



University of
Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study:

Master in Literacy Studies

Spring semester, 2013

Open

Author: Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø

.....
(Author's signature)

Supervisor: Ion Drew

Thesis title: A case study of a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) project in a 9th grade EFL class in Norway

Keywords:

CLIL
Second World War
9th grade EFL
Norway

No. of pages: ...102.....
+ appendices/other: ..36.....

Stavanger, ...15.05.2013.....
date/year

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor Ion Drew for all of his efforts and dedication in guiding me throughout this process and for his encouragements as well as valuable insight. I would also like to thank my family and loved ones for their support. A particular appreciation goes to the EFL teacher who openly invited me into her classroom over an extensive period of time, as well as the 29 pupils in her class for their participation.

Abstract

This thesis is a study of a Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) project in a 9th grade Norwegian EFL class. History, namely the Second World War from the perspective of young people's experiences, was taught with English as the language of instruction. CLIL is a content-driven approach where the main emphasis is on using a different language than the mother tongue as a tool for teaching and learning about another subject; the focus is on meaning and not the forms of language. CLIL creates a dual benefit of developing both language and content knowledge.

The thesis aimed to investigate the teacher's motives for initiating the project, the pupils' and teacher's expectations, experiences and challenges, and how the project benefited the pupils. It is a case study based on multiple methods. Two pupil questionnaires were used, one in the initial stage of the project and one after the project had ended. Thirteen lessons were observed, including observing the pupils giving oral presentations on topics they had been working on connected to the overall theme. The presentations were recorded and transcribed. In addition, the teacher was interviewed both before the project started and after it had ended and five pupils were also interviewed at the end of the project.

One of the main findings was that the teacher played a central role. The project was implemented on the teacher's initiative and interest in the topic and her view that textbook-based teaching was too limited. Finding and assessing appropriate materials for a mixed ability class was a major challenge. These included extracts from books written for native-speakers, texts from course books for the age group, and films on the subject. The teacher experienced the project to be generally rewarding for her and beneficial for the pupils. The pupils' expectations and experiences were mainly positive. For most of the pupils, learning about WWII in English was not regarded as difficult in general, although some of the texts were regarded as difficult. The pupils were mostly focused on the subject matter and not the fact that they were using English to learn about it. The use of films and activities related to them were what they liked most, while giving oral presentations, reading and writing were less popular activities. The project promoted communicative engagement in classroom discussions. Vocabulary connected to the topic was one of the areas in which the pupils developed their language, but most of them did not feel that they had developed their language in other ways.

CLIL has primarily been used at the upper secondary level in Norway. This study has shown that CLIL also has a potential with young Norwegian EFL learners.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	3
1.1	Background.....	4
1.2	The aims and scope of the present study	4
1.3	Outline of the thesis	5
2.0	English teaching in Norwegian school education	7
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	An historical overview of English curricula in Norway	7
2.3	The <i>Knowledge Promotion</i> curriculum (LK06)	9
2.4	The textbook tradition in Norway	12
2.5	Teacher education.....	13
3.0	Theory and literature review	15
3.1	The background for CLIL.....	15
3.2	The nature of CLIL.....	17
3.3	Theories of language learning	20
3.3.1	Socio-cultural, constructivist perspectives on language learning	21
3.3.2	The ‘natural approach’	22
3.3.3	Krashen’s Monitor theory	22
3.3.4	‘Natural’ language learning and CLIL	25
3.4	Studies of CLIL	26
4.0	Method	37
4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	The case study: an approach to qualitative research.....	37
4.3	Risks of bias and validity.....	38
4.4	The participants and gaining entry into the field.....	39
4.5	Observation.....	40
4.5.1	Semi-structured observation.....	40
4.5.2	The case study observation	41
4.6	Interviews	42
4.6.1	Semi-structured interviews.....	42
4.6.2	The pre-project teacher interview	43
4.6.3	The post-project interview with the teacher.....	44
4.6.4	Interviews with the pupils	45
4.7	Questionnaires	47
4.7.1	The pre-project questionnaire.....	48
4.7.2	The post-project questionnaire	49
4.8	Presenting the data.....	50
5.0	Results	51

5.1	Pre-project data.....	51
5.1.1	Pre-project teacher interview.....	51
5.1.2	Pre-project pupil questionnaire	61
5.2	Observation data	63
5.2.1	Summary of observation data.....	63
5.2.2	Pupils' oral presentations	70
5.3	Post-project data	74
5.3.1	Post-project pupil questionnaire.....	74
5.3.2	Post-project pupil interviews.....	77
5.3.3	Post-project teacher interview	83
6.0	Discussion	92
6.1	The teacher's motives	92
6.2	Expectations.....	93
6.3	Experiences.....	94
6.4	The pupils' benefits	96
6.5	Challenges	99
7.0	Conclusion.....	102
	References	104
	Appendices	109
	Appendix 1A.....	109
	Appendix 1B.....	111
	Appendix 2A.....	114
	Appendix 2B.....	116
	Appendix 3	118
	Appendix 4	120

1.0 Introduction

This thesis is about a case study of a Content and Language Integrated (CLIL) project, combining History and English, in a mixed-ability 9th grade English class in Norway. Coyle et al. (2010: 1) define CLIL as a dual approach to education ‘...in which an **additional language** is used for the learning and teaching of both content *and* language.’ CLIL emphasises a focus on content (meaning) rather than on form. The content of the CLIL project, young people’s experiences during World War II, was taught and learnt with and through the use of the target language English. The study investigates the expectations, experiences, challenges and benefits for the pupils and the teacher’s motives, expectations, challenges and experience of carrying out this CLIL-project. The data for the study was collected from October 2012 to April 2013 through multiple methods, including observations of lessons, semi-structured interviews with pupils and the teacher, and two pupil questionnaires.

The study falls within the field of evaluative educational research. According to Borg and Gall (1989: 742): ‘Educational evaluation is the process of making judgements about the merit, value or worth of educational programs.’ The practice of CLIL in Norway has primarily been at the upper secondary level (Paulsen 2010b: 10). The present study, in contrast, focuses on a level which is under-researched, namely introducing CLIL to younger pupils aged 14/15. In addition, the research will add to the limited evaluative research on materials/tasks in CLIL projects in general (Coyle et al. 2010).

There is a strong tradition for using the textbook approach in Norwegian EFL teaching (Drew 2004; Charboneau 2012; Hellekjær 2007), namely basing teaching mainly or entirely on one textbook. The present study in contrast investigates the implementation of a non-traditional approach to foreign language teaching in Norway, one which provides pupils with the opportunity to acquire language through a focus on meaning and natural language usage, and exposes them to large amounts of input through the use of a wide variety of materials. In the report *Språk åpner dører (Languages Open Doors)*, produced by the Ministry of Education (2007:54), a need is expressed for more research and more experimental and developmental work with regard to teaching foreign languages. Thus the present study also hopes to contribute to the limited research into experimental approaches to EFL practices in Norway.

1.1 Background

The ideas upon which CLIL is based are in no way new, even though the modern version of CLIL is (Simensen 1998: 103). Coyle et al. (2010: 2) point out that: 'Education in a language which is not the first language of the learner is as old as education itself.' CLIL has a dual focus: there is not just a singular focus on teaching and learning either content or language. Even though the emphasis may be placed heavier on one of the two, content and language are interwoven in the teaching and learning process (Coyle et al. 2010: 1). Mehisto et al. (2008: 7) argue: 'We have known for a long time that teaching languages and other subjects separate from one another, in a vacuum, does not produce optimal outcomes.' CLIL combines language and content which otherwise have been fragmented into separate subjects (Mehisto et al. 2008:7-9).

Krashen's (1982: 10) acquisition-learning hypothesis supports the dual focus and interwoven processes in CLIL. Krashen distinguishes between 'acquisition' of language as a subconscious process and 'learning' as a conscious one. This definition of acquisition implies that when pupils are immersed in the learning experience, and use language purposefully and meaningfully, they will automatically acquire language in a natural manner. Thus, placing the emphasis on meaning (the content) rather than on form (e.g. grammar instruction) promotes language development, and allows for the development of both language and content irrespective of where the main emphasis is placed in a given situation. The CLIL approach presupposes that pupils can develop their language without a focus on conscious learning of vocabulary and grammar through direct language instruction.

1.2 The aims and scope of the present study

The present CLIL project focuses on the early stages of the Second World War and emphasises the war experience from the perspective of young people. The 29 pupils were introduced to the topic for the first time in English, but would learn more about the Second World War in Social Studies at a later time during their 9th year. The project lasted from October to March and was restricted to the context of the English classroom, where pupils have three lessons a week. It was based on multiple materials and tasks and was conducted almost entirely in English. Authentic text excerpts and texts from several textbooks were provided, representing various genres and levels of difficulty. Films were also used. Shorter writing tasks, where pupils could choose between several options, and oral tasks, were given

in relation to the texts and films. In addition, the pupils did a longer process-writing task, choosing between writing a WWII-related article, a diary entry or a letter, writing about their own reflections or making a story, which they worked on both at school and at home. The pupils also chose a topic and presented it orally to the class.

The main research questions of the study are:

What are the expectations, experiences, benefits and challenges of the project for the pupils?

What are the motives, expectations, challenges and experiences of the teacher?

It was expected that the teacher would be a key variable, both for implementing CLIL and for its efficacy. In addition, by exposing the pupils to the English language through a focus on meaning and content, it was expected that the project would provide them with a natural and motivating context for developing their language skills. It was anticipated, however, that some pupils may experience challenges, due to their low abilities in English, or as a lack of motivation and interest in the content or the language. However, if the materials and tasks were well-adapted to the individual pupil's level, and proper assistance from the teacher was provided, these pupils could also develop both language and content knowledge.

1.3 Outline of the thesis

Chapter 2 'English teaching in Norwegian school education', provides an overview of English teaching in Norway. First it shows how English teaching practices, the status of English teaching and English curricula have changed through time. Secondly, the current status of English teaching in Norwegian education is presented, both in terms of the current curriculum *LK06*, the English subject curriculum's goals for pupils at the lower-secondary level and how English teaching is commonly practised in Norway. Teacher education in Norway is also described in this chapter.

Chapter 3 'Theory and literature review', presents the CLIL approach. It gives as description of the origin of CLIL, an explanation of the nature of CLIL, theories on language learning in support of this approach and some of the studies of CLIL in Europe, including CLIL research in Norway.

In Chapter 4 'Method', the methodology used and the process of collecting data for the study is presented, namely the case study as a form of research and the use of multiple

methods, including semi-structured interviews, observations of lessons and questionnaires to study the case in question.

Chapter 5 'Results', provides summaries of two interviews with the teacher, summaries of interviews with selected pupils, presents data from two questionnaires which were filled out by the pupils and provides a summary of the occurrences in several observed lessons during the project, including examples of and comments on several pupils' oral presentations.

Chapter 6 discusses the findings from the case study and also views them in the light of CLIL theory and research.

Chapter 7 presents a conclusion of the findings, suggests areas for future research on CLIL in Norway and also considers the limitations of this case study.

2.0 English teaching in Norwegian school education

2.1 Introduction

The main foreign language taught in Norwegian education today is English (Bøhn et al. 2007: 139). English is a school subject with its own subject curriculum and is the only foreign language that is compulsory from grades 1 to 10.

From year 1 to 7 in primary school, 328 hours are provided for teaching English, whereas the number of teaching hours in lower secondary school from grades 8 to 10 is 227. According to the curriculum, the English lessons should be provided as 60-minute units, but the common teaching practice is that the lessons are taught in 45-minute units. Moreover, English is one of three subjects that pupils can have a written exam in at the end of lower secondary school. After year 10, the last year of compulsory education, pupils are given two grades for their overall achievement in EFL, namely one grade for their written work and one for oral performance

2.2 An historical overview of English curricula in Norway

The educational system in Norway has been through numerous changes in terms of reforms and curricula which have changed the role of EFL teaching. Changes were often made as new methodologies were developed and introduced. Drew and Sørheim (2009: 22) point out that numerous approaches to foreign language learning have been tried as experts and teachers continuously attempt to discover the ‘optimal way’ to teach and learn languages.

It was not until 1959 that a new law for 9-year compulsory schooling was made, making English as a foreign language (EFL) a compulsory subject for all pupils (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 28). From the ‘Normalplan’ in 1939 and until the new law in 1959, EFL teaching had been optional. However, English was offered primarily to the academic elite, as it was consistently made obligatory in large towns and city areas while in the countryside it was primarily offered to those wishing to enter grammar school (‘realskolen’). EFL teaching at the primary levels during that time only consisted of eight lessons, provided during the 6th and 7th year, where the focus was on developing a basic competence in English. In 1969 an act was passed making it compulsory for all pupils to learn English in primary school, with a focus on developing practical skills (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 28). Since English was introduced in the final years of primary school, and to such a limited degree, the lower

secondary levels were given the responsibility of ensuring rapid development, and oral skills were largely limited to reading aloud.

In Norway and Europe, the *grammar-translation* method dominated EFL teaching for centuries up until the 1960s (Drew and Sørheim 2009:23). Pupils spent most of the English lessons reading and translating texts, and learning grammatical rules. Accuracy was emphasised and practised by writing a predefined set of sentences. Speech was not a part of the language learning process. It was in the study of Latin and Greek that the method had its origin. The focus was on learning large numbers of words and grammar rules ‘by heart’ in order to achieve the aim of being able to read authentic texts and translate them into the mother tongue. For the pupils in Norway, the grammar-translation method normally entailed ‘learning vocabulary lists by heart, doing grammar exercises and translating to and from English’ (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 23). The language of instruction was predominantly Norwegian. Writing was practised on a regular basis and the lessons regularly consisted of translating texts and reading aloud in class. There was little speech involved. Although the curriculum in the 1960s stated that the pupils should learn the English language as a tool for communication, it took a long time for it to become a common practice in the secondary schools.

In 1974, the *M74* curriculum made it possible to introduce English in the 3rd grade and obligatory to do so in the 4th grade. By lowering the onset age of English, the teachers were in great need of developing new methods for EFL instruction. The main goal of the curriculum was to develop the pupils’ oral abilities in English and comprehension. The *M74* curriculum was clearly based on the audio-lingual approach, a method emphasizing oral language, practice and language drills (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 25-29).

The *M74* curriculum provided a list of vocabulary and grammatical items for the various levels which were to be introduced by using them in ‘familiar structures’ (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 29). The texts in the textbooks were constructed in order to practise the words and grammatical items in the curriculum. The pupils got to practise their oral language skills more, but in a very artificial and repetitive manner, making lessons boring and monotonous. Moreover, the audio-lingual method required the teachers to be skilled speakers of English, which they often were not. Thus many teachers returned to the grammar-translation method (Drew and Sørheim: 2009: 29).

Communication was the main focus of language teaching in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1972, Dell Hymes introduced the concept of ‘communicative competence’ (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 26). In his view, learners needed cultural and social knowledge in order to

understand and use meaningful units of speech, such as words, phrases and sentences. Thus both learning about culture and society, and being able to use that knowledge in communication, were important parts of language learning. Hymes argued for the importance of developing the language but also for the importance of being able to adjust the use of the language according to contexts (Simensen 2007, cited in Drew and Sørheim 2009: 26).

The *M87* curriculum in Norway was largely influenced by communicative approaches to language teaching. Communication was central. Creative use of the target language was encouraged and for the first time local material was introduced into English lessons, e.g. local history and culture. Another new trend was that it addressed mixed ability teaching in terms of adapting texts and tasks, as well as grammar instruction, to the levels of the individual pupils. Furthermore teaching was based on various themes (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 27-30).

The *L97 curriculum* introduced English as a compulsory school subject for the first four years of primary school. The underlying belief was that L1 competence was the basis for L2 learning. Language was viewed as a tool for communication and for comprehending the world. The primary aim was to develop the pupils' written and oral language skills, and reading and writing a wide variety of genres was also emphasised. Furthermore pupils were expected to 'learn how to learn a language'. Language input and language production should be authentic, thus reflecting how the language is used in the real world. The curriculum also included a focus on using English as a medium through which pupils could discover English speaking cultures (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 30-31).

Two of the new features introduced in *L97* were the emphasis on project work, so called theme-oriented group tasks, and the introduction of 'learner-autonomy'. However, both of these features were criticised for not providing pupils with enough structure in their learning (Drew and Sørheim 2009: 31).

2.3 The *Knowledge Promotion* curriculum (LK06)

The current English subject curriculum, *LK06*, emphasizes the important role of English as a foreign language in Norway. It states that in order to 'succeed in a world where English is used for international interpersonal communication, it is necessary to master the English language' (*LK06*, English subject curriculum). Moreover, English is necessary for people both within the country and abroad. It is a necessity in order to communicate with people whose mother tongue is not Norwegian. Norwegian pupils encounter English outside of school through 'films, literature, songs, sports, business, products, trades and entertainment' (*LK06*,

English subject curriculum). In addition, English words and phrases have entered the Norwegian language and the use of English in education and professions is increasing in Norway and all over the world. Thus, EFL teaching and learning in Norwegian education is viewed as a requirement for preparing pupils for real life experiences in a global village where English is an increasingly common tool used for communication as well as for ‘gaining knowledge and personal insight’ (*LK06*, English subject curriculum).

All Norwegian schools, teachers and pupils at the primary, lower-secondary and upper secondary levels, are obliged to follow *LK06* (Bøhn et al. 2007: 139). *LK06* has subject curricula for each school subject including English, but with the exception of having one shared curriculum for other foreign languages. The English subject curriculum consists of various sets of competence aims, which are to be achieved by the end of the 2nd, 4th and 7th years of primary school, by the 10th year of lower secondary school and after the first and second year of upper secondary school. Thus the goals are not separated according to each school year and as such each school and teacher is required to organize when and how the aims are to be learned. Moreover, the competence aims are structured in three main areas: ‘Language learning’, ‘Communication’ and ‘Culture, society and literature’ (*LK06*, English subject curriculum).

For the lower-secondary level, the focus in ‘Language learning’ is on the pupils gaining knowledge about the English language, how it is used, and understanding how the language is learned. The pupils are required to be able to self-assess their own language proficiency and select appropriate strategies for further development. Furthermore, they are required to develop an understanding of how various languages are related to English.

The second main area ‘Communication’ focuses on how the English language is used for communication purposes. Communicative skills are to be achieved through reading, writing, listening, spontaneous oral interaction, e.g. classroom dialogue, and prepared oral presentation. Moreover, the area emphasizes that pupils should learn to use communication strategies. There is also a focus on the importance of developing language knowledge, vocabulary and various skills in order to create ‘good communication’. The competence aims after year 10 for ‘Communication’ include pupils being able to (*LK06*, English subject curriculum):

- master vocabulary that covers a range of topics
- understand spoken and written texts on a variety of topics
- express himself/herself in writing and orally with some precision, fluency and coherence

- present and discuss current events and interdisciplinary topics
- read and understand texts of different lengths and genres
- select listening, speaking, reading and writing strategies adapted to the purpose and situation

The main area ‘Culture, society and literature’ involves both content-learning and language learning in the English school subject. Some of the competence aims are for pupils to be able to:

- explain features of history and geography in Great Britain and the USA
- read and discuss a representative selection of literary texts from the genres poetry, short stories, novels and drama from the English-speaking world

Thus, the English curriculum as a whole contains elements of content as well as language. Both history and communication are represented in the competence aims. Moreover, the main subject areas are to be considered as intertwined, supplementing one another, which corresponds with the CLIL idea of integrating language and content learning.

Moreover, *LK06* has a deep emphasis on ‘basic skills’. Several basic skills are integrated into the competence aims of the various school subject curricula. For the subject of English, five basic skills are mentioned. First, ‘being able to express oneself in orally and in writing’ is considered as a major part of developing the pupils’ linguistic competence and as tools for language usage and comprehension.

Second, ‘being able to read’ refers both to the act of reading and comprehension. Through reading, pupils are expected to explore and reflect upon texts. Moreover, the texts should provide increasing challenges in order to further develop the pupils’ reading skills. Through reading, pupils should gain knowledge about various cultures and genres. By developing reading skills, the pupils’ general reading abilities will improve; practice in reading enhances the reading skill.

Third, pupils should develop necessary English terms in order to make use of the mathematical knowledge that has been learned in the mother tongue. ‘Numeracy in English’ is seen to be important in order to extract and grasp numeric data in texts, including statistics, graphs and tables.

Finally, ‘being able to use digital tools in English’ is considered important as it provides opportunities for both language production and language learning. Computers may be used both for reading, writing, research, enjoyment and communication. Competence in

the English language is often required in order to use modern technology and the use of technological tools may assist pupils in developing their English-language competence. Schools are also required to teach pupils to be critical of sources when searching on the Internet and to understand the concept of copyright and other risks (*LK06*, English subject curriculum).

The English subject curriculum states *what* the pupils are expected to be able to do, but does not provide any specific guidelines as to *how* these aims are to be achieved. Thus, the curriculum is relatively open concerning content and methods.

2.4 The textbook tradition in Norway

Norwegian EFL textbooks normally contain a number of short texts on a wide range of topics, including history, geography and culture related to the target language. In two teacher questionnaire surveys, one among primary school teachers and the other among secondary school teachers, Drew (2004; 2006) found that there is a strong tradition in Norway of using the textbook in EFL teaching at these levels. In the survey conducted in 2003, Drew (2004: 20-23) found that 70 per cent of the participating primary school teachers only used or frequently used the textbook. In addition, most teachers rarely or never used either DVDs, computer programmes, the Internet, books for native speakers or other additional reading materials. The 2005 survey on EFL teaching in lower secondary schools showed that an even higher number of EFL teachers, namely 80 per cent, used the textbook either frequently or all the time at that level (Drew 2006).

Drew (2004: 33) argues that young language learners in EFL classrooms should be exposed to the target language as much as possible. Pupils should be able to make use of the target language in reading, writing and orally through different types of communicative activities, and through the use of modern technology, such as the Internet or films. Drew (2004: 35) also found the trend of not using additional reading materials to be unexpectedly frequent in spite of the fact that several studies into the effect of extensive reading have shown that allowing pupils to read extensively provides ‘enormous benefits for language development’.

In a later study, Charboneau (2012: 57) also found that the majority of teachers in Norwegian primary schools based their English reading instruction on a textbook; non-traditional approaches were rarely used. Charboneau argues that in the textbook approach the

materials and topics are highly limited because they are chosen by the textbook writer, and they do not consider the pupils' different interests or motivation.

Furthermore, Hellekjær (2007: 27) has commented on the textbook tradition, pointing to deficiencies in current EFL instruction practices in Norway. Before the implementation of the *LK06* curriculum, PISA surveys showed deficiencies in Norwegian pupils' first language (L1) reading abilities; they lacked competence in reading strategies and information processing (Hellekjær 2007: 26). The results showed that there was a wide range of pupils' levels of reading proficiency within classes. In a doctoral study, Hellekjær (2005) found that the same problems were found in Norwegian EFL classrooms. According to Hellekjær (2007: 27-28), the main issues in Norwegian EFL classrooms are the heavy reliance on the textbook and intensive reading, focusing on form rather than content. Hellekjær argues for the importance of introducing extensive reading and incidental learning of vocabulary in Norwegian EFL classrooms as a way of promoting reading and language development.

The present study investigates an alternative to the textbook approach, one where a variety of materials is used and where incidental learning is likely to take place.

2.5 Teacher education

There are primarily two ways to become an English teacher in Norway. A Bachelor of Education qualifies for teaching at the compulsory school levels (grades 1-10), whereas a university degree is normally required for the upper secondary level together with a Postgraduate Certificate of Education, known as 'praktisk pedagogisk utdanning' (Bøhn et al. 2007: 142). Moreover, the latter combination also qualifies for teaching at the primary and lower secondary levels, from grade 5 onwards. A Bachelor of Education involves studying at teacher training universities or colleges. Until 2010, the first two years included a number of obligatory subjects, such as Norwegian, Religion and Pedagogy, while the last two years provided optional courses, from which the students could select their specialization areas. English was one of several subjects offered. However, from 2010 student teachers have to choose between two separate programmes: one qualifying to teach grades 1 to 7 and the other qualifying to teach grades 5 to 10.

A Bachelor of Arts degree involves studying two or more subjects. Thus, taking a degree in Norway qualifies for teaching competence in more than one subject. As a consequence, many teachers working within the Norwegian educational system normally teach two or three subjects they have studied. According to Bøhn et al. (2007: 142), many

combine studying a ‘foreign language and a non-linguistic subject’, and most common is the combination of English and subjects within the branch of social studies. Combining natural sciences, vocational subjects or economic subjects with a foreign language is, however, a rare phenomenon.

It seems likely that teachers make the link between the subjects they have studied, considering cross-curricular possibilities. Despite a lack of formal training in CLIL in Norway, many teachers have qualifications to teach several subjects (often across disciplines). Thus a large number of teachers are ‘formally qualified for teaching a CLIL subject’ (Bøhn et al. 2007: 143).

3.0 Theory and literature review

3.1 The background for CLIL

Teaching learners in a second or foreign language ‘is as old as education itself’ (Coyle et al. 2010: 2). A two thousand year old example is when the Roman Empire took over Greek land. As a result, children of Roman families were taught non-language subjects in Greek by Greek tutors; it provided them with a second language, expanded their professional opportunities and even gave them the possibility to settle down in Greece. Another example is when Latin became and remained the lingua franca in European education until the sixteenth century (Simensen 1998: 103).

It was primarily the wide experimentation of immersion programmes in the 1960s in Canada that led to the modern version of CLIL (Simensen 1998: 103). This is where the main evidence for the CLIL approach lies (Marsh 2009: vii). The target language for English speaking communities in Canada has been French, whereas English has been the target language for the French-speaking communities (Navés 2009: 22). Some schools in Quebec have taught the majority of their curriculum in French to English speakers. In *early immersion* programmes, instruction in the target language starts in the first grade (kindergarten). In these programmes pupils are taught second language literacy before literacy in their first language. While *delayed immersion* programmes take place in elementary schools when pupils are between 9 and 10 years old, *late immersion* programmes are initiated with pupils between 11 and 14. Furthermore, during the first three years of French *total immersion* programmes, the pupils are taught entirely in French. Later on the amount of English instruction is gradually increased. In comparison, around half of the classes are taught using French in *partial French-immersion* programmes (Navés 2009). Immersion promotes language development by immersing or ‘bathing’ learners in extensive target language input and using the target language for instruction in at least half of the school subjects, in addition to the traditional EFL teaching (Elsner and Keßler 2013: 2).

In the 1970s and 1980s immersion programmes in Canada were monitored in order to investigate to what degree the pupils learned and developed both first and second language abilities and content. The research was initiated because of parents’ and schools’ concerns over whether teaching content exclusively in a second language would be beneficial. According to Navés (2009: 23), the research data of Canadian immersion programs results in some generalizations. Firstly, pupils are required to reach threshold levels of second language

abilities in order to attain the expectations of the immersion subjects. Secondly, pupils participating in total immersion programmes ‘performed as well as their unilingual, English instructed peers on content-subject tests [but] early partial immersion students did not’ (Navés 2009: 23). In addition, even though early immersion programmes were believed to have a negative impact on first language development, research showed the opposite. Despite the fact that the first language (English) abilities of early immersion pupils were lower than those being instructed in English during the first years, they reached the same level or even outperformed their non-immersion peers during the following years.

However, a generalization can also be made about the deficiencies of immersion programmes. Although all pupils in immersion programmes reached the same level of writing proficiency in French, they did not reach the same level of achievement as pupils being taught in their first language. According to Navés (2009: 23), the deficiencies in immersion programmes are mainly found in the pupils’ grammar and vocabulary competence as opposed to ‘discourse aspects of performance’.

In another context, the multilingual population in the USA, there has been a concern for developing all pupils’ abilities to master the English language, particularly for academic purposes (Navés 2009: 22). Content-based approaches to the teaching of academic content matters have increased in North American universities, as more and more foreign students choose to study at their schools. The language and content integrated approach to teaching has long been practised in American education (Navés 2009: 23). Two traditions have been *content-based instruction* programmes (CBI) and *bilingual education* (BE) programmes. CBI programmes integrate the teaching of academic topics and skills in the second language (Brinton et al. 1989, cited in Navés 2009: 24). In these approaches, language is viewed as a tool to learn subject matter content rather than as the immediate object of the study. In BE approaches, education is conducted completely or partly in the second language, with the aim to develop second language competence in addition to addressing and ensuring development of pupils’ first language abilities and achieving sufficient educational outcomes. In most recent BE programmes in the United States, the language of instruction has primarily or partly been the English language learners’ native language. Research has shown that when properly implemented, the outcomes of BE programmes have been at least equally as successful, or perhaps even more successful, than non-bilingual education and programmes which only use the target language as the language of instruction. They have, however, been viewed as controversial (Navés 2009). Bilingual education promotes teaching and learning in both the target language and the pupils’ mother tongue (Elsner and Keßler 2013). Elsner and Keßler

(2013: 3) suggest that bilingual modules should be integrated into traditional foreign language settings in primary schools. The reason why CLIL is not practised as much in regular schools, but rather is constrained to so-called immersion or bilingual schools in Germany, where at least half of the school subjects are taught in the target language, is that: ‘Very often these [regular] schools cannot afford content-based lessons in the foreign language to their learners simply due to practical and organisational reasons’ (Elsner and Keßler 2013: 2). However, bilingual modules could provide an excellent opportunity to teach subject-specific content both in the mother tongue and an additional language. Several bilingual programmes have been implemented into German schools at the elementary levels in recent times (Elsner and Keßler 2013).

3.2 The nature of CLIL

The term ‘Content and Language integrated Learning’ (CLIL) was established in 1994 by a company of experts financially supported by the European Commission. In an interview, Marsh (2010) stated that when he was working in Northern Europe for the European Commission, children were leaving school after eight years of French and Spanish without hardly being able to string a sentence together. Marsh then became part of a research team investigating practices where the methodologies were successful at language and content learning and provided pupils with an enjoyable experience. The term ‘CLIL’ was chosen in order to reflect the experts’ shared perception of the similarities which they found in different ‘methodological practices’ of bilingual teaching across the world (Marsh 2009: vii). Thus, CLIL was launched as an umbrella term to include the common characteristics found in how bilingual teaching was practised worldwide. CLIL was used to ‘describe and further design good practice as achieved in different types of school environment where teaching and learning take place in an additional language’ (Coyle et al. 2010: 3).

In order to get a grasp of the theoretical concepts of CLIL, the experts first closely examined the works of Vygotsky, Piaget, Bruner and Skinner (Marsh (2009: vii). As a second step, available research evidence was analysed. The purpose was to view the outcomes from different teaching approaches towards bilingual education in order to find elements that could be useful and suitable for various contexts.

