University of Stavanger

Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTER'S THESIS

Study programme: MLIMAS Master in Literacy Studies Advanced teacher education for levels 8-13, specializing in English and the humanities	Spring semester, 2018 Open
Author: Hilde Holmen Brattetveit	………………………………… (signature author)
Supervisor: Ion Drew	
Title of thesis: A study of EFL reading instruction at the upper secondary level in Norway	
Keywords: EFL reading EFL reading instruction Reading materials Reading strategies Reading motivation Upper secondary level	No. of pages: 115 + appendices/other: 21 Stavanger, 11 May, 2018

Abstract

This qualitative study has investigated the teaching and learning of reading in English in five Norwegian upper secondary schools. More precisely, the study has focused on teachers' and pupils' experiences of reading instruction from the mandatory Vg1 English course in the Programmes for General Studies, with Specialisation in General Studies and Specialisation in Sport and Physical Education. The aim was to find out how reading was taught in these EFL upper secondary classes, with a focus on what, how, and how much the pupils in these classes read English, whether they were helped to develop reading strategies in English, and to what extent the pupils' motivation to read English was taken into consideration by their teachers.

The study incorporated five teachers from five different upper secondary schools and a group of five or six of their pupils. The teachers were interviewed using individual, semi-structured interviews and the five groups of pupils, 27 altogether, were interviewed using focus group interviews. The validity of the study was increased by including both the teachers' and the pupils' perspectives.

In terms of what the pupils read, four of the five participating teachers employed textbooks widely in their lessons. Many of the teachers reported using the textbook extensively despite not being content with its quality or noting that it was outdated. In addition to reading the textbook, four of the five teachers assigned one novel for their pupils to read during the Vg1 English course, and only one teacher assigned more than one novel for them to read. Moreover, the pupils reported not being able to choose reading materials themselves. Four of the five interviewed teachers were dissatisfied or unaware of the selection of English books at their respective school library and only a few pupils at one of the schools reported using their school library. In sum, relatively little reading was required by the pupils in all but one of the participating classes.

In terms of how the pupils read, the research showed that three of the teachers allowed their pupils to spend much time reading individually in class. Pupils from all but one of the classes were also allowed to read or work with texts in pairs or in groups in class. Pupils reading aloud was not a common practice in the participating teachers' classes. On the other hand, playing texts on audio files, mainly textbook texts, was an activity that was used to a great extent by all the interviewed teachers. One of the teachers also reported reading aloud to her pupils.

The research further showed that none of the teachers reported teaching reading strategies explicitly. There was also varying and limited focus on reading strategies in the lessons.

Surface-level strategies were generally focused on more than deep-processing strategies. Hence, the majority of the pupils in the study were only helped to develop reading strategies to a little extent.

The interviews also revealed that the pupils' motivation to read was not sufficiently taken into consideration by the teachers in most of the classes. The majority of the teachers only had a few ideas about how to accommodate for their pupils' motivation to read. Additionally, they did not seem to take the pupils' wishes about reading into consideration. Many of the pupils wished to be able to choose reading materials themselves and to read more interesting texts in order to increase their motivation to read, but were not given the opportunity to do so.

This thesis has added to the research on reading in English at the upper secondary level in Norway by shedding light on what and how pupils are instructed to read in the Vg1 English course. The study has also incorporated the teachers' consideration of their pupils' motivation to read English. It has approached the topic from a much wider range of perspectives than related studies of EFL reading at this level. The thesis has also contributed to knowledge about whether and how the teaching of reading in English at the upper secondary level has evolved after *LK06*. The current study, although limited in scope, indicates that the teaching of EFL reading at the upper secondary level in Norway has not evolved as positively during the *LK06* period as might have been expected.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Ion Drew, for his invaluable guidance, insight, and time in the process of writing this thesis.

Secondly, I would like to express my gratitude to the teachers and pupils who have contributed in this study. I am grateful that they took time out of their busy schedules to share their experiences and insights. Without their cooperation this study would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The present study

The present thesis is based on a qualitative study of the teaching and learning of reading in English as a foreign language (EFL) in Norwegian upper secondary classes. The study has focused on upper secondary teachers' and pupils' experiences and perspectives of reading from the mandatory Vg1 (11th grade in Norway) English subject. The study incorporated five teachers from five different upper secondary schools and a group of five or six of each of their pupils. The teachers were interviewed using individual, semi-structured interviews and the five groups of pupils were interviewed using focus group interviews. The study aimed to examine how reading was taught in EFL upper secondary classes, with a focus on what, how, and how much the pupils in these classes read in English, whether they were helped to develop reading strategies in English, and to what extent the pupils' motivation to read in English was taken into consideration.

Reading strategies are deliberate, conscious actions that a reader selects in order to reach a reading goal. In contrast, reading skills are automatic actions that occur automatically. Reading strategies that have been practised extensively can become automatic, and hence become reading skills. The reading fluency and efficacy inherent in reading skills makes this a desired outcome (Afflerbach et al. 2008: 368).

1.2 Background

The results from the 2000 international OECD PISA surveys showed that Norwegian pupils scored poorly in reading (Roe 2006: 68). The numbers showed significant discrepancies in reading proficiency within classes, and not between classes or schools. Hellekjær (2007) claims this is symptomatic of a systematic failure in the teaching of reading in Norway. More of the weaker readers were left behind in Norway than in comparable countries. Reports following the PISA surveys show that Norwegian schools traditionally have not taught reading after the first reading instruction in the lower grades and stated a need for more knowledge about a 'second reading instruction' (Roe 2006: 69).

According to Hellekjær (2007), many Norwegian pupils also struggle with reading in English. In his 2005 doctoral study, Hellekjær investigated the English reading proficiency of upper secondary and university students in Norway. Hellekjær found that two thirds of his sample of 177 upper secondary pupils did not obtain good enough reading scores on a

language test to qualify for admission to a British university. He also found that Norwegian pupils read very little because very little reading was required in the EFL curriculum in force at the time.

Many of the pupils in upper secondary school in Norway will go on to study at university level. Because Norway is a small language community, English reading materials are widely used in higher education and in business. Thus, it is crucial for pupils' success in higher education, and later in their professional lives, that they can read and extract knowledge from English texts (Hellekjær 2008: 1).

Norwegian pupils' weak scores in reading started a national debate about Norwegian pupils' reading competence. Many projects and strategies were introduced to improve the reading skills and motivation in Norwegian schools (Roe 2006: 68-69). One of the outcomes was the introduction of five basic skills in the 2006 national curriculum (Hellekjær 2007: 25). In the current Norwegian national curriculum, *Læreplan Kunnskapsløftet 2006*, hereafter, *LK06*[1], reading is listed as one of the five basic skills together with oral skills, writing, digital skills, and numeracy. These skills are to be integrated in all subjects in *LK06*. Thus, reading is considered a core skill that should be central to all taught subjects in the Norwegian school (*Framework for Basic Skills* 2012).

With the introduction of *LK06* came not only the basic skills that required more focus on reading, also in English, but a new, ambitious EFL syllabus. The competency aims after Vg1 include aims for reading, ways of reading, and critical reading in English. One of the competency aims reads 'Evaluate and use suitable reading and writing strategies adapted for the purpose and type of text' (*English subject curriculum* 2013). Hence, pupils are required to adjust the way they read to the reading material and the reading purpose, which demands knowledge, on the part of teachers and pupils, of L2 reading, reading strategies, and motivation to read.

1.3 The aims of the study

The present study aims to shed light on the given teachers' and pupils' experiences and perspectives of teaching and learning reading in the Vg1 English subject. Because reading is emphasised as a basic skill in *LK06*, along with an ambitious EFL syllabus, it is natural to

---

[1] *LK06* was revised in 2013. The revision brought about changes to the subject curricula in five subjects, including English. The five basic skills were emphasised in the revised subject curricula. In the English subject curriculum, the competence aims have been revised, and the subject area 'Communication' has been divided into 'Oral communication' and 'Written communication' (*Veiledning til læreplan i engelsk* 2015).

assume that reading, reading strategies, and motivation to read are given high priority in Vg1 English classes. The study thus addresses the following research questions:

- What and how much do the pupils read in English in five Norwegian EFL upper secondary classes?
- How do the pupils in these five classes read English?
- Are the pupils in these classes helped to develop reading strategies in English in order to improve comprehension skills? If so, how?
- To what extent is pupils' motivation to read English taken into consideration by the teachers?

The present thesis adds to the research on EFL reading at the upper secondary level in Norway by studying the phenomenon from the perspectives of the teachers and the pupils. In addition to shedding light on what and how pupils are instructed to read in the Vg1 English course and whether they are taught reading strategies in English, the study incorporates the teachers' consideration of their pupils' motivation to read English. The thesis also contributes to knowledge about whether and how the teaching of reading in English at the upper secondary level has evolved after the introduction of *LK06*.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides background information about the Norwegian school system, the current curriculum, *The Knowledge Promotion* (*LK06*), the English subject curriculum, and the status of English in Norway. Chapter 3 presents relevant literature about reading with focus on reading in a second language (L2), teaching and learning L2 reading, reading strategies, and reading motivation. Moreover, the chapter includes an overview of related research in Norway. Chapter 4 describes the qualitative methods used to gather data for the present thesis, namely semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews. In addition, the chapter provides information about the sample, the measures taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the study, as well as ethical considerations. Chapter 5 presents the results of the research. Here, the data that was obtained in the interviews with the teachers and pupils are presented. Following the results, the data is discussed in Chapter 6. The discussion is structured in four sections, relating to the four research questions, along with implications, recommendations, and the limitations of the present study. Finally, Chapter 7 summarises and concludes the thesis, with suggestions for further research.

2.0 Background

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will start by giving a short overview of the Norwegian school system in section 2.2. The current national curriculum, *The Knowledge Promotion*, is addressed in section 2.3. Section 2.4 focuses on reading in the English subject curriculum, mainly in Vg1, the first year of upper secondary school in Norway. Finally, a short description of the status of English in Norway is added in section 2.5.

2.2 The Norwegian school system

Norwegian pupils start school at age six. For the first ten years they are enrolled in compulsory school, which consists of primary school, from first to seventh grade, and lower secondary school, from grades eight to ten. Enrolment in primary and lower secondary school is mandatory. Most pupils then attend upper secondary school for three years. These three years, grades 11 to 13, are referred to as Vg1, Vg2, and Vg3. Upper secondary education is not mandatory in Norway. However, all pupils who have completed ten years of compulsory school have the right to three years of upper secondary education (*Education* 2016: 12). The pupils can choose between two main programmes when they apply for upper secondary school, either the Programmes for General Studies or the Vocational Education Programmes. The Programmes for General Studies include Specialisation in General Studies, Sport and Physical Education, and Music, Dance and Drama. These programmes lead to general university admissions certification (*Education* 2016: 12-13). Pupils interested in the Vocational Education Programmes can choose from nine different programmes, for example the Programme for Building and Construction or the Programme for Health and Social Care. The Vocational Education Programmes primarily lead to a craft or a journeyman's certificate. The pupils enrolled in the Vocational Education Programmes normally sit their craft or journeyman's examination after two years in school and two years of apprenticeship in an enterprise. The pupils in General Studies sit their final examinations after three years in school (*Education* 2016: 12-13).

2.3 *The Knowledge Promotion*

In 2006, the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research issued the current national curriculum, *The Knowledge Promotion* (*LK06*). *LK06* replaced the previous curricula *L97*, for

compulsory school, and *R94*, for upper secondary school, and is thereby the first curriculum to cover both compulsory school and upper secondary school in Norway (*Knowledge Promotion* 2006: 3). *LK06* includes the core curriculum, principles of education, distribution of teaching hours per subject, and subject syllabi. *LK06* contains new subject syllabi for all subjects and a new distribution of teaching hours. In addition, teachers and schools have gained more freedom locally when it comes to work methods and teaching materials, compared to the previous curricula (*Knowledge Promotion* 2006: 3).

An important feature of *LK06* is the introduction of five basic skills: oral skills, being able to express oneself in writing, being able to read, numeracy, and digital skills. These skills are considered a foundation for all learning and are to be integrated in all subjects in *LK06*. This implies that all teachers must accommodate for pupils to develop the basic skills in all subjects (*Knowledge Promotion* 2006: 7). The background for the implementation of the five basic skills was the results from the 2000 OECD PISA surveys. The results were published in 2001 and showed that Norwegian pupils scored poorly in reading and mathematics (Lie et al. 2001: 277). The weak scores were disappointing in light of the high standard of living in Norway and resulted in increased focus on the basic skills.

LK06 was revised in 2013. The revision brought about changes to the subject curricula in five subjects, including English. The five basic skills were emphasised in the revised subject curricula. In the English subject curriculum, the competence aims were revised, and the subject area 'Communication' was divided into 'Oral communication' and 'Written communication' (*Veiledning til læreplan i engelsk* 2015: 1, *English subject curriculum* 2013).

2.4 The English subject curriculum

The *LK06* English subject curriculum is a unified, coherent curriculum that covers grades one to 11, where English is a compulsory subject. *LK06* contains information about purpose, main subject areas, teaching hours, basic skills, competence aims, and assessment. The purpose section functions as a rationale for English as a school subject. It deals with why Norwegian pupils need to learn English, how one can learn English, and what pupils will learn in addition to the language itself. Reading is mentioned a few times in the rationale and it is viewed as both a means and an end to learning English. The curriculum states that 'The subject shall help build up general language proficiency through listening, speaking, reading and writing' (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 2). This reflects the view that reading can be a means or a tool to learn the English language. The view that one needs to read in order to learn English is

also expressed elsewhere in the purpose section: 'Language learning occurs while encountering a diversity of texts.' It is suggested that in order to learn a language, pupils should read many different types of texts and genres. An example of how reading is viewed as an end or an aim in itself is reflected in the following statement: 'Literary texts in English can instil a lifelong joy of reading and a deeper understanding of others and oneself' (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 2). It is clear in the curriculum that reading is considered valuable to pupils and is considered to encourage personal growth.

The four main subject areas in the English subject curriculum are Language learning, Oral communication, Written communication, and Culture, society and literature. These are all represented in the competence aims throughout compulsory and upper secondary school and thereby reflect a common thread in the subject curriculum, with aims that build on competence aims from previous years. The main subject area Language learning focuses on the pupils' metacognitive awareness: the pupils should have insight into their own language learning and be able to select language learning strategies that suit them. The subject area Oral communication deals with communicating in English and applying 'suitable communication strategies' (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 3). Written communication is the subject area that most directly deals with reading and reading strategies. Again, reading is described as a means and also as an end itself. This is illustrated in the following excerpt: 'The main subject area includes reading a variety of different texts in English to stimulate the joy of reading, to experience greater understanding and to acquire knowledge' (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 3). Here, reading to stimulate 'the joy of reading' is considered important and an end in itself. Furthermore, reading is also seen as a tool to gain knowledge about different topics. The subject area Culture, society and literature focuses on cultural understanding. In this respect, it indirectly deals with reading, which becomes a tool to gain understanding as 'The main subject area involves working with and discussing expository texts, literary texts' (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 4).

The English subject curriculum lists the teaching hours for primary school, lower secondary level, Programmes for General Studies and Vocational Education Programmes. Vg1 in the Programmes for General Studies has 140 teaching hours a year. The Vocational Education Programmes have 140 teaching hours spread over two years, which means 84 teaching hours in Vg1 and 56 teaching hours in Vg2.

The curriculum also includes a description of how each of the five basic skills is understood in the English subject. 'Being able to read' in English is described as understanding and acquiring knowledge through reading. Reading strategies are also

emphasised in the description of reading. Pupils should develop their reading competence by using reading strategies that work for them (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 5).

Included in the curriculum are competence aims after year 2, year 4, year 7, year 10, and Vg1 – Programmes for General Studies and VG2 – Vocational Education Programmes. The subject curriculum lists 27 competence aims after Vg1/Vg2. These aims are divided under the four main subject areas Language learning, Oral communication, Written communication and Culture, society and literature. Most of the competence aims that deal with reading are listed under Written communication. Examples are:

- Evaluate and use suitable reading and writing strategies adapted for the purpose and type of text.
- Understand the main content and details in texts of varying length about different topics.
- Read to acquire knowledge in a particular subject for one's education programme.
- Evaluate different sources and use contents from sources in an independent, critical and verifiable manner.

However, there are several aims that imply and demand reading under the main subject areas Language learning and Culture, society and literature. Examples are:

- Discuss and elaborate on different types of English language literary texts from different parts of the world (Culture, society and literature).
- Discuss and elaborate on texts by and about indigenous peoples in English speaking countries (Culture, society and literature).
- Evaluate and use different situations, working methods and learning strategies to further develop one's English language skills (Language learning).

It is clear that reading is made a priority in the competence aims after Vg1/Vg2. Reading to acquire knowledge about different topics is a recurring theme. Moreover, evaluating and using different learning strategies is also emphasised, both under Language learning and Written communication. The increased focus on using and evaluating different learning strategies and working methods demands some degree of metacognitive awareness. To have metacognitive awareness means that pupils are able to think about their own understanding and how to improve it, for example by using different learning strategies when reading different types of texts and for different purposes (Grabe 2009: 222-223).

Assessment is the last section in the English subject curriculum. Here, it is stated that after Vg1/Vg2, the pupils will receive one overall achievement grade that will appear on their final transcript after Vg3. The pupils may also be selected for a written or an oral examination. These examinations cover the whole English subject (*English subject curriculum* 2013: 11).

The competence aims after Vg1/Vg2 do not specify how much the pupils should read throughout the year/years or how much reading is required to meet the different competence aims. The teacher is left to make this decision. This means that some Vg1/Vg2 English classes can, in theory, read a good deal, whereas other classes can read very little. Moreover, it can be challenging for teachers to assess how much reading different pupils need to reach the different competence aims. However, when looking at the curriculum, it is clear that a great deal of reading is required and that reading is valued as a core skill that is central to the English subject. This is reflected in the inclusion of reading as one of the five basic skills in *LK06* and also in the ambitious competence aims in the English subject curriculum.

2.5 The status of English in Norway

Traditionally, the teaching of English in Norway has been considered as the teaching of a foreign language. However, the *LK06* curriculum distinguishes between the teaching of foreign languages, on the one hand, and the teaching of English, on the other hand. There are two separate curricula, one for English and one for all other foreign languages. In this way, *LK06* recognises the indispensable status of English in public and personal life, education, and in the occupational domain in Norway (Hellekjær 2007: 23). However, English cannot be considered a second language (L2) in Norway, defined as 'the normal language of the society in which the students live, including the language of everyday communication, business, and government' (Simensen 2007: 11). Much valuable and influential research has been carried out on teaching and learning an L2. In the present thesis, theories and research on teaching and learning L2 reading are employed, as these are considered relevant and influential for Norwegian pupils learning English. Thus, the term L2 will be used when discussing both L2 and foreign language theories and practice.

3.0 Theory and literature review

3.1 Introduction

The present chapter presents an overview of theory and research on first language (L1) and second language (L2) reading. L1 research and theory is included because it is relevant to L2 reading. First, the nature of reading is described in section 3.2, with a focus on lower and higher-level processes. Krashen's five hypotheses about second language acquisition (his Monitor theory) are presented in section 3.3. Section 3.4 deals with the differences and similarities of reading in an L1 versus an L2. Section 3.5 explores some of the aspects of teaching and learning L2 reading: reading materials, how and where L2 readers read, intensive and extensive reading, and skimming and scanning. Reading strategies are described in section 3.6, including a description of strategies that can be conducted before, during, and after reading, in addition to a subsection on metacognitive awareness of reading strategies, and teaching reading strategies. Section 3.7 deals with reading motivation, including instructional processes that influence reading motivation. Finally, section 3.8 addresses some of the research on L2 reading (and some on L1 reading) conducted in Norway that is relevant to the current research.

3.2 The nature of reading: lower and higher-level processes

When describing how reading works, Grabe (2009: 21) distinguishes between lower-level and higher-level processes. The two groups of language processing skills provide an understanding of the complex cognitive processes involved in reading. Higher and lower-level processes work together to build reading comprehension. When one reads, both groups of skills work concurrently and at times they impinge on each other.

3.2.1 Lower-level processes

Lower-level processes are not simple or unimportant skills, as the term 'lower-level' might suggest. However, they are a group of skills that must become automatized if one is to read fluently. Lower-level processes include word recognition, syntactic parsing, and semantic-proposition encoding. The working memory is essential when carrying out these subcomponent skills (Grabe 2009: 21-22).

Koda (2004: 29) explains that 'Word recognition refers to the processes of extracting lexical information from graphic displays of words.' It is important for readers to recognise and understand individual words in order to create meaning from a text. The process of

converting the letters on a page to words, sound, and meaning must happen efficiently for the reader to comprehend the text. Most researchers agree that fluent reading is dependent on automatic word recognition of a substantial vocabulary (Grabe 2009: 23). Fluent readers focus visually on 84 per cent of all content words and 17 per cent of all function words in a text, which means that fluent readers look at almost all the words on a page (Bernhardt 1998: 73). It is thus evident that fluent readers need to be able to efficiently recognise a large number of words. Grabe (2009: 36) emphasises that in order to learn to effectively recognise a large vocabulary, pupils need frequent practice at word recognition, and this practice occurs when they engage in extensive reading (see section 3.5.4).

Syntactic parsing is important in reading comprehension. Grabe (2009: 29-30) describes the process of syntactic parsing as the process whereby one creates meaning from words and sentence structure. Syntactic information is gained through, for example, word order, determiners, clauses, prepositions, modal verbs, and tense. A good deal of essential information is communicated through this kind of grammatical and structural information throughout a text. Readers need to pay attention to syntactic information in order to obtain a precise understanding of the text (Grabe 2009: 29-30, 37).

The information that the reader gains from words and structures in a text forms semantic meaning units or semantic propositions. These semantic propositions can be thought of as networks of information that temporarily 'light up' as the information they contain are combined (Grabe 2009: 31). Grabe (2009: 31) further explains that 'As immediate networks are lit up and then added to the bigger network of activated information, the propositions are connected and the textual meaning of what we read is created.' In this way, semantic propositions, word recognition and syntactic parsing build text comprehension together.

Finally, working memory has an essential role in lower-level processes. Working memory, as opposed to long-term memory, has a limited capacity, which means that it cannot store information for very long. In fact, information is usually retained for only one to two seconds. If information is not kept active in working memory, it will slip away. Only information that is retained in working memory over a longer period of time can potentially be stored in long-term memory and hence be learned (Grabe 2009: 32-33). Roe (2014: 28) refers to Lyster (2001), who explains that some readers can struggle with retaining certain phonemes, words or structures in working memory long enough for them to form semantic meaning units. If semantic meaning units are not formed, the reader will not be able to comprehend the text. Koda (2004: 198) points to research on working memory, which shows

that there are consistently clear connections between a reader's working memory capacity and reading proficiency.

3.2.2 Higher-level processes

Higher-level processes, among other aspects, include text-model formation and situation-model building. Grabe (2009: 40) explains that to comprehend a text, the reader needs more information than what is provided through word recognition, sentence parsing, and propositional encoding. The reader must also try to figure out what the writer wants the reader to know, what the text itself is communicating. This is achieved by forming a text model of comprehension. A text model is formed by 'assembling a network from the ongoing processing of words, sentences and propositions' (Grabe 2009: 41). As the reader continues to read, new elements are added, providing linkages or direct connections to the network. To form a text model, the reader must also suppress subsidiary information, disambiguate the textual input and, by inferencing, link new information to the network. As new information is added to the network and elements overlap, the reader continuously needs to restructure the text summary (Grabe 2009: 42-43).

The situation model of reader interpretation, is, unlike the text model, formed by the reader's interpretation of the text, or in other words, the sorts of information 'which are brought to the reading by the reader' (Grabe 2009: 43). Koda (2004: 126-127) explains that when forming a situation model, the reader uses prior knowledge to create real-life situations from the textual input. For this reason, situation models vary from reader to reader depending on their previous knowledge and experiences. At the moment the reader starts reading, or even before that, the reader's background knowledge is activated. The reader also activates genre knowledge and remembers similar stories that he or she has read before. At this moment, the reader also decides on his or her purposes and goals of reading. As all this information is activated, expectations about the the text are formed and thereby attitudes and emotions towards the expectations. Thus, at the outset of reading, the reader is ready to form a situation model of interpretation (Grabe 2009: 44-45). The situation model is greatly influenced by the different purposes one has for reading and the type of text which is read. The type of information that the reader wants from the text will influence what the reader emphasises in a text and hence how the reader interprets it.

The text model and the situation model can be used simultaneously. The text model is used to think about what the writer wants to convey, whereas the situation model considers how the reader interprets the text and what the reader thinks about the different textual

features. This is referred to as a two-level text-processing model (Grabe 2009: 45-46). Inherent in this model is the view that a text represents both the writer's and the reader's meaning. Reading purpose and text genres will determine which of the models are emphasised. Some texts, like textbooks and manuals, usually emphasise the text model of comprehension. Literary texts, poetry, and biographies, on the other hand, emphasise a situation model of interpretation (Grabe 2009: 45-46).

Strategy use and metacognitive awareness, which are among a number of other higher-order processing components, will be described in section 3.6.

3.3 Krashen's Monitor theory

Krashen (1982) describes five hypotheses about second language acquisition: the acquisition-learning distinction, the natural order hypothesis, the monitor hypothesis, the input hypothesis, and the affective filter hypothesis. Krashen's Monitor theory is relevant because it shows how one can gain L2 proficiency and is hence important to consider for L2 teachers and pupils alike. These hypotheses attempt to answer the question of how learners acquire language. According to the acquisition-learning hypothesis, one can gain L2 proficiency in two divergent ways: through acquisition and through learning. Language acquisition can be described as implicit, informal, and natural learning, and it refers to a subconscious process where one acquires language through communication without being aware that language is being acquired. Hence, language acquirers are not usually aware of the resulting acquired competence. An example is the grammatical rules of the language one has acquired: one usually knows which grammatical sentences are right because they 'sound right', but one might not be aware of the reason why they are right (Krashen 1982: 10). The other way of gaining L2 proficiency is by language learning. Krashen (1982: 10) defines learning as 'conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them'. Thus, what separates acquisition and learning is one's awareness of the processes one goes through to gain L2 proficiency.

The second hypothesis is the natural order hypothesis. This hypothesis is based on research which discovered that acquirers of a given language acquire grammatical structures in similar orders: a 'natural order'. In other words, particular grammatical structures, such as morphemes and function words, are acquired early and others later. Obviously, the order in which these grammatical structures are acquired cannot be completely similar among individual language acquirers. However, the similarities are statistically significant (Krashen 1982: 12). Krashen points out that the L2 acquisition order is not the same as the L1

acquisition order, although there are similarities. The order of acquisition has been most widely studied in English. Nevertheless, studies concerning Russian and Spanish as foreign languages confirm that the natural order hypothesis is applicable to other languages as well (Krashen 1982: 12-14).

The monitor hypothesis describes the different ways in which acquisition and learning are used. Acquisition is usually what starts off one's communication and helps one's fluency in an L2. Learning, on the other hand, functions only as a monitor or a self corrector, which corrects or changes communication before or after people speak or write (Krashen 1982: 15). In order to use the monitor, three conditions have to be met. Firstly, people need time to consider the learned rules of their L2. A conversation usually progresses too fast to think about the correct rules. Secondly, people need to focus on form, not just what they are saying, but how they are saying it. Thirdly, people need to know the rule. Knowing all the rules of a language is practically impossible due to the large number of rules one is exposed to in a given language. Even if these three conditions are met, people might still struggle to use the grammar they have learned (Krashen 1982: 16). Krashen (1982: 16) contends that in order to facilitate people's monitor use, their conscious grammar, no less than a real grammar test, is needed. Consequently, the monitor hypothesis posits that explicit learning of the formal rules of a language play a very small role in people's L2 communication.

The two last hypotheses, the input hypothesis and the affective filter hypotheses are of special interest to the present study because they provide detailed descriptions of how, and under which conditions, L2 proficiency can be acquired. According to the input hypothesis, one acquires language when one understands language that is more complex than one's current language proficiency allows one to. This occurrence is described as '*i* + *1*', where '*i*' refers to one's current language proficiency, whereas *i* + *1* refers to language structures that are beyond one's current competence. In order to progress from *i* to *i* + *1*, the acquirer must understand input that he or she has not yet learned. It is important to note that 'understanding,' in this case, means understanding the meaning and not the form of the input. The input hypothesis posits that one understands *i* + *1*-input by using extra-linguistic knowledge, context, and one's previous knowledge (Krashen 1982: 20-21). The input hypothesis challenges common L2 classroom practises. It is commonly thought that in order to develop fluency, pupils need to explicitly learn language structures first, and then practise them. Contrary to this, the input hypothesis holds that pupils acquire language structures when they understand *i* + *1*-input (Krashen 1982: 21).

Krashen (1982) mainly discusses the input hypothesis in terms of the development of oral communication. However, the ideas behind the input hypothesis can also be used when referring to reading and reading instruction. In this case, the reading materials are important. In order to become better readers, pupils need $i + 1$-input: in this case reading materials that are a little beyond their current level, but still comprehensible. Clearly, since not all the pupils in a class will be on the same level, providing reading materials at different levels will be in line with the input hypothesis. Furthermore, the input hypothesis makes it clear that it 'relates to acquisition, not learning' (Krashen 1982: 21). According to this view, pupils should read in order to become better readers and acquire language, instead of explicitly learning language structures and reading theory. Krashen (2004) advocates what he calls free voluntary reading, or extensive reading (see section 3.5.4). He claims that extensive reading should be the focus in language instruction.

Finally, the affective filter hypothesis describes how certain affective factors influence L2 acquisition. Research has shown that several affective factors are important for successful L2 acquisition. The majority of these factors can be divided into three categories: motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. Motivation is of great importance because it is known that high motivation usually correlates with better L2 acquisition (see section 3.7). Similarly, people with self-confidence are usually more successful in L2 acquisition. One's anxiety level can also determine one's success in L2 acquisition. Low anxiety usually leads to higher levels of acquisition (Krashen 1982: 30-31). Krashen (1982: 31-32) explains that the strength of language acquirers' affective filters varies. Some people have attitudes that are beneficial for L2 acquisition, whereas others have attitudes that counteract L2 acquisition. Those whose attitudes are beneficial for L2 acquisition have a lower or weaker affective filter. Likewise, those with counteractive attitudes have a high or strong affective filter. Having a high or strong affective filter implies that the input will struggle to penetrate the affective filter and hence not reach the language-acquisition part of the brain. In contrast, those with low or weak affective filters will acquire language more easily because the input will not be stopped by the filter. The affective filter hypothesis has implications for instruction: not only should teachers supply comprehensible input, they should aspire to do so in a low filter-setting. Krashen (1982: 32) summarises as follows: 'In order to acquire, two conditions are necessary. The first is comprehensible … input containing $i + 1$ … and second, a low or weak affective filter to allow the input "in".'

3.4 Reading in an L1 versus L2

3.4.1 Reading in an L1 versus L2

The cognitive processes involved in reading were described in section 3.2. Day and Bamford (1998: 17) contend that 'From a cognitive point of view, there is no essential difference between fluent first and second language reading.' However, there are many differences between L1 and L2 readers.

