University of Stavanger

FACULTY OF ARTS AND EDUCATION

MASTER'S THESIS

Programme of study: MLIMAS - Literacy Studies - Master's Degree Programme	spring semester, 2014 Open
Author: Stine Emilie Westbye Kongevold	………………………………………… (Author's signature)
Supervisor: Rebecca Anne Charboneau	
Thesis title: Second language teaching methods in two different countries - a case study.	
Keywords: Methods for second language teaching	No. of pages: 91 + appendices/other: 22 Stavanger, May, 2014

Abstract

In order for a minority student to function in the regular classroom, changes have been made to the way teaching a second language was conducted in America. These changes included the manifestation of English as a second language (ESL) standards that had to be reflected in the school's ESL curriculum. Complementing this, in order to improve second language teaching, the Norwegian school system had to make changes to the politics regarding school and the way it includes students with diverse backgrounds, after experiencing an increase in the number of minority students attending Norwegian schools. Based on this, both America and Norway are countries with great experience within the field of second language teaching and were chosen as target countries for this thesis of which the main topic is *methods for teaching a second language.*

As the schools that are representing the two countries in this thesis present the use of two different teaching models, the theory behind the two different models will be presented. In addition, social factors and individual factors that can influence the student's level of success in the target language will also serve as important theories for this thesis.

The purpose of this study was to gain insight into how these two teaching models were used and supported by different teaching methods. Also, the teachers and students were invited to share their opinions regarding the teaching methods used at their schools.

Based on the topic, the following research questions are addressed within this thesis:

1. What second language teaching models are used in two different countries?
2. What are the teachers' opinions and feelings regarding advantages and disadvantages within the teaching models used at their schools?
3. What are the students' opinions and experiences with the teaching methods used during teaching at their schools?
4. What factors, both individual and social, are the students affected by while learning their second language?

A qualitative approach was used during the research period for this thesis. Interviews with both English as a second language (ESL) teachers and Norwegian as a second language (NL2) teachers were conducted, in addition to interviews with students from both schools. A total of 6 teachers and 10 students were interviewed. Complementing the interviews, observations of multiple ESL and NL2 lessons were also conducted. The results of the interviews were compared between the schools and discussed in light of the theory.

1

Through the research it was confirmed that the two target schools used two different approaches for teaching a second language, and the teachers presented varied advantages and disadvantages associated with the two models. The students presented various answers to the questions during the interviews, relating to the fact that they were part in different teaching models. Also, the two student groups were influenced by different social and individual factors. The outcome of the research led to the conclusion that the Norwegian school might benefit from trying a teaching method more similar to the one used in the American school. Based on the disadvantages presented by the NL2 teachers, the current approach to second language teaching was not beneficial enough for their school. However, the factors influencing the students outside of school led to a higher level of skill amongst the NL2 students than the ESL students, regardless of the fact that they were part in a less effective teaching model.

The significance of the outcome is considerable as the teaching model described in the ESL context could solve many of the problems the NL2 teachers had with their current teaching method. The results of this thesis could contribute to further studies of implementing the push-in teaching method to a Norwegian school. However, there are some implications as only one Norwegian school was the subject of this thesis, and the results are therefore a reflection of that particular school, and not all Norwegian schools in general. Additionally this can also be said of the school in the states, as the researcher does not have information on ESL teaching in other schools.

Acknowledgements

First, and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor Rebecca Anne Charboneau. Without her this thesis would not have been possible. Her insight and help during every part of this process have been invaluable. I would also like to extend my gratitude towards the teachers and students who have participated in the research.

Also, I would like to thank my friend and roommate Julianne Ugelstad for accompanying me on my research trip to USA and my fellow students Ane Herigstad, Einar Mathias Thodal, Elisabeth Nyvoll Bø and Andres Myrset for providing me with support and motivation during this process. Finally I want to thank my family and friends for their continued love and support.

List of abbreviations

AEP – American Education Portal

CBI – Content based instruction

CCSSI – Common Core State Standards Initiative

EAP – English for academic purposes

ELL – English language learner

EOP – English for occupational purposes

ESL – English as a second language

EST – English for science and technology

NL2 – Norwegian 2, Basic Norwegian for language minority students

NSD - Norwegian Social Science Data Service

NSL – Norwegian as a second language

SLA – Second language acquisition

SIOP - Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol

TESOL - Teachers of English speakers of other languages

TLC – Target language community

Udir – Utdannings direktoratet

List of tables

Table 1: Preferred teaching methods, Norwegian students

Table 2: Preferred teaching methods, American students

Table 3: Vocabulary questions

Table 4: Choice of language with parents, both student groups

Table 5: Choice of language with siblings, both student groups

Table 6: Choice of language with friends, both student groups

1. Introduction

Second language acquisition is a phenomenon that affects many students all over the world, and has been the topic for many academic papers over the years. Researchers have developed a range of second language acquisition theories that cover different aspects of this acquisition. Some of these theories place the primary focus and importance on the learners' innate capacity for language acquisition, while others' may accentuate the role of the environment in presenting different occasions for the learner to interact with speakers who modify their language and communication forms to meet the learners' needs (Lightbown & Spada, 2006:29). Though there has been a great deal of research devoted to how people learn languages, and these theories have had a profound effect on the way we teach second languages, according to Harmer (1991:31) no one knows exactly how people learn languages.

Regardless of the second language acquisition theories, learning a second language is a complex process that is very different from learning a first language. This statement is based on the fact that in most cases learning a second language takes place in a different environment that presents different learning conditions. Though learning a second language can be based on many different conditions, the main focus of this thesis is a young learner in need of a second language in order to function in that language's target language community (TLC). Differing from the process of first language acquisition, other aspects of language learning apply when learning a second language. During the second language acquisition (SLA) process, the language learner will in most cases already have successfully acquired a first language. In addition they may also have developed a higher sense of metalinguistic awareness and can define and use grammatical rules (Lightbown & Spada, 2006:29). Based on these facts, a second language learner will require different ways of instruction and support, in this thesis provided by the teacher, in order to be successful in their acquisition.

The instruction and support required in this process is one of the main focuses of this thesis, in addition to the learner's internal factors and finally social factors, which can influence the second language learning process. This introduction to the thesis, aims to introduce the topics that are presented and discussed in the various chapters, and also give a presentation of the outline.

9

1.1 Topic, scope and background

This thesis is based on a case study of the use of different teaching models and methods for second language (SL) teaching in primary schools in two different countries. In order to conduct this case study a qualitative approach was used. The results of the research are based on interviews with six SL teachers and ten SL learners in addition to multiple observations in their classrooms. Two teachers from a Norwegian primary school, who taught Norwegian as a second language, and four teachers from an American primary school, who taught English as a second language participated in the teachers' interviews. Five students from the Norwegian school, and five students from the American school participated in the student interviews. The observations were conducted in the classrooms of both student groups, and also in some additional classes to create better context for the results of the interviews.

The topic of second language teaching methods was based on an interest the researcher developed during second language acquisition lessons in a previous educational program. Specifically, the reason for different teaching methods, their potential for achieving the same aim, and their success within specific contexts, also taking into consideration young learners' opinions within the subject, will be the focus for this thesis.

Being a multicultural country, the increase in the amount of students in need of instruction in the Norwegian language, has led to changes in the Norwegian school system and also in the national curriculum (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007:2). As a result, many efforts have been made to reinforce the position of Norwegian for language minorities, referred to as Norwegian 2 in this thesis, as a subject in Norwegian schools. The aim is for students from different backgrounds to become proficient in the Norwegian language. Based on this the Norwegian 2 curriculum includes three main components, comprised of *Language learning, Communication and culture,* and *Society and literature*, resulting in a curriculum that covers different topics necessary to function in the Norwegian society.

Relating to the previous paragraph, there have also been changes in English as a second language in American primary schools. This was a result of the need to adjust to a new cultural environment and school system. English language learners (ELLs) need a program of language instruction to prepare them for the mainstream classroom, as well as support. In addition, ELLs need to be involved in an academic program that enables them to continue their education in other subjects (Coelho, 2004:16). Based on this, in 1995 work started on making standards for the ESL subject (Short, 2000:1), which included requirements for the different schools to follow while making their curricula. This change has also resulted

in the rise of newer and more modern ways of teaching English as a second language. These teaching models that have been developed are in contrast to the teaching models often associated with teaching Norwegian as a second language. These contrasts will be discussed in later parts of this thesis, as they are reflected in the interviews with both teachers and students.

1.2 Research questions and expectations

This thesis aims to describe how different teaching models are used to teach a second language in two different countries. Through the research, the researcher aimed to retrieve information on how and why these teachers use these teaching models and what their general opinions were regarding these teaching models, including advantages and disadvantages. Through obtaining this information, the researcher expected to compare and contrast the outcome of both students' and teachers' interviews and the observations from the two different schools.

In addition, the researcher also intended to learn more about the students' opinions of the teaching models that they are a part of, including what they found effective and also their preferences in terms of teaching methods. As a section of the theory is devoted to theories regarding second language acquisition, the researcher also aimed to accumulate information from the students that could relate to different social and internal factors associated with language learning. These factors could in turn be related to the students' level of success and skill level in the second languages.

Through this research, the researcher expected to find diversity in both students' and teachers' opinions on the subject which would allow for comparison both between the different schools but also between students and teachers within each school.

Based on the topic, the following research questions are addressed within this thesis:

1. What second language teaching models are used in two different countries?
2. What are the teachers' opinions and feelings regarding advantages and disadvantages within the teaching models used at their schools?
3. What are the students' opinions and experiences with the teaching methods used during teaching at their schools?

4. What factors, both individual and social, are the students affected by while learning their second language?

To relate the four research questions, the researcher will aim to compare the teachers' and students' opinion to see there is a correspondence within each school.

The research questions are based on the researcher's hypothesis that Norwegian 2 lessons are less beneficial than those associated with some models of teaching ESL. In addition, the fact that a teacher needs to be certified to become an ESL teacher, whereas a Norwegian 2 teacher does not need any formal training besides initial teacher training might shape the success rate in second language teaching in these two countries. In other words, it is the researchers impression that there are may be more qualified second language teachers working in America than in Norway in. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 present more information on how one becomes an ESL licensed teacher and a NL2 teacher.

Most importantly, the research for this thesis aims to find out how the teachers and students, in their respective schools, perceive advantages and disadvantages associated with their teaching models.

1.3 Method

To ensure that all areas of the research were covered, a semi-structured interview guide was prepared and used during the interviews. Two interview guides were made, one with questions aimed at the students and one aimed at the teachers. The same questions were asked in the two countries. A checklist was prepared to use during the observations, to ensure that the same information was gathered from each class and the different classrooms. This also served as guidelines to show the researcher what to look for during the observations.
As the research required obtaining information from young students, letters were sent to all parents, requesting permission to both observe and interview their children.

1.4 Outline of the thesis

Including the introduction, this thesis consists of seven chapters. First, chapter 2 presents necessary background information related to the research. The chapter includes differences in both teacher education and the curriculum associated with the two different countries. In order to provide the necessary background for second language teaching as a topic, this chapter also presents how and why language teaching has been the subject of development in recent decades.

Chapter 3 presents the theory related to second language acquisition and second language teaching models. This chapter includes a description of social and individual factors that can influence a language learner. Finally, this chapter presents what English as a second language and Norwegian for language minorities entails, including which teaching models are commonly used in the respective countries. An in-depth explanation of these theories will inform the reader of the context of the study, and also be used to reflect upon the results of the research in the discussion.

Following this, chapter 4 provides an explicit description of the research method used for conducting the research. This includes ethical considerations and how to ensure validity in qualitative research. The process of selecting the informants is also explained in this chapter, along with data coding.

Chapter 5 describes the results of the interviews and observations, including the answers given by the students and teachers during the interviews. Chapter 6 includes the data analysis and discussion comparing and contrasting the results of the research, both in light of the two different schools and the theory from chapter 3. Finally, chapter 7 presents the conclusion. A list of references and appendixes follows these chapters.

2. Background

The purpose of this chapter is to gain insight in the development of both English as a second language and Norwegian as a second language in schools. This chapter will include a brief history of the subjects and also the curriculum as it is today.

2.1 Brief history of second language teaching

There is a large body of research regarding second language teaching, learning and acquisition. One thing they have in common is that English is often the language of concern. However, one should remember the unique situation of the English language, as it is the only language that can be used almost anywhere in the world between people who are non-native speakers (Cook, 2008:1). One can draw the conclusion that both teaching methods and teacher education is shaped by this statement. The way English is taught, as a second language, can be a reflection of the unique situation of the English language.

According to Cook (2008:3), a revolution took place in the last quarter of the nineteenth century that affected much of the language teaching used in the twentieth century. Cook (2008:3) explains the content of this revolution to be an opposition to the "…stultifying methods of grammatical explanation and translation of texts, which were then popular." Instead of these methods, new language teaching included an emphasis on spoken language and the naturalness of language learning and also raised importance of using the second language in the classroom instead of the first.

2.2 Curriculum for English as a second language

According to Nunan (1988:1), 'Curriculum' is traditionally used to as a reference for a statement of intent, meaning, "…what should be of a course of study." Nunan also argues that curriculum is seen in terms of what teachers actually do; 'what is' is more important than 'what should be'. Nunan states that the curriculum is conceptualized, and proposes some key elements in the curriculum model: Initial planning procedures, content selection and gradation, methodology and ongoing monitoring, assessment and evaluation (Ibid, 1988:4).

Even though there is no national curriculum for English as a second language in the United States, states, school districts and national associations do require or recommend that certain standards be used to guide school instruction. In accordance with U.S. Department of Education,

> All states and schools will have challenging and clear standards of achievement and accountability for all children, and effective strategies for reaching those standards (Education world, 1996).

In order for states to receive federal assistance, it is mandated by law that state standards will be developed and improved. Based on this the common core state standards initiative, which is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center, for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects, represents "the next generation of K-12 standards designed to prepare all students for success in College, career and life by the time they graduate from high school (CCSSI, 2014)." In order to prepare all students, including ESL students, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association created the Common Core State Standars as an initiative (CCSSI). This initiative included standards for ESL as a subject in schools (TESOL, 2013:2).

The minimum level of requirement for every school district in the US is provided by the Federal government. State legislators and local school districts have to follow their guidelines as they develop the curriculum and make decisions regarding its implementation. Federally funded schools have to follow these guidelines. In contrast, Public education is a concern reserved to the states. Basic outlines and guidelines of a public school curriculum is largely created by the state government, while the states have control of setting the main body of the public school curriculum. Finally, the local school districts are in charge of implementing the standards of the curriculum which the Federal and State governments have set forth within their own school systems. Though the local school districts have to follow the State curriculum, they are given the freedom to determine how they do so.

2.2.1 ESL standards

In addition to a school's ESL curriculum, in the early 1990s national ESL standards were set. These standards were promoted by "The Goals 2000: Educate America act" and other legislation that promoted high academic expectations for all students. These standards were made to serve the purpose of guidelines for both the state and the local curriculum and assessment, in addition to the professional development of teachers (Short, 2000:1).

In order to adjust to a new cultural environment and school system, most English language learners need a program of language instruction to prepare them for the mainstream classroom, as well as support. In addition, ELLs need to be involved in an academic program that enables them to continue their education in other subjects (Coelho, 2004:16). According to Short (2000:1) the ESL standards became a necessity at a time when students for linguistically and culturally backgrounds enrolled in U.S schools at a rate nearly ten times higher than native English speakers. At this time, English as a second language was not a designated content area, but simply implemented in other content areas. After experiencing the need for guidelines in ESL teaching, the ESL standards were made. In her article, Short (2000:1) explains how nine ESL content standards were organized under three educational goals. These three goals include:

> …what students should know and be able to do as a result of ESL instruction and set goals for students' social and academic language development and sociocultural competence.

The following is a copy of the ESL standards (Short, 2000:1)

Goal1: To use English to communicate in social settings
    Standard 1: Students will use English to participate in social interactions.
    Standard 2: Students will interact in, through, and with spoken and written English
        for personal expression and enjoyment.
    Standard 3: Students will use learning strategies to extend their communicative
        competence.

Goal 2: To use English to achieve academically in all content areas.
    Standard 1: Students will use English to interact in the classroom.

16

Standard 2: Students will use English to obtain, process, construct and provide
subject matter information in spoken and written form.

Standard 3: Students will use appropriate learning strategies to construct and apply
academic knowledge.

Goal 3: To use English in socially and culturally appropriate ways.

Standard 1: Students will use appropriate language variety, register and genre
according to audience, purpose and setting.

Standard 2: Students will use nonverbal communication appropriate to audience,
purpose and setting.

Standard 3: Students will use appropriate learning strategies to extend their
sociolinguistic an sociocultural competence.

As mentioned, the guideline for the ESL standards also included professional education for teachers. In order to ensure that students will receive sufficient exposure to the standards relevant to their current or future instructional settings, the ESL standards were implemented in all teacher education programs (Tedick, 2005:268). As a result, preparing a lesson plan that incorporates ESL standards, in instruction and assessment, in general, was included in teacher training programs (Ibid, 2005:268).

2.3 English as a second language in American teacher Education

According to the American education portal, ESL teachers instruct students whose first languages are not English, to read, write and converse effectively (AEP, 2003). Another abbreviation commonly associated with these teachers is TESOL – teachers of English speakers of other languages. Focusing on conversational and job-related communication skills, ESL teachers approach English from a real-life perspective. An ESL teacher can either teach non-native speakers of English to function in an environment which primarily uses the English language, or work abroad, introducing students to English in a foreign language context.

To complete a degree within ESL, one must have accomplished a Bachelors degree before obtaining ESL training. Attaining licensure can be achieved by completing an ESL training

program, such as the certificate program TESOL. This program will provide basic skills needed to teach ESL, including assessment of students' language skills and teaching grammar and conversational skills. These programs are designed for working teachers who have already obtained their teaching licenses, and are generally a one-year program.

After completing the TESOL certification program, or similar programs, the ESL teacher is able to work with all levels of English learners and will have received specific training and credentials that enable them to work in a school setting. Postsecondary degrees, along with the teacher certification, can typically be required of ESL teachers from public schools and some government-funded literacy programs (AEP, 2003).

2.4 Curriculum Norwegian 2

According to Seland (2013:187), when faced with an increase in the number of immigrants in Norway, changes had to be continuously made to politics regarding school and the way it includes students with diverse backgrounds. This section of the Background chapter explains how the current curriculum in Norwegian 2 attempts to face the changes needed to meet the needs of language minority students. The information gathered for this section is collected from The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, who is responsible for the development of kindergarten, primary and secondary education. The Directorate is the executive agency for the Ministry of Education and Research (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007). In contrast to America, Norway has provided a curriculum for Norwegian 2 that applies nationally and cannot be altered by the different school districts. The name of the curriculum is "Basic Norwegian for language minorities" (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007). However, the current curriculum for Norwegian 2 states that Norwegian law has given language minority students attending school in Norway rights to receive Norwegian language lessons in school until they have sufficient language skills to follow the regular curriculum. Based on that, each school was given the right to either follow the separate lesson plan called Basic Norwegian for language minority students, or to adapt the ordinary Norwegian curriculum in a way that will suit all students' needs. The principal at the individual schools makes this decision. Nevertheless, the Norwegian language lessons must maintain reading and writing skills and contribute to the development of the students' vocabulary and understanding of terms and concepts in different subjects.

2.4.1 Norwegian 2 standards

Basic Norwegian for language minorities has standards based on three different levels. The information regarding these standards has been gathered from the Department of Education. These standards are developed in accordance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007:2), which describes and defines six different language skill levels ranging form Beginner to Advanced. Different abilities and language skills are connected to each skill level. The standards are a supplement to the main curriculum.

The following are the four main standards in Norwegian 2 (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007:3)

Goal 1: Listening and speaking - Understanding spoken Norwegian, speaking Norwegian and increasing vocabulary.

> Standard: Listening and recognizing different sounds, words, expressions and terms, and being able to use them in speech. Developing communicative skill levels through oral language use in different situations.

Goal 2: Reading and writing – written communication and reading and writing competence.

> Standard: Developing and increasing vocabulary in different subjects and topics. Reading and writing texts in different genres and using different strategies in reading and writing, and using written language to gather information.

Goal 3: Language learning – What does it mean to learn a new language?

> Standard: Language as a system and language in use. Communicative and language learning strategies, and development of competence in the language.

Goal 4: Language and culture – Cultural meaning of the language.

Standard: Different ways to use the language and variations of the language in Norway and Norwegian language and culture in a historical, multi cultural and international perspective.

2.5 Norwegian 2 in Norwegian teacher education

Basic teacher education in Norway consists of four years, and various school subjects (Utdanning, 2014). Though there is no subject within basic teacher education called Norwegian as a second language, or Norwegian for minority students, the Norwegian government has ensured that some aspects of teaching languages to minority students are covered within the education. This will be explained further in this section of the thesis.

