Teachers’ Attitudes Affect Students

A Study of Swedish Primary School Teachers’ Attitudes towards CLIL

Emelie Andersson

2019

Student thesis, Professional degree (advanced), 30 HE
English
Study Programme in Education for the Primary School
Diploma Work for Teachers F-3

Supervisor: Jessika Nilsson and Henrik Kaatari
Examiner: Iulian Cananau
Abstract

Teachers play an important role in teaching English as a second language. Since many studies of students’ attitudes towards learning English already exist this study aims to compensate the lack of studies examining teachers’ attitudes towards methods of teaching English as a foreign language. The main focus of the study is on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). The definition and effects of CLIL are presented and discussed as well as pedagogical implications about teaching English as a foreign language. Via an online survey questionnaire, this study examines the attitude towards CLIL of ninety-seven teachers in the Swedish primary school’s preschool class to grade three. Findings of this study implicate that teachers in general have a positive attitude towards a content integrated approach to teaching English as a foreign language. Finally, suggestions for future research are presented.
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1. Introduction

It is always important to have students’ well-being in mind when designing teaching in all subjects. It is also essential to weigh in the thoughts and opinions of teachers and their experience. Investigating teachers’ attitudes towards methods of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) might help teachers understand which factors are considered relevant from a teachers’ point of view when designing students’ education. Different researchers consider different methods, such as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) or Classic EFL, to be the best methods for teaching English as a foreign language (Divsar and Tahriri 112). Benefits and disadvantages can be found amongst them all, but how do teachers feel about them? Many studies examine students’ attitudes towards CLIL and other methods. On the other hand few studies examine teachers’ attitudes towards CLIL. Therefore, this study will investigate Swedish primary school teachers’ attitudes towards CLIL.

Students in school today are required to learn languages other than their mother tongue, as specified by the European Union (Allström 37); this responsibility lies on the school system of every country. To help students achieve this, it is important for teachers to use the right strategies and have adequate education in the area. CLIL is one of the methods of teaching foreign languages advocated by multiple researchers. Therefore a substantial amount of studies have been focused on CLIL. Studies show both positive and negative effects of using CLIL as a method of teaching English as a foreign language, some of which are related to student and teacher attitude. Since even the European Commission speaks in favour of teaching foreign languages with CLIL methods (Tragant et al. 580), it is important to study their effects and teachers’ attitudes towards them.
In addition, science and proven experience should be the backbone of the Swedish educational system (Skollag, ch1 5§), making this study along with other studies of methods of teaching English as a foreign language very important for teacher practices.

1.1 Aim

This study aims to investigate the attitudes of Swedish primary school teachers towards Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL, as it is defined in this study. This study aims to study teachers’ attitudes towards CLIL in order to aid future and current teachers to develop their practice of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners.

1.2 Research Question

- What are second language teachers’ attitudes to Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL?

2. Background

This chapter presents background information relevant to this study. In order to present teachers’ attitudes towards Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) and in order to present teachers’ attitudes to English teaching and learning, a theoretical framework with two dominant methods in English teaching in Sweden will be presented in more detail, CLIL and Classic EFL. To aid comprehension in the Swedish context, the frameworks for teaching in Swedish school in general and teaching English in Swedish primary school in particular are presented. Furthermore, relevant previous research on attitudes towards methodology in English education related to the aim of this study will be presented. A majority of the previous studies and literature mentioned
here are carried out in a context that differs from the Swedish context; this will be discussed further along.

2.1 Teaching EFL to young learners

An adequate method of teaching English is important to develop students’ language proficiency and communication skills (Divsar and Tahriri 112). Cameron claims that “[t]here are important links between what and how children are taught, and what they learn.” (20), meaning that the method of teaching English as a foreign language is an important factor in acquiring new languages.

Koc examined how second language teachers learned a new language themselves. Results show that language learning strategies, psychological tools to learn a new language, used by the teachers themselves were also applied when educating their students (362). Furthermore, Lundberg (Tidigt Engelsklärande 26) implicates that teachers’ opinions about teaching English as a foreign language also affect their attitude when teaching. Fahd al Malihi stresses the importance of teachers in EFL contexts, saying that teachers influence and make impressions on students’ learning by inspiring and tending to their pedagogical needs (86). This shows that teachers’ attitudes are an important factor in teaching English as a foreign language to young learners. In conclusion, previous education for teachers involved in teaching English to young learners as well as their opinion about language learning affect their teaching methods and their attitude in the classroom.

Another factor related to the successful teaching of English as a foreign language is the amount of time spent on practising the new language. When being exposed to English continuously and on a regular basis, chances of a positive development are better than if English classes are seldom or irregularly offered (Lundberg, Tidigt
engelsklärande 27). This is confirmed by Yaman, who stresses the importance of continuity in second language teaching (2).

Yaman also states that one acquires a new language by using it in authentic ways. This is to be considered by teachers when researching methods of teaching English as a foreign language in their classroom (1). Creating authentic learning opportunities means putting the language in contexts where it is likely to be found outside of the classroom or school. Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL, is one way to create these authentic situations (Nicholas 386).

2.2 Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL

Content and Language Integrated Learning, CLIL, is described below. First, several definitions of the concept are presented and a definition of CLIL is established. Second, the effects of using the method are presented, and third, the relation between Content and Language Integrated Learning and vocabulary acquisition is presented.

2.2.1 Definition of CLIL

CLIL is an acronym for Content and Language Integrated Learning and a technical term used when referring to several methods aiming to teach with content in focus. For this study the acronym CLIL will be used when referring to the method.

CLIL is a widely accepted and used method for teaching foreign languages. But it is not a method used exclusively for language teaching; CLIL is also used as a general way of teaching content in an authentic manner (Augustín-Llach 77). As a matter of fact, when CLIL is used in a foreign language teaching context, a popular subject to teach is science (Tragant et al. 583; Alcaraz-Mármol 55).
Multiple definitions of CLIL exist and not all of them agree entirely with each other. San Isidro and Lasagabaster try to establish a definition of CLIL but do not succeed to present one. According to them, the definition depends on the context, although authenticity and content appear to be important (1). This opens for multiple interpretations of the term. Sylvén defines CLIL as “teaching where a language other than the mother tongue of the students is used as the medium of instruction...” (9). This interpretation puts an emphasis on content. Furthermore, concrete examples of using CLIL in English classes are described by Tyberg, where the actual process seems to be the most important (51). Creating study methods where students work with content through themes are described as subject integrated learning, which is also classified as CLIL. Another take on the CLIL method is what Nicholas describes as CBI, which is Concept-Based Instruction. This method focuses on learning by doing, meaning that if the teacher wants students to learn the rules of a language he or she teaches examples of how to use them rather than teaching the rule itself (385). Nicholas also explains how a concept-based method of teaching focuses on understanding in relation to the real world (386). In other words, this means using knowledge in an authentic situation with the intention to create understanding of content. Concept-based methods are included in the CLIL term.

A frequently used word when discussing and describing CLIL methods is authentic. It is said that the most authentic and successful way to learn a new language is to use it (Sylvén, 1). This is also how young children acquire their mother tongue (Sylvén 28). The different definitions of CLIL presented above all mention the authentic aspect in different ways, making it central when negotiating the meaning of the term.

Due to the CLIL term being so broad, including multiple branches and learning traditions, a combination of methods is possible when working with CLIL. Divsar and Tahriri (108) speak in favour of not just teaching in one single way, which is closely
related to CLIL. They write about integrated teaching which allows students and teachers to learn through both the language and the culture that it is a part of. This is described as learning about authentic content such as texts or phrases and considering the fact that “Language and culture are inseparable” (Divsar and Tahriri 109), meaning that English culture cannot be disregarded in English teaching. Yimwilay also studied how teaching English as a foreign language in an integrated way affects the students. CLIL in this context is defined as a “multidisciplinary approach” (14), and it is stated that this way of teaching helps students to apply new knowledge in other areas when needed. Yimwilay’s results indicate that this specified method for teaching English as a foreign language is applicable for almost all kind of learners (19).

