



University of  
Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

## MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study: MLIMAS

Spring semester, 2015

Open

Author: Torje Hunsbedt

.....  
(Author's signature)

Supervisor: Jena Habegger-Conti

Thesis title: CLIL in Norway: A Qualitative Analysis of Six Upper Secondary Language and Content Teachers Experiences with and Attitudes towards CLIL

Keywords:  
CLIL  
Curricular Integration  
Vocational Adaption  
Motivation  
Teacher Roles

No. of pages: 110  
+ appendices/other: 75

Stavanger, 10.05.2015

## Abstract

The present thesis is an investigative study of six Norwegian upper secondary teachers' experiences with and attitudes towards CLIL – Content and Language Integrated Learning – and similar approaches that seek to integrate the teaching of contents and the teaching of language. It also provides a thorough review of vocationally adapting general subjects (in this case English) in vocational schools. The study focuses on and questions the role of the teacher in CLIL, and ultimately poses the question whether extended use of CLIL in Norwegian schooling can be viewed as likely to occur successfully as it is expected, as well as exploring which of these curricular integrated modalities are generally aimed for, given the inherently varying contents of the non-language disciplines.

The present study provides an outline of some features of the CLIL-approach, the Norwegian schooling system and the parts of the English Subject Curriculum that exalt the instrumentality of the English language. The data for the analysis were obtained through qualitative in-depth interviews which were transcribed, analyzed and presented thematically, with ensuing discussions.

The main finding is that vocational adaption of English is the most systemic and widespread integrated approach in the Norwegian context. Moreover, the integration with language is often paired with vocational and practical subjects, which in turn provides perceived benefits for many students, but also great challenges for teachers, in terms of self-training and in terms of increased cooperation. In study preparatory contexts, language and content integration was found to be conducted as practical project work or as partial bilingual courses. In both cases, the role of language was reduced to merely an instrumental one. Teacher motivation and interest in teaching through the medium of English is crucial to success.

All the findings in this study only provide a tentative picture of the Norwegian situation. Yet, it poses relevant questions that might prove important if integrated approaches to learning are to gain a stronger curricular mandate in the future.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Jena Habegger-Conti for giving clear and concise feedback in the written drafts and for her good spirit and motivation throughout the process of supervision, as well in the MLIMAS seminars. This thesis could not have been completed without her. I would also like to thank Mona, Astri, Dina and everyone writing Master thesis the semesters of 2014-2015. Thanks to Linda for the unnumbered library sessions, and to Frode and Eivind for their easy-going in sharing a house with an MA student. A big thanks goes to the six informants of the study for their eager to share and participate. Also, thanks to Ion Drew and Iwona Lesna-Drajerczak for giving interesting interviews on CLIL. Thanks to my family for their love and support. Last, but not least, I would like to thank my dear Joanna for her suggestions and tips, as well as for her deep, reflected understanding and continuous uncompromising love throughout a year that has been challenging, yet rewarding, for the both of us.

## Table of Contents

GENERAL INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER 1 THEORY	6
1.1 INTRODUCTION	6
1.2 TERMINOLOGY	6
1.3 CLIL'S MAIN THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS IN RELATION TO BILINGUALISM, SLA AND CLT	9
1.4 DEFINING CLIL AND ITS MODALITIES	12
1.5 CLIL RESEARCHED, DEBATED AND CONCEPTUALIZED	14
1.6 CRITICISM OF THE CLIL-APPROACH	19
1.7 THE CLIL TEACHER	21
1.8 CLIL IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	24
CHAPTER 2 BACKGROUND; CLIL IN NORWAY	27
2.1 INTRODUCTION	27
2.2 LINGUISTIC INFLUENCE	27
2.3 HELLEKJÆR'S STUDIES	28
2.4 NCFL'S STUDY	29
2.5 THE NORWEGIAN SCHOOL-SYSTEM	31
2.6 THE ENGLISH SUBJECT CURRICULUM AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO CEF	32
2.7 THE TRADITIONAL ENGLISH CLASSROOM CONTENTS	33
2.8 THE ADAPTABLE AIMS OF THE ENGLISH SUBJECT CURRICULUM	34
2.9 ENGLISH IN STUDY PREPARATORY AND IN VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS	35
2.10 CLIL, ELITISM AND INTERNATIONAL CLASSES	38
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	40
3.1 INTRODUCTION	40
3.2 RESEARCH METHOD	40
3.3 THE QUALITATIVE METHOD	41
3.4 THE SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW AND EXTERNAL VALIDITY	44
3.5 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	45
3.6 FINDING INTERVIEWEES	46
3.7 THE STUDY POPULATION	47
3.8 FOCAL AREAS OF THE INTERVIEW-GUIDE	48
CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	50
4.1 INTRODUCTION	50
4.2 THE THEMATIC ANALYSIS	50
4.2.1 INTERVIEWEES' BACKGROUND	52
4.2.1.1 <i>Received Training</i>	54
4.2.1.2 <i>Defining Own Practice in Relation to CLIL</i>	55
4.2.1.3 <i>Perceptions on the Purpose of CLIL</i>	57
4.2.2 EXPERIENCE WITH CLIL	60
4.2.2.1 <i>Engaging with CLIL</i>	60
4.2.2.2 <i>Self-Training</i>	63
4.2.2.3 <i>Possible Additional Workload</i>	64
4.2.2.4 <i>Structural Issues</i>	66
4.2.2.5 <i>Textbook Issues</i>	68
4.2.2.6 <i>Materials from the Internet</i>	71
4.2.2.7 <i>Activities in the CLIL Classroom</i>	72
4.2.2.8 <i>Subject Specific Issues</i>	76
4.2.2.9 <i>Learners: High Performers</i>	77

4.2.2.10 Learners: Low Performers -----	79
4.2.2.11 Motivation and Learner Attitudes-----	81
4.2.2.12 Other Perceived Learning Advantages-----	85
4.2.2.13 Vocabulary Teaching-----	87
4.2.2.14 The Communicative Aspect -----	89
4.2.3 ASSESSMENT PRACTICES IN CLIL -----	90
4.2.3.1 Objectives and Aims: Curricular Justification-----	91
4.2.3.2 Content and Language: Findings on Assessment Practices -----	93
4.2.4 ATTITUDES TOWARDS CLIL-----	96
4.2.4.1 Content and Language Teachers – Teacher Roles and Teacher Significance-----	97
4.2.4.2 Content and Language Teachers – Teacher Cooperation-----	99
4.2.4.3 Perceptions on the Issue of Subject Combinations-----	100
4.2.4.4 “Detrimental Cost on Behalf of Subjects”-----	103
4.2.5 INTERVIEWEES’ PERSONAL PROSPECTS ON CLIL – FUTURE PROSPECTS -----	105
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION -----	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY-----	113
APPENDIX A CONSENT SHEET -----	117
APPENDIX B INTERVIEW GUIDE -----	119
APPENDIX C INTERVIEW W/ LT1 -----	121
APPENDIX D INTERVIEW W/ LCT1 -----	133
APPENDIX E INTERVIEW W/ LT2 -----	145
APPENDIX F INTERVIEW W/ CT1 -----	154
APPENDIX G INTERVIEW W/ LT3-----	166
APPENDIX H INTERVIEW W/ CT2 -----	177
APPENDIX I INTERVIEW W/ CLIL EXPERT IWONA LESNA-DRAJERZAK-----	183
APPENDIX J INTERVIEW W/ TEACHER TRAINER ION DREW -----	188
APPENDIX K THE INTERVIEW GUIDE’S IMPLICIT QUESTIONS -----	196

## *General Introduction*

The aim of this investigative study is to provide insights into upper secondary teachers' endeavors with Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and similar approaches to the teaching and learning of language and content. The main task of the thesis will be to elicit, present and discuss teachers' experiences and attitudes towards CLIL. More specifically, it will investigate different approaches to the teaching of nontraditional English-mediated content, from a language point of view. The thesis also aims to elaborate on and discuss some advantages and challenges that the CLIL-approach possesses in a few of its numerous forms, varieties and modalities of implementation and practice – including vocational adaption. Vocationally adapting the English subject, which can be said to be widely established practice in Norwegian upper secondary education, has been scarcely researched, and shares many features with the CLIL-approach which specifics will be elaborated on in see section 2.9. Altogether, the present study seeks to collect and collate knowledge that can aid to a better understanding of these kinds of curricular integrated approaches.

To start off, CLIL can be described as an approach to teaching where one or more content-driven subjects, for example History or Science, are integrated with the learning of a foreign language that is not widely used in the broader society of the learners. According to CILT; The National Centre for Languages in Great Britain, CLIL aims to:

(...) introduce students to new ideas and concepts in traditional curriculum subjects (often the humanities), using the foreign language as the medium of communication - in other words, to enhance the pupils' learning experience by exploiting the synergies between the two subjects. (CILT 2011).

Generally speaking, CLIL can be said to be an inherently cross-curricular approach with linguistic amendments that make both content and language learning more relevant and interesting for a multi-disciplinary and multilingual society. In other words, it is an approach that meets the demands which modern society ultimately poses on modern education. In this present thesis, the definition of CLIL will be: All teaching where subject content is taught with English as the medium of instruction, and where these two are integrated. This definition arises the author's hypothesis that all content taught in a foreign language, may cause problems or advantages depending on the nature of each particular subject's topics and contents. As CLIL author and promoter David Marsh puts it, CLIL can be said to be "education for the 21<sup>st</sup> century" (Marsh 2013: lecture). That language teaching is a subject to

constant and inherent change, seems raised beyond doubt. How CLIL might contribute to this change in the Norwegian context, is pursued in this paper.

Content and Language Integrated Learning in European contexts has been thoroughly tested, researched and evaluated, especially at the upper secondary levels (Marsh and Wolff 2007; Dalton-Puffer et al. 2010; Bruton 2013). The European source material consisting of many and very different studies on CLIL, is extensive and provides a strong theoretical foundation regarding CLIL's learning impact on European students at all levels. Studies with Norwegian learners are naturally fewer and smaller (Hellekjær 2005; Hellekjær 2007; Paulsen 2011; Drew and Gjendemsjø 2013), however, the findings on reading comprehension amongst upper secondary students in transit to university-level (Hellekjær 2005) and motivation amongst lower and upper secondary level students and teachers in Norwegian CLIL-projects (Drew and Gjendemsjø 2013; Paulsen 2011) have all generally all been very positive.

The contents of the present thesis are based on an amalgamation of the main theoretical underpinnings of the CLIL-approach, some crucial principles of CLIL and some criticism of CLIL. Next, it summarizes relevant Norwegian CLIL-research, provides some background knowledge of the Norwegian educational system and lists the points in the English subject curriculum that specifically encourage a CLIL-methodology. This information is in turn discussed and nuanced by qualitative data obtained through in-depth teacher interviews. The present thesis seeks to answer the following research questions: 1) What kinds of content and language integrated approaches can be found in a Norwegian context? 2) How do these approaches work, and why do they work? 3) What are teachers' experiences with these approaches? 4) What is the perceived role of language in these integrated approaches and 5) What are language and content teachers' attitudes towards working with CLIL and similar modalities? Both academic and vocational contexts will be dealt with.

The choice of a qualitative approach to the collection and analysis of data, is thought to be justified due to so-called "silent knowledge" that teachers so often possess (Paulsen 2011: 15). The extraction of this knowledge from within the working sphere of the teachers, at the same time as preserving anonymity of all respondents and schools, is thought to positively serve this theoretical thesis with its raw-data. The respondents to the teacher interviews are selected on the sole criteria of involvement in a CLIL-project, or a similar experience. All the informants in the present study currently (2015) teach at either study preparatory or vocational upper secondary schools in Stavanger.

As mentioned, the amount of research into CLIL is extensive. In countries like Spain, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy and Finland CLIL has become an established practice in certain clusters of regions as way to supplement traditional FL learning (David Marsh 2010: “David Marsh on CLIL”). With the international trends in mind, however, the present thesis does not attempt to provide any final answers to whether or not an adaption of the European Union’s extensive CLIL-implementation under Norwegian conditions should occur, as a solution to increasing migration and demands for linguistic proficiency. Neither does it aim to promote or to disadvantage Content and Language Integrated Learning as an educational method, but rather to pose relevant questions and present, question and elaborate on some crucial issues for general consideration. In essence, it aims to present teachers' *experiences* and *attitudes* and subsequently discuss content and language integrated approaches; providing a tentative picture of the current status of CLIL in a central region of Norway, thus perhaps working as a partial needs-analysis for the discussion of further CLIL-implementation in Norwegian schools. The findings might also prove interesting for students preparing to become a teacher of the English language, as well as any other students in the teaching branch whose shared challenges regarding the teaching of subjects through the medium of any given language might still lay ahead in time. In sum then, the present thesis aims to explore Content and Language Integrated Learning in the Norwegian context, and pose relevant questions which may be further pursued in eventual subsequent studies.



## Chapter 1 Theory

### *1.1 Introduction*

The first chapter maps out some characteristics of the CLIL-approach. First, some crucial terminology is presented and refined. The subsequent sections seek to better comprehend around which principles CLIL is oriented, what are some areas where CLIL has been well researched, some debatable issues, the role of the CLIL-teacher and some of the current CLIL-activity in the European Union.

### *1.2 Terminology*

Preliminarily, and for the sake of better comprehension, terminological issues – mostly educationally oriented acronyms concerning language teaching learning – are addressed and explained. The following paragraphs concern the major terms in the present thesis, and thus some restrictions imposed on their meaning and usage in the present thesis, and how CLIL relate to them. CLIL as an educational acronym will be more extensively elaborated in the subsequent sections.

**EFL** and **ESL** stand for English as a foreign language and English as a second language, respectively. It is a well-known observation that English as a second language and English as a third, or even fourth language have to be taught differently with regards to level of language and contents, ultimately due to the different learners who take these different courses. As an extension to this, it can be observed that the EFL/ESL distinction is largely based on factors related to the influence of the language community (Drew and Sørheim 2009). Necessarily, learners of English in Norway and in Poland will have different amounts of the targeted linguistic input from the wider society in which they live. English movies and television shows are either dubbed, or in most cases, voice-overed, in the Slavic countries, leaving the Polish learners with hardly any linguistic input in English from the popular media, unless they themselves have an interest in finding it. Poland has also, like most Slavic-speaking countries, a stronger cultural orientation towards other Slavic countries than they have to western Germanic language-cultures and towards the US. This is not to say that Poles

are inferior when it comes to their English proficiency in total. The point is that the EFL/ESL distinction merely addresses the prerequisites that learners in a country which culturally orients itself towards the English-speaking nations will have, and which amendments have to be made in the EFL/ESL classroom in order to overall reach the international language-objectives. More implicitly, then, the EFL/ESL distinction also says something about the general status of the English language in a given country, or in a given educational tradition. The knowledge of the EFL/ESL-distinction is important to bear in mind when exploring and comparing CLIL-practices in Europe with CLIL-practices in Norway, a country in which English now is considered a second language. On the EFL/ESL distinction, Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010) hold that:

CLIL is about using a foreign language, not a second language. That is to say, the language of instruction is one that students will mainly encounter at school since it is not regularly used in the wider society they live in (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 5).

How the EFL/ESL distinction works with respect to CLIL in any further detail, is unknown to the author. Still, if one compares Norwegian learners with those of other European countries, and given the empirical fact that CLIL-programs have actually been conducted in Norway without being too much concerned with the FL actually being an FL, the ESL/EFL distinction should rather serve merely for distinguishing the various language-prerequisites important for determining didactical choices, not for “ignoring altogether” CLIL-attempts in countries where the target language is an ESL and not an EFL. Literature on CLIL in what could be termed an “EFL-country” will therefore be considered representative for CLIL in Norway nonetheless, because the distinction strictly speaking only distinguishes the teaching-level of the language being taught and the subsequent expectations towards the learners. As upper secondary after all spans over three years of linguistic and cognitive development, the EFL/ESL distinction in language teaching is not considered essential in the present thesis.

**SLA**; Second Language Acquisition Theory – encompasses several theories, models and hypothesis that concern how a new language is being acquired. For several decades and from varying theoretical perspectives, the importance of the L1 as a reference-language for the learning of the L2 has been a debated issue. CLIL breathes a novel stream of air into the debate, because the approach relies largely on the “Input-hypothesis” of American linguist Stephen D. Krashen’s *Monitor Theory* from 1982 (Marsh and Wolff 2007; Dalton-Puffer 2010). This model strongly differentiates between the manners of consciously *learning* a

language and unconsciously *acquiring* it, and a crucial point is that the CLIL-approach helps learners do the latter rather than the former.

**CLT** (Communicative Language Teaching) is, according to the Council of Europe, a notional-functional language-learning conceptualization (Celce-Murcia 2001: 15). It seeks to build communicative competence, which can be said to encompass the three sub-categories of grammatical, discourse, sociocultural and strategic competences. CLT endorses implicit grammar teaching and inductive reasoning as key principles in language learning, thus promoting the more modern learner-centered classrooms, the teacher as a facilitator and meaning-construction among the learners in the language classroom. The communicative approach has been popular since its theoretical origins in the seventies, and it gained curricular mandate in Norway in 1987 (Hellekjær 2005: 27). Due to the fact that CLIL, with its integration of subject content with the English language, creates a learning-context where a certain topic or problem typically is subject to investigation, and thus conjures real and meaningful communicative situations, the CLIL-approach has been embellished by teachers of the CLT-classroom. Stated differently, CLIL is said to promote exactly the kinds of situations that initiates language acquisition; through natural language use – at the same time as providing increased motivation for learning the foreign language.

**FYR** is a Norwegian acronym for a Norwegian educational-vocational organization that stands for *Fellesfag, yrkesretting og relevans* (General subjects, vocational adaption and relevance). FYR's homepage allows the target user, mainly general subjects' teachers in the vocational branch, to access teaching materials created either by vocational, subject and/or language teachers. FYR intends to match the learning objectives in the general subjects' curricula with the vocational objectives; thus making the general subjects more relevant for vocational students. Low-performing students, high drop-out rates, low motivation and low prestige within general subjects have all been problem-areas for vocational schools in Norway for several years. FYR is a remedy comprising the works by several contributors which can be utilized by teachers who might either find their textbooks inadequate with regards to vocational adaption, or who otherwise struggle to make their general subject(s), may it be English, Norwegian, Mathematics or Science, more interesting, and not least, relevant for the vocational students.

### 1.3 CLIL's main theoretical underpinnings in relation to Bilingualism, SLA and CLT

CLIL as an educational approach inevitably is about instructing students in a FL as a supplement to traditional FL-teaching. Because CLIL largely is about instructing students with subject content through a FL, CLIL more than once has been confused with bilingual education. Bilingualism can be considered a more or less fluent command of two languages (depending on which definitions one prefer), and is a skill usually obtained by children of bilingual parents. In the view of this, Ellen Bialystok, Professor of Psychology at York University, introduces learners' experiences with the typical state-schooling system in the following manner:

More language knowledge surely follows from the ubiquitous foreign language requirements that most of us were required to complete at some point in our lives. This experience may have left us with many things, but fluent command of that language is probably not one of them (Bialystok 2001: 2).

Bialystok believes that students of a language, wherever in the world they may origin, receive certain advantages, or more language knowledge, from institutionalized language training, however, she prefaces that they rarely can be described as bilinguals. Studies of bilinguals provide some interesting pivots towards understanding the acquisition of an additional language. Research on bilingual children have shown positive results on the development of essential intellectual prerequisites such as increased mastering of attention and inhibition (248). According to Jean Lyon, a Consultant Clinical Psychologist and the author of the study *Becoming Bilingual*, the manner of which language is learned is determined by some factors that influence the usage of that language. These are first and foremost; that the language usage is natural, communicative and functional, but affective factors also, such as the learner's attitude towards the language, the attitude towards the language teacher and the learner's ability to successfully deal with his or her own mistakes during the learning process, contribute with determining the rate of which a language is learned (Lyon 1996: 43). In multilingual communities, for example the United States, the situation was for a long time that the minority language speakers were forced into schools and taught all subjects in the dominant language of the US community, American English. Later on, programs known as Majority Language Bilingual Immersion facilitated a transition, in which minority-speaking learners subsequently were able to enroll into mainstream education (Lyon 1996: 44). This is also the case in Stavanger, Norway (COE 2015) where non-native speakers are enrolled after subsequently having attended two years of special-classes in *Norwegian*. CLIL surely embraces some structural similarities with bilingual education, since,

unarguably, the aim of all language training is for the learner to approach some degree of bilingualism. In that sense, CLIL has emerged as a novel, yet structurally recycled approach to traditional FL teaching. The experiences with language-immersion in bilingual language communities, such as Canada and the Benelux-countries also to a great extent have influenced CLIL as an educational approach. In addition to this, increased interest in CLIL has risen partially due to dissatisfactions with results of traditional language learning through the international PISA-tests in many countries.

The theoretical foundations for the reasons of conducting bilingual instruction without minorities or bi/trilingual language-communities, however, rest largely on the theory of providing meaningful input (Krashen 1982). The *contents* in CLIL can be said to have the agenda as a language-learning promoter, and maps nicely with the *input* of this well-known SLA hypothesis. In order to understand the effect that this hypothesis has had on CLIL, firstly to understand the taxonomic distinction of learning a language versus acquiring it, is important. An introductory book to Second Language Acquisition theories written by applied linguists Bill VanPatten and Jessica Williams sums up the main idea around which Krashen's input hypothesis circulates in the following way:

The crucial and most controversial part of the distinction is that these two knowledge stores – the acquired system and the learned system – can never interact. In other words, knowledge that is learned may not be converted into acquired knowledge (...) and become available for spontaneous use (VanPatten and Williams 2007: 26).

In other words, acquisition of language is seen as both important and necessary for making the language available for practical usage. From the other perspective, as language learned is not necessarily compatible (at least not for most learners) with the acquired language used for producing real and practically oriented language, this distinction might be seen as an attack on the formal language instruction of the time, which it certainly was. Furthermore, the rise of then communicative approach as a guideline for educational practice of teaching languages, must likewise be seen much as a response to and further elaboration of, amongst others, Krashen's Monitor theory. CLIL, in turn, can be viewed as an approach to teaching a languages that may function as a possible solution for creating these real, practical, spontaneous and language-producing situations.

In order to achieve these communicative situations, learners need what Krashen refers to as comprehensible input. According to VanPatten and Williams, this statement is comprises the importance of comprehensible input in SLA:

Indeed, Krashen has claimed that comprehensible input is not just a necessary condition for SLA, it is *the* sufficient condition. In the presence of comprehensible input, SLA is an inevitable result (28).

If Krashen's statement is true, then the formal rule-based language learning known from primary levels to higher education comes out either as preliminary, supplementary or more or less obsolete. If it is so that the acquired language and the learned language cannot be combined, it seems that learning the language formally, comes out as rather unnecessary. This notion is part of CLT's predominant role in SLA as well, which in turn endorses oral, communicative and functional language skills, skills which are said to stand in the foreground of modern language teaching and learning today.

In CLIL, comprehensible input is yielded by aiming the contents slightly higher than the level the learners are comfortable with, and integrating language-features with relevant content possibilities. Given the varying nature of each school subject within any program, this combination gives CLIL a flexibility which, according to applied linguist and CLIL-author Dieter Wolff, "should not be underestimated" (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 17). CLIL is in general believed to provide learners with better language input and subsequently better productivity and learning accomplishments. In TIE-CLIL project report (Lange 2001), it can be read that positive results in CLIL can be attributed to the following learning-advantages. The improvements shown here that CLIL potentially has, should be viewed as important contributors to the popularization of the approach. In short, CLIL is said to be:

- Boosting effectiveness of foreign language learning.
- Enhanced opportunities for communication in CLIL which are generally not possible in foreign language learning classrooms.
- Understanding the potential for European citizenship.
- Bringing real-life situations into the classroom.
- Gaining a better knowledge of subjects.
- Promoting inter-disciplinarity.
- Preparing for further studies and life-long learning.
- Achieving higher educational standards.

(Overview taken from Lange, Gisela 2001: 41).

Partially, however, the notion of providing meaningful input has often been translated to implicitly accusing traditional language-teaching to be lacking of equally meaningful and

motivating contents. What is crucial for understanding the concept of CLIL is that it is not merely instruction given in a different language, but actually facilitation of language acquisition through linguistic devices subtly embedded into the teaching of contents, with both in matter for evaluation. This is seen as the core of CLIL, and it might arguably also be the most complex part of the approach. In light of such close integration, the question has been posed by CLIL-researchers whether a form of “self-contained” CLIL is actually possible to achieve. The following question of whether CLIL then is possible to standardize in these terms, is mirrored in Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010) where it is questioned whether such a template for mutually intelligible CLIL-instruction is possible, or whether CLIL as a “meta-subject” is “indeed a thing of the future” (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 2).

Having presented the role of input (or contents) in CLIL, the learners’ language production, or output, similarly needs further elaboration. Error-correction is one of the features that is said to separate the CLIL class from the ordinary language class. Depending on the level of the learners, which one would presume mostly is a level of mixed abilities, errors spoken or written are not corrected in the CLIL classroom unless they strongly prevent the meaning from getting through to the responder. Thus, once again, it is emphasized that CLIL is traditionally has been considered as weighing heavily on the content-side, since explicit language learning receives far less attention than in a traditional language classroom, however the lack of error-correction might also be shared with the CLT-classroom more generally (Drew and Sørheim). The characteristic of no error-correction can be seen both with Marsh and Wolff (2007) and with Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010). However, this clear characteristic is challenged by Llinares et al. (2012) who concede that error-corrections in terms of both clarification requests, recasts, as well as elicitation and repetition, metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction have occurred in CLIL-classrooms, given that the corrections were serving a meaningful purpose (Llinares 2012: 204).

#### *1.4 Defining CLIL and its modalities*

Content and Language Integrated Learning as an approach has according to Christiane Dalton-Puffer (2010) been established almost like a brand-name described by adjectives such as “innovative, modern, effective, efficient and forward-looking” (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 3). According to Do Coyle et al., CLIL is more than a simple educational method, it is a new way of thinking about teaching and learning; an amalgamation that can be compared to the rise of other cross-disciplinary research fields such as environmental studies (Coyle 2010: 4). CLIL-

author and promoter David Marsh roughly defines CLIL as a way of “bringing together excellence” from the fields of language teaching, content teaching and immersion. Once again, CLIL is most commonly considered a content-driven approach with integrated language enrichment-measures (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 2). With Coyle et al. (2010), however, CLIL is exalted as a *dual*-focused educational approach performed in the content classroom (Coyle 2010: 1). In general, CLIL is meant to be conducted in the content classrooms and is thus scheduled as a content subject. Yet, it may also in some cases be viewed as a foreign language teaching-method (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 2). Providing an absolute definition of what CLIL actually is in terms of concrete practice might be a rather tough endeavor, as the approach encompasses numerous varieties and modalities. Defining some characteristics, however, is what will be attempted in the following.

To begin with, there are a few common points of reference that all varieties of CLIL share. One of them is that at least 50 percent of the instruction in the course should be in the target language for it to be a proper CLIL course. This means that the CLIL-teacher may well support the class with instruction in the native tongue to aid the learners’ comprehension. Meaning through content is emphasized in all CLIL-classes. However, although other percentages like 30 percent for the distribution of target language, have been suggested, a minimum of half of the class or course is found to be the mainstream definition with Hellekjær (2005), Dalton-Puffer (2010) and Paulsen (2011).

With Christiane Dalton-Puffer, it is found that CLIL the CLIL-term may annotate everything from “short-term, high-intensity language showers, more medium-term” and “medium intensity cross-curricular modules” to doing “1 or 2 subjects in the FL for one or for several school years” (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 2). Generalizing about CLIL to a larger extent, Polish CLIL-expert Iwona Leska-Drajerczak suggests in a taxonomic overview, that the approach may structurally be divided into three categories consisting of: Hard-CLIL, Soft-CLIL and Modular CLIL. Hard-CLIL will be explicitly focusing on the target language and content throughout, at least 50 percent of the course. This is also known as partial immersion. Soft-CLIL will be to teach certain topics with different subject contents in the language classroom, whilst Modular CLIL means teaching the subject part-time as Hard-CLIL, and reflecting on the contents in the L1 afterwards (Leska-Drajerczak 2014: lecture). Furthermore, Spanish linguist and philologist Anthony Bruton (2013) shows us what he perceives as three possible modalities of CLIL in the following manner:



1) Learn the FL separately, in order to learn the content through the FL; 2) Learn the FL through the content, which has already been learned in the L1; 3) Learn the FL and the content together (Bruton 2013: 589).

In the present study it was found that the Norwegian upper secondary schools in the sample executed some of the modalities mentioned above, but also others. These were a more or less full-time bilingual course, with 60 percent use of the target language, a modular medium-term cross-curricular CLIL-project, and, finally, using the English class to reflect on and contemplate content learned in both the L1 as well as the L2. The latter category, is in fact one way of analyzing the practice of vocationally adapting the general subjects in vocational schools in Norway. All in all, the modes and varieties of which CLIL may exist, are many, as the experts also admit. However one chooses to execute this, the point with the CLIL approach is that the teaching of language shall be integrated with the teaching of contents and *vice versa*.

### *1.5 CLIL Researched, Debated and Conceptualized*

Although the body of literature on research into CLIL is vast, the endeavor of synthesizing new CLIL-research, transforming the findings into concrete practice and re-evaluate practices from the past, is still an ongoing process. As a result of this, CLIL benefits from series of literature on the subject. However similar CLIL is (and aims to be) for different students across Europe, not all CLIL-projects documented and published in these volumes, proved relevant for investigation of the present thesis, which focal areas are upper secondary teachers experiences and attitudes towards CLIL as an educational approach. Having said that, some articles that deals with CLIL as a concept, charts recommended CLIL-policies and lays the foundations for the CLIL-debate will be referred to in this section.

One of the central volumes on CLIL is the research-collation of several applied linguists' classroom-oriented articles in *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms* (Dalton-Puffer 2010) written collaboratively by institutional teacher trainers and applied linguists from Austria, Finland, the Netherlands and Spain. The research presented in this volume includes close-studies and case-studies on students' oral narratives, genre-based approaches, teachers' classroom language use, writing and speaking and language as a meaning making resource; more generally; teacher and student discourses in CLIL, from the language-point of view. As with much of the other research, the findings of Dalton-Puffer and her associates show many positive results in terms of both content and language learning. In

addition, what is evident from Dalton-Puffer and her associates' research is that the language learning, and what concretely happens in CLIL classrooms in terms of the learning of languages, has lately become the main agenda of CLIL. In other words, Dalton-Puffer's research deals with language-related phenomena and how they might differ between CLIL-classrooms and traditional classrooms. The differences found, and the impending notion that language is the main driver behind CLIL, provides an interesting backdrop for the research on CLIL. The notion that language is a main issue, has also contributed to much other research on CLIL, such as the compiled studies *Diverse Contexts – Converging Goals – CLIL in Europe* edited by CLIL promoters David Marsh and Dieter Wolff (2007). The work contains several articles and reports on CLIL research-projects throughout the European Union, notably in Belgium, Germany, Spain and Estonia. Research has also led to more refined methodologies, such as *CLIL* (2010) written by Do Coyle, Philip Hood and David Marsh, constituting perhaps the most well-known conceptualization of CLIL, whilst Llinares et al. (2012) *The Role of Language in CLIL* once again takes up the impending issue of increased language-focus in CLIL.

Moving on to the content learning in CLIL, Dieter Wolff (2007) highlights Piaget's theories of respectively knowledge-construction and knowledge-acquisition as two important learning-enhancing mechanisms that both might occur in CLIL-learners. One of these theories views the learning of knowledge as knowledge-acquisition and the internal cognitive processes that happen within the learner (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 18). When it comes to CLIL, the point is that researchers are still not sure whether the learning occurs via language-specific routes in the brain (White 1989) or via knowledge-specific routes and general cognitive processes and structures (Piaget 1979, from Marsh and Wolff 2007: 17). Whatever the case, the idea of CLIL rests largely on the theory that learning subject contents in a foreign language will somehow be processed more deeply and more thoroughly. According to Wolff, the fact that content is processed deeper, in turn enhances content comprehension with students (21). In other words, the CLIL learner's mind is subject to the process of a concept-formation where new words and terms in the L2 with a new meaning are inferred as new concepts with no pre-existing L1 equivalent. This, Wolff argues, leads to a deeper cognitive processing, both linguistically and in the formation of new schemata. Concept-formation in the L2 and deeper processing are exalted as some crucial features that separates CLIL-learners from other learners.

In his contribution to *Diverse Contexts – Converging Goals*, Dieter Wolff poses the concept of a “gap between school and real life” (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 15). Bridging this gap is not easily accomplished by traditional educational systems in most countries, and reform is being urged in top-down manner, namely, implementation of more CLIL across the European Union. Wolff explicitly mentions the inadequate results of traditional language teaching, its irrelevant contents, as well as rigid educational structures in general, which largely motivates his hypothesis that increased CLIL-practice will turn out beneficial for all parts involved. In his article, Wolff endorses the advantages CLIL proposes in terms of language learning, content learning, more specifically through using the contents as a scaffold for raising comprehension of both the language and the content. He also point to the increased relevance and subsequent motivation that arises as a result of this. Teachers' competence and innovative thinking are two crucial focal-areas Wolff highlights as essential components for achieving a successful CLIL-implementation on a larger scale.

Primarily, Wolff endorses content as a means of scaffolding, content, which due to its restricted amount of semantic language items and structures, might aid the learners in producing the target language necessary for language use as well as language learning. Scaffolding the contents of the class as a teaching-strategy is thus used in order to make the input comprehensible. Similarly, scaffolding of the language used in the classroom is achieved by providing the learners with the necessary vocabulary and syntactic structures they need in order to talk about the content. These things could also be said to be the teacher's role in CLIL: a facilitator of both the language learning and the content learning by scaffolding language learning through the contents of the class, and similarly providing the direct and indirect vocabulary for elaborating on the given topic. In comparison, traditional ESL/EFL contents are considered way too vague to be used for scaffolding in the same ways as Wolff suggests (20).

In terms of enhanced learning in a synergy, Wolff distinguishes the learner's interlanguage system, the L1 and L2, language-acquisition devices, cognitive processes and structures and the inductive communicative approaches to language learning. It is crucial to CLIL that the enhanced learning results from a combination of the learner's interlanguage level and learning new concepts in the L2. Content-wise, structuring of schemata, procedural and knowledge-based memory are exalted as essential characteristics of basically all kinds of novel concept-formation. This echoes the debates in CLIL over of Piaget's and White's knowledge-acquisition knowledge-cognitive processing versus language-specific routes;

which one of these contributes to successfully acquiring a language? In CLIL, successful language acquisition is believed to be dependent of combining certain parts of the brain simultaneously, and CLIL's contents are believed to somehow provide the cognitive challenges and stimulations that may channel this acquisition. In conclusion, then; CLIL's contents are thought to provide the scaffolding, while the foreign language enhances the novel concept-formation. Wolff argues that research on the roles of linguistic input to learners (in terms of which contents exactly may channel the FL acquisition) is essentially important, but sadly lacking.

In addition, as a result of simultaneously acquiring content and language, Wolff claims that learners in a CLIL classroom in general have better learning-results than the ones situated within traditional teaching and learning. His claim opposes the popular assumption that learning new contents in a new FL will pose greater difficulties for the learners. This assumption is answered by Wolff in the following way:

Although like in any other classroom there are children who have difficulties with the content of the content subject or with the language, the majority of the learners are at least equally good if not better in the content subject than learners in a traditional classroom. The admittedly scant research which is available show us that this is true both content- and language-wise (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 21).

In addition to enhancing the cognitive processes with the learners, CLIL is also advocated as a beneficial practice because it supposedly takes the focus in the foreign language class away from solely aspects of the target language-culture and general topics of everyday-life, and rather uses the language as a tool to learn about "content subjects from academic/scientific or from the professions" (16). It is thus seen in opposition to traditional FL teaching, not in harmony with it. Dieter Wolff even goes as far as to deliberately attack the contents of the more traditional English lesson by exemplifying textbook headlines excerpted from English subject textbooks, a selection of headlines which in an economically-rational and fast-paced society, leaves current EFL-teaching more or less open for ridicule: "In a Disco", "Shopping" and "School Uniforms in England" are some headlines that can be found in current EFL/ESL textbooks for lower secondary levels (18). In Wolff's view, then, topics of these sorts are neither relevant, nor do they raise learners' motivation, or their interest for the English subject. This is also the point where the contents of CLIL in comparison are believed to pose much greater advantages. The critique Wolff puts forth against traditional EFL/ESL teaching could more implicitly, be viewed as urged modifications to the current English curricula and syllabi in European schools. The situation with the EFL/ESL syllabi that Wolff describes as

irrelevant and demotivating for the learners, is believed to be shared in most language classrooms up to a certain level. At upper secondary levels, which the present thesis is concerned with, the content level is believed to be much higher than Dieter Wolff supposes in his article. Yet, his claim that the English syllabus in general is saturated with topics and contents which may not be very stimulating for many students, can be said to hold some truth. More generally, from all of this, it can be said that increased CLIL-implementation in many cases does not steer clear of stirring up old and firmly rooted controversies about educational matters such as syllabi, subject-division and educational methodologies versus concurrent practice.

Dieter Wolff does not confine CLIL strictly to academic settings. When presenting ways of dealing with the gap between that of school and real life, Wolff further endorses CLIL as an extra-curricular competence-builder for working life through its efficiency, its relevance towards real and probable situations in the professional spheres:

Preparation for working life is, in general, more efficient in CLIL classrooms than in traditional classrooms. This is due to the fact that teaching and learning in a CLIL classroom is comparable to real-life work (...) [A] thorough foreign language background with respect to this profession is a much better preparation for working life than the limited foreign language competence usually acquired in a traditional classroom (22).

From much of the literature on CLIL, it is evident that language-research in vocational settings in general suffers from a lower prestige and interest. Most research-projects utilized for the present study, confirms this notion. One reason for this might be that many ambitious linguists and personnel with a language-background, are easily drawn towards the academic institutions and the communities where these subjects consolidate strongholds, in which language-subject experts may gather in larger groups and also where the prestige of their subjects is mutually recognized. As a result, much language-research can be said to happen on the premises of academic contexts. Contrary to this, Wolff highlights that content and language integration does occur in vocational settings, and it is also the opinion of the author of this thesis that vocational settings might actually represent the arena where these kinds of innovation might work most successfully.

### *1.6 Criticism of the CLIL-approach*

Spanish philologist and language educator Anthony Bruton (2013) offers arguably the most hostile response to all positive views on recent CLIL-engagements in the European Union that have been published this far. His article “CLIL: Some of the reasons why ... and why not” is a comprehensive review of substantial research-literature collected from both Spanish research-projects and other European bodies of CLIL-literature, which amongst other things “intends to scrutinize the arguments in favor of CLIL (...) while sounding a word of warning against the wholesale adoption of CLIL in Europe” (Bruton 2013: 587). With his intentions explicitly stated, Bruton moves on to systematically oppose what he perceives as the main justifications for European CLIL-implementation. The main problem, according to Bruton, is that CLIL is viewed by educational authorities as “a solution to FL teaching deficiency” (ibid) without critically examining what this approach might imply for stakeholders, teachers, and most importantly, the students. In his review of CLIL-research, Bruton comments that:

To any outside observer, it should immediately raise suspicions that apparently changing the medium of instruction of content subjects to a FL is really fairly problem-free and beneficial to all concerned from national governments down to (all) the students themselves (Bruton 2013: 588).

Bruton’s main arguments on why CLIL is not a safe remedy to EFL teaching, are centered firstly on the “general vagueness” of the very arguments on which CLIL so solidly rests and secondly, the issues which are “conveniently ignored” (593). Bruton adopts the view that governmental educational departments are attracted to the idea of cost-savings by CLIL being a “two-for-the-price-of-one” type of a project (588). With this, CLIL is said to enhance both language and content learning in the same classroom at the same time (587) without mentioning too many implications concerning neither the teachers nor the students. Said differently, the first of Bruton’s two major criticisms is that the vagueness of the charting-policies of CLIL do not rest solidly at all. His assumption is based on the premises that CLIL instead of being a cost-saving “two-for-the-price-of-one” type of endeavor, its inherent complexities and potential weaknesses might easily cause it to malfunction (588). In other words, Bruton argues, the risk with implementation of CLIL is that one is left with the exact opposite: a half-for-the-price-of-two (594) which he sums it up like this: “Less FL learning of the targeted type and the same for the content in the designated period of instruction, if left up to content teachers with limited FL proficiency” (ibid).

Along with the obviously complex task of implementation, it is at the same time not clear, according to Bruton, how exactly students are to benefit from learning fairly complex

contents and language, depending on the subject taught, without any serious flaws in either of the two subjects. It is also unclear, according to Bruton, which teachers are to carry out CLIL; content teachers or language teachers? Research has shown, he claims, that: “teachers are also not likely to state both content and language aims” (589). Furthermore, as a reply to the positive complexities of CLIL as it is presented in CLIL-literature, Bruton dissects the “synergy-arguments” and attributes the success of CLIL to other factors, namely simply more exposure to the target FL, as well as the fact that “(...) many aspects of CLIL are not novel, since ‘many of the features are not just specific to CLIL, but are part of basic best practice in education’ (589).

Even more serious, what is “conveniently ignored”, Bruton poses, is the inherent inequality of CLIL; subtly selecting high-performing students to CLIL-courses without really opening for “the less academically able, the less linguistically proficient, or the less economically privileged” (595). In sum, Bruton concludes that it is questionable whether CLIL can be seen as a self-contained educational approach, and moreover, to what extent educational authorities thoughtlessly or recklessly should implement CLIL as something beneficial for all students in state schools.

One weakness of Anthony Bruton’s argumentation is that some of his examples are put forth in a rather banal way. When recollecting the experiences of a student expressing his or her anxiety of talking about science in *French* (Bruton 2013: 591) or similarly, contemplating the lack of motivation arising from the scenario of doing complicated mathematics in *German* (ibid), these situations should be regarded as fairly extreme and rare, even in continental European contexts.

Furthermore, CLIL-authors Ute Smit and Julia Hüttner’s (2014) ensuing reply to Bruton's criticism dissects his main arguments of student-selection and European cost-saving. In addition, they emphasize that contrary to what Bruton believes, CLIL does not seek to “do away” with regular FL instruction, and moreover, Bruton's series of attacks on CLIL run short simply because they do not depict the real situation based on generally positive results from CLIL-research found in European contexts. In addition, Smit and Hüttner claim CLIL should not be seen a remedy to *deficiencies* in traditional FL teaching, since it occurs most successfully in countries where educational methods and results are already modern and well-developed, such as in Finland, Australia, Canada and New Zealand.

What this argument might serve to show, is that CLIL most certainly “stirs up controversies” because it challenges the ways in which people think about education. Bruton's criticism of CLIL poses numerous questions regarding the purpose of implementing more CLIL in European state schools, and the differing attitudes and experiences teachers and students may have with the CLIL-approach which can be said to be relevant indeed for contextualizing the research of the present thesis. The explicit critics of CLIL have often accused the approach for conducting content subject teaching too slowly and that the lack of progress content-wise will affect the learning outcomes negatively, simply because there is not enough time to go through the syllabi. These issues are acknowledged by CLIL-enthusiasts, who remedy these matters by making CLIL-lessons more effective content-wise and making relevant textbooks, plans and tasks that really go to the core of the content which is to be learned. From all of this, however, it follows that the implementation of CLIL requires numerous commodities and re-structuring, syllabus-wise.

### *1.7 The CLIL Teacher*

As pointed out earlier, when regarding success of CLIL-courses or programs, the teacher was found a crucial factor with Wolff (2007), Paulsen (2011) and Gjendemsjø and Drew (2013). One crucial issue in the CLIL-literature – and an essential issue for the scope of the present thesis – is thus, the role of the teacher in CLIL. Therefore, teacher training and teacher competence becomes important for the focus of the present thesis. According to Naysmith, Marsh and Martin (2007), “[m]any fundamental elements of quality – including innovative pedagogues, learning-conducive environments and strengthening the status, roles and training of teachers and trainers – have not been implemented in most European countries” (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 33). In Norway, with very little CLIL-projects documented and researched, the current status of teacher training is believed to be similar. With this backdrop, the ideal and practical role of the teacher in CLIL with regards to the subject teacher and the language teacher, will be addressed.

