



Universidad
Zaragoza

Trabajo Fin de Máster

The role of codeswitching in the L2 learning
process: implications of the L1 in the English
classroom

Autor/es

Ana Poderoso López

Director/es

María Ángeles Velilla Sánchez

FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN
2022

ABSTRACT

The present Final Master's Dissertation delves into the phenomenon of codeswitching and, more particularly, its implications in the L2 classroom, with the purpose of determining to what extent this practice influences the L2 learning –either positively or negatively–. The question whether alternating between students' mother tongue and the target language in the learning-teaching process is a useful option or not has led to a broad discussion among those who believe that the L1 impedes the L2 acquisition, and those who defend that the L1 has consistent benefits in the learning process. In order to shed light to this issue, this dissertation proposes a theoretical framework in which arguments both in favour and against of codeswitching, as well as the pertinent curricular specifications have been discussed. This discussion had the objective of designing a questionnaire, directed to two different groups of students in the 4th year of ESO; and an interview, directed to the teacher of the previously mentioned groups. In this manner, the views of certain part of the educational community – more specifically, in the Secondary High School Félix de Azara– could be highly considered in the investigation. As a result, the initial theoretical discussion has been contrasted with the actual reality in the educational system, concluding that, although the ultimate goal of the L2 teaching process must be that of providing students with knowledge enough to help them communicate, codeswitching seems to have more benefits than drawbacks as long as it is a controlled practice with clear objectives.

Keywords: codeswitching, L1, L2, English as a Second Language (ESL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), multilingualism, communication, learning-teaching process.

RESUMEN

El presente Trabajo de Fin de Máster profundiza en el fenómeno de *codeswitching*, y, en particular, en las implicaciones que tiene en el aula de la segunda lengua, con el objetivo de concluir hasta qué punto esta práctica influye en la adquisición de la segunda lengua, ya sea positiva o negativamente. La cuestión de si la alternar entre la lengua materna de los estudiantes y la lengua meta en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje es una opción útil ha generado un amplio debate entre quienes creen que la primera lengua impide la adquisición de la segunda, y quienes defienden que la primera lengua tiene beneficios sustanciales en el proceso de aprendizaje. Para arrojar luz sobre este tema, este Trabajo de Fin de Máster propone un marco teórico en el que se han comentado los argumentos a favor y en contra del *codeswitching*, así como las especificaciones curriculares pertinentes. Esta discusión de argumentos tuvo como objetivo diseñar un cuestionario, dirigido a dos grupos diferentes de alumnos de 4^o de ESO; y una entrevista, dirigida al profesor de los grupos mencionados anteriormente. De esta forma, la opinión de una parte de la comunidad educativa –más concretamente en el IES Félix de Azara–

pudo ser muy tenida en cuenta en la investigación. Como resultado, se ha contrastado el marco teórico inicial con la realidad actual del sistema educativo, concluyendo que, si bien el proceso de enseñanza de la L2 debe tener como último fin el de proporcionar a los estudiantes los conocimientos suficientes para ayudarlos a comunicarse, el *codeswitching* parece tener más beneficios que inconvenientes siempre que sea una práctica controlada y con objetivos claros.

Palabras clave: *codeswitching*, primera lengua, segunda lengua, Inglés como Segunda Lengua, Inglés como Lengua Extranjera, Inglés como Lengua Franca, multilingüismo, comunicación, proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje.

INDEX

1. Introduction.....	p. 6
2. Theoretical Framework.....	p. 8
2.1. Multilingualism.....	p. 8
2.2. L1 as a resource in the ESL classroom.....	p. 10
2.3. Aragonese Curriculum.....	p. 15
3. Methodology.....	p. 16
3.1. Participants.....	p. 16
3.2. Data sets.....	p. 17
4. Discussion and implications.....	p. 18
5. Conclusions, limitations and future research.....	p. 23
6. Reference list.....	p. 26
7. Appendix 1. Observation chart.....	p. 29
8. Appendix 2. Questionnaire directed to students.....	p. 30
9. Appendix 3. Interview directed to the teacher.....	p. 31

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL: English as a Foreign Language; i.e., *Inglés como Lengua Extranjera*; and, in the educational background that has been investigated for this dissertation, English is labelled as *Primera Lengua Extranjera: Inglés*.

ESL: English as a Second Language.

ELF: English as a Lingua Franca

L1: First language. In the context of this dissertation, it will mostly refer to Spanish.

L2: Second language. In the context of this dissertation, it will mostly refer to English.

E.S.O: Compulsory Secondary Education in the Spanish educational system.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that English has broadened its presence in our current globalised world due to several factors. In the first place, English has consolidated itself as a *Lingua Franca*, meaning that it is used as a medium for communication among speakers who do not speak their native language (Kirkpatrick, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011). In this manner, English can serve as a tool that facilitates the sharing of information, ideas and opinions, among other aspects. Furthermore, it shall not be ignored that, beyond acting as a contact language, English itself is spoken in most parts of the world (Putra, 2020). Secondly, due to the increasing presence of technology, communication has gradually become computer-mediated and multimodal, which has resulted in a wide and fast spread of English as a common contact language among citizens all around the world. Therefore, it is not surprising that studying English has become a definite goal in educational curricula throughout the world, especially in those countries that belong to Kachru's Expanding Circle; that is, countries 'where English is used as a foreign language for international communication' (Tajeddin & Pakzadian, 2020, p. 3), in order for them to be up-to-date and cope with the rest of the world's developments, not only interaction-wise, but also in a wide range of fields such as science or technology. In this regard, Spain would be an appropriate and interesting focus for analysis, since English is studied as a foreign language and mainly used by its citizens to communicate and interact with the rest of the world, rather than being officially recognised as a first or second language by its administration.

Nonetheless, even if there seems to exist a general tendency to consider English as indispensable when it comes to learning and qualifications –also due to the opportunities it may bring to those who are able to use it proficiently–, it is also true that there are different and opposed views on how to address its teaching-learning process, especially regarding the role that the students' mother tongue might play in the process. In this manner, as will later on be developed in section 2, whereas certain scholars stand for a view of L2 learning where the L1 has little or nothing to do, many others argue that the students' L1 is a key tool in the second language acquisition for multiple reasons – such as instrumental or affective, among others–. Accordingly, considerable literature has been established discussing the views defending both arguments for and against the presence of the L1 in the L2 classroom, also leading to a certain amount of research in which it has been intended to analyse the role that a mother tongue, and more specifically, the phenomenon of codeswitching –that is, oscillating between the L1 and the L2 or including L1 words in the L2 production–, can play when trying to acquire another language.

Accordingly, the literature that will be later on discussed has taken into account diverse contexts, concerning the implications that codeswitching might have in concepts such as English as a *Lingua Franca*, Second Language Acquisition, or Communicative Language Teaching, among others. At some point, all these notions have also been related to the extent to which the L1 and the L2 are similar. For this reason, it would be convenient to analyse specific contexts in order to reach clear

conclusions on whether the inclusion of codeswitching within the English lessons might result helpful or not. However, it is also true that not much pre-existent research focuses on specific contexts, which might bring about relevant facts on the matter.

Thus, even if Spanish contexts have also been considered in certain articles, such as in Galindo's (2011) paper, not much research has been conducted in this regard. Accordingly, since Spain seems to be a significant country in terms of English acquisition and usage, due to its belonging to the Expanding Circle, but not many scholars had previously addressed it, it was considered opportune to centre the study of the present dissertation in a Spanish background. Moreover, it was noticed that the previous Spanish studies concerning this topic had been approached from a more general perspective, rather within a more enclosed, detailed context. As a result, it was also decided that this present dissertation would be directed towards a secondary high school – in which English was compulsorily studied as a foreign language – that had not been previously analysed.