When learning a new language, vocabulary learning is an inevitable element and the different methods differ in how it is taught. Sylvén considers CLIL to be a part of a “naturalist approach” (2) where the language, and thus the vocabulary, is learned by using it. This way of defining CLIL is closely related to Piaget’s ideas of creating knowledge (Cameron, 3), since the accommodation process can be argued to work in relation to learning language by content. Accommodating language is to put new knowledge to real use and to understand its benefits and the CLIL methods focuses on learning in authentic context to also help learners understand the benefits of its use (Cameron 3).

As seen above, the definition of CLIL varies from different authors and contexts. The definition of CLIL for this study is a generic term for different types of methods teaching English as a foreign or second language that is concentrated on content rather than the language and its structure.
2.2.2 Effects of CLIL

There is a significant amount of studies examining the effects of CLIL, and a variety of these previous studies are presented in this chapter.

Soft skills such as motivation and interest can be influenced by CLIL methods. In Spain, Doiz et al. investigated the effects of CLIL as opposed to Classic EFL with motivation in focus. Via a survey, it was established that a higher level of motivation existed amongst CLIL students than the students who were taught according to a classic EFL point of view (217; 220). Huang examined how motivation stands in relation to the CLIL method, in this case, content-based instruction. Huang could determine that CLIL-based learning generated a higher level of participation among Taiwanese students than other types of classes (197). Seikkula-Leino also discovered high motivation among CLIL students in Finland and this despite the fact that the same students were categorising themselves as low level foreign language speakers (335).

In relation to Seikkula-Leino’s findings, CLIL students appear to have a lower self-esteem than their counterpart in classic EFL studies, according to Doiz et al (221). Students taught with CLIL methods did not feel as self assured as students taught in other methods such as Classic EFL. By contrast, other studies have shown students taught in CLIL methods to not have a lower self-esteem than students who were taught a foreign language in Classic EFL style (Seikkula-Leino 335). Researchers explain this problem to be directly related to the nature of CLIL method lessons which requires more from the participating students than Classic EFL lessons (Doiz et al. 221).

Teaching English as a foreign language with CLIL methods also affects practical skills. Sylvén compared a CLIL group and a Classic EFL group in a Swedish classroom context. Results indicated that CLIL students exceeded Classic EFL students in all tested skills which, among other things, involved lexical skills (105).
Nieto Moreno de Diezmas examined how CLIL affected different language skills among students in year 4 in a Spanish school (92). Results showed that “...oral production and interaction...” (92) benefited the most from CLIL when compared to other skills. This was not, however, compared to other methods. Furthermore, a common feature when learning a new language is to use what Augustín-Llach describes as borrowing, meaning to use words that are a part of the students’ first language vocabulary as loanwords from the English language (84). The use of borrowings is suggested to indicate a lower level of language proficiency, according to Augustín-Llach (76). Differences in borrowings used by students taught in different methods, one of them being CLIL, were examined. Results showed that different methods resulted in similarly produced borrowing in general. In specific ages, however, CLIL students used borrowings slightly less than their respective test subjects.

Not only positive effects are reported from using CLIL as a method of teaching English as a foreign language. Doiz et al. discuss how students’ self-esteem dropped in classes taught according to a CLIL method (211) and similar findings were reported by Seikkula-Leino (335). Additionally, Nieto Moreno de Diezmas (83) argues that not all language skills are positively or at all affected by the CLIL methods, and Seikkula-Leino shows that CLIL is an effective way of teaching foreign language only when it comes to some receptive skills (330). Other productive skills, like vocabulary knowledge, were not affected positively by the chosen CLIL method used in the study (Seikkula-Leino 330). In fact, overall, both student groups; CLIL and Classic EFL performed on the same level (Seikkula-Leino 334). Lastly, Augustín-Llach points out the fact that CLIL generally offers more exposure to the target language, but this does not necessarily result in a higher level of language proficiency in authentic contexts (90).
2.2.3 Vocabulary learning and CLIL

Vocabulary learning is one of the greatest skills in second language learning. Augustín-Llach makes a connection between second language learning and vocabulary learning supporting this statement (76). According to Sylvén (31), when learning new vocabulary, we process it in different stages. One of the stages is integration, which is when the learner applies new intake of vocabulary and transforms it to output. This is related to CLIL methods since they offer many opportunities to integrate new vocabulary in authentic contexts.

Tragant et al. looked into the differences of CLIL and non-CLIL regarding acquiring new vocabulary. Results showed that students taught in Classic EFL style performed statistically better in vocabulary tests than students in a corresponding CLIL class (586). Tragant et al. compared a selection of studies made by other researchers and concluded that, from a vocabulary quantity aspect, students in the Classic EFL classroom outshined the classes taught with a CLIL method (587). This, on the other hand, considers only productive vocabulary, which is speaking and writing in English.

Regarding the grammatical aspect, some authors are in favour of teaching preventively (Divsar and Tahriri 107). The essential meaning of this is to teach words that will be helpful in future areas of work, such as teaching names of body parts when aiming for future teaching about the human body or other natural science related subjects. This is in line with CLIL methods since the authentic nature of CLIL makes it easier to teach in a preventive way. In CLIL methods, content is taught in relation to authentic situations and teaching preventively also prepares the learner for using the language in future situations, possibly authentic ones.
2.3 Classic EFL

Classic EFL is mentioned in this study as a counterpart to CLIL methods, therefore a brief description of Classic EFL is presented below.

Classic EFL takes a more structural, systematic approach than CLIL and other similar methods of teaching English as a foreign language (Sylvén, 2; 26). A structural systematic approach considers that every different part of the language learning process needs its own dedicated time. This also means it should be taught in a structured and organised manner. This is opposed to CLIL methods, where different parts of language learning structure blend into other learning processes. However, in practice, Classic EFL is often used alongside the CLIL method. Many second language teachers combine both methods in their English classroom.

In the same way as Piaget’s theory of accommodation (Cameron, 3) can be a foundation for CLIL, his ideas of assimilation can serve as an example for classic EFL teaching. Assimilation means to replicate the language output without necessarily understanding the context or the meaning of it. Assimilation is not bound to the child adapting to new knowledge, but to the child accepting the new knowledge.

Furthermore, Yaman states that a frequent issue in Classic EFL classes is the large amount of first language spoken by students and teachers (7). This appears to be more common in Classic EFL situations than in classes taught with CLIL.

Lastly, as for the definition of Classic EFL for this study, Classic EFL is a method of teaching English based on traditional ideas about language learning and teaching. Classic EFL per this definition is characterized by dedicated lessons for teaching English each week. Classic EFL is also defined as a method where language rather than content is in focus when teaching young learners.
2.4 Curriculum

To put CLIL in a Swedish context it is also important to investigate what the Swedish curriculum and the Swedish school act say about teaching English as a foreign language to young learners in Swedish Primary school.

Sylvén claims that CLIL exists in the Swedish school system (6). This is obvious when reading the steering documents. In Skolverket’s syllabus for English it is stated that education given to the students should be designed in a way that makes them understand the benefits of mastering a foreign language. The syllabus also mentions that the education in foreign language should provide students with a versatile language competence, which advocates teaching with CLIL methods (Läroplan 33).

A connection to CLIL in the Swedish curriculum and the Swedish school act can be found in several places in the documents. Tyberg argues that the Swedish curriculum for English says that students should learn in an omnipresent way (51), meaning that students of today should learn to use the target language in authentic ways and in multiple contexts to be able to use the language in such situations in the future. Skolverket states that the English language is in fact present in the everyday life for the majority of the Swedish population (Läroplan 33), which makes the education of English as a foreign language important and highly relevant. The Swedish school act also stresses the importance of this, since it is stated that the education in English helps students develop a rich life as active members of the society (Skollag ch 10 2§).

Specific knowledge requirements in the Swedish syllabus for English issued by Skolverket exist only from grade six. They do however include both written and spoken English (Läroplan 36). Children in the younger years are often still learning to write and read in their first language and therefore it could be argued that more attention should be paid towards spoken English during the younger years. Furthermore, the European
Union has stated that when teaching with a CLIL method, one quarter of the language medium should be the foreign language in question (Seikkula-Leino 329). In conclusion, an education focused on speaking the target language aligns with the principles of CLIL, and it is appropriate for younger students.

