usage of L1 and L2. This was done because my impression from talking with colleagues at the upper secondary school where I work, is that the concept codeswitching is not very familiar, neither for experienced English teachers nor new English teachers. The interview guide used as a template can be seen in appendix 3.

The topics covered in the interview guide were *background, teaching philosophy, perception of their own proficiency, perception of their students' proficiency, departmental policy and educational preparation.*

Background covered what education they had, their seniority, international experience and whether they had experience from other levels than what they taught now. The latter was especially valuable for this study because I wanted to look for a difference from lower secondary to upper secondary school, and if the teachers had experience from both that would

be particularly interesting.

The questions regarding *teaching philosophy* were concerning their attitudes towards teaching, what they viewed as the students' goals, and in general what their attitude towards L1 was and whether there were situations where L1 use was especially appropriate or inappropriate in their opinion.

The third category of questions, *the teachers' perception of their own proficiency*, was related to how comfortable they were teaching English in L2, and also how they viewed their oral teaching.

In the next group of questions, *perception of their students' proficiency*, the teachers were asked to reflect upon their view of the students' proficiency in English and also how well they thought the students understood them when speaking L2.

The interview also touched upon the *departmental policy*. The teachers were asked if the school had any guidelines regarding L1 or L2 use during lessons in EFL teaching. In addition to this they were asked if they thought their teaching differed from other teachers in the same department, especially regarding L1 or L2 use.

Finally, they were asked questions concerning their *educational preparations*. Here they were asked whether they felt that their education had prepared them for oral teaching in English as well as their opinion on a research statement.

3.2.3 The student interviews

The two student interviews were, as mentioned earlier, both with students from Hannah's class at school A, an upper secondary school. There were four students in each group interview, and the teacher had asked the class in advance whether anyone would be interested in being interviewed. Eight students volunteered and I decided to split them up into two groups to ensure that everyone would get to participate. Group interviews were chosen because they are practical since they are usually quicker than individual interviews (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 432). Also they often, as Bogdan and Biklen's paper (1992) suggests, yield a wider range of responses because in group interviews one has the potential of group discussion (as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 432). Issues concerning group discussions will be reflected upon in section 3.5.

When I told Hannah I wanted to do two group interviews she split the group of volunteers into two smaller groups with both male and female interviewees in both groups. Since the observation lesson was the students' last lesson for the day they agreed to stay a few

minutes longer to participate in the interview. The questions were asked in Norwegian to ensure that all students were comfortable enough to answer as thoroughly as possible. As well as taking notes I audio-recorded the group interviews as well.

The interview guide for the group interviews was originally not grouped thematically, that was done later in the analyzing process. However, this is not relevant for the results therefore the thematically structured interview guide is the one presented in appendix 1 and will be used from now on.

In the interview the following topics were covered: *attitudes towards English, differences in the teaching of English from lower secondary school till upper secondary school, the students' own oral participation, the teacher's L1 use and the teachers L2 use*.

In the first topic, *attitudes towards English*, the students were asked how pleased they were with the English teaching and their school and they were also asked to reflect upon what they considered to be the best way to learn English.

The second topic, *differences in the teaching of English from lower secondary to upper secondary school*, regarded whether they saw any differences in the teaching from lower to upper secondary school.

The topic , *students' own oral participation*, comprised questions regarding their own L1 use in the EFL classroom and also whether they were comfortable expressing themselves in English.

Moreover, the students were also asked about *the teacher's L1 use*. The students were here asked whether, and in what situations their teacher used L1, as well as their opinions about it, and finally in what situations they regarded L1 use as appropriate. This topic was especially important to check whether the observation lesson was representative for the teacher's L1 use in that class, or if the teacher normally used L1 more frequently. The topic was also important to scrutinize the students' awareness and attitudes towards codeswitching.

The teacher's L2 use was the final topic. The students were asked how well they understood the teacher when he or she spoke L2, in which situations the teacher should stick to L2 and finally to what extent they viewed their English teacher as a role-model in oral English.

3.2.4 The informants

As mentioned above the teacher informants were six in number, five female and one male. I have given them aliases to maintain their anonymity; Daniel, Emma and Laura for lower

secondary school and Hannah, Nicola and Penny for upper secondary school.

For lower secondary school Laura was the only one that had teaching experience from both upper and lower secondary school. Daniel had taught English for 35 years, Laura finished her degree nineteen years ago but she had not been teaching all those years, and Emma had taught English for six years. One of these teachers had a master's degree with additional courses, one had an intermediate level subject with additional courses and one a bachelor degree with additional courses. Both Laura and Emma had lived abroad for a long period of time, one of them for eight months and one of them for 12 months. Both Daniel and Emma were teaching the compulsory English course whereas Laura taught a small group of students that were reading English at VG1 level.

All informants from upper secondary school had teaching experience from both upper and lower secondary school. Hannah had 12 years of experience of teaching English in Norway, however she had taught English for three years in an English speaking country. This was her first year teaching at upper secondary school, prior to this she had been working at a lower secondary school. Her education was an intermediate course as well as TEFL-certificate. Nicola and Penny had both been teaching English for four years. One of them had a master's degree in translation and one of them a bachelor degree with additional courses. All three teachers had lived abroad in an English speaking country for a long period of time.

The students who participated in the study attended the same upper secondary school. I interviewed eight students, six female and two male. To ensure their anonymity I have for their individual utterances and opinions given them aliases. Christine, Holly, Julie and David for group interview one and Elizabeth, Rose, Amy and Eric for group interview two. The informants came from five different lower secondary schools and they were all sixteen years old.

3.3 Analysing the data

After both the interviews and the observations were conducted, the analysing process started. In the following sections this will be accounted for.

3.3.1 Analysing the observations

Extensive hand-written notes were taken during the observations. These notes were studied in greater detail afterwards, and re-written and rendered in a complete form on a computer. The

codeswitching situations that during the observations were put in one of the observation categories mentioned above, were in the analysing process studied again thoroughly, and some of them were put in a different category in this process.

The number of codeswitching situations were then counted for each teacher and put in tables, which will be presented in chapter four. The classification of the different types of codeswitching were also counted for each teacher and inserted in a different table. Afterwards I made a table where the percentages of the transpired situations were put, in order to get a more comparable number. This was done to try to illustrate the quantity of codeswitching in each of the lessons. In addition to this, since the lessons observed were of different length I decided to convert all the lessons into 60 minutes lessons in order to get even more comparable numbers. Moreover these tables enable a comparison of the teachers at the same level as well as a comparison of the different levels. All the tables are presented in chapter four.

However, without recording the observations much of the potential codeswitching situations that occur one-to-one between the teacher and a student will obviously be almost impossible to hear for an observer at the back of the classroom. The classroom structure made it on some occasions extremely difficult to hear these instances, especially if the students were working in pairs and talking loudly to each other. Thus it is important to keep in mind that the numbers are not a hundred percent correct, however the numbers can show a tendency that can be similar in other classrooms at the same level.

3.3.2 Analysing the teacher interviews

After every interview that was conducted, the audio-recording was transcribed immediately. This was done because I wanted to have the interviews fresh in mind. As Cohen et al. (2011) point out this is a crucial part of the process because “[...] there is the potential for massive data loss, distortion and the reduction of complexity” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 426). Therefore, I transcribed all my data material and listened to the interviews thoroughly several times to make sure that I had transcribed everything accurately. The notes that were taken during the interviews were used alongside the transcription in the analysing process because my notes included comments on non-verbal communication as well. This was done because as Mishler (1986) suggests, an audio-recording is somewhat limited as it cannot capture non-verbal behaviour and other significant contextual factors (Mishler, 1986, as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 426). Thus the notes became important as they contained valuable information that

the transcribed material did not include.

Since the interview guide for the teachers was organized thematically, the same categories were used in the analysing process. The audio-recordings were therefore analysed one category at a time starting with the teachers from lower secondary school. Then the same strategy was used for upper secondary school. When all the material was transcribed the notes that were taken during the interviews were incorporated. Subsequently, the transcribed documents were rendered and significant utterances for each category were chosen and analysed.

3.3.3 Analysing the student interviews

I started by transcribing group interview one, and because the interview guide was not structured thematically the interview was transcribed as a unit. Afterwards the exact same procedure was followed with group interview two. After studying the questions and the answers thoroughly the transcribed material was structured into the categories mentioned in 3.2.3. Ultimately, this document was rendered and important utterances were analysed for the results section.

The group interviews proved to be challenging to transcribe as some of the voices sounded similar. However, as Cohen et al. (2011) assert, group interviews often focus more on a collective group response than individual responses (p.433). Therefore for the majority of questions in the group interviews this would not affect the results. Nevertheless, on questions regarding the difference between lower secondary school and upper secondary school individual responses were especially interesting as the eight informants came from five different lower secondary schools. Therefore, parts of the group interviews were listened to up to ten times.

3.4 Reliability

Cohen et al. (2011) propose that reliability basically is a synonym for “dependability, consistency and replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents” (p.199). Furthermore, the term reliability is closely linked with the terms precision and accuracy, and for research to be reliable, precise or accurate it needs to establish that congruent results could be yielded in a similar context with a similar group of informants (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 201). The reliability of the observations and the interviews will be

covered in this section.

The term inter-rater reliability concerns whether a different observer or interviewer observing the same occurrence would interpret the phenomena in the same way (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 202). To ensure this kind of reliability it would have been preferable to have two people observing for this study. However, as both resources and the time frame for this study were limited this was impossible. Nonetheless, last year I participated in a state funded research project as a research assistant, and was therefore trained by experienced researchers on how to conduct observations. In addition to this, Hoff's thesis yields some of the same results as this study, and both studies are conducted within the same educational context with almost identical observation categories and interview guides which strengthens the reliability of this study. However, it is important to point out that whereas Hoff thesis investigates the issue at 8th grade and VG3 the thesis at hand examines the issue at 10th grade to VG1 and is supplementing with both teacher and student interviews to gain better insight when it comes to attitudes to codeswitching.

For observations it is according to Cohen et al. (2001) also quite common that the people being observed change their behaviour because they know they are being observed (p.473). This was the main reason why I did not tell the teachers exactly what they were being observed for. If they had known the topic before my observation it is likely that the teachers would have been more conscious about their L1 use. For the same reason, the interviews had to be conducted after the observations, otherwise the teachers would know what they were being observed for based on my questions, which would have threatened the authenticity and reliability of the results.

Because my observations were not recorded, some of the codeswitching situations that possibly occur one-to-one between the teacher and a student will be difficult to hear. However, my main goal for this study was not exclusively to look for the quantity of codeswitching, therefore this would not affect the results significantly. In addition to this, as Cohen et al. (2011) point out, during an observation something might be lost if the observer is distracted or if the researcher forgets something (p.473). However, as recommended by Cohen et al. (2011) I took extensive notes during the observation and immediately after my observations and interviews I rendered my notes and wrote a detailed report on my computer (p.473).

The lessons observed both in upper secondary school and lower secondary school were different regarding teaching methods and activities because of the difficulties I had

getting enough informants. Initially I wanted the lessons to be as similar as possible to make sure that my results were conducted in an as comparable context as possible. However, because the teachers got individual freedom when it came to teaching methods and activities the contexts were fairly different and it is important to note that some teaching methods and activities may open up for more L1 use than others which may have affected the results. Nevertheless, my focus was not solely to look at quantity and functions of codeswitching, but rather attitudes and awareness towards it, therefore this has probably not affected the results as negatively as it could have.

The coding process was as mentioned earlier a challenging process. When it comes to reliability it is obvious that the degree of subjectivity in the interpretation is an important factor that can influence the reliability negatively (Sampson, 2011, p. 296). Many switches taking place is in Sampson's (2011) opinion difficult to classify because there are often more than one probable reason or function of the switches that occur in speech (p. 296). All the material was coded and classified by myself, and some of the switches corresponded well with the description of the observation categories and thus not very difficult to code. However, I decided to perform a reliability-check on some of the switches that were found most difficult to code with some of my peer students. Most of the reliability-checks concurred with my initial coding, however in instances of disparity I reviewed the codeswitching situations once again and in the end decided on a category.

Moreover, my interview guide for the teachers was in a sense already piloted as I was allowed to use the interview guide developed by Hoff. As Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) argue, to enhance reliability for interviews it is important to pose questions that are neutral and consistent (as cited in Hoff, 2013, p. 36). And when developing the interview guide Hoff attempted to use questions of that format (Hoff, 2013, p. 36). My alterations to her interview guide were minimal. I only decided to discard some of the questions because they seemed less important for this study. Using an interview guide already implemented and tested may help to maintain the reliability in this study.

In contrast to Hoff's study this study includes student interviews as well. This interview guide was designed by me, and approved by my supervisor. I tried to make the questions as open and focused as possible, so that my data would be rich, thorough but also focused. To enhance the reliability of this interview guide I also performed a pilot interview with a sixteen year old student to make sure that the questions were understood by the target group.

3.5 Validity

Cohen et al. (2011) claim that one of the most important keys to effective research is validity (p.179). If a research project is viewed as invalid it is in their sense more or less worthless (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 179). In qualitative research the validity can be addressed through “the honesty, depth, richness and the scope of the data achieved, the participants approached, the extent of triangulation and the disinterestedness or objectivity of the researcher” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 179).

Having a representative sample can strengthen the validity of a study. However, the sampling strategy used for this study is the non-probability strategy convenience sample, and it is obvious that using a probability sample would yield more generalizable results as it “draws randomly from the wider population” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 153). Nevertheless, the validity is to some extent, regardless of the previous point made, maintained in this study. As Cohen et al. (2011) assert, small-scale studies often use a non-probability sample as it is easier to utilize, and can be satisfactory as long as the intention is not to generalize the results beyond the sample under consideration (p.155). Hence it is significant to point out that this study does not seek to generalize about the wider population, but rather endeavours to scrutinize the particular group that is being studied (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 161).

