



UiT

THE ARCTIC
UNIVERSITY
OF NORWAY

Institute of Teacher Education and Pedagogy

Ideals meet reality

A qualitative study on student teachers' thoughts on oral English

Kristine Hauglid

Master thesis in LRU-3902 English didactics May 2017.

30study points



Acknowledgment

Writing this master thesis has been quite a journey. It has been, interesting, funny, challenging and also very stressful. However, it has given me insight into the topic of using oral English in school, which interest me a lot. The informants I have followed have allowed me a look into their thoughts on this topic, and it has given me new ideas to think about that I find valuable for my future as an English teacher.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor Kristin Killie. I am very proud of myself for finishing my master thesis, but I would not have been able to do that without her. Thank you for your guidance and for pointing me in the right direction whenever I felt lost.

I would also like to thank the group of student teachers who were kind enough to participate as my informants. Thank you for making this project possible and for sharing your thoughts with me.

Finally, I want to thank my friends and family for all the support, and for believing in me.

Abstract

English lessons in Norwegian classrooms are based on K06 (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training) and its competence aims. The competence aims of oral English states that one should understand and use a general vocabulary, express oneself fluently, maintain conversations on different topics, and use central patterns for pronunciation in communication. The aspect of English in school and the oral use of it clearly express that pupils should be exposed to oral English and be able to communicate using English.

This study aims to explore how student teachers view the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English in the classroom. It also investigates whether or not the student teachers' attitudes and thoughts on oral English are reflected in their practice. The following research questions was thus formed:

“How are student teachers' attitudes and thoughts towards the use of oral English in Norwegian classrooms reflected in their practice?”

On the basis of my research question I used qualitative methods in form of observations and interviews to collect data that would answer the research question. Observation was used to see how the students used oral English during practice, while the interviews were conducted following the observations to get insight into their attitudes and thoughts towards different aspects of how to use oral English in the classroom. The interviews were also used to compare their ideals and thought with their actual practice to see if there were any similarities or differences.

The results from this study show that the teacher students' ideal English teacher concerning the use of oral English uses oral English as much as possible during English lessons, while also trying to motivate the pupils to use English. The students' practice reflected their thoughts and answers from the interviews, and showed a clear consistency between ideal thoughts on how to be an English teacher, and how their lessons were conducted.

Table of contents

Acknowledgment	ii
Abstract	iv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Aim of the study	2
1.3 Structure of the thesis	2
1.4 Limitations.....	3
2 Theoretical Framework	4
2.1 First vs. Second Language Acquisition.....	4
2.1.1 Learning conditions: input and feedback.....	4
2.2 The communicative approach.....	5
2.2.2 The comprehensible input hypothesis.....	6
2.2.1 Competence Aims	7
2.3 The use of the L1	8
2.3.1 Advantages	8
2.3.2 Disadvantages.....	10
2.4 Identity.....	11
3 Methodology	12
3.1 Quantitative vs. qualitative research.....	12
3.2 Choice of method	12
3.2.1 Observation as method.....	13
3.2.2 Qualitative Interview as method.....	14
3.3 Design of the study.....	18
3.3.1 Phenomenological research.....	18
3.4 Reliability and Validity	19
3.5 Methodological and Ethical considerations.....	20
3.5.1 Methodological considerations.....	20
3.5.2 Ethical considerations	21
3.6 Analysis and reporting of data.....	22
3.6.1 Observation.....	22
3.6.2 Interview.....	22

4 Findings.....	23
4.1 Observations.....	23
4.2 Interviews.....	25
4.2.1 <i>Using English orally.....</i>	25
4.2.2 <i>Using Norwegian instead of English?.....</i>	26
4.2.3 <i>Conscious use of English.....</i>	27
4.2.4 <i>Dealing with weaker pupils in English.....</i>	28
4.2.5 <i>The practice teacher's influence on the students' English use.....</i>	30
4.2.6 <i>Specific situations during practice.....</i>	31
5 Discussion.....	33
5.1 Exposure to English.....	33
5.1.1 <i>"Can I write gulrot?".....</i>	33
5.1.2 <i>Engaging pupils in interaction.....</i>	35
5.2 Using L1 to facilitate learning of English.....	36
5.3 The development of one's identity and ideals.....	38
6 Conclusion.....	39
7 List of references.....	42
8 Addendums.....	44
8.1 Interview guide.....	44
8.2 Informational letter to the parents.....	45
8.3 Approval from NSD.....	46

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

I have always considered English to be my favorite subject in school, and the ability to speak and communicate in English has always been something I have aspired to do. Ever since a young age all the movies, series and music I have been watching and listening to, has mainly come from English speaking countries like the United States and Britain. Back then, the exposure to English was extensive and I would definitely say that this had an effect on my knowledge of English and my level of oral English. Today, however, we are even more exposed to the English language than ever before, and we are able to some extent to learn the language through different media, like series, online gaming and YouTube. This especially applies for young children and adolescents. A study on incidental foreign language acquisition from media exposure done by Kuppens (2009) shows that pupils who frequently watch subtitled English television programs and movies perform significantly better on English tests. The study also reveals that playing English computer games positively influences the score on English tests. I would say that the key word from this study is “exposure”. It shows how important it is to be exposed to the language one is learning and use it as much as possible.

When I decided to become an English teacher I was still attending high school and also still in the process of developing my English language. Already then, the English teachers and their use of oral English started to pique my interest. When and how they used English orally was something I always noticed and I would sometimes wonder why the teachers would suddenly switch to Norwegian during an English lesson. Later on, during my studies at the university, I have attended several different practice periods where I have met English teachers with different pedagogical practices. Some of them intentionally used their English at all times so their pupils would have full exposure to it, while also creating an environment that encourages the use of oral English. Other English teachers used their English quite differently and often switched between Norwegian and English.

There are a lot of studies on the use of oral English in school. However, there is not a lot of research that focuses specifically on student teachers’ thoughts and perception of the use of oral English. Previous studies mainly focus on the pupils and what the best ways to teach

them oral English are. When deciding what my master thesis was going to be about I knew early on that it had to be about the use of oral English in the classroom. I therefore came to the decision to focus my master thesis on student teachers' use of oral English in their practice, and the differences and similarities between their image of an ideal English teacher and their own portrayal of an English teacher.

1.2 Aim of the study

The aim of this study was to explore the students' idea of the ideal use of English in the classroom by teachers. I also wanted to compare their ideas of the ideal English teacher with their own practice during English lessons and look at concrete situations where they communicate with their pupils in either English or Norwegian. This resulted in the following research question: "How are student teachers' attitudes and thoughts towards the use of oral English in Norwegian classrooms reflected in their practice?"

To gather sufficient data to answer this question I was present in an English classroom at two different schools where the students had their practice period. I acted as an observer while the students conducted their English lessons. During these observations I took notes of situations and other aspects I found important and interesting. These notes were written down in an orderly system made in advance of the observation so that every situation would be easy to trace back to the right person, right day and exact time.

After the students had completed their practice period I interviewed them one by one to get an insight to their thoughts on the ideal English teacher as well as give them the opportunity to explain and discuss concrete situations I had observed during their practice period.

1.3 Structure of the thesis

This thesis consists of five chapters as well as an introduction. Chapter 2 *Theoretical Framework* addresses theory that has informed my research and will be the foundation to the discussion of my findings. Chapter 3 *Methodology* will focus on a detailed overview of the methods of data collection that I used and how I analyzed the data. I will also discuss my selection of informants as well as the design of my interview guide. In chapter 4 *Findings* I will present my findings, which will be followed up by chapter 5 *Discussion* where I will

discuss the findings using the theory presented in chapter 2. Finally, in chapter 6 *Conclusion*, I will present my concluding thoughts as well as reflections about future studies.

1.4 Limitations

All research has some limitations. In this study there are some limitation when it comes to number of informants. For a study to end up with data that can be measured and analyzed one needs many informants to study. For this study I have used four student teachers as participants. I consider this a limitation given that the answers of four individuals is not enough to tell whether or not the findings deriving from this study applies to every student teacher of English. However, the time frame of the study did not allow me to transcribe and interview more than the four students.

Another limitation for this study was the amount of time I was able to spend observing. The students only had three weeks of practice. During these three weeks, English classes never occurred more than twice a week, which reduced the time I was able to observe the students using their English orally.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 First vs. Second Language Acquisition

Humans acquire language at a very young age. Since we are born we acquire and form our language based on the language of those surrounding us, like parents, siblings and grandparents. Stephen Crain and Diane Lillo-Martin (1999, p. 4) argue that acquiring languages is in children's genes from birth and that we are born with innate knowledge, which guides us in the language acquisition task (Chomsky, 1986). When focusing on language learning in school, in this case English, this view can be interpreted to believe that the more one uses the English language the more one is able to acquire and learn the language.

The critical period hypothesis (CPH) is often linked to the innate perspective, and states how certain kinds of knowledge and skills can only be acquired at specific times in life. After the "critical period" it will be difficult, or even impossible, to acquire these skills (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p.22). According to Lightbown and Spada, it has also been hypothesized that there is a critical period for second language learners as well. Innate capacities for learning a language are no longer available when passing the critical period. Older learners may therefore have to depend on more general learning abilities (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p.93). Whether the CPH holds true, there are many differences between first and second language acquisition. Some of these differences will be discussed in the next section.

2.1.1 Learning conditions: input and feedback

There are many differences between acquiring a first language and acquiring a second language, one of them being the learning conditions. One of the learning conditions of first language learners is that the language always surrounds them and they spend thousands of hours in contact with the language. A learner of a second language, on the other hand, will not be as exposed to the target language, especially not in school context. Second language learners who are young are often allowed to stay silent until they feel ready to speak and they are rarely forced to speak. This does not always apply for older second language learners. They are often forced to use their second language, either to meet classroom requirements or to carry out everyday tasks such as job interviews (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 38).