According to the Norwegian government, the framework for teacher education in Norway aims to ensure that all teacher education programs, will together meet the needs for qualified teachers in society and also cover all subjects within kindergarten and all levels of school. After completing a teacher education program, all teachers must be able to work for the realization of goals and aims set for the institution, and for the educational system as a whole (Utdanningsdepatermentet & forskingsdepartemente, 2003:4). This requirement for educated teachers is a par of Norwegian law. Paragraph §54a of Norwegian law regarding Universities and higher education states that

> Teacher education will through lectures, research and professional
> development, provide the professional and pedagogical
> knowledge…required for planning, executing and evaluating of teaching,
> learning and education. Teacher education will be based in different
> prerequisites for all students in school and kindergarten, and will be in
> accordance with the aims for the level of teaching within the education
> (ibid, 2003:4)

This excerpt raises the point that not all students in the Norwegian school system have the same prerequisites for learning. One can associate these prerequisites to the fact that the Norwegian school system is considered to be multilingual. Since many students enrolled in the Norwegian school system have a mother tongue that is not Norwegian, a broader perspective on Norwegian training is necessary. As a result, students who are in the teacher education program can participate in a subject called 'Norsk plan med forsterka flerspråklig profil' or 'Norwegian plan with a reinforced multilingual profil' (Utdaningsdepartementet & forskningsdepartementet, 2003:27). This plan differs from the regular Norwegian subject by reinforcing an in-depth multilingual theme and by raising the focus on oral and written communication and understanding of languages for the students.

Though the inclusion of Norwegian as a second language in teacher education is limited, teachers who have completed the teacher education program can choose to further educate themselves to specialize in different areas. Amongst these areas, two involve teaching Norwegian as a second language. A sample of Norwegian as a second language courses was collected from a randomly chosen Universities in Norway. The first course, Second language pedagogy, aims to develop its participants' prerequisites for teaching students who do not have Norwegian as a their first language, and also to create a positive learning environment for these students. This education program consists of two main subjects completed over one semester, language and language development in a multilingual perspective, and, teaching reading and writing to multilingual students (UiB, 2013).

The second educational course, Norwegian as a second language (NSL) was created as a result of a demand for more qualified teachers within second language teaching in Norway. This course aims for its participants to acquire knowledge that creates a foundation for them to use while teaching Norwegian 2 (UiB, 2013).

In summary, though there are courses designed for the development of educated teachers of Basic Norwegian for language minorities, it is not a requirement for teaching the in the subject.

2.6 Summary

The main points found in this chapter was that though there is no national curriculum in the states, there is a set of ESL standards. Contrasting this, there is both a national curriculum for NL2 in Norway, and also a set of standards.

There are further additional licensure programs available for second language teaching in both countries. However, though it is a requirement in the states, it is not a requirement in Norway.

3.Theory

This chapter will present different factors that can influence the process of learning a second language. It will also present and explain different strategies or methods of teaching a second language, and the process of literacy development in second language learner. Finally this chapter will offer one section dedicated English as a second language (ESL), and one section dedicated to Norwegian as a second language (Norwegian 2). These sections will include a few examples of teaching strategies commonly used in the respective language classes.

In order to present the different factors and strategies involved with teaching and learning a new language, it is important to clearly define the terminology involved with the subject. Based on that, this chapter will start off by defining and separating two commonly used terms when discussing second languages – learning and acquiring.

3.1 Learning vs. Acquiring a second language

Second language acquisition and learning strategies can be described as "complex cognitive skills within a cognitive-theoretical framework" (O'Malley & Chamot. 1990:85). This description of second language acquisition was established to give depth and substance to research on different learning strategies (Ibid, 1990:85). According to Nunan (1990:171) a strategy is defined as "the mental and communicative procedures learners use in order to learn and use language". Nunan explains how at least one learning strategy is underlying in every learning situation. However learners most of the time are unaware of the strategy when engaging in a learning task (1990:171). He also reviews the importance of having knowledge of strategies in the learning process. Nunan claims that being aware of the underlying process during the learning you are involved in will make the learning more effective. He supports this theory with research that shows that language learners who are taught the strategies that are underlying their learning were more motivated than those who were unaware of the strategy they are using (1990:172). Based on Nunan's research, one can say that the choice of strategies during second language teaching will have an important impact on the students' results.

Making the distinction between learning and acquiring a second language is a significant one to make when discussing a second language. Yule (2006:163) describes the

term acquisition as a "gradual development of ability in a language by using it naturally in communicative situations with others who know the language." The term learning, on the other hand is described as "… a more conscious process of accumulating knowledge of the features, such as vocabulary and grammar, of the language, typically in an institutional setting" (Ibid. 2006:163). Yule uses the example of mathematics to explain the difference between the two terms. Mathematics is typically learned in school, not acquired by your surroundings.

Another advocate for the acquisition-learning theory was Stephen Krashen. Krashen (1981:1) created the "Monitor Theory", which he explains as a theory that hypothesizes that there are two different independent systems for developing abilities in second languages.

> … subconscious language *acquisition* and conscious language *learning,* and that these systems are interrelated in a definite way: subconscious acquisition appears to be far more important (Ibid, 1981:1).

Krashen explains further that in order to acquire a language, meaningful interaction in the target language is required. During language acquisition the speaker, or learner, is more concerned with the message they are conveying than the form of their utterance. Krashen calls this "Natural communication" (Ibid, 1981:1). During natural communication, error corrections are replaced by modifications to their utterance by native speakers to help them understand and to help the acquisition process (Snow & Ferguson, 1977 in Krashen,1981:2). Through conscious language learning on the other hand, error correction and the use of explicit rules of the target language is considered to help a great deal. According to this view, where one separates acquisition and learning it is possible for a language learner to both acquire and learn features of a second language independently and at separate times (Ellis, 2008:7). Even though strong face validity is a part of this view, it is also problematic because of the difficulty regarding the demonstration of whether the process involved in a learning situation is conscious or not (Ibid, 2008:7).

Krashen's distinction between acquisition and learning have been apllied and used in many research studies, as most of the recent research regarding second language has focused on the distinction between these two terms. Harmer (1991:33) presents his explanation of acquisition as a "… subconscious process, which results in the knowledge of a language…"

whereas learning "… results only in 'knowing about' the language." According to Harmer acquiring a language is more successful and longer lasting than learning (1991:33).

For many, these terms still carry similar meaning, and will in this thesis be used interchangeably like they frequently have been in the theory supporting this thesis.

3.2 Factors influencing second language learning

According to Drew and Sørheim (2004:16), when learning a second language there are many factors that can influence the learning process. Besides the factors related to an educational context such as the curriculum, materials and available resources, one can divide these factors into two categories: *social* and *individual* (Drew & Sørheim 2004:16). This section will present both social and individual factors.

3.2.1 Social factors

Social factors are a part of what Ellis (1994:24) calls external factors. External factors are explained as factors relating to the environment in which the learning is taking place. Ellis emphasizes that the role of external factors and their importance remain a controversial issue. However, behaviorist's theories of learning consider these factors to have central importance (Ellis, 1994 24).

Social factors are explained by Drew and Sørheim as those that "have to do with the way language is regarded and used in the society in which it is being learned" (2004:16). The way the English language is viewed in Norway is used as an example to explain this theory. English is viewed as an important language to know and to be able to use in order to function in international communication. English has a high status in Norway, and the way we teach and learn English as a foreign language will be a reflection of our general feelings and opinions towards the language. In addition to the way the target language is viewed in the society, exposure to the language also serves as a social factor. Second language students will most of the time find themselves living in a target language community (TLC). TLCs are communities where "…inhabitants speak the language which the student is learning: for students of English, an English-speaking country would be a TLC. The students would need

to learn English to survive in that community" (Harmer, 1991:2). However, based on the status of the language, a TLC can also be in a place where the language is not necessarily the main language. Again, one can use the example of English in Norway. Students learning English in Norway will be exposed to the language through movies, television programs, music and computer games long before they start school (Drew & Sørheim, 2004:16). Based on this, one can make the comparison between a TLC and a high level of exposure to create better learning conditions for the students one can draw a parallel between high exposure to the language and the student's success in language learning. Exposure is also linked to Krashen's theory that the process of learning a second language would benefit from being more like the process of a child acquiring its first language. Though a child is never consciously taught a language, they acquire their first language through hearing and experiencing a high amount of language from communicative situations with adults and other children (Harmer, 1991:33). A series of subconscious processes result in a child's gradual ability to use the language; this process is the exact opposite of most second language learning where the teacher tend to concentrate on getting the student to consciously learn items of the language in isolation (Ibid, 1991:33).

One can argue that social factors will have a more indirect than a direct effect on L2 learning. Social factors will most likely be shaped by the learners' attitudes, which in turn will affect the learning outcome (Ellis, 1994:24). In addition, the social factors influencing the acquisition of a second language are likely to be different according to different social contexts.

3.2.2 Individual factors

In addition to the social factors, one can also discuss a number of factors relating to individual students. Personality, intelligence, motivation and attitude are all examples of internal factors that can have an impact on the language learning process (Drew & Sørheim, 2004:17).
It has been argued that individual factors are hard or impossible to measure as they are inter-related (Ibid, 2004:17). However, Ellis (1994) claims that mentalist theories emphasize the role played by these individual internal factors. They credit the students with a "…*Language acquisition device* that enables them to work on what they hear and to extract the abstract ´rules´ that account for how the language is organized" (Ellis, 1994:24). The joint contribution of external and internal factors is often emphasized in the cognitive theories of

25

language acquisition (Ibid). Though important to any second language acquisition theory, individual factors are not directly observable and are for the most part only inferred by learner's reports of how they learn and by studying learner output (Ellis, 1994:28).

As a part of individual factors, one can also mention motivation as a factor that can influence second language learning. Lightbown and Spada (2006) explain how it is difficult to know if motivation is a reason for successful learning or if successful learning is a reason for motivation, or if both examples are affected by other factors. Nevertheless, Lightbown and Spada (2006:63) claim, "…there is ample evidence that positive motivation is associated with a willingness to keep learning" even though "research can not prove that positive attitudes and motivation cause success in learning".

To further explain motivation, Drew and Sørheim (2011:21) present Gardner and Lamberts' (1972) theory that there are different types of motivation. Gardner and Lamberts introduced a distinction between integrative and instrumental motivation. Integrative motivation is described as identifying with and admiring the target language culture and is motivated to integrate with that culture, meaning learning a language for cultural enrichment. Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, is viewed as something being a means to an end, such as learning a second language in order to be successful in a career, or being able to travel to other countries. Nevertheless, Drew and Sørheim (2011:21) argue that the distinction between these two forms of motivation is considered too narrow as students may have inter-related and complex motivations. Lightbown and Spada (2006:64) supports this by stating that early research on motivation "tended to conceptualize it as stable characteristics of the learner" while newer research accentuates the vigorous nature of motivation and tries to take into consideration the changes that occur over time.

3.2.3 Language Transfer

An important distinction to make between learning a first and learning a second language is that when one is learning a second language, one has already accomplished learning a language before. Having a first language can affect the process of learning a second language in different ways, and can be viewed as both an advantage and a disadvantage. Even though there is variation as to what extent a first language is used when learning a second language, learners' mother tongues will influence their fluency and what level of proficiency they will

be able to achieve in the target language. This influence from other languages is called *language transfer* (Selj, Ryen & Lindberg 2004:39). Examples of language transfer include translation and borrowing, for example using the first language as a tool for successful communication; code-mixing, namely using both the first and second language to construct the same sentence; and code switching, meaning to alternate the use of first and second language within a discourse (Ellis, 1994:28-29). Incorporating features of the first language into the knowledge system of the language that the learner is trying to acquire is an example of transferring. One must distinguish between a learning process that excludes the first language for purposes of communication and one where the first language is a natural part of the teaching (Ellis, 1994:28-29). Based on this one can draw the conclusion that the study of language transfer collects evidence demonstrating that the language learner's first language will influence both the *use* and *acquisition* of the second language (Ellis, 2008:351). According to Ellis (2008:351) it is important to mention that the distinction between acquisition and use holds both theoretical and methodological importance, as the presence of transfer effects in communication is not necessarily a demonstration of the first language having penetrated the learners interlanguage system. Interlanguage is explained by Yule (2006:167) as an in-between system innate in the language learner that is used in the process of second language acquisition which contains aspects of the first language and the second language but which is a varied system with rules of its own.

Besides its systematicy, there are also other characteristics of learner language or interlanguage. Interlanguages are also presumed to be unstable and in the process of changing, or in other words characterized by a high level of variability (Mitchell & Myles, 2004:16). The types of errors that are made by a language learner in their utterances vary from moment to moment, and the learner seems liable to switch between a range of correct and incorrect forms over longer periods of time (Ibid, 2004:16). This variability is a central feature of learner interlanguage that theories on second language learning will need to explain. However, Ortega (2009:34) claims that there is strong evidence of the fact that first language transfer cannot radically impact the route of second language acquisition but can alter the rate of the language learner's progress and development. To support this theory, Ortega (2009:41) created the hypothesis that first language knowledge can interrupt certain second language choices and prime others, which can result in the underuse and overuse of certain second language forms in spoken and written learner production.

Language transfer, which is also know as *crosslinguistic influence*, can be both an advantage and a disadvantage for the language learner. Yule (2006:167) divides different forms of language transfer into two categories: *positive transfer* and *negative transfer*. If students' target language has similar features as their first language, they may be able to benefit from their first language knowledge when learning the second language, making it a positive transfer. On the contrary, transferring features or knowledge of a first language that is very different from the target language will result in negative transfer making it more difficult to communicate successfully in the target language. Yule (2006:167) comments that negative transfer, also known as *interference,* is most common in the earliest stages of second language learning and often becomes a smaller issue as the language learner reaches higher levels of familiarity with the target language.

Language transfer, or interference, may provide some challenges for second language teachers. It is thought to be a benefit for the teachers to have some knowledge of the linguistic and literacy background of their students, and also to check the student's abilities to read in their various first languages before checking their fluency and capability in high frequency words in the second language (Grabe, 2009:1279).

3.3 Literacy development in language learners

When language minority students enter schools, they need to develop both oral and literacy skills in a second language. In addition, this process needs to be both effective and productive in order for the students to keep up with their native speaker classmates. Developing these necessary skills can be a challenge for some students.

Usually the language learning process starts before a student enters school, which will allow them some basic understanding of the language. According to August and Shanahan (2006:54), this process typically includes skills that are related to reading and writing such as oral language skills, familiarity with print and an understanding of text structures and the acquisition of knowledge. During this part of language acquisition, children are still learning to decode and encode in addition to reconstructing meaning. Reading and writing therefore become tools for developing vocabulary as well as for communication (August & Shanahan 2006:54). Even though the process of literacy development takes place during a child's acquisition of a first language, it creates a basis for them to build on while they learn their

28

second language. This can be explained by the fact that many of the students will be learning to read and write in the language of instruction and the target language simultaneously. This means that young students will develop literacy skills in their L1 and their L2 at the same time. There are many factors that can make this experience complex and difficult. These factors include, amongst others, the student's previous educational experiences. For some students, this may be their first experience with school, whereas others may have started school in their home countries before moving to a new country and continuing their education there. Cultural and linguistic backgrounds may also influence the student's abilities and attitudes towards learning a new language, whilst also developing basic literacy skills. Cognitive strength, and the type of literacy instruction they receive will also influence this experience (Helman, 2009:1). Even though the students are exposed to the second language through environmental print, television, and from friends and teachers at school, many of them will have parents who do not speak the language. This results in little practice for the students at home. Literacy instruction will for many only come in the classroom from teachers and fellow students. Cultural factors can influence learning to read and write, and the students' first language can both help and make it more difficult for the student to read in a new language (Helman, 2009:1).

3.4 Spontaneous vs. guided learning

Hagen and Tenfjord (1998:17) explain that there are two ways of learning: guided or spontaneous. Language learning takes place in a social context. Though this social context usually refers to a classroom, learning a second language also requires input from the environment outside of the classroom. Historically, learning a second language was considered a guided and formal process, but this process has been questioned (Ibid, 1998:17). Social contexts outside of the classroom have recently been given more importance, leaving the use of language for the purpose of teaching in the classroom, and instead promoting language as a means of communication making language learning a spontaneous process outside of the classroom.

Hagen and Tenjord (1998) imply that there are several important differences between how one uses language in spontaneous learning or teaching, and how one uses language in guided learning or teaching. Guided teaching uses language as a means for educating the

student. The teacher is most likely the only person in the room who speaks the target language fluently and a high level of importance is given to the structure and grammar of the language. The context of a guided learning situation is typically within a classroom. Spontaneous teaching, on the other hand, is when language is mainly used as a means for communication. In this situation, people who fluently speak the target language will surround the language learner, and the importance is placed on successful and comprehensible communication rather than focusing on correct use of language structure and grammar (Ibid, 1998:18). Ellis (1994: 12) similarly distinguishes between what he calls naturalistic versus instructed second language acquisition. Ellis makes this distinction based on the same criteria as Hagen and Tenjord, namely, whether language learning takes place during communication such as "naturally occurring social situations or through study, with the help of guidance from reference books or classroom instruction" (Ellis, 1994:12). However, Ellis distinguishes these two types of language learning in a sociolinguistic sense focused on the setting and activities in which the learner would participate in order to learn the target language. Ellis argues that one cannot assume that naturalistic learning is a subconscious act, whilst instructed learning is conscious. Whether or not the process of acquisition is the same or different in the naturalistic and instructed settings, remains an open question.

Krashen (1981), who amongst others, shares Ellis' view on language teaching and learning and has been a spokesperson for the field wrote:

> What theory implies, quite simply, is that language acquisition, first or second, occurs when comprehension of real messages occurs, and when the acquirer is not 'on the defensive' … Language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drilling. (1981:6)

Krashen explain further how real language acquisition develops slowly, and that developing speaking skills takes significantly more time than developing listening skills, even under perfect learning conditions. Based on this, Krashen claims that the best methods for teaching second languages are those that supply 'comprehensible input' in low anxiety situations, containing messages that students really want to hear. Comprehensible input was a hypothesis suggesting that in order for language acquisition to take place, the teacher must give the student input, using either a level of language that the student comprehends, or one level

higher than the students' current comprehension, in order to continue progress. This hypothesis is known as i+1: I being the current level of skill, and the +1 representing the next level of skill.

Using these methods when teaching a second language will not force early production in the language, but will allow students to produce when they are 'ready'. In other words, this theory recognizes that improvement comes from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, the i+1, and not from forcing and correcting production (Krashen, 1981:6-7). Ellis (1994) agrees with Krashen on the importance of input and interaction. Ellis claims it to be self-evident that second language learning can only take place when the learner is exposed to, or has access to, input in the target language. This input can be in both written and spoken form. An example is during interaction where the language learner attempts to converse with native speakers such as the teacher or another learner. The teacher or the student will adjust their language to address the learner in a language that is on the same level as the students' level, or on a level above, to create suitable input. This type of adjusted language is often known as *foreigner talk* or *teacher talk* (Ellis, 1994:28). Relating to this subject, one can also mention scaffolding. Scaffolding refers to the concept of a more knowledgeable speaker helping a less knowledgeable speaker, for example a new language learner, to learn by providing support or assistance (Lightbown and Spada, 2006:131).

3.5 Content-based language teaching

In recent years, there have been some dramatic developments in language teaching. The nature of language has been re-conceptualized and the role of the learner within the language process has been reevaluated. In addition new insight into instructed second language acquisition has been generated (Nunan, 1999:69). Together with insights from research, this has led to some fundamental changes in the way we regard the nature of language learning, resulting in changes in the way we go about the business of language teaching (Ibid, 1999:69).

When conducting research for this thesis, two very different types of teaching methods were observed, namely content-based language teaching where a student learns the target language through working on content, and language-focused language teaching where the

students have lessons dedicated to working solely on the target language's grammatical rules and structures, vocabulary and how to use the language in different contexts.

The following sections are devoted to explaining the concept of content-based language teaching.

In order to explain the concept of content-based language teaching, one must first explain the meaning of the word content. According to different teaching methods, the concept of content has had a lot of different definitions, ranging from being comprised of grammatical constructions and vocabulary to sound patterns. However, modern teaching strategies like the communicative approach, for example, have a completely different way of defining the meaning of the word content. Snow, (2001:303) explains how content, in a communicative approach, is generally defined as "the communicative purposes for which speakers use the second/foreign language." Replacing the natural method, another definition of content has emerged more recently. Content-based language teaching defines content as "…the use of subject matter for second/foreign language teaching purposes" (Snow, 2001:303). This teaching method defines subject matter as being comprised of topics or themes in a second language setting, based on the student's interests or needs but can also be very specific and follow subjects that the students are currently studying in their elementary school classes (Ibid, 2001:304).

Snow (2001:304) also draws a parallel between content-based language teaching and English for specific purposes (ESP) where one identifies the students' vocational or occupational needs as the basis for the curriculum and materials development. Stryker and Leaver (1997:3) explicate that traditional foreign language classes have been concentrated on the learner spending time developing skills in practicing scales and practicing theory. Content-based language teaching, on the other hand, "… encourages students to learn a new language…by actually using that language, from the very first class, as a real means of communication" (Stryker & Leaver, 1997:3). Furthermore, Stryker and Leaver (1997:3) elucidate the philosophy of content-based language instruction (CBI) as aiming to empower students to become independent learners and to continue the learning process beyond the classroom.

Lyster (2011:611) writes that the objective for content-based language teaching is that non-linguistic content, including subject matter, is taught to the students through the target language to enable them to learn curricular content while learning an additional language simultaneously through an instrumental approach. Though one can argue that language

development and cognitive development go together, traditional teaching methods tend to separate language development from general cognitive development. Using this method, except for the mechanical workings of the language itself, the target language tends to be isolated from any substantive content (Lyster, 2011:611). Based on the previous presentation, Lyster (2011:611) draws the conclusion that in contrast to other approaches to teaching, content-based instruction is designed to integrate language and cognitive development.