In view of data presented earlier, the teacher informants themselves depict a relatively representative sample of teachers. They had different educations, experiences and backgrounds. Even though three of the teachers taught at the same school the fact that they differed when it came to these features may have helped to enhance the validity for this study.

Because both student interviews were conducted in the same class, the representativeness of the sample could have been better. As mentioned earlier that was difficult to acquire because of the limited time frame and the scope of this study. However, both genders were represented in both student interviews and the students came from five different lower secondary schools. Group interviews have certain disadvantages when it comes to validity. Cohen et al. (2011) propose that in a group interview one participant may dominate the interview so the other respondents do not get their say (p.432). I tried to avoid this by asking some students direct questions if they became very reticent. The group dynamic is also very important because some respondents may be reserved in front of other students and reluctant to utter their truthful opinion in front of their peers. Therefore group interviews sometimes have a tendency to produce “group think” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 432). However, from the observations, utterances from the students in the interviews and the conversation

with Hannah in advance it could seem like the students were very comfortable with each other. Because the student interviews were based on willingness from the students, it was impossible for me to control the sample. Obviously it would have been desirable to interview students with different proficiency levels, to explore opinions regarding codeswitching with highly proficient English students and less proficient English students, and since my interviews were based on willingness I could not control the sample. However, when I met the teacher who organized the student interviews in advance, she uttered that students with very different proficiency levels had volunteered to participate. This can enhance validity in the findings because not just highly proficient students or less proficient students were represented.

According to Cohen et al. (2011) researcher bias naturally exists in qualitative research because the researcher is a part of the world that is being researched and to be entirely objective about that is almost impossible (p.180). Therefore, for qualitative research one needs to minimize the researcher bias as much as possible because it is impossible to completely avoid it. To reduce bias one can for example use more than one observer or have two people transcribing the interviews. As mentioned earlier for a small-scale study like this, two researchers were impossible to obtain. Nonetheless, a common way of controlling bias is for researchers to reveal their background and express how it might influence their interpretation of the information in a study (Creswell, 2013, pp. 47, 215-216 & 257). This is presented in chapter 1. The concept of reflexivity therefore favours some sort of self-awareness around how you as a researcher might influence your findings. Both when observing and analysing I therefore tried to avoid that my personal opinions would sway or influence the data. However, that the observation categories were so clearly defined definitely helped both during the observations but also in the analysing process. In addition to this I also, as mentioned earlier, used reliability-checks on some of the codeswitching utterances where my personal opinions may have affected the coding.

In this particular study triangulation is used to provide validity to my findings. In this study teacher interviews, student interviews and observations are employed. My research project in 2013 yielded a limited picture of the issue, therefore interviews were important to employ in this study to try to understand the teachers' awareness and attitudes towards codeswitching and not just the limited picture whether they actually codeswitched or not. The student interviews were especially important for this matter too, because they could in a sense confirm or refute whether the lesson observed was representative for that teacher in general

especially regarding codeswitching. Thus interviews with students in all classes would have been preferable and that could have strengthened the validity further.

3.6 Transferability

The transferability of your findings is in keeping with Cohen et al. (2011) related to the external validity and concerns whether your results can be generalized to the wider population (p.186). However, external validity is in a lot of qualitative studies viewed as immaterial because the intention of qualitative studies is not always to generalize “[...] but only to represent the phenomenon being investigated, fairly and truly” (Cohen et al., 2011, p. 181). The transferability presented here rather relates to whether the results can be transferred or generalized within the educational context that this study is conducted within, and whether it can be transferable to other outside communities similar to this one (Maxwell, 1992, as cited in Cohen et al., 2011, p. 181).

As suggested in the introduction the status of English is in Norway perhaps shifting from a foreign language to a second language or international language in a multicultural society. Therefore this study of codeswitching will only and can only represent itself, but might show inclinations that may be similar in other educational context outside Norway where the status of English is going through the same transformation as here.

In addition to this, it is important to point out that the educational context in this study comprises six teachers from four different schools which limits the study's transferability further. Having more than six informants all teaching at different schools may yield more generalizable results. Furthermore, the observations at upper secondary school were conducted in general studies classes, and for the results to be transferable to other similar contexts the observations must be conducted in similar classrooms. Considering information delineated by some of the teachers it may be suggested that the results could have been different if the observations were conducted in a vocational studies classroom. Thus, the results yielded here may not be as easily transferable to vocational English learner classrooms.

The fact that the lessons differed regarding teaching methods and activities might make this study more transferable because the lessons observed did not share the same structure, teaching methods and activities. Therefore the ‘sample’ of different teaching methods is to some extent present in this study. However, this sample is fairly limited, and for

the results to be more uniform and reliable this sample should have been bigger. With a bigger sample one could have examined whether some teaching methods open up for more L1 use than others. In this study this can only, and will only be hinted at.

4 Results and analysis

In the following chapter the results from the interviews and observations with the six teacher informants and the eight student informants will be presented. To begin with the results yielded from the observations and interviews with the upper secondary school teachers are presented, followed by the results from the student interviews. Finally, the results generated from the observations and interviews with the lower secondary schools will be addressed.

4.1 Upper secondary level – VG1

This section initially presents the findings yielded from the observations at VG1 level. Subsequently the VG1 teachers' opinions will be addressed, followed by the findings from the student interviews.

4.1.1 The teachers' use of codeswitching – the observations

The observations conducted at upper secondary school show that two of the teachers used codeswitching occasionally. The third teacher, however, only had one codeswitching situation and consistently used L2.

To begin with the setting of the observations will be presented, then the quantity and the different types of codeswitching will be presented, and finally the teachers will be presented as individual cases.

The setting

The three observations conducted at upper secondary school at VG1 level lasted about 90 minutes each, and two of them were, as presented and explained in the methodology section, from the same school. All three observations at the VG1 level were conducted in a general studies class, where English is an obligatory subject for all students at that level. The classroom structure in the three classrooms was a bit different, which made it easier in some of the classrooms to identify more of the individual conversations between the teacher and the students, and almost impossible in other classrooms. The teachers had not been given any specific instruction as to what type of lesson or activities to implement in class, in other words

they had been given individual freedom regarding both teaching methods and activity choice, thus the lessons were structured quite differently.

The quantity of codeswitching

From the observations it is evident that one of the teachers consistently used L2 throughout the lesson with only one codeswitching situation. The two other VG1 teachers had more codeswitching situations, respectively 11 and 13, which is further presented in *table 4.1* below.

Table 4.1

Number of codeswitching situations counted: Upper secondary school

	Length of class (minutes)	Codeswitching situations
Hannah	90	11
Penny	90	1
Nicola	90	13

The different types of codeswitching

As mentioned in 3.1.4 the codeswitching situations were classified with Hoff's observation categories as a foundation, however some alterations were made to make some of these codeswitching classifications more specific. The different types of codeswitching observed in the three VG1 classes were counted for each teacher as shown in *table 4.2* below:

Table 4.2*Types of codeswitching situations counted: Upper secondary school*

	Number of codeswitching functions	Translation	Discipline	Task Instruction	Solidarity	Grammar explanation	To convey meaning	Procedural Matters
Hannah	11	III	-	III	-	-	II	III
Penny	1	I	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicola	13	IIII II	-	I	-	-	III	II
Total	25	11	0	4	0	0	5	5

Table 4.2 shows that translation is the classification category used by all, and also the category used most frequently for upper secondary school altogether. The categories discipline, grammar explanation and solidarity were not used for the observations in upper secondary school.

Table 4.3*Types of codeswitching situations percentages: Upper secondary school*

	Number of code-switching functions	Translation (%)	Task instruction (%)	To convey meaning (%)	Procedural matters (%)
Hannah	11	12	12	8	12
Penny	1	4	0	0	0
Nicola	13	28	4	12	8
Total (%)	25	44	16	20	20

Table 4.3 illustrates the percentages for each codeswitching function observed for each teacher at upper secondary school. As the table illustrates, translation was by far the most

used category altogether with 44% of the switches observed at upper secondary school. The varying percentages of codeswitching use reveal that there are great disparities between the VG1 teachers. This may indicate that there are other factors than what level they teach that can affect the use of codeswitching in the classroom. Issues regarding this will be addressed both below and in chapter five.

Hannah – occasional use of codeswitching

In Hannah's class I was because of space issues placed upfront and at the side of the classroom. This was one of the classrooms where it was easier to perceive more of the individual conversations both because of the classroom's structure and because there was little noise when the students worked in pairs and individually. The students were to begin with supposed to read a complex, factual text with many social science concepts, then listen to a short-story and finally work with tasks related to these texts.

Hannah had 11 codeswitching situations during the 90 minutes lesson. Most of her codeswitching situations consisted of isolated words in an L2 context or short answers to the students' more practical questions as the example² below illustrates:

Example 1: The students were given a handout with tasks related to the short-story they just listened to:

Student: *Kan vi skrive på arket?*

Hannah: *Ja, eller i et dokument ved siden av. Du kan velge.*

Her most recurrent codeswitching categories were, as *table 4.2* and *table 4.3* show, translation, task instruction and procedural matters. My subjective opinion of her teaching is that she quite consistently used L2 and that she often made use of other strategies than codeswitching to convey meaning, especially in plenum. She spoke quickly, but precisely and her accent was in my opinion quite close to a native speaker.

Example 2: When introducing a new text about pearls Hannah is explaining some difficult words for the students. She asks the students whether anybody knows what "gems" are. In contrast to other words she asked about none of the students now raise their hands. She then gives examples:

² All utterances are set in italics and words and phrases in L1 are highlighted in green.

Hannah: *If I say emeralds, diamonds and sapphire?*

One student then raises his hand and says *edelstener*?

Example 2 is fairly representative for the observation in Hannah's class. Her first strategy appeared to be to ask the students for an explanation of a difficult word or a concept in the target language. In most instances one of the students knew what the concept meant in Norwegian and translated the word to L1. However, if nobody seemed to know the answer she either modified her language or gave the students examples. Finally if none of the students understood she then translated the concept for them.

Example 3: The teacher explains the task in the target language and hands out a worksheet to the students:

Hannah: *Begynn nå også fortsetter vi i morgen. Ha minst ti setninger på hver.*

This example is relatively typical for her use of L1 for procedural matters. She sometimes switched to L1 in the transitions between different activities. Nonetheless this was not a permanent strategy as she sometimes used L2 in the transitions as well.

Penny – infrequent use of codeswitching

The classroom structure in Penny's class made it difficult to hear individual conversations between her and the students. The room was oblong, and I was placed at the back of the classroom and could only perceive her conversations with the students in my immediate surroundings. In addition to this, during the observation lesson, she used a lot of group work and the students tended to talk very loudly to each other during these activities. In this lesson they were going to sum up the topic from last time, the students were supposed to work both individually and in pairs with different learning strategies such as the Venn diagram, and finally they were starting a new topic and were supposed to work with tasks related to this topic.

I only perceived one codeswitching situation during her 90 minutes lesson which may indicate that she extremely seldom turned to codeswitching. My subjective assessment of her

teaching is that she made great effort to modify her language and explain concepts in simpler words in English if the students did not understand. It could also seem like she had a quite rigid policy about sticking to L2. Her only codeswitching situation came as a translated word in an L2-context:

Example 4: The teacher is explaining that using the Venn diagram is a learning strategy that is very useful if they in a test are being asked to discuss something. She then comes up with an immediate translation for the concept:

Penny: *To discuss*, *drøfte*.

The teacher explained for the students when to use the Venn diagram as a learning strategy, and may have translated the word *discuss* in an attempt to link the concept to a Norwegian word they are more familiar with. However, as this one-word translation in an L2-context was the only codeswitching situation identified in her class it may also be implied that this simply was a slip in her otherwise quite rigid L2-policy.

Nicola – occasional use of codeswitching

In Nicola's class I was also placed at the back of the classroom. The oblong classroom structure was similar to Penny's as they taught at the same school. However, Nicola's classroom was a lot bigger but with the same amount of students. Thus it was even more difficult to perceive conversations between individual students and the teacher as I was placed at the rear end. The students were to begin with given a popquiz on literary terms, then they were going to review literary terms in plenum and finally the students were going to work with a task related to a novel they had just finished reading linked up with the literary terms.

Nicola had 13 codeswitching situations during a 90 minutes lesson. However, it is important to point out that the first 10-15 minutes of her lesson was not related to English because their classroom had new desks placed in a jumble at the back of the classroom so the students had to organize their desks and rip off all the plastic that was surrounding the desks. In addition to this the popquiz lasted for approximately 20 minutes, and the students were not allowed to co-operate and had to work silently and individually. My subjective suggestion is therefore that the number of codeswitching situations probably would have been higher if the lesson had encompassed English teaching for 90 minutes and not just 60-55 minutes.

Her most frequent codeswitching category was by far translation. Seven of the thirteen codeswitching situations were analyzed as translation as the example below illustrates:

Example 5: The teacher is reviewing literary terms for the students accompanied by a powerpoint-presentation. Some of the literary terms are being translated directly.

Nicola: *Omniscient narrator, betyr allvitende forteller.*

This example is extremely representative for her use of codeswitching. She did the exact same thing during her lecture when explaining the terms singular, main character, limited narrator, dynamic character and static character for instance. It could seem like she deliberately used codeswitching in these instances to make sure that the students understood the concepts or to link it to a concept they most likely understood in L1.

