MASTER'S THESIS

M17GLU

May 2022

Teaching English as a Foreign Language in the Multilingual Classroom

Engelskundervisning i det flerspråklige klasserommet

A Qualitative Study

30 Credits Assignment

Illustration by Ada Håberg

Maria Halsen Brandal

OsloMet – the metropolitan university

Faculty of Teacher Education and International Studies Department of Primary and Secondary Education

Abstract

This master's thesis is about multilingualism in English teaching. There is an increasing number of multilingual pupils in the Norwegian school, something that provides diverse classrooms with different kinds of needs for facilitation than earlier when most of the students had Norwegian as their first language (L1). In Norway, all pupils have the right to adapted education and to be included in a learning community (Opplæringslova, 1998). Multilingual pupils who participated in English teaching in the Norwegian school may have English as their first language (L1), second language (L2), or third language (L3 or additional language). These students may have other needs than, for example, those students who have Norwegian as L1 and are learning English as L2. Therefore, I think it is important to gain insight into how English teachers can facilitate inclusive teaching in the multilingual English classroom.

This micro ethnographic study is aiming to explore how six English teachers from three different parts of the country approach multilingualism in English teaching. My research question is as follows: *How do Norwegian English teachers relate to multilingualism in the EFL classroom?*

This thesis has a qualitative research design, where I use semi-structured interviews as primary data. The participants come from six schools, half of which are located in the Oslo area, and the last three are in western Norway and in northern Norway.

The thematic analysis shows some main findings… teachers seem to focus on multilingual students' English proficiency, but it is difficult for them to name ways in which other languages can be a resource in English teaching

As a result of these findings, the study shows that there is a need for a clearer awareness and more knowledge about how English teachers can use students' first language in English teaching.

Samandrag

Denne masteroppgåva handlar om fleirspråklegheit i Engelskundervisninga. Det er ei aukande mengd fleirspråklege elevar i den norske skulen, noko som gir mangfaldige klasserom med ulike slags behov for tilretteleiing enn slik det var tidlegare då dei aller fleste hadde norsk som sitt førstespråk (L1). I Noreg har alle elevar rett til tilpassa opplæring og å verte inkluderte i eit læringsfellesskap (Opplæringslova, 1998). Fleirspråklege elevar som deltek i engelskundervisning i den norske skulen kan ha engelsk som sitt førstespråk (L1), andrespråk (L2) eller tredjespråk (L3, ofte brukt om alle språk som blir lært etter tredjespråket). Desse elevane kan ha andre behov enn til dømes dei elevane som har norsk som L1 og lærer engelsk som L2. Difor synes eg det er viktig å få innsikt i korleis engelsklærarar vel å legge til rette for ei inkluderande undervisning i det fleirspråklege engelsk-klasserommet.

Denne mikroetnografiske studien har hatt som mål å utforske korleis seks engelsklærarar frå tre ulike delar av landet stiller seg til fleirspråklegheit i engelskundervisninga. Problemstillinga mi er som fylgjande: *How do Norwegian English-teachers relate to multilingualism in the EFL classroom?*

Denne oppgåva har eit kvalitativt forskingsdesign, der eg har nytta semistrukturerte intervju som primærdata. Deltakarane er fordelte på seks barne-og ungdomsskular, der halvparten av dei ligg i Osloområdet, og dei tre siste på Vestlandet og i Nord-Noreg.

Den tematiske analysen syner nokre hovudfunn. Eit av hovudfunna er at lærarane ser ut til å fokusere meir på den engelske kompetansen til dei fleirspråklege elevane, men at det er vanskeleg for dei å skildre korleis andre språk kan vere ein ressurs i engelskundervisninga.

Som ei fylgje av desse funna syner studien at det er behov for ei tydelegare bevisstgjering og meir kunnskap om korleis engelsklærarane kan nytte elevane sitt morsmål som ressurs i engelskundervisninga.

Acknowledgments

Five years have passed, and an era of hard work and a lot of new knowledge has come to an end, and I will soon take on new challenges as a first-grade teacher. I look back at the last five years at OsloMet with gratitude.

Writing this master's thesis has been an experience unlike anything else. First, I want to thank my supervisor, Ingrid Rodrick Beiler, for thorough and fast feedback on my work throughout the process. You have pushed me just enough and have been a great support and inspiration for me this entire time.

I would also thank the participants.

Furthermore, I would like to thank the workspace in Kragskogen barnehage for the good writing environment and all the employees for being the world's best colleagues, supporters, and motivators. Finally, I would like to thank my family for the sometimes overly good support, and that you have cared so much for me and my work with the master's thesis.

Thank you!

Oslo, May 2022
Maria Halsen Brandal

Table of Contents

OSLO METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY
STORBYUNIVERSITETET

1. Introduction

English has been taught as a second or foreign language in Norway for decades. If we go back a hundred years, the language classroom was mostly monolingual, however, the societies were diverse, and multilingualism existed. The country was diverse to a certain extent even then. In addition to Norwegian, there were the Sami people, and the five national minority groups: Jews, Kvens, Romani people, Roma, and Forest Finns. Nevertheless, the school was only Norwegian due to the Norwegianization policy, where the goal was to assimilate the non-Norwegian speaking into a uniform Norwegian population (Rudi, 2018). Over the past decades, diversity has grown exponentially with immigration from across the globe. Cultural and linguistic diversity has resulted in considerably more multilingual classrooms. This forces teachers to rethink their educational habits of English as a foreign language (EFL). Today the classrooms may consist of several different L1s, and English can just as easily be someone's third (L3) or additional language instead of the second language (L2).

In the following chapter, I will start by presenting the background for choosing the theme for my master's project (1.1). The next subchapter is about multilingualism in Norway (1.2) which again paves the way for the following subchapter where the research question and sub-questions are being introduced (1.3). The structure and division of the thesis comes in the last chapter (1.4)

1.1 Background

Today there are both English teachers with teaching competence in English and English teachers without formal competence in English teaching. To many, it can be suitable to take the easy way out and make use of the grammar-translation method when teaching English. The grammar-translation method can cause trouble if there are students in the class who do not master the reference language (Norwegian) as well as the teacher and the students with Norwegian as their L1. The average English as a foreign language class in this country may consist of both students that are learning English as their L2, L3, or L4 at the same time. Something that needs to be considered, is that there are qualitative differences between learning a second language and learning a third or additional language (Krulatz, Dahl, & Flognfeldt, 2018, p. 78). If teachers use the grammar-translation method and give instructions mainly in Norwegian, many students will have a problem keeping up with what occurs in class.

My motivation for choosing this topic is rooted in an experience I had before I started my teacher's education in 2017. I was teaching English in elementary school, and suddenly I got two new students who did not speak either Norwegian or English. I did not have any experience with this, and it was not something I had thought of as an issue before this happened. The students were supposed to be in the EFL class with me and the other students and this situation were quite hopeless for a while. No one had very good advice for me, and it was my responsibility to find a way to include them and try to make them learn at least something. What I did in this situation was to make books for them with common words in their L1 with a translation in both English and Norwegian. This then was when I understood that it is very much up to the individual teacher how he or she chose to relate to multilingualism in the foreign language classroom. Some schools have their own English classes for these students, but that is rather rare. Since then, I have been curious about what teachers do in their language classrooms, both with students that do not speak either English or Norwegian but also the students who master other languages in addition to Norwegian. There could be several L1s in an EFL class, and this could make teaching English more challenging for the teacher. Earlier teachers mostly dealt with students with whom they shared the same L1, and English was everyone's L2. I find this topic highly relevant as the language classrooms get more multilingual with every day that goes by. As the world gets smaller due to globalization, EFL teaching must adapt and change to accommodate students with different language backgrounds.

1.2 Multilingualism in English Classrooms

Multilingualism is defined as knowing more than two languages (Krulatz et al., 2018, p.54). Bilingualism is a more common and well-known subject. Being bilingual means that one can use two languages. Individuals can be multilingual in all the same ways that they are bilingual: simultaneous or successive, subtractive, or additive, early, or late (Krulatz et al., 2018, p.53). In large parts of the world, people use more than one language daily, and being bilingual is very common. In Sri Lanka, there are for example two official languages, Sinhala, and Tamil. In addition to these two languages the people here often also use other local minority languages such as Veddah (Krulatz et al., 2018, p. 54).

The language situation in the Arctic North is quite complex as well. The North Calotte (Norway, Sweden, Finland, and the North-West corner of Russia) consists of nine different Sámi languages, two minority languages (Kven and Meänkieli), and four national languages (Pietikäinen, 2011). In addition to this, there are several other languages that have found their

2

way there through various global flows (Pietikäinen, 2011). The national minority languages found in Norway are Kven, Romani, and Romanes and there are three different written Sámi languages: North Sámi, South Sámi, and Lule Sámi (Regjeringen, 2022). In the Oslo school district, 38,6% of all students attending elementary school have a minority language background (Flognfeldt, Šurkalović, Tishakov, & Tsagari, 2020, p. 520) In some of the schools close to 100% of the students have minority language background, while some schools like Maridalen have others have 0%. In Oslo there are over 150 languages represented around the schools (Oslo Kommune, 2021).

Multilingualism has been viewed both as a resource and something problematic, and it can be seen both as an asset and as a problem (Ruíz, 1984). Some English teachers think that the language competence of multilingual students is poorer than the language capacity of a monolingual person capacity (Krulatz et al., 2018, p.82). On the other side, there are many advantages to being multilingual. One advantage is having the ability to understand, take part in and communicate in more than one language which can be helpful in many situations. Studies in this field also indicate that multilingual or bilingual people are often more successful than monolingual ones when it comes to completing tasks that require the ability to pay attention to formal aspects of linguistic units (Cenoz, 2013). In addition to the kind of control that is characteristic of cognitive flexibility, multilingual people have a high degree of communicative sensitivity (Cenoz, 2013).

In education, the multilingual turn can be defined as how multilingualism has found its way into the classroom. One aspect of this is that more teachers are ready to take the varied backgrounds of their students into consideration, acknowledging and making pedagogical use of the diversity of the students' language backgrounds (Krulatz et al., 2018, p.124).

In the recent decades, the field of second language acquisition and language education has witnessed a shift away from the dominant monolingual ideologies that take native speakers as the reference point for language learners and insist on a strict separation of languages, both in the mind and in the classroom (Christison, Krulatz, & Sevinç, 2021). Deciding on the appropriate use of L1 has been a great challenge for teachers in linguistically homogeneous EFL classrooms, and traditionally these classrooms were monolingual, as teachers and students shared the same L1 (Šurkalović, 2014). The English subject curriculum anticipates that the students' L1s do have a place in the classroom as it suggests students should be able to identify linguistic similarities and differences between the different languages. However, it

does not say much about what classroom purpose it should serve (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

Many of the teachers today have been professionally socialized into a monolingual approach when it comes to multilingualism (Simensen, 2007), and keeping the different languages separate is still seen as the best way to do it by many. Having to manage more than one language is by many believed to be a potential problem. For this group of teachers, a necessary first step would be to fully understand what the multilingual turn implies (Flognfeldt et al., 2020).

The different new insights into multilingualism have inspired scholars to challenge the traditional monolingual basis of assessment. The assumption that monolingualism is the norm in human communication is gradually being replaced by an acknowledgment of multilingualism as the new linguistic dispensation (Christison et al., 2021, p. 274). According to Garcia and Sylvan (2011), teaching in multilingual classrooms should focus on communicating with all students, by building on their different language backgrounds, rather than teaching and promoting one standard language (p. 386).

1.2.1 Linguistic Diversity and Multilingualism in LK20

In the core curriculum under *core values of education and training,* there is a section about *Identity and cultural diversity*. It says that education shall ensure that the students become safe language users and that they develop their linguistic identity. Knowledge of linguistic diversity in society gives all students valuable insight into different forms of expression, ideas, and traditions. All students should experience that knowing more than one language is a resource in school and in society (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019). When developing an inclusive and inspiring learning environment, diversity must be acknowledged as a resource (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

Under *principles for the school's practice,* there is a section about *teaching and differentiated instruction* which states that the school shall facilitate learning for all students and stimulate every student's motivation, desire to learn, and faith in their own mastering. The school must give all students equal opportunities to learn and develop, regardless of their background and aptitudes. Differentiated instruction means that the school adapts the teaching so that all students have the best possible learning outcome from ordinary teaching. Differentiated instruction applies to all students and shall for the most part take place through variation and adaption to the diversity in the student group within the learning community. Pupils who need

differentiated instruction beyond the ordinary teaching program are entitled to special-needs education (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

Under competence aims and assessment in the English subject curriculum, there are different learning aims that touch upon multilingualism in the EFL classroom. After year two, the students shall find words that are common in English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar. After year four, the students shall discover and play with words and expressions that are common in both English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar. After year seven the aim is that the students shall explore and talk about some linguistic similarities between English and other languages that the pupil is familiar with and use this in their language learning. After year ten, the students shall explore and describe some linguistic similarities and differences between English and other languages the pupil is familiar with and use this in their own language learning (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

As shown here, one of the aims of LK20 is that the student should be able to find words that are common in English and "other languages with which the student is familiar". This could refer to the students' L1 whatever that may be, and other additional languages they may know. The students should also be able to see other connections between English, their L1, and other additional languages. By using the phrase "other languages the pupil is familiar with" in the learning aims, diversity and multilingualism are in included. Kunnskapsdepartementet keeps this aim very open to interpretation. It is up to every teacher to make sure the students reach these aims (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

1.3 Research Aim and Research Questions

With this master's project, I will explore how English teachers relate to multilingualism in the classroom. The ever-increasing globalization and multilingualism that accompanies intrigued me to study how teachers handle and relate to multilingualism in the language classroom. The aim of this study is to understand how Norwegian English teachers relate to multilingualism in the EFL classroom. I have developed four research questions to answer the aim. The research questions are as follows:

RQ1: How do teachers conceive multilingualism?

RQ2: Do teachers experience any special opportunities in English teaching related to the students' language background?

RQ3: Do teachers experience any special challenges in English teaching related to the

students' language background?

RQ4: What are teachers' strategies to support English in multilingual classes?

These research questions are the basis for inquiry in my research project, which has a qualitative research design. I will conduct interviews to answer my research questions. The data collection method is qualitative interviews. Qualitative interviews will bring out the participants' reflections on the work with facilitation and inclusion in English teaching.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

In addition to this introductory chapter, my thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 2 is a literature review of prior research on the theme. In Chapter 3, the relevant theory is presented. In chapter 4, the methods I have used to answer the aim are accounted for. This includes choice of analysis, procedures for data selection, research credibility, and ethical considerations. In chapter 5, the findings of my research project will be presented. The discussion of the findings considering prior research and relevant theory is in Chapter 6. Finally, Chapter 7 is the conclusion.