According to Lyster (2011:612) it has been widely documented that students learning an additional language through immersion indeed succeed in mastering the content as well as if they were learning the content through their first language.

Summarizing the section on content-based second language teaching, content-based teaching has often been referred to as the "two for one" approach as the students will be learning subject matter and target language at the same time. Based on the research presented in the previous sections, one can conclude that many researchers agree, with slight variations, regarding the use for content-based language teaching and its success.

3.6 English as a second language

A distinction is often made between learning a second language and learning a foreign language. A second language often refers to a language that has an "…institutional and social role in the community"(Ellis, 2008:6). Learning English in English speaking countries in order to function in school and in the community is considered learning a second language. In contrast, foreign language learning "…takes place in settings where the language plays no major role in the community and is primarily learned only in the classroom" (Ellis, 2008:6). For example, learning French in Norwegian schools is learning a foreign language, since French does not have an important role in order to function in Norway.

As established in section 2.1, there is a difference between learning and acquiring a language. English Language Learners (ELLs) learn their language through English as a second language courses (ESL). ESL courses are designed for ELLs and target language acquisition focusing on reading, writing, speaking and listening skills, usually by extensive listening and speaking practice. Depending on in which grade the student is the course content and methods may vary. During the research for this paper, students and teachers from elementary schools, grades 1-6 were the target group.

Section 2.2 of the background chapter explains how the curriculum for English as a second language tends to vary from state to state as there is no curriculum that applies nation wide. However, there seem to be some main points in the state standards that are repeated in the different state curricula's. The following course description for ESL in grades 1-6, is gathered from the department of public instruction in North Dakota and states that the course:

> …Provides a foundation of the basic structures of the English language, enabling students to progress from an elementary understanding of English words and verb tenses to a more comprehensive grasp of various formal and informal styles… (2013:1)

In addition to covering basic English language skills, ESL also aims to help students succeed in "content classrooms, and to move into regular classrooms." Some ESL classes will also include an "orientation to the customs and culture of the diverse population in the United States" (N.D department of public instrctuin, 2013:1)."

3.7 Theories and practices in ELL

A great deal of research has been devoted to how people learn languages. Though certain theories have had a profound effect upon the practice of teaching a language, no one knows exactly how people learn languages (Harmer, 1991:31). As mentioned there are different methods for learning a second language, however there are also different reasons for wanting to learn a second language. Harmer (1991:1) lists six different reasons for learning English (or other languages) as a second language. First, school curricula will in some places demand it. Second, there are some advantages for having knowledge of the English language, and some students might want to learn English to give them advancement in their professional lives. The third reason for learning English as a second language could be because a student finds him or herself living in a target language community where English is the target language. A student would have to learn English to function in that community. As a fourth reason, Harmer (1991:2) claims that a student can learn English for specific purposes, such as English for occupational purposes (EOP), English for academic purposes (EAP), and English for science and technology (EST). The final two reasons for learning English as a second

language, according to Harmer (1991:2), are for culture, and for miscellaneous reasons. The final reasons can be linked to the different types of motivation, explained in section 2.2.2 where all but number 2 would apply when learning other language, for example, Norwegian.

For the students to reach the different competence aims set for the course, teachers can use a variety of different approaches to teaching. The next section of this thesis will describe different teaching methods for teaching ESL. Though all of the reasons for learning ESL stated above are valid reasons, the main focus of this paper is based on learning a second language where it is also a first language, or in other words, in a target language community (TLC). The teaching methods presented following this section will be a reflection of that context.

3.7.1 Push-in

In many cases of ESL teaching, the programs ELL's follow will unfold in different ways. One of these programs is called the Push-in model. In an ESL push-in model, the ESL teacher comes into a classroom to attend the needs of the ESL learner or learners while the ESL students are learning content along with the non-ESL students (Obiakor, Bakken & Rotatori, 2010:53). The number of ELLs present will vary. Push-in ESL is based on the notion that removing ESL students from the content classrooms in order to receive EL instruction is both ineffective and an inefficient use of time. This in turn may hinder students from effusively integrating and acculturating into the mainstream classroom (Hudspath-Niemi & Conroy, 2013:25). Teachers in a push-in model provide ESL services in the mainstream classroom, while collaborating with the classroom teacher to identify language goals that support the ongoing content instruction in the classroom.

The opposite of the push-in model is, as mentioned, the pull-out model. This model will be explained further in section 3.9.2 of this thesis, as it is the primary method in Norwegian as a second language teaching in Norway. This organization is a reflection of the way these models were used in the case study schools, not because it is limited to one language or other.

Though push-in is considered to be a more affective and efficient way of teaching than the pull-out model, there is one main problem with using push-in during ESL instruction. According to Hudspath-Niemi and Conroy (2013:25) securing common planning time between the ESL teacher and the content teacher may present a problem. They further explain

that an opportunity for the ESL teacher to review the content teachers lesson plan in advance is essential in order to prepare adaptations and modifications for the materials of instruction and delivery that is appropriate for the ESL students' proficiency level. Other disadvantage with this model include not being feasible for large ELL populations in a school. However, Hudspath-Niemi and Conroy (2013:26) also list advantages for this teaching model as this model is also seen as beneficial for smaller ELL populations allowing for more one-on-one skill building with the ELL teacher and students.

A push-in approach to ESL often occurs during content instruction such as math, science and social studies, even though many ESL teachers have no formal training to teaching these subjects (Zacarian, 2011:84). Based on this, the ESL teachers who are using a push-in model require professional development in both the content curriculum, the instructional materials that will be used to teach the content, and effective methods for teaching the content (Zacarian, 2011:85).

One teaching model that is based on the push-in model is SIOP. The following section will present and explain the concept of SIOP in-depth.

3.7.2 The SIOP model

During the research for this thesis, interviews and observations were conducted in an American primary school. This particular school based their ESL teaching on one specific model of teaching, the SIOP model. SIOP is an abbreviation for Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol and is a model that aims to make content comprehensible for English language learners (ELLs) in content-based teaching (see also section 2.5). SIOP is an example of a teaching model that takes advantage of the advantages that content-based teaching purpose. By combining content-based instruction (CBI), and SIOP "…teachers seek to develop the students' English language proficiency by incorporating information from the subject areas that the students are likely to study" (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008:13). Building on this, SIOP is comprised of content courses for ELLs which would normally be taught by content specialists using grade-level objectives and modified instruction to make the material comprehensible for the learners, instead of using the ESL teachers to teach the same content (Lyster, 2011:612).

The SIOP model introduces how to plan a lesson where both content and language objectives for each lesson are present and allows for the teacher to take advantage of the pre made objectives in order to teach linguistically and culturally diverse students. Content-based ESL classes are taught by language educators whose main goal is English language skills development but in addition to have a goal of preparing the students for the mainstream classroom without. The material presented is varied according to the language skills of the students in class, but will always address key topics in grade-level subjects (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2008:13).

Sheltered instruction, which is a part of the SIOP abbreviation, can be explained as a set of teaching strategies, designed for teachers who teach academic content to students with different levels of linguistic abilities within a classroom (Education Portal, 2013). Sheltered instruction was created to lower the linguistic demand of a classroom lesson without compromising the integrity or outcome of the lesson. Sheltered instruction teachers will adjust the language in many ways and also use certain teaching methods often used by language teachers to make the academic instruction of the lesson more accessible and understandable to students of different proficiency levels in the English language. This can be linked to Krashens hypothesis on i+1 (see also section 2.4).

Building on this concept, SIOP offers several areas of focus, each set with objectives for both content and language. These areas range from how to introduce sheltered instruction and the SIOP model to the students, to lesson preparation and building background knowledge. SIOP is both a teaching method and a teacher's guide that offers a guide for teachers who want implement SIOP in their classroom. The SIOP textbook, includes a chapter on comprehensible input, claiming that "students learning rigorous content material in a language they do not speak or understand completely require specialized teaching techniques to make the message understood" (Echevarra, et al, 2008:79). Echevarria et al. (2008:79) explain comprehensible input similarly to Krashen, namely as language accommodated or adapted to a level that the student can understand, using enunciation and speaking in a slow manner, however, still speaking in a natural way.

In addition to comprehensible input, SIOP offers different learning strategies and scaffolding techniques. The learning strategies and techniques aim to help teachers choose different teaching methods appropriate to a lesson's objective, and to promote critical and strategic thinking for ELL students. According to SIOP, teachers should actively be assisting in developing students' metacognitive awareness, referring to the learner's instinctive

alertness of their own knowledge and ability to understand, control and influence their own development. Cognitive and social strategies will help make learning more effective (Echevarria et al, 2008:94-112). Cognitive in this context refers to the process where input is altered, condensed, elaborated, stored and or used.

3.7.3 The grammar translation method

The grammar translation method is a third teaching method that has been frequently associated with ESL teaching. Though this teaching method would be applicable regardless of the target language, it is commonly described as one of the most used methods for teaching English as both a second language and a foreign language as the method itself appeared at a time when English was one of the most important languages to know and to be able to use. Based on this, the grammar translation strategy is included in this thesis as a part of ESL teaching.

The grammar translation method has commonly been used in foreign language teaching (Drew & Sørheim, 2004:19). This method of language teaching served as the norm for second language classroom teaching up until the 1960s and has for that reason also been referred to as the "normal method". According to Yule (2006:165), the grammar-translation method was based on the idea of treating second language learning in the same way as any other academic subject. In the grammar-translation method, the goal of second language learning was to learn a language so one could be able to read literature or benefit from intellectual development as a result of the language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:5). The grammar-translation method approached language learning through a detailed analysis of the language's grammar rules, and then applying the knowledge of the grammar rules to translating sentences to and from the target language (Ibid., 2001:6) Because of this, the student's first language has importance to and is involved in the language learning process. Supporters of the grammar-translation method consider a second language to be a system of rules to be observed in text while reading, before relating these rules to the first language's rules and meanings making the first language the basis for acquiring the second language (Aslam, 2003:40). The first language is also used as the medium of instruction, meaning it is used to explain new items and to enable comparisons between the second language and the student's first language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:6).

Richards and Rodgers (2001:6) present that when teaching languages through the grammar-translation method, the main emphasis is put on reading and writing, whereas speaking or listening are given little or no systematic attention. Based on this, it has been pointed out that this type of emphasis within language teaching leaves students unaware of how the language might be used in everyday conversations and they would be at a loss when faced with the way the language is supposed to be used in the target language community (TLC) (Yule, 2006:165).

3.8 Norwegian as a second language

As discussed in section 2.5.1, there is a difference between learning a second language and learning a foreign language. This distinction is based on the language role in the community, and the importance for the student to function in both school and the community. Based on these qualifications, Basic Norwegian for language minorities is considered to be a second language as basic literacy skills are necessary for the students to function both in the community and also in school. Basic Norwegian for language minorities is also called *Norsk 2,* which translates to Norwegian 2 (NL2). Basic Norwegian for language minorities will henceforth be referred to as Norwegian 2 in the remaining chapters of this thesis. Basic literacy skills are necessary for the students to function both in the community and also in school.

From the national curriculum posted on the website for The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, we find the description for what the Department call Basic Norwegian for language minorities. It states that the teaching based on this curriculum is meant to promote adapted education, and ensure linguistic minorities the opportunity for special instruction in Norwegian language. The Department offers all minority students special training in Norwegian until their language skills are proficient enough to follow regular school teaching. Students' language skills are assessed throughout the course to establish their level of proficiency and to predict when they are no longer in need of special instruction in Norwegian language.

Before a student enters the Norwegian 2 program, each student's language skills are assessed, and a decision has to be made as to which level in the curriculum should be the starting point for the student. From the course description, created by the Department of

Education in Norway, it states that the teaching in basic Norwegian covers the instruction in reading and writing and helps students develop vocabulary and grasp the concepts in a variety of subjects (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007:2). In addition, the teaching promotes intercultural understanding. To cover all these areas, Norwegian 2 is divided in to four main areas of teaching. The first area is *Language and learning* which entails the different aspect included in learning a new language. Second, *Language and culture* focuses on the cultural significance of the language. Culture and history are also included in this course. Third, *Reading and writing* revolves around written communication and the development of reading and writing skills. Using these methods when teaching a second language will not force early production in the language, but will allow students to produce when they are 'ready'.

3.9 Theories and practices in Norwegian 2

To reach the different competence aims set in the curriculum for NL2, there are different theories and practices the teachers can use. Kibsgaard and Husby (2009:24) elucidate how NL2 courses can generally be divided into two different types of models, dependent on different aims. The two different models are called 'bevaringsmodeller' and overgangsmodeller, which can be translated as preservation models and transition models. The preservation model refers to teaching models which main goals are to develop the student's first language, preserve the culture connected with their first language and confirm their rights as minorities (Kibsgaard & Husby, 2009:24). Curricula that are developed under this model type aim for the students to become functionally bilingual and that their first language will be developed further after the enrollment in a Norwegian school. The development of knowledge and language are viewed as equally important.

Transition models, on the other hand, have a primary goal of developing the skill level in the target language, in this context, Norwegian. In these model types, the first language may serve as a tool for making the transition from first to second language use easier. However, all lessons supporting the student's first language will cease once the student has adequate skill levels in Norwegian language (Kibsgaard & Husby, 2009:24).

3.9.1 Pull-Out

The pull-out model is presented in this thesis as it was the teaching method used in the Norwegian in this study. This is considered a transition model, as its main goal is to develop skills in the target language. Though it is commonly used the NL2 classroom, this teaching model is applicable in any second language teaching context, regardless of the target language.This model is based on the language learning students leaving the content classroom to receive NL2 instruction in a separate classroom (Vàsquez, Hansenand & Smith, 2013:27). While they are pulled out, these students typically spend a scheduled amount of time receiving NL2 instruction (Zacarian, 2011:85).

There are several advantages associated with the pull-out model, including the students receiving intensive and explicit speaking, listening, reading and writing instruction (Hudspath-Niemi & Conroy, 2013:26). Because of the fact that NL2 students are often spread out in different classrooms, the pull-out model is frequently employed to conduct the NL2 classes. Despite its frequent usage, the pull-out model is considered to be one of the least effective and there are quite a few disadvantages associated with this model. Vasquez, Hansen and Smith (2013:27) point out that while being pulled out of the content classroom, the students are missing out on the curriculum that is being taught in that classroom. Considering that the students are in some cases pulled out from many different classes, the NL2 teacher will have difficulties coordinating the curriculum taught in the NL2 classroom to match that of the content classrooms. A lot of time in the NL2 classroom will therefore be dedicated to working with subjects other than learning Norwegian, in the attempt that the students will not fall as far behind in the content they are missing. Hudspath-Niemi and Conroy (2013:6) also mention that there will be less focus on cognitive academic language development while participating in a pull-out model, based on the circumstance that the students are not present during many lessons of varied content.

3.9.2 Literature and storytelling

One teaching method that is commonly used in NL2 lessons during the pull-out sessions is the use of literature and storytelling during language development. During storytelling the students are presented with opportunities to use different expressions, both verbally and through body language and also communication. According to Kibsgaard and Husby

(2009:153) storytelling is important for young language learners with a minority background because it is fundamentally important for the child's identity. Storytelling as a teaching method consists of five main elements: Association, repetition, clarification, the process of storytelling and further developing the story.

Storytelling is a part of what is called methodological relations. Teachers involved with NL2 need knowledge regarding different elements of language development. Kibsgaard and Husby (2009:164) present a model created by Bloom and Lahey (1978) that portrays the different aspects of language and language learning. The model consists of three main components, namely form, content and use. The Norwegian learners need knowledge regarding people, objects and action, and the relationship between them in order to give them language content. Also, they need to learn how to recognize different types of context, which in turn require different forms of language use.

3.10 Summary

An important aspect discussed in this chapter is the difference between push-in and pull-put. Push-in teaches language while the students are in the mainstream classroom, by focusing on language connected to the content, by using a content-based language teaching. One teaching model associated with push-in is SIOP. Pull-out on the other hand, takes students out of the mainstream classroom in order to teach them language by using a language-based approach to language teaching.

4. Research Method

4.1 Introduction

The topic of this thesis, a comparison of second language teaching methods in two different countries, required the researcher to collect data and information from different sources. In order to do so, different methods for data collection were used, including both interviews with students and teachers and observations of different classes.

This chapter describes the different methodological procedures that were used to gather information for this thesis. This chapter and its definitions are supported by different theories. In addition to a presentation of the methods that were used during data collection, this chapter also presents the selection criteria and the process of selecting the informants for the thesis. Reliability and validity in the research will also be presented here. As a final section, ethical considerations and what measures were taken in order to protect the privacy of the informants is also explained here.

Relating to the research questions the aim was to gain insight into both the teachers' and the students' thoughts and feelings on the subject of learning a second language and also to view and compare the teaching models and methods used in the respective schools during second language teaching. It was therefore necessary to analyze the data using a qualitative method.

4.2 Research Design

Based on the nature of the research questions, a qualitative approach was used both for the collection and analysis of the data. The essential features of qualitative research are by Flick (2002:4) described as follows:

> …the correct choice of approapriate methods and theories; the recognition and analysis of different perspectives; the researchers' reflections on their research as part of the process of knowledge production; and the variety of approachers and methods (2002:4).

The results of the research in this thesis cannot be measured, but refer to the study of social relations. Qualitative research is of specific relevance to the study of social relations (Flick, 2002). In opposition to quantitative research where one can measure the outcome of the research in numbers or volume, qualitative research involves methods that "…represent a form of data collection and analysis with a focus on understanding an emphasis on meaning" (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013:112). Qualitative methods are considered non-experimental, and are used to find answers to questions like *how* and *why* within the field of human behavior by using a naturalistic approach, meaning observing and understanding your informant in their natural setting (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). Using a qualitative approach allows you to choose from four different methods: Grounded theory, Ethnographic, Narrative and Phenomenology. Based on the descriptions of these four methods, a combination Ethnographic and Phenomenology method was chosen to collect my data.

4.2.1 Ethnographic approach

The ethnographic approach is described as well suited for the fields of education and the social and behavioral sciences. It is specified as a method used to study a school, organization or an in-depth program (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013). The interview conducted for this thesis included questions regarding the use of different languages in different situations based on their ethnic background. The use of ethnography provided the researcher with contextual data and allowed for comparison of the information gathered from the interviews in light of the students' ethnic backgrounds.

4.2.2 Phenomenological approach

Phenomenology can be explained as a description of an individual's immediate experience where the goal is to understand how your informant constructs reality (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013:136). A phenomenological approach is used when the researcher is interested in "…exploring the meaning, composition, and core of the lived experiences of specific phenomena" (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2013:136). In other words, using a phenomenological approach will give one insight to people's experiences and how they understand that

experience in addition to how the informant experiences the essence of a particular phenomenon and how they understand that event (Edmond & Kennedy, 2013:138). Considering that one of the aims for this thesis was to look at both students' and teachers' feelings and experiences towards learning a second language, using a phenomenological approach served as an appropriate method to acquire both accurate and reliable data as the outcome of my research.

4.3 Selecting the informants

In order to conduct the research plan, the researcher needed two different types of informants: students currently learning a second language and teachers currently involved with teaching a second language. The research took place at primary schools in both Norway and America, which had students learning Norwegian and English as a second language in the respective countries. Both schools were suited for both observing the teaching and conducting interviews with students and teachers.

4.3.1 Selecting informants in Norway

To find a school in Norway a letter was written to explain who the researcher was and also the objectives for the research. This letter was sent to the principals of different elementary schools in the district, along with an invitation to participate in the research. The schools that were contacted were based on recommendations from the thesis supervisor and her colleagues at the University of Stavanger. After receiving a positive response from one of the target schools, a letter was sent to the teachers explaining what was wanted from them in terms of observation time and interviews. Finally, a letter was sent to the parents of all the students explaining that the researcher wanted to have an informal interview with their child. A permission slip was attached to the letter, which the parents had to sign in order to give their consent to the interview with their children. Two out of three possible groups of students and teachers gave consent to the research, which presented the researcher with two teachers and two classes of students, a total of five students to both observe and interview.

All the students that were chosen as informants were from different backgrounds, with different mother tongues. The students were from different age groups and in different grades, from 4th to 5th. They were also in different stages of learning Norwegian as a second language, divided by grade level. In this school, all the students that were observed were also interviewed.

The teachers had different educational backgrounds and different experiences with teaching a second language. The teachers were not familiar with the students' first language and were not able to use their first language as a tool for teaching the students Norwegian. This added an additional challenge for both the students who were learning and the teachers who were teaching them the language

4.3.2 Selecting informants in America

To choose the informants in America, the same process was repeated. A letter was sent to multiple elementary schools in the same area of the country, explaining who the researcher was and also stating the aims for the research. The schools that were contacted were based on recommendations from members of the faculty at the University of Stavanger. Letters were also given to all the parents who had to give consent to interview their children. After a few responses from the schools, one school was chosen. Teachers were informed of the research and gave their consent to participate by both allowing for observations during teaching and also by participating in the interview.

The students who were chosen as informants from this school were all from the same ethnic background and had the same mother tongue. They were of different age groups, ranging from 2nd to 6th grade and were at different stages of learning English as a second language.