In the CLIL approach the focus is on learning *through* and *with* a foreign or additional language, as opposed to simply learning *in* a foreign language. The dual focus in CLIL is essential to understanding how CLIL is different from other practices consisting of teaching in

another language than the pupils' mother tongue. CLIL is different from other language teaching practices in that it is *content-driven* (Coyle et al. 2010: 1). Marsh and Marshland (1999), cited in Alba (2009: 131), claim that CLIL is not meant to replace explicit language instruction that provides a focus on form. Rather, CLIL should be viewed and practised as a complement to traditional language teaching. It creates a setting which requires teachers to adapt their traditional teaching practices. It is flexible and adaptable for various contexts. It includes several models which are practised in several ways with different learner types. According to Coyle et al. (2010: 1), 'Good CLIL practice is realized through methods which provide a more holistic educational experience for the learner than may otherwise be commonly achievable'. What creates the 'dual-focused form of instruction' in CLIL are the multiple methodologies applied to support language (Coyle et al. 2010: 3). The methodologies used and the degree of focus on language differ according to the CLIL context. Whether language is addressed through a focus on meaning or a focus on form, it still needs to be paid attention to, and to be learned in a natural context (Coyle et al. 2010: 35). In one situation the dominant focus may be on language, whereas content may be the primary focus in another setting. However, Coyle et al. (2010: 6) state that no matter where the dominant focus is placed, the methodologies of CLIL create the 'fusion' between content and language of which positive educational outcomes can be achieved. According to Coyle (2002:45), cited in Coyle et al. (2010: 6), what makes CLIL unique is 'the planned pedagogic integration of contextualized content, cognition, communication and culture into teaching and learning practice'.

Coyle et al. (2010: 41) present a framework, the 4Cs, for understanding the main principles of CLIL practices, which they propose are key aspects for the successful planning and implementation of CLIL:

The 4Cs Framework...integrates four contextualized building blocks: **content** (subject matter), **communication** (language learning and using), **cognition** (learning and thinking processes) and **culture** (developing intercultural understanding and global citizenship).

CLIL is considered to promote a more holistic view on integrated learning, as it acknowledges content and language as interconnected and interdependent elements. Crandall (1994), cited in Coyle et al. (2010: 41), argue that it is not possible to develop academic knowledge and skills without language, since content knowledge is embedded, discussed and constructed through language. In addition, academic language skills cannot be acquired in a context without

content. Language and content are thus closely linked together and neither can develop without the other. According to Coyle et al. (2010: 41), the 4Cs propose that CLIL is effective through:

- progression in knowledge, skills and understanding of the content
- engagement in associated cognitive processing
- interaction in the communicative context
- development of appropriate language knowledge and skills
- the acquisition of a deepening intercultural awareness, which is in turn brought about by the positioning of self and ‘otherness’

CLIL promotes learning language and using language to learn. It is built upon seven principles (Coyle et al. 2010: 42). Firstly, developing content knowledge and skills not only occurs through acquisition, but learners also actively create knowledge and comprehension. Thus, learners are actively engaged in the learning or acquisition process. Secondly, content learning is connected to cognition (reflection and thought). In order for cognition and development to occur, the teacher must consider the linguistic demands of the content (e.g. materials and academic language). A third principle is that the cognitive tasks of the learners should be analysed to understand the linguistic demands that the learners will encounter. The fourth principle is that language which is connected to the content needs to be learned, in order to learn through language in addition to learning content connected to the language. Thus, language needs to be comprehensible and available. Learners need to be exposed to the language and they need to understand it in order to develop content knowledge as well as language. Fifth, interaction is a fundamental prerequisite for learning to take place. Through interaction learners get to practise their language skills and reflect on and discuss the content to which they are exposed. The sixth principle is for CLIL to promote cultural awareness in order to understand the relationship between the language and the culture of the speakers of that language. Finally, since CLIL is a part of a larger educational context, there is a need to consider several contextual factors, such as age and mixed ability within the class, and teachers’ need to review and adapt their teaching methods. Importantly, Marsh (2009: viii) points out that there does not exist a ‘CLIL blueprint’. CLIL has been used in various ways, but the one thing that they have in common is that they all promote development of both content and language.

The content in CLIL can vary according to the context of the setting. The content of a project can be chosen from learning aims in the current national curriculum or to provide a certain angle to a topic which is somehow connected to the curriculum. The flexibility of content choice in CLIL brings multiple opportunities for starting up a CLIL project or programme in schools. CLIL can bring opportunities to enhance learning, the acquisition of skills and development, but the essence of those opportunities will depend on what focus the content requires (Coyle et al. 2010: 28). Thus, some CLIL cases may need to be content-driven while others demand a stronger focus on language. Despite where the main emphasis may be placed at a certain point, it is crucial for CLIL that the link between language and content is upheld. Each is dependent on the other in order for learning to occur.

Only a small number of articles on CLIL in Norwegian education have been published (Bøhn et al. 2007: 144). One of the first was produced by Hellekjær (1996), cited in Bøhn et al. (2007: 144), and examined the challenges of implementing and teaching CLIL classes at the upper secondary level. Hellekjær (1996) presents several challenges and important factors that the teacher needs to be aware of when practising content-based or bilingual instruction. In content-based instruction the primary goal is to teach the particular content with language learning as an additional benefit. According to Hellekjær, the teacher should find an appropriate balance between content- and language-matter and that any direct language instruction should be a matter of facilitating 'subject-matter learning'. Hellekjær suggests that a general rule for bilingual teaching is to acknowledge that what is considered as proper and sufficient teaching of subjects such as History in the mother tongue (L1) is equally applicable in bilingual classrooms. Moreover, Hellekjær also states that teaching and using a foreign language requires adjustments. First and foremost, introducing the target language carefully into the classroom is important in order to prevent pupils from getting discouraged. Secondly, instruction should be organized in terms of balancing the subject-matter and language-instruction in order to find a successful combination. Finally, teachers need to address problems that occur and be original in their attempts to solve them.

3.3 Theories of language learning

The rationale for CLIL is found first and foremost in 'theories and research on second language acquisition' but also in socio-cultural, constructivist theories on second language learning (Crandall 2012: 151).

3.3.1 Socio-cultural, constructivist perspectives on language learning

According to Graddol (2006:86), cited in Coyle et al. (2010: 5), CLIL is the ‘ultimate communicative methodology’. However, CLIL is different from the movement of communicative language teaching that occurred in the 1970s and 80s in that it has the ability to incorporate the importance of ‘purpose’. Thus, one learns language not just for the sake of it, but to make use of the language for communicative purposes both in writing and speech; one also develops knowledge about a topic and processes it through the language (natural use of language). As Coyle et al. (2010: 5-6) argue, many of the activities in CLIL settings promote learners to be actively involved in their own learning and acquisition process. CLIL practices tend to encourage pupils to take part in developing their own skills and acquiring knowledge through activities where they can explore and investigate, and are able to make use of cognitive skills (reflect, process information, form opinions, reasoning, making comparisons and so on), for instance through ‘problem solving’. Thus, the teacher does not simply hand over knowledge to the pupils (the banking model) (Coyle et al. 2010: 28). Rather, the teacher makes it possible for learners to acquire knowledge by actively employing their own or a group’s abilities of ‘perception, communication and reasoning’ (Coyle et al. 2010: 6). This can be viewed as a move away from ‘learning by instruction’ towards ‘learning by construction’. In the socio-constructivist approaches, there is a main emphasis on providing opportunities for pupils to learn through experience and promoting active learning (Cummins 2005: 108, cited in Coyle et al. 2010: 29).

CLIL promotes a socio-constructivist view, which can influence how learners think and process new knowledge, and develops their ability to comprehend concepts. A socio-constructivist approach requires learners and the teacher to interact. Moreover, it focuses on supported learning (scaffolding) in social interaction, by the teacher or peers (someone at a higher level), or resources such as films and pictures or level appropriate texts. According to Vygotsky’s *zone of proximal development* (ZPD), there is a difference between what someone can learn alone and what is achievable through scaffolding, guidance and support (Coyle et al. 2010: 29). Coyle et al. claim that in practices which are influenced by socio-constructivist methods (such as CLIL), teachers need to promote cognitive challenges that are within the pupils’ reach (ZPD). Furthermore, teachers are required to use various supportive methods and strategies to reduce the amount of support as learners develop.

3.3.2 The ‘natural approach’

Krashen and Terrell (1988: 7) point out that most people probably acquire most of their abilities to communicate in an additional language through practices such as communicating in real situations, which allows for natural use of language for particular purposes. The natural approach can be defined as ‘a method of acquiring the ability to communicate in another language directly without instruction in its grammar’ (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 7).

Moreover, everyone can acquire language when having the need or desire to do so, and when given opportunities to practise using the language for ‘real communicative purposes’ (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 17).

The natural approach is based upon several theories of language acquisition. The ‘acquisition-learning’ distinction is considered as the most important. According to this hypothesis, there are two distinct ways to learn language, namely subconscious *acquisition* (incidental) and conscious *learning* (intentional). Language ‘acquisition’ is considered to be closely connected to the way children develop first language abilities (Krashen 1982: 10). Both the process and the results of language acquisition are considered to be subconscious, otherwise referred to as ‘picking up language’ and sensing what is correct and incorrect. ‘Learning’, however, is viewed as a conscious process, often involving explicit instruction. The learner is aware of grammatical rules and grammatical features, thus being able to speak about those features. Krashen and Terrell (1988: 19) claim that evidence has shown acquisition to be more significant for developing communicative skills than learning.

3.3.3 Krashen’s Monitor theory

The ‘acquisition-learning’ hypothesis is part of Krashen’s *Monitor theory*, which also incorporates other hypotheses (Krashen 1982). The *monitor hypothesis* claims that language which is learned can only be used as an editor, making changes to language production (Krashen 1982: 15). The alterations can be made before an utterance is spoken or a sentence is written, or as self-correction afterwards. The function of conscious learning is considered to be further limited. First, in order to make corrections, pupils need sufficient time to reflect and make use of conscious rules, which in most cases is considered to be impossible in natural and unprepared speech. Furthermore, a tendency to over-correct may lead to a lack of focus on what is being said, in addition to a hesitant form of speech. Secondly, in order to self-correct, a focus on form and a concern for what is correct is required. Third, the speaker needs to have knowledge of the rules in order to make use of them. Krashen and Terrell (1988: 19) claim

that normal conversation has a tendency to occur at a fast pace. Moreover, the focus tends to be on what is being communicated and not on how it is communicated. They acknowledge that the monitor can be used in written language production or prepared speech. However, they argue that: ‘Our conscious knowledge of grammar covers only a small portion of the rules of a language’ (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 19).

Krashen’s *input hypothesis* stresses the importance of comprehensible input. Acquisition takes place when the learner is exposed to input which is just beyond the current level of ability, referred to as $i+1$ (Krashen 1982: 20-21; Krashen and Terrell 1988: 32-33). Acquisition takes place when having a focus on ‘meaning’ (what is said), rather than on ‘form’ (how it is said). However, it is not necessary to deliberately aim to incorporate $i+1$, since successful and understandable communication will always contain some new elements. When foreign language teachers provide opportunities for the acquirer to comprehend input at an ‘ $i+1$ ’ level, through visual aids and focusing on context, it makes it possible for the acquirer to develop to the next stage. A crucial element in language acquisition is therefore the teacher’s role in helping the pupils to comprehend. Visual aids, e.g. pictures, are considered as especially helpful (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 55). Krashen and Terrell (1988: 33) claim that providing optimal input may simply mean for the teacher to ‘make sure the students understand what is being said or what they are reading’, and that enough input is provided.

Reading and *listening* comprehension are considered to be crucial elements of any language teaching practice and fluency in speech and writing are believed to emerge naturally over time (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 32). The acquirer develops knowledge and competence by being exposed to comprehensible input, which leads to the development of speech and writing. Thus language cannot be taught explicitly (learned). Krashen (1993), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 38), claims that reading is beneficial, in that it develops proficient readers, high-quality writing styles, complex grammar, sufficient vocabulary and spelling. In fact, Krashen goes as far as to claim that reading is the only way to achieve these benefits. It is also a widespread belief that pupils’ ‘learn to read by reading’ (Day and Bamford 1998: 35). A study performed by Krashen and Polak (1988), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 37-38), on reading habits of ESL (English as a second language) students in an American college, showed that students who read more were better at spelling. Furthermore, in a study of Japanese EFL college students, Day and Swan (1998), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 37-38), found that reading for meaning (pleasure) had a positive effect on students’ spelling performance.

Two of the main approaches to reading are *extensive reading* and *intensive reading* (Day and Bamford 1998: 5). Palmer (1917/1968;1921/1964), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 5), viewed extensive reading as reading an extensive amount of texts where the focus should be on meaning, in contrast to intensive reading where the focus is on form (language). Reading extensively for meaning would provide learners with the ability to read for natural ‘real-world purposes’, such as reading to gain knowledge or for enjoyment. This definition is somewhat different to Krashen’s (1993), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 7), view on extensive reading as ‘free voluntary reading’, where pupils’ motivation and reading fluency are promoted by allowing pupils to choose their own reading materials with the purpose of enjoyment. According to Day and Bamford (1998: 7-8), there are several principles which have been found in successful reading programs based on extensive reading. Some of those principles are: for learners to ‘read as much as possible’, to provide learners with a wide ‘variety of reading materials’ to give learners more choice in their reading as to ‘what they want to read’ and the possibility to stop reading a text and that the texts need to be at a difficulty level that is suitable for the learners. Furthermore, extensive reading is to read for meaning (e.g. find information, develop knowledge or for enjoyment) and it is important to give learners time do silent reading as well as for the teacher to be a role model for pupils by reading themselves. Extensive reading is also closely linked to Krashen’s input hypothesis in that the materials used in successful extensive reading programmes ‘are well within the linguistic competence’ of the learner readers (Day and Bamford 1998: 8). Simensen (1987), cited in Day and Bamford (1998: 6), argues for the importance of integrating extensive reading into EFL settings. She claims that there is a negative tendency for learners to consider texts merely as a way to study language, rather than realising their value for gaining knowledge and information, developing reading skills or reading for enjoyment.

On the basis of the *input hypothesis*, Krashen and Terrell (1988: 55) suggest that if learning is peripheral to acquisition, then there is a ‘Great Paradox of Language teaching’, namely that the best way to teach language is by transmitting messages and not through direct language instruction in order to develop conscious learning.

Although comprehensible input is crucial for language acquisition, it is not seen as the only factor for language acquisition to take place. Another hypothesis is the *affective filter* hypothesis (Krashen 1982). Research has shown that pupils’ motivation, self-confidence and level of anxiety are influential factors for language acquisition (Krashen 1982: 31). In order to efficiently make use of the input that is provided, ‘the acquirer has to be “open” to the input’ (Krashen and Terrell 1988: 19). A low anxiety environment is considered as one of several

factors which can lead to a low affective filter, thus increasing acquisition. According to Krashen (1982: 31), when pupils posit some forms of negative attitudes towards acquiring language, their efforts to acquire language are often found to be lowered. Moreover, their affective filters will also be quite high; thus even when the input is comprehensible, acquisition will not necessarily occur. In contrast, when pupils' attitudes towards acquiring language are more positive, they tend to be more engaged in the acquisition process and their affective filters are respectively low. Krashen and Terrell (1988: 21) suggest that the activities in language classrooms should aspire to lowering the affective filters of pupils by focusing on relevant and interesting topics for them and encouraging communication of thoughts, opinions and emotions.

3.3.4 'Natural' language learning and CLIL

The teaching of language to young children has been impacted by the belief that when language learning is incorporated into other kinds of learning in a naturalistic environment, young people get more accustomed to learning language (Coyle et al. 2010: 11). This kind of naturalistic learning has often been practised in primary schools. In contrast, older learners have primarily been taught by the use of a textbook in language-classrooms. Coyle et al. argue that when learners are exposed to instruction in addition to real-life experiences where they are able to acquire language in a more natural way, they are able to develop language successfully. CLIL is an approach that acknowledges the importance of authenticity in terms of using language for a purpose. The language classroom is often used to teach learners grammar and vocabulary and other aspects of language, which some would recognize as an essential part of language learning. However, in such a context learners need time to practise using the language which they have learned intentionally: 'CLIL can offer learners of any age a natural situation for language development which builds on other forms of learning' (Coyle et al. 2010: 11). When learners are offered the possibility to use language in a natural manner, motivation and interest for language learning can increase. According to Marsh (2000), cited in Coyle et al. (2010: 12), one of the most important factors for the success of CLIL, which promotes both learning of content and language, is its *naturalness*. CLIL is an approach which tries to recreate the way people learn their native language (L1), by using the target language as a tool for teaching and learning non-linguistic content (Alba 2009: 131).

3.4 Studies of CLIL

A number of studies have been carried out on CLIL. In one, Wiesemes (2009) presents findings from the *Content and Language Integration Project* (CLIP), a CLIL pilot project in England combining theories and practice. In 1998, the Nuffield Foundation initiated a research committee, the Nuffield Language Inquiry, which examined the situation of foreign language teaching in Britain. In 2000 they published the report ‘Languages: the next generation’. It stated that there was a need for the Government to develop a ‘national strategy for developing capability in languages’ and a proper system to support it (Nuffield Foundation 2000: 8). Thus the Nuffield Inquiry suggested that a program on CLIL should be nationally coordinated. As a result, the Department for Children, Families and Skills (DfES) financed the three-year CLIP project, which was conducted by the Center for Information on Language Teaching and CLIL trainers from the School of Education in Nottingham.

The CLIL trainers’ aim was to create a framework for primary and secondary schools, producing several approaches to CLIL in cooperation with teachers, and to investigate how best to support teachers in creating and implementing a CLIL curriculum. They researched CLIL practices and the beliefs of language teachers and specialists on various subjects in eight schools from different regions with different populations of pupils. There were several languages of instruction, e.g. Spanish, French and German, and they were used to teach History, Citizenship and Geography from 6th to 10th grades. The project was evaluated both by the participating schools and a research team (Wiesemes 2009: 42).

CLIP was grounded in the belief that CLIL programs increase both the competence of pupils in foreign languages and affect attitudes to content and language learning. In an interview, one CLIP trainer commented: ‘Content and cognition are part of every teacher’s toolkit, in that you have a certain content that’s part of your lesson and you want to have children thinking to make sense of what’s going on and hopefully develop their understanding. [...] you can’t do those things without language’ (Wiesemes 2009: 43). This places language at the centre of learning. A combination of language with ‘meaningful’ content and cognitively challenging tasks is vital. When teaching content in a foreign language, the pupils use cognition by reflecting on the content, which can lead to comprehension.

On the basis of what the CLIP trainers and teachers said in interviews, three factors were found to be essentially important for teachers to consider for the successful implementation, planning and practice of CLIL (Wiesemes 2009: 44):

- CLIL needs to be considered as part of an overall strategic development and reconceptualisation of teaching and learning in secondary schools
- CLIL needs to be considered as part of a larger overhaul of foreign language teaching as well as teaching and learning in general
- CLIL requires language and the use of language in classrooms to be revised as well as the surrounding support mechanisms for language planning and language use

The CLIP report concluded that, in order for CLIL to be successful, it is necessary to change how language is used in the classroom, to change pedagogical practices and to improve support systems. It was found that there is a *CLIL challenge*, namely the quality of various CLIP lessons differed substantially (Wiesemes 2009: 44-45).

The Nuffield Inquiry argued for the need for the teaching of subjects such as History or Geography in the foreign language (Nuffield Foundation 2000: 46). Bilingual teaching could result in an increase in the pupils' interest and enjoyment in learning language, but that this opportunity was currently wasted in Britain. Due to Globalization and international co-operation there was a need to connect 'language learning to real-life communication' (Nuffield Foundation 2000:46). The Nuffield Inquiry (2000: 46) expressed a need to improve the national policy in order to increase the use of bilingual teaching. The report showed that CLIL approaches were mainly found in 'specialist Language Colleges', and that there was a need to support other schools to use CLIL. Moreover, the CLIP research showed that CLIL is misunderstood as only being suitable for the elite. Results showed that the benefits of using CLIL were actually greater for low level pupils (Wiesemes 2009: 44-45). Wiesemes (2009: 44) points out that several factors may have caused CLIL to be beneficial, such as 'increased support for learners, more visual support materials and non-linguistic context, which could serve as a motivator for some learners'.

The CLIP findings suggested that cross-curricular co-operation and dialogue is an important factor in order to successfully implement CLIL practices. CLIL provides opportunities to break down barriers between departments because it creates a need to discuss pedagogies and educational principles that are relevant across various subjects (Wiesemes 2009: 45).

Developing and producing appropriate materials to benefit teaching and learning and achieve curricular aims in CLIL practices is a challenge for the teachers, which was the

greatest concern of CLIP teachers. In order for CLIL to be successful, the materials' design needs to reflect CLIL pedagogies. The materials need to be adaptable and adjustable, which requires both time and motivation on behalf of the teacher. Thus it is important that teachers are given time by the school to develop materials, to experiment and review their CLIL practices and what the pupils achieve from them. The CLIP research suggested that in order for CLIL lessons to be successful, theory and practices need to be integrated (Wiesemes 2009: 45-46).

CLIL requires teachers to be willing to reflect on their practices and be prepared to make changes. At the same time CLIL provides teachers with the opportunity to improve their language teaching practice by bringing in 'content elements', which in turn is beneficial for the pupils' motivation and learning. CLIL was most successful when teachers started thinking outside their field and were aware of learner talk and scaffolding. A CLIL framework is needed in order to ensure that CLIL lessons are repeatedly successful and applicable in various settings. CLIL teacher trainers used Coyle's 4Cs as a framework (see section 3.1), which was integrated into the CLIP curricula and taught to participating teachers as a tool (Wiesemes 2009: 49-52).

In terms of benefits for learners, the CLIP research indicates that CLIL increases motivation and the standard of modern foreign languages by providing learners with 'challenging, but accessible content through scaffolded content delivery' (Wiesemes 2009: 47). In addition, CLIL does not have any negative impact on content learning. In terms of language, the CLIP data showed that CLIL provides pupils with opportunities to 'use language in different and more complex ways' (Wiesemes 2009: 47). Compared to learners in traditional EFL classrooms, CLIL pupils tend to develop higher levels of comprehension abilities and are able to process difficult information provided in the foreign language. CLIL also helps pupils to develop communicative skills and to increase their oral target language participation in the classroom.

For teachers, CLIL benefits were found to be cross-curricular and cross-departmental dialogue, allowing language teachers to incorporate content, thereby enhancing traditional practices, and providing subject teachers with the opportunity to develop pedagogical practices by including foreign language elements in a first language setting (Wiesemes 2009: 46).

In other CLIL research, Navés (2002), referred to in Navés (2009), summarises a sample of the most important features of successful CLIL practices. First, teachers were active and gave precise and comprehensible instruction at an appropriate speed. Tasks were

explained and the teachers actively strived to maintain the pupils' engagement and help them to focus while doing tasks. Moreover, teachers informed learners what they expected them to achieve. Second, when new knowledge was introduced the teachers used scaffolding techniques and adapted their teaching strategies to ensure comprehension. According to Navés (2009: 34), the teachers:

...use appropriate strategies such as demonstrating, outlining, using visuals, building redundancy, rephrasing, scaffolding, linking new information to learners' previous knowledge and so on to make input comprehensible and context embedded.

Third, teachers observe and follow the pupils' development closely, and give pupils feedback in situations when needed. They examine the pupils' level of understanding, encouraging conversations between pupils and teachers, as well as among peers. A fourth feature of successful CLIL programmes is that, in terms of oral responses, learners are given the opportunity to reply both in the target language and their mother tongue, as well as through actions (non-verbal responses). This is a characteristic of early stages of CLIL programmes, where the main focus is placed on enhancing learners' abilities to listen and read. As learners develop language competences, they are gradually expected to reply only by using the target language. A fifth characteristic is that teachers properly integrate both the target language and 'cognitively demanding academic content' (Navés 2009: 34). These programmes are constructed so as to include opportunities for learners to develop cognitive skills (thinking skills) and procedures, for example identifying, comparing, forming conclusions and discovering differences and similarities. In addition, teachers responded to and made use of knowledge of the pupils' 'home cultures' in the classroom. A further principle was that the tasks consisted of problem-solving tasks, practical hands-on tasks and tasks in which pupils were allowed to experience and explore (experiential tasks). Finally, some CLIL professionals propose that pupils should be provided with opportunities to learn in collaboration, allowing pupil autonomy and choice (self-directed learning).

According to Navés (2009: 36): 'All efficient CLIL programmes share [one feature]... they are all programmes of varying length that provide, nevertheless, a substantially greater and better exposure to the target language'. Furthermore, there is a clear correspondence between learners' academic achievements and 'appropriate materials and curriculum' (Oakes 2002, cited in Navés 2009: 33). Appropriate materials are a prerequisite for CLIL programmes to succeed (Oakes 2002; Navés and Munõs 1999, cited in Navés 2009: 33). Unfortunately, in various CLIL contexts there are often insufficient teaching materials, leading to most CLIL teachers having to create materials themselves.

In further research, De Graaff et al. (2007), cited in Navés (2009: 34-35), found five principles that lead to efficient language teaching in CLIL programmes. First, CLIL teachers provide pupils with adapted education. This is accomplished when teachers select authentic materials that are interesting, adapt texts to suit the learners' levels and employ scaffolding techniques to content and language teaching, for instance by using visual aids. Another finding was that teachers include a focus on processing meaning by 'stimulating the learners to request new vocabulary items, check their meaning, use explicit and implicit types of corrective feedback on incorrect meaning ... and practice through relevant speaking and writing assignments' (Navés 2009: 34-35). De Graaff et al. (2007) also found that teachers included a focus on form (language), not through direct grammar instruction, but by exemplifying information, rephrasing, checking what pupils had understood, asking pupils to clarify their meaning, in addition to providing feedback.

Efficient language development was found in CLIL programmes where teachers facilitated language production (output) by encouraging learners to work in different interactive formats and practising creative forms of oral output, such as presentations and debates, and written output such as letters, surveys and articles. In addition these teachers provided learners with sufficient time to complete tasks and encouraged using only the target language (English) when speaking in the classroom. Furthermore, teachers provided feedback to incorrect language production and they also encouraged pupils to give feedback to each other. A final indicator of effective CLIL language teaching performance was when teachers encouraged learners to use strategies to compensate for their language deficiencies and get past their difficulties of understanding and producing language, in addition to using scaffolding in situations where this was needed (De Graaff et al. 2007).

In 2005 the *European Commission* published a report addressing foreign language practices. They proposed that using language for a purpose, thus using language as an instrument rather than an aim, is an outstanding approach to developing foreign language competence. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the European Commission has funded studies of CLIL practices in Europe. The report mentioned that CLIL helps to achieve the language learning objectives of EU and provides pupils with the opportunity to study a non-language-related subject in a foreign language (Navés 2009: 24-25).

Dalton-Puffer (2009: 197) claims that the increasingly popularity of CLIL in Europe is due to the commonly shared perception that the approach 'promotes the learners' abilities to communicate in ways that traditional foreign language teaching does not'. The underlying principles of CLIL practices are often claimed to be that: 1) CLIL programmes resemble

immersion; 2) the CLIL classrooms provide extensive input which promotes language acquisition and 3) a main emphasis on meaning rather than on form promotes language learning. Moreover, Dalton-Puffer (2009: 198) states that the underlying principle of CLIL is based on a view of language learning as a 'self-unfolding, individual cognitive process', based on acquisition theories (e.g. Krashen). However, she argues that CLIL should incorporate additional and complementary language learning principles to increase the focus on form (linguistics) and dialogue (socio-constructivist).

Lyster (2007), cited in Dalton-Puffer (2009: 198), reviewed research data on Canadian immersion programmes and found a need to acknowledge and strengthen the focus on form aspects in language development. Furthermore, research of CLIL in Europe has been based on the view that language and content knowledge develops in social communicative interactions between the teacher (expert) and the pupils (novice), as well as in peer dialogues (socio-constructivist view).

In terms of speech in the classroom, Dalton-Puffer (2009: 198-199) claims that the CLIL classroom is familiar to pupils, as it resembles their non-CLIL lessons in that all classroom dialogues share the common factors of 'setting', 'persons' and 'purposes'. The only factor which separates EFL from CLIL is *content*. CLIL and EFL are both different and similar in many respects.

Dalton-Puffer (2009: 201-202) investigated the focus and practice of communicative abilities in Austrian lower secondary and upper secondary CLIL classes, by analysing 40 lessons. Results showed that the oral activities in the classrooms occurred in group work, shorter group work presentations and longer individual presentations and observations of experiments. Nevertheless, class discussion was found to be the dominant communicative activity in almost every single lesson. The whole-class discussions characteristically followed the following sequences: the discussion was initiated by the teacher (an utterance), which then was responded to by one or several pupils (response), and then the teacher would follow up the response (follow-up). Similar to learners in all communicative situations, CLIL participants speak, form opinions, write, think, read and interact, which develops their communicative abilities (Dalton-Puffer 2009: 211-212).

Dalton-Puffer (2007), cited in Dalton-Puffer (2009: 202), analysed error tendencies of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. She found that lexical mistakes were the most frequent errors; the second most frequent errors were found to be pronunciation; and finally, grammatical errors were the least frequent. She concluded that the content-focused communicative classroom contexts challenged the pupils' skills in terms of lexical items.

Consequently, pupils displayed their lexical difficulties and they also aimed to overcome them. Pupils tended to realise their lexical gaps and undertake counter-measures in CLIL classrooms. On a separate note, CLIL teachers tended to perceive vocabulary as the main language benefit for CLIL pupils (Dalton-Puffer 2009: 202).

Catalán and de Zarobe (2009: 82) set out to reveal whether the form of instruction in second language learning had any impact on learners' vocabulary competence. They studied and compared the impact on 6th grade learners' 'English receptive vocabulary' by the practice of two different approaches to EFL teaching in the north of Spain. The first approach viewed and applied English as a tool for teaching non-language subjects (CLIL), whereas in the other context English was the subject, thus the focus of teaching (ES/non-CLIL). In the study, Catalán and de Zarobe anticipated that when learners are exposed to the target language in CLIL settings, they will achieve higher scores than ES learners on receptive vocabulary scores. Before the study began, the CLIL group had already been exposed to a higher amount of English instruction than the ES group.

The pupils' vocabulary and language was evaluated by the use of three different tests, namely two vocabulary tests and one cloze test (Catalán and de Zarobe 2009: 86-87). First, in the first vocabulary test, the '1000-word test', the pupils were provided with English words and Spanish translations, which they were asked to connect. The 1000-word test was chosen to represent the pupils' knowledge of the 1000 most frequently used English words. Secondly, the pupils' were tested using the 2000-word test, which required them to match English words with English definitions. On both vocabulary tests, the CLIL learners who were taught content matter through instruction in English scored higher than the ES learners. Third, the cloze test evaluated the language levels of the learners. This test showed that the CLIL-group had a higher level of language than the non-CLIL group. It was especially in the 2000-word test that the CLIL pupils significantly outperformed the non-CLIL group. On the basis of the results, Catalán and de Zarobe (2009: 87) suggested that 'CLIL instruction is more effective than ES instruction as it is the CLIL group that achieves best results'. However, it was not clear what created the high achievements of the CLIL pupils, as they could be caused both by an increased amount of language exposure and increased hours of instruction, often found in CLIL practices (Catalán and de Zarobe 2009: 88). In CBI (CLIL) there is a tendency of focusing instruction on content, thus exposing learners to content-related input and requiring learners to apply their strategies and abilities to work out and retrieve information and meaning. In addition, they often need to make summaries, form opinions and make use of cognitive processing, such as critical thinking. On this basis, Catalán and de Zarobe (2009:

89) hypothesise that the superiority of the CLIL group could have been even greater if the vocabulary tests had been connected to the content (contextualised vocabulary).

