MA THESIS

M5GLU

May 2023

Strategies to support reluctant speakers

Type: Academic

30 credits

Anders Roald & Matthias Hänsgen van Raalten

Oslo Metropolitan University

Faculty of Education and International Studies

Department of Primary and Secondary Teacher Education

Abstract

This thesis is centered on reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom and aims to investigate which strategies Norwegian English teachers use to increase oral activity for these pupils. To research this, a qualitative research method was carried out by interviewing 6 Norwegian English teachers who work in secondary school. In order to find out which strategies teachers use, it was first appropriate to see how the various teachers perceived pupils who were reluctant to speak. This was to see whether they have a common understanding of these pupils and if reluctant speakers can be recognized by typical characteristics and behavior. To implement effective strategies, it is important to be able to identify pupils who are reluctant to speak.

The findings in the thesis indicate that all 6 teachers have experience with pupils who are reluctant to speak in the EFL classroom. This indicates that such pupils are present in Norwegian English classrooms. The study's participants shared perceptions about characteristics and behavior of reluctant speakers. Special characteristics the participants highlighted to identify such pupils were that they often exhibited a reserved body language and had introverted personality traits in general. The main reasons why pupils were reluctant to participate in oral activities were the fear of showing insufficient communication apprehension and of the fear of being evaluated by peers. Strategies related to increasing oral activity were informal activities, ensuring a positive classroom environment, providing predictable routines, and praising oral participation.

The study concludes that ensuring a safe classroom environment where pupils support each other is the most prominent strategy for increasing oral participation for reluctant speakers. Nevertheless, it is argued that this is not enough, but that ensuring a safe classroom environment will be an underlying factor for other strategies to be effective. This study will hopefully contribute to an increased understanding of what is needed to ensure oral participation for reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom and contribute to further research on the topic.

Key words: Reluctant speakers, strategies, Foreign Language Anxiety, English as a foreign language, secondary school

Sammendrag

Denne oppgaven tar for seg elever som kvier seg for å prate i engelskundervisning, og tar sikte på å finne ut av hvilke strategier engelsklærere bruker for å øke muntlig aktivitet for disse elevene. For å forske på dette ble det utført en kvalitativ forskningsmetode ved å intervjue 6 norske engelsklærere som jobber på ungdomsskole. For å finne ut av hvilke strategier lærere bruker, var det først hensiktsmessig å se hvordan de ulike lærerne oppfattet elever som kvier seg for å prate. Dette var for å se om de har en fellesforståelse av disse elevene og om de kan gjenkjennes ved typiske karakteristikker. For å iverksette effektive strategier er det viktig å kunne identifisere de som kvier seg for å prate.

Funnene i oppgaven indikerer at samtlige 6 lærere har erfaringer med elever som kvier seg for å prate. Dette tilsier at slike elever er til stede i norske engelskklasserom. Studiens deltakere delte oppfatninger om karakteristiske trekk ved elever som kvier seg for å prate i engelskundervisningen. Spesielle karakteristikker deltakerne trakk frem for å indentifisere slike elever var at de ofte hadde et reservert kroppsspråk og hadde introverte personlighetstrekk generelt. Hovedgrunnene til at elever kviet seg for å delta i muntlige aktiviteter var frykt for å vise mangelfull språkforståelse og for å bli evaluert av andre elever. Strategier knyttet til å øke muntlig aktivitet var uformelle aktiviteter, å sikre et godt klassemiljø, sørge for forutsigbare rutiner, og gi skryt av muntlig deltakelse.

Studien konkluderer med at å sikre et trygt klassemiljø der elever støtter hverandre er den mest fremtredende strategien for å øke muntlig aktivitet for elever som kvier seg for å prate. Allikevel argumenteres det for at dette i seg selv ikke er nok, men at å sikre et trygt klassemiljø vil være en underliggende faktor for at andre strategier skal være effektive. Denne studien vil forhåpentligvis bidra til økt forståelse for hva som skal til for å sikre muntlig aktivitet hos elever som kvier seg å prate i engelskundervisningen, og bidra til videre forskning innenfor temaet.

Nøkkelord: Elever som kvier seg for å snakke, strategier, fremmedspråkangst, engelsk som fremmedspråk, ungdomsskole

Preface

This master thesis concludes our five years of studying at OsloMet. Through our studies we have discovered that there is so much more behind being a teacher than we previously expected. We have accumulated significant amounts of knowledge and experience throughout our education, and finally it is our time to put our acquired skills to use. Through our joint practical experiences, we discovered that we thrived within a vibrant classroom, where pupils were talkative and engaged. However, one class we taught together was more silent, and pupils seemed reluctant to participate in oral activities. We found this specific class to be more challenging to teach than others. We wondered if teachers had any specific strategies to encourage and support these reluctant speakers to create a more communicative approach to learning. Therefore, we decided conduct research on how teachers approach reluctant speakers, and what strategies may guide these pupils.

First and foremost, we want to express our deepest gratitude to our advisor Dina Tsagari. She has provided us with new insight and pushed us to reach for the skies. She has been a rock throughout this process by giving us extensive feedback and provided us with endless amounts of research and literature.

We also want to give thanks to friends and family who have supported us throughout this process. Especially those who have read the thesis and shared their thoughts. This has been helpful as it is always refreshing to get new set of eyes providing an outside perspective.

Lastly, we want to give special credit to our interview participants. We are grateful that they have given their time to answer our questions and provided exciting insight into their everyday lives as teachers. With the help of their contribution, they have made it possible to write this thesis, while at the same time we have gained knowledge that we surely will use in the classroom in the years to come.

Table of contents

List of tables and figures

Abbreviations

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
FLA	Foreign Language Anxiety
LK20	Norwegian National Curriculum 2020
TPS	Think-Pair-Share
CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
ZPD	Zone of Proximal Development
L1	First Language
TA	Thematic Analysis

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Some pupils experience a high threshold for communicating in a foreign language (Horwitz 1986). These reluctant speakers, who are hesitant or unwilling to speak in the English foreign language (EFL) classroom, offer a challenge for teachers to fully involve in classroom activities. If pupils are not speaking regularly, they may miss out on valuable opportunities to practice and refine their language skills. This might cause them to struggle to develop the fluency and confidence needed for effective communication in English. Being able to communicate properly in English is vital to learn in the modern world. As the English language is being more dominant in everyday life all over the world, it is one of the most important subjects to master in the globalized world we live in today (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019a).

Developing the ability to communicate with others is one of the main goals of the English subject. This is emphasized in the English subject curriculum (LK20) which states that:

> "The subject shall give the pupils the foundation for communicating with others, both locally and globally, regardless of cultural or linguistic background. English shall help the pupils to develop an intercultural understanding of different ways of living, ways of thinking and communication patterns. It shall prepare the pupils for an education and societal and working life that requires English-language competence in reading, writing and oral communication." (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019a).

Being a reluctant speaker will hinder the pupils in achieving these goals and provide teachers with more difficulty in assessing the pupil's actual proficiency level.

Our reason for choosing this topic was due to our own experiences with reluctant speakers. During our practical period together in the third year, we encountered reluctancy to speak in the EFL classroom. We found this experience one of the most challenging parts of our education, and experienced difficulties making lessons that suited the classroom environment. We wanted to facilitate communication and oral production in our teaching but found it challenging to appropriately accommodate our teaching methods towards reluctant speakers. This motivated us to do more research on the subject. We wanted to explore whether there was

a general understanding of how to approach these reluctant speakers and what strategies other teachers used to encourage a more communicative teaching environment.

Overall, addressing the needs of reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom is an important challenge for teachers and learners alike. By understanding what contributes to reluctance to speak, and by using effective strategies to encourage pupils, teachers can support language acquisition and confidence needed for effective communication in English. This is also necessary to achieve the aims set in the English subject curriculum (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b).

1.2 Purpose and Research Question

This thesis focuses on teachers experiences with pupils who are reluctant to participate orally in EFL lessons in the Norwegian classroom from the 8th-10th grade. We have limited our thesis to these grade levels as these are the grade levels where pupils' contribution is formally assessed (Norwegian Directorate for Teaching and Education, 2019b).

The purpose of the thesis is to investigate various teachers' approaches to reluctant speakers in secondary school and gain knowledge that can be used in teaching practices in the future. To uncover this, we have decided to frame the following research question;

What strategies do secondary EFL teachers use to facilitate oral production for reluctant speakers in English class?

To answer the research question, we will explore teachers' general views and experiences with reluctant speakers. This is to see whether reluctant speakers are a commonality in the EFL classroom, and if teachers share similar experiences regarding these pupils. To identify strategies used by EFL teachers, we will first uncover how teachers identify reluctant speakers, and then how they accommodate their teaching. We will use a qualitative approach with semi-structured individual interviews. The intention is to gain a deeper understanding of teachers' experiences and thoughts on the topic.

Hopefully this thesis will develop a greater understanding of how teachers can adapt their teaching practices to reluctant speakers and give guidance on how to approach those pupils in the EFL classroom setting.

1.3 Explanation and focus for the project

This subchapter presents keywords related to our thesis, as well as explanations of these essential terms. We found it a necessity to frame a collective understanding of certain terms to better understand our thesis, as at first glance, they may seem ambiguous. Two of the most frequently used terms in the research undertaken are *strategies* and *reluctant speakers*. Simply put, strategies are the various approaches teachers employ in their instructional practices regarding reluctant speakers. Our understanding of the term is derived from research on strategies relating to second language acquisition and will be elaborated on further in 1.3.1.

The second term, reluctant speakers, are characterized as pupils who show reluctance to participate in oral activities in English class. The explanation of the term is anchored in theory presented by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) on Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA), and literature by Sæteren (2019) who writes about reluctant speakers and the fear of speaking in a second language in Norwegian classrooms. The term will be elaborated further in section 1.3.2 of the thesis. We will justify the focus of our thesis through the Norwegian National Curriculum.

1.3.1 Strategies

Teaching strategies in ELT are specific strategies which enhance and promote communicative abilities for pupils. This includes all activities done in the classroom (Yadav 2019). O'Malley and Chamot (1990) understands the term strategies regarding second language acquisition as a complex term. They argue that there are several factors that influence the instructors' choices for deciding how to teach a second language. This may be, among other things, factors such as age, cultural background, and prior educational experiences. They refer to strategies as tools for active self-directed involvement needed for developing second language communicative abilities. What is seen as the most appropriate strategy for instructors to implement may vary between classrooms based on the factors mentioned above.

Based on Yadav (2019) and O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) explanation of the term "strategies" we have decided to define the term to be; "everything a teacher does to increase English oral activity, specifically related to reluctant speakers". We have limited the term explicitly to reluctant speakers, as this is the focus point of our thesis. Our definition of the term is also broader than the ones previously presented, as it includes factors that are not only specific to classroom activities. A major part of succeeding with English language teaching is how you

can motivate your pupils. This is not only done in the classroom. Weimer (2009, as cited in Mahdi, 2015) states that "motivating students especially the ones who are reluctant to participate, speak or engage in a classroom is one of the principles for attaining mastery in teaching". Building relationships with pupils may have an impact on learners' engagement in the classroom, especially for pupils who are academically struggling.

1.3.2 Reluctant speakers

To gain a better understanding of the further reading of this thesis, it is crucial to present a definition of the term *reluctant speakers* in an EFL setting. It is a continuously used term and a major part of the research. Generally, reluctant behavior is often used as an umbrella term for shy, anxious, socially isolated, worried or introvert behavior. What is common for this behavior, in a classroom setting, is the unwillingness to participate orally in classroom activities (Sæteren, 2019). Regarding speaking a foreign language, experiences of anxiety is even more common than in other subjects and is seen as the most threatening aspect of foreign language learning (Horwitz 1986).

Based on theory and literature, we have decided to frame our understanding of the term as follows; "Reluctant speakers in an EFL setting are individuals who are hesitant or unwilling to speak up, express their opinions, or participate in a communicative language learning context". The term will be further elaborated in the theory and previous research section of the thesis (see section 2).

1.3.3 Justification in LK20

Oral production is an important aspect in language learning as seen through the core curriculum LK20. It is first presented through the five basic skills the pupils should attain through their participation in school activities, which is oral skills, writing, reading, numeracy and lastly digital skills. It is stated that school shall facilitate for and support the pupil's development in these five different basic skills throughout the entire learning path. Oral skills in English refers to creating meaning through listening, talking, and engaging in conversation. The pupils are expected to present information, adapting the language to different purposes and choose suitable strategies for different situations. Developing oral skills in English are described as using the spoken language gradually more accurately and more nuanced in order to

communicate in both formal and informal situations with variation of receivers with varying linguistic backgrounds (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019c). One can argue that pupils will find it difficult to develop an expected level of oral skills if struggling with oral production in the classroom, and certainly it will be difficult for teachers to assess their proficiency level.

Our research is limited to teachers working with pupils in the 8th to 10th grade. It is therefore relevant to look at what pupils are expected to be proficient in after finishing the 10th grade. The core curriculum presents different aims the pupils are expected to master after year 10. Several of these aims are closely connected to communication and oral production. Some examples are such as;

- The pupil is expected to be able to express oneself with fluency and coherence with a varied vocabulary and idiomatic expressions adapted to the purpose, recipient, and situation. (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b)
- The pupil is expected to ask questions and follow up input when talking about various topics adapted to different purposes, recipients, and situations. (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b)

It is the teacher's responsibility to secure pupils learning and development (Ekspertgruppa om lærerrollen 2016). It is therefore crucial that teachers are equipped with strategies to do so. To fulfill the competence aims revolving speaking in the national curriculum, it is essential that teachers make reluctant speakers more orally active. If pupils do not speak in class, it is impossible for teachers to evaluate proficiency and development when it comes to the basic skill of oral skills. Therefore, strategies to increase oral production for reluctant speakers are highly relevant for teachers in the EFL classroom.

1.4 Structure

Our thesis consists of six chapters. In this section we have presented the background and purpose of the thesis. Additionally, we have explained some essential terms and presented our understanding of them. Chapter 2 presents theory and previous research. The thesis' main theoretical framework consists of Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) research on FLA, Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD) and research on communicative language teaching (CLT). Previous research on identifying reluctant speakers and strategies is

also presented in this chapter. Chapter 3 presents the method used for data collection. The chapter clarifies the data collection process, including the selection of participants, development of the interview guide and how we collected the data. Lastly, in this chapter we discuss the research credibility and ethical considerations during the process. Chapter 4 presents our findings through the participants' perceptions of reluctant speakers and strategies for facilitating oral production. Chapter 5 discusses findings from the previous chapter considering theory and previous research presented in chapter 2. Finally, in chapter 6 we bring forth a conclusion based on the discussion, as well as looking at the research's implications and argue what further research could be undertaken on the topic.

2. Theory and previous research

This section of the thesis will address previously established theory and research which is relevant to our research project. This is done to establish a common ground for key terminology and discuss our findings considering theory and research done by others in the same field. The theories will be used in the discussion section of the paper when analyzing our research results.

We have chosen to use Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) theory on Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA), Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) and communicative language teaching (CLT) as our main theories. These different theories will shed light upon reluctant speakers and different approaches a teacher may take in their teaching practices to support a communicative classroom environment.

After the three main theories, we will present previous research. The previous research will focus on reluctant speakers and strategies teachers may employ to facilitate communication and oral production. This will be used to uncover what others, who have researched a similar phenomenon, value when it comes to both reluctant speakers and teaching practices. One of the key aspects is how teachers characterize and experience reluctant speakers, and how it is differentiated from shyness or other personality traits. How teachers identify reluctant speakers is key to deciding how to go forward when it comes to increasing oral production. Lastly, different strategies and techniques that are related to increasing communication will be presented.

2.1 Theory

2.1.1 Foreign Language Anxiety

Foreign language learners usually express anxiety when learning a new language (Masoud, 2011). Anxiety is the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness and worry associated with an arousal of the nervous system (Horwitz 1986). This may hinder EFL pupils in learning to speak foreign language (Masoud, 2011). In a language learning context, FLA is anxiety caused by learning a second language in classroom situations. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) present three categories of different situations where FLA is prevalent. These are 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety and 3) fear of negative evaluation.

Foreign language learners usually express anxiety when learning a new language (Masoud, 2011). Anxiety is the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness and worry associated with an arousal of the nervous system (Horwitz 1986). This may hinder EFL pupils in learning to speak foreign language (Masoud, 2011). In a language learning context, FLA is anxiety caused by learning a second language in classroom situations. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) present three categories of different situations where FLA is prevalent. These are 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety and 3) fear of negative evaluation.

Difficulties in communicating in groups are a manifestation of communication apprehension, and people who typically have trouble speaking in groups are even more likely to experience greater difficulty in communicating in groups in a foreign language. On the other hand, many talkative pupils in different subjects will also have difficulty understanding others and make oneself understood due to the special communication apprehension a foreign language requires that derives from personal knowledge (Horwitz 1986). Everyone who is learning a new language, will be therefore be somewhat uncertain of their skills.

Performance evaluation is an ongoing feature of most foreign language classes, which makes test-anxiety relevant during class, not only limited to formal testing. This kind of anxiety refers to a performance type, where a fear of failure is prohibiting pupils from reaching their potential. Test-anxious pupils often put unrealistic demands on themselves and feel like less than perfect test-performance is seen as a failure. Test-anxious pupils are believed to experience considerable difficulties related to anxiety, as formal testing is frequent in foreign language learning, and even the brightest pupils often make errors. Oral tests have the potential of provoking both communication anxiety, as well as test-anxiety (Horwitz 1986).

The third anxiety causing situation is the fear of negative evaluation. It is defined as apprehension about other evaluations, avoidance of evaluative citations and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively. It is similar to test anxiety, but broader in scope, as it is not limited to test-taking situations. It may occur in any social or evaluative situation, such as speaking in class or answering questions one-to-one. Pupils may be sensitive to evaluation from peers, both real or imagined (Horwitz 1986). The fear of making mistakes, in a language learning context, has been linked with learner's concern to save their positive image in the mind of their teacher and peers (Masoud, 2011).

When learners experience FLA, the common psycho-physiological symptoms, and behavioral experiences are the same as other experiences of anxiety. These can be seen through symptoms such as difficulty concentrating, forgetfulness, palpitations, and sweaty palms. Pupils often exhibit avoidance behavior such as an evasive gaze, missing classes, or postponing or not finishing homework or other tasks at school. Experiences of anxiety prevent pupils from performing to their potential level and may cause unhealthy attitudes towards language learning and schoolwork (Horwitz 1986).

Extremely anxious pupils tend to be motivated to avoid engaging in the classroom activities they fear the most. Some may appear indifferent, while others unprepared, but teachers should consider anxiety as a factor when evaluating their behavior. Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) present two options when dealing with anxious pupils: 1) Teachers can help pupils learn to cope with the existing anxiety-provoking situation; or 2) they can make the learning context less stressful. Most importantly, before either option is viable, the teacher must acknowledge the existence of foreign language anxiety.

Reluctant speakers are presumably experiencing some levels of FLA. It is therefore important to be aware of Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) theory prior to implementing strategies for facilitating oral production for said pupils. The question of how to do so will be explored through the theories on Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) and communicative language teaching (CLT).

2.1.2 Vygotsky's zone of proximal development

Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD) is a psychological construct that describes the gap between a learner's current level of knowledge and their potential level of

knowledge with the aid of a more knowledgeable individual. This theory explains that the most effective learning occurs when learners engage in tasks that are just beyond their current level of competence, but within their ZPD, as this provides the optimal level of challenge and support for learning (Doolittle, 1995).

According to Vygotsky (1978), the ZPD is not a fixed or static construct. It rather varies depending on the learner's current level of development and the task or activity being undertaken. The ZPD can be extended through scaffolding, which involves providing learners with appropriate support and guidance to help them develop new skills and knowledge. Scaffolding can be done through means such as modeling, feedback, or simplifying tasks (Sanders & Sugg, 2005).

The concept of the ZPD has implications for teaching practices, particularly in terms of instructional design and assessment. For example, teachers can use the ZPD to design activities that are appropriately challenging for pupils, while also providing appropriate support to help them achieve success. When the pupil becomes more skilled the teacher may gradually withdraw support. Assessment can also be designed to measure progress within a pupil's ZPD, rather than simply measuring their current level of knowledge (Doolittle, 1995). Overall, Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD provides a valuable framework for understanding how learning occurs and how to optimize instructional practices for learners at all stages of development. It emphasizes the importance of providing appropriate levels of challenge and support to learners and highlights the role of social interaction and collaboration in the learning process (Doolittle, 1995).

