

Teachers' Knowledge and Classroom Practices of Pronunciation in Lower Secondary School in Norway

Ingrid Fallang

Master's thesis in LRU-3902 English didactics May 2016

30 study points



Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I want to thank all the informants for agreeing to be a part of this study. Without them the study could not have happened. You have all given me tips and reflections to consider when I myself become a teacher.

Secondly, Runar, you are my rock. Without your support I am sure that this thesis would not have reached the quality it has today. I also want to show my gratitude to Marthe, who has spent endless hours on correction and making me food. It has meant a lot during the process of making this thesis. You have both given me invaluable moral support and academic guidance.

In addition, I would like to extend my thanks to friends and family who have aided me both with academically relevant and irrelevant conversations during these past months.

Lastly, I would like to thank my advisor Minjeong for academic guidance of high quality throughout this research project.

Tromsø, 15.5.16

Ingrid Fallang

Abstract

This study investigates English pronunciation teaching among Norwegian teachers with regards to classroom practices and knowledge of this subject matter. In addition, the research aims to find out the role that formal education has when it comes to teaching pronunciation. This includes the amount of formal education in teaching and in English that the teachers have, and additionally what it could indicate when it comes to the teachers' knowledge and practice of subject matter. The final aspect that will be investigated in this study is what teachers think and consider good English pronunciation to be. Since there are no national criteria for assessment of pronunciation, this question may lead to quite subjective answers.

The data was obtained through interviews. There were six English teachers who took part in the study, all of whom work in the lower secondary school. The topics of the interview included the teachers' own cognition, their teacher training background, classroom practices and expectation and assessment of pupils' English pronunciation. Previous research on this topic suggests that teachers should be aware of how their knowledge and confidence of subject matter affect their teaching of it. Additional research on this topic indicates the importance of explicit pronunciation teaching, but also how formal education will aid teachers in developing their cognition of subject matters.

The results from this study indicate that teachers' knowledge of pronunciation as a subject matter appears to be adequate. Even though their confidence in their own pronunciation is high. However, the actual teaching practices and awareness of its importance appear to be more limited. The tendency is that pedagogical insight and self-perception of subject matter are attained through a formal education of quality in pronunciation *and* pedagogy. Still, having a lot of formal education in the subject matter is also of importance as the teachers appear to be more competent in teaching pronunciation spontaneously together with other language areas with more ease. To some informants, pronunciation is part of the oral assessment of pupils and to others, it is an indication as to the accent they encourage their pupils to speak with in English. However, all of the informants seem to agree that having a distinct pronunciation that is intelligible is important when it comes to assessing pupils' spoken English.

Sammendrag

Denne studien undersøker norske engelsklæreres praksiser i å undervise i engelsk uttale, spesielt med tanke på praksis i klasserommet og deres kunnskaper knyttet til dette fagstoffet. I tillegg vil forskningen forsøke å finne ut hvilken rolle formell utdanning har når det kommer til undervisning i uttale. Studien vil også undersøke om mengden av formell utdanning som lærer og i engelsk påvirker undervisning og kunnskap i fagstoffet. Det siste aspektet som denne studien undersøker er hva lærere tenker god engelskuttale er. Siden det ikke finnes noen klare, nasjonale vurderingskriterier i uttale, ligger det til rette for å bli subjektive svar.

Innhenting av data til studien ble gjort via intervjuer. Det er seks informanter, hvorav alle er engelsklærere på ungdomsskolen. Intervjuets temaer inkluderer egen oppfatning av lærerrollen, deres bakgrunn i engelskuttale fra lærerskolen, undervisningspraksiser, forventninger og evaluering av elevenes engelskuttale. Tidligere studier har antydning at lærere burde være bevisst på hvordan deres egne kunnskaper og selvtillit påvirker undervisningen av fagstoffet. Videre viser studier at det er viktig å undervise eksplisitt i uttale, samtidig som det viser seg at formell utdanning kan hjelpe lærere i å utvikle egen oppfatning av fagstoffet.

Resultatene fra denne studien indikerer at selvtilliten til lærere i uttale er høy, men den faktiske praksisen og innsikten av dens viktige betydning av å undervise i fagstoffet virker å være mer begrenset. Tendensen viser seg å være at innsikt i pedagogikk og selvoppfatning i forhold til engelskuttale, blir skaffet gjennom en formell utdanning som er av kvalitet både når det kommer til uttale og pedagogikk. Det er imidlertid av konsekvens å ha ganske mye formell utdanning i uttale, ettersom lærerne gir inntrykk av å være mer kompetent til å undervise lett og spontant i fagstoffet, selv når man jobber med andre engelsklæringsområder. For noen lærere er uttale i engelsk bare en del av den muntlige evalueringen av elevene, mens for andre så blir uttale sett på som en antydning til hvilken standard aksent lærere skal oppmuntre elever til å ha. Uansett er informantene enige om at en tydelig uttale som er forståelig er vesentlig i forhold til elevenes muntlige ferdigheter i engelsk.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
Sammendrag.....	vi
List of tables	xi
List of abbreviations.....	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.1.1 Relevance/contribution in the field	1
1.2 Aim	3
1.3 Disposition.....	4
1.3.1 The structure of this thesis	4
2 Theoretical framework	5
2.1 Oral skills.....	5
2.1.1 Receptive and productive skills.....	6
2.1.2 Assessment of oral skills in the national curriculum.....	7
2.1.3 Why pronunciation is important to teach	7
2.2 Teacher cognition and skills	9
2.2.1 Teacher skills.....	9
2.2.2 Teacher cognition	11
2.3 Pronunciation norms in the Norwegian classroom.....	13
2.3.1 Native speaker model and intercultural model.....	13
2.3.2 Perceived attitudes of speaker norms in the classroom.....	14
3 Methodology	17
3.1 The qualitative method	17
3.2 The informants.....	19
3.3 The interview guide - questions.....	20

3.4	The analysis of the data material	22
3.5	Ethical considerations	23
4	Findings and discussion	25
4.1	Self-cognition	25
4.2	Teaching practice.....	27
4.2.1	Classroom practices and accent.....	27
4.2.2	Corrective feedback.....	29
4.3	Educational background	30
4.3.1	Teacher training.....	31
4.3.2	Teacher skills.....	32
4.3.3	Teachers' avoidance of English teaching.....	33
4.4	Expectations.....	34
4.4.1	Expectations of pupils' pronunciation.....	34
4.4.2	Importance of pronunciation	35
4.5	Assessment	35
4.6	Summing up the most important findings	39
5	Conclusion.....	42
5.1	Criticism	43
5.2	Future research	43
6	List of references	46
7	Attachments.....	48
7.1	48
	Intervjuguide.....	48
	Interview guide	50
7.2	NSD-approval.....	52
7.3	E-mail to principals	54
7.4	The information document given to the informants	54

List of tables

Table 1 Summary of the informants' background.	20
---	----

List of abbreviations

BR – Standard British English (BrE)

GA – General American English (AmE)

ELT – English language Teaching

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

TEFL – Teaching English as a Foreign Language

ELF – English as a lingua franca

KAL – Knowledge About Language

NSD – Norsk Samfunnsfaglig Datatjeneste

PPU – Praktisk Pedagogisk Utdanning

SLA – Second Language Acquisition

L1 – first language

L2 – second language

TL – Target Language

CPH – Critical Period Hypothesis

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

In the early stages of conceptualizing this thesis, I was talking to some friends about their history of English in school. They told me about their reluctance to speak in class due to an absence of near-native-like accent. This led me to wondering whether this is still the attitude, because I remember this was the case at my school when I was young. I have always been interested in dialects and accents, and particularly the differences between American and British English in the English subject. I figured that I wanted to know what teachers teach concerning the topic of pronunciation in school. Before starting the research project, I suspected that common practice in the classroom for teachers was not to explicitly claim to want their pupils to have a near-native-like accent. However, I thought that teachers' beliefs of what pupils' ultimate state of pronunciation should be is still influenced by a preference towards a native-likeness to an English accent. Because of this influence that teachers have on pupils' attitudes and self-perception, it is even more vital for teachers to be aware of their influence and make their expectations known to the pupils.

Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) has traditions in Norway. It is not controversial to say that the teaching of English has evolved through the last hundred years as the need for it has developed. If you were to travel to France and you want to order a meal, but cannot speak French, what do you do? You speak English, which is a common means of communication due to its role as a globalized language. If one is to speak a mumbling form of Norwenglish (a Norwegian hybrid between Norwegian and English) the recipient will likely experience some trouble in understanding. The ideal is to have a distinct pronunciation that is universally understood. I want to explore what Norwegian teachers of English think about this topic. I want to know what they are preparing their pupils for. Do they aim at teaching English pronunciation to a level of attainment that is sufficient for communicative purposes, or do they expect a native-like standard of pronunciation that conforms to the norms of English with either British English or American English as a model?

1.1.1 Relevance/contribution in the field

Studies that are conducted within the field of pronunciation teaching in Norway seem, to a large extent, to be about pupils and their pronunciation struggles, identity or attitudes, such as Rindal (2010) and Rugesæter's (2012) studies. The way teachers conduct and behave in the

classroom is a part of what influences pupils. Hence, researching what teachers know about the distinct subject area of pronunciation and what they do with it in the classroom are relevant issues regarding teachers' beliefs, attitudes and competence in pronunciation. Borg (2001) claims that the amount of knowledge that teachers have affects their practices, which also influence pupils' knowledge and practice. "[...] developing strategies which enable teachers to become aware of their KAL, and to understand how this awareness influences their teaching, should also be an important goal for those involved in teacher education." (Borg, 2001, p. 21). Borg suggests here that because knowledge about language influences teachers' teaching, and teachers influence pupils, then teachers should be aware of this circle to be able to make good instructional decisions. Borg further suggests work for teacher education programs, which this thesis will not go further into details about. However, this research wants to see whether there is a correlation between teachers' knowledge of pronunciation, formal education and their teaching practices.

Pronunciation is a smaller part of one of the two main areas in English as a school subject in Norway, oral and written. The question is how much weight do teachers put on teaching pronunciation? Do they know enough to teach it efficiently or is it too small a topic for it to have any importance? Rugesæter (2014) has done research on pupils and their passive exposure to spoken English from the media, and he believed it to be interesting to see the teachers' angle of it and their practices. Rugesæter emphasizes that teachers should have phonological awareness and knowledge regarding pupils' L2 acquisition, because of learners' phonological difficulties. "[...] it would be of interest to further investigate practices in the Norwegian English classroom with regard to pronunciation teaching, and the impact these practices actually have on young learners' phonological acquisition." (Rugesæter, 2014, p. 17). Rugesæter here proposes to see how explicit teaching of pronunciation has impact on pupils' phonological competence, however, what I am investigating is the current state of affairs among teachers regarding teaching practice in pronunciation.

This particular study has not been conducted before and it is an important one to present as there seems to be change in attitude regarding the required English pronunciation competence. There are especially two points as to why it has relevance in the field of English teaching in Norwegian school. Firstly, it shows teachers and teacher educators the significance of awareness towards negative influence on incorrect pronunciation in communication. This is apparent when one looks at Gass' early study, as stated in her book from 2012, that wrong pronunciation is even more disturbing than wrong grammar when it comes to oral skills according to native-speakers (Gass, 2012, pp. 343-344). In other words,

without a clear and developed pronunciation, one's proficiency and intelligibility will be reduced. Intelligibility is "[...] the speaker's ability to be understood by the listener" (Rogerson-Revell, 2011, p. 246). With the spread of English as a global means of communication, it is most likely other non-native speakers that Norwegian pupils today will need to communicate with in English. The level of pupils' competence will not need to be native-like for this. At the same time, in order to be understood by other speakers of English, incomprehensible pronunciation should be disposed of and taught. This brings me to the second major reason for this study, which is the Norwegian pupils' end goal in learning English. What should be the ultimate goal of learning English? Should it be reaching a level of competence where you are understood by others who use it for communicational purposes? Or should it be to reach an almost native-like competence? The teacher plays a major role in how pupils assess their own level of competence, and how pupils define their own end goal of English learning. Pronunciation is one of the central elements in defining one's own oral proficiency, and it is one's language production that shapes the first impression of the interlocutor. This leads us to the aim of this study.

1.2 Aim

The aim of this study is to investigate English teachers in Norway and their knowledge and classroom practices of pronunciation. Are teachers aware of the importance of teaching pronunciation, or do they consider it to be unnecessary because they think pupils are able to learn that skill on their own? There are no clear criteria for assessment of English pronunciation in Norway, so what are the practices regarding assessment of pronunciation in the classroom? The main research question is: What knowledge do teachers have in pronunciation and pronunciation teaching and how do they practice their knowledge in teaching? I am further interested in finding out: 1) whether the amount of formal education has any correlation with the quantity and quality of the classroom teaching of pronunciation for teachers in lower secondary school. 2) what Norwegian teachers of English consider to be good pronunciation.