Another aspect of learning conditions, which Lightbown and Spada mentions, is the correction of spoken language. When children acquire their first language parents tend to respond to the meaning rather than the grammatical accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 39). In school context when learning a second language the focus on errors are more present. When pupils use their oral English in the classroom vocabulary and grammatical errors are often corrected. However, when older second language learners interact in their L2 outside of the classroom, errors that do not interfere with meaning are usually overlooked (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 39). In the classroom the L2 is being used under supervised and directed conditions while L2 outside of the classroom can be viewed as a more casual use of the language where feedback on vocabulary and other errors rarely occurs.

2.2 The communicative approach

There are various approaches to learning a language. In the traditional, and much used grammar translation method, the focus is on grammar and written language. By contrast, the communicative approach is based on the idea that language learning does not only involve the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary but rather communication. The communicative approach also emphasizes the fact that successful language learning is gained through communicating real meaning. In the classroom, the communicative approach can be seen when activities focuses on the interaction between the pupils where learning to communicate is important. Szecsy (2008) explains how communicative competence is the desired goal and refers to the ability to use languages to communicate by applying words and rules in an appropriate and coherent way.

The communicative approach can be characterized as either *strong* or *weak*. The strong version emphasizes the importance of acquiring the language through communication, while the weak version stresses the importance of using the target language for communicative purposes (Szecsy, 2008). The communicative approach derives from around the 1960s where American linguistic theory began to change (Szecsy, 2008). One of the theorists that these changes stemmed from was Noam Chomsky. He suggested that knowing a language was not necessarily just knowing the rules of grammar, but instead the ability of innovation and creativity. Followers of this approach also have a number of beliefs and principles which applies:

(a) learners learn a language by using it to communicate, (b) authentic and meaningful communication should be the goal of classroom activities, (c) fluency is an important dimension of communication, (d) communication involves the integration of different language skills, and (e) learning is a process of creative construction and involves trial and error (Szecsy, 2008).

The main ambition for the communicative approach suggests that any activities used when learning the target language should enable learners to engage in communication. At the same time one should understand and accept that learning a language is a process that involves errors, and these errors are important for learning.

2.2.2 The comprehensible input hypothesis

One of the best-known models for second language acquisition deriving from Chomsky's theory of first language acquisition is Stephen Krashen's "Monitor Model" (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 106). Krashen describes his model in terms of five hypotheses where one of them is *The Comprehensible Input* hypothesis. The hypothesis' main argument is that acquisition occurs when one is exposed to language input that is comprehensible. It contains what Krashen presents as $i+1$, where the i represents the level of language already acquired, and the 1 represents language that is just one step beyond that level (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 106). Since Krashen's model was introduced, classroom research has confirmed that pupils can make progress through exposure to comprehensible input without any direct instructions (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 107).

There are many different approaches that have been proposed as the best way to learn a second language in the classroom. One of these proposals is the "Let's Talk" proposal (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 165). The idea of this proposal is that the pupils should be given the opportunity to engage in different interactions as well as being given access to both comprehensible input and conversational interactions. Lightbown and Spada (2013, p. 166) suggest how negotiation of meaning comes from engaging in interactions. They also provide two different examples of interaction where the first example presents a group of 12-year-old pupils discussing a questionnaire about pets with their teacher. One pupil asks what *feed* means and the teacher only respond with "if you don't have a dog, you skip the question". The pupil does not actually get an answer as to what *feed* actually means. This shows an example of a constructed exercise where conversational interaction is not the main focus. In

the second example Lighbown & Spada (2013 p. 166) present a group of pupils as they are settling in at the beginning of their class:

Teacher: "How are you all doing this morning?"

Pupil1: "I'm mad!"

Pupil2: "Why?"

Teacher: "Oh boy. Yeah, why?"

Pupil1: "Because this morning, my father say no have job this morning."

Teacher: "Your father has no more job this morning? Or you have no job?"

Pupil1: "My father".

The interaction between the pupils and teacher suggest free communication rather than constructed exercise. An interaction like the second example will likely enhance pupils' motivation to participate in language learning activities Lighbown and Spada (2013, p. 166).

2.2.1 Competence Aims

K06 (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training) provides different competence aims that are very relevant for the communicative approach and communicative competence. The competence aims concerning the oral use of English are as follows:

"Choose and use different listening and speaking strategies that are suitable for the purpose."

"Understand and use a general vocabulary related to different topics."

"Demonstrate the ability to distinguish positively and negatively loaded expressions referring to individuals and groups."

"Understand the main content and details of different types of oral texts on different topics."

"Listen to and understand variations of English from different authentic situations."

"Express oneself fluently and coherently, suited to the purpose and situation."

"Express and justify own opinions about different topics."

"Introduce, maintain and terminate conversations on different topics by asking questions and following up on input."

"Use the central patterns for pronunciation, intonation, word inflection and different types of sentences in communication."

"Understand and use different numerical expressions and other kinds of data in communication."

In addition to this there are five basic skills in K06 where one of the skills are oral communication. These aim, surrounding the oral use of English, are what creates the basis for English lessons in Norwegian schools. If combining the communicative approach with these competence aims, and being more aware of how and when one can use oral English, pupils might acquire the language in a more natural way.

2.3 The use of the L1

There are different opinions about whether, when and to what extent the L1 should be used in the classroom. Some might say that the best way to acquire a second language is to completely omit the L1, while others might suggest that using the L1 in the second language classroom helps the pupil understand and learn the target language. In this paragraph I will look at the role of the L1 in second language classrooms and how it can be both an advantage and a disadvantage to use L1 as a supporting tool.

2.3.1 Advantages

Harmer (2007, p.176) suggest a lot of *What if's* when it comes to the use of L2 and L1 in a second language classroom:

(1) what if pupils are all at different levels, (2) what if pupils don't want to talk, (3) what if the class is very big, (4) what if pupils don't understand the audio track, (5) what if pupils keep using their own language, (6) what if some pupils finish before everybody else, (7) what if pupils don't do homework, and (8) what if pupils are uncooperative?

Most of these *what if's* will have their advantages by using the pupils' L1. When it comes to pupils being on different levels and not wanting to speak English in the classroom, the use of their L1 might not just be an advantage but also necessary. Teachers often speak and explain different tasks in English in an English class. When there are weaker pupils that the teacher is aware might not understand everything being said in English, a common solution is often to repeat the most important parts in the pupils' L1.

Another advantage of using the L1 in English classes is the aspect of saving time. Harbord (1992, p. 358) explains how using L1 to facilitate communication does not only mean "message-getting-across" strategies, but also time-saving strategies. He also explains how

many teachers justify using L1 because time saved by communicating in their mother tongue can be used for more productive activities. Another big advantage that involves both time-saving and “message-getting-across” relates to the grammatical aspects. Very often, teachers tend to resort to L1 to explain grammar because they feel explaining grammar in L2 is too complicated for the pupils. They also feel themselves incapable of giving a clear explanation of certain grammar (Harbord, 1992, p.353).

Harmer (2015, p. 50) mentions something called the “English-only” policy, which suggests that one should only use English in an English class because this will lead to more successful and faster learning than a blend of English and L1. However, Harmer (2015, p. 50) also suggests how this policy might also lead to quite the opposite. By not allowing the pupils to use their L1 at all during English classes, the teachers might make them feel uncomfortable, also leading to the pupils not being able to use techniques that could help them learn English. Some of these techniques might include comparing Norwegian and English words, or using Norwegian sentences to discover how English sentences have a different structure or word order. An advantage by using L1 in this case is of course the fact that some pupils might feel more comfortable if they are able to lean on their L1 when their English is not good enough. Because the pupils do not feel forced to use English, allowing the pupils to lean on their L1 might also lead them to try out new English words by themselves, once they feel ready.

A final advantage of using L1 in L2 classrooms is that it may facilitate the learning of L2. This can, according to Harbord (1992, p. 354), be done through comparison of L1 and L2. This strategy has two different, but related, purposes. The first purpose is to make pupils aware of the dangers of translation and teach them to exercise a conscious check on the validity of their unconscious translation. The second purpose is to teach the pupils ways of working towards “functional translation” (Danchev, 1982) rather than word-for-word translation that occurs when pupils’ unconscious need to make correlations between languages is ignored (Harbord, 1992, p. 354,355). Pupils usually learn word-for-word translation with words out of context. When pupils translate within a specific context, however, they are made more aware of the problems that come with word-for-word translation. The advantage is therefore not only saving time, but instead practicing pupils’ understanding of direct translation between their mother tongue and their target language (Harbord, 1992, p. 355).

2.3.2 Disadvantages

In addition to some advantages with using the L1 in second language classrooms, there are also some disadvantages worth mentioning. The sentence “practice makes perfect” explains perfectly why an overuse of L1 might be a disadvantage in second language classrooms. The more the teacher and the pupils use the L1, the less they will have a chance to hear and experiment with the language they are supposed to be learning (Harmer, 2015, p. 50). Practice does make perfect, and to practice the target language, one has to use it.

As mentioned earlier there is something called an “English-only” policy. Teachers who support this policy also support the idea that using the L1 will give the pupil less of a chance to experience and learn their target language. Using English only is also, according to the “English-only” policy, crucial for the English “atmosphere” which helps breed a cultural identity and a positive identification with the language (Harmer, 2015, p. 50). Restricting the pupils’ exposure to English by overusing the L1 prevents the pupils from being exposed to a type of English that is an ideal source of language for their acquisition (Harmer, 2007, p. 134). Teachers should therefore use the L2 as much as possible in the second language classroom given that they are an important source of input. The more time we spend speaking English, the better (Harmer, 2007, p. 134).

Using L1 to facilitate teacher-pupil relationship is something Harbord (1992, p. 354) discusses in his article. His research shows that only a few teachers admit to using their L1 for this exact purpose. He also states how good group dynamics have proven to often facilitate learning. However, he underlines the importance of what language one chooses to use in this situation. Using L1 in second language classrooms to facilitate teacher-pupil relationship has been under discussion among researchers, and strategies like chatting before the start of a lesson to reduce anxiety is one approach to this. This strategy would seem useful to achieve a good teacher-pupil relationship. However, these strategies are likely to have a somewhat negative effect on the overall tendency towards L2 use in the classroom (Harbord, 1992, p. 354). Lowering pupils’ anxiety before an L2 class by using their L1 seems to give the opposite effect. The anxiety of speaking English might increase because the safe environment is created through Norwegian rather than English. Instead, the teachers should use these strategies prior to an L2 class by also using the L2.