In the context of an EFL classroom, the ZPD is particularly relevant for reluctant speakers, as it can help teachers understand their pupils' level of proficiency and identify appropriate activities and strategies to support their language learning. As reluctant speakers are pupils who have a limited vocabulary, struggle with grammar, or are simply afraid of making mistakes (Sæteren, 2019), it's important for teachers to create a safe and supportive environment that encourages reluctant speakers to practice speaking through social interactions (Hakim, 2015).

The ZPD can also serve as a tool for teachers to determine what types of activities and support will be most effective for their reluctant speakers. By assessing their pupils' current level of language proficiency, teachers can identify tasks that are just beyond their current abilities but still achievable with guidance and support (Vygotsky, 1978). By providing appropriate support, teachers can help pupils build confidence in their second language abilities and develop their

language skills. As pupils become more comfortable with the language, teachers can gradually increase the difficulty level of the tasks within the ZPD, helping them move beyond their current level of proficiency (Vygotsky, 1978). With Vygotsky's (1978) theory on ZPD in mind, teachers can implement strategies that enable reluctant speakers to build on their strengths, and gradually develop their language skills at a pace that is comfortable for them. To create a positive learning environment, where pupils can practice their language skills, a CLT approach may be beneficial.

2.1.3 Communicative language teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is an approach to language learning that emphasizes the importance of communication in language acquisition. This approach came as a response to the traditional grammar-translation method, which focused heavily on memorization of vocabulary and grammar rules and paid little attention to the development of communicative skills (Sri, 2014). CLT is based on the principle that language is a tool for communication, and that the goal of language learning is to enable learners to use language effectively and appropriately in real-life situations (Galloway 1993). The focus is on the development of communicative competence, which includes not only linguistic competence, but also sociolinguistic competence and pragmatic competence (Sri, 2014).

In CLT, language is learned through authentic communication tasks designed to simulate real-life situations and provide learners with opportunities to use language in meaningful ways (Ju, 2013). Pupils are encouraged to use the language they already know to communicate, rather than being corrected for every mistake they make. The role of the teacher is to facilitate communication, rather than asserting their knowledge, and to provide feedback on language use as needed (Sri, 2014).

CLT also emphasizes the importance of the learner's responsibility. Pupils are encouraged to take an active role in their own learning by setting their own learning goals while the teacher monitor their progress (Galloway 1993). This approach is based on the belief that motivated pupils, who are engaged in the learning process, are more likely to develop communicative competence (Sri, 2014). CLT is therefore characterized by a learner-centered approach. The focus is on the learner's needs, interests, and goals, and instruction is tailored to meet those needs. This approach contrasts with the teacher-centered approach of the traditional grammar-translation method, where the teacher is the source of knowledge (Galloway 1993).

One of the key principles of CLT is the use of authentic materials (Ju, 2013). This includes using materials that are relevant to the learner's interests and needs, such as newspaper articles. Authentic materials provide learners with exposure to real language use and are thus experienced as meaningful (Sri, 2014). CLT places a strong emphasis on the development of intercultural competence. This involves developing an understanding of communication patterns and diversity from where the language is originally used. Language and culture are seen as intimately linked, and therefore the cultural aspect is always present when we use language.

To summarize, CLT is an approach to language teaching that emphasizes the importance of communication in language acquisition. It is based on the principle that language is a tool for communication, and that the goal of language learning is to enable learners to use language effectively and appropriately in real-life situations. CLT is characterized by a learner-centered approach, the use of authentic materials, and the development of intercultural competence (Galloway 1993). CLT can be a beneficial approach for reluctant speakers learning English as a foreign language as pupils feel more engaged in the learning process and thus motivated to speak more frequently.

2.2 Previous research

This section of our thesis presents an overview of previous studies on reluctant speakers in the EFL setting and different strategies used to encourage pupils to speak in the classroom.

In the search of relevant literature, we have used Google Scholar and the Eric database. Keywords used in the search were: *"reluctant speakers"*, *"Foreign Language Anxiety"*, *"EFL", "strategies",* and *"secondary school"*. The search was limited to peer-reviewed articles. We have also drawn inspiration from other master's theses, specifically Steinarson (2022) and Daastøl (2022). During our search for previous research, we applied the use of the snowball method, where we discovered more articles through the references of earlier found papers. It is important to note that we have not set a geographical limit to our search parameters, therefore, some articles and papers are set in a different cultural context.

The following sub-chapters will present previous research conducted on how to identify reluctant speakers (2.2.1) and strategies teachers can implement to facilitate oral production (2.2.2). The previous research done on identifying reluctant speakers is mostly based on

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) theory on FLA. The previous research on strategies includes various cognitive, affective and situational approaches others have used to accommodate their teaching towards reluctant speakers.

2.2.1 Identifying Reluctant Speakers

Why some pupils choose to go silent and not participate orally may depend on various factors. Littlewood (2004 as cited in Savaşçi, 2014) presents six factors: (1) tiredness, (2) fear of being wrong, (3) insufficient interest in class, (4) insufficient knowledge in the subject, (5) shyness and lastly (6) insufficient time to formulate ideas. Sæteren (2019) presents underlying causes for the previously mentioned factors of reluctancy. The first cause presented is that the pupils' reluctance to speak can have something to do with neglect. Both physical and psychological abuse can make children appear downcast, sad, apathetic and reserved, and they might in some cases act out. This means that reluctant speakers often have a negative self-image.

Another cause presented by Sæteren (2019) is whether the school and teachers have arranged for a positive and safe learning environment. Research shows that the teacher is crucial for both the pupil´s learning and well-being, and that the relationship between the teacher and class is central for pupils to feel safe and the making of a positive learning environment (Holfve-Sabel, 2014) (Konu & Rimpelä, 2002). In that way, the teacher is a preventive factor who creates a safe dynamic in the classroom. If a teacher is not capable to establish positive relationships with her or his pupils, it will most likely hinder pupils learning outcome, especially the reluctant speakers (Sæteren, 2019).

The importance of a positive learning environment to secure oral production in class is supported by Fitri (2014). She states that pupils often tend to be silent and not participating due to a fear of the teacher´s criticism and the possibility of embarrassing themselves by answering in what they believe is an insufficient answer. A safe and positive classroom environment is therefore necessary to motivate the pupils to speak English in class.

An inclusive learning environment is also mentioned in its own section of the core curriculum. The core curriculum establishes that "a benevolent and supportive learning environment is the basis for a positive culture where the pupils are encouraged and stimulated to develop academically and socially". Furthermore they expand on this by stating that "if pupils feel anxious and uncertain, learning may be undermined" (Ministry of Education and Research, 2017). This again confirms the importance of a positive learning environment for reluctant

speakers to facilitate oral production in the EFL classroom. Whether the learning environment is positive or negative will influence the degree of anxiety, shyness and the other factors of reluctancy previously presented in this thesis.

Over the last years some researchers suggest that a shift of focus has taken place when it comes to the English subject. Savaşçi (2014) states that the focus in EFL contexts had favoured methods such as grammar translation and audio-lingual methods. These practices were used to drill pupils in grammar by the teacher. In recent times the focus has however shifted to a communicative approach where the key factor is that the pupils are able to use the English language in communication (Sri, 2014). Savaşçi (2014) conducted her research in Turkey, but her research on English teaching and the development of oral skills, can correspond to the current situation in Norway, as seen through the core elements of the English subject curriculum (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019d). Since the communicative approach is more dominant in today's classrooms, one could argue that there is a stronger need for pupils to be orally active for the teacher to assess them properly. This could result in reluctant speakers having a disadvantage when it comes to showcasing their ability of their language learning skills compared to pupils who are more comfortable speaking.

With the introduction of the newest national curriculum, the focus on speaking is more dominant than before. The competence aims and core elements support a more communicative approach. One core element in the English curriculum is dedicated entirely to communication and states that; "Communication refers to creating meaning through language and the ability to use the language in both formal and informal settings" and "The pupils shall experience, use and explore the language from the very start" (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019d). This is further backed by Savaşçi's (2014) paper who views communication as the new standard focus in EFL contexts.

With this shifting focus towards a more communicative approach, there are some challenges arising. It has been observed in different EFL classrooms that during speaking exercises pupils tend to refuse to speak in plenary discussions more often. It has also been observed that pupils are more reluctant to speak English, but rather answer questions in their first language (L1) (Savaşçi, 2014). Pupils' reluctance to speak a foreign language is often based on their own feelings and emotions. For example, pupils tend to value opinions from their peers to a high degree, and feelings of uneasiness and nervousness may occur when pupils are uncertain about their own competence level of the foreign language.

Pupils experience forms of anxiety in the EFL classroom connected to their self-perceived abilities about their own knowledge, and often compare their own skills to others in the same classroom (Horwitz 1986). These experiences can be a barrier for learning a foreign language such as English (Steinarsson, 2022). Other feelings and emotions that may prohibit pupils to speak in the EFL classroom setting, is often connected to fear. It is typical for pupils to experience a fear of evaluation, by both their peers and the teacher, when communicating in a foreign language. This is due to pupils not feeling as comfortable in their foreign language skills as they do in their L1. This fear of evaluation prohibits pupils to fully engage in classroom discussions and makes it harder for the teachers to assess their pupil's competence level in the EFL classroom (Horwitz 1986).

Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009) conducted a qualitative study to identify the reasons for pupils not participating in oral activities. In their research, they highlight two possible reasons for what they call the speaking reticence. Speaking reticence is the inherent refraining of speech, or oral production, which derives from own feelings of not living up to personal standards of communication apprehension. The first reason revolves around pupils feeling they are not skilful enough in the English language, and the second reason is their fear of being negatively evaluated by classmates. Liu and Chen's (2014) findings on research conducted on the same topic resembles what the Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009) present. Liu and Chen (2014) present the fear of negative evaluation the most prominent reasons for why pupils are not participating in oral activities in class. This is also backed by Tzoannopoulou's (2016) research on FLA in the Greek university classroom. She also views the fear of being negatively evaluated by peers as the most dominant factor contributing to pupils' reluctance to speak.

One challenge with the research on FLA in the EFL classroom setting, is that it often focusses on adult learners such as students at higher education levels (Steinarsson, 2022). However, some researchers have conducted research on younger language learners. Aydin et.al (2017) explored levels of FLA in pupils aged 7-12. The research found that younger learners suffered more than older learners when it came to examinations and teachers evaluating them. As a concluding remark Aydin et.al (2017) recommend that teachers need to be aware that gender, age, and grade are considerable factors relating to the level of FLA among language learners, and especially young pupils.

Previous research shows that there are several reasons for pupils' reluctance to speak in the EFL classroom setting. The most prominent reasons correspond with Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) theory on FLA. The three components they present; (1) communication

apprehension, (2) test-anxiety, and (3) fear of negative evaluation is all seen through the previous research. Communication apprehension was found to be a factor contributing to reluctance to speak by several researchers. This was due to pupils being insecure in their own foreign language abilities (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009) (Fitri, 2014). One result of this insecurity is pupils' tendency to use their L1 in the EFL classroom (Savaşçi, 2014). Test-anxiety is also experienced by reluctant speakers, especially young language learners. The fear of negative evaluation was viewed as the most prominent cause of speaking reluctancy in the EFL classroom by several researchers (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009) (Liu & Chen, 2014) (Tzoannopoulou, 2016). The reasoning for this is mainly due to pupils valuing their peers' opinions to a high degree (Savaşçi, 2014). A safe and supportive classroom environment has been described as beneficial to reduce speaking reluctancy (Sæteren, 2019). Understanding the components that causes reluctancy to speak in the EFL classroom is crucial for teachers to be aware of to implement appropriate strategies for facilitating oral production.

2.2.2 Previous research on strategies

It is important to look at previous research to identify the different types of strategies teachers use to encourage oral production in EFL classrooms. In the beginning of the thesis, we defined strategies as everything a teacher does to increase English oral activity, specifically related to reluctant speakers. It is important to note that this definition differs slightly from the term *teaching strategies*, which is a generalized plan for a lesson. This includes a structured plan with desired learner behavior in terms of goals, and planned tactics necessary to implement the strategy (Isaac, 2010). In other words, teaching strategies are a more specific term that focuses on how the teacher sets up and executes a lesson, while our understanding of strategies revolves around how teachers facilitate EFL communication for reluctant speakers. Below are some general strategies that teachers employ to facilitate oral production that have been presented by other researchers.

Hue (2010) aims to provide EFL teachers with several different strategies or techniques to encourage reluctant speakers to speak in the EFL classroom. The different strategies presented are based on cognitive, affective, and situational work. Jejo and Haji (2020) have done research on teaching strategies to increase EFL speaking skills in a communicative learning environment. Other previous research and presented strategies in this sub-chapter all revolve

around teachers' strategies for making shy or reluctant speakers more orally communicative during lessons.

Hue (2010) states that one strategy for facilitating oral production is by allowing pupils to collaboratively solve communicative tasks. This is supported by Jejo and Haji (2020) who states that pair and group work promote strategies for learners to understand and make themselves understood when they feel like their own language skills are not enough.

When organizing pairs or group work, the teacher should make sure that every pupil's participation is necessary for completing the task. It is most beneficial to each participant, if they each have unique or essential information in the process of completing the task (Hue, 2010). Switching up group sizes and composition regularly will also benefit pupils. By switching up group sizes and composition, pupils will experience equal opportunities to find comfort in speaking English. Some pupils react positively to a specific partner, while others may thrive when the whole class is participating together. Shy pupils, who are often seen as reluctant speakers, may also benefit from being grouped with other shy pupils. This makes it so that one of the shy pupils must be the instigator during group work. Finding the perfect balance for group compositions when letting the pupils work collectively takes time and requires the teacher to know the individuals in the classroom (Deady, 2015).

Another strategy is giving pupils more time to complete tasks. This can either be done by giving the pupils more preparation time, or alternatively give pupils more time during the presentation of oral tasks. Ideally, by providing more time to the pupils, they will eventually complete the task and get a stronger feeling of accomplishment (Hue, 2010). However, Jejo and Haji (2020) problematize the amount of time each teacher has, to let the pupils follow through with this method in a teaching setting. Most teachers in their study argued that they did not have time to prepare pupils for oral language acquisition, due to the lesson containing more prioritized objectives. Another mitigating factor for giving the pupils more time to prepare or complete tasks was the large classroom sizes. Due to many pupils in each class, teachers found it difficult to map out and discover the pupils' individual needs.

To provide pupils with more time to think before speaking, Newbould (2019) presents four different strategies. The first one, *Solo thinking time*, done by simply giving pupils time to compose themselves and mentally rehearse their words, may increase participation. The teacher might also give the pupils tomorrow's discussion topic the day before or write some questions

on the board at the start of class for pupils to answer later. One can also provide more time between posing questions and calling on pupils to answer.

Secondly, *Think-Pair-Share* (TPS) is a strategy where the teacher poses a question, then let the pupils think about it during solo thinking time, before sharing with their learning partner prior to asking the pupils to volunteer in a plenary discussion. TPS is a cooperative learning structure, which emphasizes simultaneous interaction (Millis, 2010). TPS provides pupils with important practice in putting ideas into language and also boosts confidence by receiving response from peers and prepares the pupils more than simply asking pupils to volunteer right away (Newbould, 2019).

The third strategy, *pyramid up*, is similar to TPS. The teacher sets a task before the pupils find other peers who share their opinion or answer. While sharing their viewpoint, the pupils practice speaking with each other, before they form a group of four with another pair who either agree or disagrees. The pupils are given the opportunity to revise their opinion and learn from others. When called upon later in a plenary discussion, the pupils have backing from other peers, and a sense of security as others already have voiced their opinions on the topic.

Numbered heads together, the fourth strategy begins with pupils forming groups of three or four and designating numbers between themselves from one to three or four. The teacher poses a question and provides the pupil with a set time limit to discuss within the groups, before asking a specific number to report on the discussion. Newbould's (2019) strategies focus on giving pupils more time to think before needing to speak. By providing more time, he argues that there is a higher chance of reluctant speakers to engage in oral activities in the classroom. His four strategies all provide pupils with time to sort information and evaluate how they can respond to the tasks provided by the teacher. Most of them are in collaboration with other pupils, which increases the likelihood of pupils speaking as it ensures a level of security in their answers from their peers. When learners work collaboratively, they exchange thoughts, knowledge, and experiences, which makes pupils phrase and express themselves in different ways. This is a positive feature of letting the pupils solve tasks in groups (Jejo & Haji, 2020).

Newbould's (2019) strategies focus on giving pupils more time to think before needing to speak. By providing more time, he argues that there is a higher chance of reluctant speakers to engage in oral activities in the classroom. His four strategies all provide pupils with time to sort information and evaluate how they can respond to the tasks provided by the teacher. Most of them are in collaboration with other pupils, which increases the likelihood of pupils speaking

as it ensures a level of security in their answers from their peers. When learners work collaboratively, they exchange thoughts, knowledge, and experiences, which makes pupils phrase and express themselves in different ways. This is a positive feature of letting the pupils solve tasks in groups (Jejo & Haji, 2020). Making pupils use their background knowledge and experience in tasks is another strategy to facilitate oral production. This provides the pupils with the opportunity to recall and share from a personal point of view (Hue, 2010).

Haji and Jejo (2020) argues that communicative tasks should be experienced as meaningful, involving, supportive and language developing for the pupils. A good way of making the tasks meaningful for the pupils is by relating the teaching content in class to their own interests. When applying this method, the teachers should grade the difficulty level of oral tasks to suit their pupils' communicative ability (Hue, 2010). This is closely related to Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD, where pupils achieve learning in relation to what they can achieve with guidance from others. When pupils find interest in communicative tasks, they get more motivated to both learn the spoken language and participate in the classroom activities (Parsons, 2014). To reach an ideal learning environment for ensuring high participation in communicative tasks, it is important the learning environment is supportive, collaborative, and accepting. To achieve a positive learning environment, it is recommended to work with relationships within the classes so that the teacher can best suit the tasks to the pupil's knowledge and interests (Jejo & Haji, 2020).

Making pupils use their background knowledge and experience in tasks is another strategy to facilitate oral production. This provides the pupils with the opportunity to recall and share from a personal point of view (Hue, 2010). Haji and Jejo (2020) argues that communicative tasks should be experienced as meaningful, involving, supportive and language developing for the pupils. A good way of making the tasks meaningful for the pupils is by relating the teaching content in class to their own interests. When applying this method, the teachers should grade the difficulty level of oral tasks to suit their pupils' communicative ability (Hue, 2010). This is closely related to Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD, where pupils achieve learning in relation to what they can achieve with guidance from others. When pupils find interest in communicative tasks, they get more motivated to both learn the spoken language and participate in the classroom activities (Parsons, 2014) . To reach an ideal learning environment for ensuring high participation in communicative tasks, it is important the learning environment is supportive, collaborative, and accepting. To achieve a positive learning environment, it is recommended to work with relationships within the classes so that the teacher can best suit the tasks to the pupil's knowledge and interests (Jejo & Haji, 2020).

If pupils feel they lack competence or knowledge, it is common to exhibit feelings of not being able to perform the task well. This is a cause of pupils' unwillingness to speak (Horwitz 1986). Reducing the level of task difficulty to increase oral activity is a strategy presented by Hue (2010). Pupils are less likely to suffer from foreign language anxiety if they hold positive attitudes towards language learning (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009). Discussing the value of language use with pupils, even if not being able to speak fluently and accurately, will provide pupils with an open-mindedness towards language learning (Young, 1991). Oral activities that have a clear meaning where the goal is clearly stated, and rewarding pupils for successfully conveying messages, will gradually change their perceptions about mistakes and language use. The teacher needs to show a tolerance of making mistakes to make the pupils do so as well (Hue, 2010).