Other research on CLIL's impact on vocabulary includes a study conducted by Sylvén (2004, 2006), referred to in Catalán and de Zarobe (2009: 88). Sylvén investigated the impacts of CLIL practices in Swedish secondary schools on EFL vocabulary (pupils' word knowledge). Sylvén found that increased exposure to the target language had a positive impact on pupils' vocabulary acquisition and increased communicative abilities. Not only did the CLIL-group display a larger vocabulary than the non-CLIL pupils, but they also tended to be more exposed to the target language outside the classroom, e.g. by reading and watching television. Sylvén claimed that it was mainly reading English texts outside school that had the largest impact on the size of the pupils' English vocabulary.

In Norway, CLIL is normally a result of local initiatives, due to a non-existent official policy (Bøhn et al. 2007: 141). Thus CLIL is introduced into schools or single classes either by individual teachers, the educational institution or the county. Bøhn et al. (2007: 144) point out that there has been a lack of interest in CLIL research among the research community in Norway. Furthermore, the existing research on CLIL in Norway seems to be severely limited to the upper secondary level.

The history of practising CLIL in Norway can be traced back to 1993, when the first four CLIL classes were initiated in upper secondary education. The CLIL classes were funded by the Ministry of Education and Research. The subjects were Domestic Science, Religion, Tourism and History. Thus, two of the CLIL classes taught vocational subjects (tourism and cooking theory), whereas the other two taught academic subjects. In all four CLIL classes English was the language of instruction. The number of CLIL classes increased in the following years, leading to subjects (mainly general study subjects) being taught in German and French (Bøhn et al. 2007: 139-140).

As a result of criteria set by the Ministry of Church, Research and Education in 1993, in addition to restricted resources, the initial CLIL practices were 'sheltered' classes. They taught one subject to a group of volunteers. Brinton et al. (1989: 15) define sheltered classes as: 'content courses taught in the second language to a segregated group of learners by a content area specialist'. Thus, the rest of the learners will be taught the same subject in their mother tongue. Moreover, it also requires the teacher to be a sufficiently fluent speaker of the target language.

The Norwegian Ministry of Education proposed several requirements when defining CLIL classes (Bøhn et al. 2007: 140). First, a minimum of 30 per cent of the lessons needed to

be taught by using the target language. Secondly, the student population had to consist of volunteers (choosing to participate in the CLIL class). Third, the CLIL teachers needed to incorporate the curricula and, finally, the exams had to be equivalent to the ones provided for the non-CLIL classes. According to Bøhn et al. (2007: 140), there was a general impression that the number of CLIL classes in upper secondary education gradually increased during the 90s up until the year 2000, when the number declined. However, there was no formal registration of the number of CLIL classes during the 90s. The decline was largely due to the fact that these classes were voluntary for the pupils and pupils started to drop out.

Bøhn et al. (2007) present a national survey conducted in 2004 on the status of CLIL in Norwegian education (Bøhn et al. 2004, cited in Bøhn et al. 2007). It was run by the 'Eurydice' National Unit in Norway at the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. Despite several schools not responding to their survey, Bøhn et al. (2007: 141) concluded that there were no primary or lower secondary schools providing CLIL programmes or classes at the time. However, between 3 and 4 percent of the participating schools in upper secondary education did offer those types of CLIL practices. Moreover, English was the language of instruction in all of the CLIL practices.

Bøhn et al. (2007: 43) found that, at the upper secondary level, it is normally the teacher's oral foreign language proficiency that determines whether or not those with combined degrees are willing to teach CLIL subjects. The majority of CLIL practices in Norway were found to be initiated as a result of individual teachers' specific interests or ambitions. In addition, the lack of a formal policy was an influential factor as it leads to CLIL teachers feeling alone and without any support system.

In a doctoral thesis, Hellekjær (2005), cited in Bøhn et al. (2007: 144), examined the quality and outcomes of EFL instruction at the upper secondary level. Hellekjær tested the English reading proficiency of senior level students at the upper secondary level. The thesis sought to determine whether the current EFL instruction was sufficient in preparing students for the English language requirements often encountered in higher education. The majority of the participants had regular EFL instruction, while a substantial number had simply one sheltered CLIL subject. By using an internationally acknowledged test assessing academic reading (the IELTS test), the students having a single sheltered CLIL subject were found to achieve remarkably higher scores than those who only had regular EFL instruction. Bøhn et al. (2007: 144) argue that by analysing the findings more closely, CLIL students seemed to be more proficient in applying reading strategies, i.e. adjusting their reading to its purpose. Moreover, the CLIL students were found to have developed a higher tolerance for ambiguity

when faced with unfamiliar words. According to Hellekjær (2005: 53-54), CLIL is an efficient approach to language learning and is an alternative or supplementary approach to foreign language teaching. It is partly the extensive use of reading in CLIL and the focus on developing reading strategies that constitutes its efficiency. Moreover, due to Norwegian students' habit of reading carefully or intensively, there is a need for teaching students how to use reading strategies, e.g. extensive reading, skimming, scanning and overlooking ambiguity, in order to develop their reading proficiency.

More recently the Norwegian Centre for Foreign Languages in Education (Fremmedspråksenteret) has initiated and guided several CLIL projects at the primary and lower-secondary level (Svenhard 2010). Recent increased interest in CLIL can be connected to the raised emphasis on reading in Norwegian education, as found in the *LK06* curriculum. CLIL projects have shown a tendency to enhance pupils' reading skills, as well as providing opportunities for language and content development. Reading is the single most important 'basic skill' in Norwegian CLIL practices, and reading programs and suitable reading materials and texts are thereby essential to CLIL practitioners who are guided (and funded) by Fremmedspråksenteret (Svenhard 2010: 5).

Fremmedspråksenteret also funded a research project in 2009-2010 on CLIL at the Norwegian upper secondary level. The project investigated CLIL at seven participating schools and also looked into external research data and published studies. The research findings were presented in two separate papers by Paulsen (2010a; 2010b). Paulsen (2010b: 28) found that CLIL was a general educational method with a potential within a wide variety of areas.

Although CLIL has been an established method in Norway since the 90s, and is a widely applied method internationally, it is used in Norway on a moderate scale (Paulsen, 2010b: 10). In primary schools teachers can do theme-based CLIL teaching of a chosen topic in a subject (instruction in English) and in lower secondary schools CLIL could consist of offering English instruction for parts of the lessons in, for instance, Social Studies.

The research presented by Paulsen (2010a; 2010b) sought to reveal which factors (both individual and organisational) impact CLIL implementation and the spread of CLIL practices in secondary schools in Norway (Paulsen 2010b: 5). First, Paulsen (2010b: 9) found that CLIL is primarily initiated and implemented by individual teachers. Furthermore, the teacher's interest, motivation, perceived bilingual teaching competence and expectations were the most important factors leading to CLIL implementation. Thus, the primary factor for the implementation of CLIL practices is the individual teacher. Secondly, several of the schools

had connections with solid international networks. One of the networks was connected to 'Fremmedspråksenteret', and Paulsen (2010b: 9) argues that this network posits an extraordinary position due to its high degree of research competence and research-based knowledge. Moreover, 'Fremmedspråksenteret' also possesses resources and knowledge on CLIL which can aid and benefit CLIL implementation. However, CLIL co-operation between different subjects and their teachers could be beneficial, but was lacking in Norwegian schools (Paulsen 2010b: 31). Thirdly, the school administration was found to be a minor influential factor. The administration could impact teachers' motivation for practising CLIL, by helping teachers in their implementation of bilingual education, removing obstacles, and by promoting internationalisation (Paulsen 2010b: 9). However, the CLIL classes were still a result of the teachers' own initiative, and several teachers explained that they only experienced a moderate level of support from the school administration (Paulsen 2010b: 28). Paulsen (2010b: 9) argues that there is a need to develop an international strategy for implementing CLIL in Norway. Finally, a co-operation between schools could be beneficial for developing a CLIL framework for the implementation and practice of CLIL, based on 'active' CLIL schools' experiences.

According to Paulsen (2010b: 29-31) there is a gap between desired language competence and actual achieved language competence. CLIL provides various opportunities to bridge the gap and on this basis Paulsen argues for a national policy for promoting CLIL implementation in Norwegian education. The *LK06* curriculum highlights the importance of English in Norwegian education. According to Hellekjær (2008), cited in Paulsen (2010b: 31), CLIL is a proven tool for achieving the language goals in the curriculum. Despite this, Paulsen points out that the relationship between the (high) status of English in *LK06* and the (low) number of CLIL practices in Norwegian education is contradictory.

4.0 Method

4.1 Introduction

The current chapter is a description of the methodology applied in the thesis. The aim of the thesis is to explore and discuss the expectations, experiences, challenges and benefits of the CLIL project for the pupils, and the teacher's motives, expectations, challenges and experiences. The research approach, the case study, is presented initially. Multiple methods are used in the process of gathering data, namely interviews, questionnaires and observation of lessons. These methods are presented in the following sections. The subsections also describe the process of planning and collecting the data, gaining entry, selecting and obtaining subjects, as well as structuring and conducting the different methods of data collection.

4.2 The case study: an approach to qualitative research

According to Lichtman (2010: 13), qualitative research is a general term which includes a variety of ways and traditions of conducting research. It does not have a clear definition due to its flexibility and as such there is no one right way of collecting data. Qualitative research has often been contrasted with quantitative research in the way it generally tries to create a deep and complete description and understanding of human experiences or phenomena (Lichtman 2010: 12). The qualitative researcher normally tries to find more in-depth information. While quantitative research tends to test hypotheses and perform statistical analyses, qualitative research is formed to ask in-depth questions, such as 'why' and 'how', in order to generate meaning, understanding and description which is interpreted by the researcher (Lichtman 2010: 12). In-depth interviews and observation of participants in natural settings are common ways to collect data in qualitative research (Lichtman 2010: 5).

Qualitative research can focus on a specific person or a group of people and Lichtman (2010: 12) points out that it is not designed to 'generalize beyond the particular group at hand'. The present case study is intended to shed light on the particular case at hand. In a case study the researcher has the possibility of providing an elaborate description of a phenomenon, which, according to Borg et al. (2003: 472), quantitative research cannot. Case-to-case comparison is possible when and if the study gives a good description and in-depth detail, making the readers able to draw their own conclusions and understand the case by reading it.

The case study is used to a great extent in educational research. Borg et al. (2003: 433) state that it 'currently is the most widely used approach' for qualitative educational research.

An important aspect of the approach is to investigate the phenomenon in its natural setting and to gain insight into the participants' perspective (Borg et al. 2003: 436). Thus a goal in the current case study is to develop an understanding of the pupils' and the teacher's experiences of the phenomenon, namely the CLIL project. The case study is well suited to investigate cases which do not follow the standard trend of teaching (Borg et al. 2003: 472). CLIL is an approach without guidelines or set ways of teaching; each case is unique and the case study is thus a suitable method for conducting research on the phenomenon.

Case studies normally involve gathering a large amount of data (Borg et al. 2003: 437). According to Borg et al. (2003: 447), the use of multiple methods, namely triangulation, can increase the validity of the study. When the researcher discovers a finding, for instance through observation, the validity of the finding can be increased if the same finding is revealed by using other methods, such as interviews or questionnaires, which would not be possible when only using a single method (Borg et al. 2003: 464).

4.3 Risks of bias and validity

In qualitative research the researcher plays the key role. It is the researcher who interprets the situation occurring before his or her eyes when observing, and is the one who analyses the data collected through questionnaires, observation and interviews (Lichtman 2010: 16). Since individual researchers can interpret phenomena in different ways, qualitative research has been criticised for lacking neutrality and objectivity. The challenge of endeavouring objectivity and being unbiased is an acknowledged problem by the majority of qualitative researchers (Lichtman 2010: 16). For instance, there is a risk that a researcher could ask leading questions, or enter the research setting with a political agenda. However, interviews and questionnaires heavily rely on the participants' self-report (Borg et al. 2003: 254). There is a risk of bias in these situations when participants have trouble recollecting events and when the individuals do not provide honest information about themselves. In observation, on the other hand, the participants' behaviour and class environment is studied by the observer. According to Borg et al. (2003: 254), in order for the data to be reliable, the observation must be conducted over a substantial time period. The process of collecting the current data lasted from October 2012 until April 2013.

When the researcher is able to display his or her thoughts and perspective in the research presentation, it makes readers aware and provides them with the opportunity to

compare and decide whether or not they agree with the researcher. According to Borg et al. (2003: 472), it is this which defines a good case study report.

4.4 The participants and gaining entry into the field

The participants in the present case study consisted of one 9th grade mixed abilities English class, namely 29 pupils, and their English teacher. The participants were chosen because they provided the possibility for investigating a specific case of the CLIL phenomenon. Often CLIL and immersion have been used to teach subjects such as History and Geography (which normally have been taught in the mother tongue) teaching content with and through a second or foreign language. In the present study CLIL was used to teach content in an English class. In addition, research on CLIL in Norway has tended to focus on pupils and projects in upper secondary schools. Thus, studying the use of CLIL in a 9th grade English class provides information about an under-researched age group in this context.

The project, procedures and data collecting methods were approved by the Norwegian Social Sciences Data Services (NSD). The participants were asked to take part in the study through a letter written by the researcher. It contained information about the purpose of the study, it identified the researcher, informed about the NSD's approval, and it also gave the subjects information about what their participation would entail. For the pupils it involved filling out questionnaires and the possibility of being interviewed. The letters contained a permission slip, which was returned to the researcher through the teacher. According to Borg et al. (2003: 231), precontacting respondents can be effective because it prepares them for what is to come, and once they have agreed to participate they are under some form of psychological obligation. In addition, the letter should reflect the significance of the study and the importance of the participation of the respondents.

The participation of the teacher played an essential role in gaining entry into the field. The teacher was positive to the researcher being present during most of the English lessons throughout the entire project. Many teachers are critical to researchers investigating their teaching methods and observing their lessons, as they are reluctant to open up to criticism from outsiders (Borg et al. 2003: 255). This was not the case in the present situation. In addition, the teacher asked the school administration for permission for the researcher to take part in the case study. The case was thoroughly observed since the researcher was provided with the opportunity to follow the whole project, rather than simply gaining a short glimpse of it.

Anonymity is critical in a case study. It is important that the identities of the participants and the location are not revealed in the case study report, otherwise it could result in ethical issues (Borg et al. 2003: 472). All the participants in the case study were assured anonymity. No codes or names were used to identify any of the participants during the process of gathering data, nor in the collected data material. Any information that could reveal any participant's identity was excluded from the research presentation, and the material was then deleted. Examples of such data are the recordings of the interviews with the participants, and the pupils' presentations.

The observations, questionnaires and pupil interviews were conducted at the school, while the teacher interviews were conducted in the teacher's home. The setting is further discussed in the subsections of each data collection method.

4.5 Observation

4.5.1 Semi-structured observation

Data gathered through observation is valuable due to its nature; it provides the researcher with the opportunity to collect 'live' data from 'live' situations' (Cohen et al. 2000: 305). The researcher is able to observe situations unfolding before his or her eyes. Through observations, the researcher can make his or her own description of what is occurring in the classroom.

A semi-structured observation has a set purpose or topic, but the manner in which the data is gathered in order to provide information about it tends to be much less planned and structured than a structured observation (Cohen et al. 2000: 305). The latter form is highly pre-planned and aims to test hypotheses made before the observation takes place. The observation conducted for the present study was semi-structured or unstructured. In these forms of conducting observation, the data is gathered and analysed before any assumptions or possible explanations are made about the human phenomena or experience in question (Cohen et al. 2000: 305). Borg et al. (2003: 267) state that qualitative observation is emergent, meaning that the observers can shift focus freely at any time when new questions arise. It is in the nature of qualitative research to be holistic and naturalistic. The focus in qualitative observation is wide, looking at 'behavior and its environmental setting from a holistic perspective' (Borg et al. 2003: 267).

4.5.2 The case study observation

In the present case study, the 9th grade English class was observed from the beginning of November to the end of February, a total of 13 English lessons. The initial goal of the observation was to get a feel for and an understanding of the CLIL project. Continuous notes were written, obtaining information about what the participants did and classroom dialogues, resulting in a narrative protocol of what was said and done in the CLIL lessons. The observation did not focus on any particular pre-specified variables in its initial stage. During the CLIL project, the pupils planned and conducted oral presentations. The researcher observed 14 of these presentations, which were audiotaped. In addition notes were taken. All of the presentations were transcribed, and written to portray the pupils' pronunciation, including self-corrections (See appendix 4). The limitation of using the tape-recorder was that while listening to the recordings the sound was very low.

During the later focused stage, the researcher tried to select and focus on the statements and behaviour that seemed most relevant, namely observing what the individual pupils chose when given optional writing tasks and reading tasks, and making a protocol of how long different classroom events took. While observing, it is not possible to record everything that occurs in the classroom (Borg et al. 2003: 259). During rapid conversations, the observation notes varied between a narrative protocol with complete sentences and keywords about the content of utterances.

Descriptive and reflective field notes were written by the researcher during observation. Descriptive notes included the physical setting of the classroom, classroom dialogues and utterances of the participants, specific events and behaviour (Borg et al. 2003: 272). Some brief notes were taken concerning the materials and amount of materials, the data collection and the effectiveness of the data collecting method. For example, during the observation it became clear that observing the participants while they were watching films or silent reading was an issue in investigating the pupils' learning processes. Furthermore, this validated the need for the multiple methods approach in exploring the effect and experiences.

The researcher took the role as observer-participant. Hence, the researcher was primarily observing, entering the classroom with the aim of collecting data; interaction with the class and participants only took place in an indirect and casual manner (Borg et al. 2003: 268). Initially the researcher aimed to take the role as a complete and silent observer, but the teacher and some pupils participating occasionally addressed the observer, proving this role difficult.

Initially notes were taken from a desk in the front of the classroom, turned towards the pupils' faces. However, since the participants were unaccustomed to the researcher being present, it became clear that it was better to observe from the back. This way the pupils could focus their attention more on the teacher in the initial process of getting used to the observer's presence. It is common for pupils to be curious when an observer enters the classroom, which may result in 'nonrepresentative observational data' (Borg et al. 2003: 264). Borg et al. (2003: 264) point out that observers should be attentive to the possible effects he or she may have on subjects, and take action to increase or avoid these effects from occurring. When the observer visits the classroom several times over a period of time, the pupils start to forget about the observer and act naturally. Often the observer took notes from the back, standing up, while other times a chair was provided. When the pupils were working on individual tasks or pair work, notes were taken about what the individuals were doing as the researcher wandered around in the classroom, shifting the focus from participant from participant.

4.6 Interviews

4.6.1 Semi-structured interviews

Both questionnaires and interviews are ways in which a researcher can collect data that is not possible to collect through direct observation (Borg et al. 2003: 222). Hence, the two methods can find out about the participants' experiences, beliefs, opinions and other cognitive factors, which is of great value in an in-depth case study. The advantage of the interview is that it is adaptable. By using this method, the respondent's answer can be followed up by the interviewer and provide deeper clarification and information, which is important when the response is vague. In conducting a semi-structured interview, the researcher asks multiple structured questions (Borg et al. 2003: 240). Furthermore, in the interview situation, the researcher can then probe deeper by asking open-ended questions in order for the participant to supply more information. It could be a case of the interviewer picking up something from the participant's response and then asking a question to investigate further. According to Borg et al. (2003: 241), the advantage of the semi-structured interview is that it provides the researcher with 'reasonable standard data across respondents, but of greater depth than can be obtained from a structured interview'.

A limitation of the interview is that the situation is difficult to standardize (Borg et al. 2003: 223). It is challenging not to influence the respondents on how to answer the questions. Leading questions should be avoided in order to decrease the risk of bias (Borg et al.

2003:226). Another limitation is that the identities of the interview participants are revealed to the researcher. Therefore it is important for the researcher to build trust, so that the participants are not hesitant about revealing information, especially when concerned with negative aspects.

4.6.2 The pre-project teacher interview

The preliminary teacher interview was the first step in collecting data in the case study. It provided the researcher with information about the upcoming CLIL project and the teacher's beliefs and experiences of CLIL. The interview took place in the teacher's home. It was conducted entirely in English and lasted for approximately two hours. The interview followed a semi-structured interview guide consisting of 37 pre-specified questions (See Appendix 1a). Eight of the questions were *yes/no* questions, but were answered in depth, while the rest were open-ended *what* and *how* questions. In addition, the researcher probed deeper, asking follow-up questions to responses.

The items were designed to cover seven categories, although the items were not arranged in complete accordance with the categories in the interview-guide. The category 'background', contained questions about the teacher's qualifications in English and experience of teaching. In order to investigate the content and background of the CLIL project, the category 'project information' included items on how and why the teacher chose the topic, activities and materials. 'Adapted education' is a focus in the current Norwegian curriculum. Thus, in order to investigate this category, the teacher was asked four questions about her plan to assist pupils, whether or not to allow the use of Norwegian during the project, and whether adapted teaching had an impact when selecting the materials and exercises. The teacher's 'prior CLIL experiences' was a category consisting of four items to do with possible past CLIL projects and their benefits and challenges. The teacher's 'beliefs and attitudes' was the largest category, consisting of twelve questions. These items elicited the teacher's perceptions of various topics, such as the teacher's role, content and language learning in the second language classroom, and the difference between the CLIL project and the teacher's normal practice in English. In addition, some questions were about the role of motivation and interest, both for the teacher and the pupils, when carrying out a CLIL project. Since the case study was in a 9th grade, one of the questions was: *At what age is it appropriate to start using CLIL?*

The teacher's 'expectations' was the last category, focusing on the perceived challenges and benefits of the CLIL project. It consisted of six questions about what the teacher wanted the pupils to achieve when it comes to language and content, and how to help them achieve those goals. Items were also provided to investigate what the teacher hoped to achieve by the project, and whether the teacher had set any personal aims.

The interview was audiotaped and notes were also taken. The audio recording was then transcribed and summarized.

4.6.3 The post-project interview with the teacher

The aim of the study was to uncover possible benefits and challenges for the teacher and the pupils, in addition to factors impacting the success of the CLIL project. Thus the teacher was interviewed after the CLIL project had ended in order to gain insight into her perception of the pupils' experiences, benefits and challenges and her personal experiences, gains and challenges, in addition to her reflections on the teaching methods, materials and activities. A semi-structured interview guide was used when conducting the interview (see Appendix 1b). The interview guide contained 38 items. The first was a *yes/no* question, which was answered in depth, and the remaining 37 were open-ended *what/how* questions. The replies to some questions occasionally also provided answers to others. The researcher also asked additional questions during the interview.

The items were arranged according to the following topic areas. The first category 'Teacher benefits', included the following questions: *How was the CLIL-project beneficial for you* and *What were the advantages of using CLIL*. The second category, 'Teacher challenges', consisted of four questions and provided information about the teacher's challenges of implementing and conducting the CLIL-project, e.g.: *What was challenging with this project compared to your 'normal' English subject teaching practice?* The third category, 'Perceived pupil benefits', included eight questions, e.g.:

How was the project beneficial for the pupils?

How has this project contributed to developing the pupils' content knowledge?

In what way did the project provide opportunities for developing the pupils' thinking skills/cognition?

The fourth category, 'Perceived pupil challenges', consisted of one question, namely: *What was challenging for the pupils?* The fifth category 'Materials and activities', in contrast,

included ten questions concerning the reason for the teacher's choice of materials (films and texts), how suitable the materials were for the mixed ability class, opportunities for practising reading and writing strategies and the types of tasks the pupils were given. In addition the teacher was asked: *What resources are available at your school other than the textbook?*

The last category, 'Experiences', was the largest and contained 12 questions. Data was elicited as to what the teacher wanted to achieve, what she experienced as successful or unsuccessful and whether the project lived up to her expectations. Questions included: *How was your language competence relevant for carrying out this project?* and *What was the difference between using the CLIL approach and your 'regular' English teaching practice?* These items provided comparative information about the teacher's regular EFL practice and the CLIL approach, and what CLIL required of the teacher. Moreover, one question asked how the teacher had integrated language into the content-driven project, namely: *In what way did the project include a focus on language?* One question, concerning the teacher's use of scaffolding, was answered through prior questions. Finally, data was elicited about factors affecting the CLIL-project, what the teacher would like to have done differently, her experience of the project and thoughts about using CLIL again.

The interview was audio recorded and additional notes were written during the interview. It was conducted in English and lasted for approximately three hours. The recording was transcribed, but some details of information were excluded to ensure anonymity, thus resulting in some paraphrases.

4.6.4 Interviews with the pupils

The participating pupils were chosen in cooperation with the English teacher to ensure representation of learners of various levels of language abilities. Furthermore, both girls and boys were asked to participate. Six pupils were interviewed, including one pilot interview.

The pilot interview was conducted to ensure that the questions were clear and understandable to the pupils. It was conducted in English, and the pilot participant was given the choice to answer in English or Norwegian, so as to investigate what would make the pupils most comfortable in the interview situation. The interview resulted in the main interviews being conducted in Norwegian. The decision was validated when the interview subjects expressed a concern of having to take part in an interview in English. The pilot interview also led to an additional question, namely *How was the project compared to the normal English lessons?*

The interviews were planned by making a semi-structured interview guide (see Appendix 3). It consisted of guidelines for the researcher on how to introduce and end the interviews. The introductory part ensured the participants of anonymity and it informed them about the importance of their contribution and what it would be used for. In addition, the purpose of the interview was described, namely getting an understanding of the pupils' CLIL experience and their attitudes towards the project. The interview guide consisted of 20 pre-specified questions. Eighteen items were open-ended and two were closed *yes/no* questions. The items were arranged into six categories: 'Experience', 'Enjoyment', 'Interest', 'Benefits', 'Challenges' and 'Future work'. Initially the participants were asked to 'tell me a little bit about yourself', in order to help them to get used to the interview situation. The pupils' 'experiences of the project were researched through questions such as:

What did you think of the texts?

How did you experience learning about the Second World War in English?

How was this project compared to other English lessons you have had?

The questions in the category 'Enjoyment' provided insight into the pupils' engagement in activities and materials. The pupils were asked about their preferences, e.g.:

What did you enjoy the most?

What type of material did you enjoy the most?

In order to elicit the pupils' 'interests', and understand whether these could be an influence on their learning and enjoyment, they were asked what they found interesting and what their opinion was about the project's topic.

Since the aims of the study included finding out about the pupils' 'benefits' and 'challenges' in the CLIL project, they were asked what they had learned and what they learned the most from. These questions gave the opportunity for the researcher to find out to what degree the pupils felt they had learned language and content.

In the category 'challenges', the pupils were asked about what they found difficult or challenging and whether there was anything they would have liked to be different. Finally, in the last category 'future work', the pupils were asked two final questions:

Would you like to have more projects like this?

Is there anything else that you would like to add/tell me, about your experience with the project?

The latter question gave the pupils the chance to add any thoughts or opinions they had not been able to express through the interview so far, and it was also a way of ending the interview.

Each interview lasted for 20-30 minutes. All the pupil interviews took place at the school. They were carried out in three separate meeting rooms provided by the teacher and during the pupils' English lessons. The process of interviewing began during the last week of the CLIL project and was finished after the project had ended. All the interviews were audiotaped and only brief notes consisting of keywords were written. This allowed the interviewer to be attentive to each participant's body language and response in order to ask quick follow-up questions and register any comprehension difficulties. There was some concern whether the interview participants would have sufficient memory of the project and the information the interviewer was requesting. For example, when the participants were asked about the texts, they had difficulties recollecting all of them. Another limitation was that the participants were not always able to provide in-depth reasons for their responses. Thus the data included some short answers, such as *It was fun*, or *It was different* without any further explanations.

4.7 Questionnaires

Questionnaires have the advantage that the process of collecting the data takes fairly little time. However, by using questionnaires, it is not possible to 'probe deeply into respondents' beliefs, attitudes, and inner experiences' (Borg et al. 2003: 222), which differs from the interview situation, where the interviewer can seek a deeper understanding of statements.

The design of questionnaires is structured and more standardized than other methods. The items can be closed or open in form. Closed-form items allow for the participant to answer by choosing between prespecified options, similar to doing a multiple choice test (Borg et al. 2003: 227). Open-form items are questions where the answer is written freely and in the participant's own words. The data collected through the latter form makes for more time-consuming analysis, and it demands more writing. In addition, closed-form items are easier to analyse and quantify (Borg et al. 2003: 228). They produce numeric data, which makes it easier to compare the participants' answers.

4.7.1 The pre-project questionnaire

The pupils were given a questionnaire at the beginning of the project in the last week of October and a second questionnaire in March after the project had ended. The questionnaire was in English. The permission slips were required before the pupils could answer the first questionnaire. Due to the items in the questionnaire, the teacher chose not to inform the pupils too much, and did not start the project properly until the questionnaire was completed by the pupils. All the 29 pupils in the English class signed the permission slip and agreed to participate in the study. The questionnaire was anonymous. Initially on the sheet, the researcher's identity was revealed, in addition to an instruction where the pupils were asked not to write their names and to answer the items as honestly as possible. In order to cover a broad range of topics and a large number of questions, the questionnaire consisted mainly of closed-form items, namely 20 closed-form Likert-scale items and one open-form question (see Appendix 2a). Answering open-form items demands more writing and is time consuming. The open-form question required the pupils to write two sentences about: *What do you think it is going to be like to work on this Second World War project in English?*

The majority of the closed-form items asked the participants to choose to which extent they agreed or disagreed with the item. According to Borg et al. (2003: 228), a questionnaire measuring attitudes using an attitude scale needs to use at least ten items in order to 'obtain a reliable assessment of an individual's attitude'. The attitude scale consisted of five options in a range from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', a common scale design. The number of items was substantial, containing 19 attitudinal Likert-scale items and one item where the participants were to range six activities on a scale from 1 to 6 according to how well they learn by using them. This item proved confusing for the pupils to answer as intended and was excluded from the data presentation.

The items in the pre-project questionnaire were chosen in relation to the research questions and were designed to cover a number of topic areas, namely 'expectations', perceived 'benefits' and 'enjoyment', in addition to 'interest', 'beliefs' and 'attitudes'. Some examples of the items are:

I think it will be difficult to work on this project.

I look forward to using English in order to learn about History.

I enjoy reading English texts.

4.7.2 The post-project questionnaire

The second questionnaire was designed to be comparable with the first one and was also in English. It consisted of 20 closed-form Likert-scale items, and two open-ended questions requiring the pupils to write one sentence to each question (see Appendix 2b). The items explored the pupils' experiences, attitudes and beliefs about content-based learning in a second language compared to learning in Norwegian. It questioned the pupils about how they enjoyed the various activities. In addition, items were added as a consequence of knowledge gained through the observations and interviews, for example: *The project lasted for too long*, *The texts were too difficult*, *There were too many texts to read* and *We watched too many films*.