Example 6: After giving a direct translation of the terms *static* and *dynamic* the teacher continues in L1:

Nicola: *Statisk, noe som ikke endrer seg. Det er det samme i naturfag. Dynamisk er noe som endrer seg, noe som går igjennom en forandring.*

This example is fairly representative for her use of codeswitching for conveyance of meaning. My subjective assessment of her teaching is that her codeswitching seemed like a deliberate choice to enhance the students' understanding. Nevertheless, codeswitching was not the only strategy she used and was not always the strategy she turned to initially. She also simplified her language, used gestures and it seemed like she made great effort to adjust her language to the students' proficiency level. The class dynamic seemed to be very vigorous, and the communication between her and the students appeared to be extremely positive.

4.1.2 The teachers' attitudes – interviews

The interviews were of vital importance for this thesis. This thesis aims to scrutinize the teachers' opinions towards codeswitching, but also to reveal their awareness around it. The factors addressed in the interviews were teaching philosophy, perception of their own proficiency, perception of the students' proficiency and school policy.

Teaching philosophy

The interviews revealed that the three teachers at upper secondary school had different teaching philosophies regarding codeswitching. None of them claimed that their school had a common policy regarding language choice in the FL classroom. Nevertheless, all three teachers refer to a very collaborative work-environment. Thus, the commitment to either strict L2 usage or opening up for codeswitching seemed to be the teachers' personal choice that can in many ways reflect their distinctive attitudes towards codeswitching.

In view of data presented earlier, the three upper secondary school teachers differed somewhat regarding quantity of codeswitching. Penny only had one codeswitching situation and during her interview it became evident that this was a very deliberate choice. When being asked her opinion towards codeswitching she uttered *I am against it*. However, she also claimed that she did not have any so-called "weak students", therefore she did not see the need to codeswitch during her lessons. Hannah proposed that codeswitching should be at a minimum, however she also claimed that this is not always easy to obtain if the variation between the students is too substantial. Nicola seemed to have a policy that opened up for more use of codeswitching. Both the observations and statements such as sometimes *you have to switch languages to explain a concept that the student thinks is difficult to begin with, the English concepts that you learn need an anchor in Norwegian in a way*, and *codeswitching behaviour is a natural part of teaching a language* support this view.

What can trigger the use of codeswitching?

The teachers were asked to evaluate their own proficiency in oral English as well as how they perceive their students' proficiency in general. Both these factors can in the informants' opinion affect the degree of codeswitching in the EFL classroom.

Penny claims her proficiency in oral English is very good, however she points out that she feels she has lost some fluency because she has mainly taught lower secondary school for the last three years. She feels just as comfortable in English as in Norwegian. Hannah views herself as very competent in oral English and she is very comfortable speaking English as she has lived in an English speaking country for an extensive period of time. Nicola claims her language competence is very good *if you can accept a David Crystal/Global English-view of using the language*. She is very comfortable with English as she has used it as a working language for many years prior to her teaching career. However, her accent is not native-like because she has lived abroad and used it as a lingua franca speaking with people from various

parts of the world. In her opinion it is possible for her to obtain a more native-like accent, but then she would feel like someone else. To her, it is more important to use the language to talk freely and to use it in a manner that seems spontaneous and impulsive. Because she has a thick accent in Norwegian, she feels more comfortable speaking English than Norwegian with the students as her impression is that her accent in Norwegian is quite difficult for the students to comprehend.

The VG1 teachers all claim that their students are very proficient in English, especially in oral English. They are quite unison in their belief that in classes with greater variation between the proficient and the less proficient students, the choice to use L1 for support would be more natural than in the classes they teach at the moment. They all mention the proficiency level of the students as a trigger for codeswitching in the classroom. Furthermore, Hannah states that it is easier to stick to L2 in classes where the students are more or less homogeneous when it comes to proficiency level. To her it is easier to stick to L2 in classes with only highly proficient students or classes with only less proficient students. When the variation between the students is too extensive, she is under the impression that as a teacher you will end up in between. You will need to use L1 for support but the L2 will not be complex enough for the more proficient students. Thus, she does not necessarily believe that the proficiency level alone is the biggest trigger, but the problems arise when the disparity of the students' level of proficiency is too wide.

However, as Nicola points out, in English learner classrooms in Norway at this level, the reality is that you will always have students at different proficiency levels as this is an obligatory course. From her perspective some students will be extremely competent language users, but in the same classroom at this level you might also have a student from a reception class with only three years of English behind him/her. Thus in Nicola's opinion it is almost impossible to teach those groups of students effectively without codeswitching occasionally.

All three teachers are under the impression that the students understand them very well. Both Hannah and Nicola point out that they think they sometimes use a vocabulary that is too complex for the students. Nicola believes that learning difficult words through context is a good way of learning. Furthermore, she asserts that if there are words she uses that the students do not understand they usually understand the meaning of it through the context. However, she often links significant words and concepts to L1 to take advantage of the semantic network that is already there. In Hannah's opinion her biggest challenge is to adjust her language to the students' level and her self-evaluation is that she sometimes speaks too

quickly. However, if she is under the impression that they do not understand she sometimes repeats the sentence at a slower pace or she paraphrases the sentence. She has also asked her students in individual progress discussions held in Norwegian whether they understand her when she speaks L2 and whether she should use more L1. Her opinion from these conversations is that all students, weak and strong, prefer as much L2 as possible. Penny, on the other hand, believes that if she uses body language or other students to explain in English she does not have to turn to L1. According to Penny the teachers' own proficiency level and education can also trigger the codeswitching in the classroom. In her opinion the English teachers differ a lot when it comes to education and competence. She argues that some teachers teach English with "only" 60 credit points and have not travelled as much or used the language in a native context which can result in more codeswitching in the classroom. She proposes that if you are confident in what you are doing it is easier to express yourself in English in all situations than if your proficiency level is weaker.

When is codeswitching appropriate?

Both Hannah and Penny state that when teaching grammar explicitly they often do the whole sequence in L1. Above all, they do this to use concepts that the students are more familiar with. They both assert that they definitely could teach grammar in L2, but then they fear that 50% of the students probably would struggle comprehending. Penny claims that the students struggle with the grammar concepts in Norwegian as it is, therefore teaching grammar in L2 would confuse the students more than necessary. Hannah suggests that by switching languages when teaching grammar one opens up for the possibility to compare and contrast the languages as well. To enhance the students' understanding one can for instance use Norwegian sentences as examples. Furthermore, Hannah also opens up for codeswitching when conveying important messages to the students. First and foremost because it is time saving and by switching languages she assures herself that all the students understand the message.

Nicola argues that switching languages when teaching concepts is very useful. Her background encompasses a lot of translation and contrastive analysis, therefore her education has taught her theories about what happens when you switch from one language to another. Thus, in her opinion the important thing is to build a bridge between what you already know and the new concept you are supposed to learn. She therefore suggests that it is useful to jump back and forth between L1 and L2 when teaching concepts. However, she stresses that one

needs to be careful so the students do not get the impression that there is a one-to-one relationship between the two languages you switch between.

Both Hannah and Nicola also mention that there is no point of having a rigid policy about sticking to L2 if it goes at the expense of the students' understanding. In their opinion, as a teacher you have to consider your students and if you see signs that they do not comprehend and that they have lost focus, switching to L1 might be a good idea to pull them back in.

Is codeswitching more present when teaching lower levels?

All three teachers have taught English at both upper and lower secondary school. Penny claims that she tries to stick to L2 regardless of what level she teaches. In lower secondary school she modifies and simplifies her language and speaks with a more elementary vocabulary. As presented above she turns to L1 when teaching grammar, and in her opinion one teaches more explicit grammar in lower secondary school than upper secondary school, thus codeswitching might be more present at that level both in her teaching and in other teachers' teaching.

Hannah states that she definitely changes her degree of codeswitching according to what level she teaches. This is mainly because she is under the impression that it is easier to define the students' goals in upper secondary school than lower secondary school. In her general studies class at upper secondary she ascertains that her students' goal is to eventually function in an academic milieu and her responsibility is to prepare them for that as much as possible. Thus she tries to use L2 more consistently than in lower secondary school. At lower secondary school consistent L2 usage is more difficult to achieve because the students are more heterogeneous. Her impression from teaching at lower secondary school for eleven years is that the variation between the students is bigger because some students want to go on studying at a vocational school and have little interest and use of receiving that academic input. However, other students want to pursue a more academic career in the future and wish to take their English to an academic level already at lower secondary school.

Nicola views the VG1 students' goal the same way as Hannah; to prepare them for an academic environment that has an increasing international focus. However, she argues that the fact that many students actually drop English after VG1 makes this relatively preposterous. To prepare them for the academic environment that meets them at university in only one year is in her opinion almost impossible. However, the students that choose to continue with

English both in VG2 and VG3 do in her opinion get more academic input and are better prepared for the academic milieu that meet them at university. Nicola does not change her degree of codeswitching from lower secondary school to VG1. Nonetheless, she hardly ever switches to L1 in her VG3 class because in her opinion they need to be able to function wholeheartedly in English otherwise they will not pass the written exam that in her opinion is extremely difficult.

4.1.3 The student interviews

The student interviews were conducted as group interviews with students from Hannah's class as explained in 3.2.3. They were important first and foremost because in addition to investigate the teachers' use of codeswitching, the teachers' opinions towards codeswitching and discover differences from lower secondary school till upper secondary school, this thesis also aims to explore the students' opinions and awareness around codeswitching as well.

Topics covered in the interviews were *attitudes towards English, differences in the teaching of English from lower secondary till upper secondary school, their own oral participation and the teacher's use of codeswitching*.

Attitudes towards English

The students in both group interviews are very pleased with the English teaching at their upper secondary school. They mention that they are very satisfied with Hannah as a teacher because she uses variation when it comes to teaching methods, she makes it understandable to everyone without *dumbing it down* and *she has a cool accent*. David in group interview one expresses that Hannah is very knowledgeable and she *knows what she is doing*. My subjective assessment from both student interviews is therefore that the students have a very positive attitude towards English and Hannah seemed to be both respected and popular with the students. Based on her general English knowledge, *cool accent* and varied teaching she is viewed as good teacher by the students, that does not set the bar too high or too low for the students in this class.

Differences in the teaching of English from lower till upper secondary

Because the student informants came from five different lower secondary schools they naturally had different experiences from the English teaching at their previous lower

secondary schools.

However, most of the students agreed that they used English more orally at upper secondary school than in lower secondary school. In addition to this, it was mentioned that they had more grammar teaching at lower secondary school, and more explicit grammatical tests and grammar exercises in lower secondary school. Rose in group interview one is under the impression that she has learnt enough grammar at her lower secondary school and at upper secondary school she wants to learn to utilize this in her oral English, thus she embraces the focus on oral English at upper secondary school. The other students concurred with this statement and uttered that they also appreciated more orally oriented teaching.

Students in both groups mention that they read longer and more complicated texts at upper secondary school than what they are used to from lower secondary. However, none of the students think the texts they read this year are too difficult for them. The majority mention that they experienced the teaching at lower secondary and upper secondary school with regards to codeswitching basically the same. Nevertheless, three of the students mention that their teachers at lower secondary school used simpler language and often used L1 when explaining things in plenum. In addition to this, the students are unison in their belief that in lower secondary school the teachers were more lenient towards letting the students answer questions in Norwegian. At upper secondary school the students feel they are expected to answer most questions in English.

The students' oral participation

The students were also asked about their own oral participation, whether they were comfortable speaking English and whether they were allowed to use Norwegian during group work and classroom discussions.

There seemed to be mixed feelings about how comfortable they were speaking English in class. In the first group interview Julie, David and Christine reveal that they do not feel comfortable speaking English in front of the class. The main reason for this is in Christine's opinion her pronunciation. In her view her pronunciation is not good enough. Julie continues and mentions that all the other students are better than her which makes her unconfident. Holly is the only one in group interview one that feels completely comfortable speaking English in class. However, she believes it is easier to have a conversation about more ordinary topics than *to say smart things about an English text*.

In group interview two the students seemed to be of a different opinion. All the

students expressed that they were comfortable speaking in class. Rose suggests that this is because the classroom dynamic is very relaxed and in her opinion they are not afraid to answer incorrectly or pronounce words inaccurate. The other students in this group interview supported this view and answered in agreement to Rose's statement.

Both groups mention that during group work and classroom conversations they are expected to speak English. However, Amy states that if they read texts with a lot of complicated words they are allowed to answer in Norwegian. Rose supports this and claims that it depends on how difficult what they are doing is. If Hannah asks questions about their opinions about a text, they have to answer in English, but if the questions require more complex answers they are sometimes allowed to answer in Norwegian. Holly mentions that in these instances the students that raise their hand usually ask Hannah whether they can answer in Norwegian. But as Christine further asserts sometimes Hannah also let them know in advance that they can answer in Norwegian because the topic addressed is particularly difficult. Eric in group interview two supports this view but argues that Hannah also often tell them to try in English even though they ask to answer in Norwegian which in his opinion may prevent some students from even raising their hands.

The teacher's use of codeswitching

In group interview two the students answered very rapidly and almost simultaneously *no* when being asked whether their teacher use a lot of Norwegian in her EFL teaching. Moreover, in group interview one the students claim that their teacher uses Norwegian *very rarely* in her teaching. My impression from the observation and her self assessment can in a sense therefore be verified by the student interviews.

All the students view Hannah as an English-speaking role-model. This is mainly because in the students' opinion she has good pronunciation, but Amy also mentions that in addition to this she speaks in a manner that is not too complicated to understand and that she speaks loud and clear. Eric in group interview two states *she is very capable, I have heard that she has lived in England as well*. Holly in group interview one mentions that she has had a few different English teachers at lower secondary school and some of them *were not that competent in oral English themselves, and then it was difficult to learn pronunciation for us*.

When is codeswitching appropriate and why?

Even though Hannah in the students' view does not use codeswitching very often they have experienced instances where she has switched to Norwegian.