One last factor influenced by the Swedish curriculum is the time given to English as a foreign language. The Swedish guidelines for teaching English as a foreign language in primary school state that a total of sixty hours should be divided between the first years of school (Skolverket, **Timplan**). Divided between four years (preschool class to grade 3), this gives a total of fifteen hours per school year. Henceforth, if divided equally, this allows teachers to teach English as a foreign language to the young learners less than thirty minutes per week. If instead divided into year 1 through 3, it gives approximately fifty minutes per week of teaching time.

Governmental and EU guidelines are important to establish an equal education for all students. However, these are only words on paper. What makes the big difference, and pulls the heaviest weight, are the people involved in the actual teaching process. How they put all of the pedagogical components together to create a successful learning environment for the students cannot be stated in steering documents (Cameron, 28).

2.5 Previous research

Research performed on attitudes towards English education in general and teachers’ attitudes in specific have been reviewed for this study and are presented below.

2.5.1 Teachers’ attitudes

Wyatt studied teachers’ low expectations on themselves, the reasons behind and how to overcome them. The study found a connection between low “teachers’ self-efficacy
beliefs...” (250) and the teachers’ own knowledge of the target language. Also, Wyatt found that one of the key factors to increase the level of self-belief was to set routines for teaching (252). Routines minimized the risk of not knowing what to do and therefore enhanced the teachers’ belief of success.

Insufficient training in the method of teaching English as a foreign language and the language itself also affected the teachers’ attitudes towards teaching English. Fahd al Malihi interviewed second language teachers for young learners in Saudi Arabia and found that they did not feel properly prepared for teaching the subject to children (92).

Alcaraz-Mármol reports that many teachers in Spain feel uncomfortable with teaching with CLIL in particular (46). Teachers claimed that the main reason for this negative attitude was insufficient training. Their study also revealed that the majority of teachers find CLIL relevant as a method of teaching both content and language (51). However, fifty percent of the participating teachers considered CLIL to possibly have a negative effect on content learning (53).

Alcaraz-Mármol concluded that teachers have an overall positive attitude towards CLIL and that CLIL therefore should be a mandatory feature in teaching English as a foreign or second language (57). Yaman studied Turkish students’ attitudes and results when learning through project based learning, a method considered a part of the CLIL spectra. Results showed that students’ attitudes improved over time when being taught in a CLIL manner (160). San Isidro and Lasagabaster followed teachers in Spain during two years when implementing CLIL and even if their main focus was to examine students’ attitudes towards CLIL (4), the teachers’ attitudes showed as well. This is closely related to each other, since results showed that teachers’ attitudes depended on the students’ attitudes (14). Alcaraz-Marmol's findings along with Yaman's findings of teachers and students’ attitudes also correspond to San Isidro and Lasagabaster's conclusions.
3. Method

The acting method for this study is a survey. First, the methodology will be discussed. Second, participating teachers will be presented and ethical principles connected to their participation discussed. Third, an account for the procedure of the study is given followed by information about the analysis of the questionnaire. Lastly, the reliability and validity of this study are discussed.

3.1 Surveys

Surveys are categorized as quantitative research (Bryman 198), characterized by the quantitative statistic data. For this study, surveys were set as the method of collecting data.

Surveys are favourable considering the time aspect (Bryman 287). They are time savers in relation to other comparable research methods such as interviews and they also eliminate certain aspects of influencing the respondent. When performing interviews in person, the interviewer is at risk to influence the participator (Bryman 287). However, this is not a risk when the questionnaire takes the form of a survey. A “Self administered survey” (Bryman 285), which is additionally administered online, offers more positive aspects such as the potential to reach a large number of respondents, a minimizing of costs and an uncomplicated design process (286; 287). However, there are also possible negative aspects of surveys. It is not possible to help the respondent if questions arise when he or she is answering the questionnaire, no follow-up questions can be asked by the interviewer if unclear answers are given, respondents easily get tired when responding to surveys and it is not possible for the researcher to control who
is answering making sure it is only answered by the target group (Bryman 288).

Measures were taken to neutralize negative aspects, which are described below.

As mentioned earlier, online surveys are easily designed and administered via existing online tools. A large variety of internet-based tools for designing is available; Bryman recommends Survey Monkey (298) which is limited by a pay wall. Therefore this tool was not used for the survey, but their tool for estimating sample size was used. For this study Google Forms was used (Google) to design and administer the study. The Google Forms tool also summarizes the data. The questionnaire is presented in Swedish in Appendix 1.

3.2 Participants

This survey targeted primary school teachers in preschool class and grades 1-3 of Swedish compulsory school. The survey was distributed via social media and was answered by ninety-seven teachers of the target group.

The survey was distributed in three social media groups for teachers in Swedish Primary school. These three social media groups consisted of a total of 72219 members (though multiple users are members of two or all of the groups). The choice of distributing the survey via social media groups in general and to these three groups in particular was based on the fact that online distribution is easy and non-expensive. Target group and participants were selected on grounds of “Sample of convenience” (McKay 37), meaning respondents were chosen because of accessibility.

The sample size was calculated via Survey Monkey’s tool for estimating sample size. According to this a reasonable sample size would be approximately 383 responses. This included a 5 percent margin of error, a confidence level of 95 percent and an answering frequency of 10 percent.
Ninety-seven teachers participated in this study. Demographic questions revealed 94.8% of participating teachers identify as female. This percentile distribution of gender is somewhat proportional to the gender distribution in the teacher profession in Sweden (Skolverket, Statistik). Age range of participants strung from 18 to older than 61 years old, with a majority of participating teachers being 31 through 50 years old. Regarding experience in teaching young learners, the teachers’ experience varied from 0-5 years of experience to longer than 20 years of experience. Over 50 percent of participating teachers had 0-15 years of experience in teaching in Swedish compulsory school’s preschool class through grade 3.

Ethical principles as described by Bryman (170) were taken into consideration for this study. Participation in the survey was anonymous, no personal information other than above mentioned demographic data was asked for and there is no possibility of connecting an answer to a specific person. This was described in the initial information sent out to participants. Participating in this survey was optional and a clear purpose of the study and their participation was communicated in the information in the introduction of the survey.

3.3 Procedure

A scheme for designing and performing a survey study is presented by Bryman (225), containing suggested stages of the process. This scheme was used continuously during the process. When designing the survey all questions were directly or indirectly linked to the aim of the study (McKay 37). Prior to publishing the final version of the survey a pilot study was released to eight volunteers who were not part of the target group.

The survey consisted of a total of fourteen questions. The first eleven questions were about teaching English in primary school in general and teaching with the two targeted
methods of this study in particular. The following three questions were of a
demographic character. A combination of close ended and open ended questions were
chosen for this survey (McKay 37). Due to the risk of close ended questions being
narrow and open ended questions being the opposite (McKay 39), multiple questions
contained both fixed answers and the option “other”. The option “other” also came with
the opportunity to write a short answer. Some questions were to be answered using a
Likert scale (McKay 38). The Likert scale was a scale of 1 to 5, where the middle
number 3 was to represent a neutral mindset to the specific question.

A selection of questions provided the participating teachers with fixed alternative
answers (McKay 38), where alternatives were set not to overlap each other to minimize
the risk of confusion. Furthermore, some questions had answers in a checklist format
(McKay 38) where multiple answers were possible. All questions will be described in
more detail below. All questions, including instructions and information about the
methods were in Swedish. This decision was made considering the fact that a majority
of the participating teachers have Swedish as their mother tongue and to make
participating teachers feel at ease with answering questions without any language
barrier.

The invitation to participate in this survey was posted two times in each social media
group. The second published invitation functioned as a reminder, six days after the first
publishing in one of the social media groups and eleven days after first publishing in the
remaining two social media groups (Bryman 290).

The design of the survey included a brief instruction at the beginning where the two
methods of teaching English as a foreign language, that is, CLIL and Classic EFL, were
described. This functioned as background information to participants and a support text
to return to if needed. Instructions were also given at each question to eliminate the risk
of possible misunderstanding of questions (Bryman 291). This as a whole contributed to a well-edited survey (McKay 40).