2.   Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, the theoretical framework for my research project will be presented. I have based my theoretical framing on language attitudes and ideologies, third language acquisition, transfer, and translanguaging.

2.1 Language Attitudes and Ideologies

Language ideologies are defined as "beliefs, or feelings about languages used in their social worlds" (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498). This definition aims to capture a wide range of analytical possibilities, and thus shed light on different understandings of language (Kroskrity, 2004). Our attitudes towards language are not neutral and are influenced by factors around us such as politics, history, and society. These factors do also affect how languages are acknowledged in schools. There will always be different attitudes to language and language teaching in different schools and EFL classrooms around the country. The value and status of a language are dependent on the school's power over language use. If schools offer students multilingual teaching and use their L1 as a resource in one way or another, it shows appreciation and recognition of minority languages. This will make the languages visible and raise the status of the pupils' L1 in school.

Otherwise, the students' languages can also be downgraded and less emphasized in school. Such an ideology was previously called a *Nationalism ideology*, where all languages except the majority language were seen as foreign (García & Li, 2019). If teachers view multilingualism in the language classroom as a disadvantage and an obstacle to language learning, it most likely will color their way of teaching and the pedagogical decisions they engage in. For example, if there are children with different first languages than Norwegian in the class, and the teacher still chose to use Norwegian as a reference language, rather than encouraging them to try to figure out the meaning in English by using their own first language as a tool. Such attitudes towards language will prevent multilingual students from using their entire linguistic repertoire in a school context. This way the student's language repertoires will be an unused resource if the multilingualism in the classroom is not made visible and included in teaching. *Semilingualism* is another discredited language theory, which is described as when a person abandons his or her L1 in favor of an imperfectly acquired L2 (Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986). It is also referred to as "Halvspråklig".

Ruíz (1984) came up with three orientations in language planning. These are *language as problem, language as right, and language as resource*. "Language-as-resource" consider language as a resource that can help and ease the tension between languages and strengthen the status of languages (Ruíz, 1984, p. 25). This ideology challenges the older way of thinking where only one language should be used at a time, and where the minority language was prioritized less. Schools should create safe spaces where the students should be able to take advantage of and use all their linguistic repertoire as resources in teaching instead of creating a gap between the languages (García & Li, 2019). The use of only one language at a time has characterized multilingual classrooms for a long time (Garcia & Li, 2014, p. 82). This way of thinking goes under the language ideology Ruiz (1984) calls "Language-as-problem".

Table 1. (Pre)dispositions in the Orientations to Language Planning

Language as Problem	Language as Right	Language as Resource
• Monolingualism in a dominant majority language is valued • Policies seek to limit or eliminate multilingualism • Linguistic diversity is a threat to assimilation and national unity • Minority languages are a threat to the status of the dominant majority language • Language problems are (falsely) equated with social problems • Speaking a minority language is a communicative disability to be overcome • Minority language speakers are defined based on missing linguistic abilities in the dominant majority language • Minority language maintenance is unnecessary; minority language loss is a solution to language problems • Language education aims at transition to the dominant majority language • Educational programs that facilitate bilingual language development exacerbate social divisiveness • Skepticism that bilingual programs in general may focus on the minority language to the detriment of majority language development • Bilingualism is related to cognitive difficulties and reduced academic achievement • Second language and mainstream immersion programs are favored over bilingual education (i.e., minority students are best served by as much exposure to the dominant majority language as possible) • Language learning is generally subtractive	• Language mediates access to society including, but not limited to, employment, healthcare, jurisprudence, voting, education, and media • Concern that linguistic inequality leads to social inequality • Rights to use one's language in specific domains, such as those above, are codified in *de jure* policy (positive rights) • Rights to non-discrimination based on language are codified in *de jure* policy (negative rights) • Rights may be framed in relation to international conventions and treaties • Speaking and maintaining one's language is a human right • Access to civil rights may not be denied due to linguistic ability • Language is related to personal freedom • Language rights may be limited to certain specifically defined individuals or groups • Rights may focus on opportunities to attain proficiency in a dominant majority language and/or opportunities to develop and maintain minority languages • Academic programs for linguistic minorities facilitate equal access to education; program types may vary	• Societal multilingualism and cultural diversity are valued • National unity includes linguistic diversity • Languages are resources for everyone, not only for linguistic minorities and their communities • Languages are both a personal and a national resource • Linguistic minority communities have unique linguistic expertise to contribute to society • Languages have extrinsic value for purposes such as national security, diplomacy, military action, espionage, business, media, public relations, among other possibilities • Languages have intrinsic value for purposes such as cultural reproduction, community relations, identity construction, building self-esteem, intellectual engagement, civic participation, among other possibilities • Rationales for language maintenance are aligned with extrinsic and/or intrinsic values • The interests and needs of a nation or of linguistic minorities themselves may be variously foregrounded • Bi-/multilingualism can enhance academic achievement • Awareness of different languages and cultures reduces ethnocentrism and xenophobia and enhances intercultural understanding • Linguistic minorities are resources for the multilingual development of a dominant majority • Academic programs focus on the development of life-long bi-/multilingualism; program types may be designed for linguistic minorities or both linguistic minorities and a dominant majority • Language learning is generally additive

In this table Ruíz's three orientations to Language planning are put in order in Hult and Hornbergers words (Hult & Hornberger, 2016, p. 33).

2.2 Learning a Third Language

The first language children learn in their life is referred to as L1 and happens as a natural process (Eikrem, 2006, p. 56). This phenomenon is referred to by linguistics as *naturalistic language acquisition* and means that when children are exposed to language, it will be acquired, no matter their academic talent or what activities they engage in (Krulatz et al., 2018, p. 35). The natural ability to acquire language changes with age, and as the child grows

older exposure often needs to be supplemented with instructions and learning activities (Lightbown, 2000). The term L2 is referred to as a second (or foreign) language a person acquires in life, whereas the abbreviation L3 is used for a third or additional language. This term covers any language learned in addition to the L1 and L2. The L3 can be learned in the community in case of migration, or in school. English as a foreign language, EFL, is defined by Krulatz et al. (2018) as English taught primarily at school.

When learning a second language a first language already exists. This can be both helpful and a source of disruptions for the second language learner (Drew & Sørheim, 2009, p. 18). Both Garcia and Li (2019), Cummins (1981), and Cenoz (2003) have developed multilingual language, learning models. For a Norwegian learning English, the L1 can be seen as a resource as the languages have some similarities when it comes to elements such as syntax and vocabulary. This phenomenon is transferable to other L1s as well. When talking about third language acquisition, Cenoz (2003) claims that learning a third or an additional language is quite different from learning a second language.

It is reported that different L1s would cause different issues to learners when learning English as a foreign language. The level of typological difference between the L1 and English can explain many issues the students may get with grammar learning, for instance (Østberg, 2010, p. 170). It is still quite common that some teachers see multilingualism as a disruption of language learning (Garcia & Li, 2014, p. 71). This is mindset is called "The Separate Underlying Proficiency" and assumes that the brain only has the capacity for one language at a time, and that acquisition of new languages will happen at the expense of others (Cummins, 1980). Cummins (1980) and others with him have criticized this theory.

The different languages that are acquired do not occupy separate places in our brains, but according to Cummins it is possible to model the different language systems in our brains as part of one common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 2000). He came up with the theory as an opposite to the notion of traditional bilingualism. The model is illustrated as an iceberg, where the individual language systems are above the water and the common underlying proficiency is under the surface (Cummins, 2000). This model can explain how the different languages in our linguistic repertoire influence and interact with each other (Jessner, 2008).

García and Li (2019) consider multilingualism to be dynamic and they connect it to trans linguistic theories. In a dynamic language learning model, is the entire language repertoire of

the student seen as a recourse and there are no boundaries between the languages (García & Li, 2019).

2.3 Transfer and Translanguaging

Transfer is a language acquisition theory by Cummins and is defined as when language learners use their linguistic knowledge in one language to learn a new language. These theories highlight the role of the L1 to teach and learn an L2 or additional language (Cummins, 2000).

Research has shown that it is possible to transfer abilities between languages. The students that use more than one language often have a better metalinguistic awareness than monolingual students. Multilinguals are often more successful at tasks that require an awareness of the nature of language and words, including meaningful parts like prefixes and suffixes (Cenoz, 2003). All the different languages in a classroom can be a challenge because different students have difficulties with different aspects of English and there are many considerations to take for the teacher (Flognfeldt & Lund, 2016, p. 18). A student with Norwegian as a first language may struggle with the *th*-sound, while some speakers with different language backgrounds may find things that most Norwegians struggle with quite easy (Flognfeldt & Lund, 2016, p. 19). At the same time there can be many similarities between a student's L1 or L2 and the L3.

In Norway the L1 has normally been used as a tool to teach English as a foreign language. When introducing something new or if there is something the teacher must clarify to the students, the tradition has been to either explain or translate it to the students in Norwegian. This is still a great tool, especially in homogeneous groups of students, but the language classroom has changed, and this method does not suffice anymore. In a group of students, there is a great chance a few of them do not have sufficient knowledge of the Norwegian language and that Norwegian is their L2 or L3. If the teacher keeps using only Norwegian as the tuition language in the English lessons, it could be problematic to follow for students that are not very steady in Norwegian. According to Copland and Neokleous, research has turned from sensible use of the L1 to support the learning of an L2, to an interest in how L1 can be used to maximize the learning in L2 (Copland & Neokleous, 2010, p. 2). The teachers that share a first language with their learners can draw on two languages as resources in the EFL classroom and this is beneficial to both the teacher and the students. In addition to this, the teacher must keep in mind that the acquisition of an L2 is different from the acquisition of an

L3 or any other additional language. Already knowing two or more languages when learning a third or additional language is a great advantage for the language learner. At this point, the student already has well-developed language learning strategies and will acquire the additional language easier by using the strategies (Cenoz, 2013).

Another term that is used a lot in research on multilingual classrooms is Translanguaging. Translanguaging is defined by Garcia and Li as when bi-or multilingual speakers draw on all their different languages as needed, depending on the context of language use (Garcia & Li, 2014). Translanguaging differs from the idea of transfer in the way that the language learner uses all their language resources to reach communicative goals, while the idea of transfer is about how the knowledge of one language is used as a tool for the learner to acquire an additional language. The consequence of both transfer and translanguaging is that the multilingualism in the classrooms is used in a specific kind of way. I use the term transfer in my thesis, but I also refer to translanguaging to describe other people's research.

According to Garcia (2011), translanguaging has been a potent concept in multilingual contexts for the past two decades. It is used as an umbrella term for various means of incorporating an individual's entire linguistic repertoire that is used to achieve communicative goals in different communicative contexts and modalities. The term pedagogical translanguaging is referred to as a specific pedagogical strategy that is planned by teachers and based on the use og the different languages the students know and use (Garcia & Sylvan, 2011). In contrast we have spontaneous translanguaging which happens naturally in contexts where it is natural to switch between languages, also known as code-switching.

3. Literature Review

In this chapter, I have presented some prior research on the topic. I have chosen to limit the chapter to studies that have been done in Norway because of the limitations of the study. Both in terms of time and scope of the thesis.

3.1 Teacher Knowledge and Attitudes

The first published research on the relation between multilingualism and teaching was carried out in 2014 by Šurkalović. Before this Nesse wrote a MA thesis on the topic in 2008 (Nesse, 2008). Šurkalović surveyed 94 pre-service English teachers to study their knowledge about multilingualism, third language acquisition, the language situation in Norway, and if they had metalinguistic awareness (Šurkalović, 2014, p. 6). The findings from this study showed that the students did not have sufficient knowledge in these subjects, neither the language situation nor language in general. For example, under one-third of the participants knew that there are many L1s in Norway. In general, she found that the language awareness and knowledge of Norwegian language policy were low among the pre-service teachers and concluded that teacher education should focus more on language awareness and L3 acquisition. According to Šurkalović the most challenging part for English teachers is not that the students have different L1s than Norwegian. The issue is the great variation in these first languages the students may have (Šurkalović, 2014, p. 3).

Dahl and Krulatz (2016) surveyed 176 English teachers in Norway and interviewed 4 English teachers. The study found that only 19,9% of the participants that were interviewed had formal competence in teaching in multilingual classrooms (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). Their research did also show that there is a great need of more knowledge and competence on multilingualism in the classroom and that teachers need better didactic competence to support the cultural and linguistic diversity (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). This is supported by a study carried out by Christison et al. (2021), where they performed classroom observations in a multilingual school with newly arrived and immigrant students in Grades 4-7 in Norway. This school was one of the most multilingual and multicultural in the country where around 100 of 460 students were multilingual, and with 25 different languages represented at the school. From their findings, it was concluded that the teachers who participated in the research project clearly needed more theoretical and practical knowledge pertaining to working with multilingual young learners and that they could benefit from professional learning focused on multilingualism in education (Christison et al., 2021, p. 285).

3.2 Multilingual Classroom Practices

In a study carried out by Flognfeldt et al. (2020), teachers' perceptions and practices as regard language assessment in EFL and Norwegian in a multilingual elementary school in Norway (p. 520). The data was collected through a pre-observation survey, classroom observations, and post-observation interviews with the three teachers. A growing amount of research and practice in the field of multilingualism has shown that incorporating multilingual or translanguaging practices can improve minority students' linguistic achievements on a long-term basis (Flognfeldt et al., 2020, p. 520).

From the study carried out by Christison et al. (2021), there was little student interaction during language classes. When interaction did occur, the focus was on the teacher interacting with the whole class or with individual students. The lessons consisted mostly of teacher-centered instruction or individual work (Christison et al., 2021). In a few cases, students with the same L1 were paired up to work together to support one another, and newly arrived students got paired up with more experienced ones who functioned as translators (Christison et al., 2021). Neokleous and Ofte (2020) observed and interviewed four in-service teachers in primary and lower secondary schools to explore teachers' attitudes towards the use of mother tongue (MT) in Norwegian EFL environments. The findings of this study showed that the participants felt guilty about the presence of MT, and their reported use of MT did not always reflect their classroom behaviors. The participants did also acknowledge the potential of MT (Neokleous & Ofte, 2020).

Christison, Krulatz, and Sevinç observed great variations among the teachers that participated in the study. Some of them employed English-Norwegian translation extensively, especially when giving instructions or when answering students. A few did also support translanguaging practices among the students and one teacher encouraged the students to figure newly introduced words in English on their L1 (Christison et al., 2021, p. 281). However, in most classes where the teachers themselves practiced a monolingual approach, opportunities like this were lacking and there was little or no evidence of systematic, planned translanguaging in the classes that were observed. The teaching materials were also mostly in English or Norwegian and did not promote the development of multicompetence. For instance, materials or activities to promote pedagogically planned translanguaging was none existing (Christison et al., 2021). Nikula and Moore (2016), argue that it would be helpful if teachers had an overall understanding of translanguaging both as a pedagogic strategy to support learning and as natural bilingual discourse (p. 245).