The items, or statements, were constructed to elicit responses in five categories, namely 'enjoyment', 'interest', 'motivation', 'perceived benefits' and 'challenges'. Examples of items in the 'enjoyment' category were: *I enjoyed working on this project*, *I enjoyed presenting my chosen work to others* and *I would like to have more projects like this*. Examples of items to reveal the pupils' interest in the topic and the materials were: *I have become more interested in World War II after working on this project* and *The texts in the project were more interesting than the texts in the textbook*. However, it should be noted that the project did include texts from English textbooks, but not the class's textbook. In terms of motivation, pupils were asked whether having the opportunity to choose between several optional tasks was motivating. As for possible 'benefits' and 'challenges', the pupils were asked to express their development with regard to language and content, e.g. *I learned a lot of new English words by working on this project* and *I learned a lot about the topic by working on this project*. In order to report what the pupils considered as challenging in terms of language or materials, they were presented with several items, e.g. *I would have learned more if the project had been in Norwegian* and *The texts were too difficult*.

The two open-ended questions were placed at the end of the questionnaire. The intention was to collect data about the pupils' opinions on learning language to explore a topic and how they had generally experienced the project. The open-ended questions had a greater opportunity to provide more in-depth information about all the participants' experiences of the CLIL project, in their own words. The formulation of the first question may have been too difficult for some pupils and therefore some did not answer it.

The researcher handed out the questionnaire and explained the importance of the pupils' participation, as well the procedures for answering it. The researcher encouraged the

pupils to raise their hands and ask when faced with any problems. Results showed that even though none of the pupils asked for assistance, it did not mean they were not faced with difficulties. 22 of the 29 pupils were present. The seven pupils not present were later handed the questionnaire by the teacher, who made sure they completed it.

4.8 Presenting the data

The data is presented in Chapter 5. Summaries of the interviews are presented, including some direct quotations. The observation protocols were summarised, providing insight into the occurrences in the CLIL-classroom. The observation data also contained recordings of the pupils' presentations. These were transcribed and analysed with regard to content knowledge, content-related vocabulary and engagement. Some transcriptions are presented in full, whereas others are presented through summaries. The data from the questionnaires provided both quantitative and qualitative data. The Likert-scale closed-form items were quantified and are shown in tables, while some examples of the pupils' responses to the open-ended questions are also shown.

5.0 Results

The present chapter presents results in three main sections: firstly, pre-project data, namely an interview with the teacher before the project started and a questionnaire answered by the pupils in the initial stage of the project; secondly, data from the observations of lessons, including an overview of the materials, a brief summary of what happened in the lessons and some examples of the pupils' oral presentations; finally, post-project data, namely a questionnaire answered by the pupils after the project had ended, interviews with five of the pupils at the end of the project, and an interview with the teacher after completion of the project. The names mentioned in the data are pseudonyms.

5.1 Pre-project data

5.1.1 Pre-project teacher interview

Evelyn had been a teacher for 38 years. The first 21 years she had been teaching at the primary level and the remainder at the lower-secondary level. She had been teaching English throughout her entire teaching career. She had a Bachelor of Education degree in which English was one of her specialised subjects, and in 1999-2000 she took three additional MA university modules in English as further education.

The CLIL project was going to be about certain aspects of the Second World War with a focus on young people and the early stages of the war. When she was asked why she chose the topic, she replied that she had carried out a similar project once before with a different group of pupils. Her motivation for initiating the WWII project had primarily been her frustration with the English textbooks used by the school, as well as her personal interest in the topic. Her previous experience had also been part of her motivation to carry out the project for a second time. She pointed out:

I think that it is a *very* important topic. It links well to the English subject because it is a lot to do with Britain, and [an]integral part of (...) British society's history and culture. It may help them understand British culture and history more than if they had not done this project.

Moreover, she stressed the relevance of the topic, as it was the 70th anniversary of horrible things that had happened in the pupils' local community during the war. It was going to be in the local media, and in January she wanted to mark Holocaust day with the pupils. She felt it was a shame it was not given more attention in Norwegian schools. 'The last eyewitnesses,

there are hardly any left... and it is like history is slipping away; let us keep it, let us save it. And I thought that maybe I am part of that'. She also wanted the pupils to be part of it in some way.

Evelyn was not satisfied with the current textbooks used in the EFL classroom at her school because they only dealt with the World Wars in a very random and superficial manner. There were things that she felt were missing and she knew what they were. Some facts were partly in other textbooks, but mainly she wanted the pupils to be able to have the opportunity to learn about the subject from films and books. She referred to their current textbooks as limited. 'There was a fictional story about a German spy in Britain and two short poems, and that was it'. She wanted to be able to go deeper into the topic than the textbook would permit. Mostly she was going to use other materials, namely authentic texts, texts of various genres and lengths, including some new excerpts that she had not previously used. The longer texts would mainly consist of personal stories linked to real events. 'The more you focus on stories, personal stories, the more engaged more of them are, and then take it from there, to draw a picture of what was happening around these people, from history'. In a questionnaire conducted by the teacher after the previous project had ended, the pupils had displayed a preference for fictional texts based on facts. She added: 'But I have also chosen others because I would like them to find information in various sources of texts and genres, like articles, drama, poetry, witness accounts, novels, diary, cartoons and so on.' In addition, the project would include the use of films, both documentaries about Britain in the 40s and feature films 'because a film may be comparable with a text they read, or it may illustrate the text... it may in one way or another complement texts and it also appeals to certain learning styles, like the visually strong and those who have reading problems perhaps'. However, a problem with using films was that some pupils would not necessarily be present when showing them in class and it would be impossible to show the films over and over again.

One reason why Evelyn chose to use so many different types of material was to provide the pupils with the opportunity to build on their 'personal strengths', their preferences for ways and channels of retrieving information. It was also necessary to introduce the pupils to different sorts of texts. However, the choice and process of finding the materials was a challenge.

You need to be motivated and you need to feel that you can contribute, that you have some sort of overview...to put something together. But it is still a big job because one thing is to read something and another thing is to find out what might be suitable for this group, together with other things, other texts and films.

Evelyn needed to plan the English lessons for the entire school year, for example how topics were to be distributed and the way to spend time on each one. Thus it had taken a great deal of time. There was no recipe to follow and it was a challenge since she had to think of everything herself, both in terms of deciding on activities and finding ideas for tasks.

The reading materials needed to be fairly extensive since she was supposed to use different types of texts, and not just texts, but also different learning channels. She did not view the English subject curriculum as a curriculum per se, but rather as a group of goals and aims which were not that content-specific: ‘So we are free more or less to do any topic we would like as long as it can be linked to any of these demands. It is a content-open curriculum, so it is very well suited for CLIL really’. She had the choice between using the textbooks and not having to take any initiatives, or using CLIL and expanding on something from the textbook.

It requires you to feel confident about your English skills, to be able to talk about all of these things, because new content is in many ways a new vocabulary, right? The vocabulary to a large extent carries the content. You need vocabulary to express content... but if you focus on the content, you pull the vocabulary with you and try and let it be absorbed as much as possible in various ways... and as I said the Norwegian curriculum is very content-open, but the textbooks are not, they have decided on the content.

However, the curriculum was not the reason, but rather an excuse, for her choice of implementing CLIL. The teacher’s interest in the topic was a crucial factor. Even though some pupils might not become interested, it was still essential for the teacher to be motivated and interested in order ‘to stand a chance’. Moreover, it was important to be able to speak freely about the topic without feeling awkward.

A positive factor of using excerpts from additional texts was that she could encourage her pupils to try out reading strategies: ‘They can’t do this in textbooks, but here they can underline, they can use coloured marking, they can write or draw things in the margin...and I let them keep it in a plastic folder, to help them to use the texts as long as they can’. She had told them to keep their notes and the texts because they could find them useful in their 10th year when they might be ‘drawn’ for an oral exam in English, Social Studies or Religion. She believed that some pupils would find the project motivating, whereas others would perhaps not.

One benefit of teaching CLIL was that Evelyn could try out her own ideas. She also believed that it could provide her with the opportunity to use her knowledge more than just using the textbook would allow. She hoped that the project would increase the pupils’

motivation, communication and also spark interest in a part of history that she viewed as important as it had affected so many people in a dramatic way. Thus, an increased interest in the subject would benefit both her and the pupils.

When asked about whether she had considered adapted education and the pupils' different levels in her choice of materials, Evelyn replied that she had chosen both shorter and longer excerpts and different types of texts with various levels of difficulty. The films were anticipated to be suitable for the majority. Moreover, 'choice' was considered as a key aspect, that is to provide the pupils with different types of tasks and a choice between several tasks. The tasks could be comprehension ones, where the pupils would read some pages and answer questions about the text, for instance 'Why did this boy wet his trousers? Such tasks would be easy to answer and could even involve the pupils copying a particular part where 'He describes such and such'. The pupils would have to read a good deal in order to find that place in the text. Furthermore, in terms of reading, even the easiest excerpts could be too much for some, and then she would 'squiggle around the most important paragraphs to ...show not that it is the easiest, but that this is the important thing'. Evelyn wanted to keep a focus on the content, and preferably what the individual pupils seemed to be interested in:

They have different interests, especially to do with the war. Some are interested in war and some are not. Some are interested in personal experience, literature, others in films. Some are good at writing and others struggle with it, so I am trying to vary the exercises because of this.

She considered keeping up the pupils' motivation, encouraging and giving positive feedback as her most important task in order to help the pupils at various levels to evolve in their learning process: 'To help them pick out what they should do, and what they don't have to think about and to give positive feedback to whatever they can produce, orally or in writing, and then add a bit to it, have some kind of communication.'

It is important to have the pupils focus on the content and not their skills; the main objective is for them to understand the content. She would overlook clumsy formulations completely and usually gave her pupils examples of her British husband having to use a Norwegian word because he had forgotten the English word for it. If having to use only English words would stop the pupils from communicating, then using some Norwegian words would be fine: 'I want them to lower their shoulders when it comes to language because I think that language will gradually improve as they try to use it'. Although she would not encourage them to speak Norwegian, she would not arrest them for it either, but rather reply

in English and try to motivate them to continue in English. However, in writing the pupils were expected to use English only.

Although the focus would be primarily on the content, Evelyn assumed that language would develop naturally. Sometimes there would be a focus on language in terms of vocabulary, for instance in the form of ‘enemy language’: ‘I think sometimes the boys find that interesting...“little bastards”, and so on. I think it is nice to be able to use some bad words from literature as it motivates them to study the text’. When asked whether she was going to provide any direct language instruction, she replied that she thought she would, in particular in relation to the films. A few words and important terms from the films would be explained to prevent the pupils from missing important points, especially since films were considered to be faster than written text. The input of language and content would occur at a much faster pace in films, whereas when reading, the speed would be decided by the reader. She preferred to provide that type of language instruction before the pupils would watch the film. ‘It is not like *gloser* (glossary), it is not like words to learn, but it is information about what they are talking about and what they mean when they say it’. Language instruction would prevent the flow of information from being obstructed: ‘I want them to learn vocabulary through that flow’. She would encourage the pupils to write down any new words, but it would be up to them to do so. When reading they could ask the teacher or use dictionaries, but she would encourage them to keep reading to:

...see if you can maybe after a couple more paragraphs or the next page ...understand the word that puzzles you. So to learn the language from the content, that is another way that the content works, I feel. Not just the content itself, but it develops vocabulary, because gradually the text explains itself, by repeating a word in another context.

Evelyn was aware that doing a similar project with this group of pupils would not necessarily lead to the same results as with the previous group. The pupils in the current project tended to be more willing to speak, leading to more oral communication in the classroom.

In terms of activities, Evelyn planned to have the pupils do an oral presentation in addition to shorter writing tasks, where they would be provided with several options. Extensive writing sessions would not be a focus since they did not fit in with the term plan. Moreover, her past experience with group work was that it had not proved to be very fruitful, although she might include pair work. The oral presentations would be individual, but the pupils could discuss in groups, although she wanted to leave that up to them to decide. Previously she had taken pupils on a field excursion, but due to time limitations it would be

difficult in the current project, since she only had one school subject with this class (English), consisting of three lessons each week.

If I had Social Studies, I would have done it all. I would have done the subject in both, and I would have done it all in English more or less. I have done this before and that was really fruitful - it was *really* beneficial. And you double the benefits in both subjects, because you have got Social Studies, and twice as many lessons, only you did it in English, and then adapted a lot of the texts.

During the previous CLIL project, she had taught the same pupils both English and Religious Instruction (religion, spirituality and ethics).

Evelyn had tried to propose co-operation with the Social Studies teacher since the pupils had not yet learned about WWII in that school subject. Her initial idea was to conduct the project in the English lessons after the pupils had already learned about the World Wars and that century in Social Studies. If the Social Studies teacher could have taught the topic at the same time as she did it in English, they could have cooperated in a very conscious way. In her previous experience, the pupils had not yet learned about WWII in Social Studies, and it had turned out to be a challenge in English. 'But now this has changed; the Social Studies teachers decided after all to do it later. So this will be the same as the last project. They will meet the Second World War as a school topic for the first time in English'. The Social Studies teachers from the four different 9th grade classes cooperated in a team and planned the school year together. Thus, although the one teaching Evelyn's English pupils in Social Studies wanted to cooperate, the three other Social Studies teachers did not want to introduce the topic at that time, so it would be introduced in English first. Moreover, Evelyn was an English teacher working in an English team, had to adapt to the plan for the school year and the other English teachers wanted to do things their own way: 'The organization of the school can make it hard, but I keep referring to the Social Studies book'. She knew that the textbook in Social Studies included some English. There was a double page about the Battle of Britain that she could use. Then she could inform the Social Studies teacher about what they had done and it could lead to some sort of cooperation.

Since WWII is a major topic in Social Studies in the 9th year, the pupils would be provided with 'a more systematic go-through of this topic' at a later point. In contrast, she would provide the pupils with a more event-based, perspective-based and situation-based introduction. Furthermore, to introduce the topic for the first time in English could be a positive challenge as she hoped that the pupils would be more curious than '...if they think they know it all'. Since it had not yet been a topic at school, they would not have grown tired

of it through previous tests and presentations. Moreover, doing it in English first might not turn out to be worse than doing it simultaneously in Social Studies and English, as it would double the period for thought and reflection in terms of the content.

The organization of the school was part of the reason why the CLIL projects were individually designed by the teacher, which was not the only factor: 'But also because it is not in a textbook, so you have to put in a big effort'. The school administration bought textbooks, and these were mostly followed by the teachers at her school. Evelyn sometimes got really bored with that. She had made all her materials available for other teachers. However, her opinion was that the teacher needed to feel confident about it. This was the main problem - other teachers had not reflected on it in the same way.

In the previous CLIL project the pupils had learned vocabulary and they had gained knowledge about what happened during WWII and how it must have been for people, both in Britain, on the continent and in their local area. Moreover, she had also experienced how easily the pupils had mixed up different pieces of information and facts '...because they had not learned about the Second World War at all before and it will be the same now. So what I learned was how easily they get confused because they do not know anything in advance really - many of them- some do'. Although pre-knowledge was not viewed to be a necessary prerequisite, Evelyn believed that it was important to be aware of it. Teachers should also be prepared to find out that some things may be too advanced, due to the pupils' lack of pre-knowledge that the teacher often assumes they possess. It was important to be prepared to discover that pupils might not learn what she had expected during the project and might still be confused: 'So what you need to be prepared for, I think, is: how are they able to absorb the content?' She was not going to focus on whether the pupils understood words, but rather if they understood the content well enough and whether they were able to reflect upon it, and communicate around it.

Her aims were for the pupils to experience stories and get a deeper understanding of how events during the war had impacted young people. She expected that it could also help them to better learn about the topic in Social Studies '...and of course... things like they all develop their English, I assume, subconsciously mostly'. She wanted the pupils to be able to develop a richer vocabulary, which they would come across because it would carry the content. She believed that by including much reading, it would benefit their language, and that classroom dialogue and watching films could also be beneficial. Evelyn considered it to be a well-known fact that reading develops pupils' writing, their oral skills and their ability to understand, and that the pupils would also 'learn to learn'. She wanted to be able to increase

the pupils' interest and involvement '...and for them to feel that they are able to communicate about it, to understand and make themselves understood'.

In order to help the pupils reach the goals, she would try to guide them through it, sometimes in class, sometimes on an individual basis: 'And of course I give feedback to what they write, sometimes to what they say'. She wanted to prevent the pupils from being confused and feeling that they were 'left in the dark'. Furthermore, it was important not to 'over-do' the structuring or planning since the pupils were going to explore. Thus, they needed to have enough guidance, but not too much.

In terms of challenges for the pupils, she believed that a big challenge was for some not to lose courage, since there would be a good deal of reading and they could lose courage when observing others doing much more than them. Moreover, not having the textbook could be difficult for some since that was what they were used to. 'It is less foreseeable for some, and that shouldn't be overlooked'.

When asked about the impact of the pupils' level of interest on the results, the teacher replied that it was not important for the pupils to have an interest before the project, but that it would be very important that they would develop one during it: 'Otherwise you would have failed... I might fail with this, you never know, and you can fail for different reasons'. In her experience there would not be many results to speak of if the pupils were not interested. Furthermore, she was somewhat nervous about the post-project questionnaire because even though she would normally still sense whether or not the pupils were interested, the presence of a Masters student was a bit 'scary'. The pupils could lose interest simply because the project could last too long or the teacher could fall ill and then they would have a substitute teacher, who may allow the pupils to do something completely different or would not be aware of what they had been working with.

In addition, the project was probably going to be interrupted, for example: 'They are suddenly at a concert when I am having an English lesson'. She knew that the project was going to be put aside for a week before Christmas because the pupils were going to practise for their term test, which would be similar to an exam.

In terms of evaluation, she was going to fill out a form during the pupils' oral presentations, which would provide them with feedback on certain aspects of their oral language and what level they were at (low, medium or high). For their written products she would 'just write personally to them about structure and content and so on...when it is about language I just try to find something that I think is good and praise them for it, and maybe one major point where I feel they really need to improve'. It could be about verbs, keeping to the

past or present tense or verb phrases. She had not completely decided what and how to assess everything, although the idea was to include an oral English mark before Christmas. It would reflect the pupils' oral participation in class, their presentations, whether or not they were able to make themselves understood, and their ability to express themselves. Furthermore, she was required to include some learning aims from the curriculum, which also had to be a focus in the evaluation process.

Evelyn had an assumption that content-based teaching works well, especially at the age of the pupils in the 9th grade: 'I think it is a year where they often develop language-wise...often you notice development really at that age. So they are certainly old enough for it, and maybe open enough too.' She had been a teacher at the primary level and said that she would have loved to do it there:

...because that's the most natural way for little children I think, to learn through what you are actually doing...as long as the material you choose is adapted for the age group, and as long as you yourself adapt to them, which you would do anyway...why wouldn't it?

Moreover, she considered it to be easier to provide a pupil with a simple text when the pupils were reading different texts than when they were reading the same text in the textbook. Furthermore, the pupils could learn just as well in English as in Norwegian. For some it could be more difficult, but she felt that it was hard to predict since they could still learn just as well, only differently - different aspects, from different perspectives. She felt that the focus of the topic, young people's experiences during the war, and the perspectives in English texts written for British readers by British authors, could perhaps trigger their curiosity and promote learning. She was not certain if this would be the case, but she *wanted* them to learn from it.

Evelyn had always had great faith in subconscious learning. She saw it as a basic way of learning; the way children learn when they are very young. She assumed that the pupils would learn some language subconsciously, sometimes even without realizing it, whereas some language might be learned in a conscious way since a pupil might be used to that way of learning. Language 'becomes conscious when they have to start using it, if they try to use it when they talk or write, but first they have to absorb it. And the absorption in CLIL, I guess, is more subconscious and the production will probably be more conscious, hopefully'. As an example she mentioned that a pupil had once started to use a certain expression after reading a text.

It was important to include some language instruction, but it was essential to limit it because it could ‘...put them off as they could think of it as too schoolish...To the extent you do it I think it’s to let them understand that this is a sort of tool for them to know this term, to make sure they understand the term, to keep the flow of information so [as] not to obstruct it’. She wanted the instruction to consist of saying something around a word that they perhaps had met in a film or in their reading, and not for it to be ‘just a word thing’:

When you write you need something to write about, when you read you read about something and when you speak you want to speak about something. You don’t want to speak in order to have a language exercise. It is all about content basically, and the more they dive into content, the more they have at hand to use when they communicate, I feel. Writing, reading and talking are not empty activities, you can’t do it without content.

During the previous project, Evelyn had not known anything about CLIL. She discovered afterwards that what she had done was actually CLIL. She knew that she had a focus on content, but she did not know that there was an approach called CLIL: ‘But I was conscious that it was a focus on content and that language was secondary, or sneaking language into it’.

CLIL differed from her normal English teaching practice. The approach also demanded a good deal since the teacher would have to have good knowledge of the content: ‘If I got more used to this, if I can build up a repertoire, build up experience, especially if I could have Social Studies along with English...you can really combine them so well, and that could have done a lot’. She felt much less motivated when using the textbook, so she always tried to complement it with other texts. She viewed the WWII-project as a more complete way of teaching. She normally had to use some of the texts and tasks in the textbook, even though she did not like them: ‘I can’t always make up or build a whole new curriculum completely myself’. She wished that she could do this sort of teaching all the time, but she did not have the resources to make this a possibility.

Evelyn believed the reason why CLIL tends to be used on such a modest scale in Norwegian schools is that it is very demanding. ‘With the textbook system most schools have, why wouldn’t you use the textbook if you are happy with them?’ The textbook makes teachers feel safe: ‘You’re on the path; you’re doing things that you’re supposed to do as a teacher. You know that the aims are more or less covered if you do it this way.’ She also felt that using the textbook was easier if the teacher fell ill and other teachers were forced to take over, because the book would be there, and it would be easier in practical terms for the substitute teacher to read and understand what the pupils were working on.

At the time of the interview, Evelyn had let the pupils watch the film *Goodnight Mr. Tom* (about children evacuees during the war) because she had been away for a week. She had tried to make them curious about the topic without revealing too much before they answered the pre-project pupil-questionnaire. However, they had used the term ‘World War Two’, and she had taught them how to write it with capital letters and roman numbers (WWII). In addition, they had discussed the film in terms of the setting, although it was still ‘in the fog for them’.

5.1.2 Pre-project pupil questionnaire

This section presents the pupils’ answers to a questionnaire in the initial stage of the project.

Table 1 presents the pupils’ attitudes, expectations and prior knowledge of the topic.

Table 1: The pupils’ anticipation of the project

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I am looking forward to this project.	1	13	14	1	-
I look forward to use English in order to learn about History.	4	8	14	3	-
I have a good idea about what we are going to do during this project.	1	2	13	11	2
I think it will be difficult to work on this project.	-	2	13	13	1
I would rather work on this project in Norwegian.	-	11	6	7	5
I am interested in the Second World War.	2	13	9	4	1
I think it is important to learn about the Second World War.	5	14	6	3	1
I think that this project is going to be more interesting than regular English lessons	11	15	3	-	-
I already have some knowledge about the Second World War.	-	10	13	6	-

Almost half of the pupils (14) agreed or strongly agreed that the project was something they were looking forward to, whereas only one pupil was completely negative to it. Twelve of the pupils were looking forward to using English in order to learn about History while 14 were partly looking forward to it. The class seemed to be divided on whether they would prefer to work on the project in Norwegian. More than half of the pupils were interested in World War Two, while roughly one fifth did not seem to show any interest. An overwhelming majority thought it was going to be more interesting than regular English lessons (26). Moreover, more pupils (10) seemed to have some knowledge about World War Two than those who did not

(6). The majority (19) considered it to be important to learn about WWII, while only four pupils did not consider it important at all. Almost half of the pupils disagreed or strongly disagreed that it was going to be difficult to work on the project (14) and only two pupils felt that it would be difficult. Finally, however, only three pupils seemed to have a good idea about what the project would involve, while 13 seemed to be very unsure, and another 13 seemed to have some understanding.

Table 2 shows what the pupils believed they would learn from the project.

Table 2: The pupils' perceived learning benefits from the project

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I am going to learn a lot of English by working on this project.	1	10	12	6	-
I think that I will learn a lot about some sides of the Second World War by working on this project.	8	17	3	1	-
I think that I would learn more about these sides of the Second World War if the project had been in Norwegian.	4	7	9	7	2

More pupils agreed or strongly agreed (11) that they would learn a good deal of English than those who disagreed (6). The large majority of the pupils (25) believed that they would learn much about certain aspects of the war, whereas only one pupil did not seem to expect to learn that much about the topic. However, more of the pupils (11) thought that they would have learned more if the project had been in Norwegian than those who did not (9).

Table 3 shows the pupils' levels of enjoyment of learning English and History, in addition to their preferences for certain types of activities.

Table 3: The pupils' enjoyment of learning

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I enjoy learning about history.	1	8	12	8	-
I enjoy learning English.	4	11	5	8	1
I enjoy speaking English.	8	8	8	5	-
I enjoy reading English texts.	5	6	10	8	-
I enjoy presenting my work to the others.	2	3	10	10	4
I enjoy writing English texts.	2	4	8	9	6
I enjoy watching films in English, without Norwegian texts.	15	10	3	1	-

The pupils were divided about whether they enjoyed learning History. More pupils claimed to enjoy learning English, speaking English and reading English texts than those who did not. In contrast, almost half of the class do not enjoy presenting their work to others and more than half do not enjoy writing English texts. Finally, however, almost the entire class enjoys watching films in English without Norwegian subtitles.

5.2 Observation data

5.2.1 Summary of observation data

A total of 13 lessons were observed. The content of the lessons varied from reading texts individually, often based on the pupils' own choice from a selection of texts provided by the teacher, watching films and documentaries, the teacher introducing topics with follow-up questions and answers, including about what the pupils already knew and checking what the pupils had learnt during the project. In addition, some time was spent working on tasks connected to the texts, both written and oral. The most comprehensive tasks were presenting orally a chosen topic, which the pupils spent about two weeks on and a written assignment on a chosen topic within a given framework, which they worked on both at school and at home for about two weeks. This was a process writing assignment involving giving each other advice and feedback to drafts in pairs and the teacher giving feedback while they worked on their assignments on computers.

Materials

The pupils were provided with a plastic folder in which they could keep various text extracts and written reading advice from the teacher. The texts were of various length and genres. They included several extracts from authentic materials of various levels of difficulty, three of which were taken from books written for adult British readers, namely *The Very Thought of You* (Alison 2009), *First Light* (Wellum 2009) and *The Blitz: the British under attack* (Gardiner 2010). *The Very Thought of You* was considered to be the easiest of the book extracts, both by the teacher and the pupils. It is a novel about children evacuating from London to the countryside during the German bombing of London (the Blitz). *First Light* is an autobiography by Geoffrey Wellum, who joined 92 squadron of the Royal Air Force and was the youngest fighter pilot participating in 'The Battle of Britain'. *The Blitz* contains various witness accounts of the Luftwaffe's bombing of Britain, drawn from audio archives,

letters, diaries and interview recordings. This text was a challenge in terms of language, but was an easier read than *First Light*.

Some texts from English course books were also included, providing adapted texts and easy readers: *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas*, *Anne Frank's Diary*, a cartoon, a Churchill anecdote (*the Bet*) and war poems. *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* is a story about two boys becoming friends while representing two different sides of the war. Bruno's father is the German commander of a concentration camp, and Bruno becomes friends with a Polish boy in that camp. It is a heartbreaking story about what happened in concentration camps and ends up with the two boys dying together.

Anne Frank's Diary is a true story. Anne Frank was a Jewish girl in the Netherlands who had to go into hiding along with her family. *The Bet* is an anecdote portraying the war from a political view. It is a joke made by Churchill about a secret meeting between himself, Mussolini and Hitler. Hitler suggested that the British should surrender to prevent any more war casualties. In the anecdote Churchill proposes that they settle things in a bet. The one that would first catch a fish in a pond would be the winner. Both Hitler and Mussolini fail, whereas Churchill wisps out a teaspoon and says that it could take time, but that the British are going to win the war. In addition, the pupils read an article from a newspaper and a text from the Social Studies book (in Norwegian) that included information both about WWI and WWII, and a speech made by Churchill.

The use of films provided visual aids, especially for the pupils with lower levels of language abilities and they also increased motivation and engagement for the class in general. The films seemed to interest the pupils and they were very eager to get started. Several pupils willingly helped with closing the curtains, turning off the lights and switching on the projector. If the teacher would use some time to manage her way through the DVD' menu or finding the part of the movie where they had earlier stopped the pupils would give her advice and seemed to want to help her. Many of them remembered what they had seen in the previous lesson and knew which part of the film they were to see next. The pupils had a lot of knowledge when it comes to technology. Some of the films were versions of texts they used during the project, namely *First Light* and *Anne Frank*.

The lessons

Evelyn taught her pupils about several aspects and occurrences of the Second World War and the pupils also developed their knowledge about the topic through reading and watching films

and documentaries. They learnt some facts about how the war had started, the Nazi ideology and the parties involved in the war, especially the British and Americans fighting against Hitler and Germany. They learnt about concentration camps, that Hitler wanted to exterminate Jews, the experiences of Jewish children and that many were evacuated or went into hiding. The pupils learnt about air raids, the bombing of London, the term 'Blitz', and how children had been evacuated from London because of the anticipation of being invaded by Germany. Evelyn used examples of the pupils teaming up against each other to explain the term 'alliances'. The class also learnt about the use of ration books and housewives as being the unknown heroines of the war. Moreover, the pupils developed an understanding of the Battle of Britain, that it was an air battle which lasted for three months. The pupils got to see and read the story of one of the participating RAF fighter pilots during that period. All of the materials provided examples and descriptions of the various topics. By learning about the 'Hitler Youth' the class also got to develop an understanding of how young children around their age had to participate in the war.

In the majority of the lessons oral communication occurred through classroom discussions led by the teacher and every lesson would include this activity to some extent. Evelyn would ask the pupils questions which were followed by responses. The teacher would then follow up by asking new questions. Evelyn introduced topics, texts, films and content-related words and terms through explanations with a focus on meaning. She did not provide any direct grammar instruction for the class. Rather, she explained terms and issues to the pupils, and tried to engage them to reflect upon these terms and issues. When watching a film, she once wrote down words on the blackboard that she expected the pupils to find difficult, and later explained them. The pupils watched the films without Norwegian subtitles, and Evelyn therefore provided the class with scaffolding in terms of asking and explaining what had happened during certain scenes of the films. She also asked them questions such as: *Did it matter; was it worth it? Why do you think they stopped him from flying? What would your decision be?* There were a few situations where pupils would ask questions about what they were curious about.

The following example describes how Evelyn introduced the story about Anne Frank:

Evelyn: Who can show where Amsterdam is, or where the Netherlands is?

Pupil: (A boy goes up to towards the teacher and points to the location on a map)

Evelyn: What was so special about Germany during WWII?

Pupil: They were the ones who started it.

Evelyn: What was the name of their leader?

Pupil: Adolf Hitler.

Evelyn: Yes. He had plans to exterminate the Jews. Anne Frank is a Jewish girl living in Holland with her Jewish family.

Pupil: Hvordan fikk nazistene til å styre Tyskland? (How did the Nazis get to rule Germany?)