4.4 Data collection

Collecting the data for this thesis included conducting interviews and observations at two different schools in two different countries, one Norwegian school teaching Norwegian as a second language, and one American school teaching English as a second language. The data

collection process started in Norway. This served as the most practical solution as getting permits for doing research in America, making travel arrangements and also planning the observations was quite time consuming. In addition, it was easier to trial both the interview and observation process in Norway first to confirm that all areas within the thesis topic were covered in the interview questions. This helped ensure that the data collection process in America was successful.

4.4.1 Interviews

During the research period for the thesis, a total of ten students and six teachers were interviewed divided between the two target schools. Students came from grades ranging from 3rd to 5th grade, with different minority backgrounds. After observing the students in multiple ESL or Norwegian 2 lessons, the students participated in very short interviews, lasting no more than five minutes.

Following the student interviews, six teachers were also interviewed in the respective schools. The researcher followed the teachers and observed while they conducted multiple ESL or Norwegian 2 lessons, in grades ranging from kindergarten level to eighth grade. After an observation period the teachers contributed to the research by participating in interviews. Each teacher was interviewed once, for about twenty minutes.

The purpose of interviewing the teachers was to gain knowledge about thoughts and feelings in addition to experiences with the subject of teaching a second language. During the interviews an interview guide with prepared questions was used to ensure that all areas of the topic were covered. The interview guide was also piloted beforehand to make certain that the questions conveyed the right meaning and that the questions retrieved the desired information. In addition, piloting helped eliminate questions that were not relevant and made sure that the informants understood what was asked. The interview was recorded to make it easier to review and work with the results. This also made it easier to be accurate when quoting teachers and students from the interviews.

Two different interview guides were made before the interviews took place. One interview guide had questions directed at the teachers and the other had questions directed at the students. During the interview with the teacher, a semi-structured interview guide was used to ensure that all the informants were asked the same questions. This way, even though

the answers were different, the information that was gathered was the same. Standardized, open-ended questions were made, to make it easier to analyze and also easier to compare the answers.

The interview included questions regarding the informants' previous experiences, opinions and values concerning the topic, and standard background or demographic questions such as age, educational background, etc. The interview was ended with an open question where the informants could add any bit of information they deemed important, and also their impression of the interview. This served as a good approach for getting the story behind the participant's experiences and also presented the opportunity to pursue in-depth information around the topic. This provided focus, in addition to allowing some freedom and adaptability in getting the information from the informants.

The informants were offered to receive the interview guide in advance so they had a chance to better prepare for the interview, which could have been an advantage for the research since their opinions and impressions were a large part of the information that was searched for. Giving them the questions beforehand would have given them an opportunity to reflect upon their answers instead of giving a spontaneous response. However, none of the teachers opted for the offer to receive the questions before the actual interview.

The main reason for choosing interviews instead of a questionnaire as a basis for data collection was to make it more personal and less formal, in addition to wanting to work directly with the informant creating conversations to cover all the bases of the research. It also offered the opportunity to probe and ask follow up questions.

Even though the questions were prepared prior to the interview, they were relevant to the observations. The interviews offered opportunities for the teachers to comment upon the different teaching methods that they used during ESL or Norwegian 2 lessons, which the researcher was able to observe before the interview.

4.4.2 Observations

Repeated observations were conducted in the different classrooms. All of them were audio recorded, and detailed notes were taken. To help compare the different classes, a checklist was made to use during the observations, with different aspects of teaching to look for, i.e. 'What are the students doing while the teacher is talking?', and 'What is on the blackboard?'.

This made it easier to review and compare the similarities and differences in the classes, and also gave directions as to what to look for when observing. Though it would have been preferable, the observation checklist was not piloted before the observation period started.

During the observation period for the research, approximately 20 observations were conducted divided between the two schools. Grades ranging from kindergarten to 8th grade were observed: 4th and 5th grade Norwegian 2 lessons, and Kindergarten, 1st – 6th grade and 8th grade ESL lessons. Each lesson lasted from twenty to forty-five minutes, and included a variety of students from different backgrounds and skill levels. A large number of students were present during the observation, though few of them were interviewed. All the observations were conducted during a time period of eight days, three days observing Norwegian 2 lessons and five days observing ESL lessons. The researcher was passive throughout the observations, with the exception of some questions and information given by the teacher during the lessons.

4.5 Data coding

During the observations and interviews, some personal information about the informants, such as age, ethnic background and some information regarding their families, was collected. Since this information can be labeled as sensitive, and can lead to the informants being identified, it was necessary to code the data and anonymize the informants. Students were given labels, Student 1a, Student 1b etc. The numbers represented which student, and the letter represented which school. The same coding system was applied with the teachers. The key to the data is kept on a password-protected file on a password-protected computer.

4.6 Validity and reliability in Qualitative research

In order to trust the outcome of the research, the question of validity and reliability in the work, and in qualitative research in general, must be addressed.

Validity refers to the degree in which our test or other measuring device is truly measuring what we intended it to measure (NESH, 2006). This means that we have to use appropriate methods or forms of testing to find the answer to our questions. As an example,

testing someone's vocabulary would require a different method than testing someone's grammar skills.

During the research period, a total of 20 observations were executed. This provided rich data as many of the observations were in different classrooms, providing information on different types of teaching, in different types of classrooms. The observations, along with the interviews, gave the research depth and the possibility to compare how two different schools, in two different countries approach teaching a second language.

By using interviews, both the students and teachers got to explain their feelings and opinions freely. Besides the possibility that they gave false statements or were lying when answering the questions, there are some variables that can question the validity of the outcome. One could argue that I did not interview enough students and teachers to claim that my outcome is valid, in addition to the possibility of asking the wrong questions, or even leading questions. However, the questions included in the interview guide were based on the need to gather relevant information in relation to the theory. The questions are therefore a reflection of the theory presented in chapter 3.

In addition, the question of reliability or quality is raised to gain perspective on how to assess or evaluate what we are doing (Flick, 2007:2). Flick (2007:3) explains four different ways to question the reliability of the research. One of them was used to discuss the reliability of this research.

First, Flick raises a point of the researcher's interests in knowing about the quality of their own research is. By judging how much I trust my own research, and that I applied the methods in the correct way, I can also judge the outcome and the reliability of the results. According to Flick (2007:4): "quality criteria or strategies to assess and improve the quality will be helpful to reassure one self and to prepare for the evaluation and critique by others." During my interviews with both students and teachers, I was clear in my definitions and explained carefully what I was asking them. This eliminated confusion and also that the informants interpreted my questions in another way than I intended. Therefore I trust that the outcome of my research is reliable.

During the observations conducted for the research, a checklist was used to help guide the researcher in what to look for and to gather the same information from each classroom. This also allowed the researcher to look for certain aspects of the teaching to compare to the other classrooms, such as '*what is in the classroom?*'. Using this checklist helped make the

comparison between schools reliable, since the information obtained was the same during each observation.

4.7 Ethic considerations

During my research, some ethical considerations had to be taken. First, the research was reported to Norwegian Social Science Data Service (NSD) who gave permission to conduct the research. Second, letters were given to the parents of all the students explaining the aims of the research since they were minors. The letter informed the parents about both the research and the researcher. The purpose of interviewing their children was explained and the parents had to give their consent before the interviewing process could begin. The teacher also informed the students that someone was coming to observe and talk to them, and told them about the purpose of the research. I also introduced myself and thanked them for allowing me to be there before I started. In the Norwegian school, two out of three possible classes gave the necessary permission for the research. One was left out of the research due to lacking permission from the parents. In the American school, the researcher was permitted to observe all ESL classes, but only five parents were asked to give their consent to the interviews.

Before the data collection process began, the school, teachers, students and parents were informed that the supervisor and researcher for this thesis would be the only ones with access to the recordings and notes taken during the research. When presenting the results, all student names and the names of the respective schools were exchanged with numbers and letters to protect their privacy. They were anonymized throughout the thesis. After the thesis is complete, the files with their identities and the recordings will be kept for a short period of time, no more than six months, before being deleted.

5. Findings

As mentioned in chapter 4 Methods, the basis of the research was interviews and observations. This section will present summaries of the interviews that were conducted and also of the observations that were made during the research period, both at the Norwegian school and at the American school. In order to anonymize my informants, each student was given a number and a letter in order to label them and also to give information regarding which school they belonged to. The number represented the students and the letter represented the school. The respective letters are A and B. A is used to describe the Norwegian school, and B is used to describe the American school. The same procedure was conducted when the teachers were interviewed. The letter A is given to the teachers interviewed in the Norwegian school and B is given to the teachers interviewed in the American school.

5.1 Student interviews Norwegian school

The researcher interviewed a total of five Norwegian 2 (NL2) students for this thesis. The main goal of interviewing students was to gain insight into their experiences and preferences regarding second language learning and also to see how often they use their second language outside of the classroom. The questions that were asked came from a semi-structured interview guide, as mentioned in section 4.4.1 Interviews. The questions ranged from their ethnic background and native language to experiences with different teaching methods. For a complete list of the questions, see the appendix for a copy of the interview guide.

The following section will present the summaries of the student interviews, starting with the students from the Norwegian school, or, School A. All the interviews at the Norwegian school were conducted in Norwegian. The following summaries have been translated into English by the researcher.

5.1.1 Interview Student 1A

When the interview with Student 1A was conducted, the student was currently in the 4th grade, receiving Norwegian 2 lessons. The student was Arabic, with Arabic as his first

language. In addition to Norwegian, this was the only language the student had literacy skills in.

During the Norwegian 2 lessons, this student preferred either reading assignments or working together with the other students in groups as a method for learning the language. Working with the teacher and having her explain different concepts in the Norwegian language was his preferred teaching method, and how he felt he learned best. The second part of the interview focused more on vocabulary. The question "how do you find out about a word you don't know?" was answered in two parts. If the situation occurred in the classroom, the student would ask the teacher to explain. If the situation occurred at home while reading, the student would ask his sister or the teacher the next day.

The final questions gave more information regarding how often the student used Norwegian outside of school. When talking to his parents, the student would use both Arabic and Norwegian. However, he would only use Norwegian when communicating with his siblings and his friends. The student did not explain his answers to the final questions.

5.1.2 Interview Student 2A

Similarly to Student 1A, at the time of the interview Student 2A was in 4th grade, receiving Norwegian 2 lessons based on a 4th grade curriculum. Student 2A was originally from Thailand with Thai as his first language. Student 2A preferred his teacher to conduct black board based teaching during the Norwegian 2 classes, but found working together with the others in groups and doing reading assignments most effective.

The questions regarding vocabulary had to be explained thoroughly to this student. The question "how do you find out about a word you don't know?" was answered with "I ask for help." The student did not specify whom he would ask for help in that situation. However, should the problem of an unfamiliar word occur when reading or watching TV at home the student answered that he would ask his sister for help. At home, Student 2B spoke both Norwegian and Thai with his parents, but would limit his use of languages to only Norwegian when talking to siblings and friends. Student 2B claimed that speaking Norwegian to his siblings and friends would help him to learn more Norwegian, in addition to the fact that his friends did not understand Thai. However, he did not explain why he used both languages when communicating with his parents.

5.1.3 Interview Student 3A

Student 3A was, in the researcher's opinion, further along in the second language learning process and was able to explain her answers to the questions better than the other students even though she was following the same curriculum as the other students. In addition, this student was eager to participate in the interview and seemed less shy than the other informants.

Student 3A, who was also in 4th grade, was from Ethiopia, with Amharic as her first language. In addition to Amharic and Norwegian, Student 3A also listed English as a language in which she had some literacy skills. The student preferred her teacher to repeat words and explain them to the class, but found playing learning games on an I-pad the most effective teaching method. Although she did not specify which learning games she was referring to, the researcher observed this student specifically, playing games intended to promote skills in math, during one of the NL2 classes leading to the conclusion that this was the type of games she was referring to.

When presented with a word she was not familiar with while at school, she would think about it and would attempt to figure out the meaning herself. Should she come across an unfamiliar word while reading or watching TV, on the other hand, she would ask the teacher for help at school or her mother for help at home.

When asked about the frequency of language use Student 3A had answers similar to the other students'. When communicating with her parents, she would use a combination of Norwegian and Amharic. To that statement she added, "…If I forget words, I use Norwegian." When talking to her younger brother she would only use Norwegian, as her brother did not understand Amharic. The same answer applied when asked which language she used when communicating with her friends; "…they do not know Amharic, I don't have many friends who understand that language."

5.1.4 Interview Student 4A

Student 4A was like the previous students in 4th grade Norwegian lessons. This student was from Eritrea and her first language was Tigrinya. In contrast to most of the other students, she

listed working together in groups with the other students as her preferred teaching method, but working with the teacher as the most effective or easiest to learn from.

Throughout the interview, this student answered quite differently from the rest. Even though, like the others, she would ask for an explanation when presented with an unfamiliar word during a lesson or in a conversation, she said that she would use a dictionary to figure out the meaning of an unfamiliar word should she come across one during reading or watching TV at home. Also, she used Norwegian in fewer contexts than the other students reported. Student 4A would solely use Tigrinya when communicating with both parents and siblings. She explained that she wanted to use her first language so she would not forget how to use the language. In addition, she mentioned that her father did not understand Norwegian. Although she would not use Norwegian at home, she would use Norwegian when speaking with her friends, as they did not understand her first language.

5.1.5 Interview Student 5A

At the time of the interview, Student 5A was in 5th grade, one grade higher than the other informants from this school. Student 5A was the only student from the 5th grade interviewed for this thesis so his answers cannot be compared to students at the same grade level. Student 5A was from Kurdistan with Kurdish as his first language. In addition to Norwegian and Kurdish, he also reported he could communicate in English as his family had lived in an English speaking country, prior to moving to Norway.

This student was extremely shy, as reported by the teachers before the interview. His answers to the questions in the interview reflected these comments. Student 5A preferred learning by writing and also reported that having nice a teacher was important. He felt that getting help and cooperating with others were the most efficient learning methods for him. He did not specify who he would receive help from or cooperate with. To provide some context it should be mentioned that there were only two students in this particular Norwegian 2 group. Furthermore, he was also alone with the teacher for some of the classes as well. Thus, by listing help and cooperating with others as the most effective teaching method, one can draw the conclusion that the student was referring to the teacher. Student 5A answered that working harder, asking a teacher or reading a text multiple times would help him if presented with an unfamiliar word at school, whereas at home he would ask his mother for help.

The student reported using Norwegian in few contexts as he answered that he would use Kurdish when communicating with his parents. Student 5A specified that both parents spoke Norwegian as well, but they used Kurdish when communicating with each other and with him. He did not specify the reason for their choice of language at home. In contrast to the previous statement, Student 5A stated that he would use both English and Norwegian when speaking to his siblings and friends.

5.2 Teacher interviews Norwegian school

All of the student informants in the Norwegian school came from two different classes. The respective teachers for these two classes were also interviewed. The purpose of interviewing the teachers as well as the students was to gain insight in to their opinions and experiences with second language teaching. Additionally, this also gave an opportunity for the researcher to find out whether the teachers' thoughts regarding what students preferred in the classroom were in agreement with what the students answered during their interviews. One can make a point that it would be preferable if the teacher were aware of the students' opinions as this could in turn be reflected during teaching. The final point in the interviews allowed for the teachers to comment on the way that their respective schools approached teaching NL2.

As mentioned in chapter 4 Method, a semi-structured interview was conducted using an interview guide with prepared questions. The interview was piloted before the actual interview to eliminate any confusing or unclear questions. For a complete list of questions, see the appendix for a copy of the interview guide.

5.2.1 Interview Teacher 1A

Teacher 1A was the first teacher interviewed for the thesis. She was the teacher for the 4th grade Norwegian language learners. Teacher 1A had been working as a teacher since 1993 and had completed a four year teacher education program, in addition to further educational training in teaching religion and pedagogy. Her training within Norwegian as a second language was limited to that which was included in the Norwegian course in her initial

teacher training certification. At the time of the interview, Teacher 1A had been working with Norwegian 2 for two years.

Teacher 1A was familiar with and had used many different teaching methods while teaching Norwegian as a second language. Amongst other practices, she listed these approaches for teaching: using conversations, practicing different language terms and difficult words in conversation with the students, and preparing the students for the content classroom and other subjects. Furthermore, Teacher 1A also stressed the importance of working on behavior as the students received varied follow-up from the parents concerning homework and other factors influencing the students' performances. As for the method she found most effective, Teacher 1A claimed that active students with group work, conversations and asking questions would allow the students to learn from each other. Again she mentioned how working with vocabulary and practicing new words were a part of her teaching approach.

As a follow up question, the teacher was asked which teaching methods she thought to be most preferred by her students and also what method was found most effective by her students. She answered that working with homework and their in-school assignments for the week and also working with different themes would be their preferred method. By themes, the teacher is referring to the theme of which all reading and writing assignments were connected For example, during one of the observation weeks the theme was dinosaurs. She thought that most likely written work and group work would be what they experienced as most effective. Additionally, she mentioned generally extending their vocabulary, using varied types of teaching methods during their classes and also using singing and acting as a part of the language training. In other words, she thought that the students would find variation preferable.

In order to measure the language skills of the students, the teacher reported using conversations with the students and also a "goal-check" every week to see if students achieved the set goals. This also helped build a basis for measuring skills. She also found drawing on her experience with NL2 students helpful in determining how the students were doing and what level of skill they currently possessed.

According to Teacher 1A, this school and their approach to teaching Norwegian 2 promoted reading skills as the most important aspect of literacy skills. Additionally, oral language was given more attention than written. This builds on the idea that promoting reading skills and oral language would help the students understand each other when playing or socializing and would also allow for the students to help each other. Oral activity, social

contact and learning while being with others were the aspects of language teaching she believed to be most important.

The teacher would like to change aspects of the Norwegian 2 teaching approach at her school, if possible. According to the teacher, the school would benefit from increasing the number for Norwegian 2 lessons to one hour a day. She pointed out that it would be an advantage if the classes were taught by the same teacher every time, and that the teacher preferably should work primarily with Norwegian 2. In the same context, having a designated room for Norwegian 2 with tools aimed for teaching, like maps and flags, would also be beneficial. Finally, Teacher 1A suggested that there would be value in more cooperation with the first language teachers, and that meetings every two weeks could be a solution.

5.2.2 Interview Teacher 2A

Teacher 2A was the second and final teacher interviewed from the Norwegian school. She had been as a teacher for 13 years and was an educated teacher of four years at university level. Her education in teaching a second language was limited to a few NL2 courses and excluded any formal education or training. In addition, this was her first year as a NL2 teacher, which was reflected in her answers during the interview as she mentioned that she had no comparison or experiences in how to organize the classes. Her experience with teaching a second language was limited as her educational background included teaching competence in social studies, English and math but did not include Norwegian 2.

Even though her time as a Norwegian 2 teacher was very limited, she had already used many different methods to second language teaching, including using Ipads and computers, conversations, practicing content from other classes and working with vocabulary. In her opinion, working with vocabulary and making the students actively use the language in the classroom were the most effective way of teaching. The outcome of this was measured by testing the students' skill levels through an initial test and after six months to chart their progress. The teacher viewed the fact that the students were separated by grade level and not skill level as an important factor for progress. That way the students would not miss out on to much from the content classroom as they could focus on content from other subjects while learning Norwegian.

It was her belief that her students preferred using Ipads or games as the teaching method, while a mixture of conversations with oral language and written language would be regarded as most effective. This could be a reflection of the fact that out of vocabulary, fluency, literacy or reading skills, vocabulary was in her opinion what the students focused on most. However, she stressed the fact that she found it difficult to choose key words that were challenging and relevant for the diversity of students. Her goal was to create a strategy for choosing the right words. This explanation was also linked to spoken or oral language being viewed as more important than written. Again, finding words to explain to oneself and acquiring a good vocabulary was pointed out as an important feature in language learning. Conversely, Teacher 2A also commented on the importance of also using writing in combination with the previously mentioned oral language. She claimed that students would also learn a lot from writing exercises.

The teacher also presented some difficulties that she associated with teaching a second language. For instance, it would be preferable to have some understanding of how much input the students are able to comprehend and obtain. To that statement, she added that in contrast to her school, other schools have teachers more qualified for the position, as they are educated second language teachers. In addition, the lack of designated Norwegian 2 classrooms and materials suited for teaching a second language was an issue that Teacher 2A, in correspondence with Teacher 1A, added as a challenge. Making sure that the students would not fall behind in the subjects that they were missing due to Norwegian 2 lessons, adapting reading homework to be beneficial for other subjects and teaching terminology from other subjects was also mentioned. Finally, Teacher 2A felt that cooperating with the teachers in the other subjects would improve her schools' approach to teaching NL2. Also, moving Norwegian 2 classes to times when they were not in conflict with other important subjects was desirable.

5.3 Student interviews American school

To create a means of comparison, interviews were also conducted at the school in America. The goal was to gain insight into second language teaching where the target language was different from the target language in the first interviews, and also to create an opportunity to compare the process of language teaching in a different setting. Using English as the second

target language was interesting as English can be viewed as a universal language that many will have knowledge of prior to receiving English as a second language classes, possibly also for the students who participated in the interview. However, this possibility was not confirmed. This was a clear contrast to NL2 as Norwegian is not a language one would have knowledge of outside of Norway.

One of the main challenges in interviewing second language students in America was that the interviews had to be executed in English, which was a second language for both the informants and for the researcher. Making sure that the students understood what the researcher was asking, and explaining the questions was accomplished with varied results. Some of the students were not far along in the language acquisition process and their language skills were not yet at a level where they easily could understand the questions and also provide an answer. In addition, all the students interviewed from this school had the same first language, Hmong. Most of the Hmong students at School B came from Hmong communities located in the same area as the school. This was also the circumstance for the specific students interviewed for the thesis.