13

Krulatz and Torgersen (2016) conducted a study on one school in Trondheim and one on the island of Hitra in Sør-Trøndelag. They used interviews and observations of five teachers and a parent, and the goal was to empower English teachers to address the needs of their multilingual students and to raise their own awareness about multilingualism (Krulatz & Torgersen, 2016). Some of the findings from this study showed that the teachers were fully invested in the linguistic, academic, and social well-being of their students. They were also respectful towards the students' cultures and home languages. At the same time, it was found that there is potential for improved instructions in English, a greater understanding of what it entails to be multilingual, and increased integration of the international students' multilingual contributions to create diverse classroom communities (Krulatz & Torgersen, 2016, p. 66). In addition to this, they suggest that both teachers and students must understand that English should enter the repertoires of communicative practices as one of the several components of the students developing multilingual identities (Krulatz & Torgersen, 2016).

In a study carried out by Flognfeldt (2018), it was investigated how English is taught in year 4, in classes where students have other L1s than Norwegian. The research methods were interviews with the teachers and classroom observation. The main goal of the study was to figure out to what extent the students' L1 are used as a resource in the English lessons, what language the teachers use for instruction, and if they make strategic use of translanguaging and in that case when. The teachers in this study did not make use of the students' L1s in a systematic way, and there was not much comparison between English vocabulary and the students' L1s in class. They also stated that more knowledge is needed on the multilingual challenges and opportunities in our society (Flognfeldt, 2018, p. 246).

The findings in Christison et al.'s (2021) study, showed that the teachers were supportive of the use of L1 in their classrooms, to some extent. However, the use of students' L1 was limited to oral communication, with no teaching materials or literacy practices in a language other than English and Norwegian (Christison et al., 2021, p. 285). In Burner and Carlsen's (2022) study it was found that the teacher's main focus was the development of Norwegian, even in the English lessons. This research was carried out at a school with newly arrived students in Norway. They did observations, one-to-one interviews with two teachers, and 21 teachers participated by responding to questionnaires (Burner & Carlsen, 2022). Beiler (2020) examined teachers' and students' positioning and use of multilingual resources in English writing instructions in two introductory classes for newly arrived students in Norway. The data drew on participant observation, classroom video recording, recording of the students'

computer screens, text collection, creation of language portraits, and stimulated recall interviews (Beiler, 2020). The study concluded that multilingual literacy should be promoted as more than just an instrumental resource in the development of writing in English.

The benefit of pedagogical translanguaging is shown in a study by Prilutskaya and Knoph, where 200 Norwegian upper secondary school students answered a questionnaire about their use of background languages in a specific writing task where the students were divided into three different groups: English only, translation, and translanguaging. The English group was supposed to be in a monolingual mode, while the other two a multilingual mode. The translanguaging group could write their draft in any language/languages they wanted to (Prilutskaya & Knoph, 2020). By the participants of this study, translanguaging and using mixed languages was the second most preferred mode at the draft stage after the English-only mode. The students that chose this strategy chose to do it to solve vocabulary and grammar issues, for stylistic and rhetorical purposes, to generate as many ideas as possible regardless of the language of thought (Prilutskaya & Knoph, 2020). The participants also reported that the method engaged more parts of the brain which again made them think in a more varied way and that it resulted in longer and more engaging writing. There were also noted positive effects of translanguaging on grammar, content, and vocabulary (Prilutskaya & Knoph, 2020). Beiler (2021) also examines the positioning and use of multilingual resources in a setting where both linguistically majorized and minoritized students were included. The data were collected through classroom observations, interviews, and document collection from students from three different classes and a teacher (Beiler, 2021).

The result of this study shows that translanguaging and cross-lingual writing practices can be viewed as effective tools for creating engaging learning activities, which may facilitate students' ability to employ their linguistic repertoire in more learner-oriented ways. Other than that, it was concluded that more empirical research is needed to explore the potential translanguaging has as a cross-lingual scaffolding technique in language learning as it applies to the multilingual classroom (Prilutskaya & Knoph, 2020, p. 13). Another study that explored the students' use of translanguaging at the draft stage of writing in the EFL classroom was conducted by Prilutskaya (2020). 78 drafts were collected in this study which was a part of a larger study by Prilutskaya, Knoph, and Hanssen (2020). The findings reported in this study point to the fact that translanguaging, code-switching, and language mixing may be necessary to account for the students' diverse and complex use of translanguaging in writing as it allows for a more differentiated approach to studying the written forms of

translanguaging (Prilutskaya, 2020). Beiler and Dewilde (2020) define English translation strategies as those in which students manipulate language in order to verify or improve a translation. Their study is based on the translation practices of 22 newly arrived students in Norway (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020).

Research has also found that including all the students' L1s can help foster learners' multilingual identities and build inclusive classroom spaces (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020). This was discovered through a research project where 14 students participated through questionnaires, student logs, lesson plans, teachers' notes and reflections, and students' identity texts (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020).

3.4 Summary

As shown above, several studies have been conducted in Norway over the last years on the topic of multilingualism in EFL classrooms, teachers' attitudes to multilingualism in the classroom, language acquisition, transfer, and translanguaging. The research has mostly been in more urban contexts including some schools that are among the ones in Norway with the most multilingual students.

Krulatz and Torgersen did their research on one school in Trondheim and another one at Hitra island which is a more rural place in Trøndelag. Based on this literature review little research has been conducted that incorporate comparison of different geographic settings. Therefore, I have chosen to interview teachers from both rural and urban contexts and from three different geographic contexts, as I will write more about in the methods chapter.

4. Methodological Design

This project is carried out as a qualitative study. The qualitative approach provides a basis for in-depth and intensive analyses of the social phenomena being studied (Thagaard, 2018, p. 12). The study aims to investigate how English teachers work to facilitate the teaching best for all students regardless of language and the student language background.

In this chapter, I will explain my methodological choices. I will begin with my pre-understanding of the topic before I present my philosophical stance. Then I will explain how I prepared myself for and conducted the interviews. Further on, I will go through the strategy of selection before I explain how I have carried out the analysis of the data. Finally, I will discuss reliability, validity, and ethical considerations.

4.1 Positionality

All research, especially qualitative research, will be influenced by some form of preconception on the topic that is being studied. This means that I must be aware of what I bring with me into the research situation when it comes to prejudices, knowledge, experiences, perceptions, and opinions (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). For instance, I think there should be more focus on this topic in the national curriculum. I also think that it is not correct so much of the responsibility lies with the teacher and that the teachers are not sufficiently equipped to take on this responsibility. In a research project like this, one must position oneself accordingly. I am no minority language speaker, but I have some teaching experience of my own. I also wrote my FoU thesis on this topic where I did a literature review on whether teachers had enough training and experience to manage language-related challenges that might occur in multilingual classrooms.

The interaction between the researcher and the interviewee is characterized by the subjective features of both parties. This means that as a researcher I must reflect on how the personal characteristics of both the researcher and the interviewee can affect the interview situation (Thagaard, 2018, p. 104). During the interview, I am responsible for the situation, and my goal is to establish a good and trusting atmosphere. The relationship that is formed between researcher and participant has different ethical implications, and it can be influenced by, for example, similarities or differences between the participant and me. Other factors that may be important for how the interview goes are appearance, age, and gender. Here it is important that I am well prepared and that I am aware of my role as a researcher. According to Thagaard (2018, p. 105), the interview will be of poor quality if the researcher fails in establishing a

good and trusting atmosphere. To be able to establish a trustworthy interview situation, it is especially important to avoid creating a distance to the interviewee in the form of, for example, social distance. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) state that when the researcher becomes the main research instrument, the researchers' skills, sensitivity, and knowledge becomes essential for the quality of the knowledge produced (p.84).

4.2 Qualitative Semi-Structured Research Interview

According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2018, s. 83), the qualitative research interview produces knowledge socially, through interaction between interviewer and interviewee. This form of interview seeks to understand the world from the interviewee's point of view and aims to bring out the significance of people's experiences and uncover their understanding of the world, before forming scientific explanations (s. 20).

I have chosen what Thagaard (2018, p. 91) describes as a semi-structured approach. This means that the themes for the project are mainly determined in advance, but that the order is decided along the way. By doing it this way, I could follow what the participant told at the same time as I could adapt the questions to the interview situation and the participant, to shed light on important aspects of the topics. For example, all participants will probably have different experiences of teaching multilingual English classes and I would adapt which follow-up questions I chose to ask based on this.

It is from the qualitative, semi-structured interviews with the English teachers that this thesis is getting the data. The interview consists of a thematic semi-structured interview guide.

4.3 Selection of Participants

A characteristic of qualitative methods is that they require a fair amount of information to be obtained from a limited selection of participants. When choosing participants for a qualitative study, there are three principles to consider: size, strategy, and recruitment (Johannesen, Tufte & Kristoffersen, 2009, s. 105). In my study, the goal is to examine whether the participants have experience with teaching multilingual classes, if they have developed their own strategies, and if they see multilingualism as a resource in language learning or see it as an obstacle to the teaching. I chose to use purposeful selection which means that I systematically select people who have qualities or qualifications that are strategically based on the research aim (Thagaard, 2018, p. 54). Primarily I wanted participants with experience in teaching English and preferably some experience with teaching in multilingual English classes. I used

my personal network of contacts to find participants who I thought could contribute with interesting data to the study (Johannesen et. al, 2009, s. 105).

In the end, I chose English teachers both from the Oslo area and more rural areas of the country to get a certain spread, show variety and to give a realistic picture of how the situation is around the country. In the rural areas and smaller cities around Norway, where the communities tend to be more homogeneous than they are in the cities. For instance, I have one participant from a school in northern Norway and another from the west coast. According to Statistics Norway (SSB) there are 33,82% immigrants and Norwegian-born with immigrant parents in Oslo so far in 2022. In Møre and Romsdal this number is 13,65% and in Nordland 10,81% (SSB, 2022). This information is interesting for my study because it could influence what the participants answer and what experience they have with teaching in multilingual EFL classes.

My group of participants consists both of teachers with several years of experience and of newly qualified teachers with less experience. The selection is relatively small, therefore it is important that the selection process is purposeful in order that the analysis of the data gives a good understanding of the phenomena I study (Thagaard, 2018, p. 56). It is important to consider how many interviews it is practically possible to conduct as one has limited time for such master projects (Johannessen et al., 2009, p. 106). There should be time to both conduct the interviews well and to make an accurate transcript as well as a thorough analysis of what is said in the interviews. Since it can often be difficult to determine in advance how many interviews one may need, the final number of participants will often be decided when the study is close to the end (Johannessen et al., 2009)

In my case, I planned to start with three or four interviews and ended up with conducting six. Some of the participants had much to share and others not as much. Since some of the interviews ended up quite short, I felt it would be better to conduct more interviews and therefore ended up with six in the end.

4.4 Participant Information

Participants	Region of Norway	Years of teaching experience	Teaching competence	Teaching grade
Alf	Northern Norway	2 years	English and Norwegian	5 and 6th grade
Berit	West Coast	22 years	English, Norwegian, and German	6th grade
Cato	Oslo	1 year	English and Norwegian	6th grade
Dagmar	West Coast	23 years	English, Norwegian, and German	8, 9, and 10th
Emil	Oslo	1 year	Norwegian	1st grade
Frida	Oslo	7 years	English and Norwegian	7, 9, and 10th grade

The participants' names are replaced with pseudonyms. The pseudonyms are the names of Norwegian extreme weather and hurricanes after 2010. More details of the participants and their student groups can be found in Appendix 4.

4.5 Data Collection

Interview Guide

An interview consists of main questions, follow-up questions and probes. The main questions are aimed at the participant presenting experiences with a point of view on the central themes in the project. These questions form the basis of the interview guide (Thagaard, 2018, p. 95). To prepare good questions, it is important to have sufficient knowledge of the relevant topic. I read research and theories on multilingualism and English teaching before I started designing the interview guide. I found that there are several Norwegian studies on this topic of recent date. Furthermore, I wrote down questions I thought could help shed light on the main research question: *How do teachers relate to multilingualism in the language classroom?*

I discussed my interview questions and got peer validation with fellow students and received expert validation from my supervisor. During expert validation, we came up with several relevant questions to include in the interview.

Probes are an oral part of the interview guide. These are important tools to show the participant that I am interested in what he or she has to say. It could be words, body language or comments that are used to create flow in the conversation and to give the participant positive response (Thagaard, 2018, p. 96). During the interviews, I nodded, smiled, said "yes", "mhm" and tried to be a good listener and acknowledge what they had to share.

It was important to me to formulate the questions in the interview guide as well as possible. I wanted to have open-ended questions. The fact that the questions are formulated in a way that contributes to the participant's desire to share their experiences and points of view is crucial for the quality of the interview. Open-ended questions help to encourage the participant to tell and share more (Thagaard, 2018, p. 97). The questions also had to be easy to understand. I tried to make sure they did not contain any prejudices or that they were marked by my preconceptions on the theme.

Pilot Interview

The research interview is a craft that is best learned by practicing interviews and the interview situation (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 88). I trained on the interview situation by conducting pilot interviews on a couple of teachers I know and who also had the same criteria as the teachers I selected as participants in the study. These pilot interviews gave me good experience with my own interview practice, and I received valuable feedback. This gave me better self-confidence in the actual interview situation, something that is important to be able to form a connection with the participant that makes him or her feel safe and want to share their experiences (Thagaard, 2018, p. 99).

Interview Procedures

The interviews were conducted in different ways. Some were conducted over teams and zoom, and some were conducted at the schools where the participants worked as teachers. After more than two years of digitalization due to the corona pandemic, it worked very well for both parties to take the interviews digitally. It also made it easier to implement as it became easier to find a time that suited the participant when he/she did not have to show up anywhere to meet me in person. At the same time, it was very nice to be able to conduct some of the interviews physically in the schools.

The interviews were conducted individually. Only the participant and I were present. Before each interview, I made sure that the participant had read and understood the written information, and that the participant had signed the consent form. I started by introducing

myself and the project in greater detail before I emphasized that the participant would be completely anonymous and that it was voluntary to participate in the study. I made sure to remind the participant that I have the duty of confidentiality to assure him or her that everything said in the interview is confidential. I did also remind the participants not to describe individual students in the interview. Furthermore, I informed about the topic and the process. I explained the interview would be recorded with the secure app Nettskjema-Diktafon. The participant was given the opportunity to ask questions before we started and to add additional information when the actual interview was over. The interviews lasted between ten and thirty minutes. The interview that lasted only ten minutes was with one of the less experienced teachers, and naturally the teachers with more experience had been in more situations over the years and had more to share in the interview. To compensate for this, I had to conduct more interviews.

Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) write about how crucial the first minutes of an interview are. This is because the participant wants a clear perception of the interviewer before they start talking freely and presenting their feelings and experiences to a stranger (p. 160). My goal was to use the first part of the interview to create a safe and good atmosphere for the participant. I did this by asking simple and less complex questions in the beginning of the interview. I also wanted to appear confident and show interest and understanding of what the participant had to share.

I ended by summarizing the interview a bit so that the participant could comment or give feedback on what he or she had said (Thagaard, 2018). I also asked if he or she had anything they wanted to add, or if there was something they found interesting and relevant that I had not asked about. Finally, I thanked them for the participation and informed about rest of the process and how the audio file and information would be processed. I also repeated that the participant could choose to withdraw from the project at any time if he or she wanted to.

4.6 Data Analysis

Analysis refers to systematizing data and breaking it down to get the information we need to answer the research question. Coding of data to detect common themes and concepts is a part of the thematic analysis (Johannesen, Rafoss, & Rasmussen, 2018).

Transcriptions

Transforming the oral interview into a written text through transcription makes the interviews accessible and structured for the researcher's analysis. I conducted all my interviews myself

and used the app Nettskjema-Diktafon to record the conversations. This way, I made sure that I got hold of everything the participants said. Another advantage of recording the conversation was that I could focus more on the conversation itself instead of just focusing on taking good notes. I listened to every recording several times to make each transcript as correct and authentic as possible. I wrote everything the participants said and included pauses etc. I switched on writing the transcripts in Nynorsk and Bokmål depending on the oral language of the participant.

All the participants were offered to read the transcriptions of their interviews in case they wanted to ensure that they had been interpreted correctly. No one chose to take advantage of this opportunity, which may indicate that they trust me as a researcher.

Coding and Categorization

I chose to do a thematic analysis. In thematic analysis, we look for themes in our data. These themes were coded into different categories. Before I started analyzing the data, I read through each transcript several times and wrote a summary note for each of them. This is necessary if the researcher is to become familiar with the content and to be able to form an opinion on which phenomena the text can provide an understanding of. Going through the text several times can also lead to the discovery of new patterns in the data (Thagaard, 2018, p. 152). Doing this made it easier for me to get a better overview of the different findings, and it made the next step of the process easier. The next step was finding codes. The data was coded and interpreted by consolidating the codes (Nilssen, 2012, p. 104). I printed out my transcriptions and marked the different themes with different colors. This is one way to code. By organizing the data, an interpretation takes place at the same time (Johannesen, Rafoss, & Rasmussen, 2018).

Coding is a technique for systematizing a large amount of material (Anker, 2019, p. 7). I started the process by going over the data, to see what was interesting, and which findings I could use. This was done based on my main impression of the data before I looked closer at it and formed different codes. I did inductive coding, based on the data and not on theory. The *inductive* analysis involves discovering patterns, categories, and themes in the data as opposed to the *deductive* approach, where data is analyzed using predefined frameworks which is more common in quantitative research (Nilssen, 2012, p. 14).

The findings I did in this process were carefully looked at and interpreted. The interpretation process contributes to creating the meaning of the findings (Nilssen, 2012, p. 104).

To confirm that the research is reliable, it is important in qualitative research to account for how one analyzes one's data (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009) as I have attempted to do here.

4.7 Research Validity

In a social science research project, it is important to ask questions about reliability, validity, and generalizability (Thagaard, 2018, p. 187). What I find out about my participant's practice and their teaching strategies in the multilingual English classroom can indicate how teachers relate to the phenomenon in Norwegian schools. Even though I have had to limit myself to a few participants I see it as essential to ensure that the research is as reliable and valid as possible. Therefore, I will discuss my project in the following sections by asking questions about reliability, validity, and transferability.

Reliability

It is important to consider whether the qualitative research is credible, and therefore the reliability of the research project is a criterion (Marshall & Rossman, 2015, pp. 44-46). The researcher must argue for the reliability of the project by explaining the development of data throughout the research process. This argumentation aims to convince critical readers about the quality of the research and about the value of the results (Thagaard, 2018, p. 188).

Silverman (2014) argues for the possibility of strengthening the reliability of the research project by doing the process as transparent as possible (p. 84). This means that a detailed description is given of both the research strategy and the analysis method so that someone who is an outsider can assess every step of the research process (Thagaard, 2018, p. 188).

In this research project I have accounted for the development of data throughout the process. Ever since the development of research design, to what parts the method is composed of; the practical work in the form of collecting all empirical data; and basis for selection. I have further reflected on my own role as a researcher and possible consequences this role may have. I have also accounted for the transcription of the empirical data. Finally, I have tried to describe the analysis process as precisely as possible. I have seen this as important to do so that the research process can be as transparent as possible.

Validity

Validity is connected to the results of the research project and how the data is interpreted. It

refers to how well the interpretations reflect the phenomenon one is interested in understanding (Thagaard, 2018, p. 189). There are various ways to argue that the research is valid. Silverman (2014, s. 84) emphasizes theoretical transparency. Theoretical transparency describes the theoretical point of view that represents the basis for our interpretations and shows how the analysis provides a basis for the conclusions and interpretations we have landed on (Thagaard, 2018, p. 189). I have been taking notes and tried to justify and explain all my choices throughout this entire research process. My goal has been to make the research process as transparent as possible. Furthermore, I have presented the analysis based on the methodological choices and explained why it is the basis for my conclusions and interpretations.

The validity can also be strengthened by critically reviewing the analysis process. This can for example be done by a colleague critically analyzing my analyzes, or by examining whether alternative perspectives can provide a more relevant understanding (Thagaard, 2018, p. 189).

Transferability

According to Thagaard (2018, p. 193) qualitative studies strive to develop an understanding of the phenomena we study. Therefore, it is the data analyze that gives the basis for transferability. In other words: Can the interpretation I develop in this research project be relevant in other contexts? The findings made in this study could give knowledge, information, and insight that can be used in other research projects. The knowledge could be used in projects that address the same topic and in research on how the teachers could improve their practices or how the curricula should be to embrace multilingualism in some or all subjects.

4.8 Ethical Considerations

All scientific research requires that the researcher must take a stand on ethical principles (Thagaard, 2018, p. 20). Since my research project is a pedagogical study, it falls under the guidelines of the Norwegian National Research Ethics Committee's department for Social Sciences, Humanities, Law, and Theology (NESH, 2021). The individual researcher is always responsible for acting responsibly (NESH, 2021). In addition, the researcher must always consider the consequences of his actions for those who participate. Thagaard (2018, p. 60) emphasizes the principle of respect for human beings' anonymity, privacy, and the right to participate or not in the research project. In this project, I have proceeded based on the

overriding ethical principles, including the duty to notify the Norwegian Centre for Reseach Data (NSD), which approved the processing of personal data.

At the beginning of the project, I worked largely with the research design, and especially with how I could design my research so that it did not have any unfortunate consequences for the participant's duty of confidentiality in his or her work as a teacher. It must be ensured that the interviewee do not feel led into sharing information that he or she may regret afterwards (Thagaard, 2018, p. 113). According to NESH, researchers are responsible to all the persons who are part of or participate in their research. They must respect human dignity and ensure their fundamental equality, freedom, and self-determination. Informed consent to participate in research is a key principle of research ethics (NESH, 2021).

The interview guide consists of questions that do not have to reveal any information about the participants individual students. If the teacher always keeps the duty of confidentiality in mind, there most likely will not be any ethical issues when it comes to this.

Following the interviews, the data has been treated confidentially. I have ensured that all participants are anonymized by removing identifying information, so that it will not be possible to recognize in any publication. For example, I have chosen not to say which schools the teachers work at, only whether it is a teacher from a school in Oslo or a teacher from a school in the countryside. After the study is completed, contact information, background information, audio recordings, transcripts and consent forms will be deleted.

There are also ethical dilemmas related to topic analyzes. The researcher defines the topics that the analysis is aimed at and is characterized by his or her own understanding of the situations that are being studied (Thagaard, 2018, p. 179). As a researcher, I am rooted in a professional tradition, which then again characterizes my understanding of the data. This can lead to the results that are being presented being perceived as encouraging for the participants (Thagaard, Systematikk og innlevelse; En innføring i kvalitative metoder, 2018, p. 179).

5. Findings

In this chapter, I will present and describe the findings of the project based on the research aim: *How do Norwegian English teachers relate to multilingualism in the EFL classroom?* The chapter is thematically divided into four main sections: "Teachers' conceptions of multilingualism" (5.1), "Opportunities in multilingual classes" (5.2), "Challenges in multilingual classes" (5.3), and "Strategies to support English learning in multilingual classes" (5.4). These four parts will together shed light on the research question from the teachers' perspectives. All the quotes are from the transcriptions and they are my translation.

5.1 Teachers' Conceptions of Multilingualism

In this section, I will show how the participants answered the following research question: how do teachers conceive multilingualism? Five of the participants expressed quite similar views on the term multilingualism, which is to be able to communicate in more than one language, whereas one is of the opinion that multilingualism is connected to a foreign background.

The first participant, Alf, defines multilingualism as when one has the competence and can juggle and use the language that is easiest to be understood within different situations so that one can use language as a tool to be understood. Alf has teaching competence in English and views himself as multilingual. Dagmar has competence in English, German and French, and sees herself as multilingual. She defines multilingualism this way:

> Multilingualism is about having several languages in your tool belt, that you master and can communicate via several languages. Many of these students use Norwegian at school, while communication at home takes place via another mother tongue. In addition, they can use English at home in cases where the mother and father have different linguistic backgrounds. Some also communicate in English or German with teachers and fellow students or friends during the first time in Norway.

This teacher describes multilingualism as when someone has the competence to use several languages in communication. Dagmar refers to how the students' multilingual competence is making them able to communicate in different languages depending on the context, and she points to the ability of her students to shift between languages if that is required for a better understanding or communication. The third participant of my study, Cato, does also view himself as multilingual in the sense that he is fluent in both English and Norwegian. He defines multilingualism this way:

> Multilingualism for me, means that you have several languages that you are ... yes ... good at. You do not necessarily have to be fluent, but you are able to communicate in several langauges. So that if you come to Germany for example, you can speak German with those who are there. You may not write perfectly or have perfect pronunciation, but you can communicate.

For Cato multilingualism is synonymous with the ability to communicate in more than one language, and he seems to judge the spoken language as the most important part of multilingualism. To be fluent in a foreign language is not important for this view on multilingualism. Like the participants above, both Emil and Frida, see themselves as multilingual, since they are fluent in both Norwegian and English. Frida defines multilingualism as "mastering more than one language. The multilingual student does not have to master English (or other languages) 100%, but they are able to use the language to communicate and make themselves understood". In this statement, Frida is expressing a similar content of the term multilingualism as Cato does.

For all the teachers above, it seems that multilingualism is about having a useful competence in two or more languages. However, one of the teachers, Berit, has a slightly different view on the term compared to the rest of the teachers. Berit has teaching competence in English, Norwegian, and German. She views herself as multilingual in the sense that she is fluent in two languages but has no other linguistic background than Norwegian. She defines multilingualism this way:

> I think multilingualism is when the student has a different or more than just a Norwegian background. For example, one Norwegian parent and one with another nationality. Whether they are immigrants from anywhere outside of Norway they have a different linguistic background than the Norwegian. They can also have totally different linguistic backgrounds, and when they come to Norway, Norwegian is a new language for them. Many of those who are multilingual have their parents' language as their mother tongue at the same time as they have lived in Norway all their lives. There are many facets of what I would call multilingualism.

Berit differs from the other teachers in that she strongly associates multilingualism with minority status. So, it seems that, to her, multilingualism is synonymous with having a foreign background.

5.2 Opportunities in Multilingual Classes

In this section, I address the sub-questions: "Do teachers experience any special opportunities in English teaching related to the students' language background?". One of the main findings is that the teachers see multilingualism as a positive phenomenon. All the teachers agree on

this. It is positive in relation to English teaching, but also in language teaching in general. Even though there may be challenges connected to multilingualism and language learning, more importantly, there are great strengths reported by all the teachers.

Inclusion through English-class

In English lessons, most of the students meet a new and foreign language, and that turns out to be a good opportunity to include all the students in the learning activities. The teacher with the most multilingual students in his class, Emil, says that English lessons are the only lessons where everyone joins and where he feels that all the students are equally included "English lessons are the only lessons where everyone joins. I have two students who do not speak Norwegian yet, so the English lessons facilitate a community to the class". Similarly, Emil mentions that "English is in a way our common platform for communicating in the classroom, as the multilingual children in my class meet English more often than Norwegian outside of school". He reports that the students with less linguistic competence in Norwegian than English are more active in the English lessons than in other subjects where the language of instruction is mainly Norwegian. Because of this, it seems that English lessons end up being the one subject where everyone has something to contribute with and where all the students are included.

Oral Skills

Another finding is that all the teachers reported that their multilingual students had higher competence in oral English than in writing. Berit shared that the two multilingual students in her group are very highly competent in oral English, and she thought that one explanation could be their multilingual background. It could also be that they spend much time on social media such as TikTok, YouTube and Instagram, where English is used "I would say that some of those who are multilingual have a higher competence, especially oral competence, than those who are "only" Norwegian, to put it that way". It seems that Berit's experience is that sometimes the multilingual students have higher oral English proficiency than the students with just Norwegian as L1 and English as their L2, especially when it comes to oral competence. Frida reports that her students also have a higher oral competence than written:

> This is common to most of my students. It is clear that the students have training in using the language orally. And they are comfortable using oral language, which can mean that they also use informal formulations in writing. It is probably because they are so confident in the oral part of the language.

Most of Frida's students are according to her more competent and comfortable using oral English than written, and she explains that one reason for this could be that they have a lot of

experience in using the language verbally. This could be an explanation for the high oral proficiency of Berit's students and it could also be why the students are reported to use informal language when they write.

Students as Resource in Class

Almost all the participants are reporting that they have multilingual students with high competence in English. Emil says that "in my class, it is the multilingual students who are strongest in English. It is the Norwegian students who need more support". As written above, Emil mentioned that many of the multilingual students in his class use English more than Norwegian outside of school. The students with only Norwegian as a home language would not get the same amount of oral English practice outside of class, and this can be an explanation to this issue. These multilingual students can be used as a resource in class, for instance, by putting them in pairs with students on a lower level for instance. Cato mentions a student that he considers to be a great resource to have in class:

> In one case, when we had project work recently, I paired him up with someone who could not…was not that fluent in English. And that had a huge effect on the way that he could teach the others quite a lot too, just as I did. Because of that, he is probably the one I use the most, simply because he functions a bit like an assistant teacher.