Evelyn: People in Germany voted for them, but weren't aware of the consequences...

Repeating content and asking pupils questions seemed to help the pupils develop content knowledge and it showed that the learners had understood and gained knowledge. In the following example the teacher is repeating and checking what the class remembers from *First Light*:

Evelyn: Can anyone explain about the film, the main character?

Pupil 1: He was a pilot and he got anxious.

Pupil 2: He was a fighter pilot.

Evelyn then repeated what had happened to the young man in the squadron during the Battle of Britain, before posing another question:

Evelyn: What happened to him afterwards?

Pupil 3: He became a teacher and taught others to fly.

Evelyn: Geff (Geoffrey) joined when he was too young.

Pupil 4: But why did he join when he was too young?

Evelyn: He perhaps expected it to be glorious.

Even though some pupils occasionally used their mother tongue, Evelyn would reply in English and often encouraged her pupils to try to use the target language. This often resulted in the pupils repeating their answers in English:

Evelyn: First Light, the book and film. What was it about?

Pupil: Det var..

Evelyn: In English please, your English is good.

Pupil: It was about this young guy who became a fighterpilot.

Towards the end of the project Evelyn used one of her lessons to go through all of the texts, films and topics and to check what the pupils could remember. The pupils seemed to have learnt a good deal about the topic, and used content-vocabulary such as 'concentration camps', 'fighterpilot', 'air raids', 'bombed' and 'child soldiers'. Evelyn pulled down a map:

Evelyn: Which country was the Hitler jugend or Hitler youth in? You can say the country in English or Norwegian.

Pupil 1: Germany.

Evelyn: Tyskland. Yes, it was Hitler's country at that time. It was a Nazi-country really. The boy in the striped pyjamas, where was he?

Pupil 2: In a concentration camp.

Pupil 3: Germany. In Auschwitz, I think.

Pupil 4: It was in Poland.

Evelyn: Yes, Poland. (Some pupils start discussing among themselves: wasn't it in Germany?)

Pupil 4: Germany took over Poland so they just used the uhm..

Evelyn: Yes, they were occupied.

Evelyn engaged the pupils in communication during repetition of topics and materials. There was also a focus on reflection and interpretation of the materials. Many pupils were very interested in taking part in classroom dialogue, whereas others were attentive, but did not participate in the conversations.

Evelyn chose to have the pupils perform process-writing as the last activity. She gave the pupils four options to choose from. The first task was to write a WWII-related article for the school's webpage. The second task was to 'reflect upon something that you feel relates to WWII'. The third task was to write a diary entry or a letter from a young person during the war, and the fourth task was to write a story related to the Second World War.

The pupils were seated in pairs in three rows. During the starting phase, the pupils seated together were asked to give each other at least one positive piece of feedback on what they had written at that point, and to give advice. They were, however, not allowed to make any negative comments. Roughly half of the class had started writing at home, whereas the rest started during that particular English lesson. Many helped each other and cooperated. Two pairs of girls made mind maps to get started, while two boys used their Social Studies book, searching for information. Furthermore, one boy gave advice to the girl he was sitting with. He was trying to help her to decide what to write about and to give advice on how to get started. The majority of the class seemed engaged in the activity. However, a group of boys were not. Two boys spent most of the lesson chatting, one boy was unfocused, and two other boys seemed to have difficulties with getting started. Several girls had chosen to write a diary entry, whereas quite a few of the boys chose to write an article or a story.

Some of the pupils were more unfocused than others and often started chatting. There was a group of three boys seated near each other that seemed to be badly placed. Two of the three did read during silent reading in one of the lessons, but one seemed very uninterested and walked around the classroom and drew pictures on one of the text extracts. The pupils were asked to read, but were given the option as to which text to read. There were 27 pupils present during that lesson. The majority of the pupils (16) chose to read the book extract from *First Light*. This was the longest and most difficult text the pupils were given during the project. They had recently seen a film version of the book. Nine pupils chose to read the book

extract *The Blitz*, which consisted of eyewitness accounts of the London bombing during WWII. This text was easier than *First Light*. Two of the pupils later started reading *First Light*. Two pupils, a boy and a girl were reading the novel *The Very Thought of You*, which was the easiest of the three book extracts.

Several of the lessons were affected by activities which were not related to the English subject. For instance, Evelyn (the English teacher), was handed the task of organising an out of school activity, which took up the majority of one of her lessons (selling cookies for ‘*u-landsaksjonen*’). A second example was that pupils were occasionally taken out of English class to participate in e.g. sports activities. In another lesson, when pupils were provided time for doing silent reading, several pupils were memorising words for upcoming vocabulary tests in French and Spanish that day, until the teacher noticed it. This took the focus away from the reading activity, resulting in some pupils only spending roughly ten minutes on reading. Some seemed to be less engaged and more easily distracted during individual reading compared to class discussions and especially compared to watching films. But in one of the lessons in the early stages of the project Evelyn used the pupils’ Social Studies’ book and asked them to find a page with two quotes of Winston Churchill and a picture of the bombing of London. Then one of the girls read a famous speech made by Churchill aloud, and afterwards the teacher asked the pupils some questions:

Evelyn: Who are the enemies?

Pupil 1: Germany.

Pupil 2: Adolf Hitler.

Evelyn: What does he expect is going to happen?

Pupil 3: That Germany is going to invade them.

When reading was made a class activity the pupils seemed to be more engaged than when they were reading individually. Secondly, Evelyn turned the focus towards the picture in the book. She read the text about the picture aloud for the class and then explained why the fighter pilots had to wear goggles when they were flying. She used the blackboard and drew a picture of the windows of an airplane. Then she asked the pupils whether they had experienced that a car or their parents’ car had been foggy on the inside of the windows and explained that the fighter pilots had to wear goggles because of the wind when they opened the flaps. Thus using visual aid and trying to link the information to the learners’ own prior knowledge. Third, she asked the pupils to turn up on a certain page which contained a text in Norwegian:

Evelyn: Which war is it about?
Pupil1: The First World War.
Evelyn: How many were killed?
Pupil 2: Eight million.

Then she asked the pupils to turn up on a different page:

Evelyn: Can you find out how many were killed during World War Two?
Pupil 1: Six million Jews.
Evelyn: How were they killed?
Pupil 2: Hitler or Germany gassed them.
Pupil 3: They were kidnapped and put in 'konsentrasjonsleir'. (Concentration camp)

During one lesson Evelyn asked: *On Sunday it is an international day, do you remember?* The pupils replied that it was Holocaust day. She then informed them that there was going to be a ceremony in their local community in a chapel, where they could see the ones buried there who died in the war. Evelyn tried to connect the project to occurrences and facts about different war related places in the pupils' local community on a few occasions.

Evelyn was ill for a period of time towards the end of the project; thus the pupils had substitute teachers. The researcher observed one of those lessons. There was a big difference between this lesson and the rest of the project lessons. The teacher used Norwegian as the language of instruction, and the pupils did not utter a single word in English. The teacher had been given a note of instructions which he read. The pupils were asked to read a text (*The Bet*) and do some written tasks ('Who says what?'). The reaction of the pupils was relatively negative towards the activity, sighing and saying 'Oh no'. The substitute teacher then uttered: 'Hey, I don't know what this is!' One of the pupils addressed the researcher and said: 'Can you tell our teacher that we don't want any more texts now? We could perhaps do another presentation or watch more films?' A boy then said that he did not want to watch any more films. Thus, when the regular teacher was not present, it impacted the pupils' level of motivation, and while Evelyn would encourage the pupils, a substitute teacher would not. Furthermore, the pupils wanted more variety. Nevertheless, they did start reading and did the task.

5.2.2 Pupils' oral presentations

Each pupil researched, prepared and presented a chosen topic related to young people's experiences of war. The task included a great deal of freedom, which resulted in a variety of topics being presented. Some pupils chose to do a presentation about the Second World War, using either material from the CLIL-project, researching on the Internet or interviewing family members. Some of these presentations related to WWII outside of Norway, while others chose a Norwegian perspective. However, not all of the pupils chose WWII as a topic. Some chose topics that had not been taught during the project, namely the war in Afghanistan, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Vietnam War. During the pupils' presentations, the rest of the class were attentive while their peers were speaking, but sometimes chatted a good deal in between. The majority of the pupils seemed to have been very engaged in researching and preparing their presentations. The pupils with the highest level of language abilities seemed the least anxious about presenting their topic in front of the class while some pupils seemed to be less comfortable with the situation. One pupil told the teacher that it had been a bit scary.

The author listened to and tape recorded 14 presentations, which were later transcribed (See Appendix 4) for the complete transcriptions and follow-up questions/comments and answers). Summaries of some of these presentations are presented below and two complete transcripts are shown in the text. The length of the presentations mostly varied from one and a half minutes to approximately three minutes. Nevertheless, one presentation only lasted roughly 30 seconds. The presentations took place in the classroom during three English lessons. The teacher asked follow-up questions to the individual pupils after almost every presentation. Furthermore, the teacher filled in evaluation forms while listening, which were included in the pupils' oral marks in English for the first school term. Several pupils made Power-Point presentations. However, the projector in the classroom did not work, and as a result they had to use a laptop in the first lesson, trying to show pictures they had found on a rather small screen. During the presentations, pupils who chose a topic which was not related to the project seemed to struggle more expressing themselves and did not comprehend all of the content e.g. communism and liberalism in the Vietnam war. Nevertheless, pupils with higher levels of language abilities did not have the same troubles with the language.

Bente did a presentation about her grandmother, who had lived in Hardanger (Norway) as a child during the Second World War. She explained how the Nazis had arrived in black boats and that they were racists towards 'women and Jews'. Moreover, the Germans had made new laws, banning the celebration of 17th May (celebrating Norway's constitution and

independence) and food shortages led to the implementation of 'ration books'. People were not allowed to keep radios or weapons in their houses, which had led to her grandfather being arrested. Bente also related that all boys over the age of fifteen had to work for the Germans and that the women took care of the homes while boys were fighting in the war.

Bente had a good deal of knowledge about the situation in Norway during the Second World War. She used several content-related words and expressions, such as: 'the Second World War', 'Germans', 'the war', 'ration books' and 'fought'. Her language was sometimes impacted by Norwegian pronunciation such as 'rasist' (racist), and 'Nazists' (Nazis). Furthermore, in two cases Bente seemed to be influenced by Norwegian syntax: 'It came a black boat' and 'it came a bus'. In addition, she mixed up the plural and singular use of the past tense of the verb 'to be'. First she said 'she were', but later she used 'she was'.

Bente's language did not slow her down and she was able to express the content clearly, and her presentation had a good storyline. When Bente had practised the term 'ration books', she related it to a picture in a text they had been handed. It had thus become a conscious part of her vocabulary, and she knew that she had learnt it during the project.

Elisabeth spoke about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Her pronunciation was good and she seemed to be very interested in her chosen topic. Although she made a few grammatical mistakes, her language was good. She had found out the reason why the conflict had begun and that both Israeli and Palestinian children had been affected. 53 percent of the population in Gaza are children, and children were some of 'the victims of violence, not only by being killed or injured, but also by being psychologically affected'. Many children in Israel were 'living in fear of being attacked' and many were 'killed, uh, in suicide bombings, shooting and attacks on cars and buses, and also rapes, kidnappings and murders'. Elisabeth had also found some pictures and explained what was in them.

She used several words and terms connected to the topic of war, namely: 'the Israeli-Palestinian conflict', 'impact', 'victims of violence', 'living in fear', 'suicide bombings', 'refugee camp', 'shootings', 'injured' and 'rocket'. There were not that many mistakes, although one example was 'by being violence getting their friends'. She was able to express the content clearly and had a good storyline. The teacher did not ask Elisabeth any follow-up questions.

Jannicke gave a presentation about a girl named Trudy (*A child's Experience*, by Trudy Hamilton) who lived in Germany during the Second World War. Her presentation showed that she had understood the concept of racist ideology: 'They meant that the Germany's raze was more worth than the others'. She explained that Britain and America

were on the same side in the war against Germany. Moreover, she told the story of Trudy and her family and how Stuttgart had been bombed in air raids. Jannicke showed that she had learnt several words and phrases related to the topic of the CLIL project, such as: 'air raids', 'bomb', 'pilots', 'attacked', 'the Second World War' and 'Nazis'. Her language was highly influenced by Norwegian, for example 'There came a bomb' and 'under the war', and she overused the definite article several times. Nevertheless she was able to express herself and her topic in a comprehensible manner.

Rune gave a presentation about the war in Afghanistan. He explained that the USA had 'invaded Afghanistan in a military operation. Their assignment was to kill the terrorist Osama Bin Laden and his network Al Qaida'. He also mentioned the Taliban and that children were forced to fight and that some children lied about their age in order to join the military. Moreover, Rune had found out how many civilians had been killed by suicide bombs, the Afghanistan military and the US military. When many children had lost their families, they joined the military in order to survive. He had found a picture and described how he interpreted it and also reflected on the war as being negative because the US had not achieved anything by it other than people dying.

Rune's pronunciation and fluency was at a really high level and he spoke with an 'RP' accent. He was good at explaining himself and answering questions by using complete sentences. However, he sometimes did not explain who he meant when he said 'they', making it more difficult to comprehend his message. He used 'lots of' quite often in his speech. More importantly, he seemed very engaged in his chosen topic and he has a good vocabulary, but his language included at least two Norwegian-influenced mistakes: 'Under this presentation' and 'How they have it'. His language included words related to the topic: 'children fighting', 'civilian victims', 'young experience', 'terrorist', 'military operation', 'Al Qaida', 'Taliban', 'Afghanistan military' and 'US military'. When Rune had finished his presentation, the teacher followed up with some questions, which he gave good replies to, signalling that he had formed some opinions on his chosen topic. Furthermore, Rune got several positive comments from his peers.

Jan did not bring anything with him to class in terms of notes and he had a remarkably short presentation. He spoke about 'the children during war in Afghanistan'. He mentioned that he had wanted to find out more about the war and children's experiences. What he found out was that the war started on the 7th October 2001, that 'children had to work to get food for the family, and a lot of children had lost their family because of the bombs in Afghanistan'. Then he said he could not think of anything else (in Norwegian). Thus the teacher tried to ask

some follow-up questions, one being ‘Do you have any thoughts about children being young during war, I mean what is it like to be young, your age, when there’s a war raging around you?’ Jan believed that he would have been really scared if he had been in the war.

Except for one sentence in Norwegian, the other five sentences in his presentation were quite good in terms of grammar. The impression was that Jan’s language was fine but he had not prepared anything. He did not seem to be as engaged as the rest of the class.

Iris

Iris gave a presentation about Jewish children during the war. The transcription of her oral presentation is shown in full as an example of a complete presentation and one closely linked to the content of the project.

I chose to talk about children during Second World War because I wanted to learn more about it. The Second World War was started by Adolf Hitler, because he wanted to expand the German borders. The Nazis wanted to exterminate all of the Jews and Gypsies to get a white Arian raze. Ehm, when Hitler was elected to be the Germany’s prime minister he made...some, his... Every Jew had to wear a golden star on their jacket so they could easily be identified as being Jews. Ehm, a lot of Jews moved from Germany and Austria before the war started. Ehm, during the war people were gathered in concentration camps. The children were separated from the adults, where they later on were sent to the gas chambers. Those who spoke Jewish or didn’t speak a lot of the language had to be hidden. Children were kept in the cellars and attics where they had to keep quiet. Some of them even lived in chicken shops or (incomprehensible)... That means that during the bombing Jewish children had to remain hidden. Thousands of Jewish children survived the Holocaust because they were protected by people with another religion. Berlin Catholics hid hundreds of children in their homes, schools and orphanages. When the World War Two began in September in 1939, there were about one point eight million Jewish children, and when the war ended, one to one point five Jewish children, nei, one to one point five million Jewish were dead, that means that only eight percent of Europe’s Jewish children survived.

Iris showed a good understanding of the Nazi ideology and that she had learnt a good deal during the project about Jewish children and what had happened to them during the war. She did not use Power-Point and spoke freely about the topic, communicating her ideas clearly. She used a good deal of war-related vocabulary that the class had met through the materials and lessons for example *gas chambers*, *concentration camp*, and *Holocaust*.

Lill

Lill’s topic was based on the film *Goodnight Mr. Tom*. The whole transcript is shown below. It is relatively short, the language is relatively simple and there are a number of grammatical

errors. Nevertheless, she gets her message across, has understood the circumstances for evacuees and uses some war-related vocabulary that had often appeared during the project, for example *evacuated*, *bombing* and *gas mask*.

I am going to talk about Willy, from the movie ‘Goodnight Mr. Tom’. I chose to talk about him because we saw the movie and I know about him and his life. Ehm, the movie were in the Second World War, from 1939 to 1945. Willy was evacuated from London to a small town, with many children. Because it was too dangerous for children to live in London because German were bombing them. The kids had to use a gas mask in London. Mr. Tom he did not take care on a child. But after a while, he met Willy, he came from a broken home, and his mom he beaten him with a belt, and his mother he was, she was very sick, and he killed herself. Uhm, Willy was lucky, ehm Tom he taught, toought, took, took good care of Will. He learned him to read and write. And Willy loved this small town, and he made many good friends.

5.3 Post-project data

This section presents the post-project data, which consisted of the pupils’ responses to a questionnaire after the project had ended, summaries of interviews with five of the pupils during the final phase of the project and a summary of an interview with the teacher after the project had finished.

5.3.1 Post-project pupil questionnaire

The questionnaire answered by the pupils after the project had ended consisted of four main parts: how they had enjoyed working on the project, their preferred activities, and the benefits and challenges of working on the project.

Table 4 shows how the pupils enjoyed the project in general, to what extent they enjoyed various activities and their attitude towards doing another CLIL project.

Table 4: The pupils’ enjoyment of the project

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I enjoyed working on this project.	1	10	14	4	-
I enjoyed presenting my chosen work to others.	2	6	9	7	5
I enjoyed writing during this project.	2	6	11	9	1
I enjoyed reading the texts.	2	6	10	10	1
I enjoyed watching the films.	17	7	3	1	1
I would like to have more projects like this.	2	8	16	1	2

Eleven pupils agreed or strongly agreed that they enjoyed working on the project while 14 partly agreed. Only four did not seem to enjoy working on it. Watching the films was clearly the favourite activity enjoyed by an overwhelming majority of the pupils (24). In contrast, fewer pupils enjoyed presenting their work, writing and reading than those who did. Nevertheless, only three of the pupils were completely negative towards having more projects of this kind.

Table 5 shows the pupils' preferences of the activities they did during the project.

Table 5: Preferences of activities during the project (N28)

The texts	The films	The writing tasks	The presentation	Classroom discussion
-	26	1	1	-

An overwhelming majority of the pupils (26) preferred working with the films during the project. None of the pupils had working with texts or classroom discussions as their preference.

Table 6 shows how the pupils had benefited from the project.

Table 6: Affective and cognitive benefits from the project

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I learned a lot of new English words by working on this project.	1	3	15	8	2
My English has improved during this project.	-	3	14	10	2
I learned a lot about the topic by working on this project.	4	11	9	5	
I have become more interested in World War II after working on this project.	2	11	7	8	1
Choosing my own topic for my presentation made it more interesting.	6	13	8	2	
Having the opportunity to choose between several optional tasks was motivating.	1	11	11	6	
The texts in the project were more interesting than the ones in the textbook.	5	5	9	9	1

Very few of the pupils agreed or strongly agreed that their English in general, or their vocabulary specifically, had improved, while approximately half of the class partly agreed that they had developed in these areas. In contrast, more than half of the class believed that they had learned a good deal about the topic, whereas only five disagreed that they had done so. A higher number of pupils (13) claimed to have become more interested in the topic after the project than those who did not (9). The class was divided as to whether or not the texts

they used during the project were more interesting than the ones in the textbook. However, twice as many pupils (12) found it motivating to choose between several optional tasks than those who felt the opposite (6). Roughly two thirds of the class felt that choosing their own topic for their presentations made it more interesting, and only two of them were negative towards being able to do so.

Table 7 presents challenges the pupils experienced while working on the project.

Table 7: Challenges of working on the project

Statement (N = 29)	Strongly agree	Agree	Partly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Learning about the topic in English was difficult.	1	2	9	11	6
I would have learned more if the project had been in Norwegian.	2	7	6	11	3
The texts we used were too difficult.	2	5	8	11	3
There were too many texts.	9	10	5	3	2
We watched too many films.	3	-	5	11	10
The project lasted too long.	2	3	17	7	

The majority of the pupils (17) did not find it difficult to learn about the topic in English and only 9 of the pupils agreed or strongly agreed that they would have learned more if the project had been in Norwegian. Although the majority (19) believed that there were too many texts, only seven of them agreed or strongly agreed that the texts were too difficult. Only three of the pupils reacted strongly towards the number of films that were shown. Finally, opinions were divided as to whether the project had lasted for too long.

The questionnaire included two open-ended items. In the first question the pupils were asked what their opinion was on: ‘learning language by using it to explore a topic’. Some of the mixed responses were as follows:

‘I think it is a good way to learn language.’

‘My opinion is that I did not learn that much of the language.’

‘My opinion is that you maybe use your own word and that is (lærerikt).’

(Educational)

‘I think it is a good idea, because then I not only learn English.’

‘It doesn’t teach us enough about English as a language.’

‘I think it’s very important for all of us to experience how it is to learn a topic in another language.’

‘Jeg synes at det er gøy å lære engelsk gjennom prosjekter.’ (I think it’s fun learning English through projects)

‘Learning language by using it to explore a topic is fun, and we learn much more by doing it like that.’

‘I didn’t learned so much english.’
‘I think it’s more motivating then a regular English-lesson. (and more fun).’
‘It’s a great way to improve your language + you learn more about a topic.’
‘I don’t feel like I have learned more English by this project but it was fun.’

For the second item, the pupils were asked to write one sentence to: ‘sum up how you experienced the project’. Some of the written replies were:

‘The project was fun but I think te texts were too difficult.’
‘I think it lasted a little too long, but it was very interesting.’
‘I think it was boring but I learned a lot of WW2.’
‘It was interesting to see how peoples lived during the war.’
‘I learned a lot about the 2WW, and I learned some new words connected to it. I think that the project was very interesting and fun.’
‘It was fun, and I learned a lot by working with this project.’
‘Extremely boring, awefull, got too many booklets, and texts, folders...and so on.’
‘We learned about how it was to be a child juring the war.’
‘The project was ok, it was fun having presentasjon and writing, but there were too many films and texts, and it became a little boring.’
‘It was fun to learn about WWII.’
‘Easy because the English does not differ from the Norwegian, when it comes to understanding and learning.’
‘It could have provided more facts and knowledge than it did.’
‘This project was funny and (kjekt) we did a lot of different things and that was very positive.’

5.3.2 Post-project pupil interviews

This subsection shows summaries of five pupil interviews. The interviews were conducted in Norwegian and subsequently translated into English.

Erik

Erik had always been interested in World War Two and wanted to learn more about it. He had been to a museum in London, from which he had learned a good deal. In the project they did not learn so much about the war generally, but rather certain perspectives on the war. It was very different from normal English teaching, but enjoyable. He had always thought about the war as Hitler’s hate towards Jews, not the fact that people were living in such poor conditions in different areas.

Erik had always been interested in reading factual texts, which he enjoyed reading more than the others. The big fiction texts were not really that difficult. The texts were at a

very high level compared to those in the English textbook, where there are only short and easy texts. In comparison, these texts were quite long.

He felt they watched too many films and that he did not really learn that much from them. There should have been just one or two films and instead they could have had more factual texts and done more writing. He liked the documentary most.

Of the activities, he felt that writing was 'alright' and the reading was fine. It was not difficult learning about WWII in English. He understood everything quite well. The teacher went in-depth into the topic, repeating things many times, so he learned them quickly.

Compared to the 'normal' English lessons, they watched many films, but there was a good deal of reading compared to what they normally do and perhaps too little writing: 'Normally...we do some homework, write a bit, and then it isn't even that much.' The best and most enjoyable thing about the project was the writing task:

It was a bit different, it was more difficult, and it got me to write more, and made me want to write. It was at higher level of difficulty than what we have done before. Those who know a lot of English normally don't get to learn that much in the 'normal' English lessons, whereas now you actually got to learn something.

Erik liked the texts most of the different materials. He liked *First Light* even though it entailed a lot of reading. He prefers factual texts, but this was a good text which was very different from texts with 'a lot of action'.

Erik's favourite activity was the presentation. He feels comfortable standing in front of the class, and he likes to talk: 'To have presentations in front of the class and to show what I know. I feel that it is my 'calling' in a way.' His presentation was about the situation for children during The Second World War.

As a topic, WWII was fun to work with. He normally does not like history, but he liked WWII. He feels he has learned a great deal and would like to learn more about general aspects of what actually happened, not just about what happened in Germany and England, but also Europe in general 'because Stalin and those, they did other things as well, and we haven't had anything about that.' He did not know that there was something called 'the Hitler Youth', and that caught his interest.

Erik did not think his language had developed except for learning some new words, such as 'evacuation'. He had not learned to compose sentences in new ways. He had learnt most from writing and reading.

What was positive about the project was that ‘it took the English level to new heights, and I got to learn more.’ What was challenging was reading the texts because they were quite long, but it went well. Erik would like to have more projects like this, for example in science.

Live

Live thought the project was fun because she is partly American: ‘It’s fun to try it out in a different way. I mean, I have always lived in Norway, but kind of, now I know how it is to have this type of subject in English as well.’

Some of the texts were a bit too difficult and too long. Some pupils did not even bother reading them - they just gave up after the first page. As the texts were extracts from different books, it got a bit confusing. The *Blitz* text and *First Light* were confusing because they were ‘broken up into pieces’. It would have helped to have explanations of difficult words in the text, in the margin. The factual texts and stories were okay and easy to read. In the textbook ‘there are more short texts about a lot of different things, and not that many facts.’

The different activities were fun, especially the presentation ‘because you get to find out more about one thing, and you also learn from what the others have done. So I learned from both, what the others did and what I did, so that was positive.’ The films were a good choice. Many remember a good deal about the films because they were fun. It was also enjoyable to read the texts in the booklets, except for those that were a bit difficult: ‘But the factual texts were fun to read, to find out more about the Second World War in English.’ Live’s favourite was *The Very Thought of you*. It was understandable and not broken up into parts. It explained the girl’s point of view really well.

It was different and exciting learning about WWII in English. However, they spent too long on it. They have only gone through two chapters in the textbook the entire year.

So we have had a bit too many texts and a bit too much of the same things in a way. But in English we often have a lot about grammar and it is more fun than grammar. We learn about something in addition to learning English. And we learn it as a natural way to speak, and now it is easier for us to talk about WWII without having to reflect on grammar all the time...just talk about it since we have spent so much time working on the topic.

Live felt she had learnt language because ‘We kind of automatically get it into our brain, how they speak.’ It was more fun than just ‘sitting and memorizing by heart’.

The most enjoyable part was actually learning about something in English and the presentations. She likes ‘to tell others what I have discovered’.

Of the materials, Live probably liked the films the most, although she understood the texts. 'But for a lot of my friends, who don't have an English father or mother, it is more difficult for them to understand when they just read a text. So with the films they kind of have both the text and a picture, so they can understand what is going on, it is in a way easier.'

It was particularly interesting to see the war from the British perspective. It will be easier to have the topic in Social Studies now because they have talked so much about it. Live added: 'I have learned to use more English in daily situations, to speak about WWII, because that is not something you do in grammar instruction, to use the language in daily situations. And we have also learned a lot about WWII'. It was not really that different from learning about WWII in Norwegian; it was just a different language.

Although the whole project should have been shorter, Live would still like to have more projects of this kind 'because it was educational, I learned a lot from it, and it was fun and new and exciting. So I would recommend it to other classes so they also can try it.' Live can also imagine being taught other subjects in English, although 'Science would have been a bit challenging because of the formulas and everything'.

David

David thought the project was exciting, although there were perhaps too many films and too much reading. However, the oral presentation was both enjoyable and the most educational activity because he had got to discover things on his own. He had been able to choose the topic himself, which gave him more freedom.

David found the texts 'alright', although some were more difficult than others in terms of language. He read the difficult texts more than once to understand them properly. The text he enjoyed most was the last one, 'the most difficult one actually, the longest one - *Flight*, I think it was called (*First Light*). It was a bit more exciting because there were more things happening.' He preferred texts with more action in them. The texts were more difficult than the ones in the textbook: they were more fact-based, whereas the ones in the textbook were more fiction, which he preferred.

Although there were too many films, some of them were very good, especially the one about the young pilot Geoffrey Wellum. There was plenty of action in it: 'It makes it more exciting then, and then you pay more attention and learn more.'

As for the activities, David liked the writing tasks and oral presentations most. He likes producing language. He found it interesting to write about how Anne Frank had

experienced the war and now wants to learn more about children's experiences during the war.

It was not problematic to learn about WWII in English as he is half Irish, and actually feels better in English than Norwegian. To learn about other subjects in English is 'more exciting...and more educational as well...I feel I have learned how young people experienced the war, and Winston Churchill, and when the Germans flew over London and bombed them (air raids), bombing.'

He did not really feel his language had developed except for 'a few new words'. However, he had experienced the different activities as positive, and nothing had been very difficult or challenging. He would have nothing against being taught other subjects in English, e.g. Social Studies and Religious Instruction 'because then we "learn" in English, whereas in normal English class it is more about learning grammar and those types of things, whereas here we get to learn about a topic, in English.'

Simon

Simon thought the project was very exciting at times, but boring at other times. The texts were 'okay: 'It was a bit fun to read, and I learned a lot'. Some were more enjoyable than others. *First Light* was more exciting than the others and he also liked *Goodnight Mr. Tom*, which he also saw the film of. Some of the texts were difficult compared to the textbook, but they were 'different of course; it was more exciting to read them'.

However, in general Simon learns more from watching films than reading: 'I'm not a fan of reading. It becomes boring, because I need pictures and so on, to see how it actually was.'

Simon thought the different activities were 'okay': 'I felt that I learned a lot from doing the presentation. Yes, that was educational.' His self-chosen topic about the war in Vietnam had been interesting to work on. He had used the Internet to get information. Although he liked working on the topic, he didn't enjoy actually presenting it and didn't feel it went that well.

Simon did not think that learning about WWII in English instead of Norwegian was a problem. Compared to 'normal' English lessons: 'It has been more exciting, more enjoyable; ...it is a more uncommon thing to do, and that it is kind of fun.' The most interesting part for him was the Vietnam War and *First Light*, learning about planes.

Simon thinks he has probably learnt some language as well: 'I think so. I have learned some war expressions.' He feels he learnt most from the presentations because there were

many different topics, so he paid more attention. Although he generally liked the project, it had been stressful reading all the texts: 'It was bit too much, I feel. We got new texts all the time...but reading was okay though.' Some texts were difficult.

Simon was not sure what it would be like to learn other school subjects in English: 'I think that the English subject is enough. But it is a good thing to learn English though.'