While the studies and CLIL-theory have found that the teacher plays a central role in successful CLIL-implementation and concurrent practice, the answer to the impending question “Who actually can become a CLIL-teacher?” is addressed differently by major works on CLIL-theory and charting-policies thereof. Marsh and Wolff (2007) endorse one language and one content teachers working in co-operation, mutually and consistently evaluating one another's' results, while Dalton-Puffer (2007) maintains that a CLIL-teacher is



normally a content-expert with a generally good command of English (Dalton Puffer 2010: 108). Moreover, CLIL-writer and speaker Carmel Mary Coonan (2013) provides a more rigid answer to the question, in that CLIL is obviously concerned with language, but that language teachers are usually not competent for conducting it, formally nor in terms of experience (Coonan 2013: lecture).

According to Dieter Wolff, poor academic and scientific language in student writing tends to be a problem in the content subjects (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 19), yet, the blame for lack of these skills, might often be put on the language teachers. In many ways, CLIL seeks to answer this frustration, as Coonan (2013) claims that content teachers who use CLIL, need to (or ultimately will have to) increase students awareness about Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP (Cummins) see also Hellekjær 2005) in their target subjects. Dalton-Puffer (2010) do indeed claim that in most cases, teachers of CLIL are not native speakers of the target language, nor are they linguists or language experts. CLIL being more on the content-side, CLIL teachers are necessarily almost always content teachers, with the exceptions where a teacher may have formal competence in more than one subject.

Many of the concerns regarding CLIL are voiced idealistically by Dieter Wolff (2007), who in the following presents the issue of language teachers' and content teachers' tasks in CLIL in the article headed "Benefits of CLIL for the teacher":

CLIL teachers who are educated as language teachers learn to understand the importance of content in the language learning process. They will see that content which is related to an academic subject or a profession creates a high motivational potential in the learner and that this will help him to use this content as a scaffold for the language learning process. CLIL teachers who are educated as content subject teachers will recognize the importance of language for the learning process; they will see that academic or professional language registers are important to discuss academic or professional content and that these registers can be developed quite easily in a foreign language (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 23).

How easily language registers can be built through a foreign language, needs a slight elaboration, and this elaboration will naturally come from the language point of view. The extent to which CLIL-teachers ought to be aware of the incorporated language features in the teaching of contents, is made evident by Llinares et al. (2012). They advocate that the intention is to:

[s]how CLIL-teachers how they can help their students become aware of the ways in which language features create meaning in their subjects, and so improve both their comprehension and their spoken and written and spoken production (Llinares 2012: 154).

On a surface level, CLIL-teachers are expected to take on-board language features such as register, genre, interaction, scaffolding and register-scaffolding (Llinares 2012: 20). These categories are all fairly wide, intended to make raise the teacher's awareness of the language that is being used in CLIL-classrooms. However, on a deeper level, CLIL implies integrating linguistic items of complex dimensions. In order to deduce *ideational* meanings, CLIL-teachers are to consider the use of processes (types of verbs: action, relations, thinking, perceiving, liking, etc), participants (nouns in subject and object positions, etc), circumstances, markers of logical relations between clauses (addition, contrast, cause, sequence). *Interpersonal* meanings are attained through clause structure (declarative, imperative, interrogative), modality (certainty and obligation), attitude (positive/negative lexis), while *textual* meanings through devices to move elements or compress or distribute information, first position versus last position (passive voice) and clauses versus noun phrases, etc (Llinares 2012: 154; *Register Analysis* from Bloor and Bloor 1995). Although CLIL-teachers are not expected to teach these features explicitly (nor is a communicative language teacher of today's language classroom), it is worth asking the question of whether these matters should rather be dealt with by the language teacher, and whether it is likely that a content teacher would integrate such distinctive language features, or whether he or she should be considered competent to do so.

However one interprets the teacher roles in these definitions, two important questions remain unanswered: Firstly, how is carefully evaluated and proper language learning and assessment going to occur if no requirements other than “a generally good command of English” are required of the CLIL-teacher? Secondly, if the subject content teachers are the only ones who without additional post-education formal training are able to directly transfer into CLIL, what does that signal when it comes to the status of language subjects and language teachers more generally? Given that upper secondary teaching poses demands for formal qualifications in the subject one set out to teach, these points clearly limits not only on what a language teacher in upper secondary school can actually achieve with respect to CLIL: the strict formal demands of teachers in upper secondary schools also firmly asserts that no curricular revolution, in terms of CLIL, can occur in schools before respective changes occur in teacher-training. It is also worth questioning the assumption that any content teacher easily can venture into CLIL without any problems occurring along the way. With this in mind, it may also worth posing the question of how plausible it is to expect that sufficient amounts of implicit language-teaching embedded by most CLIL-teachers is actually going to be

substantial enough to provide students with content learning and language learning in the integrated way that CLIL promises. Moreover, it seems that language teachers in CLIL as potentially important resource persons, is a point that is constantly under-communicated in much CLIL-literature.

### *1.8 CLIL in the European Union*

The European Union's engagement with *lifelong learning* has led to a great interest in CLIL among language teachers and researchers during the last couple of decades (Lange 2001; Coyle 2010; Dalton-Puffer 2010; Llinares 2012). The EU's 1+2 policy poses the objective that every EU citizen shall know at least two foreign languages (Llinares 2012: 1). In executing these aims, the Council of Europe and their Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF) have become influential contributors to modern language teaching and learning in Europe. Many citizens of the EU may think of international mobility and the possibility of working for a foreign company as a great benefit for themselves and their family. As a consequence, within the European Union, students of higher education are offered study-opportunities abroad, including BA studies and MA studies in English (Leska-Drajerczak 2014: lecture). The EU's Erasmus Program encourages college and university students to take a semester or two abroad to learn from the knowledge and practices from other language communities.

When regarding the use of language as a tool, the instrumentality of language in general is exalted. This instrumentality can be seen through CEF's aims of language use restricted to various domains. While the CEF is commonly used when designing and assessing language education in wider international settings, it also contributes to setting the agenda for shaping curricula in the EU member states and for Council member states, which actually exceeds those of the EU.

The main stated objective in terms of the 1+2 policy is to enhance communication and understanding. Bruton (2013) exalts the instrumentality of English being the predominant CLIL-language, and thus that English as a non-culture-bound language is the crucial issue with this form of language education. The notion of the instrumentality of English, is also endorsed by Dalton-Puffer (2010) who claims that CLIL operates with "language as the means of study rather than the object of study," as well as by Paulsen (2011) with his hypothesis of "the instrumental justification," all implicitly providing arguments for using

English (Bruton 2013: 592; Dalton-Puffer 2010: 28; Paulsen1 2011: 23). With the EU encouraging cross-cultural understanding and more interaction, one may easily be tempted to pose the question of where this cultural competence is to be built, if not through the English subject. Still, it should be mentioned that the EU supports CLIL used with other languages as well, namely the so-called LOTE-projects. The point made is that English as a non-culture-bound language is the main CLIL-language across the EU, and supposedly also the most suitable one, given its adaptability to large bodies of knowledge.

In order to stronger consolidate the CLIL-approach into becoming an attractive candidate for meeting the EU demands, the specific practicalities of the approach has gone through a series of acknowledgment and standardization processes by the acts of several educational stances and researchers. One of them is the European Centre for Modern Languages' CLIL Curriculum-project; a project that aimed to make a more or less standardized Curriculum for both language and subject teachers. The project, named *Curriculum Development for Content and Language Integrated Learning* (CD-CLIL), was conceptualized as a standardized, yet adaptable curriculum that sought to help teachers meet the goals proposed by the Council of Europe, who also made the Common European Framework for Languages (CEF).

These standardizations of CLIL, however, do not go without some modification. CLIL has never been standardized in pan-European terms insofar that there is still yet no common methodology for teaching CLIL in every educational context and within every language-subject relation. Dalton-Puffer (2010) state in particular that “there is the question whether CLIL can and will play a noticeable role in the development of educational language policies across the continent” (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 11). What is certain, then, is that with CLIL, there seems to be a positive expectation that the approach over time will make teachers and stakeholders able to draw on the experiences made to teach their students the skills, knowledge and language they need to face the challenges of tomorrow's multilingual Europe.

Every region certainly has its characteristic benefits and challenges with the implementation of CLIL, and many factors affect the manner of implementation. Yet, these manners vary a great deal from region to region and from classroom to classroom. This is also made evident by Gisela Lange, who writes on behalf of a pan-European teacher-trainer project on the very differing educational contexts of Europe (Lange 2001: 5). This has a lot to do with the students' interlanguage level, the time that has been allotted to teaching them the

foreign language and whether that foreign language could be considered a foreign or a second language when taught. The implications for CLIL-teachers in Norway on these points, is that the students will have a good deal of exposure to the language from outside of school, and also a relatively early initiation of English instruction compared to European standards. In other words, their proficiency should be considered high, which might work in favor of more CLIL in the Norwegian context.

## Chapter 2 Background; CLIL in Norway

### *2.1 Introduction*

This chapter seeks to present some important CLIL-studies in Norway, elaborate on the Norwegian schooling system and the English Subject curriculum in Norway and the theoretical compatibility of CLIL with academic and vocational branches. Lastly, a few points on CLIL in opposition to bilingual and international classes are distinguished, as many of the schools that have conducted CLIL in Norway also have an international profile and bilingual courses in terms of IB-programs.

### *2.2 Linguistic Influence*

In Norway, English has the status of a second language. In curricular objectives and aims, it is treated almost like the native language, distinguished from the respective foreign languages, German, French and Spanish. Ultimately, then, before mapping out some research on CLIL under Norwegian conditions, the distinction between foreign and second languages needs a further elaboration. In terms of acquiring another language and, finally, to become a proficient speaker, learners of a *second* language are thought to have an advantage compared to students of a *foreign* language. Popular culture in Norway is to a large extent “Americanized” due to large scale emigration to the US in the late nineteenth century, and due to close alliances to the US and Great Britain during and after the Second World War. TV-shows, films and books along with computer- and TV-games supply the Norwegian population with what could be referred to as linguistic and cultural competence of English, and English-language discourse naturally exceeds or even fore-runs similar discourse in Norwegian within several topics or subject disciplines. These features are thought to be shared in all the Scandinavian countries.

### 2.3 Hellekjær's Studies

Glenn Ole Hellekjær, a Norwegian CLIL-promoter and curricular reformer, found in the 2005' exploratory study *The Acid Test: Does Upper Secondary EFL Instruction Effectively Prepare Students for the Reading of English Textbooks at Colleges and Universities?* that merely one third of the students who applied for higher education in Norway were actually capable of reading the English texts on their syllabi without any major comprehension problems. The main fields in focus when Hellekjær measured reading proficiency amongst the students were general principles of reading and processing information, be it in the L1 or the L2, with the variables of background knowledge, language knowledge, cognitive processes, inferencing of unknown words, reading strategies and metacognitive monitoring (pp 69-77). Though reluctant to define any explicit cause-effects relations between students who succeeded in reading English University level texts and those who did not, Hellekjær found that factors that were believed to enhance English proficiency such as taking the English Elective courses or study experience, did not pose an advantage in his sample. He also found that a marginal group of Norwegian students who had been attending CLIL-courses at upper secondary suffered less from difficulties when it came to reading university level texts, and thus, became one of the highest scoring groups in the sample (Hellekjær 2005: 249). In the discussion of the findings about the 39 CLIL-students who had attended a History course with English being the primary language of instruction, Hellekjær states:

[t]hat they also (...) underlined fewer unknown words could be due to their having learned to tolerate greater uncertainty or vagueness of meaning, to having become better at deducing word meaning from context, or, of course to having improved their vocabulary and language in general (Hellekjær 2005: 242).

In a later study based on a larger-scale survey answered by 1032 respondents working in Norwegian export- and import-companies, Hellekjær similarly found that there is a great need for increased English proficiency among Norwegian employees, as well as increased cultural and societal competence when dealing with other language cultures (Hellekjær 2009: 39). In this study, it was also found that English is used to a large extent as a substitute language when different language correspondence would actually be more suitable, but where this knowledge competence is lacking (ibid). The findings briefly presented above are interesting because they help to confirm the popular assumption that Norwegians are proficient speakers of "tourist-English" and good at dealing with general everyday-topics, and that it is essential that the English classroom continues to help building cultural competence as a main objective. It also shows that English is a language generally applicable to communicating with much

larger parts of the world than merely with the English-speaking countries. Implicitly, it also suggests that the relation in proficiency between basic English vocabulary and academic vocabulary is not sufficiently balanced. Hellekjær's findings bring about an urgency to the decision of what remedies should be utilized to improve the foreign language competence of Norwegian citizens. The training in language proficiency most employees possess, stems solely from upper secondary education. Hellekjær as a CLIL-promoter and a curricular reformer, suggests CLIL-courses in one or more content-subject as a way of to substantially enhance the foreign language competence acquired in secondary education in Norway (44).

#### *2.4 NCFL's Study*

Other larger-scale research has also been conducted on the didactical and practical implications for CLIL-practice in Norway. In 2011 *Fremmedspråksenteret* (The National Centre for Foreign Languages in Education) carried out a larger-scale CLIL project comprising seven upper secondary schools with the intention to evaluate CLIL's current status in Norway. According to NCFL's home page, an addition of 13 other secondary schools offered CLIL or bilingual education in Norway in 2011. To my knowledge, no other new statistic of CLIL's propagation in Norway have been made available since. The major findings were that two factors predominantly determined sustained implementation of CLIL without interruptions and halts. These were, firstly, the teacher's motivation for teaching in English, the teacher's international orientation and degree of networking, and a general sense of security when conducting lessons in English. Secondly, organizational factors at the different schools played the part of preventing "structural bottlenecks" which often occurred when establishing CLIL-classes or courses. One of the cases in this study also showed content and language integrated approaches' relevance towards vocational programs (Paulsen1 2011: 27). This vocational case-observation is partially followed up in the present study, because a larger breadth or variety in vocational branches found at upper secondary levels in Norway is represented through the study population of the present thesis.

First and foremost, structural bottlenecks were found a major factor that might seriously hamper extended CLIL-practice in the mainstream Norwegian educational system (Paulsen2 2011: 26). The process of recruiting and maintaining sufficient enrollment to CLIL-classes proved to be another large obstacle. Finding enough volunteering students to apply for the course and secure a pool for further recruiting, proved to be hard, as it demanded several



active CLIL classes within a certain degree of interchangeability regarding candidate students and their respective groups (ibid). For the particular project that Paulsen reports on, difficulties in organizing timetables for CLIL-students, non CLIL-students and partial CLIL-students can be viewed as preliminary difficulties with accomplishing structural implementations that every school would suffer from on an early stage. School policies promoting an active international profile contributed to successful implementation and more sustained practice of CLIL. Schools with international classes or an IB program (International Baccalaureate) were in general the schools that proved to have the least difficulties with maintaining and sustaining CLIL-courses (Paulsen1 2011: 18).

The findings show that CLIL teachers appreciated the financial support and the professional networking provided by The Norwegian Foreign Language Center. Cooperation between language teachers and content teachers did take place when practicing CLIL, for instance in the vocational training (Paulsen2 2011: 26). In general, however, teachers were networking with NCFL and with CLIL teachers in other schools, but less with other colleges and even less with adjacent schools (22). His study, which data were collected through qualitative interviews, furthermore provided more scientific foundations to the general assumption that CLIL teachers first and foremost are “lone riders”. Said differently, it was confirmed that the efforts of individual teachers have long been the driving forces behind CLIL and continue to be. This was also found by Drew and Gjendemsjø (2013) in their case-study of CLIL in a lower secondary English class. The fact that the individual teacher plays a large role in CLIL, is also addressed by CLIL authors and teacher trainers at international and supranational level on the other end of the continuum. In general, it seems that idealistic content and language teachers who see beyond the school’s policies of subject division and into the demands of professional and academic life, are also the ones who have conducted most of the innovation within the CLIL-practice, more so than educational authorities. This notion is also supported by Paulsen, who acknowledge that Norwegian upper secondary schools are rather loosely connected to their administrative super-structure and that innovation and change is more likely to come from the department leaders of the various subject communities rather than from the top of the educational-political hierarchy (19).

On the more didactical level, Paulsen indeed asserts that no subject-specific factors are preventing a larger-scale implementation of CLIL, or as Paulsen himself argues in the *Abstract*, there are “few context-bound limitation(s) for implementing CLIL in the school domain subject to investigation”. In other words, more than anything, CLIL should be

considered a method of wide applications (Paulsen 1 and 2, *Abstract*). The extent to which, however, there really are no subject-specific issues which can be said to prevent further implementation in Norway, is an assumption that is challenged in the present thesis.

### *2.5 The Norwegian School-System*

Norwegian children are obliged to attend a total of ten years of their lives in primary school; seven years of school starting at the age of six and finishing the seventh year at the age of 12-13 years of age, the young students are enrolled into a usually larger and more centralized lower secondary school for three additional years. Although these ten years of schooling are the obligatory minimum, most students then continue directly onto secondary school, which in the present thesis will be referred to as upper secondary preparing for either to enroll into universities and colleges, or to embark on their professional careers. Upper secondary schools are split into vocational schools, which are normally two years of schooling and two years of apprenticeship, and study preparatory schools, which normally last for three years. The percentages of enrollment are fairly equal between the two branches, with a recent very small leaning in favor of vocational schools.

Upper secondary schools in Norway are generally considered complex and large institutions with several subject specialists having to coordinate their efforts. The schools themselves are most commonly substantial in size and make their student enrollments primarily on the basis of the student's hereditary county and average performance and completion calculated from grades in each subject from lower secondary school. Exceptions to the enrollment rule in Norway, which for the sake of perspective can be said to be fairly egalitarian as far as student selection goes, are sometimes made by enrolling students either on the basis of the study program they wish to attend, if it is not offered in their own county, or on the basis of auditions in some creative study programs, such as music, dance and drama. In general, the students at upper secondary may apply for a variety of vocational or study preparatory programs, which are supposed to be respectively tailored. Norwegian upper secondary schools can happen to be integrated, meaning that they have both vocational and study preparatory programs in the same institution, often with a split in favor of either of the two main branches. The branch in favor will usually to a large extent determine the manner of which schools profile themselves to potential students (Slevesland 2014: interview). Adding to the picture, there are also strictly vocational schools and strictly study preparatory schools.

Many of these have been either one or two since their conception – or from the times when Norwegian secondary schools were separated by law – thus favoring either a strong study preparatory tradition or a strong vocational tradition.

Paulsen (2011) strongly emphasize the “peculiarity” of upper secondary schools as institutional organizations in his report on CLIL (Paulsen2 2011: 19). As he concluded, integrated schools face great organizational challenges both in terms of co-operation with the administration as well as across subject disciplines (13). The reasons for this, is primarily the numerous subject-expert communities having to coordinate and cooperate together in one large institution, with rather loose bonds to the office administration (15). This, however, also constitutes an argument for conducting classroom research with teachers as informants, as the information about what realistically goes on in a classroom is not always known in detail by the office-holders at such institutions.

## *2.6 The English Subject Curriculum and its relationship to CEF*

In Norway the 2006 curricular reform named *Kunnskapsløftet* (The Knowledge Promotion Curriculum; K06) promotes the status of English in the educational system from a foreign language to being a second language. It follows, then, that a Norwegian definition of CLIL in some contextual areas differs from its European equivalents, especially in the regards to whether the learners are expected to be at a higher level than many other European countries. In addition to this, at upper secondary level, the difficulty and complexity of contents may simply be too demanding for a language teacher to successfully teach it in CLIL-classes. Likewise, the students are believed to be on a relatively high level of proficiency. Does it follow, then, that CLIL should rather be conducted in primary or lower secondary schools rather than at the upper secondary level for such an implementation to be realistic? And, said differently, is the content teacher “who happens to have a generally good command of English” the only one who can conduct a CLIL-course at upper secondary levels in Norway?

The Norwegian English Subject Curriculum promotes competence and communication across cultures and subject areas by using the English language, thus, it self-contains some very basic prerequisites for further CLIL implementation similar to those of Europe (Paulsen1, 2011: 14). Although Norway is not a member of the European Union and does not operationalize all directives that come from Brussels, the Norwegian language curricula are

still largely affected by the same educational organizations which affects the EU's educational policies. The features shared are connected to the different competencies learners need to gain in order for them to reach the overarching aim. Domains of language usage, like social, academic and professional purposes illustrate the language as a tool of communication. The K06 is in general a very general one in terms of methods, but specific in terms of objectives. When questioned whether Norwegian schools are free to choose their approach to teaching on the basis of their learners' needs *Utdanningsdirektoratet* (The Norwegian Ministry of Education) replied that:

It is correct as you have written that our curricula do not describe any methodology in particular. In that perspective, every single school must make this decision individually. It follows, then, that the Ministry of Education do not have a governing policy on this matter (*Utdanningsdirektoratet*, 30/01-2015: respond to email).

The present study found that CLIL and similar approaches have a good deal of adaptability with the already established prerequisites of both the English Subject curriculum and with the K06 in general. Thus, extensively restructuring the curricula, are not seen as necessary. This assumption, though, is seen from the language point of view; from the perspective of the English Subject Curriculum.

### *2.7 The Traditional English Classroom Contents*

Before investigating the curriculum in greater detail it is important to distinguish factors that deal with pure linguistic matters from those which deal with content matters. Needless to say, all linguistic instruction needs content. With CLIL, one is obliged to take a standpoint regarding the selection of the contents for the course and in doing so to be able to justify the choices one has made both on the basis on the required objectives in each subject, while acknowledging the general state of the learners on whichever level of whichever program in which they might be situated. The question arises for the present thesis, however, what kind of relevance the English Subject Curriculum has when being mixed with the competency aims of another subject. Vocational subject disciplines are also embedded in this question.

Coming back to the contents and the justification any teacher could have for introducing something else into their classroom; the justified choices of content for the English language class have traditionally been literary or multi-modal texts with contents concerning English and American culture and history as well as the colonial and post-colonial linguistic heritage, indigenous peoples, globalization issues and general day-to-day discourses

from the English speaking world. All in all, the contents of the English language class has been largely Anglo-centric, and this is reflected in textbooks from primary levels throughout secondary school. At upper secondary, additionally, topics such as English Literature and History, International English, Business English and English in the Social Sciences have played an accentuated role as elective subjects for students choosing to study English more in-depth, thus these topics consolidate their role as traditionally important fields. In many ways, thus, English can already be regarded as a rather content-heavy subject at upper secondary levels, with strong connections particularly to an international understanding of the humanist content subjects History and Social Science. Those topics, alongside with traditional lexicology, grammar and phonetics also constitute the main focal areas of university-level teacher education within the English subject. In other words, the degree of coherence between the traditional contents of the English language class and teacher training is currently considered high.

### *2.8 The Adaptable Aims of the English Subject Curriculum*

The English Subject curriculum states clearly in seven out of 27 competency aims that the content selected is to be related to the students' study program. In the following, all competency aims that explicitly states that the English classroom shall incorporate content that is relevant for the students' study program are distinguished in order to get an overview of what the curriculum explicitly demands when regarding extra-curricular contents.

Under the heading "Competency aims after Vg1 – study preparatory programs and Vg2 – vocational programs" which points to the competency aims directly ensuing the General English course, seven competency aims explicitly state that the contents of the instruction is to be related to the learners' own study program. Below, a brief sum-up of the seven competency aims are provided to give an overview of the teaching context of most English teachers. The adaptable aims are organized under three out of four main focal areas found in the English Subject Curriculum, revised 2013.

These are the aims regarding Oral Communication. The learner is expected to:

- Understand and use a wide general vocabulary and an academic vocabulary related to his/her own study program
- Understand the main content and details of different types of oral texts about general and academic topics related to one's education program

- Introduce, maintain and terminate conversations and discussions about general and academic topics related to one's education program

Orally, the teacher must make sure that the learner acquires a great deal of vocabulary connected to the study program that he or she attends. They are also expected to conduct conversations and discussions on topics connected to their program and similarly, understand what others have to say about it. The teacher here is obliged to take turns around the textbook and search for materials elsewhere, as well as having a great deal of knowledge about the learners' various programs. This should be an essential expectation in order to achieve engaging classes and good language learning.

These are the aims regarding Written Communication. The learner is expected to:

- Understand and use an extensive general vocabulary and an academic vocabulary related to one's education program
- Read to acquire knowledge in a particular subject from one's own study program
- Use own notes to write texts related to one's education program

In writing, the vocabulary part is extended and an in-depth study of a particular topic is to be performed. Cross-curricular activity is also promoted by the fact that the learner is going to use his or her own notes from the subject content to produce a text in English.

One aim is found in the section of Culture, Society and Literature. It is expected that the learners:

- Select an in-depth study topic within one's education program and presents this.

These competency aims obviously constitute the ones which can be most easily adapted. Even though CLIL is supposed to be performed in the content classroom, this study found that interesting and similar activities took place in the language classrooms of Norwegian upper secondary schools, and that these approaches can integrate content in ways that may be very beneficial for the learners.

### *2.9 English in Study Preparatory and in Vocational Programs*

In both the study preparatory and in the vocational programs, the one-year 140 hours General English course is the required minimum for admittance to Universities, as well as for getting a professional certificate. In study preparatory schools, students can then choose in-depth studies of International English (second year) and English Literature or English in the Social

Sciences (third year). For vocational schools, the 80+80 hours English foundation course is distributed over two years. The English Elective courses of English in the Social Sciences, International English and English Literature are optional courses that are restricted to the academic branch. Vocational students can only select these as subjects if they choose to take the one-year supplementary course aiming for study competence, usually referred to as the Y-route.

In 2013, the English subject curriculum was revised, however only few significant changes were made. Under the Main subject areas in the 2013 revised subject curriculum, areas that each incorporate its own competency aims, the curriculum states:

The subject of English is a common core subject for all the upper secondary education programs. Learning in this subject shall therefore be made as relevant as possible for pupils by adapting each subject to the different education programs (15.12.2014, The Norwegian Ministry of Education, *The English Subject Curriculum*).

The debate over the English subject's (and generally, all the general subjects') role on vocational schools has been a controversial topic for many years. Some claim that the general subjects are more or less irrelevant for the students if one takes a rational job-oriented standpoint. The fact is that for non-academic courses – which translates roughly to vocational programs – the required language teaching that the students need to pass examinations similar to the academic branches, has been accused of being either too simple and lacking in motivational contents and levels, or regarded as obsolete in its conception. Many vocational schools struggle to get their students on the appropriate professional level for them to be enrolled smoothly into the two-year' apprenticeship. The dissatisfaction comes mainly from newspaper and article reports written by employers and companies who deplore the skills new apprentices have acquired in their main vocational subjects. This is of a rough generalization, depending on which vocational branch and school one observes at any given time. Yet, it is a hard fact that as a consequence of this, most vocational schools have undertaken vocational adaption of as many of the general subjects' objectives as possible in order to motivate and strengthen whichever vocational route their students have chosen. This is done to a much larger extent than in the study preparatory programs where maybe only the seven explicit objectives in English are adapted to the students' programs. Furthermore, this implies that content and language integration in vocational schools has been going on for extended time, more so here than in study-preparatory, and that, given the teacher education known from Universities and colleges, the English teachers largely conducting vocationally adapted English-classes must be more or less self-taught, meaning that they surface a number of

subject disciplines seemingly unrelated to the English subject. Due to rejections of and dissatisfactions with the amount of general subjects and theory at the vocational programs, in 2008, a committee was appointed to determine the general subjects' roles in vocational schools. In the introduction, the committee asserts that:

In this announcement suggestions are promoted which may contribute to increased selective possibilities on intermediate level and more vocationally adapted education in the general subjects within vocational schooling. The aim with these modifications is to better organize and prepare for a more practical and reality-oriented education (15.12.2014, *Parliament announcement no 44*, 2008-09, my translation).

Vocational adaption is relevant to CLIL for the following reasons: Firstly, as this study shows, vocationally oriented language-learning settings do to a large extent teach a content subject with English as the medium of instruction. Secondly, language learning in vocational settings, like CLIL, evaluates both language and content, depending on the situation. Lastly, the justification for vocational adaption rests on the same grounds like that of CLIL; the profound importance of content subjects, the necessity of increased language proficiency and the persistent lacking of motivation for learning English as a subject in itself.

More generally, upgrading English to a second language, has probably helped to accelerate the concurrent beliefs that the contents of the English classroom in general should no longer be restricted specifically to English-speaking cultures and day-to-day activities, but rather encompass a larger scope of contents, embedding the language domains in the CEF and, possibly, contents from other subject-disciplines that earlier were considered far removed from what could stereotypically be referred to as "plain language-teaching." However, at the same time as encouraging this adaptation of contents in English instruction to meet the learners' needs, the K06 strongly emphasizes general communication skills, cultural, societal and literary competence as well. The road teachers of the general English courses must take thus becomes twofold in almost all cases.

This thesis poses the question, given the instrumentality of language and English as a tool for communication, whether the English subject increasingly loses its prestige as a self-contained subject, reduced into what could superficially be referred to as a "dummy-subject" where English-lessons are to be utilized to teach materials traditionally belonging within other subject disciplines. One could also ask whether this is what naturally will happen within all language-subjects as soon as the students reach a certain level of proficiency. Moreover, this reduction (or transference) of contents, that CLIL can be considered a sign of, might also urge



major changes in what is supposed to be the contents of any language education, also in teacher training.

### *2.10 CLIL, Elitism and International classes*

In the following, a few points on CLIL and international classes are discussed. International classes in Norwegian schools may serve to provide a better understanding of what it is that separates CLIL from regular bilingual courses, which are happening in standardized IB-classes. Given that Norwegian students are on a high level of English proficiency, it follows that a comparison between Norwegian learners and IB-students should be made to make the distinction between CLIL, as it is intended, and international classes.

The preferred target group of present day Content and Language Integrated Learning; a teaching practice that aims towards a unified mainstream educational system (Marsh and Wolff 2007: 5) is the average student on either primary, secondary or tertiary level. In contrast, the attendants of bilingual education historically were sons of the most prominent families. The education within the subjects of arts, music and rhetoric was often taught in the *lingua franca* of the time, may it be Greek, Latin, French or English (Dalton-Puffer 2010: 7). Most people today would concede that the *lingua franca* of today is and has been English for a long period of time. In CLIL contexts, this *lingua franca* has a less rigid and more floating meaning, as it can be basically any foreign language which serves as a language of academic or professional life.

Stavanger has three International schools (COE 2015). These schools, and schools like them, have been practicing a form of bilingual education called immersion for several decades. Students attending international classes or programs, for example the Norwegian IB Program (International Baccalaureate) are enrolled by relatively strict grading systems, especially considering their grades in English and Math (Paulsen 2011: 17). It is believed that situations like this is the state of the art all over the world, since IB as an educational institution functions on a standardized international level.

The aspect of voluntariness is crucial to successful CLIL-implementation and is to a large extent a principle that contributes to a more democratic educational system. However, voluntarily selecting English-mediated courses might also increase student diversity between CLIL-classes and other classes. As presented in section 1.6, CLIL has in fact been accused of being an approach that might encourage elitism, meaning that CLIL-enrollment and practice

leans towards a kind of teaching and learning that favors high-performing students. All in all, the major difference between CLIL and bilingual instruction is that bilingual courses or classes per definition are voluntary, while CLIL *might* be voluntary. With this, it is meant that if the approach is to be applicable to the majority of learners, as is implied, it would have to be mandatory. The issue, however, is necessarily a controversial one which also can help to explain why teachers and stakeholders have for a longtime been reluctant to pick up on CLIL, despite its fine results in research and testing.

## Chapter 3 Methodology

### 3.1 Introduction

Chapter three seeks to outline and explain the research method used for the present thesis. Firstly, it deals with the qualitative method, the semi-structured interview and ethical considerations, before it describes the process of finding interviewees, the study population and presents the main focal areas of the thematic analysis.

### 3.2 Research Method

The research method that was used for the data collection is qualitative. Research that is qualitative, may be conducted depending on the inherent nature of the topic, or topics, under investigation. Six informants were interviewed on the basis of their experience with CLIL or other approaches to content and language integrated learning. According to Hennink (2011), “qualitative research is conducted to understand and explain peoples’ *views* and *behavior*”, it can be conducted to “understand *processes*, such as how people make decisions, or negotiate a job or manage a business” as well as to “uncover the *meaning* that people give to their experiences” or contribute to “give voice to the issues of a certain study population” (Hennink et al. 2011: 10). All of these applications made qualitative research natural and applicable for this thesis. It aims to better understand, elaborate on and discuss advantages and challenges that the CLIL-approach inherently possesses in its numerous forms, varieties and modalities of implementation and practice. Using six teachers with bilingual teaching experience as informants, the present study’s raw-data was collected by the means of in-depth interviews at the different secondary schools where the interviewees led their professional lives. An in-depth interview is usually applicable to conduct research on “how people make *decisions*”, “peoples’ own *beliefs* and *perceptions*” and to identify “the *motivation* for certain behavior”. It can be described as a “*knowledge-producing conversation*” (pp 109-110). All of these applications were used for the present study in order to contribute to a better understanding of teachers’ endeavors with content and language integrated approaches. An interview-guide was made to operationalize the major research questions in order to elicit the informants’ personal stories (117).

In order to maintain subjectivity as well as anonymity, the interviews were conducted in a closed private room – most commonly a vacant group-room or classroom. In most cases, the interviewees made the decision of date and place, while the interviewer provided the consent sheet and the interview-guide for common reference. The interviews lasted for 40 to 60 minutes depending on the interviewee's willingness to share and the interviewer's ability to sustain the conversation with probes and/ or follow-up questions. The interviewees were informed that the interviews would be sonically recorded. The equipment that was used for the audio recording was a Zoom H4 Digital Stereo Recorder privately owned by the interviewer. The access to the audio files was encrypted with a password and the files were deleted subsequently after a full-length transcription had been conducted.

The drawbacks of having to transcribe all six teacher interviews in full, are thought to be justified through the qualitative nature of the research questions. The interviews resulted in approximately 55 pages of transcriptions. These can be read in full under appendices C through H. Limiting the number of interviewees to six is thus thought to serve the thesis when considering its scope. If more informants were interviewed, full transcription of every interview would most likely simply take too much time for a MA thesis such as the present one. As the teacher interviews were conducted in the interviewees' and the interviewer's native tongue, Norwegian, the interviews were translated into English. It should be prefaced that all translations were done with a major emphasis on meaning. In the oral discourse, stated and non-stated clues to meaning, such as stress, false starts and stops, and discourse markers such as fillers and hedges, were not transcribed during the translation-transcription process for the sake of more easily re-consulting the textual findings and compare them during the post-transcription phase. If the informants struggled to express themselves, employing a large amount of false starts and stops, these were only transcribed if they served to list arguments that supported the following utterance or point made by the particular informant.

### *3.3 The Qualitative Method*

Qualitative research was the natural choice to engage with the teachers' endeavors with content and language integrated learning. A classroom project could have been initiated for the sake of gaining data on specific features of the CLIL-approach. However, for an investigative thesis like the present one, interviews of a target study-population with the most relevant prerequisites, was thought to be both sufficient and beneficial. The reasons for this,

are manifold. Firstly, the author of the present thesis is not currently conducting classroom practice and does not have the necessary experience a practicing teacher have. Secondly, teachers who have been conducting CLIL or a similar approach, have also conducted more traditional ways of teaching language and contents, and are therefore thought to have a good foundation for reflecting and comparing the different practices. One could say that the traditional classroom experiences that teachers may have, work as a control group to the content and language integrated groups, which, indirectly, are the research group on which this study focuses. Thirdly, it is believed by the author that the body of theory, studies and reported projects conducted on the research area of CLIL, is vast. In other words, there is currently substantial literature available for stakeholders and other interest-groups who seek to justify the implementation or non- implementation of CLIL on a larger scale. However, elicited experiences of teachers, and implicitly, their attitudes, have not been too thoroughly researched. Mostly, interviews on teacher attitudes and reflections on their experiences, have only been added as additional or supporting reports to a larger or smaller CLIL research-project. General experiences and opinions, was thought to be a good way of employing knowledge that is already vacant and available without having to design and conduct any new projects, but to rather elicit experience that otherwise would probably not be voiced and presented in a proper and researched manner. It is believed that the voice of teachers, with substantial teaching-experience and knowledge of practicalities that matter when working with CLIL, is a voice that should be addressed and heard. Practicing teachers have the practical and enduring layers of experience in assessing teaching and learning, and thus, overarching strategies and ideologies that underpin education are viewed only as secondary factors. It is believed by the author of the present thesis that the knowledge and experience of several teachers with experience in the field of content and language integration, make an interesting and representative study population that is able to pinpoint the most important issues of these integrated approaches.

“Subjectivity” is a notion that might imply honesty and integrity, a notion that might imply lack of objectivity and irrationality, and a notion that is hard to validate quantitatively. Yet, it will be argued that subjectivity elicited from a quanta of six informants within a focused framework, might serve to provide a honest, complex, and most importantly, holistic picture of the situation which is being researched in the present thesis, namely, how the experiences, opinions and attitudes of upper secondary teachers and affects their endeavors with content and language integrated learning. It is important to keep in mind that qualitative

research seeks to investigate topics which may not be easily addressed merely quantitatively. Without disregarding quantitative research, qualitative research seeks to shed light on issues which cannot fully be covered quantitatively. In other words, its focal areas are different and can be summed up like the following:

It is these qualitative areas in social life – the backgrounds, interests and broader social perceptions – which defy quantitative research that qualitative research addresses. Qualitative research does not pretend to solve the problems of quantitative research, but does not see them as constraints (Holliday 2002: 4).

Classroom practice has a number of variables which cannot easily be isolated nor measured properly. Teachers and students alike are able and competent to make generalizations of classroom life based on experiences, observations, opinions, attitudes, perceptions and personal beliefs. Qualitative research seeks to address these issues and propose them as important constituents of reality. Although qualitative research for a long time has been deemed non-scientific or flawed in a number of disciplines, its application for describing something as complex and multi-disciplinary as classroom-activity, should not be underestimated. Teachers conduct professional institutionalized teaching which is to be assessed and result-oriented constantly. Taken the recommendation that teachers are encouraged to reflect and to execute strict self-assessment regarding own practice, and given the increase of reporting and self-assessment duties in teacher jobs, it is widely held that teachers' jobs demand the practicing teachers to be very much updated and informed about their daily duties and that teachers themselves are best suited as consultants when it comes to matters that concern their workspace; like evaluating CLIL in classroom practice. Thus:

In education, the idea of “teacher as researcher” – someone who must integrate research with work in order to do the latter properly – is now common (Holliday 2001: 25).

The claim that Holliday makes that teachers are themselves researchers, is supported in other literature concerned with the occupation of teaching. According to Hitcock and Hughes (1995) “Teaching involves the application of technical and professional skills and knowledge to particular situations”. Furthermore, they maintain that there exists “an important relationship between teaching, teacher research and reflection” (Hitcock and Hughes: 1995: pp 3-4). On the other hand, some claim that most teachers are simply so busy and buried in work that their research may turn out to be too subjective (7). For the present thesis, an objective stance when dealing with subjectivity must be taken. Each teacher's subjectivity will be regarded as a natural part of that particular person's life, and most

importantly, linked to the inherent nature of this person's own *subjects* and subject combinations taught. Personal experience and personal educational backgrounds are considered factors that contribute to validity of the evidences. In other words, points made by the informants in the in-depth interviews, are treated as evidence from the nature of the school subject taught, more than merely a personal statement. Respect for the teacher as a professional and credible informant thus becomes important when interpreting the data obtained in the present study.

### *3.4 The Semi-Structured Interview and External Validity*

The in-depth semi-structured interview was chosen for carrying out the research method for the present thesis. Ideally, research should apply more than one method for investigating a phenomenon. This was partly made up for by substantial cross-checking of important issues, as well as the collective and comparative aspect of presenting the findings. Although additional experimenting, like interviews with students, teacher administrators and others involved would be a good way to check the validity of the different findings, this was not pursued. Rather, honest report and careful analysis and comparison were exalted. In terms of external validity, this study only provides a tentative picture. It can also be regarded as a collation of six case studies, with internal validity. Thus:

In in-depth interviews there are no wrong or right answers; the stories of the interviewees are the individual perspectives of your study population, and this is exactly what you intend to achieve with qualitative research (129).

Although the main objectives for the interview-guide were set, many of the possible angles towards the central research questions were becoming increasingly clearer as the process of interviewing progressed. This is also true in the sense that Hennink describes it:

Good-quality in-depth interviews (...) will produce new ideas and new concepts of which the researcher was not aware before the interviews were conducted and that were not included in the conceptual framework of the study (119).

With the idea of a continuous development in mind, the focus of the information attained by the interviewees was narrowed down as the interviews progressed. It became clearer and clearer as the interview-process was coming to an end that a certain saturation-limit of the common possible teacher experiences with CLIL, seen from different perspectives had been reached. Thus again, the study settled with a total of six informants.

### *3.5 Ethical Considerations*

All interviewees were made aware that personal or sensitive information about their personae, their students or their school, would not be evident in the finished thesis. Anonymity is preserved as the particular schools are not identified, and the teachers are only referred to as Language Teacher 1, Content Teacher 1, and so on. As this thesis is theoretically oriented and not written on a mandate to evaluate or rapport on particular schools' or teachers' endeavors with CLIL, full anonymity is not hindering the accomplishment of the present study's aims. On the contrary, it is believed that preserving full anonymity would encourage greater extent of subjectivity from each informant, thus actually doing service to the investigative nature of the present thesis.

With the informed consent, interviewees were given information on how the interview was going to be performed and what the main aims of the thesis was. Correspondingly, codes and ethics in the qualitative research-field is important to distinguish in order to make clear the personal aspects of communication, trust-building with the informants and securing personal and vulnerable data that might identify the person speaking. Thus, the following principles by Clifford G. Christians sums up the nature of conduct in the present thesis:

Codes of ethics insist on safeguards to protect people's identities and those of the research locations. Confidentiality must be assured as the primary safeguard against unwanted exposure. All personal data ought to be secured or concealed and made public only behind a shield of anonymity (Denzin and Lincoln 2008: 193).

When presenting the findings of the in-depth interviews in the finished thesis, it was important to bear in mind what information was actually relevant for the research and what had to be regarded as either too sensitive information or simply too personal. The "gap" when transcribing and at the same time convey the meaning of the sometimes arbitrary nature of spoken utterances, as well as what was ethically suitable to present, had to be evaluated. With the precautions given about attention to meaning in the process of transcription, moral principles of data validity, become a moral issue, and worth pursuing. In order to protect the research questions from biased preconceptions, prejudices or misinterpretation from the author's side,

[e]nsuring that data are accurate is a cardinal principle (...) Fabrications, fraudulent materials, omissions, and contrivances are both nonscientific and unethical. Data that are internally and externally valid are the coin of the realm, experimentally and morally (194).



Given that the interviews were transcribed with a focus on meaning, unclear utterances from the interviewees were transcribed in proper language, but their meaning was either asked for or probed in the interview setting or inserted from contextual clues during the transcription process itself. Thus, Christians' last principle was followed in practice to a large extent and a good way of representing what was conducted in the interview-process.

### *3.6 Finding Interviewees*

The interviewees were treated as informants with specific prerequisites. All teachers worked in upper secondary schools the Stavanger-area, and they had all background or current engagement with language and content integration practices. These were factors that contributed to a more limited study population, in favor of a more focused one. In many ways, Stavanger could be said to represent, if not a bilingual language community, then at least an intercultural one. A large population of English native speakers live and work in Stavanger. According to Intercultural City Index's City Sample of non-native/foreign born residents, these make over 15 percent of the total population. Poles and Brits respectively constitutes the largest single groups of foreigners, yet, as many as 174 nationalities are found in total in the Stavanger area (COE, 20.01.2015). The *EØS-avtale* (the Schengen- Agreement; European Economic Cooperation) allows EU citizens to freely perform different kinds of labor as well as traveling and living in Norway. Stavanger is geographically close both to Britain and to mainland Europe. Admittedly, Stavanger is also the home-town of the University from which this study originates and it thus also serves a convenience-purpose in finding and conducting research on the interviewees. With reference to the above mentioned factors, it will be argued that the Stavanger region proposes an interesting research population for a study that is ultimately concerned with the mastering another of language.

The prerequisites for the teachers were first and foremost that they themselves or their school had worked intensively or extensively with either a CLIL-project or teaching methods, secondly that their practice resembled CLIL inasmuch as the focal areas of this study goes; language and content integration. It was also believed beneficial that they were on beforehand acquainted with general CLIL-theory, although not all of them were. It is important to note that for the vocational informants, vocational adaption was considered a variety of CLIL. For the third, the informant of course needed to concede to being interviewed, which not all of them did. Another factor that restricted and helped focus the study population, was the current

teaching-contexts of the informants. It was in the interest of the author to investigate content and language integrated learning both in the context of study preparatory as well as vocational education. This was due to the fact that both upper secondary branches incorporate General English as a subject and that the completion of this subject is required for the admission to both further academic studies and professional vocations' certification, thus contributing to the validity and urgency of the present study.