2.4 Identity

One's identity is a crucial aspect of who one becomes and wants to be as teachers. Every teacher has certain ideas as to what kind of teacher they want to be, and their idea of the ideal teacher is often different from each other. However, the development of one's identity involves certain aspects that are similar for everyone. Wittek and Bratholm (2014, p. 29) explain how the development of one's identity never ends. Humans learn through participation, and through the process of learning, one's identity is developed. An identity describes who we are as people. It also describes how we are as specific people: parent, daughter, son or teacher. As a teacher one is always involved in different professional contexts: interaction with pupils, meetings with parents and cooperation with colleagues. As a teacher one has to form an opinion based on input from those interacting with you, one's own thoughts, and experience gained from one's own practice (Wittek & Bratholm, 2014, p. 30). As well as input from others, one's understanding of one's own identity also influences one's identity, in this case one's identity as a teacher. Wittek and Bratholm (2014, p. 30) also explain how the dynamic process of identity development can be seen from both the past and the future. By the past they refer to the understanding of one's childhood as source of identity development. By seeing one's identity development from the future they refer to the ability to visualize how one wants to solve specific school related challenges that has yet to come.

Wittek and Bratholm (2014, p. 31) present four different types of identities that are involved in a teacher's path of learning. The first type of identity is called *Natural Identity*, which involves biology and childhood environment as contributors for one's identity. The next type of identity is called *Institutional Identity*. This involves the different kinds of roles we take during our lives. An example Wittek and Bratholm offer are student teachers taking on roles as listeners during a class, as teachers during practice periods, and as writers during writing assignments. The third type of identity is called *Discourse Identity* and signifies the different way one resonates, argues and communicate in a specific way, and how these kinds of discourses unfolds in various contexts. The final type of identity is *Interest Identity*. This is explained as an identity that contains all the different communities of interests one has gained throughout life. One should participate according to the mindset of the current community. These four types of identity co-exist with each other and influence one's identity development, thus helping explain one's different thoughts and attitudes towards certain elements of being a teacher.

3 Methodology

Bjørndalen (2008, p.25) presents sociologist Vilhelm Aubert's definition of what a method is: "...an approach, a means which solves problems and reaches a new type of knowledge. Any means which serves this purpose belongs to the collection of methods". A method can in other words be viewed as a tool, which can provide an answer for specific aspects one is looking for. Bjørndalen (2008, p.25) also suggests how a method can be seen as a device to gain a better view of the world.

In this chapter I will present the design of the study as well as sample selection and methods of data collecting. I will also discuss the concept of formal and real access and look at both ethical and methodological considerations.

3.1 Quantitative vs. qualitative research

When conducting research there are several methods one can use in order to gather data. The two main types of methods are either quantitative or qualitative. A quantitative method differs from a qualitative method in the way it relates to numbers (Bjørndalen, 2008, p. 25). A quantitative method bases itself on a precise quantification of data and involves a wider selection of people. In contrast, a qualitative method is based on a more in-depth study of the data and research being conducted, and it also concentrates on a smaller selection of data (Bjørndalen, 2008, p. 25).

3.2 Choice of method

In this study I have chosen to use a qualitative method. The reason for this choice is because I believe this to be the most suitable method to gain the right kind of data and hence to get an answer to my research question. There are several types of qualitative methods and among these I have decided to use observation and interview as my methods as I believe they will provide useful information when combined.

As my research question focuses on the students' attitudes and how they are reflected in their practice, I consider observation as method as important to achieve sufficient data. This is because during an observation one is able to observe people's behavior and actions without interfering in the actual lesson. Observation can be used for several purposes in a study, but it

is usually used in what is called an *exploratory phase*, where one seeks to find out what is going on in a specific situation (Robson, 2002, p.314). Another way observation can be used is through what Robson (2002, p. 312) explains as a *supportive* or *supplementary method*. This is a method which collects data that in some ways complement data collected by other means. The latter type of observation is what I decided to use as my method as my main goal was to compare the students' actual performance with their ideals concerning the use of oral English in the classroom.

The second type of method I have chosen to use for my research is interview. This method was used to extract information about the student teachers' ideals concerning the use of English in the classroom. When interviewing, one as a researcher asks questions and receives answers from the people one is interviewing, then one uses these responses to answer one's research question. Robson (2002, 269) says that interviews can be used as the only approach in a study, but explains how they sometimes can be more useful in combination with other methods. Also, interviews allow the researcher to engage with the participants individually, giving the researcher access to different types of views and opinions. "The opportunity for dialogue which they provide allows the interviewer to probe and clarify and to check that they have understood correctly what is being said." (Atkins & Wallace, 2012, p. 86).

3.2.1 Observation as method

Observation is something humans do every day. In a pedagogical context, however, the term observation can be described as conscious observation (Bjørndalen, 2008, p. 29). It can in other words be explained as an observation where one concentrates on observing something with a specific pedagogical importance. Bjørndalen (2008, p. 29) presents two forms of observation. The first one is called *observation of first order*, where one observes the situation as an outsider and where the situation being observed is the primary goal of the observer. The second form of observation is called *observation of second order*. This involves the teacher or supervisor's continuous observation of one's own pedagogical situation. *Observation of first order* is the form I have used for this study. The reason for this is because the observation is then the primary focus. Bjørndalen (2008, p. 29) also states how this form helps secure a higher level of objectivity in one's observations. The interaction between teacher and pupil, and the use of oral English was my focus in this study. Therefore I chose to observe as an outsider to affect as little as possible of the actual class conducted by the students.

Observation is suitable when the researcher wants to gain direct access to what is being studied (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 62). This study focuses on the oral use of English in school. Therefore, an observation of the students' practice during their English classes was the best way for me to access information considering this. To also make sure every aspect and details were remembered I took notes at all times. To be able to register as much as possible it was important for me to find a system in taking notes. Bjørndalen (2008, p. 46) suggests how the use of keywords and abbreviations are good techniques for registration of the observation. He also suggests prioritizing *verbs* and *subjects* when using keywords. During the observations I was sat in the back of the classroom so that I would be able to observe everything being said and done by the students. After every class I would always make sure re-read my notes to make sure they were organized and understandable, and I would often fill in some more information if necessary.

3.2.2 Qualitative Interview as method

Bjørndalen (2008, p. 84) emphasizes how interview as a method has the advantage of discovering details that could otherwise be overlooked. He also explains how interviewing gives the researcher the advantage of understanding the informants' thoughts and perspective in a better way. Conversations are important for humans to understand each other, answer each other's question, explain what they feel, or what they think (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 77). A conversation gives insights into a person's world. A qualitative interview can be explained as a structured conversation between people. The purpose of a qualitative interview is to understand or explain something, and the interview is often more of a dialogue rather than straightforward questions and answers (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 77).

Depending on what answers one wants from an interview, and also how organized one wants the questions to be beforehand, there are four different categories qualitative interviews can be divided into (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 78). These categories represent different degrees of structure where the first one is called *unstructured interview*. This type of interview is more informal where the questions and answers appear more like a conversation. The researcher can, in addition to this, shape the interview according to where the conversation is headed and what kind of answers the informants give. The second category of

interview is called *semi-structured interview*, and as the name suggest, this type of interview is partly structured. This indicates that it has a governing interview guide as a basis for the interview itself. Questions, themes and order of questions, however, are often more unstructured and varied. The third category of interview is the *structured interview* where both themes and questions are decided beforehand. These kinds of interviews are often compared to a questionnaire, where the difference lies in the fact that questions in qualitative interviews are often available for the informants to evaluate, as there are no pre-formulated response alternatives. The final category is called *structured interview with given response alternatives*. This category is similar to the previous one. The only difference is that the informants are given alternatives for their answers. This form of interview is quite similar to a questionnaire, as it is not based on an interview guide (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 79).

For this study I used a *semi-structured interview*, which has predetermined questions but at the same time can be modified based on the interviewer's perception of what seems most appropriate (Robson, 2002, p. 270). This type of interview would also make it possible to either leave out or add new questions during the interview. Seeing as my research question was not only to look at the students' practice, but also explore their attitude and thoughts towards their practice as well as their ideals, I believed a semi-structured interview would provide a wider and better set of data compared to the other types of interviews.

The reason I chose to use qualitative interviews in my study was because I wanted to give the informants the freedom to express themselves. As noted by Christoffersen and Johannessen's (2012, p.78), when allowing the informants to express themselves freely, their experiences and perceptions are best communicated.

3.2.2.1 Sampling Selection

For this study I have used four student teachers as informants. These students are all students of English at university. After presenting my idea for my master thesis and explaining their role in the study, they all agreed to be observed and interviewed during their practice period.

The time span of this study was limited. This was also a factor when finding participants. Given that there was not enough time to interview and observe more students, I chose to focus

on four student teachers of English. However, the aim of this study was to explore the attitudes and practices of a few student teachers rather than gathering statistically significant data. I wanted to know the student teachers' thought on the use of oral English and see if their thoughts corresponded with their practice. Therefore, the four student teachers who participated in my study was sufficient for the data I wanted access to.

Another aspect with sampling selection and the qualitative method is that the information one wants to collect is rather extensive while number of informants is limited. The exact number of informants can be determined based on different factors, one of them being if the group of informants is heterogeneous or homogeneous. Homogeneous means that the group of informants are similar to each other when it comes to different criteria, while heterogeneous means that the group of informants are different from each other. If the group of informants is homogeneous, the researcher needs fewer informants to collect data (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 49). The group of student teachers can be viewed as homogeneous in the sense that they are all young adults who are student teachers of English.