A total of five students were interviewed in the American school. The answers have not been translated as the interview was conducted in English.

5.1.1 Interview Student 1B

The first student interviewed in America was in 2nd grade with Hmong as her first language. Her English language skills were limited and in addition she was extremely shy which made it hard for her to both understand what she was asked, and also to produce an answer. To make her more comfortable and also to help convey the meaning of the questions, an ESL teacher was present during the interview and helped explain the questions. The ESL teacher did not speak Hmong, and she only explained the questions in English, as she could not translate them into Hmong. The student's answers were a clear reflection of the fact that she was insecure and did not fully understand why she was interviewed and what she was asked during the interview. However, this could also be a reflection of her young age.

English and Hmong were the only languages of which she had knowledge and language skills. It was after the initial questions that it became a challenge for the interviewer to communicate with the student. Her preferred teaching method was reading. However, she

did not understand or answer what method she found most effective. As for vocabulary, Student 1B replied that if presented with a word she was unfamiliar with she would either try to figure it out herself or ask a parent or friend for help.

The student was asked about her use of languages in different situations. She used Hmong when communicating with her parents, since only her father understood and could use English. On the other hand, when talking to her siblings, she would speak English because they did not like to use Hmong, even though she liked to speak Hmong herself.   When asked which language she used when playing with her friends, Student 1B reported that she would use Hmong on the school bus and also during recess. She added that she usually played with her cousins and siblings. Finally, the student made a comment that she found it "…easiest to speak Hmong", and after a pause added "…or English". Her final statement made it difficult to know which language she preferred to use, but from her answers it was clear that Hmong was the language she used most frequently outside of school.

5.3.2 Interview Student 2B

The second student interviewed was in the 4th grade. Like Student 1B her native language was Hmong and in addition to English these were the only languages she spoke. Student 2B preferred working in groups, but found it easiest to learn when the teacher used whiteboard-based teaching. If presented with an unfamiliar word, Student 2B stated that she would ask a friend for help. Should she come a cross an unfamiliar word at home during reading or watching television, she would either try to explain the word, look it up in the dictionary or ask her brother for help.

Regarding frequency of language use, Student 2B reported that as only her father had English language skills, Hmong was the language most commonly used when communicating with her parents. When asked about communicating with her siblings, she informed the researcher that they would use both Hmong and English. She added: "…*Sometimes we speak English.*" The researcher interpreted this as Hmong being the language they most commonly used. The same answer applied when explaining language use when amongst friends. Both languages were used when communicating with her friends, as her friends were also Hmong.

5.3.3 Interview Student 3B

Student 3B was the first male student interviewed at school B. He was also in 4th grade. This student seemed less shy and reluctant to participate in the research and answered most of the questions in full sentences. Like many of the other students, group work was again reported as the preferred teaching method. However, this student answered that reading was for him the most effective and easiest method from which to learn. As for the questions concerning vocabulary, student 3B informed that when he did not understand a word, he would sometimes try to figure it out himself, and other times ask a teacher or a friend for help.

Student 3B informed the researcher that English was primarily used when communicating with his parents. They did not usually speak Hmong. Instead they spoke English but sometimes used Hmong words as well. English was the only language used when talking to his siblings. The same answer was given when asked which language he used with his friends. The student did not give an explanation for his language choices in the different contexts.

5.3.4 Interview Student 4B

Student 4B was a Hmong 4th grader learning English as a second language. Like the others, these were the only two languages he knew. His preferred teaching method was *"Whole class"*. This answer was not explained. As for his answer to which method he found most effective, this was a more reflected answer. Student 4B stated that practicing his writing skills would help him learn more English. He also read new books to learn more words. Based on that resonation, reading and writing were his choice for most effective teaching methods. When presented with a new word he tried to figure it out himself, sometimes by using dictionaries. Should he come across a new word while reading he would ask a friend for help or sometimes his parents, as they both understood English, but mainly spoke Hmong. Student 4B spoke *"Just Hmong"* when speaking with his parents. The student explained that his father had told them to only speak Hmong at home. However, the student would use both Hmong and English when talking to his sibling in order to better explain what he wanted to say. This also applied when talking to friends as he had both Hmong and English speaking friends.

5.3.5 Interview Student 5B

Student 5B was a Hmong girl, in 4th grade, attending ESL classes. This student preferred working together with the entire class, rather than individual work. This student also listed whiteboard-based teaching as the most effective teaching method, which correlates with working together with the entire class. In some of the classes observed prior to the interview, both the students and the teacher would use a whiteboard to both present and solve different problems, for example in math. Based on this one can draw the conclusion that the student's answer is based on that experience.

Moving onto the subject of vocabulary, this student had similar answers to the other students. She generally asked a friend for help when presented with an unfamiliar word at school, Should she find herself in the same situation at home during reading or watching television, she would use a dictionary or ask her mother for help.

Frequency of language use at home was limited to some English but mostly Hmong when communicating with both parents and siblings. She would also use both languages when talking to her friends, as her friends were also Hmong.

5.4 Teacher interviews American School

In between student interviews, the researcher also interviewed the English as a second language (ESL) teachers at the school. The purpose of these interviews was to complement the student interviews by creating more depth in the research, and also to allow the researcher to compare their thoughts and feelings regarding the teaching of a second language. This also made it easier to find main differences and similarities between teachers from the different schools in the two different countries.

A total of four ESL teachers were interviewed for this thesis. They were asked the same questions as the Norwegian teachers, including questions on teaching methods, student assessment, general thoughts and opinions regarding different aspects of second language teaching and also education and experience with teaching a second language. For more information regarding the preparations for the teacher interviews, see chapter 4 Method.

5.4.1 Interview Teacher 1B

Like the other teacher interviews, the first part of the interview created a short presentation of the teacher, including her background as a teacher and her education. The first teacher interviewed in School B, had been working as a teacher for 24 years. Her educational background consisted of a Bachelors degree in elementary education, a Masters degree in general education and in addition she was recently licensed in English as a second language. She had always been working with English language learners (ELLs) but this was her first year as an ESL teacher.

The aim for the second part of the interview was to collect information on experiences and feelings regarding second language teaching methods. The teacher had experience in working with SIOP and push-in as teaching models. These were also the method she found most effective. Teacher 1B stated that she preferred working with SIOP and push-in combined, and found it advantageous pushing students into the regular classroom and supporting the content teacher, using both language objectives as well as language content. According to Teacher 1B, teaching in this way would make it easier to see what language part needs to be expanded on. For example, when working with rounding off in math, she identified what words are needed for the students to be able to explain what he or she is doing. Following this, the interview went on to discuss the preferences of the students. In the teacher's opinion, the students seemed to participate in *"what ever",* which the researcher interpreted to mean that they would participate in any type of teaching practice, regardless of teaching method. Working in small groups and also using a combination of both content and language, such as in the SIOP model, was mentioned specifically.

In this school, they use a formal assessment, checking the level of the student in form of a test. In addition the classroom teacher shared his or her opinion on the student's reading level. Finally, the teacher used her own observations to assess the skill level of the student. In that context, the teacher was also asked about prioritizing different aspects of language teaching. Of these four, vocabulary, fluency, literacy or reading skills Teacher, 1B reported vocabulary as the easiest aspect to focus on, while reading was also emphasized. Teacher 1B also claimed that writing received more attention than spoken language in school. However, in her opinion, speaking came first in terms of priorities, whereas writing was the hardest domain to teach the students and for the students to learn. According to teacher 1B, the way they teach ESL is always changing, and it is important for her to look at everything from an ESL perspective.

5.4.2 Interview Teacher 2B

The second interview was with a middle school teacher. She had been teaching for four years, in addition to a year and a half in China before she got her teaching license. Her educational background entailed a Masters degree in ESL and a Bachelors degree in political science in English, which were also the subjects she taught at the school. She had been an ESL teacher since she received her license four years ago.

During her four years teaching ESL, she had gained experience in different teaching methods comprising Co-teaching, small pullout groups for writing and separate ESL classes. In terms of ESL teaching, pullouts and separate ESL classes were listed as the most effective way to teach. She explained that she found it difficult to put language into content and to plan both objectives effectively supported this statement. As for student preferences, Teacher 2B believed that it depended on the population, but mentioned both push-in and pull-out as methods that the students would prefer, because she felt that students generally do not care about the teaching method. She did not explain her answer any further, as the interview moved on to a different subject.

Regarding assessment, the teacher shared that by knowing her students' she could tell how their language abilities were growing. Furthermore the school used standardized tests that were used by the whole country to assess the students' language skills. Following this question, she was asked about priority of different language aspects. Vocabulary was listed as most prioritized over fluency, literacy and reading skills, along with spoken language over written language. This correlated with her opinion that spoken language skills should be most important as that was something everyone would have to use. Writing skills were, according to Teacher 2B, not as important for their future, not academic writing at least.

Again, the final question in the interview was if there was anything she wanted to change regarding ESL teaching at her school, to which she answered that she wanted more time to teach just language and structures as opposed to content, as her schedule did not allow for her to do that. It was her belief that this affected the students.

5.4.3 Interview Teacher 3B

At the time of the interview, Teacher 3B had been working as a teacher for eleven years with a varied educational background. She had a degree in English literature and a degree in ELL.

In addition to teaching ELL, she had worked with adult learners, and had a history of working as a nurse. She had been working with ELLs all the eleven years she had been a teacher.

During her time as an EL teacher, she had been using SIOP as a teaching model. She added that she preferred using methods that made the teaching interesting and meaningful for the students by using demonstrations, visuals, games and also doing incentives and working with how to retain information. Following up on this subject, Teacher 3B identified printed work such as visual worksheets and teaching *"how to be students"* as the most effective ways of teaching. She supplemented that using a combination of different things when teaching, was another preference.

Teacher 3B listed games including all the modalities, circular teaching with a theme, vocabulary, speaking, asking questions and speaking tests, as methods the students would prefer in her opinion. She added that the students hated reading, making engaging in reading activities a probable method that they would find effective as they would not practice reading on their own.

After establishing some information about teaching methods, the teacher was asked of vocabulary, fluency, literacy and reading skills, which language skills were prioritized. Reading and literacy in addition to how to teach reading to students, was her answer to the question, adding, *"if you can't read, you can't function"*. In the same part of the interview, Teacher 3B claimed that written language was more important then spoken. She backed up her answer by saying that basically it was the same reason as for the previous question. For the students, speaking skills would be easier to pick up on their own, whereas they needed help developing writing skills. She added that literacy should be viewed as the most important aspect of language acquisition.

Before ending the interview, Teacher 3B added that more focus on vocabulary and getting the students to use more academic words were aspects of teaching she would change regarding the way they teach ESL at her school.

5.4.4 Interview Teacher 4B

Teacher 4B was the final teacher interviewed for this thesis. At the time of the interview, she had been a teacher for fifteen years. She taught EL in kindergarten. In addition to being an EL teacher for four years, she was also the EL coordinator at her school. Her educational

background consisted of a Bachelors degree in German, a Masters degree in theology and a license to teach ESL.

During her time as an EL teacher, Teacher 4B had gained experience with different teaching methods, such as the push-in model and SIOP, in which she worked to support the content that the content teacher taught and at the same time supporting language in the classroom. In other words, teaching a class where she was writing the class objectives together with the content teacher. Depending on the objective for the class, she believed the most effective teaching practices working in small groups, which was when she would get the most speaking done with the students. Other effective ways of teaching, in her opinion, included whole group instruction, for example teaching math through literacy or working together with the content teacher. After answering this, she was asked about student preferences. Based on the fact that she taught language to kindergarteners she answered that games and singing songs would be the practice her students found most effective. Regarding student assessment, the teacher shared that the classroom teacher assessed the students' language skill, and the ESL teacher followed that assessment to modify the input to suit the students' needs. Also, their speaking skills were assessed and measured through an ESL test in addition to daily informal formative assessment.

Regarding prioritization of language skills, the teacher reported that it varied depending on the school and grade level, but at her school vocabulary was important, as vocabulary would support the students' reading and content comprehension. Writing was, in her opinion, also very important. However, at that particular school it was difficult to teach, as most of the EL students were Hmong, and Hmong is an oral language. She added that Hmong students are reluctant to speak, and that made fluency the last skill to progress in a foreign language. This could be related to cultural differences. Accordingly, the teacher viewed written skills as more important in relation to national testing, but speaking more important for life skills. Preparing the students for life, building on their skills and helping them be successful in life, were for her the most important aspects of teaching.

If presented with an opportunity to change ESL teaching at her school, the teacher also would have all teachers teach math through literacy, increase the focus on speaking and listening skills and also vocabulary and use more whole group instruction. Having a better writing curriculum and more support for the teachers in writing was also a desire. Finally, she added that she wanted more emphasis on using SIOP as a teaching model. Generally, Teacher

4B loved languages, both teaching German and English, and the idea of other cultures embracing the target language while honoring their first language.

5.5 Observations

In addition to interviewing both students and teachers regarding teaching and learning a second language, observations of the classes were also conducted. The aim for the observations was to see if there were correlations between the statements in the interviews and the actual teaching. This also allowed the researcher to observe different aspects of the teaching, including the environment, content of the lessons and interaction between student and the teacher. To help identify the same information from each observation, the researcher used a checklist with different aspects of teaching to look for (see appendix).

During the observation period, each class was observed multiple times to ensure that the observed lesson was a typical lesson representative of their usual method of teaching a second language and to minimize the researchers influence on the lesson by being present in the classroom. The following sections will present summaries of the observations conducted in both the Norwegian and American school. The information that will be presented will be sorted into four categories: environment, content, interaction and contextual factors. One section will be dedicated to the observations in the Norwegian school and another to the observations in the American school.

5.6 Observations Norwegian school

A total of four observations were conducted in the Norwegian school, divided between two classes; two observations in the 4th grade Norwegian 2 classroom and two observations in the 5th grade classroom. The 4th grade class had four students attending the NL2 lesson for both observations, while the 5th grade class had one student present for the first observation and two for the second observation.

5.6.1 Observations Norwegian school

The first two observations in the Norwegian school took place in the 4th grade classroom.
Although they used the same classroom for all lessons, this was not a designated Norwegian 2
classroom but simply a vacant classroom for the period of the Norwegian 2 class. However,
the environment was clearly adapted to stimulate the students' learning abilities. The
classroom consisted of desks and chairs, a whiteboard, a row of computers and different types
of bookshelves and cabinets including dictionaries. In addition, the classroom was decorated
with lots of colors, the alphabet, math posters and other material, and there were books
suitable for the students' age and skill level on the shelves. Also, there were binders in the
classroom dedicated to each NL2 student's worksheets that they used during the lessons.
Before the lesson, the teacher had prepared the whiteboard with different things related to the
lesson. It included the agenda for the lesson and some words that the students were supposed
to be practicing. Overall, the 4th grade classroom seemed to be an environment that promoted
learning for the students.

From there, the two last observations were in the 5th grade Norwegian 2 classroom which took
place in a smaller spare room that seemed to have the purpose of storage. The room contained
supplies for other subjects such as computers, a mannequin, science books and first aid kits.
The bookshelves were filled with science books and books for other subjects. In the middle
there were desks and chairs in a group formation. In contrast to the 4th grade classroom, there
were a lack of color, posters, the alphabet and other things that would be stimulating for the
students. Also, this room lacked a blackboard. In the researchers opinion this was not a room
intended for Norwegian 2 lessons, but simply a spare room.

5.6.2 Content, Norwegian 2 lesson

In the 4th grade classroom, both lessons had the same content, but with different focus points.
Each lesson started with the students and the teacher sitting in a circle on the floor, where the
students were encouraged to talk about themselves and their experiences with different
subjects, such as what they did last weekend. This served as a method to get the students to
practice their oral skills and also served as an opportunity for the teacher to assess them.

From there, the lesson moved on to practicing reading skills, as the students were
asked to read aloud. Taking turns, all the students read different sections from a reading

assignment given to them as homework in the previous lesson. Afterwards, the students read the same text to each other in pairs. Then the students were asked to retell the story in their own words, using Norwegian to explain certain words and concepts in the text.

In addition to reading skills and oral skills, this lesson also included grammar. The grammar topic in the lessons was vowels and consonants, namely how to describe the difference between the two and which letters belonged to each category. The teacher used worksheets that the students had to complete in the final part of the lesson. The worksheet included reading a text and identifying vowels and consonants in the text. If finished before the end of the lesson, the students were asked to work on math problems using an Ipad. This was based on the problem that the students were missing math content while being pulled out to attend NL2 lessons. There were multiple Ipads present in the classroom in order for the students to work individually and not in pairs or groups. In addition, the program they were using required headphones, which in turn required the students to work independently. The researcher was not able to observe the math program that was used on the Ipads.

The lesson for the 5th grade Norwegian 2 students was slightly different. This was both a reflection on the size of the group (one or two students) and also the teaching aids available in the classroom. The content was also different as these students were in a grade higher than the other classes observed. In light of the lack of teaching supplies, the teacher brought both books and games to use during the lesson. The content of the lesson included practicing reading skills and oral skills by asking the students questions and making them explain different concepts and words in a textbook that they are reading. One example was reading a text about Greece. The teacher read the text aloud for the students, and then asked the students questions from the text. For example, the teacher read that Greece had a democracy and the students were asked to explain what democracy was. In addition they were asked recall questions from the text that the teacher just read.

Towards the end of the lesson, they played word-games of which the main point was to describe different words. The goal was to make the students speak, using long sentences and a variety of words, increasing their vocabulary and also practicing their oral language skills at the same time. Though this is a Norwegian 2 class, most of the lesson was dedicated to working on other school subjects, such as English, social studies and religion. Also, some time was spent on preparing the students for the topics that they would be working on the following week, by reading texts that would be a part of that topic.

5.6.3 Interaction, Norwegian lesson

Throughout the lessons, both teachers had constant interaction and communication with the students. The 4th grade teacher promoted communication by asking the students questions that encouraged informal, conversations such as *"How was your weekend?"* and also academic questions. There was very little teacher-led instruction, meaning that for the most part the students and the teacher worked together instead of the teacher giving a lecture. During group work and individual work, the teacher checked homework and helped each student with any problems they were having. Questions like *"What does this mean"* and *"Did you understand that?"* were frequently asked by the teacher throughout the lesson to ensure that the students understood the tasks they were given.

By asking the students about their day in addition to helping the students with their tasks, she ensured that all the students were talked to and helped during the class. The 5th grade teacher had fewer students in the classroom, making it easier to ensure communication and interaction with both students during the lesson. The teacher asked them questions about themselves, and listened to the answers they gave before commenting and promoting an informal conversation. There was little scaffolding during these conversations as both of the students were, in the researcher's opinion, at a high level of Norwegian literacy skill. The students took turns leading two different conversations, revolving around each of them.

5.6.4 Contextual Factors, Norwegian school

In order to explain the way Norwegian 2 lessons were conducted in the Norwegian school, we need to put it into context. In this school, they used a pull-out model for second language teaching, meaning that the students were pulled out of other classes in order to receive these lessons. Because of that, the teacher had to dedicate parts of the lessons to reviewing the topics from the classes both the students were missing. As a result, the 5th grade teacher had to devote parts of the Norwegian 2 lesson to English, as it was an English class the students were missing during that time. In the same context, the 4th grade teacher had to spend time on math during her Norwegian 2 lesson, as the students were pulled out during a math class.

The 4th grade NL2 teacher spent approximately two-thirds of the lesson teaching Norwegian and one-third on other content. In this class, the content came separately from the NL2 parts of the lesson as the students had to complete the worksheets concerning NL2

before they were able to start the content part of the lesson. This also resulted in the students getting varied amounts of time to spend on math content as they did not all finish at the same time. As the students were working individually with Ipads, using headphones, the teacher was not as involved in that part of the lesson.

The 5th grade NL2 lesson on the other hand, was somewhat content based, as there was no part of the lesson that worked solely on Norwegian language or grammar. Instead the students had to explain different concepts and terminology used in other subjects, using Norwegian to do so.

5.7 Observations American School

Approximately twenty observations were conducted in the American school, divided between the different grade levels ranging from kindergarten to 8th grade. However, the main focus in the presentation of the observations will be the lowest grades, as they were most similar to the observations conducted in the Norwegian school. In addition, the ESL students in 8th grade did not receive any instruction from the language teacher during the observed class, though the language teacher was present during the lesson, in the occurrence that the students needed help. The number of students present during the observations varied, as these were push-in ESL lessons with content-based teaching. Roughly estimated, each observed class had between five and ten ESL students. Though most of the lessons took place in the content classrooms, the ESL students were usually gathered in groups within the classroom to receive ESL instruction based on the content they were working on. This was done in the classroom where just some of the students were receiving ESL instruction. In other classes, the ESL teacher whole-class ESL instruction, based on what the content teacher was teaching. The number of students included in this varied but always comprised a group with more than three students.

5.7.1 Environment American classroom

With the exception of one, each ESL lesson took place in the respective student groups' classrooms during other lessons. Students, who did not receive ESL instruction, were also

present during the lesson. Except from the occasions where the ESL teacher conducted whole class instruction, the students who were not ELL's did not participate in the ESL lessons although they were present in the classroom. Approximately two-thirds of the students in this classroom were not ELL's. In most lessons, the non-ESL students worked on content along with the content teacher, while the ESL students received instruction from the language teacher.