I want to see if there is a correlation between what teachers know about pronunciation and their amount of classroom teaching of this. The indication from the teachers' answers can illustrate their knowledge and self-perception of pronunciation, in addition to how important they consider the teaching of this subject matter to be. I am also curious about teachers' instructions and expectations towards pupils' spoken English. i.e. if they want their pupils to

use a native-like spoken standard accent, or if that particular expectation is slowly being eradicated. Previous research has suggested that amount of formal education can be an indicator of the teachers' knowledge and beliefs regarding subject matter and I want to see if that applies in my research as well. Finally, seeing how teachers assess pupils is also connected to what they consider to be good pronunciation and as there is no official norm, this is bound to be quite subjective.

1.3 Disposition

1.3.1 The structure of this thesis

This thesis is organized in three major parts, theory, methodology and findings with discussion. The theory chapter will provide a background for my research and give not only a frame as to the traditions and history of this field of research, but also definitions of important concepts and aspects that are central in this topic. Chapter three which discusses methodology provides a description of the methods that are used to undertake this research. In chapter four, I will present my findings from the conducted research and discussion in correlation with the theories I provide in chapter two. Chapter five concludes this thesis with answers to the research questions presented above.

2 Theoretical framework

This chapter discusses theoretical aspects that this thesis is built on and serve as a basis for the discussion of my findings. Pronunciation is a part of the productive oral skills and is a difficult feature to learn and develop for pupils. It is also something that teachers find rather difficult to teach and assess for various reasons. The studies that this chapter is based on will provide a background for the topics in the discussion of chapter four.

This chapter is divided into three main sections: 1) oral skills, 2) teacher cognition and skills, and 3) pronunciation norms in the Norwegian classroom. The first section will include an overall definition and descriptions of oral skills (in school), assessment and the importance of teaching pronunciation. The second section will discuss what skills and knowledge are required for teachers to teach pronunciation. The final section addresses the debate regarding pronunciation norms that are present in Norwegian schools today, the models that exist and how the debate has developed during the course of the last decades, followed by a short presentation of the views from teachers and pupils on which model one should follow in developing pronunciation skills.

2.1 Oral skills

I am interested in finding out how oral skills are taught in schools, but developing oral skills involve many different skills and areas from teaching pronunciation to communication skills, such as listening and speaking. I perceive oral skills as necessary knowledge in order to communicate with other speakers of English in the most efficient manner. The Norwegian Directorate of Education and training (2012, p. 6) defines oral skills as:

Oral skills relate to creating meaning through listening and speaking. This involves mastering different linguistic and communicative activities and coordinating verbal and other partial skills. It includes being able to listen to others, to respond to others and to be conscious of the interlocutor while speaking

The official Directorate for Education and Training in Norway emphasizes listening and speaking to make communication as understandable as possible. To develop these aforementioned skills, I think motivation, seeing the need for communication and learning to be proficient in such a way as to be understood are important factors. As it is Norwegian teachers who teach English, the question arises as to whether teachers have enough proficiency in pronunciation and knowledge of this subject matter, in order to help pupils become proficient users of English? To look at oral skills in general requires many factors and variables, such as pronunciation skills, communicative or listening skills, but due to the scope

of my research, I am going to focus only on pronunciation and how it is taught and assessed in schools. First, I will look closer into how pronunciation is a productive skill.

2.1.1 Receptive and productive skills

It is common to make a distinction between receptive and productive skills when talking about oral skills. The receptive skills in language learning include reading and listening, and the productive skills include writing and speaking (Drew & Sørheim, 2009, p. 170).

Pronunciation, however, is only a productive skill as it involves speaking. Still, the receptive skill, such as listening, is vital for developing one's oral skills with understanding of words' sounds. And as pronunciation is part of the oral skills, both skills are important in order to develop it. A teacher needs to evaluate whether the pupils' produced pronunciation makes communication difficult. As mentioned in the introduction, English is a language of communication for Norwegians, so what then is good or good enough pronunciation? How is good pronunciation developed, does the media for example contribute to pupils' oral English production?

During the last two decades, the media, followed by the internet has led to an enormous passive exposure of English in particular. Exposure is generally considered of importance as a source of new input and an opportunity to hear authentic English. The question arises as to how helpful it is for Norwegian pupils' development in pronunciation, i.e. English production. Rugesæter (2014) has written an article based on a study to investigate the implications of media exposure on Norwegian L2 learners of English. His study is based on an auditory analysis (which will be further elaborated in chapter 2.1.3) and this article focuses on the role that media exposure has on pupils' pronunciation skills. In other words, he wanted to find out whether receptive input develops pronunciation. What Rugesæter found was that because pronunciation is an active skill, and pupils need to produce their own language, then there is little influence from passive exposure on pronunciation. Furthermore, he found that Norwegian learners of English still struggle with the same phonological challenges as previous generations, he concluded that the influence from passive exposure, for example the media is not enough for learners to attain good pronunciation. Hence, teachers have to know the importance of explicit teaching regarding difficult contrastive sounds, and sounds that Norwegian learners typically struggle with. It will not suffice with the media exposure, however big it is. Both listening and speaking are essential to become a proficient interlocutor in English pronunciation. Teachers need to be able to know

how they teach pupils to develop good pronunciation, inform them of what they expect and which criteria they are assessed by.

2.1.2 Assessment of oral skills in the national curriculum

The national subject curriculum does not offer much guidance as to how oral skills should be assessed and evaluated. Different schools make their own local curriculum based on the general, national guidelines. As I have previously mentioned, the lack of guidance and assessment criteria makes this more subjective for teachers. I want to find out whether the variations between different teachers in how they assess pronunciation is significant. This might show a need for clearer norms for assessment on a national level. Pronunciation is an active skill, as defined by Rugesæter (2014), which makes it harder for teachers to assess. In addition, both for The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Research (2013) and the teachers themselves, it is difficult to define concrete assessment criteria.

There are many criteria that can play a part in evaluating oral performance. Drew and Sørheim (2009, p. 179) have developed a list of such criteria. This list includes initiative, message, fluency, good pronunciation, good intonation, idiomatic language, richness of vocabulary, variation of language forms and grammatical range and correctness. A teacher might choose to take some or all of these into consideration when assessing a pupil's performance. This list is interesting in the context of this thesis because it shows pronunciation as one of the factors when assessing oral performance. In addition, it can indicate what the common criteria for assessing oral English in Norway are. So, what should teacher focus on when teaching pronunciation in Norway?

2.1.3 Why pronunciation is important to teach

In this subsection, I will provide some theoretical perspectives as to why teaching pronunciation in English for Norwegian learners is important. In addition, this section will display which difficulties that Norwegian learners typically have in developing good pronunciation and examples of such difficulties.

The reason why explicit teaching of pronunciation in L2 teaching is important is because of underlying phonemic contrasts between Norwegian and English. From the same research as presented earlier, Rugesæter (2012) has written an article about the conducted study of which contrastive sounds that Norwegian learners of English typically make such as distinguishing

between /s/ and /z/. His aim was to find out which language elements that affect communication when learning a second language. Rugesæter's study involves an auditory analysis of 136 recorded pupils who had been learning English for four to six years. Nine out of ten pupils distinguished between the sounds /v/-/w/ and /əʊ/-/aʊ/, while eight out of ten pupils did not distinguish between the /z/-/s/-sound. Rugesæter (2012) concludes that the reason for this is the similarities between L1 and L2, which cause interference issues in pupils' pronunciation. He further concludes that:

Even though the focus today is more on communicative competence than closeness to a native speaker norm, the underlying phonemic contrasts need to be learned, with specific weight given to interference from the learners' first language, in order to strengthen the overall L2 expression. (Rugesæter, 2012, p. 129)

It is worth mentioning that Rugesæter (2012) did not include all the phonemic elements that Norwegian learners of English struggle with, for example th-sounds. The study is limited to phonemic contrasts. Still, his research illustrates the need for explicit teaching in pronunciation and in particular the phonemic differences between Norwegian and English. Teachers cannot base their teaching on the idea that pupils will decipher the underlying patterns and rules of a new language themselves (Rugesæter, 2012, p. 121). Teachers need to help pupils decipher this, hence teachers' knowledge of subject matter and practices in teaching it is important. Nilsen (2002) has researched the teaching of pronunciation and found that there are no instant effects from teaching it. However, the long-term effects are much greater. He, like Rugesæter (2012), found the need for explicit teaching because even though the media and imitating a native speaker of English might be considered good practice of pronunciation, pupils need to be taught the rules and production of pronunciation.

2.1.3.1 Why English is hard for Norwegian learners

Teachers should know what learners struggle with in order to work preventively with the mistakes. I have already mentioned some of the phonemes that pupils struggle with, but altogether the most common ones for Norwegian learners of English include: the th-sounds, (/θ/ and /ð/), /s/-/z/, /v/-/w/ and alveolar stops such as -t and -d (Drew & Sørheim, 2009; Rugesæter, 2012, p. 127).

Pronunciation differs from other language areas, as it is age sensitive and it matters if you start the learning process early in life or not. Other areas on the other hand, like grammar or syntax, can be achieved with a degree of native-likeness with more ease even if you start later in life. This is due to the "Critical Age for Language Acquisition" or the Critical Period

Hypothesis, where the potential for language proficiency deteriorates the older you get (Lenneberg, 1969). “[...] second-language learning is an academic exercise, and there is a vast variety in degree of proficiency. It rapidly becomes more and more difficult to overcome the accent and interfering influences of the mother tongue.” (Lenneberg, 1969, p. 639). Children’s brain is more susceptible to distinct sounds, thus making it easier to separate the different sounds. English is the second or third language for most Norwegian pupils. This means that they are starting the learning process later, often upon the entry to school. At this point the brain is already getting less susceptible to a new language with a new set of sounds. This is why explicit teaching of pronunciation can be important. The older a child gets, the more difficult it will be for that child to acquire phonological competence that leads to good pronunciation. So, teachers should therefore teach pronunciation explicitly from an early age, in order to prevent mistakes that interrupt communication and help pupils reach a high level of proficiency in pronunciation. In the next section I will take a closer look at the role of the teacher and which skills teachers should possess in order to teach the subject matter most efficiently.

2.2 Teacher cognition and skills

2.2.1 Teacher skills

There is no definitive answer as to whether it is the teachers that make the subject interesting or if it is the subject itself. The probable answer is a bit of both, as the teacher plays an important role in pupils’ interest, motivation and knowledge in the subject. Haugsted (1999, p. 70) explains how there is a distinction between “orality in teaching” and “teaching orality”. The first has to do with pupils, and specifically the oral interaction between teacher and pupils, and between pupils in general. For teachers, the first term includes how they use and vary the oral language used in the classroom, in addition to the quality of it. The latter term refers to situations where the oral language is the object of the lesson, i.e. specific areas to focus on such as pronunciation (Haugsted, 1999, pp. 70, 71). It is important that teachers know that there is a difference between the two terms and that both aspects are vital for pupils’ development of oral skills.

So, what knowledge of pronunciation should a teacher possess to effectively teach pronunciation in order to enhance pupils’ interest, motivation and knowledge? Rogerson-Revell (2011) has made a list of practical skills teachers need in order to help pupils develop their pronunciation skills.

Teachers need to become skilled in recognizing, analyzing and suggesting correction for pronunciation errors. In order to do this they need to be able to provide consistent models of the correct form and clear, accessible explanations. They should also be able to provide a suitable context for the pronunciation feature rather than treat it purely in isolation and integrate pronunciation work with other language areas when relevant. Finally, they need to be able to monitor learner's progress and give regular feedback as a means of maintaining motivation. (Rogerson-Revell, 2011, p. 244)

In addition, Rogerson-Revell has made a shortened list that complements the quote above.