Another strategy is for the teacher to create opportunities for pupils to feel a sense of achievement and success when using spoken English. By providing easier tasks, with simple and clearly stated goals, the pupils can achieve self-perceived communication competence, and then with time, the difficulty level should be increased. General goals should be broken into smaller, short-term goals to make pupils feel a sense of achievement regularly (Hue, 2010). By investigating what causes anxiousness in class, teachers can find out and eventually help ease irrational fears (Young, 1991). Strategies such as self-talks and relaxation exercises in class also provide pupils with ways to deal with fears (Hue, 2010). Building positive relationships with pupils can also be seen as a strategy. Pupils who feel a sense of supportiveness from both teachers and peers are more likely to be willing to speak during class (Holfve-Sabel, 2014). The following are different techniques that teachers may incorporate to create a supportive atmosphere for their pupils. By allowing pupils to compare answers before sharing in whole classroom discussions, pupils are more likely to speak up (Newbould, 2019). Similarly, a discussion with peers or a learning partner will provide the same value. Pupils are more likely to communicate more with closer friends than others in class. When organizing group work, the teacher should consider accommodations for personal traits such as allowing pupils to choose who they work with (Hue, 2010). With the shift to a more communicative approach to language learning, pupils have had an increased tendency to answer in L1 (Savaşçi, 2014). Hue (2010) argues that being tolerant to some degree of L1 use, especially at a low English communicative level, can help pupils convey their thoughts. The teacher should have a positive attitude towards the use of L1 to not make pupils feel humiliated when using L1 to assist in foreign language development. Although having a positive attitude towards L1, teachers should

tactically assist and lead pupils back to using English when possible. The classroom should be a supportive environment where pupils should not feel scared of making communicative mistakes (Ministry of Education and Research, 2017). Situations that increase anxiousness such as correcting mistakes on the spot, calling on pupils randomly, calling on pupils without giving necessary time to prepare answers, or calling on reluctant or quiet pupils, should be avoided (Hue, 2010).

With the shift to a more communicative approach to language learning, pupils have had an increased tendency to answer in L1 (Savaşçi, 2014). Hue (2010) argues that being tolerant to some degree of L1 use, especially at a low English communicative level, can help pupils convey their thoughts. The teacher should have a positive attitude towards the use of L1 to not make pupils feel humiliated when using L1 to assist in foreign language development. Although having a positive attitude towards L1, teachers should tactically assist and lead pupils back to using English when possible. The classroom should be a supportive environment where pupils should not feel scared of making communicative mistakes (Ministry of Education and Research, 2017). Situations that increase anxiousness such as correcting mistakes on the spot, calling on pupils randomly, calling on pupils without giving necessary time to prepare answers, or calling on reluctant or quiet pupils, should be avoided (Hue, 2010).

Another strategy is to explain the benefits of using English outside of class, or extramural English to pupils (Hue, 2010). Some typical extramural English activities are watching films, listening to music, reading books, or playing video games that exposes the pupils to the English language (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016). Extramural English activities gives the teacher an opportunity to link outside of class activities with more typical class instruction. The teacher may also create projects for pupils that require the use of English outside of school, such as group projects where pupils conduct interviews with foreigners or so on (Hue, 2010). Extramural English activities show pupils the usefulness of learning the language, as well as being a good arena for practicing language skills (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016).

Previous research shows that there are several different strategies used to facilitate oral production in the EFL classroom. The most common strategies allow pupils to solve communicative tasks collaboratively. We can see this through several researchers such as Hue (2010), Jejo and Haji (2020), and Newbould (2019), who all focus on pupils' interaction with each other to help them facilitate oral production. When pupils work together prior to speaking in class it ensures a level of security in their answers from their peers. The teacher is required to have good knowledge about individuals in the classroom, to find the most suitable group

compositions (Deady, 2015). Another strategy is allowing pupils more time to complete tasks (Hue, 2010). This can be done through different techniques such as solo thinking time, TPS, pyramid up and numbered heads together (Newbould, 2019). Providing more time to pupils before they speak allows them to sort information and evaluate how they can respond. Making pupils use background knowledge and experience when solving tasks also increases their likelihood to speak (Hue, 2010). The teacher can facilitate oral production by creating tasks that let pupils share from a personal point of view. Building positive relationships with pupils can also be seen as a strategy. Pupils who experience support from teachers and peers are more likely to speak in class (Holfve-Sabel, 2014). The final strategy presented above is explaining the benefits of extramural English to the pupils (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016).

Summary of previous research

Previous research on reasons for pupils' reluctance to speak in EFL classrooms identifies the three components of FLA as prominent factors (Horwitz 1986). (1) Communication apprehension is caused by pupils' insecurity in their language abilities, making it a tendency to use L1 in the EFL classroom (Savaşçi, 2014). (2) Test-anxiety are experienced more frequently by younger language learners and can be a reason for speaking reluctance. (3) Fear of negative evaluation is seen as the most significant cause of reluctance to speak in the EFL classroom since pupils highly value the opinions of their peers (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009). Teachers need to be aware of these factors to identify reluctant speakers and be able to apply the most effective strategies to encourage pupils to speak.

The most discussed strategy for facilitating oral production was identified as allowing pupils to collaboratively work on communicative tasks (Hue, 2010). This gives pupils a sense of security from their peers prior to speaking. Allowing more time for pupils to complete tasks using different techniques can help pupils sort information and evaluate their responses (Newbould, 2019). Making pupils use their background knowledge and experience also increases the likelihood of them speaking (Hue, 2010). Teachers are encouraged to build positive relationships with pupils, as pupils who experience support from teachers and peers are more likely to speak in class (Holfve-Sabel, 2014). The last-mentioned strategy is explaining the benefits of extramural English activities for pupils (Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016).

3. Methodology

The aim for this project is to gather insights on teachers' perceptions on reluctant speakers in the English subject and the strategies they implement to facilitate oral production. Based on our research topic and research question we have chosen a qualitative approach in gathering data. This was done through a set of semi-structured interviews. This is beneficial when it comes to gaining insight into the participants' thoughts and meanings on a certain topic (Avineri, 2017).

This chapter explains the benefits of using a qualitative approach and semi-structured interviews, as well as the data collection procedure. We also present the interview participants and the recruitment process. The data analysis is explained, and we reflect upon the validity, reliability and reflexivity of the research presented in our thesis. Finally we discuss ethical considerations taken during the research process.

3.1 Qualitative method

To conduct research for this project, we decided to adopt a qualitative approach. This means that the data collected were non-numerical and instead will focus on understanding subjective experiences, opinions, and attitudes of the individuals being studied. Qualitative research can be particularly useful when exploring complex experiences, as it allows for a deeper exploration of the underlying meanings and motivations that may be driving certain behaviors or actions (Charmaz, 2014). By taking a qualitative approach, we aim to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the topic at hand, which can help inform the development of more effective solutions.

Qualitative methods are often seen as a more flexible approach towards data collection. This allows the researcher/interviewer and participant more spontaneity and adaptation in their interaction along the way (Christoffersen & Johannesen, 2012). The wanted outcome of an approach like this is to explore the participants thoughts and meanings on a certain topic. Interviews were, therefore, a suitable approach as we wanted to identify the teachers' perceptions of reluctant speakers, and the possible strategies they use in order to facilitate pupils' oral production.

To implement a qualitative approach to research our topic, we decided to conduct a series of interviews. This allowed us to ask open-ended questions, which again could secure more in-depth answers and more varied responses from the participants. Because of the possibility of

varied responses and the participants´ permission to answer somewhat freely, we chose to conduct semi-structured interviews. Our interview guide established some specific questions we would like answered. In addition, when conducting semi-structured interviews, it allowed us and the participants to be more flexible in that the questions did not necessarily need to follow a strict order (Avineri, 2017). This meant that we could rearrange the order in which the questions were asked based on the different participants' answers. Choosing to conduct semi-structured interviews also allowed us to discover potential new themes based on the responses (Christoffersen & Johannesen, 2012).

Six interviews were conducted for this thesis and each interview was done individually. As researchers, conducting individual in-depth interviews provided us with the opportunity to thoroughly explore the social and personal thoughts on the topic experienced by the participants (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). In this case it meant that we were able to obtain the participants' thoughts considering the thesis' focus, how they characterize reluctant speakers and what strategies they use in helping their pupils' produce oral content in the English subject. The choice to conduct the interviews individually was made to secure responses where the participants were not affected by other peoples' thoughts on the matter.

3.2 Participants and selection process

3.2.1 Selection process

In total there were six teachers who volunteered to be interviewed for this project. Every participant is currently teaching in secondary school in or around Oslo, Norway. This was done because of the proximity to the researchers' place of residence, and due to the short duration of the project. It was most convenient to conduct interviews close to where we reside (Creswell, 2015). The limited number of participants may be a result of how we chose to recruit them. More participants could have been acquired if we used a different approach rather than a convenience sample, but it would have been more time consuming, and required us to look for participants through other channels.

Participants were recruited based on convenience criteria (Christoffersen & Johannesen, 2012). Johnson & Christensen (2014) further explains this by stating that convenience samples include available participants who volunteer and are easily recruited. They also specify that through convenience sampling one cannot generalize to a population since there is not an equal chance for everyone in a population to be included in the sample. For the aim of this paper and duration,

it was nevertheless decided that this form of sampling would provide reliable answers to both our research aim and research question. Five of the participants already knew at least one of the researchers, mostly through previous encounters in the researchers' practice experiences. The sixth participant was introduced to the researchers through another participant, as they were colleagues. We chose to include this participant to have an equal representation of gender in our sample and increase the number of participants in the study. This form of recruitment is often known as snowball sampling where the researchers' participants recruit subjects from their own personal network (2012).

After identifying potential participants, we sent out e-mails asking if they would be willing to participate in our study. In total we identified eight people whom we found suitable based on the selection set. The selection set included teachers who taught English in secondary school in Oslo, Norway. Seven out of eight responded to the e-mails, with two of them not being able to participate due to various personal reasons. The last participant did not respond at all. By that time, participants were sent a brief explanation of what the project entailed and a consent form, without access to the interview questions. This was after we had gotten the ethical approval by SIKT, which will be further elaborated on in chapter 3.7. Further communication between the participants and the researchers took place through e-mails, where we planned where and when the interviews would be conducted.

3.2.2 Participants

After sending out e-mails with invitations to contribute to our research project, we ended up with 6 participants in our study. Both genders were represented equally as we conducted interviews with 3 females and 3 males. Every participant is currently teaching English in secondary school, grades 8th to 10th. They were chosen, as the aim of the thesis is to precisely research this age group of pupils who are reluctant to speak in English class, and the teachers' thoughts and strategies regarding the pupils and their learning.

As for the different teachers' experiences, we as researchers decided to aim for a broad span when it comes to the level of experience to uncover possible differences in approaches to reluctant speakers. This was based on whether they have worked many years in the field or are less experienced in teaching practice. We wanted to explore whether experienced teachers had different strategies than the ones who newly graduated.

Pseudonym	Experience	Education	Subjects	Grade
Nicholas (m)	1 year	5 –year Teacher education	English, Social studies, Physical education	8th
Paul (m)	3 years	4-year Teacher education	English, Social studies, Physical education	10th
Christoffer (m)	6 years	4-year Teacher education	English, Norwegian, Physical education	9th
Angelica (f)	1 year	5-year teacher education	English, Religion, Social studies	8th
Beate (f)	9 years	4-year teacher education	English, Norwegian, Religion	10th
Kari (f)	12 years	4-year teacher education	English, social studies	10th

Table 1: Participants, their background, and their current teaching situation

Table 1 shows the participants in the study. Firstly, to protect and respect our participants' identity and confidentiality, pseudonyms were created. We also chose to include other factors such as experience, education, the types of subjects they teach, and the grades they are currently teaching. This was done as we identified these factors as something that could potentially affect the different participants' thoughts on the questions asked. A limitation is that our sample size is small and therefore cannot be generalized to the rest of the population. Another factor, which isn't included in a separate column in the table, is gender. Instead, we have chosen to create pseudonyms that usually represent one of the two genders and have marked the names with either (m) for male, or (f) for female.

3.3 Development of the interview guide

Before we conducted the interviews, we first piloted the interview guide with other MA students in two different pilot interviews. The following section will present the piloting of the interviews. Then we discuss decisions made regarding key terminology, and the final interview guide itself.

3.3.1 Piloting

Piloting, regarding collecting data, is a preliminary test of one's questionnaire (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). In our case, we tested our interview guide to see if we should revise any questions before conducting the actual interviews. By piloting the interview guide before collecting the actual data, we were allowed to explore how our questions were understood by others, as well as discover whether we could extract the information we were seeking. The pilot interviews were also recorded like the actual interviews. This was done so we could both listen to the interviews again, as well as make the interview situation as similar as possible to when we were going to conduct our actual research. This is recommended by Johnson and Christensen (2014), to secure legitimacy to the research undertaken.

In the piloting stage, we experienced certain questions that needed to be revised to give us more precise answers. At first, we experienced that some questions did not allow enough room for the interviewee to expand on their experiences. Specifically connected to whether the participant had experienced something in the classroom, we got a clear "yes" or "no" answer, without the participant elaborating as to why. We decided to revise our interview guide to add more follow up questions regarding these questions. Some examples are listed in the table below.

Draft question	Revised question
Have you ever experienced students who are reluctant to speak in your English class?	Have you ever experienced/experience students who you believe are reluctant to speak in English lessons? - How did/do you experience this in your teaching? - Could you elaborate? - Are there any specific situations where you feel pupils are less willing to speak up? - What situations?

Do you work in any way to reduce the discomfort of those who are reluctant to speak?	In what ways do you work to reduce the discomfort of those who are reluctant to speak? - What strategies or measures have you implemented? - Are there different strategies that work for different types of pupils? - How do you experience changes in pupil behaviour?

Table 2. Examples of revised questions after piloting the interview guide.

In Table 2, there are two questions presented where we received short answers during the piloting process of our interview guide, which we chose to expand. The first question has also been slightly revised. This is due to the question asking definitively whether someone is *something specific*, rather than focusing on the teacher's experience and understanding of a certain phenomenon. As we were trying to uncover how the teachers view, experience, and work with the pupils, the questions had to be framed to uncover the teacher's understanding.

The pilot interviews also provided us with experience as researchers that helped us develop as interviewers. As we both have limited experience in the field, we decided to conduct two pilot interviews, where we both got to try ourselves as the lead interviewer in each of the interviews. During the pilot interviews, and when listening to them afterwards, we discovered that remaining impartial, or neutral, to the answers we received were a challenge for both of us. We discovered that we were both too much of an active participant in the pilot interviews and gave too much feedback to our interview objects on the answers they gave. As researchers, we should be impartial, and keep our opinions to ourselves to reduce research bias (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). We also discovered that we gained a deeper understanding of our own interview guide during the piloting process. This helped us when conducting the final interviews with the teachers, as the interviews gradually felt more natural than the previous ones.

After piloting the interviews, we also received feedback on the interview guide from our supervisor as well as the pilot interview participants. Therefore, the interview guide has been

developed thoroughly through several steps including creating, testing, and finally revising through feedback and our own experience after the piloting process.

3.3.2 Key terminology

To conduct our research, we discussed if we should frame a collective understanding of the term's *strategies* and *reluctant speakers* to our interview objects. This is somewhat a challenge as an acknowledgement of both key terms may differ greatly from individual perceptions. Questions we asked ourselves were such as: Is someone who is shy a reluctant speaker? Will someone who weighs their words carefully before deciding to speak be considered a reluctant speaker? To what extent are teachers aware of their own use of strategies in the classroom?

When we conducted the interviews, we decided not to provide a specified description of the terms "*reluctant speakers*" and "*strategies*" to our interview objects. This was done so as not to limit the answers we received to a fixed concept of the term. By letting the participants conceptualize their own understanding of both terms, we hoped to get responses that were more open-minded and not derived from our conception of what the term may refer to. By letting the teachers make up their own mind about what they see as reluctant speakers, and strategies connected to creating oral production, we can also discuss how the concept is seen differently by teachers. A disadvantage of this is that our participants may have different conceptions of the terms. This means that the data collected will not necessarily correspond to what this study aims to uncover (Creswell, 2015).

3.3.3 The Interview Guide

The interview guide used to obtain data was developed by the current researchers with the research question for the project in mind, and learning theories included in the theory section. We decided to develop the interview guide in Norwegian and then translate it to English. The participants were asked before each interview what language they preferred the interview to be conducted. Out of the six interviews compiled, all participants chose Norwegian as their preferred language. As both the participants and interviewers first language are Norwegian, this felt natural and was expected. One benefit of conducting the interviews in Norwegian is that there is less of a chance of meaning to be lost in translation, as well as the interviews will feel

less artificial. A disadvantage however is that there is an increased need for precision when it comes to translating the answers.

As our thesis revolves around reluctant speakers, and strategies teachers use to facilitate oral production, most of the interview guide consists of questions related to these terms. The interview guide consists of three main parts where separate topics are prevalent. The first part consists of questions collecting information about reluctant speakers and FLA in practice, whereas part two consists of questions about strategies teachers use to deal with reluctance to speak in the EFL classroom. The third part of the interview guide is focused on giving the participants the opportunity to add more information freely about the research topic.

The interview guide was compiled based on the theory presented earlier in the thesis with FLA being the most used theory revolving reluctant speakers. We wanted to uncover whether the theory matched how the different teachers experienced speaking reluctance in practice. This is important to implement strategies to facilitate oral production. We therefore asked questions revolving their experiences with pupils who showed reluctance in oral production. Firstly, how they uncover whether someone is a reluctant speaker, and then later their thoughts on why the pupils show a reluctance to speak. With Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) theory of FLA in mind, the questions were related to the three factors where FLA is dominant in the classroom. These are 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety; and 3) fear of negative evaluation from both peers and the teacher.

When it came to the second part of the interview guide, where the goal was to uncover which different strategies the teachers use to facilitate oral production, we chose to focus on Hue's (2010) different strategies for teachers to encourage reluctant speakers to speak in the EFL classroom. The questions were designed with Hue's three main findings in mind. These are reducing the level of task difficulty, promoting positive attitudes among pupils, and building a supportive learning environment. We wanted to uncover the main strategies that teachers use and explore whether teachers had any other strategies on how to increase oral production in reluctant speakers.

To summarize, we developed the interview guide in Norwegian and translated it to English to obtain data for our thesis on reluctant speakers and strategies for facilitating oral production in the EFL classroom. All participants preferred to conduct the interviews in Norwegian, which allowed for a more natural conversation and decreased the chance of meaning being lost in translation. The interview guide was divided into three parts, focusing on reluctant speakers

and FLA in practice, strategies for dealing with reluctance to speak, and giving participants an opportunity to add additional information. The questions were based on FLA (Horwitz 1986), ZPD (Vygotsky, 1978), CLT and Hue (2010) who aims to uncover the strategies used by teachers to encourage reluctant learners to speak in the classroom, including reducing task difficulty, promoting positive attitudes, and building a supportive learning environment. Below is a presentation of the different topics, the aim of each topic and some sample questions from the interview guide. The complete interview guide with sub-questions can be found in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, in Norwegian and English.

Topic	Aim of Topic	Sample questions
1. Reluctant speakers	Investigate how teachers identify and experience reluctant speakers	- Have you ever experienced/experience students who are reluctant to speak in English lessons? - Are there any specific situations where you feel pupils are less willing to speak up? - Are there any specific situations where you feel pupils are less willing to speak up?
2. Measures and strategies	Investigate measures teachers implement to facilitate oral production	- Do you take any special measures if pupils are reluctant to speak? - Do you experience a different class environment in English teaching versus other teaching? - How do you work with relationship building and the classroom environment?
3. Additional comments	Uncover whether the participant has additional information	Now that we have talked about pupils' willingness to talk in English class, and the measures taken to ensure oral activity in English teaching. Is there something you have noticed, something you would like to add, or any other comments you would like to make?

Table 3: Interview guides main topics and sample questions.

3.4 Collecting data

All the interviews were conducted physically at the different schools where the respective teachers worked. Most of the interviews took place in meeting rooms, while two of them were conducted in the teachers' lounge. Both the researchers attended all the interviews, where we divided being the lead interviewer equally between us. This, however, did not hinder the other researcher in asking questions during the interviews. As the interviews were semi-structured, it often happened that the researcher who did not lead the interview, wanted to ask a question, which was encouraged by the both of us. We discovered that the lead-interviewer often would stick more to the script, while the other researcher who took notes, got more freedom to come up with questions on the spot.

To start off the interviews, we gave the participants the consent form (see Appendix 4) to sign and provided general information about their rights as participants in the project. Their rights regarding their ability to decide whether they want to opt out of the research at any given time, and how we will handle the collected data after the interview has been conducted (National Research Ethics Committees, 2022). They were also given this information in an e-mail prior to the interviews. All participants signed the consent form prior to conducting the interviews.

