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ABSTRACT

In the curriculum for the non-compulsory school system, *Lpf 94*, the concept of responsibility is mentioned 32 times, which makes it important for pupils in all ages to acquire. But the question is if teachers really know what the concept means? This thesis’ aim was to investigate how teachers in English at upper secondary schools articulate discourses of responsibility. Discourse analysis, in forms of discourse theory and discursive psychology, was used to analyze the empirical data. The data consisted of statements from semi-structured interviews with four teachers in English at the upper secondary school level.

The results and analysis were presented in eight categories, which were *The Concept of Responsibility*, *Responsibility in English*, *Responsible Behaviour*, *Responsibility but How and How Much*, *Responsibility and Influence*, *Responsibility and the Teacher*, *the Importance of Responsibility*, and finally *Inability to Take on Responsibility*. The different categories were discussed in relation to previous research and Basil Bernstein’s theory about collection and integration codes. The thesis’ results corresponded to Bernstein’s theory about how some pupils benefit from an invisible pedagogy, whereas other does not. Previous research has focused a great deal on the question of the importance of pupils’ responsibility. The statements from teachers in this study showed that they expect pupils to show responsibility. The thesis’ conclusion is, in short, that teachers have to take on their responsibility to increase pupils’ awareness and thereby pupils’ ability to take on responsibility.
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INTRODUCTION

The Swedish school system is divided into separate parts. The last part is the upper secondary school\(^1\), where pupils in the ages of 15-18 years attend. The Swedish Government and State determine the curriculum for the non-compulsory school system, *Lpf 94*, which sets out the frames for what tasks and comprehensive goals the upper secondary schools should have. In addition, it sets out the fundamental values that shall form all teaching. In addition, each course has a syllabus that decides the objects of the course. The syllabi are decided by the Swedish National Agency for Education\(^2\) and include the level of knowledge, which all pupils should achieve at the end of each course (Skolverket, 2008).

In the current curriculum, *Lpf 94*, the concept of *responsibility* is mentioned 32 times in various shades, within only nineteen pages.\(^3\) It seems as responsibility has an important function in Swedish schools and that it is important for pupils in all ages to acquire. However, responsibility is a somewhat ambiguous concept; its meaning cannot be found in *Lpf 94* (Skolverket, 1994).

The concept of responsibility can be traced back to the curriculum from 1965. Since then its components such as pupils’ awareness about language learning, their responsibility for their own studies and independent planning and evaluation have increased (Skolverket, 2000e). In the 1970s teachers had an authority and pupils did what they were told. However, in the 1980s media pictured a school in crisis and a new pedagogy and a new school were needed, and the solution was a new curriculum. The curriculum for the non-compulsory school, *Lpf 94*, emphasized the concept of responsibility. Other concepts such as flexibility and freedom of choice were introduced together with responsibility (Dovemark, 2007).

The challenges of the twenty-first century put great demands on both local and individual responsibility for creativity and reflection. Organizations such as UNESCO and OECD favour towards pedagogies, which let pupils, in groups or individually, take on responsibility for their own learning and in a close relationship to the reality outside of school (Egidius, 2003). The National Agency for Education states that the grading of pupils should only concern their knowledge, not their diligence, order or behaviour (Skolverket, 2007). However, this could become complicated when pupils’ responsibility is in one of the criteria for pass in the subject of English.

In the curriculum, responsibility is included in ‘goals to strive for’, under several headings. Important extracts from *Lpf 94* (Skolverket, 1994) concerning responsibility follows:

---

\(^1\) Swedish: gymnasium

\(^2\) Swedish: Skolverket

\(^3\) This thesis will use an English translation of the Swedish concept ‘ansvar’, which derives from the translation of the curriculum, *Lpf 94*, written by the Swedish Government and State and the National Agency for Education.
2.3 Responsibility and Influence of Pupils
The school shall strive to ensure that all pupils:
- take personal responsibility for their studies and their working environment
- strengthen their confidence in their own ability to individually and together with others take initiative, responsibility and influence their own conditions.

2.4 Choice of Education – Work and Civic Life
The school shall strive to ensure that all pupils:
- develop their self-knowledge and ability for individual study planning
- increase their ability to analyse different choices and determine their study area, […]

2.5 Assessment and Grades
The school shall strive to ensure that all pupils:
- take responsibility for their own learning and study results
- can assess their own study results and develop needs in relation to the demands of the syllabi.