As a result, the idea of investigating a precise Spanish context, together with the development of the Practicum II during the second semester of the Master's Degree, led the accomplishment of this present dissertation by analysing the implications of codeswitching in the Secondary Education High School Félix de Azara, in Zaragoza, Spain. The object of study, due to the possibilities that the Practicum II provided this author with, were two different groups of students enrolled in the 4^o year of Secondary School (i.e., 4^o of E.S.O. in Spanish terminology). Both groups were selected after the following criteria: first and foremost, it was determinant that they belong to the same academic year, in order for students to share –to a certain extent– similar prior knowledge; moreover, the fact that students are approximately of the same age would imply that their maturity and cognitive levels would be balanced; beyond this, it was also a key factor that both groups have the same teacher, so that their English lessons are developed in a similar manner, and the teaching style does not make a difference in students' perceptions of the language; and last but not least, it was also noteworthy that, even though they share the academic year, one of the groups follows different guidelines in terms of the level of contents. In this manner, it was ensured that the groups analysed shared enough common grounds to make the research meaningful, at the same time there existed some differences among them, in order to eventually compare the results and be able to appreciate certain patterns of differences and similarities. Beyond this, since simply analysing these students' views seemed a narrow focus, it was also decided to extend the research towards their teacher's perspective, thus having a more complete picture of the issue analysed. Furthermore, in order to try to avoid extremely personal or biased opinions, the research was also contrasted with certain observations, with the purpose of analysing the results by means of a triangulation of the three sets of data.

Thus, starting from all the above-mentioned factors, the purpose of this Final Master's Dissertation is to conduct an analysis on the role – and subsequent implications – that codeswitching might play in the course of English as a Foreign Language acquisition in a Spanish high-school context,

in order to determine whether codeswitching may influence –either positively or negatively– English acquisition, and to what extent. As such, the following research questions have been addressed in order to shed light on the issue from a closer perspective:

- RQ1: “To what extent does the literature concerning the integration of codeswitching in the L2 classroom align with the views of different members of the educational community and the Aragonese Curriculum?”.
- RQ2: “What is the best approach after which codeswitching could be used in the L2 classroom so that students benefit from it?” And more specifically, “How could codeswitching be successfully implemented in the L2 classroom in the Aragonese high school I.E.S Félix de Azara?”.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Multilingualism

It is undeniable that English has progressively gained popularity and importance all over the world throughout the years. Among the main reasons behind this expansion is the globalisation phenomenon, that has raised the necessity to find a language that serves as a means of communication mainly among those who do not share the same L1. Accordingly, linguists started to study this linguistic phenomenon under the notion of ‘English as a Lingua Franca’ (Seidlhofer, 2005). As such, ELF, which has been widely discussed in the linguistic field, was at first seen as a departure from the traditional concept of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Whereas EFL stands for the study and usage of English by non-native speakers –typically in educational contexts, in order to communicate with native speakers (Hülmbauer, 2007); ELF entails a more specific conceptualisation that appreciates English as beneficial and helpful in terms of intercultural communication, in a wider sense (Jenkins, 2015).

Beyond this reconceptualisation is the fact that at first the study of ELF focused almost entirely on form. However, with the passing of time the conclusion that ELF is a truly complex phenomenon in constant change has been reached, especially due to the increasing diversity among its users that come from varied lingua-cultural backgrounds but engage in communication using English (Jenkins, 2015). In line with this approach, Jenkins (2000) had previously reflected on the importance of ‘accommodative processes’ that ELF speakers’ experience when communicating among themselves. Hence, Seidlhofer (2008) proposed that the research and study on ELF should focus on the varied use of forms of ELF by its actual speakers – a concept that Wenger labelled as Communities of Practice (2008); and, accordingly, variability should remain central in the study of ELF.

As a result of this variability among speakers, the concept of ELF has thoroughly evolved throughout the years. Thus, Jenkins (2015) noticed the need for reconceptualisation, arguing the following reasons. First and foremost, diversity should be taken into account in order to properly address

the ELF users. Secondly, and as a consequence of the individual differences, multilingualism should be central according to Jenkins, against the traditional, monolingual approach that did not pay any attention to the rest of languages that speakers may know, and therefore ignored the individual's linguistic repertoires. The third reason stands for the previously mentioned concept of 'communities of practice', considering the actual use that ELF speakers make. This is, all the available multilingual resources that make possible to establish effective communication, rather than simply focusing on form. In relation to this, is the fact that non-native speakers of English outnumber the native speakers. Hence, it shall not be forgotten how English practices evolve as people actually use the language, and those users (i.e., most of the time, non-native speakers) who shape the language. Last but not least, Jenkins added her personal view on ELF by arguing that literature on the subject has been extremely narrowed and repetitive. Thus, it can be concluded that ELF shall be reframed after taking into account its actual use and users, rather than constraining it to the traditional conceptualisation which was focused on form and separated from ESL.

Following this line, then, the focus shall be directed now to the idea that English is more a medium of communication rather than a simple number of linguistic resources. As such, English learning and use should consider the building, negotiation and expansion of meaning. Thus, English as a language may also consider identity construction and cultural diversity, rather than simply the transmission of linguistic knowledge (Cogo, 2010). Accordingly, if one bears in mind the importance of diversity and individuals' previous knowledge, together with the emphasis placed on meaning elaboration, it is undeniable that the English learning-teaching process shall not divide the language's form and content from the speaker's inner characteristics. In other words, individuals cannot ignore their former knowledge when acquiring something new, and trying to strictly separate them from what they already know should not even be an option. To put it simply, the more that one benefits from all the available resources they may have, the better communicative outcome will be achieved. Hence, multilingualism permits to enhance successful communication, and restricting the use of individuals' multilingual resources would probably result in communication narrowness or even in the failure to communicate. These views on the dichotomy between the EFL and ELF implications were also considered by Jenkins (2006) and later on adapted by Kirkpatrick (2007) who synthesised them in the following chart.

EFL	ELF
Part of modern foreign languages	Part of World Englishes
Deficit perspective	Difference perspective
Metaphors of transfer / interference / fossilisation	Metaphor of contact / evolution
Code-mixing and switching are seen as interference errors	Code-mixing and switching are seen as bilingual resources

Table 1. Differences between EFL and ELF

As can be appreciated in Table 1, whereas EFL is part of the study of foreign languages (i.e., *Inglés como Lengua Extranjera*, in the context of this dissertation), ELF is seen as part of the concept of World Englishes; which, at the same time, is considered from the perspective of the existence of different English varieties but separately located in groups or regions (Kachru, 1985). This first differentiation entails subsequent appreciations of both notions.

As a consequence of English being seen as part of foreign languages, it portrays a deficit perspective. This is due to the fact that the main goal of the study of foreign languages is that of resembling as much as possible to the native variety. Accordingly, every aspect that might differ from those native norms, is perceived negatively. However, this view is opposed to the ELF notions, where the different varieties of English are appreciated for their diversity, rather than restricted for their insufficient resemblance to the native approach. Consequently, ELF is in constant evolution, as a result of the contact established between the people who communicate by using it. On the contrary, EFL considers those deviations from the native norm as interfering with the language. In other words, whereas ELF embraces the variations of the English language, EFL detracts from them. As a result, whereas in EFL codeswitching is seen as a mistake due to the interferences it might cause when acquiring the language, in ELF codeswitching is appreciated as a bilingual resource which can enhance language learning and acquisition.