We brought two different recorders to each interview, one main recorder and a backup if anything went wrong with the main recording. Both recorders were connected to Nettskjema's application "Diktafon". The interviews varied in length, but generally lasted around 45 minutes. The longest interview lasted 1 hour and 2 minutes. The process of transcribing the interviews was done shortly after each interview was conducted and amounted to a combined 52 pages worth of text. All interviews were transcribed in Norwegian Bokmål, while non-verbal communication was not transcribed. We decided instead to listen through the recordings while reading the transcriptions during the analysis phase of the research process.

3.5 Data Analysis

The process of analyzing started by transcribing the audio recordings from the interviews. Transcribing the interview is seen as a starting point for further analysis as it transforms oral interview conversations conducted into written text (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). As we were two interviewers, we decided to divide the transcriptions between the two of us. Ahead of the

transcription process, we came to an agreement on how we should conduct the writing process to make it as similar as possible. Measures taken in this part of the process was to agree to write verbatim, and not focus on grammar mistakes made by the participants. This was done to not prematurely reduce text and gain an exact reproduction of what was said (McLellan-Lemal 2003). We also decided to include the transcription of background sound and noise due to their possible impact on the interviews. At a later stage in the process, we found this was probably not necessary, as it created more work, and we found it had little impact on the interviews.

We transcribed three interviews each, then read through the interviews done by the other researcher. By doing this, we ensured the quality of the transcriptions. As the transcription procedure has several technical- and interpretation challenges, it was beneficial to us to have two researchers interpreting the interview transcriptions (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Another measure taken was to also focus on how the words were spoken by writing contextual comments. Meaning can be lost in transcription, as one would not hear and see the participants intonation, body language and the use of irony. By writing comments regarding these factors, the other researcher would more easily interpret the transcriptions, and ensure a common understanding of what was being said (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

The method we chose for analyzing the interviews was thematic analysis (TA). TA is understood as a method for systematically identifying, organizing, and offering insight into patterns of meaning (themes) across a data set. This allows us as researchers to see and make sense of collective or shared meaning and experiences. TA is seen as a flexible method that allows us to focus on our data in different ways. One can both focus on analyzing meaning across the entire data set or examine one phenomenon in-depth (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

In our project, we use TA to discover collective meanings and disagreements between the interview objects statements. Therefore, Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach to TA was used as a framework to structure our data. We first familiarized ourselves with the transcribed interviews, and then later identified themes and codes. Due to our relatively small sample size of participants, we decided to manually code our qualitative data rather than using TA software. The use of automatic coding was discussed with our advisor, but due to time limitations and a relatively limited experience with TA, a manual coding procedure was finally chosen. The approach used was inductive coding where we started from scratch and created codes based on the obtained qualitative data itself. After the codes were created, we organized the codes in a flat coding frame. A flat coding frame treats each code with the same amount of importance and is an easy way of fast manual coding. One drawback with this method is the

volume of the codes created, which may make it difficult to organize the themes at a later stage (Medelyan, n.d.).

3.5.1 Thematic analysis and the analysis process

The first phase in Braun and Clarkes (2006) approach to TA is familiarizing yourself with the data. In this phase we read the transcripts thoroughly, while simultaneously re-listened to the audio recordings. This was done to ensure the quality of the transcriptions, as well as making sure we did not miss any potential useful data. It took us multiple read-throughs to familiarize ourselves with the data, which is the main purpose of this phase in the analysis process. During our read-throughs, we took observational notes, which were not structured in any way. The notes were made to help us in a later stage in the process when generating codes. The second phase is the generation of initial codes. This is the beginning of a more systematical way of handling the data. To put our codes into a system, we applied inductive coding (Medelyan, n.d.). Initially we had some thoughts about characteristics of reluctant speakers and strategies based on readings of previous research, but due to the uncertainty of what our participants would answer, we found an inductive approach to be suitable. This uncertainty is connected to the difficulty of generating pre-established codes. Firstly, we broke down our collected qualitative data into a narrower sample-size by sorting each question separately. We then looked at one participant's answers, and generated codes related to this specific data sample. Next, we read through another participants answers for the same question and compared the data for previously generated codes of the first participant. This was reoccurring process for all participants. We took notes of coherences and differences in this stage of the process. After creating the different codes, we put them into a coding frame, as shown in Table 4.

The second phase is the generation of initial codes. This is the beginning of a more systematical way of handling the data. To put our codes into a system, we applied inductive coding (Medelyan, n.d.). Initially we had some thoughts about characteristics of reluctant speakers and strategies based on readings of previous research, but due to the uncertainty of what our participants would answer, we found an inductive approach to be suitable. This uncertainty is connected to the difficulty of generating pre-established codes. Firstly, we broke down our collected qualitative data into a narrower sample-size by sorting each question separately. We then looked at one participant's answers, and generated codes related to this specific data sample. Next, we read through another participants' answers for the same question and

compared the data for previously generated codes of the first participant. This was a reoccurring process for all participants. We took notes of coherences and differences in this stage of the process. After creating the different codes, we put them into a coding frame, as shown in Table 4.

The third phase in the TA process is the searching for themes. We created main themes based on our topic and research question. This is the teachers' perceptions of reluctant speakers, and the strategies they use to facilitate oral production. The different sub-themes derived from our generated codes in the second phase. The sub-themes are used to categorize the coded data. Here we can identify similarities and overlaps between the codes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). From the questions we gathered a number of different answers, which then can be categorized into a broader category with the same meaning. One example is question 1a: "How do you experience reluctant speakers in class?" The answers given were such as pupils *act reserved, starts to blush,* and *begin to sweat*. All these answers can be seen as signs of anxiety, and therefore the code created was finally called *anxiety*. When the initial codes were grouped into a main code, it became easier to define relevant sub-themes. An example is the sub-theme *Characteristics and behaviors* which derived from the grouped codes *anxiety*, *disorders*, *avoid eye-contact*, *self-awareness, procrastinating* and *avoidance strategies.*

The fourth phase is reviewing potential themes. The researchers should quality-check whether the themes are relevant to data, and if the codes are appropriately placed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this fourth phase, we decided to combine the two themes' *characteristics* and *behaviors* as the different codes were resemblant to each other and difficult to separate. After placing the codes into different sub-themes, we undertook another read-through of the data collected to ensure that the data captured was meaningful for our research project.

The fifth phase is the process of defining and naming themes. During this phase one should be able to define a theme as consistent as possible related to the research. Each theme should have a clear focus and be built on overarching patterns within the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The names of the main themes in our research stem from our topic and research question, as well as the different sub-themes which emerged from the grouped codes.

The sixth and final phase is producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This is a continuous phase which will be more visible in the findings section of our thesis (see section 4) where the sub-chapters will draw their content from sub-themes created in the analysis process.

To summarize, the approach to TA by Braun and Clarke (2006) involves six phases. The first phase is familiarizing oneself with the data, taking observational notes while reading transcripts and listening to audio recordings. The second phase involves generating initial codes using an inductive approach to break down collected qualitative data into narrower samples. In the third phase, main themes are created based on research questions, and sub-themes are identified by categorizing the coded data. The fourth phase involves reviewing potential themes to ensure they are relevant and appropriately placed. The fifth phase is defining and naming themes with a clear focus built on overarching patterns within the data. The sixth and final phase is producing the report, where the main chapters will be derived from the research question, and sub-chapters will draw their content from sub-themes created in the analysis process. Both the findings and analysis section of this paper will draw upon these themes and codes, where they are organized through the different sub-themes.

Main Themes	Sub-themes	Codes
Teachers` perceptions of reluctant speakers	Characterics and behaviors	• Anxiety • Self-awareness • Procrastinating • Avoidance strategies
	Reasons for reluctance to speak	• Self-esteem • Disorders • Fear of making mistakes • Fear of negative evaluation
Teachers' strategies for facilitating oral production	Learning activities	• Plenary activities • Individual activities • Playful and informal activities
	Securing healthy relationships	• Varied forms of assessment • School-home cooperation • Safe classroom-environment • Humor
	Predictability for supporting reluctant speakers	• Seating arrangement • Give preparation time • Adapted teaching
	Exposure to oral English	• Challenge pupils to speak • Extramural activities
	The use of L1 in the EFL classroom	• Mostly English • Norwegian to ensure understanding

Table 4: Visual representation of the analysis process.

3.6 Research credibility

3.6.1 Validity

The validity of the study means that the research accurately measures what the study sets out to uncover (Fitzner, 2007). Validity is often associated with terms derived from the positivist terminology such as evidence, objectivity, rigor, facts, and mathematical data. The research's validity in a project can be said to determine whether the research truly measures what it was intended to, and how truthful these results are. When it comes to quantitative data, there are several methods of testing the validity of the research undertaken, but this is seen as far more complicated when it comes to qualitative studies. For instance, through qualitative interviews, one can never be completely certain that the questions are formulated in a manner which provides accurate answers, or even if these answers exist. Another point is that the data must be interpreted to some extent. One cannot be certain that an objective third party would observe the data in the same manner as we did. We experienced this when taking notes during interviews as the notes seldom corresponded. We both weighed answers with differences in importance and noticed different things during the data collection (Golafshani, 2003).

Even though it is regarded as more challenging to strengthen the validity of qualitative research, there are some methods researchers may explore to strengthen the validity. A possible way to minimize the sources of error is through combining methods while collecting data. This sort of *triangulation* uses both quantitative and qualitative approaches to strengthen the research undertaken (Golafshani, 2003). Triangulation does not suggest a fixed method for all research but is used to test the qualitative data through a quantitative method, and other qualitative methods. This may be methods such as questionnaires or surveys from the quantitative perspective, and observation or focus groups from the qualitative perspective. In an ideal setting we would like to strengthen our validity of the research undertaken by observing the teachers we interviewed in class. By doing this we would see if their answers correlated with practice. We decided however, due to time limitations, to only pursue one source of qualitative research. This is a weakness to the validity of our data, and one can argue that our findings cannot be generalized.

Although we did not use triangulation during the research process, we wanted to strengthen the validity of the research undertaken through other means. Firstly, everyone we interviewed is teachers in the 8th to 10th grade. This means that our sample size is limited to our study's wanted selection set. We were also lucky enough to be two researchers, so that we could divide tasks

among us to increase the validity of the research. One example is during the interviews when one of us took the role as the main interviewer, while the other listened closely, took notes, and had the freedom to ask follow-up questions. This was a way to make sure we did not forget to ask important questions during the interviews. We have also secured some validity through the transcription phase where we included breaks, differences in intonation and sometimes also body language. This is relevant to ensure validity through the phycological interpretation of our participants, where sometimes irony and gesturing was used to explain phenomena (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). By piloting our interview guide prior to conducting the interviews, we also increase the validity of our research. This helped us identify if there were flaws, or limitations within the design that needed modifications prior to conducting our research (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

3.6.2 Reliability

Reliability is linked to how consistent and reliable the collected data is. It can refer to, among other things, whether the study can be repeated at other times, where other researchers use a similar method, and get similar answers as before (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). However, in a qualitative approach the possibility of retesting and getting similar data can be influenced by countless different factors, in contrast to a quantitative approach. These factors can for example be the participants and interviewers' mood for the day and how questions are being asked. Based on these factors Leseth and Tellmann (2018) explains that due to how the researchers affect the research process itself, it will be impossible to repeat the study and get identical results. Further, they clarify that it is crucial for the researchers to explain how the data material has been developed in the research process.

Through this paper, we have justified the choices made. Previously we explained our interpersonal relationships with our interview participants. All our participants were chosen based on a convenience sample. The participants were teachers we met through practice experiences during our studies, or through relevant recommendations from other participants. Apart from this, we have no other relationship with our participants. The choice of presenting our personal relationships with the participants is meant to ensure transparency in our study (Leseth & Tellmann, 2018). We have also included a table that presents various factors that can influence how the participants respond to the questions in the interviews (see Table 1). The table presents factors such as the type of education the participants have, which grades they currently teach, and which other subjects they teach in addition to English. These factors can

affect their contextual experiences with reluctant speakers. For example, the pupil's age or what current grade they are in can possibly be an affecting factor, due to how much time the teacher has had with them to create a safe classroom environment. A safe classroom environment can be seen as crucial for facilitating oral production in reluctant speakers as Sæteren (2019) explains.

Interpersonal relationships and information on the participants are important to present to ensure the study's reliability. Based on these aspects we can also identify possible flaws (Golafshani, 2003). Due to the duration of this project, it was chosen to recruit participants from a convenience sample. If the project lasted longer, it would be beneficial to include more participants from a different sample. This could be participants we had no previous relationship with, and participants who lived in different areas other than Oslo.

3.6.3 Reflexivity

The researchers' subjectivity can also potentially influence the research project. Reflexivity is to acknowledge one's own role in the research conducted in qualitative studies (Loftus, 2017). In this section we will therefore present our personal experiences with the thesis's topic and discuss potential influences this has had on the research.

The decision to investigate reluctant speakers was motivated by our personal experiences during our studies. Specifically, we were intrigued by the most effective approaches for enabling these pupils to express themselves verbally in the classroom. We experienced this as one of the most challenging aspects when teaching. During our teacher education we have been provided with many useful strategies to ensure learning. Nevertheless, we have experienced that it can be difficult to put theory into practice. For the most part, we have felt that it is primarily through our practical experiences that we have gained the most insight into the topic. Through these experiences, we have witnessed many different strategies that the teachers implement, but due to the limited time in our stays, we have never experienced whether these strategies would work over time. Having personally tested numerous strategies, we possess some preconceptions regarding what we believe to be the most effective ones. These notions may have impacted the development of our interview guide, specifically in how we phrased our questions. However, we have made efforts throughout this thesis to explain the choices we made for the research, to reduce the researchers' bias.

3.7 Ethical considerations

Qualitative research, and interviews as a method, are largely linked to human interaction. Kvale and Brinkmann (2015) explain that this type of research is filled with moral and ethical questions. The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities has developed guidelines for research in the field (National Research Ethics Committees, 2022). Christoffersen and Johannesen (2012) summarizes three types of considerations that a researcher must think through: (1) the informant's right to self-determination and autonomy, (2) the researcher's duty to respect the informant's privacy and (3) the researcher's responsibility to avoid harm.

To respect the three types of guidelines, we first applied for the project's approval through Sikt (see Appendix 3). To get the project approved, we had to establish a consent form. In the consent form we briefly presented the aim of the research and ensured full confidentiality throughout the entire duration of the research process. Additionally, the consent form contained contact information on how to reach the researchers and that participants could withdraw from the study at any point. The participants were also reminded of their rights both prior and after conducting the interviews, including their anonymity in the project. Recordings from the interviews were made using the Diktafon app. This app is initially the only tool approved by OsloMet to collect yellow and red data (OsloMet, 2022). For this project it was only necessary to collect what is called yellow data. These are general personal data such as the informants name, e-mail address and phone number. Red data is categorized as sensitive personal data and contains data regarding information such as health, ethnic origin, and political opinion (OsloMet, 2022).

The participants were informed of the researchers doing audio recordings through the consent form and were also made aware of the use of the Diktafon app before conducting the interviews. This app was the only tool used for recording the interviews. After the audio recordings were collected, the audio files were transferred directly to Nettskjema. The audio files were only listened to through Nettskjema and then deleted at the end of the project's duration. To ensure our participants' anonymity, pseudonyms were created so responses could not be traced back to them. As for the transcriptions, OsloMet does not provide any platform for storage. They were therefore stored on a password-protected personal device, to which only the researchers had access to. At the end of the project all transcripts, audio recordings, and signed forms of consent were deleted.

4. Findings

During this section of the thesis, we will present the findings from the six interviews we conducted with the different teachers who were a part of our research project. The subchapters in this section are categorized and based on the project's TA, where the different sub-themes will be discussed through the codes uncovered during the six different interviews. Firstly, this section will look at the different participants perceptions of reluctant speakers, including general characteristics and behavior, and finally what the teachers believe are the reasons for the pupils reluctancy. The second part of the findings section will take a closer look at the teachers' strategies to facilitate oral production.

All presented quotes have been translated from Norwegian to English. To understand the meaning of some of the statements, additional information has sometimes been added in brackets by the authors to clarify the statement.

4.1 Teachers' perceptions of reluctant speakers

In this sub-chapter we will take a closer look at the six teachers' perceptions of reluctant speakers. Identifying pupils who appear reluctant to speak in the EFL classroom is important so teachers can accommodate their lessons for these pupils. Revealing how teachers characterize these pupils can therefore be helpful. First, characteristics and behavior of reluctant speakers, as seen through our participants, will be presented, then their believed reasons for the reluctance to speak.

4.1.1 Characteristics and behavior of reluctant speakers

Even though experience varied between the teachers interviewed, all of them had experienced teaching pupils who are reluctant to speak, in the EFL classroom. All the participants currently teach and clarified that they experience challenges with reluctant speakers in their current classes. From the questions asked in our interviews we wanted to gain the teachers' insights and thoughts on whether there are certain characteristics to identify reluctant speakers, and if these thoughts correspond with the other teachers' perceptions. After interviewing all the participants, we could see that there was a form of consensus between them, where there were similar characteristics that were mentioned by all of them.

Both the body language and the facial expressions of the pupils were mentioned as some key indicators for identifying reluctant speakers. The teachers identified reluctant pupils by, for example, their posture or loss of eye contact between them and the pupil.

> Beate: (When asking questions to the whole class) They are evasive in their gaze, and often hide behind their iPad, for example.

Eye-contact, or rather the lack of, seems to be one of the key indicators to identify reluctant pupils for our interview participants. Nevertheless, Nicholas states that both he and his colleagues use eye contact with the pupils to inquire whether they are willing and ready to say a few words in plenary.

> Nicholas: When, or if, we have any form of discussion tasks either in pairs or groups, we (the teachers) go around the classroom and ask if anyone is willing to share some of their thoughts in plenary. Then it is often the case that we would rather meet the eyes of some pupils and then they shake their heads if they do not feel like sharing in plenary, or nod if they feel ready to share something.

It was also mentioned that pupils tried to hide when the teacher posed questions out loud to the whole class. Especially during whole-class activities, or activities with multiple participants, teachers found that pupils, who they identified as reluctant to speak, hid away. During tasks where pupils were reading out loud and assessment situations, our participants described the reluctant speakers to display a more reserved body language.

> Paul: Yes, very often they (pupils) hide, when it comes to reading aloud or if we are going to discuss anything. In assessment situations, they often hide away. Any tasks where they have to use the (English) language.

It was specifically mentioned that assessment situations would trigger the pupils' reticence and reluctancy to participate orally in class. Other situations where the interview participants experienced pupils reluctancy to speak were in collaborative discussion tasks. The participants would, for example, divide pupils into groups or pairs to allow them to discuss with each other within an agreed time frame, then ask pupils to share their thoughts in plenary. When pupils were asked to share views and thoughts in front of the class, the interview participants felt that reluctant speakers were unforthcoming.

> Kari: When you have discussion tasks, either in groups or pairs, or if you ask a pupil directly, you won't receive an answer from them, just a blank or sullen face. Or the pupils (reluctant speakers) hide away so that I won't ask them (to share their thoughts).

Other participants shared the same experience as the quote mentioned above. However, some explained that participation varied slightly depending on whether there were group assignments

or individual tasks. During group assignments, our participants said that reluctant speakers were more willing to speak, but still displayed signs of reluctancy. It was clarified that during classroom discussions, where the teacher was in charge, there would be a small group of pupils who typically were the ones speaking.

The participants believed that most pupils, who they saw as reluctant speakers, were also often the same pupils who had an introverted personality. It was explained that reluctant speakers were pupils who often sat alone during recess or had a small group of friends at school. Our participants believed that many of the pupils who were reluctant to speak often thrived in smaller groups, and therefore preferred not to speak in a plenary setting. It was explained that reluctant speakers exhibited the use of avoidance strategies more often when it came to whole-class activities. We therefore asked whether there were any specific avoidance strategies that were typical for reluctant speakers:

> Paul: Yes, of course it is. For example, when they (reluctant speakers) are supposed to have an oral presentation, then they tend not to show up. Or when they have submissions where they must talk, there is always some technical problem which means that they are not able to submit. And then you meet them in the middle by submitting in writing, you get me?

