Degree Project with Specialisation in English Studies in Education

15 Credits, Second Cycle

Teacher and Teacher Student Beliefs on Using Code-Switching in EFL Classrooms

Lärares och lärarstudenters attityder kring användning av kodväxling i engelskundervisning

Beatrice Gustavsson
Anastasia Karakitsos

Preface

This paper has been a true collaboration where everything has been written and crossed checked by both of us. All the writing was done in a shared document on Google, as was the transcribing and coding of the data. Although not all writing was done while being in the same physical space, both of us have had immediate access to each other's writing and have both edited all parts of the paper. Furthermore, we have both read the literature used in this paper and we have both been engaged in writing and editing the whole text. Where one person took the lead, the other followed and edited and added, and vice versa.

Beatrice Gustavsson   Anastasia Karakitsos

_____   _____

Abstract

This study explores teacher student and in-service teacher beliefs about using code-switching in the English language classroom. Language classrooms have long adopted a monolingual approach. However, nowadays many classrooms are multilingual and a shift towards using multilingual strategies to accommodate multilingual pupils can be seen in both research and steering documents. Plurilingualism is promoted by the European Council and the Swedish syllabus for English, and research shows that code-switching can be one method for pupils to draw from all their language skills. Although a monolingual approach is still considered ideal, in research about teacher and teacher student beliefs about code-switching most participants use code-switching. This paper therefore investigates teacher student and in-service teacher beliefs in order to explore how teachers use code-switching. Using the qualitative method of semi-structured interviews and analysing our data with the help of a coding scheme, we found that though all participants agree that a monolingual standard is ideal, they believe that it is important to acknowledge pupils' multilingual backgrounds and that code-switching can be one way of doing that while still facilitating learning. We also found that the participants' use of code-switching depends on their pupils' proficiency, that they mainly use code-switching for communicative purposes, and that the participants' own lingual backgrounds affected their beliefs about code-switching. The result of this paper shows that in-service teachers need to reflect on how and why they use code-switching while teacher education programmes need to acknowledge multilingual strategies and make students aware of when such strategies are beneficial to learning, and when they are not.

Keywords: *Code-switching, Teacher beliefs, Teacher student beliefs, Multilingual classrooms, Multilingual strategies, Multilingualism, Plurilingualism, EFL teaching*

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

When teaching English as a foreign language, the monolingual approach of using only the target language in the classroom has been promoted for a long time. The syllabus for teaching English in Sweden states that "Teaching should as far as possible be conducted in English." (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1), and that notion has been followed, after all it makes sense that an English class should be taught in English. However, recently there has been a switch of perspectives and now terms like translanguaging, plurilingualism and, code-switching seem to be everywhere. This change has inspired this study which aims to explore if and how this new direction has affected teachers of English as a foreign language, and what their professional beliefs of this direction are.

Most classrooms in Sweden today are multilingual, meaning that many pupils know more than one language, that Swedish is not necessarily the language they are most well-versed in and that though not everyone speaks multiple languages fluently, many have some knowledge of multiple languages and are, so called, emergent multilinguals (Kemp, 2009, p.19). There are different ways of teaching language in such classes, but what has been the norm is to teach through the target language alone. This approach has been promoted because of several reasons. First of all, to use Swedish as a point of departure does not make sense if the pupils' first language is not Swedish and will favour well-versed Swedish speakers above pupils who are more fluent in any other language. Secondly, and perhaps more prominent, is that immersion in, and exposure to, a language will make you learn more (Cummins, 2007, pp. 222-224). This can in turn be connected to Krashen's well-known principle of $i+1$, that is, when you are exposed to language that is slightly more difficult than what you already know, then you will reach and learn (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p.106). However, recently it has been argued that by only using the target language, teachers are ignoring the rich language knowledge that some pupils might possess and enforcing the view of other languages being impediments to learning (Cummins, 2007, pp. 224-232). To allow pupils to engage all their language knowledge when learning English, to see languages as part of a holistic system, to use strategies such as translanguaging and code-switching, is now argued to not only be an effective way of

learning languages, but also a way to strengthen pupils' agency, identity and sense of community (Garcia, 2011).

There are then, in simplified terms, two different approaches to language teaching: (1) using only the target language, or (2) allowing for multiple languages to be used. The question is, what do in-service teachers believe to be the best approach and what are they actually doing? Furthermore, what are the thoughts of teacher students who are about to graduate and should have knowledge of recent research? To use research as a basis for teaching is promoted by the Swedish curriculum (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2013, p.9) and would seem obvious. However, even though the monolingual approach has been favoured in both the syllabus and in much research, it is a common experience for pupils who have gone to Swedish schools to have had language teachers using other languages than English, asking pupils to translate, or presenting them with textbooks with Swedish explanations and glossary lists. Furthermore, anyone who has ever been a student of language has probably found themselves using their own language to learn a new one.

The Swedish syllabus for English states that one should teach in the target language. However, it also states that pupils should be given the opportunity to "develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other" (Skolverket, 2011, p.1), and The Council of Europe promotes multilingualism as a top priority (ECML, 2017). Furthermore, over the past ten years, within research on language learning, translanguaging, defined as a strategy of drawing from all one's language and culture skills (Garcia, 2011, pp. 112-116), has become increasingly prominent as a topic of research. However, translanguaging is often used interchangeably with code-switching, which Garcia (2011) argues is part of translanguaging, but not the whole of translanguaging (p.112). In this study different terms and strategies connected to using multiple languages in the classroom are explored, but ultimately this study focus on teachers' beliefs about code-switching. The use of different terminology for similar approaches can cause confusion, and teachers' different strategies in multilingual classrooms can be scoffed off as translation strategies. The motivation behind this study is therefore to explore what teacher students and in-service teachers know about code-switching, how they use it, how they defend their choices to use or not use it, and how their different teaching experiences may be reflected in their answers.

2. Aim and Research Questions

The aim and purpose of this study is to explore and compare in-service teacher and teacher student attitudes towards using multiple languages in upper secondary English classrooms in Sweden. The study investigates if their attitudes match current research within the field, and if there is a discrepancy between experienced teachers and soon to graduate teacher students. By researching this topic, our aim is to explore how attitudes within the teacher profession are affected by working experience and to investigate if we can detect a shift from a monolingual approach to a more multilingual approach. Our aim is specified and broken down into the following sub-questions:

- What do in-service teachers think of using code-switching in the English classroom?
- What do soon to graduate teacher students think of using code-switching in the English classroom?
- What differences, if any, exist between the two groups?

3. Theoretical Background

This section is divided into four main parts. In the first part, we define and explain concepts central to this study and attempt to bring some clarity to the, sometimes interchangeable, use of these concepts. In the second part, we explore notions of monolingual versus multilingual standards of EFL instruction. In the third part, we focus on code-switching in both theory and practice as we define and explain the concept and explore its benefits as well as its potential pits and downfalls. In the last section, we present previous research findings regarding teacher beliefs about using code-switching in EFL instruction and the main incentives for doing so.

3.1 Plurilingualism and Plurilingual Education

In Europe, incentives have been established to ensure the promotion, development and maintenance of plurilingualism. For example, the Swedish syllabus for English in upper secondary school, Lgy11, states that teaching should "encourage students' curiosity in language and culture, and give them the opportunity to develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other" (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1). Similarly, the European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe (2013) lists plurilingual education as one of the top priorities to ensure quality education in a multilingual Europe. Rather than treating various languages as completely distinct entities, plurilingual education should give learners the opportunity to develop their various linguistic repertoires and let the partial knowledge of several languages work together to create a plurilingual whole. Hence, plurilingualism is to be understood as a skill where knowledge of many different languages interacts and support each other (ECML, 2013).

3.2 Multilingualism

Multilingualism is a concept that often appears in connection to plurilingualism. The concepts are easy to confuse as they are sometimes used interchangeably; a confusion further amplified as an agreement on a definition of multilingualism has not yet been reached. Kemp (2009) highlights some of the various definitions of multilingualism that

have existed throughout the years. At a basic level, multilingualism can be defined as having knowledge of three or more languages (p.11). However, this distinction is problematic as it raises the question of which level of proficiency one must have in the various languages to be regarded as a multilingual speaker. Even though a speaker may display varying levels of proficiency for different languages, they can still draw from their entire linguistic repertoire when communicating and learning additional languages, rendering a distinction based on proficiency problematic. Therefore, this study will apply a holistic view of multilingualism. Similar to the definition of plurilingualism set forth by ECML, a holistic view of multilingualism is a view where speakers' partial knowledge of various languages interact and support each other to create a larger language system to facilitate communication (Kemp, 2009, p.19). Although identical to the definition of plurilingualism outlined in the previous section, we will use multilingualism to refer to individuals or communities where several languages are present and understood and spoken at various levels, whereas plurilingualism will be used to refer to the *skill* promoted by the Swedish National Agency for Education and the European Centre for Modern Languages.