Maria

Maria found it interesting to work on the project because she did not really know that much about WWII from before: 'So I have actually learned a lot about it.' Some of the texts were difficult to read, but she understood the main meaning: 'I recognized some words and then I was able to find out what it was about.' She especially liked *The boy in the Striped Pyjamas* and *Anne Frank*. Because the latter text was real, something that had actually happened, she was able to reflect more on it. The texts were longer than what she was used to and some of them more difficult than the ones in the textbook. However, she added: 'I am not very good at reading English though, so I actually feel that the texts in the textbook are difficult as well.' The actual topic was more interesting than the topics in the textbook.

Maria enjoyed the films most in the project. She liked the film about Anne Frank a lot: 'I got to see how it was because I haven't read the entire book. I have always wanted to read it, but I have never got to it. So now I got to see what it was about.' They had read a short excerpt from the book before watching the film. She thought about what it was like to be a teenager at that time. She felt she learnt more from watching films 'because then I understand, kind of the situation around it, and actually more than when I read.'

Maria talked about her grandmother in her oral presentation: 'I learned more about her, because I didn't really know anything about that from before...I hadn't really thought about the fact that she was alive during the war.' But basically Maria does not like doing presentations in front of the class.

It was difficult 'to pick up everything' about WWII in English as she does not feel that skilled in English: 'It was a bit difficult to try and learn about WWII at the same time as I was trying to learn English.' However, it was fun compared to 'normal' English lessons: 'I feel that I have learned much more during this time than I have done before. But I think it was because it was more fun, so I paid more attention, and understood more.' When something was difficult in a text, she asked her mother or father, or the teacher when at school. However, the texts were the most challenging part.

Maria found the entire topic of the war interesting: ‘I have never thought about the war before, so I actually felt that everything was kind of interesting.’ She also felt that she had learned some language, for example words to do with the topic: ‘When we were writing texts and those kinds of things, I have used the same words many times, and then I have learned those. But I haven’t really learned that much though - I learned most about the war.’ For her written assignment she wrote about what it was like experiencing the war: ‘And then I kind of learned to write, I learned about writing.’

Maria did not feel they had spent too long on the project ‘because we learnt about something new each week’. She would like to learn about a different topic from this one in English, even though it may be quite difficult.

5.3.3 Post-project teacher interview

Evelyn experienced the CLIL-project as satisfying and enjoyable because it allowed her to ‘make use of my own ideas, explore to which extent the pupils could make use of the extensive range of reading and film material’. Evelyn wanted to explore what could work and she was motivated by the idea of using her creativity.

Although the overall theme was the Second World War, the focus on young people promoted involvement during the project, ‘which is essential to reflection’. The pupils learned about young people in different situations in England and on the continent, both young people in hiding, evacuees, persecuted children, and young people taking part in fighting. Through this, the pupils ‘developed an understanding of some basic WWII issues and constellations...issues like the persecution of Jews, the bombing of civilian areas, what this meant to people [and so on]’. Evelyn wanted the pupils to develop empathy and insight, and also a greater understanding of the driving ideological forces behind World War Two, and certain aspects of the Nazi philosophy. By reading, watching films, and talking about war-experiences, the pupils would learn about history, but through stories.

She also brought up occurrences in the pupils’ daily lives, which they talked about in class, hoping that it would promote reflection. For instance, she mentioned a Premier League football match where they had a moment of silence on Remembrance Day.

Sometimes I asked a question to see if I could get an answer that made sense of course. And I did. I could clearly see that compared to in the beginning, more than before, they were able to voice an understanding of something they didn’t know before.

Later on during the project, Evelyn asked similar questions that she had asked during the early stages, and found that in the pupils' responses, they were able to express themselves better than before, and they showed a greater understanding. However, there were also pupils who did not raise their hands and some pupils did not like to raise their hand.

Initially, Evelyn had been somewhat hesitant about doing the project because she had to teach more than she had wanted to, in the 8th, 9th and 10th grades, which meant that she had to work with three different teams and had to change her focus continuously. A motivation for doing the project, however, had been the planned co-operation with the Social Studies teacher. When that fell through she felt it was a setback to have to work on her own. As a consequence she had to spend more time on including information about the historical background. Moreover, she had also planned to bring in two guest speakers: the co-author of a newly published book about Commonwealth casualties buried in the region, and a retired RAF fighter pilot. However, they could not come at that point. She believed that this would have added to the sense of 'authenticity' and 'real world', and that they could have provided pedagogical variation, information and 'are additional language models' (they would have spoken in English).

Evelyn wanted to find out how the pupils would integrate and make use of what they had learnt in the project, mostly through stories about individuals, when they were now starting with the World War Two theme in Social Studies. She was curious as to whether the approach she used would help the pupils to a deeper understanding compared to what they would have learnt in another way, in terms of timelines and other types of factual information about the war: '...with a focus on content, only through a different channel, through English, another language, and through the use of individual stories, mostly'. She knew that WWII was going to be a major topic, which meant that the pupils would have the chance to make use of their newly found knowledge. Moreover, Evelyn believed that by doing the project this way, by focusing on stories about individuals' experiences, she could make the pupils understand more about history as 'something that really happened'. It had given the pupils the opportunity to become engaged with the theme and materials.

What made the WWII-project more challenging than her normal teaching was that she could not rely on a textbook chapter, and had to 'find and assess books and films'. Moreover, Evelyn found only having one subject with the class (English) to be a challenge. It had made her vulnerable for occasional changes to the class's timetable. First, she had lost five lessons and then was not able to teach the class for an entire week. Moreover, after Christmas she fell ill for a period of time, and keeping the project running through deputy and substitute teachers

had been difficult, and even impossible at times. All of these factors, in addition to the winter break, had prolonged the project period, and made it more difficult to ‘keep a pedagogical momentum’. She sometimes had to provide reading and writing tasks which would be doable for a substitute teacher, more similar to the textbook approach which most teachers were familiar with. Thus, when she came back, she had to ‘pull the strings together again and try to make a proper finish’. Not having any teachers doing the same thing was also a disadvantage, since they could have stepped in for her.

...in my mind it is cross-curricular. You should co-operate with a teacher in at least one other subject, to have a common focus, but to work from two different angles. [This would have provided] two different perspectives but [while working] towards the same thing. [...] Or at least to have an understanding with the other teacher [...] sort of keeping each other informed [...] you can cross refer, [...] co-operate on the films, [...] and you save some time.

The project had provided the added bonus of developing the pupils’ reading skills and had hopefully thereby also developed their writing skills.

I think they often miss the quality of the story, to learn through stories. There is not much storytelling going on anymore like before. It is just like: read this text and *learn*. Why not just experience?

The language in some was more challenging than in others, and the pupils were informed of this too and given advice regarding the various texts. There was a great deal of option regarding how much to read and how many tasks to do, and to some extent texts were supported by film.

Evelyn believed that reading is necessary in order to develop reading skills, and by giving pupils the time for reading, it would provide them with a better opportunity to develop these skills. She had past experiences of silent reading as being very beneficial. However, a challenge this time was that she did not have more than three English lessons a week, which gave her less flexibility to create the space around reading that she had ideally wanted. Additionally, this class needed longer to calm down. Both of their form-teachers had been absent. Thus they had had various substitute teachers, which resulted in an increased ‘chattiness’. Nevertheless, there were moments where silent reading occurred. Evelyn had also read ‘some’ to them aloud in class, but the class had not been that positive to the idea.

Evelyn believed that reading a good deal with a focus on the content had benefited the pupils, and that by reading for meaning, the pupils could also have experienced that they learnt language as well. Moreover, during the CLIL-project the pupils read parts of books from the ‘real-world’, much the same way that they would have read an ordinary book in their first language. The textbook, however, contained disconnected chapters and texts with lists of

vocabulary and various tasks to do. It was a sort of ‘A to B’ thing. Evelyn experienced that many of her pupils were used to this type of learning from primary school, where they would read one text, do a task, learn vocabulary by heart, and then be tested and translate. Moreover, the pupils had been instructed a good deal about grammar, but were still unable to write properly when they entered lower-secondary school. What Evelyn felt was often missing was the ‘good stories’, where the pupils could experience, explore and engage with texts on a deeper level. She believes pupils are not able to develop a proper understanding by learning from a theoretical perspective. They need a deeper involvement, perhaps on an emotional and experiencing level, which is a more natural way of learning for people of their age.

Evelyn stressed the importance of extensive reading: ‘Extensive reading is known to enhance the learning of language. Also, listening while watching films provides language input, as do oral activities and writing. The pupils did all of this.’ To Evelyn, extensive reading meant reading a large number of texts of various genres, both shorter and longer texts (as the pupils did during the project), reading more than ‘you have to’ and allowing time for reading. Moreover, to read for the sake of reading itself: ‘To sink into the texts and experience what is in it’, not reading simply to do a task about it and write down unfamiliar words.

Evelyn wanted to be non-threatening about the use of the longer book excerpts, since these were more demanding. She attempted to ‘lower their shoulders’, and let the pupils have a go at reading authentic texts written for native-speaker readers, but the pupils could put them aside if they wanted to. She provided reading advice by encouraging the pupils to look at the picture on the front covers, to read the blurb at the back to ease their way into the reading experience, and to guess what the text was about by reading the heading. Looking back she said that what she probably would have wanted to do differently was to reduce the length of some of the longer book extracts, but she had wanted to give the pupils the opportunity of being able to read large parts of stories if they had become interested and engaged in a particular text. Although the school had a library it was difficult to create a sufficient amount of English reading materials for a wide variety of topics. So the resources of the school in terms of texts were limited.

When the pupils were reading on their own and came across words and sentences they did not comprehend, Evelyn did not want them to let that stop their reading process. The class was encouraged to use information from illustrations which came with some of the texts and knowledge from complementary visual materials, namely films, several of which were based on some of the texts, to support reading. Evelyn also encouraged her pupils to ask each other

or the teacher. She gave some individual reading advice to pupils, in addition to giving reading advice to the class.

The pupils were given both oral and written tasks:

There were oral tasks like interaction in pairs, groups or classroom, presentation on a topic of their own choice; first trying it out in groups and then in class. There were also written tasks, like reading tasks based on main texts [for the three more extensive book extracts]. Here they had a great variety of choice...There was also a writing session of three consecutive lessons at school towards the end of the project period. Here they chose one out of several topic-related tasks.

Evelyn believed that the tasks she gave were different from the ones the pupils were used to, as they provided them with several options; they could just do one and write much about it, or choose several and write a little about each: 'To write on the basis of what you have read, but not to be forced to write about a certain thing'. Some of the tasks were to find a particular part in the text and write it down, which the pupils expected to be easy, but demanded a good deal of reading; and they were asked to find out what happened to a boy in a text when he wet his pants. Some of the tasks were 'kind of playful, but some were more in-depth'. With one of the longer texts, *The Blitz*, the task had consisted of a double page of photographs.

Evelyn also helped the pupils to start their process-writing task by encouraging them to organise their ideas into mind maps and to write down keywords.

The very focus on content and theme is likely to have helped developing reading strategies, and writing strategies were sought, strengthened through various reading tasks and during the writing session. For both [reading and writing] they had to relate to initial instructions and reminders. And I gave them a list, for all the bigger extracts...advice that these are the important pages...and underlining, to help them find a starting point... I also made discrete notes in the texts, and for some discretely went over and [showed] them the important [parts].

Evelyn noticed how engaged the pupils were in their writing:

I could see, for instance "Frank" who is normally a strong 4 and he got a very strong 5 this time. He loves writing: 'Can I please write more' he says. But his problem was a lack of...focus. What he uses in one paragraph might as well pop up again in another one. But now he really had it, everything was in place.

This was during the process of writing. There were also some pupils who did not do as well despite it being a long writing process. However, with Frank, Evelyn found that what he had clearly needed was for something to drive him in a certain direction, and during the writing process in this project, he had developed his writing in a way that she had never seen in his work before.

And then there was “Margareth”, who got a 3 before Christmas and she got quite a good 4 this time. She wrote about her grandmother, whom she [also] did a presentation about, and she made the story good, connected it to her background of the war, and showed some sort of insight and understanding. Also, suddenly her story had structure and better qualities than before. [...] And then there was “Belinda”, strong 4 [...] she got a 5-, but that was because she forgot about the task number and to state the genre and all of that stuff. But a really powerful story [...] very powerful, independent, a kind of painful insight for the ending. Really strong as if she had really developed a sort of under the skin type of empathy with a girl who goes to the gas chambers. So she had this drive.

There were other examples of pupils who got a new drive through the input, and became more engaged, which she could see had clearly had an impact on their writing. For example, “Kim” was a pupil whom Evelyn felt she had not really been able to get in touch with during class. He had written a fantastic text, which she had discretely given him positive feedback about after the project: ‘You know so much. Where did you get it all from? Did you have to work hard or did you just know it?’ Then it turned out that “Kim” knew a good deal about the topic, and Evelyn later found out that his grandfather had actually been sent to a concentration camp. Although he was a good writer, and his English was good, the text Kim wrote during the project was different from before, and after the project he had become much more engaged during English lessons.

This is what I noticed with some, [...] that they had a new drive that also helped them structure their texts better and tell it in a better way. I really noticed quite a few [who improved] both in oral presentations and in writing as if they were more focused. They had ‘stuff’ and they could use it. They heard stories, so maybe that helped them in communicating.

Films were included to add appeal and interest and also to provide variation and an additional source of language input. The pupils immediately enjoyed the use of films ‘to fill in and support their reading’, which was not surprising to Evelyn. The films were based on both long and short extracts that the pupils read. Evelyn considered the films to be mostly suitable, but one of the films did not have the option of subtitles.

The project provided opportunities for pupils to be engaged in communication by talking about what they had seen, heard and read. They communicated and discussed both in pairs, groups, in class, and in individual teacher-pupil conversations. During the conversations in pairs, a few of the pupils with good oral skills sometimes started off by speaking in Norwegian, which Evelyn believed was because they did not want to show off. In pairs the pupils reflected and spoke about what they had read or seen. After working in pairs, they

would turn towards a different pair and further discuss what they had been talking about. Through this activity Evelyn aimed to promote communication of thoughts and development of the pupils' oral skills while focusing on the content. She also designed tasks that would lower anxiety, not challenging their reading abilities, by providing optional starters to do with the texts and films. For instance, she asked the pupils to think about a certain film, and when they had a picture or a scene in their minds, to describe it: 'It is such a good way of making them talk about it, and when they start writing as well, to make them describe and so on when they don't know what to do.'

Evelyn experienced a development in terms of oral language usage. She noticed that the pupils had put a good deal of effort into their oral presentations, in which they had been able to choose their own topics related to young people during war in general:

...there was somebody like 'Iris'. She became really engaged. She did a presentation about Jewish children, and she didn't have any Power-point or anything. She just stood there. A very mature thing and she told about how many percentages of Jewish children were killed by the Nazis, just because they were in the wrong group.

Evelyn did not use any vocabulary lists, but she highlighted some basic key concepts, terms and phrases [and provided] exemplification and 'modelling'. Some pupils had developed their vocabulary:

I noticed that some pupils were able to take more actively part in theme-related exchanges and do their presentations in a language characterised by an increased use of content-related vocabulary and precise language.

Pupils had been able to understand and use terms and expressions that they had not been able to use before, such as 'Nazism', 'the 1940s', 'invasion', 'rationing' and 'evacuation'. Also, their language had become more precise, because they possessed a higher level of content knowledge and knew what they wanted to express. Evelyn also noticed this in the pupils' written texts. The pupils had a better focus, increased drive and better structure than before.

When you have a content-based approach, it is easier for them to have a mental focus and if you have a mental focus it may be easier to put your thoughts into words....So I think the focus on content...it helps you to be more precise because you know what you are trying to say and what it is about.

Several pupils had told Evelyn that this approach had been more motivating, even for those who struggled; it had lowered their anxiety. She mentioned one pupil who became engaged in reading and additionally wrote a very good text during the process-writing lessons.

Furthermore, Evelyn was surprised to find out that pupils whom she did not expect to enjoy the project, because of their level of abilities, actually did. She noticed examples of ‘pupils who struggle with reading and writing problems, who were very keen on taking part, and became more orally active’. There was a very strong development with lower level ability pupils, as well as development with pupils at higher levels. According to Evelyn, all of their classes were mixed ability, and ‘in English they may be more mixed ability than in any other subject.’

They were trusted with ‘some’ texts that were expected to be too difficult for them which could have made some of the lower level pupils feel as if they were ‘proper students’ in a way.

Evelyn felt that one of the challenges with the project was that it had taken longer than planned, which could have lowered the pupils’ motivation and interest. A benefit was that some of the pupils became more interested in the topic in that they asked her after class about the historical background, and requested to borrow books, especially *The Very Thought of You*. Moreover, some of the pupils were able to link the content to their own lives through their families. Evelyn felt that this made them more receptive, and that it made the project a ‘more real-life thing, and not a school-subject thing’.

Some pupils have been very keen and communicative, more than before, expressing growing interest and insight. Others have not. Both categories include pupils on different language competence levels.

Evelyn found her language competence to be essential for doing CLIL. If she had been self-conscious about her language, it could have been difficult to keep a focus on the theme and to assist her pupils. In her regular English lessons, Evelyn used the textbook only selectively, used additional materials, and rarely used the textbook tasks. The greatest difference between the project and her normal teaching practice was the use of a large number of texts and films, the focus on content, and working with one theme over a larger time period. It was more in-depth than normal, and provided more time for the pupils to develop insight and reflection: ‘There was also, if not for all perhaps, a growing awareness of own language development, through increased language immersion’. By being immersed in language, terms and other language features came up again and again in various contexts. The pupils had been exposed to a ‘topic-language’ by exploring the theme, new words and terms that the pupils had to use for their presentation and written products. She especially noticed that: ‘For those who didn’t do too well...they kept repeating things that they had actually picked up’.

Evelyn's aim had been to make language an integrated part of 'content information and interaction'.

I feel more strongly than ever that CLIL works well, because it makes language teaching and learning more meaningful by offering a sense of real-life and purpose... I always try to do content-based teaching because I think language is a tool...CLIL is based on the assumption that you learn through immersion, and CLIL is about being immersed in the language...and we have to stay there a while, in order to implement it, to get insight and to be able to express it. I try to keep more focus on the content, the theme, the issue, a problem, or an idea, and the language is something that supports it and something we digest and use while we are working with this...Content-based language - I think it is something that I to some extent use anyway...only that I don't make it a project.

Evelyn also mentioned that the oral Exam in English for 10th grade pupils is more content-oriented. During these exams pupils have to discuss and talk about a topic. The exam focuses on content, pupils' abilities to communicate a topic, while grammar is peripheral. She could clearly see that pupils develop language when they engage with a topic, although some more than others. She believed that some not being so engaged could have something to do with the fact that they were uprooted that term. Moreover, Evelyn thought that some were not happy about so much reading. Nevertheless, after the project had ended, several pupils had started to ask and talk about it again, as they had begun learning about the topic in Social Studies and Norwegian: 'So some of them are perhaps waking up and seeing that, oh, we have learned about this, and putting things together, and maybe that activates a few things.'

6.0 Discussion

The first research question aimed to find out about the expectations, experiences, benefits and challenges of the CLIL-project for the pupils. The second question aimed to find out about the motives, expectations, challenges and experiences of the teacher. These topics will be addressed in the following sections.

6.1 The teacher's motives

As found with many other CLIL projects in Norway, the present CLIL project was introduced on the initiative of the teacher, so the teacher was the key factor behind its implementation (Paulsen 2010b). The teacher's motivation was primarily her dissatisfaction with the textbook and her view of the textbook as limited in that it only provides pupils with small insight into topics and that the texts and content are chosen by the textbook author. In this respect her attitude was different from the majority of lower secondary school teachers who for some reason rely on the textbook (Drew 2006). Secondly, her interest and knowledge of the topic was also a contributing factor and a reason for wanting to provide her pupils with a more in-depth understanding and knowledge of the Second World War. The topic was also suitable for English as it was closely linked to the goals in *LK06* to do with British history and culture. Since the curriculum is to some degree content-open, it gave the teacher an 'excuse' to teach a topic of her own personal interest. Thus, the curriculum does not seem to prevent teachers from implementing CLIL. By focusing on personal stories and young people's experiences, Evelyn wanted the pupils to develop a deeper cognitive and emotional attachment to the topic.

Evelyn's past experiences with CLIL projects within this age group had been successful and her strong belief in content-based approaches as being effective and educational was also a contributing factor. In addition, her confidence in her own English language proficiency was considered important; her oral language ability, in addition to her interest and knowledge of the topic, had led her to implement CLIL in several classes (Brinton et al. 1989; Bøhn et al. 2007). The planned co-operation with the Social Studies teacher had initially been one of the most influential factors for Evelyn's motivation to carry out a WWII-CLIL project again, as it was perceived as a way to increase input, exposure and educational benefits, especially since she only had one subject with these pupils herself. However, this changed and the project became one led by Evelyn alone. Still, she did not change her mind about it.

6.2 Expectations

The pupils' expectations

The pre-project questionnaire indicates that most of the pupils had been looking forward to the upcoming WWII-project. Their positive attitudes towards the project and the topic were important in light of Krashen's (1982) affective filter hypothesis; when pupils are motivated and interested, they are more likely to be open to input and to acquire language.

It appears that those who were most positive towards the upcoming project, and about using English to learn about history, were also the ones who did not expect it to be difficult. Many of those who were partly looking forward to the project apparently also partly agreed that it was going to be difficult. Thus the data suggests that the pupils' level of ability may to some degree have influenced their expectations. Almost half of the class had been interested in the Second World War before the project started and almost the entire class anticipated it to be more interesting than their normal English lessons, despite their expectations of difficulty or their level of interest in the topic. Many of the pupils anticipated that their knowledge of the topic would develop more than their language, but only a few seemed to believe that they would not develop their language at all.

The teacher's expectations

Evelyn strongly believed that a content-based approach was suitable for this age group. She believed that the project would motivate some of the pupils, but that this would not necessarily be the case for all of them. She also hoped that it would lead to increased communication and interest in the topic. However, the pupils' level of interest in the topic when initiating the project was not considered a necessity for it to become successful, but if they did not become interested, she would view the project as more unsuccessful. Her perception of the class was that many of the pupils were willing to participate in oral communication in her regular English lessons and that this would presumably lead to more communication during the project.

In terms of the materials, Evelyn had tried to consider the pupils' different interests by including different types of texts and films. The films were considered to be suitable for the majority. She had sought to find suitable materials for different learner types in her mixed ability class by including texts of various levels of difficulty. She had found texts from other textbooks, but also included authentic texts in the form of shorter and longer extracts from English books. She hoped that the use of authentic English texts would promote curiosity and

an interesting experience. However, in terms of reading, she expected to discover that even some of the easiest extracts could be too difficult for some of the pupils. Nevertheless, she hoped to promote interest in the topic and the materials. Moreover, through scaffolding and encouraging the pupils to employ reading strategies, she hoped that pupils would not be discouraged or stop reading when faced with unfamiliar words.

Evelyn expected that the pupils' language would develop naturally as they were trying to use it with a focus on meaning and content; giving the pupils the chance to read extensively would develop their language skills (Day and Bamford 1998). The pupils' ability to understand the content and meaning was expected to be the most important aspect. Nevertheless, it was easier to provide some of the learners with easier texts as opposed to when they were not all reading the same text from their textbooks.

6.3 Experiences

The pupils' experiences

The post-project questionnaire answers generally showed that most of the pupils had enjoyed working on the project, were positive to it and would like to do this kind of project again in their English lessons, which generally reflected the pre-project expectations. What the pupils enjoyed the most was the use of films. As expressed in the current *LK06* curriculum, the English language is something that children meet in their daily lives. In Norway there are many TV-series and films in English, and this generation of children is one which has grown up surrounded by technology; they are used to using computers both for reading, playing games and communication. Thus, watching films and gaining knowledge through pictures and technology seems to be a popular activity for many of these pupils as they are apparently more accustomed to a more audio-visual way of learning in their daily lives outside of the classroom. In contrast, as expressed in the post-project questionnaire data, fewer pupils enjoyed reading, writing and presenting their work than those who did.

Although most of the pupils normally enjoyed speaking English in general, the majority of the class were negative towards doing oral presentations. In contrast, the pupil interviews indicate that several of the pupils had enjoyed the process of making their presentations and exploring a topic individually. Chvala (2012) has criticised the use of informative oral presentations as an assessment form in English exams for 10th grade pupils and suggests that it is a communication activity which may be used too often in lower-secondary schools; instead pupils should be given the possibility to communicate orally for a

wider variety of purposes and in different situations. One of the reasons why so many of the pupils did not enjoy doing oral presentations may be the element of self-consciousness about their oral skills while giving a presentation in front of the whole class, especially since they were being evaluated by the teacher and presumably also by their peers.

The teacher's experiences

Evelyn had experienced the CLIL-project as satisfying and enjoyable. It had allowed her to use her creativity and explore her own ideas about EFL teaching and to explore the pupils' encounter with an extensive number of texts and films. She had found the CLIL approach to be motivating and had experienced a new 'drive' in many of the pupils, which seemed to have been beneficial across levels of language abilities. Several of the pupils had told her that they had found the project to be motivating. To a certain degree the project had also promoted engagement in various activities and development of language skills. The teacher had noticed that some had been more engaged in writing during process-writing and developed their writing skills, some had become more communicatively active during the project than before, and some had been more engaged in reading. Evelyn had experienced that pupils had developed language when they had become engaged in the topic, but some more than others. After the project had ended, she was convinced that CLIL is efficient and that it makes language teaching and learning more meaningful in terms of real-life and purpose. In both the pre- and post-project interviews, Evelyn stressed that the approach is suitable for learners of this age and that a more content-driven approach to language teaching is more beneficial than the more grammar-oriented traditions (Krashen and Terrell 1988).

During the project the pupils had been exposed to more immersion than in regular English lessons in terms of content and language in that it gave them more time to absorb and practise contextualized language related to one topic. Evelyn had experienced that both pupils with reading and writing problems and those with higher levels of language proficiency had developed language and content knowledge. The approach had in many ways been similar to her regular teaching practice, a finding in other CLIL research (Dalton-Puffer 2009). She would use the textbook selectively, add additional materials and keep a focus on content. The difference was mainly that the project was more in-depth than normal, and thus the materials were also more extensive.

6.4 The pupils' benefits

After the project had ended, there seemed to be a general consensus among the pupils that they had developed knowledge about the topic, but very few believed that they had developed their language. The pupils seemed to have been conscious about their learning of the content. However, they may also have acquired language subconsciously without being aware of it. This reflects Krashen's (1982) acquisition-learning hypothesis, which claims that in a content-based approach where pupils are immersed in language and are able to use that language for a meaningful purpose, learners will develop language automatically in a natural way without being consciously aware of it. This hypothesis is arguably one of the most important underlying language theories upon which CLIL and immersion are based. In the current project the primary goal had been to teach content knowledge with language development as an additional bonus, which is what content-based instruction (CLIL) is about (Hellekjær 1996). For learners to develop communicative abilities in a language, acquisition has shown to be more important than conscious learning e.g. direct grammar instruction (Krashen and Terrell 1988). The general impression is that language was used as a tool to develop content knowledge and comprehension, and for communicative purposes (Alba 2009). The project arguably promoted a more natural learning environment than normal for the pupils, which is one of the most crucial principles for CLIL to be successful (Marsh 2000, cited in Coyle et al. 2010).

In the interviews and in the post-project questionnaire, the pupils only seemed to be aware of having developed a few words in terms of language. From the pupils' oral presentations, especially those who chose a topic related to the overall theme of World War Two, it appeared that the pupils had developed some contextualised vocabulary and that they were able to speak about the content in a meaningful way. These findings support other studies of CLIL which have shown development of pupils' vocabulary (Catalán and de Zarobe 2009; Sylvén 2004, 2006, cited in Catalán and de Zarobe 2009).

In the lessons, several of the pupils were more and more able to participate in oral exchanges about the content. Nevertheless, not all of the pupils actively participated in the class discussions. The pre-project questionnaire indicated that half of the class normally enjoys speaking English, while only a few pupils did not do so at all. Towards the end of the project, when the teacher went through what they had read in texts and seen and listened to in films, several of the pupils became more communicative and their content knowledge and their ability to speak about the topic seemed to have increased. Even some of the pupils who

did not normally take much part in oral exchange became more communicatively active during the project. Communication is suggested to be one of the principles of successful CLIL practices (Coyle et al. 2010). Thus, providing the pupils with opportunities to communicate about the topic and materials seems to have been a benefit in itself, not only for practising language and communicative skills, but also by providing input for those who were less engaged in class discussions.

Choice seemed to be a factor which increased motivation and interest for the majority of the pupils in terms of doing various tasks. Thus autonomy was apparently a positive factor for most of the pupils and only a few did not consider choice as motivational or to have increased their interest. Being able to choose their own topic for their oral presentation was particularly motivational. Both the presentations and the process-writing task presented the pupils with the opportunity to actively take part in their knowledge and language development, in addition to cognitive development, by allowing them to explore, investigate and reflect, form opinions and create (Coyle et al. 2010). The pupil interviews suggested that some of them enjoyed the process of exploring and making their presentations more than actually standing in front of the class and presenting and that some may also have learnt from listening to others present. By including presentations as an activity in the project pupils were given the opportunity to share their research with others and in turn were able to learn from each other. During the process-writing activity pupils were also given the opportunity to assist one another. Exploring, sharing and assisting mirror the socio-cultural, constructivist theories in support of CLIL (Coyle et al. 2010).

As found in the post-project teacher interview, as well as in the pupil interviews, many of the pupils developed a new drive or motivation during the project. Some had become more motivated to write during the project than normal and several had improved their writing abilities. The reason may have been the use of personal stories and the angle of young people's experiences during the war. Through personal stories, the pupils were given the opportunity to identify with the experiences of these people even though they lived in another time. The project provided a different angle to the topic of World War Two than the one that they presumably would encounter in Social Studies. As reflected by one of the pupils in an interview, as well as in a teacher interview, while Social Studies provides a more general overview of the war in terms of facts and historical perspectives, the current project provides a more emotional connection to real people's experiences.

The topic and choices of texts and materials tried to consider different pupils' preferences by including stories, both fictional and true stories, and factual texts, in addition

to documentaries and story-based films. This range may have appealed to a large number of pupils in the classroom, as many of the boys seemed to prefer to read and watch films that included more action in them, while several of the girls seemed to prefer a more personal angle. It also seems that the majority of the pupils in general preferred a more meaning-based approach and thus found it more motivational to learn about non-linguistic subject matter. The pupils were given the opportunity to actually learn *about* something over a long period of time, rather than focusing on language-specific learning, which in turn resulted in them being able to communicate better both in oral and written discourse since they actually had something to communicate about. Thus, using language as a tool was beneficial for the pupils.

The teacher would generally always use English as the language of instruction both during the project and in her regular lessons. The only exception would be when she had to give the pupils important detailed information or instructions. Thus, the teacher was a language model for her learners, and she had often noticed pupils picking up words and expressions that she used. The only additional oral language models appeared in films during the project. The teacher's original idea of inviting two native English-speakers would arguably have benefited the pupils further. The guest speakers would have acted as additional language models; one had personal experiences of being a fighter pilot, and the other had a good deal of knowledge of the topic. These guests could also have connected the topic more to the pupils' home culture and the occurrences in their community during the war. Moreover, their presence could perhaps have promoted more communicative engagement and arguably would have provided an additional communicative experience.

