Content and Language Integrated Learning in Sweden

A report of the experiences of teachers who teach in an International Baccalaureate program and a standard program

Author: Sofi Leijon
Supervisor: John Airey
Examiner: Ibolya Maricic
Term: Spring 2016
Subject: English Language Didactics
Level: G3
Abstract
This essay has been carried out with the purpose of investigating the differences between teaching in a CLIL program and in a standard program. The results of this research are based on the perceptions of five teachers working in both programs. These teachers participated in a semi-structured group interview where they were asked questions and were given the opportunity to develop the discussions among themselves. The results have shown that there are fewer differences between these two programs than I originally thought, but the differences that do exist were unexpected. All of the teachers who participated in the study had taught English before they started to work in the IB, but are not trained CLIL teachers. Since there were only five participants and these participants are not trained CLIL teachers, this investigation does not show a general result, but instead gives the picture of how working with CLIL and a standard program simultaneously could work.
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1 Introduction

For many years, English has been the language of choice when learning a second or a third language in Sweden. Between the years 1558 and 1953, the number of English speakers went from less than five million to approximately 250 million, and it was during this time that English began its journey towards becoming an international language (Svartvik & Leech 2006:50). However, it was not until during the restoration period (1660-1688) that the written English language began to dominate in literature and in learning. Prior to this, the international teaching language was Latin, which was also the language all scientists and scholars used for their major works. Isaac Newton, for example, made a revolutionary decision in 1704 by publishing his work *Opticks* exclusively in English which forced the world to acknowledge that English was beginning to dominate (Svartvik & Leech 2006:61-63).

The English language has had an enormous impact on the way we communicate with others and it is the language apart from our mother tongue, we are faced with daily in a wide range of situations. We hear it on television, we listen to it on the radio and often, we encounter people from different parts of the world where our only option when forced to communicate with them, is to use the English language. However, when it comes to learning English, there are many different approaches to choose from. One of the approaches that is growing in popularity, is Content and Language Integrated Learning, which will be referred to as CLIL further in this essay. CLIL is an approach in which you learn a subject, through the means of English (or another foreign language). Marsh and Langé provide an explanation which defines the approach in a few words ”a dual-focused education approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language” (Marsh & Langé, 2000:1). Thus, CLIL has two aims one subject-related and one language focused, which the term "dual-focused" refers to. Teaching a subject through a foreign language means that the students are naturally exposed to the target language, while they study the content of a subject included in the curriculum (Darn, 2006). CLIL has existed in Sweden since the 1970s but was not considered an accepted, mainstream teaching approach until the 1990s (Falk, 2001:3).

Early work with bilingual education took place in North America. In Canada, bilingual education involved teaching the minority language (French) to the English-speaking majority, whereas, in the US it was the majority language (English) that was taught to a minority group of immigrants. These studies appeared to show that the target
language and content could be learned simultaneously (Airey, 2009:18).

As English grows in popularity, the concept of CLIL has generally captured the interest of many more students than previously. A reason for the growing interest and popularity of CLIL may be the growing diversity in our schools. The main reason for the growing diversity is migration, where people who are not Swedish native speakers need to be integrated into society through Swedish classes. Since these students do not share a mother tongue with Swedish students, they are forced to use a language they both speak, which in this case is English. Since English is not the mother tongue of Swedish or foreign students this makes it a Lingua Franca. The benefit of having diversity among the students when teaching CLIL is that the students have the opportunity of an exchange within the class. Research shows that non-native speakers of English are more cooperative when using the language, which means that students can help each other improve their language proficiency through communication. However, since non-native speakers are not likely to conform to native standard English, they lose some of the language. The reason for this is that non-native speakers take things out of the language and add things that are not supposed to be there. Therefore, Harmer (2007) suggests that teachers need to think about what English to teach in the classroom and adapt their teaching to meet the conditions of the students (Harmer, 2007:21).

However, CLIL raises the demand for professional teachers and forces teachers to reflect on their own teaching, what works, what does not work and the reasons for this. Teachers need to self-reflect and self-evaluate (Martínez Agudo, 2012:12). All teaching requires teachers to master their subject, but CLIL requires teachers to not only master their subject-content, but also to master the foreign language through which they are teaching. Teaching "should promote the development and learning of all pupils, and a lifelong desire to learn” (Skolverket, 2011:9). As stated, teaching should not only aim towards the learning of students, even though this is the main aim, it should also make them want to learn. Therefore, the quality of our teaching needs to be as high as possible. "The best motivational intervention is simply to improve the quality of our teaching.”(Dörnyei, 2001:26).

The desire for wanting to investigate the experiences of teachers working with CLIL comes from different experiences and curiosity. One of the reasons for this choice of topic is that during my practice period last year, I was thrown into two different kinds of teaching, one of them being CLIL and the other being the classical Swedish approach, teaching a subject in Swedish. Teaching English in the IB program and
teaching it in the standard program alongside each other made me come to the realization that they differ quite significantly. Not only do the approaches differ from each other, but also the students in the different groups are quite different. I believe that the world is being internationalized, and as a consequence, so is the school system. Therefore, teaching subjects in English can be seen as the natural approach.

Furthermore, while many studies have been made regarding teachers and students of CLIL, none investigate teachers who teach their subject both through Swedish and English. That is why I have chosen to study this aspect of the theme.

The Swedish national curriculum for compulsory school, preschool classes and recreation centres 2011 (henceforth Lgr 11) states that ”Teaching of English should aim at helping pupils to develop knowledge of the English language and of the areas and contexts where English is used, and also pupils’ confidence in their ability to use the language in different situations and for different purposes.” (Skolverket, 2011:32). As stated, confidence is an enormous part of developing one’s language skills. However, confidence is only achieved through practice by hearing, reading and speaking the language frequently. What better way to practice one’s English skills, than to be taught and study everything in English?

When entering this research, my expectations were quite high since I have encountered this subject previously and have some knowledge of it. My aim is to investigate deeper and gain as much knowledge as possible of the subject in general, but also gain some new perspectives of how teachers use this approach in their teaching, and what advantages and disadvantages accompany this particular approach. Since I will be a teacher in a future that is not too far away, knowing what approach works and what does not work, will give me an advantage when initiating my own teaching. However, knowing what works for other teachers does not mean that the same thing is guaranteed to work for me in my teaching. Nonetheless is it always useful to receive ideas and inspiration from others.

1.1 Aims and research questions

The main aim of this essay is to discover the experiences of teachers who teach their subjects through both Swedish and English. The investigation will focus on the differences in their teaching methods in the two languages and their own perceptions regarding the development of their teaching.
The questions that this essay will aim at answering are the following:

1. What are the experiences of teachers who teach their subjects through English, compared to teaching it through Swedish?

2. What do teachers say they do differently when teaching their subjects in English from when they teach it in Swedish?

3. What are the typical outcomes, according to teachers, when teaching a subject through English? Is the attitude of the students, developed competence and the students’ note taking different in the two programs? What is the attitude of the interviewed teachers?

2 Background

2.1 What is CLIL?

CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning, is the approach in which we teach a subject through the means of a second language. This means that while the focus lies on the subject matter, students learn the language in which they study. When studying a subject that the learners are interested in, they are much more likely to be motivated to acquire the language they need to communicate, and the natural language is seen in a context. Through this, their language learning is improved. When studying English as a separate subject and not through another subject, learning is often enforced. This means that the person responsible for the learning, controls the study environment and makes sure that the learners do what they are supposed to (Darn, 2006:1). It is a general belief that a second language is mainly acquired not through enforced learning, but through a consistent and natural exposure to the target language (Martínez Agudo, 2012:37).