First, L1 and L2 readers have very different starting points when they start reading. Most L1 pupils usually speak their L1 fairly well and know several thousand words before they start reading. Most L1 readers would often have been told stories and may know how different genres are structured. This means that L1 readers have some lexical, grammatical, and discourse knowledge at the outset of reading. Novice L2 readers, on the other hand, usually know very little about their L2 as they start reading, and it would take them several years of learning to match the level that their L1 counterparts have reached when they start reading. L2 learners must therefore learn their L2 while at the same time developing their reading comprehension (Grabe 2009: 130-131). As a result, it is in most cases more difficult and more time consuming for L2 readers to acquire lexical, grammatical, and discourse knowledge in their L2. Koda (2004: 23) states that it is widely accepted among reading researchers that L2 proficiency is an essential prerequisite for successful L2 reading.

Secondly, L1 transfer will influence L2 reading. This influence can, on the one hand, facilitate L2 reading, and on the other hand, interfere with L2 reading. According to the developmental interdependence hypothesis, one's L2 reading competency depends on one's L1 reading competency (Koda 2004: 22-23). In other words, someone who reads well in their L1 will most likely also read well in their L2. However, Koda (2004: 23) points out that recent research conducted on L1-L2 transfer shows that the effect of L1 reading competence on L2 reading success is limited compared to the effect of L2 proficiency.

Another difference between L1 and L2 readers is sociolinguistic knowledge. Bernhardt (1998: 14) explains that, according to a social view of reading, 'A second language learner, in order to be successful, must somehow gain access to implicit information possessed by members of the social group for which the text was intended.' Sociocultural issues can undoubtedly be a challenge for learners who have to learn appropriate language use, level of formality, and a wide range of other language conventions in their L2. Additionally, text genres and the use of these genres can vary between a reader's L1 and L2. For L2 learners with limited exposure to L2 discourse, this can be confusing and hard to understand (Grabe 2009: 133-139).

3.4.2 L2 vocabulary knowledge

Vocabulary knowledge has long been recognised as one of the most important factors in reading comprehension. In fact, pupils' vocabulary knowledge is among the best predictors of their reading comprehension (Hudson 2007: 227). The importance of vocabulary learning is also reflected in the English subject curriculum. Pupils enrolled in Vg1/Vg2 English are supposed to: 'Understand and use an extensive general vocabulary and an academic vocabulary related to one's education programme.' According to Grabe (2009: 269-271), L2 readers in English need to know a minimum of 10,000 words to understand an academic text. To read academic texts fluently, however, knowledge of more words is needed. Grabe claims that 'the likely upper limit' of how many words an L2 student who wishes to study at an English L1 university should know is about 40,000 words.

The question then arises how these words best can be taught and learned. Vocabulary can be learned explicitly, also called directly, or incidentally (indirectly). Grabe (2009: 276) holds that although pupils do not learn very many words from direct vocabulary instruction, the words they do learn are often very important. Vocabulary learned through direct instruction often represents the key words for text comprehension, words that relate to other words conceptually and thematically, and words that can lead to more contextual vocabulary learning. Grabe (2009: 276-278) points to several approaches that have proved, through research, to be effective for direct vocabulary instruction. Among these approaches are semantic mapping, where pupils can come up with associated words after reading about a topic and group them according to the information in text. Word mapping is focused on a key word and the pupils find the related word-family members and associated vocabulary. Moreover, the use of glosses has proved effective for vocabulary learning and comprehension. Glosses provide pupils with short definitions of potentially difficult words in a text. Repeated encounters with words and their word forms, as exemplified above, will improve vocabulary learning. The key words that are taught through direct instruction should form foundations for learning associated words and can thus be a basis for further vocabulary learning (Grabe 2009: 276-278).

Hellekjær (2007: 27) argues that pupils cannot achieve adequate vocabulary knowledge through explicit vocabulary instruction alone. Instead, pupils need to learn vocabulary incidentally, by reading extensively (see section 3.5.4). This view is shared by Day and Bamford (1998: 17-18), who hold that L2 readers should read plenty of varied and interesting texts that are *i minus 1*, the opposite of Krashen's comprehensible input hypothesis (see section 3.3)*, where i + 1* is the goal. In order to develop a large sight vocabulary and

automatically be able to recognise a number of words (see section 3.2.1), *i minus 1* texts are ideal (Day and Bamford 1998: 16).

In order to learn words incidentally from texts, pupils need to learn words from context. The goal for the learner is not to notice and try to learn the words, but to read and understand the text (Grabe 2009: 273). Furthermore, Grabe (2009: 273) points out that multiple studies show that when learning words from context, pupils learn about 5-15 per cent of unfamiliar words on the first encounter. This means that pupils need instructional support and multiple exposures to a word before they know it. It also means that pupils have to read extensively in order to learn a substantial number of words through context.

Much research on incidental learning focuses on the readers' guesses and inferences as they approach unfamiliar words (Hudson 2007: 245), an issue that Simensen (2007) has addressed:

> A prerequisite for optimal processing is the ability to tolerate a certain amount of uncertainty of ambiguity in comprehension […] Among other things, this implies a willingness on the part of the listener or reader to make rough guesses about the meanings of many new and unfamiliar words (Simensen 2007: 150).

According to Grabe (2009: 275-276), all readers guess unfamiliar words from context to varying degrees. For the most part, the guessed meaning of a word is quickly forgotten. The chances of learning the word increases with further encounters, as the reader has more supporting information. In any case, the context in which the reader guesses the meaning of an unknown word is crucial for understanding. For the context to be useful, almost all the adjacent words have to be known to the reader. Additionally, the most useful clues are the ones that are located close to the new word. To help pupils become better at guessing words from context, pupils need training: to be encouraged to be aware of new words when reading and to recognise important clues. Increased awareness of context information will help pupils make good guesses of the meaning of unfamiliar words (Grabe 2009: 275-276).

Conclusively, Grabe (2009: 273-374) argues that both direct vocabulary instruction and incidental word learning are necessary for vocabulary learning as the approaches support and complement each other. Direct instruction covers useful academic words, frequent words, and key words according to topic. Through extensive reading, on the other hand, pupils encounter many more words, which in turn reinforces frequent words and forms meaning networks that connect related words.

3.5 Teaching and learning L2 reading

3.5.1 Reading materials

Grabe (2009: 339-340) explains that the most common approach to L2 reading globally is using textbooks. Good textbooks can provide useful, interesting texts, as well as tasks that encourage pupils to practise a range of skills, such as reading strategies, vocabulary, and morphology. The textbooks contain texts and tasks that have been developed or chosen for a specific level or age group and many textbooks are also thematically organised, which makes them helpful and easy to use for teachers and pupils. Textbooks can have an essential role in many educational settings, especially where the resources are limited or where the teacher has limited training or experience (Grabe 2009: 339-340).

On the other hand, an extensive use of textbooks has its limitations. Most textbooks do not present many texts that the pupils can choose between when reading about a specific topic, which means that pupils on different levels and with different interests have to read the same texts. Additionally, textbooks cannot, for practical reasons, include all the different types of reading tasks, skills and strategies that are needed for pupils to improve their reading (Grabe 2009: 340). For this reason, Grabe (2009: 340) argues that reading instruction should not be based on the content of a textbook alone. Roe (2014: 131) agrees with Grabe and holds that if pupils exclusively are told to read and do tasks from the textbook throughout the school year, their motivation can be compromised. Instead, the textbook should be supplemented with a range of different types of texts in order to illuminate a theme in a varied and interesting way. Hellekjær (2007: 27) is also critical of an extensive use of textbooks. He claims that the main reason for Norwegian pupils' low scores in reading is the overuse of textbooks in Norwegian schools (see Hellekjær 2005). More precisely, Hellekjær is critical of the way textbooks are used, namely 'the focus on reading for detail and the tendency to explain all unfamiliar words and expressions, which inculcate a counterproductive way of reading in large numbers of pupils' (Hellekjær 2007: 27).

Nevertheless, choosing texts that can supplement or replace the textbook can be time-consuming and challenging for a teacher. Roe (2014: 132) recommends that teachers cooperate on finding suitable texts about different topics. This way, they can gather a large number of texts in different genres and levels and their collection can be a valuable resource for years to come. Before selecting a text, Roe (2014: 132) recommends that teachers evaluate how appropriate the text is by thinking about, for example, the quality of the text, the level of the text compared to the pupils' level, and the pupils' interests and prior knowledge.

When selecting texts, teachers also have to consider whether to choose authentic or simplified texts. Authentic texts are texts that are written for a native-speaking audience and not for pedagogic purposes. Authentic texts are considered 'interesting, engaging, culturally enlightening, relevant, motivating and the best preparation for reading authentic texts' (Day and Bamford 1998: 54). Many teachers therefore view authentic reading material as the best choice for their pupils. Nevertheless, authentic reading material can also have a negative impact on reading development: if pupils are assigned texts that are at a level well beyond their current capacity, they might be discouraged and lose confidence in their ability to read in their L2. In this case, avoiding simplified texts altogether might have a detrimental effect on the pupils' attitudes towards reading (Day and Bamford 1998: 54-56). This problem is at the centre of Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis and affective filter hypothesis (see section 3.3). According to the input hypothesis, pupils need input that contains $i + 1$ in order to acquire language. In other words, the input needs to be a little beyond the pupil's proficiency level. However, if the input is not comprehensible at all and way beyond the pupil's proficiency level ($i + 2$, $i + 3$), the pupil will not be able to understand the input and hence not acquire language. In turn, a lack of understanding can have a negative effect on pupils' attitudes towards reading. This can manifest itself as a high or strong affective filter, which means that the provided input might not be acquired.

Simensen (2007: 171) distinguishes between two types of simplified texts for L2 readers: pedagogic readers and adapted readers. Pedagogic readers are texts that are written specifically for language learners at different levels. Adapted readers, on the other hand, are authentic texts that have been simplified or adapted to suit L2 learners on different levels. Adapted readers are often simplified versions of classic stories which are no longer copyright protected. These texts are written in one of two ways: by writing the whole text over again using simpler language, which is termed a 'simple account', or by keeping most of the original text, but replacing difficult words or phrases with simpler alternatives, called a 'simple original' (Day and Bamford 1998: 56-57). There has been some discussion about the value of simplified materials. Day and Bamford (1998: 56) explain that simplified materials, whatever their type, are ill-reputed in the field of language teaching and are considered pedagogically unsound, bland, and unnatural. However, Day and Bamford themselves (1998: 57) disagree with this notion, pointing out that:

> Simplified materials are developed and used for second language reading for one inescapable reason: Beginning and intermediate second language students need them. And yet, reflecting on the cult of authenticity, simplified materials are rarely

considered for what they are – a positive contribution to instruction and language learning.

3.5.2 How and where do L2 readers read?

L2 reading can be approached in many different ways. Pupils can read individually or in groups, aloud or silently, at school or at home. Roe (2014: 133-134) encourages teachers to read aloud to their pupils. When a text is read aloud, it is given a new dimension through the reader's use of his or her voice and how the reader stresses certain words or expressions. Reading aloud to pupils means that all the pupils have heard the same information, which is a good starting point for the teacher to elaborate on the information in the text and start discussions within the class. Hearing the text read out loud can help pupils increase comprehension, expand their vocabulary, and learn more about syntax and text structure. Roe (2004: 133) points to research by Duchein and Mealy (1993), who found that being read to had a positive effect on the pupils' attitudes towards reading. This effect was evident on pupils all the way up to upper secondary school. Roe (2014: 134) encourages teachers to allow pupils to read aloud to the rest of the class. However, she emphasises that only pupils who want to read to their classmates, and pupils who read well, should do this. Roe is critical of letting all the pupils read aloud in class, especially the weaker readers. Instead of reading aloud to the class, Roe advises teachers to listen to the weaker readers read aloud in privacy, which is also an easier way to give feedback to the reader.

Individualised reading is another way of approaching L2 reading. Simensen (2007: 173) explains that the goal of individualised reading is for pupils to read individually at their own pace and on their own level. When pupils read individually, they can potentially read different texts than their classmates, either texts on different levels and/or texts dealing with different topics. Individualised reading is therefore a good way of differentiating reading instruction. Individualised reading can be practised with shorter texts within the span of a lesson, or by reading books over a longer period of time (see section 3.5.4). Individualised reading demands that pupils are well-organised and have the ability to follow through with the reading, since self-directed learning of this kind can be challenging for some pupils. Some pupils will therefore need more encouragement than others in order to complete the reading (Simensen 2007: 173). Another challenge for the teacher is to provide texts on different levels and/or about different topics from which the pupils can choose.

The question also arises whether pupils should read at school or at home. For some teachers, it might be more convenient to assign reading as homework instead of spending time on reading in class. Simensen (2007: 173) argues that it is most sensible that individualised

reading happens at home and not in class. However, Simensen holds that some reading should take place in class in order for pupils to feel that they are part of a community of readers where they can share their experiences with each other (see section 3.7.2). Harris and Sipay (1990) are advocates of spending time reading in class. They argue: 'If we do not demonstrate that reading is a worthwhile activity by providing school time, how can we expect children to value reading?' (Harris and Sipay 1990: 656). Harris and Sipay's argument can make teachers consider the signals they send to their pupils if they never spend time reading in class. In order to be good models and teach pupils to make reading a priority, teachers need to prioritise reading as well.

3.5.3 CLIL

An additional way of approaching L2 reading is through CLIL, i.e. content and language integrated learning. CLIL involves teaching L2 skills and another school subject simultaneously, such as teaching the school subject history, which is traditionally taught in the L1, in the pupils' L2 (Simensen 2007: 103). CLIL can hence be carried out by providing history texts in the pupils' L2. The assumption behind CLIL is that L2 learners learn their target language when they are exposed to comprehensible input. It is therefore not the language, but the meaning of the texts, that is the focus in CLIL. This way, the pupils' L2 is learned incidentally when pupils read texts in their L2, for example about history (Simensen 2007: 103). Large-scale experiments with CLIL have taken place in Canada, where language immersion of this kind became a popular educational movement. The Canadian experiments were described as 'highly successful' and showed that pupils gained in their L2 competence, as well as in their L1 and in subject matter learning. CLIL has gained popularity in many countries and can be found in different formats. One or several subjects in a school can be used in CLIL programmes (Simensen 2007: 103-104).

3.5.4 Intensive and extensive reading

Extensive reading, also called free voluntary reading, is an activity that is much debated in the field of L2 reading. Harold Palmer was the first person to use the term extensive reading in the field of foreign language teaching (Day and Bamford 1998: 5). According to Palmer, extensive reading involves reading fast and reading a large quantity of books. The focus should not be on the language of the text but on the content, the meaning. Palmer used the term 'intensive reading' as an antonym to extensive reading. Intensive reading, Palmer

claimed, involves studying a text carefully line by line, consulting a dictionary, translating and analysing (Day and Bamford 1998: 5). Simensen (2007: 149) further explains that intensive reading differs from extensive reading in its attention to detail. When reading intensively, readers should pay attention to both main ideas and supporting ideas, as well as information that can be found 'between the lines'. In addition to focusing on the meaning of the text, intensive readers should identify how the meaning is conveyed, e.g. language style and the type of language used.

Day and Bamford (1998) explain that it is difficult to come up with a precise definition of extensive reading that everyone can agree with. Instead of a definition, Day and Bamford (1998: 7-8) provide a list of ten characteristics of successful extensive reading programmes that can help teachers and pupils better understand what extensive reading involves: *(1) Students read as much as possible.* They should read both in the classroom and outside the classroom. (2) *A variety of materials in a wide range of topics is available*. This way, pupils can be encouraged to read about topics they might not have considered before. (3) *Students select what they want to read* because this is an important motivational factor for reading (see section 3.7.2). (4) *The purposes of reading are usually related to pleasure, information, and general understanding.* The interest of the pupil is central here, as well as the nature of the material. (5) *Reading is its own reward*, which means that the pupils should do as few post-reading tasks as possible. (6) *Reading materials are well within the linguistic competence of the students*, which implies that the text should be understandable to the pupil in terms of vocabulary and grammatical structures. Dictionaries should not be used often as frequent use interrupts fluent reading. (7) *Reading is individual and silent*. Pupils should choose their own pace and read when and where they want. (8) *Reading speed is usually faster rather than slower* because the reading material is within the linguistic competence of pupils and therefore easily understandable. (9) *Teachers orient students to the goals of the program, explain the methodology, keep track of what each student reads and guide students in getting the most out of the program.* (10) *The teacher is a role model of a reader for students*, which implies that the teacher reads his or her own book when the pupils read, and thereby demonstrate the joy and rewards of reading.[2]

Looking at Day and Bamford's extensive list of characteristics of an extensive reading programme, it becomes clear that starting an extensive reading programme requires a great deal of work by the pupils and the teacher. First, a good deal of time must be set aside for

---

[2] The italicised headings are as they appear in Day and Bamford (1998: 7-8).

reading in and out of class, which means that there is less time for other types of language instruction. Secondly, the teacher has to provide a variety of materials about different topics and on different levels for the pupils to read, which can be a challenge as not every school has a wide selection of L2 reading materials in their school library. With this in mind, teachers might wonder why they should make extensive reading a priority.

Day and Bamford (1998) gathered the results from 11 extensive reading programmes in EFL and ESL settings from all over the world, such as Elley and Mangubhai (1981) and Hafiz and Tudor (1989). These studies reported by Day and Bamford (1998) found numerous advantages of extensive reading. The 11 studies investigated the impact of extensive reading on different language competencies, such as L2 reading ability, linguistic competence, vocabulary, writing, spelling, and affect. Seven of the reported studies investigated the link between extensive reading and L2 reading, and all seven studies showed gains. According to Day and Bamford (1998: 35), these results indicate that in order to learn to read, L1 and L2 pupils alike must read. Similarly, the results from many of the extensive reading programmes showed that pupils improved their writing competence in the target language without writing instruction. These results support the claim that pupils learn to write by reading. Five studies investigated the impact of extensive reading on vocabulary and three of them showed gains. In addition, every study that examined the pupils' linguistic competence showed that the pupils increased their general linguistic competence in their L2 by reading extensively. The most noteworthy variable could arguably be the pupils' affect. Day and Bamford (1998: 35) describe the results from the studies that investigated the impact of extensive reading on affect as 'impressive'. These studies showed that pupils changed their attitudes and became more positive towards L2 reading than they were before they started reading extensively.

Krashen (2004) also analysed the results from extensive reading programmes all over the world. Krashen concludes that with all the studies that show positive effects of reading on literacy development, there should be no doubt that reading is good for you. Krashen (2004: 37) further argues:

> The research, however, supports a stronger conclusion: Reading is the only way, the only way we become good readers, develop a good writing style, an adequate vocabulary, advanced grammatical competence, and the only way we become good spellers.

If reading indeed is the only way, it would have major implications for language instruction. Krashen (2004: 38) holds that teachers would have to drastically reconsider their practices. When teachers use drills and exercises in an attempt to teach literacy, they do not, in fact,

teach, but rather they test the pupils' literacy skills. Consequently, Krashen claims, traditional language instruction is a test, one that sets pupils with limited reading experience up for failure. It is clear that Krashen advocates more reading, extensive reading, to be the focus in language instruction.

Hellekjær (2007), in line with Krashen (2004), advocates more extensive reading in the classroom. Hellekjær (2007: 27) claims that the lack of focus on extensive reading is one of the reasons why Norwegian pupils generally have not reached a higher level of reading proficiency. Extensive reading, Hellekjær holds, would assist the pupils in developing the ability to read according to the reading purpose, and hence vary their reading, by for example skimming and scanning.

3.5.5 Skimming and scanning

One of the competency aims in the English subject curriculum for Vg1/Vg2 states that pupils should be able to 'Evaluate and use suitable reading and writing strategies adapted for the purpose and type of text' (*English subject curriculum* 2013). According to Hellekjær (2007: 28), this competency aim indicates that teachers are obliged to teach their pupils how to adjust their reading according to the reading goal and reading purpose. More precisely, Hellekjær holds that teachers need to teach their pupils more than just how to read intensively (see section 3.5.4), as is often done in classroom settings. Teachers need to teach their pupils how to skim and scan and read for 'overall meaning'.

Skimming means reading to gain an overview of the structure and contents in a text. When skimming, one reads quickly, spending from half a second to five seconds on a page, depending on one's reading goal. Skimming can be done before reading, to prepare oneself for reading a text, or after reading, to review the text (Stangeland and Forsth 2001: 66).

Scanning, on the other hand, means reading to locate particular information in a text. This could be a specific topic, a name, or a word. Before scanning, the reader must therefore have a clear understanding of what he or she is looking for. Having an overview of the text, which can be gained through skimming, is an advantage before scanning a text for particular information, because one knows where the information is likely to be located (Stangeland and Forsth 2001: 74).

Hellekjær (2007: 28) argues that in addition to knowing how to skim and scan, pupils will have to be able to do this with a variety of texts: 'The one and only way to achieve this goal [above] is by combining instruction on how to read with large amounts of reading.'

3.6 Reading strategies

3.6.1 What are reading strategies?

Reading strategies can be defined as the different actions that readers can carry out in order to increase their reading comprehension (Roe 2014: 91). Strategic readers know that there are many different actions and different ways of reading that can be used depending on the reading task and the reading goal. Strategic readers are intentional, active, and monitor their own reading process (Roe 2006: 73). According to Roe (2014: 84), reading strategies are closely tied to learning strategies since the goal of both in many cases is to learn through reading. In this way, reading strategies and learning strategies are often interchangeable.

Afflerbach et al. (2008: 368) distinguish between the terms *skill* and *strategy*. What separates these terms is the deliberateness of actions. Reading strategies are deliberate, conscious actions selected by the reader to reach a specific reading goal. Reading skills, in contrast, are actions that occur automatically, without the reader's awareness. Reading skills are therefore more fluent and efficient than reading strategies. Afflerbach et al. (2008: 368) further argue that reading strategies can become skills through instruction. When reading strategies have been practised extensively they can become automatic, and hence become reading skills. This is a desired outcome because of the reading fluency and efficacy inherent in reading skills.

Researchers have named and codified reading strategies according to different qualities. One can, for example, separate between surface-level and deep-processing strategies. Surface-level reading strategies are the strategies that give one initial access and comprehension of texts. Examples can be rereading, omitting unfamiliar words, and altering reading rate. These strategies are particularly important in early reading development. Deep-processing strategies, on the other hand, refer to personalising and transforming texts. This could be in the form of comparing texts or questioning the source (Alexander 2005: 421-422).

Grabe (2009: 208) points out that both L1 and L2 reading researchers agree that the main characteristic of a good reader is reading strategy use. Research on L2 reading strategies is limited. Nevertheless, the research that has been conducted supports the findings of L1 reading strategy research (see section 3.6.2), and thereby underlines the importance of reading strategy use for L2 pupils. Strategy instruction also tends to be motivating for pupils. The main reason for this is that successful strategy instruction will in turn increase pupils' reading comprehension and hence increase their motivation to read more (see section 3.7.2). In fact, Norwegian EFL teachers are required to teach pupils how to read strategically because this is a competency aim in the *LK06* curriculum (see section 2.4). According to the English subject

curriculum, strategic reading should be introduced from lower secondary school and should be stressed more at the upper secondary level (*English subject curriculum* 2013, Hellekjær 2007: 28).

Teaching reading strategies is part of what Roe (2006: 68) calls the second (or advanced) stage of reading instruction. Roe argues that reading instruction should not stop at the moment when pupils are able to successfully decode words. Instead, teachers need to help pupils to read effectively and strategically (Hellekjær 2007: 28). Despite the many advantages and incentives of using reading strategies, researchers have found that reading strategy instruction is not carried out by the majority of reading teachers (Hellekjær and Hopfenbeck 2012; Pressley 2008). (See also section 3.8). In a Norwegian setting, Gilje (2014) and Hellekjær (2007), among others, claim that there is a minimal focus on reading strategies in the Norwegian school. According to Gilje (2014: 12), this long-term neglect of teaching reading strategies is likely to be the main cause of Norwegian pupils' poor reading skills.

3.6.2 Reading strategies: before, during, and after reading

Grabe (2009: 207) explains that two types of research have been used to identify effective reading strategies. The first is verbal think-aloud studies, where good readers have explained how they deal with challenging material before reading, during reading, and after reading. The think-aloud studies, or verbal protocols of reading, have been collected and scrutinised by Pressley and Afflerbach (1995), who identified more than 100 strategies. The other type of research on reading strategies is experimental studies where the effectiveness of certain strategies have been tested against a control group. Duke et al. (2011: 64) point out that: 'The list of strategies that research indicated are worth teaching – that is, if taught, they improve reading comprehension – varies from one research review to another.' For this reason, teachers have to decide for themselves which reading strategies they want to focus on. Below are examples of reading strategies that can be used before, during, and after reading.

Before reading

Roe (2006: 71) explains that the reader's experiences and knowledge are important when creating meaning from a text, which implies that different readers will interpret the same text differently. This understanding complies with the situation model of reader interpretation (section 3.2.2), which entails that the reader uses prior knowledge to create real-life situations from the textual input (Koda 2004: 126-127). Reading researchers widely agree that prior knowledge has a decisive role in reading comprehension (Roe 2006: 71). For this reason,

activating prior knowledge is an important pre-reading strategy. There are many examples of how prior knowledge can be activated. Previewing the text, for example, by skimming through it (see section 3.5.5), is a good way of obtaining an overview of what the text is about and to start thinking about the topic before one starts reading. *THIEVES strategy* is an example of an efficient and thorough way of previewing texts. This strategy entails that the pupils 'steal' information from the text before the actual reading begins. THIEVES is an acronym that sums up the information to be stolen[3] (Manz 2002: 434).

As part of pre-reading, Roe (2014: 93) also recommends that pupils write down what they know about a topic before they start reading, for example by using a *KWL chart*. In a KWL chart, the 'K' represents what the pupil knows about a topic before reading or instruction starts, the 'W' represents what the pupil wants to know, and the 'L' represents what the pupil has learned by reading or instruction. When using a KWL chart, pupils activate prior knowledge, plan, set reading goals, monitor the text for key points, evaluate information, and relate the information to the reading goals (Grabe 2009: 231).

Making predictions about what can happen in a text before one starts reading is also an effective reading strategy, for example one that has proved successful when reading fictional stories. Before reading fictional stories, pupils can make predictions based on their previous knowledge, their own personal experiences, or similar stories they have been exposed to (Duke and Pearson 2002: 213). Research on pupils' prediction-making has shown that the accuracy of the prediction is virtually unimportant when explaining the pupils' comprehension of the stories. In fact, it was not the predictions itself, but the engagement in the text that resulted in increased comprehension. For this reason, pupils should be encouraged to make predictions, not just before they start reading, but also during reading (Duke and Pearson 2002: 213).

Another important strategy that good readers make use of before they start reading is identifying a goal for their reading. The goal can, for example, be to find specific information, learn the material well enough to discuss it, or to study the literary devices in the text (Pressley 2002: 294). This goal will determine how the reader reads the text: which strategies the reader employs, whether the reader skims, scans, or reads the text intensively (see section

---

[3] The 'T' refers to title, the 'H' to headings, 'I' alludes to introduction, 'E' is every first sentence in a paragraph, 'V' refers to visuals and vocabulary. Finally, the 'E' stands for end-of chapter questions, and the 'S' refers to summary (Manz 2002: 434-435).

3.5). The goal of reading will also determine whether a text model of comprehension or a situation model of comprehension will be emphasised (see section 3.2.2).

During reading

Which reading strategies the reader employs during reading depends on the goal for reading and the nature of the material. Reading selectively and identifying the important information in a text are two closely related reading strategies. Pressley (2002: 295) points out that good readers tend to read texts from front to back, although they do this selectively. Selective reading involves skipping or skimming information that is irrelevant to the reader's reading goals and, on the other hand, focusing the intensive reading on what seems to be important information in the text. Good readers know that the most important information can often be found in topic sentences or topic paragraphs, which sum up the most important ideas in a paragraph or a text (Pressley 2002: 295).

Another example of a during reading strategy is using graphic organisers. Graphic organisers can be, for example, Venn diagrams[4], mind maps[5], and different types of drawings. The graphic organisers are used in order to re-present, namely to present the important ideas in a text once again in a format that is easily understandable. Pupils who create graphic organisers gain much knowledge in the active process of transforming the information in the text to visual representations (Duke and Pearson 2002: 219). Grabe (2009: 213) states that 'Applying graphic representations to organize text information leads to improved recall of information and significantly better comprehension.'

Monitoring one's reading comprehension may be the most important and challenging reading strategy. This strategy involves being aware of what one understands and what is challenging in a text. Readers can monitor their comprehension by regularly asking themselves 'Is this understandable?' If the reader does not understand the text, fix-up strategies, namely more suitable reading strategies that will aid comprehension, will need to be incorporated in the reading process in order to increase comprehension (Roe 2014: 95). Monitoring is closely tied to metacognitive awareness (see section 3.6.3), which implies the ability to think consciously about one's understanding and what can be done to improve

---

[4] Venn diagrams are graphic organisers that organise complex relationships between two or three sets of items visually. Venn diagrams are made up of overlapping circles. Each of the circles represents the elements of a set. Where the circles overlap shows what the sets have in common (Joyce 2008).
[5] A mind map, also called semantic map, is a graphic organiser where the main idea is placed in the middle with associating ideas arranged around it (Duke and Pearson 2002: 219).

understanding, as well as being aware of several reading strategies that can be used (Grabe 2009: 222-223).

After reading

Good readers summarise after reading a text. To summarise means to identify the main message(s) in the text. Duke and Pearson (2002: 221) list two approaches to teaching pupils to summarise efficiently. The first one is McNeil and Donant's (1982) six rules or steps:

> Rule 1: Delete unnecessary elements.
> Rule 2: Delete redundant material.
> Rule 3: Compose a word to replace a list of items.
> Rule 4: Compose a word to replace individual parts of an action.
> Rule 5: Select a topic sentence.
> Rule 6: Invent a topic sentence if one is not available.

By following these procedures, pupils will eventually be able to write brief summaries of a text. The second approach is the GIST procedure (Cunningham 1982). In GIST, the pupils are taught to develop summaries using no more than 15 words, first with short amounts of text, and then with gradually increasing amounts of text. These two approaches to summarisation contain operations that are useful for understanding texts on a local and global level (Duke and Pearson 2002: 222).

Assessing the text is a beneficial reading strategy that can be used after reading a text. Teaching pupils how to assess the texts that they read involves teaching them to give reasons for their assessment. In order to critically assess texts, pupils need much practice in text understanding, for example genre characteristics and knowledge of literary devices. They also need to know which criteria they should assess the text on (Roe 2014: 112). Roe (2014: 112) encourages teachers to facilitate whole-class discussions about text-assessment and to allow pupils to come up with possible improvements to the texts. This strategy could be adapted to different age groups, but is most appropriate for older pupils, especially when conducted with L2 pupils.

Asking pupils questions is a common practice in reading instruction. Duke and Pearson (2002: 222) emphasise the effect of question-type on pupils' comprehension, which can be shaped by the questions they are used to receiving after reading a text. If pupils usually receive detail-oriented questions, they will tend to focus on details when they read a text. Similarly, if pupils are used to more inferential questions, this will be the focus when they read. Consequently, teachers need to be aware of their intentions when they assign questions to their pupils and should try to vary the questions as much as possible. Duke and Pearson

(2002: 222-223) argue that pupils should make their own questions after or during reading. They refer to research that indicates that pupils' overall comprehension increases when pupils learn to produce their own questions. Pupils' question-generating is especially efficient when combined with other reading strategies and can be used before, during, and after reading.