These goals put great demands on the teacher who should constantly ask himself/herself if the pupils are given the opportunity to reflect on how tasks should be solved. The syllabus in English as a subject consists of ‘goals to aim for’, which should guide the teaching. These goals do not contain any limits for the pupils’ development of knowledge. In the syllabus for English, a ‘goal to aim for’ is that:

The school in its teaching of English should aim to ensure that pupils take increasing responsibility for developing their language ability (Skolverket, 2000a, syllabus for English, goals to aim for, 10th goal).

‘Goals’, on the other hand, in the syllabi for the different English courses have grading criteria of pupils’ knowledge. The criteria for pass (G) are:

Pupils take responsibility for planning, carrying out and evaluating their work, as well as using appropriate aids (Skolverket, 2000b, syllabus for English A, 7th criterion).

Pupils plan, carry out and evaluate their work in an effective way (Skolverket, 2000c, syllabus for English B, 10th criterion).

Pupils work methodically and consciously to develop their language in both the short and long term (Skolverket, 2000d, syllabus for English C, 7th criterion).

This means that all pupils should take on responsibility to plan and evaluate their work to pass the English A course, since this is a course that every pupil has to read at the upper secondary school. At the B and C level of English pupils should also take on responsibility for their own learning and language ability. Concepts such as awareness and reflection belong together with pupils’ responsibility for their own learning. These concepts are summarized in the concept of
Learner Autonomy, which implies that pupils should take on responsibility for their own learning. Pupils have to learn themselves how to learn (Malmberg, 2001).

Tholin (2001) writes about Learner Autonomy in a Swedish context and means that it is to:

- gradually let pupils take on a greater responsibility for their own learning
- get pupils to reflect about how they learn so that they can make adequate and aware choices after some time
- practise pupils to see their own learning in a social context to be able to co-operate with others and not just take responsibility for oneself

The National Agency for Education investigates people’s attitudes towards the Swedish school, both the compulsory and the non-compulsory schools. The survey from 2000 shows that people consider Swedish schools to be democratic. Democratic in the sense of common values, good contacts between home and school, and allowing pupils to perform responsibility, influence and freedom of choice. Teachers, pupils and people in general have a positive attitude towards each other’s influence. However, a majority of the teachers (55 %) do not think that pupils have what it takes to take on responsibility, which is needed for increased influence. While, one third of parents to children in schools think that pupils are capable to take on responsibility. According to the National Agency for Education, there is no obvious explanation to this result, but it raises some interesting questions about the different demands that are held upon pupils and what expectations they should live up to concerning influence and responsibility. In comparison to the previous study from 1997, the study from 2000 shows that pupils’ influence have decreased but teachers experience that pupils are less capable to take on a greater responsibility that comes along with influence. However, teachers at compulsory schools are more willing, than teachers at upper secondary schools, to give pupils influence (Skolverket, 2001).

Tholin (2001) argues that is seems as if teachers have big difficulties to concretize the concept of pupils’ responsibility. He means that pupils’ responsibility includes bringing the right material and to arrive on time to class, but in particular he means that is should also include responsibility for what the teaching should consist of. The reasons for teacher’s ambivalence could be that new concepts in curricula and syllabi are rarely introduced in a proper manner, according to Tholin.

From the above discussion, the thesis will try to investigate the following; what responsibility is; how responsibility is taught; and why it is important for pupils to take on responsibility. This thesis will hopefully add to the understanding of the importance of teaching pupils to take on responsibility. It is addressed to teacher and teacher-student but also to parents with children in school⁴. The author also believes that this thesis might be necessary for further discussions in both schools and homes.

---

⁴ The curricula, Lpo 94 and Lpf 94, say that parents have the main responsibility for the children’s upbringing and the school is to support the parents in this process.
This thesis is written in English for the reasons that it will be available to a wider range of people. Because of this the focus is on pupils’ responsibility in the subject of English. Moreover, the author of this thesis is aware of the problems concerning the translation of certain concepts. The English translation of the Swedish concept ‘ansvar’ derives from the English translation of the Swedish curriculum, Lpf 94. In addition, the author is also aware of the different shades and meanings of the concept ‘ansvar’ in Swedish such as ‘ansvarstagande’ and ‘ansvarsfull’. Since Lpf 94 does not make a difference between the different shades of responsibility in the English translation; this thesis will not discuss it either. The reason for this is the time limit, which this thesis brings. A discussion of different aspects of responsibility of that kind could make a thesis on its own.