Redirecting these general considerations to a closer approach related to this dissertation's object of research, framed in a Spanish context, it is truly interesting to bring about Velilla's (2021) conclusion that codeswitching from English to Spanish is a considerably resourceful tool that ensures conversational fluency when it comes to convey meaning as well as it enhances conceptual comprehension and lexical richness. Hence, this is directly related to the previous considerations in that ELF speakers make a clever, efficient use of the languages they already master in order to succeed in communicating with others. This is opposed to ESL views that aim to achieve a native approach to the language, so that codeswitching is more seen as a lack of English skills and knowledge than a resource from which everyone can benefit. However, this latter view is progressively considered as outdated or traditional, in favour of the reconceptualisation of the ELF notion that stands for a more varied, flexible construction of the language repertoire.

2.2. L1 as a resource in the ESL classroom.

The question whether using the L1 in the classroom of a Second Language is a convenient resource or not has been widely discussed and approached from different perspectives throughout the years by a broad range of linguists. Consequently, there is an extreme contraposition among those who defend the use of L1 in the classroom and those who stand for a monolingual approach where the L2 is the only language allowed in the teaching-learning process. As Velilla (2021) stated, this issue represents a challenge in several education institutions, especially to the conventional research and teaching

traditions. However, Edstrom (2009) noted, reducing the views on L1 use in the classroom without taking into account the contexts surrounding each teaching-learning situation independently is a mistake, as it is pointed out in Ellis & Shintani's work "Using the L1 in the L2 classroom" (2014).

In this line, several authors have reflected on the idea that it would be appropriate to consider both sides of the coin. Galindo (2011) considers that taking into account the benefits as well as the drawbacks of the L1 implementation in the classroom is crucial in order to decide the best course of action. Following this idea, she retrieved Stanley's (2002) views on the issue. Firstly, and foremost, she also aligned with the necessity of considering arguments that go from the most restrictive L1 use to a looser view on the issue. As a result, she noted that those proposals shall be based on sociocultural factors, learners' motivation and objectives, the teaching methodology, the learning environment and both the level and profile of the group of learners. To these considerations, Stanley (2002) also added Portaluri's (n.d) reflections on the ratio of students per teacher or the length of the lesson, among others. Later on, Levine (2003) elaborated on this idea by considering that the teacher's experience, the specific policies of every educational centre and the knowledge about L2 acquisition should be also taken into account in the L1 use discussion.

More precisely, this is something that has been labelled in the educational sphere under the term "codeswitching", towards which teachers frequently express their uncertainty (Macaro 2001). Accordingly, arguments both in favour and against the implementation of the L1 in the L2 classroom can be discussed

Among the most extended beliefs against the use of the L1 in the classroom is the idea that languages are best taught monolingually. This preconception comes from the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, and set the grounds for following approaches that aimed to ban the mother tongue of students at all costs. In this manner, both the Direct and the Audiolingual Methods prohibited the presence of the L1, arguing that learners should be exposed as much as possible to the language they are trying to learn, in order to avoid any interferences that the L1 might cause (Ellis, 2014). This avoidance of potential interferences, as Ellis herself stated, was based on the assumption that languages are learned through habits (i.e., the Behaviourist Approach). Therefore, new habits should be created in the place of those that the L1 entailed, because those could result in negative transfers from one language to the other (Larrea, 2002; Ellis, 2014)

This assumption, conveying that a mother tongue can impede the successful acquisition and command of a second language, has been widely discussed along the years, leading the way for extreme anti-L1 positions. (Cook, 2001a). In this manner, Anthea Tillyer – as compiled in Stanley's forum (2002) – advocated for full-L2 delivered lessons in which students get ready to overcome any struggle that the lack of understanding of the L2 might cause, because it finally will result in a successful communicative competence on the part of learners. In this manner, learners will not be dependent on the L1 every time they encounter difficulties when interacting in the second language, but rather, they

will aim to understand the contexts and explanations, and even try to think in the L2 – which, at the same time, will result in a more accurate usage of the L2 (Scott & de La Fuente, 2008; Ellis, 2014). Together with this idea neglecting the L1, Atkinson (1993) argued that the more students use the L2 within the classroom, the better will they acquire it as a consequence of the high exposure to the language. Furthermore, Polio had previously concluded that if the main functions of the lesson are accomplished by using the L1 of the students to facilitate the management, “there is little left to do in the L2” (1994, p. 154).

Cook (2001a) also elaborated on these approaches by proposing that a second language should be learnt in the most similar way that a first language is acquired, ideally separating the L1 from the L2 and using it as much as possible, by banning at all costs the native language of the students from the classroom. This monolingual assumption, which later on has been widely challenged, stands for the use of the L2 not only to explain the contents, but also to test, manage the classroom and as a vehicle for communication between teachers and students, as the Communicative Language Teaching defends (Ellis, 2014). In brief, this view considers that everything that may happen during a language lesson should be carried out in that language. In this manner, the most outstanding goal of this approach is to encourage students to use the L2 as much as possible in order for them to appreciate its immediate usefulness as well as its communicative effectiveness, enhancing learners’ engagement and motivation by letting them appreciate that they are able to communicate in the L2 without any need to resort in the L1 (Hall & Cook, 2012)

Furthermore, the fact that they are not allowed to use their L1 will create a monolingual environment in which students will emulate the interactions of native speakers as much as possible. (Hall & Cook, 2012). This approach aims to avoid that students simply focus on achieving the task – which often results in students drawing upon their mother tongue to solve any communication problem present during the course of the activity (especially in small groups), in favour of a more communicative environment (Ellis, 2014).

Despite the fact that there seems to be a huge number of linguists against the use of L1 in the L2 classroom, the truth is that those are outnumbered by the ones advocating for its presence, as will be discussed from now on. Scholars have been widely discussing the influence of the L1 in the affective-filter, which at the same time is directly related to the acquisition of a new language, due to the fact that the calmer atmosphere, the lower is the affective-filter; and therefore, the less anxiety that students will feel when learning (Duff & Polio, 1990; Cole, 1998; Wang, 2002; Zacharias, 2003; Levine, 2003; Miles, 2004; Rolin-lanziti & Varshney, 2008). Velilla (2021), sees codeswitching as an additional tool within a classroom where teacher and students share the same L1, especially when they deal with a topic that they feel closely related to. Nation (2003), Ellis (2014), Hall & Cook (2012) also share this view, stating that when learning a language, it is important not to feel threatened, and students’ L1 could help alleviate any possible anxiety derived from the limited L2 resources that they might have. Aligned with this

argument is Arthur's (1996) belief that the classroom should embody a safe space in which students should engage as much as possible, and allowing them to switch to their L1 might help in solving any communication issues when interacting in English (i.e., L2). Later on, Books-Lewis (2009) elaborated on this by adding that codeswitching in the classroom could enlarge and promote students' confidence and sense of achievement, by being able to understand and participate more as well as facilitating language acquisition.