- a. Recognition (of the error)
- b. Analysis (why they make the error)
- c. Discrimination (acceptable mistakes and errors)
- d. Imitation (reproduce sounds, consistent model)
- e. Contextualization (spontaneously provision of forms)
- f. Explanation (rules and patterns)
- g. Integration (link pronunciation to other lang. areas, e.g. Grammar)
- h. Monitoring (give feedback and assess progress)

(Rogerson-Revell, 2011, p. 244)

Recognition (a) has to do with a teacher's ability to recognize pupils' mistakes. If the teacher does not notice errors, he/she cannot help the pupil improve their language. When the teacher notices errors, he or she should know the reason why he/she are making them (b). In order to detect mistakes and prevent them, the teacher should know how to make good teaching schemes that facilitate this analysis. Further, it is vital in such a learning process to distinguish between mistakes that interrupt communication and mistakes one can let pass (c). The fourth category on Rogerson-Revell's list is imitation (d), and imitation includes the capability to provide a consistent model for speaking and reproducing accurate sounds. She further states that supplying a context for a pronunciation feature on the spot is important. In other words, integrating pronunciation into other areas of English teaching and providing suitable contexts for active use of language where pronunciation as a skill can be honed in the process (e). The sixth category is more technical (f), as the teacher should know patterns and rules of sound production. The next is integration (g) where the teacher is supposed to be able to use pronunciation in connection to other language areas, such as grammar or spelling. Finally, the last category that teachers should know is the skill of giving feedback and assessing progress (h). This is an important aspect when it comes to pupils' pronunciation development.

Rogerson-Revell's (2011) list is very idealized as to what teachers are expected to know. Some categories are more relevant to this thesis than others. It will be interesting to see whether teachers in Norway have reflected upon some of these skills, as this list could give an indication on their knowledge and practices of subject matter. For example, do teachers provide their pupils with a consistent speaker model, do they know of common mistakes that

Norwegian learners of English make and why, and do they give feedback on these mistakes? Finding a useful and effective way of correcting pronunciation errors and setting realistic goals for each individual learner of English is vital. There are several methods to provide pupils with corrective feedback, i.e. feedback that is supposed to correct wrong English production. Rogerson-Revell's (2011) list is quite ambitious and unrealistic when one considers the limited amount of time a teacher has. The question is how many of these skills does one need to be a competent teacher of pronunciation, and if the teacher education really provides teachers with enough training to efficiently teach this subject matter to pupils. Borg (2001, 2003) has researched how there is a difference between what teachers know and what they do in the classroom and the impact of formal education in teaching subject matter, as will be presented below.

2.2.2 Teacher cognition

Teachers' classroom practices are affected by their knowledge of subject matter, as found by Borg (2001). He investigated two teachers' classroom practices to see if there is a correlation between knowledge and classroom teaching. He wanted to find out if teachers' knowledge influenced their teaching of grammar. He both observed and interviewed two English Language Teachers (ELT), one who is a native speaker of English and the other who is a non-native speaker. They had both been working for fifteen years teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). One of them was rather experienced in working with grammar, while the other taught it quite rarely. Borg found it evident that the first teacher, who was comfortable with grammar teaching, would create discussions, give impromptu answers and bounce questions back to the class when asked about grammar-related issues. This creates a good environment for learning, due to the comfort level of the teacher with the subject matter (Borg, 2001, pp. 23-24). The other teacher felt more comfortable doing vocabulary exercises and avoided any spontaneous grammar practices. Further, he would have to prepare if a question arose that he could not answer right away. Students were not able to understand the grammar fully with a bad explanation from the teacher. He found that teachers' knowledge about grammar (KAG) defines their choices in the classroom (Borg, 2001, p. 22). Grammar is considered to be a larger topic than pronunciation in school, so comparing the two could be problematic. However, what Borg (2001) concludes with is a tendency, a tendency which I think is applicable to other language areas of teaching such as pronunciation. It is only logical that one avoids teaching aspects that one feels incompetent to teach. It will be interesting to

see if my findings from research on pronunciation correlate with that of Borgs' (2001) study regarding grammar.

Teachers' self-perception influences their knowledge of subject matter and formal education develops teachers' cognition. Teacher cognition is defined by Borg (2003) as "[...] what teachers think, know and believe and the relationships of these mental constructs to what teachers do in the language teaching classroom." (Borg, 2003, p. 80). Self-perception and confidence in subject matter is important for teachers' attitudes and conduct towards teaching it. Borg continues stating that teachers' challenges lie in making the subject matter intelligible (Borg, 2001, p. 28). He further claims that development of Knowledge About Language (KAL) is vital and something that should be a part of the teacher education programs. This is because teachers should be able to learn how to develop their cognition and thus become better educators. Further, as his study concludes: teacher education play a role for student teachers' cognition, hence illustrating the importance of teacher training (Borg, 2003).

Further, Dunkin et al. (Dunkin, Precians, & Nettle, 1994) was interested in investigating whether there is an impact of formal education in general, and the amount of it regarding student teachers. They interviewed first and third-year student teachers and found that when it comes to the pedagogical professional knowledge, maturity as a teacher and interpersonal relationships there were significant differences among students in the different years. Furthermore, after three years of studies and practice teachings, the student teachers were better equipped to be teachers. As my research investigates the role that formal education has on a teachers' practices of pronunciation, it will be interesting to see whether my research substantiates Dunkin et al.'s (1994) findings that more formal education and practices develop a teacher's pedagogical knowledge and maturity.

Formal education and cognition also appear to have an impact on teachers' practices of subject matter as researched by Gilje (2014). She conducted a study among Norwegian primary school English teachers in 6th grade to find out their knowledge of reading skills and attitudes, and whether formal education is of relevance. She conducted interviews with eight teachers of English, one of which does not have any formal education either in English or as a teacher. One has formal education in English, but not as a teacher. The remaining six all had formal education both in English and as a teacher. Gilje's (2014) findings showed that five of the eight teachers were neutral towards the impact of formal teacher education, while two believed it influenced teaching practices to a large extent. When it comes to the impact that formal education has, Gilje found that one of the teachers without formal education as a teacher and in English had trouble comprehending abstract notions, as in terms and concepts

related to the topic (Gilje, 2014, p. 10). Two of the teachers who had both formal education as a teacher and in English claimed to teach few reading-related activities (Gilje, 2014, p. 11). Her findings seem rather inconclusive as it does not necessarily depend on the formal teacher education as to whether or not teachers teach the subject matter. Further, Gilje (2014) found that teacher's cognitive abilities are based on experience from their teaching careers and/or teacher education (as previously discussed by Borg 2003). Her results indicate that formal education might not be the only crucial factor for developing one's cognitive abilities as a teacher since experience in the job is also of importance.

2.3 Pronunciation norms in the Norwegian classroom

2.3.1 Native speaker model and intercultural model

Research has recognized a change in demand in speaker norms for Norwegian learners of English (during the last decade). Rindal (2010) studies how Norwegian learners of English are presented with two speaker models, American and British English. It is vital to notice that Rindal (2010) in her study has made a distinction between *preference* towards a spoken accent and *actual pronunciation*. During an auditory analysis of 23 pupils, her findings indicate that even though pupils prefer the British English accent for pronunciation, they speak with an American-like pronunciation (Rindal, 2010, pp. 246, 255). A reason for this, according to Rindal (2010), could be that American English is physically easier for Norwegians to pronounce. She uses the example of the word "goat", which is pronounced with an "əʊ" -vowel sound, whereas in American English it would be pronounced with an "oʊ" - vowel sound, which is nearer the standard Norwegian pronunciation, thus making it easier to produce. This study only investigates the two largest speaker models that Rindal claims exist in Norway, and thus substantiates a notion that Norwegian English teaching only have two standards of speaker norms in school. Hansen (2015), on the other hand, has seen a speaker norm change in Norway that is moving towards the intelligible speaker of English. He discusses how one can be a proficient user of English without having to speak with a near-native-like accent. He describes being an intercultural speaker as one who is able to communicate with delicacy and intelligibility adapted to the situation with people from different cultural backgrounds (Hansen, 2015, p. 212). Furthermore, he explains the native speaker norm as an impossible goal, where the learners have to know non-verbal features of the culture, natural pronunciation and have strategic pragmatic competence (Hansen, 2015, p. 213). Hansen considers the advantages of using an intercultural speaker model due to the

current need. The intercultural speaker manages, among other things, to interpret between cultures, handle misunderstandings and create relations between different identities (Hansen, 2015, p. 215). He further idealizes intelligibility and the intercultural speaker model as a futuristic goal since the native speaker norm is still present in pupils, as seen in Rindal (2010). I will also consider this debate in my study. Because some researchers still seem to prefer studying native-like spoken English accents, this might still be the case in schools also. If one is to see a change and development from a native speaker to an intercultural speaker model, it will probably take time because of these notions that still exist in the Norwegian classroom.

2.3.2 Perceived attitudes of speaker norms in the classroom

Teachers' attitudes, beliefs and self-perception in the classroom influences the pupils accordingly. Both Rindal (2010) and Borg (2001) consider teachers' awareness towards own influence on classroom practices and pupils to be important for teachers to be conscious of. This study will investigate teachers' spoken accent, attitudes and classroom practices of pronunciation and see if they expect the same of their pupils. Due to no nationally specified spoken English accent or assessment of it in Norwegian schools, teachers are free to choose accent and assessment themselves (Rindal, 2016). "[...] imitating a native speaker as carefully as possible has often had successful outcomes for learners in the expanding circle"¹ (Rindal, 2014, p. 7). Rindal's (2014) quote illustrates the reason why both teachers and pupils tend to look towards a native speaker, as it gives teachers something to assess by and pupils something to strive towards while using a consistent standard of pronunciation. Simensen (2014) has observed attitudes towards native speaker norms by concluding that the pupils' ability to attain native-like standard in pronunciation and intonation affects teacher's assessment of their competence in English in a positive way (Simensen, 2014, p. 15)(my own translation²). This makes it clearer that those pupils who are able to have an almost native-like accent, have an advantage over those who are intelligible but without native-like proficiency. I believe that this is the case for many pupils, that they do not dare to speak unless they are confident that what they are saying is pronounced 'correctly'. That is why teachers should be aware of their own impact on pupils' attitudes in the classroom, as previously mentioned by

1 Kachru has made a model of English speakers in the world and divided them in three concentric circles. The expanding circle which is explained in this thesis refers to those speakers of English who use it as a foreign language, such as Norway (Jenkins, 2015, pp. 15, 16).

2 «[...] elevenes evne til å tilegne seg en tilnærmet innfødt uttale og intonasjon, påvirker lærernes evaluering av elevenes kompetanse i faget i en positiv retning.» (Simensen, 2014, p. 15)

several other researchers. In this study, I will not be able to see the kind of impact that teachers' attitudes have on pupils. However, their own perceptions of accent and pronunciation in connection with their expectation and attitudes towards this subject matter might present a tendency of how teachers want their pupils to speak English.

3 Methodology

In this chapter, I will describe the qualitative research approach and explain why I have chosen it for my research project. I will discuss the chosen method for data collection, followed by a description of the process of attaining data from the material received from the interviews that I conducted. Finally, I will look at some ethical concerns that can occur during such a process.

3.1 The qualitative method

My research topic aided me in deciding what direction to take concerning the methodology. I wanted to find out if teachers' knowledge of subject matter determined their practices in teaching pronunciation in the classroom. In order to answer this, I want to utilize a qualitative method to gather personal experiences related to a subject, for example related to how lower secondary school teachers teach oral skills, in particular, pronunciation. Marilyn Lichtman (2010) defines qualitative research as:

[...] a way of knowing in which a researcher gathers, organizes and interprets information obtained from humans using his or her eyes and ears as filters. It often involves in-depth interviews and/or observations of human in natural and social settings. It can be contrasted with quantitative research, which relies heavily on hypothesis testing, cause and effect, and statistical analyses. (Lichtman, 2010, p. 5)

Interview as a process is a part of the qualitative research method of attaining data, which also includes observation and questionnaire. I have chosen the interview method since it would give better insights into teachers' attitudes, practices and knowledge of the subject matter. By conducting interviews, I would get broader knowledge of teachers' beliefs regarding topics. When conducting qualitative interviews, the findings lies in the answers that each informant gives, for example, to compare why one informant claims something, while another reflects upon the opposite. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) interviews are conversations between two parties with a common field of interest. This is agreed upon also by Lichtman (2010) who claims that an interview is a conversation with the purpose of gathering information on a given topic from a participant. Furthermore, its purpose is to explore common opinions that can be significant in the field that is being studied. I believe it necessary in order to find answers to my research questions, i.e. to see if there are common practices and attitudes among English teachers in Norway when it comes to teaching pronunciation. Practices and knowledge are to some degree personal no matter the content, because it indicates how teachers do their job. Thus, when conducting interviews, the teachers

are able to see who they are giving this information to instead of answering questions into a questionnaire online on a computer.

Conducting a questionnaire could have been another methodological option to answer my research question but questionnaires may risk rather superficial responses. This method only answers the predetermined questions without making any room for new considerations on the subject. Another disadvantage has to do with the lack of in-depth answers. In other words, questionnaires only scratch the surface and limit the subject down to a small part of the field.