According to Darn (2006), when we used enforced learning, we focus on accuracy which is one of the most important things with this type of learning. Errors are corrected directly when they are made and it is more important to speak correctly, than fluently. In contrast, CLIL is based on language acquisition. This means that the importance of communication and the role language is playing, is in focus. This makes learners use the language with a focus on fluency with errors considered to be a natural part of language learning. Through CLIL, the targeted language is shown to the learners in real-life situations such as daily conversations and descriptions, which is built on other models of learning and is called natural language development. As a result, students reach their academic proficiency after five to seven years of studying English in a bilingual program. In addition to this, CLIL has been proven to be a long-term form of learning
According to research carried out by Falk (2001), the conditions of CLIL in Sweden vary a great deal depending on what level you teach or study in. However, there is a clear pattern between the different study levels; the intensity of the teaching increases along with the upgrading of classes. This means that the purposes and aims in the compulsory school are different from the ones in upper secondary school. The aims and purposes in the compulsory school level are more general than the ones in upper secondary school level and are not necessarily exclusively related to the language itself. Increasing the motivation and attitude of the students or to improve the traditional language teaching are examples of aims at the compulsory school level. At upper secondary school level on the other hand, the aims are more specified and demand a high level of knowledge within the target language (Falk, 2001:11). Finally, in higher education it has been argued that ”all teachers are language teachers” (Airey, 2012:64). The reason for this is that they are expected to teach students the academic discourse of their subject area. However in higher education the term English Medium Instruction (EMI) is more often used than CLIL, since the goals there are almost exclusively content focused (Airey et al, in press).

2.2 The origin and development of CLIL
The first attempt at teaching subjects in a different language in Sweden was in the 1970s, but there were only a few attempts at that time. It was not until the 90s that schools really started to work with CLIL as an accepted teaching form and studies on the topic were made (Falk, 2001:3). However, the Immersion programs originally started in Canada in the 1960s and are the type of teaching that lays the foundation for CLIL-research. The function of the Immersion programs in Canada is that the students with English as their mother tongue, study their subjects through a second language, French. The time when students begin their Immersion studies varies, but most children begin at the age of 6 and study their subject through French between 50 and 100 per cent of their study time. However, since the need for knowing another language differs between Canada and Sweden, so does the teaching. French is one of the two official languages in Canada and even though French is a minority language, to know both English and French is of importance. The aim is to achieve the highest possible level of language proficiency, preferably as close to the knowledge level of the mother tongue as possible. It has been shown that students in Canada reach a very high level of second
language competence, without affecting their language competence in the mother
tongue (Falk, 2001:4).

The term CLIL refers to “an educational approach where the learning of a non-
language subject is combined with language learning” (Airey 2016:71). The term was
first used in 1994 by David Marsh and Anne Maljers. Marsh (2002:11) explains that
CLIL ”emerged as a pragmatic European solution to a European need”. This European
need was European integration without favouring a single language (English). Here the
long-term European goal is that “all citizens should be able to communicate in two
languages other than their mother tongue: the so-called MT+2 objective” (Airey
2016:72). A detailed overview of the development of CLIL can be found in Airey
(2016).

In Sweden, CLIL is used for a number of different reasons, but to come as close to
mother tongue level is not the aim. In line with the European objectives, the aim is to
prepare students for the internationalization that is happening and to prepare them for
future studies or a career abroad. The way Swedish schools do this, is through a
modification and efficiency of the traditional teaching approach. Furthermore, the
Swedish aims are divided into two parts: pedagogical aims and individual aims. The
pedagogical aims are to improve the students’ language competence, subject content
knowledge and to increase their motivation to study a second language. The individual
aims on the other hand, are to improve the students’ chances of studying or working
abroad when finished with their language studies (Falk, 2001:10).

As previously mentioned, the first Swedish CLIL-research project was concluded
in the 1970s by Tom Åseskog, more specifically in Gothenburg in 1977 (although it was
not called CLIL at that stage). The experiment was conducted at upper secondary school
level, in a vocational program. The participants were divided into two groups, one
control group and one experiment group and the study was designed as a language-
pedagogical experiment. A control group is a group of participants who are not exposed
to the experimental variable, while the participants of the experimental group are
(Denscombe, 2009:79). The purpose of the experiment was to see whether students who
study a vocational program would improve their language competence and increase
their foreign language interest, through the teaching of a subject they clearly showed
interest for, in English. The control group had all their teaching in Swedish and
language was taught separately, which means that they learnt everything according to
the traditional teaching plan. The experiment group on the other hand were taught one
of their subjects in English. The two groups then had to fill out a questionnaire where they were to assess their own attitude towards the target language while having their classes in English. The results showed that the interest of the participants in the experiment group had increased significantly, unlike the interest of the participants in the control group. In addition to this, the experiment group assessed their newly acquired language competence in a more positive manner than the control group, which was confirmed by a test in language proficiency (Falk, 2001:11).

2. 3 English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)

Seidlhofer (2004) states that when a language that is used between two people who do not share the same mother tongue and where English is neither of the speakers’ native language, the language they use is called a Lingua Franca (Seidlhofer:2004:220). Since English is such a Global language, it is often used as a Lingua Franca which has aroused the curiosity of many researchers. Conversations between non native-speakers have been studied and as a result, some unexpected characteristics have been noted. In these conversations, the speakers tend to remove the -s at the end of verbs in third person present tense, they add definite and indefinite articles where they are not supposed to be and they remove them from where they are supposed to be, they overuse prepositions and they make plurals of uncountable nouns. These are some of the errors people make when using English as a Lingua Franca (Seidlhofer, 2004:220).

Even though non-native speakers may use the language incorrectly from time to time, removing important things and adding things that should not be there, they can make themselves understood to others who speak English. In addition to this, research performed by Jenkins (2004) shows that non-native speakers are more considerate when using English as a Lingua Franca. This means that they are more willing to cooperate with whom they are speaking to in terms of helping each other when they cannot find the right word, or helping each other explaining something, than native speakers are (Harmer, 2007:20). Because of this, researchers suggest that we should stop teaching our students the English of native speakers, and instead teach them about different types of English, their differences and similarities and the relationship between identity and language. They also suggest that we should stop correcting immediate mistakes in the classroom, and focus on helping students accommodate and use the language with fluency and confidence (Harmer, 2007:21).
2.4 The advantages of CLIL

There are many advantages of using Content and Language Integrated Learning, one of them being that it introduces students to an extensive cultural context and as mentioned in the introduction of this essay, our world is being internationalized, which students are meant to be prepared for through CLIL. Furthermore, many students make the choice of both studying and working abroad after finishing either lower secondary school or upper secondary school, which means that they are forced to have some sort of competence in a second or a third language, something that they automatically have after studying in a CLIL-based program and are thereby prepared for the future. CLIL has been proven to improve not only the overall language competence of students, but also their specific language competence. The motivation of the learners is increased as well when using CLIL, and with increased motivation multilingual attitudes and interests are developed. As for the teaching aspect, the classroom environment gains a diversity of methods and styles through this international teaching approach. It is, for example, the subject matter that determines what language the students will learn. Instead of focusing on improving one of the four language skills (speaking, writing, listening and reading) of the students each lesson, as is often the case in a standard program, CLIL lessons focus on and combine all four skills during every lesson (Darn, 2006:1).