3.2.2.2 Preparation of the interview and interview guide

To prepare the interview I needed to decide what type of questions I should ask to acquire the answers I needed to answer my research question. Formulating the questions correctly was important to ensure that the answers I would get would actually provide me with the information I was looking for. It was therefore important to be thorough and construct the questions properly.

When constructing my interview guide I used both Robson (2002, p. 281) and Christoffersen & Johannessen's (2012, p. 80) model for constructing an interview guide. Robson (2002) explains how an interview guide is not a set of tightly structured questions one should ask verbatim as they are written, but rather a list of specific things one should remember to ask the person being interviewed. The interview guide is in other words a check-list which helps the interviewer focus on the theme but which at the same time gives the person being interviewed the opportunity to speak freely. Christoffersen & Johannessen's (2012 p. 80) idea of an interview guide is somewhat the same, however, they present a list of what they suggest an interview guide should contain. Their first suggestion is having a presentation of yourself to ease any tension or discomfort. This helps build a relation between researcher and

informants. Next, they suggest starting with an introduction question to engage the informants in a specific theme, and also to let the informants elaborate about their experiences. Then they suggest how a transitional question is the most logical connection between the introduction of the interview and the key questions. The key questions can be explained as the core of the interview, and they take up most of the interview time. This is also where the informants answer the main questions for the research question. The ending of the interview is supposed to prepare the informants that the interview is almost over, as well as give both the interviewer and the informants a chance to ask or discuss incomplete aspects.

My interview guide consisted of a presentation of myself, information about the consent form, information about the project and an introduction question involving thoughts on the ideal English teacher. The introduction question was as follows:

1. “How would you describe the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English?”

Before starting the actual interview I reminded the students of some general information like voluntary participation, storage of audio recording and their anonymity. The actual interview consisted of seven questions including the introduction question. The first two questions were basic questions focusing on the general use of oral English in school and its importance, and also about the students’ thoughts on the use of Norwegian in different situations:

2. Do you find it important to speak English at all times during English lessons?
3. Are there any situations where one should use Norwegian instead of English?

These two questions can be viewed as transitional questions. Further on, there were four questions which represent the key questions of the interview:

4. Focusing on your own use of oral English. Are you always conscious of your own use of oral English?
5. How should one deal with weaker pupils during English lessons?
6. What can one do if a pupil refuses to speak English during English lessons?
7. Do you feel affected by you practice teacher’s use of oral English in any way?

These questions asked about specific situations in an English class and how the students would handle them, and what the students' thoughts were about their own use of oral English. An eighth question was also included and functioned as the ending. Here I asked about specific situations observed in their practice. These observations were focused on the students' oral use of their L1 and their L2 and would give them the opportunity to explain why they used either L1 or L2 in a specific situation. At the end of the interview I focused on any unanswered aspects from either the students or myself.

3.3 Design of the study

As presented earlier, the aim of this study was to explore student teachers' attitudes and thoughts towards the oral use of English in school. This implied that I had to use qualitative methods, which could give me more flexibility in my collecting of data. Qualitative methods offer a bigger range of spontaneity and adjustment in the interaction between researcher and informants (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 17). In order to gather this data I observed the students in their English classes during their practice period. To make my role as an observer as neutral as possible I was always seated in the back of the classroom at a desk. The students also informed their pupils about my role during their practice period and that my focus would be on them and not the pupils. This allowed me to attract as little attention as possible and to influence the student and pupils' behavior as little as possible. After the students' practice period I completed an interview with each student one at a time. The reason for choosing to conduct the interviews with one student at a time was to avoid thoughts and ideas being mixed and influenced by each other. I believe conducting the interviews one at a time gave me more trustworthy and reflected data from the students.

3.3.1 Phenomenological research

Phenomenological research explores and describes humans' experience and understanding of a phenomenon and the researchers try to understand a specific phenomenon through someone else's eyes. The purpose of phenomenological research is to increase understanding and get an insight into others' life-worlds (Christoffersen & Johannessen 2012, p.99).

The process of a phenomenological research can be described in different ways, but according to Creswell (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 100) there are three important steps:

- Preparation: In this part the researcher bases himself on knowledge and earlier experience. He tries to understand whomever he is studying and wants the participants to describe their experiences.
- Collecting data: The researcher collects data from individuals with experience about the specific phenomenon. This kind of information is often gathered from interviews.
- Analysis and reporting: The researcher interprets the data and wants to understand the deeper meaning of individuals' experience.

When referring to knowledge and earlier experiences, I have, similar to the student teachers, been in the stages of developing an identity and an ideal when it comes to oral English and the use of it. I have also participated in several practice periods and experienced being an English teacher.

This study can be seen as phenomenological research as it explores the thought and attitudes of four student teachers concerning the use of oral English in Norwegian classrooms. It also wants to explore the students' experiences of oral English in practice and give an insight to the students' perception of the ideal English teacher.

3.4 Reliability and Validity

When somebody says that people are reliable we believe them to be dependable, consistent, predictable, stable and honest (Kumar, 2005, p. 156). When explaining reliability in relation to research the meaning of the word reliability has a very similar meaning. When the data are consistent and stable, and hence predictable and accurate, it is said to be reliable (Kumar, 2005, p 156). In other words, it can be explained as being critical to any findings and their ability to answer the research question.

This study does have some limitations when it comes to reliability. The number of participants is too small to be representative of the overall attitude and thoughts of English student teachers in Norway. The data is, however, sufficient to provide an insight in the way some student teachers of English may think and relate to oral English in school.

Another aspect of reliability is seen in the interview. A way the study's reliability can be affected is if the informants, for any reason, answer the questions either incompletely or by

not being honest. As for my study and my informants I do not see that this could be a relevant problem, as the questions do not involve any sensitive or intimate information.

Kumar (2005, p. 153) defines validity as the degree to which the researcher has measured what he wanted to measure. An important question when measuring the validity of the collected data is whether the data are good representations of the phenomenon being researched (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2012, p. 24). To measure the research's validity Christoffersen and Johannessen (2012) suggest conducting what they call a validity test. This is a test where one first use observation to gather data relating to the research question. Then, conduct either a questionnaire or interview with the same people one observed to see if the findings of the observation correspond with the answers received from the interview. This is exactly what I have done in my study and I also believe this has strengthen the validity of this study.

3.5 Methodological and Ethical considerations

Like all research, there are both some methodological and ethical considerations a researcher has to be aware of. In this paragraph I will look at some of these considerations and how they have affected this study.

3.5.1 Methodological considerations

In 1972, William Laboy, the father of modern sociolinguistics, said that “the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain this data by systematic observation” (1972, p. 209). Laboy termed this phenomenon the ‘Observer’s Paradox’, and it has remained an important concept ever since. Thus, also Kumar (2005, p 120) explains how individuals or groups may change their behavior when they are aware of being observed. This phenomenon is relevant to my study because one of the things I had to consider regarding observation as a method was the fact that the students were always aware that I was observing them. However, in agreement with my supervisor, I decided that I would give them limited information about the specific aspect I wanted to observe in order to affect their behavior as little as possible. What is observed may actually not be their normal behavior and could therefore affect the observation both negatively and positively. Another aspect of the observation is the interpretation drawn from the observation. One observer may differ from another observer as

to what they actually see (Kumar, 2005, p. 121). The possibility of misinterpretation is a danger any researcher needs to be aware of, and alternative interpretations should be discussed where this is found to be relevant.

When it comes to interview as a method there are also some aspects one has to consider. In this study I had four informants, which I both observed and interviewed. To be able to clearer describe the tendencies of my findings I could have chosen a larger group of informants. However, recruiting informants takes time and there were also some criteria, which had to be fulfilled to fit as an informant for my thesis. I also believe that the idea that informants tend to be affected by the fact that they are being observed, as mentioned in the above paragraph, also applies to interviews. With this in mind I made sure that both before and after the students' English classes, I would engage in an informal conversation with them to let them get to know me and I them. I felt this was helpful for both parts as the interviews were both interesting and satisfying.

3.5.2 Ethical considerations

Prior to the data collecting I reported my project to the NSD, the Norwegian Centre for Research Data. Their role in my study is to secure the informants' privacy. In this case there were some indirect information being collected, which could potentially reveal the identity of my informants. All four of my informants were over the age of 18 and I therefore only needed their own consent of participation. To make sure my informants stayed anonymous I always referred to them as student1, student2, student3, and student4 when writing or taking notes. They were never mentioned by name except when speaking directly to them.

It was also important for me to ensure the informants' anonymity throughout the entire process of this study. After the observations were analyzed and the interviews were transcribed, information like practice school or gender were left out to completely anonymize any information that could lead back to the informants. All recordings of the interviews were transcribed shortly after they took place and the recordings were also deleted as soon as the process of writing the master thesis was completed. During the time I was not working on the recordings, but would need them later, I kept them locked away at all times.

3.6 Analysis and reporting of data

In this section I would like to explain what methods I used for analyzing the data collected from the observation and the interviews.

3.6.1 Observation

Observation on its own is according to Bjørndalen (2007, p. 107) a method where one often analyzes and assesses something. This is done unconsciously and unstructured. To be able to analyze my observations thoroughly and process any findings during the observations I used a systematic notation form. Bjørndalen (2007, p. 107) accentuate the importance of notes, logs or recordings during observations to *freeze* one's visual impressions and this way learns much more from the data being collected. When analyzing my observation I sat down straight after every observation when everything was still fresh in mind. My process of analyzing the observations involved using my notes combined with a fresh memory of observation to write a new and more detailed document. The same process was applied to each observation.

3.6.2 Interview

As mentioned earlier my interview guide consisted of questions concerning the use of oral English in school as well as specific situations where both L1 and L2 were often used. When analyzing the transcription of my interviews the first thing I did was divide different topics from each other by using color-coding. Thus would questions concerning L1 have one color while questions concerning L2 have another color. This allowed me to focus on one specific topic at a time. Further on, I started close readings of my transcription, focusing on one topic at a time, where I used a new document to list important findings, as well as any differences or similarities between the students' answers. This gave me a much more structured overview of their answers.