Due to such disadvantages that questionnaires can bring to the nature of the data, I have chosen interview as I believe it to be the most advantageous method in order to answer the research question that this thesis is building on for various reasons. Firstly, I wanted to be able to ask follow-up questions or questions for clarification. If the informants consider topics, I can pursue these topics further during the interview. Secondly, the interview method is a good way to be flexible and go back and forth if details are forgotten (Robson, 2002, p. 272). A last advantage of this method is the contradictory point to questionnaires. The interviews provide an opportunity to ask in-depth questions, in order to get answers that cover a wider range of the field of research and not only specifically the aspects being enquired. However, there are also some negative aspects of conducting interviews. It is quite time-consuming to conduct interviews. In addition, in the process of gathering data, it is vital to stay neutral in the interview situation in order to maintain reliability and prevent bias. Maintaining reliability concerns not being influenced by outside factors and preserve transparency between the words of informants and researcher's interpretations (Drew & Sørheim, 2009, p. 170). To maintain this, I have tried to stay as neutral as possible and used the words of the informants as far as it goes when translating from Norwegian to English. As a result of the interviews, I was hoping to see tendencies of teachers' attitudes and practices in school. Conducting interviews would give opportunities to ask flexible follow-up and in-depth questions, which will lead to a broader understanding of teachers' knowledge and practices of subject matter.

There are several types of interviews, such as structured, semi-structured or unstructured (Robson, 2002, p. 270). The first is recognized by its predetermined questions in a fixed order. The second type of interview also has predetermined questions, but the order can vary (Robson, 2002, p. 270). The interview I conducted is partly structured and partly semi-structured. The layout itself is structured and I created it in a way to make room to ask follow-up questions or questions to elaborate. The interview is a structured guide with a set of

questions to ask the informants. Each interview lasted for about 30 minutes. In this way, the interview could resemble a questionnaire in its structured form.

In order to get as valid results as possible, I wanted to have a one-hour observation session of the informants early in the phase. Kvale and Brinkmann (2015, p. 276) state that validity in qualitative research has to do with the “right” conclusions being made from some given premises. To validate the interview material, in particular with regards to the teachers’ practices in teaching pronunciation I could have also tried to observe their lessons as in the previous studies, such as Borg’s study (2001). I decided then not to do an observation due to limited time allowed to finish my thesis. Moreover, there are difficulties in guaranteeing that the interviewed teachers would give any pronunciation teaching during the lesson I would be allowed to observe given that most teachers do not allocate an entire lesson only for pronunciation teaching. Less focus on pronunciation teaching was also confirmed by several informants, which I will come back to in more details in the next chapter.

All interviews have been tape-recorded to prevent any data from being neglected or lost. Using a tape-recorder is an efficient way of securing transparency and validity. I transcribed the data in order to be more organized and have my material in a written format that is easier to withdraw information from. In addition, I will be able to present the quotes from the informants to further increase the transparency and quality of the data.

3.2 The informants

For this research, six teachers have been interviewed, the number of which is considered to be sufficient considering the scope of this study (30 credits). The first qualification required of the informant was that he or she was an English teacher. The next step was e-mailing principals in order to find teachers willing to be a part of the project. This is called eclectical selection, where the informant him/herself chooses to be a part of the project due to interest, not obligation (Grønmo, 2016, pp. 116, 117). This turned out to be more difficult than predicted due to many negative responses from the principals. I finally got one teacher as a pilot interview, and five others to participate in the regular interview. The pilot interview which was originally supposed to be a test interview is also included in the data material since the interview was considered as a contribution to the discussion when not many changes were deemed necessary. Two of the schools where the informants worked were located rurally and four in the city of Tromsø, and they are all lower secondary schools. In the thesis I have substituted the informants’ names with fictional names: Patricia, Ann, Bea, Cathy, Diane and

Erica due to the confidentiality agreement statement not to reveal any personal information that can be traced back to them.

All the informants are women, which makes it impossible to see any tendencies that can correlate with gender. There is one informant between the age of 25-35, three between the age of 35-45 and two between the age of 45-55. The youngest informant between the age of 25-35, has worked for two years as a teacher, which is the shortest period among the informants. She has taken a bachelor's degree in English and Praktisk Pedagogisk Utdanning (PPU). One of the three teachers between the age of 35-45 has 60 study points in English and has worked for eight years as a teacher. The second informant in that age group has worked fifteen years as a teacher and her education is "grunnfag" i.e. a one-year program in English at university level. The last teacher in the 35-45- age group has worked for four years and has English one (30 study points) and didactics (which she is now studying) as her education. The first teacher in the age group of 45-55 has worked more than twenty-five years and has English as a "mellomfag" which is equivalent to a bachelor's degree at the university level. The second teacher in the same age group has worked twenty years in the job and has 60 study points in English. The table below summarizes the information and background of all informants that took part in my study.

Informant\background	Gender	Age	Education	Years as a teacher
P (Patricia)	Female	35-45	"grunnfag" univ.	15
1 (Ann)	Female	35-45	English 1+didactics	4
2 (Bea)	Female	45-55	"mellomfag" univ.	<25
3 (Cathy)	Female	45-55	60 study points	20
4 (Diana)	Female	30-40	60 study points	8
5 (Erica)	Female	20-30	Bachelor +PPU	2

Table 1 Summary of the informants' background.

3.3 The interview guide - questions

The interview guide consists of six main categories and twenty questions. The first question has to do with general information concerning personal details on the informant, as will be explained/illustrated below. The reason for opening the interview with personal questions is to take the pressure off and make the informant feel more comfortable in the situation. The questions in the next category deal with teachers' own confidence. This question involves

teachers' satisfaction with their own pronunciation and perceived difficulties towards the subject matter. The third category has to do with the informants' teaching practices in the classroom. They were asked to give further information about pronunciation teaching, such as if they teach pronunciation at all, if they give corrective feedback and if they know about any typical pronunciation difficulties that are recurring in the pupils' oral production in English. When asking about this, I was hoping to see how they work with the subject matter and in addition whether they are aware of pupils' mistakes. Within this category, I also asked about the teachers' usage of competence aims in the classroom teaching. The fourth category involves the informants' own education. It includes how much training they got during their teacher training program, and what knowledge they believe teachers need in order to be able to teach pronunciation efficiently. The fifth category is teachers' expectations, and it includes what kinds of expectations the teacher has for his or her pupils. I wanted to figure out if the informants expect the pupils to have a standard of native-like accent or not. The topic of the last category is assessment. It involves how they guide pupils during an oral project and give assessment after pupils' oral performance. This topic also included which criteria they use regarding oral production in English. From these questions, I hoped to both see how important teachers consider pronunciation and how much time they spend on it. My last question concern how teachers evaluate what good pronunciation in English is. I suspect getting somewhat contrasting answers from this. Firstly, because it is a how-question and secondly because it is quite subjective. However, I think it will be interesting to see if there are any similarities or some peripheral views as to what is considered to be good English pronunciation.

I conducted the interviews in Norwegian for the simple reason that all my informants are Norwegian, and therefore it would be artificial to conduct them in English. A second aspect to why I chose to conduct the interviews in Norwegian is that I believed I would get more reflected and elaborate answers if the respondents could answer in their mother tongue which they probably feel more comfortable with. However, conducting the interviews in Norwegian would require more work as the significant data material need to be translated into English and some of the original nuances or meanings by the informants can lose their authenticity. Hence, all the quotes will be a translation from interview results that were conducted in Norwegian.

3.4 The analysis of the data material

There are several ways to carry out an analysis of the raw data that comes from the interviews. What I found to be the most comprehensible and straightforward way was to create tables. Robson (2002) has reflected upon advantages and disadvantages of using computer programs (the tables I created are not such programs, but the same facts still apply). Using computer programs or tables in a Microsoft Word-document as I did, is a good way to organize and make raw data more straightforward (Robson, 2002, p. 462). In my case, the raw data went from being a hundred and nineteen pages to nine. What I did was create a table that had seven columns and twenty-one rows, columns for a number of informants and columns for each question in the interview guide. By doing it this way, I would more easily be able to compare the findings to see if there were correlations or big discrepancies between the informants' answers. However, the amount of time that is consumed making such a table or any computer program for that matter is considerable (Robson, 2002, p. 462). When I was inserting data into the tables, I had to shorten the data in order for it to be more tangible. Therefore, I used keywords and shortened sentences to only get the main idea of the informant's reflections. After the initial process of inserting data into the table, I double-checked the transcriptions with the search function in Word to see if I had written and understood every informant's answer in the table. The search function was also used to see if specific words recurred in order to see which if the informants' thoughts correlated with each other. In order to separate and divide the content of the interviews into smaller pieces, I used codes and categories. Codes are described by Nilsen (2012, p. 82) as a way of shortening longer texts, such as raw data from an interview and find patterns in the material from expressions or attitudes. Categories are the connections between these given codes, and they provide an overall structure to be able to see themes that can aid in the answering of the research question (V. Nilsen, 2012, p. 85). I decided that the most straightforward way to make this distinction was to use the subheadings from the interview guide (see attachment 1).

When I had finished inserting the raw data into the table, I printed it out and looked for tendencies between the informants' answers. Further, I attached post-its to the tables with my own reflections and possible theories and previous research that might substantiate or be an opposition to my findings. I used deductive coding to analyze the data. Deductive coding is when the researcher bases the codes that have been found in theory before beginning the analysis process (V. Nilsen, 2012, p. 79). For example, I used Rogerson-Revell's (2011) list as a starting point for some of the questions in the interview guide. By having quite predetermined codes that I wanted to analyze, I would risk neglecting some codes or

interesting aspects that the informants reflected upon, i.e. inductive codes. Inductive codes are codes that you find from the data material (V. Nilsen, 2012, p. 79). This is how I was able to come up with two additional codes, “adapted teaching” and “pupils’ proficiency today” that I will only slightly mention in the next chapter.

Before moving on, I must mention two particulars that are of consequence to the next chapter. First, when transcribing I utilized the sign (..) to indicate when the informant was taking a longer pause before answering. I created this sign and added my own meaning to it because there is no universal way to write the transcriptions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015, p. 208). The second aspect is that Patricia – the pilot interviewee has not received all questions which is a result of my mistake. I was insecure as a researcher and believed I had already asked similar questions and thus omitted them, which leads to less validity regarding these questions. The questions that this applies for are “difficulty with pronunciation”, “importance with pronunciation” and “assessment after a project”.

3.5 Ethical considerations

Finally, in this subsection, I will present some ethical concerns that are important to take into consideration during this research. The cautiousness concerning the informants’ personal information is the most significant ethical consideration to make. The informants sign a document agreeing to be a part of my study, and I sign a document of confidentiality. In addition, I am obliged to inform them that they will be anonymized and can withdraw their consent at any time. However, in my project the personal information I received was minimum. Still, an example of this would be if an informant tells me where she lives, because then I would have to substitute the place with either a fictive name or an X. Nonetheless, I applied for an approval for my project at Norsk Samfunnsfaglig Datatjeneste (NSD), which is attached at the end of this thesis. The approval makes sure that I, as a researcher, keep all my data with possible personal information stored where no one else can get an access to it. This includes the recording device I use where all the raw data lies, as well as the voice of my informants (which is very personal). “[...] we are more likely to see something we are looking for than something we’re not expecting to find.” (Atkins & Wallace, 2012, p. 218). As a reader, one is presented with one side and that is the researcher’s interpretation of given data. It is important that I stay as true as possible to the informants’ words and at the same time give my interpretations without bias. This is a difficult task as it involves not letting attitudes and emotions disturb the analysis.

4 Findings and discussion

In this chapter the findings from the interviews will be presented. The order in which they are presented will follow the same structure as the interview guide (see attachment 7.1). First, the topic of teachers' self-cognition will be introduced, followed by the findings regarding teaching practices, own education, expectations and lastly assessment will be presented. The discussion will be integrated with the presentation of the findings from each question. Lastly, I will provide a summary and discussion of the most important findings.

4.1 Self-cognition

Within the topic of self-cognition, I was interested in finding out if the informants are satisfied with their own pronunciation, whether they have any difficulties when it comes to pronunciation, if they use some sort of accent or spoken norm and what they think influences their English pronunciation.