3.3. Monolingual and Multilingual Perspectives on Language Teaching

During the past decades, the dominant discourse in EFL teaching has been the so-called monolingual approach. This approach is based on the notion that for successful acquisition of a target language, instruction should be given exclusively in the target language (Cummins, 2007, p.223). This monolingual standard of instruction rests on the assumption that for successful language acquisition to occur, learners must be subjected to adequate input of the target language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p.105). The monolingual standard of instruction, as stated by Cummins (2007), assumes the position that the target language should be the sole medium of instruction without any additional languages. Furthermore, different languages should be kept strictly apart and thus translation practices between the target language and pupils' L1 should be avoided (pp.222-223), a notion that is reflected in the Swedish syllabus for English which states that "teaching should as far as possible be conducted in English" (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1). These assumptions in turn rest on the beliefs that

simultaneous use of several languages is confusing to the learner and hinders language development (Jessner, 2008, p.39). Furthermore, Lundahl (2019) points out that using pupils' L1 in interaction can be problematic if not everyone shares the same language. Similarly, using Swedish in the English classroom could be disadvantageous to pupils with non-Swedish language backgrounds (p.314). Lundahl (2019) also points out that for teachers to be able to use their pupils' multilingual knowledge for learning, it is necessary for them to have some knowledge of all the languages spoken (p.319), which of course not all teachers do. The monolingual approach is then a way to maximise target language exposure while avoiding favouring one pupil demographic over another.

Naturally, being exposed to input of the target language is highly beneficial for language acquisition and thus should not be disregarded. However, there has been a change in the field where multilingual perspectives on language teaching are becoming more recognised. Within research regarding multilingual teaching, findings point to the potentially beneficial effects of encouraging cooperation between and simultaneous use of all multiple languages present within each individual. Källkvist, Gyllstad, Sandlund and Sundquist (2017) summarise current research findings and conclude that evidence suggests that strategic use of pupils' L1 may help learners advance in their L2 in areas pertaining to vocabulary and grammar (p.29). Furthermore, Lundahl (2019) states that when pupils' L1 share similar or identical words with the target language, then positive transfer can take place (p.314). In addition, Lundahl (2019) specifically points out the potential for multilingual approaches when it comes to teaching pupils with limited target language knowledge (p.317).

Although there has been a shift towards multilingual approaches in language teaching, a critical perspective is still in place. Lundahl (2019) argues that maximised output should still be the goal and that pupils need to be challenged to find strategies in order to learn the target language (pp. 316-317). Ellis and Shintani (2014) find that both teachers and pupils are using their L1, but that it is not entirely clear what the potential consequences might be for learning. They also find that though there are several arguments in favour of multilingual approaches, those arguments are often based on empirical studies where the importance of context can get lost. Furthermore, using L1 in language teaching can contribute to greater communication between pupils, but research also shows that thinking in the target language helps with target language development (pp.232-233).

Nevertheless, a shift towards multilingual approaches can be discerned. This can be seen through McKay (2012) who points to an urgency for EFL research to acknowledge bi-, and multilingual pupils, stating that full recognition must be given to other languages spoken by English learners as this will result in equal status of all languages spoken by learners within a classroom (p.20), a stance similar to the Swedish curriculum (2011) which states the the Swedish school should "actively promote equality of individuals and groups" (p.10). Naturally, it can be questioned whether this is important to do in an English classroom where the goal is English language development, and whether promoting equal status of languages could be better suited for other school subjects.

3.4. Code-Switching

One of the most prevalent strategies to support and facilitate language learning in multilingual classrooms is code-switching, henceforth referred to as CS, a linguistic phenomenon that in its broadest sense can be defined as the alternation between two or more linguistic codes within the same context (Gardner-Chloros, 2009, p.4). According to Corcoll Lopéz and González-Davies (2015), CS has traditionally been understood as a bilingual mode of communication that specifically occurs when the speakers engaged in conversation have a shared understanding of two languages and alternate between them within the same conversation (p.67). However, the linguistic knowledge of individuals nowadays often includes two or more languages, which is why CS today may be understood as a multilingual mode of communication as well, since speakers may draw on all their linguistic knowledge in the same speech acts. Therefore, in this study we have used a definition by Corcoll Lopéz and González-Davies (2015) that defines CS accordingly:

> the ability of plurilingual speakers to switch within or between sentences from and to the codes in their repertoire, in order to fulfil communication needs triggered by decisions concerning the communicative context in which they are immersed. (p.69)

CS is a phenomenon that has been studied within various fields and through multiple lenses, and the attitudes towards the phenomenon have shifted over the years. For a long time, CS was considered an unwanted by-product of bilingual speech and a sign of insufficient knowledge of one's languages (Lee, 2012, p. 147). Correspondingly, there

was an agreement in research literature regarding foreign language learning that CS should be avoided to the greatest extent possible since the simultaneous presence of two languages was believed to result in reduced exposure to, and hinder the acquisition of, the targeted language (Corcoll López & González-Davies, 2015, p.68).

However, the notion of CS as something inherently negative has gradually disappeared and been replaced by the notion that CS is a common practice that is "naturally and spontaneously developed by plurilingual speakers" (Corcoll López & González-Davies, 2015, p.68). This shift in attitudes has no doubt influenced how CS is perceived in learning contexts. Furthermore, research shows that CS can be a resource for facilitating foreign language learning. In fact, Kamwangamalu (2010) presents research pointing to CS as an important resource in language classrooms to clarify meaning, to compensate for lack of understanding and to thereby also facilitate language acquisition (p.128).

However, though CS is no longer seen as an inherently negative hindrance to learning, it should still be seen through critical eyes. If CS is not used consciously it can become a way to avoid speaking the target language, and it is therefore important that allowing CS in the classroom does not result in limited use of the target language (Lundahl, 2019, p.317). Lundahl (2019) argues that the benefits of CS are dependent on the context in which it is used. Factors that need to be countered in are, amongst others, pupils' age, proficiency, the languages present in the classroom and the teacher's knowledge of those languages (pp.318-319). In addition, Ellis and Shintani (2014) present a list of arguments in favour and against CS. The arguments in favour consist of claims of CS being able to reduce pupil anxiety, recognise pupils' language backgrounds, limit classroom time spent on explanations, and help pupils understand advanced grammar. However, though these arguments have valid points, the arguments against CS bring forth alternative options that does not diminish target language exposure and claim that by using CS when explaining, teachers signal that the target language is not to be used for real interactions, that for advanced learners grammar should be taught in the target language as it provides important input, that CS can result in hindering target language development when pupils do not learn other strategies, that encouraging translation can result in pupils not trying to think through the target language, and that using target language in intrapersonal functions can be the most authentic context in which the pupils will learn the target

language (pp.334-335). In addition, communication breakdown and exclusion might occur when not all pupils share the same languages (Lundahl, 2019, pp.314-319)

CS should then not be the only strategy presented to pupils and the benefits of using CS should not overrule the importance of maximised exposure to target language. In their work, Ellis and Shintani (2014) cite Macaro (2011) who argues that when it comes to CS, teachers should employ intra-sentential CS rather than inter-sentential CS. That is, teachers should not CS whole sentences but use CS to "make the meaning of essential words or lexical strings clear" (p.233). When used efficiently, CS should then be used as a multilingual strategy where pupils can use their language skills to compare and contrast in order to attain target language, not as a communication strategy.

3.4.1. Code-Switching and Identity

Multilingual approaches are being discussed by researchers from different standpoints, presenting both possible benefits and downfalls for language acquisition. However, to allow for pupils to use the entirety of their linguistic backgrounds in second or foreign language classrooms may have other effects than language acquisition. There is research pointing to the fact that for bi-, or multilinguals, CS can serve as an expression of identity and function as a marker of belonging, while also promoting a sense of inclusiveness. In line with the markedness approach to CS, as explained by Kamwangamalu (2010), all linguistic choices are products of social negotiations. Depending on the context and its participants, the choice to engage in CS may have various outcomes that positions the speaker in relation to the other participants. According to the markedness approach, CS may be either an unmarked choice signalling social belonging, a marked choice signalling social distance or an exploratory choice to display multiple identities (p.124). One might argue that CS's importance for pupil identity is moot in an English classroom where learning English should be the main goal. However, the Swedish curriculum does point out that pupils should be able to develop "A secure identity" (p.4) and that all who work at schools should "contribute to developing the students' sense of belonging" (p.10). Furthermore, Malsbary (2014) stresses that for youths to learn and develop, a sense of belonging to a community is of utmost importance. Speaking practices are central to the way in which one constructs and maintains identity and are central functions of meaningful participation in social contexts and communities (pp.1313-1315). CS can thus

function as a way for all multilingual speakers to express identity and create a sense of belonging. Worth noting is that though CS can work as way to signal identity, promoting belonging and acceptance can also be done through the target language if teachers are conscious of how they interact with their pupils (Ellis and Shintani, 2014, pp. 234-235).