Julie in group interview one thinks that when Hannah uses Norwegian it is to make sure that everybody understands. Holly continues and utters that Hannah usually say something in English first and if she suspects that it is too difficult she translates it into Norwegian so everyone understands. They all agree that is a good thing. Holly argues that to switch to Norwegian is very important sometimes because *it is not fair to the students that are on a low level to restrict and ruin their possibility to understand something by only speaking English*. Thus switching to Norwegian is in her opinion very meaningful as long as it does not happen all the time. Rose in group interview two thinks Hannah sometimes switch to Norwegian to make sure that all the students have understood the task they are going to undertake. Elizabeth and Amy have the impression that she also switch to Norwegian to really emphasise something, for instance if there is an important message that all the students need to perceive. However, when they go through homework and repeat material for a test they all think that a teacher should stick to L2 because that usually contains words and phrases that they should know anyway.

4.2 Lower secondary level – 10th grade

The findings from the observations and the interviews at lower secondary level will be presented in this section. First the observations will be accounted for referring to the quantity of codeswitching situations and in which situations codeswitching were used, and then the teachers' attitudes and opinions towards codeswitching are being presented.

4.2.1 The teachers' use of codeswitching – the observations

The observations conducted at lower secondary school demonstrate some divergence when it comes to quantity of codeswitching situations. One of the teachers had 19 codeswitching situations, one of them four and the last one two.

Initially the setting of the observations will be presented, and then the quantity of codeswitching situations will be accounted for followed by a presentation of the different codeswitching situations, subsequently the teachers will be presented individually.

The setting

The observations at lower secondary school varied in length, one them lasted 45 minutes, the next one 60 minutes and the last one 90 minutes. The classroom structure was quite different for the lower secondary schools too. One school was an open-plan school, the second one was originally an open-plan school, however restructured and re-built to contain more traditional classrooms and the last one was a traditional school with traditional classrooms. The different classroom structures made it in some of the classrooms more difficult than in others to hear the individual conversations between the teacher and the students.

Two of the observations were conducted in the regular English subject obligatory for all the students in 10th grade. The last observation was conducted in a class with only nine 10th grade students that were reading English at VG1 level. The teachers had complete freedom regarding teaching method and activities thus the lessons were all quite different in character.

The quantity of codeswitching

The observations reviled that one of the lower secondary school teachers used codeswitching quite frequently with 19 codeswitching situations. The two other teachers had four and two codeswitching situations respectively as illustrated in *table 4.4* below:

Table 4.4:

Number of codeswitching situations counted: Lower secondary school

	Length of class (minutes)	Codeswitching situations
Daniel	45 min	19
Emma	60 min	4
Laura	90 min	2

The different types of codeswitching

The situations in which the lower secondary school teachers used codeswitching show some similarities and some disparity as exemplified in *table 4.5* below:

Table 4.5

Types of codeswitching situations counted: Lower secondary school

	Number of codeswitching functions	Translation	Discipline	Task Instruction	Solidarity	Grammar explanation	To convey meaning	Procedural Matters
Daniel	19	IIII III	-	II	I	-	IIII	III
Emma	4	III	-	I	-	-	-	-
Laura	2	I	-	-	-	-	I	-
Total	25	12	0	3	1	0	6	3

All three teachers used codeswitching to translate words or concept to L1 and that is the only category used by all the teachers at lower secondary school. None of the lower secondary school teachers used codeswitching to correct behaviour or to explain grammar.

Table 4.6

Types of codeswitching situations percentages: Lower secondary school

	Number of code-switching functions	Translation (%)	Task instruction (%)	Solidarity (%)	To convey meaning (%)	Procedural matters (%)
Daniel	19	32	8	4	20	12
Emma	4	12	4	0	0	0
Laura	2	4	0	0	4	0
Total (%)	25	48	12	4	24	12

Table 4.6 shows the percentages of the different codeswitching functions observed for each teacher at lower secondary school. For lower secondary school translation is the category used most frequently with 48% of all switches observed as highlighted in yellow. To convey meaning was also a category used quite frequently with 24% of the switches. Task instruction (12%) and procedural matters (12%) was also represented to some degree, while solidarity (4%) was represented to a lesser extent, and was also only observed in one of the classrooms.

The inconsistencies between the teachers can imply that there are other possible explanations of the varying use of codeswitching than what level they teach. This will be addressed below and in chapter five.

Daniel – high frequency of codeswitching

The classroom used for Daniel's lesson was originally a part of an open area as the school used to function as an open-plan school. However, this open area had been re-structured into several traditional classrooms. This classroom did not have a door and the walls towards the hallway consisted of several partition walls, thus noise from the hallway did occur quite frequently. During his lesson the students were supposed to practise writing an article as preparation for a midterm-test. His first sequence involved a typical lecture with power point slides and teacher talk, and afterwards the students were supposed to practise writing an article.

As illustrated above he had 19 codeswitching situations during a 45 minutes lesson. Eight out of 19 situations were analyzed as translation making it the most recurring category. Five of his switches were analyzed to belong in the category to convey meaning, making it the second most recurring category.

Example 7: The teacher is reading an example text and after the first paragraph he stops and explains in English that the first sentence in a paragraph is called a key sentence.

Daniel: *Alle setningane i avsnittet skal være linka til temaet i første setninga.*

This example is very characteristic of his use of codeswitching to convey meaning. Without asking whether the students understand the concept or not, he switched to L1 to explain the meaning of the concept. When he used codeswitching for conveyance of meaning the codeswitching usually appeared in chunks as a whole. Regarding my subjective opinion of his teaching he used a very simplified language and vocabulary, both adequate and well-adjusted to the students' proficiency level. His use of codeswitching also seemed like a deliberate choice, if he suspected that something was difficult for the students he switched to L1. He also seemed to be communicating very well with his students, and considering that many of the students asked questions it might be implied that the class dynamic was lively and that

most students were not afraid to ask if something was unclear or difficult.

Example 8: The students are given a handout consisting of the first three paragraphs out of an essay. As a practice they are supposed to continue this essay by following the same paragraph structure. The teacher is reading the first three paragraphs out loud, and in the first paragraph of the main body he reads:

Daniel: *This is evident in the Middle East where Israel has steadily conquered new chunks of this valuable resource, verdifull ressurs.*

This example illustrates how he used codeswitching to translate important words. In most of these instances he came with a direct translation to a single word in an original L2-context. He did the exact same thing when words such as *food staples*, *retirement pension* and *unemployment* were used in the paragraphs later in the text. Thus most of his codeswitching for translational purposes were isolated words and not chunks of words in L1.

Emma – occasional use of codeswitching

Emma's school was an open-plan school and the learning area they used for this particular lesson did not have a door towards the hallway. All the students had an iPad each which they brought to class. The students were supposed to sit in groups and present a task they had prepared at home, in addition to this the groups were supposed to answer and discuss questions provided by the teacher regarding the main topic for that period. The first sequence was devoted to organizing the students in different groups, then the groups were going to present and discuss with each other, and finally they were supposed to sum up some of the questions in plenum.

Emma had four codeswitching situations during a 60 minutes lesson. Considering that her lesson consisted of group work for approximately 40 minutes the number of codeswitching situations may have been higher if a different teaching method had been observed.

Example 9: To start the lesson Emma is explaining the agenda for the day.

She gives the instruction in English:

Emma: *Please take a seat in your usual... firergrupper.*

Considering the hesitation between the L2-sentence and the L1-word it can seem like she either translated the word because she did not know the L2-word for it or because she thought that word would be too difficult for the students to comprehend. This is fairly representative for her codeswitching for translational purposes strengthened with the example below:

Example 10: The teacher is asking the same questions that the groups have discussed in plenum. On the question about what the students thought was the worst part of the institution slavery one student answers that the worst part was that they did not have any rights. The teacher continues:

Emma: *At that time they did not have... Hva heter det igjen.... FN's menneskerettighetskonvensjoner.*

Regarding my subjective assessment of her teaching these codeswitching situations did not seem like a deliberate choice, but rather a result of lack of memory or lack of proficiency. She used simple words and phrases that seemed adequate and well-adjusted for the students' proficiency level. The class dynamic seemed lively, however the iPad did seem like a distraction for some of the students as I observed that a lot of them were using the iPad to send snapchats and chatting away on different social media sites. However, this appeared to go fairly un-noticed by the teacher.

Laura – low frequency of codeswitching

Laura taught a class of nine 10th graders that were reading English at VG1 level. They were selected in 8th grade and they were offered to follow this program because of their high proficiency level. Because of the relatively small-sized classroom and the scarce number of students it was easy to hear individual conversations between the students and the teacher. The students were in this lesson supposed to continue working with a topic they started the week before. They were going to work together in pairs, then share in class. In addition to this

they were going to practise writing an article about the main topic for that period.

Laura had two codeswitching situations during a 90 minute lesson which suggest low frequency of codeswitching. One of the codeswitching situations was analyzed as translation and the other one as conveyance of meaning. Thus it is difficult to say anything about the representativeness of her codeswitching based on this lesson only.

Example 11: The teacher is explaining that to write a good introduction the students need a good hook and that the introduction always includes the thesis statement. She can sense that the students do not completely understand and she asks them if they understand what a thesis statement is. None of the students raise their hand and the teacher says:

Laura: *Har dere hørt om problemstilling?* The students nod.

This example illustrates how Laura dealt with the students' lack of understanding. She usually asked them if they understood, and generally one of the students knew the concept that she asked about. The difference in this lower secondary class was that instead of translating the concept into L1 most of these students tried to explain the concepts in L2. My subjective assessment of her teaching is that it could seem like she could use a quite complex language because of the students' high proficiency level. Her first strategy seemed to be to modify her language instead of switching to L1 if the students did not understand. The class dynamic in this class seemed very energetic, and the students were not afraid to ask questions and they seemed very comfortable with each other and the teacher.

4.2.2 The teachers' attitudes – interviews

Below the results from the interviews with the lower secondary school informants are presented. Topics covered in the interviews were *teaching philosophy, perception of their own proficiency, perception of the students' proficiency* and *school policy*.

Teaching philosophy

None of the informants refer to having common guidelines for oral teaching at their schools. However, Daniel argues that it is implied that you use as much English as you can and vary

the teaching with different activities. At Laura's school they have meetings where they discuss issues such as language choice, but they have no departmental guidelines for it. Emma also states that they have no common policies for language choice at her school. Thus the language choice in the classrooms seemed to be the teachers' personal decision rather than a common departmental policy.

Emma asserts that she uses Norwegian in her teaching sometimes, and she is under the impression that her students often switch to Norwegian themselves when discussing in groups or pairs thus she often needs to remind them to speak English. She tries to stick to English as much as she can herself, but she does not have a rigid policy about it. Laura on the other hand tries to stick to L2 as much as possible because *then you create an English world inside the classroom*. She proposes that one of the best ways to learn a language is to use it as much as possible therefore one should try to stick to L2 as much as possible to maximize the learning outcome. Her general opinion is to use English most of the time, however she understands that some teachers are tempted to switch to Norwegian occasionally if they teach classes with varying proficiency levels. She believes that most teachers that use codeswitching frequently probably starts out in English and repeats in Norwegian. Nevertheless, she states that one should be a bit careful with this approach as well so the students do not get blunt. In her opinion if you constantly explain something in English first and repeat it in Norwegian afterwards, some students will probably chose not to listen to the English explanation because they know it will be conveyed in Norwegian afterwards. Emma also mentions this drawback with recursive codeswitching in her interview.

Daniel believes that using codeswitching for support is necessary in some classrooms. He further asserts that teachers naturally have a *gut feeling* when and how much to switch after years in the teaching environment. However, he stresses that one should be careful not to use it too much. He claims it is important to push the limit and use L2 as much as possible without risking that the students lose motivation or lag behind. He is not happy by the amount of codeswitching he has to employ in class himself, and he argues that codeswitching is not solely positive. Nevertheless, he claims it is present in the teaching because of the students' variable proficiency level. In the classes he teaches at the moment he has students with individual subject curricula that are barely able to understand the graded readers in addition to highly proficient students. In his opinion switching between the languages is almost the only option to make all the students comprehend at the same time.

What can trigger the use of codeswitching?

All lower secondary school teachers mention that the main factor that can trigger the teachers' use of codeswitching is the students' proficiency level. Other statements about what can prompt codeswitching were more heterogeneous.

All lower secondary school teachers state that they are comfortable teaching in English and view themselves as competent language users. Emma states that her oral teaching is *decent*, but sometimes she finds it difficult to remember words and concepts which can make her a bit hesitant at times. Daniel asserts that early in the morning he sometimes notices that his oral English stalls a bit, and then both the precision and accuracy of his oral English makes his English a bit *grubby*. However, he further states that his proficiency in oral English is very solid and that comes with his many years of teaching experience. Laura states that she is just as comfortable teaching in English as in Norwegian.

Both Emma and Laura allege that their students are very proficient in English. Laura teaches a group of 10th grade students that reads English at VG1 level. The students were handpicked in 8th grade because they were already on an advanced proficiency level. She states that the students have understood the importance of varying the language and finding precise words and phrases to broaden their vocabulary and acquire a more advanced language. She never has to remind them to stick to L2, they automatically talk to each other in English and to her in English. She is under the impression that they understand her quite well when she speaks L2, and if they are uncertain they always ask her. Emma maintains that her students have a very solid fundament in English from their primary schools. She has students coming from one of the schools that rank highest in the country when it comes to national tests. She is under the impression that it varies a bit whether the students understand her when she speaks L2, however she is aware of the students that might be uncertain so she usually checks up with them individually afterwards. Emma further suggests that her own insecurity also has an impact on her language choice inside the classroom. She states that she desperately wants all the students to understand what she is saying, thus she sometimes switches to make sure that all her students will understand.