This shows that the student almost functions as an assistant teacher, because of his mastery of English. Cato is also placing this student in pairs with fellow students that benefits from his proficiency and support in tasks that may be a bit complicated for them, which I think is a clever way of using this special student's English proficiency as a resource in class. The two multilingual students in Berit's class are also reported by her to be a great resource "Sometimes they are so good that I would like to take them to 10th grade to show the students there how it should be done. They have a very good competence in English, so the resource here is fantastic, right". The two multilingual students in Berit's class seem to be wonderfully good at English, and Berit sees them as a resource to the rest of the class and believes they could even be a resource to older students because of their English competence. These multilingual students the teachers talk about obviously have excellent English skills and seem to be a resource to their teachers because of that.

Different Languages and Cultures as Resource

Exploring and getting to know different languages and cultures through multilingual students is mentioned by some of the teachers as a positive opportunity that comes with multilingualism in the classroom. Alf experienced that exploring the language of a student

with a minority language background opened for opportunities to learn about this particular student's culture and background, in a way the class otherwise would not have experienced "This is because when they have different language backgrounds, they can also have different cultural and geographical knowledge that other Norwegians may not have". Using multilingual students as a resource when learning about different languages and cultures is a good opportunity to learn about a multitude of things that are not necessarily in the curriculum.

Dagmar reports that ideally there are many opportunities for exciting and educational conversations and discussions rooted in the students' linguistic and cultural background, but that this is not easy to implement in practice:

> For example, in work with topics such as clash of cultures, typically Norwegian vs. English cultural forms/expressions or by focusing on the value of being able to communicate in a world language. All of these are topics that are represented within the competence goals in the English curriculum, and in this case students with a different language background naturally often have a broader experience base and many interesting references, examples and reflections that can create greater depth and more nuanced discussions about such topics. In general, however, my experience is that most people do not want special focus on their own language background or their ethnicity, so it is not so easy to initiate such professional discussions in class.

To take advantage of these opportunities it presupposes that the students are willing to share and take part in discussions. Dagmar also reports what she thinks could be an explanation for students not wanting special focus on their own language background or their ethnicity:

> My experience is that this is very difficult to achieve, as the students often do not want such a focus. I suggest this is easier to achieve on the lower levels, since it is a main goal for many of the older students to be just like everyone else and not be different.

Dagmar's experience is that the older students often do not want to stand out of the crowd and have the spotlight on them, and therefore, using their cultural and linguistic background as resource in class could be problematic.

5.3 Challenges in Multilingual Classes

In this section, I address the sub-question: "Do teachers experience any special challenges in English teaching related to the students' language background?".

Lack of Competence in Norwegian as L2 or L3

All the participant mentions that one of the major challenges arises when the students' Norwegian competence is poor. In those cases, the students probably lack some Norwegian

grammar and the common building blocks on which the rest of the teaching is based. When the reference language and the language of instruction is Norwegian this can become a problem for the students with poor Norwegian skills.

Cato says that he often uses Norwegian words and expressions to compare and describe in the English lessons, especially when working with grammar:

> If we are talking about verbs, for example, then I can compare yes, that's how we inflect in Norwegian. Degree inflection for example "høg- høgare-høgast". Then you can compare it in Norwegian and English to explain it. If the student does not know Norwegian well enough to understand this comparison it is a problem that influences the learning.

In this statement, Cato expresses that it is a problem that is influencing the learning of the students that do not have sufficient competence in Norwegian as L2 or L3 because they are going to have trouble understanding the instructions in Norwegian. Secondly, it could be challenging when students have had English as a subject in another country than Norway before they came here. Frida communicates that:

> These students often lack the basic grammar in English, and it can be hard for these students to get the word order right because the grammar is different in their L1 and because they do not know the Norwegian grammar well enough. These students do not have a set of basic language skills, something that makes them struggle in English.

Here the teacher describes that some students who have had English as subject in another country before they came to Norway, often lack basic knowledge of English grammar and syntax. She also reports that they often lack knowledge about the structure of the Norwegian language and that because they are missing these basic language skills, they end up struggling in English. The fact that the teacher describes her students as lacking when it comes to basic skills is interesting and probably worthy of criticism. Dagmar is also mentioning some challenges that may follow students with languages from completely different language families and that they could have specific difficulties related to grammar structures:

> Students from completely different language families may have specific difficulties related to other grammatical structures, such as the use of a specific and indefinite article, verbs that may be embedded in the subject, syntax, etc. This may require specific guidance as this is not a problem they share with the rest of the class, and which is, therefore, unsuitable for whole-class teaching.

Somehow, I think Dagmar and Frida are addressing a similar issue here, which is what they believe could be possible reasons to why students may struggle with acquiring English. Dagmar seems to have a good understanding of how students' difficulties with grammatical

32

structures and the like could be linked to their language background, and especially if the language originates from a completely different language family.

In addition to this, Dagmar mentions some other issues and challenges related to the student's language background:

> For instance, there are examples of students with specific reading and writing difficulties who are not detected because the problems are attributed to their foreign language background. In such cases, it takes a long time to uncover for example a dyslexic difficulty, and there are few mapping tools to make use of.

In this quote, Dagmar explains that students can have problems such as dyslexic difficulties that are hard to detect because the problems are attributed to their foreign language background. She also reports of another issue that can arise:

> I have also experienced that a multilingual background (for example with a German father, Lithuanian mother, have had a German stopover on the way to Norway, Norwegian school and friends, and English as communication at home) has led to difficulties in "landing" on any of the languages as the main language for communication, and subsequent confusion around grammatical structures, syntax, and semantic understanding, in addition to word acquisition and concept understanding in both Norwegian and English. This is still one of the exceptions but is a demanding and complex problem that requires very specific measures and special education. I have also experienced cases where language challenges led to the need for follow-up of the school health service due to problems related to identity and frustration related to a lack of receptive and expressive preconditions for creating an adequate social and professional interaction. In other words, there is every reason to pay special attention to the challenges these students often face.

What she explains here seems to be that some multilinguals can get confused by their languages, and some can struggle with deciding on which language to use as their main language of communication. She reports that it can even cause identity problems and frustration because the student may experience issues related to social and professional interaction because of this.

Teachers' Lack of Competence in this Topic

One last finding is that several of the teachers report that they do not feel that they have sufficient knowledge on this matter and that they are left to resolve these problems on their own. Cato puts it this way:

> People often talk about diversity and the challenges of education, and that's what I must refer to, mostly, since I am a recent graduate. But we talk very little about what you are going to do to get them involved. How should you explain to someone who can barely write Norwegian how to write sentences

in English? That, yes, so the only strategy I use is to try to pay extra attention to them when I have the opportunity, if they are in the classroom, not out with a special educator.

In this statement Cato reports in his opinion as a recent graduate, there was too little about this complex problem in teacher education. It also seems that he felt that he was not prepared to face these challenges. It does also seem like Cato find it very challenging to figure out good strategies by himself.

5.4 Strategies to support English learning in multilingual classes

In this section I address the last sub-question: "How do teachers work to support English learning in multilingual classes?".

As mentioned in section 5.2, one finding of the analysis shows that almost all the participants report that they have experience with multilingual students who have what they understand as a higher oral English proficiency than the average student. However, they also mention that there are students in their classes that lack knowledge of Norwegian and therefore need extra support. These students may be in the same English class, and in relation to that it will be a challenge to adapt the teaching to all of them. The participants reports that they have various strategies and ways they work to support English learning in the multilingual classroom.

Time and Attention

A first theme was that all the participants mention how important it is to spend some extra time on the students who need it to detect the students' individual needs and how to support them. Berit express it like this "we have a number of tools that we can use in relation to both Norwegian teaching and English teaching, but first we must discover "what is the need here?" and then we must agree on the strategies afterwards". In this quote Berit explains that there is a necessary step before they develop strategies and that is to find out what the needs are. Frida and Cato mention the importance of slowing down and taking som extra time to make sure everyone is included. Frida puts it like this:

> We must take our time. We need to take the time to practice pronunciation and put it in context. Get a picture of what we are talking about, and feel free to use visual and auditory aids to get the students connected. The strategy is first and foremost to slow down and take our time. And I am concerned with including everyone in the lessons.

In this statement, Frida explains that it is important to her to slow down and make progress in a tempo adjusted to the students to make sure everyone is included and that the students really understand the content of what is taught. Cato reports something similar, he emphasizes the

importance of checking in on the students during the lessons to make sure they know what to do and what the tasks are about:

> It's probably a good idea to try to pay them a little extra attention during the lesson, after review of the subject matter, double-check if the students have actually perceived what they are going to do and that they understand the instructions

What Cato is saying here is that he thinks it is important to take this extra time to make sure the students understand the instructions and the subject matter. Alf says that when he is teaching grammar, he can use some extra time to find out for example what the patterns for verb conjunction are on the students' L1 so they can understand it in English "I could spend time getting to know how verb conjunction or pronoun is in the students' first language instead of Norwegian or in addition to Norwegian. It takes a lot of time, but it is certainly an opportunity". What he explains here is that he sees it as a possibility for the teacher to spend the extra time to make translations of the subject matter in the students' L1 if there are students that do not understand the instruction language which is Norwegian.

Translation, Visualization, and Comparison

All the participants strived to provide students with the necessary tools they needed to follow the particular lesson. All the teachers mention translation as a strategy they use to support teaching. Emil reports that he uses Google Translate, gesturing, and concretization a lot during English class:

> If students are unsure of what the word means in English or Norwegian, we search together on google to see pictures and then we search on Google Translate to for example find the word in Arabic. This also goes both ways, if there is a word the students want to say, but do not have a translation for, then we try to spell the word in their language on google.

Since English is the language of communication and the common platform of understanding in Emil's student group, he mostly gives instructions in English. He repeats in Norwegian to the ones that do not understand the English explanation, and if there are some students that still do not understand, they find out together in class by using google to find the word or phrase in the students' L1 or search in google to see pictures. He explains that visualizing is a good tool if there is a word the student wants to share but only knows in his or her L1. The practice is somewhat different from Cato's class "We continuously translate for each other. Possibly, if there is anyone else who knows that word in English, then they are allowed to say it". Cato say that they translate for each other constantly, he does not mention whether they use any tools to translate or whether they just take it from their "head" consecutively. Dagmar

35

mentioned an example from a few years ago when she had some students in her English class that were learning basic Norwegian at the same time:

> In this case, learning English words was challenging because the Norwegian words also had no content for these students. Then the visualization in the form of pictures, film clips and physical demonstrations of for example verbs became an important part of the English teaching. The students also learned how to use the Google Translate function on their tablets in the work with the English language both at home and at school. In this way they could find the connection between words in their L1, Norwegian and English. They also practiced the strategy of typing the word in English and Norwegian and then doing an image search on the tablets. This is how they created a larger repertoire of concepts.

What Dagmar explains in this quote is that her experience of using google as a tool for learning is positive. The students she talks about in this example used Google Translate as support when they were on the beginner stage in both English and Norwegian, and because of this she reports that they managed to create a larger vocabulary. Unlike the others, Frida prefers dictionaries over Google "The students must have access to good dictionaries, including those that can translate from the mother tongue. There are many different online dictionaries, such as "Lexin" and "Clue" where the students can see the word in context". It seems that Frida thinks that the students learn more by using dictionaries, where they can see the word they lock up in context.

Comparing Languages in Class

Another finding was that all the teachers reported that they to a certain extent compared the students L1 with Norwegian and English. They did this either to play and explore, expand, or understand the students' understanding. Alf mentioned one example with a Russian student:

> We drew Russian which was the student's language into the teaching where we compared Russian, Norwegian and English words. We had to use Russian translations for the student to understand what we were doing in English. The teaching is traditionally based on a Norwegian language understanding, and this became a bit problematic since the student did not have sufficient competence in Norwegian.

In this quote Alf explains that they translated and compared the students L1 with English and Norwegian. This was accomplished so that the student could understand what they were doing in English and hopefully make some sense out of it with the Norwegian translation as well, since the student had low competence in Norwegian.

Another factor, when it comes to comparing languages, is that some of the teachers report they do it for fun, and that the students find it enjoyable. Emil reports that:

> By letting the students use their languages they have a lot of fun, and it creates unity and interest in others. If they learn a new word in English one can exclaim "yes, that's almost the same as in Tamil" and the like. They have much fun with words and languages in this class. We also go through similarities in different languages, but this does not happen exclusively in English lessons. The students themselves have heard that two languages in Europe are similar, and we have then seen on the map that it may be because they are close to each other.

Through this statement, he explains that he and his students had a lot of fun playing with words in the different languages in his class and that they discuss the similarities and differences between the words.

Frida says that multilingual students can be good support for the group. She mentions especially the student with English-language background, and the conversations they get about words and concepts because this particular student can be beneficial for all the students' learning "When working with synonyms, and with vocabulary, the student with an English-language background can be good support for the group. The conversations we get around different words and concepts can be a resource". In this quote, she explains why and how a student with an English-language background is a resource when working with synonyms and vocabulary. She does not mention any of the students with other language combinations, than the one with Norwegian and English as a resource. Therefore, the focus seems to be on English language learning here.

Pair Work

Both Berit, Alf, Cato, and Emil mention that students often get to work in pairs so that those who are strong in English can help the other students. Emil also lets the students with similar language backgrounds work together to help each other understand and make meaning of the content of the lessons:

> In English lessons, students often get to work in pairs, so that those who are strong in English can help and model for those who are not as linguistically strong. I have several students who speak the same language, so they also get the opportunity to help each other.

In this quote Emil explains that he uses the students that are ahead linguistically as partners fort the students that are a bit behind linguistically. He also reports that he lets the students with similar language backgrounds help each other with understanding and tasks.

Adapted Education

All the teachers report that they use adapted education in one way or another. Cato says he has been using a method where the students can choose which level to work on in class based

on their English level from "Level 1 (spor 1)" to "Level 3 (spor 3)", where level 1 is the easiest and level 3 is a more advanced language level. This is a method the students are familiar with from other subjects such as mathematics where they have differentiated textbooks "In mathematics, they often work with levels, and I have tried to transfer this concept to the English lessons. Not specifically for students of multilingual or majority language background, but I tried to adapt it to some extent". What he reports in this quote is that he has tried to use a method that works well in mathematics, where the students themselves assess what level they are on and choose one of the levels (1,2,3) based on this. I assume the teacher must always have three different arrangements, one for each level, which is probably very time-consuming.