When asked about their satisfaction with own pronunciation, all informants answered that they were satisfied. Ann, Cathy, Diane and Erica emphasized their satisfaction without much hesitation, while the remaining two teachers, Bea and Patricia remark that they have aspects of their pronunciation that they are displeased with. Bea mentions that she does not practice her "own English", because in the classroom she speaks with pupils, implying that she modifies her language for her pupils. Patricia is satisfied with her own pronunciation. However, she reflects upon how could have been better. The tendency from these findings is that all of the informants consider themselves satisfied with own pronunciation. According to Borg (2001), self-perception influences attitudes and conduct towards teaching subject matter. If one is to take Borg's findings into consideration, then this could indicate that the teachers in my study are quite predisposed to teaching to English pronunciation because of their self-perception. Due to their positive cognition, they are more inclined to do impromptu work with pronunciation, as Borg's findings suggested. However, if they actually do it will become more evident in section 4.2 – classroom practices. This is also more apparent because few informants in my study have difficulties with pronunciation.

The informants were asked if they have any difficulties with pronunciation. Four out of the six teachers do not. Bea and Erica's answers are related to vocabulary and difficult words, where the first is unrelated to the question. Erica made the example "literature", by which she probably means that the word is difficult to pronounce. If so, then she is the only one who considered to have concrete difficulty with pronunciation, it raises the point as to

whether the teachers are very competent in this subject matter, or if they have not reflected much upon it. Another tendency that appears, is what the informants consider pronunciation to be. As will be presented later in this chapter, vocabulary appear to be an important criterion for several teachers when assessing oral skills. In addition, it is a recurring notion throughout the findings, that teachers seem not to have clear perception of what the different aspects of oral skills are. This is not a problem with pronunciation per se, but one can start questioning some teachers' perception and cognition of this subject matter. In order to investigate the informants' cognition of a common aspect of pronunciation, I asked if they use a norm or an accent when they speak English.

On the question of whether they use an accent or some sort of speaker norm in English, all of the teachers speak with a British English standard except for Erica who claims to speak with an American English one. Bea, Cathy and Patricia claim to have a clear British English accent, Diane has an Irish-British English accent, while Ann's British English is modified for the sake of the pupils. The tendency from this question is that all the teachers have reflected on the type of spoken accent standard they use. Rindal (2016) has considered the native-like standard accents in Norway and has concluded that it is a common aspect of the English subject and language to have reflected about. Reflection about language is something that should be conveyed to the pupils, both to know which attitudes towards accents of English there are, and to talk about these attitudes in the classroom in order to enhance pupils' metalinguistic awareness (Rindal, 2016). For teachers to enhance pupils' metalinguistic awareness, they need to have such awareness themselves.

The informants were further asked about their awareness regarding what they believe to influence their pronunciation in English. The findings were almost unanimous as most of the teachers in my study find media to be what influences their English pronunciation. Patricia, Bea, Cathy, Diane and Erica all concretely claim that TV, music and travel among other things, influence their pronunciation. Ann argues that she is influenced by pupils and her primary school education from Oxford. This is interesting because there is a common notion that the media has quite a lot of influence on English production. However, as Rugesæter (2014) found, the media with its passive exposure has minimum impact on active skills, such as pronunciation. In addition, three informants claim specifically, at one point or another during the interview, that pupils today are very proficient because they are influenced by so much media. However, as research suggests then, pronunciation should be taught explicitly because of the minimum impact from passive exposure (Rugesæter, 2014). The

indication show that this subject matter is not prioritized as much when it comes to explicit teaching due to many teachers' cognition that deems it less necessary to teach.

4.2 Teaching practice

Teaching practices can display tendencies of how teachers work with pronunciation in English. In this subsection the goal is to find out if the teachers actively teach pronunciation, whether they teach with a standard accent that is close to native-likeness and whether or not they give feedback on pupils' pronunciation. In addition, I am interested in finding out if the teachers are aware of some typical pronunciation mistakes that pupils encounter.

4.2.1 Classroom practices and accent

The informants were asked if they have lessons of pronunciation, to which all of them remarked that they teach it to some extent, but no teachers teach full classes of this subject matter. Bea says she uses speaking in class, in addition to teach aspects of pronunciation if they appear (see quote below). This latter practice is also remarked by Diane, who uses "magic e" as an example of a specific pronunciation task. Only one other teacher uses a specific task, called "tongue twister" and that is Ann. All teachers claim to integrate their pronunciation teaching to other lessons, and this is how Bea comments on how her practice is regarding pronunciation teaching:

yes, because it is something that is there all the time, and something that we can pause and dwell on for a while when it appears and it fits. I can say something like this: "okay, listen, when we are talking about this ...".³

This quote illustrates how one of the informants work with pronunciation. However, it can also be an indication of how they consider pronunciation to be only a part of the English subject that is "always there" and does not necessarily have to be taught explicitly that much. This correlates with one of the teacher skills Rogerson-Revell (2011) "integration" (see section 2.2.1). The general impression is that the teachers teach this subject matter, but none appear to teach it extensively. The teachers consider pronunciation to be an aspect of the English language that is automatically taught when using orality in the classroom, rather than teaching orality i.e. teaching pronunciation explicitly (Haugsted, 1999). Pronunciation is a topic that does not have a distinct definition and teachers consider it to be composed of

³ Bea: «Ja for det er sånt som bare er der hele tiden, og som vi kan stoppe opp og dvele litt grann ved når det dukker opp og når det passer. Kan si sånn «okei, hør her, når vi først er inne på det her...»

different features of language learning. I think teachers also find it hard to say how and when pronunciation teaching starts and the teaching of another language feature continues. Still, they were all very reflected on own pronunciation standard accent, hence it is interesting to see whether they have reflected on their spoken standard in the classroom.

The question was whether the informants use an accent or spoken English norm in the classroom. The teachers seem generally reflected on their own classroom accent. The accent they use when speaking in the classroom is consciously chosen. Bea, Cathy and Diane do not modify their classroom accent, while Patricia, Ann and Erica do. Modification, in this case, is when the teachers make their English easier to understand for the Norwegian pupils. The reasons for both opinions were for the sake of their pupils. The teachers who do not modify their classroom English want their pupils to hear a standard and consistent speaker model of English. The ones who modify it do it to make it more comprehensible to the pupils, i.e. “making it the classroom language”⁴. A curious notion here, is that Bea claims not to modify her English in the classroom, but earlier in the interview she states that she is not able to practice her own English because she uses the language only when speaking with thirteen to sixteen year-olds. Which leads to wondering how much reliability there is in her answer when she claims to speak with a British English standard in the classroom also. Since there is no official norm that states how teachers and pupils should speak, in terms of accent, then what is the preferred model? Hansen (2015) claims that the intercultural speaker model and intelligibility is a fitting end goal of spoken English in Norway. If one is to take Hansen’s goal of speaking to be the right one, then those teachers in my study who modifies their English to be understood are making their language more intelligible for the pupils and thus also preparing them for what their needs are later in life. Rindal (2016) concludes that what Norwegian pupils need English for does not require a native-like standard variant of English. She also emphasizes the native speaker-ideal as a near-impossible goal and thinks that the native-like speaker model does not necessarily make the language more understandable. The findings from my study appear to correlate with these previous researches as at least four informants claim to modify their classroom accent to make it more understandable. The importance is for teachers to provide a stable and consistent speaker model for the pupils, as mentioned by Rogerson-Revell’s (2011) skill “imitation” (see section 2.2.1). Since there is no official speaker norm that teachers have to use, there are bound to be discrepancies. Nonetheless, the teachers in this study agree that being understood and provide a standard

⁴ Ann: «ja, også fordi at det er det som blir klasseromsspråket»

speaker model for their pupils is important. Further, I wanted to know the teachers' classroom practices when it comes to using competence aims.

The question was merely whether they used any competence aims. All six of the informants use competence aims, but only half of them seem to know and use them concerning the topic of pronunciation. I got the impression that the teachers did not really care much for the K-06 and that they use it mostly to structure their lessons. It is hard to say what the tendency is. Still, it seems as if they use the aims on a general note. Again, their knowledge of specific pronunciation related tasks presents itself as quite limited. These aims regard more general knowledge when it comes to subject matter, but how do teachers work with correcting pupils' pronunciation mistakes which are more concentrated around specific work with this subject matter?

4.2.2 Corrective feedback

The question was whether the teachers provide their pupils with corrective feedback regarding pronunciation. All informants give feedback to their pupils the difference is in how and what kind of feedback. All teachers claim to use both oral and written feedback, in addition to one-to-one (only teacher and pupil present). When it comes to giving feedback, all of the informants have different ways of how they give feedback, such as immediate feedback in class and writing mistakes down and giving it back after class. Cathy stresses that oral feedback is the optimal method. It is, however, very time consuming and cannot be given all of the time. Diane prefers to use ICT-feedback, with tools like OneNote and iPads. Rogerson-Revell (2011, p. 244) explains how giving feedback and assessing progress is an important teacher skill. If the teacher does not provide the pupils with sufficient feedback, then pronunciation is unlikely to be improved. These are not interesting findings, as giving feedback is something that all teachers have to do, because pupils should have an overall grade in oral performance (Ministry of Education and Research, 2013, p. 11). The informants answered more generally when claiming that they give feedback, and not specifically on pronunciation, thus the answers to this question do not provide important findings relevant to this thesis. Even though there were vague answers regarding this particular factor, it is interesting to see if the teachers know about typical pronunciation mistakes that learners of English makes, due to it being the reason why teachers would need to give corrective feedback.

I asked if the teachers knew of some typical mistakes that pupils make. All six of the informants mentioned at least two typical mistakes each that Norwegian learners of English

make. Ann and Cathy came up with four examples of typical mistakes, Patricia and Erica mentioned three examples and Bea and Diane came up with two. Below is a quote where Ann comments upon the mistakes that pupils make.

they say “sjl” (making the sound) instead of “sl”, then they say “sj” [...] uhm, they struggle with v and w. [...] in addition, there are many of them that don’t contract, uhm, past tense – ed, they say walk-ed like that, you know, that they do it the old-fashioned way that they don’t just say the d, they say e and then d. [...] the next thing that they say (making the sound) “vuery”. Instead of “very” [...] the weakest pupils I have, they put the th-sound in when they see a t, then they use th.. [...] thaughter or yes..⁵

As presented, Ann makes the distinction between /v/ and /w/ -sounds, and then she mentions “vuery”/“very” as a concrete example. The th-sound was considered to be a difficulty for pupils by four out of the six informants while three mentioned past tense-ed and three the distinction between /v/ and /w/. Two teachers commented that the /sl/-sound (sleep) is a challenge for pupils, while the contrastive sounds / əʊ/-/oʊ/ and voiced /s/-/z/-sounds were reported by one informant. Lastly, Patricia stated that hissing sounds and words like “cathedral” gave pupils trouble, without thinking which phonemic aspect of the word that created the difficulty. The th-sound, sl-sound and past tense-d- sound are all examples mentioned by the informants. These examples are not very common among the Norwegian phoneme sound system, and because of this they should be taught and practiced in school. As the informants are aware of these sounds, they are more inclined to teach them. Yet again, it is impossible to say anything about the response of the pupils or the actual classroom teaching. However, it might be that the teachers in my study teach more than they remember to mention during such a stressed atmosphere as an interview. The next subsection will present the informants’ education to be able to see if it correlates with teachers’ teaching practices.

4.3 Educational background

This subsection will investigate to find out about the amount of education they received during the teacher training program. I also thought it would be interesting to see what kind of knowledge they thought teachers should possess in order to teach pronunciation more

⁵ Ann: altså at de sier; (lager lyden) «sjl» i stedet for «sl», så sier de «sj», [...] Ehm, de strever med v og w. Ja, forskjellen mellom v og dobbelt v, ja, (.) også er det mange av dem som ikke trekker sammen, eh.. fortid altså -ed. De sier walk-ed eller sånn, altså de, de gjør det på den gammelengelske måten de rett og slett sier ikke bare d-en, de sier e og d. [...] det neste er at de sier (lager lyden til) vuery, ikke sant, i stedet for very [...], også d, de svakeste elevene jeg har, de putter også inn th-lyden når de ser en t, så putter de inn th.. de tror at det er (lager lyden) «th», thaughter, eller ja..

efficiently. To see if they are aware and self-reflected on this topic, the last question regards whether they avoid teaching anything in the English subject.