Daniel on the other hand states that in the classes he teaches at the moment the variation between the students' proficiency level is enormous. From his point of view the students are spreading out over the entire grading scale and they also have varying interest for the English subject and motivation for learning it. The students' different levels of motivation and interest in the subject are also in his opinion factors that can influence the use of

codeswitching alongside the students' proficiency level. In addition to this Daniel mentions that the pace you want to maintain during a lesson also is something that can trigger the use of codeswitching. In his opinion, if you constantly need to stop because you want to drag an English answer out of a student or because you need to explain a word or a concept in a simpler language in L2, you almost get sidetracked and then you lose some of the pace of the lesson. Further on, he asserts that the degree of codeswitching depends on the teaching material as well. Some textbooks such as "Stages" do in his opinion promote more "English-only" in class with more orally oriented tasks. Other textbooks again such as "Crossroads" are in his opinion heavier and more theoretical and thus they encourage more L1 usage because the texts are more complex.

When is codeswitching appropriate?

Laura states that when teaching grammar it is relevant to use Norwegian because the grammar concepts and terms are difficult for the students to begin with. For instance she states that by introducing "the present continuous" to the students in L2, the students will have no idea what she is talking about. Thus switching is helpful to enhance their understanding about grammar and grammatical terms. From her point of view it is also relevant to be able to draw parallels between the languages thus switching to Norwegian when teaching grammar is in her opinion highly appropriate. However, in all other aspects of the teaching she tries to give them the adequate vocabulary they need instead of switching to L1 all the time. She rather modifies her language than switching to L1.

Emma also tries to explain most concepts in English but if she sees *blank faces* she usually switches to L1 and asks them whether they understand. Nonetheless, if there are concepts that she finds difficult to explain in an easy manner in L2 she might switch to L1 to give a more complex and thorough explanation. In addition to this she also may switch to L1 when giving the students important messages that it is vital that they all perceive.

Daniel states that he usually translates texts for the students. In 8th grade where they use "Stages" he does it first and foremost because they are young, and in 9th and 10th grade where they use "Crossroads" he does it because the texts are fairly complicated. Furthermore, he asserts that he has students in his classes that have never attended school before they moved to Norway therefore he maintains that switching is present in the teaching at all times. He also affirms that there is no point of having a rigid language policy if that means that you are unable to reach the students. He argues that it is definitely possible to persistently use

English, but he is not entirely sure that the learning outcome is in compliance with the effort you have to put into it and everything you refrain from doing.

Is codeswitching more present when teaching lower levels?

Laura is the only one of the lower secondary school informants with teaching experience from both upper and lower secondary school. She claims that her degree of codeswitching does not change with the age levels. She asserts that she rather modifies her L2-vocabulary to the group in front of her. When she teaches 8th grade and vocational studies she uses a much simpler language than she does in 10th grade or when teaching general studies. Emma however asserts that she definitely change her degree of codeswitching with the age levels. In 8th grade she uses Norwegian more frequently because she often gets comments such as: *I do not understand what you are saying*, thus she switches to make sure that the less proficient students also understand. Daniel claims that his degree of codeswitching changes more with what textbook the different classes use than what age level the students are on. From his viewpoint the textbook *Crossroads push you into a direction that promotes more Norwegian*. However in 8th grade they now use “Stages” and with that textbook he claims it is easier to maintain a pace and focus that promotes more English usage because of how that textbook is designed.

4.3 Comparison

Above the results with the 10th grade teachers and the VG1 teachers and students are presented individually. In this section the results yielded from both levels will be compared and contrasted for the sake of a richer understanding and a possible explanation of the variation in the codeswitching use.

4.3.1 Comparison of the quantity of codeswitching

As mentioned in 3.3.1 the observations were not recorded thus the quantity of codeswitching situations in these classrooms are more an estimate that can show a tendency rather than accurate figures suited for a thorough comparison. However, since none of the observations were recorded all observations were gathered in quite comparable contexts.

Table 4.7*Comparison of the quantity of codeswitching**Table 4.7 gives an overview of the number of situations, original length of class and codeswitching situations adjusted for a 60 minutes lesson.*

	Number of situations	Length of class originally	Situations per 60 minutes
Hannah	11	90	7.33
Penny	1	90	0.66
Nicola	13	90	8.66
Total upper secondary school	25	270	5.55
Daniel	19	45	25.33
Emma	4	60	4
Laura	2	90	1.33
Total lower secondary school	25	195	7.69

The table above displays length of minutes originally, the number of codeswitching situations and the number of codeswitching situations adjusted for a 60 minutes lesson. The comparison of the quantity of codeswitching between the lower secondary school teachers and the upper secondary school teachers show that there are great individual differences between the teachers, but little variation between the levels. For upper secondary school the quantity varies between 0.66 and 8.66 situations which indicate great individual differences. The same tendency is present for the lower secondary school teachers, only that it shows even greater variation. The table above illustrates that the quantity varies between 25.33 situations and 1.33. Possible explanations to these inconsistencies will be discussed further in chapter five.

4.3.2 Comparison of the different types of codeswitching

The analysis of the different functions of the codeswitching uncovered that there are similarities between 10th grade and VG1 when it comes to which functions that were observed most frequently as shown in *table 4.8* below:

Table 4.8*Comparison of the codeswitching functions*

	Lower secondary (%)	Upper Secondary (%)
Translation	48	44
Discipline	0	0
Task Instruction	12	16
Solidarity	4	0
Grammar explanation	0	0
To convey meaning	24	20
Procedural matters	12	20

Translation was for both levels used more than 40% of the transpired situations as highlighted in yellow, and the categories discipline and grammar explanations was not observed in either of the levels. Codeswitching for conveyance of meaning was also quite similar for the two levels, respectively 24% for lower secondary and 20% for upper secondary school.

4.3.3 Comparison of the teachers' attitudes and opinions

The informants were asked different questions in an attempt to scrutinize their opinions and awareness around codeswitching. Not necessarily to confront the teachers with their own use in the lessons observed, but rather to uncover their general beliefs regarding when to use it, how to use it and whether they used it more or less when teaching specific levels.

None of the six teacher informants claim that they have a common departmental policy regarding language choice at their school. It can therefore be suggested that in both lower secondary school and upper secondary school the degree of codeswitching in the English language learner classroom is the teachers' personal choice. Teachers at both levels mention that the students' variable proficiency level is the main factor that can trigger the use of codeswitching in the classroom. Nicola at upper secondary school and Daniel at lower secondary school both suggest that to get highly proficient language users and students with low language competence to understand at the same time is almost impossible without codeswitching. Hannah also supports this and argues that in classrooms with great variation between the proficient and the less proficient the teacher often end up in between. In these instances she claims that the L2 will not be complex enough for the highly proficient students and the L2 will be too difficult for the less proficient, thus you will need to turn to

codeswitching for support regardless.

Furthermore, teachers at both levels also propose that grammar teaching in L1 is highly appropriate. In the teachers' opinion the students struggle with grammar terms in Norwegian to begin with, and without turning to L1 they fear that as much as 50% of their students would probably not comprehend. Moreover it is also mentioned by teachers at both levels that codeswitching is also meaningful when teaching grammar because it gives them the opportunity to compare and contrast the two languages. In addition to grammar teaching it is also mentioned that in order to get all the students to understand an important message it can be useful to codeswitch. Some of them use codeswitching to really highlight something as well, then they often say it in English first and repeat in Norwegian directly afterwards. However, as Nicola, Laura and Emma all point out one has to be careful with this strategy. Because if the teacher use this as a permanent strategy some students may decide to not pay attention to the explanation in L2 because they know that an L1 explanation will always come afterwards.

The answers were quite inconsistent when the teacher informants were asked whether they change their degree of codeswitching from one level to another. Laura and Penny claim that they do not use codeswitching more when teaching lower levels. They maintain that instead of turning to codeswitching they rather modify and simply their language to the group in front of them. In contrast, Hannah, Emma and Nicola assert that they change their degree of codeswitching with what level they teach. Hannah, who has experience from both upper secondary school and lower secondary school, mention that she even changes her degree of codeswitching from 10th grade to VG1, whereas Nicola assert that she does not use more codeswitching when teaching 10th grade than what she does when teaching VG1. However, when teaching VG3 Nicola hardly ever uses codeswitching because in her opinion the students need to accomplish a very advanced L2 competence to pass the exam. The student informants expressed the same inconsistency. Some students claimed that their teachers at lower secondary school used just as much/little codeswitching than what they experienced this year at upper secondary school. However, three of the students uttered that their teachers at lower secondary school used more codeswitching in their teaching than what their current teacher does.

Most teachers seemed quite aware of their use of codeswitching. Daniel from lower secondary school with the highest amount (25.33 situations per 60 minutes) claimed that he was not happy with the amount of codeswitching he had to utilize in class. However, he also

argued that in his class the variations between the students' proficiency level are so extensive that it is necessary to switch between the languages so the students do not lose motivation and interest. Penny with the lowest amount (0.66 situations per 60 minutes) expressed in her interview that she was against L1 use in her classroom and that she used it as little as possible. However she also uttered that she did not have any "weak students" therefore she did not see the need to use codeswitching regularly. Laura, also with a low amount of codeswitching (1.33 situations per 60 minutes), expressed that she wanted to create *an English-speaking world inside the classroom* thus she tried to use L2 as much as possible. Nicola (8.66 situations per 60 minutes) was extremely aware of her use of codeswitching and seemed to have given this issue much thought. During her interview she expressed that *it seems bizarre not to take advantage of the extra cognitive resource that the mother tongue gives you*, and she expressed that when teaching concepts codeswitching was highly appropriate and most of her switches occurred when teaching literary concepts as illustrated above.

Hannah, Daniel, Laura and Nicola mention that it is possible for them to use L2 more consistently in their respective classrooms. However, they assert that there is no point of having a strict policy about "English-only" if it goes at the expense of the students' understanding and motivation. The students' opinions about codeswitching concurred with this. They claim that codeswitching is important so all the students have the opportunity to understand regardless of proficiency level. The students expressed that it is meaningful to use codeswitching in such instances as long as it does not happen all the time. Situations they viewed codeswitching to be specifically appropriate were for task instruction and important messages.

5 Discussion

In the following chapter the study's results will be discussed in light of the relevant theory and research presented in chapter two. The teachers' attitudes and opinions will be compared and seen in light of the quantity and functions observed and the upper secondary school students' opinions. I will begin with reviewing the research statement, then I will discuss the findings in light of the relevant theory, then I will attempt to answer the research question by summarizing the main points from this study.

5.1 Research statement

As presented in the introduction my research statement is as follows: "What are teachers' and students' attitudes towards codeswitching in the English learner classroom in Norway, and what can influence the teachers' utilization of it?"

In order to answer this question, I observed and interviewed six English teachers, three from upper secondary school and three from lower secondary school. In addition to this I conducted group interviews with eight students to scrutinize and include their perspective on the issue.

The results show that all six teachers had quite distinct and personal ideas about whether and how to use codeswitching effectively in the language learner classroom. The variations are first and foremost found between the individual teachers and not between the levels. The quantity of use in most cases concurs with the teachers' perceptions, and the observations illustrated great variations between the teachers as previous research also has revealed (Grim, 2010; Hoff, 2013; Thompson, 2006). The inconsistent results showed that codeswitching was used in various degrees in both upper and lower secondary school. 5.55 situations per 60 minutes for upper secondary school and 7.69 for lower secondary school altogether. The student interviewees verified that the lesson observed in their class was representative for their teacher's use of codeswitching in general. However, the interviews uncovered different attitudes about codeswitching between the individual students as well.

5.2 Attitudes and opinions

The results from the interviews showed that the different teachers had very distinctive attitudes towards codeswitching. In the following sections factors that can explain their different opinions will be discussed in light of the relevant theory.

5.2.1 The teachers' teaching philosophy

Even though the teachers had very different teacher educations, results yielded from their interviews may suggest that their opinions and beliefs were linked more to their personal experiences of teaching language than what type of education they had. In addition to this, as shown in *table 4.7*, the variations are first and foremost found between the individual teachers and not between the levels. This suggests that there are other explanations than what level they teach that influence their utilization of codeswitching.

First and foremost it is extremely important to point out that none of the six teachers mention that they have a departmental policy at their school regarding language choice. This is an indication that much freedom is up to the teachers themselves to either utilize codeswitching or to avoid it completely. As presented in the introduction our current curriculum does not state anything about how much English the teachers should employ in the language learner classroom. An extreme focus is however put on the fact that “English is a universal language” (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013), and that the students should develop communicative language skills (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

The fact that our syllabus does not say anything about the teachers’ language use in the classroom, and the fact that none of the teachers claim that they have departmental policies regarding language choice at their schools, corresponds with what Halliwell and Jones (1991) reported. In their opinion avoidance of L1 is so well-established in teaching techniques that teaching manuals usually do not mention L1 use in L2 teaching at all, unless to mention why it should be avoided (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 404). Daniel mentioned in his interview that it is implied that they use as much English as possible even though there are no written rules about it in his department, thus referring to the same notion Halliwell and Jones reported. The other teachers reported a collaborative work-environment but no formal rules about language choice.

In Nicola's opinion it seems absurd to have rules about language choice. Since the teachers have different backgrounds and they all use their own personalities in their teaching the result will naturally be different teaching styles and attitudes towards language choice in her opinion. Thus centralized directives about how to either avoid or incorporate L1 in the teaching seems unnatural to her. However, as Hoff (2013) points out, a possible implication of the lack of centralized guidelines for how to use L1 effectively in the teaching is "uncritical and potential overuse of L1" (Hoff, 2013, p. 83) which clearly can be avoided if there are certain guidelines provided from the Ministry of Education and Research or even from the different language departments locally .