While analyzing the interviews I also included my analysis of the observation at the end of the process. This was done to compare their behavior and use of oral English in their practice to their answers and thoughts obtained from the interviews. By doing this I was able to further analyze both the observations and interviews simultaneously and thus providing a clearer result.

4 Findings

In this chapter I will present my findings from the observations and the interviews. I will include any aspects of the data collected that I found interesting and important for my research question. When presenting the results from the interviews I will keep the structure of the interview guide presented earlier.

4.1 Observations

One of the most notable observations I made was that both schools where the students had their practice period promoted a version of the “English-only” policy (cf. section 2.3.1). The number of pupils using English orally was therefore quite high, which then made it easier for the students to mostly use English. Another interesting observation concerning the “English-only” use, was the fact that student1 and student2 and their practice teacher spoke to each other using only English whenever they were present in an English class. This also included conversation involving daily life and small talk. It was obvious that the “English-only” policy was something the pupils were quite used to. Whenever the practice teacher or student1 or student2 spoke even one word in Norwegian, the pupils always commented and told them that it was not allowed to speak Norwegian in an English class.

During the observation of both student1 and student2 and student3 and student4 I noticed a frequent use of L1 combined with L2. I did not interpret this as a bad thing seeing as whenever a Norwegian word was used was when one of the pupils could not find or remember the correct word in English. To ensure that what I was observing was correct I asked the students during their practice about this. I was told from all of them that being confident in speaking English was something they had worked on in both classes for a while. They also explained how it had become a rule for both teachers and pupils that it was allowed to use “Norwenglish” whenever words or formulations became difficult. As long as the pupils kept practicing their English and trying their best to use English only, a few Norwegian words were accepted.

Even though most of the classes where conducted while speaking English I did observe some use of Norwegian from student3 and student4. However, these observations were mostly from the beginning or the ending of English classes. What was being said during these observations of Norwegian use was mostly casual talk like; ‘Okay, let’s settle down’, ‘Are you guys ready

for a new week/day?’ and ‘How are you guys today?’. Student3 and student4 also took attendance in Norwegian, mostly to get started with the English classes quickly. Student1 and student2 always began and ended their classes in English. They explained that this was a conscious choice to bring the pupils into English-mode. Even though the beginnings and endings of student1 and student2, and student 3 and student4’s classes were slightly different, the pupils in each class spoke English just as much as the other one. The only difference could be that student1 and student2’s pupils would go into English-mode faster and easier than student3 and student4’s pupils.

When it came to the use of the L1 during conversations between the students and the pupils I also made some observations. These observations mostly involved whenever the pupils could not come up with the correct word, or when the students spoke with weaker pupils. One example was from an English class with student3 and student4. The pupils were working on a group project and the students would converse with them whenever they raised their hand to get help. One pupil needed help with something and started asking questions in Norwegian to student3. The answer from student3 was given in English, given that it was an English class and they wanted to use English as much as possible. The pupil then continued the conversation in English. Further on in the conversation, the pupil seemed unsure of certain words and therefore switched to Norwegian again. The student seemed to notice the pupil’s discomfort of speaking English and also switched to Norwegian. The same thing occurred when student 4 was helping the same pupil. It seemed to me like student3 and student4 were both trying to encourage the pupil to use English without saying it directly. It also seemed to me that when they realized the pupil was struggling, both to express and understand, they switched to Norwegian to make sure that any important explanation or information was clarified. There were also some situations similar to the previous one, where the pupils would use Norwegian and the students would continue using English to guide the pupils towards using English. In these situations I observed that the technique of silently guiding them to English worked. I did not have control of the pupils’ English level, but I did find these observations interesting regardless.

A second example was with student1. The class had a discussion about a movie and its themes. One of the pupils raised his hand to explain how prejudice was one of the themes. The pupil seemed a little bit reluctant to speak English and did in addition not remember how the word prejudice was pronounced neither in Norwegian nor English. All this combined

seemed to make the pupil a bit uncomfortable, which student1 noticed. The student then switched over to Norwegian to explain the word prejudice and then switched back to English explaining the same thing again, thus helping the pupils with difficult words while also steering him back to using English.

4.2 Interviews

In this part I will present my findings from the interviews conducted with the students following their practice period and the observations. These findings will be presented in the same order that the questions were asked. Even though all the interviews were conducted separately I have chosen to present their answers combined to give a clearer picture of which thoughts and attitudes were similar and which were different. Also, I will present questions concerning the same subjects together.

When referring to my informant I will be using the feminine pronoun “she” for all four informants. This is a choice I have made to anonymize their sex, while also maintaining a clear structure.

4.2.1 Using English orally

The first question I asked the students was a general question about their ideal English teacher: “How would you describe the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English?”

As expected, from my observations, they all thought it was important to use English as much as possible. Two of them also mentioned how the English environment is important and how one must work on creating a safe and fun environment where it should be ok to say or pronounce words wrongly. Student4 argued the following: ‘It should not be dangerous to pronounce a word wrong. If a pupil does not know what a word is in English they can say it in English-Norwegian, Norwenglish. Defuse it.’

Another aspect I found important while analyzing the interview was the answer of student1. The student explained how exposure to English is important but one should also remember as a teacher to vary what type of lessons one has. By this she meant that the lessons should not be the pupils reading out loud from books every time they are supposed to practice their oral

English, but rather use different methods of practicing their oral English by using role-plays or have meaningful and interesting discussions which can motivate the pupils to speak.

The next question involved the importance of speaking English rather than using Norwegian. I asked the students if they find it important to speak English at all times during an English class and why or why not. All four students had somewhat the same opinion towards this question. They all expressed a preference for an English-only use during English classes and explained how it could also help pupils get used to using English if English classes were mostly conducted in English. Also, all four students mentioned that there are always some pupils who do not understand certain words or need a clear and simple explanation to properly understand. Without any guidance for their answers they all explained how using English is important but that it is also important that every pupil understand and receive the correct information. Therefore, they believed that situations like that would often require either a simplified use of English or even translating the information to Norwegian.

Student3 provided an example where using English and a safe environment were mentioned. The student thought that using English during English lesson is important but how it is also equally important for the pupils to understand that using Norwegian or *Norwenglish* whenever they do not understand something or can not come up with the correct word, is allowed. The student told me about an example from practice where one pupil could not think of the correct word during a conversation. The word he was looking for in English was the Norwegian word *stikkord*. Instead of stopping in the middle of a sentence because of one word he was unsure of, he simply just said *stikkwords*. Student3 explained how this was a good example of how one can be able to use English only, with the help of a safe environment and allowing the pupils to make mistakes and use Norwegian words if they feel unsure.

4.2.2 Using Norwegian instead of English?

As a follow-up question to the previous one I asked the students if there are any cases where one should use Norwegian instead of English. The answers I was given was quite similar to each other, however, there were some differences to their answers which I feel are important to discuss. Student1 immediately remembered a situation from the practice period where they discussed the concept of intertextuality. The student explained how it was instantly clear that

none of the pupils had really heard of this before, neither in English nor Norwegian, and therefore decided that it would be best to use Norwegian to discuss this.

Student2 and student3 had a somewhat same answer for this question. They both mentioned how Norwegian can be useful if there are any weaker pupils present in the English class. They both talked about words and short sentences being translated to Norwegian, rather than whole discussions being translated. They also explained how they would always speak in English first and then translate the more difficult or important parts in Norwegian. Neither of them mentioned grammar lessons. I therefore asked both of them a follow-up question about how they would interpret the same question if they focused on grammatical lessons. Also here they both answered somewhat the same. Student3 explained how the differences between a regular English lesson and a grammatical lesson would not be that big. The student would still use English as much as possible but make sure to explain certain words or phrases in Norwegian. Student2 would also use as much English as possible, but mentioned how a grammatical lesson can often contain concepts the pupils have never heard of before. The student suggested how a grammatical lesson could therefore start in Norwegian by explaining common words like nouns and grammatical tenses, and then continue the lesson in English trying to use these words. Lastly, student4 would use English as much as possible but suggested that communicating important information or instructions in Norwegian could be helpful for both the teacher and the pupils to ensure that nobody were missing certain information.

4.2.3 Conscious use of English

“Are you always conscious of your own use of oral English?”. This was the fourth question I asked the students. I wanted to ask this question to really make them think about their English use. Student1 said: ‘Whenever I have an English class I am always prepared that I am going to speak English. I also, in the back of my mind, remember that there might be some situations where I have to use Norwegian, but I usually decide to use English only.’ Student2 was also conscious of the way English was used orally. However, she explained that the reason was mostly because she had always heard others say that the more one uses English orally the better. Further she said that even though this was an attitude she had gotten from someone else it was something she believed in as well and had come to consciously do. Student3 also answered that she was conscious of her use of English and also explained how

she sometimes consciously switched to Norwegian in order to give important information or just to make sure that everybody had gotten the message.

The only student with a somewhat different answer than the others was student4. She described how she did not feel too conscious about how and when English was being used. However, she would always be aware that it was an English class and it was mostly the beginnings of the classes where she would consciously use English: ‘I do try to use English as much as possible, but it is not like I have plans for when I am supposed to speak English. I do what comes naturally in different settings and situations.’

4.2.4 Dealing with weaker pupils in English

Another aspect of the students’ attitudes towards oral English that I wanted to explore was their attitude towards dealing with weaker pupils concerning the use of oral English. I therefore asked them how one can or should deal with weaker pupils of English. The answers I first anticipated was that an English teacher should in cases like these explain and translate to Norwegian. However, their answers immediately reflected their thought on what their ideal English teacher was. Student1 told me that she believed simplifying her English use, rather than speaking Norwegian in these situations, could be helpful. She also told me about a specific situation where a small adjustment to her English was all she had to do to make it easier for some of the pupils to understand. She explained the situation as following: ‘I have had some pupils come up to me during our practice period telling me that I talk too fast when speaking English. Instead of explaining words and sentences in Norwegian the pupils just needed me to adjust the speed of my speech and simplifying some words.’ She also mentioned how they were always working on the pupils feeling safe when using their English, and how they always kept reminding the pupils that if they could not remember or did not know the English word to use it was okay to *norwegianize* some words. In addition, she explained how she found it important to show the pupils that even the teachers sometimes *norwegianize* some words and how she hoped this would lead to a safer environment for trying and failing.