2.5 Goals of CLIL

The obvious goal of CLIL is the improvement of the language proficiency of students without forcing them to translate everything from their mother tongue before starting to work in English. However, this is not the only aim of teaching a subject through English. Having another language than your mother tongue in the classroom, gives the teaching an intercultural aspect. This intercultural aspect is one of the aims that has had a remarkable effect when formulating aims for CLIL. Language aims have a great deal of importance, but are not dominating. They are included in a list with other types of aims and are not placed above any other. Every aim is equally important (Dalton-Puffer, 2008:2-3). Among the aims formulated are the development of intercultural communication skills, different perspectives of how to study content should be offered, students should be prepared for the internationalization that is happening, terminology that is specific for the studied subject in the targeted language should be accessible, improvement of language competence in the targeted language (oral communication
2.6 The effects of CLIL in Sweden

CLIL has been the subject of many discussions since schools first started working with it, and there is little doubt that the discussions will continue. The main areas that are especially discussed are whether CLIL actually does improve students learning of the targeted language, whether their competence in the subject that is taught through the targeted language decreases, and whether learning a subject through English can complicate the development of the student’s mother tongue (Falk, 2001:3).

2.6.1 Effects on students’ subject knowledge

There is a large number of studies that investigate the effects of CLIL on the students’ subject knowledge. Unfortunately researchers do not agree with each other regarding this particular aspect. According to the majority of the studies done on this topic, there is nothing to suggest that the students’ subject knowledge would in any way be affected in a negative way. In one of the studies by Washburn (1997) the students themselves however did think that their subject knowledge would have been much more improved if the teaching had been in Swedish, a common opinion which is supported by teachers. In another study implemented by Hägerfelth and Hall (1992) on the other hand, just a small percentage of students thought that their subject knowledge suffered from studying it in English. Based on the results of the studies and not on the perceptions of the students and the teachers participating in these studies, Hägerfelth and Hall establish, not surprisingly, that there is an overall positive effect on the students’ language competence. Another subject that is discussed back and forth is what subjects are most suitable for CLIL teaching. According to the students themselves, the easiest subject to study in English is mathematics while the hardest one is science, due to the difficult terminology within the subject (Falk, 2001:21).

2.6.2 Effects on the Swedish language

Many of the students in CLIL programs say themselves that their Swedish has been affected in a negative way, mostly regarding the terminology in the subjects related to science (Åseskog, 1982). It has even been shown that the students are sometimes forced to use English terminology, due to their lack of Swedish technical language. This
has been supported when analyzing texts that students in upper secondary school have written, where it shows that the students in CLIL programs have difficulties with writing in Swedish. They make mistakes such as preposition errors, semantic and stylistic errors, they choose the wrong word and they separate words that are not supposed to be separated (Falk, 2001:22).

2. 6. 3 Effects on students’ competence in the target language
According to Falk (2001) regarding the students’ competence in the targeted language, the students in CLIL programs assess themselves as having improved their language proficiency more than the students in non-CLIL programs. The students say that it is not only the technical terminology that has improved, but also their reading, listening and writing skills, as well as their ability to perform orally. Even though the students in CLIL programs are generally learning faster than other students, it is important to mention that the students themselves do not think that they learn as much as they originally expected. However, the interest for language studies has been proven to increase in classes in CLIL programs. Åseskog (1977) confirmed these statements of positive attitudes towards CLIL through a test. However, the results showed that other than the difference in oral performance there are no significant differences regarding the language competence between students in CLIL programs and students in non CLIL programs (Falk 2001:22).

2. 7 Note taking
According to Boch and Piolat (2005), note taking helps students learn, as well as helping them learn how to write. The functions of note taking are to record information and to encourage reflection, which means it requires a high level of concentration. Through these functions, the aim is to build up a stable memory that can later be used at any time. For students, note taking is used as a tool to gather information from literature and lectures that they will later have to use in order to pass an exam or to write an essay (Boch and Piolat, 2005:102).

Moreover, Boch and Piolat (2005) state that there are five indicators that trigger the note taking of the students. These indicators are when the teacher writes on the board, speaks slowly or in a low vocal register, lists of information, definitions or catch phrases and lastly, expressions such as “firstly” and “secondly” (Boch et al, 2005:103).

As well as indicators that encourage note taking, there are some indicators that
actually discourage it. These indicators can be parenthesis (information that does not contribute to or clarifies what is being taught), interaction between the teacher and the students or between the students themselves, hesitations in speaking and certain movements (walking around the classroom or when the teacher puts down his or her notes) (Boch et al, 2005:103).

2.8 The attitudes of CLIL teachers towards teaching in English
Some research into what type of people choose to be CLIL teachers has been carried out. One of these studies performed by D’Angelo (2011) in Spain and Italy, shows that many teachers who choose to teach in CLIL programs have some kind of multilingual background. Either their parents have different mother tongues or they have lived in multilingual communities. The majority of the participants in the study had spent some time abroad, which had awoken their interest for the different linguistic barriers that exist between people all over the world. Even though they all had different backgrounds and different relationships to the target language, they all agreed on one thing; the most common teaching approach that they had encountered in language teaching, was based on translation and grammar. This classic teaching approach does not leave much room for communication in the classroom and does not give the students the opportunity to practice their oral competence. They also agreed that the best way to develop their own communicative competence in order to teach in the best possible way, was to be in an English speaking environment. Unfortunately, this is not a possibility for most teachers and therefore, many CLIL teachers do not have sufficient knowledge in the language through which they are teaching their subject. However, the teachers themselves share a very important common opinion when it comes to their feelings about being a CLIL teacher; they all have a very positive attitude regarding their self-image and they claim that they have become more motivated and their self-esteem has increased through working with CLIL. They also claim that language skills and knowledge that were buried deep inside them, resurfaced and was put to use through their teaching (Breidbach, 2013:109-112).

2.9 CLIL teacher training
CLIL is growing and spreading at a very high pace and the need for teachers educated in the field increases every year. Since it is spreading at such a high pace, there are not enough trained teachers in relationship to the number of students who choose CLIL.
programs. In the classic teaching approach, it is the teacher who controls the classroom and the teaching, but through CLIL, the students lead the learning and the classroom becomes more interactive than with a classic approach. Teachers go from being the delivery system of knowledge, to the promoter of knowledge. CLIL demands a high level of competence in the teachers and with this, the workload tends to increase. CLIL teachers are required to make an effort as well as taking initiatives and cooperate with their colleagues in order for integration to take place. One of the problems that occurs with CLIL teaching is that very few of the teachers master the language in which they are teaching, due to the lack of teacher training programs. Not only do they have to master the language through which they are teaching, they also have to master the content of the subject (Fernández & Pérez Cañado, 2012:182).

Moreover, what is often the case is that subject teacher trainees often learn the content and didactic aspect of their subject through their mother tongue, while language teacher trainees study their subject content in the target language. As a consequence, teacher trainees do not meet the demands of being a CLIL teacher which leads to the need for further training. Therefore, the study made by Fernández and Pérez (2012) suggests that teacher training programs should have a bilingual study plan and that teacher trainees should study 50 per cent of their subject-content in the targeted language (Fernández & Pérez Cañado 2012:188-189).