A second finding is that it is best to help the students in a discreet way so they can participate and be a part of the ordinary class. Frida mentions that the fellow students probably understand what level their classmates are at and which of them needs extra help "For young people it is most important to be part of the "herd", so one must think about this while helping the students". It seems that Frida thinks it is important to arrange as discretely as possible so that the students do not have to share that they have special difficulties or needs with their classmates. This is supported by a statement from Berit:

> On a regular basis, I want there to be no major differences in the way they work, and that there will be no "us and them". I think about that a lot. I do not plan for big changes, but I like to focus on that, and then I often mean that we have investigated in advance what competence the students have, and then we take that as a starting point".

In this quote, she reports that it is important for her to avoid making a clear distinction between those who need extra support and the other students in the class.

Extra Support

Another factor some of the teachers mentions is that they sometimes have specific classes, beginners' courses, and one on one education with students that have little or no knowledge of English, and this is often combined with the students having little or no knowledge of Norwegian.

Both Berit and Cato both report that if there are students that are way behind the level of teaching and therefore need extra support, they have strengthening classes and special educators who take the students out of the ordinary class to give them adapted teaching on some areas for shorter or longer periods. Cato puts it this way: "The students in my group that

work with the special educator can for example get the same task as the rest of the class, except they do not have to answer in English. They are allowed to answer in Norwegian instead". One finding here can be that the students that receive adapted teaching with the special educator can focus on the content of the task instead of focusing on using the correct language since they are allowed to use Norwegian. In Berit's school they sometimes have arranged beginners' classes or intensive courses in English for newly arrived students and students that are behind on their linguistic proficiency:

> These intensive courses have been for both Norwegian students and multilingual students. In the beginning, we have a small test to check out the student's language level, and then together with a colleague, we decide on what strategy to use. Often, we focus more on oral competence than written.

In this quote, Berit explains that before they assign students to these courses and decide what strategy to use, the students must take a test to map their language level. They also often focus more on oral English than written in these classes. That could mean the teachers in this school believe it is more important to be able to communicate than to know the rules of grammar.

5.5 Summary

The analysis shows that five of the participants view multilingualism as when one is able to communicate in several languages. They focus on useful rather than perfect multilingualism. One of the teachers seems to have an understanding of multilingualism as being synonymous with having a minority language background. The teachers report of both opportunities and challenges they experience in multilingual classes. Finally, they seem to focus on multilingual students' English proficiency, but it is difficult for them to name ways in which other languages can be a resource in English teaching.

6. Discussion

In the sixth chapter, I discuss the findings of the study in light of theory, previous research, and political documents. The discussion is based on the research aim: *How do teachers relate to multilingualism in the language classroom?* Based on the research aim and the findings of the study, this part constitutes the answer to the aim.

6.1 Teachers' Conception of Multilingualism

Research shows that working methods that support multilingualism is relatively little used in EFL teaching (Flognfeldt M. , 2018) (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016) (Šurkalović, 2014). The teachers' relation to multilingualism in the classroom is both a challenge and an opportunity as shown in the Core Curriculum under Identity and Cultural Diversity "All pupils shall experience that being proficient in a number of languages is a resource, both in school and in society in large" (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019).

As pointed out in the Core Curriculum the teaching and training shall ensure that the students are confident in their language proficiency, that they develop language identity, and are able to use language to think, create meaning, communicate, and connect with others (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019). Like in Krulatz et al. (2018) most teachers express an understanding of the term, and that there are many different types of multilingualism and one can belong to a language majority or a minority and at the same time be multilingual. They also focus on having useful multilingualism rather than perfect language skills. In disagreement with this view, one of the teachers in Krulatz and Torgersen (2016) commented that she taught English was often studied as an object of linguistic analysis rather than a communication tool. One of the teachers in my study stands out by linking multilingualism to minority students. The attitude Berit refers to, by associating multilingualism with minorities is still a common attitude. This view may have its origin in the old way of looking at languages, which Garcia and Li (2019) refer to as a Nation-State Ideology, where all languages except from the majority language are seen as foreign.

In general, both in my study and in other research, Krulatz and Iversen (2020), teachers express very positive attitudes toward multilingualism and multilingualism as a resource, without necessarily being able to implement it into the teaching in a good way or at all. The teachers of my study see it solely as a positive phenomenon, both in relation to English teaching and language teaching in general. They also mention challenges related to it, but most importantly that there are great strengths. Teachers' perceptions of multilingualism in

Carlsen and Burner (2022) are similar to the findings of my study. The teaching staff of the introductory school reported of a high degree of awareness about the importance of L1 development and the benefits of multilingualism (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 41). In addition to this, all the teachers believe it is important that students develop their L1 competence. They also report of the importance of using the students' background knowledge and experiences with their L1s to learn new languages (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 42). Cummins (1980) illustrates this with an iceberg model where all the different languages in our linguistic repertoire influence and interact with each other (Jessner, 2008). In my study both Dagmar and Frida emphasize the importance of being skillful in L1 as a foundation for learning an L2 or L3 (Copland & Neokleous, 2010).

6.2 Opportunities in English Teaching Related to the Students' Language Background

There are several important findings regarding what the teachers consider as opportunities related to multilingualism and the student's language background in the EFL classroom. The three main findings from the analysis are about students as resources in class and insight into languages and cultures.

Students as Resource in Class

The teachers regard their multilingual students as a great resource in class in one way or another. Emil commented that in his class it was the multilingual students who were the strongest in English and that it was the monolingual students who needed more support. By pairing the multilingual students up with students who have lower competence in English, they can be used as a resource in class according to Emil. Cato mentions a student that is a great resource to the rest of the class because this student functions almost as an assistant teacher because of his high level of English. Berit reports similar conditions with the multilingual students in her class. She claims their English level is exceptional and that they are so good they could even be a resource to students on higher grades because of their competence. These findings are similar to what was discovered by Burner and Carlsen's (2022) study where a teacher mentioned that the students in his with the broadest language repertoire were also the fastest learners. There can be different reasons for this. One reason is that the student has a broad repertoire because he or she is a fast learner already, or it can be due to other socio-economic home-related factors (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 44). Emil explained that his students use English a lot to communicate outside of school, and he believes his students have high linguistic proficiency because they use English and other languages frequently in their daily life. This is parallel to the findings in Krulatz and

Torgersen (2016), who discovered that multilingual students were more aware of their own learning, used more learning strategies, and had a more complex knowledge of grammar than monolingual students. According to Cenoz (2013) multilingual people often are more successful than monolingual ones when it comes to completing tasks that require the ability to pay attention to formal aspects of linguistic units, and they are reported to have a high degree of communicative sensitivity and cognitive flexibility.

Both Berit and Frida report that their multilingual students have higher oral proficiency than the proficiency they have in writing. They do also seem to have higher oral proficiency compared to the monolingual students in class. Frida's students are so comfortable using the language orally that she suggests it influences their writing. Her students use informal formulations, and she thinks the reason could be that they listen to and use informal English orally. This is supported by Sundquist and Sylvén (2016), with their research on extramural English. Extramural English is the English the students learn outside of school (Sundquist & Sylvén, 2016). In Flognfeldt (2018), the opposite was reported. In her study it was found that many students were hesitant about speaking English, and it seemed that the students were holding back, even when they got support about how to say something (p. 240). This is similar to what Krulatz et al. (2016) found out about the lack of strategies and scaffolding that disadvantaged the multilingual students in comparison to their Norwegian-speaking peers. Some of them were unable to follow the oral instructions, and their participation in oral activities was limited. However, Flognfeldt and Lund (2016) claim that learners of English in Norwegian basic education are expected to learn how to communicate and that the main aim for any English teacher should be to help learners develop their communicative competence (p. 21).

Insight Into Languages and Cultures

Multilingual students are shown to be an asset in class when learning about different languages and cultures. These students may have the knowledge we never would have gained without them. Dagmar states that ideally there are many opportunities for exciting and educational conversations and discussions rooted in the student's linguistic background. However, her experience is that this is difficult to implement in practice and that the students often do not want to share or have a special focus on their language background or their ethnicity. She believes the reason for this could be that students this age often want to be just like everyone else, and therefore, spotlighting their cultural and linguistic background could

be problematic. Beiler (2021) explains that this relates to the social stigma of being a minority, especially if students have a non-Western background. However, she also argues that this stigma is something that teachers ought to challenge, not by forcing it on the students, but rather challenge the stigma by fighting bias and racism in school and society (Beiler, 2021).

6.3 Challenges in English teaching related to the students' language background

Both teachers, as well as researchers, report what can be seen as different challenges in relation to multilingualism in the language classroom. Three main findings on what the teachers see as challenges emerged in this study. The first is confusion on what language to choose for students with several languages, the second challenge they report is when the students have little proficiency in Norwegian as L2, and finally, it was found that the teachers feel they do not have enough competence in this topic.

Students' Lack of Proficiency in Norwegian as L2 or L3

English teaching in Norway is proved to have less focus on grammar than in many other countries, which is in line with the findings from my study which say that teachers emphasize that most importantly students should be able to communicate. Compared to the Polish English teaching, the Norwegian school is described as content-oriented whereas the polish is more language-focused (Scheffler, Horverak, Krzebietke, & Askland, 2017, p. 207). Nevertheless, learning of grammar and language structure emerges as a source of problems in the study. All the teachers of my study state that one of the major challenges is when students' Norwegian proficiency in Norwegian as L2 or L3 is poor. In Flognfeldt (2018) the students' language proficiency generally is described in negative terms, such as "poor when it comes to language", which is similar to what some of my teachers reported about their students. Cato reports that he often uses Norwegian words and expressions for instruction and to explain in class, especially when working with grammar. Christison et al. (2021) found that lessons consisted mostly of teacher-centered instruction. When the students have poor proficiency in Norwegian as L2 or L3 they are probably missing out on a lot in the lessons because Norwegian is used so much and their L1s are rarely used at all. This argument is supported by Burner and Carlsen (2022) where the teachers highlighted the difficulty of learning English as an L3 for students who lacked competence in their L2 (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 42). One teacher in their study also mentioned that English and Norwegian are typologically close to each other and therefore could cause confusion for students that were learning them both at the same time (Burner & Carlsen, 2022). It can also cause confusion if the students' language

43

belongs to a completely different language family than English or Norwegian. Dagmar describes that these students may have "specific difficulties related to other grammatical structures, such as the use of a specific and indefinite article, verbs that may be embedded in the subject, syntax, and so on". This is supported by "The Separate Underlying Proficiency" which assumes the acquisition of languages happens at the expense of others because the brain only has the capacity for one language at a time (Cummins, 1980).

On the other hand, Flognfeldt (2018) found that the teachers believe that their students have a lot of knowledge that is not made visible in the classroom. Therefore, it is important that teachers realize the importance of translanguaging, and that it is a normal practice among bilingual students as the language mix will not lead to them becoming linguistically confused (Krulatz et al., 2018, p. 139). Translanguaging as a linguistic practice should therefore be seen as something positive and beneficial for students' general development. One of the teachers in Beiler's (2020) research allows the student to use the language that expresses the student's ideas in the best possible way. The student can use his or her linguistic repertoire in the initial phase of a writing assignment, and thus this teacher creates a space for multilingualism in the classroom (Beiler, 2020, p. 13).

Deciding on a Language

For the students with more than one L1 it can be confusing and also difficult to decide on which language to choose as the L1. Dagmar had experienced that this had led to difficulties in "landing on" any of the languages and subsequent confusion around grammatical structures, syntax and semantic understanding, word acquisition, and concept understanding in both Norwegian and English. Flognfeldt (2018) found that the learners might not be very proficient in Norwegian, and therefore, introducing another language can make them more confused. In the literature this is sometimes referred to as Semilingualism, which is a discredited theory, first introduced by Swedish philologist Nils Erik Hansegard who called it *halvspråklighet*. It is described as when a person abandons his or her L1 in favor of an imperfectly acquired L2 (Martin-Jones & Romaine, 1986). Flognfeldt (2018) reported that multilingual students with several languages could end up with only medium proficiency in all of them because of to many languages to deal with. Dagmar has experience with more serious issues related to this which led to the need for follow-up of the school health service because of problems connected to identity and frustration related to lack of receptive and expressive preconditions for creating an adequate social professional interaction.

Teachers' Reported Lack of Competence

Finally, the teachers describe a lack of competence among themselves. Cato and others with him are blaming the teachers' education and do not feel prepared to meet the challenges that may arise. He puts it this way "How can one explain to someone who can barely write Norwegian how to write sentences in English?". The teachers seem to be despairing over the situation. This is supported by the findings of Neokleous and Ofte's (2020) research on the attitudes toward use of MT in EFL environments, where the teachers felt guilty about the presence of MT. The teachers did also demand clearer guidelines in the curriculum (Neokleous & Ofte, 2020).

The importance of teachers having good competence in multilingualism in the EFL classroom was illustrated by Krulatz and Torgersen (2016) where the teachers wanted more education and training on how to handle multilingualism in the classroom. The teachers in the research of Christison et al. (2021) needed more theoretical and practical knowledge. Šurkalović (2014) found that the participants of her study did not have the competence they needed to face the multilingual EFL classroom, exactly as the teachers in my study. Krulatz et al. (2016) reported that the teachers were unaware of the cognitive benefits of being multilingual, nor were they able to elaborate on the linguistic advantages (p. 59). Like the participants of Šurkalovićs study, these teachers commented that their teaching degrees had not prepared them to work with students of multilingual and multicultural backgrounds. Flognfeldt (2018) suggests that more knowledge is needed on the multilingual challenges and opportunities in our society (Flognfeldt, 2018). Even though multilingualism is viewed by teachers and educators as a great resource, research shows that many teachers of classes with cultural and linguistic diversity are not well enough prepared to meet the students' needs when it comes to language education (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p. 5). However, in the new master-level teachers' education, there is an explicit learning outcome for English teachers which says that the students must know how to make use of multilingualism as a resource in the classroom (Flognfeldt, 2018).

6.4 Strategies to Support English Learning

The analysis of the results suggests that the teachers do little to support multilingualism in the EFL classroom. Some teachers also believe they must master the different L1s to a certain degree to use them as resources in class. Using the students' L1 as a resource in Norwegian teaching does not require that the teachers have competence in the relevant languages (García & Li, 2019). However, they report of some strategies they use to support English learning in

the multilingual classroom. The teachers report a variety of strategies they currently use or have experience using. These are strategies and activities which are not specific to multilingual classes and are probably just as likely to be used in all classes around the country for different purposes. Translanguaging as a teacher-led activity has been shown to have positive outcomes, but despite this, it is not a widespread practice in schools (García & Li, 2019, p. 147). There is no systematically planned translanguaging among the strategies mentioned in my study, but some of them make room for spontaneous translanguaging (García & Li, 2019, p. 95). The strategies I have identified are pair work, translation, visualization, and comparison. Due to the scope of the thesis, I cannot discuss all the strategies.