One of the initial informants was recommended to the interviewer by the respective university supervisor. Another was known from a praxis-period on that particular secondary school. These two served as gatekeepers, meaning that they had a functional role in sending the interviewer further to the next informants. This meant that the study population was put together along the way, as tips and recommendations kept coming. The study population therefore could be said to be made on the basis of acquaintances and personal connections. Several emails were written and phone-calls made in order to get in touch with the interviewees. Casual factors also played a role in finding the CLIL-teachers. One potential informant claimed her experience was not relevant for the present study, another was on sick-leave during the interview-phase and did not have the time to be interviewed. A third potential informant had retired just recently. Interviewing the two latter informants privately could have been executed, however, this endeavor was not pursued.

### *3.7 The Study Population*

The six teachers interviewed were first and foremost picked on the basis of their experience with CLIL or their experience with similar approaches to content and language integration. Type of school was another factor that helped focusing the scope of informants. School-type, structure and ideals have also proved to be factors governing implementation and continuing practice of CLIL in Norway (Paulsen 1 and 2 2011) and is worth paying attention to. According to NCFL overview (2011), three schools in the Stavanger-area have formal CLIL programs, but currently only one school do. Nonetheless, the experience that resigned CLIL teachers might still have was regarded as an incentive to contacting the two other schools as well. A third factor governed the different types of teachers. In order to get an overview of the situation, broad teaching backgrounds was both desirable and attainable for the present study. Popularly, the two major branches of teachers at general secondary level, position themselves in either of the two "camps" which are commonly referred to as "the humanists" and "the

realists”. In the context of CLIL, however, it is the distinction of *language* teacher and *content* teacher that is viewed as crucial. Both those types of distinctions, however, are based on each individual teachers’ academic orientation and professional qualifications. In secondary education, teachers in general have two or three subjects in which they are required to have wide formal competence. University or college education is required, and one year of pedagogical training in addition. Teachers’ subject-choice is usually based on personal preferences, perceived mindset and skills. Usually, their subjects are related, meaning that they are studied within the framework of one single university faculty, thus consolidating the two most popular “camps” of teachers. There are exceptions to this. Some teachers have formal qualifications from two or more untraditional branches. One of the informants in the present study, has both a background in the profession of being a language teacher as well as professional certificate in industrial mechanics. In sum, four different schools have provided informants; two study preparatory schools, one integrated school (both vocational and study preparatory) and one only-vocational school. One of the study preparatory schools used to have vocational programs, thus, the informants from this school had experiences one would normally expect from someone working at a vocational school. For a closer elaboration on these kinds of schools, see section 2.5.

### *3.8 Focal Areas of the Interview-Guide*

All information obtained in the interviews that was crucial for the scope of the present thesis is presented thematically in Chapter 4. It follows, then that the elaboration on the unfolding themes of the interview-guide as well as the research questions that the interview guide operationalizes, need to be shown explicitly. A rundown of all questions along with their operationalized research-questions, along with the question-guide can be found under Appendix K. The main research questions for the present study are what kind of experiences Norwegian secondary teachers have had with CLIL and similar approaches to content and language integrated learning. Underpinning the interest in these experiences, lays the problematics of the CLIL approach which have been elaborated on in the preceding sections. For the sake of convenience, the research questions are listed once again in the following:

- 1) What kinds of content and language integrated approaches can be found in a Norwegian context?
- 2) How do these approaches work, and why do they work?
- 3) What are teachers' experiences with these approaches
- 4) What is the perceived role of

language in the content and language integrated approaches and 5) What are language and content teachers' attitudes towards working with CLIL or similar modalities of content and language integration?

The focal areas of the interview-guide can be briefly summed up as: *Interviewee's Background, Interviewee's Experience with CLIL, Interviewee's Attitudes towards CLIL, Interviewee's Assessment Practices and Interviewee's Future Prospects on CLIL*. The full interview-guide can be found under appendix B.

To conclude this section, while other studies (Hellekjær 2005; Paulsen 2011) have pointed out curricular and organizational factors respectively as governing when it comes to the lack, or lagging, of CLIL-practice in Norway, the present thesis aims to proactively investigate the opinions and attitudes of those who are supposed to carry out the integration. In exploring some of these opinions and attitudes, it is hoped that the focus can come back to the specific didactics of each subject involved in CLIL by showing that content and language integration is actually currently occurring successfully in Norway already. Surely, CLIL, as any other concept originates in a world of ideas, and has subsequently been attributed with charting policies, rules of proper conduct and eventually hard methodologies. Though it is true that research needs to be performed and validated as well as collected and collated, teachers' own views on these matters are thought to be an essential criterion for any successful CLIL practice within any system or teaching and learning tradition.

## Chapter 4 Findings and Discussions

### 4.1 Introduction

The findings from the in-depth interviews of the CLIL teachers are presented in the following. The findings will be presented as close to the informants' original statements as possible using in-text citations and additional introductions, summaries, commentaries and discussions. In summing up or making any generalization about the information voiced by the informants, all views expressed explicitly or implicitly solely belong to the author, who stands for these personally. Having said that, the findings of the present thesis are to be problematized on the premises of the theoretical underpinnings in the preceding chapters and compared to each another where this is found suitable. It should be kept in mind that the teachers' own experiences with content and language integration is the main focus of the interviews and that other views on education and teaching might surface that do not necessarily fit into the general aim and scope of the thesis, but which in light of the interviews turned out to be relevant for the discussion of content and language integrated approaches nonetheless. The reader should keep in mind that the present study does not aim to ascertain whether or not CLIL is happening in Norway, but to investigate which kinds of content and language integrated practices can actually be found, and attempt to answer why it is so.

### 4.2 The Thematic Analysis

The analysis is divided into the sections of *Informants' Background, Experiences with CLIL, CLIL Attitudes, and Future Prospects on CLIL*. The in-text citations from the informants are positioned under the common heading of what they may serve to respond to. The findings have been systematized topic-wise. For the full interviews with each teacher, see appendices C through H.

It should be noted that an additional post-transcription analysis was necessary to conduct for two main reasons: Firstly, the informants did not always respond solely to one question at a time, but answered many questions in the same reply. Secondly, the question guide intended to operationalize more implicit research-questions, which enhanced this process. In other words, one question was asked, and this question became nuanced, extended and further elaborated on by the informants. This was a factor that contributed to making the

transcriptions messy and hard to categorize in the manner that was required for showing the results in an orderly way. It follows then that the statements from the informants necessarily have been elicited from their context in the interview text and synthesized as they are here presented. No quotes from the informants have been completely detached from their textual surroundings, as these contexts are provided and/or commented by the author if necessary.

In order to distinguish the teachers' voices from the author's, the in-text citations from the transcriptions will be indented and marked with the informants' pseudonymous name-tag. The six teachers that constitute the study population are referred to as Language Teacher 1, 2 and 3, Content Teacher 1 and 2 and Language Content Teacher 1. Abbreviated, the informants are referred to as L1, L2, L3, C1, C2 and LC1.

All the language teachers in the present study had qualifications for teaching one or more content subjects in addition to their language subject, which consistently is English. Having several subjects, is very common with Norwegian upper secondary language teachers. However, these informants are referred to as Language Teachers (LT1, LT2, LT3) nonetheless, because the content subjects in which they had formal and real teaching competence, were not the subjects in which they conducted content and language integration, making their competence in this or these subject(s) more or less obsolete for the investigation of the present thesis. Only the Language Content Teacher in the study sample (LCT1) had both formal and real qualifications in both subjects that he taught in integration.

In the study sample, there are three teachers working on primarily vocational schools (LT1, LT2, and LCT1) and three teachers in study preparatory (LT3, CT1, and CT2). In order to show the findings at each school type relative to one another, the three teachers are treated as vocational- and study preparatory informants with separate and/or joined discussions of the replies. Note that LT2 and LT3 have backgrounds in both school types and are treated as study preparatory or vocational informants depending on their reference to this background in their replies.

#### 4.2.1 Interviewees' Background

In the following, the basic prerequisites of the informants are presented. Because this part of the analysis focuses more on each informant's general background, the replies will not be presented thematically, but based on each and every informant's personae and presented one by one. The fields in which each informant is interrogated are, firstly, formal and real subject competence, additional job experience and longer stays abroad that somehow might have enhanced their English competence. Secondly, teaching experience from upper secondary level and total year of practicing teaching is shown (all levels). The third and fourth fields are related to currently taught subject and level of upper secondary, including current educational programs taught, once again, these might be either vocational or academic. All in all, this section serves the purpose of becoming formally acquainted with the study population of the present thesis.

LT1 has a major in English Linguistics and the additional subjects of Psychology, French, Pedagogy and Sociology. She has also worked as a translator in the UK for several years and has by this acquired a broader linguistic competence in her main subject: English. At upper secondary, she has taught English and Social Studies with a teaching experience of six and a half years. LT1 currently teaches English and Social Studies on the second year of studies as well as on *Lærlingskolen* (an additional schooling for apprentices within any vocation who have to retake subjects in order to gain their professional certificate). The program LT1 currently teaches is solely *Bygg og Anlegg* (Building and Construction) which is a vocational program.

LT2 also has a major in English. Social Studies, French and Pedagogy is her additional subjects. She has been a teacher at upper secondary level for 25 years and has taught all of her subjects at all levels. LT2 has also taught most programs at upper secondary schools, but is currently engaged with *Elektrofag* (Electronic Installments and Engineering), *Idrettsfag* (Sports and Athletics) and *Påbygg* (an additional one-year course for vocational students giving them study competence, often referred to as the Y-route). Respectively, her programs are vocational, study preparatory and study preparatory. It should be noted that LT2 has substantial experience from study preparatory branches.

LCT1 has a major in Specialized Pedagogy as well as the subjects Philosophy and Psychology; all of them from the US. In Norway, LCT1 has taken the subjects Nordic, English, professional certificate as a machine engineer and experience from sales and

marketing. He has more than five years of experience as a teacher, within the subjects of Norwegian, English, *Teknisk og Industriell Produksjon* (Technical and Industrial Production abbreviated to *TIP*; a vocational subject within the field of mechanics) and a little experience teaching History. Currently, LCT1 teaches Norwegian and English on the first year of studies within the programs of *TIP* and *Design og Håndverk* (Design and Craftsmanship; a vocational course that amongst other things trains hair-dressers).

LT3's formal competence is English, Pedagogy, Philosophy and, lastly, Organizational Science; a subject which belongs to the Social Science studies. She has taught the General English course and the Elective English courses, namely International English, English Literature and English in the Social Sciences. LT3 has also taught English at the *International Baccalaureate* (IB) which later on will be referred to as *International classes*. Total teaching experience is more than 14 ½ years. LT3 currently teaches the English Elective subjects only, which translates to the second and third years of upper secondary. These subjects are constituted of students who come from various programs within the study preparatory branch as well as the *international classes*, which are confined to the second and third years as well. LT3 has also taught two vocational programs prior to the present study and will thus be treated as a vocational teacher when she refers to her experiences in this branch.

CT1 has a major in Didactics and Pedagogics (US) and the subjects of Biology and Chemistry (US). She also has a major in School Administration from Norway. CT1 has stayed in the US for several years of her life and is married to an American husband; for these reasons, she should be considered a bilingual. At upper secondary, she teaches Chemistry, Biology and Natural Science, and has been doing so for 24 years. CT1 currently teaches her subjects at first and second years on study preparatory programs where students aim for a career within the Hard Sciences. She also teaches the first year of the international classes, which starts on the second year of the three levels of upper secondary.

CT2's formal qualifications are History, English, Geography and Social Science. Worth mentioning, CT2 has in addition worked as an NRK journalist for five years and within Adult Training for a considerable amount of years. CT2 is a founding member of the European Youth Parliament International, and has been the leader for the Norwegian committee, where Norway is one out of its 34 member nations. For 35 years, he has been teaching the upper secondary subjects of History and Social Science, including Politics and Human Rights, Sociology and Social Anthropology, as well as English. However, English is



not currently one of his taught subjects. CT2 works on study preparatory programs at second and third years of studies.

Although there are several things that might be elicited from the above mentioned, a few issues deserves explicit comments. Firstly, as previously mentioned, none of the three LTs Language Teachers have any formal training which is non-academic, although two of them teach vocational programs. This means that the competence they have in teaching these programs, must have come from other places, such as self-training or possibly post-training. This issue will be further elaborated in the presentations of the informants' statements. Secondly, regarding the CTs Content Teachers and the LCT Language Content Teacher, these informants all possessed either formal qualifications in English, an extensive stay in an English-speaking country, or both of these prerequisites. I will argue that it is not likely that these three content teachers constitute a representative sample of content teachers in Norway; representativeness neither in terms of sheer quantity, nor in terms of their linguistic prerequisites. The Content Teachers in the study sample of the present thesis rather constitute a "hand-picked" selection that ought to be made according to availability, and following the criteria that he or she had to be engaged with teaching a content subject through the medium of English. Therefore, it follows that one can question whether their backgrounds of, or qualifications in, the language of English is transferable to other content teachers in Norway more generally. The point is that when discussing the findings presented by either the Content Teacher informants or the Language Teacher informants, the arguments that may be made, must be viewed as several case-studies amalgamated for this study and therefore these discussions may only serve to give a tentative picture of the situation in Norway in general. Yet, I retain that the findings on the experiences and attitudes of these teachers remain an interesting springboard for investigating what is happening, and what may be likely to happen, in terms of increased content and language integrated learning in Norway.

#### *4.2.1.1 Received Training*

None of the informants had received any training that considered teaching a language and a content subject together, nor instructions or experience regarding the didactic implications of such a cross-curricular endeavor. However, CT1 admittedly was trained in teaching Sciences through the medium of English, with the reservation that this happened in the US and was on the premises of an "English as an L1" context. LT1 and LCT1 mentioned that the topic was

discussed in respectively one and two PPU-seminars during their pedagogic education. LCT1 and CT1 had both been to CLIL seminars after completing their degrees. It was thought fruitful to ask this question not to make any explicit points about to which extent teachers were prepared for content and language integration, but instead to investigate whether any good practice exists that is actually geared towards preparing teachers for the situations demanded of them, see section 2.8 on the aims of the English Subject Curriculum. It is fully understood that academic Teacher Training institutions simply cannot take on the agenda of preparing teachers for literally any course or study program, especially not for vocational programs (13 different programs). Still, as shown in Chapter 1, the issue of increasing teacher competence and training staff for the purpose of CLIL can be said to be imminent, yet under-communicated in many cases. How realistic, however, it is to expect teacher-training institutions to make a remedy for increased subject integration into English teacher training, is made evident by applied linguist and teacher trainer Ion Drew in the following elicited from an interview conducted in February, 2015:

That would mean so many different kinds of courses, wouldn't it? I seems to me that what you're saying is that they are not specialists in all of these different subjects areas. But they are also language teachers, aren't they? So, I think the specialized area and developing vocabulary, that's something that one can do whether one is a teacher or a student (Ion Drew, Interview 2015/02).

From Drew's statement, it can be read that from the language teacher's perspective, the basic skills that language teachers have to teach, can also work as tools for understanding and conducting teaching on contents and topics that are not necessarily within the field of traditional language-teaching. The idea of "the teacher as a student" is important here, and also strongly relates to the issue of teacher training. Clearly, a language teacher ultimately is required to deal with aspects of the language. However, as CLIL encourages teachers to integrate their approaches, the implications this might have for both language and subject teachers are many.

#### *4.2.1.2 Defining Own Practice in Relation to CLIL*

Before merging into the "in-depth" parts of the interviews, the informants were asked how they would position their own practice in relation to the standard definitions of CLIL. The standard definition proposed in the interviews was in most cases: "CLIL is said to be an educational approach where a subject is taught with English as the medium of instruction at

least 50 percent of the time. How would you relate your work to this definition?” The replies from the three vocational informants are shown below:

LT1: My background is with a CLIL project at our school. Nine different countries from the European Union worked together and made an educational approach from scratch using the CLIL methodology. But we employed the CLIL-concept in a wider sense. It was condensed to “learning language in vocationally relevant situations”. There was no testing and evaluation of neither the language nor the content; we did it to promote learning.

LT2: It might be a deviation of CLIL. But it is more similar to *VOLL*. It came earlier than CLIL: also an EU-initiative. *Vocationally Oriented Language Learning*. It is having it renaissance now, I have noticed in the literature on vocational adaption. It is a kind of adaption that also takes into account the notion of “lifelong learning”, functioning in a social context, etc. Vocational adaption is more directed towards *VOLL* than CLIL, I think. In the term “vocational adaption” there is a notion that you should not only use materials and texts which are simply concerning their vocation, but also that the methods shall be directed towards their current activities.

LCT1: For my part, vocational adaption is pretty close to what could be called CLIL methodology, but I do not bring English into the vocational training. This is done in the English class. So, strictly speaking, it is more about adapting the English class to the vocational program, rather than adapting the vocational program to the English language.

It is found that vocational adaption of the English subject might be said to somewhat concur with the standard definition of CLIL; that a non-language subject is taught using English as the medium of instruction for least 50 percent of the time. This applies, however only given that vocational subjects are on beforehand attributed with the definition of a “self-contained subject” to the same extent as academic or scientific subjects are, which I would argue that they should be. In this case, vocational adaption of the English subject in vocational schools, can be said to be a form of long-term, high intensity CLIL, but which is performed in the English class and by the English teachers. It could be said to be a form of language-teaching methodology (Dalton-Puffer 2010).

In addition, LT2 mentions the educational acronym *VOLL* as a way of describing the act of vocationally adapting contents, language, methods and materials of the English class to suit her vocational learners. Note that *VOLL* and vocational adaptation will be used interchangeably in this chapter, since they depict similar entities. It should be mentioned that the author did not manage to obtain any information on *VOLL* in Norwegian upper secondary schools.

To sum up, the vocational informants were all acquainted with CLIL, but did not necessarily concede that vocational adaptation directly translated to CLIL. In conclusion, then, some factors make vocational adaptation a practice that could arguably be considered to be under CLIL's umbrella. In the following, it will be briefly presented how the study preparatory informants positioned their own practice to that of CLIL:

LT3: We did run some cross-curricular projects, and one teacher published an article on the project. To me, the CLIL-project was something I was familiar with from before: When English is used as a tool, and other subjects determine the contents. I have joined quite a number of cross-curricular projects.

CT1: We decided to start practicing regular CLIL. It was CLIL proper, we played the game by the rules!

CT2: I taught History in English, plainly.

The study preparatory teachers distinguish their different practices in relation to CLIL to the following three: Cross-curricular projects, “CLIL proper” and a bilingual program where History was taught through the medium of English. All of these approaches imply an English enrichment measure (Dalton-Puffer 2010) stemming from integrating subjects across the curriculum.

#### *4.2.1.3 Perceptions on the Purpose of CLIL*

It is thought relevant to show some of the informants' replies to what they thought the purpose of CLIL should be. Though not an intended question in the interview-guide, a review on the purpose of this kind of curricular integration amongst the informants may in many ways determine how the teachers would go about practicing the integration of content and language.

LT1: I like the idea of CLIL very much. Because it is about learning a language without really knowing that you are in fact learning. Like with kids, learning a language comes automatically. The same goes for being bilingual. They do not really think about it.

LT2: CLIL, as it is intended, has an incredible amount of good ballast in terms of language, Krashen and language immersion, which means that you will build an understanding for language in a more natural way. Of course, if you teach Social Science in English, the students will read a great amount of English written texts. That has got to do something about their “sense of language”. The same probably goes for passive vocabulary as well, which means that from the language point of view, it has a lot of benefits.

LCT1: I like the likening from the Karate Kid movie where he thinks that he is waxing a car, but in reality he is learning moves that he can use in karate. So, the students think they are simply doing something relevant for welding or making components, but it turns out that they also acquire a great deal of general English as well. Much of this circles the notion of the silent knowledge amongst our students. They have seen and heard a lot of English. To extract this competence, make them conscious of it, is easier for me to do if the framework allows me to just get them started on some sort of a relevant task rather than sitting down and reading literary texts.

Two out of three vocational informants positively mention the notion of unconscious learning (or acquisition) of English as a positive benefit that probably distinguishes the VOLL variety of CLIL from traditional ESL classrooms. Moreover, a positive attribution towards an increased exposure to a larger amount of English written texts attributed to ordinary CLIL is highlighted as a positive factor by LT2. Having said that, content and language integration as it is performed in vocational contexts can be seen as slightly different from this, in the way that it incorporates less traditional ESL texts and rather deploys more subject-specific and less traditional texts as well as less traditional notions of literacy in the English class. In sum, then, the teachers perceive the purpose of integrating vocational contents in the English classroom as a means to enhance language acquisition. The perceived purpose of CLIL is elaborated with slightly more varying specifics, yet similar main-purposes in the study preparatory branch:

LT3: Regardless of the students' selection of subjects, yet in particular if they choose the Hard Sciences, a large extent of the syllabi are in English. And still more of them consider higher education, where much of the required reading will be in English. Thus, the idea has been to increase the level of English proficiency in general.

CT1: The point is that one should vary. One should not do the same thing over and over where the teacher talks and the students listen. Because you learn from what motivates you. This is where CLIL fits the context. It is a form of variation. Especially if you vary it throughout the year. In other words, the students should not have a CLIL project the entire year. If you do CLIL all the time, that is not what I would call variation. I think that CLIL can be of great help so that when the students encounter the literature of Physics or Chemistry, they understand what they are reading. The students on study preparatory have to study; they get no professional certificate after they are done here. They actually do not gain anything. The only thing they get, is the possibility of further studies.

CT2: I believe that all our students in future studies or professional settings will encounter situations where they need to work in English. Many of them are going to study at universities abroad, which is self-evident. However, many of them are going to study in Norway, but using English language subject literature. Or they will attend international exchange programs. It is like learning by doing. Given that you need the language for another purpose, you will learn it automatically. You just have to write about your topic or your project for an international audience. Then you will automatically learn what you need. The terms, the phrases, the words, they come all by themselves.

In study preparatory it is found that the students' prospects of further studies and professional and academic development is emphasized as strong purposes for preferring CLIL-instruction over regular subject-divided instruction. Preparing students by increasing their academic reading-proficiency in English for enrollment, and success, at higher-level educational institutions, as highlighted by CT1, can be said to be the purpose of the study preparatory programs in general.

The purpose of learning subjects with an increased amount of English instruction, then, could be summed up rather vaguely as "future relevance." However, the category of future relevance can also be seen as overlapping categories between the two branches, as will

be shown in more detail in the following sections. In sum, the vocational branch teachers perceive the purpose of integrating content and language as a means of increasing the students' ESL acquisition in a subconscious manner, whereas the study preparatory teachers view the purpose more directed to increased exposure to texts, subject literature and further, possibly international, studies. All in all, the purpose can be said to relate to increasing English proficiency from different starting-points, different learners and various abstractions of future relevance, namely, future professional life and future studies, domestic or abroad. CLIL is in general perceived as a good way of accomplishing these goals.

#### 4.2.2 Experience with CLIL

In the following sections, the teachers elaborate on the categories of *Engaging with CLIL*, *Self-Training*, *Possible Additional Workload*, *Structural Issues*, *Textbook Issues*, *Materials from the Internet*, *Activities in the CLIL Classroom*, *High Performers*, *Low Performers*, *Motivation and Learner Attitudes*, *Other Perceived Learning Advantages*, *Vocabulary Learning* and *The Communicative Aspect*. Although some of these items' categories seem to overlap, such as *High Performers* and *Attitudes and Motivation*, this might be simply due to the fact that a "High Performer" is a relative term and dynamic in its nature, as learners are. Therefore, the sometimes rigid categories of the analysis will, if found necessary, be given some extent of leeway.

##### 4.2.2.1 Engaging with CLIL

The following responses help to illustrate which factors work as an initiator that could get teachers into working with topics and content subjects using the English language and/or what the teachers might find a motivating factor for doing so. It adds to the picture that the idea of making both language and contents more tangible and accessible through cross-curricular integration, especially crossing subjects with English, is probably seen as an attractive concept with many teachers, on a more general basis. Specific reasons mentioned by the informants for engaging with integrated learning are subject specific relevance, curricular impose, motivation through motivating, personal significance and personal inspiration.

LT1: Earlier, I was on *Design og Håndverk* [Design and Craftsmanship; a course training hair-dressers and fabric designers]. There, the students needed to learn how to

deal with customers on the phone; receiving orders and messages from clients, how they want their hair to look, and that kind of stuff. In such a situation, it is rather natural to find the correct vocabulary, practice courtesy, etc.

LT2: There was a great deal of more vocational adaption during the earlier reforms. R94 [the curricular reform that was valid up until 2005/06] introduced more theory and general subjects. English became one of them. Looking back, I feel lucky, because I started practicing teaching at a time when adaption was the norm; that you as an English teacher were supposed to walk into their class and teach them their subject content in English. So I just brought the experience with me. Motivationally speaking, this is a precondition for making many of these classes work.

LCT1: It has a lot to do with motivation and opinions I believe. You eliminate some of the excuses from the lower performing students, like the question: “What is this good for?” One example, if the student is to work in the oil industry, and needs English, motivation-wise, it is easier to get the students engaged with their English education. They learn more English, even though their intention is not to learn English. You get more of a positive pressure on both the teaching and the learning. That was my motivation.

The motivation(s) for engaging with CLIL may be complex. For the vocational informants, the three main reasons given are firstly vocational subjects' contents' relevance towards English and the ease of adapting English to this subject content. However, the course mentioned by LT1 is a course that trains hairdressers and fabric designers, which can be said to have a communicative mandate towards their clients. For successful language teaching to occur, a communicative mandate to create communicative situations is one of many main ingredients. How transferable such a communicative mandate is to all 13 programs of vocational educations, on the other hand, is a debatable question. The second reason mentioned by LT2 for engaging with CLIL, was that vocational adaption was strongly emphasized by earlier curricula. Given the re-introduction of vocationally relevant contents into the general subjects at vocational schools, one could be tempted to question the current curriculum. The Knowledge Promotion Curriculum re-introduced more theory and general subjects into vocational programs, and later on increased the extent to which General subjects' teachers were obliged to vocationally adapt these general subjects. A more important question, however, would be to question how teachers in practical terms can achieve such integrated



learning-aims successfully. Increasing motivation for the English subject among students, is mentioned by the third vocational informant. In many terms, his own motivation is linked to the students' motivation and could be said to endorse a socio-constructivist view on learning and teaching because the interplay between teacher and learners is thought meaningful and thus facilitated throughout the learning process. One might argue that socio-constructivist approaches to learning in general are more evident in vocational contexts and suggests relations to how these learning environments thus enhances the extent to which content and language integrated approaches may occur successfully.

Below, two study preparatory informants elaborate on how they started engaging with CLIL. The statements provided by these teachers, are much more related to personal prerequisites, needs and interests. Generally, these teachers showed a large amount of interest in internationalization, which also reflects their personal prerequisites and the international profile of their schools, more importantly.

CT1: I applied for this vacant teaching position in Norway. I am Norwegian, but I have lived in the US for 28 years, which is a long time. So, when I moved back to Norway, I was not really fluent in Norwegian. The IB-position that was vacant at this school, fitted me perfectly.

CT2: I took the initiative; I had heard about it from other schools. I was a bit fascinated by the IB-system, where most things are conducted in English. Or everything, rather. Personally, I like the English subject itself, I am a sort of an "anglophile". So I went to the principal and asked if he thought this was a good idea; should we try it out? He agreed, and we introduced it in History and in Natural Science for the first-year students.

Both CT's work at different schools, both with an International profile. CT1 got into teaching out of necessity for herself and her personal situation. At that time, she knew English better than Norwegian, and started teaching in the International classes. CT2 had a personal interest and motivation for making the subject of History more internationally relevant for his students, and he was the initiator of starting the bilingual project. He is also a former English teacher and had a genuine interest for languages, whereas CT1 has a bilingual background.

From these observations from the vocational and study preparatory branches, it might be suggested that the practice of adapting the English classes vocationally, is happening in a more systematized way, given that the curriculum guides the teachers systemically towards

what they are to do. Yet, as will be shown under the category of *Curricular Justification*, the vocational context very much varies how thoroughly the vocational adaption is executed. The observations also shows that the reasons teachers give for getting into integrating contents and language vary strongly on both branches and is only highlighted as a matter of sheer necessity by one out of six informants.

#### 4.2.2.2 *Self-Training*

As a natural consequence of no formal training in teaching a content subject and a language subject in synergy, the teachers reported on how they needed to get acquainted with new contents. It is evident throughout that, given the high English proficiency of the CT's in this study, the content teachers, if they commented on this, commented lesser on difficulties, but rather on their own personal prerequisites. Thus, it naturally follows that in the present study, it was the language teachers who have the hardest time becoming acquainted with new materials.

LT1: Within the program of Building and Construction, there are numerous varieties, right? There are timber house constructors, you have the furniture carpenter, the concrete mold constructors, masons, painters and scaffold builders. These are the ones that I have to focus on here on the second year programs alone. A big variety. It is expected that I know much more than what I actually do! So I just have to learn it.

LT2: I started teaching at upper secondary before R94. It [vocational adaption] was a virtue and necessity back then. I taught English for vocational students, second year only: two hours a week. Completely adapted. I found myself having to sit down with giant books on automation and pipe-contracting – in English. In order to succeed with this – I was trained in Shakespeare, not pipe blueprints – great efforts were demanded of me. But still, I was there, I had their books, and this was what they were going to do.

LCT1: I have a great advantage being a subject teacher in TIP. That means that I am not dependent on the general branch teachers in order to vocationally adapt the English class. I just go into the workshop and explain the lathe [spinning machine used to fabricate mechanical metal parts] to the students.

In this category, the vocational language teachers commented on the need for them to further extend their knowledge horizon on topics and subjects traditionally unrelated to the English subject. Only LCT1 comments on a lack of difficulties, given his specific prerequisites. How common these prerequisites are in vocational contexts in general, is not known to the author. Moreover, the vocational informants did somehow find the materials with which they needed to acquaint more differing and challenging from those of traditional language teaching, a fact which is also implicitly admitted by LCT1. For the study preparatory branch, the need to extend knowledge was elaborated as such by two informants:

LT3: As a teacher, you need a great deal of input yourself due to the nature of the job: You give a lot all the time; you need to refill yourself. I have always been interested in further educating myself. There has been a lot of programs where I have needed to get acquainted with new contents and knowledge that I have acquired after finishing my formal education.

CT2: I needed to prepare over again, you might say.

In general, the amount of self-training needed for study preparatory teachers, equals the amount that they would normally need for staying in tune with the contents, the aims and their subjects' methodologies. All teachers in the present studies viewed the practice of self-training explicitly as a natural part of their job and a continuing necessity in order to handle the task of teaching. Yet, the integration of vocational contents into language teaching at vocational schools might be said to demand a greater flexibility with the teacher who is to execute it. In most cases, these need for these flexibilities translate to the language teachers.

#### *4.2.2.3 Possible Additional Workload*

The issue of extra work when performing or preparing CLIL lessons was highlighted by three informants (all teachers from the vocational branches) while two informants did not mention the issue at all, and one informant briefly mentioned that it was not a problem. These are the issues proposed by the three teachers who somehow did find the workload greater when conducting language and content integration than with regular subject division:

LT1: It sure takes a good load of work. I think most language teachers are more of the academic sort, and do not necessarily know too much about these kinds of things. I also believe that in a school like this, with so many different study programs, I have

had the privilege of being more or less permanently positioned on Building and Construction, while others have been moved around from program to program. But it is a lot of work, I know literally nothing about buildings and constructions.

LT2: Firstly, you need to have the outer frames right. One need to have English teachers who can be granted most of, or at least a good deal of their classes teaching the same study program. It is very demanding to “get into” the subject, right? So the outer framework should save you from teaching ten different study programs at the same time, and rather let you focus on two or three. This is solely to build up your own competence in their subject content. It has been time demanding to find materials. And it will continue to be. However, I think that is a part of the job you are supposed to do, due to the fact that you will never find a textbook in English which is always adapted to the exact thing the students are doing at every given time.

LCT1: What is expected from a teacher, is that you have to be interested in what the students are actually doing in their workshops. You have to “get up from the desk” and move into the workshop and physically observe what the students are engaged with. You also need to have an interest, to the extent that you can find texts and materials, which for starters would be using the vocationally adapted chapters in the textbook, which are there already. But it is demanding to expect this of course, especially if the school is organized in such a way that teachers work within very many different programs. You then need to get acquainted with the vocabulary, different kinds of equipment, whether the students have their workshop in mechanics, are in the kitchen, are making clothes from fabric, in the TIP workshop, in the Building and Construction workshop, in the Electronics workshop, and so forth. So, many of the challenges for the teachers are connected to the organization of the school. I think, if you are positioned in one program mainly, you will yourself create the competence needed. But good textbooks are a must. If they are not proper, I mean, if you come from the university with ordinary English literature and the traditional background of an English teacher, good textbooks is a must if you are to execute the vocational adaption. You cannot create it yourself.

Interestingly, only the teachers who conducted vocational adaption commented explicitly on greater workload. Therefore, the findings should not be generalized to CLIL in general, but rather be seen as an inherent aspect of the current practice of vocationally

adapting the English subject to vocational programs. Clearly, the largest struggles connected to increased workload are related to how the school would distribute teachers on different programs. This notion is elaborated on by all the informants. One might argue, that for some, the practice of positioning language teachers on many different programs might seem somewhat random. However, it is reasonable to believe that language teachers in vocational settings usually confine their classes within a few programs, not several. Yet, in order to ensure that good and meaningful teaching and learning of both language and content, the perceived increased workload should be viewed as a positive remedy from the language teachers' side to bridge the gap in their English training between academic and vocational discourses. How healthy or unhealthy this workload might be in the long-run and to what extent compensations for further educating oneself should be implemented, falls out of the scope of the present study. Yet, it is argued here that language teachers' need of increasing relevant subject content knowledge certainly is an issue that imminently needs further discussion by the Ministry of Education and leading educational stakeholders.

#### *4.2.2.4 Structural Issues*

Similar to the Paulsen's (2011) findings, structural issues were reported as a problem when establishing and particularly maintaining CLIL-courses. Structural issues were mentioned by four out of six informants. A few distinctions can be made: the vocational schools struggle more with curricular issues for the students and structural issues related to the teachers' teaching positions. The study preparatory teachers reported to a larger extent on enrollment issues, the aspect of voluntariness, and making the groups of students work in relation to other groups at the same institution.

LT2: The Curriculum in itself is a challenge, because it splits the vocational programs into two years. So, the students have three hours per week in the first year and two hours per week the second year. Two hours per week the second year? How much can you possibly do when you are required to teach topics like for instance literature as well? So, there are some issues. In the student enrollment for the second year, you might get students who did not attend our school the first year, or who might have had another course book, etc. There are no directives in the curriculum that explicitly states that "on the first year, you shall do this, and on the second year, you shall do this". You may both have students who lack what you taught them the previous year, and you

may have students who have already done what you are about to do. You never know that!

LCT1: Our particular school is the only one in this region which is purely vocational. On an integrated school, you will have study preparing classes and vocational classes simultaneously. In that case, I believe that very often, the teachers teach exactly the same to the study preparing branch and to the vocational students. You have, for instance, merely course books that prepare you for further studies and less vocational adaption on an integrated school because the teachers there are more comfortable with study preparatory English.

These two vocational informants comment on two different structural issues that might gravely hinder curricular integration in vocational schools. LT2 highlights how the vocational curriculum randomizes what kind of instruction the students may get, especially if they have to change school. All in all, there might be a lack of coherence between the two years of vocational education. This is probably not only an issue that has to do with the English subject, but rather with any subject. LCT1 prefaces that integrated schools will not integrate general subjects in the same way that a fully-vocational one will. This also relates to the exam arrangement, where it may still be thought more worthwhile to teach study preparatory English to the vocational students. In general, parts of their concerns, are related to how one goes about teaching English in vocational contexts in general. Easily, one get the impression that the amount of vocationally adapted English-instruction the students receive, is more or less a game of chance depending on the English teachers' interests in adapting the English subject. As it will be shown in the category on *Assessment*, the exam format encourages the practice of maintaining the English subject as academic because of the increasingly popular Y-route (adding a year of general subjects that provides vocational students with study competence). The English subject in vocational contexts can thus be said to be split in two, with different subjects necessarily pressing their interests. One might be encouraged to ask the question whether the exam arrangement is a fair arrangement or not. The issue will be elaborated further in section 4.2.4.4. The structural issues for conducting content and language integration were voiced differently by the study preparatory informants:

CT1: I think that in order to engage the students, one needs to lower the student enrollment threshold. Especially if they themselves have not chosen CLIL. Our CLIL project was mandatory. Those in the international classes, on the other hand, had

chosen it for themselves because that class is after all conducted 100 percent in English. In order to sustain, it must be something meaningful for the students. Otherwise, it will just be a “happening”.

CT2: For a period of time, we had two bilingual subjects running, in the sense that 60 percent of the classes should be in English. These classes were a practical problem, because the students needed to choose what they wanted, which meant that we had to set up two History classes in parallel on the schedule. I taught the students who wanted to do the subject in English, and another teacher had the students who wanted History in Norwegian. Schedule-wise, it was a problem. This is the reason why we do not offer bilingual courses anymore.

Student selection of classes was highlighted by the study preparatory teachers. This must be considered a “cold-start problem” and should be viewed more as a structural issue starting up CLIL-projects rather than an issue crucial for maintaining them. In the cases where CLIL-initiatives comes to a halt, structural bottlenecks (Paulsen 2011) are definitely the largest challenge, which in turn requires structural amendments. If it is true that sustained CLIL practice is achieved by established routines for managing CLIL-programs, this should be encouraged politically. The important aspect of voluntariness mentioned both explicitly and implicitly by the informants, is also reflected in the CLIL literature (Dalton-Puffer 2010). Voluntariness, however, might also encourage elitism, and is thus not merely positive. This will be shown and further elaborated in section 4.2.2.9.

#### *4.2.2.5 Textbook Issues*

As the textbook tradition is strong in Norway, issues concerning the usage of curricular textbook are to a large extent a predominant finding in the present study. Hellekjær (2005) and Drew and Sørheim (2009) both mention that Norwegian teachers mostly rely heavily on the textbook even nowadays, when the access to other teaching materials is at a higher level than ever before. Experimental use of other resources will be shown as evident when integrating content and language in Norwegian school lessons. It should be mentioned briefly that the textbook issue turned out to be a problem for four of six informants. The following serves to illustrate in what ways these problems may have occurred.

LT1: It is very hard to cooperate with other English teachers because the textbooks are so different from program to program. They are also very superficial when it comes to the actual vocational adaption. There might be pros and cons with the books, of course. *Tracks'* second year course books are miserable when it comes to any kind of vocational adaption.

LT2: If a teacher wishes to start a CLIL-program in his class and his subject, an important issue will be to find proper materials to use. You might have to use a course book in English written for a different country, different language preconditions. It might not fully cover the Norwegian curriculum demands in the particular subject. The language might also be on the verge of being too difficult for the students. With this, finding the resources will be a challenge for a teacher who wants to start doing it. Earlier, we used *Tracks*. In the second year, these books were completely lacking vocationally adapted content. Nothing at all. All vocational programs used the same book for the second year. This demanded that the teachers needed to be very creative in terms of finding subject content materials that were relevant.

LCT1: We use *Tracks* at this school. It has four chapters which are vocationally adapted. Many teachers use these books in their own instruction, while others wait until after Christmas, because they think that the first year students simply do not know enough about their vocation the first semester of their studies.

Firstly, due to the subject-specific nature of the textbooks, vocational English teachers mention struggles cooperating with other English teachers at the institution because the various vocational programs' books are so different. One should keep in mind that there are in total 13 different vocational programs. Quite rarely, however, all of these are found at one single institution. Secondly, the textbooks for the second year students are shared across the programs. Thus, it follows that English textbooks for the second year students are lacking when it comes to vocational adaption. This is solely in order to prepare them for the exam. Thirdly, issues dealing with adopted teaching materials from an English-speaking country was mentioned. These adopted materials might be irrelevant for the Norwegian curricula, a finding that was also supported on the study preparatory branch. Lastly, one vocational informant mentions that the students might not be thoroughly prepared for vocational adaption until the second semester of their training. This could imply that successful vocational adaption of the English subject might in many cases only occur in one out of four semesters of English



classes, however this possibility will not be further pursued in the present study. Yet, one can make the argument that teachers necessarily need to continue relying on the textbooks despite their shortcomings because materials relevant enough for both English and vocational subjects are not yet available. The issue is thought to be hard to discuss, due to the fact that English in the vocational branches is a final subject with a shared exam. It seems, that all issues related to syllabus, adaption or lesser adaption relies on the current exam-practice's compatibility with the Y-route. Below follows the study preparatory informants' statements on textbooks.

LT3: Our textbooks are not adequate; they are outdated. Especially in the elective English courses. In a context like that of a secondary school, you simply have to seek materials beyond the syllabus textbook. It hardly ever stands on its own.

CT1: Firstly, we do not have an English-language textbook at all. This is due to the fact that the subject curriculum for Natural Sciences in Norway is very peculiar. It does not really look like similar curricula from the English-speaking world. This is a challenge in relation to CLIL, because you simply cannot find books with that particular combination of topics, where you have astronomy as well as batteries, nutrition and all kinds of strange and random topic combinations. This happened with the curricular reform of 2007 [The Knowledge Promotion Curriculum, sic]. Before then, we used English textbooks from Great Britain.

CT2: I used an American textbook. From the Historian's point of view, it was interesting to read an American textbook of History, because it emphasizes other issues than a Norwegian one would. The author's point of view is different. To me, this was a more genuine World History, rather than the "History of Europe in a global perspective," like Norwegian textbooks tend to be.

For the study preparatory branch, inadequate and outdated textbooks in the elective English courses is highlighted firstly. Secondly, the Norwegian curriculum of Natural Science makes foreign textbooks usage for CLIL-projects in Natural Science CLIL-situations primarily obsolete, or at best, problematic (this might also be the case in other subjects such as Religious Instruction, see Hellekjær 2005: 53, which topic combinations are also specific to Norway), while in the subject of History, on the other hand, foreign textbooks are thought so serve an authenticity-purpose compared to using domestic textbooks. All in all, the problems encountered when utilizing foreign materials are shared between the vocational and

study preparatory branch. The issues encountered when employing foreign textbooks, are not primarily language level, but rather the combination of topics, which makes most textbook issues a curricular issue. Teachers also agree that the textbook hardly stands on its own, but that good textbooks are necessary, or definitely preferable for content and language integration to successfully occur. Such textbooks are not found as widespread in the present study.

#### *4.2.2.6 Materials from the Internet*

Many of the teachers commented on the usage of other resources to complement the textbooks, which were found to be lacking. Most of these other sources translated to the use of the internet and television. Linked to the problems with the textbooks discussed above, the practices of seeking information from additional sources, are also linked to additional workload by some informants, however not all informants view it negatively.

LT2: When it comes to other resources, I use movie clips, *How Stuff Works*; there is plenty of good materials on the web, which can be used for vocational adaption. In addition, we employ User Manuals which the students have for their tools.

*Elfagkatalogen* [the Electric Subject Catalogue] is available both in English and Norwegian on the internet.

LT3: I have to deal with other texts than the ones found in the textbooks, for numerous reasons. When it comes to the CLIL project, I conducted English classes without a textbook for two years. One of them was the CLIL-project year. All the educational materials were found elsewhere. Mostly on the internet. I used the *NDLA* to a large extent, *BBC*, *CNN*.

CT1: Yes, we do have the internet, but the students really, really prefer a book, because of the sheer amount of material they have to go through. They also like to keep it on a certain level. Because, if you go about “clicking” on the internet, random websites that the teacher may have found, a couple of clicks more, and you end up on a PhD thesis. A fifteen-year-old will not understand a thing from what he or she is reading. It is frustrating for them inasmuch as they don’t know what to do! Another problem is that they cannot re-access materials. They are not really proficient at saving the links they have.