Furthermore, more practical and instrumental reasons have been also taken into account in analysing the role of codeswitching in language acquisition. Velilla (2021) maintains that speakers usually tend to exploit all the resources available, especially in communication. To this, Ellis (2014) contributed that the L1 usage is beneficial when performing interpersonal communication and socialising; and also, as a strategy when they are asked to communicate some messages, but they do not have enough L2 resources. This, Ellis reflects, would show that the L1 can be a resourceful tool then learners' L2 knowledge is limited to face some specific communication problems. On this issue, some other authors have noted the importance of collaboration and interaction are crucial in the learning process. In this manner, collaborative dialogues are the key factor in the Social Learning Theory. This, together with the idea that the L1 could help learners interact more with one another, conveys one of the fiercest arguments in favour of codeswitching within the classroom (Brooks & Donato, 1994; Block, 2003; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Alongside these instrumental contributions, linguists have also reflected on the cognitive resources that the L1 might bring to the classroom. In particular, contrastive analysis has been considered the main argument that several authors have provided when supporting the L1 use within the L2 classroom. Ellis (2014) draws her attention to the concept of "positive transfer", which, according to Ringbom (2007) happens when both L1 and L2 are similar to some extent. In this case, learners, consciously or not, do not look for differences, they look for similarities wherever they can find them' (p. 1). These similarities will help students scaffold meaning throughout their learning process, acting both as a considerable cognitive tool and a catalyst for a positive learning environment (Ellis, 2014 & Harmer, 2007). Furthermore, other authors emphasized the role of contrastive analysis between the L1 and the L2 in order for students to notice and focus on form. In this manner, when comparing both languages, students can develop a certain awareness in language formation (Hall & Cook, 2012; Castellotti & Moore, 2002). At the same time, the fact that students are able to make connections by themselves will enhance their learning process, something that psychologist David Ausubel (2002) considered crucial in the teaching-learning process, as he argued in his Meaningful Learning Theory. For him, meaningful learning happens when the new knowledge is, to some extent, related to the learner's prior knowledge, since it can be retained and applied more easily. Beyond this contrastive approach is the belief that L1 usage can enhance L2 acquisition by means of clarifications that will boost the comprehension and subsequent learning of new words. On the one hand, students can rely on their L1 – as long as every member in the classroom shares the same mother tongue— to

make questions and discuss clarification of words with the teacher, so that they feel sure about their understanding of the contents. On the other hand, teachers can take advantage of this L1 use to introduce and present new vocabulary words to their students (Kalivoda, 1990; Macaro, 2001; Hall & Cook, 2012). Hence, the L1 serves as a strategic vocabulary channel from which both sides can benefit.

Linguists also draw their attention to the fact that prior knowledge plays a crucial role in effective language learning and acquisition in that it enhances noticing, contrastive analysis and clear links between languages (Hall & Cook, 2012). As such, the L1 cannot be ignored or avoided within the classroom. As Galindo (2011) stated, a mother tongue cannot be unlinked from the learning process of a new language, an idea that aligns with Cook’s (2001b) statement that people “who speak more than one language should be considered in their own right” (p. 195). In this manner, one cannot ignore the fact that a native speaker of whatever language has some inherent knowledge attached to him/her, and ignoring that inherent rationale would not only be seen as a mistake but also as a sign of disrespect to the students’ L1 if considering that English is somewhat superior (Nation, 2003). This does not necessarily mean that the L1 has to be the protagonist in the L2 classroom, but rather seen as helpful as long as its use is controlled and limited by pedagogical purposes – and especially in precise tasks (Atkinson, 1987). Apart from this argument, there is also the notion that the language learning process shall be considered as any other learning process in which the learner brings all his/her previous knowledge and skills in order to establish the new connections (Bransford, Brown and Cocking, 2000; Rinvolutri, 2003; Cummins, 2007). In this manner, students take advantage of various multilingual resources, being able to accommodate their strategies for various purposes (Cogo, 2009).

The main arguments of the afore discussion have been gathered and countered to one another in the following table.

Arguments against the use of the L1	Arguments in favour of the use of the L1
Languages are best taught monolingually.	Students’ L1 might act as a tool to scaffold meaning, guiding students towards a focus on form which ultimately might result in awareness in language formation.
The L2 should be acquired in the same manner as the L1.	Meaningful learning takes into account the students’ prior knowledge.
	Students’ mother tongue shall not be unlinked from the learning process, since it is an inherent characteristic.
	Students take advantage of various multilingual resources, which would enhance L2 acquisition.

L1 could impede the successful acquisition of the L2, since it might create dependence.	The L1 lowers the affective-filter, which decreases students' anxious feelings when learning
	Important not to feel threatened, and L1 might help when there are L2 limited resources.
The more students use the L2 in the classroom, the better will they acquire it.	L1 might enhance learners' self-confidence and sense of achievement.
Exposure should be the ultimate goal of L2 teaching, avoiding L1 interferences.	Positive transfers are resourceful when it comes to contrastive analysis, especially when the L1 and the L2 are similar.
Languages are learned through habits and L2-new habits should be implemented in the place of the L1.	The L1 might serve as an additional tool, especially when they deal with closely-familiar topics.
If the L1 is constantly present in the classroom, there is little work left to be done in the L2.	L1 might help to solve communication struggles, not only contents-wise but also in relation to classroom management.
If students interact among themselves in the L2, they will emulate interaction of native speakers as much as possible, which would not be possible if students immensely rely on the L1.	Collaboration and interaction are crucial in the learning process and L1 could make students interact more among themselves.
L2 usage in the place of L1 will make students appreciate L2 immediate usefulness.	The L1 might serve as a pertinent tool when it comes to concepts' clarification and new vocabulary channel.

Table 2. Contraposition between arguments and counterarguments for the L1 presence in the classroom.

2.3. Aragonese Curriculum

Apart from the convenient considerations that have been made regarding linguistic concepts (e.g., ELF, ESL, multilingualism...) it is also of extreme importance for the present investigation to take into account the legal grounds upon which the learning-teaching process is accomplished in the analysed context for this dissertation (i.e., the IES Félix de Azara, in Zaragoza).

On the one hand, it is necessary to first look at the specific provisions for *Inglés como Lengua Extranjera* in the Aragonese Curriculum. From them, both the Learning to Learn Competence and the Linguistic Communication Competence have been selected in accordance with the present discussion. The former assumes that students “learn to learn” when they reflect about the strategies that they use to acquire knowledge by reflecting on their self-learning process, making special emphasis on the employed procedures. In this manner, the fact that students are aware of their own learning techniques enhances their competence. As regards the use of the L1 within the classroom, it could be assumed that, as long as students are aware of how, when and why they are recurring to their L1 in the L2-acquisition process, their Learning to Learn would not be affected but rather it could be even enhanced, making students reflect on their learning methods.

Nonetheless, the latter (i.e., Linguistic Communication Competence) stands for the development of the communicative ability by means of a contextualised and functional usage of the language (in this case, the Second Language). Accordingly, one might reach the conclusion that making use of the L1 in the L2 classroom would interfere to some extent with the acquisition of communicative competence, since L1 usage would lessen the amount of L2 that students use within the classroom.

However, this Competence also argues that the Second Language Acquisition is somehow related to the L1 knowledge, consolidating not only that knowledge but also the skills and attitudes that both languages require. Hence, it is not surprising that the L1 plays a crucial role in L2 acquisition, even though at first it might not seem the most accurate choice for some teachers. In relation to this idea, the Aragonese Curriculum proposes evaluation standards “Est.IN.2.2.1” and “Est.IN.2.1.2.”. First and foremost, these standards intend that students are able to participate in fluent conversations — both formal and informal—on varied subjects. Beyond this, the curriculum also aims that students produce coherent discourses adapted to the particular communicative situations, at the same time they are aware of the language use, which may help them to improve their productions (Aragonese Curriculum, p. 56, my own translation.) Hence, it should be taken into account that, beyond the idea that students need as much exposure as possible to the target language, it is also important that they count on the necessary resources to improve their language skills, which include not only the linguistic proficiency itself but also other features related to language. Therefore, the L1 might help with both pragmatic and contextual knowledge, as it can serve as a tool for clarification (see Table 2). For this reason, despite the fact that the L1 will not play a role in fluency development, it will contribute to scaffold meaning by building necessary context adapted to the task.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

In order to properly address the main aim of the dissertation it was firstly required to do some literature review on various topics concerning the notions of ELF and EFL, as well as the role of multilingualism and the L1 in the L2 acquisition as has been discussed in section 2. In this manner, the grounds upon which this dissertation has been developed were specified. Beyond the literature review, it was decided by this author to design two questionnaires: one directed to students – which, at the same time, was directed to two different groups of students —, and one for the teacher of those groups to answer.