The data supports prior research that CLIL is wrongly mistaken as being suitable only for an elite or higher ability learners (Wiesemes 2009: 44-45): the project was also beneficial for low level pupils. One girl stated during an interview that, despite her low level of abilities and the challenging input, she felt that she had learnt more during the project than she had ever done before. A paradox in CLIL practices is that although immersion and a natural approach to language development has shown to be more similar to the way young children learn their mother tongue and a more natural way for them to learn, CLIL is mostly used with older learners at the upper-secondary and university levels in Norway. This project has shown it has a potential with younger learners. However, the teacher seems to be the most important contributing factor for pupils across ability levels to benefit from a project like this by providing them with support, both through visual aids, such as films and pictures, supporting the use of reading and writing strategies and by providing the class with a non-linguistic context (Wiesemes 2009).

Language development is a long and cumulative process and, as expressed in the post-project interview with the teacher, some of the benefits from the CLIL project may also appear at a later time, which has also been found in studies of immersion programmes (Navés 2009).

6.5 Challenges

In terms of challenges, the majority of the class did not consider the experience of learning about the topic in English as difficult. This supports the idea that CLIL is a more natural way of learning in that it resembles the way young people learn content matter in their mother tongue (Alba 2009). Furthermore, research on CLIL has shown that CLIL does not have any negative impact on content learning, which also seems to be the case with most of the pupils in the present study (Wiesemes 2009).

The large majority of the pupils felt that the number of texts had been too extensive, which seems to have been a challenge in terms of motivation and engagement. However, in comparison, only a few of the pupils had experienced the texts as too difficult. The majority of the class had apparently managed well with reading the texts. The materials provided the pupils with some adapted texts, but it also gave them some challenges by including more difficult authentic texts. The two longest text excerpts from the books written for adult native-speakers of English were generally considered to be challenging by the pupils. Excerpts in themselves can be challenging as they only provide a part and not the whole, compared to for example a graded reader. The pupil interviews indicated that for some this may have made the reading less enjoyable. One of the principles of extensive reading is to provide pupils with the opportunity to read texts in the classroom in much the same way as they would read a book for pleasure outside of school, namely ones they have chosen out of interest at their level of ability, and probably in those situations learners would have the entire text to read (Day and Bamford 1998).

However, as in Krashen's (1982) Input hypothesis, a focus on meaning is not the only requirement for acquisition to take place. Learners must be exposed to input which is 'just beyond' their current level of ability. Appropriate materials are a prerequisite for CLIL to be successful and beneficial for pupils (Oakes 2002; Navés and Munõs 1999, cited in Navés 2009). Research has shown that CLIL is motivational and improves foreign language teaching when learners are provided with challenging content that they are able to comprehend through

scaffolding (Wiesemes 2009). The project arguably provided pupils with more challenges than their textbook, both on a cognitive level and in terms of language.

The teacher acknowledged that doing a good deal of reading could be a challenge for some. She had told the pupils that the authentic book texts had been written for adult native speakers of English. They could try to read them, but were given the choice of putting them aside. According to Day and Bamford (1998), the most suitable texts for EFL pupils are materials made specifically for learners at that level, e.g. 'language learner literature' or graded readers. The post-project questionnaire suggests that about half of the class did not consider the texts to be too difficult, while the rest of the class seemed to have experienced some or all of the texts to have been too difficult. The pupil interviews indicate that the project had been more challenging for the pupils than the normal English lessons. While one pupil felt that it had provided him and other pupils with a high level of language competence a chance to develop in a way that they normally would not be given in normal English lessons, one of the girls had even regarded the texts in their textbook as too difficult. Arguably many of the texts were suitable for the class majority, while others were not. However, as the teacher pointed out, all classes are mixed ability classes, especially reflected in English. This class was no exception.

A limitation of the strong Norwegian tradition of basing EFL teaching on a textbook (Drew 2004, Charboneau 2012, Hellekjær 2007), is reflected in one of the pupils' comments that some pupils are not challenged enough in regular EFL teaching practices, and that the use of such an extensive amount of varied materials seems to have been largely beneficial to language learners across levels of abilities. The teacher had spent a considerable amount of time and effort finding interesting materials for the class and assessing how suitable they were, which is a challenge for teachers in CLIL settings (Wiesemes 2009). Moreover, it may be that few graded readers are about this subject. In addition Evelyn had put a good deal of energy and time into trying to scaffold and making the texts readable for as many as possible (De Graff et al. 2007). The resources of the school in terms of materials were limited, and thus it was a necessity for the teacher to find and assess the materials alone, a challenge which also has been found in several CLIL contexts (Navés 2009).

Evelyn had expected that it could be a challenge that the pupils had not learnt about WWII at school before the project had started, which she was conscious about. She included more background information and used some of the texts from the Social Studies' textbook in the early stages of the project. Having pre-knowledge about the subject would probably have made it easier for pupils. Furthermore, not being able to co-operate with the Social Studies

teacher and the limited framework of only having three lessons a week made the project more of a challenge. Evelyn also knew that the project was going to be interrupted and that if she fell ill, it would also impact the project negatively. When she did actually fall ill, it was challenging to keep up the momentum. It also extended the duration of the project too much. When being responsible for a CLIL project alone, there is a higher risk of being negatively impacted by unplanned occurrences and outside influence. In addition, the project and the teacher could probably have benefited from being given more time and a lesser work load during a project like this, which demands more of a teacher than regular lessons. Support from other teachers and the school administration would have been helpful. However, co-operation between teachers of different subjects in CLIL settings seems to be rare (Paulsen 2010b). Therefore, the role of the teacher was a key aspect in the current project since: Despite the obstacles, the teacher's dedication to her pupils seems to have been essential for carrying through the project and its positive outcomes.

7.0 Conclusion

This thesis is based on research into a CLIL project where History and English were combined in a 9th grade English class in Norway. The focus was the Second World War, specifically young people's experiences of the war. Multiple materials were used, for example extracts from authentic books, other school coursebooks, and films. Classroom activities included watching films, individual reading, class discussions about the texts and films, individual oral presentations of a self-chosen topic and a longer writing assignment. The aims were to explore the expectations, experiences, and challenges for the pupils and the teacher, the teacher's motives for initiating the project, and the benefits of the project for the pupils. It was a case study using multiple methods: pupil questionnaires, interviews with pupils and the teacher and observations of lessons.

One of the main findings was that the teacher played a key role in the project. The whole project was a result of the teacher's initiative and interest in the topic. It was an alternative to simply using the textbook and allowed her the possibility to provide the pupils with an in-depth learning experience of a topic she considered as important. Her emphasis was on meaning as opposed to the forms of language. However, she was faced with a number of challenges, for example finding and assessing appropriate materials, taking into consideration that there were big differences in the pupils' levels of ability and being alone with the responsibility for the project. The teacher in general experienced the project as motivational and rewarding for herself and the pupils. However, it was unfortunate that she fell ill during the project period, which made her lose momentum in addition to prolonging the duration.

As for the pupils, their expectations and their experiences were generally positive towards the project. They were more focused on the topic they were learning about than the fact that they were using English to learn about it. The majority did not experience learning about the Second World War in English as difficult. However, some of the texts were more difficult for some than others since it was a mixed ability class. In contrast, the films appealed to almost the whole class as a form of input of both language and content. In general they became more communicative and engaged when talking about the topic in class, but many did not like doing oral presentations in front of the other class members, which had also been the case before the project. According to the teacher, some but not all of the pupils developed their writing abilities and became more enthusiastic about writing in connection with the longer assignment. Vocabulary connected to the topic was one of the areas in which the pupils

developed their language, but most of them did not feel that they had developed their language in other ways. On the other hand, they felt that they had learnt a good deal about the Second World War, and especially from the perspective of young people. The majority were positive to having more CLIL projects.

One of the implications of the research is that CLIL has a potential in EFL teaching also at the lower-secondary level. The case in question did not aim to teach the entire curriculum of another subject, such as Social Studies, in English, but rather an in-depth topic related to the curricula of both Social Studies and English. The project seems to echo some of the recommendations which have been made for improving EFL practices and pupils' development of language through incidental learning and a wider range of materials than just the textbook. However, the challenges with CLIL include the lack of resources in schools in terms of materials to cover a wide variety of topics and that so few teachers are willing to work with and thus cooperate over projects like this. It would make it easier if there was a network or a database of materials, encouraging the use of more content-based and meaning-based teaching in Norway.

A limitation of the current study is that it is a case study and one can therefore not make generalisations because of it. However, it has contributed to the CLIL research in Norway by studying learners younger than those at the upper secondary level, where most CLIL practices have been implemented. Furthermore, by following the current project from beginning to end, which was dependent on the teacher's approval and openness, and by using multiple sources of data collection, it has provided a number of impressions about how a project of this kind works for both the pupils and the teacher involved. Research into other similar CLIL case studies at the lower secondary level would provide a broader picture of the suitability and effects of CLIL with the age group concerned.

References

- Alba, J.O. 2009. 'Themes and vocabulary in CLIL and non-CLIL instruction.' In Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (130-156). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Borg, W. R. and Gall, M. D. 1989. *Educational Research. An Introduction*. (5th edn). London: Longman.
- Borg, W. R., Gall, M. D. and Gall, J. P. 2003. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. (7th edn). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A. and Wesche, M.B. 1989. *Content-Based Second Language Instruction*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Bøhn, H., Hellekjær, G. O., Svenhard, B. W. and Servant, K. 2004. *A survey of content and language integrated learning in Norwegian schools in the 2004-2005 school year* (unpublished). Halden: Østfold University College.
- Bøhn, H., Hellekjær, G.O., Servant, K. and Svenhard, B.W. 2007. 'Norway'. In Maljers, A., Marsh, D. and Wolff, D. (eds.), *Windows on CLIL. Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight* (139-144). Alkmaar: European Platform for Dutch Education.
- Charboneau, R. 2012. 'Approaches and practices relating to the teaching of EFL reading at the Norwegian primary level'. In Hasselgreen, A., Drew, I. and Sørheim, B. (eds.), *The Young Language Learner. Research-based Insights into Teaching and Learning* (51-69). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Chvala, L. 2012. 'Genre and situational features in oral exam tasks in 10th grade'. In Hasselgreen, A., Drew, I. and Sørheim, B (eds.), *The Young Language Learner: Research-based insights into Teaching and Learning* (233-246). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. 2000. *Research Methods in Education* (5TH edn.). London: Routledge Falmer
- Coyle, D. 2002. 'Against all odds: Lessons from Content and Language Integrated Learning in English secondary schools'. In Daniel, W.C. and Jones, G.M. (eds.), *Education and Society in Plurilingual Contexts* (37-55). Brussels: Brussels University Press.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P. and Marsh, D. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crandall, J. 1994. 'Strategic integration: Preparing language and content teachers for linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms'. In Alatis, J.E. (ed.), *Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics. Strategic Interaction and Language Acquisition: Theory, Practice and Research* (255-274). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Crandall, J. 2012. 'Content Based Instruction and Content and Language Integrated Learning'. In Burns, A. and Richards, J.C. (eds.), *The Cambridge Guide to Pedagogy and Practice in Second Language Teaching* (149-160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cummins, J. 2005. 'Using information technology to create a zone of proximal development for academic language learning: A critical perspective on trends and possibilities'. In Davison, C. (ed.), *Information Technology and Innovation in Language Education* (105-126). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. 2007. *Discourse in CLIL Classrooms*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. 2009. 'Communicative competence and the CLIL lesson'. In Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (197-214). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Day, R.R. and Bamford, J. 1998. *Extensive Reading in the Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Day, R.R. and Swan, J. 1998. 'Incidental learning of foreign language spelling through targeted reading.' *TESL Reporter*, 31(1): 1-9.
- De Graaff, R., Koopman, G.J., Anikina, Y. and Westhoff, G. 2007. 'An observation tool for effective L2 pedagogy in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).' *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10(5): 603-624.
- Drew, I. 2004. *Survey of English teaching in Norwegian primary schools*. Report for the Central Norwegian Education Authorities and Stavanger University College.
- Drew, I. 2006. 'Literacy practices in L2 English in Norwegian primary and lower secondary education.' Paper presented at the ISCHE 28 Conference, *Technologies of the Word: Literacies in the History of Education*, Umeå University, 16–19 August 2006.
- Drew, I. and Sørheim, B. 2009. *English Teaching Strategies. Methods for English Teachers of 10 to 16-year-olds* (2nd edn). Oslo: Det norske samlaget.
- Elsner, D. and Keßler, J. 2013. *Bilingual Education in Primary School: Aspects of Immersion, CLIL, and Bilingual Modules*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture, Vocational Training and Language Policy. 2005. *Europeans and Languages: A Euro-barometer Special Survey*. B-1049. Brussels: European Commission.
- Graddol, D. 2006. *English Next*. London: British Council.
- Hellekjær, G. O. 2005. *The Acid Test: Does Upper Secondary EFL Instruction Effectively Prepare Students for the Reading of English Textbooks at Colleges and Universities?* PhD thesis: The Department of Teacher Education and School Development. University of Oslo.

- Hellekjær, G.O. 2007. 'Reading: From a forgotten to a basic skill'. *Språk og Språkundervisning*, 2: 23-29.
- Hellekjær, G. O. 2008. 'A case for improved reading instruction for academic English reading proficiency'. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 2(1): 1-17.
- Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. 2009. 'The receptive vocabulary of EFL learners in two instructional contexts: CLIL versus non-CLIL instruction'. In Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (81-92). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Krashen, S.D. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S.D. and Polak, J. 1988. 'Do we need to teach spelling? The relationship between spelling and voluntary reading among community college ESL students.' *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1): 141-146.
- Krashen, S.D. and Terrell, T.D. 1988. *The Natural Approach. Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. London: Prentice Hall International.
- Krashen, S.D. 1993. *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. 2007. *Språk åpner dører. Strategi for styrking av fremmedspråk i grunnsopplæringen 2005-2009*. Rev.edn. Oslo: Kunnskapsdepartementet.
- Lichtman, M. 2010. *Qualitative Research in Education: A User's Guide*. (2nd edn). London: Sage.
- Lyster, R. 2007. *Learning and Teaching Languages through Content. A Counter Balanced Approach*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Læreplanverket for Kunnskapsløftet*. 2006. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet.
- Marsh, D. and Marshland, B. (eds.) 1999. *Learning with Languages*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Marsh, D. 2000. 'An introduction to CLIL for parents and young people'. In Marsh, D. and Langé, G. (eds.), *Using Languages to Learn and Learning to Use Languages*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Marsh, D. 2009. 'Foreword'. In Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (vii-viii). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Mehisto, P., Marsh, D. and Frigols, M. J. 2008. *Uncovering CLIL- Content and Language Integrated Learning in Bilingual and Multilingual Education*. Oxford: Macmillan.
- Navés, T. and Munõz, C. 1999. 'Implementation of CLIL in Spain.' In Marsh, D. and Langé, G. (eds.), *Implementing Content and Language Integrated Learning. A Research-Driven TIE_CLIL Foundation Course Reader*. Jyväskylä: Continuing Education

- Centre, University of Jyväskylä on behalf of TIE-CLIL (European Lingua Project). 145-158. [05.05.13] Can be viewed at: <http://www.ub.edu/filoan/addendumen.html>
- Navés, T. 2002. 'Successful CLIL Programmes'. In Navés, T., Muñoz, C. and Pavesi, M. (eds.), *The CLIL Professional Development Course*. Milan: Ministero della Istruzione della Università e della Ricerca. Direzione Regionale per la Lombardia. 93-102. New Jersey State Dept. of Education, T.D. o. C.B.E. 1984. *Effective Practices for Successful Bilingual Parent Involvement Programs: An Administrator's Handbook*. P.T.M. No. 400.20
- Navés, T. 2009. 'Effective Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) programmes'. In Jiménez Catalán, R.M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (22-40). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Oakes, J. and Saunders, M. 2002. *Access to Textbooks, Instructional Materials, Equipment, and Technology: Inadequacy and Inequality in California's Public Schools (October 1, 2002)*. UCLA'S Institute for Democracy, Education and Access. William Watch Series: Investigating the Claims of *William v. State of California* (Paper wws-rr001-1002). 10.01.02. [05.05.13] Pdf-file can be downloaded at <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/4ht4z71v#page-1>
- Palmer, H.E. 1964. *The Principle of Language-study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published in 1921)
- Palmer, H.E. 1968. *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published in 1917).
- Paulsen, J.M. 2010a. *Lærerperspektiver på CLIL. Didaktiske valg og rammebetingelser. Evaluering av CLIL i videregående skole 2009-2010. Del 1*. Høgskolen i Hedmark: Oppdragsrapport 2-2010: 1-34.
- Paulsen, J.M. 2010b. *Hvilke faktorer har betydning for implementering og spredning av CLIL? Analyse av CLIL i videregående skole 2009-2010. Del 2*. Høgskolen i Hedmark. Oppdragsrapport 3-2010: 1-42.
- Simensen, A.M. 1987. 'Adapted readers: How are they adapted?' *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 4(1): 41-57.
- Simensen, A.M. 1998. *Teaching in a Foreign Language. Principles and Procedures*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Simensen, A.M. 2007. *Teaching a Foreign Language: Principles and Procedures* (2nd edn). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Svenhard, B.W. 2010. 'Innledning'. In Svenhard, B.W. (ed.), *Fokus på Språk: CLIL- Engelsk og Fremmedspråk i Andre Fag*. Halden: Fremmedspråksenteret.
- Sylvén, L.K. 2004. *Teaching in English or English teaching? On the Effects of Content and Language Integrated Learning on Swedish Learners' Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition*. Göteborg: Department of English, Göteborg University.
- Sylvén, L.K. 2006. 'Extramural exposure to English'. CLIL special issue. *Views* 15 (3): 53.

Wiesemes, R. 2009. 'Developing theories of practices in CLIL: CLIL as post-method pedagogies?' In Jiménez Catalán, R. M. and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (eds.), *Content and Language Integrated Learning: Evidence from Research in Europe* (41-59). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Online References

Hellekjær, G. O. 1996. *Easy does it: Introducing pupils to bilingual Instruction*. *Språk og språkundervisning* 3: 9-14. [30.03.13]
<http://www.fremmedspraksenteret.no/nor/fremmedspraksenteret/laringsressurser/leseveiledning-i-engelsk/methodological-approaches/clil/easy-does-it>

Marsh. D. 'David Marsh on CLIL'. Cambridge University Press. *Youtube*. 11.11.10. [27 04.13] <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Czdg8-6mJA>

Nuffield Foundation. 2000. *Languages: The Next Generation. The Final Report and Recommendations of The Nuffield Languages Inquiry*. London: Nuffield Foundation. 05. 2000. [27. 04.13]
http://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/languages_finalreport.pdf

Appendices

Appendix 1A

Pre-project teacher interview guide:

Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø, Master in Literacy student at the University of Stavanger.

Background

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. What are your qualifications in English?

Project information

3. What is the project about?
4. How did you choose the topic?
5. What materials are you going to use?
6. What types of exercises/activities are you going to use in the project?
7. What is the reason for your choice of materials?
8. What factors have influenced your choice of exercises?
9. What made you decide to try out CLIL in your class?

Adapted education

10. How have you considered adapted education (tilpasset opplæring) in your choice of materials and exercises?
11. How are you planning to help pupils on different levels to evolve in their learning process (scaffolding)?
12. Is it important that the pupils only use English, or could the pupils also make use of their mother tongue when faced with difficulties?
13. How can CLIL be beneficial for pupils at different levels?
14. How are you planning to prepare the pupils for the project?

Prior CLIL experiences

15. Have you tried the method before? If yes, how did it go?
16. Which benefits did you experience the last time?
17. Which challenges did you experience?
18. What did you know about CLIL before you tried it?

Beliefs and attitudes

19. How would you define your role as a teacher in a CLIL project?
20. How important is the process of planning, before starting a CLIL-project?
21. How much do the pupils learn about the topic in CLIL compared to what they would have learned in Norwegian?
22. How do the pupils learn English during a CLIL project? (Conscious vs. Subconscious).
23. When pupils are learning about a topic in a different language than their mother tongue, is it important that they have prior knowledge?
24. Is there any difference between using CLIL compared to what you normally do in the English class?
25. Does CLIL provide more or other opportunities for reading, writing and speaking English in comparison with a “normal” English classroom?
26. Is CLIL suitable for pupils in the 9th grade?
27. At what age is it appropriate to start using CLIL?
28. What is the role of motivation in a CLIL project, for the teacher, and for the pupils?
29. What is your opinion on the significance of the teacher’s interest in the CLIL-topic?
30. What impact does the pupils’ level of interest have on the results?

Expectations

31. What are the challenges for the teacher?
32. What are the benefits for the teacher?
33. What are your expectations for the project, when it comes to benefits and challenges for the pupils?

Aims

34. Have you set any aims (learning goals) for the pupils?
35. What would you like the pupils to achieve when it comes to language?
36. What would you like the pupils to achieve when it comes to content?
37. How are you planning to help the pupils reach the goals you have set?
38. What would you like to achieve, as a teacher, in this project?
39. Have you set any aims for yourself?

Appendix 1B

Post-project teacher interview guide:

Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø, Master in Literacy student at the University of Stavanger.

Benefits for the teacher

1. How was the CLIL-project beneficial for you?
2. What were the advantages of using CLIL?

Challenges for the teacher

3. Which challenges did you experience as a teacher?
4. What was challenging with this project compared to your 'normal' English subject teaching practice?
5. What challenges did you experience with regards to initiating a CLIL-project at your school?

Benefits for the pupils

6. How was the project beneficial for the pupils?
7. How did the CLIL-project benefit the pupils compared with the textbook approach?
8. In what way did the project provide opportunities for enhancing the pupils' language?
9. How did the project provide opportunities for the pupils to be engaged in communication?
10. In what way did the project bring opportunities to develop the pupils thinking skills/cognition? (reflection, comprehension, reasoning,)
11. How has this project contributed to developing the pupils' content knowledge? (culture)
12. In what way did the project impact the pupils' motivation?
-compared with your traditional English subject practice?
13. How has this project contributed to developing the pupils' language abilities/competence?

14. How did the different activities provide benefits for the pupils? (presentation, process-writing, reading and working with texts, watching and working with films, classroom discussions)

Challenges for the pupils

15. What was challenging for the pupils?
- Topic introduced to the pupils for the 1st. time.
 - How were the pupils able to deal with difficulties in terms of vocabulary, grammar and comprehension?
 - Did any of the challenges benefit the pupils/some pupils?
 - Interest and motivation: engagement.

Materials/Activities

16. What was the reason for including the use of films in the project?
17. Why did you choose those particular films?
18. How suitable were the texts for the mixed ability class? (Comprehensible input, adapted, graded readers,)
19. What was the reason for including the use of texts in the project?
20. Why did you choose those particular texts?
21. How suitable were the films for the mixed ability class?
22. What types of tasks were the pupils given?
23. What opportunities did the project provide for the pupils to communicate about the topic?
24. What resources are available at your school other than the textbook?
25. What opportunities did the pupils have to practice and develop reading strategies and writing strategies?
26. How were the materials, tasks and activities adapted/adaptable to the mixed ability class?

Experience

27. What did you want to achieve?

28. What did you experience as successful or unsuccessful?
29. Did the outcome of the project live up to your expectations?
-communicative class, more communication etc.? (follow-up question)
30. How was your language and content competence relevant for carrying out this project?
31. What was the difference between using the CLIL approach and your 'regular' English teaching practice?
32. In what way did the project focus on language?
33. How did you guide/scaffold the pupils through the various materials, tasks and activities?
34. What is your impression on how the pupils experienced this project?
35. You mentioned in the first interview that some factors may have an impact on the project such as: the teacher falling ill, unrelated schools activities stealing time from lessons or some pupils being absent. What factors affected the CLIL-project?
36. What would you like to have done differently?
37. You had planned to have guest lecturers participating in the project. How can guest lecturers be beneficial for the pupils in a CLIL project?
38. How would you briefly sum up your experience of the project?
39. What are your thoughts about using CLIL again in your teaching practice?

Appendix 2A

Questionnaire about the Second World War project

Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø, Master in Literacy Studies student at the University of Stavanger, would like you to answer the following questionnaire. Try to answer as honestly as you can. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME. Your answers will be anonymous.

Put a cross in the box you feel is most suitable: [x]

1. I am looking forward to this project.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

2. I am interested in the Second World War.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

3. I think it will be difficult to work on this project.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

4. I am going to learn a lot of English by working on this project.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

5. I would rather work on this project in Norwegian.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

6. I think that I will learn a lot about some sides of the Second World War by working on this project.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

7. I think that I would learn more about these sides of the Second World War if the project had been in Norwegian.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

8. I think it is important to learn about the Second World War.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

9. I have a good idea about what we are going to do during this project.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

10. I think that this project is going to be more interesting than regular English lessons.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

11. I look forward to use English in order to learn about history.

strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

12. I already have some knowledge about the Second World War.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

13. I enjoy learning about history.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

14. I enjoy learning English.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

15. I enjoy speaking English.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

16. I enjoy reading English texts.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

17. I enjoy presenting my work to the others.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

18. I enjoy writing English texts.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

19. I enjoy watching films in English, without Norwegian texts.
strongly agree agree partly agree disagree strongly disagree

Which of the following methods do you learn the most from?

(Rate them on a scale from 1 to 6, 1 being the best)

Reading

Watching movies

Listening to people talking about a topic

Discussing a topic

Writing my own texts about a topic

Making my own presentation about a topic

What do you think it is going to be like to work on this Second World War project

- in English? (Write two sentences about this)

Appendix 2B

(Post-project pupil questionnaire)

Questionnaire about the Second World War project

Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø, Master in Literacy student at the University of Stavanger, would like you to answer this questionnaire. Answer as honestly as you can. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME. Your answers will be anonymous. Thank you for participating.

Mark the box that is best suited: [x]

1. I enjoyed working on this project.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

2. What I enjoyed the most during this project was:

The texts [] The films [] The writing task [] The presentation [] Classroom discussion []

3. I enjoyed presenting my chosen work to others.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

4. I enjoyed writing during this project.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

5. I enjoyed reading the texts.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

6. I enjoyed watching the films.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

7. I would like to have more projects like this.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

8. I have become more interested in World War II after working on this project.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

9. I learned a lot of new English words by working on this project.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

10. I learned a lot about the topic by working on this project.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

11. Having the opportunity to choose between several optional tasks was motivating.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

12. The texts in the project were more interesting than the texts in the textbook.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

13. Choosing my own topic for my presentation made it more interesting.

strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

14. My English has improved during this project.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

15. Learning about the topic in English was difficult.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

16. I would have learned more if the project had been in Norwegian.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

17. The texts we used were too difficult.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

18. There were too many texts.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

19. We watched too many films.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

20. The project lasted too long.
strongly agree [] agree [] partly agree [] disagree [] strongly disagree []

21. What is your opinion on learning language by using it to explore a topic?
(write **one sentence**)

22. Sum up how you experienced the project. (write **one sentence**)

Appendix 3 (Pupil interview guide)

Forskningsprosjekt om CLIL som metode brukt i engelskfaget, utført av Universitetet i Stavanger.

Miriam Orvik Gjendemsjø, Master in Literacy Studies student at the University of Stavanger.

Introduction:

I want to interview you in order to understand how you experienced this project. It will help me to understand how you perceived the project and I want to use that understanding in my master thesis. It will be entirely anonymous. Your name will not be mentioned anywhere so nobody will know who I interviewed. What you say will not be evaluated in terms of grades or anything. I am going to record this interview so I can listen to it again. Nobody else will listen to the recording. It is important for my research to understand how this project was like for you and what you and the others in your class experienced. Is there anything you would like to ask me before we begin?

Interview questions for the pupils:

Experience:

1. Can you tell me a little bit about yourself?
♫boy ♫girl
2. How was this project for you/ what do you think about it?
♫positive ♫negative
3. What did you think of the texts?
4. How were these texts compared to the ones in your English textbook?
5. What did you think of the films? (Subtitles, language, learning, motivation, interest?)
♫positive ♫negative
6. What did you think about the activities?
Reading, presentation, process-writing tasks etc. (Interest, motivation)
7. How did you experience learning about the Second World War in English?
8. How was this project compared to your regular English lessons?

Enjoyment:

9. What did you enjoy the most?
10. What type of material did you enjoy the most? (texts, films etc)
Which film? Which text or text-type/genre? Why?
11. Which activity did you enjoy the most? (Presentation, reading, films, writing)

Interest:

12. What did you find interesting? (content, film, text-materials)
13. What is your opinion on the topic? (Young people, WWII, interest?)

Benefits:

14. What did you learn during this project? (Content, language)
15. What did you learn the most from?
16. What did you think was positive?

Challenges:

17. What did you find challenging/difficult?
18. Was there anything that you would have liked to be different?

Future work:

19. Would you like to have more projects like this? Why/why not?
20. What would it be like to have instruction in English in other subject?
21. Is there anything else that you would like to add/tell me, about your experience with the project?

The questions will be asked in Norwegian, so the pupils are able to tell freely about their experiences.

Appendix 4 (Transcription of pupil presentations)

Presentations

The pupils are asked to take the time of each presentation. After the presentations the teacher asks the pupils some follow-up questions. The presentations last from 1 to 5 minutes, most between 2-2,5.

Date: 12.12.12

1. “Bente” (girl)

For this presentation about being a child during wars I interviewed my grandmother. She were only six years old when the second world war started. She told me that everything began when it came a black boat to the coast. The boat was packed with the nazists, and they were on the German’s team. They were very rasist and they hated women and Jews. My grandmother didn’t knew any Jews so she didn’t see all the pain they caused them. She lived on Hardanger on the west coast, coast. And it was seven other farms there. During the war it became a lot of new laws, and it was recommended for all children to go outside with an adult. Everyone over fifteen had to show their passport when they took the bus, and it wasn’t allowed to celebrate 17th of May. But once, my grandma and some of her friends broke the law, and, and, wore their national costumes outside. Suddenly they’ve heard a plane and they became so afraid that they hide in some bushes. But luckily they didn’t get caught. They also had ration books as the one what, that was pictured in our booklet, because it wasn’t so much food and they had to share everything very precise. It wasn’t allowed to have any weapon at home, and if you had and someone told on you, they came and got both of you and your weapon. It was also not allowed to have any, listen to radio, and if you did, and, my grandfather was arrested for three weeks because of that. The biggest difference was that everyone over fifteen had to work for the Germans. The women had to cook and clean while the boys fought. When the war ended my grandmother were eleven years old. She was on her way to a farm to buy some milk, when it came a bus and they told her that the war was over and they asked her if she wanted a free ride. Afterwards everyone was celebrating and they were so happy because the war was finally over.

Teacher: Ok, X you had a lot of work doing this. Was it nice to do this?

Pupil: Yes.

Teacher: Where does your grandmother live?

Pupil: When she was fifteen she lived on the westcoast in Hardanger.

Teacher: Does she still live there?

Pupil: No, she lives in Ålesund.

Teacher: Okay, even further up. Yeah, right. So you had to be on the phone or email or?