Part one of the survey consisted of eleven questions. The five first questions aimed to give researchers more information about the respondents’ preferences in teaching English as a foreign language. The following six questions were evenly apportioned to ask about classic EFL and CLIL.

In the first five questions of the questionnaire participants were asked to specify how much time per week they have dedicated to teaching English as a foreign language and how this time is distributed during one week. These questions aimed to give information regarding their current teaching methods. The first question consisted of blank spaces for the participants to fill out time in hours and minutes, for example 00:45. The second question, had teachers specify how these minutes were distributed in one week. This question consisted of pre-set alternatives and also the option to write a short answer.

The following three questions aimed to investigate respondents’ relation to their current method of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners in the Swedish primary school. Questions asked participants to specify what method they used at the moment of the study using fixed alternative questions with the option to write a short answer. Participants were asked to name one or more factors which made them choose their method for teaching English as a foreign language. There was also a question about estimating their attitude towards the specified method of choice using a Likert scale.

Further along in the survey, six questions about the two chosen methods of teaching English as a foreign language, Classic EFL and CLIL, were asked. Three identical questions on each method were presented. In short, these questions first asked the participants to estimate their attitude towards each method using a Likert scale. Then they were asked to specify possible benefits of each method by choosing one of the
fixed alternatives or writing a short answer. And lastly, they were given an open
question about their own thoughts and comments on each method.

Specifically, question number 6 as well as question number 9 investigated
participating teachers’ attitude towards the two methods of teaching English as a foreign
language set as the main focuses in this survey, classic EFL and CLIL. Using a Likert
scale (Bryman 294), respondents were asked to appreciate their attitude towards the
named method from 1, representing a very negative attitude, to 5, representing a very
positive attitude. The value 3 on the Likert scale was described as a neutral attitude
towards the specific method. These questions were adapted from the questions used in
San Isidro and Lasagabaster (5) asking about positive and negative impacts that CLIL
have on the students, and the options on the Likert scale were adapted from the
questionnaire made in Fahd al Malihi’s study (93) and in McKay (47).

Questions number 7 and 10 were “which of the following alternatives do you see as
benefits of teaching with the classic EFL method?” and “which of following alternatives
do you see as benefits of teaching with the CLIL method” respectively (author’s
translation). For the above-mentioned questions fixed answering alternatives were set as
“Engaging for students”, “Time-saving for the teacher”, “Students learn a lot” and
“Accessible material” which were adapted from previously mentioned studies (author’s
translation). As an addition to the pre-set answering alternatives, the option “Other” and
to write one or more benefits in a short text, was given. Lastly, in the last section of
questions about each of the two methods of teaching English as a foreign language,
participants were given the optional opportunity to contribute with their own thoughts
or comments about the aforementioned method.

Part two, the last part of the questionnaire, consisted of three demographic questions.
This was to find out age, gender identification and years of experience in the Swedish
primary school system. These questions do not directly link to the research question and
aim. The reason for these questions to be included in the survey is to give the researcher information about the participants. The three demographic questions were all closed end questions and placed at the end of the survey (Bryman 334).

3.4 Analysis

The data collected by the survey in Google Forms was exported to a data sheet for further categorisation and analysis. Prior to administering the survey, when constructing questions, a couple of pre-set categories were established for some of the questions. For question number 5, where participants were asked to specify one or more factors that were essential for their current choice of method, categories “Based on science”, “Good results”, “Not active choice”, “Practical”, “Related to material”, “Students’ perspective”, “Time-related” and “Other” were pre-set. For questions number 8 and 11, the optional question where participants were asked to contribute with their own thoughts and comments about the mentioned method, categories “positive”, “negative” and “other” were pre-set.

Some answers needed re-categorization before the analysis. For question number 1, one answer was re-categorized from “20.00.00” meaning twenty hours, to “00.20.00” meaning twenty minutes. This re-categorization was made due to the obvious mistake, which was confirmed when reviewing the answers from one of the participants where it became clear that the participants had interpreted the answer as referring to minutes, not hours. In addition to this, in question number 2, three of the answers were re-categorized from “other” to “multiple short periods” and one answer was re-categorized from “other” to “2 periods”. These answers were re-categorized because of the information given in the short text answers. Continuing with question number 3, fourteen answers were re-categorized from “other” to “both”. Questions number 4, 6
and 9 were Likert scale questions. For these questions, answers were categorized according to the pre-set answering alternatives. Additionally, questions number 7 and 10 asking about benefits of each method consisted of pre-set answering alternatives as well as the option “other”. The categorization of answers in these questions was made according to the pre-set answering alternatives. Lastly, questions number 12 to 14 were demographic questions with pre-set answering alternatives. Data from these questions were exported to diagrams for reference about participants.

3.5 Reliability and Validity

Measures to ensure reliability and validity in the survey were taken and are described below.

A pilot study was performed before releasing the study to the target group. The purpose of this pilot study was to ensure accessibility to participants and to make sure questions were designed in a clear and professional way (McKay 41).

The concepts of Classic EFL and CLIL, which are the objects of this questionnaire, are described in the beginning of the survey to assure all participants are familiar with the definition of both methods. This increases the internal validity due to a lower risk of misunderstandings (Mckay 12). Identical questions were asked about both classic EFL and CLIL to assure no method appeared to be favoured by the questionnaire (McKay 39). Designing questions in this manner lowers the risk of respondents answering in a way they expect is desired (Bryman 79). Different types of questions and answer alternatives were used, such as a Likert scale, multiple choice questions stating benefits and short comments to investigate the attitudes from several angles. This ensures that questions in a survey align with the study’s research question and aim. Different types of questions can confront the research question and aim in different ways and therefore
increase the possibility to answer the research question (Bryman 209). Furthermore, the categorization of answers was based on previous research in similar areas affecting the interrater reliability positively (Bryman 208).

4. Results

Results from the survey are presented below in graphs. Questions are sorted in categories according to their content. Presented figures in results are all translated to English. All figures are presented in Swedish in Appendix 2.

4.1 Teaching English as a foreign language

The survey begins with five questions gathering background information about the participating teachers and their relation to teaching English as a foreign language to young learners in Swedish primary school. Results are presented per question below.

4.1.1 Question 1

Question number 1 examines how many minutes per week each participating teacher teaches English as a foreign language in their classes.
Ninety-seven answers were given to question one in the study, and as shown in figure 1 above, a majority of students in the Swedish primary school receive between thirty and sixty minutes of English teaching per week. This aligns with how Skolverket (*Timplan*) prescribe required hours of teaching for each school year in their documents.

As for the extremes on the scale twenty minutes and six hours. The difference between the lowest time, twenty minutes per week, and the second most common alternative, thirty minutes per week, is very small, which makes it less of an extreme. On the other end of the scale we find three larger numbers; two hours and fifty minutes, three hours and fifty minutes and lastly, six hours, that are explained in the following question.

### 4.1.2 Question 2

Question number 2 is an extension of question number 1, aiming to specify how the aforementioned teaching time is distributed during one week.

![Allocation of English classes per week](image)

Almost six out of ten teachers put all of their English teaching in one single period per week. Nearly thirty out of ninety seven participating teachers allocate their dedicated time for English classes to two or more occasions. Furthermore, out of thirteen
comments regarding the category “other”, ten answers mention they both used one particular period as well as several short periods along the week. As mentioned in question number 1, some teachers reported to spend two hours and fifty minutes or more on their English teaching per week. This aligns with these answers in question number 2.

One participating teacher declared that they spend one period every other week on English as a foreign language, making it 0.5 periods per week, and one teacher said to alternate between one to three lessons per week depending on external factors. All short text answers are presented in Swedish in appendix 3.

4.1.3 Question 3

Question number 3 asked teachers to specify which method of teaching English as a foreign language they currently use.

![Figure 3. Current teaching method](image)

The majority of teachers claimed to use classic EFL or a variation of both methods as a current teaching method in their English teaching. Ten percent of the participating teachers said they use a CLIL method in their teaching. The least common alternative in question number 3 was “other”. In the category “other” participants stated that they used
games and conversation as a main method of teaching English as a foreign language and also that they used digital resources in English class. However, since this was a multiple answer question, eighteen teachers ticked several boxes. Figure 3 shows ninety-nine answers because of the re-categorization of answers. All short text answers are presented in Swedish in appendix 4.