The replies from the respondents differ greatly on the question of whether looking up materials on the internet is perceived as advantageous or not. LT2, a vocational teacher, has a positive attitude to looking up additional materials for the students and use these materials to furnish the book where this might be lacking in terms of the vocational adaption. LT3, feeling her books were not up-to-date, conducted English instruction in the Elective courses without a textbook for a longer period of time, both with and without financial compensation. Similarly with CT1, however, LT3 emphasized the fact that conducting educational instruction without a proper textbook for a longer period of time, can be a though endeavor. CT1 emphasizes texts with non-adapted levels that might be discovered by her students while they are browsing the web. The students' lack of routines, source critique or study techniques to find, store and utilize the correct information needed is also highlighted. CT3 has prefaced earlier that for English instruction to occur naturally in Natural Science, no foreign textbook alone covers the right topic combinations in the syllabus. Moreover, students cannot have a situation with several books and hand-outs, and, one would assume, even less so in several subjects. Once again, even though the curriculum is open for the choice of methods, it puts restrictions in terms of topics how much leeway teachers in general can give to their instructional methods, which in this case, includes CLIL.

#### *4.2.2.7 Activities in the CLIL Classroom*

Activities in the CLIL Classroom were discussed as a way of finding out which kinds of content and language learning took place in the content and language integrated classrooms. It proved to be an important means of eliciting information on what actually happened in the vocational settings, using the English lesson to learn about subject specific contents from various subject disciplines, as well as further distinguishing the varieties of CLIL-practice found in the more academic contexts. What was found, was that vocationally adapted English lessons to a large extent take place in the students' workshops. In the academic branch, the practices varied much more. For instance, LT3 reports on the importance of focusing on subject-specific writing to prepare students for university-levels when she is teaching the predominantly content-heavy English Elective courses, CT1 reports on a cross-curricular CLIL-project with subject and language teachers cooperating and CT2 reports on a bilingual History-course he conducted, where most activities were similar to what he would do in Norwegian, but using the English language as the medium of instruction. First, the vocational informants' replies:

LT1: For instance, the students have erected carrying timber walls; they erect them, tear them down, erect them, and tear them down so that they get good practice. I usually ask them to leave one of them standing so that I may use it for an evaluation, for instance that they tell me in English how they went about building it. The practice depends on what kind of workshop and what the students are dealing with.

LT2: It is all about being in the vocational classes; working with their vocation; in English. We read texts, we use materials from their vocation, and I run some of the classes in their workshops, which is a great advantage. Because, there, you have their world which you as an English teacher enters. That I think is good!

LCT1: In TIP, it happens that we work quite a bit on the lathes and other kinds of machinery the first semester. That is why I found it natural to vocationally adapt the English already at this stage, because I noticed that the given chapter in the book was more relevant for the student in combination with what they were doing in the workshop. Last year, for instance, I had 12 weeks of logs and reports writing, seven in Norwegian and five in English. That meant that the students wrote a log every single English class.

What can be seen from the information presented above, is that in vocational contexts, much of the learning and teaching is taking place in the students' workshop. For the English language teacher, this must necessarily mean that over the years, they will themselves gain some factual knowledge of the students' vocational subjects through the manifestations in the learning environment. It is also clear from what has been presented that this practice benefits the students greatly by providing them with not only the sign of the entities with which they deal on an everyday-basis, but actually the very concrete objects and processes which their subject theory denotes and connotes. In other words it means that a good workshop at a vocational school provides the learners with a more holistic and realistic learning experience, and an absolutely obligatory arena than functions in many of the same way as a laboratory or a sports' hall does for chemistry and gymnastics. How this context, given the proper linguistic amendments, might positively affect language learning, is an area that definitely needs more research. It is believed by the author that the vocational learning contexts embellish some crucial overarching aims of CLIL which can only merely be touched upon in more traditional language learning environments. Following this hypothesis, however, falls out of the scope of

this study. Below, some of the activities in the classrooms mentioned by the study preparatory branch teachers follow:

LT3: This school has been very much into subject specific writing. We have had numerous projects on subject specific writing. Because, when the students come from intermediate, this is fairly unknown territory. “Immerse them in language”. That’s often what you keep thinking as a language teacher, right? How can you teach language, teach subject content, when you don’t live in that particular country? Therefore, I think it comes very natural to use the language as much as possible, but with some contents: you must teach them something, because then I believe they remember and learn the language better; it gets more interesting. Sometimes, however, you need to conduct the meta-language level, where they learn about the language itself. One need to teach expressions, some grammar is important in order to understand the underlying structure of the language. I think CLIL is an interesting approach, and I still think that it is an interesting approach, because it is what I do in the elective English courses. Those students are so linguistically competent that they are capable of discussing advanced problems in English.

CT1: We decided to combine three subjects. These were English, Geography and Natural Science. Next time we did it, we combined English, Technology and Research and Natural Science. These were larger scale projects where the teachers picked competency aims from their own subjects and made an amalgamation by sitting down and discussing how they were going to go about it. The students were to produce something, some kind of a product. In our case, the CLIL-project was about Sustainable Development. The students were asked to make a prototype of an energy-saving device. There was a free choice within the framework, but it was required that the students were able to tell us why this was a good idea: how much one could save, they did some calculations, told us something about that, and in the end, we had a Science Fair where the students had their own stands, exhibited their products for the other class and told them about the prototype they made.

CT2: All lessons are different. And a pedagogic credo is variation, after all. They vary a lot. Sometimes, the students work in groups, sometimes there is project work, we have discussion classes, we work with tasks, we search the internet for information, in other words; in the same way as any other History class. In general, I introduce topics

with a lecture of 20 minutes up to one hour. Then we work for maybe six to eight lessons with reflecting on and utilizing the materials. The students work in different ways, of course.

In the study-preparatory branch, the activities in the classroom illustrates what happens in the already content-heavy English Elective courses of the second and third years, a cross-curricular project conducted partly in English and in the bilingual History-course conducted solely in English. LT3 emphasizes training students in academic writing and critical thinking skills as the main domains of her classes, without really going into depth on what kinds of activities are actually performed in the classroom. CT3 reports on the cooperation between different subject specialists to form the objectives for the cross-curricular project. Indeed, this project's scope of activities can be said to encourage the learners to transmit knowledge across subject boundaries, producing items and conducting activities which are tangible and adaptable with post-secondary professional projects such as engineering or with marketing an idea. Moreover, this cross-curricular project was conducted in English, and the language was evaluated by a language expert. The CLIL-project integrated subject specialists from all the subjects involved. It is not known to the author how the materials were utilized to facilitate the integration. However, the practical nature of Natural Science, and to some extent Geography, could be said to be a factor that make these cross-curricular projects somewhat subject-specific. Said differently, similar projects in for instance Math, History or Social Science would provide more theoretical contents and are perhaps not as applicable as Natural Science to "carry the load" of the project and to make it practical utilitarian for the students. Even though such a project would certainly be beneficial to those theory-heavy subjects, it is likely that CLIL in theoretical subjects in general would support itself more on methodologies that enhance those subjects' international applications; global relevance, perspective and language enrichment, as can be seen in CT2's long-term bilingual class. It should also be mentioned that CLIL-projects necessarily will mean a short-term, or modular CLIL, while World History in English would imply extensive use of English as the medium of instruction in a longer term perspective. From the language point of view, one could always pose the question of which variety contributes the most to enhancing the level of English exposure, English usage, and ultimately, English mastery with the students.

#### 4.2.2.8 Subject Specific Issues

Related to the previous section, some informants commented explicitly on positive and negative aspects that became evident when crossing a subject discipline with the English language. In other words, how naturally compatible certain subjects at upper secondary are with the English subject. What these responses might serve to illustrate, is how subject disciplines differ greatly in terms of content at upper secondary level, and how these contents may or may not easily be adaptable to a foreign language with linguistic categories ultimately stemming from another language culture. To illustrate this, the theory of a given subject may on the one hand be easily adaptable to English, even advantageous, if one chooses universalizing or broadening the contents to make them compatible with the FL. CT2 provides an example of this. When using the English language to teach World History, he experienced more authenticity and a broader perspective on his content subject, History. If one chooses to go more into content detail by narrowing the contents down to the theory of a Norwegian-specific vocational subject, integration with a foreign language might on the other hand pose difficulties. This can be seen when the subject of Norwegian building customs (which vocabulary and jargon is not even unison in Norwegian) meets the English subject.

LT1: Preliminarily, I think that it is good if the students can tell someone a little about their job and describe the course of their educational path in English. However, to expect that they shall learn all of this subject-specific jargon within building and construction, which I do not even know in Norwegian? To me, a plank is a plank, but they can be called so many different things. I do not think it is too important that they shall be able to talk too much about that. Another issue is that in Stavanger, the jargon is different from for instance Oslo. This makes it truly hard for me. For instance, I have to learn the words in the Stavanger dialect, as well as in “bokmål” [standard Norwegian written language] before I myself can even learn them in English. This is because the students have their own jargon, the books have another one.

CT2: When dealing with the subject of History, it was fairly easy to do this, because it is split in two: Norwegian History and World History. World History is 60 percent of the syllabus. So we did World History in English, and Norwegian History in Norwegian.

These findings relate to the inherent subject-specific factors that may determine which subjects one would find appropriate to teach integrated with a foreign or second

language. It seems to be the case that for these two subjects mentioned by LT1 and CT2, Building and Construction and History, subject-specifics and inherent adaptability or non-adaptability to a large extent determines how easily it is taught in integration. Whereas History was taught in English by CT2 due to convenience-purposes, LT1 makes the evaluation that Norwegian traditional within Building and Construction does not necessarily overlap nicely with English terminology, which she mentions later on, is partly because the building standards and traditions of English-speaking countries are different from that of Norway. Conclusively, whereas it is true that general subjects on vocational programs might gain authenticity and relevance by integrating other contents into language teaching, integrating a foreign or second language into the vocational contents in Norway may not always serve an authenticity-purpose at all, and might therefore be a much more complex task, which for certain disciplines might lack a sense of purpose totally. From the perspective of other vocational programs however, this sense of purpose might prove entirely different. Academic contexts would arguably find more natural matches with English supplying terminology and linguistic frameworks to conduct English-mediated courses successfully in more topics. However, this needs confirmation.

#### *4.2.2.9 Learners: High Performers*

In the next sections, issues concerning different learners will be mapped out. In addition to subjects' significances, learner significance was found as a crucial factor when discussing content and language integration. Five out of six informants commented explicitly on the high performers. Why the CT1 did not comment explicitly on "high performers" and CT2 preferred to use the term "ambitious students" might be related to the types of schools we are dealing with and their types of learners. For many schools and teachers alike, "low performers" equates "non-motivated students" and the informants' view on this matter will be shown in the category of *Motivation and Learner Attitudes* in section 4.2.2.11. As Norwegian schooling is presumed to be egalitarian, and CLIL has been found criticized for being selective (Bruton 2013), a closer elaboration on the constellations of different learners on the various programs is thought to serve the scope of the present study in a good way.

LT1: The high performing students are OK with anything. The high performing students can be challenged to a larger extent. That is, if the instruction is not



vocationally adapted. If I adapt to their future vocations, everything is on a lower level, both for them and me.

LT2: I think that CLIL is beneficial for both high and low performers. I believe that students who both have a high linguistic competence and high competence subject-wise, still will have something to aim for.

LCT1: One advantage is that vocational adaption, with that kind of content, is something that neither the low performers, nor the high performers, necessarily know in advance. The high performers also need to acquire new vocabulary, they also need to engage with the task of expanding what they already know.

The vocational branch LTs are rather unison on how they perceive content and language integration, be it CLIL or VOLL, and its ability to democratize the contents of the language classroom so that traditionally high performers' "monopoly" on classroom discourse and interaction can be challenged by the low performers, as highlighted by LCT1 and LT2. This idea, however, depends on several factors, and is said to be nuanced differently. One main factor is how the terms "high" and "low" performers, can vary according to motivation (see section 4.2.2.10). Another relates to how one can be a higher performer in the practical parts of for instance Building and Construction might be a lower performer linguistically, and *vice-versa*. L1's prefaces how the gap between learners in content-adapted English classes may lower the general level of instruction, both linguistically and in terms of contents. Elaborations from the study preparatory branch are presented in the following:

LT3: We have very bright students here; most of them are very proficient English speakers. A lot of grammar and traditional language work is simply too boring for these students. They need challenges.

CT2: The point is, when the students themselves chose to have the History lessons in English, one might ask which students chose this? And it was of course the stronger students and the ambitious students; students who know that they might study abroad, see the usefulness of improving their English, simply. Many found it a bit "cool".

On the academic branch, LT3 prefaces that her upper secondary-students are on such a high level linguistically, that explicit language instruction is considered more or less superfluous. In such a context, the need for blending other contents into the subject, becomes imminent. This is what happens in the content-heavy English Elective courses previously

mentioned. CT2 on high performing students, reports that the enrollment in his classes happened on the premises of the students' perceived level in the subject of History and whether the students felt that their interest for the subject to a large enough extent allowed them to choose to have it in English. Therefore, the class generally became a stronger class, both in terms of level and in terms of motivation, compared to the History class with Norwegian instruction. This may serve to illustrate that the aspect of voluntarism might enhance elitism and increased difference of levels between classes. For the participants of this particular class, however, the issue was reported as a positive factor for the class internally, enhancing motivation and providing a very positive learning-pressure.

#### *4.2.2.10 Learners: Low Performers*

These are the findings that show to which extent the informants commented explicitly on low performing students and what content and language integration might imply for these learners. The findings point in two main directions. Low performers in vocational schools might either find the integration of vocational subjects in the English class motivating and fun (more of this under *Motivation and Learner Attitudes*, section 4.2.2.11), or the vocational adaption might further hinder their performance in the English class if the vocational subject contents are either already demanding for them, or if their English proficiency in general is too low. Lowering the general level of both language and content was found as a necessary remedy in some situations. Also, students who were high-performing in their vocations might still struggle if the class was adapted. A similar tendency was found in the study preparatory branch, where high performing students in Mathematics, Science or Social Science (generally considered "strong students") could be found linguistically disadvantaged if the language of instruction was English rather than Norwegian.

LT1: My experience is that the lower-performing students are exactly the ones who struggle the most with the vocational adaption. Because, this [vocational adaption] only increases the number of new things they need to keep in mind. Learning new words by heart is what they find difficult. These students find it easier to tell me about Native Americans than to tell me how to erect a timber wall that is meant to carry the load of the house. Somehow, they already possess the vocabulary to say something about the Native Americans, yet regardless of them being very proficient at erecting

this carrying timber wall, they struggle with the sheer scope of new words in an entirely different language.

LT2: For the lower performing students, the concerns mostly have to do with motivation and the sense of mastering something. I believe that they are provided with an opportunity to both get engaged with the content and also to show me what they can do, because they know the subject content, and that knowledge will help them produce English utterances.

LCT1: Low performers can more easily talk about their own experiences. If they get to explain how they welded or constructed a go-kart, how they veer a lamp, assemble a water pump or whatever it might be that they are doing, it is easier to get them engaged, and sufficiently motivated for daring to throw themselves in.

LT1 prefaces that low performers in general might severely be hindered by integrating their subject contents in the English subject. She also finds her experiences empirical evidence that contradicts the notion of such an integration benefiting the poorly motivated (or low-performing) students. In her view, vocational adaption might lead to students to fail coping, when traditional contents from the English-speaking world in comparison would actually help them. For her, vocational contents do not necessarily function as a good scaffold for the students. LT2 and LCT1, on the other hand, strongly emphasize that vocational adaption leads to increased motivation for learning English due to increased relevance of the contents, which leads to increased sense of mastering and engagement with both the subject content and the language, and, most importantly, does away with some students' language anxiety. LT1 also mentions that "some students find a certain motivation in being able to explain things to me" in another reply. Yet, in this study, the main findings point in two inconceivably different directions. The practice of integrating vocational subjects into English might be said to be a complex task that can might work as a spring-board for some students and a fall-pit for others. Whether this relates to the different learners themselves, the teachers, or the materials and approaches being used, is believed to be an important question. On the issue of low performers, the replies from the study preparatory branch follow below:

LT3: You might have a politically active and impassioned student in Social Studies who is not a very proficient English speaker, but very elaborate in his native-tongue. As a teacher, one has to pay attention to these different kinds of learners, so that the students do not lose their grade, and lose their motivation in both subjects.

CT1: It depends on how you structure the materials. Low performing students are not necessarily weak students after all, subject-wise. Sometimes, it's just a matter of engaging them.

CT2: Some students had a higher threshold for daring to perform orally. This was due to the fact that other students again had a very high English proficiency. Some of these were native-speakers of English; Americans, Englishmen, Australians, or they had attended English language schools earlier and felt very safe. Other students again were very good at speaking, by all means, but they still felt somewhat inferior, and this resulted in lesser oral activity amongst these. This might have been minor hampering to spontaneous communication and the amount of spontaneous discussions that arose in this class compared to the Norwegian History class.

The study preparatory teachers report from the language point of view that some students do not have an “aptitude for languages” and will not benefit from having instruction in content-wise complex subjects at upper secondary levels. CT1 views the term of high- and low performers as relative terms that can be altered by teachers through how the materials are furnished. In her case, there is no such thing as a static or notorious low performer. Moreover, she reports that certain students find English “cool” and a sufficient means of paying more attention to otherwise boring or laborious teaching in the native tongue. The notion of “cool” or “different” has also been mentioned by CT2, who moreover shows us that conducting subjects in English with one or more native-speakers might decrease the frequency of which Norwegian learners dared to “throw themselves in” orally. Moreover, CT2 in fact reported further what he observed that in the History class, some spontaneous interaction between teacher-students and between students might have been hindered due to the medium of instruction, increasing the amount of Teacher Talking Time at the expense of Student Talking Time, a finding that has been both confirmed and contradicted in CLIL discourse-studies (Dalton-Puffer, 2010).

#### *4.2.2.11 Motivation and Learner Attitudes*

Following the items above, a section on learners' attitudes and motivation is shown. This also follows from the literature and Dieter Wolff's (2007) hypothesis that Content and Language Integrated Learning helps “bridging the gap between school and real life,” thus having the

ability of motivating students thoroughly through integrating more relevant contents into the language learning.

LT1: I can see the benefits with traditional CLIL, if vocational teachers were able to occasionally employ some English in their classes. For instance: “Hey, did you know that *HMS* [Helse, Miljø og Sikkerhet; Health, Security and Environment] is called *HSE* in English?” They could talk about building customs and traditions in foreign countries that would incorporate something from their students’ programs, such as building brick houses in England. I believe that they find vocational adaptation more labor-demanding rather than something motivating.

LT2: When it comes to vocational adaptation I see great advantages when it comes to motivation. That you take the vocational students seriously. Throughout their schooling, they have experienced lacking recognition for their way of learning. The issue is very much about their way of learning. The English teacher enters the kind of teacher role which is relevant for their vocation. It’s almost like a master – apprentice model; you walk around together, you work together, you talk together about what the students are actually doing in their vocation. It is much less teacher-centered. Many of the experiences come from them, which I think is very positive, and which gives them another role than in traditional English classes. This is because they are the content-specialists. I am not. Motivation for learning and motivation for increasing the English subject’s status and show them that it is useful for them. This is tremendously important.

LCT1: There is an incredible motivation within the Oil Industry in Stavanger, Rogaland and in the western parts of Norway in general. When it comes to TIP, a great deal comes for free because many of the students have set their minds on working with oil production and oil-related industry. The fact that there is a sense of purpose in the foundation: “I will need this in the future, this is important” is of great advantage. You gain a lot for free because the contents are relevant.

LT3: My vocational students used to have *Service og Samferdsel* [Service and Logistics] and *Reiseliv* [Travel Studies]. They were not very motivated always, motivated to learn about literary topics. Many of them were not very fond of reading. I am generalizing now, but on a class basis, it was hard to encourage the students. It felt relevant to insert topics which were connected to their vocations.

LT3 is considered a vocational teacher here because she reports on her experiences in the vocational branch. Increased motivation for vocational students is the main finding here, in particular, motivation for the students who are not particularly “literarily apt”. LT1, however, stresses that subject relevance and authenticity as well as cultural relevance must be given predominance, and that this is best achieved by cooperating with subject specialists. In her view, and as shown in section 4.2.2.10, vocational adaptation does not always translate to increased relevance nor to increased motivation. Thus, LT1 further highlights that the most successful adaptation will probably happen if the subject teachers were the ones who dealt with the specifics of it, and the English teacher could be free to talk more generally about cultural traits, customs and vocationally oriented practices if and when these were found relevant for the students at any given time. All in all, LT1 puts forth cooperation with subject specialists as well as increasing their respect for the English subject domain as solutions to increasing motivation in general.

LT2 thinks that motivation amongst the students comes by attributing predominance to her students’ manner of learning in general; their styles of learning, preferences of learning and their *ways* of learning more generally. She claims that vocational learners throughout their schooling careers have found their learning-styles to be frowned upon by more academically-oriented teachers (a claim that probably holds a fair amount of wisdom) and that vocational adaptation (VOLL) can be viewed as a tool that seeks to finally re-attribute the more practically oriented students with a sense of approval and promotion of their strong sides, learning-wise. She further elaborates that this approval and promotion leads to the students being the masters of the classroom, actually having *them* teaching *her*. As is well-known in general pedagogy, the best way to learn something is to teach it to someone else, and LT2 utilizes the students’ subject knowledge to scaffold her own lacking on the matter, herself providing them with linguistic scaffolding on the way, thus enhancing motivation.

LCT1 withholds that the “outer motivation” of future work in international companies should be viewed as the one large motivational factor and that the motivation for working in an international and professional environment along with added content relevance gives the learners “a lot for free” content-wise, because of this.

LT3, treated here as a vocational informant, comments on the added relevance of integrating vocational contents in the English class. Her view on the matter is interesting, due to the fact that she has not been conducting vocational teaching for many years. Her

background is mostly study preparatory. Therefore, her views on the matter may serve to illustrate how naturally content and language integration actually is, and should be, on vocational programs. This is relevant, as previously mentioned, largely for the less “literarily apt” meaning the ones who struggle to read or access written knowledge. The motivational effect on the students is there, and is an important finding of the present study. In the following, the study preparatory informants elaborate on to which extent content and language integration may enhance students’ attitudes towards learning and their motivation for learning:

CT1: Positive attitudes will not be achieved by forcing the English on the students. The attitude must be that they’re part of something cool. They need to “buy it”; it needs to be something they want to be a part of. A tough situation will be if you have a group where very many students wants to do CLIL, but two or three students who are negative. Those few students can very well ruin a great deal. So, my conclusion is that there needs to be a certain degree of volunteering for it.

CT2: I experienced that the students were more interested in the subject of History. The thought it was neat to read subject literature in another language than their own. They found it fun and cool that the teacher spoke English in the lessons and that they themselves spoke in English in the lessons. They felt different. Like “the chosen ones,” you might say. As previously mentioned, there is a surplus of ambitious students, or high performers. That means that in a class setting, they will pull one another along; they motivate each other. They are ambitious; they want good grades: If Per gets good grades, I need to get that as well, and I have to work in order to get them! So there is some sort of an inner motivation device in such a class.

In terms of attitudes and motivation for learning, CT1 here once again emphasizes the importance of each and every student volunteering for CLIL in order to help them become them sufficiently motivated and create a healthy class environment throughout the time-span of the English-mediated instruction. CT2 mentions more implicit factors that might work as motivating factors such as finding the subject literature more interesting, a certain prestige and coolness (also mentioned by CT1 previously) and students feeling “different”. Yet, with reference to the previously mentioned on the notion of elitism, the categories of feeling like “the chosen ones” and volunteering meaning a surplus of ambitious students compared to other classes, one could always pose the question of how wanted or relevant for the

Norwegian Unified Schooling system an additional student-dividing factor like CLIL will actually be. Similarly, one can argue that the increased interest for the subject due to the “coolness” of the English language and feeling different doing it, are factors related to the novelty of the practices, at least in CT2's case where the bilingual projects only ran for a limited number of years. More widespread practice of bilingual classes, or even entire programs, would probably sadly do away with these positive and motivational factors amongst the students. This notion is also supported by CT1, who, as mentioned in section 4.2.1.3 claims that CLIL-projects need to be a variation for the students for its novelty to impact the students' attitudes, not an entire class for an entire school-year.

#### *4.2.2.12 Other Perceived Learning Advantages*

In this section, other learning advantages with CLIL will be presented. Three out of six informants attributed positive factors other than increased motivation as an important element of cross-curricular class-structures and content/language integration. However, it should be mentioned that besides the factors mentioned here, the informants were less elaborate when it came to the didactic reflection on issues concerning content and language integration itself and the various learning possibilities that theoretically might arise from such an educational approach. The teachers were mostly concerned with how the integration benefited either of the main subjects taught, and were not too explicit on the factors which might be attributed to the “synergy” (CILT 2011) between the two subjects.

LT2: For the vocational subjects, this [the vocational adaption] means that English works as a kind of a repetition where the students get a chance to deep-dive, or I wouldn't say “deep-dive”, but they get the chance to do it over again, repeat it, work more with their subject, in English.

LCT1: The advantage is that the students become more engaged with the language of English without intending to; that they engage themselves more because the content is about what they are doing in their production. In terms of language learning, it is more of an inner origin; they are describing the experiences they themselves have had.

The vocational informants here emphasize two learning-auxiliaries that contributes to better learning in both subject matter and the language achieved by carefully integrating the two. On the one hand, there is LT2, who highlights that the role of the English subject in her



case is to make the students reflect on the vocational subjects; repeat the content knowledge they have acquired through theoretical and practical work, and learn terms, jargon, phrases and language structures in English by doing this. LCT1, on the other, positions language in the center and prefaces the content knowledge as a mere scaffold-contributor that encourages implicit language use and structures from dealing with the subject contents. He also highlights that engaging the students is easier due to them talking about something practical that they have done or experienced, and that for these learners, moving over from practical work to the theory through describing what they have done, is more motivational, and thus beneficial, for his learners.

CT2: Many students came up to me and said that they learned more English in the History lessons than in the English lesson. This is because it comes by itself, in a way. Learning the subject of English comes through working in English. All oral activity is in English. Everything written or read was in English. So they used the language. And this is the practice from which one learns most language. Prerequisites are of course some basic knowledge of the language to build on. And all of the students had that.

CT2 here mentions the positive implications of learning a language through purposeful use over an extended period of time, a goal that is also explicitly stated by the entire specter of contributors to the body of communicative language learning theory. In other words, natural language use, writing for a purpose, utilizing the foreign language to talk about something tangible and thus endorsing language acquisition, knowledge of language usage domains and language functions can be achieved through the English-mediated content classroom. However, there are reservations. First and foremost, the students need to have the basic language. For very many learners, these basic steps are done in primary and lower secondary school. Content and language integration in these settings falls out of the scope of this study, but can be mentioned briefly as both possible and potentially fruitful endeavors (Gjendemsjø 2013). Given that this has been fulfilled, as English can be said to be a second language in Norway and given Norwegians' generally good reputation as proficient speakers, moving over to more content integration in the English subject (as done in vocational schools) or integrating English into content classrooms (as done on study preparatory) can both be said to be good ways of achieving increased English acquisition. Yet, this leaves two issues unanswered: Firstly, as has been alluded to earlier, increased English-mediated instruction will necessarily happen on the cost of the native language in all cases. Moreover, the role of the English subject as a builder of cultural competence and knowledge of the English-

speaking world might have to face an identity-crisis with the following possible questions arising: Will the competence and the knowledge in the English subject be considered vitally important for the position of the English subject as we know it, to what extent might these competences and knowledge domains be integrated into for instance English-mediated Social Sciences, what will be the role of the language classroom on upper secondary, and what kind of challenges and changes might be imposed on Teacher Training, language teachers, and, finally, the students, as a result of posing these questions? In other words, with what kind of content knowledge should the language subjects be filled and what should be the overarching aim of language training in state schools of the modern era?

#### *4.2.2.13 Vocabulary Teaching*

One inevitable consequence of conducting subject matter teaching in a second or foreign language, entails vocabulary learning. The importance of increased focus on vocabulary and the need to transmit this explicitly to the students, can be said to be an important ingredient of the practice, mentioned explicitly by four out of six teachers. The category relates to the need of teachers self-training as well as briefly reporting on the urgency of learning and teaching the relevant subject vocabulary and the enrichment measure this might provide for student communication and for English proficiency within vocational and academic contexts.

LT1: If the students lack vocabulary, it [the vocational adaption] will not work. You need to make sure that they have the necessary vocabulary on beforehand. However, when dealing with acquiring new vocabulary, I think one have to use this vocabulary a lot in order to learn it properly.

LCT1: No matter what you do, you need to be able to get the students talking about the experiences they have from the workshop. So the challenges are connected to vocabulary, but within these words, there is also a good deal of general English language that you need in order to describe what it is that you are doing. There are subtle sentences and language constructions that are concerned with past/presence for instance. When students are writing, they need to determine which adjectives and prepositions they need in order to describe what they want to say.

In light of these statements, for language teachers to introduce new vocabulary from hitherto unknown language domains, dealing with vocabulary acquisition amongst the

students might become a larger time-consumer than it has traditionally been in upper secondary language classrooms; a time-consumer probably outperformed only by the glossary-tests from early primary school. This goes for teaching of both new content words (direct vocabulary teaching) and for function words and markers (indirect vocabulary teaching). The extra-ordinary focus on acquiring new vocabulary, is also seen as an issue on the study preparatory branch:

LT3: Being a language teacher myself, that [vocabulary] is the area where I gain something as an English teacher. This is where the students develop great proficiency, for instance about pollution and climate-changes in the world: They have a tremendous vocabulary on these matters in English. They are able to express themselves.

CT1: Norwegians in general are very proficient in general English, in comparison to many other countries. In Germany and Italy, for instance, the English is poorer. Norwegians, however, lack subject specific terminology. They simply don't have it. I find it strange that subject specialists from other fields are not admitted [into the English subject]. If this had be done, the students would have talked and written completely differently.

The study preparatory language teacher LT3 urges that the CLIL-project provided her students with a great vocabulary for discussing the topic of the project using the English language. Discussions and debates where students are able to express their views using the correct terms to the domain they are discussing, is seen as the outcome of the project that she as a language teacher benefits the most from. CT1, on the other hand, prefaces that it is necessarily the content teachers who are in the position of actually providing the students with relevant and thoroughly vocabulary. Thus, in a scenario of more English-mediated courses, it should be the content teachers who deal with vocabulary learning and, in many cases, with subject-specific writing within subject-specific language domains. That this translates to more language-focus from content teachers and a less prominent role of language teachers, is believed to be a basic characteristic of CLIL, traditionally. However, as argued in section 1.7, it might not always be a guarantee for success.

#### 4.2.2.14 *The Communicative Aspect*

Given that CLIL has sprung out of the traditions of second language acquisition theory (Dalton-Puffer, 2010, Marsh and Wolff, 2007), incidental language learning (Hellekjær 2005) and communicative language usage (Bruton 2013), the question was posed to the informants how CLIL might benefit the communicative classroom. The results are shown in the following. To repeat, the communicative classroom is based to a large extent on spontaneous language use, a communicative purpose, lesser focus on the structure of the language itself and more focus on how the tasks and activities will inductively encourage the learners to use the language more freely and effortlessly. Note that CT2 partially replied to this question in section 4.2.2.10 where he reported that some spontaneous oral communication was lacking due to the language of instruction being English instead of Norwegian. His reply is not represented in the following. Also note that content teachers were not necessarily as familiar with the term *communicative*, and reported merely on student oral activity in general. Their replies on the matter will therefore not be shown explicitly.

LT1: CLIL is a great tool for communicative situations. It is a strategy for providing them something tangible to talk about. And also, it is something that they are supposed to know a great deal about on beforehand.

LT2: In terms of VOLL, you as a teacher enter a social context which is already familiar to the students. Talking about a subject content which is familiar to them, makes it easier to make them cooperate, it simply invites them to cooperation. This is due to them physically being in a landscape which they know well, in which they feel comfortable, and that is what, I think, makes it easier for them to act together, both orally and in writing.

LCT1: What happens when we are writing logs during the initial 20 minutes of each English session, is that the entire class gets interested in what is the English word for roller bearing, what is the name of a steering rod, what is the English term for a V-joint? This engages the students.

Content and language integration is highlighted by all the vocational informants as a great tool for encouraging communicative situations, e.g. using the language for a communicative purpose. LT1 put forth the reservation however, that this can only be achieved with the students who are highly interested in their vocational subjects on beforehand, and who has a motivation and acceptance for working with their experiences using English as a

tool to do so. LT2 endorses the familiar learning situation for the students possibly working as an encouraging factor to a communicative purpose, and thus, increased communication in the classroom. LCT1 is on the same page, but puts it in other words and provides an anecdote from a typical classroom-situation. Below follows the study-preparatory LT3's view on the matter:

LT3: It should be communicative. It is all about making the students use the language as much as possible in the classroom. That is what I do as a teacher, and all the activities I plan, should encourage language use. Especially oral communication. One is required to communicate something, and with the objectives and aims imposed by the curriculum, one should elaborate and discuss.

The language teacher from study preparatory comments on the role of the English teacher as a critical skills and discourse-competence builder. Inasmuch as these skills are strongly imposed on English teachers by the curriculum, they are easily transferable to all parts of the curricula. Real language use by the students (increasing STT on the cost of TTT and developing oral proficiency) can be said to be one of the main goals for the communicative classroom. Yet, using the language requires users to talk about *something*. This *something* is, according to LT3 in another response, the one aspect of CLIL (the content-part) which for a traditional English teacher always will pose a challenge. Developing critical skills and subject-specific discourse with students can thus be said to rely on contents more than anything else. However, saying that upper secondary language-classrooms are inherently lacking in relevant content, is an exaggeration of the issue. This will also be shown in the last sections, which deals with teacher attitudes.

#### 4.2.3 Assessment Practices in CLIL

When discussing the possibilities for CLIL in Norway, one cannot omit touching on the relevance of content and language integration in relation to the Curricula, objectives and aims and the way one would assess students in these classes. The reader should note that in the present study, the curriculum in focus is mostly the English Subject Curriculum. As English teachers are mostly the ones conducting CLIL-modalities at vocational upper secondary schools, it then becomes crucial that these teachers are able to find curricular justification for these practices if it is to occur successfully. On the content-side, using the English language would be justified by referring to more over-arching international adaptability and future

studies-arguments for conducting this teaching. Three out of six teachers are positive about how the curriculum encourages either VOLL or CLIL. One informant argues that total vocational adaption is more or less easy to execute depending on the nature of the subjects. In study-preparatory, the Language Teacher makes the point that the Elective English courses are already very content-heavy, and one Content Teacher prefaces a problem with the lack of English competency aims completion when they jointly conducted a cross-curricular CLIL-project.

#### 4.2.3.1 Objectives and Aims: Curricular Justification

Below follow the vocational informants' views on curricular justification which might serve to illustrate how the practice of vocational adaption can or cannot be grounded in the current English subject curriculum.

LT1: It [the curriculum] is very open for personal interpretation and the choice of methods is not specified.

LT2: The subject curriculum perfectly maps with the CLIL approach. The question arises then, will the teachers be able to conduct this business alongside with everything else the curriculum requires them to do? And this goes beyond vocational adaption. Students on study preparatory programs should have English instruction which is academically adapted, so to speak.

LCT1: Some of the competency aims, you simply cannot adapt, and you need to employ more traditional strategies. In *Design og Håndverk* [Design and Craftsmanship] you can make clothing related to for instance Native peoples, and thus connect the two, while with TIP [Technical and Industrial Production], this is harder.

It should be noted that when the vocational informants refer "to the curriculum," they mean the English subject curriculum, which translates to the General English course, which is common for vocational and study preparatory programs. This curriculum does not explicitly mention methodology, nor does it mention in great detail what kinds of materials is to be covered. The competency aims are more general, topic-oriented and indeed leaves it up to the teacher how to achieve them, whilst the exam-format and contents are fairly standardized inasmuch as contents and aims goes. The different competency aims in the general English subject consists of, as mentioned before, seven aims that explicitly instructs teachers to adapt

the subject to the students' program. The remaining 20 aims may be adapted, but as seen previously, the actual amount of this adaptation might vary between different school types and from teacher to teacher. If, then, the goal is to adapt the entire scope of English competency aims to the students' programs, some of the aims might be hard to adapt within any given program. Thus, once again, there are subject-specific issues which makes generalizations impossible. LCT1's example of integrating Native Peoples into Technical and Industrial Production illustrates this difficulty quite well. In other words, total vocational adaptation in total coordination with the current English curriculum is in theory impossible. This leaves the vocational English teachers with no choice but to teach some more traditional contents, like cultural aspects of the English subject as well. In many ways, one can argue that the English curriculum on vocational schools is not perfectly clear on what is going to happen in the students' English classes. No doubt is implied, however, on that vocational teachers must indeed be both creative and hardworking when conducting vocational English-teaching.

LT3: Throughout the curriculum, it is emphasized, at least on the first year of secondary that the students are to gain knowledge of the English-speaking world and society, be able to discuss societal problems, social conditions and of course, culture. So we have an expectation that they are supposed to have some knowledge on this field. To me, these kinds of topics are indeed geared towards the content-side. In the English Elective courses, there is a clear expectation. English in the Social Sciences, relies heavily on the contents. It has History, political institutions, being able to elaborate and discuss topics... There is just vast amounts of material that make out the syllabus in this subject: So much to go through. At least with the Knowledge Promotion Curriculum. The [CLIL-] project was conducted on the first year, in the general subjects. Only communicative objectives were embedded from the English subject's point of view. Everything that related to contents, culture, society, and so on, I could not integrate in the project. At least not with the first year objectives and aims. If the Elective English courses were part of the CLIL-project, it would have been easier to integrate more competency aims. More content aims. Because, with the CLIL-project, English as a tool was the only role of the English subject.

CT1: In Natural Science, there is not a word about English. The specific basic skills are there, but the language is not specified. No English competency aims.

CT2: Yes, indeed!

Study preparatory teachers are split in their view of competency aims. A few generalizations can be made. Firstly, the Content-only teachers when answering the question of curricular justification, naturally referred to the curricula that governs their content-subjects. Secondly, what we might gain from reading the above presented, is that both content-teachers admittedly found that their content subjects' aims were covered sufficiently when teaching in English. Here, we need to be aware of the reservations on topics in for instance Natural Science or Religious Instruction that Norwegian syllabi might impose (as seen in section 4.2.2.5). The point is that, given natural topic combinations, proper linguistic level of the materials, and teachers who are interested in conducting their instruction in English, the content subjects' aims can indeed be achieved without any extra-curricular imposes, as highlighted by CT2. On the other hand, there are, according to CT1 no part of for instance the Natural Science curriculum that encourages English instruction in the subject. However, given the right stimulus, there is not much that really hinders content teachers from reaching their competency aims through English-mediated instruction. If this then can be called Content and Language *Integrated Learning*, is another question.

Secondly, the language teacher complained that her role may be reduced to merely dealing with the language and not being neither expected to nor allowed to evaluate the contents. With the level of contents on upper secondary and the sheer scope of getting acquainted with subject specific issues, it is probable that language teachers might perceive this practice as a factor limiting their practice and competence as teachers, reducing their role to a mere instrumental one, looking at language and evaluating language and communication only. Others again would argue that doing this is exactly the language teacher's job. The dispute will have to remain unresolved for the time being.

#### 4.2.3.2 *Content and Language: Findings on Assessment Practices*

Assessment practices in these integrated classes becomes an important entry into exploring various CLIL-practices, because this is where the results of the practice, testing, as well as cooperation between teachers across teaching branches, surfaces. It is also the point where teachers are really required to have formal competency in what they evaluate before grading the students' performance.

LT1: I think I would evaluate both because I am a language teacher. Maybe the History teacher or the vocational teacher would only evaluate content; I do not



evaluate the students' Norwegian language in Social Studies. At the same time, this is about concept formation, so they do need to know various terms. To me as a language teacher, however, I think it is more natural to review the language as well.

LT2: In VOLL, it's all right, because there you evaluate both of them. Because they are required to be able to show that they can connect the two if they are to present, or something similar. We evaluate both content, structure and language in the English class, right?

LCT1: They [the students] are required to write an English report, and they have four oral presentations in the workshop. We're talking about the lathe, which they of course already know what is, they have been dealing with them hands on for seven weeks. When it comes to their written work, students receive comments on such areas like incorrect grammar, spelling errors, construction of sentences; the whole package. All of this relates mostly to the language. When it comes to content, usually I personally try to be that much aware of what I am asking for that I myself can also assess the contents. So for me, those two are not isolated. In TIP, that was never a problem, because I always knew what was going on. In other departments, however, I need some help to evaluate the contents. Normally, however, I feel that it is a part of my job to get involved with this content well enough to assess it. But when it comes to teaching other content than that which I am acquainted with from before, those contents can never be too advanced, in terms of what you are doing as the language teacher. It needs to be a summary; a generalization of what they have been doing. The big fear is the final exam. The exam is the same one that the general branch studies have; the students need to show skills and competence of that kind. They are not prepared for it.

The vocational language teachers all endorse the view that they are all used to and comfortable with evaluating both language, contents and structure. LCT1, as a combined teacher, admits that he needs the subjects' teachers' help to evaluate the contents of other programs than TIP. Yet, he stresses that he sees the need for, but also the possibility for language teachers getting acquainted and engaged with the subject-specific materials from their primary target vocational programs. Though, he adds, these contents often needs to be simplified, somewhat superficial, or sort of a sum-up rather than in-depth elaborations. This also concurs with LT2's statement in section 4.2.2.12, where she endorses the students getting

a chance to rework their content materials, but in another language. Simplified contents were also prefaced by LT1 earlier. Evaluation found in the study preparatory branch is presented below:

LT3: In the CLIL-project, the subject teacher evaluated the contents. The students were engaged with different cross-curricular works. I was English teacher in one of the classes entailed. My job was to look at the language.

CT1: I, who have Natural Science with them, think that the most important thing is for them to learn Natural Science. In the CLIL project, they got a grade in three subjects, one for each. So for me, who did not have the English subject, even though I do speak English, Natural Science was my subject in this situation, and I did not really consider poor English or anything like that when they had their presentations. That was not my thing. I only looked for points about sustainable development and scientific topics. In other words, whether they were able to describe and make an argument within these meanings in order to achieve a good grade.

CT2: I emphasized language to a lesser extent when it came to the English language than with Norwegian. I did not really consider language too much at all. These students all have a high proficiency in both Norwegian and English. So it wasn't really a problem. I evaluated subject content in specific, not language. This was a History lesson.

The matter of evaluation practices for the study preparatory branch may be summed up as such: All content teachers emphasizes that they evaluated contents first and foremost. CT1 did not evaluate language at all, because this was the English teacher's job. CT2 could have evaluated language, but he let it pass because the sheer enrichment-measure of conducting his History class in English was his main objective with this practice. All in all, both content teachers would have been perfectly able to evaluate the language themselves, given their prerequisites, but did not perceive of this as their mandate. The language teacher elaborated on her mandate to look at the language. However one twists and turns these findings, it seems that the CLIL- or bilingual projects on study preparatory are not yet as integrated approaches as that which CLIL actually aims for, language and content-wise. Whatever role the language plays, this is achieved by involving the language-specialist when time comes for evaluation. Yet, this admittedly tentative observation may serves to illustrate an important point as well: Is it reasonable to expect that content teachers will ever find it

their task to somehow integrate more explicit linguistic aims and items in their teaching of content subjects other than simply changing their medium of instruction?

#### 4.2.4 Attitudes towards CLIL

The attitudes of the teachers presented here, were based on their experiences, but are not directly related to how each teacher conducts his or her teaching in particular. Necessarily, the attitudes of the informants were reflected through deeper personal analyzes of the criteria on which teachers view their competence(s) and base their instruction and teaching practices. One cannot deny the impending fact that a teacher with formal and real competence in both the content subject *and* the language subject would be a perfect candidate for conducting content and language integrated learning. However, as this is sometimes, but not near always the case, it follows that a close attention to legitimizing teachers' practices through formal competence, investigate the possibilities for increased teacher cooperation, review the issue of possible content and language combinations, and lastly to channel any concerns about the shortcomings of CLIL on behalf of students, subjects or teachers should be attempted.

As expressed by Drew (2015):

Attitudes have to change; beliefs have to change. Because beliefs of teachers and beliefs of students are very strong in the learning process. So if the teacher believes that this is the way it should be done, that's the way they're going to do it. And often, their beliefs are based on their own experiences. So you continue a sort of status quo, you perpetuate the status quo, and that is not always healthy. In language teaching there are developments all the time, basically. So I think we all need to learn more, but things are happening around Europe and around the world in this context, and I think we just need to familiarize ourselves with the research findings and so on. And to be able to apply them in our context here (Drew 2015: Interview).