Comparison and Translation

All the teachers mention translation as a strategy they use in class. Some of them reported of translating mainly into Norwegian, which is a common practice in language classrooms around the country. This is supported by Krulatz and Torgersen (2016) who found that in most of the observed classes, there seemed to be a heavy reliance on translation into Norwegian, either to make sure the students understood every word they read or heard or when giving task instructions (Krulatz & Torgersen, 2016, p. 62). Flognfeldt (2018) observed that teachers mainly translated from English into Norwegian. This tendency is reported by teachers in my study as well. Cato reported that in his class they translated all the time to make sure everyone could understand every word and phrase. Translation as a strategy gives multilingual students the opportunity to learn language and content through translanguaging because students can have a basic understanding of the L1. It is therefore important to create a translingual space as we see the teacher in the study of Beiler (2020) has done by letting the student write in the language the student masters in the initial phase of a task. The development of the vocabulary of a multilingual student is related to the size of the vocabulary in the L1. All the teachers in my study report that they to a certain extent practice comparison, where they compare the L1 with Norwegian and English. This practice is in line with the learning aims from LK20 which states that "after year two, the students shall find words that are common in English and other languages with which the pupil is familiar" (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2019). Alf has a Russian student in his class, and they compared Russian with Norwegian and English, both to help the student understand, but also to explore the Russian words together in class. Krulatz et al. (2018) emphasize the importance of creating an inclusive environment, where all languages are respected, visible, and appreciated

in teaching. In Emil's class, they compare and translate both for educational purposes and for fun "by letting the students use their languages they have a lot of fun; it creates unity and interest in others". This is supported by Burner and Carlsen (2022), who found that integrating the students' L1 into the language lesson has a positive effect on the students' attitudes. "It is an advantage that they know the words we talk about in their mother tongue. When they don't know a word, I like to ask what it is in their mother tongue. They think presenting their language is fun" (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 45).

García and Li (2019) mention that allowing students to use translation programs to gain an understanding of the content of the subject is a good idea (p.90). If teachers facilitate such activities, it is called pedagogical translanguaging (García & Li, 2019, p. 105). Some of the teachers argue that Google is a useful tool in teaching. They use Google both for translation purposes and to search for pictures to visualize words and meaning. It has previously been argued for the didactic value of translation as teacher-led activity in the teaching of for example EFL (Krulatz & Iversen, 2020).

Dagmar explains that her experience of using Google to achieve communicative goals is positive. Her students use it to translate, and as a tool to visualize and make meaning of words that are unfamiliar and unknown to the students by searching for pictures, film clips, and physical demonstrations. She mentions that her students develop larger vocabularies by using Google as a tool, and reports that this strategy is especially effective for the students with little knowledge of English, Norwegian or both. Emil also finds Google beneficial, and it is frequently used in class to translate words into the students' L1 and to search for pictures to concretize. In contrast, Beiler and Dewilde (2020), found that teachers were more often skeptical about using Google Translate as an aid in teaching. The teachers' main concern was using Google Translate for sentence-leveled translation, which they felt posed problems both for producing well-formed sentences and having students author their own text in English (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020, p. 539). One of the teachers in their study also reported that he taught the students to use it for single words instead of translating to generate text (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020, p. 539). A teacher in the study of Burner and Carlsen mentioned that Google Translate entailed some challenges as it often produced wrong translations (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 45). This is supported by one of the teachers in my study that rather would use online dictionaries such as Lexin or Clue, where the words are put into context.

Beiler and Dewilde (2020) reported that several students expressed ambivalent attitudes to translation. Their attitudes ranged in skepticism to translation, and the students pointed out

47

both benefits and challenges of translation. One advantage was that translating gave them more opportunities to draw on their multilingual repertoire in the English subject, and for the multilingual students, translation provided opportunities to activate their linguistic resources (Beiler & Dewilde, 2020). As one of the teachers in my study, Emil, reported Google Translate is a good way to include the students' L1s in the classroom activities. They search for words in for example Arabic together in class. Flognfeldt et al. (2020) found that incorporating multilingual practices can improve minority students' linguistic achievements on a long-term basis. There are also seen positive effects of translanguaging on grammar, content and vocabulary (Prilutskaya & Knoph, 2020).

Pair work

Another strategy the teachers use is pair work. Some of them pair students with common L1s together to help each other as learning partners. The teachers also group students with different language skills so that the ones with more proficiency in the subject can help and support students with less. In Beliers (2020) research, it was found that teachers draw on students' L1s in various ways, for example by grouping students by language background to scaffold each other's writing (Beiler, 2020, p. 7). Christison et. al (2021) did also find that their participants paired students with the same L1 up so they could help each other. Teachers should make room for interaction and discussion in class, and by working together in groups or pairs students should be allowed to clarify key concepts in their L1 (Cummins, 1981). Working together like this gives the students the opportunity to translanguage naturally to create meaning to the content of the teaching (García & Li, 2019). In Beiler (2020), we see that the students use each other and that it both promotes learning and is inclusive at the same time. If the teachers are lucky enough to have students with similar L1s in their classes, I think this must be a good way of scaffolding language learning and a great strategy to use.

6.5 Multilingualism as a Recourse

Ruíz's orientation in language planning considers language as a resource that can strengthen the status of languages, and also reduce the tension between the languages (Ruíz, 1984). When teachers say that their multilingual students have such high linguistic proficiency that they almost function as assistant teachers, they refer to an understanding of multilingualism as a resource in class. Another finding that points towards an understanding of multilingualism as a resource is the opportunity to gain insight into new cultures and languages from multilingual students.

6.6 Multilingualism as a Problem

Ruíz also has an orientation called language as problem (Ruíz, 1984). There are some approaches to multilingualism as a problem in the findings of my study. For instance, what the teachers say about the students' insufficient proficiency in Norwegian and therefore have trouble acquiring English as L3. This seems to be a problem because the students are not able to fully understand the language of instruction which is Norwegian. Even though the student's language skills generally are valued by the teachers, their L1s also cause tensions since teachers believe they are harmful to L2 learning (Burner & Carlsen, 2022, p. 46). These views are similar to what is found in In language as a problem, where monolingualism in the dominant majority language is valued, and minority language speakers are defined based on their missing abilities in the majority language (Ruíz, 1984). Another finding that points to an understanding of multilingualism as a problem is that one of the participants seem to view multilingualism synonymous with minority languages or students.

7. Conclusion

This thesis aimed to answer: *How do teachers relate to multilingualism in the language classroom?* To answer this main research aim, I have developed four research questions:

How do teachers conceive multilingualism? Do teachers experience any special opportunities in English teaching related to the students' language background? Do teachers experience any special challenges in English teaching related to the students' language background? What are teachers' strategies to support English in multilingual classes?

According to my study, all the teachers conceive multilingualism as a resource, and five of them chose to focus on a useful multilingualism rather than perfect language skills. One of the teachers stands out in that she associates multilingualism especially with minority students. Regarding what the teachers see as opportunities related to the student's language backgrounds, one main finding is that they all view multilingual students with high linguistic proficiency as a resource. They also see multilingualism as a great opportunity to gain insight into different languages and cultures. The challenges experienced by the teachers are when the students lack proficiency in Norwegian as L2 or L3 and the fact that the teachers themselves feel that their competence in the field is insufficient. Research says that teachers and students in the teacher's education do not have the required knowledge on how to teach a second or foreign language in the multilingual classroom today. The teachers need more knowledge and understanding of multilingualism and how to use the different L1s appropriately. This indicates that teaching methods of foreign languages such as English must change to accommodate students with varying language backgrounds instead of just supporting the learning of English. Researchers also commented that English teachers need better didactic competence to support the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity, something the teachers of my study agree on. I believe the teacher's education should focus even more on language competence so that future teachers will be well prepared and have the right tools to handle the challenges in teaching and guidance of multilingual students. Teachers' strategies to support English teaching in multilingual classrooms are pair work, translation, visualization, comparison, adapted education, time and attention.

7.1 Implications of the study and suggestions for further research

As this study has shown, it seems teachers have a way to go when it comes to including the students' first languages in the teaching. Instead, the teachers seem to focus on how to best support English teaching in the multilingual classroom.

As this study is a small study with just a few participants, it does not provide a complete picture of how teachers relate to multilingualism in the EFL classrooms in general. To gain relevance, I should have had a more extensive set of data, and this study did not have the scope for that. Nevertheless, I believe that the findings can be transferred to the situation of other teachers with multilingual students. I still think it would be interesting to build on this research aim to see how a more significant number of teachers relate to the issue. I hope that English teachers will become more aware of using their students' first language as a resource, not only how to support English teaching in these linguistically diverse classes. Teachers must be aware of how they can use translingual strategies and create room for multilingualism in the teaching.

I want this master's thesis to help make teachers more aware of how important it could be to use the students' first languages as a resource in teaching. This should be done in one way or another, even though the teachers do not master the students' different languages. The period I have worked with this thesis has taught me a lot about multilingualism in the language classroom and how some teachers conceive it. I have personally grown as a teacher by gaining insight into multilingual classrooms. This is something I will bring with me as I have become more aware of the challenges teachers face connected to the languages of their students.

8. References

Anker, T. (2019). *Analyse i praksis: En håndbok for masterstudenter.* Oslo: Cappelen Damm.

Beiler, I. R. (2020). Negotiating multilingual resources in English writing instruction for recent immigrants to Norway. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(1), pp. 5-29. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.535

Beiler, I. R. (2021). Marked and unmarked translanguaging in accelerated, mainstream, and sheltered English classrooms. *Multilingua, 40*(1), pp. 107-138. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2020-0022

Beiler, I. R., & Dewilde, J. (2020). Translation as translingual writing practice in English as an additional language. *Modern Language Journal, 104*(3), pp. 533–549. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12660

Burner, T., & Carlsen, C. (2022). Teacher qualifications, perceptions and practices concerning multilingualism at a school for newly arrived students in Norway. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 19*(1), pp. 35-49. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1631317

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(1), pp. 71-87. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F13670069030070010501

Cenoz, J. (2013). The influence of bilingualism on third language acquisition: Focus on multilingualism. *Language Teaching, 46(1)*, pp. 71-86. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000218

Christison, M., Krulatz, A., & Sevinç, Y. (2021). Supporting Teachers of Multilingual Young Learners: Multilingual Approach to Diversity in Education (MADE). In A. Wolanin, & J. Rokita-Jaśkow, *Facing Diversity in Child Foreign Language Education.* Switzerland: Springer Nature AG.

Copland, F., & Neokleous, G. (2011). L1 to teach L2: complexities and contradictions. *ELT Journal*, 18, pp. 270-280.https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq047

Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In I. Alatis, *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 81-104). Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). California State Department of Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Dahl, A., & Krulatz, A. (2016). Engelsk som tredjespråk: Har lærere kompetanse til å støtte flerspråklighet? *Acta Didactica Norge*.

Drew, I., & Sørheim, B. (2009). *English Teaching Strategies.* Oslo: Samlaget.

Eikrem, B. O. (2006). Between 'filling up harddisks' and 'looking for talents and creativity'*: teaching English as a foreign language in the 21st century: Perceptions, attitudes, dilemmas, types of talk and educational needs.* Oslo: Faculty of Education, University of Oslo.

Flognfeldt, M. (2018). Teaching and learning English in multilingual early primary classrooms. In K. P. (Eds.), *Den viktige begynneropplæringen: En forskningsbasert tilnærming* (pp. 229-248). Universitetsforlaget.

Flognfeldt, M. E., & Lund, R. E. (2016). *English for Teachers and Learners.* Oslo: Cappelen damm akademisk.

Flognfeldt, M., Šurkalović, D., Tishakov, T., & Tsagari, D. (2020). The practice of assessing Norwegian and English language proficiency in multilingual elementary school classrooms in Norway. *Language Assessment Quarterly: An International Journal, 17*(6), pp. 520-540. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2020.1827409

Garcia, O., & Li, W. (2014). Translanguaging in Education: Principles , implications and challenges. In O. Garcia, & L. Wei, *Translanguaging: language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 119-135). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

García, O., & Li, W. (2019). *Transspråking: Språk, flerspråklighet og opplæring.* Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Garcia, O., & Sylvan, C. (2011). Pedagogies and Practices in Multilingual Classrooms: Singularities in Pluralities. *Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), pp. 385-400. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01208.x

Hult, F. M., & Hornberger, N. H. (2016). Revisiting Orientations in Language Planning: Problem, Right, and Resource as an Analytical Heuristic. *The Bilingual review, 33*(3), pp. 30-43. https://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/476

Jessner, U. (2008). Teaching third languages: Findings, trends and challenges. *Language Teaching, 41*(1), pp. 15-56. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004739

Johannesen, L. E., Rafoss, T. W., & Rasmussen, E. B. (2018). *Hvordan bruke teori: Nyttige verktøy i kvalitativ analyse.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Johannessen, A., Tufte, P. A., & Kristoffersen , L. (2009). *Introduksjon til samfunnsvitenskaplig metode* (4 ed.). Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti, *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 496-571). Oxford: Blackwell.

Krulatz, A., & Iversen, J. (2020). Building Inclusive Language Classroom Spaces through Multilingual Writing Pratctices for Newly-Arrived Students in Norway. *Scandinavian Journal of Education Research, 63*(4), pp. 372-388. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2018.1557741

Krulatz, A., & Torgersen, E. (2016). The role of the EFL classroom in maintaining multilingual identities: Issues and considerations in Sør-Trøndelag public schools. In E. Mackinney, S. Keyl, C. Amanti, & J. Alvarez Valencia, *Critical Views on Teaching and Learning English Around the Globe* (pp. 53-68). Information Age Publishing.

Krulatz, A., Dahl, A., & Flognfeldt, M. E. (2018). *Enacting Multilingualism.* Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2019). *Competence aims and assessment (ENG01-04).* Hentet fra Utdanningsdirektoratet: https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv1?lang=eng

Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2019). *Identitet og kulturekt mangfold.* Retrieved from Utdanningsdirektoratet: https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.2-identitet-og-kulturelt-mangfold/

Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2019). *Undervisning og tilpasset opplæring.* Retrieved from Utdanningsdirektoratet: https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/3.-prinsipper-for-skolens-praksis/3.2-undervisning-og-tilpasset-opplaring/

Kvale , S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing.* United States of America: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lightbown, P. M. (2000). Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 21*(4), pp. 431-462. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.4.431

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2015). *Designing Qualitative Research* (6 ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc.