4.1.4 Question 4

Question number 4 is an extension of question number 3, asking teachers to rate their satisfaction with the above mentioned method of teaching English as a foreign language.

![Satisfaction with current teaching method](image)

*Figure 4. Satisfaction with current teaching method*

As shown in figure 3, the majority of respondents claimed to be satisfied with their current teaching method. Thirteen teachers out of ninety-seven were, to an extent, dissatisfied with the method they used at the moment. Almost one quarter of the participating teachers have a neutral attitude to their current method of teaching. Additionally, none of the participating teachers claimed to be very dissatisfied with their current method of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners, making this option left out of the diagram.
4.1.5 Question 5

Question number 5 is related to previous questions number 1 through 4, examining which factors were most important when choosing above mentioned methods of teaching English as a foreign language for the participating teachers.

![Figure 5. Determining factors for choice of method](image)

According to the data from question number 5, it is most common amongst Swedish primary school teachers to have the students’ opinions and well-being in mind when choosing method for English teaching. After that, the time aspect is the second most important factor when selecting method.

Fourteen teachers out of ninety seven did not make an active choice of method of teaching English as a foreign language in their classes. According to their comments, reasons for this were that the method was a remainder from previous teachers of the class or that they felt compelled to use it for organizational reasons. Furthermore, 1.9% of the participating teachers claimed to base their choice of method on research and 0.9% made their choice due to insecurity in the area of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners. Lastly, about fifteen out of the total responses on question
number 1 said that good results from students were a determining factor of choosing the method of teaching. All short text answers are presented in Swedish in appendix 5.

4.2 Attitude towards CLIL

Following questions number 1 through 5, six questions examining attitude towards the methods classic EFL and CLIL were presented in the survey. Questions are presented two and two with one question for each method in each section below.

4.2.1 Questions 6 and 9

Question number 6 aimed to investigate teachers’ attitudes towards the Classic EFL method and question number 9 aimed to investigate the same for the CLIL method.

![Attitude towards classic EFL](image)

**Figure 6.** Attitude towards classic EFL. The value 1 represent a negative attitude, value 5 represent a very positive attitude.

The majority of participating teachers have a positive attitude towards teaching Classic EFL in a young learner’s classroom. Forty-two out of ninety-seven respondents claimed to have a neutral attitude towards Classic EFL.
Figure 7. Attitudes towards CLIL. The value 1 represent a negative attitude, value 5 represent a very positive attitude. The same amount of teachers, forty-nine, only with another distribution between values 4 and 5, claim to be on the positive spectra regarding their attitude towards both the CLIL method and the Classic EFL method. Forty-four teachers stand neutral towards CLIL as a method of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners.

Six teachers stated that they have a negative attitude towards Classic EFL, while four teachers had a negative attitude towards CLIL.

4.2.2 Questions 7 and 10

Question number 7 asked the participating teachers to specify their beliefs regarding the benefits that come from teaching with the classic EFL method. Question number 10 asked the same question regarding the CLIL method.
The belief that students acquire knowledge of the target language as well as the easy access to teaching material are the top benefits stated by participating teachers. In the category “other” the most common answer was to elaborate on how the method was executed in the responding teachers’ classes. For example, comments mentioned that the Classic EFL method enabled more spoken English in classes and working in themes such as body parts and foods was easier to execute than in the CLIL method. All short text answers submitted to question 7 are presented in Swedish in appendix 6.

Regarding positive benefits from teaching with CLIL methods, teachers answered that it helps to motivate students by engaging them in the education. This also encourages
students to reach better results in the target language. Easy access to teaching material was considered a benefit by 4.8 percent of participating teachers. As well as in question number 7, contributions to the option “other” consisted of accounts on how education with the specified method functioned in actual classes along with negative aspects of the CLIL method. For example, comments mentioned that the CLIL method could be connected with the Swedish classes and the social study classes. Some of the negative aspects mentioned were that the CLIL method is a time consumer when it comes to planning and that it is hard to plan in advance for CLIL lessons. All short text answers submitted to question 10 are presented in Swedish in appendix 7.

4.2.3 Questions 8 and 11

Questions number 8 and 11 gave all of the participants the opportunity to contribute with their own comments about each of the methods. These questions were not obligatory questions. Thirty-six answers were submitted to question eight, and thirty-seven answers were submitted as of question eleven. A selection of comments translated to English is presented in table 1, about the Classic EFL method and table 2 about the CLIL method below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The students feel safe with familiar routines. Listening to texts from books and reading the text along with textbooks with assignments lets the students know what will happen”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Students with neuropsychological needs feel safe with one ‘style’. As a teacher you feel comfortable with the knowledge involved in the classic process of learning a new language”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I love my way! I have also noticed that my students learn more than their peers. My students are brave and they are not afraid to speak”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Gets more clear, easier for me personally to know which goals I am working towards and to see what students are learning. A downside is that it is harder to make a connection between content when English is its own subject”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"It does not give durable results and I cannot see that it benefits or motivates the students. They need to see and hear the language in real life!"

"Hard to engage all students when in a large class"

**Table 1. Comments about classic EFL.**

A majority of submitted comments were of a positive character towards Classic EFL as a method of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners. Out of the thirty-six submitted comments, four comments spoke negatively about Classic EFL and a total of seven participating teachers left comments which included both positive and negative opinions. The comments in table 1 are a representation of how both positive and negative attitudes were presented in question number 8. All short text answers submitted to question 8 are presented in Swedish in appendix 8.

"Encourages engaged students and it becomes natural for them"

"An easy way to sneak in a little extra English and to fix the knowledge by repetition in the everyday life"

"Maybe English does not feel as difficult if being content integrated cause you can catch on to words in context where you have it, more naturally than in language class"

"Resistance from certain students when we go against their anticipations. It is common that we hear them say that English should be in English classes only and nowhere else. A lot of students get disturbed by jumping between subjects"

"It takes time to find suitable material on the right level, it takes off a lot of our planning time"

"Can be confusing for students. Especially hard for the students with another mother tongue than Swedish"

**Table 2. Comments about CLIL.**

In question number 11, nine participating teachers had a positive attitude towards CLIL when asked to write their own comments and thoughts about the method. The larger part of submitted comments, twelve, expressed negative attitudes considering CLIL as a method of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners. Additionally, eight answers out of the thirty-seven comments on question number 11 were of both negative
and positive character towards CLIL in the Swedish compulsory school. As shown in table 2, positive attitudes included reasons such as motivated students and a simple way to make English classes feel easy and authentic. On the other hand, negative attitudes were expressed as time related and related to confusion amongst students. All short text answers submitted to question 11 are presented in Swedish in appendix 9.

5. Discussion

First, the results of this study in relation to previous studies are discussed. Second, the methodology of the present study is discussed.

5.1 Result discussion

The vast majority of previous studies presented in this study are carried out in either multilingual contexts or contexts where the English language is not spoken to a large extent outside of school. However, differences in culture and exposure to English also exist in the Swedish school context. As Allström mentions, there is a big difference in the mix of people of different cultures and the foreign language exposure depending on where in Sweden you live (38). It has been difficult to find studies conducted in a Swedish, or similar, context. Augustín-Llach performed a study on students who had previously received up to three hours per week of EFL teaching since the start of year 1 (81). This is not comparable to a Swedish context since Swedish first year students should receive approximately thirty to fifty minutes of English per week (Skolverket Timplan). What makes it comparable, however, is the fact that the researchers narrowed down the dedicated time of EFL teaching to one hour per week during the study (81). This time spent on EFL is also seen in Saudi Arabia, where approximately two hours per week are given to the students (Fahd al Malihi, 95). The time aspect could affect
teachers’ attitudes. As seen in questions number 5, 7 and 10, fifteen to twenty-five percent of teachers consider time as a relevant factor when designing education for students. Just as Seikkula-Leino states, it is problematic to put some studies in the same frame because of the different contexts in which they are carried out (331). For example, the time spent on teaching foreign languages per week differs in countries and schools. Tragant et al. performed a study in a Spanish school where students participated in four hours of English training per week in the ordinary context (582). This is significantly more time than most Swedish students receive per week, which makes it difficult to compare the results with Swedish studies.