Following Drew's reflections on the power of attitudes, the following quotes from the informants illustrate these attitudes amongst a selection of Norwegian teachers. It should be kept in mind that the vocational teachers report on their perceptions of CLIL regardless of their own experience with "CLIL proper." Therefore, the following responses must be viewed as ideal perceptions of CLIL voiced by every single informant.

The subheadings for this last part of the analysis comprise *Teacher Roles and Teacher Significance, Teacher Cooperation, Perceptions on the Issue of Subject Combinations* and *"Detrimental Cost on Behalf of Subjects"* (phrase intentionally borrowed from Bruton, 2013: 587). The following findings are believed by the informants to be essential issues to consider preliminary to an eventual escalation of CLIL practice in Norway.

#### *4.2.4.1 Content and Language Teachers – Teacher Roles and Teacher Significance*

In the following, the informants contemplate on what they perceive as necessary or sufficient teacher prerequisites and on issues connected the role of the teacher, whether the teacher feels comfortable teaching in a foreign language and what factors determine to what extent the teacher is “suited” for the task at hand.

LT1: It is of profound importance that the language teachers actually know the language they are teaching. They need to know it very well. I believe that a vocational teacher who has a generally good command of English, can do extremely well in terms of vocabulary teaching and vocational discourses. I think that CLIL or some modality of it is extremely hard to implement because we do not have enough teachers who are both language teachers and subject teachers.

LCT1: To an English teacher from a traditional upper secondary school, with an academic English education; literature, phonetics, grammar, then supposed to enter a classroom with vocational students, it must be quite a shock. For this, they should be better prepared.

As illustrated by two of the vocational informants, there is a need to increase language teachers' competence on vocational subjects. That this competence-increase should occur before their teaching initiates, in Teacher Training, is highlighted by LCT1. LT1 mostly makes the point that there needs to be time allotted for the language teachers on vocational branches to re-educate themselves. Both findings can also be said to illustrate the issues of self-training and, ideally, that the educational authorities to a larger extent should make amendments to today's practice of educating teachers, both mentioned earlier. All in all, vocational language teachers at vocational schools today are aware of their potential shortcomings, and, it is believed that these issues are possible to deal with. However, as this study has shown tendencies towards, the matters of sufficiently training and preparing both subject-vocational and language-general teachers can both happen more easily if stakeholders agree on what exactly a vocational education should entail. For the study-preparatory branch, the findings are mapped out below. Note that LT2 is treated as a study-preparatory teacher here.

LT2: You need to master the language. I am talking about CLIL in general, not vocational adaption, because there, English teachers are the ones who intercepts and

conduct the CLIL, and they know English, right? If you are to teach Social Science and Natural Science in English, you truly need a teacher who knows the language. Or else, it will be really hard for the teacher to transmit the subject. The teacher needs to know both language and content.

CT1: I believe that teachers who are forced into a CLIL situation, and who do not master the language, will perhaps be a disadvantageous situation for this class. That is due to the fact that the teacher will not be able to stand there and master it, and be her or himself, plainly. You might have some jokes or stories that you tell the students. If you can't be yourself, you will get very disadvantaged. You will end up only sticking to what says in the book or on a sheet. No good teaching and learning will result from this kind of practice.

CT2: The teacher need to feel comfortable with the language. That is a governing condition. Some of the teachers who taught other subjects here, are not particularly English proficient, but they have read and studied their subjects in English. They have command of the language, they might not have a very good pronunciation, but that does not really matter.

Notice that LT2 is treated as a study-preparatory teacher here due to her prerequisites as a Social Science teacher. What can be seen at the study preparatory branch is that the teacher's linguistic proficiency when teaching in English is emphasized in unison by all informants. To contrast, LT2 makes the point that teachers in VOLL already know their language subject very well because VOLL is performed by the language teacher. For content teachers teaching bilingually, mastery in transmitting knowledge in English is viewed as the governing factor for success: Content teachers being able to communicate, feeling comfortable with the language and teachers feeling free to be themselves non-constrained by linguistic factors. Perfect pronunciation is considered less important. These must be considered minimum requirements for success however; success of implementing and sustaining bilingual courses or classes, from the institution's point of view. For integrated approaches more specifically, such as CLIL aims for, content teachers in general can be said to lack the in-depth language prerequisites that CLIL demands of them. The same can be said about language teachers in terms of content knowledge. The imminent solution, then, must be based on teacher cooperation, which will be addressed in the following.

#### *4.2.4.2 Content and Language Teachers – Teacher Cooperation*

Given that language and subject combined qualifications are more rarely found among practicing teachers, increased teacher cooperation is highlighted as one solution to the high competence-demands imposed on CLIL teachers at upper secondary levels. The need for increased cooperation is also found in Marsh and Wolff (2007) and Dalton-Puffer et al. (2010). How this cooperation structurally and organizationally could be executed, falls out of the scope of the present study, yet, the following informant responses show how the teachers view the strengths and weaknesses of increased teacher cooperation.

LT1: It can be hard to cooperate with the vocational teachers, due to time constraints, both in the classroom, to fulfill respective learning aims for each subject, and when planning and assessing. The vocational teachers do not think that their business is to engage in language work. Reading is the kind of thing that we [the language teachers] are doing.

LT2: We also have cooperation with subject teachers, in the same class with both teachers being present. But I am mostly alone. You need a close cooperation with the vocational teachers and that takes time. I cooperate with the vocational teacher in order to find out what the class is up to. Then I make a “mission to learn” with him. It’s almost like a project.

LCT1: At this school, we are organized in teams, and we sit down with the general branch teachers and thus become more acquainted with them, and to a larger extent, a part of that community.

Vocationally, cooperation can be considered a widespread practice, if not a household-practice. Overviews of the students' topics and endeavors in their vocations should govern the course of the adapted general subjects, including English. That the economical and time-allotted factors are here provided administratively in order to execute this cooperation properly, is important here. Yet, the teachers complain the sheer time-demands of this practice. Admittedly, one is obliged to make compromises, when it comes to the time-issue. The amount of cooperation at vocational schools in general is believed to be both widespread and rather systemic. This also has to do with vocational subjects' didactics and the more cooperative learning- and teaching styles found. As was mentioned by LCT1 earlier, there is reason to believe that purely vocational schools might have the most established cooperation between vocational subject teachers and general subject teachers compared to integrated

schools. This, however, needs stronger confirmation. In similar terms, one of the informants from the study preparatory report on cooperation in their CLIL-project below:

CT1: Cooperation between subject teachers helped strengthen the [CLIL-] project. However, what happens at an upper secondary school is that teachers get obsessed with the competency aims in their own subjects. If they cannot find a direct link to a competency aim, they are simply not interested. That was a challenge when it came to the English subject, which was in the CLIL project as well. Because it was actually quite hard for them to see how CLIL in the English subject covered properly the English subject competency aims.

As reported here, cooperation happened mostly in accordance with a project. The statement presented above represents the only statement served to illustrate teacher cooperation at the study preparatory branch found by the present study. In general, what can be seen is that teachers jointly worked on the project, but that their specified roles in terms of objectives might have been a factor that limited the project for some participating subjects. This is reported by a content teacher, particularly on behalf of the English subject, and the issue will be further elaborated on by a language teacher in section 4.2.4.4.

The idea of cooperation is maybe implemented to a larger extent on vocational schools than it is on study-preparatory, once again, predominantly based on the nature of the subjects taught. However, this is only one suggestion to explain the difference in the amount of already established cooperative working-methods, there might be many more. Lack of cooperation on vocational schools might or might not be prominent, as the sample from this study is strictly limited. The extent of cooperation, or lack of cooperation, therefore cannot be generalized to the entire population of study preparatory language and content teachers in Norway, but merely hint about common practice and their adaptability with integrated approaches.

#### *4.2.4.3 Perceptions on the Issue of Subject Combinations*

Dieter Wolff poses in his theoretical paper “CLIL: bridging the gap between school and working life” that the “flexibility of the approach (CLIL) should not be underestimated”. Studies have shown that CLIL’s potential in primary contexts, secondary and tertiary; academic as well as vocational. Yet, the findings from this collective study show that there are bottlenecks also on the issue of possible subject combinations, mostly related to subject-

specific issues. In the following, teachers' prospects replying to the interrogation of possible subject combinations in CLIL are shown. One cannot escape the notion that certain content subjects, or parts of them, within the branches of the Humanist subjects, the Social Sciences and the Hard Sciences all have concurrent curricular aspects with English, or their contents can be utilized as a scaffold for instance vocational language learning. Yet, the curriculum may also put restrictions on the limits of what is actually possible to achieve, as might the above mentioned factors of teacher significance and teacher cooperation.

LT1: In general, it's actually easier to vocationally adapt Social Studies than it is to adapt English, because so many things in the syllabus are shared between the subjects [Building and Construction+ and Social Science]. For instance teaching about different companies within different branches. There are many concurrent aspects there.

LT2: Combining English with other humanist subjects is absolutely possible. History, Social Sciences, probably also Geography. Talking about the international community in the Social Sciences, in English; merely the fact that you are using this other language truly increases your vision from solely focusing on Norway. It will also train the students' critical skills, because they will be using English newspapers on the web and similar resources. English and vocational programs? Definitely. Partly because the English subject in upper secondary for vocational studies points in two different directions. One of the directions point on towards further studies, because it provides them with the general study competence. The other one points towards their profession.

LCT1: Social Studies is favorable, I try to bring some mathematics into the English class, because one of the competency aims instruct teachers to do that. It is very much up to the interest of the particular teacher. But English can be combined with all vocational subjects.

Generalizing the findings from the vocational teachers, Social Studies is perceived as a natural partner of English and a subject which parts and topics easily could be conducted in English. This seems an indisputable quality of English and Social Science, as contents in the English classroom could be defined as similar to, or concurrent with, Social Science. LT1, however, prefaces that Social Science as one of the general subjects, is also vocationally adapted, meaning that its nature of topics are geared more towards a given vocational subject.



However, this discussion is considered more marginal and outside the scope of the present thesis. Due to topical overlap with the traditional English subject, all subjects within the humanities and the vocations in general are considered good candidates to be paired with English instruction and language-learning. Possible subject combinations on study-preparatory are listed as follows:

LT3: Parts of Social Science overlap quite nicely with the English Elective courses on the 2nd year. For cross-curricular projects, you need equal partners. The general subject of Social Studies is a good option here. For the second and third years, I guess one could think somewhat differently. In order not to degrade the English subject to strictly an instrumental subject, it [English] should first and foremost be combined with the humanist subjects.

CT1: I believe that the most natural combinations would be those subjects where the students would experience that as soon as they get admitted to the university, the subjects will be in English. This means that also the students who intend to study in Norway, will have a need for subject terminology. Subjects like Jurisdiction could just as well be kept in Norwegian. Because the laws of Norway are of course in Norwegian. The same goes with Norwegian history.

CT2: There really aren't any that are more advantageous. Whether you are to study Medicine, Engineering or Social Sciences, it is just as useful. For all, I believe.

The study-preparatory informants are somehow split in their views on which courses should be the ones preliminarily offered in English, whilst the potential benefits of offering other courses in English is more evident. While LT3 prefaces that the humanist subjects are equal and preferable candidates to English, CT1 holds the hard sciences (at least parts of them) as good candidates with the argumentation that these subjects' literature on university-level is largely in English and that the intention should be to prepare the students for this. She continues to highlight that certain "Norway-specific" courses (or parts of courses) would seem rather pointless to conduct in English, while CT2 takes a more relaxed standpoint to the issue and generalizes the relevance of increased English-mediated instruction as beneficial for most study-directions.

More generally, what can be seen from this, is that the informants have not completely made up their minds on which subjects (or parts of subjects) that should be meaningfully taught in English if they had to chose. If they possess opinions on the matter, these are mostly

related to their own subject combinations, or to related subjects. On the one hand, one might argue that this is good and perfectly natural, and the author concedes that it is. On the other hand, however, deeper reflections on the purpose of combining content subjects with English-mediated instruction cannot be proved to have occurred amongst all teachers, yet it could indeed be said to be an impending issue for Norwegian learners.

#### 4.2.4.4 “Detrimental Cost on Behalf of Subjects”

The perceived explicit short-comings of CLIL in the Norwegian educational system are shown next. From what is found here, it is evident that some language teachers fear what might happen to their subject’s contents if these are to be “replaced” by CLIL instruction. In addition, content teachers and language teachers alike emphasize what might happen to the development of the *native tongue*; an issue which could be said is “conveniently ignored” (borrowing Bruton’s formulations again) by CLIL promoters in Europe with the counter-argument that learning in one language, facilitates the other.

LT1: History, linguistic development, how English has been spread, Native peoples and topics from the English speaking world; if all English instruction should be vocationally adapted or CLIL, we lose that other aspect. This is something that our students need, at least to an equal extent. In an international world where we travel from place to place, understanding of cultures is of profound importance. This is one of the issues that I am worried about. Due to all the currently promoted pressure on vocational adaption, I am afraid we will lose the all-encompassing education that many of our students really need. They need it much more than other students. They are lacking a lot of it. It is important that they learn how other people think, how they behave, why migration is different in the United States and in England, compared to Norway. Because this constantly relates to our reality. We do not live in a closed world; we live in a world where we eat Chinese food, watch Japanese movies, read American novels, etc. I think that it is so important that they see and get the chance to understand and comprehend that the world is not only the Stavanger-area. My point is, understanding other cultures is the most important aspect here. The professional/vocational approach to learning languages will only function as additional training in learning a language. I hope they will not replace it entirely.

LCT1: My background as the regional leader for FYR [a national forum channeling vocationally-adapted materials for the general subjects] has taught me about the impending dangers of lacking motivation and dropping out of school. English study competence is linked directly to the professional certificate. This means that if you do not have at least an E in English, which translates to study competence, you will not get your professional certificate. I surely do not hope that this will be the situation in the future. I hope that these two matters will be separated politically so that the ones who aim for study competency really get challenged with a lot of English, while the ones who aim for vocational education and jobs, get more English relevant for their profession.

In the category of the eventual negative outcomes of more content and language integration, LT1 emphasizes the following: Vocational students will become lacking in general facts about the larger world and issues that have to do with how people socialize. The traditional English subject implicitly carries this mandate; to educate the students more generally and provide them with cultural competence. Thus, the traditional English subject is doubtlessly perceived as reduced on behalf of vocational English. LCT1, on the other hand, is more concerned with the current twofold role of English in the curriculum, which translates to unclear aims for vocational and study-preparatory competences. According to him, the current model requires too much from the vocational students, and one should work further towards defining where the division between vocational and academic English actually should be, and what this demands from the students and from the teacher. In his case, then, the role of English in vocational programs is seen as a factor hindering students from getting their professional certificate. With this, language teachers on vocational schools are once again torn on the question of more vocational integration, or less.

LT3: My students experienced some “gaps”. They had less literature, less language-specific instruction; they received less of what I consider the English subject. The demand for English proficiency is rising. However, we cannot only teach English. What about the native tongue?

CT1: Personally, I get a little provoked when the Norwegian language is disappearing from the subjects. The focus on language is too vast. That is the opposite of what one reads in the newspaper. With three grades in Norwegian, one grade in a foreign

language and another grade in something that is not referred to as a foreign language anymore, English, these grades add up to a great number.

In the study-preparatory branch, the mutual concern on behalf of both language and content teachers, is directed towards the students' ability to express themselves properly in Norwegian. LT3's concern for losing aspects of the English subject must also be taken into consideration when dealing with these issues. Though it is true that CLIL-classes, as intended, should operate on the side of language-instruction, it is beyond doubt that CLIL-promoters explicitly justify CLIL by referring to poor results achieved by the so-called "traditional English classroom." Unable to make any empirical claim to justify this, except by referring to Marsh and Wolff (2007), the issue of the Norwegian language losing its domain to English, must be regarded as the largest cost that CLIL or similar approaches impose. In addition, too much emphasis on language-mastery in the form of no less than five language grades might be a factor that gravely hampers certain students' preferred admission to university programs. True as it is, this characteristic of Norwegian schooling at upper secondary levels does anything but facilitate *more* language-focus with the content teachers, as CLIL indeed would expect them to.

#### *4.2.5 Interviewees' Personal Prospects on CLIL – Future Prospects*

The last item of the analysis presents teachers' prospects on what might be expected by educational stakeholders in the future. Teachers seem reluctant to predict any sudden or radical changes in their practice. Some structural and organizational factors are highlighted as preconditions for further development of CLIL in Norway.

LT1: I do not think that too much novel will be expected. Maybe that we will have to position ourselves more in an outwards direction. The language teachers are already in this position. We have traveled, we have lived elsewhere. Very many of us have, at least. I hope the demand will be that an English teacher at least has some interest for the subject he or she is to teach. For my own part, in secondary school, I do not think there will be any distinctive change in our practice.

LT2: I do not have a clear answer to this. I do not think that it necessarily will change anything. There will still be an English subject, and there will be other subjects taught in English. In a CLIL setting, grammar and all the linguistic parts of the English

language competence will probably not be the major focal point. The focus will rather be on the content.

LCT1: They [the students] should not need to have the same final exam. I hope the project in which I am involved, will conclude with this. However, this again will mean more knowledge about vocational adaption within the teacher training. I think most English teachers must be expected to teach in both camps.

Didactically, in terms of language-teaching, no distinct change is perceived as likely to happen by the informants, and no crucial finding can be pointed out here. LT2 mentions that in case of CLIL, the language teaching will be more content-driven. LCT1, once again, is more concerned about the exam-format changing to the better for all students. All in all, the vocational language teachers seem quite secure and comfortable with their current practice and methods, not expecting anything essentially novel in particular. The study-preparatory informants' replies are shown below:

LT3: If someone has the idea of implementing more CLIL, I think there is a danger that the English subject, and thus the experts on English language, will have a less prominent role in the subject communities. That is definitely not good for the English training. I think it is very important to maintain the language subjects because that is where the expertise in terms of training our youth towards becoming proficient foreign language users, is found. I could always get a native speaker from Great Britain as a student. He or she is not necessarily very proficient in academic writing in English just like that. They are fluent users of course, but the language is terrible, in terms of level of precision, teenage slang, and so on. In practical, everyday-life they are very much all right, but they are not prepared for the university.

CT1: It needs to be systematized. Right now, it is very *ad hoc*, the whole CLIL-thing. It needs to be something that teacher can relate their work to. Because it was hard to amalgamate across subjects and classes. No one at this stage perceives CLIL as something which is naturally within their subject. It needs to come from the top-down and be implemented in the entire system.

LT3 further extends her concern for the traditional English subject and its teachers. She is concerned that the language-specific focus; training skilled readers, writers and speakers, as well as their critical skills, is disappearing. She exemplifies her concerns with a native-speaker of English in the class. He or she will be linguistically fluent and proficient in

English, yet, she subtly claims, academic skills must be learned. They do not come naturally for most students. This training, if mandated by anyone, is by her thought to belong to the language subjects. LT3 seems reluctant to believe that teaching these skills can simply be transferred to other subjects' specialists and have the same outcome. As a result of her elaboration, LT3 justifies the role of the English subject and English teachers to a great extent. To sum up, there is little evidence that suggests that the English subject as we know it is threatened. Yet, it cannot be denied that English teachers often have to stop and rethink their subject in terms of contents, materials and the over-arching purpose of learning a second language such as English. To conclude, CT1 believes that no teacher – content or language – perceives CLIL as something “naturally within their subjects” the way that it is being implemented today. CLIL-projects are perceived as more or less mandatory for the teachers as well as the students. Therefore, she claims, CLIL in Norway today is kind of anticipating the situation, but more than anything, CLIL needs to be recognized more thoroughly by the educational authorities in order to thrive and spread. Clearly, from what has been presented in this chapter, content and language integrated approaches must be executed firmly, consistently and systematically in order for clear empirical benefits to surface in a Norwegian research-context.

## Chapter 5 Conclusion

The present study has attempted to present Norwegian upper secondary teachers' experiences with and attitudes towards content and language integrated approaches to learning and teaching. The main finding is that, contrary to what one would assume, content and language integration in Norway is found more widespread and systemic in vocational schools than it is in academic contexts. Moreover, it was found that all kinds of content and language integrated approaches necessarily demanded (or encouraged) more cross-curricular cooperation, especially when planning and assessing. Nonetheless, increased cooperation was perceived as a time-consuming, but rewarding endeavor. Teacher competence was highlighted as an important constituent to successful CLIL practice. For content teachers, knowing the language well enough in order to subsequently teach well in that language was highlighted as the main factor for success, while for language teachers, self-training and increasing ones awareness and knowledge of other subject areas was believed necessary, although not always sufficient, for successful integration. Issues concerning teaching materials were highlighted as more or less problematic by five out of six informants.

Content and language integration in Norwegian upper secondary schools can mainly be said to happen in two different ways: Firstly, in the content classroom, and secondly, in the language classroom. Content teachers may teach their subjects in English; using English as the medium of instruction. This is what CLIL normally is oriented around. In addition, vocational schools could be said to use CLIL as a language teaching methodology. For content teachers, in order to integrate content with language, usually a language specialist was called in to assess the students' language, either after a designated period of time, or continuously throughout the project. Some content teachers, in CLIL-modalities that are not in the format of a cross-curricular project, might teach bilingually throughout the course, with the objective being subconscious language acquisition, motivation and relevance, a sense of prestige and implicit language-enrichment measure (Dalton-Puffer 2010). These aims can be said to be common for all CLIL-endeavors done either in the content-subjects or cross-curricularly in this study. Said differently, in both study preparatory cases reported, content teachers' approaches to CLIL were primarily content-driven with a more overarching focus on the language. For vocational schools, content and language integration happen in the language classroom, as subject teachers may be reluctant to teach their subject disciplines in English.

Following up the students' agendas in their target subjects and engaging with them in projects, workshops, and through contemplating subject matter in the English class, were some of the ways that language teachers sought to answer the demands of integrating other contents into their language-teaching. While conducting this practice, language teachers were found naturally prone to the integration of the contents and language, as such integration practices to a large extent is what they normally do in the English classroom with much more superficial contents. However, in most cases, the subject contents in vocational adaption necessarily needed to be simplified.

It might be argued that the foreign language provides the platform from which integration of content teaching with language teaching takes off. Applied Linguist and Teacher Trainer Ion Drew at the University of Stavanger concedes: "Primarily, I think CLIL is a language-issue. And it is something where the starting-point is the foreign language" (Drew 2015: Interview). CLIL as an example of curricular integration which encompasses many aspects of traditional English bilingual education, but that also emphasizes explicit language learning (Llinares 2012) has spread across areas of the EU. Though the reasons for teaching and learning content subjects such as Science or History through another language are many, one of them have been emphasized again and again by teachers, learners and stakeholders: Due to the demands of globalization and internationalization, English second language teaching as it is traditionally considered has, given the demands of our time, become more or less obsolete.

Generally on the one hand, there is an issue concerned with to which extent all subjects' and vocational disciplines' areas and topics have a one-to-one mutual intelligibility with being taught using English as the medium of instruction. The main issues mentioned here, are purpose and relevance for teaching in English. If English falls short of being meaningful in its essence for a subject or a topic, student motivation and participation will decrease. In addition, relevant subject literature in English might be difficult to obtain. In other words, vocational adaption might not always benefit from vocationally adapting the entire English curriculum, while in academic contexts on the other hand, CLIL is often restricted to suiting topics, cross-curricular projects and international relevance. On the other hand, topics taught in English could significantly raise student motivation. For the study preparatory contexts, using English-mediated instruction could raise the level of prestige of the content subject being taught. For certain students, it was reported that CLIL even contributed to them learning more English than in the regular ESL-classroom. In vocational



contexts, vocational adaption more contributed to making the *language* more interesting and relevant, thus working the other way around. In both academic and vocational contexts, however, there is no doubt that the integrated approaches essentially serve to improve the students' general English proficiency, while it is the content goals which remain unaltered. Therefore, language can be said to constitute the variable and the essence of what CLIL is, at least in the Norwegian context. All teachers in this study partially or fully agree that the language enrichment-measure in CLIL is present.

One could argue that English as a language subject in Norway has already mostly been done away with, due to the reduction to the one-year General English course as the only formal requirement one needs for continuing ones academic or professional career (Hellekjær 2005). Elective English courses such as International English, English in the Social Sciences or English Literature may be chosen in addition, singularly or together, but are often not prioritized due to the admission demands in terms of more sciences and other content subjects posed by higher educational institutions (Hellekjær 2005). This means, then, that learning English as a skill, used for an instrumental purpose, is now what is *ad hoc*, and that English teaching and learning now is promoted by other subject disciplines than the language discipline itself in upper secondary education. To this, there are numerous implications:

Firstly, concerning the teachers who are to execute parts of the students' English training, namely what is referred to as content teachers: For a content teacher to teach successfully, completely or partially in English, these teachers need not only a relatively high degree of English proficiency, but also, necessarily, a feeling of comfort while teaching in English and a will and motivation to do so (Paulsen 2011). Even though the relevance of teaching content subjects like Science or History in English, with the adaptability to larger bodies of research and literature, and the sheer usefulness of knowing English terms and vocabulary within various subjects disciplines may both be good arguments in favor of integrating language features, content teachers' possible reluctance to conducting their teaching in English might relate to the perceived need for protecting the usage of the native language, as much as utilizing the argument that often concerns bilingual education of all sorts; that CLIL will favor selectivity and elitism. Additionally, although the General English curriculum is in favor of integrating other contents, the content subjects' curricula are currently too dense for the integration of English in more than a few topics per year. Notice that conducting a bilingual course, falls beyond the scope of this assumption, as bilingual course admittedly are not integrated. Moreover, given the increasing focus on vocational

adaption of *all* general subjects, English included, an additional question to ask regarding CLIL conducted by vocational content teachers is likewise whether, and to what extent, these teachers and instructors should be given the task and responsibility of increasingly developing their students' oral, written and communicative language skills within the discourses and registers of their particular vocations, and at the same time to pose the question of how likely such a scenario is. How likely it is that such instruction will occur using the language of *English*, is another question worth pursuing.

Secondly, if there is anything that CLIL has done for the English language teachers' situation this far, it is to encourage reflection over the imminent issue: What is content? While it is true that many English teachers do question the role of British and American cultural predominance in one of the core-disciplines of the English Subject, namely, culture, it is also true that the subject is in an identity-crisis with a subsequent lack of prestige and a content-vacuum left by the communicative approach. With this, it is meant that large parts of what used to be the English subject (grammar and phonetics) over the years has been downplayed in education. What CLIL has contributed to, is simply to propose a new way of filling this vacuum. Moreover, it has naturally helped to confirm the notion that *more* English equates *better* English, which is achieved by running several English-mediated subjects along with the traditional English subject. Yet, there is a need for English teachers to review the idea of the instrumentality of English and English as a non-culture-bound language. If it is the instrumentality of English which is "currently to the fore" (Dalton-Puffer 2010) then also English teachers need to rethink and reconsolidate their own subject. If English is non culture-bound, then why should it still be used to teach so extensively about the Anglophone countries? And if CLIL seeks to further refine language-teaching to merely the "nuts and bolts" of language (Coyle 2010: 11) and let other subjects provide the contents, would not these nuts and bolts imply going back to more literature, molding the English subject more into an aesthetic subject, or to open the doors for more explicit grammar-teaching of the constituents and functions of language?

In vocational contexts, it was found that true integration of content and language learning could take place without necessary costs to neither content nor English learning. However, in order to integrate the contents with the language, it is necessary to have teachers who are familiar with both of them. While it is true that language teachers over the past years have been forced to consider various forms of contents (*too* varying, according to Drew 2015), and to incorporate a large amount of topics (even though these have only been

superficial and limited in scope) it is also true that this has happened with, above anything else, an consistent and explicit focus on language integration. Turned around, to say that the English subject does not have any contents, would be an outright lie. In addition to this, it seems demanding indeed to ask content teachers to start employing linguistic considerations on the top of what is already expected from them. Language is not the reason why they themselves at one point chose to become content teachers, and one is likely to assume that they will let contents' comprehension and assessment of their students predominate to a large extent, leaving the particularities of language continuing to be a moot point. Needless to say, the curricula of the content-subjects are time-consuming indeed, and it seems unnatural to in any way assume that content teachers would gladly pick up the mandate of teaching language features, given their dense subject curricula, even less so in a foreign language, while the unexploited resource of language teachers are left more or less in a vacuum.

All in all, discussing education means putting fundamental values at stake. These values can be summed up as such: Whereas some people choose to have an international perspective on education and what this should entail, others preface that being more regionally or nationally oriented is generally a better approach. On the one hand, certain people believe that schooling is supposed to prepare you for a successful working-life, while others hold that it supposes to prepare you for life in much more general terms. To conclude, this thesis has implicitly shown that these views are also held by teachers. It has also helped to distinguish which kinds of integrated practices are found in Norway, showed how and why they work, and implied some fundamental reasons to why CLIL is not yet an established pedagogical approach in Norway.

## Bibliography

- Asikainen, Tuula et al. «Talking the Future 2010-2020; CCN Foresight Think Tank.” *CLIL-CD*. CLIL Cascade Network. 04.2010. Web. 12.03.2015. <http://clil-cd.ecml.at/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=E4w8aVIV8TQ%3d&tabid=936&language=en-GB>
- Bialystok, Ellen. 2001. *Bilingualism in Development: Language Literacy and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Print.
- Bonnet, Gerard. “The CEFR and Education Policies in Europe.” *JSTOR*. Modern Language Journal, Vol. 91, No. 4 (Winter, 2007). Web. 29.04.2015. [http://www.jstor.org/stable/4626092?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/4626092?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)
- Bruton, Anthony. 2013. “CLIL: Some of the reasons why ... and why not.” Sevilla: Universidad Sevilla, System 41. Web.
- CILT 2011. The National Centre for Foreign Languages in Great Britain. Web. 09.07.2014. Link expired.
- Coonan, Carmel Mary. “The role of CLIL teachers.” *Youtube*. Eido Lab APS, 29.09.2013. Web. 12.12.2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=doN8oLApasU>
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Thomson Learning. Print.
- Coyle, Do et al. 2010. *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Print.
- Dalton-Puffer, Christiane et al. 2010. *Language Use and Language Learning in CLIL Classrooms*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Web.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. 2008. *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Print.
- Drew, Ion and Sørheim, Bjørn. 2009. *English Teaching Strategies*. Oslo: Det Norske

- Samlaget. Print.
- 2013. "Using Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade."  
Trondheim: Akademika Forlag. Print.
- Ellis, Rod. 2012. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition: Second Edition*. New York:  
Oxford University Press. Print.
- Gjendemsjø, Miriam Orvik. 2013. *A case study of a Content and Language Integrated  
Learning (CLIL) project in a 9<sup>th</sup> grade EFL class in Norway*. MA. Universitetet i  
Stavanger. Web.
- Heaton, Janet. 2004. *Reworking Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Print.
- Hellekjær, Glenn Ole. 2005. *The Acid Test: Does Upper Secondary EFL Instruction  
Effectively Prepare Norwegian Students for the Reading of English Textbooks at  
Colleges and Universities?* Diss. Universitetet i Oslo. Web.
- 2009. *Fremmedspråk i norsk næringsliv – Engelsk er ikke nok!* Halden:  
Fremmedspråksenteret. Web.
- Hennik, Monique et al. 2011. *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications  
Ltd. Print.
- Hitcock, Graham and Hughes, David. 1995. *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative  
Introduction to School-Based Research*. London: Routledge. Print.
- Holliday, Adrian. 2002. *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications  
Ltd. Print.
- Holter, Anne Sofie. «St.meld. nr. 44 (2008-2009).» *Regjeringen.no*. Kunnskapsdepartementet.  
Web. 04.03.2015. <https://www.regjeringen.no/nb/dokumenter/stmeld-nr-44-2008-2009-/id565231/?docId=STM200820090044000DDDEPIS&ch=1&q=>

- Hughes, Stephen and Madrid, Daniel. 2011. *Studies in Bilingual Education*. Bern: Peter Lang AG International Academic Publishers. Print.
- Hüttner, Julia and Smit, Ute. 2014. "CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning): The bigger picture. A response to: A. Bruton. 2013. CLIL: Some of the reasons why ... and why not." Southampton/Wien: University of Southampton/Universität Wien. System 44. Web.
- "Intercultural Cities" COE. Council of Europe. Web. 05.01.2015.  
<http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/Index/Stavanger.pdf>
- Lange, Gisela. 2002. *TIE-CLIL Professional Development Course*. Milan: Direzione Regionale della Lombardia on behalf of the TIE-CLIL project. Print.
- Llinares, Ana, et al. 2012. *The Roles of Language in CLIL*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Print.
- Lund, Helge. "The English Subject Curriculum." *Læreplaner*. Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013.  
 Web. 04.10.2014. <http://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/>
- Lyon, Jean 1996. *Becoming Bilingual: Language Acquisition in a Bilingual Community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD. Print.
- Marsh, David et al. "Background to CLIL-CD." *Curriculum Development for Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Council of Europe; European Centre for Modern Languages, 2011. Web. 20.01.2015. <http://clil-cd.ecml.at/CLILCD/tabid/2326/language/en-GB/Default.aspx>
- "David Marsh on CLIL." *Youtube*. Cambridge University Press ELT. 11.11.2010.  
 Web. 12.12.2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Czdg8-6mJA>
- et al. "European Framework for CLIL Teacher Education; A Framework for the Professional Development of CLIL Teachers." *Curriculum Development for Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Council of Europe; European Centre for

- Modern Languages; Empowering Language Professionals, 2011. Web. 22.02.2015.  
<http://clil-cd.ecml.at/Portals/24/flashfiles/index3.html>
- Marsh, David and Wolff, Dieter. 2007. *Mehrsprachigkeit in Schule und Unterricht Volum 6: Diverse Contexts – Coverging Goals – CLIL in Europe*: Peter Lang AG. Web.
- “Why CLIL is Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> century – David Marsh.” *Youtube*. Eido Lab  
 Aps. 29.09.2013. Web. 23.02.2015.  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b4Y0vTzcAQg>
- “Why CLIL now with David Marsh.” *Youtube*. Nelly Deutsch, 17.01.2014. Web.  
 14.01.2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OL5Cqi35dZk>
- Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Newbury House  
 Teacher Development. Print.
- Paulsen1, Jan Merok. 2011. «Lærerperspektiver på CLIL – Didaktiske valg og  
 rammebetingelser.» Elverum: Høgskolen i Hedmark. Web.
- Paulsen2, Jan Merok. 2011. «Hvilke faktorer har betydning for implementering og spredning  
 av CLIL?» Elverum: Høgskolen i Hedmark. Web.
- Ritchie, William C. and Bhatia, Tej K. 1996. *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. San  
 Diego: Academic Press. Print.
- Svenhard, Britt W. “CLIL-prosjekter i videregående skole 2009-2011.”  
*Fremmedspråksenteret*;  
*Nasjonalt senter for fremmedspråk i opplæringen*. Fremmedspråksenteret, 14.12.2011.  
 Web. 15.09.2014.  
[http://www.fremmedspraksenteret.no/nor/fremmedspraksenteret/forsking-og-utvikling/clil-content-\\_language-integrated-learning](http://www.fremmedspraksenteret.no/nor/fremmedspraksenteret/forsking-og-utvikling/clil-content-_language-integrated-learning)
- VanPatten, Bill and Williams, Jessica. 2007. *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction*. New Jersey: Routledge. Print.

## Forespørsel om deltakelse i forskningsprosjektet

### ***“Challenges and Benefits of Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)***

#### ***A study of Norwegian Upper Secondary Level teachers' experiences with and attitudes towards CLIL in the English Foreign Language (EFL) classroom”***

#### Bakgrunn og formål

*Masterstudie om CLIL i norske Videregående skoler, Institutt for Kultur og Språkforskning, Universitetet i Stavanger*

Formålet med studien er å synliggjøre og sammenligne norske engelsklærere i videregående skole sine erfaringer med CLIL gjennom analyse av deres metoder, lærebøker og eventuelt annet undervisningsmateriell. Lærernes vektlegging og holdninger til CLIL opp imot målene i Kunnskapsløftet, samt læreres refleksjoner omkring egen praksis og deres oppfattede fordeler og ulemper med CLIL. Generelle erfaringer med henblikk på CLIL vil også bli problematisert ved å trekkes opp imot forskning elevens fremmedspråklig tilegnelse med fokus på både studiespesialiserende og yrkesfaglige utdanningsprogram. Målet er på en god måte og synliggjøre fordelene og ulempene ved bilingval undervisning og avdekke noe av det arbeidet som gjøres i den norske skole for å møte fremtidens krav til engelskkompetanse.

Utvalget av intervjuobjekter (norske CLIL-lærere i Stavanger-regionen) er innhentet fra eget nettverk.

Intervjuobjektene holdes anonyme, både i prosessen og i den publiserte oppgaven. Om lag 6-8 lærere skal etter planen intervjues. Intervjuene er kvalitative og respondentene benyttes som førstehåndskilder om temaer som kan være vanskelige å forske på. Intervjuene er semi-strukturerte, det vil si at en del spørsmål er fastsatte, men at oppfølgingsspørsmål og eventuelle ekstra spørsmål er både ønskelige og matnyttige fra intervjuerens side. Se vedlagt spørsmålsark. Det er opp til respondenten om han eller hun ønsker å ikke svare på enkelte spørsmål, dette har ikke stor betydning i en kvalitativ studie.

Datainnsamling skjer ved bruk av digital lydopptaker. All data om lærere og elever er totalt anonymisert. Alle personlige erfaringer/holdninger/ømfintlig info vil bli anonymt fremstilt.



Lydfilene vil bli sikkert oppbevart ved kryptert adgang og destrueres etter transkribering. Spørsmålene vil omhandle egne erfaringer og refleksjoner rundt eget arbeid, og, etter ønske, generelle opplysninger om eget materiell, metodikk, samt elevers prestasjoner og motivasjon.

### **Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?**

Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Kun intervjuer/student har tilgang til lydfilene. All tilgang til lydfilene er kryptert.

Ingen deltakere vil kunne gjenkjennes i publikasjon.

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 30. april 2015. Alle lydfiler vil da være slettet.

### **Frivillig deltakelse**

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

Dersom du ønsker å delta eller har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med

Torje Hunsbedt

99490585

te.hunsbedt@stud.uis.no

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

### **Samtykke til deltakelse i studien**

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

-----  
(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

**Jeg samtykker til å delta i intervju**

**Jeg samtykker til at opplysninger om meg kan innhentes fra klasselærer/fastlege/register**

**Jeg samtykker til at personopplysninger kan publiseres/ lagres etter prosjektslutt]**

## Spørsmål til CLIL-lærere

### *Seksjon 1: Personlig bakgrunn*

- 1) Hva er din utdannelsesbakgrunn?
- 2) Hva slags erfaring har du som lærer?
- 3) Hvilke fag har du?
- 4) På hvilket nivå underviser du?
- 5) Hvilke studieprogrammer?

### *Seksjon 2: Erfaringer med CLIL*

- 1) Fikk du noen slags trening i utdannelsen vedrørende å lære bort Engelsk sammen med et annet fag?
- 2) CLIL blir ofte definert som et fag som læres bort med Engelsk som instruksjonsmedium. Ville du personlig ha gjort noen endringer på denne definisjonen?
- 3) Hvordan begynte du å undervise i både språk og innhold?
- 4) Vil du si at det er CLIL du faktisk praktiserer i klasserommet? Hvorfor, eller hvorfor ikke?
- 5) Hvordan vil du beskrive CLILS fordeler når det gjelder
  - a. Språklæring?
  - b. Innhold/Faglæring?Hva forventes av:
  - c. Lærerens kompetanse og prestasjoner?
  - d. Elevenes kompetanse og prestasjoner?
    - i. Sterke elever?
    - ii. Svake elever?
    - iii. Motivasjon?
- 6) På hvilken måte mener du at CLIL er fordelsaktig for et kommunikativt klasserom? (**Språklærere**)
- 7) Hva er de største utfordringene når man gjennomfører CLIL undervisning?
- 8) Hvordan ville du strukturert en CLIL time? Med tanke på
  - a. Undervisningsmateriell/tekstbøker?
  - b. Andre ressurser?
  - c. Oppgaver og aktiviteter?

### *Seksjon 3: Holdninger til CLIL*

- 1) I hvilke fagkombinasjoner ser du for deg at CLIL kan være fordelsaktig?
- 2) Tror du at CLIL fungerer best for språklærere eller faglærere?
- 3) Hvor relevant er det å kombinere Engelsk med fag i Videregående skole?

- a. Kombinere Engelsk med andre humanistiske fag?
- b. Kombinere Engelsk med vitenskapelige fag?
- c. Kombinere Engelsk med ulike yrkesfag?

#### *Seksjon 4: Evaluering*

- 1) Mener du at CLIL praktisering er rettferdiggjort gjennom læreplanen i Engelsk?
- 2) Hvordan vil du evaluere elever I et CLIL program?
  - a. Språk?
  - b. Innhold/fag?
  - c. Begge?

#### *Seksjon 5: Framtidsperspektiver*

- 1) Hva tror du blir forventet fra en språk/faglærer I fremtiden?
- 2) Hvordan vil du beskrive nødvendigheten av å lære bort både språk og innhold/fag?
- 3) Hvordan tror du CLIL vil forandre det å lære fra seg språk/innhold?

*Interview 1 – Language teacher 1*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I have a foundation course in Psychology, three semesters of French and an MA in English Linguistics. I also have the pedagogical course, of course, and 30 study points of Sociology. That is my educational background.

Q: What is your teaching experience?

A: After completing my MA, I lived in England for four years, and worked there, but as a translator, not as a teacher. After my return, I have been teaching at different intermediate schools for on and a half years, and I have taught at secondary level in Stavanger for five years.

Q: What subjects do you have?

A: Here I do Social Studies and English.

Q: At what level?

A: Social Studies is restricted to the second year on this school, and currently I also teach English for the second year students only. I have been teaching English for the first year students earlier. I am also associated with the Apprentice School (*Lærlingskolen*), for students who are taking another approach than the ordinary students. The subjects I teach are the same. But on the Apprentice School, I also teach the first year. The Apprentice School is for students who are already working, but who need to retake subjects in order to get their Professional Certificate (*Fagbrev*). Some of them are previous drop-outs, students who failed certain subjects, kids who were tired of school aso. A mixed group indeed, background wise. Sometimes they need to take all the subjects from the General Studies branch because they have only been working for a company, and they need the General subjects in order to gain their approved certificate.

Q: What kind of Vocational Programs are you occupied with?

A: I am within Buildings and Construction (*Bygg og Anlegg*). The students from the Apprentice School come from all kinds of vocational backgrounds, but mainly, I deal with Buildings and Construction.

Q: In Vocational Programs, Vocational Adaption of the general subjects (*Yrkesretting*) has been a standard practice for many years. Did you receive any training when it came down to teaching English alongside with another subject?

A: Nothing.

Q: All right. You are probably acquainted with the standard definition of CLIL in Europe. Would you personally do any changes to this definition, related to your own practice?

A: I would, because of my background with the CLIL project at our school, where 9 different countries from the European Union worked together and made an educational approach from scratch, using the CLIL methodology. But we employed the CLIL concept in a wider sense. It was condensed to “learning language in vocationally relevant situations”. That has been done in Norway for many years. There was no testing and evaluation of neither the language nor the content, we did it to promote learning, through this project, which was named the Marina Project. It was developed simultaneously in 4 different languages, so I guess it would be something else. Many of the tasks can be used in an educational setting, but the evaluation part was left out. It was merely about learning to communicate, learn simple and maybe less simple subject terms, connected to the topic, which was the Marina. Vocabulary for different things in many different situations. And these kinds of things are in fact directly transmittable to my own methods in general. For instance, when I have students who are going to work in the workshop, builders and so forth, they can also work with their vocabulary in the same way, it is a more exciting way to learn new vocabulary for instance.

Q: How did you personally get into CLIL, or in your case, vocational adaption, where you bring the vocational programs into the English lesson?

A: I also try to make my vocational colleagues bring the English language into the workshops, but they're not always comfortable with that. I try to make them, for instance explain to the students “In English, this machine is called like this and like this”. I have been on Design and Craftmanship (*Design og Håndverk*) earlier, there they need to learn how to deal with customers on the phone, receiving orders and messages from clients, how they want their hair to look, and that kind of stuff. In such a situation, it is rather natural to find the correct

vocabulary, practice courtesy, on these points, the rules differ a lot between English and Norwegian. Please all along and so forth.

Q: Right. How would you describe the advantages with vocational adaption of the English class when focusing on learning outcomes language wise? When you adapt the curriculum, using the vocationally oriented textbook, for instance, and when bringing the vocational subjects into the English class.