Pupil: Yeah. Phone.

Teacher: Yeah, what did you feel you learned about the war doing this?

Pupil: I learned very much. I didn't know so much before. So it was very interesting to hear everything, and how different it was under the war.

Teacher: Yeah, uhm, you said how old she was when the war started didn't you?

Pupil: Yes, she was six years old.

Teacher: Yeah, and then when it ended she was?

Pupil: Eleven.

Teacher: Yeah. If it had been you, do you think you would have remembered as well as she did?

Pupil: Uhm. She said she didn't remember that much. But I think sh, I think she remembers pretty much.

Teacher: Yeah. Thanks a lot x. The time? Alright.

(2 min 30 sec)

Applause

Teacher: Who's next? If I try to do this; (The projector isn't working. Turns the computer screen/pc closer to the class, because the next pupil has a pp-presentation) Now you can do your power points and people can see a little. One of the nice things about this is that in different parts of the world, from different times there are different perspectives. And this is x.

Chitchat during

Teacher: would you like to come up and sing for us?

Pupil: Yeah, can I?

Teacher: Yes please.

Pupil: Can I sit here and sing?

Teacher: If you could sing, well yes.

Pupil: It's only four letters but okay. Sings: A, B, C, D.

Teacher: Okay, now it's X.

2. “Elisabeth”:

Alright. I am going to talk about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the impact it has on children. Uh, so first, short about the conflict. Uh, this conflict is mainly about the state Israel. It started in the early 1900s and it's still not solved. The reason why there is conflict is because, both because the Palestinians and the Israeli people want to own the same piece of land. Uhm, and the Palestinians, uh, claim that they were promised to own Israel, but the Israelis say, that it's their country, and they won't give it away. Uhm. Out of the 4 million Palestinians living in the west bank in Gaza, around 53 percent is children. So, uhm, over half of the people living there are children. Ehm, they are all around the victims of the violence. Not only by being killed or injured, but also by being psychologically affected by being violence getting their friends and family and people they know. Ehm. In Israel, many children are also affected by the conflict, by living in fear of being attacked by Palestinians. Uhm, 70 percent is killed, uh, in suicide bombings, shooting and attacks on cars and buses, and also rapes, kidnappings and murders has also happened. Uh, I have some pictures here?

Teacher: It is a pity we can't show them, we have to do that later.

Pupil: Oh, okay.

Eh, there is one picture of a little boy. Standing in front of a house, that has been bombed. And that's, that picture was taken one day after a bombing of a refugee camp. And then there is one boy sitting in, a wheel-chair?

Teacher: Yes.

Pupil: And his, and his leg is crushed, he was nine years old, in this picture, and he lost his leg after a rocket exploded by accident. And then there is this picture of a fourteen year old boy, called Faris Odeh. And he used to throw stones at tents, ehm, but he was shot only ten days after this picture was taken. Ehm, so that I think, this conflict has a serious impact on children's opportunities to live as (they would really like? the sound was too low to understand the words). And that's my sources.

Applause

Teacher: That was different, now we have learned that as well. And as I said on Monday, to some of you, I am going to make a hand-in task on it's learning, in the young during the war folder. So in your pamphlets have a look if there are things that you would like to see again or that you haven't had a chance to see right now, or for discussions or for talks or whatever. Isn't that a good idea? Yes. And the time was? Okay, who's next? Don't think about her (the observer) I didn't bring my list, who has not done it? okay, that's X.

3. **“Jannicke” (girl): (*Germany During World War II: A Child's Experience* By Trudy Hamilton)**

Pupil: And now I will talk about a little girl called Trudy, In Germany during the Second World War. Ehm, the Second World War, the Second World War started in 1939, when Trudy was three years old and was already 1945 when she was nine. Eh, the Hitler and the Nazis in Germany was the reason for the war began, and they meant that the Germany's raze was more worth than the others. And they wanted Germany to be the biggest country in the world. The British and the Americans was some of the uponents to the Nazis. So in Stuttgart where Trudy lived, they often became attacked by air raids and by bombs. Eh Trudy: Trudy was very little under the Second World War, eh, and she lived with her twin sister, mother and daughter, eh and her father. Becky's father was always in the military service, so they only saw him two weeks in the year. Something I found out. Eh, she saw and experienced things, in Stuttgart like the city became bombed, to the pilots, air raids and [thirty??] She was nearly always hungry and she had no time to play. She was a very long time at school, and she was there from eight to five, five the afternoon. Ehm, air raids: Juicy Field where Trudy lived, they often became attacked by bombing. And they, and then they could hear it, see it, smell it or even see it. Ehm, there were different sounds before the attacks, so they had told them how much time they had to move into the main cellar. Ehm, and their cellar was under the apartment. And, they never knew how long time they needed to stay there. And sometimes they needed to stay there for up to eight-ätt days. Yeah, and one day, there came a bomb direct on the house. And [Incomprehensible] was not a house to live any more. And I think that Trudy and other children in Germany under the Second World War, either worked hard lives, and they had no time to lose.

Applause

Teacher: Uhm, and x in her talk about another little girl in the war, where did she live? Pupils whispering, Girl: Hardanger.

Teacher: Yes, not that far from Bergen. So who's next, x? Have you enjoyed yourself Miriam? Researcher: Yes.

Teacher: Which date is it today?

The pupils: The twelfth of the twelfth,

Teacher: All should get married today. Or have birthday today. What an easy date to remember. What if you were twelve today and in was your birthday?

Pupils: And you were born at twelve o'clock. Discuss the number twelve, and the time and so on.

Teacher: And it is a beautiful day, what a lovely weather, and the traffic has almost stopped. Okay, now it is x.

4. "Geir"

I am going to talk about being a child during the war in Vietnam. Eh, a bit about the war. Eh, the war, the Vietnam War began the first November in 1955 and ended the thirteenth of Aprils 1975, so it lasted nineteen years, and more (not understandable) Eh, the children. When I was searching for things to talk about I came across a picture. This one. And, eh, there's, eh, the girl, the one in here, she is real famous because of this picture, and she is known as the girl in the picture. Eh, the girl in the picture: Her name is Huang Tik Quan Cook, (tries to spell it out) I hope I said that right. And she was born in 1963. She is not the girl that's the girl in the picture, and the picture was taken eight of June 1972. She also won many awards for capturing the moment. Eh, and it shows how, eh, children were alone and suffered during the wars, and you can see them running away from a bomb. Eh, on the picture you can see them running away from a town, which has just been bombed by a napalm bomb. It was South Vietnam, the airplanes that bombed the city, and they had missed their target and hit that village instead. Eh, after the picture was taken, eh, the photographers and a group of soldiers, and people there, eh, took the, those children, and took them to a hospital. So that they could wound their, eh, so that they could help their wounds. Eh, the picture shows that eh, children in war have to survive and stay alive by themselves. And with little help. These children were very lucky that there were people there, and that someone could help them. Eh. All the children. Eh.(Silence) Ehm, Phong stayed at the hospital for fourteen months before she could return home. And later that year she was evacuated to America where she lives today. And some months after the war ended. She repr, she now represents the struggle that many children have to go through in the wartime. And it shows that it is possible to survive, as a child, but it's hard and it costs a lot. She lost her home and she lost her family. And she, she said in an interview that she still, eh, feels pain from that, eh, bomb, attack. That's all I have.
Applause

Teacher: Thank you.... (applause makes it impossible to hear the teacher's words).... I got really curious about that picture. The little girl in the picture. Could you say a little bit more about the picture? Could you describe what's in it?

Pupil: Ehm. The picture's taken on this dirt road. Where it's taken towards, the city. And you can see a lot of smoke and children running eh, from it, bleeding, and they're screaming.

Teacher: And could you describe her?

Pupil: In the picture, she's running towards the photographer, and she is on the left side of the road, yeah right side for her, ehm left side.

Teacher: (says something, but the voice is too low to hear). It is awful isn't it? What about the time?

Pupil: 2 minutt og 55.

Teacher. The next is? Who has not done it? Look at her classlist.

Pupil: Men eg har tenkt å bruke storskjerm.

Teacher: Yes, but that it a problem for all of you. Goes through the ones who have done it, and those who have not.

Pupil: Men eg e ikkje klar, ja men eg har ingenting med meg i dag.

Teacher: But come and say quickly what it is going to be about.

Pupil: Men eg huske ingenting.

Teacher: What is it going to be about?

Pupil: Men eg har gjort det.

Teacher: Oh, okay, I thought you said that you hadn't done it. Goes on trying to find out who has not done it.

Chatting

Teacher: Who's coming back tomorrow?

Pupil: X.

Chatting

Teacher: Kremt. Do you remember today, with the Christmas decorations? Don't touch it. A boy is going to present. But pupils are chatting. Teacher hushes on them, and says: x sorry.

5. "Raymond":

I am going to talk about the Vietnam War. I am going to talk a little bit about children suffering and some about the facts of the war. Yeah, it was of course in Vietnam and around that area. It was a military conflict, which meant that it was the American who started the war, and they yeah, attacked Vietnam, and yeah, in Vietnam, and they, yeah, it began the 1st November 1965. The war was like ended in thirteenth April 1975. The Vietnam, the Vietnamese was supported by the communists, so the Americans was like the non-communists. The location was taken place in South-Vietnam, North-Vietnam and ehm, Cambodia. The North-Vietnamese won the great Vietnam War, and, because the Americans like forfeited, or like backed off. And there exactly is a, like a memorial stone in the USA where all of the people who died are all, not just from the Americans, who died. Uhm, children suffering the war. Ehm, there is this picture which I think X was explaining about, these children running towards the came-ra, and there is like a bomb behind them. And it is pretty horrible I think because, yeah, one of them had like no clothes, because she was like burned, in the back too. So it was really horrible. And there's uhm, there there is another one where they are helping the ones that are hurting really bad. Uhm, and these are the sources I used, uhm, Wikipedia and , yeah.

Applause

Teacher: Uhm, okay, thank you. Uhm, X why did you want to talk about the childrens' suffers during the Vietnam War?

Pupil: Uhm, It sounded exciting, and I didn't know so much about it, so I wanted to learn more.

Teacher: Yeah, isn't it a bit difficult, to understand how it started, who was against who, it is a bit complex this conflict. What do you think that you learned from this, from working with this presentation?

Pupil: Ehm, what I learned?

Teacher: x and x, again! (Someone chatting)

Pupil: I think I learned about a little bit more about Vietnam and what it was like to be children in the war.

Teacher: Do you know where Cambodia is? Is it a person or a country?

Pupil: Yeah, I think it is a town or a country. It is not very..

Teacher: Yeah, yeah, thanks a lot. And now, ehm... X?

Pupil: Koffor kan ikkje x gjøre det? Kan ikkje x? Ja, men han e også klar.

Teacher: X! X! (Discussing which ones of them should do it)

Pupil: Menne, krig e jo alltid en sånn derre ting då.

Teacher: Just try to talk English all this time. By the way, X it is you, because I asked you to do it this other day and you refused, so you can come and do it now. Sorry, sit down. (This other boy is going to do it instead now).

Chatting a lot

Teacher: Everyone quiet now.

Whispering pupils

6. "Birger":

I am going to talk about how it was to be young during the Vietnam War. Childrens; Many childrens got killed during the War, some lost their family and had to live by their own. They did often live on the streets and did not have anywhere to go. They had to survive on their own. Homeless children; homeless children had often no family to take care of them, and they, they lived on the street, and they had to do their best to survival. The reason why the Vietnam was that they had to escape from?. Their houses or the houses maybe bombed or destroyed. There is a picture of a boy maybe dead, holding the hand of a little girl, maybe his

sister, ? on the street. (talking in a very low voice) Ehm, I think that it was unfair, that children at my age and younger had to, were forced to kill people. ?. It must have been terrible for them. Ehm, refùgees; Under the war, and all people that had escaped from the war, because of the bad conditions people couldn't survive any longer. They were starving, and were sick, they became refùgees in their own country. At least some were lucky and get out of the ? place. Others, had to get help from friends and family to get out. The refugees did immigrate to other countries all around the world. Yeah, many kids had to suffer a great deal, some survived some did not. It was a terrible war. Many lives were lost, it was bad, many were killed or were forced to kill. Takk. Yeah.

Applause

Teacher: What was your most important source?

Pupil: Pictures I found.

Teacher: The pictures you found, okay. You chose a picture, of two kids sleeping, holding hands sleeping in the street. Why did you pick that picture? What did it express?

Pupil: Ehm, it express ehm, the war for everyone, the conditions, and how it was to ?

Teacher: Why did you want to do a presentation on children of this war? Was it because it was easy to find the location or was it because you were curious of that war?

Pupil: ?

Teacher: Are you happy you did it?

Pupil: Yes.

Teacher: What would you chose if you could chose again?

Pupil: I don't know.

Teacher: Something about the war today or?

Pupil: I don't know.

End of the lesson

Presentations 14.12.12

Could anyone take the time?

Pupil: Eg kan gjørr det eg kan gjør det. Ok, ein to tri.

7. “Ommund” (boy):

I am going to talk about Willy, from the movie ‘Goodnight Mr. Tom’. I chose to talk about him because we saw the movie and I know about him and his life. Ehm, the movie were in the Second World War, from 1939 to 1945. Willy was evacuated from London to a small town, with many children. Because it was too dangerous for children to live in London because German were bombing them. The kids had to use a gas mask in London. Mr. Tom he did not take care on a child. But after a while, he met Willy, he came from a broken home, and his mom he beaten him with a belt, and his mother he was, she was very sick, and he killed herself. Uhm, Willy was lucky, ehm Tom he taught toought, took, took good care of Will. He learned him to read and write. And Willy loved this small town, and he made many good friends.

Applause

Teacher: It was very good for us X, to be reminded of Willy again. It has been so long since we saw him. So thanks for doing that. Ehm, why did you want to have your, to do your mini-talk about him? Why did you decide to do your mini-talk about him?

Pupil: First I know a little bit about him.

Teacher: What do you think about him as a person, as a boy? If you imagine, he was a small one then, if he had been fourteen now what do you think he would have been like?

Pupil: ??? (Speaks too low.)

Teacher: Do you think it was good for him to be evacuated or do you think it was bad for him?

Pupil: Good.

Teacher: Why was that so good?

Pupil: Because he wasn’t taken care of.

Teacher: And, yeah, he wasn’t taken well care of at home was he? No, because you explained about his mother. What do you think of Tom, Tom Oakley, the old man? Was he a typically a very nice man? What do you think about him?

Pupil: He was nice?

Teacher: Yeah, but he was a bit scary in the beginning wasn’t he?

Pupil: Yes.

Teacher: Okay. Thanks anyway. Thanks x.

Pupils: Eg hadde 1.30 min. Eg hadde 1 minutt.

Teacher: Okay, thanks a lot. Now next is, on my list, uhm. X.

8. “Rune” (boy): (British-like accent)

Under this presentation I am going to talk about children in Afghanistan. Contents; I will talk about the war in Afghanistan, children fighting, civilian victims and young experience. Why I chose to talk about this subject; is because I think it is very interesting, and I wanted to learn more about it. The war; the war in Afghanistan started 7th October 2001. Once the USA invaded Afghanistan in a military operation, their assignment was to kill the terrorist Osama Bin Laden and his terror network Al Qaida. They also wanted to destroy Taliban, who controlled the country, and protect it, from Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaida. Children fighting; only 40 percent of Afghanistan’s population has jobs. That means the children need to help to provide food and money for the family. The children were forced to fight and join the military or the police, it was the only way they could help the family. But there was a rule that said that if you were under eighteen you couldn’t join the military. The children faked NIC-cards, that stands for National Identity Cards, who shows them who they are and how old they are, and they increased their age. Civilian victims; lots of, there has been lots of civilian deaths. Over the past six years there has been killed twelve thousand seven hundred and ninety three civilians. Most of them died in suicide bombing or were killed by the Afghanistan military or US military. Young experience; Lots of the children had a very difficult time, a hard life, their family has been killed, they have no parents, and they live all alone. Lots of them that, their only hope to survive is to join the military. Here you can see a picture of a child that’s just someone that is very close to it. These are the sources I have used to find my information for this presentation. Thanks for listening.

Applause

Teacher: Hugh thanks to you then. Thanks a lot X.

Pupil commenting: Bra X.

Teacher: It just shows you how, this wide span of what you are doing now first the Second World War and Willy, and now towards today’s situation in Afghanistan. And you said that you wanted to do it because you thought it was interesting and that you wanted to learn more. What in particular do you feel you have learned, something important that you learned from working with it?

Pupil: I learned about the children’s problems, how they have it in the war. How it has effected lives and..

Teacher: Uhm, any of the things you show, was there any picture that you remember choosing, that there was something special about a picture?

Pupil: The last picture, the one with the sad child, who was crying because I think he had lost someone very close to him, his mother or father or family.

Teacher: Yeah, so pictures can tell a lot obviously. Is there anything you would like to say, your own opinion about these things?

Pupil: I think that, now on the news for a while ago, the USA just went out of Afghanistan, so the war is over now. So I think that it was not good that the USA invaded Afghanistan.

Teacher: Or the NATO, I think it was NATO wasn't it? But they are the biggest. So why do you think that it was not good?

Pupil: Because they didn't achieve anything. They just killed lots of people.

Teacher: When we think about the war in Afghanistan, because I think that there were someone else who talked about Afghanistan who was that?(another boy), and he mentioned girls. So what do you think of the faith of girls in Afghanistan?

Pupil: I don't think that girls are allowed to go to school there, they have less rights than the men.

Teacher: And who is, is it the Taliban or is it?

Pupil: Yes the Taliban.

Teacher: But you had to have another focus of course, you chose different things to focus on. I find that interesting, so thanks to you today, and thanks to everyone. I just (checking her list, writing notes). And now the next one is X. No, sorry I have to make a change, it is X, because he has to go outside later. Could you, I don't want to hear any small sounds from the corner over there.

9. "Jan" (boy): (Doesn't seem prepared)

I am going to talk about the children during the war in Afghanistan. I chose to talk about this because I wanted to learn more things about this war, and how children lived during the war. Ehm, okay, the war started 7th of October 2001, and.. Ehm. Yeah, and the children had to work to get some food for the family. And a lot of children had lost their family because of the bombs in Afghanistan, and.. Ehm.. Eg komme ikkje på så mye meir.

Teacher: Would you say a little bit about why you started making the presentation about these children, why was that?

Pupil: Because, ehm, it was really interesting, to learn how children lived during the war, and how they suffer without their family and yeah.

Teacher: And this is actually what you found out as well when you studied it. So, ehm, did you read about one boy or girl or.. ?

Pupil: No, I just read about ehm, how children lived in Afghanistan.

Teacher: Yeah, and now of course X has just talked about it. Do you have any hopes for the future for these children?

Pupil: That their life will get much better, and they can get to school.

Teacher: Anything else you would like to tell us? It doesn't have to be facts you remember you know. Do you have thoughts in general about children being young during war, I mean what is that like, to be young, your age, when there's a war raging around you?

Pupil: Well , if I would have been in the war, then I would have been really scared and, ehm, yeah.

Applause

Pupils discussing their presentations in Norwegian, and mentioning grades.

10. "Leidulf":

Pupil: Skal eg begynne? Ready? (starts to speak but gets interrupted)

Teacher: Yes, you may.

Why I choose to talk about the young during Second World War, was because I was interested to know more about the world war and ?... Some about the facts about World War, nei, war, ups, War was global on the war and it involved almost every nation in the world. It started in 193, nei, it started in 1939 and it ended in 1935. (probably meant 1945). The war was ended allies where there was just (?). Seventy million died, and fifty of this, of those nei, fifty millions were civilians. Children under second world war; the war.... (not understandable). Stops talking:

The pupils start talking, another interruption

Teacher: No he is good, he copes well with things happening, now you can continue.

Pupil: Okay. Millions of children were evacuated from their home and families. And they were mostly... with trades. (I couldn't understand).. Uhm. Children were under great (Gas mask lessons?).... Uhm.. In the war there were a lots of air raids bomb the ?, and the children lived in fear almost every day. And some days they lived in air raid cellars. And eh, when the bombs comes they would take the gas masks or mickey mouse masks so it wouldn't be so scary for them. Here is a picture of the toys the children had, you can see uhm, the kids playing uhm 'LUDO'? Here are my sources, thanks..

Teacher: It is actually called Ludo (in a positive tone)

X, what made you do this? About the young during the second world war? What made you choose this?

Pupil: Because, I heard some, eller, I knew some things before and I wanted to learn more.

Teacher: That was really interesting. Was it, humh? Was there any of the pictures that you had, that you think was extra good for the power point presentation. Can you remember the picture? Was it the Mickey Mouse gas mask or was it another one?

Pupil: Yeah, gas mask.

Teacher: Why did you pick that picture?

Pupil: I guess, that, I don't know. I guess that I, kan eg sei det bare på norsk?

Teacher: English please, you are so good at that.

Pupil: I don't know.

Teacher: But that is fair enough. Anything else that you would like to say?

Pupil: Uhm, this was scary.

Teacher: Well, thanks for doing it.

Applause

Chit chat

Teacher, and then X. Before we go on it is really important that you are quiet, take your feet down from there. You wanted to do it again?

Pupil (boy): Yeah.

Teacher: Oh, then it will have to wait, sorry, I didn't concentrate. Thanks for being so willing... You are doing it without a power point.

11. "Iris" (girl) :

I chose to talk about children during Second World War because I wanted to learn more about it. The Second World War was started by Adolf Hitler, because he wanted to expand the German borders. The Nazis wanted to exterminate all of the Jews and Gypsies to get a white Arian raze. Ehm, when Hitler was elected to be the Germany's prime minister he made .. some, his .. Every Jew had to wear a golden star on their jacket so they could easily be identified as being Jews. Ehm, a lot of Jewz moved from Germany and Austria before the war started. Ehm, during the war people were gathered in concentration camps. The children were separated from the adults, where they later on were sent to the gas chambers. Those who spoke Jewish or didn't speak a lot of the language had to be hidden. Children were kept in the cellars and attics where they had to keep quiet. Some of them even lived in chicken shops or ... That means that during the bombing Jewish children had to remain hidden. Thousands of Jewish children survived the Holocaust because they were protected by people with another religion. Berlin Catholics hid hundreds of children in their homes, schools and orphanages. When the World War Two began in September in 1939, there were about one point eight million Jewish children, and when the war ended, one to one point five Jewish children, nei, one to one point five million Jewish were dead, that means that only eight percent of Europe's Jewish children survived.

Applause

Teacher: X, that was actually a big shock what you told me, that only about eight percent survived. That's many children right? So that was your special focus, and I noticed you talked about the racist ideology. So what made you decide to make a presentation about this?

Pupil: We learned about the Second World War, and I wanted to learn more about it.

Teacher: And why the Jewish children more than the rest?

Pupil: Maybe because, the Nazis wanted to kill them more than the other children?

Teacher: Do you think it was worth while studying this and doing this, was it useful for you? What do you think is the most important thing you learned from this? Or maybe the most interesting thing about it?

Pupil: Ehm, that only eight percent survived.

Teacher: Because somebody wanted them to die. How long ago was this, the war, the Second World War?

A different pupil, boy: Nearly seventy years ago?

Teacher: Yeah, roughly seventy years ago, roughly. Okay, thanks a lot x.

Okay, next is, X. Shh.

Chit chat

Teacher: You are quiet now, aren't you?

12. "Espen" (boy):

I am going to talk about a Norwegian group of children during World War Two. I was checking a lot of fact websites, but I didn't find that much, and it was always different things, so I just took one, and I got these and it wasn't that much but. The World, uhm, the World War Two started in Norway on Tuesday 9th of April in 1940. Ehm, on that day, there was fly, ehm, the Germans dropped flying letters to the Norwegian telling them to, that the Germans would keep them safe from the English men. And already that day, the children were sent to school, ehm, but the schools were closed and the children didn't know what was going on so they were sent back home. So lots of people got happy maybe lots of people got sad. And already on that first day Bergen got bombed, because that was a very important place for the Englishmen, they imported, they used ships to get, to get.. and stuff like that. Uhm. The children didn't understand so much of what was going on. And they were, they weren't that sure of what was going on. Many children uhm got killed, uhm, in these days, and there were also many killed, that got killed in the first days. Uhm, the German had no war experience, so they weren't that good, and when the Norwegian resisted and started to fight back, uhm, the

Germans started to uhm, abuse the children and the women, and got very aggres..
(Pronounced in Norwegian then corrects himself), aggressive and started to kill a lot of Norwegians. Ehm, the, all, everyday lots of children in Norway experienced bombing and flight alerts. Eh, and there was a lot and almost every day. That was all I got. Thanks for listening.

Applause

Teacher: Okay, X, did you talk to any people about this? Did you discuss it with anyone?

Pupil: No.

Teacher: I guess in your textbook there wasn't very much about children or younger people either. Do you have any thoughts about why there is so little about children during the war?

Pupil: Because, it was not that much children that did stop, they were just getting the Jewish, the kids. And there wasn't actually not that important.

Teacher: Mhm, and what do you think about that?

Pupil: Uhm, I think it is kind of bad that they have got such little facts because the children was also a part of the World War Two. So they, there should be more about the children.

Teacher: (addressing the researcher: Do you agree?)

Researcher: Yes, I am kind of fascinated about all your thoughts about..

Teacher: Yeah, I think actually a lot of grownups would have taken great interest in listening to you, in these lessons. I think a lot of grownups would have been amazed about what you have found out, that they haven't thought about. Yeah, how long was it by the way?

Pupils: To sytten.

Teacher: Yeah, on my list, is there anyone now who has not done it, apart from X? All of you in here, you have all done it now? Is that right?

Pupils: Yes

Teacher: X, you wanted to do it again, and we have time. Is there anyone else that wants to do it again today? On Monday you are going to get your, term tests back with a mark and with some comments.

Pupil: Ka tid får me dette her då?

Teacher: I think you get this on Monday too. And this is because Monday is the only lesson I have got together with you.

Pupil: Men får du bedre om du gjør det igjen?

Teacher: Sorry?

Pupil: Do you get credits if you do?

Teacher: I remember we talked a little about it the last time, but I am not sure, I have to think about it. But I think that X really felt that the wanted to communicate this in another way to you. Okay X.

13. “Finn” (boy):

Hi. Today I am going to talk about the Vietnam War, and the childrens, yeah. So how did the war begin? The war begin after the World War Two, when the North-Vietnam wanted to be a communist and the South-Vietnam wanted to be very liberal. So it started, uhm, a civil war. Ehm, the war began as a civil war, but years later ehm, the US they joined ehm, and teamed with the South-Vietnam to help Vietnam because the US didn't want to, didn't want that Vietnam was going to be a communist. And the China joined, teamed up with the North-Vietnam because the China didn't want ehm, Vietnam to be a liberal, ehm, ehm, yeah. So how did the children have it? Ehm, many childrens had to escape from Vietnam because there were lots of bombing and lots of soldiers attacking the villagers. Here you can see a famous picture, it is a girl, uhm, that, ehm, is walking in the street, because ehm, in the background you can see a napalm bomb that the South-Vietnam ehm, missed and bombed the South of Vietnam because they missed the target. Here you can see some young ehm, kids that are, ehm, in the military. And here you can see uhm, a picture of childrens that eh, are escaping from the Vietnam. A lots of Vietnam had to travel with boats to eh, Norway and US because they were getting, pretty much eh, bombed and attacked a lot. So the war ended by that the North eh,-Vietnam took over the South-Vietnam. Thanks for listening.

Applause

Teacher: Thanks a lot X. How long was it? Okay, see you later.

14. “Ingebjørg” (girl):

I am going to talk about my grandfather because he was a child during World War Two in Norway, and when the war started he was five years old and it lasted ten years time. Ehm, when the war began an German officer came to their house and took over. So he, they just came in and said that they wanted to live there. So, seventeen soldiers moved up in the second floor in their house. And in the house from before, there lived a family of five, my grandfather, his brother, mother and father and then his grandmother. And also eh, a couple that lives not far away had to, come over to them because German soldiers came and took over their house too. So totally in their house they were twenty-four people, so there was a lot of people in their house. Ehm, Germans lived there two years because they wanted to build a military camp. And, they had to be very careful of what they said and what they did so that they didn't say anything wrong. My grandfather wasn't really afraid of the Germans because they were really nice, and they had kids themselves, so, they know, ehm, so he went up and talked to them a lot and became good friends. And very often they would play cards when

they were up there. And once when he was up there and playing cards with them, one guy asked him: do you love Hitler? And then he didn't know what to say because, eh, he wasn't supposed to say that he loved him. And then he asked him again: do you love Hitler? And then he said: No. So, the German soldier got a little bit mad, and threw him into the hallway and asked him again: do you love Hitler? And once again he said: No, I do not love Hitler. So he just pushed him down the stairs, so he fell. And my grandma got really worried because the Germans could just eh, come down and kill them if they wanted to, because they had a lot of guns, but nothing happened so it was okay. Uhm, but that was only one of many stories, because he has told me a lot of them. And he has also written them down.

Applause

Teacher: Okay. So that soldier pushed your grandfather, because he said no. Have you been talking about your grandfather about this or, is he still alive?

Pupil: Yeah, I was talking to him.

Teacher: Where does he live?

Pupil: In Sunnmøre.

Teacher: Uhm, can you tell us a little about the place where he grew up? The area?

Pupil: Yes. They don't have neighbors, it's like in the middle of nowhere. But it is by the coast so it was very central for the Germans to come there because it was very easy to get to other places. Eh, and they could, they were able to build things there.

Teacher: Could I just ask you the name of the place, I'm just curious?

Pupil: Årang.

Teacher: Årang, I have been there. There are a few more houses there now, then. Have you been there?

Pupil: Yeah.

Teacher: Could you see things there that the Germans built during the war?

Pupil: There are some ruins, just right over.

Teacher: Okay, thanks a lot, anything else you would like to say about this? No? Okay, thanks for doing it. Could I just ask you one thing, because you have been away for so long, I am not sure uhm, how much, you have maybe heard here and so on. So what do you know about the Second World War? Do you feel you know a lot or? Maybe about how long ago, and who started the war and so on?

Pupil: Yes, the Germans were the ones who started the war around seventy years ago.

Teacher: Why were the Germans in Norway? Do you know? Because several of you have talked about grandparents or a great grandfather who remember Germans moving into their

area. But why were they here? (Silent) Did we invite them to come here? Did they come because we wanted them to come? Or? Well, they came and took the country didn't they? Because they thought they needed it, and they thought they needed it to grow stronger, and to become more powerful and to have more control over things that they needed for their industry, things that were good for ship traffic, and so on. So we were invaded. (Silent) Do you know what an invasion is? Can you imagine an invasion, what happens when one invades? Does someone know what that's about? Has that got anything to do with the war or not with the war?

Pupil: De bare kommer og tar det.

Teacher: Yes, they just came and take over. Taking over power in a country. Taking control of a country even if they don't want you to. Well, thanks to all of you, it has been absolutely brilliant. During the lesson we are going to do more than one thing, we are going to, you are going to get your term tests back. And with some comments, and I am really, really, sorry if my handwriting is not good because I write with a small pencil.

Hands out term tests with grades and feedback, lesson ends