2. 10 The future of CLIL

According to Darn (2006) language learning and learning a subject matter through language are two processes that go hand in hand with each other. Nonetheless, reflection regarding traditional language teaching is required for the implementation of CLIL and there seems to be difficulties in doing so. Teachers who are not language teachers may be reluctant to take on the responsibility that comes with teaching both their subject, and a second language. Along with CLIL, comes the pressure on the teachers since it demands a high level of skills in the language since CLIL is based on incidental language acquisition. This means that the focus does not lie on language teaching, the students learn the language by studying the subject matter. Many teachers who are currently teaching on bilingual programs do not have any training in this area and the reason for this is that there is an absence of teacher-training programs where they can receive the proper education for this type of teaching. Research implemented by Darn (2006) shows that there is not much evidence to prove that the absence of
language competence reduces the understanding of content. However, it may be that students have difficulties appreciating the culture and literature of their own country through L2. The future of CLIL is currently unpredictable and will remain so until the issues of proper training and materials for bilingual program teachers are resolved. Nonetheless, the need and interest for bilingual education remains and CLIL may one day be the common denominator for many education systems in Europe (Darn, 2006:1).

3 Method and material

In the autumn of 2015, I spent five weeks in a school in the south of Sweden doing a part of my teacher practice. This particular school is special in the sense that it has the International Baccalaureate (IB) program, which means that the pupils have the opportunity to study all of their subjects in English. The school is a lower secondary school and in 2015, approximately 440 pupils were registered and 45 of these pupils were a part of the IB program. All of these students have made an active choice to study the IB program, rather than the standard program.

3.1 Material

The IB program was established at this school in the spring of 2014 and is therefore fairly new, which means that it is still a work in progress. The program has eight different subject areas and the pupils study according to the Swedish curriculum (Lgr 11) as well as the IB’s international curriculum for the Middle Years Program (MYP). At this school, eight teachers in total teach in the IB program and five of these teach in the standard program in parallel. Worth mentioning is that none of these five teachers teaching in both programs, are English native speakers.

The collected material used for this research was the recorded interview, along with notes taken during the interview. The interview was then manually transcribed and the answers and discussions from the participants were analyzed and will be presented in the next section ”4 Results”. The results will be presented by using quotes from the interview and will then be connected to previous research presented in the theoretical framework of this essay. The interview was conducted in English and it was therefore not necessary to translate it from Swedish. Because of this, all the quotes and statements presented in this essay are direct quotes, including any grammatical errors made. An ethical permission form was also used in order for the participants to feel secure about their information not being made public. This permission form be will presented in the
next subsection and can be found in Appendix 1.

3.2 Choice of method

Since it is unusual for teachers to teach their subject in two different languages, I chose to do a group interview with these five teachers in order to discover what particular differences there are in their teaching in the two programs and how they themselves experience their teaching and their students. The interview was conducted during an hour in the teachers’ office in the centre of the school and was recorded with my cellphone. The five participants all have a Bachelor’s degree and are certified to teach in lower secondary school. All five participants were women and in the table below, information about their age, teaching experience and what subjects they teach is presented along with a pseudonym (A-E). Further on when the results are presented, all teachers will be referred to by their assigned pseudonym.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>English Language &amp; Literature, Second language acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Second Language acquisition, Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Individuals &amp; societies, History, Geography, Religion, Social studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher D</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Chemistry, Mathematics, Biology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher E</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Science, Chemistry, Biology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers A, B and C had all been teaching English before starting to work in the IB program and they are all certified to do so, while teachers D and E had not been teaching in English before, nor are they certified to do so.

Interviews have been proven to be a very effective way for research regarding perceptions, opinions, experiences and feelings since these things typically raise the need for developing the answers and cannot be answered in a few words, which they would in a questionnaire. During an interview, the interviewer also has the opportunity to ask follow-up questions, in order to receive as much information as possible and to get as much out of the interview as he or she possibly can (Denscombe, 2009:232-233).

Before beginning the interview, the teachers signed an ethical permission form in order to give their consent to the material being used in the study (See Appendix 1). In the ethical permission form, the participants were given information about what the
collected material was going to be used for, that the interview was being recorded and that no information about their identity would be revealed in the final essay. It is important in terms of research ethics that all participants have all the information they need and enter the interview under the same conditions (Denscombe, 2009:231). The participants have voluntarily chosen to be part of the study. That does not however mean that they should suffer in any way when the results are presented. They should be able to speak their mind and answer the questions without having to worry about the possible consequences if their identity were to be revealed (Denscombe, 2009:195).

Since I chose to do an interview to reach a result, this is a qualitative study. The reason for this is that the entire result was based on the answers from the interview. The answers were not to speak for themselves, they were thoroughly analyzed and then used together with quotes from the interview to present a result that was then connected to the background used for this essay (Denscombe, 2009:367).

3.3 Type of interview
The interview used for this study was a semi-structured interview, which means I had prepared a list of themes and questions but I also had to be prepared to be flexible with the order of the different themes. All of the questions during the interview were open-ended questions, to give the participants the opportunity to develop their answers as much as possible and not be controlled by the interviewer or have the opportunity to answer with a simple yes or no (Denscombe, 2009:234-235).

The interview consisted of 13 questions, which can all be found in Appendix 2. All of the questions were related to the experience of the teachers regarding teaching their subject through both English and Swedish, since this is what this essay aims towards discovering and discussing. Even though the main theme is the experiences of the teachers in teaching their subject through a different language than their mother tongue, the questions were divided into minor themes as well. Among these themes were the differences between the pupils studying through English and the ones studying through Swedish, planning lessons and preparing students for standardized assessments, along with questions about the different levels of ambition and competence among the students.

Since I needed to receive as much information as I possibly could with a small number of interviewees, I chose to gather the participants and do a group interview. When doing personal interviews, the opinions and points of view are limited. With a
group interview on the other hand, the participants have the possibility to interact with each other and build on the opinions and perceptions of one another. Group interviews have been proven to be very informative since one interviewee can express an alternative point of view, which gives the other interviewees the opportunity to express their opinions about this. Group interviews make use of the psychological and social aspects of the behaviour of a group. The reason for this is that it encourages the participants to cooperate, express their opinions and reflect on the opinions and perceptions of their peers (Denscombe, 2009:237). Nonetheless, I asked the questions and steered the participants in the “right” direction to maintain the original aim of the interview.

However, it is important to emphasize that there are some problems with this choice of method. This research is very limited due to the fact that I chose to do a group interview. The idea was to retrieve more information from the participants than I would with individual interviews, by giving them the opportunity to share their thoughts, discuss and build on each other’s ideas. As it turns out, I would probably have obtained more information from them by interviewing them individually.

As for reliability, this investigation does not show a generalizable result. Only five teachers in total participated in the interview and they all work in the same school. The result only shows the experiences of these five teachers and not the experience of all teachers working with CLIL. However, since it is quite unusual in Sweden for teachers to work in both the IB program and the standard program, we can assume that this result paints us a fairly accurate picture of the experiences of teachers working on both sides in Sweden. However, this is not a guarantee.

One aspect of the interview that must be taken into account is the fact that the participants may be affected by the observer’s paradox. Denscombe (2009) states that people who participate in interviews, have different perceptions of the interviewer and can differentiate their answers depending on how they perceive the person who is doing the interview. The level of honesty and how much the participants choose to tell the interviewer often depends on the ethnic background, age and gender of the interviewer (Denscombe, 2009:244). This affects the reliability of this research and the results would probably be somewhat different if someone other than me conducted the research.
4 Results

The following section will present the results found through this research. As previously mentioned, this interview was conducted in English and the used quotes are taken directly from the transcript.