A: You mean, for instance that they are supposed to learn vocationally relevant vocabulary? Some would say it is advantageous, but this is a hot topic that is being thoroughly debated. Some would say that it increases motivation by learning things that they are actually going to use later on. My experience is that the lower performing students are exactly the ones who struggle the most with the vocational adaption. Because it only increases the number of new things they need to keep in mind. Learning new words by heart, that's what they find difficult, they think it is easier to tell me about Native Americans than it is to tell me how to erect an outer timber wall that is meant to carry the load of the house. Somehow, they already possess the vocabulary to say something about the Native Americans, but regardless of them being very proficient at erecting this carrying wall, they struggle with the sheer scope of new words in an entirely different language. So, in theory, it is said to be more motivating, but practically speaking, it might make things even more difficult for many of them. That is a fact that counterproves what very, very many people are saying, and I myself was surprised the first time I experienced how it actually was. Yes, the ones who rested solidly on a C on tests and such, they were doing all right. The E candidates, whom I presumed would find something familiar in all of this, struggled hard and hated the whole thing. "Why do we have to learn this, we do we have to use these?" And I answered them that, in your future workplace, there are many foreigners, but then they say "Yes, but they don't know English either". The foreigners in Norwegian construction grounds struggle just as much to learn the Norwegian terminology. Their English is not very good either. This is true, I have heard it myself. My own thoughts on the subject is that just a little vocational adaption is all right. Preliminarily, I think that it is good if the students can tell someone a little about their job and describe the course of their educational path in English, so some things are OK, but to expect that all of this subject specific jargon within building and construction, which I don't even know in Norwegian, to me, a plank is a plank, but they can

be called so many different things, I don't think it is too important that they shall be able to talk too much about that. Another issue is that in Stavanger, the jargon is different from for instance Oslo, where they might say something completely different, so it's truly hard for me, for instance, I have to learn the words in the Stavanger dialect, in standard Norwegian (*bokmål*) before I can even learn them in English. Because the students have their jargon, the books have another one. I think that it is important that the students learn what's relevant for life, both within their job and their leisure. Like writing reports, pretending that your manager is from the States, that you are to inform, sell something, but this is not the most motivating for the students, from what I can see. But I can see the benefits with the traditional CLIL, if the vocational teachers were able to employ some English in their classes, occasionally, for instance "hey, did you know btw that HMS (*Helse, Miljø og Sikkerhet*) is called HSE in English?" right? Or that, talked about building customs and traditions in foreign countries, something that would incorporate something from their programs, like building brick houses in England. It might be hard to find Norwegian vocabulary in that case, because one does not build a house the same way in Norway and England. Small things like this, if that was present in the curriculum to a minor extent, it would significantly improve the interest for my subject. Because there I can meet them. They are not here in order to study English. I like the idea of CLIL, but it can be hard to cooperate with the vocational teachers, due to time constraints, both in the classroom, to fulfill respective learning aims for each subject, and when planning and assessing. It can't be all for good fun. But I like the idea of CLIL very much. Because it is about learning a language without really knowing that you are in fact learning. Like with kids, learning a language comes automatically. The same goes for being bilingual. They don't really think about it, and that's what's good. That is something I probably could have done in a better way with my own students. For instance employing articles about something they were engaged with, in English.

Q: What do you think is demanded from a teacher who is going to engage with Vocational Adaption or CLIL, from the language teacher's point of view?

A: It sure takes a good load of work. I think most language teachers are more of the academic sort, and don't necessarily know too much about... There are a few exceptions, for instance one of our own teacher who has a background in mechanics as well. But I believe, most people don't proceed from such a boyish vocational field and start dealing with

languages. I also think that this means that either must I learn a great deal of stuff and get acquainted with a lot, or the vocational teachers need to learn a great deal more of English, and in an ordinary workday, which is relatively busy, it is not very likely that one would get one another's qualifications. In such a case, cooperation must be the key to accomplish it. But I have to say, it is of profound importance that the language teachers actually know the language they are teaching. They need to know it very well. Some would claim that I personally am over-qualified for teaching on the level where I am currently working, but my thoughts on the subject are that I know what I know, and I know it well, no matter what. So that gives me much more energy which I can focus on adaption of materials, vocational adaption, and last but not least; building relations. That's where I focus my energy. I also believe that in a school like this, with so many different study programs, where I have had the privilege to be more or less permanently positioned on Building and Construction, while others have been moved around from program to program, and this means that the work I put down in one year, I can use again further on. But it is a lot of work, I know nothing about buildings and constructions.

Q: There is no way you could be qualified in every single vocational specific course?

A: No way, but even within Building and Construction, there are numerous varieties, right? There is timber house constructors, you have the carpenter, the ones who make forms for concrete constructions, masons, painters and scaffolders. These are the ones that I have to focus on here on the second year programs. A big variety. So if I make, say, two good sets of tasks and texts per year, let's say that three of the classes will all be touching on, scaffolding, for instance, so if I have a good structure on scaffolding, then I have an advantage there. And last year, I made a good class setup with the carpenter class dealing with wood technique. It was about finding the words in English and explain to me what kinds of machines they were using to make a locker, and so forth. It is expected that I know much more than what I actually do! So I just have to learn it. But I do learn a great deal, I must say.

Q: What kind of performance can be expected from the students in such a cross curricular setting, if we can call it as such?

A: About high and low performing students and motivation. I have already talked a bit about it, but I can always repeat myself: The high performing students are okay with anything. The high performing students can be challenged to a larger extent. That is, if the instruction is



not vocationally adapted. If I adapt to their future vocations, everything is on a lower level, both for them and me. It needs to be pretty simple, or else even I won't follow and won't know what we're dealing with. This practice is not challenging enough for the high performing students in the English class. For the lower performing students, it is close to getting too difficult. Almost all the time. That is, if I am to keep the whole thing on a level that would justify their final grade, and their study competence. Because English is a general subject. So, I do think that vocational adaptation is very hard to achieve, because the high performing students think that everything is all right. They like what we do. They like to talk, they enjoy helping me find the correct English words. "Don't you worry about them planks", they say, "we will help you." And so, they help me to detect the technical jargon, and they have a good time. And the students may very well learn what I want them to learn, but I find that they have a better time with the more "pure" English-English. Not grammar, of course, but topics like culture, history and literature. About student motivation, I believe that they find vocational adaptation more as a labor demanding thing than something motivating. Some of the lower performing students in the English class who are high performers in the workshop, find a certain motivational gain in being better than me and to be able to explain things to me.

Q: In what ways do you think that CLIL facilitates the communicative classroom?

A: CLIL is a great tool for communicative situations. It is a strategy for providing them something tangible to talk about. And also, something that they are supposed to know a great deal about on beforehand. So it is good, the only thing is that if they lack vocabulary, it will not work. You need to make sure that they have the necessary vocabulary on beforehand. Because, it is easier to make them talk about, let's say a movie they saw or something like that, because then they already possess the vocabulary needed for such a discourse. But when dealing with acquiring new vocabulary, I think one has to use it a lot in order to learn it. I think that CLIL or some modality of it is extremely hard to implement because we don't have enough teachers who are both language teachers and subject teachers. So, it then becomes important that people, like me, who are purely academically oriented and doesn't have a clue about technical stuff, but who would rather be a candidate for just continuing one's career within the academic world, and who have a great time doing academic things, they need to find some pleasure in being in a situation like I am, enjoy the

students and so forth. We need to get the chance to learn new material, and to have the time necessary to figure out what we are to do.

Q: Right. Next question, how would you go about structuring an English class that incorporates vocational adaptation? For instance in relation to the textbook and other course materials?

A: We used to have Tracks, but we just changed to Skills. I regret it. I was part of the committee which decided on the change of textbooks, but I don't think that Skills is too good after all. It is supposed to be... Let's say it like this, it is very hard to cooperate with other English teachers because the textbooks are so different from program to program. They are also very superficial when it comes to the actual vocational adaptation. There might be pros and cons with the books of course, but one of the things I fell for when I went to a Seminar and this book was introduced to me, was that when they had a section on London, they had a picture of the Shard; the new skyscraper that has been built adjacent to London Bridge. It is a magnificent building, enormously tall. And it has a glass façade which reflects the light everywhere. Not necessarily a positive thing though, we sat on a pub in the vicinity of it this summer. We sat in the shade, but the sunlight was directed straight into our eyes. Anyways, that they are using this building as an example, that is something that I like about Skills. Tracks' second year course books are miserable when it comes to any kind of vocational adaptation.

Q: How about other resources, you mentioned that you are also in the students' workshops?

A: Yes, and the practice depends on what kind of workshop and what the students are dealing with. But when it comes to the three programs within building; timber house builder, scaffolder and concrete form carpenter, I have a round in the workshop and take a look at what they are doing and talk with them. I observe and build relations. That is my job.

Q: You work together with the vocational teacher?

A: Yes, the vocational teacher is there. I use my leisure hours to talk with the students in the workshops. It's supposed to be more informal. I have also done evaluation in the workshops. For instance, the students have erected a carrying timber wall, they erect them, tear them down, erect them, and tear them down so that they get good practice. But I usually ask them to leave one of them standing so that I may use it for an evaluation, for instance that they tell me in English how they went about building it. The high performers, of course, talk

freely, and the ones who are low performers in English, are allowed to have a small note of vocabulary in order to talk. We also work together in order to find the proper name in English, because good dictionaries are predominantly absent. That's at least what I did last year.

Q: Very well. In what subject combinations can you picture CLIL, or a modality of CLIL, as advantageous? One language subject and one content subject?

A: It is important in English, of course. But in general, it's actually easier to vocationally adapt social studies than it is to adapt English, because so many things in the syllabus are shared between the subjects. Like the teaching of different companies within different branches, there are many concurrent aspects here. Between this course and social studies. This happens in Norwegian of course; writing logs and reports, it is about using the language. Many of our students are low performers in general in terms of reading and writing. So it's just about getting them into writing.

Q: Do you think that CLIL is most suitable for language teachers or content teachers?

A: Here on this school I would say... It is very dependent on the actual person. On this school, there is a borderline; the vocational teachers do not think that their business is to engage in language work. Reading is the kind of thing that we (language teachers) are doing. We, on the contrary, believe that reading is important within any subject, but the vocational teachers think it's primarily the Norwegian teachers' job. There is a complete lack of interest for our subjects. So it is utopic, at least on Building and Construction at this particular school, to say that they (the vocational teachers) should engage with CLIL. It will never happen. On the other hand, they are very good at collaborating with me so that I can pull the vocational aspect into my subject. But in general, they themselves have little faith in their own English skills. I have heard them myself when we were out travelling together. Their language is fine, but they have this mental block. So, in sum then, it's in general easier for me. I know English very well. I think it is interesting, and important to get to know what the students are actually doing. Ideally, however, it would have been fantastic if the vocational teachers were able to teach their subjects in English. I think many students are able to finish the course, partly or fully, in English. I think the vocational teachers would also do fine, but they don't believe it themselves.

Q: How do you think it would be to conduct a Social Studies class in English?

A: I run them concurrently, topic wise, if the topics are right. For instance, we have a project on a specific location in South Africa, which we collect funding for, in order to build dwellings and such. I choose movies which I can use in either subject, for instance. It's more of a minimum of concurrency, I have to say. But we do discuss the difference between being poor and rich, which can be done either in Norwegian or in English. Also, we have international relations, wars, etc. We also have some topics like ethics, sustainable development, consumer society and related topics that one can do in both English and Social Studies. Many of these, like international relations, feels very natural to do in English. If we are dealing with wars, colonies, African countries, like Uganda, watching "The Last King of Scotland", "Blood Diamond" or something like that, it is almost just as natural to deal with it in English. But I personally do not practice this. But I guess I could have been doing it. The problem with Social Studies is the amount of concepts. I have several low performing students who struggle with the learning of concepts. Many concepts, which I would describe as pretty basic, is unknown to these students. Never heard of them. One extreme example came about when I had a Jeopardy session last year. None of the students knew who the Prime Minister in Norway was. It is very extreme. And, on the top of that, imagining that I would conduct the lesson in English, in addition to them only having a weak suspicion about what I actually am talking about, it will be too much. I have to break the instruction down and keep it on a very basic level. This was an extreme example, of course. I guess it will depend on the level of the learners. How much one can expect. How challenging can I make it? I remember when I went to a secondary school on a seminar on a teacher who conducted CLIL with a science class, which seemed much more natural, because the students were all potentially high performers, and the combination of science and English actually benefited them. But for my students, it might have the straight opposite effect.

Q: Right. Do you think that CLIL practice, or your variety, is justified through the English Subject Curriculum?

A: Yes, it is very open for personal interpretation. And the choice of methods is not specified. So I would say yes.

Q: If you were to evaluate a CLIL program or something similar, would you focus mostly on language or content?

A: I think I would do both, because I am a language teacher. Maybe the history teacher or the vocational teacher would only evaluate content. I don't evaluate the students' Norwegian language in Social Studies. At the same time, it is about concept formation, so they do need to know various terms, but for me as a language teacher, I think it is more natural to review the language as well. If I am to put a grade on their English, it's completely unnatural to withdraw oneself totally from the students' ability to communicate. After all, I need to be able to understand what it is that they are saying. Communication is essential for me. I evaluate both, but it depends on the context.

Q: What do you think will be expected from a language teacher, or any teacher, in the future? In case of a larger scale implementation, international mobility, and so forth...

A: Yeah, with student exchange and everything. I think that things change constantly. For me, I didn't start teaching as the first thing that I did in my professional life. I had other kinds of work. There has definitely been some development, in terms of the appropriateness of movies, fun, that it is allowed to have a good time during classes, whereas, earlier it was more about drilling and such activities. Still, there are limits to how many ways one can actually learn something. Even when I went to school, they used a drawing of a doll with the word "DOLL" underneath, the first English word I learnt in 4<sup>th</sup> grade. Some things remains the same. For instance, connecting pictures with text and vocabulary, and connecting actions. I don't think that too much novel will be expected. Maybe that we have to position ourselves more in an outwards direction. The language teachers are already in this position. We have traveled, we have lived elsewhere. Very many of us have, at least. My kids today are in primary school with teachers who barely know the English language. My kids are helping the teachers. I hope the demand will be that an English teacher at least has some interest for the subject one is to teach. For my own part, in secondary school, here, I don't think there will be any distinctive change in our practice.

Q: In ordinary CLIL, English classes have the same structure as they always have had, only English is used to a wider extent in the content classrooms, with the precaution that content teachers have a generally good command of English. What do you think will happen to English as a subject of its own? Any implications?

A: I believe that a vocational teacher who has a generally good command of English, can do extremely well in terms of vocabulary teaching and vocational discourses. When it comes to

such things as pronunciation, it is not learnt on this level of studies, those skills have been acquired on an earlier stage. Some have an aptitude for languages, others keep the guttural <r> until the day they die. Living in the States for forty years, will not help these students. In terms of English language, I think it will be merely positive. But this will be at the cost of everything else that accompanies the English subject. The things that both my students and I myself find most motivating, like movies and history. Many students come here from intermediate school and ask: "Are we not going to have history classes? That was so much fun!" So history, linguistic development, how English has been spread, native peoples, topics from the English speaking world... If all English instruction should be vocationally adapted or CLIL, we lose that other aspect. And that is something the students need, at least to an equal extent in an international world where we travel from place to place; understanding of cultures is of profound importance. That is one of the things I am worried about. Due to all the currently promoted pressure on vocational adaption, which is CLIL, or another branch of it, I am afraid we'll lose the all-encompassing education which many of our students really need. They need it much more than other students. They are lacking a lot of it. There's lots of stuff they have never heard about, many things they don't know. My students don't know that we just had an election in the States. When there was the vote for independence in Scotland, they didn't really know. It's important that they learn how other people think, how they behave, why migration is different in the United States and in England, compared to Norway, because this constantly relates to our reality. We don't live in a closed world, we live in a world where we eat Chinese food, watch Japanese movies, read American novels, where does the cellphone come from? I think that it's so important that they see and get the chance to understand and comprehend that the world is not only the Stavanger area, where kids cry because they don't have an iPad of their own; there is so much more out there. It should be relevant for many subjects, but these issues are primarily the content in social studies and English. Losing this, is what I fear. The specifics. And it is not too much about the literature. Personally, I love reading books. But that is not something that I can use in my instruction either way. I lose them. If it is a movie, it's easier to keep them focused. But, my point is, understanding other cultures is the most important aspect here. The professional/vocational approach to learning languages will only function as additional training in learning a language, I hope it will not replace it entirely.

Q: All right, thank you.

A: Thank you.

*Interview 2: Language Content Teacher 1*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I started out as a student in a vocational school and took a Professional Certificate as a machine engineer. This happened in the late 70s – early 80s. After that, I studied Philosophy, Psychology; a BA of four years and an MA of one year in the United States. When I came back to Norway, I worked in selling and marketing for many years. Then I decided to become a teacher, and I took Nordic and English one year studies, with an emphasis on Norwegian at Agder University. I also have an MA in specialized pedagogics in Stavanger. So I have Norwegian and English. I have also worked on an international project in connection with the Technical and Industrial Production (*TIP*) vocational subject and computer controlled lathes and mills, amongst other things. So you might say I am an insider in both “camps”, and at this particular school, I have taught Norwegian and English on the first year courses, five years in *TIP*, in what used to be Machines and Mechanics. I have also been teaching a minority class with minority languages in the workshops. The English have been vocationally adapted all along, Norwegian follows this path as well to a larger and larger extent.

Q: Right. And what is your experience as a teacher?

A: I have one year in Drammen teaching the Study preparing branches in History and Philosophy, a little Norwegian within all the three years of studies, and some English classes connected to my own Pedagogical education and training. Currently, I am changing to the Design and Craftsmanship courses. So my current agenda is to vocationally adapt the English subject to this branch of the vocational courses. The same goes for Norwegian.

Q: What subjects do you teach?

A: Norwegian, English, the level is mostly restricted to the first year of studies. The study programs are mostly *TIP* and Design and Craftsmanship.

Q: Did you receive any kind of training in your education concerning teaching content other than the traditional English class content in your education?

A: No, no particular training, not in English, not in the pedagogics. But Glenn Ole Hellekjær is



a part of the pedagogics and conducted two lectures where he discussed how he personally applied a variety of this in a school up in the north-west, and where he evaluates the competency one acquires when only strictly teaching English. It was more of a motivational thing. His experiences with CLIL, and vocational adaption as well, I believe, is more of an inspiration, no concrete training.

Q: Right. CLIL is often described as an approach where content is transmitted with English being the medium of instruction. Would you personally make any modifications to this definition, connected to your own practice?

A: Well firstly, I have a great advantage being a subject teacher in TIP. That means that I am not dependent on the general branch teachers in order to vocationally adapt the English class. I just go into the workshop and explain the lathe and the mill for the students. So for my part, vocational adaption is pretty close to what could be called CLIL methodology, but I don't bring English into the vocational training. It is done in the English class. So, strictly speaking, it is more about adapting the English class to the vocational program, rather than to adapt the vocational program to the English language. But the strict categories here are to some extent floating ones. I think the students experience that it's all about... I might have one student, for instance, who haven't been performing in the English class, and then I can simply find him in the workshop and do an oral evaluation while he is welding in English, for instance. So there is some degree of overlap.

Q: How was it that you got into teaching both language and content simultaneously?

A: It has a lot to do with motivation and opinions I believe. You eliminate some of the excuses from the lower performing students, like the question: "What is this good for?" One example, if the student is to work in the oil industry, and needs English, motivation wise, it is easier to get the students engaged with their English education. They learn more English, even though their intention is not to learn English. You get more of a positive pressure on both the teaching and the learning. That was my motivation. We use Tracks at this school. It has four chapters which are vocationally adapted. Many teachers use these books in their own instruction, while others wait until after Christmas, because they think that the first year students simply don't know enough about their vocation the first semester of their studies. In TIP, it happens to be that we work quite a bit on the lathes and other kinds of machinery the first semester, that's why I found it natural to vocationally adapt the English

already at this stage. That was because I noticed that the given chapter in the book, was more relevant for the student in combination with what they were doing in the workshop. I could have covered other topics, like welding, tools and hand mechanics, but I choose to do what is relevant for the students when they are in their workshop.

Q: Would you say it is CLIL that you practice?

A: The vocational adaption is vast. Last year, for instance, I had fourteen weeks of logs and reports writing, seven in Norwegian and five in English. That means that the students write a log every single English class. They are required to write an English report, and they have four oral presentations in the workshop. I step over the border of what could be CLIL, but it is called vocational adaption of the English subject.

Q: How would you describe the advantages of vocational adaption in terms of language learning?

A: The advantage is that the students become more engaged with the language of English without intending to; that they engage themselves more because the content is about what they are doing in their production. In terms of language learning, it is more of an inner origin; they are describing the experiences they've had, compared to reading literary texts, where they read something, and are going to discuss what they have read. So, they are allowed to tell about something that happened in the workshop.

Q: How would you describe the advantages when it comes to learning the content?

A: The advantage is the motivation and attention of the students. I can talk about or show a student or an apprentice who learns to weld in Australia, and what kinds of experiences he makes with the welder, what experiences he has learning about different materials, with the cutting torch; very concrete practices which the students can easily connect to their own experiences in the workshop. That makes it much easier for the lower performing students, to keep them engaged, than if we were to talk about language history and development, varieties of language, literature, reading a text and discuss it; traditional fields within the English subject. These topics are every hard to teach when the literacy level is as low as it is at our school. 60 percent of our students have problems with this. They are all below the limit of the D, in their writing skills, which we find alarming. As I said, last year we spent five weeks writing logs in English. This project shows that it is possible to produce a great extent

of literary work, not only oral. But the oral evaluation where they talk and explain what they are doing, is easier to manage, of course.

Q: What is expected from a teacher in order to do what it is that you are doing?

A: What is expected from a teacher is that you are interested in what the students are actually doing in their workshops. You have to get up from the desk and move into the workshop and physically observe what the students are engaged with. You also need to have an interest to the extent that you can find texts and materials, which for starters would be using the vocationally adapted chapters in the book, which are there already. But it is demanding to expect this of course, especially if the school is organized in such a way that teachers work within very many different programs. You then need to get acquainted with the vocabulary, different kinds of equipment, whether the students have their workshop in mechanics, are in a kitchen, are making clothes from fabric, in the TIP workshop, in the Building and Construction workshop, in the electronics workshop, and so on. So, many of the challenges for the teachers are connected to the organization of the school. I think, if you are positioned in one program mainly, you will yourself create the competence needed. But good course books is a must. If they are not proper... If you come from the university with ordinary English literature and the traditional background of an English teacher, this is a must if you are to execute the vocational adaption. You cannot create it yourself.

Q: What is expected from the students, for them to be a part of this kind of instruction?

A: One advantage is that vocational adaption, with that kind of content, is something that neither the low performers, nor the high performers, necessarily know in advance. The high performers also need to acquire new vocabulary, they also need to engage with the task of expanding what they already know. Very often, for the higher performing students, the level of the instruction in vocational school will be so easy that they can simply sail through it without putting in too much of an effort. The constellation of the class is usually in a manner that it ranges from mediocre performers to very low performers. The gap can be extreme. You might have a student who is simply tired of school. He comes to us, he has been an A achiever in intermediate language subjects, he might be very clever, but as the teacher, you feel like you're not really able to provide him with too much, because the focus is on saving those E and F candidates from failure. The low performers might be of a non-native background. These students might have been withdrawn from the English class to benefit

their Norwegian. The gap is enormous. By vocational adaptation, you give the students a lot to stretch out for, also for the higher performers. These students are often motivated for working in the oil industry, an arena where English will come into use. Many of them are interested in learning vocationally relevant English in relation to future work. Low performers can more easily talk about their own experiences, than it is to talk about literary texts. If they get to explain how they welded or constructed a go-kart, how they veer a lamp, assemble a water pump or whatever it might be that they are doing, it is easier to get them engaged, and sufficiently motivated for daring to throw themselves in it. But very often, there is so much fear and anxiety that they just simply say “no, I won’t do it” and you end up struggling to get something out of them at all. Motivation is the big difference. It is relevant. They are more motivated. This is something that I need in the future. I want to become an industrial or car mechanic, I want to become a plumber, how shall I be able to use this poetry, this epic tale. It is hard to motivate them. That’s why it’s more tangible for everyone, both for the low and high performing students.

Q: To what extent do you practice vocational adaptation? Is it focused in modules, or persistent throughout?

A: Of the competency aims, approximately 20 or so, there are 5 which are hard to adapt. They might be easy to adapt in programs like Health and Upbringing (*Helse og Oppvekstfag*) because these competency aims have to do with native peoples, language development and things like that. Some of the competency aims, you simply cannot adapt, and you need to employ more traditional strategies. In the design and craftsmanship, you can make clothing related to native peoples for instance, and thus connect the two, while with TIP, it’s harder. 14 or 15 of the competency aims, the ones where program adaptation is explicit, and the ones related to vocabulary, for instance, should be fairly easy to adapt vocationally. The big fear is the final exam. The exam is the same one that the general branch of studies have; the students need to show skills and competence of that kind. They are not prepared for it, that’s why there’s a lot of vocational adaptation on the first year, and very little on the second: to prepare them for the final exam. The exam format in general contains very vague vocationally adapted exam questions, which I think teachers fear, to put it bluntly. “What kinds of virtues do you need in your future employment? Which personal abilities are important in your future job?” It’s this much abstract, that it’s hard to sufficiently prepare a

vocational student on something like that. Instead, they could have asked them to describe something that you have made or something that you have done, some processes; something connected to experiences in the workshop. So, the exam tasks are very little concrete, they are rather weak. Many students are not sufficiently prepared for this. So, they choose the general studies tasks, because those, they have received practice and training in on the second year of studies. So in sum then, there's a good deal of adaption on the first year and less on the second year.

Q: What can you say about the communicative classroom?

A: What happens when we are writing logs during the initial 20 minutes of each English session, is that the entire class gets interested in what is the English word for roller bearing, what is the name of a steering rod, what's the English term for a V-joint. This, what the different tools and processes are called, engage the students much more than the question: "What did we just read?" A literary text, a novel by Ernest Hemingway, can be extremely dense and hard for the student's to get engaged with because the vocabulary is too hard for them. They don't possess the basic skills nor the competency. A movie might be easier, I guess. At least, I find that the communicative classroom is much more engaged with tools and processes in the workshop than it is with literary texts.

Q: What kind of challenges with vocational adaption can one encounter?

A: No matter what you do, you need to be able to get the students talking about the experiences they have from the workshop. So the challenges are connected to vocabulary, but within these words, there is also a good deal of general English language that you need in order to describe what it is that you are doing. There are subtle sentences and language constructions that are concerned with past/presence for instance. When students are writing, they need to determine which adjectives and prepositions they need in order to describe what they want to say. Many factors sort of sneak in to this setting because the students are motivated and are able to make sense out of what they are doing. They are exposed to a good deal of English. For instance, Hellekjær discovered that the excessive practice students got, effectively improved their distinguishing and avoiding common errors like grammatical gender and so on. It provides safety. Many of the students who come here in August and don't even want to utter a single word in English, they do not extend this

practice for too long; that oral performance in English is still problematic at the end of the first year course.

Q: What kinds of educational material do you use? You mentioned the course book Tracks?

A: I use Tracks a lot. I have also used At Work. I adapt the sequence of the educational material concerned with their vocation to their schedule in the workshops. The oral presentations, they perform in the workshop. I prepare them through the texts we have read, figures, posters, and other items from the books that illustrate the given subject matter. But there's not really much I need to do. This is because they already have the experience from the workshop. We're talking about the lathe, which they of course already know what is, they have been dealing with them hands on for seven weeks. So I don't have to start explaining it in detail for them, they know. All they need are the English names for different parts of the lathe. Depending on the general level of the class, after a few weeks of preparation and reading of texts, we go out to the workshop and the students are doing fine talking about the lathe and explain some mechanical part that they have made. Sometimes, the level is a little lower, and I can differentiate by that lower performing students get the vocabulary in the form of small labels that they are to place on the right part of the machine. So it becomes more of a glossary test. Can they place the right word on the right part? Then I say, all right, let's stop the assessment process here, and the students are graded on the basis of how they performed on that particular part of the task. So, if they misplaced a part, I notify them and clear up their vocabulary, so to speak, so that they have the correct word on the correct part. Then I say, all right, now tell me how you used the machine to make a component. Because, the different terms are by this point placed accurately on the corresponding parts of the machine. Me helping them, does not grant them a top grade, because they needed that amount of support in an assessment situation. So it would at best give them a C. The amount of support, we negotiate on beforehand. Many students who are clever, but who are not that eager also choose this variety because it provides them with the relevant vocabulary. For some students, this support might mean the difference between an F and an E.

Q: In which subject combinations do you find vocational adaption to be particularly beneficial?

A: There is an incredible motivation within the oil industry in Stavanger, Rogaland and in the

western parts of Norway in general. When it comes to Technical and Industrial Production (*TIP*), a great deal comes for free because many of the students have set their minds on working with oil and oil related industry. The fact that there's a sense of purpose in the foundation - "I will need this in the future, this is important" – is a great advantage. The same goes for Building and Construction. There is no way one can become a builder or work at a construction ground without the knowing English, this will become absolutely necessary. The same goes for Service and Transport, it's possible to draw a line to the English language. English is no longer a foreign language in Norway. It's a second language.

Q: I see. You are both a language teacher and a content/subject teacher. Picture yourself that you were only one of the two. What would be most demanding? To be a language teacher who had to get acquainted with a new subject/content field, or a subject teacher who had to get acquainted with a language?

A: The hardest thing, I think, is related to the kind of school we're dealing with. Like vocational schools or integrated schools. Our particular school is the only one in this region which is purely vocational. On an integrated school, you will have study preparing classes and vocational classes simultaneously. In that case, I believe that very often that the teachers teach exactly the same to the study preparing branch and the vocational students. You have, for instance, merely course books that prepare you for studies, less vocational adaption on an integrated school because the teachers are more comfortable with study preparatory English. This is partly due to them being relieved from laborious class preparations. So it has more to do with the type of school, and it has to do with personal interests; how engaged one chooses to be. On this school, we are organized in teams, and we sit down with the general branch teachers and thus become more acquainted with them and to a larger extent a part of that community than other general branch teachers, other philologists. If you go to other schools with vocational programs in this region; schools who clearly profile themselves as vocational schools, you will find vocational adaption. But if you go to the more traditional joint of a traditional vocational school and a gymnasium, for instance a relation of 60/40 in favor of study preparatory programs, there will be a much stronger profiling on the study preparatory sides of the school. So, I think that in general, when overlooking school structures and profiles, teachers who are particularly interested, want to help or have some kind of bilingual background, Scottish, English or something like

that, and who are interested in or who wants to be interested in what the students are doing, I think to a large extent that the problematic aspects here, they have to do with kinds of schools.

Q: How about combining a language subjects with other content subjects?

A: I combine a lot of Norwegian and English. Social Studies is favorable, I try to bring some mathematics into the English class, because one of the competency aims instruct teachers to do that. It is very much up to the interest of the particular teacher. But English can be combined with all vocational subjects. All you have to do is to take what has been said and learnt in Norwegian, and just repeat it in English. So, it is a simple subject to vocationally adapt. Very simple.

Q: When it comes to assessment and reasons for this practice, how is the justification of subject combinations like this justified through the English Subject Curriculum?

A: Very many competency aims are vocationally adaptable. And you are able to engage the students. You can get much more oral and written performance from doing this – I'm talking about our classes here at our school – than you will from focusing merely on different types of literary texts. Many students are low performing when it comes to literacy skills. And some of them are very strong performers orally. It's easier to connect the English subject to vocational content.

Q: Right. When it comes to assessment, you already mentioned some situations. Do you evaluate content and language equally?

A: When it comes to their written work, students receive comments on such areas like incorrect grammar, spelling errors, construction of sentences; the whole package. All of this relates mostly to the language. When it comes to content, usually I personally try to be so much aware of what I'm asking for that I myself can also assess the content. So for me, those two are not isolated. In TIP, that was never a problem, because I always knew what was going on. In other departments, however, I might need some help to evaluate the contents. If I teach English at other vocational branches. That might well be. Normally, however, I feel it's a part of my job to get involved with this content well enough to assess it. But when it comes to teaching other content than that which I am acquainted with from before, the contents can never be too advanced, what you're doing as the language teacher. It needs to be a sum-up, a generalization of what they've been doing, for instance hair styles, receiving



instructions, communicate with clients, which form shall the hair have, which color, and stuff like that. But they don't have to elaborate too much on it in the same way that they would do it in Norwegian. So it's more of a sum-up. Thus, it shouldn't be an impossible task to evaluate the contents. Still, many language teacher view it as an advantage to involve a content teacher in such an evaluation situation. Vocational teachers are mostly not comfortable with evaluating English language, Norwegian is all right.

Q: What do you think is expected from content and language teachers in the future? More cooperation? Different educations? Post education?

A: My background as the regional leader for a national vocational adaption channel has taught me that drop out and lack of motivation. English study competence is linked directly to the professional certificate. This means, if you don't have at least an E in English, study competence, you won't get your professional certificate. I surely do not hope that this will be the situation in the future. I hope that these two matters will be separated politically so that the ones who aim for study competency really get challenged with a lot of English, while the ones who aim for vocational education and jobs, get more English relevant for their profession. That they shouldn't need to have the same final exam. I hope the project in which I'm involved, will conclude with this. But this again will mean more knowledge about vocational adaption within the teacher education. I think most English teachers must be expected to teach in both camps, so to speak. Maybe the pedagogics and the didactics at the university will integrate some of the vocational training. I don't think that the universities and the academic world will pick up this agenda first. There are strong political currents that say "we need a high general English competence in Norway". Changing the final exam, for instance, seem to be a rigid endeavor, politically speaking. It's rather unlikely that they will change anything significantly here. In the Practical Pedagogical Education (*PPU*) we were shown some course books with examples of vocational adaption. However, the English PPU did not contain any lectures, except the one on CLIL, no presentations in the lectures were directly related to vocational adaption. For an English teacher from a traditional upper secondary school, with an academic English education; literature, phonetics, grammar, and who then is supposed to enter a classroom with vocational students, it must be quite a shock. For this, they should be better prepared. CLIL was shown as an example for inspiration and motivation, with a number of usage areas. When talking about humanist and

scientific subjects, in study preparatory, I think this should be elective; to study another subject in English. Traditionally, when it comes to the native language and the second language, the L1 has the role of being the reference language. Often, if I were progressing the English teaching, or being slightly ahead of schedule, I often got the feedback “oh wait, we haven’t had about this yet! So, we can’t learn it in English.” But then I just said to them “well, what about people in England? They also need to learn how to use a lathe in English. Why can’t we do the same?” There’s always some who object, but we usually do it. So, when I introduce new content material to the students, using the English slots, I am touching the CLIL domain I’d say. Living in America provided me with an inductive way of learning how to construct sentences, avoiding many L1 interference mistakes in the process. That was because I only heard and read American for four or five years. The grammar just sticks, without me thinking about what I’m doing or how I’m doing it. Teaching English in Norway is like a greenhouse; you make a frame which is a linguistic construction and the linguistic barriers are broken. In particular, when talking about vocational programs, a sense of purpose and motivation are important. That you gain a lot for free because the contents are relevant.

Q: How would you describe the necessity of teaching language and content in a kind of a synergy?

A: The low performing students are the motivation for me. This makes it easier for me to get them involved in a language learning situation. Because, normally, there’s so much resistance and anxiety to be found amongst them, fear, lacking sense of mastering, and God knows what. The students have this heritage from the intermediate school. They don’t want to speak, they are reluctant to write, and this and that. “I have never had English”, etc., lots of substituting reasons for some kind of anxiety. It’s easier to reach out to them if there’s some relevance to what they themselves wish to become. That goes for the most of them. Not all of course, because some of our students come here simply because they couldn’t get in where they wanted to go. I like the likening from the Karate Kid movie where he thinks that he’s waxing a car, but in reality, he is learning moves that he can use in karate. So, the students think they’re simply doing something relevant for welding or making components, but it turns out that they also acquire a great deal of general English as well. Much of this circles the notion of the “silent knowledge” amongst our students. They have seen and

heard a great deal of English. To extract this competence, make them conscious of it, is easier for me to do if the framework allows me to just get them started on some sort of a relevant task rather than sitting down and reading literary texts. In study preparatory branches, this is probably less hard to do, because most students have a stronger aptitude for literary skills. At least they should have, if they choose the study preparatory programs.

Q: That's all I have. Thank you.

A: Thanks.

*Interview 3: Language Teacher 2*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I have a Cand Mag in English, Social Studies and French and Practical Pedagogical Education (*PPU*) from Agder University.

Q: What kind of teaching experience do you have?

A: I have been working since 1990 in upper secondary school. Mostly integrated schools; both study preparatory programs and vocational programs.

Q: Which subjects do you teach?

A: English, French and Social Studies.

Q: Which level?

A: All three years within upper secondary school.

Q: Which study programs?

A: Very many. The most, but today I teach at Electronics, Sports and the 3<sup>rd</sup> year course which provides vocational students with general study competence.

Q: Did you receive any training concerning teaching a language with another subject?

A: No, I didn't. But I took the PPU course back in 1991, back then, it was not a topic. The term CLIL probably came later. And vocational adaption was not a topic either.

Q: Right. CLIL is often defined as a teaching a subject with English being the medium of instruction, usually at least 50 per cent of the instruction should be in English. Would you make any changes to this definition considering the conditions for CLIL practice in Norway?

A: I would not change the definition. If it's going to be CLIL, this definition is sufficient.

Rather, the question is whether this 50 per cent minimum should be the limit or not, what is the point of that? CLIL is one or more subjects taught with English as the medium of instruction.

Q: Can you tell me something about vocational adaptation, which is what you practice?

A: It's about being in the vocational classes, working with their vocation, in English. We read texts, we use materials from their vocation, and I run some of the classes in their workshops. On the one hand, you might say that I teach another subject than my own, in English. On the other hand, I am not a subject teacher, which I believe is important for the CLIL approach; that the one who conducts the teaching should have competence in the subject. If vocational should be CLIL proper, so to speak, it should have been the vocational teachers who taught their own subject in English. I am actually very often in their workshops teaching English. This is partly due to this school's infrastructure; we don't have regular classrooms. So that is provided by the sheer architecture of our school building. It is illuminated and open, and there just aren't ordinary classrooms in the vocational departments. So we teach them in the workshops, which is a great advantage. Because there, you have their tools which you – as an English teacher – enters. That I think is good! The practice we have, is built on cooperation. The English teacher becomes the kind of a teacher role which is relevant for their vocation. It's almost like a master – apprentice model; you walk around together, you work together, you talk together about what the students are actually doing in their vocation. It is much less teacher centered. Many of the experiences, they come from them, which I think is very positive, and which gives them another role than in traditional English classes. This is because they are the content specialists. I am not. We also have cooperation with subject teachers, in the same class with both teachers being present. But I am mostly alone. If we are two teachers, this usually happens in accordance with a project, for instance if they make an iMovie about something they do in their vocational subject with English explanation. In that case, I evaluate the language and he will evaluate the contents. In a situation of assessment.

Q: How did you get into this kind of practice; vocational adaptation?

A: It's so long ago, it was a virtue and necessity back then. I started teaching upper secondary before R94. I taught English for vocational students, second year only. 2 hours a week. Completely adapted. I found myself having to sit down with giant books about automation and pipe contracting, in English. In order to succeed with this – I was trained in Shakespeare, not pipe blueprints, it demanded a great effort from me. But still, I was there, I had their books, and this was what they were going to do. So there was a great deal of more

vocational adaptation during the earlier reforms. R94 introduced more theory and general subjects. English became one of them. Looking back, I feel lucky, because I started practicing teaching at a time when adaptation was the norm; that you as an English teacher were supposed to walk into their class and teach them their subject content in English. So I just brought the experience with me. Motivationally speaking, this is a precondition for making many of these classes work. If you can't beat them, join them, right? Motivation for learning and motivation for increasing the English subject's status and show them that it's useful for them. Tremendously important.

Q: Is it CLIL that you practice?

A: It might be a deviation of CLIL. But it's more similar to VOLL. It came earlier than CLIL, also an EU initiative. Vocationally Oriented Language Learning. It's having its renaissance now, I have noticed, in the literature on vocational adaptation. It's a kind of adaptation that also takes into account the notion of "lifelong learning", functioning in a social context, etc. Vocational adaptation is more directed towards VOLL than CLIL, I think.

Q: How would you describe the advantages of CLIL in terms of language learning?

A: In general, CLIL, as it is intended, has an incredible amount of good ballast in terms of language, Krashen and language immersion, which means that you'll build an understanding for language in a more natural way. Of course, if you teach Social Science, in English, the students will read a great amount of English written texts. That has to do something with their "sense of language". This probably goes for passive vocabulary as well, which means that from the language point of view, it has a lot of benefits. For my part, when it comes to vocational adaptation, or VOLL, or that modality of CLIL, I see great advantages when it comes to motivation; that you take the vocational students seriously. They have experienced, numerous times, to be met with prejudices from the general subjects' teachers. Throughout their schooling, they have experienced lacking recognition for their way of learning: it is very much about their way of learning. Because, if you adapt the English subject, and if you bring it into the workshops, you're able to employ their ways of working, which are often more hands-on, like Dewey - Learning by doing and reflecting. So it gives a sense of approval to that kind of learning strategy and that kind of education. You take the English down from that (unknown word) and make it useful, plainly. It helps the students to

understand the relevance of English in terms of their education, and that is important for their motivation.

Q: Can you see any advantages when it comes to subject learning when teaching in English?

A: For the vocational subjects, this means that English works as a kind of a repetition that the students get a chance to deep dive, or, I wouldn't say deep dive, that they get the chance to do it over again, repeat it, work more with their subject, but in English.

Q: What is expected from the teacher in a CLIL kind of a setting?

A: A lot. Because, you need to master the language. I am talking about CLIL in general, not vocational adaption, because there, English teachers are the ones who intercepts and conduct the CLIL, and they know English, right? If you are to teach Social Science and Natural Science in English, you truly need a teacher who knows the language. Or else, it will be really hard for the teacher to transmit the subject. The teacher needs to know both language and content.

Q: What must be expected from students in such a setting?

A: I think that CLIL is beneficial for both high and low performers. I believe that students who both have a high linguistic competence and high competence subject wise, still will have something to aim for. It will provide them with another perspective of entering the subject and a different type of texts. I think that the thought or theory of deeper processing really has something to contribute with in this field. For the lower performing students, the concerns mostly have to do with motivation and the sense of mastering something. Now, I am back on vocational adaption, or VOLL. I believe that they are provided with an opportunity to both get engaged with the content and also to show me what they can do, because they know the subject content, and that knowledge will help them produce English utterances. It would be harder, on the other hand, if I were to do this in the Social Science class. I have done cross-curricular projects there, but I have never taught social science in English, so to speak. That's because I think "Well, what about the students who struggle communicating in English?" If I am to run a social science test and it is supposed to be in written English, will that then deprave their communicating a subject content that they actually know very well? This is a conflict area, in my opinion. And I would also be a little unsure about how to assess the performance; would you assess English or content or both of them? In VOLL, it's all right, because there, you evaluate both of them. Because they are

required to be able to show that they can connect the two if they are to present something or to do something similar, because we evaluate both content, structure and language in the English class, right? But what about natural science, math, geography? Plainly, I don't know. I think I would find it hard, if I were to do something like that.

Q: How do you think that CLIL may be beneficial for the communicative classroom?

A: In many ways, I think. In terms of VOLL, you enter, as a teacher, a social context which is already familiar to the students. It does away with some of that "language anxiety" that I believe some of our students have. Talking about a subject content which is familiar to them, makes it easier to make them cooperate, it simply invites them to cooperation and removes some of that language anxiety. This is due to them physically being in a landscape which they know well, in which they feel comfortable, and that is what, I think, makes it easier for them to act together, both orally and in writing. In the term "vocational adaption" there is a notion that you should not only use materials and texts which are simply concerning their vocation, but also that the methods shall be directed towards their current activities. Again, cooperation and cooperative learning is very popular in vocational schools and that is something one can employ in the teaching of English as well, if your day to day activities is concerned with vocational programs.

Q: What are some of the biggest challenges with VOLL?