3.6.3 Metacognitive awareness of reading strategies

Koda (2004: 211) explains that 'Metacognition, or cognition of cognition, refers to learners' understanding and control of their own thinking and learning. Many theorists believe these capabilities are primarily responsible for readers' online decision making in regulating their actions.' The belief that metacognition can regulate readers' actions has caused massive interest in the effects of metacognition on reading strategy use. On this note, Garner (1987: 17) emphasises that metacognitive awareness 'is about *ourselves*, the *tasks* we face and the *strategies* we employ'. Garner further argues that the readers' level of metacognitive awareness will determine what they do when they fail to comprehend: which strategies are employed and their outcome (Garner 1987: 19). Grabe (2009: 223) points out that 'On a general level, metacognition involves awareness and control of planning, revising, summarising, and evaluating. Essentially, we learn awareness of our comprehension processing.'

Koda (2004: 212) distinguishes between two aspects of metacognition: the reflective aspect and the control aspect. Research on the reflective aspect targets learners' awareness of their own cognitive resources. Here, the assumption is that readers who can reflect on their own cognitive processes should be able to figure out how they can improve their performance and how to make it happen. The control aspect, on the other hand, deals with how readers can regulate their actions to improve their performance. Regulating actions implies undertaking the adjustments and evaluating the results of the actions (Koda 2004: 211-212).

Most reading specialists agree that what separates good from poor readers is their ability to monitor their reading comprehension. Moreover, metacognitively aware readers know their cognitive limitations and hence know what they are good at and what they struggle with. Similarly, they are aware of many reading strategies and know how and when to use them effectively. These readers may even develop their own strategies to make up for their shortcomings (Koda 2004: 212).

3.6.4 Teaching reading strategies

Duke and Pearson (2002: 208-210) hold that reading strategies should be taught explicitly. They provide a list of five components that should be included in reading strategy instruction. (1) *An explicit description of the strategy and when and how it should be used*. This component emphasises the importance of explaining the strategy thoroughly and accurately describing how and under which circumstances it should be used. Teachers might assume that the pupils know how to use the strategy, especially if they are in higher grades. However, pupils have different backgrounds and different prior experiences. It would therefore be counterproductive to ignore this step because several pupils might not follow the instruction. (2) *Teacher and/or student modeling of the strategy in action*. This step implies that the teacher shows, or models, how the strategy can be used. Here, it is important that the teacher expresses what he or she is thinking when he or she performs the reading strategy so that the pupils understand what they should focus on when they use the reading strategy themselves. (3) *Collaborative use of the strategy in action*. This step in the reading strategy instruction implies that the class joins the teacher in using the reading strategy. The example that Duke and Pearson use is the reading strategy prediction. In turn, the teacher welcomes each of the pupils to make one prediction about what will happen in the text as they go along reading it. (4) *Guided practice using the strategy with gradual release of responsibility*. When the previous three components have been successfully carried out, the pupils should be ready to use the strategy with some guidance from their teacher or peers. The teacher can assign the pupils to groups where they practise the reading strategy, while still monitoring the groups to see if they need further assistance. (5) *Independent use of the strategy*. With the help of clear reading tasks and reading goals, the pupils should now try using the reading strategy independently (Duke and Pearson 2002: 208-210).[6]

Although Duke and Pearson's (2002) list of components for reading strategy instruction focuses on the acquisition of one reading strategy, Duke and Pearson (2002: 210) emphasise that good readers do not use only one strategy when they read. In fact, good readers use multiple strategies simultaneously as they read. For this reason, reading strategy instruction should in turn introduce, encourage, and model several strategies. Grabe (2009: 218) agrees with this notion, claiming that one strategy should be introduced at a time and that pupils should be taught about ten to 15 reading strategies during a semester or a year. It is important that these strategies are revisited and practised often so that pupils do not forget

---

[6] The italicised headings are as they appear in Duke and Pearson (2002: 208-210).

31

them. Grabe (2009: 218) suggests creating a chart called 'effective strategies for reading' that is visible for the pupils, where they can add new strategies as they are introduced.

3.7 Reading motivation

3.7.1 What is motivation?

Ryan and Deci (2000: 69) elucidate that 'Motivation concerns energy, direction, persistence and equifinality – all aspects of activation and intention.' In other words, motivation is what moves one to act. Motivation is multifaceted and people are motivated by different factors. Different motivational factors are commonly referred to as extrinsic or intrinsic motivation. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 407) explain that in a reading setting, intrinsic motivation is characterised by one's enjoyment of reading for its own sake. Intrinsically motivated readers have a desire to read because they experience enjoyment and excitement when reading. Pupils who are intrinsically motivated to read tend to show more successful behaviours than others, they perform better, have a lower dropout rate, and exhibit a higher quality of learning (Guthrie 2008: 107). Extrinsic reading motivation, on the other hand, refers to readers who read to seek rewards, recognition, or incentives. Examples here can be pupils who read simply to get rewards or good grades. Pupils with extrinsic motivation to read tend to focus on completing the reading task instead of understanding or enjoying it. These pupils are prone to using surface-level strategies for reading instead of deep-processing strategies (see section 3.6.1), and hence compromise comprehension (Guthrie and Wigfield 2000: 407).

Self-efficacy is another aspect of motivation that is important to consider in this context. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's perceptions about their performance of a certain task. In other words, self-efficacy is task-specific and one's self-efficacy can vary from activity to activity. The reason why pupils' self-efficacy is important to consider is that high self-efficacy generally leads to higher achievement and low self-efficacy leads to losses. Providing clear learning goals, modelling by teachers or pupils, and feedback on progress can increase pupils' self-efficacy for reading (Yudowitch et al. 2008: 75).

3.7.2 Instructional processes that influence reading motivation

Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 409-416) list ten instructional processes that have been shown, through research, to influence reading motivation. *(1) Learning and Knowledge Goals.* The types of reading goals (see section 3.6.2) that pupils and teachers focus on are crucial for pupils' motivation. Learning-goal oriented pupils are more concerned with learning content

than scoring well on tests. These pupils tend to be more engaged in learning than other pupils. Performance-oriented pupils, on the other hand, are mostly concerned with performing well and outperforming others and are therefore less concerned with learning. Pupils who believe that their teachers value pupils' comprehension more than test scores, tend to believe in their ability to work hard. The type of reading goals that teachers set for pupils, and in turn the goals that pupils set for themselves, should therefore be considered thoroughly.

(2) Real-World Interactions. Real-world interactions are connections between the text that is read and the pupils' experiences. These interactions are enjoyable and interesting for pupils and can in turn foster reading motivation. Real-world interactions are designed to be intrinsically motivating and hence evoke pupils' attention. Teachers can provide intrinsically motivating, real-world interactions by using varied, diverse, and interesting tasks. Examples are role plays, projects, films, relating the text to the pupils' lives, and hands-on activities, such as showing models or artefacts.

(3) Autonomy Support. Autonomy support refers to the support and guidance that the teacher provides when pupils make choices about reading. Teachers can promote pupil autonomy by letting pupils choose which texts or books they want to read, which reading tasks they want to do, and how and where they want to read (see section 3.5.2). Research shows that choice is motivating for pupils (Guthrie and Wigfield 2000: 411-412). For this reason, teachers should provide meaningful, relevant alternatives that pupils can choose from. When pupils realise that the teacher respects them enough to let them choose, they tend to work harder and become more involved in their learning. Similarly, as the teacher sees that the pupils work harder and are more involved in their learning, the teacher allows the pupils more choices and more responsibility.

(4) Interesting Texts for Instruction. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 412) explain that interesting texts 'refers to single-authored works in which the text matches the topic interest and cognitive competency of the reader'. Research shows that pupils spend more time reading texts that they find interesting versus texts they find uninteresting. Additionally, pupils learn more from interesting texts. Consequently, teachers should provide a multitude of interesting texts for pupils to read in order to increase their motivation. This instructional process is closely tied to autonomy support and providing choices, as pupils generally do not find the same texts interesting. Providing varied and interesting alternatives for the pupils to choose from would therefore be important.

(5) Strategy Instruction. Strategy instruction, which includes direct instruction, modelling, and guided practice (see section 3.6.4), tends to be motivating and empowering for

pupils. One of the reasons for this is that pupils who are more aware of their abilities and limitations, as is often the result of working with reading strategies, are more motivated than pupils who are less aware. Moreover, long-term, successful strategy instruction will enable pupils to use multiple reading strategies. This will in turn increase their reading comprehension and thereby increase their motivation to read more.

(6) Collaboration. Collaboration between pupils in the classroom can increase pupils' intrinsic motivation. Social support and the feeling of belonging in a community of readers is important for pupils' motivation for reading. In this context, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 414) emphasise the importance of prosocial goals. Prosocial behaviour in the classroom involves helping peers who need assistance and promoting friendship and collaboration. The feeling of belonging and being accepted in the classroom can also help increase pupils' self-confidence and reduce anxiety levels. Low anxiety usually leads to higher levels of language acquisition (Krashen 1982: 30-31) and correlates with a low or weak affective filter (see section 3.3), which means that pupils will acquire language more easily.

(7) Praise and Rewards. Providing praise and rewards are common strategies for increasing pupils' reading motivation. Nevertheless, teachers should only praise pupils under certain conditions. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 414) argue that:

> Effective praise is given contingently on effort and achievement, specifies the particulars of the accomplishment, shows spontaneity, orients students toward better appreciation of their own work, attributes success to effort, and fosters appreciation of task relevant strategies.

Other types of rewards, such as points or gold stars, can have a negative effect on pupil motivation. The reason for this is that extrinsic rewards foster extrinsic motivation and performance goals, such as good grades, instead of learning goals, such as comprehending and learning content.

(8) Evaluation. Much focus has been given to motivational classroom instruction, although it is just as important to provide motivational evaluation activities. Evaluation activities can make up a continuum from objective and standardised evaluations, on the one hand, to pupil-centred and personalised evaluations, on the other hand. Standardised evaluations are less time-consuming for teachers to administer. However, they do not reflect the extent of pupils' knowledge, their motivation, and reading practices. Personalised evaluations, such as portfolios, foster pupil motivation but are on the other hand time-consuming and in many cases difficult for teachers to evaluate. The use of portfolios or other extended projects is a way of evaluating pupils' progress over time. In these projects, pupils

often get feedback on their progress, which can increase their self-efficacy and strengthen their belief in their own competence. These factors are essential for pupils' intrinsic motivation.

(9) Teacher Involvement. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 416) describe the involved teacher as one who 'knows about the students' personal interests, cares about each student's learning, and holds realistic but positive goals for their effort and learning'. Guthrie and Wigfield refer to research by Skinner and Belmont (1993), who found that pupils who felt their teacher was involved in their progress and facilitated pupil autonomy were more engaged in the classroom. The research also showed that highly engaged pupils performed well across school subjects. Skinner and Belmont (1993) did not find a direct link between teacher involvement and pupil outcomes. It was in fact pupil engagement, a result of teacher involvement, that lead to positive outcomes for pupils.

(10) Coherence of Instructional Processes. There are connections between the instructional processes discussed above. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 416) argue that the processes should not be carried out in isolation. In order to increase pupils' reading motivation, teachers should fuse the instructional processes. When there is coherence among the instructional processes, pupil engagement increases.[7]

3.8 Related research in Norway

As far as research on L1 reading concerns, the results from the 2000 international OECD PISA surveys showed that Norwegian pupils scored poorly in reading. The numbers showed significant discrepancies in reading proficiency within classes, and not between classes or schools. There were also significant discrepancies between genders, with females performing significantly better than males (Roe 2006: 68-69). Additionally, Norwegian pupils reported using less reading strategies than pupils in most of the other countries taking part (Roe 2014: 85). Reports following the PISA surveys showed that Norwegian schools have traditionally not taught reading after the first reading instruction in the lower grades and stated a need for more knowledge about a 'second reading instruction' (Roe 2006: 69). (See also section 3.6.1). The low reading scores drew massive attention to the reading proficiency of Norwegian pupils and resulted in several policy initiatives to improve reading instruction (Roe 2014: 13).

Despite the measures taken to improve Norwegian pupils' reading proficiency after the 2000 PISA survey, Norwegian pupils achieved even lower scores on the 2003 and 2006 PISA

---

[7] The italicised headings are as they appear in Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 409-416).

surveys (Roe 2014: 204). However, Norwegian pupils' reading scores improved in 2009. The discrepancies in reading performance between the pupils were lower than in the previous surveys. Nevertheless, the gender discrepancy was still significant. Similar results were seen in the 2012 PISA survey (Roe 2014: 204-205).

The pupils' reading habits and attitudes towards reading were measured in a questionnaire in connection with the PISA surveys. In all the PISA surveys, Norwegian pupils reported rather negative attitudes towards reading. This finding was especially pronounced among males (Roe 2014: 206). Paper-based reading has decreased in popularity since 2000, whereas online reading has increased steadily. It is thus difficult to pinpoint what the pupils read and how much they read online (Roe 2014: 206).

Berge et al. (2017) examined Norwegian 4th grade teachers' reported use of reading strategies in their instruction. All the teachers who responded to the 2016 PISA teachers' questionnaire were included in the study. They were asked which reading strategies they taught, how often and whether this varied among different classes. Berge et al.'s results suggest that far more teachers teach reading strategies now than in the early 2000s. Berge at al. also found that the teachers reported teaching many different reading strategies, which again shows that the teachers were aware of, and used many strategies in their instruction. However, the results also showed that surface-level strategies were taught significantly more than deep-processing strategies (see section 3.6.1). Berge et al. concluded that there was a potential for more reading strategy instruction among 4th grade teachers, especially deep-processing strategies that could develop pupils' comprehension further.

As for L1 studies on the upper secondary level, Brevik (2014) examined how 21 Norwegian upper secondary teachers of all subjects described their strategy instruction. The study was based on a four-week professional development course (TPD course) in reading strategy instruction for upper secondary teachers. The teachers were interviewed before and after the TPD course. Brevik found that there was an observed change in the teachers' descriptions of their teaching practices before and after the TPD course. Before the course, Brevik found the teachers' descriptions of their practices to be 'implicit and unarticulated' (2014: 59). After the TPD course, the teachers described their practices quite explicitly. As a result, the TPD course did not primarily teach the teachers new strategic knowledge. However, the teachers 'experienced a renewed strategic knowledge' (2014: 60). Brevik's findings suggest the need for TPD courses in reading strategies and reading instruction.

Turning specifically to EFL reading studies in Norway, Charboneau (2016) studied EFL reading instruction in Norwegian primary schools. Charboneau found that the majority of

the 370 primary school teachers who participated in her study exclusively used the textbook in their instruction. Furthermore, few teachers used, or had access to, other reading materials in English and little time was spent on individual reading. Charboneau also found that little attention was given to reading strategies. Instead, the English subject was often reduced to discussing social or cultural issues in English- speaking countries (Nyberg 2017).

Gilje (2014) found similar results in her investigation of teacher cognition, reading-related materials, and practices among eight 6th grade EFL teachers in Norway. Her findings showed that textbooks were widely used in all eight classes in her study, confirming what she calls 'the established textbook tradition of Norwegian EFL teachers' (Gilje 2014: 17). Gilje's informants also focused minimally on reading strategies and genre awareness. Moreover, the formally educated teachers in the study were able to reflect more around their practices, thus suggesting the importance of in-service courses and access to an extensive selection of reading materials in schools.

When it comes to studies at the lower secondary level, Bakke (2010) researched EFL reading in lower secondary schools. Bakke interviewed ten teachers at six different schools. She found that most of the teachers were not content with the quality of the textbooks, but reported using them extensively anyway. The teachers also reported a minimal focus on reading strategy instruction.

As for studies at the upper secondary level, in his 2005 doctoral study, Hellekjær investigated the English reading proficiency of upper secondary and university students in Norway. Hellekjær found that two thirds of his sample of 177 upper secondary pupils did not obtain good enough reading scores on a language test to qualify for admission to a British university. He also found that Norwegian pupils read very little because very little reading was required in the EFL curriculum in force at the time.

Finally, in a qualitative study of EFL reading in upper secondary school in Norway, Faye-Schjøll (2009) interviewed 12 upper secondary EFL teachers, all but two employed at different schools. Faye-Schjøll found that her informants did not work on reading strategies and that little reading was done in class, except for textbook reading. Johansen (2013), on the other hand, found the opposite results. She studied the use of reading strategies at two upper secondary schools in Norway and found that there was a good deal of focus on reading strategies among teachers and pupils.

The present thesis adds to the research on reading in English at the upper secondary level in Norway by illuminating what and how the pupils are instructed to read in the Vg1 English course. In addition, the study has included the aspect of pupils' motivation to read.

The present study includes the experiences of both the teachers and their pupils, thus shedding light on EFL reading instruction from two different perspectives.

4.0 Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology employed to answer the following research questions:

- What and how much do the pupils read in English in five Norwegian EFL upper secondary classes?
- How do the pupils in these five classes read English?
- Are the pupils in these classes helped to develop reading strategies in English in order to improve comprehension skills? If so, how?
- To what extent is pupils' motivation to read English taken into consideration by the teachers?

This chapter starts by describing what qualitative research is in section 4.2. In the following section, 4.3, the data collection is described: the sample and the methods used to collect the data, namely semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews, in addition to an account of how the pilot interviews were conducted and the adjustments that followed, and lastly, a subsection about how the results were presented. Section 4.4 describes how the researcher aimed at increasing the study's validity and reliability. Finally, the ethical considerations that were taken into account are recounted in section 4.5.

4.2 Qualitative research

The present study makes use of qualitative research methods to investigate reading, reading strategies, and motivation for reading in Norwegian EFL classes. Denzin and Lincoln (1994: 2) explain that 'Qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.' Qualitative researchers are, in other words, interested in people's social experiences: how the social experiences are created and how people give them meaning. The emphasis on processes and meanings implies that qualitative researchers cannot measure their results in terms of amount, frequency, or quantity (Denzin and Lincoln 1994: 4). The data that is collected in qualitative studies are therefore usually in the form of notes and written or spoken words, and not, as in the case of quantitative data, in the form of numbers and statistics. The main goal of qualitative research is thus not to acquire data that is representative of a large group, but rather to seek to describe distinctive human experiences and understandings of the topic under investigation (Dörnyei 2007: 126).

Qualitative research is used in many different disciplines and qualitative researchers make use of a wide range of methods. Common methods are interviews, participant observation, case studies, and survey research. These methods are used to investigate empirical materials, such as personal experiences, life stories, introspective, and different types of texts (Denzin and Lincoln 1994: 2-3). The qualitative methods that were used in the present study were semi-structured interviews with teachers and focus group interviews with pupils.

The researcher has a fundamental role in qualitative research. Denzin and Lincoln (1994: 4) emphasise what they call 'the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied'. The researcher's active involvement in the field under investigation can offer valuable insight and knowledge into the field. On the other hand, the pivotal role of the researcher can be problematic: there is always a risk of researcher bias when conducting qualitative research, which has to be taken into consideration in order to secure the validity of the research.

4.3 The data collection

4.3.1 The sample

The present study is based on individual interviews with five teachers from five different upper secondary schools in urban areas and focus group interviews with five to six of their pupils. Dörnyei (2007: 127) claims that in an interview study, six to ten informants are an appropriate sample. Thus, the present study should generate ample data.

Both teachers and pupils were included in this research because both perspectives were considered important in order to answer the research questions. It provided the chance for both teachers and pupils to express their experiences and opinions about reading and reading instruction in upper secondary school. By interviewing both teachers and pupils, the researcher also had the opportunity to find potential discrepancies between how the teachers described their teaching practices and how the pupils perceived them.

The informants for the teacher interviews, upper secondary EFL teachers, were found through *gatekeepers*. Lodico (2010: 113) explains that 'Gatekeepers can assist researchers by identifying people or places for study that best fit the goals of the research.' The gatekeepers in the present study were upper secondary teachers from the researcher's contact network in five upper secondary schools. The gatekeepers approached colleagues who might be interested in participating in the study and thereby provided the researcher with the contact

details of those teachers. The informants were contacted via email. The researcher contacted seven potential informants and five of them agreed to participate in the study.

The five interviewed teachers selected the pupils from their classes to participate in the focus group interviews. In order to illuminate different experiences, the teachers were encouraged to ask a mixture of high and low performing pupils from their English class to participate in the study. Nevertheless, the researcher emphasised that the most important factor was the pupils' willingness to discuss the topic under investigation and to share their experiences.

All of the teachers and pupils who participated in the study were in the Programmes for General Studies and not from the Vocational Education Programmes. This was regarded as the most sensible choice because, although they have the same competency aims in the English subject, there are several differences between the two programmes. The Programmes for General Studies complete the English subject in one year, Vg1, whereas the Vocational Education Programmes complete the same subject over two years, Vg1 and Vg2. This means that if the researcher were to interview pupils from a Vg1 Vocational Education Programme, they might not have come far in covering the subject's competency aims. Moreover, the pupils from the two programmes normally have different career paths. Many of the pupils enrolled in the Vocational Education Programmes will go on to work in their chosen craft or occupation after upper secondary school. Most pupils who finish the Programmes for General Studies, on the other hand, will pursue higher education. The teaching practices and the pupils from the Programmes for General Studies are thus of particular interest to the present study because Vg1 is the last year where English is mandatory before they potentially start university. The reading instruction that takes place in Vg1 Programmes for General studies might therefore influence the pupils' reading habits in English when they start higher education.

Arguably, in order to obtain a better picture of the pupils' experiences in the Vg1 English subject as a whole, the researcher could have conducted the focus group interviews towards the end of the school year and not in November or December. However, this would not have been possible because of the time restraints in the present study. Alternatively, the researcher could have interviewed pupils who had already completed the Vg1 English course. This was not done because the researcher wanted to interview a teacher and his or her pupils from the same class in order to compare their experiences, which means that they needed to be involved in the English subject at the same time.

4.3.2 Semi-structured interviews

The present study included interviews with five teachers from five different upper secondary schools. The teachers were all interviewed in November 2017 to January 2018. The interview format that was used was individual, semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are interviews where an interview guide with pre-prepared questions is compiled. The format is more open than a structured interview, which means that the interviewer can ask follow-up questions and the interviewee is encouraged to further explain and elaborate on important topics (Dörnyei 2007: 136).

The interviews in the present study were conducted in one session with the informant and lasted from 60 to 90 minutes, which made these interviews typical qualitative interviews, according to Dörnyei (2007: 134). Nevertheless, Dörnyei is critical of interviews conducted in one session, as he fears they will not produce comprehensive data. Dörnyei (2007: 134-135) argues instead for a sequence of three interviews. A sequence of multiple interviews has the advantage of gathering more, and more in-depth data than a one-off interview. However, sequences of multiple interviews might also be problematic as the informant potentially has the opportunity to prepare or improve his or her answers. Planned answers might not reflect a teacher's true teaching practices, but ideal ones.

A pre-prepared interview guide was used during the interviews (see Appendix 1 and 3). The interview guide included 34 questions, which were categorised into six different categories: background, reading materials, amount and ways of reading, reading strategies, learner differences in motivation, and further comments. The final category was added to encourage teachers to add any relevant information that they were not asked about. These categories helped the researcher to ensure that the interview was on track and that the discussion stayed relevant to the study. Examples of questions that the teachers were asked are: How much time do you spend on reading and reading-related activities in your English lessons? Do you teach reading strategies to improve the pupils' comprehension in your lessons? How do you accommodate for learner differences in motivation for reading and reading-related activities?

Before they were interviewed, the teachers in the present study received an information letter where the topic and aims of the study were described. However, the teachers did not receive any information about the categories in the interview guide or the questions they would be asked. This was done to ensure that the teachers did not plan their answers in advance. The questions in the interview guide were thus written with the teacher's lack of preparation in mind. However, some questions proved to be difficult for most of the

teachers to answer, especially the ones about the amount of reading. This resulted in some unspecific answers.

The informants were invited to choose which language they wanted the interview to be conducted in. This was done to make sure that the informants were as comfortable as possible in the interview setting, and that they focused on the questions and content of the interview instead of the language. All the five teachers chose to be interviewed in Norwegian. The fact that all of the interviews were conducted in Norwegian meant that the researcher had to translate parts of them to English. When one translates from one language to another, one always risks translation issues that could potentially compromise the data.

4.3.3 Focus group interviews

Five focus group interviews were conducted in the present study. The focus groups were made up of five to six of the pupils of the five interviewed teachers. A focus group interview is a type of group interview, typically with six to twelve participants (Dörnyei 2007: 144). A focus group is made up of participants that have been chosen to discuss a certain topic based on their knowledge of the topic or their background. It is the interaction within the group that is the source of data. This means that the interviewer should take a step back after asking a question, leaving the participants to discuss the topic with the rest of the group and not with the interviewer. Because focus group interviews are very focused on a specific topic, they might provide useful and insightful data that would otherwise not have been available (Cohen et al. 2000: 288).

Morgan (1988: 25) argues that 'Focus groups are useful when it comes to investigating *what* people think, but they excel at uncovering *why* participants think as they do.' This is an advantage of focus group interviews. Other methods of inquiry, such as observations of classes and questionnaires, could potentially investigate what pupils think, but they could not uncover why the pupils think as they do. The possibility to ask follow-up questions, ask the pupils to elaborate, and further discuss a topic makes focus group interviews ideal for this study.

Furthermore, the more relaxed and informal tone that is created as pupils interact with each other, as opposed to in individual interviews, might make the pupils more comfortable and hence share more of their experiences and opinions (Cohen et al. 2000: 288-290). This format also invites the pupils to draw on each others' ideas and come to conclusions they might not have managed to come up with on their own. Moreover, the open-ended questions that characterise focus group interviews can cause the pupils' discussions to take different

directions than the researcher had anticipated. Consequently, the resulting data might surprise the researcher (Barbour 2007: 32). On the other hand, the focus group format is not ideal for all pupils. The social nature of focus group interviews is both its strength and its weakness. Some pupils might not dare to express opinions that contradict the others, and some might not have the courage, or the desire, to participate in the discussion at all.

An interview guide was made for the focus group interviews (see Appendix 2 and 4). The interview guide was divided into five categories: reading materials, ways of reading, reading strategies, learner differences in motivation, and further comments. Examples of the questions the pupils were asked are: Are you allowed to choose reading materials yourselves? What do you do if you do not understand what you read in English? What do you think the teacher can do differently to accommodate for learner differences in motivation for reading? Just like their teachers, the pupils were only informed about the topic of the present study before the interview (see Appendix 5) and they were not given insight into the interview guide beforehand.

The focus group interviews were conducted in the pupils' mother-tongue, Norwegian. This was done so that the data would not be compromised. The researcher wanted to make sure the pupils felt comfortable enough in the interview setting to express their opinions and also to eliminate the risk of them wanting to express something they were unable to because they did not know how to formulate it in English. Nevertheless, this created further challenges for the researcher as some of the interaction had to be translated from Norwegian to English, which was both time consuming and ran the risk of mistranslation, although every effort was made to avoid this happening.

4.3.4 Pilot interviews

The semi-structured interview and the focus group interview were piloted. The pilot interviews were conducted with a teacher and pupils in a different class at one of the five selected upper secondary schools in October and November 2017. The informants in the pilot interviews received the same information as the informants in the actual interviews, namely the topic and aims of the present study. However, they were not informed about the questions they would be asked.

Some issues were discovered when the pilot interviews were conducted. The pilot interview with the pupils lasted longer than expected. This was a problem because in most cases the pupils who were scheduled to participate in the focus group interviews only had a set amount of time, usually no more than an hour, to spend on the interview. It was difficult to

facilitate a fruitful discussion among the pupils in the pilot interview because they had so many questions to consider and limited time to do so. Some questions were therefore eliminated from the focus group interview guide in order to facilitate discussions among the participants. Some of the questions also proved to elicit other responses than the researcher had intended. These questions therefore had to be rewritten and made more specific.

The pilot interview with the teacher uncovered additional issues. As with the focus group pilot, the pilot interview with the teacher lasted slightly longer than anticipated. For this reason, a few questions that did not seem very relevant were eliminated. However, the researcher did not want to eliminate too many questions. The teachers who were scheduled to participate in the interviews were therefore informed that that the interview might last more than an hour. Another issue was that the teacher struggled to refer to examples of reading strategies that were used in the Vg1 English subject. The reason for this could be that the teacher did not have a chance to prepare for the interview questions, as none of the informants were informed what they would be asked about. In any case, some of the questions were rewritten and made more specific with the teachers' lack of preparation in mind. The researcher also realised that it would be wise to explain more about what reading strategies were and use examples when asking about which reading strategies the teachers used, in order to elicit an elaborate and realistic response.

4.3.5 Presenting the results

The results of the research in the present study are presented in Chapter 5. The results from each of the five schools are presented separately. Likewise, the data collected from the teacher interview and the focus group interview at each of the schools are presented separately. The schools are referred to as Schools One to Five. The teachers are referred to using pseudonyms, whereas the pupils in each school are referred to as P1 to P6. The results are described according to the same categories that were used in the interview guides. Direct quotations from the interviewees are employed where appropriate. All the data collected in the ten interviews has been translated from Norwegian to English. Consequently, the direct quotations presented in Chapter 5 have been translated from Norwegian into English as well. Interjections have been omitted from the direct quotations. Quirk et al. (1985: 74) define interjections as follows: 'Interjections (…) are grammatically peripheral (…) They frequently involve the use of sounds which do not otherwise occur in English words.'

4.4 Validity and reliability

Richards and Morse (2007: 190) explain that 'Briefly, reliability requires that the same results would be obtained if the study were replicated, and validity requires that the results accurately reflect the phenomenon studied.' Richards and Morse (2007) point out that the concepts of validity and reliability are different in qualitative and quantitative contexts. The nature of qualitative research can make validity and reliability problematic. It is, for example, almost impossible to replicate a qualitative study because the data reflects peoples' social experiences within particular contexts (see section 4.2). Furthermore, it is difficult to judge how accurate the results are because qualitative researchers see social experiences as social constructions (Richards and Morse 2007:190). Nevertheless, validity and reliability are the qualitative researcher's goals. Several steps can be taken to ensure validity and reliability in qualitative research. The ways in which the present study established validity and reliability are recounted below.

An important criterion for assessing the validity and reliability of research is whether it is methodologically appropriate. According to Borg (2010: 9), 'Good research is often associated with quantitative methods involving statistics.' Borg emphasises that this is a misconception and that the quality of research does not depend on using specific methods, although the methods have to be appropriately chosen (Borg 2010: 9). The present study could have made use of different methods of inquiry. Questionnaires and observations, for example, could have been used instead of focus group interviews to illuminate the pupils' experiences. Questionnaires have the advantage of being less time consuming than other methods and, unlike in focus group interviews, it is possible to include the whole class simply by giving each pupil a questionnaire. Furthermore, the use of questionnaires, which has a set number of possible answers, makes it easier for the it is researcher to analyse the data and compare the answers. However, it would be very demanding to ask the pupils follow-up questions and ask for the reason behind their opinions if there were many respondents.