4.1 Teaching in English vs. teaching in Swedish

"I think it’s important to say that we don’t teach completely in English. Except in language acquisition obviously. But other than that it’s not intended to be completely in English.” (Teacher C)

One may think that because students are a part of the IB program, all of the teaching is supposed to be in English. This is not the case. The teaching is, as stated, not intended to be completely in English other than in language acquisition where the language and its structure, grammar and vocabulary are in focus. In the other subjects, the subject matter is the variable in focus and the language serves as a bonus part of learning, but is not what teachers and students focus on. The teachers all agree that the majority of the lessons are in English. However, on some occasions it could be that certain assignments are in Swedish. It can also be that some aspects of the assignments in focus are hard for the students to understand in English and therefore the teachers have to adapt their teaching and sometimes explain things in Swedish. Furthermore, the teachers say that it is very difficult to find appropriate literature related to their subjects and much of the literature is therefore in Swedish. Most English literature that is adapted for the students of this age, is not adapted to be taught to Swedish students.

"Most of my lessons are mainly in English, but there are still elements that are in Swedish and it could be that certain assignments might be in Swedish or literature might be in Swedish but we discuss things in English, or the opposite.” (Teacher C)

When speaking about the standard programs and CLIL programs (IB), going into this research, my belief was that the two teaching approaches were very different from each other. They are, in the sense that one is completely in English, while the other is completely in Swedish, but the reality in this case is that they are actually quite similar.
Since these teachers have all been teaching for quite a long time before starting teaching in the IB program, they have all developed their own way of teaching and chosen an approach that suits them. Therefore, one may assume they had to change a great deal when beginning to teach in a program new to them. However, when asked if the teachers do anything differently when teaching in English and when teaching in Swedish and what they in that case do, they all agreed that their lessons are not significantly different from one another in the different programs.

"I think that when it comes to teaching in English, I don’t change my lessons, my lessons are no different than they were before. I still teach the same way I did before. The only difference I feel is that I have to use vocabulary studies a lot more in my subject. I did that before too in Swedish, but now I have to be more thorough with that to make sure they actually understand all the words in the concept.” (Teacher E)

As a reaction to this answer, Teacher E was asked by Teacher B if she had to improve her own English when starting to teach her subjects in English. Her answer was the following:

"Not that much, it’s like certain words that are specific, like subject specific that I didn’t know before that I had to check, so I mean a little bit of extra time is needed to prepare the lessons. Especially if you start a new unit that you haven’t had before. Then you have to spend a little time to check on words and concepts that you didn’t know beforehand.” (Teacher E)

As previously mentioned, the majority of the participants taught English before starting to teach in the IB program and are therefore very familiar with the language and comfortable using it. However, when you teach in a language that is not your mother tongue, there is always a possibility that you encounter words that you are not familiar with. This quote covers the common opinion of these teachers. They all agree that in their subjects, there sometimes is vocabulary that they are unfamiliar with and they therefore need to spend a little more time preparing these lessons than when they teach their subject in Swedish. The teachers also mentioned that if they plan a new unit, they more than ever need more time to prepare their vocabulary lists, both for their own sake,
but mainly for the sake of their students. This was the thing they all agreed was the most significant change for them when beginning to work with the IB, to plan and create the units. They say that there is a significant difference when working in units, but their way of thinking when planning their lessons did not have to change.

”I don’t think that, not when it comes to the language. I mean we have to create units based on a whole other curriculum. That’s another philosophy, that’s different in a lot of ways. But using English in the classroom, it’s just, it’s still, I feel that I am still teaching the same things, I’m just using another language.” (Teacher B)

This quote shows quite well that the common belief that teaching every subject in English is significantly different from teaching it in Swedish, is not entirely true. The most significant difference is, the difference in curriculum and the way of working with themes and units, not the language and teaching itself. When planning and working with a theme in the standard program, the teachers do not have to include criteria from two different curriculums, they only need to focus on one. When planning their units in the IB program, two curriculums need to be included in order for the students to pass the assignments and this therefore takes more time and consideration for the teachers. Apart from this, the teachers say that they teach the same things independent of the program and language in which they teach.

4. 2 Preparation for standardized assessments
In every subject there is a certain amount of required knowledge that the students must demonstrate in order for them to receive a grade. To reach these requirements, there are different kinds of standardized assessments. These assessments are usually based on essays and tests and students need to be prepared for these in different ways. As teachers, it is our responsibility to help them reach the knowledge requirements. We cannot give our students assignments and expect them to know exactly what they have to do in order to reach the criteria. Therefore, the perception that I have is that we must prepare them correctly and inform them of what is expected of them and how they reach the different aims and criteria. What I wanted to know was whether the teachers prepare their students for these assessments differently when teaching in the standard program and the IB program.
"I guess you have to adapt the task to the curriculum and what is said in the assessment criteria. So there you need to think more, so you cover everything. Because you know, it’s a bit different, but not much. But still you need to think about that so you can, you get all the strands and that you cover all the strands and everything.” (Teacher C)

Since there is a separate international curriculum for the students in the IB program that needs to be combined with the Swedish curriculum, the tasks obviously have to be adapted to agree with both curriculums. The aim is the same in both programs, to cover every criterion and help the students reach all the requirements. However, because the IB program works towards two different curriculums, the students need to be prepared to reach the aims in both curriculums. The teachers prepare the students in similar ways, but always consider the additional criteria in the IB program.

4. 3 Successful teaching methods and students’ motivation
The interviewed teachers state that they usually use the same methods when teaching in both programs and that they are successful in both programs as well. However, some of the groups are more reluctant to use the English language itself and some of the methods are by extension affected.

"I think it depends on the group. I mean we have three groups in the IB. Two of those groups I think it doesn’t really matter that much which language I use. One group is very reluctant to use English. It’s not a problem for me to teach in English there, they don’t mind that, they understand it almost as well actually. I don’t have to change things that much.” (Teacher A)

There are three groups in the IB program, seventh, eighth and ninth grade. Two of these groups (the seventh and ninth graders), do not have a problem with either listening or speaking in English during the lessons. However, the students in eighth grade are very reluctant to speak English during the lessons. They answer, ask questions and speak to each other in Swedish during the lessons even though the majority is intended to be in English and the students in particular should be using English all the time. The teachers all agree that it is a cultural phenomenon in this particular group. Some of the students
were probably reluctant to begin with, and after spending time together, the rest of the group followed. This does not however change the teaching, the students understand every instruction, they are just reluctant to use the language themselves. When the students are asked a question, they often answer in Swedish and when asked to answer in English, they choose not to answer or combine the two languages.

"That also happens in language acquisition in the English class. Which is very interesting, and also they say that they want to improve their oral English. But they just don’t want to use it.” (Teacher B)

Here is an example of a peculiar phenomenon regarding the eighth graders in the IB program. The students themselves state that they want to improve and develop their oral performance, and even so they do not use the language in class. Instead they ignore the opportunity to practice their English and in extension improve and develop their language acquisition.

"I don’t know if it could be that they are nervous to say something wrong or if they feel that they miss some kind of vocabulary, if we analyze for example, that they do it very, they do it very briefly. And it could be because they are, I don’t know, a little bit afraid of using English.” (Teacher A)

"But there’s a huge difference because that group contains mainly Swedish speaking students. They are so much more confident in Swedish, and they only have one student or two that might need more English. But they don’t feel they have to adapt the same way the others do. The other groups are more mixed. So that’s why English, it’s more natural for them to use English I think.” (Teacher D)

As stated, the group in the eighth grade are mostly Swedish students which makes them feel like it is easier to speak Swedish, because it is a language that everyone understands. The students feel that when it comes to English, it is unnatural for them to use a foreign language when almost everyone has Swedish as their mother tongue.