The classrooms were a clear representation of the grade level with a lot of decorations designed to promote teaching and learning. Colorful alphabets, posters with grammar rules and a carpet with a map of America on it were present in all the classrooms. Computers and whiteboards were also a feature in most of the classrooms. In addition, there were individual, paper-sized whiteboards for all the students to use during lessons, for example when solving math problems together as a whole group. In the researcher's opinion, the classrooms in the American school were extremely child-friendly, and seemed to be designed to stimulate their learning abilities.

5.7.2 Content, ESL lessons

The content of the lessons varied from Basic English to science and math. Though a lot of classes were observed, not all are described as the teaching methods, interaction and environment were similar in most of the ESL lessons. Three different grades are presented here: Kindergarten, 2nd grade, and 3rd grade.

The kindergarten class consisted of the ESL teacher and two or more students working together in a group, building their vocabulary and oral language skills. The number of students participating in the ESL lesson varied in the different classes that were observed. The highest number of students in one ESL group in kindergarten was six. The lesson lasted for approximately twenty minutes, but the elapsed time varied some according to how many students present in the group. These kindergarten students were not missing any content while receiving ESL instruction as the other students present in the classroom were coloring.
The lessons observed by the researcher in this grade level focused on the alphabet and the letter F. The students were asked to identify different words starting with the letter F and then explain the meaning of the words they identified. To promote the letter, the teacher used a picture of a farm, where the student had to identify different objects on the farm, and place

them into the sentence "A farm has…" that the teacher had written on the whiteboard. Throughout the lessons, the teacher was scaffolding the students' oral language skills, as there was a lot of L1 interference in most of the students' pronunciation. The main problem the Hmong students were facing was using the plural and using more than one syllable in one word. The Hmong language does not have plural endings. Also, it is monosyllabic, meaning that there are no words with more than one syllable. This resulted in the word *farmer* being pronounced as *far –,* shortening the word farmer to have only one syllable. The sentence *I have two eyes* became *I have two eye,* in which the plural –s ending from the word eye was remove. A lot of time was therefore spent on correcting grammar and pronunciation, emphasizing the plural ending and pronouncing all syllables in multisyllabic words.

The 2nd grade math lesson was the one lesson that did not take place in the classroom. This was the only lesson the researcher observed where students were pulled out to participate in the ESL lecture. A group of four students together with the teacher sat in the hallway to practice math. The content of the lesson was the clock and how to tell time. The teacher used a small whiteboard to show the students the topic for the lesson. The students were given individual clocks and were asked to show different times on the clock. This created an opportunity to work on the students' vocabulary and also listening comprehension, as the teacher would say a time and the students had to indicate that time on the clock. In addition they had to explain different concepts of telling time, thus promoting their vocabulary and understanding of the terminology used in math. As an example of this, the students had to explain what *half past six* meant, and also how this was the same as *six-thirty,* or how *six forty-five* and *a quarter to seven* had the same meaning. The teacher used positive reinforcements in the form of praise and stickers when the students worked well and successfully solved different problems, such as showing the correct time on their individual clocks.

The 3rd grade class took place in the students' classroom. During the class, all the students in the class were divided into groups and worked individually at different stations. The stations included, amongst others, independent reading, writing and ESL. The researcher primarily observed the ESL station, and was not able to observe the other stations. However it seemed like the students were able to choose what content they wanted to work with. The independent reading station, for instance had a bookshelf, with different books the students could read. Only two of the groups consisted of ESL students, and these were the only two

groups who visited the ESL station. Each of these groups consisted of three students and the ESL teacher who worked with them.

The topic reviewed at the ESL station was the solar system. The aim was to promote their vocabulary by explaining different concepts and terminology related to the topic. The students worked on a text about Saturn. The teacher started with reading the text aloud to the students. Following this, the students had to write down questions about the topic, Saturn, which in turn, were answered both orally and in writing by the other students in the group, with assistance from the teacher. They answered the different questions by using information from the text.

Through this lesson, the students were prepared for their science class. In addition they also received instruction in what an index is and how to use it, what kinds of information sources are present in a text and what captions are. In conclusion, the students' language skills were supported and they acquired new knowledge regarding science simultaneously.

5.7.3 Interaction, ESL lesson

Throughout the lessons, the teachers were in constant interaction with the students. The teacher and the students worked together in groups, and the teacher was constantly asking the students questions regarding a text, asking them to explain different concepts or explaining terminology related to the topic of the lesson. There was no whiteboard-based teaching during the EL lessons, but the teachers used a communicative approach to language teaching, which promoted communication as both the means and goal for the lesson.

5.7.4 Contextual factors

The way ESL lessons were conducted in the American school was shaped by their choice to use a push-in approach rather than a pull-out approach during language teaching. Also, all ESL instruction was content based, making it easier for the teacher to go into the classroom instead of pulling out the students. This approach allowed for the teachers to teach English and the content of the lesson at the same time, eliminating the problem of students falling behind in other subjects due to ESL pullouts. In addition the teacher could focus on the

objectives set for the lesson, without spending time on teaching other subjects as they related the ESL objectives to the content of the lesson they were currently in. The presence of a content teacher in the classroom while the language teacher was teaching also shaped the teaching methods the ESL teacher used in addition to the content. This was based on the fact that in the SIOP model, which was used in this school, the content teacher and the language teacher collaborated in deciding aims and objectives set for the lesson. More specifically, the language teacher would set language objectives based on the content objectives.

5.8 Summary

This chapter has presented the outcome of both the students' and teachers' interviews in the two schools in addition to the outcome of the observations. Different aspects within the two teaching models, including advantages and disadvantages in addition to the students' and teachers' preferences were included in this chapter. The presentation of the findings will be discussed in the following chapter.

6. Data analysis and discussion

The research that was conducted for this thesis was in attempt to answer the research questions: *what are the main similarities and differences in second language teaching in two different countries*, and, *what are the ESL students' and teachers' opinions and experiences with second language learning and teaching at their schools.* This was done by using a qualitative approach, as explained in chapter 4 of this thesis. In this chapter, the results of the research will be compared to find similarities and differences between the variables. The interpretations of the results and the discussion of the limitations will be placed within the theoretical bounds found in chapter 3, and in light of the background presented in chapter 2.

The results of the student interviews are presented in different tables, according to the different topics that were inquired about during the interview. In addition the answers found in the tables will be discussed according to the observations conducted prior to the interviews. The first table presents the results from Norway, and the following table presents the results from America. After presenting the answers in a table, they are used as the basis of the discussion. However, the interview with the teachers included more variables and is therefore presented in form of summaries, which is discussed according to the different topics that were included in the interviews. Each section discusses one topic begins by summarizing the answers given by the students and the teachers during the interviews in both countries. After presenting the answers in a table, they form the basis of a discussion.

6.1 Preferred teaching method, students

The individual factors (section 3.2.2), though important to many theories regarding second language acquisition, are not observable. Asking students to explain how they learn is, for the most part, the only way to assess these factors in relation to second language acquisition. This statement was the basis for making the inquiry about the students' preferred teaching methods during ESL lessons.

A total of five students in Norway and five students in America were interviewed for this thesis. The first aspect of their second language learning experience that was the subject of inquiry was the teaching method they found most effective, and which they preferred. The

result of these questions is presented in the table below. For these questions, the students seemed unable to make the distinction between effective and preferred, making their answers intertwine. The summaries of their answers to these two questions are therefore presented as one. Each of the five students in Norway presenting two answers to these questions makes the total of answers ten. In America one student produced three answers meaning that he listed three different methods, one student only produced one answer and the final three produced two answers each, making the total number of answers ten.

Table 1: Teaching methods Norwegian students

Method:	Working with the teacher	Blackboard based teaching	Reading	Working in groups	Working with Ipads
Number of students:	2	2	1	4	1

Table 2: Teaching method American students

Method:	Writing	Whiteboard based teaching	Reading	Working in groups	Whole class
Number of students:	1	2	3	2	2

Tables 1 and 2 are a description of the preferred and most effective teaching methods in the opinion of the students. The results from each country differ from each other but also present some similarities as not all of the categories are presented in both table, and the number of students listed under the respective categories varied. However, in contrast to the similar names of the teaching methods, some of these teaching methods listed in both Table 1 and Table 2, are a representation of different contents, as they are part of two different second language-teaching models. This statement is based on what the researcher observed in the different classrooms, and also in accordance with the theory regarding ESL and NL2 presented in chapter 3. The following section will present the similarities and differences in one of the previously mentioned teaching methods, namely working in groups. This method was chosen to discuss based on the fact that out of all the methods mentioned by both groups of students, this was also observed in both schools. This offered the opportunity to both

compare and contrast the use of the teaching method, in light of both what was observed and also in accordance with the theory linked to both schools.

6.1.1 Discussion of teaching methods

One teaching method listed by the students that offers the largest differences in how it was implemented was "Working in groups". The researcher observed this particular teaching method in both schools, and it is therefore an interesting method to discuss. Using the SIOP model, which is a part of the push-in approach used in the American school (see sections 3.7.1 and 2), gave the ESL student another definition of group work than the NL2 students. This means that within the SIOP model, group work was used differently than in the NL2 classroom. In a push-in approach to teaching a second language, the teacher comes into the classroom to attend to the needs of the language learner (see also section 3.7.1). Based on the ongoing content instruction in the classroom, the teacher will work with the language learners to support the content objectives with language objectives. In the ESL lessons that were observed, the language teachers conducted mainly two different types of lessons, namely whole class, whiteboard-based instruction, or working in groups. As mentioned, the number of students present during the ESL lessons varied. The choice of lesson type was a reflection of the number of students in need of ESL instruction. Based on the observations, group work in ESL consisted of a number of students working together with the teacher in the classroom, in a group, while the rest of the class worked separately on the content objectives set for the lesson.

The group work was comprised of the ESL students working on the content objectives, while being supported by the language teacher ensuring that they both understood and could use the correct terminology associated with the content. This observation is supported by Krashen's theory that "language acquisition does not require extensive use of conscious grammatical rules, and does not require tedious drilling" (1981:6). This theory was further explained in section 3.4 and is a part of spontaneous versus guided learning. Concurring with the observations of the teaching method "group work" in the American school, the content-based approach to language teaching suggests that one should view the content of the language lesson as the communicative purposes for the speaker's use of the target language (section 3.5). By working together with the ESL students in groups, the teacher had an opportunity to base the language objectives on the communicative purpose in the particular lesson. Terminology and concepts associated with the content objectives were

79

therefore the basis of the group work, using grade-level objectives and modified instruction to make the material comprehensible for the learners. This observation was directly linked to the SIOP teaching model, which was used at this particular school.

One thing that ties the Push-in model, SIOP and the observed group work together was the use of comprehensible input and modified speech, or teacher talk (section 3.4). The teachers accommodated their language to a level that the students could understand, in order to convey the meaning of the different concepts and terminology related to the content that they were working on.

Contrasting this version of group work, the Norwegian 2 students who reported group work were describing something different. Based on the observed NL2 lessons, group work in this setting was comprised of the students working together in groups of two or more students, depending on the number of students present. During this variant of group work, the student groups would work on an assignment together, while the teacher alternated between the groups to assist them. The assignments the students were working on during the observation period were reading a text aloud to each other and explaining words and concepts within that text. Instead of working together with the students that formed the group, the teacher assisted by listening to the groups and correcting their mistakes and rewarding their success. In this context the teacher was more passive. This also offered the opportunity for the teacher to assess the students' skill levels, which, as established in section 3.8, is a part of the teacher's responsibilities. The NL2 approach to group work is also supported by their second language teaching model, pull-out (section 3.9.2). The main goal for the pull-out model is for the students to receive intensive and explicit instruction in the four different language skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing instruction. By doing reading assignments during the group work, the students were able to practice three out of those four fields, by both reading a text aloud and also by listening to the other students in the group. At the same time, the teacher was able to assess these three language skills. Though the content of the text was not given the highest importance, being able to read it and to convey its meaning was very important. Based on the observed group work in the NL2 lessons, this method supported the theory on using storytelling as an occasion for allocating different expressions both verbally and through body language while also developing the three main components of this model, namely form, content and use (Kibsgaard and Husby 2009:164). As a final point, this method helped the students recognize the different types of context that required different types of language.

Comparing these two approaches to working in groups shows clear differences. One can easily draw the conclusion that the two different approaches to teaching a second language shaped teaching methods in different ways. Push-in and pull-out serve as two very different ways of approaching teaching, which in turn is reflected in how the teachers use teaching methods differently. This was also established during the observations.

6.2 Vocabulary

Following the questions regarding teaching methods, the students who participated in the interviews were also asked questions regarding their vocabulary. The two questions asked to cover this aspect of their second language learning were *"How do you find out about a word you don't know in school?"* and *"How do you find out about a word you don't know at home?"*. Though the answer to these questions, regardless of the outcome, is not directly linked to the teachers or their choice of teaching methods during ESL or NL2 lessons, it was an interesting topic to inquire about as it can be related to the theory about motivation (Lightbown & Spada, 2006:63) and distances between languages (Ortega, 2009:41).

Before discussing the results, the answers will be presented in two tables, one representing the NL2 students, and one representing the ESL students. Though the questions were asked separately, again the answers to the two questions will be presented in the same table, making ten total answers from the NL2 student, and 14 answers from the ESL students, as most of the ESL students produced more than one answer to the questions. The main reason for combining all answers given to the two questions in the same table is founded on the assumption that the students may have been confused and mixed their answers, regardless of the context they were asked about. Combining the answers of the two answers in one table will therefore give more credibility.

Answer	Ask teacher	Ask parent	Ask sibling or friend	Figure it out/dictionary
Number of NL2 students	3	1	3	3
Number of ESL students	1	3	5	5

The answers presented in Table 3 are a representation of how the students would find the meaning of unfamiliar words, either at school or at home. Based on the answers given to the questions, the researcher gained some insight into some of the internal and also external factors of the students related to second language learning.

The results of these questions present a lot of similar answers from the two groups of students. This could be a reflection of the similar age and grade level of the students. The students that were interviewed came from the same grade levels, though in the researcher's opining there were some differences in level of language proficiency between the NL2 students and the ESL. Their level of proficiency could be related to the motivation of the students, and also distance between first and target languages and language interference.

The following section will discuss the answers presented in Tables 3 in light of the observations and also the language learning theory.

6.2.2 Discussion of vocabulary

The choice of aids when working on vocabulary can be a reflection of the students' social and internal factors. As explained in section 3.2.1, social factors include how language is regarded and used in the society where it is being learned (Drew & Sørheim, 2004:16). In both situations presented in this thesis, the students find themselves living in a TLC where the target language is a requirement to function in the society. Though social factors are argued to have a more indirect effect on second language learning, these factors can, as mentioned, be shaped by the learners' attitudes, which in turn will affect the learning outcome.

What links these factors to the students' vocabulary is motivation. There is a direct relationship between the students' motivation and the willingness to keep learning (Lightbown & Spada, 2006:63). Based on this, one can argue that the students who listed

"figure it out" or "use a dictionary" as an aid to learning the meaning of a new word are more motivated to learn the language than the students who did not as they chose a more academic way of learning. However, this could also be a reflection of the aids available to the students when working on vocabulary.

The topic of vocabulary was also discussed with one of the ESL teachers, who implied that although some of the ESL students had reported using dictionaries when working on vocabulary, she highly doubted this to be the case with the students at her school. In her opinion, the ESL students were not familiar with the concept of a dictionary, nor have the knowledge of how to use one. Based on this one can draw the conclusion that the ESL students were not taught nor encouraged to use a dictionary to increase their vocabulary. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the ESL students were not taught how to use a dictionary or how to "figure out a word" in school, using a dictionary was reported by five students during the interviews with these students and can be viewed as a reflection of their motivation as they might have taught themselves, or had others outside of school teach them how to use a dictionary.

In comparison to the ESL students, three out of five NL2 students listed dictionaries as an aid for extending their vocabulary. This number was lower than the ESL number, indicating that for this school there was not a connection between school and the use of dictionaries, as there were dictionaries present in the NL2 classroom and still fewer students used them than the ESL students. Despite this, one can draw the conclusion that the NL2 students were not in need of help with their vocabulary as much, based on the researcher's observation that the NL2 students had a higher level skill within vocabulary and pronunciation. Also they seemed to have a higher level of listening comprehension. Unfortunately, this claim cannot be supported, as the researcher did not have access to any form of official language assessments for either student group. However, communication between the NL2 students and the researcher was easier than the communication between the ESL students and the researcher, despite the fact that both student groups conducted the interview in their second languages. This could be a reflection of the fact that the researcher was able to use her first language when interviewing the NL2 students, making it easier to use modified language, which in turn could have led to better comprehension from the NL2 students. Nevertheless, the researcher also modified her English language aiming for the ESL students to better comprehend the questions, though one can argue that the level of modification was different as English was not the researcher's first language.

While this was not a formal assessment of the students language skills, the statement that the ESL students were not as fluent in their second language as the NL2 students, can be supported by one of the ESL teachers who made a comment on the presence of interference, or language transfer by the ESL students (see also section 3.2.3). According to this teacher, the grammatical structure of the students' first languages differed significantly from their second language, which posed some challenges for them in oral language and pronunciation. The fact that their first language is monosyllabic made it hard for the students to pronounce and use words that contained more than one syllable. This is corroborated by the researcher's observations, especially among the youngest students, and some of the students who were interviewed. Also, the circumstance that all the ESL students had the same L1 presented the same challenges with language transfer for the entire student group.

6.3 Use of languages in different contexts

The final section in the student interviews covered their usage of their L1 and L2 in different contexts. The students were asked which languages they use when talking to different people. These questions included which language they used when communicating with their parents, their siblings and finally their friends. The motivation for asking these questions was to gain insight in the different arenas that the L2 was used, which in combination with the explanations that some of the students gave for their answers, may be discussed in relation to some theoretical aspects of second language learning.

The following tables present the answers given by the two groups of students. As there were only three possible answers to the questions, there was no need to separate the two student groups into separate tables. The results from both NL2 students and ESL students are therefore presented in the same table, but the results from each school are identified within the table. In order to make these presentations clearer, each of the three questions is presented in a separate table, making the total of tables three, with a total number of ten answers presented in each table, five from each student group.

The first table, Table 4, presents the answers given by the students to the question "what language do you use when communicating with your parents". The second table, Table 5, describes the choice of language between the students and their siblings, and the final table, Table 6, presents the choice of language between the students and their friend

Table 4: choice of language with parents

	Both L1 and L2	Only L1	Only L2
Norwegian students	3	2	0
American students	1	3	1

Table 5: Choice of language with siblings

	Both L1 and L2	Only L1	Only L2
Norwegian students	0	1	4
American students	3	0	2

Table 6: choice of language with friends

	Both L1 and L2	Only L1	Only L2
Norwegian students	0	0	5
American students	3	1	1

6.3.1 Discussion of language choice in contexts

The summarized answers collected during the interview present results that were both expected and unexpected. The answers the NL2 students reported were somewhat as expected, based on the knowledge the researcher had regarding their ethnic backgrounds and first languages before conducting the interview, such as their minority background and their first languages. In contrast, some of the ESL answers were unexpected mainly based on the unforeseen fact that all the ESL students had the same L1. The NL2 students, on the other hand, all had different ethnic backgrounds and different L1s. As a result of their backgrounds, the two students groups listed different answers to the inquiry regarding their choice of languages in different contexts.

Overall the students at the schools had different language use in the various contexts. Out of the five NL2 students that were interviewed, three listed using both languages while communicating with their parents, two listed using only their first languages and none listed using only their L2, Norwegian. Contrary to this, only one ESL student reported using both languages while talking to their parents, three informed that they would use only their first language, Hmong, and one listed using their L2, English.

Though the results varied, most of the students gave similar explanations for their language choices. Out of the students who were inclined to use only their first language while talking to their parents also mentioned some explanations for their choices. One of the NL2 students mentioned that communication with her parents was the only opportunity for her to use and practice her first language, as she did not know anyone outside of her family that spoke the same language. In contrast, two out of the three ESL students who listed "just Hmong" as their language choice for talking to their parents explained that only one parent understood English.

Out of the three NL2 students who listed using both languages with their parents, one explained that though one or both parents did understand their second language, they used a mixture of the languages to better explain themselves. Using both languages allowed for them to practice using both languages at home. Contrary to the NL2 students, the ESL student who listed using both languages at home stated English was the main language choice, but some Hmong words were used to support their communication.

The result of the language use with their parents summary is not a reflection of the language use at home in general as many of the students would choose a different language when talking to their siblings and not their parents. Four of the five students listed Norwegian as their only language choice when talking to their siblings. Though not all of them gave explanations for their answers, one of the students explained that using Norwegian in that context would help him learn more Norwegian, and another explained that her brother did not understand her L1. In contrast, three ESL students listed both L1 and L2 as a communicative tool with their siblings, and two listed only their L2. Again, not all answers were explained, but one student explained that using both languages helped him to better explain himself, and another explained that her siblings did not like to speak Hmong.