Nevertheless, as a teacher you need to make decisions regarding both planning and organizing of the teaching. And as Simensen (2007) both claims and backs up with observations to successfully implement a "monolingual classroom" where the students and the teacher only speak L2, requires that the teacher really commits to this principle (pp.236-237). If the teacher is too lenient, he or she will need to spend much time reminding the students to use L2 and thus "waste a lot of time and energy" (Simensen, 2007, pp. 236-237). Penny uttered in her interview that she was against codeswitching, which is a fairly strong utterance. During the observation in her class it was evident that she had a strict policy about English-only since I only observed one codeswitching situation. However, students seemed to use mostly L1 and also asked her questions in L1 even though she answered in English. When working in pairs she walked around constantly and reminded the students to speak English. Thus this can be an example of how difficult it is to implement such a strict regime without having to remind the students.

Laura mentioned in her interview that she wanted to create *an English world* inside the language learner classroom. From the observation it was evident that she implemented this somewhat successfully because she did not have to remind the students to stick to L2 and used only English herself. However, in classrooms today, students are constantly in touch with the world "outside" as they use computers and mobile phones to connect with each other through social media for instance. Thus the *English world* some teachers refer to is in fact not as isolated as they might think, because the students are constantly in touch with the Norwegian world "outside" and receive Norwegian input in spite of the teachers' efforts to avoid it. This was especially visible in Emma's class where all the students had iPads and I observed that many of them used it for social media and to communicate with each other. If the students receive Norwegian input regardless of the endeavors a teacher makes to create an

English world, to proscribe codeswitching used more systematically for support to negotiate meaning, as a communication strategy, to build relations or for repetitive functions for instance does not seem especially appropriate as it actually serves a purpose. Using codeswitching in a manner that can facilitate learning and using it systematically may thus be appropriate as the *English world* the teacher aims to create seems to be a fallacy in today's world of social networking and computers and mobile phones in the classroom.

Teachers at both lower and upper secondary school mention that to have a strict monolingual policy in the English learner classroom is possible for them to employ, but they are not willing to do so because they emphasize that it can go at the expense of the students' understanding and motivation. Some researchers claim that to switch to L1 is beneficial because it can lead to a better understanding for the students when teaching both grammar and concepts for instance (Sampson, 2011; Sert, 2005). In addition to this, allowing L1 use may be a motivation for less proficient students to actually participate in class (Levine, 2003, as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Daniel uttered that it is important to push the limit and use as much L2 as possible without risking that some students lose motivation thus implying that codeswitching is a motivational factor for some students. However, it is also important to consider that the motivation many students have for learning a new language is to be able to function in an L1-free context. Thus, learning strategies for dealing with breakdowns in communication will possibly be a major motivation for those students. In addition to this, exposure to and practice of L2 will definitely be another positive motivation for them, and thus Sampson (2011) calls for "a common-sense approach" by language teachers (p.293). As a teacher you will need to get to know your students so you can balance the need that some students have for L1 use with other students' aspiration to function wholly in an L2 context. Daniel also emphasizes this and utters that teachers have a certain "gut-feeling" about when and how much to switch after years in the teaching environment. Hence some independence should perhaps be given to the teachers as they probably will know how codeswitching is utilized best in their respective classrooms.

5.2.2 Perception of the students' proficiency

All the teachers report that a widespread level of proficiency is the main trigger for their utilization of codeswitching. However, in the lessons observed there were instances when the teachers had immediate translations of L2 words, where adjustment of their L2 perhaps could have been a more appropriate strategy to maximize the students' L2 input. In cases of

immediate translation the teacher translates the word directly without checking the students' comprehension, which may be a good strategy to link unfamiliar concepts to something familiar. Mattson and Burenhult (1999) mention that a common function of codeswitching by the teacher is to use it for repetitive functions (as cited in Sert, 2005). This was observed in classes at both upper and lower secondary school. Especially Daniel seemed to use this strategy and also mentioned that he had to do it because of the students' variable proficiency level. However, if this is used as a permanent strategy it can be detrimental for the students' academic development because they might decide to only listen to the L1 explanation and thus they will not get the appropriate input to learn the language properly (Sert, 2005). Both Emma and Laura also mention that to use codeswitching for repetitive functions as a permanent strategy will probably make some of the students lazy. If they know that the explanation in English always is followed by an explanation in Norwegian some students may stop paying attention to the English elucidation and thus minimize their academic English input severely. This can reflect what Hoff (2013) refers to as uncritical L1 use by the teacher.

However, most of my teacher informants seemed to use other strategies such as modifications and paraphrasing as their initial plans and only turned to codeswitching if their students still did not seem to comprehend. These strategies are according to Zagura (2012) more suitable than codeswitching because they are efficient when communicating with interlocutors with a different L1 than yourself (p. 280). In such instances there seemed to be a conscious decision behind the codeswitching usage by the teachers.

After conducting the teacher interviews it became apparent that some of the teachers felt the need to almost apologize or justify their codeswitching situations even though I made it clear in advance that I was not there to judge them, only to discover their attitudes towards L1 use. Daniel uttered that he was not satisfied that he had to resort to codeswitching as much as he did, but felt it was necessary because of the students' wide range of proficiency levels. Mitchell (1998) made the same reflection and reported that the teachers he interviewed seemed to consider their high frequency of L1 use as "an admission of professional misconduct" (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 405). This seems to be a great paradox. All the teachers mention that the students' variable proficiency level is the main trigger for their use of codeswitching in the classroom and some of them refer to it as *useful* and *necessary*. Yet they almost seem ashamed if they have to turn to codeswitching frequently. If they view it as necessary for the students' language learning and resort to it because they want to make sure that all the students understand them, surely the teachers should not be embarrassed by a more

positive attitude towards codeswitching? As mentioned several times, there are no directives from the Ministry of Education and Research and none of them have departmental guidelines at their school, thus they are not breaking any rules by codeswitching.

One reason for this embarrassment is perhaps the general underlying antagonism towards L1 use in the L2 classroom that still influences teaching environments today. Codeswitching has usually been seen as a sign of inadequate language command or as a sign of laziness (Sridhar, 1996, p. 59). Cook (2001) mentions that a certain hostility towards L1 use has been present in teaching environments for over 100 years, ever since the Direct Method established that L1 use should be avoided in the L2 classroom (Cook, 2001, pp. 403-404). It can therefore be suggested that this hostility is still present today or at least that there is an underlying negative attitude towards it, even though research conducted more recently has proved that L1 use may in fact facilitate learning and not just hinder it (Antón and DiCamilla, 1998; Atkinson, 1987; Brooks and Donato, 1994; Carless, 2007; Cenoz 2007; Lantolf, 2000; Macaro, 2005; Sampson, 2011; Swain and Lapkin, 1990; Villamil and de Guerrero, 1996). At least this can explain why certain teachers felt the need to explain and justify their L1 use in the classroom in this study.

5.2.3 The teachers' ability to adjust their L2

As previously pointed out, our English subject curriculum focuses a great deal on communicative competence. One of the main objectives of CLT is to avoid L1 as much as possible and for the teachers to both utilize and teach the students other communicative strategies than codeswitching (Swain, 1985, as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 112). Our own syllabus even highlights that the students should develop communicative language skills (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013).

Even though some teachers in this study paraphrased or seemed to modify their language instead of turning to codeswitching, none of the teachers made the students aware that this was a communication strategy in the lessons observed. In fact, communication strategies were not mentioned explicitly by any of the teachers in the interviews, even though it would have been natural to do so when speaking about codeswitching. In addition to this, none of the students seemed to use other communication strategies than codeswitching if they were unable to explain something in L2. Zagura's study indicates the same trend. In her study both proficient and less proficient students used codeswitching as a communication strategy even in instances where they should have the language competence to convey everything in

L2 (Zagura, 2012, p. 280). In addition to this, Lantolf (2000) claims that none of the researchers who have investigated the mediation function of L1 have managed to determine why some choose to use the mother tongue to negotiate meaning even though there are clear indications that they have the proficiency to use the L2 as a metafunction instead of their mother tongue (Lantolf, 2000, p. 87).

It can therefore seem like the teachers have difficulties teaching the students' effective communication strategies, which is one of the main objectives of CLT. Li's study reports the same tendency. One of the major findings from his study was that the teachers' own problems prevented them from implementing CLT successfully in the classrooms (Li, 1998, p. 686). The teachers in his study did not believe they had the adequate language proficiency to teach the communicative language skill to the students (Li, 1998, p. 686). They considered themselves as proficient in writing, reading and English grammar but they reported that their communicative language proficiency was not adequate to teach implement CLT successfully (Li, 1998, p. 686). A suggestion is therefore that the teachers may have little knowledge and practice themselves with utilizing communication strategies, and therefore have difficulties teaching the students different achievement strategies they can employ when they experience breaks in communication.

5.2.4 Adjustment of codeswitching from lower to higher levels

The teachers were asked whether they change their degree of codeswitching from lower to higher levels. Penny claims that she sticks to L2 regardless of what level she teaches, and Emma and Laura from lower secondary school express the same thing. Hannah mentions that she often changes her degree of codeswitching from lower secondary school till upper secondary school. Her opinion is that it is easier to assert a more academic language in the higher levels at general studies because she considers one of the main objectives of that course to prepare them for universities. When she taught at lower secondary school she mentioned that her students were more heterogeneous, many of them were going on to study at a vocational school pursuing a more practical career and did not need that academic input and because of their widespread proficiency level she used codeswitching more at lower secondary school or when teaching vocational courses today. The student interviews revealed the same inconsistency as only three of the eight students claimed that their teacher used more L1 at lower secondary school than upper secondary school. However, all the students seemed to agree that teachers at lower secondary school were more lenient towards letting the

students ask and answer questions in Norwegian. Thus the assumption that L1 use is more present in 10th grade than in VG1 only seems partly valid.

Sampson (2011) argues that to utilize and teach the students other communication strategies than codeswitching is important at lower levels as well (Sampson, 2011, p. 302). As the students at lower levels usually have more restricted linguistic resources in their L2 repertoire to choose from, it is useful for them to learn repair strategies to employ when encountering speakers from non-L1-speaking contexts (Sampson, 2011, p. 302). Hence teaching communication strategies at lower levels is in fact very beneficial. In addition to this, students pursuing a more practical career will also experience situations in which they will need to repair breaks in communication in an L2. Even though they might not need an advanced academic English repertoire that Hannah also states, they will need strategies for repairing breaks in communication regardless. For instance, mechanics and carpenters will probably encounter distributors from other countries or customers with little or no proficiency in their L1. Thus teaching and utilizing other communication strategies than codeswitching is in fact essential in such educational contexts as well.

At upper secondary school students are only required to study English in VG1. Nicola argues that it is difficult to prepare them for the academic environment in only one year, and she further asserts that many students drop English after VG1 because there is no room for it in their timetable that perhaps consists of many science subjects. However, in her opinion students that continue with English in VG2 and VG3 receive more academic input and are better prepared for the academic situation at universities. However, research conducted by Hellekjær suggests otherwise. He asserts that not even students choosing to study the Advanced English course have the reading proficiency or vocabulary knowledge to function in the academic milieu and according to him many students drop out as a result of this (Hellekjær, 2009; Hellekjær, 2005). In his doctoral thesis he did not find a positive correlation for completing the Advanced English Course with reading proficiency scores (Hellekjær, 2005, p. 247). This may suggest that choosing English in VG2 and VG3 may not actually prepare the students any better than the obligatory course at VG1. Nonetheless, both Hellekjær (2005) and Elise Sivertsen Arnsby (2013), maintain that other variables may contribute to this (Arnsby, 2013, pp. 90-92). For example Hellekjær (2005) mentions the same variable that Nicola expressed that this can be due to negative selection (p. 247). According to Kaja Skarpaas (2011) capable students tend to choose science subjects and even though they might want to choose English and know that it would be useful, there is no room

for it in their timetable (Skarpaas, 2011, p. 97). Thus a tendency is that “fewer of the capable students opt for this course” (Hellekjær, 2005, p. 247).

5.2.5 Grammar and translation

Teachers at both levels mention that when teaching grammar they might do the whole sequence in L1. This corresponds to one of the functions Mattson and Burenhult (1999) refers to as topic switch (as cited in Sert, 2005). According to them, teachers switch to L1 when teaching grammar for instance, to direct the students’ attention to new knowledge (Mattson and Burenhult, 1999, as cited in Sert, 2005). Even Penny and Laura, who seemed to have the closest thing to a monolingual classroom, mention that when teaching grammar explicitly they often did the sequence in Norwegian to use concepts the students are more familiar with. Hannah asserts that by using L1 in grammar teaching one opens up for the possibility to compare and contrast the languages, which research done by Cenoz (2007) also suggests is a helpful skill to learn (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). In Cenoz’ opinion bilingual speakers have a more evolved metalinguistic awareness than monolingual speakers, thus the students’ L1 knowledge is important to exploit and should be encouraged by the teachers to for example perform contrastive analysis between the students’ L1 and the TL (as cited in Sampson, 2011, p. 294). Nicola used codeswitching very systematically in the lesson I observed her in, she linked important concepts to L1 by providing a direct translation of an L2 concept. Furthermore, the most recurrent function of the codeswitching observed in this study was by far translation, which was represented with more than 40% of the transpired situations for both levels.

Both the grammar approach and the translation approach are unmistakably uniform with main objectives of the grammar-translation method, which according to Cook (2008) still has a foothold in certain teaching contexts despite widespread criticism (Cook, 2008, p. 180). Cook (1997) asserts that there is disagreement among both teachers and researchers whether grammar teaching is most effective in L1 or L2 (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 414). The teachers I interviewed claimed that the students’ knowledge of grammar concepts was not adequate in L2 thus using L1 was time-saving and a matter of efficiency and understanding, and as Cook (2001) points out those are the most common reasons for switching when teaching grammar (pp. 414-415). As *table 4.2 and table 4.5* showed, codeswitching for grammar explanations was not present in the lessons I observed. However the lessons observed were not devoted to explicit grammar teaching, which may explain why this

category was not used, because as mentioned above many of the teachers stated that they usually taught grammar in the students' L1.