Time spent on teaching English as a foreign language can be an indicator as to teachers’ attitude towards CLIL. The majority of teachers in this study claimed that they used the recommended time of teaching English as a foreign language. However, some teachers claimed to spend significantly longer time than recommended which could indicate that they have a positive attitude towards CLIL. Regarding the claimed distribution of periods along the week, close to half of the participating teachers also claim to spread out English classes in some way, during the week. This could indicate that CLIL methods are used to some extent because English taught with a CLIL method is often included in other subjects throughout the week. Spread out classes could therefore be a sign of a CLIL method of teaching.

In Saudi Arabia teaching English as a foreign language in such young ages as the early school years is a new practice (Fahd al Malihi, 88) which could affect teachers’ level of competence and, in the long run, their attitudes towards teaching EFL. This is somewhat similar to a Swedish context, considering the relatively new introduction of teaching English in the early ages. As mentioned in the background research, many second language teachers in different parts of the world feel insecure in teaching via CLIL because of a lack of relevant method training. In this study, only a few
participating teachers expressed insufficient training or being insecure regarding
teaching language as factors of choosing method as seen in figure 5 or as comments on
questions number 8 and 11. These data are not representative of previous studies which
showed a significant number of teachers claiming insufficient training, and henceforth
insecurity, being factors of negative attitudes. Comments about Classic EFL indicated
that this method made students feel more secure and comfortable than comments about
CLIL indicated as seen in table 1 and table 2. It has been stated that CLIL could affect
self-esteem negatively and this data could support statements of this character.

The way a teacher feels about the subject affects their attitude towards the teaching
as stated by Lundberg and Koc. Teachers in this survey claim to have a neutral or
positive attitude towards CLIL as a method, yet the majority of participating teachers
state that they use Classic EFL as a current method. Additionally, data shows that about
sixty percent of participating teachers are, to some degree, satisfied with their current
teaching method. Results from questions number 7 and 10, as seen in figure 8 and figure
9, show that teachers claim students learn more from CLIL than from Classic EFL. That
CLIL students perform better than their peers is also shown in previous studies
performed by Sylvén and Nieto Moreno de Diezmas. Teachers estimate that students
learn more with CLIL as opposed to Classic EFL, as shown in figure 8 and 9. One
reason for this statement could be that CLIL is a way to make learning authentic,
making students learn more. Also, teachers claim CLIL offers more engaged students
than Classic EFL, which corresponds with how Doiz et al. showed CLIL students to be
more motivated than others. Also, Huang found that CLIL made students participate in
classes to a higher extent. Engaged students and motivation could be closely linked to
each other.

Augustín-Llach discusses if CLIL and Classic EFL complete each other by providing
different positive benefits and negative side effects (91). Many factors from other
previous studies of CLIL also argue for the methods not to be used on their own. Nieto Moreno de Diezmas mentions CLIL to only affect some of the language learning aspects (84). The results of this study show that both methods would be needed to secure the best results. In question number 2, several teachers spoke in favour of combining the two methods, the same applies for questions 7 to 11 where teachers described in their own words how they prefer or would prefer to work with both methods.

Overall, considering teachers’ perceived attitudes towards CLIL and their subconscious attitudes showing in the additional questions, this study indicates that teachers in Swedish primary school have a positive attitude towards CLIL, which aligns with the findings of Alcaraz-Mármol. However, this does not implicate that teachers have a negative impact towards Classic EFL or other methods.

5.2 Method discussion

Some aspects of the methodology need to be discussed. Firstly, the sample size of ninety-seven in relation to the expected sample size of 383 is approximately 25 percent. The low answering rate of the survey is partially explained by Bryman who claims that online surveys typically generate a lower answering rate than surveys which are administered in other ways (303). One other factor to explain low answering rate is the short amount of time the survey was available to respondents. A smaller sample size could affect the possibility to generalise the results (McKay 12). In addition, regarding respondents, the survey was distributed in Facebook communities and therefore reached a large amount of teachers who were not qualified for the study; this makes it uncertain that it only reached suitable participants. On the other hand, the character of all answers submitted to the survey indicates that only people in the targeted audience participated.
The choice of distribution channel could also have had a positive effect despite the limited time the survey was open for submitting.

Regarding the questions asked in the survey, the following aspects need to be discussed. One previous study used for reference was Alcaraz-Mármol, who chose to ask participants their level of academic training (48). I chose to not include this question in this survey due to the possible exclusion of uneducated teachers and the level of education not being related to the aim of this study. The same study did not include questions about the time aspect (Alcaraz-Mármol 55), which instead was included in this study. The choice to include it was made because it can be related to method of teaching English as a foreign language since Classic EFL and CLIL lessons can be distributed differently. Furthermore, regarding questions with Likert scale options, a scale of one to five was chosen, in which the middle number, three, was set to represent a neutral mindset to the specific question. This could be problematic since answering neutrally can be equal to not making a choice (McKay 38). Lastly, no focus was on students’ age, all teachers in preschool-class to grade 3 have been accepted in this survey with no question about which grade they are teaching, since this was not relevant to the research question.

6. Conclusion

Attitudes clearly originate from multiple sources. What is negative for one teacher can be positive for another teacher. Reading how teachers in this study discuss methods of teaching English as a foreign language to young learners and about CLIL in particular may assist when designing future education plans. However, one must take into consideration how different aspects of language teaching affect teachers differently. For example one teacher may see the time-aspect as crucial when designing English lessons.
whereas another teacher finds the time-aspect as irrelevant. We can conclude that teachers have an overall positive attitude towards CLIL, but, as mentioned earlier, this does not rule out a positive attitude towards other methods. In fact, results from this study and previous studies implicate multiple methods should be included in educating our future citizens of the world.

This study shows a small selection of teachers’ attitudes. Further studies are needed to involve a larger sample size to be able to generalise results. Furthermore, studies of this character could be executed with structured interviews as well as combining teacher and student attitudes for a broader perspective. Another perspective suggested is to study teachers’ attitudes towards other methods of teaching English as a foreign language.

A final conclusion is that teachers possess important thoughts, experiences and information about the everyday life in our schools and this experience needs to be respected.
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Appendix

Appendix 1 Questionnaire

### Engelska i år F-3

Hej!

Det här är en undersökning till mitt examensarbete som syftar till att undersöka hur vi undervisar engelska i den svenska skolans årskurs F-3.

Enkäten fokuserar på två metoder:

- **Klassisk engelskundervisning** som innebär en traditionell undervisningsmetod där engelska lärs ut genom dedikerade lektioner med språket i fokus.

- **Ämnesintegrierad engelska**, vilket innebär att det engelska språket lärs ut genom de andra ämnen (t.ex. läsning genom ämnesintegrierad engelska kan innebaka att läsa till exempel dagar under morgonstunden eller att lära ut beskrivende ord såsom short/talet under matematiklektioner).

Jag behöver hjälp mig genom att svara på följande frågor. Alla svar är anonyma. Enkäten består av 14 frågor och tar cirka 3-4 minuter att genomföra.

Tack på förhand.

Emelie Andersson

*Obligatorisk*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hur mycket tid per vecka undervisar du engelska i din klass? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klicka i de blanka rutorna nedan. Svara i timmar och minuter; t.ex. Ex 00:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tid: __________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vilken metod nedan anser du passar bäst in på det sätt du undervisar i engelska för år F-3? *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>För mer utförlig beskrivning av metoderna, se längst upp på sidan. Flera val är möjliga. Om du svarar &quot;Övrig&quot;, beskriv med egna ord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Ämnesintegrierad engelska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Klassisk engelskundervisning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Övrigt: ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44
Hur fördelas ovan nämnda minuter? *
Fyll i det alternativ som passar bäst. Om du svarar "övrigt", beskriv med egna ord.