Discussing the students' language choice at home is difficult as for most of the students it was based on their own and/or their parents' and siblings' preferences. However, their choice of languages when communicating with their friends can be put in to another context of language learning. Contrary to the ESL students, where three listed using both English and Hmong when talking to their friends, and only one listed that they solely used Hmong (one used only English), all five NL2 students reported that they used Norwegian when communicating with their friends. One can say that a student's level of success in the target language will influence their level of integration to their school (Harmer, 1991:2). Though second language learners are often reliant on high levels of skill in their target

language in order to communicate and relate to friends who will most likely be native speakers, this was not the case in one of these student groups, namely the ESL group, due to the predominance of Hmong speakers at that school and in the community in which most of these students lived.

Social factors are considered to be of central importance in the context of SLA (Ellis, 1994:24). This concept was further explained as factors related to the way language is viewed and used in the society where the student is learning it. In addition, exposure to the language is also connected to these factors. Though these students find themselves in a TLC most of the time, and are reliant on developing their second language skills in order to properly function in this community, the ESL students also found themselves in a community where Hmong was the target language for parts of the day. According to some research on the state where this student group lived, Hmong people have created their own community within the state (Fennely & Palasz, 2003:24). In this community it is not a requirement to be able to know and speak English, as all the inhabitants in this community come from different generations of Hmong people. Also, Hmong people have generally had a difficult time integrating into the American society and to gain proficiency in the English language (Fennely & Palasz, 2003:24). This fact was supported by one of the ESL teachers who informed the researcher that there was in fact very little English in use in the Hmong community. Thus, the students were just as reliant on their Hmong as their English language skills, in order to function as a part of that community. As explained in section 3.2, a TLC can be in place where the language is not necessarily the main language, but simply holds a high status. Based on this fact, the Hmong students' home and community would be a TLC for Hmong.

Based on the previous section, one can highlight the connection between a TLC and high level of exposure to create better learning conditions for the students. This exposure will directly affect the success of the language learner. The previously mentioned observation that the ESL student had a higher level of language transfer and did not, in the researcher's opinion, possess the same level of language skill as the NL2 students can be supported by the notion that they were a part of two different TLC's. As English was not the only target language outside of the school, the students might only be exposed to the language part time, which in turn had an impact on their success in acquiring English as a second language. The lack of English input from the Hmong environment outside of school can also be linked to the subject of guided versus spontaneous language learning (section 3.4). Different types of language are used in a guided and in a spontaneous situation (Hagen & Tenfjord 1998:17); the

language acquired during a guided situation is for the purpose of education, while successful and comprehensible input while surrounded by native speakers of the language is the main focus in a spontaneous learning setting. Based on the previously stated fact, one can conclude that the NL2 students received both guided and spontaneous language learning, while the Hmong students received guided language learning more frequently than spontaneous. This could lead to the result that the NL2 students would learn how to use their target language in more contexts than the ESL students. This is also reflected in the language choices the students reported in the different contexts as shown in tables 4, 5 and 6.

Founded on the results of the interviews regarding language use in different contexts, one can assume that the NL2 students were receiving a higher level of exposure from their surroundings and environment, both at school and at home. As these students all had different L1s and also since their L1s were not languages typically used in Norway, they received more opportunities to use their second language, which could also be a reason for their higher level of language skills.

6.4 Discussion Teacher interviews

The results of the student interview are complemented by the results of the teacher interviews, which can be used as both a comparison and a contrast. The following sections will be devoted to the discussion of different elements obtained from the teacher interviews in both countries, both in light of the observations, the theory and also the student interviews, as there were some similar questions in both interviews. The background information found in chapter 2 will also be relevant to this part of the discussion.

As the results of these interviews varied a lot according to the respective teachers that were interviewed, these answers will not be presented in tables, but discussed under different topics: teacher education, teacher's preferred teaching methods, aspects of language, and challenges with second language teaching. Each section will be devoted to the discussion of a different topic, by first presenting the answers given by the teachers in the two different countries, before discussing them further.

6.4.1 Discussion of teacher education

Out of the two NL2 teachers who were interviewed neither had any formal training or education within the field of teaching Norwegian as a second language. Their educational backgrounds consisted of basic teacher training and further education of an-in depth subject other than NL2. As established in section 2.4, basic teacher education does not include any subjects related to Norwegian 2 teaching, even though the school system is based on the fact that not all students have the same prerequisites, in this case, not the same first language. It is not a requirement for a NL2 teacher to have any formal training in that area to be able to teach NL2 as a subject in school. In that way, the two NL2 teachers are representative of most NL2 teachers in Norway. Though neither of them had any formal training, they both worked as NL2 teachers. Teacher 1A had been working with NL2 students for two years, and teacher 2A was in her first year within the same field.

In comparison to the NL2 teachers, the four ESL teachers that participated in the same interview were certified ESL teachers. In order for them to work with ESL students, it was necessary for them to complete an ESL training program and attain the correct licensure. Though they had been working as teachers and with ESL in particular, for different amounts of time, they had common educational backgrounds.

The NL2 teachers viewed having qualifications within second language teaching as desirable, though they had not achieved it yet themselves. Teacher 2A discussed her limited knowledge of second language acquisition by reported that she would benefit from having more knowledge regarding how much information the students can obtain and comprehend. This could be explained by her lack of NL2 competence and the paucity of the topic within Norwegian teacher education. She added the school would benefit from more qualified teachers.

The main topics that the NL2 teachers mentioned as challenging for their teaching were points included in the TESOL education program (see section 2.3). In other words, if they had TESOL qualifications, they might have had less difficulty making objectives relating to the curricula, better knowledge of students' abilities to obtain and comprehend input, and better ways of structuring a second language classroom. This along with other challenges presented by the SL teachers will be presented in later sections in this chapter.

6.4.2 Discussion of teachers' preferred teaching methods

Though based on different experiences, both the NL2 teachers and the ESL teachers listed their preferred methods for teaching a second language. As the two groups of teachers took part in two different teaching models, namely push-in and pull-out, their preferred teaching methods were related to those included in the respective models. These teaching methods will therefore be discussed in light of the teaching models in which they are a component, and also in coherence with the observations. First the preferred teaching methods of the NL2 teachers will be presented, followed by the preferred teaching methods of the ESL teachers.

Based on the results of the interviews, the two NL2 teachers had the same preference in terms of teaching methods. They both listed the use of conversation and practicing different language terms, in order to make the NL2 lesson most beneficial and effective for the students. Teacher 1B added that preparing the students for the content classroom was important and therefore a part of her teaching methods. Another element that was mentioned by both teachers was to have active students, working in groups, by practicing their vocabulary in conversations. This part of the language teaching process is directly linked to Goal 1, in the Norwegian 2 standards, which includes understanding spoken Norwegian, using Norwegian orally and increasing vocabulary (see also section 2.3.1). Teacher 1A's method of making the students use questions to learn from each other, further develops this goal by developing communicative skills through oral language. Based on this, one can say that the teachers' preferred teaching methods are a clear reflection of which aspect of language learning they find most important, namely vocabulary. However, this will not be discussed here, but will be the focal point of a later section.

As far as the assumed preferences of their students, teacher 1A and 1B found that students tended to prefer working on different themes, or with iPads and games. As for the method the students would find most effective, they listed, amongst others, using conversations and extending their vocabulary, which correlates to the method they themselves found most effective.

As far as the assumed preferences of their students, Teacher 1A and 1B found that students tended to prefer working on different themes, or with iPads and games. As for the method the students would find most effective, they listed, amongst others, using conversations and extending their vocabulary, which correlates to the method they themselves found most effective. In relation to the observed Norwegian 2 lessons, all the aforementioned teaching methods were applied while the researcher was present.

In contrast to the NL2 teachers, the ESL teachers had different preferred teaching methods. Three out of the four teachers listed that using SIOP and push-in were the teaching methods that they found most effective. The fourth teacher had different opinions, which will be discussed later in this section.

Multiple teachers mentioned the concept of supporting the content with language as a beneficial way of teaching language. Though all four teachers agreed on this, they offered some different ways of implementation. Teacher 3B mentioned that the use of demonstrations, visuals and games would be helpful. Teacher 1B explained how focusing on words that would help the students describe what they were doing when working on the content objectives would be effective. Teacher 4B on the other hand made a point that different methods would work for different objectives, and mentioned that working in small groups would be beneficial for working on oral skills, whilst whole class instruction might be a better method for teaching math. As a final point, Teacher 3B also mentioned the importance of teaching the students "how to be students", in other words, general learning skills and strategies. Overall, all of these methods were compatible with the SIOP model.

Dissimilar to the other ESL teachers, Teacher 2B reported that in her opinion, small pull-out groups and separate ESL lessons were more effective. She found that including language-focused instruction into content, and teaching both objectives effectively, was challenging. However, she added that the push-in model might be good for the students.

The teaching methods mentioned by the teachers corresponded with the guidelines for SIOP and push-in models. The teaching methods associated with the models that they are explaining were also observed multiple times by the researcher, leading to the conclusion that these teachers in fact use these models consistently. However, teacher 2B, who did not agree with the other ESL teachers, mentioned the one problem most commonly associated with push-in, namely securing common planning time between the ESL teacher and content teacher, to ensure that both objectives will be taught effectively (section 3.7.1). The research on the push-in model suggests that this teaching model is fitting for smaller populations of language learners (Hudspath-Niemi & Conroy, 2013:26) This school had a very high percentage of ELL's, making Teacher 3B's assessment of the problem accurate. Nevertheless, the ESL teachers are working in accordance with the content of their teaching models, as most of their comments regarding teaching methods are supported by the description of the push-in and SIOP models (see sections 3.7.1 and 3.7.2).

As for the ESL teachers' comments regarding student preferences, two out of the four teachers again mentioned push-in, while the other two elaborate their answers to include games and visuals, singing and circular teaching, meaning that the students worked in groups on different stations to cover more content within one class. There was only one teacher who mentioned group work, which was listed by two of the five students leading to the assumption that there are not always correlations between what the teachers presume that the students' prefer, and what they actually prefer.

6.4.3 Discussion of prioritized aspects of language teaching

This section presents the teachers opinions regarding this which aspects of language they viewed as most important to focus on, and discusses their opinions in light of the theory associated with their respective schools.

Agreeing on which aspect of language they found most important, both NL2 teachers listed vocabulary. Teacher 1A mentioned how extending the students' vocabulary by using varied types of teaching methods, such as singing and acting, would be beneficial for the students. She related this to the fact that oral language was important for the NL2 students in order to be able to play and be social with the other students. However, she mentioned that this aspect would also gradually develop on its own, as the students would receive a lot of input during social activities with their fellow students. Based on this, the teacher considered reading skills important to focus on when teaching, as the students required more help in that area. Teacher 2A explained her choice of vocabulary as the most important aspect, including making a strategy for choosing key words within a topic to focus on during the lesson. She was very aware of the importance of incorporating content into the language lessons, to ensure that the students did not miss out on too much. Creating a good vocabulary based on content would support this. She added that oral language was important, incorporating a good vocabulary to make it easier for the students to express themselves.
Written language was in her opinion effective to use in combination with the other aspects she mentioned.

Relating the teachers opinion on the importance of different aspects of language to second language theory, one can say that both teachers are in favor of the transition model as their main focus was to make the transition from first to second language easier for the

students (Kibsgaard & Husby, 2009). By extending the students' vocabulary first, they are allowing the students to better function in and outside of the classroom. Teacher 2A's point to use key words related to content to extend the students' vocabulary is also linked to the standards for NL2, as the standard in Goal 2 is to develop and increase vocabulary in different subjects and topics (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007).

Among the ESL teachers, three of them listed vocabulary as the most important aspect of language to focus on. This might be seen in relation to the fact that SIOP aims to teach content through language, and that the main focus of the teachers was to teach the ESL students words and concepts that would allow for them to explain what they are doing. Teaching math through literacy can be used as an example. This also relates to three of the teachers' comments that oral language was more emphasized than written, as oral language would help them with content comprehension. Also, Teacher 4B mentioned that speaking fluency is the last skill to develop, making oral language important. Based on these statements, the three aforementioned teachers, Teachers 1, 2 and 4B, related their views on the most important aspect of language to Goal 1 of the ESL standards ensuring that the students were able to use English to participate in social interactions (Short, 2000; see also section 2.2.1)

In contrast to these teachers, Teacher 3B's main focus was on Goal 2, as her opinion was that reading and writing were the most important aspects of language. It was her belief that oral language would develop on its own, whereas the students would need help to develop writing skills. This supports the second standard in Goal 2, which states that the students will use English to provide subject matter information in spoken and written form (Short, 2000).

6.4.4 Challenges with second language teaching

Finally, teachers were asked to discuss aspects of second language teaching that they found challenging or would change in their schools' policies. Teacher 1A discussed some of the problems related to using the pull-out model. In her opinion, the number of hours spent on NL2 lessons needed to be increased to better suit the needs of the students. She also mentioned that using the same teacher for all the NL2 student groups would be beneficial, as she preferred to be solely working with NL2. Another challenge with second language

teaching was in her judgment, the lack of designated NL2 classrooms. Teacher 2A supported this statement, and also added the lack of materials as a problem. This is reinforced by the researcher's observations of NL2 lessons, which occurred in a spare room used for storage unsuitable for NL2 teaching. Finally, she added that the school's teaching model should allow for more cooperation with the L1 teachers.

Teacher 2A, on the other hand, had different concerns related to second language teaching. She would prefer to cooperate with the content teacher to eliminate the challenge concerning missed content for the students. She preferred using subject content in her language lessons, to diminish the amount of missed content for the students, and also to prepare them for the content classroom. Her concerns are supported by models for second language teaching differing from the model used at her school, namely content-based language teaching and the push-in model. The push-in model supports the fact that teaching language through content will better prepare the students for the mainstream classroom, and also eliminate the problem of missed content lessons (Hudspath-Niemi & Conroy, 2013:25). The push-in model would also require cooperation with the content teacher, which teacher 2A desired.

The final aspect that teacher 2A discussed, was her limited knowledge of second language acquisition. She reported that she would benefit from having more knowledge regarding how much information the students can obtain and comprehend. This could be explained by her lack of NL2 competence and the paucity of the topic within Norwegian teacher education. She added the school would benefit from more qualified teachers.

Again, the ESL teachers identified other challenges than the NL2 teachers. First, Teacher 3B, who contradicted her previous statement that reading and writing was more important than oral language, said that more time for vocabulary and having the students use more academic words would improve the ESL teaching. Teacher 4B, on the other hand, commented on the benefit of having a better curriculum. This can be related to the fact that that there is no national curriculum for ESL in the states. However, it is required by the U.S Department of Education that the school should have challenging and clear standards, complimented by effective strategies to achieve those standards.

Finally, teacher 2B listed some problems that are not typically associated with the teaching model found in her school, but are often associated with a different teaching model. She requested more time to teach "just language" and language structures, not just subject content. These problems are more related to the pull-out model and the grammar translation

method rather than to the SIOP model, as they contradict the content-focused instruction of both SIOP and Push-in models (see also sections 3.7 and 3.9). The teacher's lack of time to spend on language-focused lessons was confirmed through the classroom observations, in which this never occurred.

6.5 Summary

This chapter has discussed the different results from both the students' and teachers' interviews. As a result, there are some differences between the advantages and disadvantages listed by the teachers regarding the teaching models used in their respective schools, in addition to preferences on how to use different methods within the models.

Some of the problems the NL2 teachers listed were connected to their lack of formal education and training within the field of second language teaching as opposed to the ESL teachers who were all licensed second language teachers. In addition, the NL2 teachers listed some disadvantages that are commonly associated with their teaching model, namely pull-out.

The students' interviews resulted in both similarities and differences. Though they listed similar answers to the questions regarding preferred teaching methods and vocabulary, the choice of language in different contexts were quite different. The outcome found in the discussion will be presented in the following and final chapter.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to gain insight into how two different second language teaching models, namely push-in and pull-out, was used in two different countries. Complementing this, advantages and disadvantages associated with both teaching models were also presented by the teachers who participated in the research. Through this case study, the researcher was also able to compare the opinions and experiences of the students who participated in the research to those of the teachers. Finally, the researched gathered information on how different social and individual factors affected the students in the two different countries.

7.1 Research questions

In order to conduct this research, four research questions was formed:
1. What second language teaching models are used in two different countries?
2. What are the teachers' opinions and feelings regarding advantages and disadvantages within the teaching models used at their schools?
3. What are the students' opinions and experiences with the teaching methods used during teaching at their schools?
4. What factors, both individual and social, are the students affected by while learning their second language?

The research questions were answered in chapter. 6 and a summary of the answers will be presented in this chapter.

7.2 Method

A qualitative approach was when collecting and analyzing the data for this thesis. The research method consisted of interviews with ESL teachers and students in the States, and NL2 teachers and students in Norway. To complement the interviews, multiple ESL lessons and NL2 lessons were observed during the research period of this thesis. Semi-structured interview guides with prepared questions were used during the interviews with both the

students and teachers in both schools, in addition to a checklist that was used during the observations.

The first research question concerned the different teaching models used in the respective schools. It was found that the main difference between the two schools' approaches to teaching a second language, was their use of either push-in or pull-out. The use of SIOP and content-based language teaching strongly characterized both the ESL teaching and the outcome of the ESL teaching. This was supported by the multiple observed ESL lessons, which only included one pull-out session supporting the result stating that SIOP was the predominant model used at that school. Similarly, the NL2 teaching at the Norwegian school was also consistent of one particular model, namely pull-out, which was used during all of the observations. All the observed NL2 lessons included components associated with the pull-out model, although some of the lessons also included some components associated with content-based language learning, which was not generally a part of the schools teaching model. In conclusion, the answer that the push-in model is the second language teaching model used in the target school in America and the pull-out model is the second language teaching model used in the target school in Norway, is not only confirmed by the observations.

Regarding the second research question concerning the teachers' opinions and feelings towards the teaching models associated with their respective schools, the results of the NL2 teachers' interviews led to the belief that there was a general dissatisfaction and frustration with the second language teaching model used at their school. However, many of the disadvantages listed by the two teachers are commonly associated with the pull-out model, and could be eliminated by the implementation of either the content-based language teaching approach, the push-in model or both. For example, both NL2 teachers commented on the limited time for NL2 teaching, the students missing out on content in their primary classes and the lack of cooperation with the subject content teacher. Another drawback that was mentioned by both NL2 teachers was the problems related to their lack of formal education and training within the subject and that the school did not have any dedicated NL2 teachers. One benefit that the teachers contributed during the interview, was that the pull-out model allowed for them to spend a lot of time working on vocabulary and oral language, the aspect of language that both teachers found most important. Summarizing the results from the interviews, according to the two NL2 teachers, the model had more disadvantages than advantages.

Contrary to the results of the NL2 teachers' interviews, the outcome of the ESL teachers' interviews resulted in the belief that the teachers were generally satisfied with the teaching method implemented in their school. Three out of the four teachers listed how working with content-based language teaching was a benefit for them and the students. The fact that all ESL teachers were licensed also resulted in better understanding of the students' needs, and how to apply the right input to reach the language objectives while working with content. How to do this correctly and in accordance with the curriculum, was also included in their education. Using the SIOP model also allowed for the language teachers to cooperate with the content teachers.

The disadvantages of the SIOP model presented by the ESL teachers were also quite different from the presentation of disadvantages listed by the NL2 teachers. Teacher 4B pointed out that the school might benefit from a better curriculum, making the point that there is no national curriculum for ESL. In the researcher's opinion, the SIOP model could have served as the basis for a national ESL curriculum as it was affective and solved many of the problems that are associated with the pull-out model. However, Teacher 2B had discussed some disadvantages that are not often associated with the SIOP model. In her opinion, the pull-out model and having more time dedicated to language learning, apart from subject content, would serve as a better way of teaching. Using a content-based language teaching approach did not allow for her to spend time on separate language lessons, excluding content from the ESL lesson. In conclusion, the ESL teachers were generally satisfied with the advantages found in the teaching model, and had few disadvantages to comment upon during the interviews.

Relating to the third research question, the student interviews showed that though they were participating in two vastly different teaching models, there was not much variation regarding the students' preferences in teaching methods. However, the content of the teaching methods the students found most preferable and most effective, had some variations. As a result of the presented preferences, and supported by the observations, the NL2 students might benefit from receiving input and support in an environment more similar to the environment found in the ESL teaching model. The lack of designated NL2 classrooms led to some of the lessons to be conducted in a spare storage room, while the ESL lessons took place in colorful and stimulating classrooms.

The suggested use of SIOP in the NL2 lessons is supported in the fact that two of the NL2 students listed working with the teacher as the most effective teaching method, which

the ESL students did not. This could be a reflection of the teachers' participation in ESL students group work, eliminating the need for them to list working with the teacher as a separate teaching method. Though the two student groups seemed generally satisfied with the teaching methods they were receiving, the preferences varied to some extent between the two countries.

Finally, as for the factors influencing the students' level of success in the target language, the two student groups were affected by different factors. The fact that the ESL students found themselves participating in two different TLC's during the day had a clear impact on their results and levels of fluency in the English language. However, motivation was a factor that had some impact on both student groups. This factor mostly presented itself in the choice of language in different contexts, as the discussion showed that the ESL students mainly used their first language in the different contexts, whereas the NL2 students limited the use of their L1 to communication with their parents, and for some also their siblings.

7.3 Limitations

One of the limitations associated with this thesis is based on the fact that it is a case study, and the conclusions found based on the research cannot always be extended more generally. Also, the results of the interviews conducted within this research are connected to these individuals specifically, and other individuals may share different opinions. Regarding teacher education, the teachers who were interviewed in both Norway and America may not be representative of teachers in general, as the researcher does not possess any statistics of how many teachers were actually qualified second language teachers in either country at the time of the research. As a final limitation, one can argue that the students did not fully understand the questions asked during the interviews, due to the language barrier. This could have led to false results.