Many of the participants stated that in recent years they had made more use of the opportunity to let the pupils do oral assignments digitally, for example by recording audio of themselves talking about a given topic. This was done so the teachers did not have to set aside too much time in class to carry out a high number of presentations in the classroom. This has, however, created a challenge for the teachers. The digital solutions were primarily meant to help pupils who suffered from various disorders such as OCD or poor mental health, but in time, more pupils became aware of the possibility of submitting digitally. This made it challenging for the teachers to increase oral participation in class. When many pupils submit oral tasks digitally, the room for discussing oral presentations became more limited.

> Kari: Today's school is incredibly good at arranging teaching for the individual pupil, but I feel that in some situations it is arranged a little too well and that we rather end up sewing pillows under the children's arms (idiomatic expression for making something very easy for others). When pupils know they don't have to give a presentation (in front of the class) it creates a classroom where it's okay not to speak.

Our participants saw general characteristics and behaviors of reluctant speakers in a similar way. The most frequent characteristic of reluctant speakers was hiding in plenary settings. Typical signs were pupils who showcased a reserved body language and an evasive gaze. Typically, reluctant speakers were seen as introverted in other settings as well as in the

classroom. Some pupils would speak more in smaller groups, but this was not always the case. Participants had noticed that reluctant speakers would tend to not show up to oral formal assessment situations, and therefore facilitated digital solutions instead. This has created a challenge for teachers, as the classroom has become quieter due to many pupils preferring this solution.

4.1.2 Reasons for reluctance to speak

There was a broad agreement among the participants about possible reasons as to why some pupils were reluctant to speak in class. Stage anxiety was seen as a major reason for reluctant speakers. The teachers said that reluctant speakers often felt nervous about what reactions they could potentially get from fellow pupils. Based on the teachers' statements, it can be stated that the classroom culture and the classroom environment have an influence on the willingness to talk in both the English subject. One of the participants explained that pupils in different classes may have different levels of fear connected to communication apprehension based on the environment within the class.

> Paul: It depends a bit on what kind of class you have, I think. In some classes, there is more room for making mistakes, while in other classes there is almost a culture of fear of answering things incorrectly.

We asked a follow-up question whether he thought the fear was linked to the response the pupils got from peers or if it was linked to communication apprehension.

> Paul: When it comes to making errors or answering incorrectly, it's more about response. They are more afraid of the response they get from those around them. Because there is always a class where there is a pupil who has to "arrest" the other pupils. Classrooms where if someone says something wrong, there is always someone who will point it out by laughing or saying it was wrong or something like that. There are also some teachers who find it difficult letting pupils make mistakes, so they correct the pupils instead of saying "that was a good idea" or something like that.

Other participants had similar views. One of the main reasons why pupils are reluctant to speak is because of the fear of evaluation, especially from peers. It was also explained that pupils sometimes felt they were being corrected by the teacher. This happened even if the teacher tried to praise the attempt and at the same time guide pupils. Our participants agreed that correcting pupils in the classroom had to be done carefully.

> Angelica: Last year, I received some feedback from some pupils who felt that I corrected them. For example, when they said something, I repeated the same thing they said, which they found a little uncomfortable. Then I had to explain that when I say the same thing back or in a slightly different way,

it is not because you are wrong, but rather that if I say it in a broader sense, it is possible that more pupils connect and understand what we are talking about. And after I had explained my reasons for repeating their response, they understood and did not feel uncomfortable anymore.

The participants also pointed out that they worked to ensure that pupils respected each other, and hurtful comments were not being tolerated. They stated that classroom environment was something they worked on continuously and explained that they would often conduct teaching sessions ahead of plenary presentations on how to behave as an audience. Often, they would give the pupils in the audience special roles, so that they could focus on their tasks related to the presentation they were listening to. This could be anything from following a particular topic in the presentation, or being able to provide feedback on what was good about the presentation after it was finished. One participant, however, still believed that situations could arise where grimaces were made, or comments said, that the teacher was not aware of.

> Beate: It can often be that someone sends a small look or a grimace that says something to the effect that they think what you say is stupid or funny because it is wrong, and for many people this can be perceived as very hurtful. So, we (the teachers) try to work on that all the time, but it is very difficult.

Other situations where it was difficult for teachers to control were situations that occurred outside of school. These were situations that often arose on social media, where some of the teachers experienced that there were pupils who could harass others and make fun of them on various mobile applications. The teachers found it demanding not having insight in what was said by pupils outside of school and felt that there were many external factors that contributed to creating a possible culture of fear of speaking in English classes.

> Beate: (On whether she finds it demanding to account for external factors) Yes, at least when it comes to things like social media where I don't have complete control over what happens. I have control over what happens in the classroom, but then they can go out and write some crap on snapchat, right? It is not certain that they do, but it has happened that they joke with each other a bit, for example, someone had created a group on social media where they made fun of some of their fellow classmates. These were pupils (those who were bullied) who typically aren't the loudest or most clever in school.

To explain the fear of being negatively evaluated by others, it was pointed out by our participants that especially in the English subject, it is the fear of being ridiculed due to communication apprehension that worried the reluctant speakers the most.

> Christoffer: I feel in a way that the English language introduces an extra element, where pupils both worry about whether they answer with the wrong pronunciation in addition to worrying about whether they answer the task correctly at all. If, for example, the class had been held in Norwegian, there would

probably have been more people who had dared to answer, but when you add that you have to answer in English, it becomes, in a way, another scary thing that they must face.

There were different opinions among the participants regarding whether the pronunciation of English plays a significant role in some pupils' reluctance to speak in the EFL classroom. Some believed that it could be a contributing factor, as some pupils may ridicule those who speak differently from what is perceived as the "correct" way of pronouncing certain English words or phrases. On the other hand, some believed that since pupils are exposed to extramural English quite frequently, they possess an adequate vocabulary in the English language. They argued that it is rather the grammar that is lacking. It was noted that simply having a vast vocabulary does not equate to having the necessary knowledge of grammar rules, such as verb conjugation, required to produce a spoken piece of language.

Overall, the teachers agreed that the primary reasons for pupils' reluctance to participate in oral activities in the classroom were the fear of showing a lack communication apprehension and the fear of evaluation by peers. The teachers noted that the pupils' main concern was making errors in grammar, which is crucial for effective English communication, and that they became excessively self-conscious about their own pronunciation. The teachers also found it challenging to address issues that occurred outside of the classroom but had an impact on the teaching environment. Some of these situations occurred on social media outside of school. On social media there were, for example, pupils mocking their classmates and fellow pupils. The pupils who were ridiculed were typically those who struggled academically and generally preferred to not engage in group activities with others. This could have effects on how much these pupils chose to participate orally in class.

4.2 Teachers' strategies for facilitating oral production

We have now looked at the participants' perceptions of reluctant speakers, and their general characteristics of what causes pupils to be reluctant speakers. There was a consensus among most of the project's participants regarding what causes reluctancy towards speaking in the EFL classroom, where the lack of communication apprehension and fear of negative evaluation was the most dominant in our findings.

We will now take a closer look at the different strategies the teachers use to facilitate oral production, and how they accommodate their teaching to reluctant speakers. The sub-chapters are based on the different sub-themes presented earlier during the TA of our research. Firstly,

different learning activities supporting reluctant speakers, then more overarching aspects of the teaching practices such as securing healthy relationships, predictability for supporting reluctant speakers, exposure to oral English, and then finally the use of L1 in the EFL classroom.

4.2.1 Learning activities

Some of the teachers we interviewed put importance of oral communication, and how it is emphasized in LK20, where oral communication has received a larger part in both the curriculum aims and learning goals. They argued that pupils have a responsibility in EFL classroom to be active orally, more now than before, so that the teacher may assess their pupils properly and fairly. When discussing how the newest course curriculum had affected their teaching processes, regarding the importance of oral communication, one participant said:

> Christoffer: To assess the pupils properly according to LK20, we need to be able to see them even more orally active than what we were used to during the old curriculum. This has made me use more verbal tasks, or at least I try to include small speaking tasks every class where they must communicate with each other. I also believe this is a good way of reducing the fear of speaking, when talking in English is just considered a normal part of the school day.

All the teachers we interviewed claimed that they tried to include different learning activities in each class hour, where they included both written and oral tasks during the classes. Most of them argued that the concentration level of the pupils is higher with multiple shorter tasks than spending a whole class hour on one specific way of achieving learning. Although they all tried to include a variety of written and oral teaching, some teachers argued that the differences in the classes they taught caused them to accommodate their teaching thereafter.

> Paul: It is very contrasting to teach different classes. There are some classes where there is more room to make a "fool out of oneself", and in these classes it is easier to have a higher degree of oral activity, whereas in other classes, where there is less room for such, I tend to have more written activities.

Other participants also made comments related to how the pupils behaved. It was a tendency to set up different exercises based on the group of pupils. There was a consensus between the teachers that classrooms which generally displayed a positive relationship with each other, was favorable for reluctant speakers to be more orally active.

When teachers focus on oral production, reluctant speakers make planning and organizing activities more complicated for teachers. All participants seemed aware that individual pupils might find oral activities uncomfortable and said that they took measures both in class and prior

to the lessons regarding these pupils. With these pupils in mind, one teacher stated that one way of making them less anxious is by "tricking them into talking". By using seemingly helpful or playful activities, they experienced reluctant speakers to be less nervous.

> Kari: Sometimes I try to "trick them" into assessment situations by speaking English with them after class. I might ask them; "Oh, can you help me tidy the classroom?" I kind of lure them in with a couple of questions, and then I might get a response. This way they (reluctant speakers) are also more inclined to answer in English, not Norwegian, which some of them does when I ask them in class.

Another teacher also emphasized his use of helpful and playful activities to make reluctant speakers more orally active. He characterized these activities as "games", where English language communication skills is needed to participate. Reluctant speakers would be less aware of their own use of the foreign language, and more focused on the activity itself. With that in mind, he included such activities every week for the pupils to play. These could be new, but he also had some favorites that he came back to more often than others. One of them, where he gave each pupil a laminated card, with a certain character and information regarding the subject they were working on, was a favorite to make the reluctant speakers more orally active in class.

> Christoffer: When I do this activity, where I give the different pupils roles with certain responsibilities to gather information about a certain field, and then provide them with a few problems they have to solve, it makes them discuss and figure out the best courses of action, and then I experience even the reluctant speakers to be more involved. I think they forget a bit that they are speaking English and are rather focused on the task. No one wants to be the team's worst player!

One of the most talked about strategies to facilitate oral production for reluctant speakers that came up during the interviews, was pairing pupils together before sharing in a plenary setting. Some teachers argued that working together benefits the reluctant speakers as they receive both time to think and discuss questions prior to answering. They argued that this was beneficial for several reasons. Firstly, by allowing pupils more time to think about questions, it is more likely that they will speak. Sharing in groups also creates a sense of safety for the pupils as they have already practiced formulating their answers to other pupils. It was also argued that it was beneficial as single pupils did not have sole ownership of the ideas, and the teacher could then ask the groups to share rather than individuals. One teacher talked specifically about group work when asked about how she worked on reducing the discomfort for reluctant speakers.

> Beate: I try to reduce their discomfort of speaking by using a lot of pairing or group exercises. I allow the pupils to check (their answers) with the group first, and I believe a lot of them find it easier to speak afterwards. Then they realize they are onto something, and also get some time to do research if necessary.

It also ensures that they have backing from the group, as they all must agree on what they should present most of the time, which makes it easier for them to say it out loud afterwards.

The majority of the participants made clear that group work and pairing of pupils were commonly used strategies to facilitate oral production. Specifically, the TPS activity was used in almost every class. Most of the participants were fond of activities that closely resembled TPS without mentioning it by name as well. They explained that it gave the pupils an opportunity to collect their thoughts, before seeking validation and new ideas with someone else, and therefore lowering the threshold for speaking in a plenary setting.

Kari: I try to use the think-pair-share activity at the start of every class, where they (the pupils) are allowed to first think for themselves for a couple of minutes. Then I group them up in smaller groups or pairs, where they are allowed to share their thoughts with fellow pupils. I experience that it is easier to get them talking when they have "warmed up" in smaller groups or pairs, before sharing in front of the whole class.

Other participants discussed whether it really helped the most reluctant speakers with such activities. They argued that it made it easier for the reluctant speakers to hide in smaller groups, and that it was the same pupils who spoke most of the classes, in both group work and plenary settings. It was mentioned that the most reluctant speakers opt out of the sharing activities, even when specifically asked to share what they had talked about in the group. Even when trying to push for answers, it was not often they would get a response.

Christoffer: As we have talked about, I do try a lot of different things (learning activities), and sometimes it helps (reluctant speakers talk more), but most of the time I feel like it is the same 4-5 pupils who speak every class.

A widely used solution among the participants was to allow pupils to hand in work digitally. This applied both to written assignments, which are traditionally delivered digitally anyway, but also to oral assignments where the pupils made voice recordings and handed in whatever they had produced through digital solutions. This was seen as a measure to help reluctant speakers, and through this method the pupils would at least demonstrate some of the competence in the English language that they possess. Some of the participants addressed the positive side of handing in oral assignments digitally, as this allowed pupils to produce oral English in a setting where they feel safe. Other participants saw advantages in having the opportunity to hand in video presentations and audio recordings but stressed the importance of practicing performances in front of the whole class as well.

> Beate: There has been a limited number of whole-class presentations (due to the pandemic), with a significant increase in video presentations. Just now we are starting to implement live presentations again, but pupils may have had less experience standing in front of the class due to the pandemic.

Pupils with other challenges have typically opted out of whole-class presentations, through deals with their contact teacher. However, due to an increase in the number of such pupils, live presentations have become less frequent. This shift has also made it clear to other pupils that alternative forms of assessment are available, resulting in more pupils choosing this solution instead.

> Kari: Nowadays it seems that there are more pupils who do not like to present in front of the class. In the past it was less problematic, I think. Before, you could say that, for example, if you had a half-class, everyone should say something out loud at the end of the lesson in front of the class. But we have several pupils now who have informed the contact teacher that they do not want to have a presentation in front of others at all. I don't quite know why it has become like this, but we have several pupils who struggle with various things, such as OCD and other mental health problems, so it is usually these pupils who will make deals with the teachers to find other solutions. I also think that other pupils realize that this is something I can ask for, so they might take advantage of it a little too.

Whether the video presentations were shown in front of class or whether only the teacher saw it, differed between the participants. For many of the teachers, this way of presenting was a direct substitute for the more traditional presentations done in front of the whole class, while with other participants it seemed like it was used more as a creative tool for teaching. The decision of whether to present pupils' work to the entire class was made through agreements between the teachers and the pupils. Although this did not necessarily motivate reluctant speakers to showcase their work, it did provide them with the opportunity to present their work to a larger audience without having to produce English orally on the spot.

When it comes to learning activities, the participants claimed it was a tendency to set up different exercises based on the group of pupils. Classrooms which displayed a positive relationship with each other was viewed as more favorable for reluctant speakers. Helpful or playful activities was a common strategy applied by the participants. It was argued that such activities made reluctant speakers less aware of their own communication apprehension. Another strategy was pairing pupils together before sharing in a plenary setting. This benefits reluctant speakers as they receive time to think and gather their thoughts prior to speaking. The most common strategy connected to pairing pupils were TPS. Digitally handing in oral assignments was also used to reduce reluctant speakers fear of evaluation by others.

4.2.2 Securing healthy relationships

The participants prioritized building positive relationships with their pupils and creating a safe environment to enable the pupils to perform to the best of their abilities. According to all the participants, a safe classroom environment was a key component to getting reluctant pupils to speak more in English lessons. During interviews, the majority agreed that building relationships with pupils should extend beyond the classroom to include activities like recess. Checking in with pupils during breaks, asking how they were doing or what their weekend plans are, was seen as a valuable way to show interest and strengthen relationships.

> Beate: (On relationship building) I can ask questions such as "how did the football match go this weekend?" Positive things to show that you care and to show that you want them well. Because there are many pupils who quickly go into a defensive position when they feel that they are being tested, regardless of whether the purpose was to test them or not. It is always about getting them to understand that they must learn things for themselves in order to, among other things, feel safe.

It was also added that teachers should not be afraid of admitting mistakes. By showing mistakes made by oneself as a teacher, it was argued to help show reluctant speakers who experienced a fear of lacking communication apprehension, that it was okay to make mistakes.

> Paul: Some of us (the teachers) are quite good at making a fool of ourselves. Because even though I'm an English teacher, it doesn't mean that I understand everything. Sometimes I'm left wondering which words to use and then I try to make a bit of humor out of it so that they will understand that it's not dangerous to be uncertain of something or to answer incorrectly.

The use of humor is also something other participants values. It was a consensus that if you, as a teacher, manage to not take yourself too seriously, it will benefit the relationship between the teacher and the pupils. One of the participants had chosen to tell the pupils in his class which football team he supported. This meant that pupils, especially those who were also interested in football, knew that they could talk to him about the topic. At the same time, this meant that he could be in danger of being teased if his team had lost, but this helped to create a bond between him and his pupils.

> Nicholas: I have told them which team I support, and this has made the pupils see that I also have other interests apart from being a teacher. In many ways I feel that I have humanized myself and that this has led to more people daring to make contact if they just feel like talking to someone. Of course, there are always some pupils who will remind me when my team has lost, but these are the same pupils who can handle me teasing them back when their team loses. I feel like this sort of banter helps in making an inclusive and safe classroom environment.

Building positive relationships with the parents and guardians of pupils was also seen as crucial in creating a positive school environment. In cases where pupils were experiencing academic difficulties, such as being reluctant to speak, teachers would collaborate with parents and the pupils themselves to establish achievable goals within agreed time frames. The participants all agreed that having a positive relationship with the parents and guardians of the pupils was beneficial when implementing strategies to facilitate oral production. Encouraging collaboration between the school and the home environment was argued to reduce possible challenges that pupils might bring with them from home.

Ensuring a safe learning environment for the pupils was seen by all interview participants as essential for getting reluctant pupils to speak and participate more in class. All agreed that the work to strengthen the relationships between them and their pupils could not only take place in the classroom, but that they also had to make efforts during recess as well. Humor was often used as a tool to create an informal environment, where pupils could see that there was room for wrong answers. A strong collaboration between school and home was also seen as important for the pupils' learning environment, as it was necessary for teachers to have an overview of what resources the pupils had available at home, and to agree learning aims for the pupils.

4.2.3 Predictability for supporting reluctant speakers

All interview participants agreed that providing pupils with a predictable daily routine could positively impact their learning. This was especially true for pupils who faced academic challenges, as they tended to perform better when the school day was structured in a consistent and predictable manner. Ensuring predictability could involve various factors, such as the seating arrangement in the classroom or clear guidelines on how much preparation time pupils had before formal tests. By providing a stable and predictable learning environment, teachers could support their pupils in achieving their academic goals.

Seating arrangements in the classroom was seen to have an impact on reluctant speakers. For instance, reluctant speakers may benefit from sitting closer to the teacher as this can increase their engagement and motivation levels. Similarly, the participants argued that seating them alongside more motivated or high-performing peers could provide a positive influence and encourage reluctant speakers to participate more actively in class. Others were more fund of placing reluctant speakers together. By doing so, they argued that one of the reluctant speakers had to be an instigator when solving communicative tasks. A strategic seating arrangement,

such as grouping pupils together based on their interests or abilities, can also promote collaboration which can help motivate and engage reluctant speakers.

> Nicholas: I think it is important for the teacher to put much thought into how the pupils are seated in the classroom. I for one, believe reluctant speakers benefit from being placed with others who experience the same difficulties.

The participants had a somewhat similar seating arrangement in their classrooms. All classrooms were set up in a way where pupils sat in pairs, often solving tasks together. While the terminology used by the different teachers to refer to these pairs varied, their function remained the same across all classrooms. In some of the classrooms, it was also the case that if you had tasks in larger groups, it was possible for one pair to turn to another and create a larger group for the task. Paul was one of the teachers who had a seating arrangement like this in his classroom, and when asked if he thought this was the most optimal solution, he replied with the following statement.

> Paul: I think it is best, because it helps as a measure that if you know that some of the pupils are insecure, they can be put with someone they are safe with and then it will make them talk more. It is also us (the teachers) who set up the class maps (seating arrangement) with where the pupils should sit. Then we are in control, which makes it easier for us to arrange for as many pupils as possible to dare to participate in the lessons.