5.2.6 Organization of class, discipline and solidarity

Codeswitching for procedural matters and organization of the classroom was for lower secondary school used for 12 % of the transpired situations and for 20 % in upper secondary school. None of the teacher informants mention that organization of the classroom is a situation in which codeswitching is especially appropriate. However, the students indicate that they believe that switching to L1 when emphasizing something that is important for them to perceive is very useful. They also view a teachers' codeswitching as necessary in order to enhance the weaker students' language learning. In addition to this they also believe that their teacher (Hannah) also codeswitched to L1 sometimes to make sure that they have all understood a task they are going to work with. This corresponds with Brooks and Donato's research (1994) that illustrated that switching to L1 is a common phenomenon when working with classroom tasks (as cited in Lantolf, 2000, p. 86). It is as Cook (2001) points out important that for students' to undertake an exercise they must understand the instruction thus by codeswitching when explaining instructions learning is made more efficient (Cook, 2001, p. 415).

It is also worth mentioning that switching to L1 for disciplinary actions was not observed in any of the lessons in contrast to results yielded from Macaro's (1997) study which suggested that the teachers viewed L1 as a more serious language to correct student behaviour in (as cited in Cook, 2001, p. 415). However, all the teachers I observed had to correct discipline or behaviour, in terms of telling their class or certain students to keep their voice down, but they all did that in the target language. Neither the student informants nor the teachers mentioned disciplinary actions as an appropriate situation for codeswitching, which may suggest that L2 was viewed as serious enough for disciplinary actions.

Solidarity was observed only one time in the observations I conducted. Codeswitching is according to Mattson and Burenhult (1990) quite useful for affective functions, solidarity and building positive relations in the language learner classroom (as cited in Sert, 2005). However, as explained in 3.3.1, without recording the observations it is difficult to perceive individual conversations between the teacher and the students, and my subjective opinion is that a lot of solidarity happens here. That may be one explanation why that category remained almost unused because as Cook (2001) asserts, L1 is often used for personal contact because

using L1 will presumably be viewed as more natural by the students as it associated directly with their personalities rather than an fake L2 character (Cook, 2001, p. 416). In addition to this, language is as Lantolf (2000) suggests, strongly implicated in our identity (p. 87). He maintains that to avoid using L1 is difficult as our L1 is a big attribute of our identity therefore proficiency is not the only quality that prompt the “use of our native language to mediate ourselves, others, and the interrelationship between the two” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 87). Thus it can be suggested that codeswitching is not necessarily an indication of low proficiency level, which also corresponds with Zagura’s research that illustrated that proficient language users also turned to codeswitching (Zagura, 2012, pp. 278-281).

5.2.7 Multilingual classrooms

As classrooms today tend to be more heterogeneous it is important to point out that to rely solely on codeswitching on the teachers’ part may not be beneficial for all students. All the functions of codeswitching referred to above presuppose a classroom where all students have knowledge of the same L1. However, this is not always the case in Norwegian classrooms today as presented in the introduction.

Using codeswitching may therefore elevate some students’ L1 over the others which can be detrimental as students with different L1’s from the majority’s may end up not understanding an L2 concept or the L1 explanation of it if their proficiency in the majority students’ L1 is as low or lower than their proficiency in the target language (Sridhar, 1996, p. 62). However, for students with a minority language as their L1, the majority students’ L1 often is an additional target language. Therefore, codeswitching may in fact help them acquire an understanding of two languages if used in an appropriate manner. Although, if it is used uncritically and unconsciously by the teacher it may not be beneficial because as mentioned above, immediate translations may not help these students if they neither understand the L2 concept nor the translation into the majority students’ L1.

If the students themselves only learn to use codeswitching as a repair strategy they will probably experience problems when having a conversation with speakers of English that do not understand their L1 (Sampson, 2011, p. 302). Thus it is important to develop other strategies one can employ when breaks in communication occur in speech.

5.2.8 Towards the teaching of EIL?

As argued previously, to say that we teach English as a foreign language in Norway today is not entirely accurate. As many scholars have argued (Crystal, 1997; Dürmüller, 2008; McKay, 2002; 2003, Suzuki, 2011), English belongs to its speakers and that some speakers should provide standards for others would seem unfair and unreasonable (McKay, 2002, pp. 18-19). By changing the paradigm from EFL and ESL to EIL one opens up for more variety and that the speakers of EIL can take their own cultures into the ‘new’ language. EIL does not belong to any *one* culture, therefore adding features from different languages into EIL is fruitful, exciting and adds colour (McKay, 2003, pp. 18-19; Sridhar, 1996, p.63). Thus, by accepting the EIL philosophy codeswitching may not always be the source of negative transfer as Ellis (1997) claims it sometimes is (p.51), but rather is something that adds colour to the language.

An acceptance of more variety when it comes to pronunciation is also regarded as important in EIL philosophy (McKay, 2002, 2003). Nicola claims her proficiency in English is very good as long as one can accept *a David Crystal/Global English-view of using the language*. The Global English-perspective involves an acceptance of a shared ownership of the English language, and that all speakers of the language in a sense own it. Thus it involves a certain rejection of the native-speaker model (Crystal, 1997, pp. 2-3). As Nicola explained in her interview, she has used English as a lingua franca prior to her teaching career to communicate with people from different parts of the world. Thus her accent is in her opinion not native-like, but her language competence is very good regardless. As Jenkins (2000) points out, phonological variation in the English language should not be equated with incorrectness as long as the accent is intelligible (as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 72). By accepting this, there is no need for Nicola to question her proficiency in English just because of a non-native accent.

It also became evident that the students viewed a native-like accent to be important, and utterances from the student interviews imply that the native-speaker model has a strong foothold among the students as well. The students were asked whether they viewed Hannah as an English-speaking role model. All the students agreed that she was a good English-speaking role model, and the first reason they mentioned was that Hannah had a *cool accent* and one of the students mentioned that he thought that Hannah had lived in England as well. This

suggests that the students view an English-speaking role model as a person with a native-like accent. Furthermore, one of the students mentioned that at both primary and lower secondary school she had experienced some English teachers with poor pronunciation, and expressed that it was difficult for the students to learn pronunciation properly from that particular teacher. This indicates that the students regard a native-like accent as an important feature of their language learning. Moreover, some of the students claimed that they were not confident enough to express themselves in English in a classroom discussion because they felt their pronunciation was *not good enough*. They expressed that they were confident in class with their teacher and with their peers but their own pronunciation hindered them from participating in whole class discussions. Here, educators have an important responsibility. It is important to convey to the students that to sound like a native-speaker is not a goal in itself. The focus should rather be on how well they are able communicative what they want to say. As codeswitching is a natural attribute of a bilingual speaker, codeswitching can therefore in a classroom discourse be appropriate as it allows students to express themselves instead of distancing themselves from the conversation because of a disbelief in their pronunciation. In addition to this, as Atkinson (1987) proposes, codeswitching may be important in the language learner classroom as it offers all students a chance of success (Atkinson, 1987, p. 242). In one of the upper secondary school classes, the text the students read was considered very difficult with many natural science concepts and the teacher allowed the students to answer in Norwegian because it offered them a better opportunity to answer the questions thoroughly in the following oral discussion. In addition to this, in all the classes I observed, with the exception of Laura's small group, some students seemed quite passive and uneager to participate in whole class discussions. If students realize that codeswitching is a natural attribute of bilingual speakers, and understand that to take their own culture into EIL is perfectly acceptable, they may identify more with the language and be confident enough to use the language both in educational contexts and as a language for wider communication.

With that said, it is as both Dürmüller and McKay point out, important not to forget that some sort of point of reference is needed in order to ensure a certain degree of intelligibility and to be able to communicate with each other successfully (Dürmüller, 2008, p. 247; McKay, 2003, p.52-53). However, as Bamgbose (1998) maintains, speakers always work towards a common intelligibility when participating in a conversation and "it is people, not language codes, that understand one another" (as cited in McKay, 2002, p. 53). Thus taking paralinguistic competence into an EIL speaking discourse as well as codeswitching would for

instance be highly appropriate and natural in an EIL discourse and may help the learner express the intended meaning by using gestures, sign language and body language for instance.

As emphasized with the CoE's introduction of the term plurilingualism, languages are not stored and learned separately but a plurilingual speaker uses different elements of the languages stored in order to communicate with a particular interlocutor. This suggests that it is unrealistic for a language teacher to expect learners to keep their languages compartmentalized and separate and avoid codeswitching for instance. As Sridhar (1996) points out, codeswitching should not be regarded strictly as interference (Sridhar, 1996, p. 63). Although some transfer types from a person's mother tongue can lead to loss of intelligibility or pragmatic failure in the EIL discourse, much of the transfer from the other languages can enhance a learners' ability to communicate, for instance by transferring communication strategies learned in one language into the 'new' language discourse (p.63). In addition to this, transferring semantic formulas such as requesting something or complementing someone may be enriching in EIL discourse as it does not belong to one culture because the ownership of EIL has become "de-nationalized" (McKay, 2003, p 3; Sridhar, 1996, p. 63).

Supporters of a native-speaker model and traditional SLA teaching have pointed out that it is not right to deprive students from an indispensable language experience in the L2 as many students only encounter the language inside the classroom (Cook, 2001, p. 408). Utilizing codeswitching frequently as a teacher, students will be deprived of optimal L2 input and additionally, letting students use codeswitching divest the students from exercising L2 output. As Cook (2001) asserts, one of the main objectives of language teaching should be to provide students with appropriate samples of the target language as classroom interaction may be the only chance some students have to encounter the language (Cook, 2001, p. 408). However, Duff and Polio's study proposes that the assumption that students have little exposure to the TL outside the classroom is only partly valid (Duff & Polio, 1990, p. 157). Their study included thirteen different languages classes and their questionnaire showed great variation between the different languages as some students claimed they had appropriate exposure to the TL whereas others did not have as much (Duff & Polio, 1990, pp. 157-158). Results from my teacher interviews indicate that many of them assess their student as very proficient, and the problem was not lack of input out of school, but rather what kind of input they received out of school. Thus an important responsibility teachers must take into

consideration is to provide students with optimal and appropriate L2 input. Additionally, as presented in the introduction the very reason why the status of English in Norway is shifting is because we are exposed to relatively optimal language input because of a globalized world, media and that we start studying English at the age of six. Thus it is incorrect to say that to utilize codeswitching on occasions in the classrooms would deprive the students from the only chance of encountering the English language.

5.3 What are teachers' and students' attitudes towards codeswitching in the English learner classroom in Norway, and what can influence the teachers' utilization of it?

As discussed in the sections above, the factors that influence the teachers' attitudes, opinions and utilization of codeswitching are many and diverse and are mostly linked to the teachers' personal experiences of teaching a language.

First and foremost the perception of their students' proficiency seems to be the main factor as all the teachers claimed that when teaching classes with wide disparity between the students' level of proficiency they tended to utilize more codeswitching. They also mentioned that switching languages when teaching grammar was especially useful, again because in the teachers' opinions the students do not possess the adequate knowledge about the grammatical terms to be able to follow a grammar lesson completely in L2. For the teachers it is also time-saving and makes the learning more efficient to switch languages when teaching grammar. The students view codeswitching as an important learning tool, especially for the weaker students. They maintain that to switch languages is helpful when the teacher is clarifying something or wants all the students to understand something.

An external factor that can influence the attitudes and utilization of codeswitching is the general assumption that using L1 in an L2 lesson is a sign of inadequacy and laziness. As presented and discussed above, most of the teacher informants seemed to be under the impression that codeswitching was wrong even though neither the Ministry of Education and Research or the local language department had any guidelines that L2 was to be maximized and used for all functions in the classroom. Thus, implementing the EIL strategy with a more positive attitude towards codeswitching must be done early and in the teacher training programs to attempt to assert and illustrate that codeswitching can facilitate learning and is not necessarily a sign of weakness and inadequacy.

6 Conclusion

In the final chapter the implications of the study's findings will be presented in addition to suggestions for further research and a few concluding remarks.

6.1 Implications of the findings

In the present study, teachers at lower secondary school and upper secondary school have been compared with regard to their attitudes, opinions and utilization of codeswitching in the language learner classroom. Student interviews have also been conducted in order to investigate and include their opinions on the matter.

Ultimately, as this study has shown, teachers have very distinctive attitudes and utilization of codeswitching in the language learner classroom. A small-scale study like this, with only six teacher informants, has shown that attitudes towards codeswitching vary from a quite negative attitude, to an attitude that views codeswitching as necessary, to an extremely positive attitude that views it as something that facilitates learning. This attitude relates to the teachers' personal experiences of teaching languages and seems to be connected to how they choose to utilize codeswitching in their classrooms. The negative attitudes the results yielded can be seen in light of the former native-speaker model that had as its main aim that learners should view their ultimate goal as acquiring native-speaker proficiency and viewed L1 as interference.

As argued in this thesis, we are moving away from the native-speaker model and towards the teaching of EIL. Because it is bilingual speakers that are shaping EIL, and codeswitching is a natural attribute for bilingual speakers, it should not be proscribed from the classrooms but rather used with a clear purpose by the teachers. The global orientation that EIL embraces allows new words to transpire within the language thus codeswitching is not something that will always lead to negative transfer and loss of intelligibility. As EIL is used as a language for wider communication across cultures and not solely to talk to native-speakers, speakers always work towards a common intelligibility and as plurilingual language users possess knowledge about more than one language codeswitching can be useful in such discourse.