7.4 Future research

The results of this thesis could be used as the basis for future research. Possible follow-up research could include an action research project to try push-in as a second language-teaching

model in the Norwegian school presented in this thesis. Interviewing the same NL2 teachers after a trial period of push-in and SIOP would allow for a comparison of their opinions on two different teaching models. This also allows for comparing and contrasting advantages and disadvantages associated with two very different teaching models, using the opinions of teachers who had experience using both teaching models.

Reference list

Aslam, M. (2003). *Teaching of English. A practical course for B Ed students.*
Foundation Books.

August, D. & Shanahan, T. (2006). *Developing Literacy in Second Language
Learners.* Report of the national literacy panel on language minority children and
youth. New Jersey. Lawrence Erblaum Associates, publishers.

Beerknes, R. (2010). *Receptive multiligualism as a language mode in the Dutch German
Border Area.* Waxman.

Bull, T. & Lindgren, A.R. (2009). *De mange språk I Norge – Flerspråkelighet
I Norsk.* Oslo. Novus Forlag.

Burns, A. & Richards, J.C. (2012). *The Cambridge guide to Pedagogy and practice in second
Language teaching.* Cambridge.

Byrnes, H. (1998). *Learning foreign and second languages. Perspectives in research and
Scholarship.* The U.S. The modern language association of America.

Coelho, E. (2004). *Adding English: A guide to teaching in multilingual classrooms.*
Pippin publishing Corporation.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching.* Fourth edition.
Routledge.

Drew, I. & Sørheim, B. (2009). *English teaching strategies. Methods for English teachers Of
10 to 16-years-olds.* Oslo. Samlaget. Second edition. 2009.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E. & Short, D.J. (2008). *Making Content Comprehensible for English
Learners: The SIOP Model.* 4th Edition. Pearson.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research & language pedagogy.* London. Wiley
 Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition.* Second edition. Oxford.

Ellis, R. (1992). *Second Language Acquisition and Language Pedagogy*.
 Britain. British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.

Fennelly, K. & Palasz, N. (2003). *English Language Proficiency of immigrants and refugees
 in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.* International Migration, vol 41, issue 5.

Flick, U. (2002). *An introduction to Qualitative Research*. Second Edition. London.
 Sage Publications.

Flick, U. (2007). *Managing Quality in Qualitative Research*. London. Sage publications.

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

Hagen, J. E. and Tenfjord, K. (1999). *Andrespråksundervisning. Teori og praksis*.
 Oslo. Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Harmer, J. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching*. New edition.
 Longman.

Hasselblatt, C., Jonge, B. & Norde, M. (2010). *Langauge contact: new perspectives*. John
 Benjamis B.V.

Helman, L. (2009). *Literacy development with English learners. Research based instruction
 In grades K-6*. New York. Guilford press.

Ho, D. G. E. 2007. *Classroom talk – Exploring the Sociocultural structure of Formal ESL
Learning*. Germany. Peter Lang. Second edition.

Howatt, A. P. R & Widdowson, H.G. (2004) . *A history of English language teaching*. Second
edition. Oxford. 2004.

Hudspath-Niemi, H. S. & Conroy, M. L. (2013). *Implementing Response-to intervention to
Address the needs of English-language learners. Instructional strategies and
Assessment tools for school psychologists*. Routledge.

Hvistendahl, R. (2009). *Flerspråkelighet I skolen.* Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.

Høberg, E. (2012). *Håndbok I grammatikk of språkbruk. Norsk for innvandrere*.
Fagbokforlaget.

Kibsgaard, S. & Husby, O. (2009). *Norsk som andre språk – Barnehage og barnetrinn*.
2.utgave. Oslo. Universitetsforlaget.

Klein, W. (1986). *Second language acquisition*. Cambridge university press.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Language acquisition and language learning*. University of southern
California.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How langauges are learned.* New York. Oxford
University press, Third edition.

Long, M. H. and Doughty, C. J. (2011). *The handbook of language teaching.*
Wiley-Blackwell.

Lyster, R. 2011. *Content-based Second Language teaching.* In Hinkel, Eli. 2011. *Handbook
of research in second language teaching and learning*. Volum 2. Routledge.

Mitchell, R., Myles, F. & Marsden, E. (2013). *Second Language Learning Theories.* Third

edition. New York. Routledge

Nuna, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Heinle, engage learning.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered Curriculum: A study in second language teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge Press.

Obiakor, F. E., Bakken, J. P., & Rotatori, A. F. (2010). *Current issues and trends in Special education: Research, technology and teacher preparations*. Emrald Group publishing lmtd.

Odin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Crosslinguistic influende in language learning*. Cambridge university press.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge Applied Linguistics, Cambridge University Press.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second language acquisition*. Great Britain. Hodder education.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers T. S. (2011). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Second edition. Routledge,

Raya, M. J., Gewher, Pamela, W.F.P & Anthony J. (2001). *Effective Foreign language teaching at primary level*. Germany. Peter Lang.

Seland, I. (2013). *Fellesskap for utjevning. Norsk skolepolitikk for en flerreligiøs og flerspråklig elevmasse etter 1970.* Tidsskrift for samfunsforskning, Norway.

Selj, E., Ryen, E. & Lindberg, I. (2004). *Med språklige minoriteter I klassen – Andrespråkslæring og andrespråksundervisning*. Oslo. Cappelen akademiske forlag.

Simensen, A.M. (1998). *Teaching a Foreign language. Principles and procedures*.

Fagbokforlaget.

Stryker, S. B. & Leaver, B. L. (1997). *Content based instruction in foreign language Education. Models and methods*. Georgetown University press.

Tedick, D. J. (2005). *Second language Teacher education: international perspectives*. Lawrence Erblaum Associates Inc.

VanPatten, B. & Williams, J. (2007). *Theories in second language acquisition – an introduction.* New York. Routledge.

Vàsquez, A., Hansen, A. L. & Smith, P. C. (2013). *Teaching language arts to English Language learners*. Routledge. Second edition.

Yule, George. 2006. *The study of language.* Third edition. New York. Cambridge.

Zacarian, D. (2011). *Transforming schools for English learners. A comprehensive framework for Schools Leaders.* Corwin. The United States.

Website articles

AEP, American Education Portal 2003. *How to become an ESL teacher. Step-by-step guide.* Retrieved from http://education-portal.com/how_to_become_an_esl_teacher.html. Accessed April, 2014

ELL, Best Practices for ELL. 2010. *What is Sheltered Instruction.* Retrieved from http://ell.nwresd.org/node/42. Accessed January, 2014.

CCSSI, 2014. *Common Core State Standards Initiative.* Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/. Accessed March, 2014

Education world, 1996. *National standard.* Retrieved from http://www.educationworld.com/standards/. Accessed March, 2014

ND.department of public Instruction, 2013. *English as a second language course codes.Grades PK-12.* Retrieved from http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/resource/corscode/2014pdf/seclang14.pdf. Accessed October, 2013.

Short, Deborah J. 2000. *The ESL Standards. Bridging the Academic Gap for English Language Learners.* Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/0013-short-esl.pdf. Accessed March, 2014

Snow, Marguerite Ann. 2001. *Content-Based and Immersion Models for Second and Foreign Language Teaching.* Retrieved from http://static.schoolrack.com/files/213546/639761/CURR_223_L(2-5-6-7-9).pdf. Accessed November, 2013.

TESOL, 2013. *TESOL/NCATE Standards for P-12 Teacher Education Programs*. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/advance-the-field/standards/tesol-ncate-standards-for-p-12-teacher-education-programs. Accessed April, 2014.

Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2007. *Basic Norwegian for language minorities*. Retrieved from http://www.udir.no/kl06/NOR7-01/Hele/Hovedomraader/. Accessed Oktober, 2013.

UiB, 2013. *Norsk som andrespråk, for lærerer. Prisme.* Retrieved from http://www.uib.no/utdanning/evu/evutilbud/norsk-som-andrespraak-for-laerere-prisme. Accessed April, 2014.

Utdanning, 2014. *Lærerutdanning.* Retrieved from http://utdanning.no/studiebeskrivelse/laererutdanning. Accessed May, 2014.

Utdanningsdepartementet and Forskningsdepartementet, 2003. *Rammeplan for allmennlærer utdanningen.* Retrieved from http://utdanning.no/studiebeskrivelse/laererutdanning. April, 2014.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Letter to principal, Norway

Kjære rektor

Forskningsprosjekt om Norskopplæring og Norsk som andrespråk

Mitt navn er Stine Emilie Kongevold, og jeg er student ved Universitetet I Stavanger.
Jeg er nå på mitt siste år som Master student innen språk og språkopplæring. I den anledning
har jeg nettopp startet arbeidet med min masteroppgave som omhandler Norsk som
andrespråk i grunnskolen. Jeg vil invitere lærer ved din skole til å delta i et forskningsprosjekt
hvor jeg vil se nærmere på undervisning innen Norsk som andrespråk. Dette er et todelt
prosjekt, hvor jeg vil sammenlikne resultatet fra min forskning i Norsk skole, med resultatet
av samme forskning på en Amerikansk skole, da med fokus på Engelsk som andrespråk.
Målet er å få bedre innsyn i forskjellige metoder for å lære et andrespråk , hvordan lærere
foretrekker og undervise samt hvilke metoder de finner mest effektive innen emnet, og om
elevene har samme meninger som lærerne.
Du har rett til innsyn i de opplysninger som er registrert om deg i prosjektet, i tillegg til et
sammendrag av det ferdige prosjektet.

Deltakelse i denne delen av prosjektet innebærer at jeg observerer noen timer med
Norskopplæring på din skole og intervjuer lærerne som underviser innen dette emnet.
Intervjuet er relativt kort og vil ikke vare lengre enn 10-15 minutter. Jeg kommer til å bruke
en intervjuguide. Hvis ønskelig kan intervjuguiden sendes til dere på forhånd. I tillegg ønsker
jeg å utføre veldig uformelle intervjuer/samtaler med elevene. Dette vil gjennomføres i løpet
av to uker. Jeg vil bruke lydopptak ved intervjuene og under observasjonene for å sikre
pålitelighet, og for å bruke det som refleksjonsmiddel i intervjuet med læreren. Lydopptak vil
ikke bli brukt som vurderingsgrunnlag. Siden elevene blir observert, vil jeg informere og
innhente samtykke fra foreldrene om observasjonen. Det vil ikke bli gjort lydopptak av
elevene som ikke deltar i prosjektet.

Det er frivillig å delta i undervisningsobservasjonene og intervjuene og dere kan på hvilket
som helst tidspunkt trekke dere. Jeg håper likevel at dere vil bidra til forskningsprosjektet og
føle at dere også får utbytte fra det. Det er ingen andre enn min veileder og jeg som vil få
tilgang til de personidentifiserbare opplysningene. Vi er underlagt taushetsplikt og
opplysningene vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. I publikasjoner vil opplysningene være
fullstendig anonymisert, slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes.

Prosjektet er planlagt ferdig innen utgangen av Mai, 2014, og prosjektet er meldt inn til
Personvernombudet for forskning, Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS. Etter
prosjektslutt vil alle opptak bli slettet.

Dersom noen av lærerne ved din skole ønsker å delta i prosjektet, og du som rektor støtter
dette, vennligst be de interesserte lærerne om å svare på denne e-posten.

Ta gjerne kontakt med meg pr. e-post om dere har spørsmål se.Kongevold@stud.uis.no

På forhand takk for samarbeidet.

Med vennlig hilsen,

Stine Emilie Kongevold
Universitetet i Stavanger
4036 STAVANGER
Tlf. 40224398
e-post: se.kongevold@stud.uis.no

SVARSLIPP

Forskningsprosjekt om Norskopplæring

Jeg har mottatt skriftlig og muntlig informasjon og er villig til å delta i studien.

Signatur
Dato

Appendix 2: Letter to principal, America

Research project regarding English as a second language in primary school

My name is Stine Emilie Kongevold, and I am a student at the University of Stavanger. I am currently in the Masters program in Literacy and I have just started working on my thesis of which the main focus will be teaching a second language. I am inviting teachers in your school to participate in a research project studying the teaching of English a second language. This is a two-part research project, where my aim is to compare the outcome of my research in your school, to the outcome of the same research in a Norwegian school. The goal is to gain better knowledge about different strategies for teaching a second language, how teachers prefer to teach and also what strategies the pupils prefer.
If any, I will inform you of any information registered in the project regarding you or your school. You will also receive a summary of the finished project.

Participation in this part of the project entails me interviewing a teacher involved in teaching English as a second language, observing some of the classes, and having very informal interviews/conversations with the pupils. This will all take place within a timeframe of no more than ten workdays. During my observations and interviews, I will use a tape recorder in addition to taking notes to ensure that I get all the information is reported correctly in my thesis. The recording itself will not be used by anyone other than myself. Since the pupils are being observed in class and also recorded, I will inform and get permission from all of the parents.

Participation in my research is voluntary, however I hope you will participate in my project, and that my findings may also be beneficial for you.
All the data that I collect is confidential, and my supervisors and i will be the only ones with access to it. In my finished thesis, all of my informants will be anonymized to ensure that their identities cannot be recognized.

The thesis is scheduled to be finished by May, 2014. Data Protection Official for Research at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD), have been informed of my research and it has been approved as abiding by ethic research practices.
After the project is finished, all recordings made during my observations and interviews will be deleted.

If any of the teachers at your school are interested and willing to participate in my research, and you as the principal agree to this, please contact me.

If you have any questions, please send me an email at se.kongevold@stud.uis.no

I thank you for your cooperation.

Kind regards,

Stine Emilie Kongevold
Stavanger

Universitetet i
4036 Stavanger

Universitetet i Stavanger
4036 STAVANGER
+4740224398

Permission slip

Research project targeting English as a second language

I have recieved oral and written information and I am willing to participate in the project.

Signature
Date

Appendix 3: Letter to parents

Parents,

I am inviting your son/daughter to participate in a research project, which involve me observing, and recording in your child's classroom. My name is Stine Emilie Kongevold, and I am currently in a masters program at the University of Stavanger in Norway. I am working on my master's thesis, which will study the teaching of a second language. The goal is to compare how English is taught as a second language in an American primary school, to how Norwegian is taught as a second language in a Norwegian primary school.
 In order to do so, I will observe the teaching. I would also like to have very informal conversations with the students regarding their views on their language lessons. Since I will observe and record the students, I want to inform, and also get permission from you, the parent, to do so.

For this part of my research, I will observe ESL lessons in your son/daughters class.
This will take place in January for about two weeks. I will use a tape recorder to help ensure accuracy when analyzing and writing. Your child will not be identified in the thesis, as all information collected will be anonymized as I turn my observations in to writing. I will only be recording during ESL teaching, not other lessons.

Participation in my research is voluntary, and you can at any time withdraw your child from the observation. I hope you will allow your child to participate.
All the data that I collect is confidential, and my supervisors and I will be the only ones with access to it. In my finished thesis, all of my informants will be anonymized to ensure that their identities cannot be recognized.

The thesis is scheduled to be finished by May, 2014. Data Protection Official for Research at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD), have been informed of my research and it has been approved as abiding by ethic Research practices. After the project is finished, all recordings of your son/daughter will be deleted.

If you want your son/daughter to participate in this research project, please sign the following permission slip, and return it to…
You can also allow them to only participate in parts of the research, meaning just the observation and not the informal conversation.
If you have any questions, please send me an email at se.kongevold@stud.uis.no

I thank you for your cooperation.

I agree to allow my son/daughter to be involved in the study and to be observed during classroom teaching. Yes/No

I agree to allow the researcher to talk to my child in an informal conversation. Yes/no

Signature:
Dear teacher

Appendix 4: Letter to teachers

Research project regarding English as a second language in primary school

My name is Stine Emilie Kongevold, and I am a student at the University of Stavanger. I am currently in the Masters program in Literacy and I have just started working on my thesis which main focus will be teaching a second language. I am inviting you to participate in a research project targeting the teaching of English as a second language. This is a two-part research project, where my aim is to compare the outcome of my research in your school, to a similar research project in a Norwegian school. The goal is to gain better knowledge about different strategies for teaching a second language, how teachers prefer to go about teaching and also what strategies the pupils prefer.

Participating in this part of the project, will include interviews with you regarding your thoughts and experiences about teaching English as a second language. The interview should last no more than 20-30 minutes and I will use an interview guide with pre-prepared questions. If necessary and requested by you, the interview guide can be sent to you in advance. In addition to the interview, I wish to observe some of your classes, to see your strategies for teaching in use. During the observation I want to very informally interview your pupils regarding their experiences and preferences within the subject, either during the lesson or after, depending on when it is convenient for them. This will all take place within a timeframe of no more than ten workdays. During my observations and interviews, I will use a tape recorder in addition to taking notes, to ensure that I get all the information correctly recorded in my thesis. The recording will not be used by anyone other than myself. Since the pupils are being observed in class and also recorded, I will inform and get permission from all of the parents.

Participation in my research is voluntary, however I hope you will participate in my project, and that my findings also may be beneficial for you.
All the data that I collect is confidential, and my supervisors and me will be the only ones with access to it. In my finished thesis, all of my informants will be anonymized to ensure that their identities cannot be recognized.

The thesis is scheduled to be finished by May, 2014. Data Protection Official for Research at the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD), have been informed of my research and it has been approved as abiding by ethic researh practices. After the project is finished, all recordings made during my observations and interviews will be deleted.

If you are interested and willing to participate in my research, please contact me.

If you have any questions, please send me an email at se.kongevold@stud.uis.no

I thank you for your cooperation.

Kind regards

Stine Emilie Kongevold

Appendix 5: Interview guide, teachers

Interview guide

- How long have you been working as a teacher

- What is your educational background

- (if necessary/not answered in previous question) what education or training have you had regarding teaching English/Norwegian as a second language?

- What subjects do you teach besides Norwegian/English as a second language?

- How long have you been working with teaching English/Norwegian as a second language?

- What methods of teaching English/Norwegian as a second language have you used?

- Which method do you find most effective?

- How do you measure the skills of the students?

- Which method do you think your students prefer

- or find most effective?

- What is prioritized – vocabulary, fluency, literacy, reading skills

- Written or spoken most important

- In your opinion, what should be viewed as most important?

- Would you change anything about the way you teach Norwegian/English as a second language?

- Any thing to add (optional)

Appendix 6: Interview guide, students

Interview guide – students

- What is your background – what languages besides Norwegian/English do you speak?

- What teaching methods do you prefer? (Will explain teaching methods)

- What teaching methods do you find most effective? (Easiest to learn from)

- Vocabulary – how do you find out about a word you don't know?

- Reading – what do you do when there is a word you don't know?

- What language do you use when you talk to your parents, and why?
- What language do you use when you talk to your sibling, and why?
- What language do you use when you talk to your friends, and why?

Appendix 7: Checklist during obervations

Checklist during observations

- Environment – what's in the classroom?

- What is on the blackboard?

- What are the students doing while the teacher is talking?

- What material is being used?

- Is the teacher interacting with the students, and how?

- What methods are the teacher using?

- Are all the students being talked to and helped during the class?

- What is being taught? Topic?

Appendix 8: NSD approval

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

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS
NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES

Rebecca CharboneauInstitutt for kultur- og språkvitenskap Universitetet i Stavanger Postboks 2557 Ullandhaug4036 STAVANGER

Vår dato: 19.11.2013 Vår ref: 36205 / 2 / LMR Deres dato: Deres ref:

TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 06.11.2013. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

36205 Behandlingsansvarlig Daglig ansvarlig Student

Metoder for undervisning av Norsk og Engelsk som andre språk Universitetet i Stavanger, ved institusjonens øverste leder Rebecca CharboneauStine Emilie Kongevold

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

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

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

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

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 30.05.2014, rette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Vigdis Namtvedt Kvalheim

Kontaktperson: Linn-Merethe Rød tlf: 55 58 89 11 Vedlegg: ProsjektvurderingKopi: Stine Emilie Kongevold stineemilie87@hotmail.com

Linn-Merethe Rød

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

Personvernombudet for forskning

Prosjektvurdering - Kommentar

Ifølge prosjektmeldingen skal det innhentes samtykke fra informantene samt elevenes foreldre basert på skriftlig informasjon om prosjektet og behandling av personopplysninger. Personvernombudet finner informasjonsskrivet tilfredsstillende utformet i henhold til personopplysningslovens vilkår, forutsatt at kontaktopplysninger om veileder også tas med.

Innsamlede opplysninger registreres på privat pc. Personvernombudet legger til grunn at veileder og student setter seg inn i og etterfølger Universitetet i Stavanger sine interne rutiner for datasikkerhet, spesielt med tanke på bruk av privat pc til oppbevaring av personidentifiserende data.

Prosjektet skal avsluttes 30.05.2014 og innsamlede opplysninger skal da anonymiseres og lydopptak slettes. Anonymisering innebærer at direkte personidentifiserende opplysninger som navn/koblingsnøkkel slettes, og at indirekte personidentifiserende opplysninger (sammenstilling av bakgrunnsopplysninger som f.eks. skole, alder, kjønn) fjernes eller grovkategoriseres slik at ingen enkeltpersoner kan gjenkjennes i materialet.