In response to subsequent questions, the participants emphasized that they also considered the pupils' preferences when assigning seats. Some noted that there may be instances where they delegate the responsibility of the seating arrangements to the pupils themselves. This was done to give the pupils a sense of responsibility when it came to decisions regarding their everyday school life. It was a consensus between the participants that this did not hinder predictability for the pupils, as this seating arrangement were applicable for longer durations of time.

To ensure predictability, the participants had drawn up rules on what to expect in assessment situations in collaboration with the pupils. Something that often became a topic of discussion between teachers and pupils was whether the pupils should be given preparation time before they had to give presentations in front of the class. This varied among the different teachers, as some of them only allowed 5 to 10 minutes of preparation before the presentation, while others had set aside more time. In classes where many pupils were reluctant to speak in front of the whole class, some of the teachers allowed these pupils more preparation time. They did this, for example, by putting these pupils up last in the order of presentations, or that they had had a chat with them beforehand about where in the order these pupils wanted to be. This was often

agreed upon prior to the presentation day to ensure predictability for the reluctant speakers in class.

> Angelica: When we have presentations in class, I have often talked to the reluctant speakers beforehand, who I know struggle with presenting in front of the class. I typically ask whether they either want to start or end the presentations. Most reluctant speakers want to be last, so then I rather let them go to the hall and prepare, instead of having them sit and listen to the others present.

The participants saw advantages of ensuring predictability for reluctant speakers. They identified simple steps such as deciding where pupils should sit in the classroom, and which other pupils they should sit with, could help some reluctant speakers participate. Some also point out that it is advantageous in some situations to let pupils decide for themselves where to sit. As this was decided for longer periods of time, it was argued that this did not affect the experienced predictability of the regular school day. In assessment situations, some participants would agree prior to the presentation day, that reluctant speakers would have more time to prepare for oral presentations. This increased the likelihood of them speaking.

4.2.4 Exposure to oral English

The participants referred to exposure in an EFL language learning context as the amount of exposure that pupils have to the English language in various forms. This could be through means such as listening, speaking or extramural English. Exposure is also connected to the teacher's expectation of how much the pupils should speak in class or during presentations. It is closely connected to how much they challenge pupils to produce orally in class.

All our participants agreed that they had to challenge the reluctant speakers to speak in various class situations. Mostly connected to live presentations where the rest of the class were spectators, the reluctant speakers tended to make excuses, or simply refuse to carry out the presentation. As the participants agreed that it was important for the reluctant speakers to practice their public speaking skills, they all said they tried to motivate the pupils to try to speak in front of the class. Some of the participants debated the difficulties connected to how much they should challenge the reluctant speakers when conducting presentations and saw it as something that could affect their relationship with the pupil.

> Beate: It is difficult to know to what extent one should challenge the reluctant speakers to talk during classroom activities, I definitely have colleagues that "push" (the reluctant speakers) more than me. To me it is more important that some pupils show up (to class), rather than them actually producing schoolwork. Many pupils must work on their "school-endurance", and therefore I value a better

relationship with them to a greater extent than them actually being involved in the classroom activities, or how much they say during presentations.

In contrast, other participants held a divergent perspective. They maintained that pushing the reluctant speakers beyond the approach mentioned above would prove advantageous for them in the future. It was contended that by urging the pupils who were unwilling to participate in classroom activities, such as live presentations, to take up the challenge, they would feel a sense of achievement and appreciate the practical value of doing so. It was further expressed that there were instances where things had escalated beyond control, and some pupils had suffered mental breakdowns due to excessive pressure, which was regrettable. All participants emphasized the significance of being familiar with the class to determine which pupils could handle more encouragement of exposure than others.

> Paul: Indeed, there have been varying outcomes for my pupils. While most of them have done very well, others have struggled. For instance, some pupils were initially reluctant to speak English, but with encouragement, they gradually became more comfortable and confident. However, there have also been instances where I have attempted to push pupils too far, resulting in even complete breakdowns. Nevertheless, as a teacher, I believe you will develop the ability to understand which pupils should not be pushed beyond their limits.

During discussions on encouraging reluctant speakers to participate in classroom activities, it became apparent that there was a small difference between the opinions of male and female participants. The male participants expressed a higher willingness to challenge reluctant pupils to a greater extent than their female counterparts. This highlighted a diversity of perspectives among teachers where they debated the need for a balanced approach to challenging pupils while also ensuring their well-being.

The participants agreed that pupils who were exposed to extramural English activities were less reluctant to speak in the EFL classroom. They connected the social stimulation between extramural activities, and the exposure of English on a regular basis, to pupils' confidence in the English language and speaking in plenary settings in the classroom. One participant said that extramural English activities were important to achieve a high level of proficiency for many of his pupils.

> Christoffer: I believe that pupils who are exposed to English out of school, for example; readers, gamers and so on, have a higher chance of learning English, and build confidence to speak out loud in the classroom as they use the language a lot.

These views were shared by others, but related activities outside of school were more connected to social participation, rather than the participation to English.

> Angelica: Pupils who are active (referencing participating in sports) are often less reluctant to speak in the classroom. I think that most pupils learn a lot from being part of a team, which builds confidence in social settings. I think some of the reluctant speakers I teach today would benefit greatly from playing team sports outside of school.

Even though many of our participants said extramural English activities was beneficial to reduce reluctancy to speak in the EFL setting, they all said that they did not actively encourage such activities to the pupils. Some argued that it was not part of their role as a teacher, while others simply said that the pupils should be allowed to spend their free time how they like.

Exposure to English both in the classroom and through extramural English activities, was seen to be beneficial for reluctant speakers. The participants held a divergent perspective on to what extent they should push reluctant speakers to speak. Especially when it came to presentations. Some valued maintaining a positive relationship with the reluctant speakers more than the need for them to produce orally. They all agreed, however, that a balanced approach was beneficial. The exposure to extramural English was seen to have a positive impact on oral production for most pupils. The participants argued that this was due to social stimulation and exposure to the language. They did not, however, actively encourage pupils to take part in such activities.

4.2.5 The use of L1 in the EFL classroom

All the participants explained they preferred to use the English language predominantly when teaching in the English subject. They argued that, through the pupil's exposure to the English language as much as possible, they would secure an increased learning outcome. This would benefit the pupils' vocabulary and lower the threshold for them using the language as well. However, reluctant speakers were more allowed to answer in Norwegian than others. This was justified by the participants who argued that when reluctant speakers made the effort to speak, they should be encouraged to do so again.

> Beate: (When pupils answer in Norwegian) It depends on which pupil answers. The most natural thing to do, would be ask them if they could repeat what they just said in English, but if there is a pupil who seldom speaks (in whatever language) I tend to accept Norwegian.

Some of the participants claimed it was a tendency that speaking a foreign language felt artificial when everyone is more proficient in communicating in Norwegian. However, there

was a consensus that the more the class spoke in English, the less artificial it would become over time. One reasoning for sometimes choosing to speak Norwegian in English class, was when there were a class where the proficiency level of English was very low. This was done to ensure understanding for all the pupils in the classroom.

> Beate: Sometimes I repeat statements in Norwegian (after speaking English). This can both be things I said or what other pupils have answered. I do it to ensure that everyone understands what has just been said.

Another reasoning for speaking Norwegian in English class was when there were important messages shared with the class. This was generally information regarding homework, field trips or other assignments or events.

> Paul: I try, to the best of my ability, to mostly teach in English. Sometimes I do however, switch to Norwegian to ensure that everyone in class understands important messages.

The participants in the study preferred to use English predominantly when teaching the English subject, as it would benefit the pupils' vocabulary and encourage them to use the language more. However, some teachers allowed reluctant speakers to answer in Norwegian, while others encouraged them to repeat their answers in English. Speaking a foreign language can feel artificial, but the more the class talks in English, the less artificial it becomes. Some teachers chose to speak Norwegian in English class when the proficiency level of English was very low or when sharing important messages with the class.

4.3 Summary of findings

In this chapter, we have presented characteristics and behavior of reluctant speakers as perceived by the study's participants. In their experience, reluctant speakers tend to hide in plenary settings, exhibit a reserved body language and are often perceived as introverted in other settings. Many reluctant speakers avoid oral assessment situations, preferring digital solutions instead, which has created challenges for teachers where classrooms appear less communicative. The primary reasons for reluctant speakers to not participate in oral activities in the EFL classroom, were the fear of showing a lack of communication apprehension and the fear of negative evaluation by peers. The participants also found it challenging to be aware of issues occurring outside of the classroom that have a negative impact on the classroom environment.

The participants in the study shared strategies they used to encourage reluctant speakers to participate orally in class. A common strategy mentioned was setting up different learning

activities tailored to the different classrooms' social environment. Other strategies found was pairing pupils together to collaboratively solve tasks, using playful or helpful activities, and letting reluctant speakers digitally hand in oral assignments. The participants also emphasized the importance of creating a safe and predictable learning environment, as well as building positive relations with pupils. Exposure to English, both in the classroom and through extramural English activities, was seen as beneficial, and the participants had some varying perspectives on how much they should push the reluctant speakers to participate in class. The participants use of L1 during English class was predominantly used to ensure understanding and convey important messages.

The next chapter will discuss our findings considering theory and previous research as presented earlier in the thesis.

5. Discussion

In this study, we have researched how teachers perceive pupils who are reluctant to speak in the EFL classroom and which strategies they use to facilitate oral production from said pupils. This section of the thesis will discuss our findings in light of relevant theory and previous research. Firstly, we will discuss teachers' perception of reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom, then we will analyze teachers' strategies for facilitating oral production.,

5.1 Teachers' perception of reluctant speakers

As presented in the findings, the participants of the study identified what characteristics and behaviors they saw as typical for reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom. They also discussed their perspective on the underlying reasons connected to this reluctancy to speak. Gaining insight into the different characteristics and behavior seen in reluctant speakers is crucial for teachers to implement strategies to make the pupils more orally active. It is beneficial to see how teachers identify reluctant speakers, as different perceptions of reasons for the pupils' reluctance to speak are closely connected to what strategies the teachers choose to implement.

5.1.1 Characteristics and behaviors

The teachers we interviewed all characterized reluctant speakers with similar observations. Typically, reluctant speakers were characterized by hiding in plenary settings, displaying a reserved body language, and behaving introverted in other settings. This coincides with Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) descriptions of common psycho-physiological symptoms and behavioral experiences of anxiety. They describe that pupils who experience FLA often exhibit avoidance behavior such as a seeking refuge in the last row, missing classes or postponing or not finishing homework. Even though our participants worked in different schools, they all shared a similar concept of characteristics and behavior typical for reluctant speakers. Furthermore, their descriptions of reluctant speakers correlate with previous research on the same field (Liu & Chen, 2014) (Savaşçi, 2014) (Sæteren, 2019) (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009).

Especially plenary work was more difficult for reluctant speakers to participate in. Savasci (2014) states that pupils tend to value opinions from their peers to a high degree. This also coincides with the findings of our study as reluctant speakers were less likely to answer

questions in plenary settings. It was also acknowledged that reluctant speakers tend to be more introverted in general than other pupils. The interview participants connected this to their self-image and level of confidence. Sæteren (2019) supports their claims as her description of reluctant speakers, who often seem apathetic and reserved, is connected to a negative self-image.

Even though perceptions of characteristics and behavior for identifying reluctant speakers correlate between our study, theory and previous research done on the field, we question whether a conceptualization of the term is valid. Limiting the understanding of reluctant speakers to these characteristics and behavior can exclude other traits. This may hinder identifying other reluctant speakers who exhibits atypical characteristics. Limiting the conceptualization of the term to certain specific characteristics may cause some reluctant speakers to go unnoticed. Therefore, teachers may find it difficult to implement appropriate strategies to facilitate oral production for said pupils.

5.1.2 Reasons for reluctance to speak

Our study revealed some reasons as to why pupils exhibit reluctancy to speak in the EFL classroom. Predominantly the reasons were connected to pupils' fear of showing a lack of communication apprehension and the fear of evaluation by peers. This is supported by the FLA theory (Horwitz 1986). Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009) also mentions that some pupils might feel that they do not possess enough skills to master the English language, which coincides with theory and our findings. The fear of speaking in English, due to the insecurity of one's skillset, was frequently mentioned by our interview participants as a reason to why pupils were reluctant to speak in the EFL classroom. In the study, the participants connect a lack of communication apprehension with the fear of being negatively evaluated by classmates. Even though the theory on FLA suggests that these are two different reasons for reluctancy to speak, one could argue that they are connected to some degree. Pupils who are uncertain about their own communication apprehension seems to experience a higher degree of fear of evaluation from peers.

The findings show that the room allowed for making mistakes in the classroom, may impact pupils' willingness to speak. A supportive, collaborative, and accepting learning environment is important to ensure high participation in communicative tasks (Jejo & Haji, 2020). This is also emphasized in the newest national curriculum, where the focus on more communicative

learning aims is being favored (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b). A classroom which is supportive and accepting will reduce the fear of evaluation by peers. How teachers approach the classroom may therefore be a reason of reluctancy. A CLT approach to teaching, where the focus is more on communicative tasks, requires the teacher to not assert knowledge, but rather facilitate communication, and be less fixed on correcting mistakes (Sri, 2014). By practicing a CLT approach, we argue that the reasons for reluctancy to speak, may be reduced.

The findings identified high levels of reluctancy to speak during presentations or other forms of assessment situations. This correlates to Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) possible reason of test-anxiety for pupils experiencing FLA. Oral assessment situations were explained to often trigger reluctant speakers' anxiety, and the participants agreed that this often was a challenge. A contributing factor as to why pupils would feel anxious during assessment situations was the potential of being negatively evaluated by their classmates. The fear of being negatively evaluated was often described as a result of a culture of fear in some classrooms. Some participants recognized that this was a major problem and that a lot of work had to be done to establish a safe classroom environment.

Even though assessment situations can be a cause of anxiety connected to speaking, it is not limited to reluctant speakers. Participants had also experienced other pupils, who do not exhibit characteristics and behavior connected to reluctant speakers, often freeze or struggle during these types of situations. One can therefore argue that test anxiety in itself is not enough to identify a reluctant speaker. To characterize someone as a reluctant speaker multiple factors need to be present.

5.2 Teachers' strategies for facilitating oral production

The study revealed a wide range of answers from the teachers on which different strategies they used to ensure oral communication in reluctant speakers. This suggests that there may be multiple effective strategies for promoting oral communication in the EFL classroom. By examining these different approaches, we aim to identify commonalities and practices that can be applied more broadly. Furthermore, we will see how these different strategies uncovered in our findings, align with previous research done in the field. The strategies presented correlates with our findings section, where we will present approaches to learning activities, securing

healthy relationships, predictability for supporting reluctant speakers, exposure to oral English and finally the use of L1 in the EFL classroom.

5.2.1 Learning activities

Although there were many different learning activities mentioned in the study, most of them shared a common trait of working in smaller groups or pairs. Our participants argued that by working with others, the pupils could achieve a sense of validation and confirmation, without the need to speak in a plenary setting. This is supported by Hue (2010) and Jejo and Haji (2020), who see group work as a way to promote learners to understand and make themselves understood when the pupils feel their language skills are not adequate enough. By working in smaller groups, it lowers the threshold for speaking (Newbould, 2019). Pupils who struggle in a plenary setting will struggle even more in a foreign language (Horwitz 1986).

It is important however, as a lot of participants explained, that the group composition is not made at random, but rather carefully planned. The teachers proclaimed that they generally know which pupils work well together and would focus on composing groups where the reluctant speakers could thrive. Finding the perfect balance for group compositions takes time and requires the teacher to know the individuals in the classroom (Deady, 2015). This relates to Vygotsky's (1978) theory of ZPD, which emphasizes the importance of providing appropriate levels of challenge and support to learners and highlights social interaction and collaboration as a method to achieve learning.

Deady (2015) argues that pairing reluctant speakers with other reluctant speakers may be a good method of facilitating oral production. She argues that one must take the role as an instigator in the group work. These arguments were debated by our participants, but they did not all agree. Some stated that placing reluctant speakers with more vocal pupils would be more beneficial, as a group of explicitly reluctant speakers would tend to sit in silence for longer periods of time. Others, however, agreed with Deady (2015), but exclaimed the need for spending extra time with those groups to get them started. This showcases that the teachers typically know what works best for their own pupils. Therefore, one strategy regarding group composition may not apply for every class. Group composition must on the other hand be worked out by a method of trial and error, where the teacher with time will figure out the best strategy regarding reluctant speakers.

The study reveals that pupils may feel uncertain about their own communication apprehension when learning a foreign language. Reluctant speakers often struggle with a lack of confidence and fear of communicating (Horwitz 1986). To reduce this fear, several of our participants mentioned that more informal tasks is a good method to facilitate oral production. This is supported by the newest national curriculum, which states that the English language should be used in both formal and informal settings (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b). These informal activities, presented by our participants, could be activities such as; quick talks, speed-dating, games or approaching pupils with English other places than in the classroom. A commonality between these activities is that the pupils can relate their own experiences and background knowledge to the language learning process. Making pupils use their own experiences and share from a personal point of view is beneficial for their engagement and motivation in the tasks (Hue, 2010). This is further emphasized by Haji and Jejo (2020), who argues that communicative tasks should be experienced as meaningful, involving, and supportive for the pupils. This strategy will most likely increase the pupils feeling of a safe and supportive environment, which encourages them to take more risks and practice in speaking.

Our participants claimed that to reach the more orally focused goals presented in the newest national curriculum, they had to have an increased focus on communication (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b). A challenge they saw with reluctant speakers according to the newest curriculum was the ability to fairly assess them, as some reluctant speakers produced very little orally. The theory of CLT also emphasizes the importance of this learner responsibility (Galloway 1993). Learners are encouraged to take an active role in their own learning, with the belief that learners who are motivated and engaged are more likely to develop communicative competence (Sri, 2014).

Since assessing reluctant speakers may be challenging due to their limited participation in oral activities, teachers may need to rely on other measures of proficiency to fairly assess them. These measures may involve comprehension exercises or focusing more on written assignments. When reluctant speakers do participate, their contributions may be uneven or sporadic. This can make it difficult to assess their overall proficiency level as teachers may not have a complete understanding of their abilities. We would therefore argue that it is the teacher's responsibility to encourage and look for ways to assess reluctant speakers based on their small amounts of participation.

5.2.2 Securing healthy relationships

The most discussed subject in our study was strategies regarding relationship building with the pupils. All participants acknowledged that a reluctance to speak in the classroom, and especially in a foreign language, was mainly due to pupils' relations with others at school. This was mostly connected to relations with other peers or their teachers. Most of our participants emphasized how a safe classroom environment, where pupils where supportive of each-other, was highly beneficial for facilitating oral production in all pupils. Theories on CLT and ZPD also mention the need for such a collaborative classroom environment (Ju, 2013) (Vygotsky, 1978). In CLT, where language is taught through communication, with focus on engaging activities and motivation, the need for a safe classroom environment is essential. This is supported by others who agree that a safe classroom environment facilitates oral production (Holfve-Sabel, 2014). ZPD also discusses the need for a supportive and encouraging environment for pupils to take risks and practice speaking (Hakim, 2015).

Building a supportive classroom environment also helps reduce the three situations of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) theory on FLA where anxiety is often experienced. Their first point of anxiety provoking situations; communication apprehension, our study links closely to fear of negative evaluation from peers. By building a supportive classroom environment, our participants argued that the need for a high level of communication apprehension was less focused on. Rather, reaching higher levels of proficiency compared to oneself was the main goal. A CLT approach supports such a view, where pupils should set goals for themselves, not based on other pupils' proficiency levels. Making the learning context less stressful is also regarded as a strategy to reduce levels of FLA (Horwitz 1986).

When it comes to Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope's (1986) second point of anxiety provoking situation, test anxiety, our participants identified the feeling of a safe classroom environment as a key factor to help reluctant speakers. They connected the fear of testing towards two different attributes. Firstly, pupils internal wish to do well, and secondly, pupils fear of negative evaluation from peers. For many of our participants, it was important to emphasize that the pupils should set realistic expectations for themselves in formal testing situations. Some of our participants mentioned that they tried to make pupils focus on which methods they used to work on the project, and how they achieved learning, not necessarily their grade.