Martin-Jones, M., & Romaine, S. (1986). Semilingualism: A half-baked theory of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), pp. 26-38. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/7.1.26

Neokleous, G., & Ofte, I. (2020). In-service teacher attitudes toward the use of the mother tongue in Norwegian EFL classrooms. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology, 8*(2), pp. 68-88. https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v8i2.436

NESH. (2021). *Forskningsetiske retningslinjer for samfunnsvitenskap og humaniora.* Retrieved from Forskningsetikk.no: https://www.forskningsetikk.no/retningslinjer/hum-sam/forskningsetiske-retningslinjer-for-samfunnsvitenskap-og-humaniora/

Nesse, K. (2008). Multilingualism: Challenges facing minority background pupils learning English as a third language in Norwegian primary schools. *[Masteroppgave]*.

Nikula, T., & Moore, P. (2016). Exploring translanguaging in CLIL. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1254151

Nilssen, V. (2012). *Analyse i kvalitative studier. Den skrivende forskeren.* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Opplæringslova. (1998). *Lov om grunnskolen og den vidaregåande opplæringa.* Retrieved from Lovdata: https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/1998-07-17- 61#KAPITTEL_2

Oslo Kommune. (2021). *Andel minoritetsspråklige elever i grunnskolen 2020/2021.* Hentet fra https://statistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no/webview/index.jsp?study=http%3A%2F%2Fstatistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no%3A80%2Fobj%2FfStudy%2FMinsprakGS2&cu

be=http%3A%2F%2Fstatistikkbanken.oslo.kommune.no%3A80%2Fobj%2FfCube%2FFMinsprakGS2_C1&mode=cube&v=2&top=yes&l

Pietikäinen, S. L.-K. (2011). Frozen actions in the Arctic linguistic landscape: A nexus analysis of language process in visual space. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 8*(4), pp. 277-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2011.555553

Prilutskaya, M. (2020). Writing in L2: Norwegian Students' Use of Translanguaging at the Draft Stage. *Nordic Journal of Modern Language Methodology, 8*(2), pp. 1-26.

Prilutskaya, M. (2021). Examining Pedagogical Translanguaging: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Languages , 6*(180). https://doi.org/10.3390/languages6040180

Prilutskaya, M., & Knoph, R. (2020). Research on three L2 writing conditions: Students' perceptions and use of background languages when writing in English. *Cogent Education, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1832179

Prilutskaya, M., Knoph, R., & Hanssen, J. A. (2020). The Use of Students' Linguistic Resources in Teaching English as an Additional Language in Norway.

Regjeringen. (2019, Mars 5). *Minoritetsspråkpakten*. Retrieved from Regjeringen: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/urfolk-og-minoriteter/nasjonale-minoriteter/midtspalte/minoritetssprakpakta/id86936/

Regjeringen. (2022). *Nasjonale minoriteter*. Retrieved from Regjeringen.no: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/tema/urfolk-og-minoriteter/nasjonale-minoriteter/id1404/

Rudi, I. B. (2018). *De nasjonale minioritetene i Norge*. Hentet fra Nasjonal digital læringsarena: https://ndla.no/subject:1:e0a0faa8-cefd-481f-bf79-b45ad4d7c5e7/topic:3:182163/topic:3:184527/topic:3:169760/resource:1:184715

Ruíz, R. (1984, https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8*(2), pp. 15-34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Scheffler, P., Horverak, M. O., Krzebietke, W., & Askland, S. (2017). Language background and learners' attitudes to own-language use. *ELT Journal, 71*(2), pp. 198-217. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw058

Silverman, D. (2014). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction.* London: SAGE.

Simensen, A. M. (2007). *Teaching a foreign language: Principles and Procedures.* Fagbokforlaget.

SSB. (2022). *Innvandrere og norskfødte med innvandrerforeldre.* Retrieved from Statistisk sentralbyrå: https://www.ssb.no/statbank/table/09817/

Sundquist, P., & Sylvén, L. (2016). *Extramural English in Teaching and Learning: From Theory and Research to Practice.* Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46048-6

Thagaard, T. (2018). *Systematikk og innlevelse; En innføring i kvalitative metoder* (Vol. 5). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2020). *Identity and cultural diversity.* Hentet fra Utdanningsdirektoratet: https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/opplaringens-verdigrunnlag/1.2-identitet-og-kulturelt-mangfold/?lang=eng

Østberg, S. (2010, Juni 1). *Mangfold og mestring. Flerspråklige barn, unge og voksne i opplæringssystemet (NOU 2010:7).* Retrieved from Regjeringen: https://www.regjeringen.no/no/dokumenter/NOU-2010-7/id606151/sec1

Šurkalović, D. (2014). Forbereder grunnskolelærerutdanningen engelsklærere for undervisning i engelsk som tredjespråk i Norge? *Acta Didactica Norge, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.1129

9. Appendix

9.1 Appendix 1: Interview Guide

<div align="center">

Intervjuguide

</div>

Introduksjon

- Presentere meg selv og prosjektet
- Understreke at personen vil være anonym, at det er frivillig og at personen når som helst kan trekke seg og unngå å svare på spørsmål om man ikke vil
- Ingen svar er feil eller riktige. Alle svar er gode svar.

Kartlegging av engelskundervisning for flerspråklige elever

Bakgrunn om læreren

- På hvilket trinn underviser du?
- Hvor lenge har du jobbet som lærer?
- Hvilke språk har du selv kompetanse i?
    o Ser du på deg selv som flerspråklig?

Undervisningspraksis

- Hvordan vil du beskrive elevgruppen din/elevgruppene dine når det gjelder engelsknivå og språkbakgrunn? (minne om taushetsplikt)
- Hvor mye erfaring har du med undervisning av flerspråklige elever i engelsk?
    o Hvordan vil du definere flerspråklighet?
- Opplever du noen spesielle muligheter i engelskundervisningen knyttet til elevenes språkbakgrunn?
- Opplever du noen utfordringer knytt til elevenes språkbakgrunn? I så fall hvilke?
- Hvordan jobber du for å støtte flerspråklige/minoritetsspråklige elever i engelskundervisningen?
    o Bruker du egne strategier for å nå de minoritetsspråklige elevene med engelskundervisningen?
- Hvilke språk bruker du og elevene i engelsktimene?
    o (Hvilke språk får elevene bruke i engelsktimen?)

- Hva betyr det for deg å benytte den flerspråklige kompetansen til elevene som ressurs i engelskundervisningen din?

- Ønsker du å legge til noe?

Avslutning

- Takke for deltakelse.

- Forklare hva som skjer videre med prosjektet (databehandling, transkribering og sletting av data ved prosjektets slutt).

Informasjonsskriv og samtykkeerklæring

"Teaching English as a Foreign Language in the Multilingual Classroom"

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et intervju hvor formålet er å undersøke hvordan lærere forholder seg til flerspråklighet i engelskundervisningen. I dette skrivet vil du få informasjon om hva deltakelse i prosjektet vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Jeg studerer lektorutdanning ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet med fordypning i engelsk. Jeg skal utføre en kvalitativ undersøkelse for min masteroppgave der jeg vil intervjue 5-6 lærere om hvordan de forholder seg til flerspråklighet i engelskundervisningen. Prosjektet vil gi et innblikk i hvordan lærere oppfatter fenomenet og hvordan de jobber for å støtte og inkludere minoritetsspråklige elever i engelskundervisningen.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

OsloMet - storbyuniversitetet er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Jeg skal intervjue 5-6 lærere som underviser engelsk i grunnskolen. Jeg kommer til å intervjue 3 lærere i fra skoler i Oslo-området og 2-3 engelsklærere fra skoler i distriktene.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Dersom du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at du stiller til intervju med meg. Det vil ta ca. 15-20 minutter. Intervjuet vil bli holdt på norsk eller engelsk. Spørsmålene vil handle om hvordan du som engelsklærer opplever å undervise i flerspråklige engelskklasser. Du vil bli anonymisert, og det skal ikke være mulig å spore tilbake til deg. Intervjuet vil bli registrert ved lydopptak og eventuelle notater undervegs.

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i prosjektet. Dersom du velger å delta, kan du når som helst trekke samtykket tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle dine personopplysninger (navn,

kontaktinformasjon, lydopptak) vil da bli slettet. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for deg hvis du ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke deg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om deg til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette skrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket. Tilgangen til dine opplysninger vil være tilgjengelige for masterstudenten og veileder.

Hva skjer med opplysningene dine når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Opplysningene fra deg blir anonymiserte når prosjektet avsluttes/oppgaven er godkjent, senest desember 2022.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra Oslo Metropolitan University har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke opplysninger vi behandler om deg, og å få utlevert en kopi av opplysningene,
- å få rettet opplysninger om deg som er feil eller misvisende,
- å få slettet personopplysninger om deg, og
- å sende klage til Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Dersom du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å vite mer om eller benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

- *Oslo Metropolitan University* ved:
  Ingrid M. Rodrick Beiler, førsteamanuensis, ingrid.rodrickbeiler@oslomet.no

- Vårt personvernombud ved LUI: personvernombud@oslomet.no

Dersom du har spørsmål knyttet til NSD sin vurdering av prosjektet, kan du ta kontakt med:

- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no)
  eller på telefon: 53 21 15 00.

Med vennlig hilsen

Ingrid M. Rodrick Beiler   *Maria Halsen Brandal*

(veileder)

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet «Teaching English as a Foreign
Language in the Multilingual Classroom» og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål.

Jeg samtykker til:

☐ å delta i *intervju*

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet

----

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

9.3 Appendix 3: Approval from NSD (Godkjenning fra Norsk Senter for Forskingsdata (NSD))

NSD NORSK SENTER FOR FORSKNINGSDATA

Vurdering

Referansenummer

565834

Prosjekttittel

Teaching English as a Foreign Language in the Multilingual Classroom

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet / Fakultet for lærerutdanning og internasjonale studier / Institutt for grunnskole- og faglærerutdanning

Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)

Ingrid M. Rodrick Beiler , ingrid.rodrickbeiler@oslomet.no, tlf: 93271530

Type prosjekt

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

Kontaktinformasjon, student

Maria Halsen Brandal, s177031@oslomet.no, tlf: 46822362

Prosjektperiode

20.12.2021 - 31.12.2022

Vurdering (1)

06.01.2022 - Vurdert

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen, så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet den 06.01.2022 med vedlegg, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og Personverntjenester. Behandlingen kan starte.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET
Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige personopplysninger frem til 31.12.2022.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG
Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 nr. 11 og 7, ved at det er en

frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse, som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake.

For alminnelige personopplysninger vil lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 a.

TAUSHETSPLIKT
Informantene i prosjektet er lærer, og har taushetsplikt. Det er viktig at intervjuene gjennomføres slik at det ikke registreres taushetsbelagte opplysninger. Vi anbefaler at dere minner informantene om dette i forbindelse med intervjuene

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER
Personverntjenester vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i personvernforordningen:

• om lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
• formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke viderebehandles til nye uforenlige formål
• dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
• lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet.

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER
Vi vurderer at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18) og dataportabilitet (art. 20).

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER
Personverntjenester legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

OneDrive og Nettskjema Diktafon er databehandlere i prosjektet. NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene til bruk av databehandler, jf. art 28 og 29. Ved eventuell bruk av andre databehandlere (spørreskjemaleverandør, skylagring eller videosamtale) må behandlingen oppfylle kravene til bruk av databehandler, jf. art 28 og 29. Bruk leverandører som din institusjon har avtale med.

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER
Dersom det skjer vesentlige endringer i behandlingen av personopplysninger, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til Personverntjenester ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. Før du melder inn en endring, oppfordrer vi deg til å lese om hvilken type endringer det er nødvendig å melde:
https://www.nsd.no/personverntjenester/fylle-ut-meldeskjema-for-personopplysninger/melde-endringer-i-

meldeskjema. Du må vente på svar fra oss før endringen gjennomføres.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET
Vi vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er
avsluttet.

Kontaktperson hos oss: Silje Fjelberg Opsvik
Lykke til med prosjektet!

65

9.4 Appendix 4: Additional Information About the Participants and their Student Groups

The participants were asked to describe the students in terms of English level and language background. Dagmar's group of students is described as a mix of students with higher and lower English proficiency. The language of communication in class is mainly English. There is a large spread from level 1 and meager goal achievement to level 6 and outstanding goal achievement based on age and grade level. 2 students out of 16 have a foreign language background. One was born and raised in Norway but had parents from Eastern Europe. The other also has parents from Eastern Europe but has lived in Norway for approximately six years. Both students have excellent English skills (level 5) both orally and in writing.

Emil is teaching in first grade, and he describes his student group as "very strong" in English. Many students have English as their L1 and communicate in English with friends and family. There are at least 12 different languages in his student group, and many of the students attend school on the weekends to strengthen their mother tongue. Two of the students do not speak Norwegian yet. They use English, Norwegian, and gesturing to communicate in the English lessons.

Berit describes her group of students as pretty good in terms of English level. At the oral level, there are many students she defines as quite competent. The students have development potential when it comes to written competence. Here the gap between the students is more significant. There are two students with another L1 than Norwegian, but these students are fluent in both Norwegian and English as well. Berit and the students use mostly English to communicate in the English lessons. She says that if there are students who struggle, parts of the instructions may be in Norwegian if that is necessary.

Alf says that the English level varies significantly in the student groups he teaches. Some students excel in front, while others are a bit behind. In the English lessons, they use English most of the time and Norwegian when working with, for example, grammar.

Cato's student group consists of primarily ethnic Norwegian students, and there are only three students with a different language background than the rest of the students. One student has Swahili as L1 and Norwegian as L2, another has Arabic as L1 and Norwegian as L2, and one is bilingual with English and Norwegian as his languages. Orally, the level of English is generally high in this student group as well, while they are a bit weaker in written English. The bilingual student is naturally good at both written and oral English, and his knowledge of

the two languages is an advantage to him. In the EFL classroom, they use both Norwegian and English as the language of communication. The participant always speaks and reads the instructions in English first, then explains in Norwegian afterward. It is a goal for the students to use English as much as possible, but they are always allowed to answer in Norwegian.

Frida is teaching English in the 7th, 9th, and 10th grades. The student groups are varied, with a minority of students having two Norwegian-speaking parents. The students come from many different language backgrounds. Her student groups are like the other participants' student groups when it comes to the fact that the students are better at speaking than writing English. She thinks one reason for this may be that the students spend so much time on the internet where they listen to English all the time. This strengthens oral English but perhaps weakens the written language since the student does not read or write that much outside of English class. One of her students has an English father, and this student has English as his first language in addition to his mother's language, which is jet another language than Norwegian. The language of instruction in her lessons is always English, and it is essential for her to be consequent on this. The main rule for the student is to use English all the time, but if they must, they can use Norwegian, and then the teacher translates the word or phrase into English. It is essential that the students feel safe in the EFL classroom and that they dare to try and fail.

67