The groups selected as participants of this study were chosen after the following criteria: In the first place, both groups of students were chosen because they belong to the same academic year (i.e., 4th year of ESO), which seemed resourceful in terms of comparative analysis. Secondly, both groups seemed of interest due to the nature of their curricular development. Whereas the first group (henceforth, 4°D), does not have any curricular/content adaptation and follows a regular 4° of ESO coursebook (i.e., Together 4° of ESO, Oxford); the second group (henceforth 4°A) requires the use of an adapted coursebook (i.e., Teamwork 4, Burlington Books). In other words, even though the students are all in the same academic year, they experience completely different teaching-learning processes and methods, especially due to the nature of the A group. Students in this class have complicated personal backgrounds, have retaken some courses or have skipped classes in previous years. Accordingly, it was believed that the results in both groups might bring about interesting insights regarding the use of L1,

especially in accordance with the level of the groups and the differences in the lesson plans as well as their own personal views on the matter. At the same time, the fact that the interviewed teacher is in charge of both groups was a determinant factor, so that his/her view may contribute with truthfulness to the study and its conclusions. Apart from this, his/her opinions on the matter might either corroborate or contradict the students' views, which may result in interest for future investigations. Both the questionnaire and the interview were designed after the theoretical framework was built, aligned with the main principles discussed in that section.

3.2 Data sets

Following the line of the methodological design for this dissertation, three different data sets – which permitted the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data – were collected as follows, with the objective of triangulating them and extracting considerable inferences that generate solid grounds upon which final conclusions are supported in the dissertation.

In the first place, the classrooms' dynamics were observed during the placement for the 'Practicum II' in the course of the second semester in the Master's degree. During this period, that went from the 21st of March (2022) to the 29th of April (2022), observations in relation to L1 presence and purposes in the development of the lessons were registered in both groups. Moreover, this observation was combined with this author's own implementation of materials and teaching, which served as a complementary tool to the observation practice, since it brought about detailed nuances and interesting conclusions from a holistic point of view. In other words, the dynamics were in the first place observed from an outsider point of view and later on those observations were experienced from an insider perspective. In order to follow an accurate register, an observation chart adapted from the Practicum II observation task 2, "*The Use of the mother tongue (L1)*" was used as a tool (see appendix 1). In this register, the purpose was to note and exemplify students' use of the L1 and the teacher's reaction to it, with the determination of analysing the implications behind the dynamic and extracting qualitative data that served as reflection tool

Secondly, a questionnaire was designed and circulated among students in both groups. This questionnaire, based on the grounds settled in the Theoretical Framework (section 2), intended to collect students' views on the role of the L1 and codeswitching in the English classes. In order to do so, the questions were built on diverse matters previously discussed. Accordingly, the set of questions (see appendix 2) evolved around the role of codeswitching in relation to concepts' clarification, scaffolding, development of tasks, interaction and the affective-filter in the learning process. In this manner, the questionnaire was proposed so that it served as a tool for either validating or refuting the previous observation process, since it was circulated towards the end of the Practicum II placement, after the observation task's main conclusions had been extracted. Beyond this, it is worth commenting on the design of this questionnaire, as it permitted to measure students' views both quantitatively –with yes/no

format questions– and qualitatively – with a space devoted for students’ open justification on their previous answers–.

The last data were extracted from the teacher’s interview (see appendix 3), also designed according to the Theoretical Framework (section 2). This personal interview had the aim of appreciating whether the first observations as well as students’ views on the codeswitching were also appreciated from the teacher’s perspective or not. Hence, this last step in the data collection was a key element in the data triangulation, as it considered not only similar aspects to the previous tools (i.e., affective filter, interaction, performance...) but also more specific elements adapted to the teacher’s role (i.e., class management, class preparation, sense of responsibility or guilt...), which provides the discussion with sufficient support.

4. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Relying on the aforementioned data sets (i.e., students’ questionnaire, teacher’s interview and this author’s observations), it is of interest now to triangulate the obtained results and then contrast them with the previously established Theoretical Framework, in order to successfully appreciate the L1 implications in the L2 classroom.

As to whether codeswitching serves as a resourceful tool to apprehend English, 100% of students, both in 4^oA and 4D groups agree on the idea that the introduction of the L1 in L2 explanations helps them understand and remember concepts better. In that regard, the teacher recognises, in the first place, that even though he avoids using Spanish as much as possible, code switching is helpful in the lessons when he feels that some specific grammar points need clarification. Furthermore, the teacher acknowledges that codeswitching is extremely useful when dealing with specific or precise vocabulary, especially when those concepts do not exist in the students’ L1 and some nuances need further clarification. As an example, the teacher refers to the expression “take for granted”. Both students and teacher’s views were correlated to this author’s observations. Despite the fact that students’ beliefs or opinions cannot be objectively measured from an outsider point of view, it was repetitively observed that students tend to ask “How do you say X in Spanish?”, which implies that students prefer translations when it comes to concepts acquisition. Hence, it is pertinent to bring about again Kalivoda (1990), Macaro (2001) and Hall & Cook’s (2012) views on the matter, who state that the L1 can serve as a means for L2 enhanced acquisition by clarifying some terms and therefore boosting comprehension and learning of words, especially if students can discuss their doubts with the teacher.

Beyond this previously presented instrumental tool, it was also intended to discover if the L1 has a role in students’ affective filter. In that regard, 87,5% of students in group 4^oA and 75% of students in group 4^oD admitted that codeswitching helps them alleviate their anxiety in the classroom, especially if they sense that their resources are limited; and therefore, creating a safe environment for everyone in the classroom, an idea on which 100% of students in group 4^oA and 85% of students in group 4^oD

agreed. Students' views on this matter were also correlated by the teacher's insights, which revolve around the idea that codeswitching and Spanish use is truly significant for students who struggle with anxiety issues or those who are more introverted. Hence, the teacher acknowledges that students' level of stress may lessen whenever they feel stuck with something they do not know and can rely on Spanish. As to what has been observed, it can be stated that students who seemed nervous or anxious when speaking in English always made it clear if they did not know how to say something in English and they stopped trying straight away, especially in the group 4^oA. On the contrary, whenever they were allowed to use a Spanish term, they felt calmer and contributed more. In this regard, Notion (2003), Ellis (2014) and Hall & Cook (2012), gave a considerable importance to the idea that when learning a language, it is important not to feel threatened. For this reason, the L1 could serve as a tool to alleviate students' feeling of anxiety if it is derived from their L2 limited resources, thus helping to lower students' affective-filter, which can create a calmer atmosphere for learning (Duff & Polio, 1990; Cole, 1998; Wang, 2002; Zacharias, 2003; Levine, 2003; Miles, 2004; Rolin-lanziti & Varshney, 2008). Lastly, both the lessening of the affective-filter and the subsequent anxiety alleviation seem to be crucial in order to create a safe environment, which Arthur (1996) found determinant for students to engage in the lessons as much as possible.