They also emphasized that pupils should not compare themselves to others in class, but rather their own previous work. This can be seen as a form of offering guidance within the pupils ZPD

(Doolittle, 1995). The participants wanted to promote positive attitudes towards language learning for pupils who show speaking reluctancy in the EFL classroom. This is in accordance with Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009), who argue that pupils are less likely to suffer from FLA if pupils hold positive attitudes towards language learning. Young (1991) argues that oral activities with a clear meaning, where the goal is clearly stated, will change reluctant speakers' perceptions about mistakes and language use over time. Our study did not identify such strategies, but some teachers did however argue that meaningful tasks with clear goals were beneficial to make reluctant speakers more orally active.

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) third anxiety provoking situation, fear of negative evaluation, was the most mentioned cause of speaking reluctance in our study. Our participants experienced that the fear of negative evaluation was predominantly related to other pupils' reactions, and less connected to evaluation from the teacher. Tsiplakides and Keramida (2009) has highlighted the fear of being evaluated negatively by classmates as one of the two main factors for speaking reticence. Liu and Chen (2014) also present this fear of negative evaluation from peers as one of the most prominent reasons for why pupils do not participate in oral activities in class. Our study reveals that teacher's perception concurs with the previous research on the field. In our study, it was also emphasized that classrooms that were more socially connected and supportive of one another, also had less reluctant speakers. The idea of facilitating a socially connected classroom where teachers can have tasks that supports sociolinguistic competence through activities such as group work and role-play was argued to be a factor in increasing oral production for reluctant speakers. All the participants of the study argued that a CLT approach to teaching, where the focus of development in communicative competences was important to achieve learning in the EFL classroom.

The importance of a safe learning environment is, however, not necessarily enough to ensure that no pupils exhibit reluctance to speak. As we have seen through theory, FLA does not only occur through pupils' fear of evaluation by peers, but also other factors such as the fear of lacking communication apprehension and test-anxiety (Horwitz 1986). Our study does reveal that teachers mostly focus their attention and effort towards creating a safe learning environment. This can be due to the easiness of seeing when unhealthy social behavior occurs. It is inherently more difficult to identify pupils lack of belief in their own skill set, rather than vocal misconduct. One can therefore argue that teacher's attention to a safe learning environment is due to other factors than it being the most affecting cause of reluctance to speak. Other reasons for this being a focus of our study might be due to the researchers' own conception

of what causes speaking reluctancy. When conducting the study, we ultimately had our own preconceptions of what caused reluctance to speak, and therefore our interviews may have been affected by researcher's bias.

On the other hand, other studies have acknowledged the importance of building safe learning environments to facilitate oral production (Holfve-Sabel, 2014). It also seems highly unlikely that all participants had such a major focus on the learning environments influence on reluctant speakers for it to be insignificant. Strategies securing healthy relations between reluctant speakers, their peers and teachers can therefore be seen as prominent for them to participate orally in the EFL classroom.

5.2.3 Predictability for supporting reluctant speakers

Our participants argued that predictability in the daily school routine was important for pupils for several reasons. It helped pupils engage more in the classroom activities and also increased motivation. Our participants argued that predictability in both learning activities, seating arrangements, and schedule would make learning a new language less stressful. Making the learning context less stressful is a method presented by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) to reduce anxiety. One could also argue that creating predictable routines for pupils will benefit a CLT approach, as our study revealed that teachers believe more pupils would be willing to speak with predictable routines in place. Most of the teachers we interviewed had routines when it came to seating arrangements, where the pupils swapped seats typically each month. Hue (2010) argues that teachers should be sensible when placing pupils, and consider factors such as collaboration abilities, interests, and personal traits. She also states that pupils who are closer to each other outside of the classroom are more likely to communicate with each other in class as well. Our participants also shared these beliefs, and many of the teachers put a good amount of thought into placing pupils. Most of our participants placed pupils with whom they believe they communicate well with unless it affects concentration levels regarding schoolwork.

During our study, we uncovered that the most used strategy to facilitate oral production was through small tasks which closely resemble TPS. When used regularly, it lowers the threshold for speaking both in groups and later in plenary settings. TPS provides pupils with important practice in putting ideas into language. TPS is also a strategy that boosts confidence by receiving responses from their peers and prepares the pupils more than simply asking pupils to volunteer right away (Newbould, 2019). To facilitate a CLT focused approach to the teaching,

we believe it to be important that the classes and facilities around the learning process are seen as predictable by the pupils. If not, it would likely increase insecurity, and thus hinder oral communication particularly for reluctant speakers.

Providing additional preparation time was also mentioned by some of the participants. Hue (2010) argues that giving preparation time to pupils is beneficial for increasing oral activity. More time to prepare increases the chances of the pupils finishing the task, and thus a stronger feeling of accomplishment. It was however, mentioned by some of the participants that giving more preparation time was often desirable, but not always possible. The teachers argued that giving more time to complete the tasks simply was not possible if they were to get through all topics they had planned during the school year. It was also mentioned that catering to all the pupils' different needs while still giving the most struggling pupils additional time to finish tasks was difficult. Jejo and Haji (2020) also raises this issue and states that a mitigating factor to let pupils' complete tasks fully, can be due to large classroom sizes.

Our study revealed that predictable routines were seen as important by teachers for facilitating oral production for reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom. However, predictability in routines was not solely seen as enough for reluctant pupils to speak. Combining predictable routines with other measures can have a positive effect. When it comes to seating arrangements and predictability in partnering for group activities, it is important for the teacher to give thoughts on which pupils the reluctant speakers would feel most comfortable with. Providing additional preparation time can be seen as a predictable strategy but must be done with care. Giving additional preparation time and catering too much to reluctant speakers might have a negative effect on the other pupils in class.

5.2.4 Exposure to oral English

When the participants were asked how much English their pupils should be exposed to, their answers varied. Primarily, this variation was due to the question of how much to "push" the pupils to speak English. When discussing situations where pupils should develop public speaking skills, we received different answers from the teachers interviewed. A few of the participants stated that they found it difficult to know exactly how much they should challenge their pupils to speak during classroom activities. Some teachers justified the challenge of this dilemma by saying that they did not want to challenge pupils too much, as many of their pupils

had difficulties with turning up at school. Therefore, it was considered that pushing these pupils too much could make them choose not to show up at school.

These considerations can be seen as supported through a CLT approach to language teaching. CLT emphasizes the importance of autonomy and responsibility (Galloway 1993). By not pushing pupils into situations where they feel unsafe, it may increase motivation to participate in the subject as the focus of such an approach is on the learner's needs and interests (Sri, 2014). On the other hand, there were other participants who favored a more challenging approach. They believed that challenging pupils to speak could give the pupils a sense of achievement in the subject. This is contradictory to what Hue (2010) presents about how the teachers should preferably avoid calling on reluctant pupils. At the same time, one could argue that these teachers wanted to achieve, by challenging their pupils, a non-threatening place for learning. Hue (2010) states that the classroom should be a supportive environment where the pupils should not fear to make mistakes during oral activities. A strategy used to reduce insecurity in the classroom was to show that even teachers could make mistakes when speaking English. Often with humor, some participants used this strategy to a great extent.

Another aspect of exposure to oral English, seen as beneficial for reluctant speakers to speak, is extramural English. Some participants argued that the pupils who engages in extramural activities, where they are exposed to the English language, will have a higher chance of learning English. However, many of the participants said that it was more during recess they would engage in conversations with the pupils regarding their interests outside of school. Haji and Jejo (2020) states that tasks regarding communication should be experienced as meaningful and a tool for developing the pupils' English language skills. Creating tasks with the pupils' interests in mind is a good method of ensuring that pupils will experience the English subject as relevant. This is also supported by Hue's (2010) research who argues that pupils should be given an opportunity to recall and share from a personal point of view. When assignments are created taking into consideration the pupils' interests it will foster a CLT approach that aims to equip learners with the ability to use language proficiently and suitably in real-life situations.

5.2.5 The use of L1 in the EFL classroom

There was broad agreement among the participants that the teacher speaking English during EFL lessons, would benefit reluctant speakers. The choice to use the English language as much as possible was made based on the argument that this would benefit the pupils over time in

terms of their vocabulary, pronunciation, and public speaking skills. The participants also argued that if the pupils were exposed to the English language more frequently, the awkwardness of speaking English in the classroom, where everyone's primary language was Norwegian, would gradually feel less artificial. Still, the participants clarified that they allowed reluctant speakers to use their first language to a greater extent.

Reluctant speakers were allowed to speak more in their L1, as participants did not want to discourage reluctant speakers who dared to speak in class. This is supported by Hue (2010) who discusses the possibilities created when teachers tolerate a fitting use of L1. Hue (2010) says that if teachers tolerate some degree of L1 use, they can help pupils experience positivity surrounding the English subject. It is more beneficial for pupils to experience some form of mastery by answering in their L1 than to feel humiliated by trying to speak in English. This also corresponds to Vygotsky's ZPD (1978).

The strategy of allowing reluctant speakers to use their L1 during EFL lesson may give opportunities for teachers to assess their proficiency level. Our study also revealed that reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom traditionally were reluctant speakers in other classes as well. By not discouraging reluctant speakers who dared to speak one can argue that it creates positive reinforcement and motivates these pupils to speak more often in class in the future.

6. Conclusion and implications

In this thesis we wanted to uncover what strategies secondary EFL teachers use to facilitate oral production for reluctant speakers in English class. To answer the research question, we explored teachers' general views and experiences with reluctant speakers. This was to see whether reluctant speakers were a commonality in the EFL classroom, and if teachers shared similar experiences regarding these pupils.

6.1 Conclusion

Through the study, we confirmed that many teachers experience reluctant speakers in the EFL classroom. The findings and discussion section show that reluctant speakers typically exhibit a reserved body language and refused to speak when called upon to answer in plenary settings. Reluctant speakers also tended to freeze or struggle during oral assessment situations. The teachers' reflections regarding these pupils correlates with Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope's (1986) theory on FLA, and previously presented research on reluctant speakers. Our study and the

theory and previous research argue that reluctant speakers exhibit a lack of confidence, fear of negative evaluation and anxiety during assessment situations. However, we question a conceptualization of the term, as limiting the understanding of reluctant speakers to these specified characteristics and behavior, can exclude other traits.

The study found that collaborative strategies is often used by EFL teachers. The participants explained that they had an increased focus on communication in their teaching. This is also emphasized in the newest national curriculum (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2019b). Specifically smaller groups or pair work can be effective to facilitate oral production for reluctant speakers. To execute this properly, the group composition should be carefully planned. Informal and playful tasks were also found to be beneficial in reducing fear and increasing engagement in reluctant speakers. Deady (2015) argues that placing reluctant speakers together can be beneficial. However, our study revealed that teachers were divided in this claim. Some favored placing reluctant speakers together, while others would place reluctant speakers with more orally active pupils. We therefore argue that the teachers typically know what works best for their own pupils, and certain strategies regarding group composition may apply for every class.

The importance of securing a supportive classroom environment was regarded as essential for facilitating oral production in the EFL classroom. Participants emphasized that a safe and collaborative classroom environment is beneficial for reducing anxiety and fear of negative feedback from peers. These are also regarded as causes for speaking reluctance according to the theory of FLA (Horwitz 1986). We argued that a safe learning environment is not necessarily enough to ensure that no pupils exhibit reluctancy to speak. However, due to the participants major focus on securing healthy relations to facilitate oral production for reluctant speakers, we value this as an important strategy.

The study found that creating predictable routines in the EFL classroom, is a good strategy for facilitating oral production for reluctant speakers. Tasks, such as TPS, were found to be effective if used repeatedly due to its predictableness for pupils. Providing additional preparation time was also seen as beneficial for increasing oral activity but can be difficult to implement due to time constraints and catering to the different needs of pupils. We argue that predictable routines are important to facilitate for oral production, but that it is not solely enough for reluctant pupils to speak. Teachers should combine predictable routines with other strategies to achieve a communicative classroom environment.

The thesis further explored different perspectives on how much the teachers should challenge the reluctant speakers to participate orally in class. The CLT approach emphasizes the importance of pupils' responsibility to showcase their oral abilities (Galloway 1993). We consider challenging pupils to speak as a strategy for facilitating oral production, but doing so requires a non-threatening classroom environment. Our study revealed that teachers often would use humor, and highlight their own language mistakes, to make the classroom more communicative.

The participants aimed to use as much English as possible in their English lessons. However, they allow reluctant speakers more use of their L1. This was done with the intent to create positive associations with speaking out loud. Sometimes teachers also spoke in their L1 to ensure understanding. Tolerating some degree of L1-use can create positivity and mastery according to our study. By identifying reasons for reluctance to speak English teachers can tailor tasks and assignments to build on pupils' strengths and thus gradually develop language skills in a way that pupils feel comfortable with.

6.2 Implications

The findings of this study suggests that teachers share a collective understanding of the term reluctant speakers. Based on the participants experiences there is still challenges regarding pupils who exhibit such behavior. From our research, we found that the most experienced cause of reluctancy to speak is due to fear of negative evaluation from peers and a lack of communication apprehension. To reduce this fear, we found that securing healthy relations and inclusion of informal and playful tasks were beneficial.

Even though we discovered several different strategies to support reluctant speakers, providing a supportive and collaborative classroom environment was seen as essential by all participants. Through communicative and socially meaningful tasks pupils would feel encouraged to engage more in classroom activities. Using strategies that create predictable routines teachers can also increase oral production in reluctant speakers. Finally, it was revealed that teachers know their classrooms and pupils best, and therefore which strategies are most useful for facilitating oral production may vary.

6.3 Further research

In this research, six interviews have been carried out with teachers at the secondary level. Due to the project's time limits, it was chosen to make a convenience sample in recruiting informants. These were recruited through the researchers' own networks, as most of the participants have been practice teachers for the researchers or colleagues of the researchers' friends. This also meant that the research was geographically limited to a specific area in Norway. For further research, it may be highly relevant to recruit a larger selection of informants in a larger geographical area. One potential for investigating further could be to replicate the study in a larger sample size and a more diverse population group.

The method chosen was semi-structured interviews. This meant that it would be difficult to replicate the study. To ensure the further research's quality, different methods can be applied when researching similar topics. For instance, we have only looked at teachers' perceptions of their own teaching practices. Interviews may be combined with observation and quantitative research to better ensure the validity and reliability. One can also look at the pupils' perception of the teaching's practices as it is difficult to argue which strategies would be most suitable only from teachers' perspective.

Our research has also had a broad scope when researching strategies used to facilitate oral production in reluctant speakers. Other studies might examine more closely the most prominent findings of our research. These can be such as how relations between pupils affect reluctant speakers, or how the classroom environment is fostered for oral production.

7. References

Avineri, N. (2017). *Research Methods for Language Teaching* Palgrave.

Aydin, S., Harputlu, L., Çelik, S. S., Uştuk, O., & Güzel, S. (2017). Age, Gender and Grade Effect on Foreign Language Anxiety Among Children *TEFLIN Journal*, 133-154. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2232

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1 January, 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.no/books?id=v_GGAwAAQBAJ

Christoffersen, L & Johannesen, A. (2012). *Forskningsmetode for Lærerutdanningene.* Abstrakt Forlag.

Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research.* SAGE Publications. https://books.google.no/books?id=51UXBAAAQBAJ

Deady, K. (2015). Engaging and encouraging reluctant ESL students

DiCicco-Bloom, B. & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40 (4), 314-321. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Doolittle, P. E. (1995). *Understanding Cooperative Learning Through Vygotskys Zone of Proximal Development*. Southeastern Louisana University.

Daastøl, L. K. (2022). *Speaking reluctance in the English as a foreign language classroom: Teachers' experiences and practices regarding speaking reluctance in oral activities in Norwegian primary schools*. OsloMet Storbyuniversitet.

Fitri, A. W. (2014). Students' Reluctance To Speak In English Classroom Interaction At Senior High School *Universitas Pgri Sumatera Barat*.

Fitzner, K. (2007). Reliability and Validity: A Quick Review. *Diabetes Educ,* 33(5), 775-780. https://doi.org/10.1177/0145721707308172

Galloway, A. 1993. "*Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction and Sample Activities.* ERIC Digest.

Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitive Research. *The Qualitative Report, 8(4)*, 597-607. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2003.1870

Hakim, M. AR. (2015). Experienced Efl Teachers' Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Speaking for Introvert Students. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 48,* 437-446.

Holfve-Sabel, MA. (2014). Learning, Interaction and Relationships as Components of Student Well-being: Differences Between Classes from Student and Teacher Perspective *Social Indicators Research*, 119(3), 1535-1555. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013- 0557-7

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign Language Anxiety *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132. https://doi.org/10.2307/327317

Hue, M. N. (2010). Encouraging reluctant ESL/EFL learners to speak in the classroom *The Internet TESL Journal*, XVI(3). http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Hue-ReluctantSpeakers.html

Isaac, J. C. (2010). *Methods and strategies of teaching: An overview*. Pondicherry University Press.

Jejo, S. & Haji, S. (2020). Teaching Strategies to Increase EFL Speaking Skills in a Communicative Learning Environment *Degree Project with Specialisation in English Studies in Education*. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:mau:diva-31617

Johnson, B. R. & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational Research: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come *Educational Researcher*, 14-26.

Ju, Fa. (2013). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): A Critical and Comparative Perspective *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1579-1583.

Konu, A. & Rimpelä, M. (2002). Well-being in schools: A conceptual model *Health promotion international, 17*, 79-87. https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/17.1.79

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *Det Kvalitative Forskningsintervju*. Gyldendal Akademisk.

Leseth, A. B. & Tellmann, S. M. (2018). *Hvordan lese kvalitativ forskning?* (2.utg.ed). Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

Liu, Hj. & Chen, TH. (2014). Learner Differences among Children Learning a Foreign Language: Language Anxiety, Strategy Use, and Multiple Intelligences *English Language Teaching*, 1-13.

Loftus, L.G. (2017). Bruk av teori for økt refleksivitet i praksis: Praksisarkitektur som rammeverk for å belyse forskerens plass i datagenereringen.

Mahdi, D. A. (2015). Motivating Reluctant EFL Students to Talk in Class: Strategies and Tactics *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 5(8)*, 1703-1709. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.22

Masoud, H. (2011). Language Stress And Anxiety Among The English Language Learners *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30,* 1811-1816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.349

McLellan-Lemal, E., Macqueen, K., & Neidig, J. (2003). Beyond the Qualitative Interview: Data Preparation and Transcription *Field Methods, 15*, 63. https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239573

Medelyan, A. (n.d.). *Get Thematic*. Coding Qualitative Data: How to Code Qualitative Research. https://getthematic.com/insights/coding-qualitative-data/

Millis, B. (2010). *Cooperative learning in higher education: New Pedagogies and Practices for Teaching in Higher Education*, 1st edition. Stylus Publishing.

Ministry of Education and Research. (2017). *An inclusive learning environment*. Layed down by Royal decree. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020. https://www.udir.no/lk20/overordnet-del/3.-prinsipper-for-skolens-praksis/3.1-et-inkluderende-laringsmiljo/?lang=eng

National Research Ethics Committees. (2022, May 26). *Forskningsetikk.no*. Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities. https://www.forskningsetikk.no/en/about-us/our-committees-and-commission/nesh/guidelines-nesh/guidelines-for-research-ethics-in-the-social-sciences-humanities-law-and-theology/

Newbould, S. (2019). Turn-Taking Strategies to Motivate Reluctant Speakers. *TESL Reporter*, *52*(1), 94-98.

Newton, J., Yates, E., Shearn, S., & Nowitzki, W. 2015. *Intercultural communicative language teaching: implications for effective teaching and learning*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3118.1526

Nilsson, M. (2019). Foreign Language Anxiety: The case of young learners of English in Swedish primary classrooms. *Apples (Jyväskylä, Finland), 13*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201902191584

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019c). *Basic skills (ENG01-04)*. Established as a Regulation. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020. https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/om-faget/grunnleggende-ferdigheter?lang=eng

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019b). *Competence aims and assessment*. Established as a Regulation. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020. https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv4?lang=eng

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019d). *Core elements (ENG01-04)*. Established as a Regulation. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020. https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/om-faget/kjerneelementer?lang=eng

Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training. (2019a). *Relevance and central values*. Established as a Regulation. The National curriculum for the Knowledge Promotion 2020. https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/om-faget/fagets-relevans-og-verdier?lang=eng

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.no/books?id=HGzxBMBp4lkC

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Bailey, P., & Daly, C. E. (1999). Factors associated with foreign language anxiety. *Applied Psycholinguistics 20 (2)*, 217-239. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716499002039

OsloMet. (2022, November 22). *Get started with recordings for interviews*. oslomet.no. https://student.oslomet.no/en/kom-i-gang-med-lydopptak

OsloMet. (2022, July 4). *Storing and processing information in a bachelor's- and master's thesis*. oslomet.no. https://student.oslomet.no/en/lagre-og-behandle-data-i studieoppgaver

Parsons, J. (2014). Teaching for Enthusiasm *Early Childhood Education*, 28-31.

Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. MY., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach *Review of educational research, 81*(4), 493-529.

Sanders, D. W. & Sugg, D. (2005). Strategies to Scaffold Student Learning: Applying Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development *Nurse Educator*, 203-207. https://journals.lww.com/nurseeducatoronline/Fulltext/2005/09000/Strategies_to_Scaffold_Student_Learning__Applying.7.aspx

Savaşçi, M. (2014). Why are Some Students Reluctant to Use L2 in EFL Speaking Classes? An Action Research at Tertiary Level *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 2682-2686. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.635

Sri, D. (2014). Communicative Language Teaching and its Misconceptions About the Practice in English Language Teaching (ELT) *Bahasa & Sastra*, 36-43.

Steinarsson, I. H. (2022). *Teachers' Experiences with Reluctant Speakers : An investigation on how EFL teachers approach reluctant speakers in 5th-7th grade*. NTNU.

Sundqvist, P. & Sylvén, L. K. (2016). *Extramural English in Teaching and Learning: From Theory and Research to Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan UK : Imprint: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sæteren, AL. (2019). *Læreren i møte med elever med stille atferd : hvordan kan læreren møte elever med stille atferd?* Gyldendal.

Tipton, E., Hallberg, K., Hedges, L. V., & Chan, W. (2016). Implications of Small Samples for Generalization: Adjustments and Rules of Thumb *Evaluation Review*, 8 July, 472-505. https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841x16655665

Tsiplakides, I. & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping Students Overcome Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety in the English Classroom: Theoretical Issues and Practical Recommendations *International Education Studies*, 39-44.

Tzoannopoulou, M. (2016). Foreign language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation in the Greek university classroom *International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 823-838.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. MA: Harvard University Press.

Yadav, L. N. 2019. "Teachers' Strategies for and Used in Teaching Speaking." TUCL eLibrary.

Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a Low-Anixety Classroom Environment: What Does Language Anxiety Research Suggest? *The Modern Language Journal*, 426-439.

List of appendixes

Appendix 1: Interview guide (Norsk)

Appendix 2: Interview guide (English)

Appendix 3: SIKT-confirmation

Appendix 4: Consent form

Appendix 5: Co-authorship declaration

Appendix 1: Interview guide (Norsk)

Intervjuguide: Læreres oppfatning om elever som kvier seg for å snake og strategies for å øke muntlig aktivitet

Intervjuobjektet:

- Kjønn og alder
- Utdannelse / Spesifikt engelsk?
- Andre engelskspråklige forutsetninger?
- Yrkeserfaring

Rammefaktorene i klasserommet

- Antall elever
- Kjønnsfordeling
- Klassetrinn
- Klasserommets hjelpemidler

Elever som kvier seg for å snakke

1. Har du noensinne erfart/erfarer elever som kvier seg for å snakke i engelskundervisningen?
   a. Hvordan erfarte/erfarer du dette i undervisningen?
      o Kunne du utdypet dette?
   b. Er det noen spesifikke situasjoner der du opplever mindre villighet til å ta ordet?
      o Hvilke situasjoner er dette?
      o Hva tror du, ut ifra egen erfaring, er grunnen til at elevene kvier seg for å prate i disse situasjonene?
      o Har du noen konkrete eksempler fra egen jobbhverdag?
   c. Hvor tror du et eventuelt ubehag med å snakke engelsk oppstår hos elevene?
      o Er det en forskjell i muntlig aktivitet ut ifra ulike arbeidsformer (Plenum/Gruppe/Individuell)

2. Hva tror du ubehaget med å snakke engelsk i timene skyldes?
   a. Vil ikke delta før de vet at det de gjør er korrekt
   b. Redd for å si feil
   c. Endring i plenum eller alene lærer

3. Arbeider du på noen måter med å minske ubehaget hos de som kvier seg for å snakke?

    a. Hvilke strategier eller tiltak har du iverksatt?

    b. Er det forskjellige strategier som fungerer på ulike typer elever?

    c. Hvordan opplever du en endring hos elevene?

4. Hva gjør du om en elev ikke vil snakke engelsk over tid?

    a. Tilretteleggelse for elev/elevezne

    b. Møtevirksomhet med involverte parter og foresatte

    c. Langsiktige tiltak for å bedre situasjonen

5. Er det sammenheng mellom de som ikke prater i andre timer, og i engelsktimene?

    a. På hvilken måte?

    b. Har du noen andre formeninger om hvorfor?

6. Hvilke undervisningsmetoder bruker du mest i engelskundervisningen?

    a. Hvilket språk blir mest brukt?

        o Hvorfor?

    b. Skriver eller snakker dere mest i engelskundervisningen?

        o Hvorfor?

    c. Omtrent hvor mye tid bruker dere på muntlig aktivitet i engelsktimen?

        o Hvilke muntlige aktiviteter brukes (Lesing/Boklesing/Rollespill/Samtale/Annet)

7. Hva gjør du om elever svarer på norsk, om du spør på engelsk/søker svar på engelsk?

    a. Er det en forskjell på hvordan du tilnærmer deg elever ut ifra villighet til å prate engelsk og faglig styrke?

    b. Eventuelt hvorfor en forskjellig tilnærming

    c. Har du andre forventninger ut ifra situasjonene?

8. Er det en sammenheng mellom mestring i engelskfaget og arbeidet som blir lagt ned både i timen og generelt?

    a. Er det noen som ikke møter i engelsktimen?

    b. Opplever du unngåelsesstrategier?

c. Er det noen som legger ned ekstra innsats?

9. Opplever du nervøsitet blant elever som skal svare på engelsk i timen?
   a. I hvilke situasjoner?
   b. Kan du utdype?
   c. Har du noen strategier for å minke nervøsiteten blant elevene i faget?

10. Hvilke kjennetegn er det oftest hos elever som kvier seg for å prate ut ifra din oppfatning?
    a. Faglig kompetanse/utadvendt/innadvendt/kjønn/alder – sent eller tidlig på året

11. Hva er din holdning til bruk av førstespråk i engelsktimen?

<u>Tiltak og strategier</u>
1. Hvordan arbeider du med relasjonsbygging og klassemiljø?
   a. Hvordan følger du opp eventuelle tiltak?
   b. Hvordan opplever du at klassemiljøet endrer seg i løpet av skoleårene?

2. Opplever du en korrelasjon mellom godt/negativt klassemiljø og elevers villighet til å ta ordet?
   a. Er dette noe annerledes for engelskfaget?
   b. Snakker de samme elevene i engelsk, som i andre fag?

3. Opplever du et annerledes klassemiljø i engelskundervisning kontra annen undervisning?
   a. På hvilken måte?
   b. Hvorfor tror du det er slik?

4. Iverksetter du noen særegne tiltak om elever kvier seg for å snakke?
   a. Hvilke tiltak?
   b. Bruker du noen spesifikke strategier i møte med elever som snakker lite i engelsktimen?

5. Diskuteres eventuelle tiltak for elever som kvier seg for å prate i kollegiale sammenhenger?

 a. Er dette for å rådføre seg om tiltak?

 b. Samsvarer opplevelsen av eleven/elevene i de forskjellige fag

 c. Samsvarer tiltakene i de ulike fagene/ulike lærerne?

6. Hvordan er oppsettet med sitteplasser i klasserommet?

 a. 1 og 1/med læringspartner/i grupper

 b. Hvor ofte bytter dere plasser?

 c. Har du andre ønsker for hvordan dere vil sitte?

Oppsummering og avslutning

1. Er det en sammenheng mellom villigheten elever har til å prate i engelsktimen, og deres relasjonelle forhold til andre på skolen?

 a. Opplever du at de har et godt forhold til lærer?

 b. Medelever?

 c. Andre aktører på skolen?

 d. Hjemme?

2. Nå har vi snakket om elevers villighet til å prate i engelsktimen, og tiltakene som iverksettes for å sikre muntlig aktivitet engelskundervisning. Er det noe du har bitt deg merke i, noe du vil tilføye, eventuelt andre kommentarer du ønsker å legge til?

Tusen takk for praten!

Appendix 2: Interview guide (English)

Interview guide: Teachers' perception of reluctant speakers and strategies to increase oral activity

Interview subject:

- Gender and age
- Education / Specific English?
- Other English language prerequisites?
- Professional experience

The framework factors in the classroom

- Number of students
- Gender distribution
- Grade level
- Classroom aids

Reluctant speakers

1. Have you ever experienced/experience students who are reluctant to speak in English lessons?
   a. How did/do you experience this in teaching?
      o Could you elaborate?
   b. Are there any specific situations where you feel pupils are less willing to speak up?
      o What situations?
      o What do you think, based on your own experience, is the reason why students are reluctant to talk in these situations?
      o Do you have any concrete examples from your own work experience?
   c. Where do you think any discomfort with speaking English arises for the pupils?
   d. Is there a difference in oral activity based on different forms of work (Plenary/Group/Individual)

2. What do you think the discomfort with speaking English in class is due to?
   a. Will not participate until they know that what they are doing is correct
   b. Afraid of saying the wrong thing

    c. Differences in plenary or alone teaching

3. Do you work in any way to reduce the discomfort of those who are reluctant to speak?
    a. What strategies or measures have you implemented?
    b. Are there different strategies that work for different types of pupils?
    c. How do you experience changes in pupil behaviour?

4. What do you do if a student does not want to speak English class over time?
    a. Facilitation for the student(s).
    b. Meetings with involved parties and guardians
    c. Other long-term measures to improve the situation

5. Is there a connection between those who do not talk in other classes and in English classes?
    a. In what way?
    b. Do you have any other ideas as to why?

6. Which teaching methods do you use the most in teaching English?
    a. Which language is used the most?
        o Why?
    b. Do you mostly write or speak in English lessons?
        o Why?
    c. Approximately how much time do you spend on oral activities in English class?
        o Which oral activities are used (Reading/Book reading/Role play/Conversation/Other)

7. What do you do if pupils answer in Norwegian, when you ask questions in English/seek answers in English?
    a. Is there a difference in how you approach students based on willingness to speak English and academic strength?
    b. If so: Why a different approach?
    c. Do you have other expectations based on the situations?

8. Is there a connection between mastery in the English subject and the work that is put in, both in class and in general?
    a. Is there anyone who does not attend the English class, that attend other classes?
    b. Do you experience any avoidance strategies?
    c. Is anyone putting in extra effort?

9. Do you experience nervousness among students who have to answer in English in class?
    a. In what situations?
    b. Can you elaborate?
    c. Do you have any strategies to reduce nervousness among students in the subject?

10. Which characteristics are there most often in students who are reluctant to talk based on your opinion?
    a. Academic competence/extrovert/introvert/gender/age - late or early in the year

11. What is your attitude to the use of the first language in the English class?

Measures and strategies
1. How do you work with relationship building and the classroom environment?
    a. How do you follow up any measures?
    b. How do you feel the classroom environment changes during the school years?

2. Do you experience a correlation between good/negative class environment and pupils' willingness to speak up?
    a. Is this different for the English subject?
    b. Do the same students speak English as in other subjects?

3. Do you experience a different class environment in English teaching versus other teaching?
    a. In what way?
    b. Why do you think this is so?

4. Do you take any special measures if pupils are reluctant to speak?
    a. Which measures?

    b. Do you use any specific strategies when dealing with students who speak less in English class?

5. Are any measures discussed for students who are reluctant to talk in collegial contexts?
    a. Is this to consult about measures?
    b. Corresponds to the experience of the student(s) in the various subjects
    c. Do the measures in the different subjects/different teachers correspond?

6. How is the seating arrangement in the classroom?
    a. 1 and 1/with learning partner/in groups
    b. How often do you change places?
    c. Do you have other wishes for how you want to sit?

Summary and conclusion

1. Is there a connection between pupils' willingness to talk in English class and their relationships with others at school?
    a. Do you feel that they have a good relationship with the teacher?
    b. Fellow students?
    c. Other employees at the school?
    d. At home?
2. Now that we have talked about pupils' willingness to talk in English class, and the measures taken to ensure oral activity in English teaching. Is there something you have noticed, something you would like to add, or any other comments you would like to make?

Thank you for your time today!

Appendix 3: SIKT-confirmation

◖◗ Sikt

Meldeskjema / Reluctant speakers and relationship building / Vurdering

Vurdering av behandling av personopplysninger

Referansenummer	Vurderingstype	Dato
156072	Standard	30.01.2023

Prosjekttittel
Reluctant speakers and relationship building

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

Prosjektansvarlig
Dina Tsagari

Student
Matthias Hänsgen van Raalten

Prosjektperiode
02.01.2023 – 15.05.2023

Kategorier personopplysninger
Alminnelige

Lovlig grunnlag
Samtykke (Personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a)

Behandlingen av personopplysningene er lovlig så fremt den gjennomføres som oppgitt i meldeskjemaet. Det lovlige grunnlaget gjelder til 15.05.2023.

Meldeskjema ☑

Kommentar
OM VURDERINGEN
Sikt har en avtale med institusjonen du forsker eller studerer ved. Denne avtalen innebærer at vi skal gi deg råd slik at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet ditt er lovlig etter personvernregelverket.

Deltagerne/Informantene i prosjektet er lærere, og har taushetsplikt. Det er viktig at du/dere gjennomfører intervjuene og datainnsamlingen på en slik måte at det ikke registreres taushetsbelagte opplysninger. Vi anbefaler derfor at dere minner informantene om taushetsplikten før dere gjennomfører intervjuene.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER
Vi har vurdert at du har lovlig grunnlag til å behandle personopplysningene, men husk at det er institusjonen du er ansatt/student ved som avgjør hvilke databehandlere du kan bruke og hvordan du må lagre og sikre data i ditt prosjekt. Husk å bruke leverandører som din institusjon har avtale med (f.eks. ved skylagring, nettspørreskjema, videosamtale el.)

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).

MELD VESENTLIGE ENDRINGER
Dersom det skjer vesentlige endringer i behandlingen av personopplysninger, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til oss ved å

Vil du delta i forskningsprosjektet

Reluctant speakers

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta i et forskningsprosjekt hvor formålet er å få innsikt i hvordan lærere arbeider med elevers villighet til å prate i engelsktimen gjennom relasjonsbygging. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for deg.

Formål

Dette prosjektet er i forbindelse med vår masteroppgave, som etter planen skal ferdigstilles våren 2023. Prosjektets tema og formål innebærer å undersøke sammenhengen mellom elever som kvier seg for å prate i engelskfaget og hvordan et fokus på relasjonsbygging kan støtte disse elevenes utvikling. Dette skal forskes gjennom semi-strukturerte intervjuer med et utvalg lærere fra ungdomstrinnet.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet) er ansvarlig for prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Vi spør deg om å delta på denne undersøkelsen ettersom

… du underviser i engelsk på ungdomstrinnet, eller

… du har erfaring med engelskundervisning på ungdomstrinnet

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

Hvis du velger å delta i prosjektet, innebærer det at du deltar i ett intervju med oss, med mulighet for oppfølgingsspørsmål i ettertid. Intervjuet vil omfavne spørsmål som innebærer dine erfaringer og tanker med elever som er lite villige til å ta ordet i engelskundervisningen sett i sammenheng med relasjonsbygging. Det er viktig å påpeke at dine svar kun vil bli brukt til dette masterprosjektet, og alt av informasjon som kan knyttes til deg vil bli anonymisert.

Det vil bli gjort lydopptak av intervjuet, før studentene transkriberer det. Lydfilene vil bli oppbevart på OsloMets server. Hvis du ønsker, kan du få tilgang til det transkriberte intervjuet.

Det er frivillig å delta

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

- Det er kun masterstudentene og veilederen som vil ha tilgang til disse opplysningene. For å unngå at andre skal få tilgang, vil de bli oppbevart som nevnt ovenfor.

- Deltakerne i dette prosjektet vil ikke kunne gjenkjennes i publikasjonen. Alle navn vil bli byttet ut med pseudonymer, dette gjelder også navn på skole/arbeidsplass. Opplysninger som kan være relevant å ha med i publikasjonen er kjønn og alder, relevant utdannelse i henhold til engelskfaget, andre engelskspråklige forutsetninger, yrkeserfaring eller annen informasjon som kan være relevant for oppgavens formål og problemstilling, og som ikke kan brukes til å gjenkjenne de aktuelle personene.

Hva skjer med personopplysningene dine når forskningsprosjektet avsluttes?
Prosjektet vil etter planen avsluttes når oppgaven er blitt godkjent. Dette skal etter planen være i løpet av mai 2023. Gjennom prosjektets gang vil dine personopplysninger anonymiseres og etter prosjektslutt vil datamaterialet med dine personopplysninger slettes.

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 (OsloMet) har Personverntjenester 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
- å sende klage til Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger

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

- *Oslo Metropolitan University (OsloMet)* ved Dina Tsagari (veileder/prosjektansvarlig) e-post: dintsa@oslomet.no, telefon: +47 67 23 53 78
- *Anders Langøy Roald (student), e-post: anders.roald@online.no, telefon: 99236654*
- *Matthias Hänsgen van Raalten (student), e-post: matthias.raalten@gmail.com, telefon: 97025022*
- Vårt personvernombud: *Ingrid S. Jacobsen, e-post: personvernombud@oslomet.no*

Hvis du har spørsmål knyttet til Personverntjenester sin vurdering av prosjektet, kan du ta kontakt med:

- Personverntjenester på epost (personverntjenester@sikt.no) eller på telefon: 53 21 15 00.

Med vennlig hilsen

_____

Anders Langøy Roald og Matthias Hänsgen van Raalten

_____

Dina Tsagari   (Forsker/veileder)

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet *[sett inn tittel]*, og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

☐ å delta i semi-strukturert intervju

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

_____

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, dato)

Appendix 5: Co-authorship declaration

OSLOMET

Medforfattererklæring

Om to eller tre studenter gjennomfører og/eller skriver masteroppgaven sammen, skal det legges ved et medforfatterklæring, jf. emneplan MGMO5900:

"For studenter som velger å gjennomføre masteroppgaven som gruppearbeid, skal det gå tydelig fram i egen redegjørelse hvordan arbeidet er fordelt, og hvordan hver enkelt oppfyller kravet om selvstendig vitenskapelig arbeid. Her benyttes en medforfattererklæring som begge eller alle tre parter signerer."

Masteroppgavens tittel:

STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT RELUCTANT SPEAKERS

Redegjørelse på hvordan arbeidet er fordelt, og hvordan den enkelte oppfyller kravet om selvstendig vitenskapelig arbeid:

Arbeidet er fordelt slik at begge studentene har vært involvert i samtlige deler og prosesser av oppgaven. Vi utarbeidet sammen en prosjektskisse hvor temaet og ideene stammer fra en felles erfaring gjennom studiene på OsloMet. Innhentingen av dataen er blitt gjort ved semistrukturerte intervjuer, hvor vi begge var til stede under alle intervjuer. Det ble byttet på annethvert intervju hvilke roller vi hadde, hvor en student ledet intervjuet mens den andre tok notater og hadde mulighet til å stille eventuelle oppfølgingsspørsmål. Analyse, drøfting og tolkning av resultater ble gjort i samarbeid med hverandre, hvor begge studentene har vært aktive. Arbeidsmengden er tilnærmet likt fordelt gjennom hele prosessen.

Undertegnede bekrefter å ha bidratt til følgende deler av masteroppgavearbeidet:

Prosjektskisse, idé og tema for masteroppgaven	Ja/Nei
Praktisk gjennomføring av studien for eksempel innhenting av data	Ja/nei
Analyse, drøfting og tolkning av resultatene	Ja/Nei

Undertegnede har lest og godkjent den innsendte versjonen av masteroppgaven

Oslo   06/05-2023

Oslo   06/05-2023

(sted)   (dato)   (signatur)