"That’s a very specific group where, that’s that culture that they have in the
class. The other two classes are a bit different and they are more open with using both English and Swedish. So that’s, I mean in the ninth grade, It’s completely the other way around!” (Teacher A)

The group of students in the eighth grade are different from the other two groups. The group mentality is the reason for this according to the teachers, they are reluctant as a group. The reason for this may be that teenagers are typically very self-conscious or have a lack of empathy with other cultures, which may create an acquisition barrier (Yule, 2014:189). The students in the ninth and seventh grade are not reluctant towards using the English language during class. In fact, the ninth graders are the exact opposite from the eighth graders, they use English as much as they possibly can. They even speak English during their breaks and in-between lessons.

"Yeah it’s the other way around and in that group, based on what kinds of students we have in that group, English works better because we have students that are more confident in English than Swedish in that group. So in that sense, English works better in that group. As a whole group they are more confident in English than in Swedish. So in that sense, I’d say when I have English lessons, completely English lessons, I reach more students in that group than if I would do the same thing in Swedish.” (Teacher C)

The students in the ninth grade are a multicultural class in the sense that they have different nationalities and few of them are Swedish. Swedish is the mother tongue of approximately half of this class. Therefore, English works better in this particular class since it is a language that everyone understands, a common language or as it is also called, a lingua franca.

"I think when it comes to, the ninth graders in that group, they’ve been very positive about English, they speak English to one another during their breaks and it’s like you said, it is their lingua franca, that’s their common language. They think it’s a lot of fun and they experiment with it by trying things and sometimes they find an expression they have no idea what it means but they try it and they try to figure it out so they play with the language in a whole other way. And then we have the seventh graders which is a completely
different group too, with a bit of a mixture. They’re a little bit more reluctant than maybe the ninth graders are, but I think there are more people there than in the eighth grade, like they are more positive and trying and they’re quite curious about it and they want to learn more and to them it’s pretty natural. Nobody reacts if I switch to English suddenly, it’s just something that happens. They don’t see that as something strange or something they react to. They’re quite comfortable with it.” (Teacher C)

The ninth graders are very willing to use the English language not only in the classroom and during school hours, but they also use it during their free time and in-between lessons. This shows that their level of motivation towards learning and developing their language skills is higher than the motivation of the students in the eighth grade. The ninth graders are not afraid to try different things and see what works and what does not. The fear of making mistakes is nearly non-existent in this group. Their curiosity for the language has the upper hand.

The seventh graders are a little different from the ninth graders; they do not use the language as well or as often as the ninth graders. However, the seventh graders are not as reluctant to use the language as the eighth graders are. The seventh graders actually want to learn and are curious about the language, which makes their overall attitude towards English quite positive. They feel comfortable hearing the language continuously and think that it is quite natural.

4.4 Students’ note taking
During lessons, teachers are faced with dealing with students’ note taking, whether or not they do it, how they do it and if they need to be told to do so. Note taking can be dealt with in different ways and some teachers choose not to tell their students to do it, but expect them to do it. The act of taking notes comes naturally to some students but some have difficulties with both listening and writing simultaneously (see similar findings in Airey & Linder, 2006; 2007 and Airey 2011). As previously mentioned in section 2 of this essay, research implemented by Boch and Piolat (2005) shows that note taking is used to store and reflect on information received in lectures and literature in order to build up a stable memory. This gives students the opportunity to use this information at a later date in order to pass an exam or write an essay for example (Boch et al, 2005:102). Therefore, the teachers were asked how they deal with the students’
note taking during their lessons.

"You actually need to tell them, otherwise they don’t. Maybe you expect the students to, if I write something on the board, you should take notes. But kids are not like that today.” (Teacher D)

"But isn’t that a difference, isn’t that different now? Cause I haven’t been teaching, well I have been teaching for eight years, but I felt that when I started teaching, they took notes. Like if I wrote something on the whiteboard, they understood that okay so this is something we need to know. But now they ask or you have to tell them that okay, so you should write this down.” (Teacher B)

"They take photos of the whiteboard.” (Teacher A)

Here it becomes quite clear that note taking does not come naturally for the students in these classes. The students need to be told what to take notes of and what they are going to use them for. The students have also found new ways of taking notes, without actually taking notes. They use their smartphones to take pictures of the board or the PowerPoint presentations, instead of putting pen to paper and writing the information down. However, this seems to have changed in the last few years. When one of the interviewed teachers started teaching, things were quite different. The students took notes whether or not they were told to do so. They did not ask if they were supposed to write the information down, they just did.

4. 5 Difficulties with learning a subject through English
As previously mentioned in the theoretical framework of this essay, learning a subject through a foreign language comes with some difficulties for the students. However, these difficulties can depend on many things depending on the subject and the students. The teachers were therefore asked what they think are the most prominent difficulties for the students when studying a subject through English.

"I think a couple of different things. I don’t think the language in itself is a hindrance if I prepare it well. But it depends on how I prepare it. It’s like you
said there is a lot of subject specific words that they feel a little bit more comfortable with in Swedish if they are from Sweden originally. But to be honest, I have to use vocabulary lists for Swedish students as well. It’s not that different because there are a lot of words and expressions in the books in Swedish that they don’t understand either. So I’m still doing it, I’m just adding another language. So I don’t think that’s an issue. What I can feel is a bit confusing for them is that we haven’t really found a system for the literature always. Like sometimes it’s in Swedish, sometimes it’s in English. I can imagine that can be a little bit confusing sometimes. In my subject I haven’t found any good English books yet, then I use a Swedish book, which is okay I guess. But then I have to complement that with English texts sometimes and that can be a bit confusing for some students. Because the content doesn’t always correlate and it can be a bit tricky.” (Teacher C)

The interviewed teachers all agreed that it is not the language itself that is the most difficult for the students as long as the teachers are well prepared in terms of material and glossary lists that they give to the students. Since some subjects have very specific and difficult terminology, glossary lists are a significant part of the teaching. However, the glossary lists are not needed because of the difficulties with the English language, since the teachers need to use these lists when they teach in Swedish as well because of some expressions and words that are unfamiliar to the students. The most significant issue that the teachers and students have is the literature. The teachers have problems finding appropriate literature that is in English for their subjects. Therefore the literature sometimes has to be in Swedish and as a result, the students are easily confused. The students can be even more confused if as in this case, the literature in some subjects is both in Swedish and in English. Therefore, the teachers agreed that the most prominent difficulty the students have is not the language itself, it is the way of studying it through literature in Swedish.

"I’m also thinking about when it’s in English, that they tend to want to know if there’s a word or expression they don’t know, they want me to translate it into Swedish. Whereas I want them to maybe explain the word in English so that they learn it in English.” (Teacher E)
Often when learning a language, we tend to want to translate everything into our mother tongue or at least receive the equivalent words. However, the aim when studying a language is to learn the language to the extent that you do not have the need to translate everything, due to the fact that the target language comes naturally. To obtain this level of knowledge in the target language, teachers want their students to use strategies to explain certain words in the target language instead of translating them into their mother tongue. This is difficult for the students since they most often want to translate everything.

5 Discussion

The results that were found through the group interview were somewhat surprising, but clarified some of the questions and thoughts I had going into this investigation.