3.5 Previous Research

In this section, we present previous research pertaining to teachers' and teacher students' beliefs about CS, as well as their reported use of CS.

3.5.1 Teacher and Teacher Student Beliefs about Code-Switching

The general attitude within the field towards including multiple languages and using practices such as CS in EFL classrooms has, as we have seen in the previous section, started to shift during the past years. However, the attitudes of practicing teachers regarding the use of L1 in foreign language teaching are varied, and many studies have been carried out on the subject.

In one study by Mokgwathi and Webb (2013), the role of CS in four secondary schools in Botswana was examined with the help of 130 teachers. In these schools the language of instruction is English. However, there are other languages present in Botswana and both the teachers and the pupils speak multiple languages (pp. 109-111). Similar to Sweden where Swedish has been used as the point of departure, this study focuses on CS between English and Setswana (p.112). The researchers found that though CS occurred in all subjects, only 36 % reported that they use CS in the English classroom (p.114). The English teachers believed that their role was to help their pupils develop their English and felt that the use of CS diminished the pupils' exposure to the target language and would have implications for pupils' language development (p.117). The authors state that while the teachers saw CS as useful to enhance understanding, increase participation and recognition of different ethnic groups (p.121), they believed that it negatively affects the learners' confidence and ability to express themselves in English. Furthermore, teachers CS in Setswana were excluding pupils with higher competence in other languages. The study concludes that while teachers in Botswana believe that CS might have a place when

teaching content and promoting social relations, they do not believe it to be beneficial for language development (pp.121-123).

In another study, Muller and Baetens Beardsmore (2004) investigate multilingual interaction in plurilingual classes in Brussels and find that CS is often employed as a communication strategy in multilingual settings. This is interesting as Brussels, like Sweden, adheres to the European Council. The participant of this study was a teacher who knew three languages and taught primary school classes with pupils of mixed language backgrounds (pp.29-32). The teacher used CS several times which was possible thanks to the teacher's language knowledge (pp.31-37). Though the context of primary school is not necessarily transferable to upper secondary schools in Sweden, this study does add to the thinking that for CS to facilitate learning, teachers need to have knowledge of the languages used to CS. However, this does not necessarily mean that CS is useful in terms of language development. In fact, teachers' disbelief in the language development benefits of CS can be seen in both Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) above, and in the study below.

Cheng (2013), explores the attitudes of Chinese EFL teachers to the use CS in instruction. The study investigates the beliefs of Chinese teachers from several universities who had undergone their teacher training in Singapore, which is interesting as both China and Singapore have multilingual populations. Results show that a majority of the participants believed that the use of L1 and CS should be kept to a minimum. In a pre-study questionnaire, 22 out of the 28 participants claimed that approximately 91-100% of the content in their lessons was taught using English as a medium, indicating negative attitudes towards incorporating the L1 to instruction. In contrast, the study shows that CS was in fact commonplace, indicating a discrepancy between the beliefs and actual practices (p.1280).

There are no general conclusions to be drawn regarding teachers' attitudes towards the use of CS as the context in which instruction takes place highly influences CS practices and thereby also the beliefs connected to them. It is thus interesting to shed a light on how teacher students, who have not yet attained the experience in-service teachers possess, differ in their view of CS. A study by Lee (2016) explores 207 Korean in-service teachers' and teacher students' beliefs about teaching through a monolingual versus bilingual

approach. The study was carried out in a monolingual society and thus the participants' beliefs about CS as an instructional strategy is not relevant. However, what is relevant is how the teacher students' opinions differed from the in-service teachers, especially since a monolingual approach is promoted in Korea. Through both questionnaires and interviews, the results show that practicing teachers' attitudes towards using L1 in EFL instruction were more positive than those of the teacher students, indicating that the reality of teaching might differ from teaching in theory (p.769).

Bateman (2008) also investigates teacher students' beliefs about conducting lessons using only the target language and how these beliefs changed over time. The subjects of the study were ten teacher students in the US studying to become Spanish teachers, and the data was collected from both questionnaires and interviews. Initially, all ten students expressed a belief that speaking the target language in class was very important and that it should be spoken as much as possible. However, the attitudes changed as the teacher students were faced with challenges affecting the possibility of using the target language. These challenges included factors pertaining to themselves, the activities or the classrooms and the pupils therein (pp.14-27). These results indicate that though the context is different from Lee's (2016), actual teaching experience may influence attitudes towards teaching through monolingual versus multilingual approaches regardless of setting.

3.5.2 Teachers' Reported Reasons for Code-Switching

Although the use of CS, and by that also the functions CS performs, is highly dependent upon contextual factors such as proficiency and the linguistic diversity within a given classroom, some patterns of when teachers chose to use CS can be discerned regardless of context. First and foremost, the extent to which CS is used seem to be dependent upon learners' proficiency levels. In a qualitative study on the use of CS in two EFL groups in Brazil, Greggio and Gil (2007) suggest that the occurrence of CS is connected to proficiency. Through classroom observations and interviews, the authors conclude that CS was used to a much larger extent in the beginner group than in the pre-intermediate group (pp. 374-376). Similarly, in Cheng's study (2013), 94% of the participants claimed that their use of CS was informed by issues regarding students' proficiency levels (p.1280).

Another possible incentive to engage in CS is related to what Lin (2008) calls ideational functions, which is when teachers switch to the pupils' L1 to explain, translate, exemplify or annotate content, or to provide and further clarify instructions (p.6). In both Cheng (2013, p.1281) and Greggio and Gil (2007, p.376) participating teachers reported using CS to further clarify content, give instructions, or explain grammar and linguistic features. In addition, all teachers used pupils' L1 to explain new vocabulary or, as expressed in Greggio and Gil (2007), to "provide equivalent meaning(s) in L1" (p.378). However, as pointed out by Ellis and Shintani (2014), there is a potential disadvantage to utilising pupils' L1 to explain new vocabulary as the meanings of the L2 might be treated as mere translation equivalents of the L1 (p.236). Nonetheless, research presented in Turnbull and Arnett (2002) concurs that a conscious use of L1 in instances such as the ones outlined above may very well be effective to support language development, but that teachers should be mindful and use it solely for the purpose of supporting knowledge construction in the target language (pp.207-208).

Lastly, yet another reason for engaging in CS practices can be recognised. This reason falls under the term intrapersonal functions (Lin, 2008) which refers to using CS to change social relationships within a group, to mark identity and to signal social inclusion or distinction. Results show that teacher students in Bateman (2008) all used CS for intrapersonal functions. Participants reported using CS to manage the classroom, to express their own state of mind and emotions or to build relationships (pp.18-20). One of the teachers in Greggio and Gil (2007) also utilised CS for intrapersonal functions as he used the students' L1 to bring about humorous effect (p.382). These findings support the notion that the choice to CS is connected to expressing identity and creating a sense of community and belonging.

4. Methodology

This section outlines and argues for the methodology used in collecting data for this comparative paper. In this section participants in the study, the context in which the study was carried out, ethical considerations, the procedure of the data collection, the instruments used to collect data, and the analysis of the data are presented.

4.1 Participants and Context

The participants in this study consist of four working teachers from one upper secondary school in Skåne, and four teacher students scheduled to graduate from Malmö University in 2019.

4.1.1 Teacher Students

The common denominators for the teacher students interviewed for this study are that they have studied together at Malmö University, that they are soon to graduate after five years of study, and that they all have English as their major subject. These participants were elected for the interviews for a number of reasons. First of all, they were easy to access. Secondly, they have all studied the same major, with different minor subjects. Finally, they have different teaching experiences at different upper secondary schools in Skåne.

Table 1. Characteristics of Teacher Students

Teacher students	Subjects	Language knowledge	Teaching Experience	Classroom demographics
Teacher student (A)	English and Swedish as a second subject	Speaks 3+ languages	VFU and substituting in central Malmö	Diverse pupils
Teacher student (B)	English and Religion	Speaks 3+ languages	VFU and substituting in central Malmö	Diverse and newly arrived pupils

Teacher student (C)	English and Religion	Speaks 2+ languages with minor knowledge of additional 3+ languages	VFU, substituting and SFI teacher in Ystad, Svedala and Central Malmö	Diverse and non-diverse pupils, newly arrived adults, diverse adult students
Teacher student (D)	English and History	Speaks 2+ languages	VFU in Helsingborg	Non-diverse, and newly arrived pupils

4.1.2 In-service Teachers

The common denominator for the interviewed in-service teachers is that they all work at the same school in a municipality just outside Malmö and that they, similar to the teacher students, all have English as their major subject with varying minor subjects. There were additional reasons informing the choice of the interview subjects which are specified more in detail in the following.