4.3.1 Teacher training

The question regarded the teachers' training in English pronunciation. Only one out of six teachers feel that her teacher training regarding pronunciation was extensive enough. A notion that should be mentioned concerning this question is that Bea, Diane and Erica consider "speaking in class", either from professors or from conversation between students as training in pronunciation. Cathy is very satisfied with her education in phonetics which included using songs and learning the phonetical alphabet with a great teacher. Bea and Erica received "some" phonetics in their education which included intonation courses and they both emphasized how the "speaking-aspect" of English is important. Patricia reflects how she would have preferred more training. But then she also got more input after her education. Diane expresses that her education regarding pronunciation during teacher training was very limited, while Ann does not remember much, but believed that she received training in the phonetic alphabet. Furthermore, Ann claims that since pronunciation is not a central topic in the English subject, there is not much teacher training needed in order to be able to teach it efficiently⁶. The number of study points can give some indication as to how satisfied the teacher is with the amount of education of pronunciation and how much phonetics training the teacher received in the teacher training program. Still, the impression of this is that the amount of didactics is vital. Bea and Erica who received some phonetics training, seem to use pronunciation mostly for the purpose of assessment and not for the purpose of development in oral skills. In other words, not much explicit pronunciation teaching. For example, Bea claims that presentations are a way that she works with pronunciation in class. Cathy, on the other hand, claims that pupils think pronunciation is fun to work with, however, this statement lacked elaboration. However, her teacher of pronunciation during the teacher training program also sang songs and was knowledgeable, which may indicate that good teacher educators are important for the teachers' practices in primary and lower secondary school. In other words, the quality of the didactics regarding pronunciation that teachers receive during their education is of consequence as to how it is approached to pupils in school. Hence, teachers using "speaking-in-class" as a tool for enhancing pupils' pronunciation is uninspiring and little advantageous according to Rugesæter's (2014) findings where passive exposure to

6 Ann: ja, ja også fordi det [uttale] ikke er veldig sentralt, så man trenger ikke veldig mye undervisning

English is quite insufficient. Furthermore, Dunkin et al. (1994) findings concluded that formal education and practice help developing teacher's knowledge and maturity, which is also the case here. There are significant differences between Ann and Bea for example. For the first, Bea appear to have more knowledge of pedagogy, pronunciation and critical to her own role. Ann claims that because she knows the subject as well as she does, then both she and the pupils will hear the mistakes themselves as they make them⁷. By the way she phrased herself, I got the impression that her confidence in the subject matter overshadows her ability to see the pupils' needs. Secondly, this could also be related to how Bea has worked for twenty-five years as a teacher, while Ann has only worked for four. Still, this could be comparable to Dunkin et al.'s "practice", if one considers practice to be equivalent to years of experience. Experience as a teacher is also what Gilje (2014) found to be an important factor for knowledge in subject matter. The conclusion from this is that formal education and experience as a teacher matters for teachers' cognition, knowledge and pedagogical insight in the classroom of pronunciation work.

4.3.2 Teacher skills

The teachers were asked what kind of skills they thought teachers needed to teach pronunciation efficiently. The teachers in my study do not seem to have reflected much on the topic of which skills teachers need to efficiently educate pupils in the production of oral English. They mention what teachers *do*, not skills or knowledge they *should have*. Patricia puts weight on a quantitative input of English, knowing the difference between writing and pronunciation and how to code phonemic script. Ann concludes that she can hear the mistakes and has such confidence in herself that she thinks it unnecessary with a lot of training on this topic. Bea states that one needs more time in school and that she uses listening and repeating, in addition to iPads and language labs. Cathy believes teachers should have a fundamental knowledge and interest for the entire subject, for example of literature and genre, but also didactics and fluency in own pronunciation. Diane, on the other hand, concludes what she would want in school is a troubleshooter – a booklet of the common mistakes that Norwegian pupils specifically struggle with. She reflects that rhythm and rhymes are also good strategies.

⁷ Ann: «i det, (..) eh, ja. Også tenker jeg at, at jeg har såpass selvtillit på min egen engelskuttale at, at det, ja, jeg vil høre det når de gjøre noen feil, eller. [...] nei, eh...men de oppdager, når de snakker høyt, hvis de snakker høyt i timen. Så oppdager de det [feilen] ofte selv»

Lastly, Erica's answer is given below, where she reflects upon what a teacher needs to know to efficiently teach pronunciation:

(..) uhm, I think that they should have a good pronunciation in English themselves, [...] you should be confident enough to speak orally and talk and read a lot, in order to be encouraging to one's pupils. Uhm, and then I think you need, you need one, in a way... A relationship, a good one. You need to work on the relations with the pupils so that it can be safe and okay to say the wrong thing and receive correction on what you say, or adjustments to what you say.⁸

Erica was the only informant who mentioned an aspect on Rogerson-Revell's (2011) skills, "monitoring" (see section 2.2.1). Even though "monitoring" is the only part from Rogerson-Revell's list, Erica also mentions important skills that a teacher needs, such as the ability to build relationships. The reason why the teachers do not answer so concretely could be because they underestimate the value of pronunciation in school. In other words, that anyone who is an English teacher can also teach pronunciation efficiently. Furthermore, how I asked the question could be part of the reason why there are misinterpretations. The conclusion regarding this question is that teachers have not considered this subject matter important enough to reflect on the skills that would be optimal or necessary to teach it more efficiently. Since the informants have not considered skills they should have had, then it is interesting to find out whether teachers are aware of their avoidance of certain aspects.

4.3.3 Teachers' avoidance of English teaching

On the question of avoidance in the English subject, most informants in this study gave the impression of being quite introspective and self-critical. When answering this, all teachers except Bea admit to not being infallible in their role. Ann and Patricia are the only ones who consider not to teach phonetics that much, even though they both claim not to avoid it on purpose. Furthermore, the remaining three teachers remarked avoidance or points of improvement in general terms of the English subject, such as adapted teaching or thematically in the subject. This question opens up for self-reflection of teachers' own KAL and the admittance of not being infallible (Borg, 2001). Borg (2001) also found that if you lack confidence in subject matters you will avoid teaching them to some degree. The discrepancies regarding my study, lies in the teachers' perception of the importance of pronunciation, not in their confidence. The reason for this can be answered from section 4.1, where all informants

⁸ Erica: «(..) hmm, jeg synes jo at man skal selv ha god uttale i engelsk, så jeg synes det er viktig at hvis man skal være engelsklærer, så skal man være trygg på å øve seg på å prate muntlig, og prate og lese høyt mye, sånn at man kan være en støtte for elevene sine der. Emh, så synes jeg man må ha en litt sånn, man må ha en, på en måte.. en relasjon, en god. Man må jobbe med relasjonene til elevene, slik at det skal være trygt og okei å både si feil og å motta korreksjoner på det man sier, eller justeringer på det man sier.»

claim to be confident and satisfied in themselves concerning this subject matter. The conclusion drawn from this discussion is that the teachers in general have aspects of English which they can improve on, however, pronunciation does not appear to be one of them. So, if the teachers are confident and satisfied in own pronunciation, do they want their pupils to reach their level of pronunciation proficiency? The next sub-section will take a look at the teachers' expectations regarding their pupils' pronunciation.

4.4 Expectations

This subsection is interested in seeing what kind of expectations teachers have regarding their pupils' English pronunciation. It will further explore whether teachers believe pronunciation to be an important topic of teaching. However, because of the way I phrased myself, the informants probably perceived the question as: "what good pronunciation is made of".

4.4.1 Expectations of pupils' pronunciation

The question was "what kind of expectation to you have of your pupils' pronunciation?" To which the answers varied a lot. However, the main distinction was how they distinguish between stronger and weaker pupils. For example, Ann, Cathy and Diane claim to expect more of their stronger pupils, Ann specified that if the strongest wanted to try, they could practice speaking with a native-like accent. Bea also wants her pupils to use the British and American media to their own advantage, which indirectly indicate that she wants her pupils to speak with such a standard native-like model⁹. Erica is also concerned with distinguishing between her pupils and she uses the example of different expectations between 8th and 10th graders. In the 8th grade, Erica emphasizes that just having a presentation is expected, while in the 10th grade, having the right verb tense and endings, in addition to speaking clearly is considered the expectation. The overall expectation that the teachers in this study have for their pupils appear to be quite adapted. They expect differently from one pupil to the next, which is an important aspect of adapted teaching (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2014). I had not considered adapted teaching when making the interview guide, still most of the teachers mention it themselves. The question is, do the teachers expect the strong pupils to use a native-like standard when speaking, while for their weaker pupils their expectancies are only to be understood? Because the conclusion from these answers is that

⁹ Bea: «de har så mye rundt seg med engelsk og amerikansk tale, at jeg forventer at de skal dra nytte av det, og at de skal bruke det»

teachers differentiate between strong and weaker pupils and some teachers expect strong pupils to use a native-like standard. This correlates with Simensen's (2014) findings that pupils with a near-native-like accent is assessed positively. The teachers in this study 'only' expect such an accent from their strongest pupils in English, thus making it harder for the pupils that are unable to use a native-like standard when speaking English to reach the highest grades. It is particularly important for the pupils that struggle with distinguishing between phonemic contrastive sounds that the teacher teach these explicitly.

4.4.2 Importance of pronunciation

The question regarded what teachers find important with pronunciation. Intelligibility is what most teachers in this study consider to be important with pronunciation. There were four out of the five teachers who answered this question that regarded the term "intelligibility" in the context of this question¹⁰. The only teacher who once more emphasized the native-like standard in her answer was Bea: "if we can avoid having too many Petter Solberg-speakers, that's great."¹¹ Furthermore, both Patricia and Erica comment on the importance of words and vocabulary. The tendency from this question is that teachers consider the pupils' ability to communicate to be most important with pronunciation, even if it is on the most basic level of proficiency. The intelligible element of oral production in English is noticeable also in research on this topic. Nilsen (2002) and Hansen (2015) both consider intelligibility to be the ultimate end goal for Norwegian learners of English. The indication seems to be that it is personal preference when teachers want pupils to use a native-like standard model of speaking. And further that teachers on a basic level acknowledge the notion that if the pupil is making himself/herself understood, then that is the most important with their oral production. Teachers' assessment of pupils' pronunciation and oral production will be further investigated in the next and last subsection of this chapter.

4.5 Assessment

This subsection describes findings regarding how teachers assess pupils' oral skills during and after their performance. It also shows what kind of criteria teachers use for assessment, for

10 "Intelligible" and "understandable" are considered to be synonyms and communication to be the overall end goal for these terms, hence they all overlap to some degree.

11 Bea: «jeg synes at, jeg synes at, det er fint hvis vi ikke får for mange sånne Petter Solberg-prater» (Petter Solberg is a Norwegian rally driver who has quite Norwenglish pronunciation and has become famous for both those things in Norway).

example if they emphasize on features of native-like accents. Finally, this section presents what teachers consider to be good pronunciation. Since there are no national criteria, it is interesting to hear what their criteria actually are. English is a learning process where unclear pronunciation and making mistakes is a part of the process. This makes it even more important for teachers to teach pupils how to get rid of such mistakes in order to become intelligible speakers. It is interesting to see if there are a lot of discrepancies in the answers, or if the teachers in my study agree on what is considered to be good pronunciation. I do expect the answer to vary, as Rugesæter (2014) found that it is harder to assess pronunciation due to it being an active skill.

The question of how teachers assess pupils before and after their performance. To which the teachers' answers were varied. Whether there is coherence between what they guide their pupils on during and after is not always clear. Patricia answers that she both guides and assesses her pupils from whether or not they were understood. Ann also wants and guides her pupils on being understood, which she also uses as a factor in her assessment, in addition she also assesses correct and distinct sounds. Bea, Cathy and Diane all consider the importance of rehearsal, fluency/clarity and knowledge of words as guides during/before presentations. However, both Bea and Cathy prefer to keep the feedback positive in class. Diane mainly uses the aforementioned keywords before pupils' oral performance, and terminology, fluency and communication as criteria of assessment after the performance. Finally, Erica uses a presentation she has created for the pupils to use as a model before making their own. Even though there are no assessment criteria from Udir, there seems to be quite similar practices among the teachers. Vocabulary, intelligibility and fluency are features that the majority of the teachers in my study consider to be important guidelines for the pupils before speaking English. These features make up for three out of nine points on Drew and Sørheim's (2009) list of oral pronunciation features a teacher can assess from. That is if "idiomatic language" is a feature that is covered when being an intelligible speaker. Compared to Drew and Sørheim's list, the informants' criteria cover their list quite well, because their list is rather exemplary and unrealistic. When it comes to assessment, pronunciation only becomes a part of a larger list, and this is probably why teachers think of pronunciation only as a subcategory, and also why there seems to be minimal explicit teaching. Still, the teachers were quite united regarding what they want their pupils to focus on when producing oral English, which is interesting to see as there is no common, concrete guide or criteria for assessment. The next paragraph will explore which criteria the teachers in my study use when they assess pupils' oral performance.