In relation to the role of codeswitching in communicative situations, 100% of students in group 4^oA and 80% of students in group 4^oD admitted that introducing Spanish terms helps them in those circumstances when they need to say something to their teacher and they do not know how to do it appropriately in English. On his/her part, the teacher appreciates that codeswitching serves as a communication tool especially when, even though a huge effort on their part is noticed, students cannot find a way to express themselves in English. Accordingly, the teacher admitted that even though he/she intends to avoid using Spanish as much as possible –in favour of L2 immersion–, he/she relies on it whenever an extremely important message needs to be transmitted to the students. He/she exemplifies this situation by pointing out that he/she may clarify exam's dates or assignment's instructions if he/she notices that students might have not properly understood them. The teacher's view was corroborated by the observations of the dynamics of the lessons, where it was noticed that every time that students encountered the need to ask something to the teacher – especially if the doubt was related to exams or assignments –, they did it in Spanish. Equally, whenever the teacher was about to explain something important, they asked the teacher to do it in Spanish, which in the end resulted in the teacher's predisposition to clarify this information directly in Spanish, without students' request to do so. Aligned with these insights, are Velilla's (2021) views on the usefulness of the exploitation of all the resources that students might have available – including their mother tongue knowledge – in language acquisition. Similarly, Ellis (2014) concluded that the L1 can be a resourceful tool in cases where students do not have enough L2 resources to face some specific communication problems.

Closely related to this previous discussion is the question whether L1 has any influence on students' interaction or not. To this, students in group 4^oA showed their agreement with a 100% of affirmative answers, followed by group 4^oD with a 95%. In this manner, students see a clear relation between the use of Spanish words and the interaction with their peers. However, the teacher showed an opposed view, as he/she feels that once that students start introducing Spanish terms when speaking among themselves, they end up excessively relying on their mother tongue and leaving English aside. In this regard, students do interact, but they do not use the L2 as much as they could. For this reason, the teacher believes that it might result counterproductive. As for the observations in this regard, it was noticed that in group 4^oD students tried to speak in English among themselves more often than in 4^oA. However, whenever students in both groups started to introduce Spanish terms in interaction, they ended up not following that English interaction but rather speaking in Spanish the whole time, as the teacher claimed. As for whole-class interaction (e.g., in whole-group discussions), students participated more if they included one or two terms in Spanish in an English sentence in order not to be stuck when speaking, so it could be stated that in that case, codeswitching favoured students' interaction. Furthermore, closely related to L1 implications on interaction is the influence that it may have in group-work realisation. Students in both group 4^oA and 4^oD admit, with 93,75% and 95% respectively, that Spanish undoubtedly facilitates the accomplishment of activities and tasks when working together. In this matter, the teacher recognises that codeswitching does influence the development of group-work in some occasions, although students do not rely on it very much –instead, they end up speaking only in Spanish, as previously commented. He/she also appreciates that being able to switch between English and Spanish can indeed make students feel more confident sometimes, but beyond this he does not appreciate many more advantages because they tend to overuse L1 in detriment of L2 usage. As for what had been observed, it was noticed that codeswitching totally helped students to complete group activities, especially in those groups of students where the English level varied among them. However, as previously said, sometimes they relied on Spanish too much and deviated from the task. Concerning both issues – i.e., L1 role in interaction and group-work development – certain authors previously mentioned such as Brooks and Donato (1994), Block (2003) or Lantolf and Thorne (2006) drew the attention to the importance of collaboration and interaction in the learning acquisition process. Hence, it is true that cooperative work might set the grounds upon which successful learning occur, and the L1 seems to be helpful in this regard, as students tend to speak more if they use it. Nonetheless, it has been observed that the uncontrolled recurrence to the mother tongue can end up being counterproductive, as students may both deviate from the assignment and not practise with the L2 enough.

Another aspect that was taken into consideration when analysing the students views on codeswitching was if the fact that they needed to rely on Spanish to express themselves made them feel that English is a language in which they are not able to fully communicate. Interestingly enough, this aspect arose opposed views on the part of respondents. Whereas the 62,5% of students in the group 4^oA

appreciated that codeswitching does make them sense that they are unable to communicate, the 75% of students in group 4°D rejected this belief. These extremely opposed views might be a consequence of each group's nature. As has been previously commented on and also observed in the class dynamics, 4°A students come from different educational and personal backgrounds, and most of them had experienced difficulties in the learning process. As a consequence of this, they used to feel anxious when performing in class, as well as they constantly tended to consider themselves unable to achieve the proposed tasks and activities, which made them feel demotivated with higher frequency; and, eventually, they ended up underestimating their capacities. On the contrary, 4°D students were perceived as more confident whenever they had to express themselves out-loud. They did not hesitate as much when they did not find the appropriate word, and most of the times, in the end they found another way to entail the same meaning of what they wanted to say in the first place. The teacher's views were also correlated to this vision, in the sense that he/she also perceived a gap between one group's self-perception and the other. However, he/she did not reach any specific conclusions regarding students' own perceptions on whether they saw English as a language they can fully communicate or not, because he/she considers that it is a rather specific point of view in which each individual might differ. As for the literature, the Communicative Language Approach (CLT) stands for environments where students practise the L2 as much as possible, so that students appreciate both the immediate usefulness of the language they are trying to learn, and their own ability to communicate in the L2 without resorting in their mother tongue (Hall & Cook, 2012). In this manner, this L2 restricted view that the CLT defends would align with 4°A students' views on English as a language in which they are not able to communicate, since they get frustrated whenever they have to introduce L1 terms.

On a different level, students were asked to reflect on whether codeswitching helps them appreciate similarities and differences between both languages (i.e., L1 and L2) or not. Again, students showed agreement to a great extent. In 4°A, 75% of students admitted that changing between English and Spanish is a resourceful tool for them to contrastively compare both languages and therefore make meaningful connections; and the 95% of students in 4°D shared also this view. Even though the teacher did not make any telling reflections on this matter, it was indeed observed in the classroom dynamics of both groups that students frequently resorted to comparisons between both English and Spanish, especially regarding vocabulary, with statements such as "*Esta palabra es como en español*" ("*This word is the same as in Spanish*"), "*Esta palabra no se parece en nada al español*" ("*This word has nothing to do with Spanish*") or "*¿Cómo se dice X en español?*" ("*How do you say X in Spanish?*"). For this reason, it has been concluded that students see contrastive analysis as a resource from which they can acquire or remember better certain terms. Once again, this instrumental process would be aligned with Velilla's (2021) idea on letting students bring about all their previous knowledge, including their L1 awareness. Beyond this, Ellis (2014) took into consideration the notion of 'positive transfer', especially when, according to Ringbom (2007) L1 and L2 are not extremely different from one another,

as they can look for similarities that can help them to scaffold meanings on their own (Ellis, 2014 & Hammer, 2007). This individual process prompts that students make connections on their own, something crucial in the Meaningful Learning Theory proposed by Ausubel (2002), which defends that the fact that students make connections between what they already know and what they are learning enhances the learning process.