Table 2. Characteristics of In-service Teachers

In-service Teachers	Subjects	Language knowledge	Teaching Experience	Classroom demographics
In-service Teacher (A)	English and History	Speaks 2+ languages	17 years in a municipality outside Malmö	Non-diverse and diverse upper secondary pupils
In-service Teacher (B)	English and German	Speaks 3+ languages	1 year in a municipality outside Malmö	Non-diverse and diverse upper secondary pupils
In-service Teacher (C)	English, Philosophy and Swedish	Speaks 2+ languages	20 years in a municipality outside Malmö	Non-diverse and diverse upper secondary pupils

In-service Teacher (D)	English and Spanish	Speaks 3+ languages	11 years in a municipality outside Malmö	Non-diverse and diverse upper secondary pupils

4.2 Ethical Considerations

In accordance with the guidelines from the Swedish Research Council (2002), this study follows the four main principles of ethical research. In accordance with the information requirement (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p.7), the participants in the study were informed about the purpose of the study and of their role in it. They were informed that their participation is voluntary and that they are free to withdraw from the study at any time. In accordance with the consent requirement (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, pp.9-10), the participants were asked to sign a document stating their willingness in participating. In accordance with the confidentiality requirement (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p.12), all names and information about the participants which could point to their person was removed or re-coded. Finally, in accordance with the fourth main principle, the requirement of usage (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002, p. 14), personal details about the participants as well as their answers will not be used for commercial purposes and will be deleted after this paper has been approved. Besides following these guidelines from the Swedish Research Council, the collection of data has also been conducted and stored according to European GDPR laws.

In order to comply with The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), Malmö University has put forth guidelines which demand that the processing of personal information is registered on a GDPR website, that participants sign a specific consent form, that any data collected is recorded through devices that are not connected to the internet, and that all information collected through the study should be destroyed after the paper has been approved. Furthermore, coinciding with the advice from the Swedish Research Council, any information pointing to specific persons should be avoided in the data collection, and removed from the data presented (Kvalex, n.d.). These guidelines were all followed in this study.

4.3 Instruments Used to Collect Data

As this study deals with attitudes and beliefs, a qualitative approach was used to gain insight into the participants' real thoughts and opinions. As Nunan (2001) puts it, qualitative research is exploratory and is a method used when one wants to discover behaviours as described by the subjects themselves (p.4). While quantitative approaches can provide more numerical data, the qualitative approach provides the opportunity to learn more about what lies behind the participants answers and how they actually apply their beliefs (Brinkmann, 2013, pp.21-24), something which fits this study.

To gather data for this study the qualitative method of semi-structured interviews was used. According to the *Oxford dictionary of Social Research Methods*, the semi-structured interview is the most common method for gathering information for qualitative studies as it is open and allows for new topics to be raised during the interview (Elliot, Fairweather, Olsen & Pampaka, 2016, p.19). This is the same reason why semi-structured interviews were used in this study. Furthermore, as Brinkmann (2013) argues, semi-structured interviews leave space for finding gaps in participants' stories and can help the interviewer find answers to how the participants themselves would describe their situation (pp.22-24), all of which is beneficial to this study. The semi-structured interviews conducted for this study were centred around three main areas: previous experience and knowledge, attitudes and usage of code-switching, and attitudes and usage of a monolingual approach.

The process of gathering the data was guided by Nunan's (2001) suggestions for planning and conducting interviews (p.151-153). After deciding on the angle of code-switching and on the three areas that would be discussed, an interview guide was prepared. The three different areas were broken down into several questions, most of which were open ended in order to elicit more data. To be able to guide the answers in the right direction, keywords and follow-up questions were included in the interview guide (see Appendix). In this manner, the aim of the semi-structured interviews was to create a space where the participants felt free to express their opinions and to offer new ideas which were not necessarily present in the interview template.

The risks of conducting interviews as described above are that the answers stray too far from the topic, or that the interviewers' own thoughts and opinions shine through and colour the participants' answers. Though it is hard to avoid all bias, we tried to not promote any specific angle in our questions or in our responses to the participants' answers, and expressed that it was the participants' opinions that were important, not what they had been told by others. Furthermore, there is a risk of making participants feel as if there is asymmetry in the power hierarchy while being interviewed (Nunan, 2001, p.150). To avoid this, we offered the participants access to their data to offer the participants agency of their own answers. A possible unequal power structure was also diminished by the fact that the interviewers conducted the interviews as students whereas the participants were interviewed in their capacity as experts.

4.4 Procedure and Analysis

The process of collecting data started with the creation of the aforementioned interview guide that can be found in the appendix of this paper and continued with contacting the thought-of participants. The interviews were then conducted at the teacher students' university and at the teachers' place of work. This was done for two reasons: (1) it was convenient and (2) it provided the participants with a space they had ownership over. This was done with the goal to even out the hierarchy differences that can be present between interviewers and interviewees. When starting to ask questions about the participants' views on CS, the participants' own definitions were elicited before a formal definition was shared. This formal definition was based upon Corcoll Lopéz and González-Davies's (2015) definition (p.69) which can be read about in the literature section above. The formal definition of CS was then used to elicit answers about the participants' beliefs about using CS as a strategy, about their own use of CS, and about their actual classroom practice. After having asked about the participants' beliefs about CS, the interview moved on to focus on their beliefs of using only target language in the classroom, also known as the monolingual approach.

The interviews were recorded on a laptop with the internet turned off and then stored on Malmö University's server. However, two interview participants did not want to be recorded, but they were patient and it was therefore possible to write down their answers

word for word, these notes were also stored on Malmö University's server. The recordings of the interviews were transcribed in full, including mumbles and laughter.

When all the transcriptions were finished, the data was analysed with the help of qualitative content analysis. The analysis process followed the steps of qualitative content analysis as described by Zhang and Wildemuth (2009). The goal of qualitative content analysis is to "identify important themes or categories within a body of content, and to provide a rich description of the social reality created by those themes/categories" (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 11). When doing qualitative content analysis, it is common to use specific computer software (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p.6). However, this was not possible for this study as Malmö University's comments on the GDPR law include not uploading the data collected to anything connected to cloud services (Kvalex, n.d.). Therefore, all coding and analysing was done by hand.

There are different approaches to qualitative content analysis, but the one used in this study is conventional content analysis. This means that the coding categories used emerged inductively from the raw data (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p.2). As this study deals with beliefs and qualitative data, comparable themes were used as the unit for analysis instead of specific linguistic units. As Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) puts forward, (citing Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1990), themes as coding units can be used when one looks for "expressions of an idea" (p.3), and can therefore be ascribed to large amounts of text as long as the text can be said to be represented by a single theme (p.3). The themes were found and defined through close-text readings of the transcripts. The categories in the coding scheme were as follows:

- Working and life experience
- Knowledge about code-switching including training
- Believed benefits of code-switching
- Believed challenges of code-switching
- Use of code-switching in the classroom and in life
- Believed benefits of a monolingual approach
- Believed challenges of a monolingual approach
- Other multilingual practices

Finally, the question of objectivity, validity and reliability of the data was considered in conducting the method of qualitative semi-structured interviews. As Kvale (2007) puts it, one way to make objectivity more easily obtained is if the content of an interview analysis is coded and put into quantifiable categories (pp.121-122). Therefore, the data was put into categories and coded, as described above. Furthermore, the semi-structured interview, in contrast to a fixed questionnaire, allows for the participants to ask questions and to not agree with the interviewees which Kvale (2007) argues is a way to create a more objective result, "*allowing the object to object*" (p.122). Moreover, two people were involved in analysing the data which diminishes the risk of bias (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 4). In connection to objectivity, ensuring the reliability of the data is important to the validity of the result. The transcriptions of the interviews were therefore made in full as to make sure that no data was removed before it was analysed. Parts of the constant comparative method was then applied during the coding, meaning that all texts added to a category were compared to texts already assigned to that category (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009, p. 4). When the coding was done it was once again checked to make sure that the results were consistent and that the meaning of the coding categories had not shifted throughout the process. Similarly, in line with Kvale's (2007) definition of validity, which boils down to constantly questioning one's own interpretations of the data (pp.124-125), validation was seen as continual process throughout this study.