Student2 had a somewhat similar answer as Student1 did and also emphasized the importance of adjusting her English rather than using Norwegian in every situation. However, she did explain that if it was obvious that some of the pupils did not understand anything at all she

would explain it in Norwegian. Although she mentioned translating to Norwegian she emphasized that: ‘Always explain things in English first, and then if there are someone who still does not understand one can maybe try explaining again in English using simplified language. After that one can translate to Norwegian.’ Again the idea that the more one uses the language the more one learns is expressed through her answer, which also reflects her thoughts on the ideal English teacher.

Student3 had a short but specific answer. She also mentioned the importance of adjusting both language and the lessons for weaker pupils, but had a stronger opinion towards using English as much as possible. She suggested how one could provide the weaker pupils with easier tasks but make sure that they always tried to use English. Student3’s main focus when talking about weaker pupils was that one can only learn by actually using the language: ‘Letting the pupils speak and at all times helping them speak is important.’

Student4 had a slightly different view on this question. She did mention the importance of using English rather than translating to Norwegian all the time. However, she believed that it could be helpful for weaker pupils to work in groups. She explained:

‘It could seem a bit scary for those who do not feel safe. One could perhaps put them in groups with someone on the same level as themselves so that they may be able to discuss and use the English language. One could also put the pupils in smaller groups or with someone they can lean on - there are those who take the initiative and those who are more silent. The first thing I can think of when it comes to weaker pupils is putting them in smaller groups and making sure to guide and help them with their English.’

Student4 seemed really interested in how one can best make the weaker pupils feel safe but at the same time use English as much as possible.

To dive deeper into the students’ thoughts surrounding this theme I asked a question wondering what one could do if a pupil refuses to speak English. All four of them mentioned safe environment as helpful in cases like that. Student1 found the question to be quite difficult given that she had only experienced being a teacher through practice periods. Nevertheless, she believed good communication with the parents combined with continuous work on building a safe English environment for the pupil could help. Student2, on the other hand, had

a concrete example from her practice period regarding this theme: ‘There was this one pupil who was constantly trying to get attention by only using Norwegian. He did speak English very well so he only did it to get the attention. What I did was respond with “sorry, I can’t understand you”. But we could only do this because we knew that he was actually really good in English.’ She further explained that if a pupil is struggling with English she would try to work on the English environment as well as explaining to the pupil that it is allowed to use Norwegian words whenever she feels unsure about the English words.

Both student3 and student4 were quick to mention how it is important to encourage the weaker pupils to speak English but also equally important not to push them too hard as that could lead to the opposite effect; speaking less English. Similar to student1 and student2, student3 also mentioned the aspect of creating a safe English environment to make it a normal part of the pupils’ school day to speak English. Using role-play as a method for speaking more English, and feeling safe doing so, was also something student3 believed could be helpful. Another good idea to help pupils who refuse to speak English is voice-over, which student4 explained as a helpful tool. She explained that for each given subject or theme the weaker pupils prepare a manuscript of what they want to answer to a given question or task. Then, this manuscript should be practiced before recording it. This way the pupils will not have to speak in front of a bigger audience but still be able to use English orally as well as practice and get advice and guidance from the teacher.

4.2.5 The practice teacher’s influence on the students’ English use.

Students often begin their practice period as observers, where they get to know the class and observe how the teacher, their practice teacher, conducts the lessons. Through this, students will often, unconsciously, copy or borrow some of the practice teacher’s characteristics and attitudes. I myself have experienced doing so, which is why I decided to ask my informants if they felt affected by their practice teacher’s use of English in any way.

To this question almost every one of them answered yes. However, student3 argued that she felt more affected by last year’s practice teacher and his way of being an English teacher. Student3 further explained how last year’s practice teacher and the current practice teacher mostly had the same attitude towards oral English. Still, student3 explained that: ‘He (last year’s practice teacher) was very determined to use English at all times, very much the same

as my current practice teacher, but he is who I have been most affected by given that my current practice teacher did not provide me with anything new.’ Based on this answer I asked student3 whether she felt affected when it came to thoughts on the ideal teacher concerning oral English. She answered that she did feel somewhat affected but that throughout primary school there has been several teachers who spoke a lot of English, and felt they had affected the idea of the ideal teacher more.

The other students all expressed that they felt affected by their practice teachers. Student1 argued how she felt quite affected by how the practice teacher did certain things and used English orally, but she explained that these were all ideal-thoughts she had before starting her practice period. However, student1 explained that during the weeks of practice she learned a lot of new things from the practice teacher that she would incorporate into her own ideals. Also student2 explained how she felt affected by how the practice teacher did things: ‘The practice teacher told me from the beginning that they only use English during English lessons. Even when I spoke to the practice teacher about something non-school related she insisted that we would speak English only.’ Student2 further explained how she felt strongly affected by the practice teacher’s way of being and believed her methods worked, thus wanting to incorporate this into future English lessons of her own.

I found student4’s answer to be quite interesting. She explained how speaking English only, was something she had never completely done or had as a part of the ideals before. However, during the weeks of practice her practice teacher’s use of oral English had really affected her thoughts towards oral English: ‘I believe it has affected me to speak more English.’ She also mentioned last year’s practice period where the practice teacher had used more Norwegian during English lessons. This had led to student4 also using Norwegian more than English. In addition, she explains how most students will probably be affected by their practice teacher’s thoughts and attitudes towards the use of oral English.

4.2.6 Specific situations during practice

During my observations I also took notes on specific situations concerning the way the students used English orally and if there were any cases where they used Norwegian instead of English.

The first situation I want to present is a situation with student3. During the beginning of an English lesson there was some casual talk to get the pupils to their seats and prepare for English. This was all carried out in Norwegian. When interviewing student3 I asked whether this was done consciously and why. The answer I got was as follows: ‘I do it consciously to not just jump straight into the English lesson, and also to create a calmness before starting a lesson. I would have done the same in any other subject as well.’ The same situation occurred with student4 where she took attendance, as well as some casual talk, in Norwegian. Again, I asked if this was done consciously and why. Student4 answered that the plan was always to speak as much English as possible but that the English lessons would sometimes start in Norwegian to calm the pupils and prepare them for a new subject.

Another situation involved student4 in a conversation with a pupil who needed help. The student asked by using English how she could help the pupil. The pupil then answered in Norwegian while student4 continued using English. Eventually, the pupil also switched to English. I asked student4 to explain the situation and why she continued using English even though the pupil answered in Norwegian. The following answer was given:

‘It seemed to me that the pupil was testing to see if he would be able to answer everything in Norwegian. Not because of poor skills in English but rather for being lazy. I decided I would continue using English to see if the pupil would also switch to English, which he did. Also in that situation I remember switching to Norwegian at the end. The reason I did this was because I could see on the pupil’s face that he was not entirely sure what everything I had said in English meant. To make sure that the pupil would understand everything, and receive all the information, I shortly summed up everything again. ‘

Student4 ended his answer by arguing how the ideal would be to mostly use English but that it can in some cases be quite useful to switch to Norwegian, but only for a short time. It had also proven useful for student4 to use Norwegian to ensure that everyone had understood any important information.

5 Discussion

In this chapter I will discuss my findings from the observations and interviews, using the theoretical framework presented in chapter 2.

5.1 Exposure to English

During the interviews all four of the students expressed how speaking English at all times was important for them. As presented earlier (cf. section 2.2), the communicative approach (Szecsy, 2008) is based on the idea that language learning is the acquisition of communication rather than grammar and vocabulary. Similar to the students' idea of exposure to English, the communicative approach also underlines the importance of how successful language learning is gained through communicating and the interaction between the pupils. The aspect of communicating and interaction is something I find quite interesting in this discussion. When it comes to oral English in the classroom, and being able to communicate in the language, it is important to create an English environment for both the teachers' and the pupils' benefit. The more consistent one is with using English orally in the classroom the less scary it could be for the pupils to use and try out their English.

5.1.1 "Can I write gulrot?"

Another aspect of communicating and interaction in the classroom, which was discussed during the interviews, is the aspect of allowing the pupils to try and fail when speaking English. As mentioned, when I presented the data from the interviews, all of the informants expressed how they believed allowing the pupils to use some Norwegian words when feeling uncertain, could help them increase their English use. Examples the informants mentioned about using Norwegian words mixed with English, were pupils saying 'can I write gulrot?' or words like 'stikkwords'. These are examples I also observed during their practice, which shows a consistency between what the student actually practiced and their thoughts on what their ideal teacher is like. These thoughts are also supported by Harmer's explanation of how using the L1 can be an advantage for the pupils (2015) (cf. section 2.3.1). He also states how denying the pupils to lean on Norwegian words can lead to the pupils feeling uncomfortable speaking English, which are thoughts the student teacher's expressed as well.

Seeing as all four informants discussed somewhat the same thoughts towards trying and failing, and also what I have experienced throughout my own schooling concerning feeling safe when speaking English, I believe working on a safe English environment is important for speaking English. If one allows the pupils to participate in the choices of oral activities, while also focusing more on learning the language through communication rather than grammar, oral English lessons can maybe develop into a more realistic communication situation. As previously seen, Lightbown and Spada's (2013) (cf. section 2.1.1) study on learning conditions shows that one of the main differences between acquiring a first language compared to acquiring a second language is how meaning is responded to rather than the grammatical accuracy. These are also ideas that occurred in the students' explanation of what their ideal teacher is like. Even though most of the English lessons involved written tasks, the idea of learning the language through communication rather than explicit grammar teaching was always present, and the students would often overlook smaller errors and instead focus on speaking using the English language.