- 1 arbetspass
- 2 arbetspass
- Utspritt under veckan i korta segment, ex. några minuter under flera arbetspass
- Övrigt: ________________________________

Hur nöjd är du med din nuvarande undervisningsmetod i engelska? *
Fyll i det påstående som stämmer bäst överens med din egen upplevelse av metoden.

- Missnöjd
- Något missnöjd
- Varken missnöjd eller nöjd
- Något nöjd
- Mycket nöjd

Vilken metod nedan anser du passar bäst in på det sätt du undervisar i engelska för åk F-3? *
För mer utförlig beskrivning av metoderna, se längst upp på sidan. Flera val är möjliga. Om du svarar "övrigt", beskriv med egna ord.

- Ämnesintegrerad engelska
- Klassisk engelskundervisning
- Övrigt: ________________________________

Nämnn minst 1 avgörande faktor för ditt val av den metod du använder idag? *

Ditt svar: ________________________________
Vilket/vilka av följande alternativ anser du vara fördelar med att undervisa enligt metoden "Klassisk engelskundervisning"? *
Flera val är möjliga. Om du svarar "övrigt", beskriv med egna ord.
- Engagerande för elever
- Tidsbesparande för läraren
- Eleverna lär sig mycket
- Material är lättillgängligt
- Övrigt:

Egna kommentarer om att arbeta enligt metoden "Klassisk engelskundervisning"
Fyll i dina åsikter i rutan nedan. Ex. nackdelar eller egna erfarenheter
Ditt svar:

Hur uppskattar du din inställning till att undervisa enligt metoden "Ämnesintegrierad undervisning i engelska"? *
Fyll i den siffra som slämmar bäst med din inställning: 1 motsvarar väldigt negativ, 5 motsvarar en neutral inställning, 3 motsvarar en väldigt positiv inställning.

1 2 3 4 5
Väldigt negativ

Väldigt positiv

Vilket/vilka av följande alternativ anser du vara fördelar med att undervisa enligt metoden "Ämnesintegrierad undervisning i engelska"? *
Flera val är möjliga. Om du svarar "övrigt", beskriv med egna ord.
- Engagerande för eleverna
- Tidsbesparande för läraren
- Eleverna lär sig mycket
- Material är lättillgängligt
- Övrigt:
Engelska i åk F-3

*Obligatorisk

Frågor om dig som svarar

Hur gammal är du? *

- 18-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61+

Könsidentitet *

- Kvinna
- Man
- Annat alternativ
Hur många år har du arbetat inom årskurs F-3? *

- 0-5 år
- 6-10 år
- 11-15 år
- 16-20 år
- Längre än 20 år

[Skicka]

Skicka alltid ibenörd med Google Formulär
Appendix 2 Figures

Question 1

Undervisningstid i Engelska per klass

Question 2

Fördelning av undervisningen i Engelska per vecka

Question 3

Nuvarande undervisningsmetod
Question 4

Tillfredsställelse med nuvarande undervisningsmetod

Question 5

Avgörande faktorer för val av metod

Question 6

Attityd gentemot metoden klassisk engelskundervisning
Question 7

Fördelar med Klassisk EFL-undervisning

- Övrigt: 25,1%
- Eleverna lär sig mycket: 20,0%
- Engagerande för elever: 30,2%
- Lättläsigt/engagerat material: 16,6%
- Tolksparande: 7,5%

Question 9

Attityd gentemot ämnesintegrierad engelska

- Räkna
- 5: 22
- 4: 37
- 3: 44
- 2: 2
- 1: 1

Question 10

Fördelar med ämnesintegrierad engelska

- Övrigt: 32,3%
- Eleverna lär sig mycket: 37,7%
- Engagerande för elever: 10,2%
- Lättläsigt/engagerat material: 15,0%
- Tolksparande: 0,0%
Appendix 3 Answers to question 2

| 11 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 10 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 3 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| Varannan vecka 60 minuter engelska |
| 2 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 7 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 2 arbetspass i halvklass, en halvtimme per halvklass. |
| 1 arbetspass i halvklass, en halvtimme per halvklass. |
| 9 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 5 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| 12 arbetspass plus lite överallt |
| Varannan vecka 60 minuter engelska |
| 8 arbetspass plus lite överallt |

Appendix 4 Answers to question 3

| Nyklassisk. Där alla pratar, rör sig, leker sjunger, läser sagor mycket annatmy |
| Varierat arbetssätt. Blandat lyssna, se, skriva och prata. |
| Lära sig genom lekar, spel och samtal. |
| Vet inte om den har ett namn men barn lär sig ett nytt språk på samma sätt som de lär sig sitt hemspråk. |
| Jobbar med olika teman där eleverna får befästa kunskaperna genom kooperativa övningar bland annat. |

Appendix 5 Answers to question 5

| Undervisar i både åk 1 och 2, är klasslärare i åk 2 så där använder jag det även i andra ämnen |
| I åk 2 arbetar vi med att få igång talet, åk 3 skrivning/läsning. |
| Då engelska inte längre ligger som ämne i åk 1 i den lokala timplanen, har jag valt att lägga in engelska i den allmänna undervisningen. |
| Att veta att eleverna får den undervisningstid som behövs och att de får de olika teman som skall tas upp inom åldersgruppen/grupperna. |
| Tycker det är lite för lite undervisningsminuter på lågstadiet, undervisar bara i en klass vilket gör att jag inte håller igång min egen talande engelska utan mest fokus läggs på de andra ämnen. |
| Vi arbetar med integrerade klasser. Men när det gäller engelska har vi en ren år 3. |
Vardagsengelska. Använda engelska på samlingen i kör
Pratar endast engelska med eleverna men "förstår svenska".
Många övningar där eleverna pratar engelska. Undervisning helt på engelska
3 klasser grupperade i fyra grupper pga bad och idrottspass, dvs lektion baserat på schemat som gjort oss "änneslärare" i grupperna.

Appendix 6 Answers to question 7

Eftersom jag valde oklassisk. Menar jag att det är ibland lätt arbetat och ibland svårt och krångligt.
Planer kan hållas eller braka.
Eleverna blir medvetna om att vi har engelska.
Jag gillar inte klassisk undervisning, men nu med en åk 3 behöver vi även träna att läsa och skriva och då är en dedikerad lektion bra. Det muntliga kör vi ämnesintegrerat hela veckan.
Rolig undervisning, eleverna lör sig i "chunks" och inte bara lösryckta glosor.
Ser inga fördelar.
Man kan gå ner på djupet mer med olika områden.
Enkelt att samla allt till en lektion istället för utspritt.
Det blir mycket engelska på en gång, längre språkbad. Eleverna gillar alla spel där de går runt och pratar engelska med varandra på
Eleverna får mera lupp på själva ämnet engelska.
Tematiska arbetsområden t ex body parts, family, food, things I can do
Roligt material ger motiverade elever!
Det har varit engegerade elever, även om jag själv skulle vilja forma om undervisningen.
Lugnt
Du tränar många olika dela och inget "glöms bort".
Hinner med bedömning i formativ form och inte endast "slutuppgifter" eller summativ bedömning. Ger mig möjlighet att se/höra alla elever.

Appendix 7 Answers to question 10

Aldrig provar
Det blir mer naturligt. Eleverna kan tycka det är roligt med engelska
Engelska ord i det dagliga men passar inte i vissa temaområden då blir det för svårt.
Inget av de ovan nämnda. Kanske att språket kommer i ett naturligt sammanhang, men det kräver ju oerhört mycket noggrann planering för att man ska få in t ex 60 min engelska i veckan på ett sånt sätt.
Jag har aldrig gjort enbart denna metod. Men jag har blandat båda.
Kan bli röligt för de barn som behöver hålla isär saker för att få ordning i hjärnan.
Om man jobbar med yrken i so så jobbar vi med det iengelskan med
Svårt att veta i förväg vad som kan komma upp.

vet ej eftersom jag aldrig undervisat så

Vet ej. Har inte jobbat så.

De lär sig nya begrepp som vanlig undervisning inte tar upp.

Eleverna bygger upp en vana med språket och blir väl förtrogna med det. De pratar numera (åk 3) gärna engelska med varandra på rasterna eller i matsalen och med mig när de har frågor eller vill ha hjälp. Det är naturligt för dem.