5. Results and Discussion

In this section we present and discuss our results derived from the data of the semi-structured interviews. The data is synthesised and presented under a series of headings with the aim to answer our research questions: What do in-service teachers think of using code-switching in the English classroom? What do soon to graduate teacher students think of using code-switching in the English classroom? What differences, if any, exist between the two groups? This results and discussion section begins with the participants' beliefs about CS, benefits, challenges and reported use, and continues with the participants' beliefs about not using CS, that is, their beliefs about the monolingual approach, its benefits and challenges. Every part begins with presenting the teacher student beliefs and continues with presenting the in-service teacher beliefs. We then discuss our results with the help of theories and previous research written about in our literature review under each heading.

5.1 Beliefs About Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

5.1.1 Beliefs About the Benefits of Allowing Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

The main benefit that all teacher students agree on is that CS can be useful when teaching pupils with lower proficiency. They believe that pupils who share a common language besides English can use CS to help each other understand and to draw parallels between their languages and English, with Teacher student (D) saying "they can support each other if they know the same mother tongue." In addition, three teacher students express that using CS can be a way to draw from all one's language skills to develop the target language, believing that it can help with identifying linguistic structures. Similarly, they believe that languages can be supportive of each other and that CS allows pupils to develop and use all their languages. What they mean is that CS can be beneficial to promote plurilingualism, believing that working with several languages simultaneously strengthens all of them.

Interestingly, no one expresses beliefs similar to the previously held monolingual notions, as stated in Jessner (2008, p.39), that mixing languages can be confusing for the learner. Rather, three out of four teacher students believe that CS is a natural part of using languages. Teacher student (C) says "I use code-switching in my daily life, and I think it comes natural when you know a lot of languages." This sentiment is echoed by the multilingual teacher students who have knowledge of more than three languages. These three teacher students believe that CS can be used beneficially in several ways. However, Teacher student (D) who does not know as many languages as the other teacher students views CS as useful only as a last resort.

All teacher students agree that CS is useful when teaching pupils with low proficiency, but Teacher student (A), (B), and (C) also see other benefits, using CS to speed up the learning process, to find common ground, to make sure that important points get across, and to enforce clarity and deepen vocabulary understanding. Finally, as Teacher student (C) states "I also think it can in a way make them more comfortable if they know that they can switch to another language if they don't know the word.", believing that allowing for CS is a way to reduce pressure which makes it easier for pupils to express themselves.

The in-service teachers' beliefs about the benefits of CS were similar to those of the teacher students. All the teachers agree that knowledge of many languages is beneficial to learning the target language. Similar to the teacher students, Teacher (A) regards CS as a resource when it is used as a strategy to notice, compare and translate. Furthermore, two teachers believe that CS as a strategy can be beneficial for multilingual pupils, and Teacher (C) believes that CS can be used "to supplement an explanation with a word in another language." Three teachers, akin to some teacher students, also express that when giving pupils important information about practical issues, CS is a good strategy to ensure understanding.

Similar to the teacher students, the teachers all agree that CS can be beneficial when teaching pupils with lower proficiency. Teacher (A) deems that allowing for CS results in less pressure and encourages pupils to try to speak English while allowing for a way out. Teacher (C) agrees with this, believing that if pupils are "actually trying", then he cannot see any problems with using CS. The main benefit that the teachers agree on is

22

that though CS is not the goal, allowing for it can result in pupils who feel free to express themselves without fear of being told off and silenced.

In our study, the teacher students and the in-service teachers express similar beliefs about the benefits of allowing CS. Firstly, all participants agree that CS and the use of additional languages in EFL classrooms can be beneficial to support language learning; beliefs that reflect the changing notion of CS from an unwanted feature of multilingual individuals towards an understanding of CS as a possible resource (Lee, 2012, p.147). The belief shared by all our respondents is that the main context in which CS might be beneficial is in groups with low proficiency, which indicates that CS is mainly used to perform ideational functions (Lin, 2008, p.7). These beliefs are mirrored in Cheng (2013) where one of the main factors influencing the choice to CS was the pupils' proficiency levels (p.1280). This is also in line with Lundahl's (2019) statement that multilingual approaches are mostly beneficial when learners lack sufficient target language knowledge (p.317) and with Kamwangamalu (2010) who states that CS can be useful when compensating for a lack of understanding (p.128).

Both teacher students and in-service teachers mention CS as a beneficial strategy to notice, compare and contrast languages and linguistic aspects. These findings are in line with those presented by Källkvist et al. (2017) indicating that CS is a beneficial strategy when used to facilitate learning of grammar and new vocabulary (p.29). This is somewhat backed up by Lundahl (2019) who points out that contrastive approaches can be beneficial if the languages used are related enough for positive transfer to occur (p.314). Furthermore, Ellis and Shintani (2014) cite Macaro (2011) who states that for CS to work as a strategy for language development, it should be employed in an intra-sentential manner to make meaning of separate words or lexical strings (p.233). However, Ellis and Shintani (2014) state that pupils that benefit the most from explicit grammar teaching are pupils of higher proficiency levels (p.334), and in line with Krashen's theory of $i+1$ (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p.106), it can be beneficial to teach grammar in the target language as this, albeit complex, may serve as the +1 language unit that pupils will acquire to further develop the target language. Furthermore, using the L1 to teach grammar naturally diminishes the amount of comprehensible input pupils are subjected to.

In addition to explaining new vocabulary or grammar and using CS to compare different linguistic units, most of our participants believe that CS is a beneficial strategy to ensure understanding when sharing important information pertaining to, for example, national tests. Clearly, the choice to CS in such instances is more connected to logistics than language development. To ensure understanding is of course important and Kamwangamalu (2010, p.124) points to CS as a beneficial strategy in instances where meaning has to be clarified. However, Ellis and Shintani (2014) argue that sharing important information in L1 indicates that the L1 is the preferred language when "real" communication is required, which in turn may undermine the legitimacy and status of the target language (p.236). However, perhaps it is important to differentiate between CS as a strategy to enhance communication or language development, and CS as a strategy to ensure understanding of content not directly related to the lessons. Nonetheless, the participants in our study might risk undermining the legitimacy of the target language through their use of CS.

Lastly, both teacher students and in-service teacher (C) claim that they use or allow for CS in order to facilitate intrapersonal communication and to create a safe space where pupils are encouraged to try out their knowledge of the target language. In addition, all teacher students point to the possibility of pupils who share the same native language to use each other as resources, a benefit none of the in-service teachers mention. These results indicate that the beliefs of the benefits of CS extend beyond aspects pertaining to language acquisition. Rather, the use of CS in this regard can be connected to identity formation and the creation of a sense of belonging as expressed by Kamwangamalu (2010, p.124) and Malsbary (2014, pp.1313-1315). This notion is further mirrored in the beliefs of the participants with multilingual backgrounds, who all state that CS is natural and may work as a beneficial tool to create a space where pupils feel free to express themselves. Interestingly, the participants without multilingual backgrounds do not raise this point. Though the participants in our study claim to use CS to build rapport and establish intrapersonal relations, which is similar to findings in both Mokgwathi and Webb (2013), Bateman (2008), and Greggio & Gil (2007), Ellis and Shintani (2014) point out that using the target language to fill these functions instead of resorting to the L1 helps pupils develop their communicative language skills in areas pertaining to personal expression. They furthermore contend that it is possible for teachers to foster relationships and acknowledge pupils' identities through the target language as well (p.236). CS may

very well be a beneficial strategy to establish relationships, but maintaining the target language would instead create further opportunities to broaden pupils' linguistic repertoires. Interestingly, in Mokgwathi and Webb (2013), the teachers believe that CS can be useful for intrapersonal reasons, but that allowing pupils to CS affects the pupils' confidence and ability to express themselves in English negatively (pp.121-123), which stands in contrast to the participants in our study who believe that CS can be used to strengthen pupils' ability to express themselves.

5.1.2 Beliefs About the Challenges of Allowing Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

While the teacher students could see benefits with using CS in the classroom, they could also see challenges. All the teacher students agree that using CS somewhat goes against what they have been trained to do, which is to use and stay in the target language at all times. Although three out of four teacher students allow CS in their classrooms, they believe that it is hard to find the balance between allowing pupils to use their multilingual backgrounds and to maximise target language input and output. Teacher student (A) states that "Yeah, that balance is really hard to find, especially if you don't know several languages." In this sentence Teacher student (A) also touches upon another challenge, that if pupils CS in a language the teacher does not know, then how can one know if they are using it as a resource? Furthermore, Teacher student (C) believes that if the pupils get used to using CS in the classroom then "Their language becomes more informal, it can be more difficult for English speakers to understand them in authentic settings" Teacher student (D) who sees little benefit of CS agrees that it can be "quite harmful for the conversation." All the teacher students consider a prominent challenge to be pupils relying too much on CS, resulting in pupils who do not look for other communication strategies, "they think that they can always switch language, and not speak English at all and that's a problem."