Focusing on communication in English was a recurring theme during the interviews. None of the questions asked focused specifically on the use of grammar. However, all four students mentioned during their interviews how they believed freedom to speak, without assessing the pupils' grammar, is important for practicing oral English. Learning conditions and correction of spoken language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013) (cf. section 2.1.1) provides a wider understanding of the students' thoughts towards this. When children acquire their first language the responses are always on meaning and not the children's grammatical accuracy. Also, when comparing how one learns English as a second language outside school, with how it is learned in school, the differences lies mainly as to what extent one's grammatical accuracy is assessed or not. The answers received from the interviews show that the students' ideal teachers follow Lightbown and Spada's (2013) idea that grammatical mistakes should not interfere with meaningful communication.

On the basis of my thoughts before conducting this study, and also from my observations and the interviews, there is an indication that teachers should expose pupils to a larger amount of meaningful communication when teaching oral English. The focus on grammatical accuracy should also be reduced and reserved for grammatical lessons only. Szecsy (2008) (cf. section 2.2) talks about the communicative approach, which suggests that successful language learning is gained through communicating real meaning and the focus on interaction. An

interesting discovery from both the observations and the interviews was the fact that all four students communicated in the interview that they preferred to let the pupils speak freely and not comment on errors. The observations, on the other hand, provided me with contradictory situations. I sometimes observed the students correcting the pupils' language during oral activities, disrupting the flow of oral English use. I feel it is important to mention that the corrections made by the students did not happen much, but were observed a couple of times during their practice. These situations of correction led me to think that the students' thought on the ideal English teacher, concerning oral English, have a big effect on how they want to be as teachers. However, I also believe that the desire teachers have, to help and teach the pupils to speak proper English, can sometimes get in the way of practicing free communication in the classroom, something I think was the case when the students corrected the pupils' English language.

5.1.2 Engaging pupils in interaction

If looking at the "Let's Talk" proposal by Lightbown and Spada (2013) (cf. section 2.2.1) there are some similarities between that and the students' ideals and practice. When asking the students about their ideal English teacher, concerning oral English, they all mentioned that it is crucial to create a safe English environment so that all pupils can engage in different interactions. During the observations I noticed how the students would interact with the pupils when words or themes became difficult. There was always room for any type of questions if the pupils did not understand. At the same time, the pupils were always conscious about using their English and were always asking for help whenever they could not remember certain words or mixed them up with other words. These interactions between the students and the pupils resemble what Lightbown and Spada (2013) (cf. section 2.2.1) refer to as negotiation of meaning. They suggest how free communication and access to comprehensible input can lead to negotiation of meaning.

I find the similarities between the "Let's Talk" proposal and the students' thoughts and practice quite engaging. Before I properly met the students who were going to be my informants, I had some hypotheses as to what I would discover during my research. I believe that one has to expose the pupils to as much oral English as possible, while at the same time create room for the pupils to use it. With this I mean creating a safe environment, make it clear that errors need to be made in order to learn, and that the input the pupils get should be

comprehensible. These are all thoughts I expected to hear about from the students as well. Second, given that one is exposed to English everywhere today, which probably involves that a new generation of English teachers will most likely look at oral English a different way than previous teachers, I expected the students' thought on oral English to be somewhat similar to each other. I believed that the answers I would receive when asking about the use of oral English, would mostly support the argument of "practice makes perfect". As it turned out, many of my assumptions about what I would discover were right. Both the students' practice and their answers during the interview, led back to Lightbown and Spada's (2013) argument on how negotiation of meaning comes from engaging in interaction. All four students expressed how using English in different interactions, while at the same time making sure no one felt forced to speak, was how they believed pupils would be encourage to speak more English.

5.2 Using L1 to facilitate learning of English

When asked if there were some cases one should use Norwegian instead of English, the students were quite hesitant to say yes. They all stuck to their ideal thoughts about using as much English as possible during English lessons. However, two of the student did use a lot of Norwegian during the beginning of their classes. When reminding them of these situations, they explained that the reason for using Norwegian was to get the class more quickly settled down while also introducing what they were going to do during that lesson. According to Harbord (1992) (cf. section 2.3.1) many teachers justify using L1 during English lessons to save time for more productive activities. If we are to compare the thoughts of the two students and what Harbord says, I believe their ideas on using L1 to save time are very much alike. This also shows an agreement between the teachers' thoughts that Harbord has researched, and the thoughts of the students I have observed and interviewed.

When it comes to the question about using the L1 during grammatical lessons, the students' first answer was that they would try to use English as much as possible, even during grammatical lessons. Harbord (1992) (cf. section 2.3.1) also talks about using L1 during grammatical lessons, and his research showed that teachers use the L1 because they believe grammar explained in English would be too difficult for the pupils. After discussing the topic of grammatical lessons with the students, they explained how they believed grammar could often be difficult for pupils. They also explained how they view grammar as very important in

order to learn proper English, and thus how using the L1 could be an advantage for both them as teachers and for the pupils, to make sure the basic grammatical rules would be understood by everyone. An answer, concerning this topic, which I found quite interesting, was one of the students saying how some aspects of the grammatical lessons at the University would sometimes be taught in Norwegian. The student then explained how this was really helpful to acquire every detail of the grammatical rules, and also how this prevented any misunderstanding. Therefore, the student believed teaching the pupils grammatical lessons in Norwegian could give a better outcome overall. Thus, Harbord's (1992) (cf. section 2.3.1) findings on how most teachers resort to L1 during grammatical lessons are consistent with the students' answers. However, his study also mentions (cf. section 2.3.1) that some teachers feel incapable of explaining grammatical aspect in English and therefore tend to their L1, which was not what the students' answers showed. The students' thoughts on the use of oral English, also concerning grammatical lessons, reflect their explanation of the ideal English teacher.

When discussing, during the interviews, using the L1 in English lessons, one of the students mentioned a situation where the word "intertextuality" was brought up. None of the pupils had heard of that word, and some of them did not even know what it meant in Norwegian. The student explained how this was a situation where it was important to use the L1. This way the word would be properly explained in Norwegian, and afterwards the pupils could explore the word and its meaning in English. What was a recurring answer among the students, when talking about the use of L1, was how they would use Norwegian to translate difficult English words or sentences for the pupils. What none of them discussed during the interviews was what Harbord (1992) (cf. section 2.3.1) mentions as a way to facilitate learning of L2 by using the L1. He mentions how pupils should be taught to compare words from the L1 and the L2 to make them aware of the dangers of direct translation, and also to teach them "functional translation". Even though none of the students mentioned these aspects during their interviews, I did observe a few situations during their practice where pupils would use Google Translate to find out what English words or sentences were in Norwegian. The translated words and sentences they ended up with did often sound quite odd in Norwegian, and the students would point out to the pupils how using a tool like Google Translate, and how direct translation would often lead to the words being incorrect.

5.3 The development of one's identity and ideals

The last question I asked the students, during the interviews, was if they felt affected by their practice teachers' use of oral English in any way. Most of them explained that they did feel affected in some ways, but that the way their practice teachers used oral English was also how their ideals was like before starting their practice. The development of one's identity starts from the moment one is born and is formed and adjusted at all times. According to Wittek and Bratholm (2014) (cf. section 2.4), the development of one's identity never ends. This also applies to the student teachers. Throughout their childhood, schooling and practice, the students have developed, and are still developing, an identity as teachers. This identity is also what describes their ideal English teacher.

During the interviews, thoughts on the students' childhood, and how it had affected the development of their ideals, was sometimes brought up by the students. One of the students explained during questions concerning one's own use of oral English, how having a mother who is a teacher and how her use of oral English had affected the student's ideals during childhood. One of the other students explained how having an English teacher during primary school who always used English during English lessons, played a big part in the development of what the ideal English teacher looked like. Even though I did not ask directly about what had affected their view on the ideal English teacher, they all mentioned during their interviews, aspects about their childhood and schooling that had somehow had an effect on what they today view as the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English. If comparing the observations to what was said during the interviews, it is rather difficult to know for sure what parts of their oral English that has been affected by the aspects mentioned above. However, one can look at Wittek and Bratholm's (2014) (cf. section 2.4) study where they discuss types of identities that are involved in a teacher's development of identity. The type of identity called *Natural Identity*, which involves childhood environment, supports what the students explained as factors that has played a part in their development of their identity and ideals. This makes their practice and use of oral English much more interesting to examine. Instead of just comparing their oral use of English during practice to their answers during their interviews, Wittek and Bratholm's (2014) study offers a wider understanding of the comparison between the students' thoughts on the ideal English teacher, and how they are as teachers during their practice.

Another type of identity I feel is relevant for the discussion is the identity Wittek and Bratholm (2014) calls *Interest Identity*, which are all the communities of interest one has gained throughout life. All student teachers who have chosen to study the teacher education and who have chosen English as their subject, are in the same community of interest. One student mentioned in the interview how fellow student teachers and their use of oral English would also affect how one would want to use English orally in the classroom. Based on what the students said during the interviews about their childhood and how they then viewed the use of oral English, and also how they discussed their ideals today, there are several factors that together have developed into what the students view today as the ideal English teacher. These are factors I find very interesting, especially when combined with their practice and what I have been able to observe. Through what Wittek and Bratholm (2014) (cf. section 2.4) presents as different types of identities, and other factors throughout the students' life, their thoughts on the ideal English teacher have been developed and their attitudes towards the use of oral English have been constructed. When looking at how this was reflected in their practice, their thoughts and attitudes did mostly represent their actions.

The study has given me an insight into how one's identity and ideals are built up by different factors. The development of their identity is also what has constructed the answers I was given by the students. The most interesting part, concerning the topic of development of one's identity, is that even though the students grew up differently, some with parents being teachers, some with teachers using more Norwegian than English, and some getting a genuine interest for English when starting at the University, their thoughts and attitudes towards oral English are almost identical.