Eleverna får ett tydligare syfte samt en direkt egen erfarenhet där man kopplar ihop svenskan och det vi gör direkt med det engelska språket.

Sker "naturligt", blir en del av vardagen

Upprepande!

Appendix 8 Answers to question 8

Jag älskar mitt sätt! Jag ser även att mina elever lär sig mer än parallellklasserna. Mina elever blir modiga och vågar prata.

Vi ämnetsintegrerar med bild/musik men utöver i låg ålder kör vi engelska som eget ämne.

Det funkar bra, man kan se på film och sen arbeta med innehållet.

Eleverna får öva koncentrerat under en sammanhängande tid, kan variera med muntliga övningar, film och skriftliga övningar.

Kan gynna ordförrådet.

År tråkigt för mig ibland därför blandar jag båda metoderna

Bättre fokus.

Arbetar mycket med sagor, rim ramsor o dyl.

Blir mer tydligt, lättare för mig personligen att veta vilka mål jag jobbar mot och se vad eleverna lär sig.

Nackdelen är att det kan bli svårt att se den röda tråden att engelska blir mer eget ämne

Det är roligt för eleverna och lärorikt

Det krävs en kombination av metoderna och stort engagemang och intresse från min sida. Det smittar av sig till eleverna.

Jag bygger en grund utifrån saker och ämnen nära eleverna; färg, antal. Veckodagar, kroppen, maträtter, frukter etc. Jag lär ut fraser; vad heter Du, jag heter etc. Jag kopplar ihop vårt tema t.ex maträtter med ett spel där fråga svar/fraser mellan eleverna tränas samtidigt med orden på t.ex maträtter. Alla eleverna vågar fråga/svara. Se hjälper även varandra.

bra, eleverna lär sig lättare.


Man vet att eleverna får den undervisningstid de ska få, de längtar till engelskan.

Jag tycker inte det är någon nackdel när de är nybörjare. Vi berör lite olika områden där de får lyssna på mig samt film/musik. Vi spelar spel och gör ramsor och de får oftast en stencil att jobba med.
Jag leder, eleverna härmar/repetar. Sjunger, ramsor, grupparbeten, affischer med bild och ord t ex animals in the forest, at the farm, in the see, at the zoo...

Har en röd träd. Sedan behöver man komplettera med annat material och andra slags övningar. Vi ser på film, sjunger, leker dialoglekar mm

KRAVS mer än MER AN bara klassisk

Det finns elever som är duktiga o de som är mindre duktiga. De kan hjälpa varandra. Sedan kan jag arbeta med dem som har det svårt.

Gillar det framförallt för att det ger möjlighet till fördjupning inom ett område i engelskan, medan nackdelen blir att det kanske blir mer läromedelsfokuserat snarare än att man utgår från elevers intressen och erfarenheter. Det blir inte lika vardagsnära som ämnesintegrerad engelska.

Det ger inte hållbara resultat och jag ser inte att det vare sig gynnar eller motiverar eleverna. De behöver få se och höra språket in real life!

Vill ha ett annat tänk och upplägg till nästa termin. Där vi arbetar på ett annat sätt.

Eleverna trivs med samma rutiner. Lyssna på text ur bok och läsa texten samt arbetsbok med uppgifter gör att eleverna vet vad som ska hända.

Titta, lyssna, skriva behövs också tränas på

För mycket fokus på skrivande

Aldrig tänkt på engelskan som två typer av undervisningssätt. För mig har det varit naturligt att ha engelskalektion och samtidigt integrera engelskan i andra ämnen. Inget utesluter det andra.

Lätt tillgänglig material, och lärarhandledning

Elever med neuropsykiatriska behov känner sig trygga med en och samma ”stil”. Som lärare känner man sig trygg med kunskapsinnehållet, dvs. progressionen i när man lär sig ett nytt språk. Sedan kan den klassiska undervisningen uppfattas som tråkig för vissa elever, men då får man varva med spel och interaktiva läromedel.

Eleverna är trygga med att följa ett läromedel och det blir tydligt för dem vad de ska lära sig och varför.

Svårt att engagera alla elever i en stor klass.

Det blir mycket prat på engelska när vi läser dialoger mm

Har provat olika sätt att arbeta med engelska i de lägre årskurserna och ser ingen större skillnad i resultat. Hade gärna haft mer tid dock.


Appendix 9 Answers to question 11

Då fylls minuter på som ända ses som annat ämne.

Nackdelen är att eleverna upplever att vi inte har engelska.

Man sprider ut lärandet under veckan. Det kan vara svårt att minnas om man enbart arbetar med engelska 30 min i veckan.
Engagerade elever och det blir naturligt för dem.

Tjatigt ibland därför blandar jag båda metoderna

Naturligt i min undervisning

Jag tror ämnesintegrerad undervisning i engelska är jättebra, men den klass jag har nu består av halva klassen andraspråkslever vilket innebär att jag måste lägga stort fokus på svenska språket i alla andra ämnen. Jag tror att för vissa elever skulle det bli jobbigare om jag även undervisade om engelska samtidigt.

Se ovan


Har aldrig arbetat men tycker inte det verkar bli lika varierande

Kräver kontinuerligt grundläggande och uppbyggande arbete från fskkl för att nå dit där vi är idag. Men det är otroligt kul att se hur de har utvecklats och vilken tilltro de har till sin egen förmåga =)

En jättegod tanke men kräver mycket erfarenhet att kunna hålla allt i både huvud, hinna förbereda all eventuell material, plan B, inkludering ev olika nivåer .

Ett lätt sätt att få in lite extra engelska samt att befästa kunskaperna genom repetition i vardagen.

Ser fördelar med att koppla flera ämnen.

Variation är det bästa. Vi försöker alltid låta engelskaämnet följa något tema i andra ämnen så det går att ämnesinteragera men växlar med också klassiskt avskiljd engelskaundervisning.

Det är lätt att glömma bort när det inte är schemalagd men däremot tror jag det är mer givande för eleverna när de får in engelskan i ett sammanhang. Det blir ju dock mer begränsade områden man får in .

Det kan ju också bli svårare för eleverna att förstå det egentliga syftet med lektionen om de ska omvandla ord och begrepp till engelska. Isåfall får man integrera det i ämnen/tillfallen som är så bekanta med eleverna att de inte har några problem med att förstå betydelsen på svenska, som tex veckodagar, månader, årstider vid samling eller lättare begrepp på maten eller om man pratar och siffror/färger. Man blir mer begränsad .

Engelskan upplevs kanske inte heller direkt som svårt om man ämnesintegrerar för man kan snappa upp ord i sammanhang som man kanske är ämnesstark i för övrigt även om man har svårt för språk.

Kan vara svårt för elever som har svårt i det aktuelle ämnet att lägga in ett till språk för att nå kunskaper i huvudämnnet. Tycker inte att alternativen ovan speglar min syn på frågan ovan, men ett alternativ måste väljas för att komma vidare.

Kräver mer förberedelse och tid.

Har morgonsamling och vissa begrepp vi tränar ofta och har ramsor, sånger etc och arbetar med champ åk 3, the game pch liknande

Jag arbetar inte så

Motstånd från vissa elever när vi ”bryter” deras förväntningar. Vanliga kommentarer är ”Eng har vi på eng-lektion och inget annat”. Många elever blir störda av att hoppa mellanämnena.

Risk att det blir för kortfattat. Tänker då framförallt på de högpresterande eleverna.
Två språkliga elever kan blanda ihop engelska begrepp med svenska.

Absolut bästa sättet att lära ut språk till yngre elever. Jag önskar att alla gjorde så!

Man kan utgå ifrån elevernas intressen

Roligt! Se ett samband och det ger förtrogenhet.

Samma som ovan.

Tar tid att hitta material på rätt nivå, tar mkt av den korta planeringstid vi har

Jag tror generellt på att blanda flera olika metoder och gör alltid så

Använder det hellre som komplettering till traditionell eng.

Jag vill lära mig mer om detta

Ibland passar det jättebra att lära sig på svenska och engelska samtidigt

Kan bli diffust för eleverna. Svårt för eleverna med SVA.