The last part of the questionnaire was dedicated to the relation between the amount of codeswitching and the level of English. On the one hand, 62,5% of students in 4^ºA and 50% of students in 4^ºD do not believe that if Spanish was not allowed at all in the classroom, they would learn more and faster. In other words, those students do not reckon that codeswitching plays a bad influence on their English learning process, which would align with all the previously displayed results where students admitted that the inclusion of Spanish terms is helpful for their understanding. On the contrary, the teacher also considers the scenario where students that abuse L1 use do not benefit from the English lessons as much, so that he/she believes, to a certain extent, that codeswitching can play a bad influence on L2 acquisition, especially if it ends up being an uncontrolled practice. Consequently, he/she fiercely admits that he/she feels guilty whenever he/she does not use English in the classroom, considering that the role of the English teacher should be that of the facilitator. Subsequently, the teacher is convinced that as much amount of language exposure as possible should be provided by him/her, to make sure that in the end students have possibilities to end up mastering the English language. The view of the teacher is backup by an extensive display of literature in which several authors stand for full-L2 delivered lessons in favour of language acquisition. As noted in the Theoretical Framework, there was a tendency during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to believe that languages are best taught monolingually, setting the grounds for certain approaches such as the Direct and Audiolingual Methods, in which the L1 shall be banned from the class (Ellis, 2014). If those methods are to be followed, students will not become dependent of the L1 –as the teacher fears– but rather they will start thinking and solving communication problems in the L2, resulting in a more accurate use of the L2 (Scott & de La Fuente, 2008; Ellis, 2014). Beyond this, Atkinson's (1993) ideas also corroborate the teacher's opinion of L2 exposure, arguing that the more students listen to and use the L2 within the classroom, the better will they master it. As for the observations, it is true that it was noticed that the lessons where Spanish was not used were more profitable in terms of vocabulary acquisition. Nonetheless, regarding grammar clarification, especially in 4^ºA group, codeswitching was required and played a crucial role in knowledge-transmission, in order to ensure students' comprehension. For this reason, it can be concluded, once again, that codeswitching can serve as a resourceful tool in language acquisition as long as it is a controlled practice with clear aims.

On the other hand, 81,25% and 95% of students in groups 4^ºA and 4^ºD respectively acknowledge that codeswitching becomes less necessary as they progress with English. In other words, the majority of respondents consider that the more English they know, the less Spanish they need to

introduce in the class. This is reinforced by the teacher's views on the matter. He/she admits that even if he/she tries to use the same amount of English in every group at the beginning of each academic year, it gets complicated as the year advances because not every group is on the same page level-wise. Accordingly, in classes where the level is a bit lower, codeswitching is crucial in order to make the key points clear for everyone. On the contrary, he/she believes that in the groups where the level is higher, this is not always necessary because clarifications can be done in English and students feel comfortable this way. Beyond this, the teacher is also aware of the differences that might exist inside one single classroom, since there can be classes where some students are more advanced than others (i.e., having in one classroom students that are on a B1 level whereas others might have a C1). In those situations, it is clear for him/her that some students use more the L2 than others, reinforcing the belief that the more English they know, the lesser Spanish they use. All this detailed explanation on the teacher's part was confirmed with the observation stage, in which it was undoubtedly appreciated that codeswitching was more used and required with students whose level was a bit lower. This idea that a more settled English knowledge will lessen the amount of L1 required to communicate and learn can be compared to the Behaviourist Approach and its assumption that languages are learnt through habit-formation (Ellis, 2014). In this sense, it could be understood that a student with a more proficient command of L2 is able to create and reproduce habits in that L2 instead of using the L1 as a resort.

5. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The present dissertation has intended to frame the wide scope of views both for and against of the use of codeswitching in educational contexts, in order to set the grounds upon which a new investigation could be delivered. This has been conducted taking into account not only the pre-existent literature and curricular notions but also –and more important– actual and current learning-teaching practices in a Secondary high school in Zaragoza (Spain) in order to appreciate whether those theoretical backgrounds align the educational reality or not.

Concerning the detractors of codeswitching it has been mainly argued that languages should be learnt and taught monolingually, avoiding any potential interferences or negative transfers from the L1 to the L2 and acquiring new habits directly in the target language. Beyond these principles, it has been also widely commented on that students should experience an immersive educational situation in which exposure to and practice in the L2 are the ultimate aims (Larrea, 2002; Ellis, 2014). On the contrary, codeswitching defenders state that it might serve as a resourceful tool if it is taken into account that students could make the most of their multilingual resources and their previous knowledge, building meaningful learning processes on their own (Velilla, 2021) and enhancing their Learning to Learn Competence at the same time. Hence, considering both positions as a starting point, a questionnaire, an interview and an observation rubric were designed in order to value the positions that different members of the educational context may have in this regard.

Once all the data were collected, the main extracted conclusions revolve around Ellis (2014) and Velilla's (2021) views. First of all, around the idea that the L2 shall ideally be taught in an as much immersive situation as possible in order to provide students with plenty of opportunities to develop their L2 competence; without leaving aside students' prior knowledge – in which multilingual resources may play a crucial role –. In this manner, students should be considered on their own right and nature, considering that what they already know might help them develop further their L2 skills. Beyond this, affective factors are also an important reason to incorporate codeswitching in English lessons, as it can lower the students' affective filter, reducing their anxiety and therefore enhancing their language acquisition (Duff & Polio, 1990; Cole, 1998; Wang, 2002; Zacharias, 2003; Levine, 2003; Miles, 2004; Rolin-lanziti & Varshney, 2008), a factor to which students have shown high agreement. Finally, more instrumental reasons such as meaning or instructions clarification have been extensively argued (Kalivoda, 1990; Macaro, 2000; Ringborm, 2007; Hall & Cook, 2012) and reinforced by students' perceptions, as they clearly admitted that their mother tongue helped them to clarify meanings and remember better those concepts that are similar to their L1.

Eventually, and trying to establish an ideal situation in which codeswitching is resorted in the best manner, it has been concluded that codeswitching seems profitable in the L2 teaching-learning process as long as it is a controlled practice with clear aims. That is, neither that the L1 becomes the protagonist in the L2 lessons, nor that it prevents students from being considerably exposed to and practising the L2 – following what Larrea's (2002) and Ellis' (2014) proposed–; but rather making the most of what they already know and giving them sufficiently clear instructions or clarifications when required – after Hall & Cook's (2012), Velilla's (2021) et al. argued.

Hence, the inclusion of codeswitching with clearly defined goals may help enhance students' Learning to Learn Competence as well as their Linguistic Competence, both extensively present in the Aragonese Curriculum. The former would be present any time that students resort in the L1 as long as they are aware of the purposes behind that choice, in the way that they would be conscious of their own learning strategies. The latter would include the fact that L1 and L2 can be related to some extent, since every single language requires certain skills and attitudes in order to progress with the language acquisition. Therefore, it could be stated that certain strategies that students may have in their own L1 could be transferred to their L2 learning process, helping to consolidate the target language acquisition.

On a different level, even though the present dissertation has considered three different data sets to conduct the investigation, it is also slightly limited due to the reduced number of respondents. Accordingly, even if the results have brought about enough information to consider certain aspects regarding the use of code switching –such as anxiety-reduction factors or meaning-making among many others–, it would be truly relevant to conduct in the future further research in similar contexts in order to compare and contrast the results and be able to analyse potential tendencies.

In this manner, those factors that have been extensively agreed on by the respondents of this investigation could possibly be ratified if a wider number of answers was collected along the same lines. Equally, for those inquiries where the opinions are more diverse in the present investigation – that is, those percentages which do not show a clear tendency towards one side or another –, it would be appropriate to observe the tendencies with more respondents, in order to have a more reliable picture on the matter.

Finally, it is worth remarking the necessity to find a balance between students' needs and the ideal L2 teaching-learning situation. A background in which students acquire the necessary competences to successfully communicate at the same time that their specific needs – in relation to level, anxiety or lack of comprehension in a precise moment, among other issues previously exposed – seems the best option in the learning-teaching process.