The in-service teacher beliefs about challenges with CS are on par with the teacher students' beliefs. Two teachers agree that CS results in pupils not thinking of other strategies when communicating. Furthermore, Teacher (B) and (D) state that when they themselves use CS in the classroom then "all of the students stop speaking English." The teachers also share similar views with some of the teacher students, that relying too much

on CS might cause communication breakdown in conversation with English-speakers, with Teacher (A) stating that "it's not okay because, that wouldn't make sense to an English speaking person who wouldn't know Swedish, so then that would hinder them, reaching those goals."

All participants in this study are trained to favour the monolingual approach and all advocate maximised input and output of the target language. Though all participants can find benefits with allowing CS in the classroom, the main challenge agreed upon is that the use of CS might potentially diminish the input and output of the target language and that a balance between the two is hard to find; a concern influenced by the monolingual notion of maximised input and output of the target language as a prerequisite for language acquisition (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, pp.105-106). Teachers (A), (B) and (D) claim that possible setbacks of using CS are that pupils might rely too much on CS and by that not being able to, as expressed by Teacher (A), reach the goal of finding strategies to be able to "support communication and to solve problems when language skills are inadequate" (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1), indicating a concern that too much CS might result in a decline in the standard of English.

While discussing the benefits of CS, the participants partly commented on how CS might be beneficial for language development. Interestingly, in their answers about challenges they digress from discussing CS for learning towards discussing CS for communication. Using CS for communication is a strategy that can be seen in Muller and Baetens Beardsmore (2004) where CS was used to avoid communication breakdown, and in Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) where CS was seen as beneficial when teaching content. However, in line with Krashen and the notion of maximised input, allowing for too much CS clearly diminishes the input pupils are subjected to which may affect their target language development. The participants of our study express that too much CS can result in pupils not developing other communication strategies which Ellis and Shintani (2014) support by arguing that allowing pupils to resort to their L1 to solve communication issues will hinder their language development (p.236). Naturally, to be able to communicate is a skill that is to be mastered for successful development in the target language, and the teachers seem to believe that CS as a strategy to help pupils advance in their communication skills may be both a friend and a foe.

While acknowledging CS as a useful and beneficial strategy, teacher students (A) and (B) both express the belief that it is difficult for teachers to control the practice should they not have an understanding of all languages used to CS in the classroom. These are valid concerns as both Ellis and Shintani (2014), Lundahl (2019), and Muller and Baetens Beardsmore (2004) enforce that for CS to work teachers need to have some knowledge of the languages present in the classroom. Interestingly, only one of the teachers mentions the potential exclusion of pupils not sharing the L1 with the majority of the group. As stated in Lundahl (2019) and by the teachers in Mokghwati and Webb (2013), CS between the target language and the L1 may exclude pupils whose L1 is another than that of the majority. However, this may be connected to previous experience and the extent to which teachers and teacher students have been subjected to diverse, multilingual classrooms.

5.3 Reported use of Code-Switching in the Language Classroom

The beliefs about the benefits and challenges of allowing pupils to use CS in the classroom have been made clear, but there are times in the classroom when teacher students themselves use CS. As can be gathered from the sections above, the teacher students use CS themselves when the pupils do not understand or need an explanation, "I strictly speak English at all times, unless we're really, we've hit a wall, there's communication breakdown, or when I really want to have them understand it really clearly." Furthermore, they also use CS when communicating important information that may affect pupils' performance. Moreover, while Teacher student (D) tries to not say anything in any other language than English, he does use CS when pupils have very low proficiency.

Besides using CS to help with understanding, some teacher students also use CS to build rapport. Multilingual teacher students CS more to "Build the relationship, establish a more personal relationship with the student. Building rapport let's call it", stating that when using their languages with multilingual pupils they can connect on another level. Furthermore, the teacher students believe that using pupils' multilingual backgrounds as teaching resources can give the pupils a sense of inclusion, that as a teacher it is important to affirm the pupils' own languages and cultures, "You'd want to have the students

develop, I mean, their own sense of identity, their own sense of culture or community, or belonging to something."

The in-service teachers use CS to promote understanding. Teacher (A) and (B) state that they use CS when giving important information and when helping pupils, but that they otherwise try to only speak English. Only Teacher (C) uses CS explicitly to build rapport with pupils saying, "it's fun I suppose, yes, because it's not, it's not strictly how a teacher behaves." Although not as explicit, Teacher (B) expresses that she avoids CS, but can use it when she wants to show pupils that she too can have trouble finding the English word.

The reported use of CS in classrooms by both teacher students and in-service teachers corresponds to some of the beliefs held by both groups about the benefits of allowing for CS in the classroom. However, what is striking is that though several of the participants could see benefits with using CS as a contrastive practice to help with language development, their reported use is only connected to communication strategies. Participants of both groups claim that they often use CS to stress important information not related to the content per se, or to promote understanding and solve communication breakdown. This is similar to Bateman's (2008) study where the teacher students used CS to ensure understanding of important information, or to manage the classroom (pp.12, 17-18). However, this type of use of CS does not have any clear evidence suggesting that it would be beneficial for language learning (Ellis & Shintani, 2014, p.233). In addition, there is also the risk of excluding pupils who are not proficient in the language used to clarify and give information (Lundahl, 2019, pp.314-319).

Furthermore, both teacher students and in-service teachers report that the choice of allowing for CS depends upon the proficiency levels of the pupils. Again, this mirrors the findings presented by Cheng (2013), and Greggio and Gil (2007) indicating that the choice to CS is mostly dependent upon the proficiency levels of each group, and used as a strategy to advance in the target language rather than being an explicit choice to promote plurilingualism. This even though it is stated in the Swedish syllabus for English that pupils should be given "the opportunity to develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other" (Swedish Agency for Education, 2011, p.1).

One difference between the teacher students and the in-service teachers stands out in particular. Teacher students (A), (B) and (C) alongside Teachers (C) and to some extent also (B) express that they use CS to build rapport with their pupils. This is similar to the beliefs and reported use present in Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) and in Bateman (2008), where the participants saw building rapport as one of the benefits of CS. In general, the teacher students can be said to be more aware of the effects CS may have on intrapersonal relations as they claim that allowing for CS allow them to connect with the pupils on another level. This result indicates that the choice to CS is, as put forth by Kamwangamalu (2010, p.124), either a marked or an exploratory choice made to create social belonging or display pupils' or their own multiple identities. As pointed out by Lin (2008, p.7), in such cases where CS achieves intrapersonal functions, the main incentive is to signal social belonging or to negotiate relationships rather than advancing in the target language. Teacher student (C) believes that acknowledging pupils' multilingual backgrounds may be a beneficial learning resource that creates a sense of belonging. This belief is supported by Malsbary (2014) who states that to facilitate learning, a sense of belonging is of paramount importance. Furthermore, the definition of belonging set forth by Malsbary (2014, pp.1313-1315) is mirrored by Teacher student (B) who says that the choice to CS, and by that also affirming pupils' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, is informed by the notion that "you'd want to have the students develop, I mean, their own sense of identity, their own sense of culture or community, or belonging to something", clearly exemplifying the belief held by all teacher students and some in-service teachers that CS may work as a strategy to affirm pupils' languages and by that also their identities. However, even though the use of CS to promote belonging might be valid, it should be noted that there is no hard evidence that CS for intrapersonal functions will result in improved language learning. What is shown to promote language learning is being exposed to the target language, and as Ellis and Shintani (2014) put forward, teachers should be able to promote belonging in the target language as well, simultaneously modelling how one can communicate personal matters in the target language (pp.334-333).

5.4 Beliefs About Having a Monolingual Approach in the Language Classroom

5.4.1 Beliefs About the Benefits of Having a Monolingual Approach in the Language Classroom

The teacher students, though they all use some CS in their classrooms, express that they have been trained to teach English with a monolingual approach, as it is what the syllabus states. All teacher students believe that having a monolingual approach can be beneficial for learning as "The students are encouraged and pushed to use the target language more, and that's good." On that same note, most express that using the target language is when you learn, and that a monolingual approach increases both input and output. Furthermore, two teacher students consider the possibility that a monolingual approach could be encouraging pupils to find other strategies than CS. As Student (B) states, "I think it's the ideal we should be working towards."

The in-service teachers agree that a monolingual approach is the ideal, that it would maximise output and input, and that a monolingual approach increases the opportunities for pupils to use the target language. Furthermore, they also believe a monolingual approach will help pupils stick to English. However, two teachers are more hesitant to a strict monolingual approach. Teacher (C) states that he would never have a strict monolingual approach, and Teacher (B) finds one benefit, stating that after a while of using a monolingual approach "students might start to trust themselves to start to try ask questions or say something even though they are not totally secure." However, all in-service teachers state that a monolingual approach is promoted by the syllabus for English and that no matter their own opinions, the syllabus is to be followed.