6 Conclusion

This study has provided some interesting insights into attitudes on the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English, and how these ideals are represented in the students' practice. As seen, research has shown that teachers of English view the use of oral English differently. Some follow the English-only policy (cf. section 2.3.1), while some see how using the L1 can be useful for learning English. Based on the interviews there are many similarities between the research presented and the student teachers' attitudes and thoughts towards the use of oral English. What I have found to be the most interesting and important

aspect of the interviews was the student teachers' explanation of the ideal English teacher when it comes to the use of oral English. They all argued how using oral English as much as possible was the best way to teach pupils English, which left me with the conclusion that at least some student teachers advocate the idea of the English-only policy in some ways.

What I also found important, regarding the interviews, was the student teachers' answers regarding what to do concerning weaker pupils during English lessons. Instead of switching to Norwegian when pupils find it difficult to understand or speak English, the students suggested different approaches without omitting English completely. Some of these approaches included simplifying their English during lessons, and using a mix between Norwegian and English if necessary. Some concluding thoughts deriving from this was that the student teachers' thoughts on how oral English should be used as much as possible, were also reflected in a conscious attitude towards the use of the L1 during English lessons. I believe this shows, and also strengthens the assumption, that these students advocate the English-only policy, and that they are aware of their English use and thereby construct the pupils' English lessons accordingly.

A final conclusion to my thesis is that the students' attitudes and thoughts towards the use of oral English in the classroom were very much reflected in their practice. To answer the research question of this study I would say that the student teachers found it important to speak English and also encourage the pupils to speak English. I also believe that they facilitate for the use of English and try to simplify their English when necessary, rather than using Norwegian. Based on this study I also think that the student teachers encourage the use of oral English, and their ideals are implemented in every part of their English lessons. To establish these findings conclusively and draw a general conclusion, a larger study which involves more informants and covers many areas of the country, is necessary.

There are several aspects of this study which could be interesting to further research. One of them is the aspect of acquiring a more general answer to the study question. To be able to do that one could get more participants to observe and interview. These participants should also be student teachers from several different universities in Norway. This way, one would be able to compare the attitudes and thoughts of a larger amount of student teachers, and thus be able to look at how these thoughts agree with the students' practice.

A second aspect which could be interesting to further research, is the pupils' use of oral English. One could spend a longer period of time focusing on how and when pupils use English. Then one could implement the English-only policy to see if there are any changes or improvements to the pupils' English use.

7 List of references

- Atkins, L. & Wallace, S. (2012). *Qualitative Research in Education*, London: Sage Publications Ltd
- Bjørndalen, C. R. P. (2008). *Det vurderende øyet*, Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag AS
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*, London: Praeger Publishers
- Christoffersen, L. & Johannessen, A. (2012). *Forskningsmetode for lærerutdanningen*. Oslo: Abstrakt Forlag AS
- Crain, S. & Lillo-Martin, D. (1999). *An Introduction to Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition*. Massachusetts USA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Harbord, J. (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal* 46 (4) p. 350-355
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Longman.
- Kumar, R. (2005). *Research Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd
- Kuppens, An H. (2009, 25.11). Incidental foreign language acquisition from media exposure. Retrieved from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17439880903561876>
- Laboy, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Lightbown, Patsy M. & Spada, N. (2013). *How Languages are Learned*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research*, Victoria Australia: Blackwell Publishing

Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative Competence: Some roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development*. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253), Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Szecszy, E. M. (2008). Communicative approach. In J. M. González (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of bilingual education* (Vol. 2, pp. 156V158). Thousand Oaks

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (n.d). Competence Aims After Year 10. Retrieved from: <https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Kompetansemaal/kompetansemaal-etter-10.-arstrinn>

Wittek, K. & Bratholm, B. (2014). *Læringsbaner – om lærernes læring of praksis*, Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS

8 Addendums

8.1 Interview guide

- 1) Hvordan vil du beskrive den ideale engelsklæreren? Hvordan vil du beskrive den ideal engelsklæreren når det kommer til muntlig bruk av engelsk?
- 2) Er det viktig å snakke engelsk til enhver tid i engelsktimer? Hvorfor/hvorfor ikke?
- 3) Er det noen tilfeller hvor en bør bruke norsk i stedet for engelsk?
- 4) Er du alltid bevisst på engelskbruken din? Utdyp.
- 5) Hvordan bør/kan en håndtere svakere elever i engelsk?
- 6) Hva kan en gjøre hvis en elev nekter å snakke engelsk i engelsktimene?
- 7) Vil du si at du blir påvirket av engelskbruken til din praksislærer på noen måte? Utdyp.
- 8) Spørsmål til informantene basert på konkrete hendelser i engelsktimene deres hvor de kan reflektere og forsvare sine valg og metoder.

Presentasjon

- presentasjon av meg selv
- informasjon om prosjektet
- ideallærer i engelsk
- intervjuet: hvor viktig er bruken av muntlig engelsk i engelsktimer?

Generell informasjon

- frivillig deltakelse
- informanter kan trekke seg når som helst
- lydopptak – lagres sikkert og slettes ved prosjektslutt
- anonymitet
- resultater skal presenteres på konferanse ved prosjektslutt

Bakgrunnsinformasjon

- lærerstudenter ved uit
- årstrinn - 2. årsstudenter
- årstrinn på praksisskole

8.2 Informational letter to the parents

Masterprosjekt vår 2017

Kristine Hauglid

Hei, mitt navn er Kristine Hauglid og jeg skal i løpet av uke 5 og uke 6 samle inn data for min masteroppgave ved _____ skole. Masteren min vil kun fokusere på de to studentene som gjennomfører sin praksis på skolen. Jeg vil være til stedet i deres engelsktimer og blir kun å benytte meg av observasjon samt ta notater i løpet av engelsktimene deres. Det vil ikke bli samlet inn noe som helst informasjon verken om skolen, klassetrinnet eller elevene ved skolen. Mitt fokus vil kun være på lærerstudentene.

Med vennlig hilsen

Kristine Hauglid

8.3 Approval from NSD

Kristin Killie
Institutt for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk UiT Norges arktiske universitet

9006 TROMSØ

Vår dato: 09.02.2017

Vår ref: 52029 / 3 / AGH

Deres dato:

Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 10.01.2017. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

<i>52029</i>	<i>Ideals meet reality: How are teacher students' attitudes and thoughts towards the use of oral English in school reflected in their practice?</i>
<i>Behandlingsansvarlig</i>	<i>UiT Norges arktiske universitet, ved institusjonens øverste leder</i>
<i>Daglig ansvarlig</i>	<i>Kristin Killie</i>
<i>Student</i>	<i>Kristine Hauglid</i>

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i meldeskjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, ombudets kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, <http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/meldeplikt/skjema.html>. Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal skje skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, <http://pvo.nsd.no/prosjekt>.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 26.06.2017, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Kjersti Haugstvedt

Agnete Hessevik

Kontaktperson: Agnete Hessevik tlf: 55 58 27 97

Dokumentet er elektronisk produsert og godkjent ved NSDs rutiner for elektronisk godkjenning.

Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Kopi: Kristine Hauglid kristinehauglid@msn.com



UTVALG OG DATAINNSAMLING

Utvalget er lærerstudenter ved UiT. Datamaterialet innhentes gjennom personlig intervju og observasjon i klasserom under lærerstudentens praksis.

Det er ikke meldt at det skal registreres personopplysninger om skoleelever. Personvernombudet forutsetter derfor at du ikke registrerer personidentifiserende opplysninger om enkeltelever. Du har i e-post mottatt 06.02.2017 bekreftet at du ikke vil gjøre opptak i klasserommet.

Vi forutsetter at du innhenter tillatelse fra ledelsen ved skolene til å gjøre observasjon i klasserommet. Vi anbefaler at barnas foresatte får informasjon om studien, og at det framgår at du ikke vil registrere opplysninger om enkeltelever.

TAUSHETSPLIKT

Vi minner om at lærerstudentene har taushetsplikt overfor elever de underviser når de er i praksis, og at de ikke kan gi opplysninger som kan identifisere en enkeltelev direkte eller indirekte. Det er svært viktig at intervjuet gjennomføres på en slik måte at taushetsplikten overholdes. Dette gjelder også når du kjenner til elevene på bakgrunn av observasjon, og i et slikt tilfelle må du og informanten være særlig påpasselige. Du og informanten har sammen ansvar for dette, og bør innledningsvis i intervjuet drøfte hvordan dette skal håndteres.

INFORMASJON OG SAMTYKKE

Utvalget informeres skriftlig og muntlig om prosjektet og samtykker til deltakelse. Informasjonsskrivet er hovedsakelig godt utformet. Vi ber imidlertid om at følgende endres/tilføyes:

- Oppgi dine og veileders kontaktinformasjon.
- Fjern setningen "i løpet av deres praksis vil det også bli tatt opptak av deres interaksjoner med elevene".
- Presiser følgende setning, så det ikke kan tolkes som at informantene får tilgang til data om hverandre: "De som vil ha tilgang til informasjonen som blir samlet inn i løpet av studiet er jeg, min veileder og mine informanter".
- Vi anbefaler at du skriver at datamaterialet vil bli anonymisert ved prosjektslutt, heller en slettet, slik at du kan ta vare på anonymt datamateriale.

INFORMASJONSSIKKERHET

Personvernombudet legger til grunn at forsker etterfølger UiT Norges arktiske universitet sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet.

PUBLISERING

I meldeskjemaet er det krysset av for at det skal publiseres personopplysninger i oppgaven. Personvernombudet legger til grunn at dette er feil og har endret dette punktet. Vi gjør oppmerksom på at dersom

personopplysninger skal publiseres må det innhentes et eksplisitt samtykke til dette. Det framgår ikke av informasjonsskrivet at personopplysninger skal publiseres.

PROSJEKTSLUTT

Forventet prosjektslutt er 26.06.2017. Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal innsamlede opplysninger da anonymiseres. Anonymisering innebærer å bearbeide datamaterialet slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes. Det gjøres ved å:

- slette direkte personopplysninger (som navn/koblingsnøkkel)
- slette/omskrive indirekte personopplysninger (identifiserende sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. bosted/arbeidssted, alder og kjønn)
- slette digitale lydopptak