6. REFERENCE LIST

- Arthur, J. (1996). Code switching and collusion: Classroom interaction in Botswana primary schools. *Linguistics and Education* 8, 17–33.
- Atkinson, D. (1987): “The mother tongue in the classroom: a neglected resource?”, *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), págs. 241 – 247. Atkinson, David (1993a): Teaching monolingual
- Atkinson, D. (1993): *Teaching monolingual classes*. Londres, Longman.
- Ausubel, D. P. (2002) Adquisición y retención del conocimiento. Una perspectiva cognitiva. Barcelona: Editorial Paidós Ibérica.
- Bransford, J., A. Brown & R. Cocking (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Castellotti, V. & Danièle M. (2002): Representations Sociales Des Langues Et Enseignements. Guide pour l’élaboration des politiques linguistiques éducatives en Europe – De la diversité linguistique à l’éducation plurilingue. Division des politiques linguistiques, Conseil de l’Europe. www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/CastellottiMooreFR.pdf
- Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversations: A study of pragmatic strategies. In A. Mauranen, A. and E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a Lingua Franca: Studies and Findings* (pp. 254 - 273). Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Cole, S. (1998): “The Use of L1 in Communicative English Classrooms”, *The Language Teacher Online* 22.12. <http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/98/dec/cole.html>
- Cook, V. (2001a): “Using the First Language in the Classroom”, *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57 (3), págs. 402 – 423.
- Cook, V. (2001b): *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics (CJAL)* 10.2, 221–240.
- Edstrom. A. (2009). Teacher reflection as a strategy for evaluating L1/L2 use in the classroom. *Babylonia*, 1, 12–15.
- Ellis, R., and Shintani N. (2014). *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. London and New York: Routledge, pp- 225-248.
- Galindo Merino, M^a M. “L1 en el aula de L2: ¿por qué no?”. *ELUA. Estudios de Lingüística*. N. 25 (2011). ISSN 0212-7636, pp. 163-204
- Hall, G. and Cook, G. (2012) Own-language use in language teaching and learning: state of the art. *Language Teaching*, 45 (3). pp. 271-308. ISSN 0261-4448 Published by: Cambridge University Press URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000067>>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- Kalivoda, T. (1990) Teaching grammar in the target language. *Hispania* 73(1), 267–69.

- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larrea, E. (2002): “Should we (or should we not) use L1 in the communicative English classroom?”. *APPROACH. A Journal for English Language Teaching in Cuba*, December. http://www.up.edu.pe/idiomas/programas_ingles/go_beyond_nuevo.php?pid=7
- Levine, G. S. (2003): “Student and Instructor Beliefs and Attitudes about Target Language Use, First Language Use, and Anxiety: Report of a Questionnaire Study”, *The Modern Language Journal*, 87 (3), págs. 343 – 364.
- Macaro, E. (2001): “Analysing Student Teachers’ Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making”, *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (4), págs. 531 – 548.
- Miles, R. (2004): *Evaluating the use of L1 in the English language classroom*. Memoria de máster para la *School of Humanities* de la Universidad de Birmingham, UK. <http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/Milesdiss.pdf>
- Nation, P. (2003): “The role of the first language in foreign language learning”, *Asian EFL Journal*, 5 (2). http://asian-efl-journal.com/june_2003_pn.pdf
- Orden ECD/489/2016, de 26 de mayo, por la que se aprueba el currículo de la Educación Secundaria Obligatoria y se autoriza su aplicación en los centros docentes de la Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón, no 105, 12640-13458.
- Polio, C. (1994): “Comments on Elsa Roberts Auerbach’s “Reexamining English Only in the ESL Classroom”, *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, págs. 153 – 157.
- Putra, E. (2020). The Importance of Learning English Nowadays. -. 7.
- Ringbom, H. 2007. *Cross-linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Rinvolutri, M. (2003): “Contrasting language exercises using mother tongue sensibly”, BBC/British Council Teaching English. IATEFL 2003. http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/iatefl2003/magali_26.shtml
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. & Varshney, R. (2008): “Students’ Views Regarding the Use of the First Language: An Exploratory Study in a Tertiary Context Maximizing Target Language Use”, *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 65 (2), págs. 249 – 273.
- Tajeddin & Pakzadian *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* (2020) 5:10 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00089-9>
- Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*. 59/4. 339-341. 10.1093/elt/cci064.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2008). ELF findings: form and function. Plenary paper given at the First International ELF Conference, Helsinki, March 2008.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2011). *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, K. (ed.) (2002): “Using The First Language In Second Language Instruction: If, When, Why and How Much?. (TESL-EJ Forum)”. *TESL-EJ. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 5 (4). <http://tesl-ej.org/ej20/f1.html>

Velilla-Sánchez, M. A. (2021). Bilingual resources in English-medium instruction lectures: the role lecturer's L1 is playing in EMI courses. *Language Value*, 14(2), 45-67. Universitat Jaume I ePress: Castelló, Spain. <http://www.languagevalue.uji.es>.

Wang, C. (2002): "First Language or Second Language?", *Essay Depot*. <http://www.essaydepto.com/essayme/1882/index.php>

Zacharias, N. T. (2003): *A survey of tertiary teachers' beliefs about English Language Teaching in Indonesia with regard to the role of English as a global language*, MA-ELT Thesis, Institute for English Language Education, Assumption University of Thailand, *Asian EFL Journal*, June 2007. http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/thesis_N_Zacharias.pdf

APPENDIX 1. OBSERVATION CHART (adapted from the Practicum II observation task 2, “*The Use of the mother tongue (L1)*”)

Students’ utterances in the mother tongue	When and what for?	Teacher’s reaction to students’ use of the mother tongue	Teacher’s utterances in mother tongue	When and what for?

APPENDIX 2. QUESTIONNAIRE DIRECTED TO STUDENTS.

AS A STUDENT, DO YOU THINK THAT ‘CODESWITCHING’ (i.e., using both English and Spanish in the classroom) ...

	it does	it doesn't	how?
helps you understand/remember concepts better?			
helps you alleviate anxiety when you feel that your resources are limited?			
creates a safe environment for everyone in your classroom?			
helps you resolve communication difficulties? (for example, if you want to say something to your teacher and you do not know how to do it appropriately)			
helps people in the classroom interact more among themselves?			
helps you carry out activities/tasks when working in groups? (i.e., do you think that Spanish facilitates the realisation of group-work?)			
makes you see English as a language in which you cannot fully communicate?			
helps you appreciate similarities and differences between English and Spanish?			
plays a bad influence in your English-learning process? / do you think that if Spanish wasn't allowed at all in the classroom you would learn English more and faster?			
becomes less necessary as you progress with English? (i.e., do you think that the more English you know, the less Spanish you need to use in class?)			

APPENDIX 3. INTERVIEW DIRECTED TO THE TEACHER.

AS A TEACHER, DOES *CODESWITCHING*...

- Q. 1. make you feel comfortable when you have to refer to Spanish terminology in the classroom? (which terms? // which terminology? / when?)”
- Q. 2. helps you deal with something that was not prepared beforehand? (e.g., if a topic that you were not expecting arises in the classroom) / (aside topics or digressions?)”
- Q. 3. ensure your students’ understanding of the concepts you are teaching? (scaffolding/reinforcing)”
- Q. 4. help you clarify essential words or concepts?”
- Q. 5. solve communicative or comprehension problems?”
- Q. 6. help you with classroom organisation and management? (tidy it up, ending the lesson, giving instructions...)
- Q. 7. vary depending on your students’ L2 proficiency? (do you think there are several levels of proficiency in the class?) (do you do it more frequently with those with lower level?)”
- Q. 8. make your students participate more actively in the classroom? (peer-interaction / teacher-student interaction)”
- Q. 9. influence the development of tasks in groups?” / do you think you have to remind your students to use English because they only use Spanish?” / to what extent do you think is useful to use the L1? And restrict it simply to the L2?” Which is your “power” to restrict their use of L1?”
- Q. 10. make you feel guilty? (maybe because you think that if you use Spanish your students will learn less?) // (the less input the less achievement of high proficiency?)”
- Q. 11. alleviate your students’ anxiety?”