A: They are many. Firstly, you need to have the outer frames right. One need to have English teachers who can be granted most of, or at least, a good deal of their classes teaching in the same study program. It is very demanding to "get into" the subject, right? You also need a close cooperation with the vocational teachers. And that, takes time. So, the outer framework should save you from teaching ten different study programs at the same time, and rather let you focus on two or three. This is solely to build up your own competency in their subject content, right? You need to get acquainted with the vocational teachers. In addition, the Curriculum in itself is a challenge, because it splits the vocational programs into two years. So that the students have three hours per week in the first year and two hours per week the second year. Two hours per week the second year? How much can you possibly do, when you are required to teach topics like for instance literature as well, right? So, there are some issues, in the student enrolment for the second year, you might get students who didn't attend our school the first year, who may have had another course



book, etc. There are no directives in the curriculum that explicitly states that “on the first year, you shall do this, and on the second year, you shall do this”. You may both have students who lack what you taught them the previous year, and you may have students who have already done what you are about to do! You never know that! When it comes to CLIL: if a teacher wishes to start a CLIL program in his class and his subject, will be to find proper materials to use. You might have to use a course book in English written for a different country, different language preconditions. It might not fully cover the Norwegian curriculum demands in the particular subject. The language might also be on the verge of being too difficult for the students. With this, finding the resources will be a challenge for a teacher who wants to start doing it. This makes the teachers go: “Oh, screw this!” Back in the 90s, a course book in social studies came out in both Norwegian and English versions. They were completely similar, only linguistically different. Teachers and students were to choose which one they opted for. Do you want this course in English or in Norwegian? This made it easy for the teacher, because then you had a textbook adapted to Norwegian conditions, but with English language. But the language was of course adapted. Not authentic. Authentic language is said to one of CLIL’s upper hands.

Q: How would you structure a VOLL class?

A: I depends very much on what the students are currently engaged with. And it also depends on what kind of objectives I have set out for my English class. We have English the entire year, but I have thematically structured modules, say, four weeks of vocational adaption, if that is something they are currently engaged with, I join them, so to speak. Small exposures are not sufficient in themselves, you need to engage with the same content over an extended period of time in order to “get into” it. “Skills” is the basic course book. The school purchased it this year, so I haven’t yet tried it for too long. Earlier, we used “Tracks”. In the second year, these books were completely lacking vocationally adapted content. At all. All vocational programs used the same book for the second year. This demanded that the teachers needed to be very creative in terms of finding subject content materials which was relevant. When it comes to other resources, I use movie clips, How Stuff Works, there’s plenty of good materials on the web, which can be used for vocational adaption. In addition, we employ uses manuals they have for their tools, the Electric Subject Catalogue (*Elifagkatalogen*) is available both in English and Norwegian on the internet. It has been time

demanding to find materials. And it will continue to be. However, I think that is a part of the job you're supposed to do, due to the fact that you'll never find a textbook in English which is always adapted to the exact thing the students are doing at every time. Actually, I had an experience today, we were discussing safety when dealing with electricity. The students were working with some tasks on the "Skills" textbooks homepages. One of the questions were: "What are you supposed to do if you get an electrical shock so that you get a burn, a wound?" The answer on the website was that you should keep it under running cold water. The students replied no, they had just been attending a course where the instructor said that this is not what you should do! That's old days fashioned. But it can also be a good thing, because it leaves the students reflecting on the fact that the teacher not always possesses the ultimate truth. The students can contribute with their own experiences. So you are dependent on finding other materials than the course books.

Q: How do you go about structuring an English class in the workshops?

A: Firstly, I cooperate with the vocational teacher in order to find out what the class is up to, simply. Then I make a "mission to learn" with him. It's almost like a project.

Q: In which subject combinations do you think that CLIL could be advantageous?

A: All of them. If you're thinking about building linguistic competence, I think it can be used in all subjects. Maybe humanist subjects in particular, though, because in these subjects, one reads a great amount of texts. If one is to develop the reading skills, this is a good strategy.

Q: Do you think CLIL is most suitable for a language teacher or a subject teacher?

A: I am very uncertain. I guess it would depend on the person one is talking about. For many of my colleagues, it would be unthinkable to talk in English, do you follow? So I don't know. Very uncertain here.

Q: Which subject combinations in particular?

A: Combining English with other humanist subjects is absolutely possible. History, Social Sciences, probably also Geography. A combination of these with English would be very good. Also because you get this relevance to the world beyond Norway. Talking about the international community in the social sciences, in English, it truly increases your vision from solely focusing on Norway, only the fact that you're using this other language. International conflicts, watch movies in English, read the contents in English. It will also train their critical

skills, because the students will be using English newspapers on the web, and similar resources. I think this would be a very good combination. When it comes to combining English with the hard sciences, I have no idea. I do not have a scientific background, so I simply do not know. English and vocational programs? Definitely. Partly because the English subject in upper secondary for vocational studies points in two different directions. One of the directions point on towards further studies, because it provides them with the general study competence. The other one points towards their profession. So, as an English teacher at vocational studies, you become slightly schizophrenic due to you having to combine these two. CLIL might be a way to combine these directions in a way that is relevant for them and which actually works. And this doesn't only go for teaching the vocational subject content. The students need to communicate in a professional market which is internationally oriented. Many of them will work abroad. Several of my students in automation will work in the North Sea. In these contexts, the professional language very often is English. So I think it's useful.

Q: Is CLIL practice justified through the English Subject Curriculum?

A: To a very large extent! The subject curriculum perfectly maps with the CLIL approach. The curriculum in Norway in general is very much influenced by the EU engagements like the language portfolio, competences, basic skills and things like that. But also because it emphasizes English as an international language, lifelong learning and skills which is intended for future professional or academic life. This is persistent in the general part of the curriculum, but maybe even more so in the revised English subject curriculum from 2013. Six of the competency aims within the basic skills of communication, writing and oral skills state clearly that the English instruction should be directed towards the study program the students are on. In addition, the educational authorities have sustained the law from 2008/09 (*Karlsen-utvalget*) where a committee evaluated the role of the general subjects in vocational education. The law was implemented on an early stage of the Curriculum, and it says that English is an obligatory subject on all study programs, and it is intended to be directed towards the study program the students are on in order to make it relevant for them. Having said this, the focus from the curriculum is imminent. The question arises then, will the teachers be able to conduct this business alongside with everything else the curriculum requires them to do? And this goes beyond vocational adaption. Students on

study preparatory programs should have English instruction which is academically adapted, so to speak.

Q: What do you think will be expected from a language and a subject teacher in the future?

A: I think it is strange that CLIL is not widespread in Norway. All Scandinavian countries have a linguistic society and culture which drills us in using the English language. The English status in the curriculum have been raised to regarding English as an L2. The foreign languages German, French and Spanish do not have this status. I think to myself, it shouldn't be too hard to implement CLIL on a bigger scale. We have many teachers, I think, who communicate well in English. We have students who are used to relate to English materials in their everyday life. So why not? I don't know. Linguistic competence in general will become more and more important in the future. I think it's extremely important. It's all about providing students the ability to orient themselves in a society that is ever more characterized by cooperation, globalization, travelling, reading subject literature in English, etc. I think linguistic competence is a necessity in a future society, and CLIL might be a way to achieve it. Also, cross cultural communication, inter-cultural competence, can be nurtured through CLIL. You need both language and knowledge about culture and conventions within that culture, right? Cross curricular work in general will be more important in the future because students and future employees need to be able to adapt quickly to new conditions.

Q: How do you think that CLIL will change the manner of how languages are taught?

A: I don't have a clear answer to this. I do not think that it necessarily will change anything. There will still be an English subject, and there will be other subjects taught in English. If you teach social sciences in English, you don't teach the language, you get textual and oral input in English. In a CLIL setting, grammar and all the linguistic parts of the English language competence, will probably not be the major focal point. The focus will rather be on the content.

*Interview 4: Content Teacher 1*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I have a Bachelor of Science; biology and chemistry and a Master in didactics and pedagogics. Both of them are from the US. I also have a Master in school administration from Norway. So I am the vice principal of this school as well. But I was not a vice principal when our school did the CLIL project.

Q: Teaching experience?

A: I have taught both in the US and in Norway. In USA, I taught at college level for six years. In Norway, I have been exclusively on this school since 1997. So it's quite a number of years! Upper secondary classes in Norway, and college in the states.

Q: Which subjects?

A: Hard sciences; chemistry, biology and natural science, for the most part.

Q: Which levels?

A: I have been teaching all of them, but mostly on the first and second years.

Q: Which programs?

A: Both study preparatory and *IB* (International Baccalaureate). We don't have vocational studies here at this particular school anymore. I have taught *Helse og Sosialfag* (Health and Social Worker) earlier, when I came here in 97, that was one of our offers, but the program was later placed on a different school. Currently, this school is exclusively study preparatory.

Q: Did you receive any kind of training in your education concerning teaching your subjects together with language teaching?

A: No, I did not. But I worked in the US, and there they knew English of course. But previously, I taught IB, and there the teaching is in English with primarily Norwegian students. So I would say I am used to it. But I think like this: If you start at the IB program, you are supposed to attend it for two years, and then you have a final exam in all subjects after two years. My thoughts on the subjects is that one just plunges into it and starts teaching, in English. We do not spend any additional time training them in English, but after

two years, their English will have improved because, after all, they have all their subjects in English. So I have never considered a “soft start” or anything like that, because students who select IB are after all not forced to choose it. They are free to choose regular study preparatory. So, the students who actually make the choice, they actually have a genuine interest, and many of them may have lived abroad and things like that. So there is a reason for them choosing IB. But there, the books are in English, the tests are in English; everything is in English. So, it’s not CLIL in the same way. This year, I have two students who have led most of their lives abroad. They are attending a regular first year class. Their Norwegian is terrible, simply. But they managed to enroll in regular study preparatory. They have found one another, so to speak, two boys. One of them is from Singapore and the other one is from the states. What I’ve noticed is that they speak in English between themselves, even if the book is in Norwegian and I only teach in Norwegian. Due to my experiences with CLIL, I now have a different approach than I used to have. When they write their answers on test, when they mix Norwegian and English, I let it pass. Because for me, it’s all about showing that you know the content. I guess they get enough negative feedback from the teachers in their language subjects, right? I, who have natural science with them, think that the most important thing is for them to learn natural science. Whether it’s in English or in Norwegian is not really that important to me as long as the show that they have an understanding. If the answer is *røntgen* and I want them to answer *røntgen*, I don’t really care if they write x-rays, that’s perfectly fine with me. It’s just something which I decided for myself. I haven’t really discussed it with other teachers, but I think that these students probably have a hard time in the Norwegian subject for instance, due to the fact that their Norwegian is so poor. But if this issue should be as serious in every subject, they will never advance. They are bright boys, they will do fine in the university: they just need some time to get the Norwegian down. To be honest, this is not the first time I have dealt with language mixing, what to accept and so on. The number of international students are ever increasing, so these are the kinds of problems we will have to deal with more and more in the times that are ahead of us.

Q: Right. CLIL is often defined as a subject taught using English as the language of instruction. Would you change this definition?

A: No, but I think that in order to engage the students, one needs to lower the enrolment

threshold. Especially if they themselves haven't chosen CLIL. If they have not hooked of "I want English instruction". Our CLIL project was mandatory. The ones in the international classes have chosen it for themselves, hooked of "I want natural science in English." Because it is, after all 100 percent in English. While when conducting the CLIL project it was mandatory, and also currently on the scholar program (chemistry for second year students). In this class, approximately one third of the instruction is in English, not all of it. When they are tested, all the tasks are in English, but if the flop the paper, all the tasks are present in Norwegian. The reason for this is that if their book is in Norwegian and their English is not too sturdy, I think it's a shame that this issue will affect their final grade in their subject. They may then choose English or Norwegian, as long as they stick to the language they choose. They cannot switch within the same answer, but if there are topics they know better in English or better in Norwegian, I let them answer it as they would like. The students who find answering in English to be "cool" (very many of them do), they will answer completely in English. And those students who are really a bit negative to the whole concept, answer exclusively in Norwegian. There's room for the ones who may or may not struggle. I get less complaints because the students are free to choose.

Q: How did you get into teaching language and content at the same time?

A: I applied for this vacant teaching position in Norway. I am Norwegian, but I have lived in the US for 28 years, which is a long time. So, when I moved back to Norway, I was not really fluent in Norwegian. So the IB position vacant at this school, fit me perfectly. Because then I had the chance to teach in English. So that's how I started teaching in Norway; only in English. Gradually, I started teaching in Norwegian as well. Today, I teach almost solely in Norwegian. But I think that, for me, the students, I think it yields better learning for them when I teach in English, simply because English is the language I master the best due to my personal background. I believe that teachers who are forced into a CLIL situation, and who do not master the language, this will perhaps be a disadvantageous situation for this class. That is due to the fact that the teacher will not be able to stand there and master it, and be himself, plainly. That's it. You might have some jokes or stories that you tell the students, right? If you can't be yourself, you will get very disadvantaged. You will end up only remaining to what says in the book or on a sheet. No good teaching and learning will result from this kind of practice. It gets tedious and impersonal, right? So I think it's all about

finding the right persons and place them in the correct position. When a teacher tells me that they'd like to be on IB, I don't place them on IB. Because the students will not benefit from having a teacher who does not himself wish to speak English, or simply can't speak English, or have a lack of confidence speaking English. Of course, everyone knows some! How did I personally get acquainted with CLIL? I don't remember exactly. It's a while ago. I can't really say when and how. I know I was asked to start working with a CLIL project, which turned into a cross curricular project. Three subjects were involved in this particular class. Some teachers are not CLIL pro, I have to add.

Q: Right. Would you say that it is CLIL, that which you practice in the classroom?

A: We decided to start practicing regular CLIL. It was CLIL proper, we played the game by the rules!

Q: How would you describe CLIL's advantages when it comes to language learning?

A: What happens at an upper secondary school is that teachers get obsessed with the competency aims in their own subjects. If they cannot find a direct link to a competency aim, they are simply not interested. That was a challenge when it came to the English subject, which was in the CLIL project as well. Because it was actually quite hard for them to see how CLIL in the English subject covered properly the English subject competency aims. I have been to a couple of CLIL conventions, I have heard people talk about it and I know that there's a great number of approaches, without me being able to tell right from wrong. We decided to combine three subjects. It was English, Geography and Natural Science. Next time we did it, we combined English, Technology and Research and Natural Science. These were larger scale projects where the teachers picked competency aims from their own subjects and made an amalgamation by sitting down and discussing how they were going to go about it. The students were to produce something, some kind of a product. In our case, the CLIL project was about sustainable development. The students were asked to make a prototype of an energy-saving device. It was a free choice within the framework, but it was required that the students were able to tell us why this was a good idea: how much one could save, they did some calculations, tell us something about that, and in the end, we had a science fair where the students had their own stands, exhibited their products for the other class and told them about the prototype they made. For instance, one of the boys had a bike where he had a dynamo mounted which charged his cell phone. And it worked! He showed



us that his mobile charged, that there was power, etc. His argument was that bicycling was something he did very often, and he thought that it was a waste not to harvest the energy which generates from riding your bike. Other students had entirely different ideas. There was no limit for what they could make, but they had to argue that it was a good idea. The other class then voted for the product they had most faith in. Then they switched turn, the classes. They got a grade in three subjects, one for each. So for me, who did not have the English subject, even though I do speak English, Natural Science was my subject in this situation, and I did not really consider poor English or anything like that when they had their presentations. That was not my thing. I only looked for points about sustainable development and scientific topics. In other words, whether they were able to describe and make an argument within these meanings in order to achieve a good grade. That was how we executed it: Every teacher went around with each and one having their own assessment criteria and their own grade. It was a cooperation. It was also a strategy that helped us execute a project at this scale without draining hours from one single subject. The students got enough time without us having to sacrifice 15 English lessons or something like that. This was what the teachers liked as well. That they could move on with the competency aims, not halt for too long because of one single project. This was the CLIL project at our school. We had regular tests as well to set the grade. The CLIL project was in addition. Cooperation between subject teachers, helped strengthen the project. For my own part, I have enough study points for being an English teacher, formally. But I lack experience. It's not really trustworthy that I can approach a group of Norwegian speaking English teachers and tell them: I am a guru, I can teach English. I belong in the hard sciences. But I happen to speak English very well. That's just the way it is! I stick to my subjects, consistently. If I worked in a more rural community somewhere, it might well be that I would be teaching English there. But not here. There are plenty of English teachers here.

Q: Would you say that there is any difference teaching Natural Science in Norwegian than in English?

A: I can tell that for the students who have low motivation due to them being tired of going to school or whatever, English might give the subjects some degree of "cool". Those who are tempted to put their heads on their desks and sleep, these might be students with good competence, maybe they know much of what we're dealing with from before, they're just

simply bored and can't stand the daily hassle which regular teaching consists of. With CLIL, suddenly, there's something different, it breaks with traditional Norwegian schooling. Some of these students might benefit from CLIL; it breathes life into them again, so to speak. Now they want to participate, now they're interested. They find their own materials in the internet, because the internet has vast amounts of English materials. They think it's more fun. Especially, when they know that we're not going to practice error correction. As previously mentioned, I have not done that. If, for instance, they write something amusing, I put a small smiley in the correction, implying very bad language usage, or that they are writing something completely different than what they intended to say. Other than that, I haven't commented on their English at all.

Q: What's expected from a teacher who is going to practice CLIL?

A: I can only tell you what I think personally. And I think one's command of English should be solid. If you aren't, the whole project will fail.

Q: What's expected from students in CLIL groups?

A: It's about attitudes, I think. You need them on your side; they need to be optimistic about working in English. It's very much about how the teacher introduces the project; are you able to convince the students to do this? Are you able to create some kind of liability within the class? This is important to achieve in order to avoid moaning and complaints from the students. "Why do we have to do this in English? This is boring! It makes it even harder! Lots of additional work!" etc. If this happens, you may just as well forget about the whole thing. Positive attitudes will not be achieved by forcing the English on the students. The attitude must be that they're part of something cool. They need to buy it, it needs to be something they want to be a part of. A tough situation will be if you have a group where very many students wants to do CLIL, but two or three students who are negative. Those few students can very well ruin a great deal. It doesn't take many negative students to put you in a difficult situation as a teacher, and you don't really know what to do anymore. You don't want to receive complaints from teachers and students. There need to be a certain degree of spontaneity. That the students wish to be a part of this. I have experienced this, one year in the international class, we were wanting three students in order to fill the class. This was something we had to do. So we selected three random students and put them in the class. We did check that their English grades from intermediate school were at the top level. We

thought to ourselves: All right, these students can actually bear having natural science in English. So we put them in the international class. However, the three of them were so negative due to them not having chosen it for themselves. The other ones had. This experience has put restrictions on our practice of placing students in CLIL groups without having carefully informed them about the idea and let them make the selection themselves. This one year, I had a group of 30 students where 27 wanted it to be in English, and three students refused. The dynamics in the class became unfortunate because the three students were under pressure. I had to tell them that we couldn't do it in English if everyone did not comply. This is a Norwegian school, so the students have a right to have the instruction in their native tongue. The consideration resulted in that we had most of the classes in Norwegian with a few suiting topics in English. It's not easy to find a way to handle these issues. So, my conclusion is that there needs to be a certain degree of volunteering for it.

Q: Is CLIL for high performing or low performing students?

A: It depends on how you structure the materials. Low performing students are not necessarily weak students after all, subject wise. Sometimes, it's just a matter of engaging them. I have zero experience as a vocational teacher, take that into consideration when I'm telling you this. If you teach vocational cooking, for instance, and if you are able to get the students into the idea of making some British dishes, or Australian or whatever which is in English, Jamaican or anything, and that they then could make an English menu, if the students think it's fun, I think most of the students would be able to master it even at vocational studies. It's not true that they cannot read, they're not illiterate. The most of them are ambulant, after all. Another thing, variation is of profound importance. I have helped writing some books about making the hard science subjects engaging for the students. The point is that one should vary. One should not do the same thing over and over where the teacher talks and the students listen. Because you learn from what motivates you. This is where CLIL fits the context. It is a form of variation. Especially if you vary it throughout the year, in other words, the students shouldn't have a CLIL project the entire year. It should be introduced somehow. We used to have a kind of a kick-off event. All our teachers dressed in green because the project was called "Going Green" right? We showed movie clips, things were going on. It created a buzz, you know. It became something interesting for the students. They were all like "Wow, what's this?" and it provided them with a motivation for

joining the project. If you do CLIL all the time, on the other hand, that is not what I would call variation.

Q: How do you think CLIL can be used to create communicative situations?

A: Personally, I get a little provoked when the Norwegian language is disappearing from the subjects. I firmly believe that Norwegian is important for Norway. The language is already in jeopardy because it is a small country with few inhabitants. There are many immigrants. Some of them only work here, then they go back home. When I go to a restaurant in Stavanger, I expect to have a waiter who is proficient in Norwegian. It's increasingly not so! Either they speak English, or they speak Swedish. Everything but Norwegian. The ones who object to CLIL, often point to situations like these. Watering down the Norwegian language. At university level, Norwegian becomes obsolete to a large extent. I am in Norway, I want to speak Norwegian. Even if I'm married to an American and we speak in English at home every day. But it's not about that. It's about Norway; the location of a native tongue. So I understand the critics of CLIL. But I don't have an answer. I am mostly concerned with my situation and my students. What are they going to learn? What triggers them? What motivates them? What makes them comply with working with the subject? This is where we can make CLIL work for you. But in a wider perspective, I understand the worries. We don't want to make Norwegian some sort of a pidgin, like some Indian tribes have lost their language? I think this might become an issue.

Q: What's the biggest challenge when teaching for instance natural science in English?

A: Due to my background, I have no problems with that. Many of the speakers at this CLIL conference were also native speakers of English. It's understandable that they opt for CLIL, of course.

Q: How would you structure a CLIL lesson in terms of educational materials and textbooks?

A: Firstly, we don't have an English textbook. This is due to the subject curriculum for natural sciences in Norway is very peculiar. It does not really look like similar curriculums from the English speaking world. This is a challenge in relation to CLIL, because you simply cannot find books with that particular combination of topics, where you have astronomy as well as batteries, nutrition and all kinds of strange and random topic combinations. That happened with the curricular reform of 2007 (*Kunnskapsløftet*). Before then, we used English textbooks from Great Britain. Those books worked fine for us. Now, suddenly, only a small fraction of

those books can actually be used. This leads to the students getting frustrated. This is currently what we're experiencing. A Norwegian textbook combined with English instruction, is rather hard. In other words, if they are to have English instruction, they want the books to be in English as well. But these do not exist. Thus, it becomes a tough endeavor, which I have received complaints on for many years. The students are unhappy. Last month, I went looking for new course books at a conference. The Oxford University Press and many other publishers. But it just doesn't fit. Either, the level is completely wrong, or the combination of disciplines is wrong. It's rather frustrating. And yes, we do have the internet, but the students really, really prefer a book, because of the sheer amount of material they have to go through. They also like to keep it on a certain level. Because, if you go about "clicking" on the internet, random websites that the teacher may have found, a couple of clicks more, and you end up on a PhD thesis. A fifteen year old will not understand a thing from what he or she is reading. It's frustrating for them inasmuch as they don't know what to do! Another problem is that they cannot re-access materials. They're not really proficient at saving the links they have. They find this practice very difficult. This is the state today, when I teach natural science in English. It's easier with chemistry. On the Scholar Program, we have 30 percent of the instruction in English. I currently teach this program. Here, it's much easier because it's ordinary chemistry. Norwegian, English or American chemistry does not differ that much. So in these contexts, switching between English and Norwegian works perfectly fine.

Q: In which subject combinations do you picture CLIL as particularly advantageous?

A: I can picture that teaching English at vocational studies would be fun. But I have no experience with it and no competency either. I need to consider what is to be found in the study preparatory branch. There, I believe that the most natural combinations would be those subjects where the students would experience that as soon as they get admitted to the university, the subjects will be in English. This means that also the students who intend to study in Norway, will have a need for subject terminology. Subjects like Jurisdiction could just as well be kept in Norwegian. Because the laws of Norway are of course in Norwegian. The same goes with Norwegian history. But all the hard sciences are good candidates I think. At least parts of them. I remember when I came to Norway, I needed to take the Bergen test in order to prove to them that my Norwegian was proper enough. I did, so I took a year of

physics. Let me refresh my knowledge a little, I thought to myself. I took the test, and got admitted to the university. Only to discover that it was the same one I had used in the states. So, in sum then, I had to prove to the authorities that I was proficient in Norwegian in order to take a one year course in English. That's how it works in Norway. You prove that you know Norwegian, but most things are actually in English. This is where I think that CLIL can be of great help. So that when the students encounter the literature of physics or chemistry, they understand what they are reading. Earlier, a part of the textbook in chemistry was actually in English. That was a result of embellishing the thought of further studies at university level. Nowadays, everything is in Norwegian. There is no English to be found at all. The students on study preparatory, they have to study. They get no professional certificate after they're done here. They actually don't gain anything. The only thing they get is the possibility of further studies. That is the way they should be going, and we need to prepare them for this. That is our responsibility; to prepare them sufficiently. And not only the ones who are to study at closed programs where everything is in Norwegian. Because very few studies are like that. Most studies are at least partly in English.

Q: Is CLIL most suitable for the language teacher or the content teacher?

A: I think they need to have different roles. What I experience with some language teachers is that what they know, in terms of writing and using subject terminology, they don't know the specific vocabulary in the subjects that I teach. Moreover, they don't know how to write a log report, they don't know how to write an article about something that the students have made or of something that they have analyzed. Mathematically speaking, for instance. A language teacher is not necessarily the right person to guide the further way for a students within the frames of a content subject they do not possess knowledge in. They might know the grammatical forms and correct usage, but when it comes to actually use the subject, I am not sure whether the language teacher is actually the most proficient teacher. I am not sure about that at all. I am of the opinion that it can be hampering the students' progress if their language is to be evaluated all the time while dealing with the subject. So it's not stupid to be a little less demanding in terms of language usage and terminology; if they use the wrong verb, that is not really too important. Maybe you will not cover the competency aims in the English subject. You'd rather be using the specific vocabulary of physics. When we run chemistry in English in the scholar program, there is no language teacher present. It is

important that the subject teacher feels safe when talking in English, that it is all right, joyful and fun for them. They need to be positive. If the teacher is negative, you can be sure that the students are negative too. The teacher needs to have a very good combination. But they do not need to have a perfect language. As long as they think that it's fun. And the subject specific terminology, they should already have, I think. Because, if they have an MA in hard sciences, they must have read a good deal of English themselves, right? Therefore, I think that this is sufficient. Norwegians in general are very proficient in general English, linguistically, in comparison to many other countries. In Germany and Italy, for instance, the English is poorer. But Norwegians lack subject specific terminology. They simply don't have it. I find it strange that subject specialists from other fields are not admitted (into the English subject). If this had been done, the students would have talked and written completely differently.

Q: Can you justify the practice of CLIL through the subject curriculum?

A: In natural science, there is not a word about English. The specific basic skills are there, but the language is not specified. No English competency aims.

Q: What can be expected from a language teacher and from a subject teacher in the future?

A: That will be exciting to see. I honestly do not know. I think many issues are connected here. There are many linguistic demands in Norway currently. The way it is today, the focus on language is too vast. That is the opposite of what one reads in the newspaper. With three grades in Norwegian, one grade in a foreign language and another grade in something that is not referred to as a foreign language anymore, English, these grades add up to a great number. If you're not really a language person, more of the mathematical sort; seeing relations, describe things mathematically, these students get an A in all the hard sciences and a D in Norwegian. That might lead to them not being enrolled at the specific program they want to study at the university. With five language grades on their school leaving certificate, this becomes something which hampers them gravely. We have many examples, especially with boys. Language is what holds them back. They might not get admitted. I find it sad, to be frank.

Q: How would you describe the necessity of teaching content and language at once?

A: That's when it gets interesting! I remember studying Spanish at upper secondary. It was a little scary, I didn't think that I was able to drill the language fast enough to meet the

teacher's expectations. The language did not really make any sense to me. But then I traveled to Mexico as an exchange student. Suddenly, it became very exciting to learn the language. I could use it for something, it was fun, it was culture, it was music, everything. It made sense. When I came back, I was able to speak Spanish fluently, which was very nice, I was very proficient. To give the language meaningful contents is of profound importance. One year, when the students in the first year were very negative to English. When I asked them why, they replied: "English is about a load of stuff that does not interest us. Like the Royal Family. The literature we are required to read is really boring. Why can't we read some fun books in English? Why can't we work with football, for instance?" The contents does not make sense to many students, you do not reach them with this. Some love English naturally. With them, you can do anything. For others, you need to hit the nail in a better way and find out what teenagers actually like. If one wants them to learn English. Or else, it will just be a branch of Social Studies. Concealed Social Studies.

Q: Do you think that CLIL will change how we teach in Norway?

A: I hope so. It needs to be systematized. Right now, it's very ad hoc, the whole CLIL thing. It needs to be something that teacher can relate their work to. Because it was hard to amalgamate across subjects and classes as well, perhaps. There are many opinions. No one at this stage perceives CLIL as something which is naturally within their subject, so it needs to come from the top and be implemented in the entire system. In order to sustain, it must be something meaningful for the students. Otherwise, it will just be a happening.



*Interview 5: Language Teacher 3*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I have my major in English and I am of course also pedagogically trained since I'm a teacher. I also have Philosophy, Literature Science, and Organization Science – which is a part of Social Studies.

Q: Right. And I also understand that you have a bilingual background? Can you tell me something about that?

A: Yes, I am bilingual. Part of my childhood I spent in Australia. But I am born, and have spent most of my life, in Norway. When I came back here as a teenager, I had forgotten about my native tongue (Norwegian) so I had to learn it again, so to speak.

Q: And you got educated after this stay abroad?

A: Yes, definitely afterwards. I did not intend to study English, I was going for Social Science, and started studying at the University of Bergen. But then, I started leaning more and more to more Humanist subjects; more philosophy, more literature, more language, and I found out that this was what I was the most interested in. After studying philosophy, I wanted to travel. So then, I thought, the easiest subject for me to take, if I am to travel, was English. So I studied it in a somehow condensed way, and did some travelling as well. The English worked very well for me, and I found out that I liked it a lot.

Q: What kind of teaching experience do you have? How many years?

A: I started teaching lessons at the University of Bergen. It lasted for approximately 4 and a half years; 9 semesters. I did literature and academic writing. Mostly American literature, British, Australian, lots of different things. Then, I moved with my family to Stavanger. It was not as easy to get a job at the University here, at least not back then. I ended up teaching at Intermediate, where I taught the subjects where there was a demand for teachers, really. Everything from specialized pedagogics to English, Norwegian, Social Studies. I continued working in Intermediate school for 10 years. Two different schools. I had subjects like *Mat og Helse* (Nutrition and Health subjects), *RLE* (Religion, Philosophy and Ethics); they'll use you for what you're worth! Lastly, I got a job at the school where I am currently working – an

upper secondary school. Here, I've taught Norwegian, English and English on *IB* (International Baccalaureate). Currently, I teach the English elective courses, English general subject and English on *IB*.

Q: English elective courses are the ones that the students themselves select in the second and third years?

A: Either more in-depth studies of literature or English in the Social Studies. Political systems and institutions. Those kinds of things.

Q: I see. Currently, you only teach English, but you have experience from several subjects. What levels?

A: Yes. I teach all three levels. This year, however, I only teach second and third years. But normally, I also teach the first year students.

Q: Which study programs?

A: When I started teaching here, we also had vocational courses. I used to be English and Norwegian subject teacher on vocational programs. We used to have *Service og Samferdsel* (Service and Logistics), *Reiseliv* (Travel Studies), second year.

Q: All right. Did you receive any formal training in your education considering teaching a subject content in a foreign language?

A: No, but I remember we discussed it during the *PPU* (Practical Pedagogical Education) classes. Within the framework of subject didactics. An exciting subject indeed! I remember we discussed such issues. But when I started teaching at this school, some classes here had pieces and bits of Natural Science and Social Studies in English. They were called international classes. This happens on the first year, before the students can choose to enroll in *IB*. The students who might be interested in continuing their studies on *IB*, then, can apply for international classes on our school. They will get some "appetizers" of subjects taught in English, just to show them what they go to if they choose *IB*. That's one of the routes our students may choose. The other one is, regardless of the students' selection of subjects, yet in particular if they choose the hard sciences, a large extent of the syllabi are in English. And still more of them consider higher education, where much of the required reading will be in English. Thus, the idea has been to increase the level of English proficiency in general. Me being an English teacher, I think this has been very good. What it is all about, we have very

bright students here; most of them are very proficient English speakers. A lot of grammar and a lot of grammar and traditional language work, is simply too boring for these students. They need challenges. What I do in my subject, currently, I am not part of a CLIL project right now, but I teach Social Studies, which is, after all, a part of the English Subject Curriculum. Yet, it's still on a bit more advanced level than something I would have done where the average students was a lower performer, and the students would probably need more grammar, for instance, right? Yet, even when I taught intermediate levels, I had a number of learners who were not what one would describe as high performers, academically speaking. Not at all. Even in that situation, I found that it is better to just talk in English, walk the line, which I was very comfortable with myself; I was able to. Even if all students may not have understood every single word, they were nonetheless, I mean, "Immerse them in language". That's often what you keep thinking as a language teacher, right, how can you teach language, teach subject content, when you don't live in that particular country? It is, of course, a lesser problems here when it comes to English than when it comes to French or German. But my intentions were the same. The didactics of the subject; how should one go about that? Therefore, I think it comes very natural to use the language as much as possible, but with some contents: you must teach them something, because then I believe they remember and learn the language better; it's more interesting. Sometimes, however, you need to conduct the meta-language level, where they learn about the language itself. One need to teach expressions, some grammar is important in order to understand the underlying structure of the language. I think it is an interesting approach, and I still think that it is an interesting approach, because it is what I do in the elective English courses. Those students are so linguistically competent that they are capable of discussing advanced problems in English. When it comes to integrating language and content, I slid in quite naturally in CLIL. I did. On *IB*, this is what it's all about, right? Even though I am dealing with English-B, which is a kind of acquisition course – not the most proficient speakers, they don't attend the English Language and literature-course, but they have a simpler variety. These students are proficient in English, no doubt, but they are not good enough to take English as a first language subject, so English-B is rather a more SLA-oriented subject. I am free to determine the contents of these classes. And I do. I pick materials from anthropology, psychology, sociology, literature – of course – something from all kinds of subjects. So, it's through the contents that they acquire the language. A very natural method, I think. I also

think that I am not the only one who does this, I am not unique. But the extent to which we are very conscious of what we're doing, that's eeehhh... To be honest, I never discussed it with the other teachers: What are we doing when we are doing CLIL? But we did run some cross-curricular projects, and one teacher published an article on the project. To me, the CLIL-project was something I was familiar with from before: When English is used as a tool, and other subjects determine the contents.

Q: Right, right. CLIL is often defined as a content transmitted through a foreign language, where both matter for assessment. Would you do any changes to this definition, based on your own practice?

A: I have not thought much about the definition. As an English teacher, I have a great passion for the English subject. Notwithstanding that English is currently my only subject. It's all right, sometimes, to make compromises in such cross-curricular projects. However, my students experienced some "gaps". They had less literature, less language-specific instruction; they received less of what I consider to be the English subject. From Glenn Ole Hellekjær's side, literature and the English subject has been confronted, and CLIL is suggested as a solution to it, on the expense of the English Subject. I don't agree with him. If the student maintains a C throughout secondary, this does not mean that the student has not improved. On the contrary. The grade of C in third year is a greater achievement than a C in the initial year.

Q: In relation to objectives and aims?

A: No, more topic-wise. English was degraded, almost, to an instrumental subject. Intended to transmit other subjects. That's okay now and then, it really depends on the class, on the teacher, and so on, but I wouldn't do it every year. The English subject in itself is very broad in general. The elective English courses are split in two: Two different courses, either literature and culture, or English and social studies. So, the English subject in Norway is a bit... scattered, a bit here and there. One has not perhaps agreed completely on what kind of English subject we are going to have. On *IB*, we have science teachers within the fields of physics and chemistry who do conduct their instruction in English. But that is not my role. I am supposed to transmit both language and culture. Language and culture is in the core of the English subject. Yet, this is a very wide definition. All subjects are, of course. They

expand, after all. I have been a teacher for so many years now, I have joined quite a number of cross-curricular projects. I know what it is about. It's very nice when the students get excited, when you have pleasant co-operation with your colleagues; it absolutely has something about itself. But CLIL stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning. It is definitely the Content which leaves you a question-mark. What is that going to be actually? I think that is the thing one should consider before engaging with the CLIL-approach.

Q: Right. Because, you already integrate many different disciplines and subjects in your own English teaching?

A: Yes, I do. I think that what's fashionable, pedagogically speaking, is like a pendulum. It goes back and forth. I too have joined this pendulum, forth and back. Grammar is "in", grammar is "out". This method has wind in the sails, that one has lost its momentum. I think it's natural, I don't have any problems with it. Grammar and linguistics, for me, is a big deal, and a vast amount of stuff. But, as I said, my students are high performers. We don't really do a lot of grammar, neither have I been teaching grammar for the last fifteen years or so either. But this year, I got back to it. There's a few things that the students need to learn; these fine nuances in language; the devices that make language more precise and accurate. This (grammar) is stuff that the students never ever saw before. I kind of direct them towards a more academic writing course. How to structure a sentence so that it is correct and concise, right? That the accordance with the preceding elements is correct. I have done some of that, actually, and I thought to myself that: This must be the language teacher's job! And they will definitely benefit from this later, when the professors at the university don't find their writing adequate enough, and so on. Right, they will think, in secondary, we were doing a bit of this, that's right. This school has been very much into subject specific writing. We've had numerous projects on subject specific writing. This school is after all study preparatory, so I think that is what we're supposed to try and achieve. We have to provide training for this. Because, when they come from intermediate, this is fairly unknown territory.

Q: How would you describe CLIL's advantages (in the cross-curricular project) in terms of language learning/teaching? And all other linguistic advantages which don't have to do with the "traditional English" syllabus?

A: For my sake (teaching), it's interesting, right? When you have been a teacher for

numerous years, it's fun to try new things and always reach for something and learn new stuff yourself as well. As a teacher, one needs a great deal of input yourself due to the nature of the job: you give a lot all the time, you need to refill yourself. If else, you'll simply run empty. And you might get a bit sick and tired of it all. It's certainly interesting to get acquainted with other subjects, like the hard sciences, which are not part of my background. I have social studies, literature and languages and linguistics, but no hard sciences. So that is interesting. When it comes to the students, the advantages depend largely on the particular class. If it is a class where very many are interested in either social sciences or geography or hard sciences, I think that it's fun for them. You ignite the passion in them and absolutely expand their vocabulary. As a language teacher, that's the area where I gain something as an English teacher. That's where the students develop great proficiency, for instance in pollution; climate changes in the world; they have a tremendous vocabulary on these matters in English. They are able to express themselves. So, this and the passion. Motivation, but knowledge-wise: vocabulary.

Q: Do you perceive any advantages when it comes to content learning and teaching?

A: In Norway? Definitely. The reason why CLIL is very easy to conduct in Norway, at least on some schools, is that our youth are in general very proficient English speakers. At least, they understand a great deal and are not too afraid of talking in English. In written material, it might be worse. When they start secondary, they have not yet acquired the writing skills which are sufficient just yet. But that's also about the age group. Intellectually and cognitively speaking, they're not there yet – where they're able to perform academic writing. When they come to us at the age of 16, that's when, I'd say, this process should start. Give or take. It's a natural progression. I think it is fine, this starts at secondary school level. In French, Spanish and German, my colleagues tell me, they're working on basic topics, in a school like ours where the level is high in general. Not everyone are good at speaking French, Spanish and German. They're often not motivated. That's where the problem is. Those languages are not "free" like English. When the students struggle (in the FLs) to express past tense, you just cannot expect very advanced learning, in Spanish for instance. In the Foreign Languages, one sticks to language, and that's more than enough. Society changes all the time. The demand for English proficiency is rising. But we cannot only teach English, what about the native tongue? After all, the students think in Norwegian and should

be given the opportunity to express themselves in Norwegian. It sure is a lot to consider! Some say that the multilingual students are better students, that there is a sort of synergy effect. That this effect affects both languages positively. That one gets more and more clever the more languages one have, that's one of the arguments to stick to *nynorsk* ("New-Norwegian;" a variety of Norwegian taught alongside with or as a part of the Norwegian subject). The more languages, the better.

Q: What is expected from you as a teacher when conducting content and language integrated learning?

A: I don't really know! No one is hovering above my head and expecting results, so to speak, when regarding CLIL. The project at our school is finished. What qualifications I need in order to practice CLIL. I have social studies, I have always been interested in further educating myself. There has been a lot of programs where I have needed to get acquainted with and knowledge I've acquired after finishing my formal education. In that respect, the expectations are persistent; both before, while and after my teaching initiated.

Q: What's required from the students when conducting a class in English with more subject-specific contents?

A: We have high-performers here. Throughout the curriculum, it's emphasized, at least on the first year of secondary that the students are to gain knowledge of the English-speaking world and society. To be able to discuss societal problems, social conditions and culture, of course. So we have an expectation that they're supposed to have some knowledge on this field. To me, these kinds of topics are indeed geared towards the content-side. In the English elective courses, there's a clear expectation, we have English in the Social Sciences, which relies heavily on the contents. It has history, political institutions, being able to elaborate and discuss topics. There's just vast amounts of material that make out the syllabus in this subject. So much to go through. At least with the Knowledge Promotion Curriculum. Mostly, you end up with just a little bit of Africa, a bit of Australia, a small bit of Canada, possibly, right? In general, it's more than enough. For the students to get properly acquainted with the British Parliament and understand how it works, you need to spend some time on that! We're also supposed to compare, discuss historical events; how British and American society has developed, why has it developed like it has, and last, but not least; conflicts in the world.

The Afghan war, the Iraqi war, the battle against the Islamic State, and so on. It is, I have to say, as content-oriented as it can ever be.

Q: Do you think that CLIL has motivational effects on the students?

A: Yes! I absolutely think so. They think it's interesting. Take indigenous peoples, for instance, which for a long period of time has been a part of the English subject. This might be interesting to the students. But the multicultural society in America is perhaps even more interesting to them, for instance. Global issues/challenges as well, a part of International English on the second year of secondary, they find immensely interesting. And you need to expand their knowledge horizon. It's motivating for them, at least, that's what they tell me. Sometimes, they say "Ugh, we surveyed this topic last year!" due to the fact that they've had the same topic or seen the same movies on intermediate, as their teacher already showed it to them. That's no problem, we just need to find other materials. The students sure like to expand their knowledge. That's the role of the traditional school: we're here to learn. That's why we're here. That's what I think gets lost at vocational schools. Why are we really here? It's not always as evident. In vocational schools, I think, content integration absolutely plays a part. My vocational students used to have *Service og Samferdsel* (Service and Logistics) and *Reiseliv* (Travel Studies). The latter were actually naturally motivated for English, I remember. While *Service og Samferdsel* had the entire spectrum of learners, from the motivated ones who claimed that English was irrelevant for them. Being students who aimed for work in stores, shops and the like, I don't know from where that notion derived, but, oh well. Cross-curricular projects in vocational settings had great benefits because the students got to employ their vocational subjects in English. They were not very motivated, always. Motivated to learn about literary topics, because many of them were not very fond of reading. I am generalizing now, but on a class basis, it was hard to encourage the students. It felt relevant to insert topics which were connected to their vocations.

Q: What can you say about CLIL and the communicative approach to language learning?

A: That was very much fashionable when I did my pedagogical training. It should be communicative. It's a great advantage. It's maybe the main reason why I am a language teacher. It's all about making the students use the language as much as possible in the classroom. That's what I do as a teacher, and all the activities I plan, should encourage language use. Especially oral communication. They need something to discuss. And at this



level of language proficiency, you cannot just talk about your summer holiday. The foreign language teachers, on the other hand, would do exactly that. It's on a lower linguistic level, simply. One is required to communicate something, and with the objectives and aims imposed by the curriculum, one should elaborate and discuss. You don't discuss what you did in your summer holiday?

Q: Have you encountered any problems when conducting content and language integrated learning?

A: Some types of students are easily forgotten in these kinds of projects. They'll end up struggling. The mediocre students. They don't follow, content-wise, because their lagging, linguistically. That is a fall pit. Some students are simply not too fond of English, and much higher performers in Natural Sciences, for instance. They think that a project such as CLIL, sucks, plainly. Their performance might be above average in Natural Sciences and math, and only mediocre in English, so when fusing these two subjects, for them, this is no advantage. You might have a politically active and impassioned student in social studies who is not a very proficient English speaker, but very elaborative in his native tongue. As a teacher, one has to pay attention to these different kinds of learners, so that the students lose their grade, and loses motivation in both subjects. As long as you're aware, it's of course possible to evaluate separately. The same goes for group-grading. How one assesses. Individual grades is a matter of importance. I give individual assessment in the English subject.