The question that was given to the informants was “do you have any criteria you use to assess English pronunciation?” Vocabulary is the criterion that is considered the most important one by most informants in my study when assessing pupils’ pronunciation. Once again, the informants regard vocabulary to be important with pronunciation, even though that is a separate language feature. As there are no national criteria to assess from, these criteria can be considered local, as each school makes their own criteria based on teaching (and assessing the pupils regarding) the oral skills. Fluency, vocabulary and distinct pronunciation were mentioned by at least three informants. When more than two informants regard a feature, it is giving that particular criterion more validity. Other criteria mentioned are, eye contact, staying on topic or level of accomplishment (a way to assess performance). Bea, Erica and Patricia consider the importance of presenting the pupils with the criteria beforehand, in order for them to understand what they are supposed to learn or know (Udir.no, n.d.). Bea: “I’ll comment on the criteria that have been chosen, but the pupils have to know which criteria beforehand [...] in order for them to know what we’re paying attention to.”¹² Bea comments how pupils adapt to the teachers’ expectations if they receive the criteria before performing. Furthermore, the impression from this question is that teachers consider vocabulary to be an important aspect of pronunciation. This could be because they have experienced that a lack of word will tear apart the flow of the pronunciation. Another reason why teachers consider vocabulary to be a vital feature of pronunciation is because they believe English language teaching as a unity with overlapping features. This can lead to a questioning of the teachers’ specific knowledge on the topic of pronunciation and the assessment of it in primary and lower secondary school. However, the conclusion is that even though there are no national criteria, schools use quite similar factors for assessing oral English. When asking about criteria I am bound to get several factors, including those that are somewhat outside of the topic of pronunciation. This makes it more interesting to hear what each informant consider good pronunciation to be, because it will be even more distinct and specific feature to consider that their criteria.

The question was “how do you evaluate good pronunciation?”. Good pronunciation is related to either using a native-like pronunciation standard or right sounds, according to the informants in this study. Cathy, Patricia and Ann, believe right sounds are relevant, and the two latter teachers also believe precise words to be important. In addition, Patricia argues that

12 Bea: «jeg vil kommentere de kriteriene som er satt opp, men elevene må gjøres kjent med kriteriene på forhånd. [...] sånn at de vet hva det er vi hører etter»

beautiful pronunciation is vital, however without elaborating what she puts in the term “beautiful”. If one is to speculate, it could be that Patricia, without having reflected upon it, prefers a native-like pronunciation standard. Furthermore, Bea, Cathy and Diane think that “Norwenglish” is bad, and Bea and Cathy specifically argue that British, American and Australian intonation and pronunciation are preferable. They both concretely claim to prefer a near-native-like pronunciation in their pupils, as illustrated below.

Bea: if they speak British English, then I will be very happy about that, but I am not going to judge anyone for the American one, that I won't do. [...] but English for me, is British English.

Cathy: If you have an... almost real Australian, or British, or American [English accent], then that's great.

Ann: yes, I always encourage pupils to do that [produce British or American English], that I encourage to speak in different ways, and some have an American accent to it, others have a British one, but it is not central at all.¹³

Ann also likes near-native-like pronunciation, but on a more personal level. However, as previously stated, she does not let that influence her assessment as she thinks pupils' ability to be understood is the most important aspect of pronunciation. Diane agrees with the fact that the communication is important, in addition, she considers correctly pronounced words, stress and pitch as relevant features. Finally, Erica who has a strong linguistic background believes that good pronunciation consists of sentence structure, verb-inflection and being understood. Hence, one can say that most teachers prefer a native-like pronunciation standard, but whether their actual evaluation of the pupils is based on their ability to produce native-like accents is impossible to say. Three informants in my study prefer pupils to have an almost native-like accent, which concurs with Simensen's (2014) findings that teachers assess pupils with a close-to-native-like accents better. Are these teachers who assess near-native-likeness to a standard speaker norm positively aware of how their subconscious attitudes are perceived by the pupils. Today, the evaluation of what is considered to be good pronunciation, is subjective and in the hands of each individual teacher. If a more concrete norm existed for teachers to

13 Bea: «hvis de prater britisk engelsk, så blir jeg veldig glad for det, men jeg har ikke tenkt til å ta noen for den amerikanske, det har jeg ikke [...] men engelsk for meg, det er britisk engelsk.»

Cathy: «hvis du da har en.. nesten snakker ordentlig australsk, eller britisk, eller amerikansk, så er det jo supert»

Ann: «jo, jeg oppmuntrer alltid til det [Britisk/amerikansk aksent], altså jeg oppmuntrer til å snakke på forskjellige måter og noen har en amerikansk sleng på seg og noen har en britisk, men, men det er ikke sentralt i det hele tatt»

follow and assess by, negative attitudes towards non-native-like standards such as “Norwenglish”¹⁴ or an intercultural speaker model would likely not be as prevalent. The question remains, do teachers agree on what good pronunciation is? On a general note, it seems that most teachers agree that using Norwegian language features such as intonation and stress in their English pronunciation is considered bad and using correct and accurate sounds are fundamental when producing good oral pronunciation in English.

4.6 Summing up the most important findings

The tendency from my study and informants is that there is a correlation between formal education and knowledge of subject matter. The most evident example is Ann whose answers stuck out the most during the analysis process. She has a 30 study point formal education in English and appears to have the least self-perception and pedagogical insight of subject matter compared to the other informants in this study. This could be a small indication on the fact that the amount of formal education plays a role regarding practice in teaching subject matter. The amount of personal interest and teacher training also seem to be influencing teachers’ knowledge of subject matter, even more than the time spent as an English teacher. This becomes evident as Cathy, who has a 60 study point education within teacher training in English, received extensive didactics of pronunciation also teaches quite a lot and with ease.

When it comes to pronunciation teaching in the classroom the tendency appears to be that the teachers in this study considers it to be too small of a topic to spend much time on explicit teaching of it. Even though researchers such as Rugesæter (2014) and Nilsen (2002) have found the need for explicit teaching of dissimilar phonemes between the two language systems, it seems that the teaching of pronunciation all the way back to teachers’ formal education is limited, leading to less time spent on teaching it in school. As only Patricia and Cathy claim to teach this subject matter much explicitly, it appears that the quality of the teacher training the teacher got related to pronunciation is most consequential as to the classroom practices of subject matter. As a side note, two of the six informants claimed that the topic of pronunciation teaching in school is something that they can improve on. So it

14 “Norwenglish” is a hybrid between Norwegian and English where one uses English vocabulary, but Norwegian pronunciation, intonation and stress. “Similects” is a term developed by Anna Mauranen (2012) in *Exploring ELF: academic English shaped by non-native speakers*, explained by Jenkins (2015, p. 42) as a way of using English with transferred L1 features. “Norwenglish” can be considered to be the Norwegian “similect” of English.

seems that researching own practices in school help teachers to stay updated and increase awareness to their KAL, which again influences instructional decisions (Borg, 2001). Thus being a part of this study has maybe made them more aware of their own practice or rather lack of practice in the classroom that can enhance future teaching of pronunciation.

As far as the pupils' pronunciation goes, all informants claimed at one point or another that they wanted their pupils to be understood, i.e. intelligible. The impression given from this, is that most teachers in this study seem to think that intelligible is the most basic level that the pupils have. For some, to reach a native-likeness to an accent is considered the ultimate goal of pronunciation in school, even though that is near-impossible when it comes to this subject matter in English. Regarding expectations, it is Bea who most clearly expects most clearly closeness to a native-like accent from her pupils. Both she and Erica with 180 study point formal education expect quite a lot. However, Erica's expectations were more related to her strong linguistic background with correct sentences and verb inflection. Thus making a distinction between the teachers in attitudes.

The informants in this study can be divided into two groups when it comes to classroom accent and expectation of their pupils. On one side there are Ann, Erica and Patricia who modifies their classroom English accent, and on the other side there are Bea, Cathy and Diane who uses "real" English in the classroom¹⁵. The tendency seems to be that those teachers who speak with a "real" English accent in the classroom, also expect more from their pupils' pronunciation. It has less to do with formal education and more to do with own cognition of this subject matter. Erica and Patricia for example have quite vague expectations, and they also claim to specifically modify their own oral classroom English. In other words, those teachers who deliberately modifies their English accent in the classroom are also more inclined to expect pupils' pronunciation to be intelligible as a more important aspect, it would seem.

Another feature of development of oral skills that all informants considered, was the criteria they use for assessment. Because even though there are no national criteria, most of the teachers agreed that vocabulary and precise words are criteria that are most important when assessing pupils' oral production. The impression is that there is a certain common notion as to what good oral English is among Norwegian teachers of English because the criteria overlap to some degree.

¹⁵ "Real" English is Cathy's way of describing the unmodified version and is used by those who prefer the accent to stay consistent to a standard native-like accent.

5 Conclusion

The main research question of this study is: What knowledge do teachers have in pronunciation and pronunciation teaching and how do they practice their knowledge in teaching? To begin with, I would like to say that it is quite impossible to say anything definite regarding the informants' knowledge. The aspects that were investigated during the interview only scratch the surface of the tendencies within the field of English pronunciation teaching in Norway. Hence, their knowledge in this study is based on their own self-assessment of pronunciation. The teachers are confident of own English pronunciation and own knowledge regarding this subject matter. However, they do not work much explicitly with pronunciation, but rather integrate it while focusing on other language areas. Another tendency is that teachers' cognition leads them to consider this subject matter as an unnecessary topic to teach because they teach it sufficiently during for example speaking in class. The conclusion to the main research question is that teachers are aware and confident regarding own pronunciation, however my impression of their knowledge of this subject matter is that it seems to be only adequate. This is visible through limited classroom teaching of pronunciation and a lack of recognition of its necessity to teach much explicitly in class.

The second research question is: Whether the amount of formal education has any correlation with the quantity and quality of the classroom teaching of pronunciation for teachers in lower secondary school. There were three different amounts of study points, both in didactics and in English, represented in this study. It is the quality and quantity that separates them. The 180 study point formal education provides quite a lot of competence in subject matter, however, the didactics does not appear to be as sufficient. The tendency from the teachers with a 60 study point formal education is namely the quantity and quality of the didactics. As there was only one informant with a 30 study point education it is rather speculative to see a tendency. Still, the impression is that 30 study points formal education is rather insufficient, both in terms of didactics and knowledge in teaching this subject matter in general. As a comment to this, the teachers who have worked the longest as a teacher, appeared to be both knowledgeable of subject matter and to some degree, teaching it. Which could mean that experience could be key to becoming competent in teaching pronunciation. The conclusion to this question is that formal education matters in terms of providing background knowledge of subject matter and the didactic skills required to teach it efficiently. In addition, the years of experience also contribute positively when it comes to integrating pronunciation into lessons in a didactical manner.

The final research question is: What do Norwegian teachers of English consider to be good pronunciation? The tendency drawn from the last research question is that the teachers in this study consider clear pronunciation, together with fluency and vocabulary to be the most important factors when it comes to assessing pupils' oral English production. Furthermore, they seem to think that pronunciation is mainly something to be taught as a part of other subject areas, i.e. speaking in class, rather than to explicitly teach pronunciation. When it comes to the teachers' relation to a native-like pronunciation standard, the general tendency and attitudes among teachers is that intelligibility is something they all think pupils should achieve and that that the strongest pupils should strive to reach a near-native-like accent. A level of proficiency which research has made it clear is near-impossible to attain. The conclusion is that the basic level of proficiency Norwegian teachers of English believe necessary for Norwegian pupils is intelligibility, however, using a native-like standard when speaking English is still considered as positive.

5.1 Criticism

This research project has aspects to it which could have made it more valid. The interview might not have been the best one, or at least not as the only method. As a sole method in gathering data, interview has its limits as I am not able to validate what the informants say. If I included observation of the informants in class as another method, the validity could have been further pursued. In this way, I could have determined and considered the truth behind the informants' words to a much larger extent than when just conducting interviews. Finally, I will point out that the time limits when conducting this research has been present in every step of the process. Still, the interviews have given me information and insights to the field of teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching pronunciation.

5.2 Future research

During this research I have come across three aspects in particular that would have been interesting to pursue further as important research in the field of English pronunciation teaching in Norway.

Firstly, my research has been conducted from a teacher's perspective, however, to know what pupils think about pronunciation lessons would be interesting. For teachers to know which methods that work for pupils, one needs to ask the pupils what helps them in

improving their English pronunciation. Whether it is a particular kind of feedback or integrated lessons of pronunciation with focus on distinct phonemic sounds or words, that improves the pupils' knowledge. Teachers should know of such methods in order to make lessons as efficient and sufficient as possible to improve pupils' pronunciation. The question is, how do teachers acquire this knowledge?