Thus, focus group interviews were chosen instead of questionnaires because interviews were seen as the best way to gain in-depth insight into the pupils' experiences. Similarly, observing the pupils and teacher in the classroom would allow the researcher to see the teaching practices and the pupils' reactions to them first hand. Nevertheless, observations would not result in insight into the pupils' opinions and reflections, as the pupils are usually not given the opportunity to express themselves about, for example, the focus of this research, in a classroom setting. Moreover, there are practical challenges involved in observing teachers and pupils. As this was not a longitudinal study, it would arguably not have been possible to

make meaningful observations over a long period of time in each of the five different classes involved in the study.

Two methods of research, namely semi-structured interviews with teachers and focus group interviews with pupils, were included in the present study in order to increase its validity and reliability. This practice is called *triangulation*, which involves comparing data that was obtained by using different methods (Barbour 2007: 46). In quantitative research, researchers use triangulation in order to corroborate or confirm results. Qualitative researchers, on the other hand, are more interested in analysing the differences and discrepancies that can arise from different datasets (Barbour 2007: 46-47). By including both the teachers' and the pupils' perspectives in the study, the researcher had the opportunity to compare their answers and reveal potential differences and discrepancies and the reasons behind them. Because the questions that this study aims to answer are mainly about teaching practices, the researcher could have interviewed the teachers only. However, the researcher aimed at increasing the study's validity and reliability by including different methods, and hence, different perspectives, i.e. both that of the teachers and the pupils.

The issue of researcher bias is important to consider when conducting interviews. Janesick (1994: 212) points out that there is 'no value-free or bias-free design' in research and that for this reason, it is important that the researcher identifies his or her biases. Huberman and Miles (1994: 438) list three ways one can avoid what they call 'the most obvious biases', namely ensuring representativeness, scrutinising researcher effects, and triangulating the evidence. In the present study, several steps were taken to minimise the threat of researcher bias. First, five teachers and a group of each of their pupils were included in the study to improve the probability of representation. However, it is important to note that the aim of the study, and of qualitative studies in general, was not to acquire data that was representative of a large group. In addition, one can never be sure of the representativeness of the informants involved.

Moreover, to minimise researcher effects, the teachers involved in the study were not in the researcher's contact network. This meant that the researcher was not aware of the teachers' views and teaching practices beforehand, and she thus did not choose informants based on a desired outcome. The interviews were also carefully planned and piloted. The researcher prepared interview guides for both the semi-structured interviews and the focus group interviews. The questions were compared to interview guides in similar studies and the researcher aimed to formulate the questions as openly as possible in the hope that the informants would answer honestly, and not come up with answers they thought the researcher

wanted to hear. When piloting the interviews, the researcher had the opportunity to see how the informants responded to the questions, and thus rewrite questions that were poorly formulated. The data was also triangulated by using different methods and different perspectives. In this way, both the teachers and the pupils' perspectives ensured that the data was not one-sided.

The focus group interviews with the pupils and the teacher interviews were conducted in the participants' mother-tongue, Norwegian. In the focus group interviews, this was done to make sure that the pupils expressed their opinions and participated in the discussion regardless of their English proficiency, thus erasing a potential language barrier. Cohen et al. (2000: 288) emphasise the importance of 'ensuring that participants have something to say and feel comfortable enough to say it' in focus group interviews. This was especially important because the researcher had encouraged the teachers to ask pupils of mixed ability levels to participate in the focus group interviews. The teachers were allowed to choose whether they wanted to be interviewed in English or Norwegian. Even though their English proficiency should be good, they expressed that they would be more comfortable if the interview was conducted in Norwegian. In other words, the researcher was open to conducting the interviews in Norwegian in the hope that this would result in richer data. Consequently, the researcher had to translate parts of the interviews to English. When translating speech, one always risks mistranslations and inaccurate translations due to misunderstandings, which can be a threat to the validity and reliability of the study, but every effort was made to ensure their accuracy.

In order to make the study more reliable, the interviews were recorded. Recorded interviews give the researcher the opportunity to listen to the interviews after they have been conducted and hence write more accurately about the results. This would be more difficult if the researcher used written notes or memory recall. The use of written notes or memory recall run the risk of leaving out important information, forgetting answers, or misquoting the informants.

4.5 Ethical considerations

There are several ethical issues involved in using focus group interviews and semi-structured interviews as research methods. Qualitative methods, as opposed to quantitative methods, focus on people's opinions and beliefs and therefore include many ethical considerations (Dörnyei 2007: 63). Barbour (2007: 67) points to one of the ethical issues, namely confidentiality. Confidentiality is especially important in pre-existing groups, such as school

classes where the participants' everyday life together will continue after the interview, hopefully without negative consequences. Barbour (2007: 67) claims that it is essential that the researcher stresses the importance of confidentiality before and after the interview. In order to create a comfortable environment, the informants need to be confident that the researcher or the other informants will not disclose the information they have shared and protect their anonymity. For this reason, the informants in the present study were informed in writing that they would be anonymous: that their names, their schools and their age would not be revealed. They were also informed that the tape recording of the interviews would only be accessed by the researcher and that it would be deleted after the thesis was submitted. The focus group participants were also reminded, before and after the discussion, not to disclose to anyone else what was discussed during the interview.

Another ethical consideration was what to do about potentially sensitive information. This investigation does not include particularly sensitive issues per se. However, the pupils were asked to evaluate what went on in the classroom and they were encouraged to discuss this and related topics freely. In two of the focus group interviews, some of the pupils communicated information that could be considered sensitive, namely negative characteristics of their teacher or other teachers. The researcher then has to consider whether or not this should be included in the thesis. Whether sensitive information should be included in the thesis has to be assessed from case to case. The researcher has to consider whether the information is relevant and whether it can be traced back to a teacher or a pupil.

The pupils who participated in the focus group interviews were asked to sign a letter of consent agreeing that they wanted to participate in the study (see Appendix 5). The letter informed them about the topic and the aims of the investigation. Furthermore, the letter stated that they would be anonymous and that they had the possibility to withdraw from the study, at any time, if they wished to. The teachers were also informed about the topic and aims of the study and their anonymity in writing, via email.

5.0 Results

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the research in the present study. The chapter consists of five sections that present the results from each of the five upper secondary schools included in the study. The results from the teacher interviews and the focus group interviews are presented separately. Each interview has been divided into subcategories where the results from the different topics in the interviews are summarised. Direct quotations from the interviewees are employed where appropriate. The schools are referred to as Schools One to Five. The teachers are referred to using pseudonyms, whereas the pupils in each school are referred to as P1 to P6.

5.2 School One

School One is located in an urban area. The class consisted of 28 pupils who were enrolled in the Programmes for General Studies with Specialisation in Sport and Physical Education. Five pupils participated in the focus group interview. The teacher interview and the focus group interview were conducted in November 2017.

5.2.1 School One teacher interview: Mia

Mia, the teacher in School One, had 14 years of teaching experience. She had English 'mellomfag'[8] (subsidiary subject) and a Master's degree in Norwegian. Mia taught English at Vg1 and Norwegian at Vg1, Vg2, and Vg3 in School One, where she had worked throughout her teaching career. Mia explained that the school did not have a common policy or guidelines for reading and teaching reading in English or in other subjects. Likewise, Mia was not aware of any traditions for reading and teaching reading in the school.

Reading materials

Mia used the textbook in class, but not as homework. She explained that her pupils were very busy with sports outside of school and that they did not have much time to do homework. Therefore, the pupils were only assigned homework if they did not finish what they were working on in class. When asked to what extent she used the textbook in class, Mia answered 'a lot'. Mia found the textbook convenient to use because the texts and the tasks were placed

---

[8] 1,5 years of English.

together, and the grammatical, linguistic, and structural tasks were all related to the text. Mia used a textbook called *Passage* (Burgess and Sørhus 2009). Despite noting that the textbook was 'too old', Mia reported that she was pleased with its quality.

When questioned whether she used other reading materials in her lessons, Mia answered that her pupils had just finished reading the novel *Of Mice and Men* (Steinbeck 1998). The reason why she chose this novel was because the school had 30 copies of the novel, so the whole class could read it simultaneously. Mia pointed out that 'they [the pupils] think that the novel is difficult [to read]'. Mia reflected that she would very much like to have her pupils read a newer novel, but this was a question of economic resources and the school did not have the resources to buy many new books at present. Mia did not plan on assigning more novels for her pupils to read during the school year.

From time to time, Mia also supplemented the textbook with articles about the topic they were working on. She explained that she found some of the articles by searching online. In addition, the English teachers shared texts that they found useful on *One Note*, a software program for collecting and sharing information. She selected the reading materials by considering how relevant the texts were for the topic they were working with.

When the conversation turned to whether the pupils were allowed to choose reading materials themselves, Mia felt it was more convenient for the whole class to read the same texts. She commented: 'I think it is more fun [when the pupils read the same text] because we have this [the text] in common. And I think this is easier because I get to read the text and prepare it and we can work with it in a different way [than if the pupils read different texts].'

Mia reported that she was not content with the selection of English books at the school library. There were few English books and the majority of them were old.

Amount and ways of reading

Mia reported that reading and reading-related activities had been prioritised higher in her English lessons than other skills, especially in the past weeks when the class had read the novel *Of Mice and Men*. However, she was uncertain about how much time the pupils should spend reading individually in class. Mia felt that allowing the pupils to read in class was not always a good use of the time as many of the pupils struggled to focus on the reading.

When asked how much time she spent on reading and reading-related activities in her English lessons, Mia answered that the pupils spent a good deal of time reading in class during the weeks they read the novel. The pupils were given several 80-minute lessons to

finish the novel. However, apart from when they read the novel, the pupils rarely read individually in class. Instead, they listened to audio files of the textbook texts they were working on. If Mia assigned texts without audio files, she read the texts aloud to her pupils herself. After the pupils had listened to a text, they usually worked with questions from the textbook, and some of them collaborated in pairs and answered the questions together. Mia reported that the class usually studied two texts a week, usually two to three pages long. With 38 weeks in a school year[9], the pupils read about 228 pages during the Vg1 English course, in addition to the novel.

Mia admitted that she usually did not encourage her pupils to read English at home. She claimed she would probably encourage her pupils to read English at home if something was done about the school library. Mia described the reading of *Of Mice and Men* as an extensive reading project and the pupils had been given four weeks to finish the relatively short novel. Mia had not collaborated about reading in English with teachers who taught other subjects.

Reading strategies

Mia reported using reading strategies in her lessons to improve her pupils' reading comprehension. When asked which strategies the pupils used before, during, and after reading, Mia focused first on what she instructed her pupils to do when they were reading *Of Mice and Men*. Before the pupils had started reading, they found information about the author, John Steinbeck. They also read a text about what characterised the American dream in the past and in today's society.

While they were reading, Mia instructed the pupils to write down quotes from the book that were associated with literary key words, such as setting, character, symbols, climax, and theme. Mia provided a chart where the pupils could fill in the quotes and add their own comments. Mia also instructed the pupils to draw the inside of the bunk house that was described in the novel because 'they read the first pages that include a lot of detailed descriptions (…) then I have sort of helped them along by having them draw this house. They probably had to use the dictionary if they did not understand what the different things were'. Mia also spent one 80-minute lesson discussing the novel with groups of four to seven pupils at a time. After the pupils finished reading the novel, they were assessed and graded in an oral

---

[9] According to the Norwegian Education Act (Opplæringsloven).

group discussion with three to four pupils. The pupils were assessed on their ability to use the literary key words and examples from the text.

The interviewer then asked which reading strategies she instructed her pupils to use before, during, and after reading in a regular lesson (when they were not reading *Of Mice and Men)*. Mia reported that she usually instructed her pupils to answer the pre-reading questions in the textbook before they started reading. Before every text, there was a box with questions which were supposed to activate the pupils' prior knowledge about a topic. Mia did not instruct her pupils do do anything while reading. After reading, she instructed her pupils to do post-reading tasks in the textbook.

Mia further explained that when the class listened to texts on audio files, she usually paused the audio file and asked the pupils questions to make sure that they had understood what the text was about. In one lesson Mia instructed the pupils to formulate their own questions to a text. This was a reading strategy that a friend who worked at The Reading Centre at the University of Stavanger had advised her to do and a strategy that Mia found interesting. However, she had not had the opportunity to look at the pupils' questions yet.

Mia mentioned that she had talked briefly in class about the differences between skimming, scanning, intensive and extensive reading, 'so they [the pupils] have heard about it'. In order to help her pupils remember important information when they read, Mia instructed them to take notes while reading and find examples from the texts.

If the pupils did not understand what they read in English, Mia advised them to use a dictionary. She had instructed her pupils to download dictionaries on their computers and had showed them how to use the dictionaries. On the other hand, Mia emphasised: 'You [the pupils] cannot be stressed if you do not understand all the words, try to understand the context (…) clearly, if they are going to progress they cannot look up every word [in the dictionary].'

Mia was uncertain about how much vocabulary her pupils learned in her lessons: 'I think I work inadequately with vocabulary (…) I work a little with technical terms but I do not assign glossary tests. I do not know if this is bad because it is very important that they learn new vocabulary.' Mia also mentioned that she usually paused the audio files that she played in class if she came across words she felt that the pupils did not understand.

When asked what she thought was challenging about helping the pupils become better readers, Mia answered that she found the difficulties that arose when the pupils were on different proficiency levels in English the most challenging. She also found it challenging to find texts that engaged all the pupils. If she had more reading materials, or a bigger budget,

Mia would have bought 30 copies of a newer book that the pupils wanted to read 'because I think it is fun that the whole class read the same text.'

Mia did not think that the Vg1 English course prepared pupils well enough for reading in English in higher education. She believed that the amount and level of difficulty would be overwhelming for the pupils. She reflected: 'I think that when they get to university [and have to read in English], they will be shocked.'

Learner differences in motivation

When asked how she accommodated for learner differences in motivation, Mia stopped to think. She then started talking about the textbook *Passage*: 'The advantage of getting to use a textbook, even though it is old, is that there are simpler versions of the texts [in the textbook].' When the class read a text in the textbook, low achieving pupils had the option of working with the simpler version of the text. This could increase their motivation to read because it increased the chance of their understanding of the text. However, Mia only played the most advanced text on audio file for the class. Low achieving pupils were also allowed to answer fewer questions from the textbook after reading. Mia also pointed out that letting the pupils read in class when they were reading *Of Mice and Men* could be a way of motivating them to read. If they read efficiently in class, they would have less to read at home.

5.2.2 School One pupil focus group interview

Reading materials

The pupils explained that they had not used the textbook, *Passage*, much in class yet because they had spent a good deal of time reading the novel *Of Mice and Men*. However, the pupils were pleased with the texts they had read in the textbook so far, except for one pupil who found the textbook 'a little difficult'. When they had used the textbook, they had for the most part listened to the texts on audio files. The pupils preferred listening to audio files over reading aloud because they were anxious about reading aloud to their peers.

The pupils had spent the last four weeks reading *Of Mice and Men* in English class. When asked what they thought about reading *Of Mice and Men*, the following conversation took place:

> P2: It is a very difficult book [to read].
> P4: Yes, there are a lot of descriptions.
> P3: There are so many strange words.
> P2: Yes, they [the author] do not write regular words (…)

P5: It is old fashioned language (…)
P3: If we had not seen the movie [*Of Mice and Men*], I would not have understood anything.
P2: I spent so much time translating single words. Like, in the middle of the text, it was like, 'I did not understand that', so I spent so much more time than I would have done had I seen the movie first (…)
P4: When I have been reading this book, I have been sitting with my dad and I have read aloud to him because I only understand half of it, so I always, sort of, ask him if there are any words [that I do not understand] because his English is very good.

This exchange showed that the pupils did not enjoy reading the novel because it was well beyond their language proficiency. They all agreed that they would much rather choose what to read themselves. P1 elaborated: 'Because then you can find, sort of, books that you like yourself and then the reading might be a little more fun because many [pupils] do not like to read.' The pupils were never allowed to choose reading materials themselves. They were assigned the same texts in the textbook and the whole class had to read *Of Mice and Men*.

Aside from reading the textbook and the novel, the pupils reported that they had been assigned little additional reading materials. They mentioned three texts that the teacher had found elsewhere: a poem, a text about the American dream and 'something about Billy Elliot'.

The pupils claimed that there were many books in English at the school library, but they did not look for them as they did not have the time. The pupils were aware that it was beneficial to read English books at home, but claimed that they were too busy to do so.

Amount of reading

The pupils had been given about one hour of all the English lessons for the past four weeks, two 80-minute lessons one week and three in the alternating weeks, to read *Of Mice and Men*, a total of ten hours. According to the pupils, the novel was about 170 pages long, which meant that the pupils would have to read about 17 pages each lesson in order to finish reading the book within four weeks without reading at home. However, all but one of the pupils did not take advantage of the time they were allotted to read in class:

P3: I do not read [in class] (…) or maybe a little bit, but then you always lose a little motivation (…) and if you sit in a group study room then it is just like you sit and talk and do sort of other things.
P2: We have not been very good at reading.
P3: No, and then it is like, I think it has to do with priorities too, because if we for example have a test that week [in another subject], then I think more about that test

(…) and that is why I have not sort of read as much as I should and then I have ended up reading a lot more at home than I really had to (…)

The pupils reported that Mia did not encourage them to read in English in their spare time. None of the focus group participants claimed to read in English at home on their own initiative.

Reading strategies

The pupils reported that they were not usually instructed to do any pre-reading activities in class. Before they started reading *Of Mice and Men*, Mia had told them to read about the author, John Steinbeck, and write some sentences about him. During reading *Of Mice and Men*, the pupils had been given two tasks: to fill in quotes from the novel on a chart and to draw the inside of the bunk house that was described in the novel. The pupils disagreed about the usefulness of the chart. Two of the pupils found it confusing and had not used it, whereas the other three found it useful and they were pleased that they could bring it to the oral group discussion they were scheduled for the same week. On the other hand, the pupils all agreed that drawing the house was fun and useful. P3 explained: 'It was very nice, because we were asked about what [the bunk house] looked like during the mock oral group discussion that we had. And then (…) you just thought "oh, it was like that" and then you pictured your drawing in your head.'

After reading in class, the pupils were usually instructed to discuss a given topic from the text, first in pairs, and then share their thoughts with the class. Post-reading tasks from the textbook were also used frequently. The pupils all found discussions about the texts useful as they improved their comprehension. The pupils pointed out that the the reading strategies they used in class had not been taught explicitly.

When the interviewer asked which reading strategies the pupils used to increase their reading comprehension when they read by themselves, P4 and P5 reported summarising during and/or after reading, whereas P3 usually wrote key words. P1 and P2 admitted to not using reading strategies when reading by themselves. The conversation then turned to whether reading strategies had been focused on in lower grades. The pupils had widely different experiences from their previous schooling. P1, P3, and P5 reported that there was much focus on reading strategies in their primary and/or lower secondary school. In contrast, P4 felt she had not learned enough about reading strategies in compulsory school, she expressed: 'I think we [P4's previous classes] have spent too little time on them [reading strategies] because I have no idea what I should do when I read a text.' This showed that there were significant

differences between the pupils' knowledge of, and experiences with, reading strategies. Whether or not the pupils were familiar with reading strategies when they started Vg1 depended on the school they went to or the teacher they had in primary or lower secondary school.

The pupils had not been taught different ways of reading, like skimming, scanning, intensive and extensive reading in English class. However, these terms were familiar from Norwegian class. Mia had instructed them to skim a chapter in the textbook once, so the pupils were familiar with skimming.

The interviewer then asked what they did to remember important information when they read. P3 responded: 'I just try to picture it.' The others expressed that they used discussions with peers to remember important information. Two of the pupils also used *Youtube*[10] videos, especially if the text was difficult to understand. On *Youtube*, the pupils found videos where the topic of the text was explained. Watching these videos helped them understand and remember the topic they were reading about.

The pupils responded differently when asked what they did if they did not not understand what they read in English. Two of them claimed to use dictionaries frequently, one asked a parent, and two guessed the meaning from the context. The pupils further explained that Mia had instructed them to continue reading even if they did not understand all the words. Mia instructed the pupils to use *Quizlet*, a web page where one could make one's own vocabulary tests or flash cards in order to learn new vocabulary. None of the pupils found *Quizlet* useful. They claimed that they had not learned any new words because they forgot about them quickly after exiting *Quizlet*.

Furthermore, the interviewer wondered what the pupils thought was most challenging about reading in English. The pupils all expressed that they found new words, grammar, and the sentence structure in English challenging. In addition, P3 also found pronunciation challenging when reading.

The conversation then turned to what was lacking in the teaching of reading and what they wanted more of. The pupils agreed that they wanted more pre-reading activities. They believed that this would help them gain insight into what the texts were about and hence increase their comprehension.

---

[10] *Youtube* is a web page where users can share videos. https://www.youtube.com

Learner differences in motivation

When the interviewer enquired whether the pupils thought learner differences in motivation were accommodated for in reading and reading-related activities, they responded:

> P1: No.
> P3: No, because this book [*Of Mice and Men*] is way too difficult for me, I am not proficient in English.
> P4: Many [pupils] thought it was very difficult, and there was not an easier option either.
> P2: But she [Mia] has given us so much time to read it, so she has sort of been good there [about that]. We have not had a lack of time, we have just not been making the most of the time (…)
> P1: But the fact that we saw the movie [*Of Mice and Men*], did make it easier, so she has sort of made it easier for the ones who maybe did not understand the book.

When the discussion turned to what the pupils thought the teacher could do differently to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation, all but one of the focus group participants expressed that they wished they could choose which book to read themselves. P3 emphasised: 'I feel that if you have your own book, then it is more your own interest and then it is often like you want to maybe sit down and find out more about the book because you think it is fun.' The pupils also requested texts on different levels that they could choose from when reading in class, so that everyone could read texts that matched their current language proficiency level.

5.3 School Two

School Two is located in a city. There were 29 pupils in the class and they were in the Programmes for General Studies with Specialisation in Sport and Physical Education. Five pupils took part in the focus group interview, which was conducted in December 2017. The teacher interview was conducted in January 2018.

5.3.1 School Two teacher interview: Lisa

Lisa, the teacher at School Two, had 44 years of teaching experience. She had previously worked in primary and lower secondary school and started working in upper secondary school 35 years ago. Lisa had 'grunnfag'[11] (basic courses) in English, Religious Studies, and Physical Education. She taught English and Physical Education. School Two did not have a common policy or guidelines for reading and teaching reading. They did not have traditions

---

[11] One year of study.

for reading or the teaching of reading either, Lisa explained: 'This is up to the individual teacher.'

Reading materials

Lisa commented that she used the textbook 'to a large extent'. She used the textbook in most lessons and she assigned homework from the textbook at least once a week. Lisa used the textbook *Targets* (Balsvik et al. 2015). She was pleased with the quality of the textbook and emphasised that it was very comprehensive. Lisa felt that some of the tasks in *Targets* were too mature for the Vg1 pupils. In addition to the textbook, she reported using Aschehoug's[12] digital platform *Lokus*, which complemented *Targets*. *Lokus* included comprehension tasks, grammatical tasks, crossword puzzles, true and false statements, and other tasks which were based on the texts from *Targets*.

Occasionally, Lisa allowed the pupils to go online to read current news from English language sources. Presenting and discussing current news was one of the competency aims in the English subject curriculum. The pupils were allowed to choose which news they wanted to read about, and Lisa encouraged them to choose news that they were interested in. Lisa also mentioned that if some of the pupils finished the assigned tasks in class, she sometimes instructed them to go online and read something that 'excited' them. However, there were no restrictions to what the pupils could read and she did not know what they read.

Lisa revealed that her pupils would not be asked to read a novel during the Vg1 English course. Lisa defended her lack of focus on reading books by emphasising that it was no longer explicitly stated in the English subject curriculum that the pupils had to read books.

> They no longer have to read a book. It was terribly stressful for a while (…) Many of the pupils did not read the book. Then they gave a presentation of the book and they had only read something online or read at the back of the book. So it is removed [from the curriculum], it is no longer obligatory to read a novel or a book.

When asked what she thought about the selection of English books at the school library, Lisa confirmed that there were English books in the school library. However, she reported that she had not been in the school library and had a look for herself. The pupils usually had a tour of the school library with the librarian at the beginning of the school year, Lisa was not sure whether the librarian presented English book on the tour.

---

[12] Aschehoug is a Norwegian publishing firm.

Amount and ways of reading

Lisa prioritised reading and reading-related activities highly. Most of what was done in the lessons was related to the text that they read in the textbook. Thorough reviews of the texts were prioritised. A substantial amount of time was set aside for individual reading and/or completing comprehension tasks each lesson, except for the lessons when they watched a film about the topics they worked with in the textbook. The pupils were allowed to read and do reading-related activities individually or in pairs. As all the pupils were seated with a peer, it was easy for the ones who wanted to, to cooperate about the reading or the reading tasks.

The pupils rarely read aloud in class. Sometimes, if they read very short texts, Lisa asked if anyone wanted to read aloud, but this was voluntary. She reflected that many of the pupils were very anxious to read aloud or speak in class, which was one of the reasons why she usually avoided pupils reading aloud. However, Lisa reported that she advised her pupils to read aloud to themselves at home and then summarise the plot to themselves afterwards: 'It was these kinds of advice I got in the 1970s.' The pupils often listened to the texts on audio files. Lisa reported that she did not use audio files every lesson, but that she especially liked to play the short stories on audio files.

When asked how much the pupils were required to read in English during a week, Lisa replied that the texts that they read from the textbook were usually three to four pages long. Most weeks they read two texts and other weeks only one text. The pupils in Lisa's class read approximately 300 pages during the Vg1 English course.

Although she did not assign books for the pupils to read, Lisa claimed that she encouraged the pupils to read English at home:

> A good deal [of the pupils] read English books, so I try to encourage them to do that because I attended a course in English at Aschehoug before Christmas. Then he said, the lecturer, who taught at the University of Stavanger: in order to become proficient in English, they [the pupils] have to just read and read and read in English, either books or articles. Because that book [the textbook] is probably not the coolest they have read.

Lisa had not had an extensive reading project with her pupils and had not collaborated about reading English with teachers who taught other subjects.

Reading strategies

Lisa reported using reading strategies before, during, and after reading in her lessons.

When introducing a new text, Lisa frequently instructed the pupils to look at a little text box that read 'Before you read', which was placed over every text in the textbook. This text box included a few questions that were supposed to get the pupils thinking about the topic they would read about. The pupils answered the questions in pairs.

Before they started reading a new text from the textbook, Lisa photocopied the text and gave one paper copy of the text to each of the pupils. She did this so that the pupils could 'scribble' on the paper copy, which they were not allowed to do in their textbook. The pupils were instructed to skim through the text and highlight words that they thought would be important, take notes in the margins, as well as writing down new vocabulary on the paper copy. 'Usually, the first round [of reading on the paper copy] is just to read through it so that they get into the story before they start listening to it [on audio file] (…) just get an impression about what it is, then we will "dig" a little more [into the text].' The pupils who did not like 'scribbling' on the paper copy were allowed to take notes on their computer or by hand.

After the pupils had answered the 'before you read' questions, skimmed through the text, and 'scribbled' on the paper copy or taken notes, they usually listened to the text on audio file. 'I myself think that they have the best learning outcome by working first with the paper copy or take notes and then they get to hear the text read aloud by a native reader and then they have "been there" a bit themselves.' Another reason why Lisa let the pupils listen to the text on audio file was that some of them read very slowly and would barely finish the pages if they read on their own: 'Everyone sort of finishes when they listen to the short story.'

After reading, the pupils answered post-reading tasks from the textbook, mostly in writing and sometimes orally. Occasionally, Lisa tried to start discussions about the texts in class, although this was often difficult as many of the pupils were anxious to speak and share their opinions with the class in English. In addition to answering tasks from the textbook, the pupils answered tasks on *Lokus* which related to the text that they had read.

Lisa reported that she did not teach these reading strategies explicitly. In other words, while she instructed her pupils to perform the strategies, she did not teach them step by step and she did not explain why they did it. Similarly, Lisa had not taught the pupils different ways of reading. However, she had instructed them to skim though the texts before they started reading a text. The pupils were therefore familiar with skimming as a way of reading.

When questioned about whether she advised the pupils about what they could do to remember important information when they read, Lisa could not think of anything besides what she had already described: taking notes and highlighting important parts of the text.

If the pupils did not understand words, sentences, or paragraphs in a text, Lisa explained that they could raise their hand and she could sometimes tell them what the word or the sentence meant. Other times she advised them to look up words in a dictionary, because 'this is how you learn'. Lisa pointed out that the pupils had access to *Ordnett pluss*, an online dictionary, so they could look up words that they did not understand. However, Lisa emphasised that using a dictionary might not always be the best option: 'If there are many words [the pupils do not] understand in a text, if you understand broad features of the idea in the text, then you do not need to understand all the words.'

Lisa did not explicitly teach new vocabulary in her lessons. She explained that she occasionally read the list of words that was listed next to the texts they were reading to the pupils and said '[I] hope many of these words are familiar already'. Lisa advised her pupils to pick out ten words from each text they read and make their own vocabulary notebook. In addition to writing down the words, she advised them to find the word in a sentence and write the sentence. However, the pupils were not given time in class to do this.

The pupils' reading comprehension was assessed in December in the form of an oral, individual assessment. The pupils drew a piece of paper from a basket with the name of the text they were to discuss. The texts they could draw were texts from the textbook that they had read and worked with in class over the first semester (August to December). The pupils were, for example, asked to contrast and compare the text they drew to other texts they had read in class.

When asked what she thought was challenging about helping the pupils become better readers, Lisa commented: 'The challenge is that there are so large classes and wide differences in competency levels [between the pupils].' Pupils from foreign countries who spoke minority languages and had barely learned English in their prior schooling constituted a major challenge. These pupils barely understood what went on in the classroom and Lisa found it difficult to adapt their education and help them on their level because she had 30 pupils in her class. Lisa claimed that she could have done many things differently if she had more time or access to more reading materials. However, she was uncertain about whether the pupils would want to do more. She emphasised: even if I had more time, *they* have to want to make an effort.

When the conversation turned to whether the pupils were prepared for reading in higher education, Lisa expressed that the pupils would get a 'mega shock' when they started university. She then reflected about her own role in teaching them reading:

> OK, it is my responsibility, when they get to May or June, they will sit a written [exam], or they will sit an oral [exam], then it is my responsibility that I have guided them through this book [the textbook], whether it is *Targets* or other textbooks (…) then it is the book, or the competency aims (…) We know that Aschehoug has assured that they have covered the competency aims, so that I can think that when I have guided them [the pupils] through this book [the textbook], then they should be able to sit a written [exam], and they should be able to sit an oral [exam].

Learner differences in motivation

Lisa could not think of many ways she accommodated for learner differences in motivation. All the pupils were assigned the same texts to read, even if they were on different levels, had different interests or had varying levels of motivation. However, they were allowed to choose what to read when they read current news, and occasionally they could go online and read what they wanted to if they finished their work in class. When they worked with post-reading tasks, the pupils who struggled with the tasks were allowed not to finish all the tasks. Lisa also claimed: 'I try at the best of my ability to vary [the activities in class].'

Lisa reflected that many Norwegian pupils lacked motivation, which she thought was due to the successful Norwegian oil industry, and that Norwegian pupils had not seen the meaning and rewards of hard work, like the pupils in, for example, Finland. Lisa found it challenging to 'give and give and inspire' and then get little back from the pupils, who just wanted breaks. She claimed that teachers should not always focus on what was 'fun' for the pupils, and that the pupils should learn to be bored and focus on a task for 25 minutes.