Both the teacher students and the in-service teachers agree that a monolingual approach is the ideal way to teach language. This is in line with the previously discussed notion that learning a language through the target language is the best approach. As Cummins (2007) presents, the concept of this approach is that interference from pupils' other languages should be restricted, and that it is important to maximise both input and output of the target language (pp.222-223). These beliefs are somewhat mirrored by the

participants of our study. The teacher students and the in-service teachers believe that it is when you use the language that you learn, this in line with Krashen's theory of *i+1*, and the monolingual theory that it is when you are exposed to and pushed to use the target language that you acquire language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, pp. 105-106). Both the teacher students and the in-service teachers also bring up the syllabus for English, stating that they of course should follow the instruction that "teaching should as far as possible be conducted in English" (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1).

Even though all participants allow CS, most agree that maximised input is the goal. These beliefs are in line with Corcoll López and González-Davies's (2015) findings that research on language learning is in agreement that CS should be avoided in favour of maximised exposure (p.68). The shared beliefs of the benefits of a monolingual approach are mirrored in Cheng's (2013) study where 22 out of 28 participants had negative attitudes towards allowing the use of other languages in the English classroom (p.1280), and in Mokgwathi and Webb's (2013) study where English teachers believed that they should expose their pupils to as much English as possible (pp.114-117). Furthermore, the belief that a monolingual approach helps pupils find other strategies than CS is expressed by most participants of this study.

5.4.2 Beliefs About the Challenges of Having a Monolingual Approach in the Language Classroom

All teacher students agree that there are some challenges with incorporating a strict monolingual approach in language classrooms. The main challenge that the teacher students agree on is that a monolingual approach might hinder pupils from expressing themselves, believing that it would take a long time to "build them up" to be able to speak freely. Three teacher students believe that a monolingual approach is only possible when teaching advanced pupils, but that such an approach is unrealistic, and might inhibit and/or exclude other pupils. Furthermore, Teacher student (C) expresses that "It would not be authentic to forbid all use of other languages, it's real life and we're supposed to teach them how to talk to people in real life. And I think we use all our language skills to communicate."

The beliefs of the in-service teachers differ somewhat from both the teacher students and from each other. Teacher (A) sees no real challenges, believing that a strict monolingual approach would only make her pupils better. Though one teacher sees it as ideal, she believes that it can cause difficulties for pupils with lower proficiency. However, she states that a monolingual approach is still a fair way to find common ground in heterogeneous groups. Teacher (B) and (C) partially disagree. They believe that a monolingual approach would exclude and hinder pupils from daring to express themselves and ask questions. Teacher (C) states that a strict monolingual approach is a primitive approach to teaching languages and concludes that "being a teacher means understanding what language learning is, and it is accepting and encouraging any kind of use."

The main concern about enforcing a strict monolingual approach that 6 out of 8 participants explicitly voice is the danger of excluding pupils. Furthermore, the participants believe that a strict monolingual approach might affect the pupils' relationships to each other and to teachers. This is mirrored by Malsbary (2014) who concur that speaking practices affect pupils' participation and how they construct their identities (pp.1313-1315). Furthermore, McKay (2012) states that CS is one way to encourage proficiency for all learners, regardless of language background (p.20). This angle can be seen in the participants' weariness of forbidding all CS, believing that besides excluding pupils, it can also result in hindering pupils from understanding and expressing themselves. On the other hand, Ellis and Shintani (2014), Turnbull and Arnett (2002), and Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) claim that using L1 in instruction may exclude pupils who do not have the same understanding or relation to the L1 as the majority. This is mirrored by one teacher who believes that a monolingual approach is the best way to create a fair classroom. Furthermore, contrastive to our respondents, the teachers in Mokgwathi and Webb (2013) believed that using CS would result in pupils not finding the confidence to express themselves in the target language. A thought that can be seen in Ellis and Shintani's (2014) claim that offering CS as a way out will result in pupils not finding other strategies and thereby diminishing their ability to express themselves fluently in the target language (pp.334-335). However, as both Lundahl (2019) and Ellis and Shintani (2014) point out, and as can be seen in teacher beliefs about CS versus monolingual approaches, the decision to CS should be contextual and one cannot say for sure in what instances CS will be excluding and in what instances it will be including.

Though a general statement cannot be made, one instance in which some teachers seem to regard CS as inclusive is when their pupils have very low proficiency. However, this of course also prerequisites that the teacher speaks the languages of the pupils.

Interestingly, the results of our study digress somewhat from the results in some other studies. Though it is worth noting that their findings might have been influenced by the level of proficiency of the participants, Lee (2016) finds that experienced teachers are more positive towards multilingual approaches while teacher students are more positive towards a monolingual approach (p.769). In addition, Bateman (2008) finds that teacher students, before they gain teaching experience, prefer a monolingual approach (p.15). This is not necessarily the case for the teacher students in our study, with three out of four teacher students being open to allowing several languages in their future English classrooms. Perhaps it is in this response that we can detect the shift towards multilingual approaches. Furthermore, though Teacher (A) only sees benefits with a monolingual approach, three teacher students and two in-service teachers regard it as an unrealistic and inauthentic way to teach languages, mirrored by Corcoll López and González-Davies (2015) who concur that CS comes natural to multilinguals (p.68). However, the stance that CS is something natural for multilinguals does not necessarily mean that it should be a part of English education as Ellis and Shintani (2014) state that thinking through the target language benefits target language acquisition (pp.334-335).

Curiously, though several of our participants use the syllabus as an argument to use a monolingual approach, no one refers to the plurilingual priority of ECML (2013) nor to the syllabus that also states that pupils should "develop plurilingualism where skills in different languages interact and support each other" (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2011, p.1) to support their beliefs. As have been detected above, although they can see some linguistic benefits with CS, the participants' reported use of CS and their thoughts about the monolingual approach is connected to CS as a communicative strategy. Though a formal definition of CS was introduced during the gathering of the data, it is clear that the participants' answers digressed, revealing their own beliefs about what CS is and how they believe it should be used. Therefore, their failure to bring up the syllabus to defend their choices to CS can perhaps be explained by their prevailing focus on communicative strategies.

6. Conclusions

This project has investigated teacher students' and in-service teachers' beliefs about using code-switching as a strategy in the English classroom and what differences, if any, exist between the two groups. In this concluding section we summarise the main findings and draw conclusions about the beliefs about code-switching and their possible implications for the teaching profession. We then address the limitations of this study and, finally, we give some suggestions on further research based on our findings.

First and foremost, the difference in beliefs of using CS in the English classroom is visible between those participants who have multilingual backgrounds, and those who do not have multilingual backgrounds, regardless of whether they are in-service teachers or teacher students; a result somewhat different from previous research within the field.

Secondly, all participants believe that CS works best as a complementary strategy. The main factor influencing the participants' choice to CS is the pupils' proficiency levels, and their main reported usage is CS as a communicative strategy, not as a tool to facilitate actual language learning.

Thirdly, the findings show that teacher students to a larger extent use CS to build rapport with pupils. These findings indicate that teacher students to a greater extent pay attention to language and CS as way for pupils to express their identity than the in-service teachers do.

Fourthly, both groups state that they find it hard to create a balance when allowing for CS. Several participants believe that CS is natural, but express a fear of pupils relying too much on it as their only communication strategy. We can also see that participants are hesitant to a strict monolingual approach, questioning its authenticity and worrying that it might exclude and inhibit pupils.

To conclude, though this study is too limited to draw any general conclusions, we can see several indications through the result that suggest a shift in language education. The main

finding of our study points to that although the monolingual standard is still the ideal, CS is not always seen as hindrance, and teachers and teacher students alike are open to including it in their teaching.

Finally, the results of this study can have implications for the teacher profession and might inspire teachers in their profession and make them reflect on how and why they use CS. What is seen here is that teachers use CS as a strategy to build rapport and to facilitate communication. Consequently, their large focus on CS as a communicative strategy and not as a linguistic strategy might have negative effects on language development. This implies the importance for teachers to receive in-job training on new areas and for teacher education programmes to offer insight into methods of teaching in multilingual classrooms which can further language development. This is especially important in the context in which this study was carried out where most schools have diverse and multilingual pupil populations. In such a context it is important to have knowledge of linguistics and modern language acquisition theories in order to be able to recognise when CS is useful and when it can become a hindrance to learning. Hence, Swedish teacher education programmes need to build awareness of CS, what it is, when it is useful and how the practice works in Swedish contexts. Certainly, Swedish teacher programmes need to acknowledge that though a monolingual approach is still standard, there are other multilingual strategies that can be seen in the light of shaping identity and community, and that teacher students need to be aware of the dangers and opportunities that come with such strategies.