One thing that was quite surprising was the fact that all teaching in the IB program is not in English. Both teachers and students use Swedish frequently during lessons. The teaching is not intended to be completely in English, even though one might think that this would be the best way to learn. When teaching in an IB program in Sweden the aim is to improve the students’ English, but it is not the aim in focus. The subject matter is the most important thing and therefore, the teaching cannot be completely in English. However, precisely as stated in the background of this essay, during lessons teachers do not use enforced learning (Darn, 2006; Falk 2008; Söderlund, 2013). When using English in the classroom, the teachers want to encourage their students to communicate as much as possible, without correcting them on every little mistake they make. The aim is for the students to reach a level of comfort and to be fluent in their communication instead of focusing on getting every single word right.

Regarding the competence of the teachers and their difficulties when beginning to teach in the IB program, all teachers stated that the differences between teaching in a standard program and a CLIL program are not as many as one may think. CLIL programs are growing in popularity and with this the demand for more trained CLIL teachers. Teaching in CLIL programs demands a higher level of knowledge since you are teaching both subject content and a foreign language. However, three of the teachers participating in this study taught English before they started teaching in the IB program and were therefore already trained English teachers. The teachers themselves say that they have not encountered any specific elements that have been especially difficult since they have taught English since they began teaching. However, all of them use
vocabulary lists for themselves as well as their students because of the difficult terminology they may encounter in the different subjects. Fernández & Pérez Cañado (2012:188) state that the workload of CLIL teachers tends to increase due to the fact that they have to master two things at once in order for the students to learn as much as possible and for the teaching to work as smoothly as possible. According to Fernández & Perez (2012:189), teachers study the didactic aspects of their training in the targeted language, which means that non-English teachers study the didactic aspects of teaching in their mother tongue. This can make CLIL teaching quite inconsistent since non-English teachers have studied the didactic aspects of their training in their mother tongue within their subjects. Because of this, Fernández & Perez suggest a bilingual curriculum for all CLIL teacher trainees. This would make CLIL teaching more consistent than it is now, since every teacher would have the same type of training.

Referring back to previous research regarding the use of CLIL in Sweden, Falk (2001:21) mentions the increasing intensity of the teaching along with the upgrading of classes. Since the participants in this study all work in the compulsory school, we do not know how their teaching would be different in the upper secondary school. However, we do know that they all agreed that their groups of students are not equally motivated to use the English language during lessons. Falk (2001:10) mentions that the purposes and aims of teaching CLIL in the compulsory school are very general and not exclusively related to the language itself. The aim is to encourage the students to use the language as much as possible, but not focus on their use of the language. That is exactly what the interviewed teachers state that they have to work with in their different student groups. They all have one group that is very reluctant to speaking English during lessons, while they have two other groups that use the language frequently and are not afraid to try different things with it.

In one of the groups that these teachers have, the ninth graders, English is used frequently and does not have to be forced by the teachers. This group of students use English as much as possible due to the fact that the group consists of students with many different nationalities and there are just a few of them with Swedish as their mother tongue. English is their common language, the language that everyone understands. Therefore, as Seidlhofer (2004:220) mentions, English works as a Lingua Franca in this group because it is the common language between students who do not share the same mother tongue.

One of the many goals with CLIL is the fairly obvious one, to improve students’
language skills (Dalton-Puffer, 2008:2-3). The aim is to help the students reach a level of fluency that allows them to use the English language without having to translate it from Swedish first. This is quite difficult for Swedish students it appears. The interviewed teachers all say that many of their students often have the need to translate from Swedish to English and the other way around. The teachers often experience that if they are using words the students do not understand, they want them to translate it into Swedish whereas the teachers want the students to be able to understand explanations and using strategies themselves instead of translating everything. However, the teachers do not say anything about the students’ subject knowledge being affected in a negative way. As long as the teachers use vocabulary lists for the subject specific terminology, it does not matter what language they use. According to Falk (2001:21), the participating students in one of her studies stated that they themselves noticed a negative effect on their subject knowledge when studying the subject through English. They stated that the difficulties with the language takes the focus away from the subject matter. However, the teachers participating in this investigation do not agree regarding their own students. This may be a question of the knowledge level of the students, since it may be the case that if the knowledge level is high enough, the subject matter is not affected and focus does not lie on the language itself.

Falk (2001:22) also discusses the question of how the students’ Swedish language can be compromised when working with CLIL. According to findings in one of her studies, many CLIL students state that their Swedish has deteriorated regarding terminology in certain subjects since they started studying a CLIL program. These students sometimes had to use English terminology due to their lack of Swedish technical language and their deteriorating Swedish showed in written exams and essays in form of preposition errors and semantic and stylistic errors. This is not the case according to the teachers in this study (and was not the case in Airey’s (2010) study). Since they use vocabulary lists for the difficult terminology in their subjects, the students learn both the Swedish and English technical language. The reason for this difference may be the fact that Falk implemented her study fifteen years ago and CLIL programs have developed since then. However, the differences may still exist and every CLIL program is different from the other. Not all teachers work in the same way and they do not use the same material, which makes every CLIL program unique.

As mentioned in section 2, the theoretical framework of this essay, Boch and Piolat (2005:102) state that note taking improves students’ learning. Unfortunately,
the participants in this study cannot get their students to take notes as a habit. They have to be told to do so, otherwise they focus on listening and do not take advantage of the opportunity to build up a stable memory (Boch et al, 2005:102). Instead of taking notes and writing the information they receive down, some of them use their smartphones to take photos of the whiteboard or the PowerPoint presentation used by the teachers. However, it is not clear whether or not the students look at these photos at a later date in order to re-read and reflect on the received information. In addition to this, the interviewed teachers said that this is the result of a change that has taken place during the last few years. Teacher B, who has been teaching for eight years, said that students were actually taking notes during lessons when she started teaching.

In conclusion, the teachers who participated in this study have not experienced any major differences between teaching their subject through English and teaching it through Swedish. The clearest difference is the level of competence within the targeted language, though it is not as significant as one may think. The most notable differences are within the IB program, between the different classes. The different levels of motivation is the factor that affects the teaching the most. The students are not equally motivated to use the English language, even though they have chosen to study all their subjects in English. However, the teachers do not change their teaching, but try to encourage the students to use different strategies to learn the language. The teachers themselves say that their teaching is the same, independent of which program they are teaching in. They basically use the same exercises, the same essays and tests for the students in both programs. The thing that is different is that in the IB they work in so called units, which they do not do in the standard program. This does not make the teaching different, but rather the work that the teachers do. They report their work in a different way and plan their teaching more thoroughly using aims and guidelines from the international curriculum for the IB, but the teaching itself is the same as in the standard program.

6 Conclusions
When entering this research, my expectations were quite high in the sense that I thought I would be able to analyse and compare many differences between the IB program and the standard program through the experiences of the teachers participating in this research. This was unfortunately not the case. The differences in perceptions and experiences were few among the participating teachers and due to the shortcomings in
my choice of method, the results were not what I had hoped. However, the answers to my research questions will be presented in the following section.

The aim was to investigate the experiences of teachers who teach their subjects both through Swedish and through English in two different programs. To do this, I was aiming towards answering the three following research questions;

1. What are the experiences of teachers who teach their subjects through English, compared to teaching it through Swedish?

2. What do teachers say they do differently when teaching their subjects in English from when they teach it in Swedish?

3. What are the typical outcomes, according to teachers, when teaching a subject through English? Is the attitude of the students, developed competence and the students’ note taking different in the two programs? What is the attitude of the interviewed teachers?