5.3.2 School Two pupil focus group interview

Reading materials

The focus group participants expressed that the textbook, *Targets*, was used frequently and they agreed that the texts in the textbook were boring and not interesting to read. They claimed that the texts were 'old' and wished the book had more 'adolescent' content. When asked about other reading materials in the English course, the pupils answered that they had only been assigned reading materials from the textbook. They had never been able to choose reading materials on their own. The discussion then turned to the school library, in which the pupils assumed there was a selection of English books. However, they were not sure as they

had never been informed about it and they had not had a look for themselves. 'I guess it is just thick, advanced books', P4 reflected.

Amount of reading

When asked how much they read in English during a typical week, the pupils reported that they read about two texts a week, each of about three to five pages long. In addition, they claimed that they were assigned homework after each lesson (they had two lessons one week and three the alternating week). P5 reported that because they had so much homework, many pupils did not do it: 'It ends up with everyone sending (…) One [pupil] does the homework and sends it to everyone in the class.'

When asked whether their teacher encouraged them to read in English in their spare time, the pupils responded that Lisa frequently encouraged them to work with English in their spare time, especially with grammar, oral English and writing. However, the pupils claimed that Lisa had not mentioned reading in particular. None of the pupils reported reading in English in their spare time.

Reading strategies

The pupils explained that before reading, Lisa usually talked about the text they were about to read and the topic that the text covered. Then the pupils were given a paper copy of the textbook text. The pupils believed that they listened to the text on audio file every other week, while other times they read it individually. The pupils explained the process:

> P5: First we are always given a sheet of paper [a paper copy of the textbook text] and then we are instructed to highlight on that, or at least read it.
> P4: But you read first and then you highlight. We do not highlight when we read for the first time.
> Interviewer: So you read the paper copy once before you highlight?
> P1: Yes.
> P4: And if we finish that [reading and highlighting], we wait, sort of, for the others [to finish], but then we sometimes have to read the text several times to understand it.
> Interviewer: What are you instructed to highlight?
> P5: You decide.
> P1: What you think is relevant.

The pupils were unsure about the advantages of highlighting on the paper copy of the text. P4 stated that it was not always helpful. P2 further explained: 'You sort of forget the context (…) You see the word [that you highlighted], but you sort of do not remember what it was.' After reading, the pupils reported doing post-reading tasks on the digital platform *Lokus* or in their

textbook. These tasks were mainly comprehension tasks. When asked whether these post-reading tasks increased their comprehension of the texts, P5 commented: 'You have to vary the way you learn. She [Lisa] always gives us a text and questions. It is not easy to learn from that, every time, when we just do the same.' After reading short stories, the pupils were often asked to analyse them, to identify, for example, the main characters, the literary devices, the topic, aim, and the setting. The pupils claimed that they had not learned to analyse texts in English and therefore found analysing challenging.

The pupils claimed that they did not use reading strategies when they read at home and hence were not instructed to do so. However, two of them reported skimming texts before reading to increase their comprehension. The pupils had worked with skimming and scanning in English lessons. They skimmed the text on the paper copy before reading more times and they scanned for specific information when they answered the post-reading tasks. Otherwise they reported that they always read intensively.

Three of the pupils stated that they were familiar with and had worked with reading strategies in primary and lower secondary school. The remaining two pupils reported barely being familiar with reading strategies and they did not remember having learned them in their previous schooling.

When asked what they did to remember important information when they read, they replied that they did not do anything besides what their teacher instructed them to do, which was to highlight important words or sentences and take notes from the text.

The interviewer asked what the pupils did if they did not understand what they read in English. Most of the focus group participants reported that they had tried to ask their teacher about the meaning of unfamiliar words. However, they did not feel comfortable asking her as she did not provide a proper answer and seemed annoyed when they asked. They usually did not use dictionaries either. Instead, many of the pupils reported asking classmates about the meaning of unfamiliar words or longer stretches of text.

The pupils reported learning very little new vocabulary in class. Occasionally, they claimed, Lisa wrote some words on the blackboard and translated them into Norwegian, but the pupils were not instructed to do anything about them and hence did not learn them. All the focus group participants wished they could learn more words in class so that they could increase their vocabulary. On a similar note, the pupils stated that what they found most challenging when reading English was comprehension, i.e. not knowing what words meant. The pupils had several suggestions when the interviewer asked what they thought was missing in the teaching of reading:

P1: Variation!
Interviewer: Can you think of anything else?
P1: We do not know what it is like to do anything else.
P4: And more interesting texts.
P2: I think we are a class that like, sort of, to learn in the form of [physical] activity.
P5: Or some texts that maybe was about [physical] activity or something.
P1: [Topics] that we might be a little bit interested in.

Learner differences in motivation

The pupils felt that learner differences in motivation were not accommodated for in reading and reading-related activities: all the pupils read the same texts, regardless of their language proficiency level, interests, or motivation to read. The pupils were worried that some of their classmates were falling behind because they struggled to understand the texts they were assigned. P5 commented: 'But I kind of feel that when people [pupils] fall sort of behind then I feel like she [Lisa] does not do anything about that either. She just lets them sink.' P1 added: 'When the best [pupils] understand it [the texts] she just continues.'

The pupils expressed that their teacher could take many steps to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation. Firstly, the pupils requested more interesting texts and claimed that if the texts were more interesting they would pay more attention in class and learn more. Secondly, P1 wished that Lisa would have individual conversations with each of the pupils to find out if they had any problems in English or whether they had any suggestions as to what could be done differently. Thirdly, the pupils wished they could read a book of their own choice. They claimed that they would learn more from reading a book they were interested in. They would also like to be assigned to read their chosen book as homework rather than reading and answering tasks in the textbook.

5.4 School Three

School Three is located close to a large city. The class consisted of 30 pupils enrolled in the Programs for General Studies, with Specialisation in Sport and Physical Education. Six pupils participated in the focus group interview. The teacher interview and the focus group interview were conducted on the same day, in November 2017.

5.4.1 School Three teacher interview: Erik

The teacher in School Three, Erik, had six years of teaching experience. In his first year as a teacher, Erik had worked in lower secondary school. He started working at School Three in

2012. He had English 'årsstudium' (one-year programme) in English. In addition, Erik taught social studies and sociology. This was the first school year (2017-2018) that had Erik taught English in Programmes for General Studies. He had previously taught English in the Vocational Education Programmes. According to Erik, there were no policies or guidelines for reading and teaching reading in English at school three. However, there were some traditions:

> All the teachers at Vg1 Programmes for General Studies, they [assign a novel] (…) usually with a specific competency aim as a starting point. This time with indigenous peoples, which is a competency aim in the English subject. So the pupils read a novel that they will interpret and analyse, and that we talk about in class and grade them on. A book like that takes a big part of the autumn semester to go through and discuss.

Reading materials

School Three offered the textbook *New Experience* (Heian et al. 2009) to Vg1 General Studies English classes. Erik used this textbook in class and as homework from time to time. When asked what he thought about the quality of the textbook, Erik elaborated: 'I am not impressed. There are some good texts and some places there are good tasks, but [the textbook is] fairly mediocre, I would say. I will not say that it is bad, but not very exciting either'. For this reason, Erik often photocopied texts and tasks from other textbooks and used them in class. Erik reported photocopying all kinds of texts from other textbooks, from poems to short stories and texts about political topics. When questioned about how he selected the reading materials, Erik replied:

> I have some colleagues with pretty good collections of different [text]books, so I flick through them a bit, but for the most part I use *Skills*, which is the new Vocational Education [text]book. And there, there are a lot of great texts and tasks. Fun tasks. Much more variation, both vocabulary tasks and reflection tasks, which are much better than in the other [texts]books.

Erik admitted that he used photocopies from *Skills* (Lundgren et al. 2014), a Vocational Education English textbook, more than he used *New Experience*. In addition to the textbook texts, Erik sometimes used lyrics from songs that he felt were suitable for the topic they were working on. In addition, he had assigned the novel that the class were reading at the time of the interview, *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* (Alexie 2009). Erik wanted his pupils to read this book because the main character, Junior, was a Native American adolescent boy, and hence, belonged to a minority. Many of the pupils in Erik's class belonged to minority groups and he therefore felt that the pupils could recognise some of

Junior's struggles and identify with him. Erik reflected: 'Recognition is important for whether they will want to read the book.' Erik stated that the pupils would not read more novels during the school year.

The pupils in Erik's class were never allowed to choose reading materials themselves. Erik chose the textbook texts that they read in class or as homework and he also chose the novel they read. The pupils could not choose between different texts as the class always read the same texts. Erik did not use the school library and hence could not comment on the selection of English books there. Erik reflected that if he had a class that were more motivated to read, he could let them choose which book they wanted to read themselves and hence use the school library more. However, as the pupils in his class were not motivated to read, he felt that more of a 'military regime', in which he chose the reading materials for them, was necessary.

The amount and ways of reading

When talking about the amount and ways of reading in class, Erik felt he had to explain what type of class he taught before proceeding:

> Many [pupils] are very unmotivated. This is a Sport and Physical Education class (…) so this is adolescents who choose Sport and Physical Education, not because they are necessarily good at sports, but to avoid theory [theoretical subjects]. [School Three] is basically a school without admission requirements. And you can say that the Sports and Physical Education classes are the most demanding in terms of [academic] levels. And that is part of the context here. And I must say that because it has to do with the way you approach the subject, so how you, how much you have to work with (…) It is [the pupils are] very nice, sympathetic adolescents. But they are unmotivated (…) they are unmotivated for theory, quite simply. Even the high achievers in English (…) they have not read [done their homework].

Because of the challenges Erik faced teaching a class with many unmotivated pupils, he had to make some decisions that he would not have made under other circumstances. One of the choices involved text length. Erik explained:

> If you present them with a text on many pages [then it is highly unlikely that they will read it]. But if they can see that the text is on one page with a good amount of 'air' in between, like in a poem, then there is a bigger chance that we can go through [the text], that we read it and we can talk about it and we get a conversation.

It was, in other words, challenging for Erik to motivate the pupils to read texts that were more than one page long. One example Erik emphasised was that he had assigned homework to the

class earlier in the semester. The pupils were supposed to read a short story of four pages and answer some post-reading questions. None of the pupils submitted the homework. Erik clarified: 'It is manageable for most of them in terms of abilities but not in terms of what they are willing to put down in effort.' Erik interpreted this incidence as a 'hint' that the four-page long text was too long for his pupils. However, Erik knew that he had to make some changes since the pupils could not continue reading only one-page texts.

When asked how much reading and reading-related activities were prioritised in the English subject compared to the other skills, Erik explained that this varied. At the time of the interview, there was a greater focus on reading because they were reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian.* However, oral English had been the main focus before they had started reading the novel because the pupils liked practising oral English better than reading and writing. Erik saw this as a way of motivating the pupils in the English lessons. On the other hand, Erik considered his pupils' oral English skills to be fairly good compared to their written English and he therefore wanted to focus more on writing. This had proved to be a challenge as the pupils 'did not bother' and hence produced little writing.

Erik reported that the time spent on reading and reading-related activities in the English classes also varied. In many lessons the focus was on texts and tasks. However, the pupils rarely read individually in class because that 'did not work', as the pupils struggled to focus on the reading. On the same note, Erik did not allow the pupils to read in pairs or in groups as they saw it as 'an excuse to talk about other things'. Earlier in the semester, Erik had tried to encourage the pupils to read aloud in class. However, this was not a success as only one pupil volunteered to read. Erik therefore decided that reading aloud was not a suitable activity for his class.

On the other hand, Erik felt that it was beneficial to play the audio files in his class because it helped the pupils who lacked motivation to read and the pupils who had concentration difficulties. Erik felt that when he used audio files, there was a greater chance that the pupils paid attention and 'grasped the text'.

Erik found it difficult to answer how much the pupils were required to read in English during a week or during the school year since he was still trying to figure out how best to adapt the education to his group of pupils and what he could require from the class. However, he admitted: 'I probably give them less and less homework because I see that the ones who need it the most they do not do homework anyway.' When it comes to the reading of the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian,* Erik did not expect all the pupils to read the whole novel, especially not the low achieving pupils. Erik emphasised that the pupils

could learn much, for example about Native Americans, from reading just the first four chapters.

Erik encouraged the pupils to read in English at home. However, he doubted that most of his pupils did because: 'When they do something (…) they do not do it for themselves, they do it for me. They do it to avoid a disciplinary mark, not to develop [academically].' Erik had not had an extensive reading project with his pupils and he had not collaborated about reading in English with teachers who taught other subjects.

Reading strategies

When asked about whether he taught reading strategies in his lessons, Erik informed that he did not do so explicitly. However, he incorporated some reading strategies in his lessons. Before reading, Erik reported that he focused on 'establishing motivation for the topic'. He pointed out that he had experienced some success using music videos to introduce a new topic or a text to the class. Before reading, Erik also talked about the setting and the theme of the text in order to help the pupils understand the text. In addition, Erik advised his pupils about what they should do before they started reading. He emphasised that the pupils should get to know the text, and the best way to do that is 'to skim through [the text], read maybe the first sentence in each paragraph and [think] OK, what is this about?' According to Erik, this was a way of provoking the pupils' curiosity while simultaneously preparing their brain for all the details they will absorb.

Erik could not think of any reading strategies he had instructed the pupils to do during reading. After reading, Erik often asked the pupils whether there were any unfamiliar words in the text that they should write on the blackboard. From time to time, some pupils requested words. Furthermore, Erik instructed the pupils to do the tasks in the textbook or on the handouts (texts from other textbooks). These were mainly comprehension tasks that were done either orally with the whole class or in writing. Nevertheless, Erik admitted that when the tasks were done orally, 'then it usually ends up with me having to say [the answer] myself'.

Erik reported that he had not taught the pupils different ways of reading. However, he claimed that the pupils were familiar with skimming and extensive reading. Erik did not give specific advice to the pupils about what they could do to remember important information when they read. If the pupils did not understand words, sentences, or paragraphs in a text,

Erik encouraged them to ask him or to consult a dictionary. He pointed out that the pupils had access to *Clue*[13] and *Ordnett pluss*[14].

When questioned about whether the pupils learned new vocabulary in his lessons, Erik commented that he had not worked systematically with vocabulary in his lessons so far. However, he wanted to increase his focus on facilitating the pupils' vocabulary learning because he had recently conducted an evaluation of his lessons where the pupils were welcome to state their opinions about the English lessons. In this evaluation, many of the pupils stated that they wanted to learn more vocabulary. Despite not working systematically with vocabulary, Erik had used a game called *Memories* in order to teach the pupils new vocabulary. He claimed that this game was suitable for pupils with concentration difficulties. Additionally, Erik reported that he sometimes wrote 'important words' on the blackboard and made a mind map to facilitate vocabulary learning.

When asked about assessment, Erik commented that after reading the novel, the pupils were assessed orally in an individual conversation about the book with the teacher. The pupils were assessed on their ability to comprehend what the book was about and on the topic 'English as a word language' that they worked with earlier in the semester. The pupils had given an oral presentation and were asked follow-up questions. This assessment also measured their comprehension of the topic.

When the conversation turned to the challenges of helping the pupils become better readers, Erik commented: 'When we talk about this group [the class], it has to do with motivation (…) I struggle with getting everyone involved in conversations and talk about the the book. This is largely because it is difficult to get them to read.'

If he was given more time or access to more reading materials, Erik claimed he would want to gain a thorough understanding of each of the pupil's reading strategies. When thinking about his pupils' future and how prepared they were for potentially reading in higher education after completing the Vg1 English subject, Erik reflected: 'It is a whole different level of vocabulary. It will definitely be a big leap from the curriculum and the literature that we work with.'

---

[13] Clue is an online dictionary. https://clue.no/
[14] *Ordnett pluss* is an online dicationary. https://www.ordnett.no/programvare/

Learner differences in motivation

When asked whether he accommodated for learner differences in motivation in reading and reading-related activities, Erik answered 'both yes and no'. Erik assigned the same texts to all the pupils, even if they were on different competency levels, had different interests, or struggled with motivation to read. Erik never allowed the pupils to choose what to read. When it came to selecting texts, Erik had a different focus:

> What is most important is to choose texts that all the pupils can gain something from. So that we can talk about it together [as a class]. It is very impractical and time-consuming if one should talk about, if a group of 30 pupils should read different texts and then having to talk about all of them.

Erik defended his lack of focus on assigning different texts to pupils with different needs by emphasising that 'if one never demands anything from the ones who have an apathetic relationship to schoolwork, if one never demands anything, always gives them "set up" and easier tasks, then it is difficult to prepare them for the written exam, that they will also sit'.

Despite not letting the pupils read different texts, Erik reported that he did take some steps to accommodate for learner differences in motivation, claiming to differentiate on how much of a text he required the pupils to read and allowing the low-achieving pupils not to finish reading the texts. An example of this was the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, which Erik did not expect the low-achieving pupils to finish reading. Similarly, high-achieving pupils were assigned more tasks as well as more demanding tasks than the low-achievers. Erik also pointed out that when he taught reading, he walked around in the classroom and talked to the pupils who struggled to start reading. Moreover, in case some of the pupils sat 'apathetically' and could not seem to start reading or writing, Erik had a selection of activities up his sleeve, such as interactive vocabulary games where the pupils could fill in the correct words. Erik considered the interactive activities to be good alternatives for pupils who otherwise might not have done anything during that lesson.

5.4.2 School Three pupil focus group interview

Reading materials

The pupils explained that the textbook, *New Experience*, had not been used much so far this semester. The focus group participants therefore did not feel that they were in a position to comment on the textbook. Instead, the class had been assigned several handouts to read, which contained texts from other textbooks. The pupils believed that they were assigned handouts to read about every second English class. They reported that the handouts were in

the form of one to two sheets of paper with text and tasks. When asked what they thought about the handouts, the pupils were taciturn:

> P1 and P2: They are OK.
> P4: I do not have a comment.
> P3: Not that I care about them.

At the time of the interview, the pupils were reading the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian.* The pupils found the book all right. P1 elaborated: 'The plot in that book is OK, sort of, but I have not read in it that much, I do not like reading.' The other pupils agreed that they were not interested in reading. The pupils reported that they had been given a good deal of time to read the novel in class. However, they all found this boring. The focus group participants claimed that they were not assigned homework any more, except for when they were reading the novel and had to finish certain chapters on given dates.

The pupils pointed out that they had never been allowed to choose between different reading materials or choose reading materials themselves. When the conversation turned to the selection of English books at the school library, none of the pupils knew whether there were any English books in the school library at all, as they had never had a look, nor had they been informed about them.

The amount of reading

When asked how much they read during a typical week, the pupils immediately steered the conversation towards the last couple of weeks when they had been reading the novel. P1 and P2 reported that they did not read much. P4 commented: 'About 90 per cent of the class could not be bothered to read the book. We just read the summary, sort of. But it is not much reading.' However, when they were not reading the novel, the pupils commented that they read about one and a half to two pages each lesson, which added up to three to four pages each week. The pupils could not remember whether their teacher had encouraged them to read in English in their spare time. However, they reported that he had encouraged them to read the novel at home. None of the pupils claimed that they read English books in their spare time. Nonetheless, they all asserted that they read in English on the Internet a good deal. P3 commented: 'So 90 per cent of my English comes from there [the Internet]. Not from the English [subject] at school sort of.'

Reading strategies

P2 explained what the teacher usually did before the pupils started reading: 'In class, he [the teacher] explains a little bit about what the texts are about and (…) about what the theme of that text is. And then he says, maybe, that we will read it and do those tasks, and then he just lets us read it.' The other pupils agreed with this observation and had nothing to add.

The pupils were hesitant when asked what they were instructed to do while reading in class. P2 eventually remembered that they were sometimes instructed to underline words in the texts that they did not understand. Then, after reading, the teacher would explain what the words meant.

After reading, the pupils reported that they were often assigned written tasks from the textbook or the handouts, or asked to discuss the texts orally with peers. The tasks and the topics for discussion were mainly about text comprehension. P2 claimed that they worked together in pairs a good deal. The pupils also added that the teacher sometimes asked questions to the class. The pupils reflected that the reading strategies used in class had a moderate improvement on their reading comprehension as they did not enjoy reading.

Furthermore, the pupils reported not using any reading strategies to improve their understanding of the text when they read by themselves. Three out of the six focus group participants reported that reading strategies had been focused on in lower grades. They claimed that there was less focus on reading strategies in Vg1 English. Moreover, the pupils expressed that they had not worked with different ways of reading in the English lessons at School Three. However, they did recognise terms such as skimming, scanning, and intensive and extensive reading from their Norwegian lessons.

When asked what they did to remember important information when they read, the pupils claimed that they sometimes wrote key words. They stressed that their teacher had not given them advise about what they could do to remember important information.

The interviewer wondered what the pupils did if they did not understand what they read in English. P1 reported that he looked up unfamiliar words in a dictionary. P4 and P2 on the other hand, tried to look at context clues to guess the meaning of any unfamiliar words. The focus group participants claimed that their teacher had encouraged them to ask him about the meaning of any unfamiliar words they came across. Two of the pupils also reported that they read a text over again if they did not understand the whole text. Furthermore, the pupils pointed out that they usually had access to a computer when reading in class and they looked up words in online dictionaries if they felt they needed to.

The pupils were annoyed that there was little focus on learning new vocabulary in the English lessons. The teacher sometimes wrote new vocabulary on the blackboard but the pupils were not instructed to do anything about the words. P3 expressed 'I do not remember any of them [the words] sort of.' P1 was also frustrated about the lack of focus on vocabulary learning and stated that: 'He [the teacher] could have made us remember them [the words] better somehow.'

The pupils had a clear understanding of what they found most challenging when reading in English. They explained their views as follows:

> P4: To bother.
> P5: Yes.
> Interviewer: Why do you think it is so?
> P4: You [I] are bored to death.
> P3: Reading in general, we do not have the energy.
> P1: We do not read something that we really care about (…)
> P5: Reading, I do not bother.

The conversation then turned to what the pupils thought was missing in the teaching of reading. P3 answered 'Motivation!' The other focus group participants nodded affirmatively.

Learner differences in motivation

When asked whether they thought that learner differences in motivation were accommodated for in the teaching of reading and reading-related activities, the pupils commented:

> P2 and P3: No.
> P1: It is more the pressure of [knowing] that you will be graded [based] on this so you have to [read] really.
> P4: And then I think that there are many [pupils] that forget about this, so they do not bother [to read].

The pupils explained that different interests were not accommodated for because the pupils were never allowed to choose between reading materials based on interest or choose their own reading materials. Similarly, mixed ability levels were not accommodated for in reading because all the pupils were assigned the same texts. P4 was discontented with the lack of accommodation for low-achieving pupils: 'It is like, [those] who struggle with English, who are not as good as everyone else in the class, they are given [assigned] the same [texts] as us, so they do not keep up [in English class] the way that we do.'

The pupils had many suggestions when questioned about what the teacher could do differently to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation:

> P4: Maybe ask us what we want to read about (…) If he came with [assigned] something that the whole class wanted to read, then everyone would have been more enthusiastic about reading.
> P1: If he came with [assigned] something that we wanted to read, instead of something he wants us to read (…)
> P5: I do not know. But maybe he [the teacher] could find a more interesting way of teaching and presenting that book [*The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*] maybe.
> P3: Maybe more group work and stuff (…) so that you read and [then] tell your group [what you read] and stuff. Not just in pairs.

P3 further elaborated that he would have liked to have the option to read aloud in a group: 'Because then you have to pay attention to the text. If you are for example five pupils in a circle, sort of, then you read one paragraph each, you have to pay attention to know where you are [on the page] so you do not make a fool of yourself all of a sudden.'

5.5 School Four

School four is located in an urban area. 84 pupils were enrolled in the Vg1 English course in the Programmes for General Studies with Specialisation in General Studies. The teacher taught one third of the class at the time. Hence, the pupils rotated between three teachers. Six pupils were interviewed in the focus group interview. The teacher interview was conducted in November 2017 and the focus group interview was conducted in December 2017.

5.5.1 School Four teacher interview: Anne

Anne, the teacher at School Four, had been teaching for 28 years. Anne worked in compulsory school for six years before starting her job at School Four. Anne had English 'hovedfag'[15] (main subject). In addition to English, Anne taught German and Social Studies at school four. Anne reported that the school had some policies for reading and teaching reading in English: 'Our system is that we work very much together [with other teachers]. You have to do that in our system, working very, very much together.' Additionally, Anne stated that they had traditions for teaching reading in English: 'We try to make them [the pupils] read as much as possible. We think that extensive practice is what they [the pupils] need.'

---

[15] 'Hovedfag' is the equivalent to a Master's degree. Unlike a Master's degree, one had to study six years to graduate with 'Hovedfag'.

Reading materials

At School Four, the Vg1 English teachers could use the textbook *New Experience* (Heian et al. 2009). However, Anne reported not using the textbook much because it was quite old. She reported using some of the short stories and the poems but she found the non-fiction partly outdated and messy and hence did not use it. Aside from *New Experience*, Anne sometimes used texts from other textbooks or from *NDLA*[16] in her lessons. Anne explained that she liked using *NDLA* because:

> It is very handy, because there [on *NDLA*] it [the text] is on the computer. And there are some [pupils] that have different eyesight issues (…) and we have dyslectics [in the class] and they can almost always hear it [the text] on audio [files] on *NDLA*, what is there. So that is very handy. And it is very helpful for many others as well, they can read and listen at the same time, those who struggle with reading, and we have a good deal of them [in the class].

Anne also used novels in her class to a large extent. At the beginning of the semester, the pupils were assigned the graphic novel *Macbeth* (Shakespeare 2008). The pupils could choose between three different versions of this novel: the original text or two adapted readers on different levels (see section 3.5.1). The pupils were allowed to choose between the three versions of *Macbeth* based on what they considered their level. However, there were only 30 versions of each of the books, so some of the pupils had to read the novel in the original language even if they did not feel they were able to. Anne admitted that it was challenging for the pupils to read the original language. However, she asserted: 'They get the pictures [in the graphic novel], and that helps them a lot. But we also submitted summaries [on *It's Learning*[17]] so they could read. So they got the continuity in the story if they struggled to get that.' Anne explained that the pupils were given about five weeks to finish the novel and that they were given a good deal of time to read in class.

After reading *Macbeth*, the pupils started reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* (Alexie 2009). 'And that one is a lot easier to read', Anne expressed. When they had finished reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, the pupils would be allowed to choose which books they wanted to read for the rest of the school year:

> We try to make it so that they always have a novel to read. So that when they are done with these [*Macbeth* and *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*], then we

---

[16] *NDLA* is an acronym for Nasjonal digital læringsarena. It is a web page with open educational resources for upper secondary education in Norway. https://ndla.no

[17] *It's Learning* is a digital learning platform. https://itslearning.com/no/

hope that we go to the [school]library and then they borrow a book each that they choose themselves maybe, so that we try to keep up the reading.

Anne reported that when the pupils chose their own books, they did not have to choose novels, but could choose which genre they liked, whether fiction or non-fiction because 'our main ambition is that they actually should do it [read]'. On the other hand, the pupils were not allowed to choose between texts or choose their own texts when they read shorter texts in class. Nevertheless, on *NDLA* pupils could choose a simpler version of the assigned text in many cases.

The pupils were not assigned homework in the Vg1 English course. However, when they read novels, some of the pupils had to read at home in order to finish the novels by certain dates. Anne considered that the selection of English books in the school library was 'not so bad'. The teachers were allowed to suggest books that the librarian could purchase, but Anne had also been to a shopping centre with a colleague to buy English books for the school library.

The amount and ways of reading

When questioned about how much she prioritised reading and reading-related activities in the English subject compared to other skills, Anne answered: 'It is oral English that is the "baby" here [at school four] really. They [the pupils] do a lot of both reading and writing. Maybe, yes, they probably read more than they write. So it is a fairly high priority.' Anne further explained that from time to time, whole 80-minute lessons were set aside for reading a short story and working with the text. Anne estimated that the pupils read and did reading-related activities about 60 per cent of an average lesson.

Anne reported that she always set time aside for the pupils to read a text in class. She claimed that if the pupils were assigned a text to read before a class, some of them would not read it. For that reason, Anne felt it was better to let the pupils read in class before discussing a text. When reading in class, the pupils could choose whether they wanted to read individually, in groups, or listen to the text on audio file by themselves with earplugs. When working with texts, Anne encouraged the pupils to discuss the tasks in English with classmates. In other words, she was open to different ways of reading and working with texts in her lessons. However, she did not care for pupils reading aloud to the whole class: 'It is almost considered borderline bullying now [that pupils read aloud to the class] because there are so many [pupils] that are anxious to read while others listen.' Because she felt that letting

the pupils choose how they wanted to read worked well, Anne rarely played the text on audio file for the whole class.

When she assigned texts for the pupils to read, Anne had noticed that 'They [the pupils] quickly think that something [a text] is too long. So they need to focus over time. [That is] very challenging for many.' Anne explained that on average, the texts that they read in class were about five pages long. She pointed out: 'They [the pupils] do not complain when it is five pages, they complain when it is eight, ten [pages].'

When asked how much the pupils were required to read, Anne explained that they were given about five weeks to finish reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, the novel that the pupils were reading at the time of the interview. The novel had 230 pages, which meant that the pupils had to read 46 pages each week to finish it. However, Anne pointed out that while working on the novel, they worked on factual texts about indigenous people in class. The class usually read one or two texts each week beside the novel they were working on. For this reason, it was difficult to point out exactly how much the pupils read during a week, and hence the whole school year.

Anne encouraged her pupils to read English at home, both the novels they were reading throughout the school year and other reading materials in English. Whether Anne and her colleagues' practice of facilitating book reading throughout the school year could be considered to be an extensive reading project would be a question of definition. The pupils were given about five weeks to finish each of the novels, which meant that technically the pupils did not have to read much each week. Anne had not collaborated about reading in English with teachers who taught other subjects this school year.

Reading strategies

When asked whether she taught reading strategies to improve the pupils' reading comprehension in her lessons, Anne answered:

> Not much, it is not like, 'now we talk about reading strategies'. Sometimes I do that [work with reading strategies] with the pupils but I probably do that most when we read short stories. Right, if you have that [short story] 'A Great Day'[18] for example, which is in the textbook, right? [I say] 'look at that picture, what do you think this text will be about?' Right? That we discuss sort of the title, the info around [the text in the textbook].

---

[18] 'A Great Day' is a short story by Frank Sargeson (1940).

In addition to talking about the picture and the title of the text they are about to read, Anne encouraged the pupils to read the words in the margins that had been translated into Norwegian before they started reading. These were often the most difficult words and being aware of their meaning might make the text easier to read. Before reading texts in the textbook, Anne also focused on the questions or topics for discussion that were listed before the texts. These questions were a feature of the textbook with which Anne was very pleased. She explained that the pupils discussed the questions in groups, that way they were 'a bit into the problem' before they started reading.

Anne also pointed out that before the pupils started reading the two novels that all the pupils were assigned, the teachers lectured the pupils on the main topics in the novels. For example, before reading *Macbeth*, the teachers lectured the pupils on the setting of the novel, about Shakespeare, the genre drama, the supernatural elements in the novel, and about the universal, human feelings portrayed in *Macbeth*. However, Anne did not instruct her pupils to do anything while reading.