That is why I believe the second interesting aspect of future research concerns how teacher education prepares student teachers for the teaching of this subject matter. The teacher education need to provide the student teachers with enough knowledge in order for them to master the skill "teaching pronunciation". This means that attaining a good pronunciation themselves is not enough to be able to teach the subject matter proficiently, which appears to be the tendency from my study. A specific example of a didactic practice that would be useful for student teachers to learn, are the typical mistakes that Norwegian learners of English make. In addition to learn how to recognize and how to dispose of these mistakes with ease and efficiency in the classroom. In other words, this means that good didactics are vital, also for teachers in lower secondary school. The teachers in this study were all lower secondary school teachers and most of them believed that specific pronunciation work were more common practice in primary than lower secondary school.

This is why it would be interesting to know and compare the different practices between the two age groups in school when it comes to work with pronunciation. Some teachers interviewed in this study thought they did not need to teach much pronunciation explicitly because that is more practiced in primary school, but is that really the case? Because of the critical period, the most advantageous time to teach subject matter for pupils' development of sounds is from an early age i.e. primary school. Still it needs to be further practiced and developed later in life i.e. lower secondary school.

6 List of references

- Atkins, L., & Wallace, S. (2012). *Qualitative Research in Education*. London: British Educational Research Association & Sage.
- Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Oxford University Press*, 55(1), 21-29.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language learning: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Cambridge University Press*, 81-109. doi:10.1017/S0261444803001903
- Drew, I., & Sørheim, B. (2009). *English Teaching Strategies*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.
- Dunkin, M. J., Precians, R. P., & Nettle, E. B. (1994). Effects of formal teacher education upon student teacher's cognitions regarding teaching. *Teacher and Teacher Education*, 10, 395-408. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0742051X94900213> doi:10.1016/0742-051X(94)90021-3
- Gass, S. (2012). *Second Language Acquisition, an introductory course*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Gilje, T. M. (2014). Teacher cognition and the teaching of EFL reading in Norwegian upper primary classroom. *Acta didactica Norge*, 8(2), 17.
- Grønmo, S. (2016). *Samfunnsvitenskapelige metoder* (2. ed.). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Hansen, T. (2015). Språknormer. In M. D. o. G.-A. M. Camilla Bjørke (Ed.), *Fremmedspråksdidaktikk* (pp. 2011-2218): Cappelen Damm akademisk
- Haugsted, M. T. (1999). *Handlende mundtlighet*
Mundtlig metode og æstetiske læreprosesser. København: Danmarks Lærerhøjskole.
- Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes* (3. ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *Det kvalitative forskningsintervju, 3. utgave*. Oslo: Gyldendal akademisk.
- Lenneberg, E. H. (1969). On Explaining language. *American Association for the Advancement of Science*, 164(3880), 635-643. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1725957>
- Lichtman, M. (2010). *Qualitative Research in Education, A User's Guide*. California: Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Education and Research, U. n. (2013). *English Subject Curriculum*. Oslo Retrieved from <http://data.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03.pdf?lang=eng>.
- Nilsen, T. (2002). *British and American pronunciation*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Nilsen, V. (2012). *Analyse i kvalitative studier*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, U. n. (2012). *Framework for Basic Skills*. Oslo Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, U. n. (2014). *Tilpasset Opplæring*. Retrieved from <http://www.udir.no/Regelverk/tidlig-innsats/Skole/Begreper-og-prinsipper/Tilpasset-opplaring/>.
- Rindal, U. (2010). Constructing identity with L2: pronunciation and attitudes among Norwegian learners of English. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 240-261.
- Rindal, U. (2014). What is English? . *Acta didactica Norge*, 8(2), 17.
- Rindal, U. (2016). Læreplanen sier ikke hva som er "riktig" engelsk uttale. *Utdanningsnytt.no*. <https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/magasin/2016/april/lareplanen-sier-ikke-hva-som-er-riktig-engelsk-uttale/> Retrieved from <https://www.utdanningsnytt.no/magasin/2016/april/lareplanen-sier-ikke-hva-som-er-riktig-engelsk-uttale/>
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

- Rogerson-Revell, P. (2011). *English phonology and pronunciation teaching*. Great Britain Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Rugesæter, K. (2012). Phonological competence in English among Norwegian pupils and implications for the teaching of pronunciation in the English classroom. In A. Hasselgren, I. Drew, & B. Sørheim (Eds.), *The young language learner, research-based insights into Teaching and learning* (pp. 119-130). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget, Vigmostad og Bjørke.
- Rugesæter, K. (2014). Difficult Contrasts: an analysis of phonemic distinctions in the English of young Norwegian learners seen against the backdrop of incidental foreign-language learning. *Acta didactica*, 8(1), 20.
- Simensen, A. M. (2014). Skolefaget engelsk. Fra britisk til mange slags "engelsker"- og veien videre. *Acta didactica Norge*, 8(2), 18.
- Udir.no. (n.d.). *Vurdering for Læring*. Retrieved from <http://www.udir.no/Vurdering-for-laring/4-prinsipper/>.

7 Attachments

7.1

Intervjuguide

Teachers' knowledge of subject matter and practice in teaching pronunciation

Informere om prosjektet og at det er lov å trekke seg når som helst. Anonymisert.

INTRO.

1. År i jobben
2. Formell utdanning i engelsk(ja/nei)

SELVTILLIT/EGNE REFLEKSJONER

3. Fornøyd med egen engelskuttale?
 - 3.1 Spesielle områder som er vanskelig? – lyder – intonasjon – stress – rytme
4. Følger du en norm/aksent du bruker?
5. Hva tror du påvirker din engelskuttale?

UNDERVISNING

6. Underviser du i uttale? Separate timer, integrert i annen undervisning
7. Hvilken type materialer bruker du da?
8. Underviser du med en type aksent? Hvorfor?
9. Gir du rettleidende tilbakemeldinger til elevene når det kommer til uttale?
Hvordan gir du denne?
10. Vet du om/føler du at det er noen vanlige uttaleproblemer for elevene? –
Typiske lyder – intonasjon
 - 10.1 Hva/hvordan hjelper du disse elevene med å forbedre dette?
11. Bruker du kompetansemål i undervisningen? Hjelper det undervisningen din?

EGEN UTDANNING

12. Hvor mye trening fikk du selv innenfor uttale-delen av engelskfaget på skolen?

13. Hva synes du lærere trenger av kunnskaper, for effektivt å undervise i uttale?

14. Er det noe du unngår å undervise? Hvorfor?

FORVENTNINGER

15. Hvilke forventninger stiller du til elevenes engelskuttale? Hvorfor?

16. Hva ser du på som viktig med uttale i engelsk?

VURDERING

17. Hvordan veileder du elevene underveis i f.eks et muntlig prosjekt-presentasjon?

17.1 Og hvilke vurderinger gir du etter en muntlig presentasjon?

18. Har du noen vurderingskriterier til muntlig engelskuttale? Hvilke? – innhold, flyt, nøyaktighet, uttale.

19. Hvordan evaluere hva som er god uttale?

AVSLUTNING

20. Er det noe du lurer på, eller vil tilføye som du ikke fikk sagt?

English version

Interview guide

Teachers' knowledge of subject matter and practice in teaching pronunciation

(Inform informants that they can withdraw their participation to be a part of this project at any time, without an explanation. Also that this project will anonymize any participants.)

INTRODUCTION

1. Years in the job
2. Formal education in English

SELF-COGNITION

3. Satisfaction with own English pronunciation?
 - 3.1 Some aspects that you think is hard?
4. Do you use a norm or accent?
5. What do you think influences your English pronunciation?

TEACHING PRACTICES

6. Do you teach pronunciation?
7. Do you use some particular material to do this?
8. Do you use an accent when you are teaching English?
9. Do you provide corrective feedback to your pupils? (How do you give this?)
10. Do you know of any typical or common pronunciation issues that pupils tend to make?
11. Do you use competence aims in your lessons? Do you feel the aims provide support for the lesson?

OWN EDUCATION

12. How much education did you yourself get regarding pronunciation training of English?
13. What kind of knowledge and skills do you think teachers should have to efficiently teach pronunciation in school?
14. Do you avoid teaching anything?

EXPECTATIONS

15. What kind of expectations do you have when it comes to the pupils' pronunciation?

16. What do you consider to be the most important with (teaching) pronunciation in school?

ASSESSMENT

17. How do you guide pupils during and after an oral English situation? ex: presentations.

18. Do you have any criteria for assessment of pronunciation of English? Which?

19. How do you evaluate good English pronunciation?

ENDING

20. Do you have any questions, or something you want to add?



Harald Hårfagres gate 29
N-5007 Bergen
Norway
Tel: +47-55 58 21 17
Fax: +47-55 58 96 50
nsd@nsd.uib.no
www.nsd.uib.no
Org.nr. 985 321 884

7.2 NSD-approval

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS

NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES

Minjeong Son

Institutt for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk UiT Norges arktiske universitet

9006 TROMSØ

Vår dato: 07.01.2016

Vår ref: 45918 / 3 / AGL

Deres dato:

Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 01.12.2015. All nødvendig informasjon om prosjektet forelå i sin helhet 06.01.2016. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

45918 Teachers' attitudes towards native-like pronunciation

Behandlingsansvarlig UiT Norges arktiske universitet, ved institusjonens øverste leder

Daglig ansvarlig Minjeong Son

Student Ingrid Fallang

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

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

2

Avdelingskontorer / District Offices:

OSLO: NSD, Universitetet i Oslo, Postboks 1055 Blindern, 0316 Oslo. Tel: +47-22 85 52 11. nsd@uio.no

TRONDHEIM: NSD, Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 7491 Trondheim. Tel: +47-73 59 19 07. kyrre.svarva@svt.ntnu.no

TROMSØ: NSD, SVF, Universitetet i Tromsø, 9037 Tromsø. Tel: +47-77 64 43 36. nsdmaa@sv.uit.no

<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, 18.05.2016, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Katrine Utaaker Segadal

Audun Løvlie

Kontaktperson: Audun Løvlie tlf: 55 58 23 07

Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering

Kopi: Ingrid Fallang ingrid.fallang@gmail.com

7.3 E-mail to principals

Hei.

Jeg er en mastergradsstudent på den nye integrerte lærerutdanningen, 5.-10.-klasse og skriver om engelsk didaktikk. Min forskning omhandler læreres praksis, om hvilke strategier og vurderinger de bruker av elevenes muntlige ferdigheter. Jeg skal bruke intervju som metodisk innsamling, og det vil foregå i begynnelsen av februar og vil maksimum ta en time.

Kunne en av engelsklærerne ved din skole vært interessert i å delta på min forskning?

Med vennlig hilsen

Ingrid Fallang.

7.4 The information document given to the informants

Forespørsel om deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet

”Teachers’ knowledge about subject matter and practices to pronunciation.”

Bakgrunn og formål

Mitt formål for denne studien er å finne ut hvilke vurderinger norske engelsklærere gjør i forhold til uttale på muntlig engelsk. Jeg har lyst til å finne ut hvorfor lærerne tenker, veileder og vurderer elevene slik de gjør. Hvilke kriterier bruker lærerne for å vurdere, og hva vektlegger de. Resultatene fra denne studien skal brukes i en mastergradsoppgave ved Institutt for lærerutdanning og pedagogikk ved det Arktiske Universitetet i Tromsø.

Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?

Studien innebærer intervju som datainnsamlingsmetode, da det er et utvalg holdninger jeg er ute etter å undersøke. Spørsmålene vil blant annet undersøke holdninger og metoder til vurdering. Jeg vil finne ut av hvilken måte lærerne vurderer elevene og grunner til dette. Dette for å få en oversikt over hva utvalget lærere mener om aspekter ved muntlig engelskuttale. Innhentingene blir registrert via lydopptak, i tillegg vil egne notater bli brukt.

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?

Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Det er kun undertegnede og veileder som vil ha tilgang til personopplysninger. Opplysningene vil bli lagret i et låsbart skap, hvor kun jeg har tilgang. Deltakere i studien skal ikke kunne bli gjenkjent, dog informasjon som kjønn og alder vil bli publisert. Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 18.5.16, og da skal alt av personopplysninger og opptak slettes.

Frivillig deltakelse

Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.

Dersom du har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med Ingrid Fallang, 913 85 721, eller ifa006@uit.no. Veileder til studien, og daglig ansvarlig, er Minjeong Son, 77660764/93849701 og minjeong.son@uit.no.

Studien er meldt til Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS.

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien

Jeg har mottatt informasjon om studien, og er villig til å delta

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)