Questions number 1 and 3 were unfortunately only partially answered through this research. One of the reasons for this is, as previously mentioned are the shortcomings in my choice of method. If I had chosen to interview the teachers individually, they could have elaborated on their views on their experiences. However, I did manage to answer the questions about the attitude and notetaking of the students to a satisfying degree. In addition to this, the question of what teachers do differently when teaching in the two languages was also fully answered. Unfortunately, the differences were neither interesting nor surprising, but my question was nonetheless answered.

The demand for trained CLIL teachers is growing every day along with the increased popularity and interest for CLIL programs. The majority of the teachers participating in this study were teaching English long before they started teaching in the IB program, but were not used to teaching all of their subjects in English. That is why I chose to do this type of research and do a study on this unusual phenomenon, where the participants teach in both an IB program and a standard program.

Firstly, the teachers who participated in this study all agreed that the most significant change when starting to teach in the IB program was not their teaching methods, but working in units. Units are another way of planning lessons and themes, where the teachers have to include international aims and guidelines and report everything they do. The participating teachers stated that their ways of teaching are the
same, but with some modification. The level of work they put in their planning of their
lessons for the IB students is slightly higher since the demands in the curriculum for the
IB program are higher than the standard one. They also have to work a great deal more
with vocabulary lists in the IB program than they need to in the standard program. The
teachers also cooperate more than they do in the standard program since they share
everything they do with each other and collaborate in the different subjects.

The differences between the two programs are fewer than you may think,
but do exist. The most significant difference lies in the students and not the teachers,
which this research was focusing on. The fact that there are students who do not speak
any Swedish at all in the IB classes does not change the teaching, but it does affect the
interaction between the students. In these classes, English is more than just a subject, it
is a tool to understand one another. English works as a lingua franca, a language
everyone understands and is used as the main form of communication. This makes it
very easy for the teachers, since everyone chooses to use English all the time and there
is no need to force the students to use the language. However, the teachers all agreed
that they do not change their way of teaching when teaching their subjects in English
but they do use more vocabulary lists than they do in the standard program.

As for preparation for standardized assessment, the results show that there
are few differences between the two programs. The teachers themselves say that they
prepare their students in the same way, but have to adapt the tasks they use in order for
them to fit in the different assessment criteria since they are different in the two
programs.

Furthermore, there are some significant differences between the different
the IB classes in terms of students’ motivation. All students in this program have chosen
to study all of their subjects in English, but some of them are surprisingly reluctant to
use the language and do not speak English unless they are forced to do so. The eighth
graders are particularly reluctant and do not have the same fearlessness when it comes
to making mistakes and trying new strategies like the seventh and ninth graders have.
Since they know that everyone understands them and Swedish is the lingua franca, they
take the easy way out. This is the most significant problem for the teachers and is
something they work with every day in order for the students to reach the aims and
goals for their program. However, this does not mean that the teachers change their
teaching methods, only that they have to encourage the students in this particular class
more than they need to in the other IB classes.
When it comes to students’ notetaking, the teachers agreed that it is something that they have to work with since it does not come naturally to the students. The opportunity given to the students in terms of taking notes in order to build up a stable memory, is ignored by the students themselves. Instead of taking notes and learning by writing, they take photos of the whiteboard or ignore the notes on the whiteboard completely. They need to be told to take notes, otherwise they just listen to what the teachers say during the lesson. This is however something that the teachers said has changed the past few years. About eight years ago, when one of the participants started teaching, the students actually took notes without being told and did not take pictures of the whiteboard. One explanation might be the increasing popularity of smartphones. It is easier to take a photo of something than to write it down. Unfortunately we do not know whether or not the students actually use these photos the study the content of their subjects.

Learning a subject through a second language can come with some difficulties for the students. According to these teachers, the language itself is not a hindrance for the students. Yes, they need to use vocabulary lists for certain terminology within the subjects, but the teachers do this when they teach in Swedish as well. What can be difficult and confusing for the students is the fact that there is a lack of appropriate literature in English, to use in the IB program. Therefore, some of literature that is used is in Swedish, while the teaching is in English. The students also tend to want to translate everything they learn in English into Swedish, which the teachers work to avoid. They want their students to use strategies to explain certain things in English instead of translating it. This is a very common thing when learning a second or a foreign language and teachers should work with students to eliminate the desire to do this.

Over all, this study has shown a positive view of the teachers’ experiences when working with CLIL. It has also shown that the differences between CLIL programs and standard programs are not very great based on the teachers’ point of view. Since these teachers are fairly unusual in the sense that not many teachers teach their subjects in two different languages, it would be quite interesting to investigate the possibility of the existence of more teachers who work in an IB program and a standard program in parallel. If there are such teachers in the upper secondary school, a comparison between the ways of working and structuring their work could lead to some useful findings. Also, since the focus of this essay has been the experiences of the
teachers, further research could possibly focus on the students and the reasons for their choice to study all their subjects in English.
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Appendix 1

Ethical permission form

The data collected during this interview will be used as research material for an essay regarding the teaching approach CLIL. The study aims towards the discovery of the differences between teaching a subject through English and teaching it through Swedish.

The interview will be recorded, transcribed and saved for future reference. If the participant wishes to withdraw their participation and wishes that the collected material will be erased and not used for any research, this will be arranged by contacting the interviewer (Sofi Leijon). Contact information can be found on the bottom of this form.

I have been informed of the purpose with the study.
I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project.
I understand that at any given time, I can withdraw my participation.
I agree to being recorded during the interview and the possibility of being quoted in the written essay.
I understand that any information about my identity or the place where I work will not be published.
I understand the conditions and agree to participate in the study.

Name of participant:_____________________________________
Signature: _____________________________________________

Contact information of the interviewer and writer of the essay:

Sofi Leijon
0733102177
sl222nm@student.lnu.se

Contact information of supervisor:

John Airey
john.airey@lnu.se
Appendix 2

Interview questions

Background questions
What subject(s) do you teach?
In what grade do you teach?
For how long have you been teaching?
For how long have you been teaching your subject(s) in English?

1. How have your experiences been since you started teaching your subject in English, in general?

2. How was it for you changing to teaching in English?
If there were difficulties, are these things still difficult?

3. Do you think your teaching in Swedish differs from your teaching in English?

4. Have you experienced something that worked well when teaching it in English, but not when teaching it in Swedish? Something that worked well when teaching it in Swedish but not in English?

5. How do you prepare your students for standardized assessments (such as tests & essays) when teaching in English vs when teaching in Swedish?

6. What are the main differences between your students in your subject in English and in Swedish? Regarding motivation, language competence, if they are willing to speak in class etc…

Is there a difference in motivation and ability between English and Swedish classes (here I’m thinking about the fact that CLIL students have made an active choice, so they might be more ambitious…)

Do you notice any difference in levels of interaction (questions, answers to questions, discussion etc.) when teaching in English?

How do you deal with student notetaking in English?

7. According to your experience, what difficulties do the students have when learning a subject through English?

8. Does your philosophy when teaching in English differ from your philosophy when teaching in Swedish? Are your aims different? Getting students to speak, increase their motivation, develop their vocabulary, improve their grammar….

9. How does a typical lesson look when teaching in English vs when teaching in Swedish? Do you plan them differently?

13. How is it to teach your subject in English? Are there any things that are different when your subject is in English? Terminology, approach, assignments…