After reading, Anne usually focused on the literary key words, namely setting, characters, plot, and theme. This was important, Anne claimed, because the pupils would encounter these literary key words in both the Norwegian and the English subject as they continued their education. Anne explained that most texts had post-reading tasks and that she usually instructed her pupils to answer the questions that dealt with the literary key words. However, Anne emphasised that the class only worked with a couple of these key words at a time: 'Before that short story, it was setting and character. Before that short story, it was plot and theme.'

When asked how the class worked with the literary key words, Anne replied that when, for example, they talked about character, Anne modelled on the blackboard. She asked the pupils to suggest a name that was known to all of them, but was not among them. The class chose the US President, Donald Trump. Anne asked the class to come up with characteristics of Trump, which she wrote on the blackboard. Anne explained to the pupils that she wanted them to do the same with the character in the short story they had read. The pupils were instructed to only use characteristics that were rooted in the text and they had to be able to defend their statements. The characteristics that the pupils had written down were then discussed in plenary.

After reading novels, the pupils were assessed in the form of individual, oral conversations with a teacher. They were graded on their ability to discuss the plot and themes

in the novel. After finishing *Macbeth*, the pupils had a written test where they wrote about the role of women in the novel.

The interviewer wondered whether Anne had taught the pupils different ways of reading. Anne commented:

> Not like very clearly (…) and *Macbeth* is so 'heavy', so if I put it like that, they really had to read it pretty intensively too. So now only with [*The Absolutely True Diary of a*] *Part-Time Indian* were they able to read extensively, I think. And sort of walk [read] away. Otherwise it is mostly intensive reading [in the English course].

Anne further clarified that she had not taught skimming or scanning in the English lessons yet, but that she would try to do this in a while, especially as the pupils would have to skim and scan when they started writing their in-depth project later in the school year. Moreover, Anne had not advised the pupils about what they could do to remember important information when they read. 'I have not done that so far this year', Anne admitted.

When the conversation turned to what the pupils were advised to do if they did not understand what they read in English, Anne reported that she gave them the following advice:

> I try to make them think from the context. That they quite simply have to guess a little. To make them think about 'what can that mean?' Because one cannot look up all the words [in a dictionary] all the time. But OK, if you are completely stuck, then you have to look up [the word in a dictionary] or, quite simply, ask someone. Your seatmate maybe, or me.

The pupils did sometimes use online dictionaries when they read, Anne reported, especially when reading *Macbeth*, as they encountered many words that were unfamiliar to them. When asked whether she taught new vocabulary in her lessons, Anne answered: 'No, or yes, what can I say? Reading is vocabulary learning too. And we try to sometimes talk about, so, the words in the margins [in the texts] really, and what they mean. And recurring words that we know they struggle with.'

When the conversation turned to what Anne found most challenging about helping her pupils become better readers, she emphasised motivation. She found it most challenging to motivate the pupils to read literature. The pupils that did not like reading presented the greatest challenge. Anne reflected that the pupils who liked reading tended to read very well. If Anne had more time to teach English, she would have set aside more time for reading. She would also have liked to discuss the texts with the pupils in small groups. Anne viewed this as important because when she asked questions about the texts in class, the same pupils tended

to answer. Anne reflected that more pupils would probably dare to speak their mind if they were placed in smaller groups with a teacher.

Anne did not think that the Vg1 English course prepared pupils well enough for reading in higher education. She claimed that the pupils were not ready to read factual texts in Social Studies or Mathematics in higher education. Nevertheless, Anne stressed that in her experience, some pupils found the transition to reading in English in higher education to be fairly smooth, despite finishing English in Vg1, whereas others struggled more and would have liked to learn more English in upper secondary school. This also depended on the level and study habits of the individual pupil.

Learner differences in motivation

Anne reported that she accommodated for learner differences in motivation in reading and reading-related activities in different ways. In terms of the pupils' varying proficiency levels in English, Anne explained that when reading *Macbeth*, the pupils could choose between the three different levels of difficulty. Similarly, when reading texts from *NDLA*, the pupils could choose a simpler version of the text provided on *NDLA*. The pupils could also choose the difficulty level of their self-chosen books. However, the teachers tried to give them advice about what they should read, so that the pupils picked books that matched their competency levels. Nonetheless, the pupils were not allowed to choose alternative reading materials when reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian,* and in lessons where other sources than *NDLA* were used, the pupils did not have an option of reading texts on other difficulty levels or alternative reading materials in which they were more interested.

Anne commented that low-performing pupils were allowed not to finish all the assigned tasks in a lesson and they were not required to finish the tasks at home. From time to time, Anne also advised low-performing pupils about which tasks they should focus on in the lessons because she knew that some of them would not be able to work through all the tasks.

Anne emphasised the advantages of the pupils reading self-chosen books based on their interest and motivation to read. Reading quantity was the aim of the project. Anne and her colleagues believed that the pupils would be more motivated to read, and hence read more, if they were allowed to choose books that they were interested in. For this reason, they were open to different types of books. Anne commented: 'It does not have to be that [novels], it could also be, say biographies, or [books] about factual topics. Some [pupils] do not like fiction very well, and reading is the most important thing.'

5.5.2 School Four focus group interview

Reading materials

The pupils informed that they had been given the textbook *New Experience*. When asked what they thought about the textbook, the pupils responded that they did not think they had used it yet. Because the pupils claimed they had never, or barely, used the textbook, they did not feel that they knew enough about it to form an opinion. On the other hand, they had a good deal to say about the other reading materials in the course. When the conversation turned to the graphic novel *Macbeth*, the following exchange emerged:

> P1: It was all right.
> P4: More boring than the other [*The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*].
> Interviewer: Why was it more boring?
> P4: At least the ones [the pupils] who had difficult text [the original language], had like, we had three different levels in language, and the difficult one [the original language] I think was a little difficult to understand and read sort of. You [I] did not grasp very much. The plain texts [adapted readers] were probably all right (…) and then there was, it is a very old text also, so sort of, it is not really [similar to] what we usually read. It is still just a book, but maybe not our level sort of (…)
> P5: It was a little like difficult to read because there were speech balloons, many pictures, small text, weird font [so that] you could not grasp what was written. Then you had to sit and decipher it. So I think I used very much time to read ten pages, sort of. Because you [I] had to read everything over again and then try to understand it, then you [I] had to translate it, and then, so I could not do it. I read less than 30 pages in less than a week sort of (…) and then it is not an interesting book either (…)

The above discussion showed that the majority of the focus group participants were not content with reading *Macbeth*, mainly because of the format and the use of original language. The pupils did, on the other hand, find *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* to be 'fun' to read and more suitable for their age group:

> P2: Much more fun [than *Macbeth*].
> P5: Very good.
> Interviewer: What did you like about it?
> P5: *Macbeth* was a little heavy and very like old. This [*The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*] was sort of a little like humorous and easier to read, drawings and large font, I want to say, but [a] regular book, just with drawings and stuff (…) and a little more like modern, not like castles and spirits and stuff.
> P1: I would have read it in my spare time [voluntarily]. I think it was very good. So it is like I could have read it really since from the tenth grade sort of. It is a very good book. It is not difficult either. It was really pretty well written and fun to read. And it was interesting, I wanted to finish reading it sort of.
> P4: [It was a] very glaring contrast between that [*The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*] and *Macbeth* too. Because, sort of, both books have sort of a little dark

theme, just like he [Junior, main character], he grew up in the most tragic way possible. And *Macbeth* is about a power-hungry man's slow fall into insanity. Simultaneously, in *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, they [the author] represented it in a much more comical way and kept it pretty light and cheerful. I think that was much better.

In addition to the two novels, the pupils reported using reading materials from *NDLA* or materials that the teacher had posted on *It's Learning*. This was often shorter texts, for example poems or short stories. The pupils claimed to be happy about these reading materials. The interviewer wondered whether the pupils had been allowed to choose reading materials themselves, which they had not been able to do yet. However, they had been allowed to choose between different levels when reading *Macbeth*. When talking about how they felt about being able to choose their own books to read for the rest of the school year, P2 expressed: 'I think that will be better [than reading books the teachers has chosen]. Because I do not like reading fiction that much, and if I can choose what I want, non-fiction, then that is a lot better, for me at least.' P5 agreed and commented: 'It is nice to pick a book that you want to read. Then you sort of want to read it more.'

The pupils were given a guided tour of the school library at the beginning of the school year, so they knew that there were English books there. The librarian showed them how to search for and find books. However, the pupils claimed not to have used the library yet and hence did not know much about the selection of English books.

The amount of reading

When discussing the amount of reading the pupils were required to do during a week, the pupils explained that they typically read two texts a week in the English lessons, often short stories. In addition, they were expected to read the assigned novels. However, not all the pupils read what they were assigned. P1 commented: 'There were many [pupils] that were not able to finish [*Macbeth*] because it was very complicated. And, with [*The Absolutely True Diary of a*] *Part-Time Indian*, there were many [pupils] who quite simply did not bother to finish reading.' P5 agreed and expressed: 'But then, sort of, that *Macbeth* book I read, I think I got to page 24 out of 150 sort of, it was not possible to read any longer. It did not work.' The pupils related that from time to time they were encouraged to read English in their spare time via messages that the teachers sent to all the pupils on *It's Learning*. Half of the focus group participants reported reading English books in their spare time. All of them claimed that it was difficult to set time aside for reading because they had so much to do.

Reading strategies

When asked about which reading strategies were used in the English lessons, the pupils reported that they were normally not instructed to do anything before reading or during reading. Before reading, the teachers usually introduced the texts orally. When reading the two novels, the teachers introduced the topic of the books and related issues.

After reading shorter texts in class, the pupils were often instructed to do post-reading tasks. P4 commented that the tasks often dealt with text analysis and literary key words. Although the tasks were usually individual, the pupils were allowed to work together in their *makkergrupper* (partner groups of four). The pupils liked to work with their peers and found the arrangement helpful.

When questioned about whether other reading strategies had been used or discussed in class, the pupils responded that they could not remember that occurring. Similarly, different ways of reading, such as skimming, scanning, intensive and extensive reading, had not been a topic in English class in Vg1. P4 pointed out: 'They [the teachers] usually expect that we have learned that [reading strategies] in lower secondary school.' On the other hand, the pupils reported using a few reading strategies when reading by themselves. P1 and P4 reported rereading text if they felt they had not understood it properly. The pupils stressed that reading strategies that can be used to remember important information had not been presented to them in English class. However, many of the pupils reported taking notes to remember important information when reading. All the focus group participants claimed to have had teachers that focused on reading strategies in their previous schooling.

If the pupils did not understand what they read in English, they usually tried to figure out what the word meant by looking at the context. Their teacher had advised them to ask her about difficult words or to search for them online. For that reason, the pupils rarely used dictionaries. Furthermore, the pupils expressed that they seldom learned new words explicitly in class. From time to time, the teacher explained what some words meant, but no activities were undertaken to explicitly promote vocabulary learning. Most of the pupils wished they could learn more vocabulary in the English lessons.

The pupils struggled to come up with examples of what they found challenging when reading in English. P4 found the tasks that often followed the reading challenging: 'Interpret it [the text] and form a discussion and stuff. Reflect on it without writing the same as what is in the text and form an opinion and argue for that opinion the right way, fairly, in writing.' On that note, P3 and P4 wanted more written tasks about what they had read to practise for a

potential written exam at the end of the school year. Written tests where they wrote about what they had read were good for their progress in English, claimed P3.

Learner differences in motivation

When the conversation turned to whether learner differences in motivation were accommodated for in reading and reading-related activities, the pupils reported that they had not noticed that varying levels of motivation were accommodated for. The pupils stated that mixed ability levels were accommodated for when the class were reading *Macbeth* and they could choose between three versions of the book with different difficulty levels. When reading texts in class, the pupils were not given a choice between different texts or texts on different levels of difficulty. Different interests and varying levels of motivation had not been accommodated for up to this point, but would be accommodated for when the pupils started to choose which books to read for the rest of the school year.

The pupils had some suggestions as to what the teachers could do differently to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation. P1 wished that they could provide a textbook with texts of different difficulty levels, such as he had had in lower secondary school. The different levels were colour coded and were easily identifiable and a great help, P1 claimed, especially for pupils who struggled to read in English and hence tended to lose motivation to read. P5 suggested that the teachers could provide different texts that the pupils could choose from, although he admitted 'That is a bit more work though [for the teacher]'.

5.6 School Five

School Five is located in a city. There were 14 pupils in the class and they were in the Programmes for General Studies with Specialisation in General Studies. Five pupils participated in the focus group interview. The teacher interview and the focus group interview were conducted in November 2017.

5.6.1 School Five teacher interview: Tom

The teacher in School Five, Tom, had been teaching there for six years. He had previously worked as a teacher in an institution where he had taught grades 1 through 13. Tom had a Master's degree in History and a Bachelor's degree in English. He taught English, Religious Studies, and Geography.

School Five had participated in different research and development projects in reading. At the time of the interview, the school was working on a reading experiment in all subjects. Tom explained: 'The experiment that we have used is that we start the day, independent of all subjects [in all subjects], by having a short reading session, about 15 minutes or so.' The English teachers at Vg1 also had some traditions for reading: 'We have, as part of the English curriculum, that we have literary books that we go through, read and work with. In addition to, of course, in the lessons, facilitating reading.'

Reading materials

Tom used the textbook *Targets* (Balsvik et al. 2015) in his lessons and sometimes as homework. He explained that when planning the contents in the Vg1 English course, he took the competency aims as his starting point and then figured out how he could make the most of the texts in the textbook. Consequently, Tom used the textbook to a large extent in his lessons. However, he did not usually assign homework and if he did, it was in order to enable the pupils to finish a topic they had been working on for a while or to prepare to start a new topic. Despite his frequent use of the textbook, Tom did not think that the one he used covered the competency aims in a satisfactory way:

> There is little development in the [text]book in relation to the curriculum. It is, sort of, the publisher has figured out that these [topics] they think fit well together and then it is not updated in line with the demands that are in the curriculum (…) So that is a weakness. And combined with [the fact] that one cannot purchase new editions [of the textbooks], so that one gets updated editions. That happens in English as well, that things change.

Occasionally, Tom used other reading materials in his lessons. At the time of the interview, the pupils had just started reading the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* (Alexie 2009). Tom did not plan on assigning other novels during the school year. Once or twice a month the pupils worked on different kinds of projects. When working on projects, they were assigned handouts or weblinks with reading materials that helped them carry out the project.

When asked where he found the reading materials and how he selected them, Tom commented:

> I have a colleague that I am parallel with in the teaching. So we have three classes and we share the English teaching and we work together. So it is with a basis in the competency aims and that [text]book we have, and also the topics there and our

knowledge of what would potentially be a good supplement [that we select the reading materials] (…) [And] simultaneously match the competency level and the academic diversity in the class.

The pupils in Tom's class were rarely allowed to choose reading materials themselves. Tom felt it was most convenient that the pupils read the same novel in Vg1. That way, they could get used to the concept of reading novels before they were allowed to choose for themselves. The pupils were allowed to choose reading materials when they were assigned specific tasks, for example in group projects, where they had to find sources outside of the textbook. In these situations, the pupils were given advice about where to look for texts and how to be critical of the sources.

When the conversation turned to the selection of English books at the school library, Tom confirmed that there were English books there. Nevertheless, he was not pleased with the selection: 'We have a small one [school library]. Now I cannot brag that it is actively used (…) The quality of what is available for loan is variable. So there are options, but it is not a satisfactory library in any way. But it is a possibility.'

Amount and ways of reading

When asked how much he prioritised reading and reading-related activities, Tom replied:

> [It is] difficult to set an accurate percentage because it is difficult to say that the whole class is similar, so it [the teaching] has to be adapted. But I try to prioritise the oral [English] more, have more focus on it and then put written [English] as number two. Because in my experience, most of the pupils read English. That [reading] is the area of English that they, I want to say, have the least problem with and that they master the most, depending on how you choose to look at it. Then it is more important to get them over the obstacle that it is to speak and write [in English], I think. And I share that view with many of my colleagues.

Tom reported that the pupils spent between one and two hours each week, out of a total of five, on reading and reading-related activities in his English classes. However, now that they had started reading the novel, the pupils had been given more time to read in class. Most of the reading in class was individual reading. Nevertheless, some of the pupils read in pairs from time to time. According to Tom, some of the pupils paid more attention when reading with a peer. Some of the low-achieving pupils benefited from reading with a high-achieving pupil. Luckily, Tom pointed out, some of the high-achievers in the class understood the value of learning by teaching others. More often than reading together, the pupils worked with tasks in small groups. This was done almost every lesson. Tom found this beneficial because it was

a good way of facilitating language use. The pupils had to communicate together orally in English. More pupils dared to speak in small groups than in front of the whole class. That way, the pupils could also help each other and hence gain a better understanding of a text. In addition, Tom reflected, it was a nice way of helping the pupils to get to know their classmates.

The pupils had read aloud to the rest of the class twice during the semester. Tom emphasised that this was not an activity that he made a priority, mainly because he did not see the advantage of spending time on it. Instead, Tom preferred playing audio files. He reported playing the textbook texts on audio files to the pupils when they read short stories. The advantage of using audio files was, according to Tom, to let the pupils become familiar with different varieties of English, such as Irish, Australian, and American English. Additionally, the pupils could increase their reading fluency.

The length of the texts that the pupils read in their textbook and in the handouts were about two to five pages long. Tom felt he could not answer how much the pupils were required to read during a typical week and hence during a year. He did, however, inform that the pupils usually read one or more texts a week in English class in addition to reading the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* during the autumn semester.

Tom also encouraged the pupils to read in English at home: 'You can learn a lot when it comes to vocabulary [when reading in English], so I encourage them to read a lot in their spare time. And I spend a lot of time on that [encouraging the pupils to read] in all the feedback [I give them].' Tom had not had an extensive reading project and had not collaborated with teachers who taught other subjects this semester.

Reading strategies

When asked whether he taught reading strategies in his lessons to improve the pupils' reading comprehension, Tom commented:

> To a certain degree but not so consciously that 'now we talk specifically about reading strategies'. We have, when we have had [read] short stories, for example, we use, we have had a review of literary key words. So that they [the pupils] can, when they read, that they should be aware of the literary key words. That way, they can understand the plot better. Otherwise, I have had a single round [lesson] with them where I explained that when one reads, it is better that one reads coherently at first, instead of stopping at every word and translating. [So] that one reads and gets that reading fluency. Because then, when one sees the whole picture, one can better understand that way: understand parts of what is going on and maybe rather note down a few words as one goes if that is something one needs, instead of stopping [to translate a word]. But it is not like we

sit down with a focus on 'now we will learn a reading strategy'. It is more like that it comes as an implicit part of the instruction. [There is] more [focus] on literary key words and [reading] flow.

Despite not teaching reading strategies explicitly, Tom had some thoughts about what was important to do before, during and after reading. Before reading a text, Tom placed the text in a wider context so that the pupils could see that the text they were working on was part of a bigger picture. Especially when starting a new topic, Tom explained why they were reading that specific text and stressed the literary key words that would be focused on when reading. Tom also found it important to prepare the pupils for what else they would do when working on the current topic.

Tom did not report instructing the pupils to use any reading strategies while reading. However, as he discussed in the above quote, Tom emphasised that the pupils should read coherently and try to understand words from the context instead of stopping to consult a dictionary and translate every unknown word. Additionally, when reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, Tom instructed the pupils to think about the literary key words they had been working on to prepare them for the oral assessment in January. Because Tom considered his pupils to be easily distracted, he instructed them not to listen to music, sit in the classroom and not in a group study room, and remove their computer and cell phone when reading. That way, Tom hoped that it would be easier for them to read coherently and hence understand more.

After reading a text, Tom checked the pupils' understanding, which was normally done in class discussions. Some pupils noted down words or longer stretches of text that they did not understand and, after reading, Tom explained what these meant. The pupils were often assigned post-reading tasks, especially when reading in the textbook. These tasks were reviewed orally in class. Occasionally, the pupils were asked to prepare a presentation or write a longer text based on what they had read.

When the pupils had finished reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, they would be assessed and graded based on their participation in a discussion of the novel in a book circle. The book circle would consist of the 14 pupils in the class. Tom planned on asking them questions and the pupils who want to reply could raise their hands. This way, Tom hoped to facilitate a good discussion.

Tom had not taught the pupils different ways of reading in English class, such as skimming, scanning, intensive, and extensive reading. He did report advising some pupils to scan a text to determine whether they had the information they needed. When it came to

advising the pupils about what they could do to remember important information, Tom reported that he had advised the pupils to think about the literary key words they had gone through and to take notes. That way, the pupils had a 'peg' to hang the information on, and they were able to see the coherence in the work that was done in class over time. Tom had reviewed the following literary key words in class: turning point, theme, characters, climax, plot, and setting.

Tom did not teach vocabulary explicitly in class. Nevertheless, before reading texts in the textbook, he sometimes made the pupils aware of the words in the margins. Occasionally, he wrote the new words or expressions on the blackboard, while other times he just pointed to them in the textbook. This was mostly done in the beginning of the semester.

When asked what he found most challenging about helping the pupils become better readers, Tom pointed out that he found teaching pupils who were new to the country and spoke foreign languages most challenging. He elaborated that he had some pupils in his class who spoke neither English nor Norwegian because they had spent so little time in Norway before starting Vg1. Tom found it challenging to find a way to communicate with these pupils in order to find a platform to build on further. In these cases, the pupils required special attention and close observation, which was time consuming.

If Tom had more time or access to more reading materials, he would have made some changes. Firstly, the pupils would have been able to read more, they could have had 'the luxury of reading for the sake of reading'. Secondly, he would have liked to have more choices in class literature, so that he could find literature which suited his pupils better.

When the conversation turned to how well he thought the Vg1 English course prepared the pupils for reading in English in higher education, Tom stressed that he thought the pupils should learn more English before finishing upper secondary school. Tom elaborated that the pupils who only took the Vg1 English course had a 'handicap' when they started higher education because they had not been enrolled in an English course for at least two years and hence would most likely have forgotten a good deal. Consequently, Tom thought that the English subject should be obligatory throughout upper secondary school, for example by expanding the curriculum or teaching other subjects in English.

Learner differences in motivation
Tom reported accommodating for learner differences in motivation in reading and reading-related activities by giving pupils who struggled with motivation more help and attention when the class read. Tom also reported that he sometimes allowed some pupils to sit in a

group study room and work on alternative tasks. This could be either pupils who struggled with the assigned tasks or pupils who needed more challenges. By assigning alternative tasks, Tom made sure that all the pupils could work on tasks that matched their competency level. Additionally, Tom accommodated by allowing low achieving pupils to do fewer tasks, whereas high-achieving pupils could be given additional challenges.

On the other hand, the pupils were not allowed to choose what to read or choose between texts on different levels or about different topics, except for when they were working on group projects. The pupils were always assigned the same textbook text or handouts and there were no alternatives to reading the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*.

5.6.2 School Five focus group interview

Reading materials

The focus group participants agreed that the textbook, *Targets*, was 'fine'. P1 wished that more words were translated from English into Norwegian so that it would be easier to understand the texts. P3 explained that the textbook was used to a large extent, not every lesson but often. She elaborated: 'The [text]book has been (…) I think that the [lessons] are based on the [text]book, sort of. Not that that is bad but yes.' P5 would have preferred to read less in the textbook: 'One wants to, sort of, find something from the Internet [rather] than to look in the [text]book.'

When asked what they thought about the other reading materials in the course, the pupils answered that they had only been assigned a few handouts beside the textbook. P3 emphasised: 'We have not had that many texts [that were not from the textbook].' For that reason, the pupils felt they could not comment on the other reading materials. P2 and P3 wished they could be assigned more handouts instead of mainly reading texts from the textbook. They claimed that more varied texts would make reading more interesting. The focus group interview was conducted before the pupils had started reading the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. The pupils had not been allowed to choose reading materials themselves this semester.

The pupils disagreed amongst themselves when the interviewer asked about the selection of English books at the school library. P1 was discontent with the selection. He claimed that the library was too small and that it was difficult to find good books. P5, on the other hand, was content with it. She thought that there were many good books in different

languages, and a 'good deal' in English. She claimed that she could find many books there that she could not find elsewhere, and that it was easy to locate the books. P3 estimated that there was one set of shelves containing English books in the library.

The amount of reading

The pupils were unsure about how much they read in English during a typical week. They felt that there was little structure in terms of the content of the English subject. Additionally, they rarely had homework, so the reading was mostly done in class. The pupils claimed that they were allotted little time to read individually in class. Instead, they listened to audio files or read to each other in pairs. The pupils had been encouraged by their teacher to read in English in their spare time. Three of the five pupils reported reading English books at home while the remaining two pupils claimed to read in English on the Internet and watched TV series where English was spoken.

Reading strategies

The interviewer wondered which reading strategies were used in the English lessons. P4 reported: 'We have not worked with that [reading strategies] because they [the teachers] take if for granted that we know it.' The focus group participants reported that before reading, their teacher usually talked about the setting of the text and what it was about. P3 explained: 'He says "Yes, now we will read a novel or a short story" or something (…) Then he usually just puts it on [the audio file]. There is not very much like [pre-reading strategies], and then we talk about it [the text] afterwards instead.'

When the conversation turned to what the pupils were instructed to do while reading, the pupils had more examples of reading strategies. Their teacher had instructed them to take notes while reading at the beginning of the semester. He had stopped reminding them, the pupils reported, but it was now taken for granted that they did take notes. Occasionally, the pupils were encouraged to write down unfamiliar words they encountered while reading, so that these words could be addressed after reading. P4 also found listening to audio files beneficial: 'What we have used the most [while reading] is audio files. And then it is like, we keep up [with the text] in the [text]book and stuff, and that helps (…) both visually and that you can listen.' The class often listened to the audio files twice during a lesson. This was done, the pupils explained, to make sure that they understood as much as possible.

After reading a text, the teacher often asked them if there was anything they did not understand. Usually, the class discussed what they had read. Sometimes the discussion started in groups of four and then the groups shared what they had discussed with the class. The pupils were usually assigned tasks based on the text, which were tasks from the textbook or tasks their teacher had composed.

When enquired about which reading strategies they used when reading by themselves, the pupils had different answers. For example, P1 reported not using any reading strategies. P3, on the other hand, used a reading strategy she had invented herself, she marked different aspects of the text with Post-it flags of different colours, she explained: 'Yellow is for difficult words, green is for quotes that I think were good and stuff.' Before reading a book, P2 looked through the headlines, the pictures, and the texts boxes. After reading once, she usually rereads the text and takes notes.

All the pupils confirmed that reading strategies had been focused on in lower grades. P4 emphasised: 'It has been very important to get that [reading strategies] as a good basis and then be able to build oneself upwards.' On the other hand, P2 noted: 'But again, we have never done that [focused on reading strategies] in the in English subject. You are supposed to use what you have gotten [learned] in the Norwegian subject sort of.'

The focus group participants could not remember working with different ways of reading in the English lessons, such as skimming, scanning, and intensive and extensive reading. P2 expressed that this was something they were expected to know when starting upper secondary school. She also reflected that elements such as reading strategies that were addressed in the Norwegian subject, should not have to be focused on in the English lessons as well.

The pupils stated that the teacher had not given them much advice in terms of remembering important information that they had read. Tom had advised them to take notes or key words, or read a text over again to better remember what they had read. All the pupils found this helpful. The focus group participants had different strategies for dealing with unknown words in a text. Three of them reported that they looked up unknown words in a dictionary as soon as they encountered the unknown word in a text. The remaining two pupils preferred reading further to see if they could understand a word from the context. If not, they consulted a dictionary. Consequently, they often used dictionaries, mostly online, when reading. The pupils reported that they usually did not learn new vocabulary explicitly in class.

Their teacher sometimes asked them which words they did not understand after reading a text. He told the pupils what the words meant and sometimes wrote them on the blackboard.

When asked what they found most challenging when reading in English, the pupils found it difficult to come up with an answer. P3 admitted that it could be difficult to read English texts if the author used slang or a distinct dialect. P4 found it challenging to read factual texts that contained many advanced or long words that she usually did not encounter in everyday speech.

On the other hand, the pupils found it easier to answer what they thought was missing in the teaching of reading:

> P1: Grammar.
> P5: Grammar, yes.
> P3: More reading books that you choose or that they [the teachers] choose. More book reading.
> P2: Yes, like interesting books, like for example *Lord of the Flies*, that is a book that sort of catches the pupils.

Learner differences in motivation

The pupils felt that learner differences were not accommodated for in reading and reading-related activities: they all read the same texts regardless of their English competency, interests, or motivation to read. When it comes to the question of what the teacher could have done differently to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation, the pupils had different opinions. P1 wished that the class could be split into three different groups based on their English proficiency level. This might be helpful for pupils' motivation as well, because, he claimed, one's motivation will sink quickly if one does not understand what one is doing. The other focus group participants disagreed with this approach. P5 reflected that pupils who struggled with motivation had to make a change themselves, and that it was useless to help them. The other three pupils expressed a wish to choose what they were to read themselves and claimed that more interesting reading materials would increase their motivation to read.

6.0 Discussion

6.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the present research that were presented in Chapter 5. The findings are discussed in light of the theory and related research presented in Chapter 3. The discussion is structured according to the four research questions. What and how much the pupils read in English in the five classes is discussed in section 6.2. Section 6.3 discusses how the pupils in these five classes read English. Whether the pupils in these classes are helped to develop reading strategies in English to improve comprehension skills is discussed in section 6.4. Section 6.5 discusses to what extent the pupils' motivation to read English is taken into consideration by their teachers. Finally, implications and recommendations are presented in section 6.6, and the limitations of the study are described in section 6.7.

6.2 What and how much do the pupils read in English in the five Norwegian EFL upper secondary classes?

Reading materials

The first research question relates to the kinds of reading materials and amount of reading in English employed in the five schools. The findings show that four of the five interviewed teachers employed textbooks widely in their EFL lessons. Interestingly, the teachers at School One (Mia) and School Five (Tom) reported an extensive use of textbooks despite noting that they were not pleased with the quality of their respective textbooks. Three of the schools employed textbooks that were nine years old.

The interviewed pupils had different opinions about their respective textbooks. Pupils from three of the schools were content with the textbook texts. However, although most of the pupils at School One were content with the textbook, one pupil found it 'too difficult'. The pupils from School Two found their textbook boring with few interesting texts and requested more 'adolescent' content.

The heavy reliance on textbooks in these classes supports the findings in studies by Bakke (2010), Charboneau (2016), Faye-Schjøll (2009), Gilje (2014), and Hellekjær (2005), who also found a strong dependency on textbooks among Norwegian EFL teachers at different levels in the school system. Many scholars have discussed the use of textbooks in language teaching. For example, Grabe (2009: 240) argues that reading instruction should not be based on the content of a textbook alone since textbooks cannot include all the different types of reading tasks, skills, and strategies that are needed for pupils to improve their

reading. Additionally, most textbooks do not present texts on different language levels, which means that pupils on different language levels and with different interests have to read the same texts. Hellekjær (2007: 27) is also critical of an extensive use of textbooks and attributes the Norwegian pupils' low scores in EFL reading (Hellekjær 2005) to the overuse of textbooks in Norwegian schools. Hellekjær is particularly critical of how textbooks are used, namely their focus on intensive reading (see section 3.5.4). In contrast, numerous scholars agree that in order to acquire language and become good readers, pupils should read extensively (e.g. Day and Bamford 1998; Grabe 2009; Hellekjær 2007; Krashen 2004).