Q: How did you deal with assessment in the CLIL-project?

A: This project was conducted on the first year, general subjects. Only communicative objectives were embedded from the English subject's point of view. Everything that related to contents, culture, society, and so on, I could not integrate in the project. At least not with the first year objectives and aims. If the elective English courses were part of the CLIL-project, it would have been easier to integrate more competency aims. More content aims. Because, with the CLIL-project, English as a tool was the only role of the English subject. That was the problem. Parts of Social Science overlap quite nicely with the English elective courses on the second year. There are definitely possibilities. Either that, or you have to go as an English teacher into the CLIL-project with an open mind and comply with the notion that your assessment will merely be geared towards communicative aims. When regarding the English subject, that is.

Q: How do you deal with educational materials?

A: I have to deal with other texts than the ones found in the textbooks, for numerous reasons. When it comes to the CLIL project, I conducted English classes without a textbook for two years. One of them was the CLIL-project year. All the educational materials were found elsewhere. Mostly on the internet. I used the NDLA to a large extent. BBC, CNN. Spent several hours looking for appropriate materials. The first year, I got some financial compensation. The second year, however, no extra time was added. Third year, I was tired, and I wanted a textbook. So, now I'm not under that pressure anymore. Our textbooks are not adequate, they're outdated. Especially in the elective English courses. It's hopeless. In a context like the one of a secondary school, you simply have to seek materials beyond the syllabus textbook. It hardly ever stands on its own. I now use it approximately fifty percent of the time. This year, I use it twenty percent in International English and ten to twenty percent in English Literature and English social studies.

Q: Any subject combinations that are beneficial for CLIL?

A: For cross-curricular projects, like the one we had, on the first year of secondary, you need equal partners. The general subject of social studies is a good option here. For the latter years, I guess one could think somewhat differently. In order NOT to degrade the English subject to strictly an instrumental subject, it should first and foremost be combined with the humanist subjects.

Q: Do you think that CLIL is justified, with regards to the curriculum?

A: Absolutely. And what is content anyways? Literature is, after all, a big subject internationally speaking. In the *IB* system, English Literature is immensely popular.

Q: How do you evaluate students in a CLIL program, as a language teacher?

A: It's unproblematic. It's what we've always done. Evaluating the content, the elaboration and ability to discuss and to communicate. In the CLIL-project, the subject teacher evaluated the contents. It sure was a lot of fun. The students were engaged with different cross-curricular works. I was English teacher in one of the classes entailed. My job was to look at the language.

Q: Do you think that the expectations towards the English teacher will be different in the future?

A: I think the expectations to the English teacher will be wider and wider, and higher and higher. I have given it some thought, actually. Where are we going? The third year is split in two now, should it be? Should we go deeper into literature and less purified social studies?

Q: How would you describe the necessity of CLIL?

A: How should it be done otherwise? In the classroom, you need some kind of contents. Even linguistics is a subject.

Q: Do you think that CLIL will change the manner one teaches and learns languages?

A: Politically, I think it's hard, but if someone get the idea of implementing more CLIL, I think there's a danger that the English subject, and thus the experts on English language, will get a less prominent role in the subject communities. That is definitely not good for the English training. I think it's very important to maintain the language subjects because that's where the expertise is found, in terms of training our youth towards becoming proficient foreign language users. I could always get a native speaker from Great Britain as a student. He or she is not necessarily very proficient in academic writing in English just like that. They are fluent users of course, but the language is terrible, in terms of level of precision, teenage slang and so on. In practical, everyday-life they're very much all right, but they are not prepared for the university.

Q: Thank you, that's all!

A: Thank you.

*Interview 6 – Content Teacher 2*

Q: What is your educational background?

A: I have a major in History, a minor in English and foundational course in Geography. Educational-wise otherwise I can add real competence within all social studies at secondary levels, adult training and the private school system, so I have a bit more “education” that what my University degree signifies. So I’ve been into quite a lot. I am also an active member in something called European Youth Parliament, I am in the Norwegian National Committee and have been a leader there, and I helped founding European Youth Parliament International in Berlin, which now is an organization with 34 member nations, with 300 adolescents who attend two big sessions every year, here and there in Europe. This is also a part of my education, or real life-competence, rather. In addition, I am the coordinator for several international school projects on the side; within the Comenius system, and I am currently in the process of writing an Erasmus Plus application to the EU. I am also the internationalization coordinator at our school.

Q: What is your teaching experience?

A: I have worked as a teacher in upper secondary for 35 years. One of those was in lower secondary. I have worked within adult training for 30 years, in addition, and I worked as a journalist in NRK for five or six years alongside with it all.

Q: What subjects have you taught?

A: I have taught politics and human rights, sociology and social anthropology, history, geography, English and social science. I only teach 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years.

Q: Which study programs?

A: Study preparatory. The elective courses are within the branches of Sciences, Social Sciences, or Language Subjects. Students need to choose two subjects from within the same branch, and are free to choose the last subject on the basis of their preferences.

Q: Right. Did you receive any training when it comes to teaching contents through a foreign language?

A: No. I took the initiative, I had heard about it from other schools. I was a little fascinated by the IB-system, where most things are conducted in English. Or everything, rather. Personally, I like the English subject itself, I am a sort of an “anglophile”. So I went to the principal and asked if he thought it was a good idea; should we try this out? He agreed, and we introduced it in History and in Natural Science for the first year students, in fact. So for a period, we had two bilingual subjects running, in the sense that 60 percent of the classes should be in English. This was a practical problem, because the students needed to choose what they wanted, which meant that we had to set up two History classes in parallel on the schedule, and I taught the students who wanted to do the subject in English, and another teacher had the students who wanted History in Norwegian. Schedule-wise, this was a problem. This is the reason why we don’t offer bilingual courses anymore, it became so difficult. The issue is to have two history classes in parallel on the schedule. At the same time. That is hard. It is related to how the students choose subjects. They have 15 lessons per week with obligatory subjects. These subjects are common, shared by them all. Then they have 15 hours per week where they have elective courses. Within these, they are to have three different ones, they need to be distributed on those 15 lessons, and all the elective subjects have five hours per week. This meant that these bilingual courses governed the schedule to some extent; how many elective groups is there? Right? So, when we did this, we added four more hours, where the coordinators had to amend for that students chose something different. Do you understand? So, for the two classes in History, there wasn’t 15 hours per week, but rather 19. Plus the four history lessons, right? So, it complicated the scheduling, finding classrooms, and find slots where we could actually do this.

Q: Right, right. When talking about CLIL, this is often referred to as a content subject taught with English as the medium of instruction. Would you say this was what you were doing?

A: Yes, it was. I taught History in English, plainly. The students studied in English. I used an American textbook, for instance. In World History. When dealing with the subject of History, it was fairly easy to do this, because it is split in two: Norwegian history and World history. World history is 60 percent of the syllabus. So we did World History in English. And Norwegian History in Norwegian.

Q: How would you describe the advantages of doing this when it comes to subject content learning?

A: I experienced that the students were more interested in the subject, history. They found the subject more exiting. The thought it was rad to read subject literature in another language than their own. They found it fun and cool that the teacher spoke English in the lessons and that they themselves spoke in English in the lessons. They felt different. Like the chosen ones, you might say. The point is, when the students themselves chose to have the history lessons in English, one might ask which students chose this? And it was of course the stronger students and the ambitious students. Of the 60 students, I had the 30 strongest ones, while the other poor history teacher had the 30 weaker ones. The least interested. So the opportunity of students selecting, ended in the situation where I on average had higher performers in my class. More motivated students. And like I say, the fact that we're doing it in English, is itself a motivating factor.

Q: How about language learning? Any advantages?

A: Yes. Many students came up to me and said that they learned more English in the History lessons than in the English lesson. This is because it comes by itself, in a way. Learning the subject of English comes through working in English. All oral activity is in English. Everything written or read was in English. So they used the language. And this is the practice from which one learns most language. Prerequisites are of course some basic knowledge of the language to build on. And all of the students had that.

Q: What kind of prerequisites did you need to have as a teacher to do this?

A: I needed to prepare over again, you might say. I used, as mentioned, an American textbook. A big book. 800 pages. Big and heavy book. I needed to raise money to buy these books. Normally, the students buy their own books, but we couldn't expect them to go and buy an American, big and expensive textbook. So the school ordered a class set for these particular students. From the Historians point of view, it was interesting to read, an American textbook of history, because it emphasizes other issues than a Norwegian one would. The author's point of view is different. To me, this was a more genuine world history, rather than the history of Europe in a global perspective, like Norwegian textbooks tend to be.

Q: Is it natural that the high performers are attracted to these programs?

A: Let us use the word ambitious students. Students who know that they might study abroad, they see the usefulness of improving their English, simply. Many found it a bit cool. Several of the students who chose this were actually from abroad, who had a high English proficiency and were used to working in English. Some of them were native speakers, but there were also students from other countries. Our school profiles itself as an International one. We have worked within internationalization at least for two decades, and had exchange programs and projects. We travel abroad regularly. We offer Latin here as one of three schools in Norway. We also have Chinese here. We try to internationalize most subjects here.

Q: Can you say something about high performers, low performers and motivation?

Elaborate?

A: As previously mentioned, there is a surplus of ambitious students, or high performers. That means that in a class setting, they will pull one another along; they motivate each other. They are ambitious; they want good grades; if Per gets good grades, I need to get that as well, and I have to work in order to get that. So there is some sort of an inner motivation device in such a class.

Q: How much did you emphasize language learning in this context?

A: When it came to formal evaluation, some asked if they could answer in Norwegian, which I allowed them to. Others preferred to answer in English, without this affecting their grade. I emphasized language to a lesser extent when it came to the English language than with Norwegian. I didn't really consider language too much at all. These students all have a high proficiency in both Norwegian and English. So it wasn't really a problem. I evaluated subject content in specific. Not language. Because this was a History lesson.

Q: How did this bilingual history lesson facilitate real life communication in the classroom?

A: Well, some students had a higher threshold for oral activity. This was due to the fact that other students again had a very high English proficiency. Some of these were native speakers of English. Americans, Englishmen, Australians. Or they had attended English language schools earlier and felt very safe, while other students were very good at speaking, by all means, but they still felt somewhat inferior, and this resulted in lesser oral activity amongst these. It might have been minor hampering to spontaneous communication and the amount

of spontaneous discussions that might arise in this class compared to the Norwegian history class. Because they felt like they needed to think more thoroughly about what to say; mentally prepare what they intended to say, find the right words to use, so to speak.

Q: How would you structure such a class? In terms of the textbook, other resources?

A: As usual. But the question is a little obsolete. All lessons are different. And a pedagogic credo is variation, after all. It varies a lot. Sometimes, the students work in groups, sometimes there's project work, we have discussion classes, we work with tasks, we search the internet for information, in other words; in the same way as any other history class. In general, I introduce topics with a lecture of 20 minutes up to one hour. Then we work for maybe 6-8 lessons with reflecting on and utilizing the materials. The students work in different ways. Sometimes the topic was finalized through a written test. Other times with project presentations. The students might conduct mini-lectures. Sometimes they were to make good questions and ask their fellow student. Whether it was bilingual or in Norwegian as usual, it is basically the same structure. There was not really a bigger workload.

Q: Is there any subject combinations that you perceive as more advantageous than others?

A: I believe that all our students in future studies or professional settings will encounter situations where they need to work in English. Many of them are going to study at universities abroad, that is self-evident, but many of them are going to study in Norway, but using English language subject literature, or they will attend international exchange programs. So there really aren't any that are more advantageous. Whether you are to study Medicine, Engineering or Social Sciences, it is just as useful. For all, I believe.

Q: Would you say that teaching bilingually is something that the content teacher or language teacher should do?

A: The teacher need to feel comfortable with the language. That is a governing condition. Some of the teachers who taught other subjects here, are not particularly English proficient. But they had read and studies their subjects in English. They have command over the language, but they don't have a very good pronunciation, but that doesn't really matter a single bit. It doesn't matter. English is a language that is spoken in India; Indian English and in Tanzania in Tanzanian English and in Southern Africa in Southern African English, in the US in American English, and in England in British English. This means that there is a shared accept for all the ways one can pronounce English. French is strictly opposite, perhaps, where they



have certain demands. French people laugh of everyone who speaks different than they do themselves. Englishmen are not like that. They're used to the different varieties of their language.

Q: Very interesting. Was your practice justifies through the Curriculum?

A: Yes, indeed.

Q: What do you think is expected, cross-curricularly, in the future?

A: Interesting question. I am just now writing an application to the EU, an Erasmus Plus Project, where one of the main objectives is to test cross-curricular work. We call it Architecture and Society. It combines several disciplines. I have a great esteem in cross-curricular work in education. It is an international project with five countries participating. We are to make a model. We need to travel and meet. And the work language is English for everyone. It is after all an international school project, and it is bilingual for all participants.

Q: Interesting. How would you describe the necessity of cross-curricular work like this?

A: I think it's an impending demand. People who are to start their professional career in tomorrow's everyday life, simply need to be English proficient. They do it all along even today. English is used all the time. A lot of the information available, is in English. They may contact whoever they want, anytime, and English is the lingua franca after all.

Q: How do you think CLIL might change teaching languages?

A: It's like learning by doing. Given that you need the language for another purpose, you will learn it automatically. You just have to write about your topic or your project for an international audience. Then you'll automatically learn what you need. The terms, the phrases, the words, they come all by themselves. So, instead of sitting in a boring English class, drilling, learning step-by-step, and stuff like that, it just comes to you. People who have worked in the oil industry for 40 years, they speak English, of course! This is not due to schooling, but because they have used it as a professional language for 30 years, right? Because they have to, simply.

Q: What is your background and how do you connect to CLIL?

A: I have had some experience with more or less, I could say, “soft-CLIL” and when I was in Secondary school back in Gdynia (Poland), it was a school of English; English as the language of instruction. We had a number of subjects, like Mathematics, Geography, History, in English. When you consider that it was in the 1970s, then it was pretty early, we didn’t talk about it as CLIL, but really, when you think about it, we had something similar to “soft-CLIL”. It wasn’t International Baccalaureate, which is a type of a CLIL program itself, for secondary school mostly, but that’s how I saw how it worked, because it did work, although we had parts of the class, or one class, one Mathematics class in English, then another one in Polish. Or once in a week, or once in two weeks we had a class in English, with the materials from English course books, Geography course books. And then I became interested because it started to be, I wouldn’t say popular, but in demand in Poland.

Q: In demand?

A: In demand, yes.

Q: And this was a secondary school?

A: Right, yes, but right now, CLIL is in demand in, I suppose in Gymnasium and in secondary schools. Because in Poland, we suffer from a demographic low and quite a number of schools are closed, that’s one of the reasons why teachers of subjects wants to offer another possibility, another learning experience to the learners. On the other hand, because Poland for many years, basically for twenty years, Poles have emigrated from Poland and lived abroad, and now children, they don’t want to work doing manual jobs. They’d rather go abroad and have a job, have a good job or study abroad, so they need English in order to do that.

Q: Or maybe work for a foreign company, but live in Poland?

A: Exactly, or live in Poland. So they need specialist English to do that.

Q: So what do you know about CLIL’s state of the art today, what do you know about CLIL, for instance in the European Union and in Poland as a part of the Union?

A: I think it’s still developing, because of the globality, when you think about it, of the multi

culturalism and English as a global language. Now I am talking about English, but you can do CLIL in any other language for that matter, but English seems to be the most popular choice, because a language that, let's say, a few decades ago was mainly a language of communication, now has for a long time been the language of business, the language of studies which are offered all around the EU, these studies are in English.

Q: Yes, some people have even argued that it should be named "CEIL" which is Content and English Integrated Learning. Because that's the most popular variety for natural reasons?

A: Yes, and many Universities across Europe offer BA and MA courses in English, in their native language or in English. In Poland for example, you can be a Polish native speaker, you can study BA or MA programs at the Polytechnics, in specific faculties you can study in Polish or in English. So you don't have to go abroad. This is in preparation for a future job abroad where you need English.

Q: Right. In your presentation, you were talking about a subject teacher using CLIL, that is, with English as the medium of instruction, and you also talked about language teachers talking about other subjects than for instance grammar, English culture, and so forth. Do you think that CLIL is most suitable for subject teachers or language teachers?

A: I suppose it depends on the level of the learners. Because, if you're talking about secondary education, then I think it's easier for the teacher and easier and better for the learners, because then the subject content comes at a fairly high, or a very high level. So, it will be easier for a subject teacher to learn English than for a language teacher to learn Mathematics at that level of physics or chemistry. Whereas, at lower levels, like in the primary classroom, or even lower secondary gymnasium classrooms doing culture, history, geography, when dealing with that extent of knowledge, I think you can be a language teacher, and you can actually master the subject knowledge necessary for the level of the learners in terms of developing content knowledge for primary school and so on. But later on, I think it would be difficult for a language teacher to become a subject content teacher.

Q: Right. We know that CLIL is compatible with subjects like history and geography because there is already a little English history and English geography within the English Subject Curriculum. Is there any hope for the language teacher in other subjects than humanist subjects?

A: As I said, it depends on the level of the learners. Two colleagues of mine in Poznan last year wrote a very successful book for General English; for spoken English at an advanced level for our students. It is called "Issues" and I wrote the teacher's version, like, how to use it. Then an interesting thing happened, another colleague of mine from the Polytechnic, she liked the book very much and she said, would you like writing a book like that for my students at the Polytechnic, learning English, but they are studying management, engineering, construction and so forth. And we wrote one unit so far, had it tested, and I decided to teach there for one year in the extramural studies just to become familiar with the learners and their language needs. They are adult learners of English. To answer your question, it is easy to build a glossary, because you just take a dictionary, look in the internet, and it actually gives you a number of words that are related, but actually how things work, what are the learner needs at that level, and how should it be structured, what is it that they are talking about, you have to teach them to see which grammatical structures they would need the most to talk about what, what they should talk about, just like the language teacher, you can learn these things, but, again, it will still, I believe, if it is done by a language teacher, from the language point of view, it will be very well done, but it may be simplified content wise. So, going back to CLIL, I will still answer the demands of language because I will give them the structures, the chunks, the vocabulary and everything, right, and the subject content is as much as I understand what it is they are doing in terms of construction. But then, really, I am not sure if I'd be able to master that much, like say the specifics of the building and construction study.

Q: That leads me to the next question. What do you think we can expect from language teachers in the future, being a teacher trainer yourself, when it comes down to combining across subjects, and what do you think will be the demands from international life, and professional international life in terms of studies, for instance?

A: I think, like always, great flexibility and good observation skills, because you can't stop that today it's CLIL, or some other area which comes in focus. We do it, because we do service to the learners, this is in demand, or this is necessary for them to get to jobs, for globalization, and so on and so forth, that's why we do it, but maybe other things that right now... You teach here for example, we are working out techniques and ways of actually teaching with a computer. We can't say they're not learning from the computer, because

they are. It's just that we're streamlining them so that they use the computer to improve their English. For example, WebQuests or all kinds of things where they can use the computer to access knowledge, not to play games. So I think, in the future, I think whether the future is made by my generation, your generation or the next generation, I think that open mindedness and readiness to find the best way to effectively teach the language whatever the need of society. There may come a moment when English, when everybody, I don't know how, but maybe there will be ways that English, okay everybody will be bilingual with English as the official language for everything, maybe there will be another necessity of another language, right, and we will build from that. Or else, I think e-learning, distance learning, is becoming very important. I don't think it will ever replace people communicating in a classroom.

Q: Very interesting. I was wondering, we know that CLIL facilitates communicative approaches and task based learning because it provides a good context for talking, but in what ways do CLIL give a good way to differentiate between high and low performing students?

A: That's right, because we have to take it into account that a good teacher, a good subject teacher will find a way to explain the subject content to the learner. There are areas I have come across, I have taught English for more than thirty years now. I have come across very few people who I'd say very English proof, for example, they would never learn the language because they did not think in terms of linguistics. For them it was beyond the comprehension, that's about the only reason, not pronunciation, nothing. There are very few, very few people like that, so it is, to some extent, it is finding a way of getting to the root with the differentiation to the learners, just like with language, just like with Polish, just like with learners, like Norwegian, where some learns to read faster, some learn to read slower, I think it's more scaffolding, giving them very strong scaffolding, because in fact, you never know how it is going to turn out, somebody who is very quick at grasping ideas at the beginning, may not necessarily develop to the same extent as someone who needs much more good scaffolding, but who eventually will become a very independent learner. I strongly believe in giving everybody the same chance. I am sorry, but that's me, maybe I was, you know, maybe it's the generation or the times when I grew up, but I do believe that it's the teacher's responsibility or skill, or finding ways of getting through to the weaker

students to explain things to them, not really take the opportunities from them by saying that you're not good enough. Personally, no. That's not the teacher's job. You can get through to almost everybody, with a lot of work. It is even reflected in films and books, and all of a sudden, students understanding and grasping the concept. I think that's our job, that's what we have to do.

Q: I think I have everything I need. Thank you.

A: Thank you.

Q: Your project reported on a CLIL project at lower secondary levels. As we both know, it's easier to be an English teacher teaching other subjects than English at lower secondary than it is doing the same at upper secondary. At least that has been my experience.

A: Yeah, well, I think there are many ways of looking at CLIL. I think, as you say, it can be that you take a whole subject, like history or geography, and it's the history or geography teacher that teaches that subject then in another language, not the native language. So that's probably the most recognized form of CLIL. But it can also be, you know, with smaller projects, the language teacher, the foreign language teacher, who then takes a topic, a larger topic, and either because that person also teaches in other subjects, so if that person also teaches history, for example, or geography, and then decides that in the language lessons, not the history or geography lessons, but in the language lessons, that topic, that area will be taught in English. Because I think primarily, CLIL is a language issue. And it's something where the starting point is the foreign language. And the content comes second. That's the way I see it anyway. It's primarily to help pupils to advance their language skills. But at the same time, they learn about something else. And that's my experience with CLIL, because I don't have too much experience with CLIL. But I have experience through the project that you're referring to, I have experience to it through a MA student who wrote a thesis about CLIL, which I supervised. And both of those projects were in a way linked to history. And it's partly because, you know, I'm very interested myself in history and especially the second world war, because I've worked on myself some cross-curricular subjects here in our department, so although I'm connected to English and Literacy studies, I have been involved in projects that have a more historical perspective, about the second world war, and I've done research into that, and so on. So, I have seen the potential of in a way using that kind of content in schools. And it's the teacher who sort of felt inspired by these kinds of projects that I've been working on who decided that she would like to try this out with her pupils in English lessons at lower secondary school. That's my experience. Otherwise, I feel there's a great potential for this and perhaps it's the experience is mostly with CLIL in upper secondary schools in Norway, and I think Norway hasn't that much experience in general with CLIL, but what there is, is at upper secondary school. But I know that for example in Germany, they do it in primary school. So, there's no reason why one has to wait until one gets to a certain age.

Q: Interesting. Do you think that the reading and writing skills in English as a second language are sufficient from lower secondary school to start teaching CLIL in upper secondary?

A: I think that pupils can read more than they do, because there is a very strong textbook tradition in Norway. So a lot of teachers just use the textbook. I think there can be much more reading of other kinds of texts either to addition to the textbook or as an alternative to the textbook. But having said that, the projects that I have experience with, they show that pupils can cope with other kinds of texts about subject matter. And if you think of an ordinary textbook, for example, then you see that a lot of the topics, the themes, in an ordinary textbook, well, they are about something else, they are about a subject. It could be geography, it could be, you know, history, so, in a way, CLIL is there. It's always been there. Because the Norwegian curriculum, you know, has always emphasized culture and literature and so on, culture is maybe the one that has the most to do with CLIL. The pupils are getting small doses of the topic, they're getting one text, perhaps. And nothing more. But the level of their reading skills, there's no reason why they shouldn't be able to cope with, let's say, in-depth text-sources around a particular theme rather than just switching, and that's what my experience has been, and in fact, the teacher who used the second world war project with CLIL, whom I cooperated with, had also conducted another CLIL-project with another class previously on the industrial revolution. That was with another class some years ago. And that also worked. You know, I'm not grading, like giving grades on how successful these projects are, but I mean, she was able to teach about the industrial revolution in English to lower secondary school pupils. She was able to teach about the Second World War in English, to lower secondary school pupils, because as soon as you have a focus on a topic, you can bring in lots of different kinds of sources. So, you can bring in written texts, but you can also use film and media, other, you know, documentaries, you can invite people to come in and talk about, that's what this teacher did, so the pupils were actually getting input from several different sources. And altogether, that was quite stimulating for them. And then, they were also producing output in different ways, so that they were writing, they were giving oral presentations, they researched themselves on specific sub-topics within the main topic. In groups and so on. So, there was a variety of input and there was a variety of output. And that's one the things about CLIL, that you have this chance of going much more into depth over a longer period. That's one of its strengths, basically.



Q: So, ideally, CLIL should not be a meta-subject, but rather a cross-curricular thing?

A: Well, it has to be a subject that's gonna interest them and a subject that is very relevant for their school curriculum anyway, and, ideally, I suppose that it's a subject that they would be taught in in one of the other subjects at school, so they're actually complementing the teaching in the language classroom and in, let's say, the history classroom, if it's done the way that I'm talking about now. If it's in upper secondary school, I know that even here in Stavanger, the whole of the history curriculum in some upper secondary schools have been taught in another language. In English as a foreign language. And that has worked as well. But that's a slightly different thing from what we're talking about; we're talking about younger pupils, and I think that maybe it has to be on this smaller scale that we're talking about when we're talking about younger, lower secondary or even primary school pupils. It's not really likely that it would be acceptable to take, let's say the social studies curriculum in a lower secondary school, and teach it in English. I don't think that is gonna happen. But it is possible to take topics within other subjects, or from other subjects that are relevant for the subjects, and teach them through the language classroom. And, well, you know, the experience of the teacher that I worked with was that both she and, probably, many of the pupil just get bored with a textbook. At least the teacher did. So in a way I think that the whole idea of CLIL as a challenge to the textbook-tradition in Norway, this provides an alternative to teaching a language just by looking at fragmented texts in a textbook that, perhaps, is not linked to each other in any way, and so on. So, this is an alternative, basically.

Q: Why do you think that CLIL has not “taken off” in Norway?

A: I think it hasn't taken off for different reasons, but probably, the principle one is you need to have the teachers willing to think differently. And to have some insight as well, into the possibilities here. I think the teacher probably needs to be interested in both language and subject area, within another subject.

Q: That might make things a little accidental?

A: It can do, but on the other hand the norm in Norwegian schools is for teachers to have more than one subject. So, in a way, Norway makes it far more possible or feasible for CLIL-projects than other countries where the language teacher is probably the one-subject teacher; doesn't have any other subject. So in Norway, you often have the case that a language teacher also teaches social studies, or religion, something like that. But they need

to know what it is and what the possibilities are, and I'm not sure that it's that well known at the moment. So, it would have to come into teacher-training and so on.

Q: Right, right. What role do you see for language in CLIL?

A: It's really, you know, it's the language that's being developed in a meaningful way. And, of course, if the learners are so engaged with what they are doing, then they don't become conscious of the fact that they're doing it in a foreign language. You can say the same about playing a game. If games are so interesting in themselves in foreign language teaching that the learners, the pupils, just forget that they're using a language that isn't their mother tongue, then that's kind of optimal language teaching I feel. So yes, CLIL definitely has this potential to increase language skills; to develop language skills.

Q: What about the distinction between lower and upper secondary, in terms of demands to teachers and qualifications expected?

A: Well, in lower secondary, there are fewer demands in that respect, but also maybe possibilities to differentiate the teaching as well, because there will be mixed ability groups. They won't all be on the same level. So of course some of them may be able to read simpler texts than others, some may relate more to films and visual media than text-field media. So, when you bring in this variety of sources that you can do with a CLIL-project to use that term, then you have a far greater chance of reaching all of the students whereas if they all have to do exactly the same thing, you know. That's also you know, when you choose your own sub-topics, like is what happened in the project on the second world war which I researched. I mean then you choose what you're most interested in. So, how often do pupils get that opportunity, basically, to make those kinds of choices? If it's a textbook, the text is given. But, you know, within a CLIL-like project, then some of them, the boys may be interested in more the technical things, you know, how the planes work, weapons. The girls may be interested in more the emotional side of a topic like the Second World War; how does it affect individuals, families, and so on. The personal aspect. So, within that big topic, there are so many sub-topics and then individuals may relate to some of them and not others, but they would get the choice to pursue what they were interested in.

Q: As a native speaker of English, how would you describe English proficiency in Norway in general? Given the influence of British and American languages, would you say that Norwegians are bilingual?

A: It depends on how you define bilingualism, but I think yes, most Norwegians who've been through compulsory education in Norway are bilingual, without being absolutely bilingual. In other words, as proficient in English as they are in their mother tongue. There are degrees of bilingualism. Compared to other countries, the Scandinavian countries have always been considered as having a very high proficiency in English, and English is like a second language. I have attended conferences and things like that abroad, and then I get the impression that when people realize that I represent Norway and English as a foreign language context, they sort of look up to Norway, you know, what is it that's happening in Norway that makes Norwegians so good, and so on. So yes, generally speaking, that is the feeling; that Norwegians and other Scandinavians have very high proficiency in English, for many of the reasons that you said. So, to answer your question, yes. But there are reservations here. And written skills, reading skills can be improved. And oral skills as well. So, one can generalize and one can compare to other countries, where the situation is much, much worse. But I do wonder if advances in technology have influenced learners in school, in some way. More computers and less interaction. Verbal interaction. People are interacting, they're communicating in different ways. They're sending sms'es, they're sending emails. They're on Facebook. But this kind of, you know, verbal face to face interaction, maybe, has come into the background. And that has affected, perhaps, what's going on in some language classrooms, or many language classrooms. This is what I've picked up signals from people who have been into schools and so on, and said: Well, I can't get my pupils to speak English. I was at a conference in Sweden last summer. And they were talking about English in Sweden. And Norway and Sweden have often been very comparable. But it was not a very rosy picture at all. About English language skills among Swedish young learners: primary school children and so on. It seemed pretty bleak, the way that they were describing the level and the conditions in language classrooms. I just didn't get the impression that the proficiency skills in English were that good, and I was very surprised. And that people were struggling to get Swedish kids to communicate. I have picked up signals here through my colleagues who have students in school, and they say similar things. That surprises me because, going back in time, it was not a problem at all. So possibly, something has happened, and why it has happened I don't know. Because you stated the reasons why it should be easier for Norwegians to develop their English skills, and I agreed with all of those reasons. And it has also always been the case: have Norwegians and Scandinavians always been so good in

English because of what goes on in schools, or have they been good in English in spite of what's going on in schools? Which may not always have been great. Hellekjær's argument was that students don't read enough extensively. That too much of the teaching in schools is based on textbooks, and therefore they don't get enough input, variety of input and don't read books and so on, extensively. And we also hear that people who start at higher education, they claim that they've never read a book and so on. So that's also worrying. It's the amount that they read. Or don't read. Because of a tradition, basically, I think there is this very strong tradition that schools should have a textbook. And the headmasters believe that, if they have a textbook, then there's no need to invest in any other material. If teachers also believe that, then nothing else will happen, you know.

Q: Given that English subject teachers in upper secondary often need to teach vocationally adapted English to vocational students, do you think that the educational authorities will pick up on these requirements and offer PPU-courses or something similar that is kind of geared towards these approaches?

A: I doubt it. I very much doubt it. I mean, that would mean so many different kinds of courses, wouldn't it? It seems to me that what you're saying is that they're not specialists in all of these different subjects areas. But they are also language teachers, aren't they? So, I think the specialized area and developing vocabulary, that's something that one can do whether one is a teacher or a student. It's something that one can develop, but what is the most important thing for these students? Is it to know the vocabulary of being a car mechanic or is it to be able to construct proper grammatical sentences in English? If your basic language skills are lacking, does it help so much that you know the vocabulary? So there's always been this kind of balance or dichotomy between the specialized skills, subject and the vocabulary that one needs and then the basic skills. If the vocational students are not always those who are the highest performers, what are they doing with the subject that they're learning? Is it simply because that's gonna be their profession, and they need to be able to communicate these things in English, or is it simply to make English more relevant to their profession? I know that there was a problem when the vocational students was going to have exactly the same curriculum as the academic students. And obviously one can question that; what is the point then? I mean, that was the case not too long ago, if I understand correctly, the development there. So, it makes more sense that they get and talk about subjects and

vocabulary that is more related to their specialized line, or area. But one can't forget that they also need these basic skills. And if you have those basic skills, it is not that difficult to be able to put the subject into its proper context and develop the vocabulary you need and so on. So, there has to be that balance. So, I think that the teachers, to come back to your question, I think still that the teachers should, that their primary training should be in how to develop English language skills, maybe to have some kind of input on how you would do it in specialized fields, maybe that's something that's been lacking from teacher training. I don't know if we've addressed that at all. But I can't see how one could then go in and say: Well, you know, to spend a lot of time on that. It would have to be something very general about that. Where there would be a session or two on that particular area. I think you're right, that something has been lacking, we haven't taken it in for consideration, I think, but primarily, they are language teachers; we're training and producing language teachers, and how they can help learners to develop their language skills, that's the most important. When they have those skills, then I think the other things – there's not such a great jump, basically. That is, to putting it into the specific context of the car mechanic or, whatever it is that they're going to become.

Q: Do you think that, from a language teacher's perspective, how do you think that a language teacher will operate in the future?

A: In terms of CLIL and everything, I cannot see that happening in Norway on a big scale in the nearest future. I think the language teachers need to come into the forefront here. That's what I would say. I think it's a very long process before it's implemented on a great scale, but I think the important thing is that more research is done into this so that one can actually refer to the research and the findings of research. For example, as I said to you, I have a colleague in Germany whom I've worked with for many years who says, well, yes, now we're doing CLIL in 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> grade of primary school. And she sent me a book about this. In Germany, they always do research; they don't implement something without following it up. So if there's a new curriculum, if they say we're gonna lower the age of language teaching from the 4<sup>th</sup> grade to the 1<sup>st</sup> grade, they always follow it up. The ministry of education follows it up. In Norway, that doesn't happen. The ministry make the decisions, but they have no experience or duty to do follow-up research, so they expect other people to do that. Whereas in Germany, it's the same people who are making the political decisions about

language teaching who are obliged to follow up with research. I think we have to look at research from other countries about what does this tell us about the potential for younger learners to be learning content subject matter using a foreign language. And then I think that has to come back into the teacher education context and student teachers have to be informed about these things and be made aware of them. Then, gradually, I think there would be a process of change, and I think the most important thing, really, is whether it's CLIL or whether it's extensive reading or whatever, it's really to get away from this predominant textbook tradition; this belief that if you have a textbook, you've solved all the problems and that it is an end in itself, rather than just one means to an end together with lots of other means that one could be using. It's gonna take time, there probably will be changes, but they need to be informed by research, and they need to be introduced more into teacher education. And attitudes have to change. Beliefs have to change. Because beliefs of teachers and beliefs of students are very strong in the learning process. So if the teacher believes that this is the way it should be done, that's the way they're gonna do it. And often, their beliefs are based on their own experiences. So you continue a sort of status quo, you perpetuate the status quo, and that's not always healthy. In language teaching, there are developments all the time, basically. So I think we all need to learn more, but things are happening around Europe and around the world in this context, and I think we just need to familiarize ourselves with the research findings and so on. And to be able to apply them in our context here.

Q: Thank you. Very interesting.

### *3.7.1 Interviewee's Background*

The opening questions of the interviews were concerned with the interviewee's personal background. This information served to provide the thesis with enough general information about the informants to somehow structure it according to a given set of criteria. Crucial background information was important to distance and relate the informants from one another. These questions also served a purpose of establishing contact and rapport with the interviewee, as they were closed questions with a limited, factual answer well known to the interviewee (Hennink 2011: 113). The questions were concerned with

- *Educational background*; degrees and number of years in University or college education. Provided some context, establishing type of teacher, individual formal competence and possible subject combinations across traditional educational backgrounds.
- *Teaching Experience*; number of years of teaching, be it in primary, secondary or tertiary education. Providing greater or lesser credibility to the teacher, more importantly, this question granted important background information in terms of previous subject teaching experience. It should be mentioned that no teachers in this study were “freshmen”.
- *Subjects you currently teach*; where the informant is currently positioned at the school, what his or her daily life and routines is affected by. The study is first and foremost concerned with current teaching practice and the current subjects taught by the teacher.
- *Level*; which of the three levels of upper secondary the informants teach or have taught. The three study years in Norwegian secondary school can be radically different from one another when regarding subject combinations, the elective subjects and, not least, the linguistic/cognitive development of the learners and the linguistic/cognitive instruction following this development.
- *Programs*; which study programs the teacher teach or have taught. Study programs can be very varying when regarding their inherent content and traditions. Some programs have certain structures or procedures of building knowledge that are more or

lesser adaptable to language learning, and need to be elaborated on. Learner level also statistically varies from one program, or one school, to another. Thus, every program at every secondary school or level is different from one another and a complex matter indeed.

### *3.7.2 Interviewee's Experience with CLIL*

In order to make an easy transition from the interviewees' background and into the questions concerning CLIL, one question was added to the interview guide. It also served to settle the issue of the novelty of CLIL in the Norwegian teacher educational system. Without pinpointing any particular tertiary institutions, the question was concerned with whether the informant:

- Received any formal training in teaching a language/subject in combination.

It was initially assumed that this question would be mostly concerned with the language teachers. However, as will be demonstrated later, the question proved to be just as relevant for the content teachers. Once again, it should be pointed out that no institutions or schools are named or referred to in the finished thesis. And if they were, the question was linked to the background of the informant and to the idea that this background should be examined carefully in order to get a sound and clear understanding of each informant's personal context and background. It was intended as a simple yes/no question, but most informants elaborated on the matter, thus nuancing it and help to build the larger picture of what is being examined.

The next question gave a quick and general definition of the term "CLIL" and asked the informant to position him- or herself in relation to this definition:

- CLIL is often defined as an approach where content is taught using English as the medium of instruction. Would you make any particular changes to this definition?

The question sought to uncover the informants' personal position to CLIL-theory and practice. Without sounding like an examiner, the question was intended to initiate reflection and settle the matter that was going to be discussed in the following. This question also elicited important information about what teachers thought of the purpose of curricular integration and made them reflect on the ever important why-question. In addition, it



somehow distinguished various characteristics of each teacher's individual practice and helped teachers sum up, question and make essential what kind of CLIL they were themselves practicing.

The interview then continued by asking about the background of how CLIL and the informant came into contact using a broad and open-ended question:

- How did you get into CLIL, or teaching language and content at the same time?

The question helped to uncover common practice in Norwegian educational institutions when deciding the implementation of a new practice. As shown in section 2.8, schools are themselves free to decide educational approaches for schooling of the children. It is personally relevant, particularly for each informant to elaborate on their own role in embarking on CLIL-projects, be it small or large ones. In order to sort out the informants' experiences with CLIL fully, a follow-up question was asked:

- Would you say that it is CLIL that you're actually doing?

This question was not made in order to, once again, somehow examine if the teacher was conducting CLIL properly. It was merely to make the teacher reflect on the content/language issue and how these two fields were generally weighted in the informant's teaching practice. It also functioned to sum up the informant's general views on theory and practice.

Two questions then focused on CLIL's perceived advantages when it came to

- Content learning
- Language learning

Given the inherent difference between the informants' teaching backgrounds and subject-leaning, the manner of the language teachers' and subject content teachers' individual replies to a large extent reflected their own teaching vocation and style. The answers given here, nonetheless helped to point out crucial differences between the CLIL-approach and what could be referred to as the traditional approach within both content and language teaching. Given the nature of the question, information that negated the interrogated topic "perceived advantages of CLIL" were also provided. It follows then, that many teachers here found it natural to talk about disadvantages as well, which was intended from the

interviewer's side. The disadvantages with CLIL, worded as "challenges when conducting CLIL or similar approaches" was cross-checked later in the same section of the interview guide. Many of the answers resulted in long anecdotes with examples from classroom experiences. The informants in general had a summative and concluding tone, pointing towards the assessment part of the interview guide as well as to providing information on common practice and reflections upon this practice. Thus, not all answers came robotically within the theme or question where one would expect them to come. The findings from these two particular questions were so broad that much of what was said, will be presented under, among others, the assessment-part of the thematic analysis.

Information on the teachers' perceived working load was elicited by pointing towards:

- What is expected of the teacher (in order to run a CLIL-project)?

as well as:

- What is expected of the students (in order to attend a CLIL-project)?

The first part of this question was intended to distinguish what kinds of difference a CLIL-project would impose on the teachers, in terms of resources available, working hours, perceived teacher prerequisites and structural challenges (Paulsen 1 and 2 2011). The second part, camouflaged within a similar wording, operationalized perceptions on the question of student enrolment, egalitarianism, unified schooling, student abilities in terms of low and high performers and multiple intelligences. Although not a central research question in the present thesis, it was slowly gaining importance through the interview process that student diversity, level and attributions given by their study programs should and would influence how CLIL is put into practice and how different learners respond to CLIL, also shown by Bruton (2013). Probes were given on this question regarding registered effects on high performers, low performers and increased motivation among students. As motivation has proved to be invaluable in all learning activity, and given the overarching goal of CLIL to motivate students, testing these notions with the informants was thought to be worthwhile execution and resulted in a lot of additional material for the analysis beside the main research questions.

As argued in section 1.2, CLIL can be viewed as an effort to create communicative language learning. To test if this was the reality in Norwegian schools a simple question was asked.

- In what ways do you think CLIL is beneficial for the communicative classroom?

Lastly, challenges when conducting CLIL and specific didactic preparations were interrogated. These questions were voiced as follows:

- What are the largest challenges when conducting CLIL?

This question functioned merely as a cross-checker and further elaboration on matters addressed in former questions. Biased teachers is considered a part of the full picture, but mostly, declarative sobriety and honesty were prevailing with most of the informants.

The last question was:

- How would you structure a CLIL-lesson
  - In terms of educational materials and textbooks?
  - In terms of other resources?
  - In terms of tasks and activities?

This last section intended to uncover the many peculiar and interesting practices that may be found in Norwegian schools. A great deal of information was provided on this area. It also sought to question the rumor of Norwegian textbook-traditions (Drew 2013) and lastly operationalized cross-checking and eliciting elaborations from teachers on the matter of how lacking CLIL-materials might hamper the development of these kinds of practice in schools.

### *3.7.3 Interviewee's Attitudes towards CLIL*

At this point, it seemed natural to start interrogating each informant's personal opinions on CLIL as a concept and CLIL put in practice in Norwegian schools. Although teacher attitudes to some extent could have been evident from the preceding questions, it seemed natural to

also operationalize some attitudes through questions of structures of subjects, didactics and school organization factors. The questions were presented the following way:

- In which subject combinations do you perceive CLIL as beneficial?
- Do you think CLIL works best for content teachers or language teachers?
- How relevant is it to combine the English language with subjects in upper secondary?
  - Academic subjects, scientific subjects and vocational subjects were given as probes to exemplify combinations and ease the cognitive effort of the teachers trying to wrap their minds around the question asked.

In addition to test teachers' notions of traditional curricular subject-division, the questions helped to illuminate teachers' intention or will to cooperate and their perceived organizational challenges with CLIL as an educational method.

#### *3.7.4 Interviewee's Assessment practice*

Assessment practice is a crucial field for a theoretical thesis like the present one because it helps distinguish what teachers find most important for assessment: content or language, which goes to the core of almost every question of teaching practice. If not mentioned earlier, the questions were formulated as such:

- How would you assess students in a CLIL-program?
  - Content
  - Language
  - Both

This question helped distinguish different teachers' common practice and emphasis on the finished product of oral or written activity that the students produce, touched upon the issue of error-correction, and lastly helped probe how different types of teachers fundamentally view these matters and thus how they perceive CLIL's potential for bridging these matters.

### *3.7.5 Interviewee's Future Prospects on CLIL*

For the sake of inviting the informants to reflect on their own practice in relation to the trends of the times, or even in relation to eventual radical changes of how current trends in learning, teaching and teacher training is to be performed, the informants were posed the following questions:

- What do you think will be expected from a language/content teacher in the future?
- How would you describe the necessity of teaching both content and language at the same time?
- How do you perceive that CLIL might change how we learn and teach content and language?