To successfully achieve this we need an attitude change among teachers and students. As this thesis has argued a prevailing antagonism towards anything that seems like a

hindrance to a native-speaker-model still seems to exist today. As presented and discussed previously some students uttered that they did not want to participate in a classroom discussion because of their pronunciation. Teachers have an important responsibility here, it needs to be conveyed properly and thoroughly to students that to sound like a native-speaker should not be a goal in itself. The important thing is whether you are able to communicate successfully with an interlocutor in English. However, to implement the teaching of EIL successfully we also need a consciousness-raising among teachers and an increased attention around the concept of codeswitching. In order for codeswitching to facilitate learning, teachers and students must be aware of the opportunities it may provide, but also that codeswitching is not beneficial in all contexts. In English learner classrooms in Norway today, the reality is that more than one L1 is present and for instance to implement grammar teaching strictly in the majority students' L1 may not be beneficial for all students.

As discussed above, codeswitching may not be beneficial in all communicative situations. In EIL discourse you cannot always know that your interlocutor will understand you by using codeswitching as a communication strategy if he has no knowledge of your L1 or other languages that can resemble your L1. To avoid that codeswitching becomes the primary and only strategy the students turn to, they need to develop other strategies to handle breaks in communication. This is impossible without an enhancement of the teachers' competence with regards to how to teach communication strategies effectively to the students. Teachers will also need to provide students with good examples and illustrate how communication strategies can be applied successfully in lingua franca communication to avoid that codeswitching is used as the only strategy.

Since there are no guidelines for L1 use in the English learner classroom, there is little doubt that the teachers are incorporating or avoiding to utilize codeswitching based on the "gut-feeling" one of the teachers referred to. Even though formal directives from the Ministry of Education and Research quite possibly will be considered a discredit in the knowledge teachers are possessing it could be an idea, as Hoff (2013) also suggests, to develop some guidelines at the language departments locally. However, in order for codeswitching to facilitate learning the teachers much assess the group in front of them to know how and when to use it, and last but not least, an attitude change towards the teaching of English needs to take place.

6.2 Suggestions for further research

As presented in chapter 3 this study is only transferable to similar teaching contexts and the transferability is limited because of its small sample. As this is a relatively small study, with only six teacher and eight student informants it would be insightful to conduct a quantitative study with a larger and more carefully selected sample to be able to draw more generalizable conclusions. More student interviews would also have thrown more light on the subject, and to conduct interviews in all the classes one is observing would be especially productive.

In addition to a bigger sample it could be interesting to compare English teaching at general studies with English teaching at vocational subjects because some teachers indicated that they taught somewhat differently when teaching vocational courses. Additionally, a study that focuses solely on how teachers teach the students communication strategies in Norway would also be very valuable. Moreover, it could also be interesting to interview headmasters or heads of the language departments to scrutinize their opinions on developing departmental guidelines for L1/L2 usage in the language learner classrooms. Another option could be to explore textbooks in greater detail, to investigate whether textbooks promote the native-speaker-model or whether they have a more multilingual/plurilingual approach. Finally, further research may also include interviews with student teachers, newly qualified teachers and teachers with longer teaching experience to compare and contrast their attitudes and opinions to each other.

6.3 Concluding remarks

The main implication of this study is an attitude change among teachers and students with regards to codeswitching. It is important to realize that to utilize codeswitching in the classroom can be beneficial and is not a sign of inadequacy or necessarily an indication of low proficiency level.

As a teacher it is important to make decisions regarding your own teaching in the classroom and self-awareness around language choice is necessary in order for codeswitching to be a systematic and productive approach and not just an unconscious strategy one chooses to apply because of apathy. Personalities and teaching perspectives influence how you choose to structure your teaching and this freedom should in my opinion not be limited by too many

centralized directives on how to conduct a successful lesson.

For teacher training courses and future teachers it is important to elucidate this issue and perhaps incorporate the EIL perspective early in the teacher training programs to highlight the opportunities codeswitching can provide and not just focus on the negative impacts. In the future, the use of social media will possibly only increase and create more opportunities for students to multitask and talk with foreign friends and Norwegian friends simultaneously, increasing the use of codeswitching both inside and outside language learner classrooms. The reality already is, and possibly will always be, that students bring mobile phones to the classroom and use computers to interact socially with each other, switching languages when playing games or when chatting with friends from different parts of the world. Because of this growing use of social media that amplifies the students' use of codeswitching, to proscribe codeswitching in classroom discourse seems disadvantageous because students are exposed to it regardless. Teachers should rather learn to use it systematically to enhance learning in addition to encouraging and teaching students to use other communication strategies the students can apply in L2 conversations.

References

- Antón, M., & Dicamilla, F. J. (1999). Socio-Cognitive Functions of L1 Collaborative Interaction in the L2 Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233-247. www.jstor.org/stable/330338
- Arnsby, E. S. (2013). *How do Norwegian beginner students' experience the reading of English course material at university?* . (Master's Thesis), University of Oslo, Oslo. Retrieved from <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-41461>
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource? *ELT Journal*, 41(4), 241-247. doi: 10.1093/elt/41.4.241
- Bollerud, R. (2002). *Teaching English as a foreign language: To what extent is Norwegian used in our English teaching today - and why?* (Master's thesis), University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (4th ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework Of Reference For Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How Much Foreign Language Is There in the Foreign Language Classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154 - 166. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/328119>
- Dürmüller, U. (2008). Towards a new English as a Foreign Language curriculum for Continental Europe. In M. A. Locher & J. Strässler (Eds.), *Standards and Norms in the English Language* (pp. 239-254). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eldridge, J. (1996). Code-switching in a Turkish secondary school. *ELT Journal*, 50(4), 303-311. doi: 10.1093/elt/50.4.303
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Figueras, N. (2012). The impact of the CEFR. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 477-485. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccs037
- Grim, F. (2010). L1 in the L2 Classroom at the Secondary and College Levels: A Comparison of Functions and Use by Teachers *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 7(2), 193 - 209. <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v7n22010/grim.pdf>
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2005). *The acid test : does upper secondary EFL instruction effectively prepare Norwegian students for the reading of English textbooks at colleges and universities?* (Doctor Artium, Doctoral thesis), University of Oslo, Oslo. Retrieved from <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-11346>
- Hellekjær, G. O. (2009). Academic English reading proficiency at the university level: A Norwegian case study. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 21(2), 198-222. <http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2009/articles/hellekjær.pdf>
- Hoff, M. S. T. (2013). *L1 use in EFL instruction*. (Master's thesis), University of Oslo, Oslo.

- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Second language learning as a mediated process. *Language Teaching*, 33(02), 79-96. doi: 10.1017/S0261444800015329
- Li, D. (1998). "It's Always More Difficult Than You Plan and Imagine": Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Introducing the Communicative Approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 677-703. doi: 10.2307/3588000
- Little, D. (2006). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Content, purpose, origin, reception and impact. *Language Teaching*(03), 167-190. doi: 10.1017/S0261444806003557
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an International Language: Rethinking Goals and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L. (2003). Toward an appropriate EIL pedagogy: re-examining common ELT assumptions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 2-22. http://people.ufpr.br/~clarissa/pdfs/EILpedagogy_McKay.pdf
- Mehl, T. H. (2013). *Code-switching in English learning classrooms in Norwegian schools*. Unpublished manusprift.
- Ministry of Education and Research. (2013). *The Knowledge Promotion Reform - English Subject Curriculum* Retrieved from: <http://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Formaala/?lplang=eng>
- Moodley, V. (2007). Codeswitching in the Multilingual English First Language Classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(6), 707-722. doi: 10.2167/beb403.0
- Polio, C. G., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Teachers' Language Use in University Foreign Language Classrooms: A Qualitative Analysis of English and Target Language Alternation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 313 - 326. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/330110>
- Sampson, A. (2011). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal*, 66/3 July 2012, 11. doi: 10.1093/elt/CCR067
- Sert, O. (2005). The Functions of Code Switching in ELT classrooms. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XI(8). Retrieved from: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Sert-CodeSwitching.html>
- Simensen, A. M. (2007). *Teaching a Foreign Language: Principles and Procedures* (2nd ed.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Skarpaas, K. G. (2011). *Subject choice and the English programme subjects in Norwegian upper secondary school*. (Master's Thesis), University of Oslo, Oslo. Retrieved from <https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/32418>
- Sridhar, K. K. (1996). Societal Multilingualism. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching* (pp. 47-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, G. L. (2006). *Teacher And Student First Language And Target Language Use In The Foreign Language Classroom: A Qualitative and Quantitative Study Of Language Choice*. (Doctorial dissertation), University of Arizona. Retrieved from http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/bitstream/10150/194958/1/azu_etd_1705_si_p1_m.pdf
- Zagura, N. (2012). Focus on the form versus focus on the message in lingua franca conversation. *Estonian Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 8, 275 - 287. doi: 10.5128/ERYa.1736-2563

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Interview Guide - Students

Appendix 2: Observation categories

Appendix 3: The Interview Guide – Teachers

Appendix 1: The interview guide – students

Holdninger: ATTITUDES TOWARDS ENGLISH

Hvordan er du fornøyd med engelskundervisningen på din skole?

Hva mener du er den beste måten å lære engelsk på?

Forskjeller: DIFFERENCES IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH FROM LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOL TILL UPPER SECONDARY SCHOOL

I hvilken grad mener du engelskundervisningen er annerledes på VGS enn på ungdomsskolen?

Muntlig deltagelse: STUDENTS' ORAL PARTICIPATION

Føler du deg komfortabel med å uttrykke deg på engelsk i klassen? Hvorfor / hvorfor ikke?

Når dere stiller spørsmål og svarer på spørsmål svarer dere alltid på engelsk? Opplever dere at det er greit hvis dere svarer på norsk?

Lærerens L1-bruk: THE TEACHER'S L1-USE

Opplever du at engelsklærer bruker mye norsk i undervisningen? I så fall, i hvilke situasjoner bruker engelsklærer norsk? I samme situasjoner hver gang?

Hva synes du om at engelsklærer bruker norsk i undervisningen?

I hvilke situasjoner synes du det er greit/nyttig at engelsklærer bruker norsk i engelsktimen?

Lærerens L2-bruk: THE TEACHER'S L2-USE

I hvilken grad ser du på engelsklæreren din som et engelskspråklig forbilde?

Hvor godt forstår du engelsklæreren din når han / hun snakker på engelsk?

I hvilke situasjoner burde lærer kun bruke engelsk i undervisningen?

Appendix 2: Observation categories

- 1. Translation (both immediate and delayed):** the teacher uses the L1 to give the translation of a word or expression, without asking the students for the meaning or taking the time to check students' comprehension. In the case of delayed translation the translation is for example prompted by questions from one of the students. This category mostly conforms to plain translations, particularly to single-words, with and without equivalents in the L2. Whole utterances can also be coded as translations, when the purpose of the L1 is the translation itself.
- 2. Discipline (classroom management):** for teacher maintenance of discipline; the teacher uses the L1 to deal with lack of concentration, noise, talk, misconduct, etc.
- 3. Task instruction (classroom management):** the teacher uses the L1 to give instructions for an activity or a task.
- 4. Solidarity:** the teacher uses the L1 in a sense of closeness with students either to show understanding or to create a friendly support. Chatting with the students as a whole or with groups and individuals is also registered as solidarity.
- 5. Grammar explanation:** the teacher uses the L1 to help explain grammar.
- 6. To convey meaning:** the teacher uses the L1 to convey meaning of e.g. a new topic. This function can be motivated by a belief that the students would not understand, or motivated by a student's question. This also includes the teacher's checking of comprehension. This category is also defined more loosely than the others, and situations that are not appropriate for any of the other categories often fall into this category.
- 7. Procedural matters:** When the teacher switches languages between tasks, to explain how to proceed to the next activity. Switches explaining how the next lessons are going to be structured are also included in this category.

Appendix 3: The interview guide - teachers

Lærerbakgrunn

Hvor lenge har du undervist i engelsk?

På hvilke nivå har du undervist (f. eks 10.trinn og VG1)?

Hvilken utdanning har du?

Har du studert/bodd utenlands i et engelskspråklig land over en lengre periode?

Undervisningsfilosofi

Generelt om læring

Hva mener du er den beste måten å lære, og å lære bort et fremmedspråk på?

Hva oppfatter du som målene for dine studenter i din engelskundervisning?

Om norskbruk

Hva mener du om bruk av norsk (L1) i engelskundervisningen?

Er det noen spesiell type L1-bruk som er passende?

Er det noen spesiell type L1-bruk som er upassende?

Er det noen faktorer som kan utløse bruken?

Har du noen formening om fordeling av norsk og engelsk i undervisningen?

Opplever du at din egen bruk av norsk (L1) i undervisningssammenheng endrer seg med elevenes klassetrinn? (Altså fra for eksempel 10. trinn til VG1?)

Lærerbakgrunn

Hvordan opplever du din egen muntlig undervisning?

Hvordan føler du din egen ferdighet/kompetanse er i muntlig engelsk?

Føler du deg like komfortabel i undervisningen når du snakker engelsk som når du snakker norsk?

Opplevelse av studentenes ferdigheter

Hva er din opplevelse av dine elevers ferdigheter i engelsk?

Når du snakker engelsk (L2) i timen, hvor godt tror du de forstår deg?

Skolepolitikk

Har din skole noen retningslinjer om muntlig undervisning i fremmedspråk?

Har dere noen retningslinjer for fordeling av L1/L2?

På hvilke måter, om noen, tror du at du underviser annerledes enn andre i din avdeling?

Lærers kunnskap

Forskning tilsier at det å maksimere engelsk i muntlig undervisning er en fordel, men samtidig bruke norsk på passende steder kan være fordelaktig – hva er din mening om dette?

Hvor godt synes du engelsklærerutdanningen din har forberedt deg til muntlig undervisning på engelsk?