6.1 Limitations

The main limitations for this study are: (1) The small number of participants. (2) The choice of participants, with all coming from similar contexts (3) The focus on CS in the English classroom where a larger focus on foreign language teaching might have offered a larger perspective on language learning. (4) The context of Skåne presents a specific language demographic which is not necessarily present in other parts of Sweden. (5) Because of GDPR our method does not investigate what pupils think of the use of multiple languages in the classroom. (6) Finally, as is the nature of qualitative research, this study is bound to in some ways be coloured by the researchers' ideology and does not offer any

absolute answers, but present versions of reality. All of these limitations inevitably affect the validity and reliability of our study.

6.2 Further Research

During our study, several areas that could be further explored and added to the canon of CS research emerged. Though we can, through both our result and previous research, detect a shift in beliefs about monolingual versus multilingual approaches, we cannot make any general conclusions about the underlying reasons for the shift. It would therefore be interesting to explore those reasons and what impact a shift in perspectives might have on language learning. On that note, it would be motivated to actually measure learning in an experimental study involving pupils in a CS classroom and pupils in a control, target language classroom. Furthermore, not only are the pupils' perspectives missing from this paper, they are also missing from other studies used in this paper. It would therefore be relevant to research pupils' perspectives on the use of CS in the classroom and how the inclusion of possibly unfamiliar languages would affect the pupils' sense of learning and their sense of self.

Reference List

Bateman, B. (2008). Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about using the target
   language in   the classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*. Vol. 41., No. 1.

Brinkmann, S. (2013). *Qualitative interviewing [Electronic resource]*. Oxford: Oxford
   University Press.

Cheng, X. (2013). Research on Chinese college English teachers' classroom
   code-switching: Beliefs and attitudes. *Journal of Language Teaching and*
   Research, Vol. 4., No. 6. Academy Publisher. doi:10.4304/jltr.4.6.1277-1284

Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual
   classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, (2), 221. Retrieved from
   https://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.mau.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsdoj&
   AN=edsdoj.7aabb27458d44dc5a7cac34bb6f8085f&lang=sv&site=eds-live

Elliot, M., Fairweather, I., Olsen, W., & Pampaka, M. (Ed.). (2016). A dictionary of
   social research methods.: Oxford University Press,. Retrieved 9 April 2019,
   from
   http://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191816826.001.000
   1/acref-9780191816826.

Ellis, R & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language*
   acquisition research. Abingdon & New York: Routledge

European Centre for Modern Languages of the Council of Europe. (2017). *Plurilingual*
   education. Retrieved 15/4 2019:
   http://www.ecml.at/Thematicareas/PlurilingualEducation/tabid/1631/language/n-
   GB/Default.aspx

García, O. (2011). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*
   [electronic resource]. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University
   Press.

Greggio, S & Gil, G. (2007). Teacher's and learners' use of code switching in the English
   as a foreign language classroom: a qualitative study. *Linguagem & Ensino*,
   Vol.10., No..2.,   pp.371-393. July/Dec. (2007).

Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages. Findings, trends and challenges. *Lang.*
   Teach. (2008), 41:1, 15–56. Cambridge University Press
   doi:10.1017/S0261444807004739

Kamwangamalu, N. (2010). Code-switching in education. in Hornberger, N.H.M., Hornberger, N.H., McKay, S. & McKay, S.L. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and Language Education [Elektronisk resurs]*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Kemp, C. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In Aronin, L. & Hufeisen, B. (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism. Development of research on L3, multilingualism and multiple language acquisition* (pp.11-26). Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews. [electronic resource]*. SAGE. Retrieved from https://search-ebscohost-com.proxy.mau.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05074a&AN=malmo.b1829113&lang=sv&site=eds-live

Kvalex. (n.d.) Guide till ett GDPR-korrekt examensarbete. *Malmö University*. Retrieved 9 April 2019 from: https://www.mah.se/upload/FAKULTETER/LS/Institutioner/BUS/Guide%20till%20ett%20GDPR-korrekt%20ex-arbete%20(003).pdf

Källkvist, M., Gyllstad, H., Sandlund, E., & Sundqvist, P. (2017). English only in multilingual classrooms? *LMS - Lingua*, 2017(4), 27-31.

Lee, J.H. (2012). Implications for language diversity in instruction in the context of target language classrooms: Development of a preliminary model of the effectiveness of teacher code-switching. *English Teaching: Practice And Critique*, 11(4), 137-160.

Lee, J.H. (2016). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers beliefs about the monolingual approach: differences between pre-service and in-service Korean teachers of English. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 37:8, 759-773, DOI: 10.1080/01434632.2015.1133629

Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. (4. ed.) Oxford: Oxford univ. press.

Lin, A. (2008). Code-switching in the classroom: Research paradigms and approaches. in King, K.A. & Hornberger, N. H. (eds). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education.* 2nd edition. Vol. 10. Research Methods in Language and Education. 273-286. Springer Science + Business Media LLC

Lundahl, B. (2019). *Engelsk språkdidaktik texter, kommunikation, språkutveckling*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.

Malsbary, C.B. (2014). "It's not just learning English, it's learning other cultures": belonging, power, and possibility in an immigrant contact zone. *International*

Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27(10), 1312-1336. doi: 10.1080/09518398.2013.837210.

Macaro, E. (2011). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(3). 320-337.

McKay, S.L. (2012). English as an international language. In Burns, A & Richards, J.C. (Eds.) *The Cambridge guide to pedagogy and practice in second language teachi*ng. (15-22). New York NY: Cambridge University Press

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1990). *In-depth interviewing: Researching people*. Hong Kong: Longman Cheshire.

Mokgwathi, T. & Webb, V. (2013). The educational effects of code-switching in the classroom-benefits and setbacks: A case of selected senior secondary schools in Botswana. *Language Matters, 44*(3),108–125. https://doi-org.proxy.mau.se/10.1080/10228195.2013.839734

Muller, A., & Hugo, B. B. (2004). Multilingual interaction in plurilingual classes-European school practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, *7*(1), 24–42. https://doi-org.proxy.mau.se/10.1080/13670050408667799

Nunan, D. (2001). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2011). *English*. Retrieved 17/4 2019: https://www.skolverket.se/polopoly_fs/1.174542!/English%20120912.pdf

Swedish National Agency for Education. (2013). *Curriculum for the upper secondary school*. Retrieved 17/4 2019: https://www.skolverket.se/publikationsserier/styrdokument/2013/curriculum-for-the-upper-secondary-school?id=2975

Turnbull, M., & Arnett, K. (2002). Teachers' Uses of the Target and First Languages in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*, 204–18. Retrieved from: https://search-ebscohost-com.proxy.mau.se/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ647280 &lang=sv&site=eds-live

Vetenskapsrådet (2002). *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning [Elektronisk resurs]*. Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet.

Zhang, Y., & Wildemuth, B. M. (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. In B. Wildemuth (Ed.), *Applications of social research methods to questions in information and library science* (p.308-319). Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited. Available from https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~yanz/Content_analysis.pdf

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Theme 1	Questions	Key-words/Follow-up
Work experience and knowledge	1. What is your working experience? 2. What is your education?	How long have you been teaching? Where? Subjects? Do you have experience working in multilingual settings?
	3. Do you have any other experience working/studying in multilingual settings?	Have you received training/education for teaching EFL in multilingual classrooms?

Theme 2	1. What do you know about code-switching?	Definition/shared understanding
Code-Switching		
Usage and Attitudes	2. Do you allow/use code-switching?	When?
	3. Do you ever use code-switching yourself? In the classroom? Why/why not?	Are there specific cases where students are allowed to use a language other than the target language to solve language issues and/or tasks?
	4. What benefits do you see with students using their multilingual backgrounds to learn? What challenges?	How do you think it aids and/or hinders students?
	5. Do you think allowing for code-switching in the classroom can help with language development? How?	Are there any instances when you feel it is better to use code-switching/other languages than English to teach?
	6. If you do not allow for code-switching, what other, if any, methods do you think should be used to promote and support multilingual students?	Do you use any such methods?

How have you arrived at these methods? |

Theme 3 Target Language/Monolingual Approach	1. What do you know about the target language/monolingual approach?	Definition/shared understanding
Usage and Attitudes	2. How do you use the target language in your classroom?	Are there any instances where students commonly deviate from using the target language?
	3. What benefits do you see with a monolingual approach? What challenges?	
	4. How do you think a monolingual approach aids language development? Do you think it may hinder them in any way?	How do you address these difficulties?
	5. Have your opinions regarding teaching using the target language only changed over the years?	If so, how? What, do you think, could be possible reasons for this change?
Possible additional questions arising during interview		