Roe (2014: 131) holds that pupils who exclusively read textbook texts can have their motivation compromised. This argument is in accordance with Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 412), who found that pupils spend more time and learn more from texts they find interesting. Not all pupils are likely to find the same texts interesting. A lack of motivation was prominent among the pupils at School Two. Interestingly, these were, by far, the pupils who used the textbook the most in this study and were the ones who were the least content with their textbook.

Considering the aforementioned arguments, the heavy reliance on textbook texts found in this study could arguably hinder the pupils in improving and developing their reading, which suggests that the teachers should, to a larger extent, supplement the textbook with additional reading materials in order to facilitate pupils' reading development and increase their motivation to read. However, as pointed out by Roe (2014: 132), it can be challenging and time-consuming for a teacher to find and choose texts that can replace the textbook. Roe therefore recommends that teachers cooperate on finding suitable texts about different topics and thus gather a large number of texts that can be a valuable resource for years to come. Most of the teachers in this study reported cooperating with others about collecting texts. Nevertheless, when considering how much the textbooks were employed by the teachers, one can argue that they could have cooperated more on collecting and using considerably more up-to-date, interesting, and relevant additional reading materials.

In terms of other reading materials apart from the textbook, all but one of the teachers assigned a novel for the pupils to read during the Vg1 English course. Besides textbook texts and novels, the teachers reported minimal use of other reading materials. In relation to assigning novels to read, the teachers at School Two (Lisa) and Four (Anne) stood out from the others in different ways: Lisa did not plan on assigning any novels during the Vg1 English course, whereas Anne assigned two novels for everyone to read and allowed the pupils to

choose which novels to read for the rest of the school year. Anne's intention was that the pupils should always have a novel to read.

As for the pupils, those at School One found *Of Mice and Men* to be too challenging to read, mainly because there were too many words they did not understand. The pupils at School Four, who read *Macbeth*, were dissatisfied with the novel because of the format and the use of the original (Shakespearean) language. The pupils at School Three and Four had started reading *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*, and they all reported being pleased with the novel. Those in School Four liked the novel because the language was easy and it included humour. Although the pupils at School Three found the book 'ok', they pointed out that they were not interested in reading and that 90 per cent of the class would probably not read the book.

All the novels that the interviewed teachers in this study employed were authentic reading materials (see section 3.5.1), i.e. materials not written for language learners. The only exceptions were the two simplified versions of *Macbeth* that the pupils in School Four could choose if they did not want to read the version that contained the original language. Day and Bamford (1998: 54) point out that many scholars and teachers view authentic reading material as the best choice for their pupils. However, authentic reading materials can also have a detrimental impact on reading development. If pupils are assigned texts that are at a level well beyond their current capacity, as was the case for the focus group participants at School One and Four, they might lose confidence in their ability to read in their L2. Krashen (1982) also addresses this issue in his input and affective filter hypotheses (see section 3.3). The input hypothesis posits that pupils need input that contains $i + 1$, namely reading materials that are a little beyond the pupil's proficiency level, in order to acquire language. However, if the input is way beyond the pupil's proficiency level ($i + 2$, $i + 3$), the pupil will not be able to comprehend it and hence not acquire language. This will in turn have a negative effect on pupils' attitudes towards reading. A negative attitude towards reading can manifest itself as a high or strong affective filter (see section 3.3), which can hinder the provided input from being acquired.

The detrimental impact of input that is way beyond the pupil's proficiency level was clearly seen in the interviewed pupils in School One and School Four. P5 at School Four, who read the graphic novel *Macbeth* with original language gave up reading because she spent so much time trying to understand the Shakespearean language, ultimately she concluded that it was too difficult for her.

Most of the pupils who were assigned the novel *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* reported enjoying reading it. In addition to the relatively easy language in the novel that clearly matched the proficiency level of most of the focus group participants who had read it, the content seemed familiar and recognisable to the pupils. This point was addressed by Erik, the teacher at School Three, who reported assigning the novel because he thought that many of his pupils would identify with the main character. This is in line with one of the instructional processes described by Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 409-416), namely real-world interactions, which are connections between the text that is read and the pupils' experiences. Guthrie and Wigfield argue that real-world interactions are enjoyable and interesting for pupils and can in turn foster reading motivation. This point was illustrated by P1 at School Four, who thought *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian* was so well-written, interesting, and fun to read that he would have read it voluntarily in his spare time.

Notably, the interviewed pupils from School One, School Two, and some from School Five expressed a wish to choose which novels to read themselves. However, only pupils at School Four were allowed to do so (after finishing two assigned novels). The other pupils had to read books that they were possibly not interested in or that did not match their proficiency level in English, which again might result in low motivation, low confidence, and a lack of learning (cf. Krashen 1982). Arguably, these issues could have been addressed had the other teachers also allowed their pupils to choose which novel(s) to read. In that case, they could have read books that they found interesting and that matched their proficiency level. Guthrie and Wigfield (2002: 411-412) advocate pupil autonomy and letting pupils choose reading materials. They point to research that shows that choosing reading materials is motivating for pupils. When allowed to choose, pupils tend to work harder and become more involved in their learning.

One of the reasons why the teachers did not allow the pupils to choose what to read could be the limited selection of English books in the school libraries. Four of the five interviewed teachers were either dissatisfied with the selection of English books in their school library or were not aware of what was in the library. Anne was the only teacher who planned on using the school library, describing the selection of English books in School Four's library as 'not so bad'. Similarly, all the interviewed pupils reported not using the library or not being aware of the selection of English books in the library, except for some of the focus group participants in School Five, who used the library actively.

This suggests that teachers should allow their pupils more autonomy when it comes to choosing reading materials as this could potentially increase their motivation and hence their learning outcome. Additionally, these findings emphasise the importance of access to a wide selection of reading materials in English.

Amount of reading

Despite claiming to make reading a high priority, all the teachers except Anne reported assigning relatively little reading to their pupils during the Vg1 English course. Their reported amount was what can be assumed to be between 300 and 500 pages during the school year. Anne's pupils, on the other hand, read significantly more because they were expected to choose novels to read for the rest of the school year and hence always have reading materials available.

Only the interviewed pupils at School Four and Five reported being encouraged to read in English at home. Erik and Lisa claimed to have encouraged their pupils to read in English at home as well, but their pupils could not remember this happening. Interestingly, the pupils who reported being encouraged to read in English at home were also those who reported reading English books at home, thus indicating the positive outcome of the teachers' encouragement in this respect.

The reported amount of reading in English in this study demonstrates that none of the interviewed teachers facilitated extensive reading. A possible exception is Anne, who first assigned two mandatory books for her pupils to read and then let them choose which books to read for the rest of the school year. Many of Anne's reported practices are in line with Day and Bamford's (1998: 7-8) ten characteristics of successful extensive reading programmes (see section 3.5.4), such as facilitating large amounts of reading, providing a variety of materials, allowing the pupils to select what they want to read, helping the pupils to choose books within their linguistic competence, and facilitating individual, silent reading.

Many scholars emphasise the benefits of reading extensively (e.g. Day and Bamford 1998; Grabe 2009; Hellekjær 2007; Krashen 2004). Day and Bamford (1998: 33-38) gathered the results from 11 extensive reading programmes in EFL and ESL settings from all over the world, such as Elley and Mangubhai (1981) and Hafiz and Tudor (1989). These studies reported by Day and Bamford (1998) found numerous advantages of extensive reading, including improved L2 reading, improved writing competence in the target language, increased general linguistic competence in L2 and increased affect, e.g. more positive attitudes towards L2 reading (see section 3.5.4). Krashen (2004: 37-38), who also analysed

results from extensive reading programmes worldwide claims that the only way pupils can become good readers, writers, and spellers, as well as developing a sufficient vocabulary and grammatical competence, is by reading.

When considering the above-mentioned benefits of reading extensively, it was obviously a disadvantage for the pupils in this study that their teachers did not facilitate extensive reading. As argued by Hellekjær (2007: 27), one of the reasons why Norwegian pupils have not reached a higher level of reading proficiency is the lack of focus on extensive reading in Norwegian schools. This suggests that Norwegian EFL teachers should make extensive reading a priority as this could significantly increase pupils' L2 proficiency and their motivation to read.

6.3 How do the pupils in these five classes read English?

The second research question asks how the pupils in the five classes read English. Three of the teachers (Lisa, Anne, and Tom), reported spending much time on individual reading in class. Simensen (2007: 173) explains that the goal of individualised reading is for pupils to read individually at their own pace and on their own level. Individualised reading can thus be practised with shorter texts within the span of a lesson, or by reading books over a longer period of time. Lisa, who did not assign novels for her pupils to read, practised individual reading only with shorter textbook texts in her lessons. All the other teachers practised individual reading when their pupils read the assigned novel(s). As argued by Simensen (2007), one of the advantages of individualised reading is that pupils do not have to read the same texts, but can read texts on different levels or about different topics. Individualised reading is thus an easy way to differentiate instruction. Nevertheless, none of the teachers, except Anne, differentiated their instruction by letting the pupils read different texts when reading individually in class.

Mia and Erik reported spending little time on individual reading in class when their pupils did not read the assigned novel. They both claimed that it could be problematic to allow the pupils to read individually because many of them struggled to focus on their reading, which was confirmed by many of their pupils. Simensen (2007) claims that self-directed learning of this kind can be challenging for some pupils, who thus need more encouragement than others to complete the reading. Despite the potential challenges of individualised reading in class, Harris and Sipay (1990: 656) strongly advocate it. They argue that if teachers do not set aside time for reading at school, and thereby show that reading is important and worthwhile, one cannot expect pupils to value reading. Consequently, not

facilitating reading at school, and hence not showing that reading is valuable, could have a detrimental effect on pupils' motivation to read.

All of the pupils except those from School Three were allowed to read or work with texts in pairs or in groups in class. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 414) point out that collaborating in class can increase pupils' intrinsic motivation to read. Social support and the feeling of belonging in a community of readers are important for pupils' reading motivation. A feeling of belonging can help reduce pupils' anxiety levels. According to Krashen (1982: 30-32), low anxiety correlates with a low or weak affective filter (see section 3.3), which results in more efficient language acquisition. In this context, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 414) emphasise the importance of prosocial goals, which involve helping peers who need assistance and promoting friendship and collaboration. This was exemplified by Tom, who explained that he sometimes placed low and high achieving pupils together because some of the low-achieving pupils benefited from reading with a high-achieving pupil. Tom claimed that the high-achievers in his class understood the advantage of learning by teaching others. Erik, on the other hand, did not allow his pupils to work in pairs or in groups as he claimed they saw it as an excuse to talk about other things. Considering the potential advantages of collaborating in class, Erik's pupils may have missed out on opportunities to form a feeling of belonging to a community of readers, which could potentially result in less language acquisition and a decrease in their motivation to read further.

None of the teachers in the study reported inviting their pupils to read aloud in class to a large extent. Some of the teachers had tried this activity a few times and some teachers allowed their pupils to read aloud if they reviewed short texts in class. In that case, only pupils who wanted to read aloud did so. Anne did not care for her pupils reading aloud to the whole class. She contended that making the pupils read aloud in class was 'borderline bullying' because so many pupils were anxious to read to their classmates. This reservation is supported by Roe (2014: 134), who is critical of letting all the pupils read aloud in class, especially weaker readers. Roe claims that only pupils who want to read to their classmates, and pupils who read well, should do it.

On the other hand, playing texts on audio files, mainly textbook texts, was an activity that was used to a great extent by all the interviewed teachers. Erik claimed that listening to audio files helped the pupils with a lack of motivation or concentration difficulties to read. Tom, on the other hand, saw playing audio files as a good opportunity to introduce his pupils to different varieties of English, such as Irish, Australian, and American English. These beliefs are in line with Roe (2014: 133-134), who argues that there are many advantages to

hearing texts read aloud. For example, the text is given a new dimension through the reader's use of voice and how the reader stresses certain words or expressions. Hearing texts read aloud can help pupils increase their reading comprehension, expand their vocabulary, and learn more about syntax and text structure.

Mia reported reading aloud to her pupils if the text she employed in class did not have audio files available. Duchein and Mealy (1993) found that being read to had a positive effect on the pupils' attitudes towards reading. This effect was evident on pupils all the way up to upper secondary school. Teachers, even at the upper secondary level, should therefore not have reservations about reading aloud to their pupils.

6.4 Are the pupils in these classes helped to develop reading strategies in English in order to improve comprehension skills? If so, how?

The third research question relates to whether the pupils in the five classes were helped to develop reading strategies in English in order to improve comprehension skills. None of the interviewed teachers reported teaching reading strategies explicitly in their classes. The lack of focus on teaching reading strategies in the present study is in line with Hellekjær and Hopfenbeck (2012) and Pressley (2008), who claim that researchers have found that reading strategy instruction is not carried out by the majority of reading teachers.

Duke and Pearson (2002) hold that reading strategies should be taught explicitly so that all pupils can employ the strategies on their own in the best way possible. Duke and Pearson (2002: 208-210) list five components that should be included in reading strategy instruction, namely a description of the strategy and when and how it should be used, modelling of the strategy, collaborative use of the strategy, guided practice using the strategy, and finally, independent use of the strategy. Duke and Pearson (2002) and Grabe (2009) claim that good readers use multiple strategies simultaneously as they read. Reading strategy instruction should therefore introduce, encourage, and model several strategies. Roe (2006: 68) also advocates teaching reading strategies. Reading strategy instruction is part of what Roe calls the second or advanced reading instruction, which indicates that teachers need to help pupils to read effectively and strategically. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 413) also point out that strategy instruction, namely direct instruction, modelling and guided practice (see section 3.6.4), tends to be motivating for pupils. The reason for this is that long-term strategy instruction enables the pupils to employ multiple reading strategies, which will in turn increase their reading comprehension and hence their motivation to read. When one considers

the above-mentioned benefits of teaching reading strategies explicitly, it was arguably a disadvantage for the pupils that none of the teachers explicitly taught reading strategies.

Despite not teaching reading strategies explicitly, all of the teachers reported employing reading strategies in their classes to some extent. Most of the interviewed teachers focused minimally on pre-reading strategies. The four teachers who assigned novels talked about the setting and/or the theme(s) in the novel before the pupils started reading them. Three of the teachers also reported instructing the pupils to think about or discuss the pre-reading questions listed in the textbooks before reading textbook texts. The teachers and pupils in the remaining two schools reported little focus on pre-reading strategies. Lisa stood out from the other teachers in terms of her use of pre-reading strategies. Lisa photocopied all the textbook texts she employed in the classroom and gave one paper copy of the text to each of the pupils. Before reading, the pupils were instructed to skim through the paper copy and highlight words and take notes. Erik reported encouraging his pupils to skim through the text and look at the first sentences in each paragraph, although his pupils could not remember this occurring. Erik reported sometimes using music videos to introduce a new topic or a text to his class.

Reading researchers widely agree that prior knowledge has a pivotal role in reading comprehension (Roe 2006: 71). A reader's experiences and knowledge are central to creating meaning from a text. For this reason, different readers will interpret the same texts differently (Roe 2006: 71). This understanding is in accordance with the situation model of reader interpretation (see section 3.2.2), which also posits that readers employ prior knowledge to create real-life situations from the textual input (Koda 2004: 126-127). The three teachers who reported employing the pre-reading questions in the textbook, activated the pupils' prior knowledge before reading to some extent, depending on the questions.

Making predictions about what will happen before starting to read has proved to be an effective reading strategy, especially when reading fictional texts (Duke and Pearson 2002: 213). Research conducted on pupils' prediction-making showed that it was not the prediction itself, but the engagement in the text that resulted in increased comprehension (Duke and Pearson 2002: 213). Anne was the only teacher who reported facilitating prediction-making before reading texts which, according to Duke and Pearson (2002), could have increased the pupils' comprehension when reading the text.

Furthermore, none of the teachers reported identifying reading goals before the pupils started reading. Making goals before starting to read will help pupils determine how they should read the text: which strategies they should employ and whether to skim, scan, or read

intensively. Similarly, the reading goal will help determine whether a text model or a situation model of comprehension will be emphasised (see section 3.2.2).

The minimal focus on pre-reading strategies found in the study may hinder the pupils from improving their reading comprehension, as prior knowledge has a decisive role in reading comprehension. Interestingly, the pupils at School One requested more pre-reading activities. When asked what they wanted more of in the teaching of reading, they claimed more pre-reading activities would help them increase their comprehension.

The teachers in the study employed few during-reading strategies. All the teachers played the texts on audio file to a large extent (see section 6.3). Three of the teachers also encouraged their pupils to take notes or highlight words when reading. Mia prepared two graphic organisers that the pupils could make use of when they read the novel. The pupils were given a chart where they could write quotations from the book according to literary key words, such as character and setting. Mia's pupils were also instructed to draw the inside of the bunk house that was described in the novel to show that they had understood what it looked like. Most of the interviewed pupils in School One found these graphic organisers to be helpful for their comprehension. This is in line with Duke and Pearson (2002) and Grabe (2009), who state that organising text information into graphic organisers leads to improved comprehension and improved recall of information.

Pressley (2002: 295) states that good readers tend to read selectively: skipping or skimming information that is irrelevant to the reader's reading goal and focusing the intensive reading on important information. None of the interviewed teachers had taught ways of reading, such as skimming, scanning, intensive, and extensive reading in class (see section 3.5.4 and 3.5.5). However, most of the teachers had instructed their pupils to skim texts in class. According to Hellekjær (2007: 28), the *LK06* competency aims (see section 2.4) indicate that teachers are obliged to teach their pupils how to adjust their reading according to the reading goal and reading purpose. Thus, Hellekjær (2007) claims that teachers need to teach their pupils not just intensive reading, but how to skim and scan and read for 'overall meaning'.

The teachers focused mostly on post-reading activities. However, they used few and similar post-reading strategies. All the teachers reported instructing their pupils to do post-reading tasks in the textbook. Four of the teachers also facilitated group or class discussions about the texts they had read, often with the post-reading tasks in the textbook as a starting point. All of the pupils who were assigned novels were assessed and graded after finishing the

novel. Most of these assessments were conducted orally, individually or in a group, where the pupils were supposed to answer and/or discuss the teacher's questions.

Duke and Pearson (2002: 222) argue that the type of questions the pupils are used to receiving after reading a text can shape their comprehension. This means that teachers should vary the questions they assign their pupils as best they can. Most of the interviewed teachers regularly assigned the same types of questions from the textbook and thus did not vary their question types. P5 at School Two pointed out that they were always assigned the same type of questions and that he did not learn much from always doing the same. Instead, Duke and Pearson (2002: 222-223) advocate pupils making their own questions to the text. They point to research which shows that when learning to make their own questions, the pupils' overall comprehension increases. Mia reported instructing her pupils to form their own questions to the text once.

By reviewing the strategies that the teachers in the study employed, it becomes clear that they mainly employed surface-level strategies, such as extracting information from a text, and not deep-processing strategies, such as assessing and comparing texts (see section 3.6.1). This complies with the findings of Berge et al. (2017), who found that surface-level strategies were taught significantly more than deep-processing strategies in Norwegian 4th grade classrooms. Considering that the pupils in this study are significantly older, and should be able to process texts on deeper levels, the lack of focus on deep-processing strategies in the five classes is a concern.

The varying and relatively limited focus on reading strategies in the five classes in the study complies with related research conducted in Norway (e.g. Bakke 2010; Charboneau 2016; Faye-Schjøll 2009; Gilje 2014; Hellekjær 2007). Gilje (2014: 12) points out that the minimal focus on reading strategies on all levels in Norwegian schools is likely to be the main cause of pupils' poor reading skills.

Many of the interviewed pupils reported that when reading by themselves, they used reading strategies that they had already acquired and found beneficial. For this reason, some of the participants in the study reported that they did not see why reading strategies had to be focused on in upper secondary school because they were supposed to already know such strategies by now. P4 at School Five, for example, claimed that they had not worked with reading strategies because the teachers took it for granted that the pupils were familiar with them. However, six of the 27 interviewed pupils reported that there had been minimal focus on reading strategies in their previous schooling. Hence, they were not sure about how to approach texts and how to improve their comprehension. Arguably, if reading strategies are

not focused on in Vg1 English because the teachers or pupils take it for granted that every pupil knows how and when to employ different reading strategies, the pupils that have not learned reading strategies previously will fall even further behind in their reading. For these pupils, it will arguably be even more difficult to increase their comprehension because they are not aware of the reading strategies that can help them do so.

The minimal focus on reading strategies is also problematic in terms of the *LK06* competency aims in English. After Vg1, pupils are supposed to be able to 'Evaluate and use suitable reading and writing strategies adapted for the purpose and type of text.' Some pupils would arguably be able to do this based on their existing knowledge of reading strategies. However, the fact that reading strategies were not taught and were focused on minimally, suggests that especially the pupils with limited previous experience with reading strategies will fail to reach this competency aim.

In terms of vocabulary, all the teachers, except Erik, claimed to have explained to their pupils that they did not have to know or understand all the words they read in English. Hence, most of the pupils in the study had been advised to skip or guess the meaning of unfamiliar words from context instead of stopping to consult a dictionary. This is in line with Simensen (2007), Grabe (2009), Hellekjær (2007), and Hudson (2007), who argue that in order to sustain reading fluency, the reader must learn to tolerate some ambiguity in comprehension. Thus, the reader must guess the meaning of unfamiliar words. Grabe (2009: 275-276) points out that the context in which the reader guesses the meaning of unfamiliar words is decisive for comprehension. Grabe (2009) also argues that pupils need training in order to improve on guessing words from context. Increased awareness of context clues can help pupils become better at guessing the meaning of words. However, training to detect context clues was not conducted in the five studied classes.

None of the teachers reported teaching vocabulary explicitly in class. However, most of them focused on literary key words. While Mia had used *Quizlet* in order to facilitate vocabulary learning in her class, none of her pupils found it useful. Erik reported using *Memories* to teach his pupils new vocabulary, claimed to sometimes write 'important words' on the blackboard, and made a mind map to facilitate vocabulary learning. However, Erik's pupils felt there was a lack of vocabulary learning, according to his class evaluation. The focus group pupils in School Two, School Three, and School Four expressed a wish to learn more vocabulary in class. Grabe (2009: 276) states that pupils do not learn many new words from direct vocabulary instruction. However, the words they do learn are often very important. The key words that the pupils are taught through direct instruction can thus form

foundations for learning associating vocabulary and be a basis for further vocabulary learning. Although the pupils in the study did not learn many words through direct instruction, they did report learning about literary key words. These are important words that can function as foundations for learning associated vocabulary.

Considering that the pupils in the study were not taught reading strategies explicitly and that there was a minimal focus on reading strategies in most of the classes, it can be argued that the pupils in these classes were not helped to develop reading strategies very much. This suggests that teachers should focus more on reading strategies, which supports the findings of Brevik (2014), who examined how 21 Norwegian teachers in upper secondary school described their strategy instruction. Brevik's study was based on a professional development course (TPD course). Brevik found that after a four-week TPD-course, the teachers experienced a 'renewed strategic awareness' (Brevik 2014: 60). Hence, Brevik's findings suggest the need for TPD courses in reading strategy instruction for Norwegian teachers.

6.5 To what extent is pupils' motivation to read English taken into consideration by the teachers?

The fourth and final research question asks to what extent pupils' motivation to read English is taken into consideration by the teachers. The interviewed teachers in the study reported generally doing very little to accommodate for pupils' motivation to read. However, all of the teachers explained that they allowed the low achievers to answer fewer post-reading tasks than other pupils, or these pupils were assigned alternative tasks. At School One and School Four, the pupils sometimes had the option of working with simpler versions of texts. The pupils at School Four would also be allowed to choose which books to read after finishing reading two mandatory books. Tom also claimed he paid closer attention to the pupils who struggled with motivation.

Despite their minimal focus on accommodating for pupils' motivation to read, the teachers seemed to agree that low achievers did not benefit from having to solve post-reading tasks they did not understand or, at School One and Four, read texts that were well beyond their current capacity. According to Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis and affective filter hypothesis (see section 3.3), if the provided input is well beyond the pupil's proficiency level, the pupil will not acquire language. Not being able to understand what they read can have a negative effect on pupils' attitudes towards reading, which, in turn, can manifest itself as a high or strong affective filter resulting in lack of acquisition.

In terms of the pupils, the focus group participants in the study did not generally think that their motivation to read was taken into consideration by their teachers. Most of the interviewed pupils could not even think of one instance in which their teacher took their motivation to read into consideration. However, the pupils at School One found watching the film about the novel they had read motivating and they were pleased that they had been given much time to finish the novel. The interviewed pupils at School Four reported that mixed ability levels, and hence motivation, were taken into consideration when the pupils could choose between different versions of *Macbeth* and also when they would be allowed to choose which books to read.

Several scholars have emphasised the benefits of motivation in reading, and hence the importance of taking pupils' motivation to read into consideration. Krashen (1982: 30-31), for example, states that motivation is important because it is known that high motivation tends to correlate with better L2 acquisition. Guthrie and Wigfield (2000: 412) also point out that research shows that pupils spend more time reading texts they find interesting than texts they find uninteresting. In turn, more reading is likely to lead to increased L2 acquisition.

The pupils provided many suggestions as to what their teacher could do differently to better accommodate for varying levels of motivation. The majority of the focus group participants from all the schools, except School Four, expressed a wish to be able to choose what to read themselves. Most of the interviewed pupils from School Two, Three, and Five requested more interesting texts. Pupils from School One and Four suggested that their teachers could assign texts on different levels to motivate them to read. Pupils from School Three, who were the only ones who were not allowed to work in groups, requested more group work. Interestingly, the focus group participants' suggestions are in line with Guthrie and Wigfield's (2000) instructional processes that have been shown to influence reading motivation, namely autonomy support, interesting texts for instruction, real-world interactions, and collaboration (see section 3.7.2).

This study did not aim to inquire how motivated the pupils themselves were to read. Nevertheless, a worrying number of pupils who participated in the study expressed a lack of motivation to read. This finding complies with the findings from the PISA surveys, where pupils' reading habits and attitudes towards reading were measured. In all the PISA surveys, Norwegian pupils reported negative attitudes towards reading (Roe 2014: 206).

These findings suggest that teachers may not know how to, or are not concerned about taking pupils' motivation to read into consideration. For this reason, one can argue that teachers need more awareness of the importance of reading motivation, as well as practical

suggestions as to how to motivate their pupils to read. This study also suggests that a good starting point might be to ask the pupils what motivates them to read, as many pupils can provide thoughtful and insightful answers that can be worth considering.

6.6 Implications and recommendations

A significant finding in this study was that four of the five interviewed teachers employed textbooks widely in their EFL lessons. Many of the teachers used the textbook extensively, despite noting that they were not content with its quality or that the textbook was outdated. The extensive use of textbooks was confirmed by the pupils. As many of the participating pupils expressed a wish to read more interesting texts, an implication is that it might have been beneficial for the pupils that their teachers supplemented the textbooks with more interesting reading materials from other sources. One recommendation would therefore be that teachers employ a wide selection of additional reading materials in their EFL lessons. Increased availability of reading materials could be facilitated by more cooperation among teachers, as described by Roe (2014: 132), where teachers share interesting reading materials on different levels that can be used when reviewing different topics.

Another important finding was that four of the five teachers in this study were dissatisfied or not aware of the selection of English books at their respective school library. None of the pupils, except pupils at School Five, reported using the library. As the pupils requested more interesting materials and being able to choose what to read themselves, it would have been beneficial for them to have access to, and knowledge of, school libraries with a wide selection of reading materials in English. A further recommendation would therefore be to increase the resources in school libraries. Arguably, if the school libraries had a variety of reading materials on different topics and on different proficiency levels, they would have been used more by teachers and pupils alike, and hence facilitated more reading.

Furthermore, the present study shows that relatively little reading was required by the pupils in all the classes, except in Anne's class. Pupils reading in greater quantity would have been beneficial in these classes. One recommendation would therefore be for the teachers to launch an extensive reading programme with their pupils, as described by Day and Bamford (1998), as this would have facilitated reading and reading motivation. As some of the teachers in the present study did not seem to be aware of the advantages of extensive reading, a further recommendation would be to focus more on reading and the benefits of reading in teacher education and/or in professional development courses. More knowledge of the benefits of reading among the teachers might result in more reading in the Vg1 English upper secondary

classes, and hence even out the big differences in terms of the required amount of reading between the classes.

Another key finding in this study was that none of the teachers reported teaching reading strategies explicitly and that there was varying and limited focus on reading strategies in their lessons. Furthermore, the reading strategies that were used were most often surface-level strategies. This suggests that the pupils would have benefited from more focus on reading strategies, especially deep-processing strategies. A recommendation would therefore be for teachers to teach reading strategies explicitly by describing, modelling, and guiding the pupils in using reading strategies, as described by Duke and Pearson (2002: 208-210). This way, the teachers could ensure that all the pupils were aware of, and knew how and when to use a variety of reading strategies. This could in turn increase the pupils' reading comprehension and facilitate more reading and motivation for reading. A further recommendation would be for teachers to attend professional development courses (TDP courses), as described by Brevik (2014). TPD courses might enhance teachers' awareness and knowledge of reading strategies and encourage them to focus more on teaching and working with reading strategies in their lessons.

Another key finding was that the pupils' motivation to read was not sufficiently taken into consideration by the teachers in most of the classes. Most of the teachers could only think of a few ways in which to accommodate for their pupils' motivation to read. In addition, they did not seem to take the pupils' wishes into consideration. As the pupils wished for more autonomy and more interesting texts to read, it would obviously had been a benefit for them to be able to choose reading materials themselves. One recommendation would thus be to allow pupils more autonomy in terms of choosing what to read. This would obviously be easier if the school had a well-stocked school library, as discussed above. However, pupils could be given the opportunity to choose books from public libraries, read online, or bring reading materials from home.

A further recommendation would be to take the pupils' perspectives into consideration. The focus group participants in this study had many opinions and suggestions as to what their teachers could have done differently in order to motivate them to read. These suggestions could be worth considering. After all, each pupil knows best what motivates him or her to read English.

6.7 Limitations of the study

This study is limited first and foremost in terms of the number of participants. The study included interviews with five teachers from five different upper secondary schools in Norway and 27 of their pupils. The findings in this study cannot thus be generalised to all teachers and pupils involved in the Vg1 English subject in upper secondary school in Norway. However, on certain aspects of the teaching in the five studied classes, some trends were notable. In addition, because only five or six pupils from each of the five classes were interviewed, their perspectives and opinions that were reflected in the interviews cannot be generalised to the rest of their respective classes.

Another limitation was that the majority of the interviews in the study had to be conducted in November, which is fairly early in the semester. Consequently, the pupil interviewees only gained insight into what the teachers had taught up until that point in the course. The teachers might have had a plan to focus on certain competency aims, strategies or practices at a later stage in the course. In this way, the study does not reflect an accurate presentation of the practices in the Vg1 English subject in these classes over a whole year. Additionally, when asked about plans for the rest of the Vg1 English course, some of the teachers could have been influenced by the researcher's questions and claimed to want to focus on something they had not really planned on at a later stage.

Furthermore, most of the teachers were interviewed before the pupils. In many cases the focus group interviews with the pupils unravelled additional questions for the teachers that would have been interesting to follow up on. However, this was not possible as the study did not include follow-up interviews. Follow-up interviews could have resulted in richer data and could have clarified certain aspects within the study. For example, some of the pupils remembered certain activities or strategies that had been conducted in class that the teacher did not remember or did not mention. It would have been interesting to ask the teachers about these findings. Follow-up interviews would also have enabled the researcher to ask questions that arose when analysing the data, such as the teachers' reasons for some of their choices.

Moreover, the researcher has not conducted classroom observations of the teaching or reviewed the reading materials and other instruction materials used in the five classes as the data collection was only based on the perspectives of the teachers and pupils. For this reason, the researcher has not been able to check whether the reported activities and the reading materials that have been referred to have been accurately reported.

7.0 Conclusion

The present study was a qualitative study of the teaching and learning of reading in English in five Norwegian upper secondary classes. The study focused on the given upper secondary teachers' and pupils' experiences and perspectives of reading from the mandatory Vg1 English subject. The study aimed to examine how reading was taught in these EFL upper secondary classes, with focus on what, how, and how much the pupils in these classes read English, whether they were helped to develop reading strategies in English, and to what extent the pupils' motivation to read English was taken into consideration.

Following the Norwegian pupils' poor reading scores on the 2000 PISA surveys, many policy initiatives were introduced to improve reading instruction in the Norwegian school. Among them were a new curriculum, *LK06*, which incorporated reading as one of the five basic skills and ambitious EFL competency aims. The researcher thus wanted to investigate the outcome of more than ten years of increased focus on English reading in the Norwegian school, and add to this from multiple perspectives. The mandatory Vg1 English classes seemed to be appropriate subjects to investigate as the Vg1 English course is the last year in the Norwegian school system where English is mandatory. Many of the pupils from these classes will hence go on to study at university and/or work in the Norwegian workforce, for which the ability to read in English is crucial in both. Because reading is emphasised as a basic skill in *LK06*, along with an ambitious EFL curriculum, the expectation was that reading, reading strategies and motivation to read would be given high priority in Vg1 English classes.

The present study focussed on Vg1 English classes in the Programmes for General Studies, with Specialisation in General Studies or Specialisation in Sport and Physical Education. It incorporated five teachers from five different upper secondary schools and a group of five or six of their pupils. The teachers were interviewed using individual, semi-structured interviews and the five groups of pupils, 27 pupils altogether, were interviewed using focus group interviews. Including interviews with both teachers and pupils enabled the researcher to gather data from two different perspectives, and thus increased the validity of the study. The researcher gathered data about how and what the pupils were instructed to read, the strategies that were used in class, and to what extent the teachers took the pupils' motivation to read into consideration.

The research revealed that four of the five teachers employed textbooks widely in their lessons. Many of the teachers reported using the textbook extensively despite noting that they

were not content with its quality or that it was outdated. These findings support those of Bakke (2010), Charboneau (2016), Faye-Schjøll (2009), Gilje (2014), and Hellekjær (2005). In terms of other reading materials, four of the five teachers assigned a novel for their pupils to read. However, only one teacher assigned more than one novel during the Vg1 English course. Moreover, only pupils from one of the schools were allowed to choose reading materials themselves. In addition, four of the five interviewed teachers were dissatisfied or not aware of the selection of English books at their respective school library. None of the pupils, except some at School Five, reported using the library. The heavy reliance on textbook texts and the limited supplemental reading showed that relatively little reading was required by the pupils in all but one of the participating classes. Considering the benefits of reading extensively (e.g. Day and Bamford 1998; Grabe 2009; Hellekjær 2007; Krashen 2004), this was a surprising finding.

In terms of how the pupils read, the interviews showed that three of the teachers allowed their pupils to spend much time reading individually in class. Pupils from all but one of the classes were also allowed to read or work with texts in pairs or in groups in class. Pupils reading aloud was not a common practice among the participating teachers' classes. On the other hand, playing texts on audio files, mainly textbook texts, was an activity that was used to a great extent by all the interviewed teachers. One of the teachers also reported reading aloud to her pupils.

The interviews with the teachers and pupils further revealed that none of the teachers reported teaching reading strategies explicitly. There was also varying and limited focus on reading strategies in the lessons. Surface-level strategies were generally focussed on more than deep-processing strategies. Hence, the majority of the pupils in this study could only be said to be helped to develop reading strategies to a small extent. These findings comply in this respect with those of other studies (e.g. Bakke 2010; Charboneau 2016; Faye-Schjøll 2009; Gilje 2014; Hellekjær 2007). However, the findings are a concern in terms of the EFL competency aims in *LK06* and the benefits of reading strategy instruction and use (e.g. Duke and Pearson 2002; Grabe 2009; Pressley 2002; Roe 2014).

The results also showed that the pupils' motivation to read was not sufficiently taken into consideration by the teachers in most of the classes. The majority of the teachers could only think of a few ways in which to accommodate for their pupils' motivation to read. Additionally, they did not seem to take the pupils' wishes into consideration. Many of the pupils desired being able to choose reading materials themselves and to read more interesting texts in order to increase their motivation to read.

The present thesis has added to the research on EFL reading at the upper secondary level in Norway by studying the phenomenon from multiple perspectives. The thesis has illuminated what and how pupils are instructed to read in the Vg1 English course, whether they are taught reading strategies in English, and it has incorporated the teachers' consideration of their pupils' motivation to read English. It has approached the topic from a much wider range of perspectives than related studies of EFL reading at this level. The thesis has also contributed to knowledge about whether and how the teaching of reading in English at the upper secondary level has evolved after *LK06*. The current study, although limited in scope, indicates that the teaching of EFL reading at the upper secondary level in Norway has not evolved as positively during the *LK06* period as might have been expected.

In terms of future research, one could conduct a large-scale questionnaire survey about reading instruction among teachers and pupils at the upper secondary level in Norway, and thus gather data from a much larger sample than was the scope in the current study. Moreover, one could conduct a survey of first-year university students who study English to find out to how well the Vg1 English course had prepared them for reading English texts at university level. Finally, one could conduct an EFL extensive reading intervention study at the upper secondary level in Norway to investigate the challenges and benefits of implementing an extensive reading programme in the English subject.

References

Afflerbach, P., Pearson, P.D. and S.G. Paris. 2008. 'Clarifying differences between reading skills and reading strategies.' *The Reading Teacher*, 61: 364-373.

Alexander, P.A. 2005. 'The path to competence: a lifespan developmental perspective on reading.' *Educational Journal of Literacy Research,* 37: 413–436.

Alexie, S. 2009. *The absolutely true diary of a part-time Indian*. New York: Little Brown Company. [first published 2007]

Bakke, M.H. 2010. *Teaching reading in EFL-instruction. What are teachers' attitudes towards reading in EFL instruction and how is it taught?* MA thesis, University of Oslo.

Balsvik, L., Bratberg, Ø., Henry, J.S., Kagge, J. and R. Pihlstrøm. 2015. *Targets*. 4th ed. Oslo: Aschehoug & Co.

Barbour, R. 2007. *Doing focus groups*. London, Sage.

Bernhardt, E.B. 1998. *Reading development in a second language: theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Borg, S. 2010. 'Doing good quality research.' *JACET Journal,* 50: 9-13.

Brevik, L.M. 2014. 'Making implicit practice explicit: how do upper secondary teachers describe their reading comprehension strategies instruction?' *International Journal of Educational Research*, 67: 52-66.

Burgess, R. and T.B. Sørhus. 2009. *Passage: engelsk vg1 studieforberedende program*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm.

Charboneau, R.A. 2016. *Approaches to English as a foreign language (EFL) reading instruction in Norwegian primary schools*. PhD thesis, University of Stavanger.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and K. Morrison. 2000. *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Cunningham, J.W. 1982. 'Generating interactions between schemata and text.' In Niles, J.A. and L.A. Harris (eds.), *New inquiries in reading research and instruction*. New York: National Reading Conference. 42-47.

Day, R. and J. Bamford. 1998. *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln. 1994. 'Introduction: entering the field of qualitative research.' In Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 1-17.

Dörnyei, Z. 2007. *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: OUP.

Duchein, M.A. and D.L. Mealy. 1993. 'Rememberance of books past… long past. Glimpses into aliteracy.' *Reading Research and Instruction*, 33: 13-28.

Duke, N.K. and P.D. Pearson. 2002. 'Effective practices for developing reading comprehension.' In Farstrup, A.E. and S.J. Samuels (eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction*. 3rd ed. Delaware: International Reading Association. 205-242.

Duke, N.K., Pearson, P.D., Strachan, S.L. and A.K. Billman. 2011. 'Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension.' In Farstrup, A.E. and S.J. Samuels (eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction*. 4th ed. Newark DE: International Reading Association.

Elley, W.B. and F. Mangubhai. 1981. *The impact of a book flood in Fiji primary schools*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Faye-Schjøll, L.H. 2009. *Reading in upper secondary: what do they read, how is it taught and what are the teachers' attitudes towards the teaching of reading?* MA thesis, University of Oslo.

Garner, R. 1987. *Metacognition and reading comprehension*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Gilje, T.M. 2014. 'Teacher cognition and the teaching of EFL reading in Norwegian upper primary classrooms.' *Acta Didactica Norge*, 8: 1-17.

Grabe, W. 2009. *Reading in a second language: moving from theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guthrie, J.T. 2008. 'Growing motivation: how students develop.' In J. Guthrie (ed.), *Engaging adolescents in reading*. California: Corwin Press. 99-113.

Guthrie, J.T. and A. Wigfield. 2000. 'Engagement and motivation in reading.' In Kamil, M.L., Mosenthal, P.B., Pearson, P.D. and R. Barr (eds.), *Handbook of reading research: volume III*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 403-418.

Hafiz, F.M. and I. Tudor. 1989. 'Extensive reading and the development of language skills.' *ELT Journal*: 43: 4-13.

Harris, A.J. and E.R. Sipay. 1990. *How to increase reading ability: a guide to developmental & remedial methods*. Michigan: University of Michigan, Longman.

Heian, B., Lokøy, G., Ankerheim, B. and I. Drew. 2009. *New experience: engelsk for studieforberedende utdanningsprogram*. 2nd ed. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Hellekjær, G.O. 2005. *The acid test: does upper secondary EFL instruction effectively prepare Norwegian students for the reading of English textbooks at colleges and universities?* PhD thesis, University of Oslo.

Hellekjær, G.O. 2007. 'Reading: from a forgotten to a basic skill.' *Språk og Språkundervising,* 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.

Hellekjær, G.O. and T.N. Hopfenbeck. 2012. 'CLIL og lesing. En sammenligning av vg3-elevers leseferdigheter og lesestrategibruk i 2002 og 2011. Report to the Norwegian centre for foreign languages in education, investigating students' reading comprehension at the age of 18, comparing IB, CLIL and ordinary ESL students in upper secondary schools.' In B.W. Svenhard (ed.), *CLIL: kombinert fag- og engelskopplæring i videregående skole. Fokus på Språk*, 28: 84-124.

Huberman, M.A. and M.B. Miles. 1994. 'Data management and analysis methods.' In Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 428-444.

Hudson, T. 2007. *Teaching second language reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janesick, V.J. 1994. 'The dance of qualitative research design: metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning.' In Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 209-218.

Johansen, E.K.N. 2013. *Reading strategies in upper secondary school. How and to what extent are reading strategies taught and used in Norwegian upper secondary schools?* MA thesis, University of Oslo.

Koda, K. 2004. *Insights into second language reading: a cross-linguistic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S.D. 1982. *Principles and practices in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.D. 2004. *The power of reading: insights from the research*. 2nd ed. Westport, Connecticut: Libraries Unlimited.

Lie, S., Kjærnsli, M., Roe, A. and A. Turmo. 2001. *Godt rustet for framtida? Norske 15-åringers kompetanse i lesing og realfag i et internasjonalt perspektiv*. Vol 4. Oslo: Department of Teacher Education and School Development, University of Oslo.

Lodico, M.G. 2010. *Methods in educational research: from theory to practice*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: Wiley.

Lundgren, H., Langseth, J., Lokøy, G. and S. Hellesøy. 2014. *Skills: elektrofag, Engelsk for yrkesfag vg1/vg2*. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Lyster, S.H. 2001. 'Lese- og skriveutvikling – om forebygging av lese- og skrivevansker.' In H. Solheim (ed.), *Dysleksiforbundets brukerhåndbok*. Oslo: Dysleksiforbundet i Norge. 142-149.

Manz, S.L. 2002. 'A strategy for previewing textbooks: teaching readers to become THIEVES.' *The Reading Teacher*, *55*: 434–435.

McNeil, J.R. and L. Donant. 1982. 'Summarization strategy for improving reading comprehension.' In Niles, J.A. and L.A. Harris (eds.), *New inquiries in reading research and instruction*. New York: National Reading Conference. 215-219.

Morgan, D.L. 1988. *Focus groups as qualitative research*. London, Sage.

Pressley, M. and P. Afflerbach. 1995. *Verbal protocols of reading: the nature of constructively responsive reading*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pressley, M. 2002. 'Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension.' In Farstrup, A.E. and S.J. Samuels (eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction*. 3rd ed. Delaware: International Reading Association. 291-309.

Pressley, M. 2008. 'Epilogue. What the future of reading research could be.' In Block, C.C. and S.R. Parris (eds.), *Comphrension instruction. Research-based best practices*. 2nd ed. New York: The Guilford Press.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and J. Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Richards, L. and J.M. Morse. 2007. *README FIRST for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. 2nd ed. London, Sage.

Roe, A. 2006. 'Leseopplæring og lesestrategier.' In Elstad, E. and A. Turmo (eds.), *Læringsstrategier: søkelys på lærernes praksis*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 67-92.

Roe, A. 2014. *Lesedidaktikk – etter den første leseopplæringen*. 3rd ed. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Ryan, R.M. and E.L. Deci. 2000. 'Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being.' *American Psychologist*, 55: 68-78.

Sargeson, F. 2009. 'A great day.' In Heian, B., Lokøy, G., Ankerheim, B. and I. Drew (eds.), 2009. *New experience: engelsk for studieforberedende utdanningsprogram*. 2nd ed. Oslo: Gyldendal. 112-120. [first published 1940]

Shakespeare, W. 2008. *Macbeth: the graphic novel*. C. Bryant (ed.). Towcester, UK: Classical Comics.

Simensen, A.M. 2007. *Teaching a foreign language. Principles and procedures*. 2nd ed. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Skinner, E.A. and M.J. Belmont. 1993. 'Motivation in the classroom: reciprocal effects of teacher behavior and student engagement across the school year.' *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85: 571-581.

Stangeland, T.K. and L. Forsth. 2001. *Hurtiglesing superlesing fotolesing*. Oslo: Aquarius Forlag as.

Steinbeck. J. 1998. *Of Mice and Men*. Norwegian ed. by K. Hals. Oslo: Cappelen. [first published 1937]

Yudowitch, S., Henry, L.M. and J. Guthrie. 2008. 'Self-efficacy: building confident readers.' In J. Guthrie (ed.), *Engaging adolescents in reading*. California: Corwin Press. 65-82.

Online references

Berge, I.M., Helgevold, L. and K. Schulz-Heidorf. 2017. 'Hva lærerne rapporterer om egen undervisning i lesestrategier.' Accessed 22 Mar. 2018. https://www.idunn.no/klar-framgang/9-hva-larerne-rapporterer-om-egen-undervisning-i-lesestrategier

Education – from kindergarten to adult education. Oslo: Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. 2016. Accessed 04 Oct. 2017. https://www.udir.no/Upload/Brosjyrer/5/Education_in_Norway.pdf?epslanguage=no

English subject curriculum. Oslo: Utdanningsdirektoratet. Aug. 2013. Accessed 27 Sept. 2017. http://data.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03.pdf?lang=eng

Framework for basic skills. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Sept. 2012. Accessed 12 Sept. 2017. https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf

Joyce, C. 2008. 'Venn diagrams.' Accessed 15 Mar. 2018. https://arbs.nzcer.org.nz/venn-diagrams

Knowledge promotion - information for pupils and parents/guardians: What is new in the 10-year compulsory school and upper secondary schools from the autumn of 2006? Oslo: Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. 2006. Accessed 04. Oct. 2017. https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kilde/kd/bro/2006/0002/ddd/pdfv/292311-kunnskapsloftet2006_engelsk_ii.pdf

Nyberg, E. 2017. 'Tidspress gjør at engelsklærere velger enkle løsninger.' *Forskning.no*. Accessed 26 Sept. 2017. http://forskning.no/2017/01/norsklaerere-og-engelsklaerere-samarbeid-lesing/produsert-og-finansiert-av/universitetet-i-stavanger

Veiledning til læreplan i engelsk. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Aug 2015. Accessed 26 Sept. 2017. https://www.udir.no/globalassets/upload/larerplaner/veiledning/veiledning-lareplanen-engelsk-udir-2013.pdf

Veiledning til læreplan i engelsk. Oslo: Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. Aug 2015. Accessed 26 Sept. 2017. https://www.udir.no/globalassets/upload/larerplaner/veiledning/veiledning-lareplanen-engelsk-udir-2013.pdf

Appendices

Appendix 1

Teacher Interview Guide (my English translation)

Background
1. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
2. Have you worked at the same school and in the same grade throughout your teaching career?
3. What kind of education do you have?
    a. How many credits do you have in English on a university level?
    b. Do you teach other subjects as well?
4. How many pupils are in your English class?
5. Does your school have a common policy or guidelines for reading and teaching reading in the different subjects or in English specifically?
6. Are there any traditions for reading, working with texts or teaching reading at the school you work?

Reading materials
7. Do you use the textbook in your lessons or as homework?
    a. To what extent?
    b. What is the name of the textbook and when was it published?
    c. What do you think about the quality of the textbook?
8. Do you use other reading materials in your lessons or as homework?
    a. What kind of texts?
    b. To what extent are they used?
    c. How do you select the reading materials?
    d. Where do you find the reading materials?
9. Are the pupils allowed to choose reading materials themselves?
    a. To what extent?
    b. Do you provide choices or are they completely free to choose?
    c. Do you advise the pupils about what they could read?
10. What do you think about the selection of English books at the school library?

The amount and ways of reading
11. How much do you prioritise reading and reading-related activities in the English subject compared to other skills (such as writing and oral English?)
12. How much time do you spend on reading and reading-related activities in your English lessons?
13. How much time is spent on individual reading in the English lessons?
    a. How often do the pupils read individually?
14. Do the pupils read or work with texts in pairs or in groups?
    a. How often is this done?
    b. How is this done?
15. Do the pupils read aloud in your lessons?
    a. How often?
    b. How is this done?

16. Do the pupils listen to the texts on CDs or audio files in your lessons?
17. How long are the texts that the pupils read in class or at home?
18. How much are the pupils required to read in English during a typical week?
19. How much are the pupils required to read in English during the school year?
20. Do you encourage the pupils to read in English at home?
21. Have you had an extensive reading project with your pupils?
22. Have you collaborated about reading in English with teachers who teach other subjects (CLIL) this school year?

Reading strategies
23. Do you teach reading strategies to improve the pupils' reading comprehension in your lessons?
    a. Which strategies do the pupils use before/during/after reading?
    b. Are these reading strategies taught explicitly?
24. Have you taught the pupils different ways of reading (according to the reading goal?)
    a. Have you talked about skimming, scanning, intensive, and extensive reading?
25. Do you advise the pupils about what they can do to remember important information when they read?
    a. Have you talked about reading strategies that can be used to remember important information?
    b. Which reading strategies have you used?
26. Do you advise the pupils about what they can do if they do not understand words, sentences or paragraphs in a text?
    a. What have you told the pupils about the use of dictionaries?
    b. Do the pupils use dictionaries when they read?
27. Do the pupils learn new vocabulary in your lessons?
    a. How is this done?
    b. To what extent is this done?
28. Is the pupils' reading comprehension assessed or are they given feedback on their reading or reading comprehension?
    a. If yes, how?
    b. How often?
29. What do you think is challenging about helping the pupils become better readers?
30. Would you do anything differently if you had more time or access to more reading materials?
31. Do you think that the Vg1 English course prepares pupils well enough for reading in English in higher education?

Learner differences in motivation
32. How do you accommodate for learner differences in motivation in reading and reading-related activities?

Further comments
33. Is there anything that you think is relevant that I have not asked you about?
34. Do you want to add anything?

Pupil Focus Group Interview Guide (my English translation)

Reading materials
1. What do you think about the textbook in the English subject?
    a. To what extent is it used?
2. What do you think about the other reading materials in the course?
    a. To what extent are other reading materials used?
3. Are you allowed to choose reading materials yourselves?
    a. How often?
    b. What do you think about that?
    c. What do you base your choices on?
4. What do you think about the selection of English books in the school library?

The amount of reading
5. How much do you read in English during a typical week?
6. Does your teacher encourage you to read in English in your spare time?
7. Do you read in English in your spare time?

Reading strategies
8. Which reading strategies are used in the English lessons?
    a. Which strategies are used before/during/after reading?
    b. Do you think these reading strategies improve you understanding of the texts?
9. Which reading strategies do you use when you read by yourselves to increase your reading comprehension?
10. Has reading strategies been focused on in lower grades?
11. Have you worked with different ways of reading in your lessons? (according to the reading goal).
    a. Have you worked with skimming, scanning, intensive, or extensive reading?
12. What do you do to remember important information when you read?
13. What do you do if you do not understand what you read in English?
    a. What has your teacher told you to do in these situations?
14. How often do you use dictionaries when reading?
    a. What have you learned about using a dictionary?
15. Do you learn new vocabulary in the English lessons?
    a. If so, how is this done?
16. What do you think is most challenging when reading in English?
17. What do you think is missing in the teaching of reading?
    a. What would you like more of?

Learner differences in motivation
18. Do you think learner differences in motivation are accommodated for in reading and reading-related activities?
    a. Are varying levels of motivation accommodated for?
    b. Are different interests accommodated for?
    c. Are mixed ability levels accommodated for?
19. What do you think the teacher can do differently to better accommodate for learner differences in motivation?

Further comments
20. Is there anything that you think is relevant that I have not asked you about?
21. Do you want to add anything?

Appendix 3

Intervjuguide for lærere (original Norwegian)

Bakgrunn
1. Hvor mange år har du jobbet som lærer?
2. Har du jobbet ved den samme skolen og på det samme nivået alle årene?
3. Hva slags utdanning har du?
    a. Hvor mange studiepoeng har du i engelsk på universitet/høyskolenivå?
    b. Underviser du i andre fag enn engelsk?
4. Hvor mange elever har du i engelskklassen din?
5. Har skolen du jobber på en felles forståelse eller retningslinjer for lesing eller leseundervisning i de forskjellige fagene eller i engelskfaget?
6. Har dere noen tradisjoner for lesing, å jobbe med tekster eller leseundervisning på skolen du jobber?

Lesemateriell
7. Bruker du tekstboken i dine timer eller som hjemmelekse?
    a. I hvor stor grad?
    b. Hva heter tekstboken og når er den fra?
    c. Hva tenker du om kvaliteten på tekstboken?
8. Bruker du annet lesemateriell i dine timer eller som hjemmelekse?
    a. Hvilken type tekster?
    b. I hvor stor grad brukes tekstene?
    c. Hvordan velger du lesemateriellet?
    d. Hvor finner du lesemateriellet?
9. Får elevene velge lesemateriellet selv?
    a. I hvor stor grad?
    b. Gir du elevene valg eller kan de velge hva som helst?
    c. Gir du råd om hva elevene kan lese?
10. Hva synes du om utvalget av engelske bøker på skolebiblioteket?

Mengden og måten det blir lest på
11. Hvor mye prioriterer du lesing og leserelaterte aktiviteter i engelskfaget i forhold til andre ferdigheter (som for eksempel skriving og muntlig engelsk?)
12. Hvor mye tid bruker du på lesing og leserelaterte aktiviteter i din engelskundervisning?
13. Hvor mye tid brukes på individuell lesing i timene?
    a. Hvor ofte leser elevene individuelt i timene?
14. Leser eller jobber elevene med tekster i par eller i grupper?
    a. Hvor ofte?
    b. Hvordan blir dette gjort?
15. Leser elevene høyt i timene?
    a. Hvor ofte?
    b. Hvordan blir dette gjort?
16. Hører elevene på at tekstene blir lest opp fra CD/lydfil i timene?
17. Hvor lange er tekstene elevene leser hjemme eller på skolen?
18. Hvor mye krever du at elevene leser på engelsk i løpet av en gjennomsnittlig uke?
19. Hvor mye krever du at elevene leser på engelsk gjennom et skoleår?

20. Oppfordrer du elevene til å lese på engelsk hjemme?
21. Har du noen gang hatt et ekstensivt leseprosjekt med elevene?
22. Samarbeider du noen gang om lesing på engelsk med lærere som underviser i andre fag (CLIL)?

Lesestrategier
23. Underviser du om lesestrategier for å forbedre elevenes leseforståelse i dine engelsktimer?
    a. Hvilke strategier bruker elevene før, under og etter lesing?
    b. Underviser du eksplisitt i disse lesestrategiene?
24. Har du undervist om forskjellige måter å lese på (etter målet med lesingen?)
    a. Har dere snakket om skumlesing, skanne tekster, intensiv og ekstensiv lesing?
25. Gir du elevene råd om hva de kan gjøre for å huske viktig informasjon når de leser?
    a. Snakker dere om lesestrategier for å huske informasjon?
    b. Hvilke lesestrategier har dere brukt eller diskutert?
26. Gir du elevene råd om hva de kan gjøre dersom de ikke forstår ord, setninger eller avsnitt i en tekst?
    a. Hva lærer du elevene om bruk av ordbok?
    b. Bruker elevene ordbøker når de leser?
27. Jobber dere med vokabularinnlæring i timene eller som lekse?
    a. Hvordan blir dette gjort?
    b. I hvor stor grad blir det gjort?
28. Blir elevenes leseforståelse vurdert eller får de noen form for tilbakemelding på lesing eller leseforståelse?
    a. Hvis ja, hvordan?
    b. Hvor ofte?
29. Hva synes du er utfordrende med å hjelpe elevene å bli bedre lesere?
30. Hadde du gjort noe annerledes dersom du hadde mer tid eller tilgang til mer lesemateriell?
31. Synes du at engelsk på Vg1 forbereder elevene godt nok for lesing på engelsk i høyere utdanning?

Elevforskjeller i motivasjon
32. Hvordan legger du til rette for elevforskjeller når det kommer til motivasjon i lesing og leserelaterte aktiviteter?

Ytterligere kommentarer
33. Er det noe du synes er relevant som jeg ikke har spurt om?
34. Vil du legge til noe?

Appendix 4

Intervjuguide for fokusgruppeintervju (original Norwegian)

Lesemateriell
1. Hva synes dere om tekstboken som blir brukt i engelskfaget?
    a. I hvor stor grad blir den brukt?
2. Hva synes dere om de andre tekstene som blir brukt?
    a. I hvor stor grad blir andre tekster brukt?
3. Får dere noen gang velge lesemateriell selv?
    a. Hvor ofte?
    b. Hva synes dere om det?
    c. Hva baserer dere deres valg på?
4. Hva synes dere om utvalget av engelske bøker på skolebiblioteket?

Mengden lesing
5. Hvor mye leser dere på engelsk i løpet av en gjennomsnittlig uke?
6. Blir dere oppfordret av læreren deres til å lese på engelsk på fritiden?
7. Leser dere på engelsk på fritiden?

Lesestrategier
8. Hvilke lesestrategier bruker dere i timene?
    a. Hvilke strategier har dere brukt før/under/etter lesing?
    b. Synes du at disse strategiene hjelper på deres forståelse av teksten?
9. Hvilke lesestrategier bruker dere når dere leser for dere selv for å øke leseforståelsen?
10. Har det blitt fokusert på lesestrategier på ungdomsskolen eller barneskolen?
11. Har dere jobbet med forskjellige måter å lese på i timene (etter målet med lesingen?)
    a. Har dere snakket om skumlesing, skanne tekster, intensiv og ekstensiv lesing?
12. Hva gjør dere for å huske viktig informasjon som dere leser?
13. Hva gjør dere dersom dere ikke forstår det dere leser på engelsk?
    a. Hva har læreren sagt om dette?
14. Hvor ofte bruker dere ordbok når dere leser?
    a. Hva har dere lært om bruk av ordbok?
15. Jobber dere med vokabularinnlæring i timene?
    a. Hvordan blir det gjort?
16. Hva synes dere er mest utfordrende med å lese på engelsk?
17. Er det noe dere synes mangler i leseundervisningen?
    a. Hva synes dere det skulle vært mer av?

Elevforskjeller i motivasjon
18. Synes dere at det blir lagt til rette for elevforskjeller når det kommer til motivasjon i lesing og leserelaterte aktiviteter?
    a. Er det tilrettelagt for elever med manglende motivasjon?
    b. Er det tilrettelagt for forskjellige interesser?
    c. Er det tilrettelagt for nivåforskjeller?
19. Hva synes dere at læreren kan gjøre annerledes for å tilrettelegge for elevforskjeller i motivasjon?

Ytterligere kommentarer

    20. Er det noe dere synes er relevant som jeg ikke har spurt om?

    21. Vil dere legge til noe?

Undersøkelse om lesing og lesestrategier i engelskfaget på Vg1

Bakgrunn og formål
Mitt navn er Hilde Holmen Brattetveit, jeg er mastergradsstudent ved Universitetet i Stavanger. Jeg arbeider nå med mitt mastergradsprosjekt som handler om lesing og lesestrategier i engelskfaget på Vg1. I den forbindelse ønsker jeg å intervjue elever og lærere som har engelskfaget på Vg1. Formålet med studien er å belyse lærere og elevers erfaringer med lesing i engelskfaget og på den måten bidra til forskning på dette temaet.

Hvordan vil intervjuet foregå?
Intervjuet er et såkalt fokusgruppeintervju der ca. fem til seks elever sitter sammen og diskuterer spørsmålene som jeg stiller. Spørsmålene vil handle om innholdet i engelskfaget, om undervisningspraksis og arbeidsmåter. Intervjuet vil vare i ca. en time og vil bli avholdt på norsk.

Personopplysninger
Alle elever og lærere som deltar i studien vil være anonyme. Det vil si at jeg ikke skal avsløre navn eller hvilken skole informantene er fra. Intervjuet vil bli tatt opp på lydfil, dette for at jeg skal få med meg alt som blir sagt. Lydfilene er det bare jeg som vil ha tilgang til og de vil bli slettet ved prosjektslutt. Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes innen mai 2018. Jeg vil ikke innhente eller bruke andre personopplysninger om deg.

Din deltakelse
Du har mottatt dette brevet fordi din engelsklærer har sagt ja til å være med i forskningsprosjektet. Det er frivillig å være med i prosjektet og du kan når som helst trekke deg. Spørsmål kan rettes på email til hh.brattetveit@stud.uis.no.

Vennlig hilsen,

Hilde Holmen Brattetveit

Samtykke til deltakelse i studien
Jeg har mottatt skriftlig informasjon om studien og jeg samtykker til å delta i et gruppeintervju som blir tatt opp på lydfil.

_____   _____
Dato   Elevens signatur