The author is also aware of the problems of performing the interviews in English. Some of the teachers could have felt blocked in the interviews because of using English instead of Swedish, which was the first language of all interviewees. However, the teachers were told to use Swedish if they did not find the correct English word and after the interviews, none of the interviewees said that they felt uncomfortable by using English. The interviewees’ possible misinterpretation of the English concept ‘responsibility’ was cleared out before the interviews began in the information in Swedish about the aim of the study and the translation of the concept.

A more personal reason for writing in English is because the author wanted a big challenge at the end of the teacher education, and the desire to write a thesis at an advanced level in English.

The continued outline of the thesis divides into five parts. The first part emphasizes previous research concerning pupils’ responsibility and a short discussion about the postmodern society we live in today. In the second part, the aim and questions are outlined. The theoretical framework and methodology are introduced in the third part, which is divided into two minor parts. These two are brought together at the end of the third part when the design of this study is outlined. The results are presented in the fourth section, results and analysis. This section also includes the analysis of the statements from the interviewees. In the fifth and last section, discussion and conclusion, the results are discussed in relation to the theoretical framework and previous research. From the thesis’ results and previous research a conclusion is drawn, which also ends the thesis together with some ideas of what might be interesting to investigate further.
PUPILS’ RESPONSIBILITY – PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Against the background sketched above, previous research concerning pupils’ responsibility, both in order to learn English and in general, will be discussed. This section is divided into four parts. The first three parts contain research on pupils’ responsibility concerning the questions of what, how and why. The forth part contains a description of the postmodern society we live in today, in order to deepen the understanding of the study’s results. A summary of the previous research is included at the end of this section.

What is Responsibility?

A number of researchers have focused on what responsibility is and most of them mention the political, judicial and the philosophical interpretations of responsibility. In a literature review by Permer and Permer (1994) different interpretations of responsibility are outlined. They discuss responsibility in general and its history. Responsibility was from the beginning set up by rules, which took the responsibility from the individual. Later on, that was considered undemocratic which lead to a change. From the 1960s onwards, concepts such as participation and influence were connected to responsibility and the interpretations were considered to be more democratic.

Political science has a rather diffuse definition of responsibility, but it is together with the judicial, focused on the consequence of your own actions. Philosophical interpretation of responsibility has its origin from Aristotle. These interpretations could be divided into three different perspectives. Firstly, a deterministic perspective can be adopted. It means that responsibility assumes the possibility of freedom, which humans do not have according to determinism and therefore there is no reason to talk about responsibility. Secondly, an existentialistic perspective which means that human beings are free but are responsible for their own actions and their own lives. Human beings should find ways on their own to seek freedom. Existential psychology presupposes behaviour from the understanding of the individuals’ intentions and expectations. Thirdly, a humanistic perspective which means that human beings are responsible for what is accounted as good and right. Humanistic psychology suggests that human beings can have freedom of choice and are therefore responsible for their actions (Permer & Permer, 1994; Wiberg, 2001).

In the early 1990s, a proposition concerning pupils’ influence was discussed in the Swedish parliament. It dealt with pupils’ influence and how it increased pupils’ motivation. It was considered necessary to allow pupils to have even more influence on their education compared to before. However, the question of responsibility was not discussed to the same
extent as influence. Permer and Permer mean that by giving pupils influence their ability to take on responsibility should increase in the same pace depending on their age and how mature they are (Permer & Permer, 1994).

Teachers, in a study by Bråten, Johansson and Stjernerberg (2006), interpret pupils’ responsibility as proficiency. Bråten et al. means that this might suggest that pupils have become more aware of the possibility to influence by taking on responsibility. The teachers also thought responsibility to be a strategy, which means that pupils used their responsibility to profit the teaching. Permer and Permer (2002) mean that responsibility is pretty much about to put up with the everyday life in schools, how to behave and to manage in a social context. In short, they mean that responsibility is a sort of adjustment. Pupils have to adjust to the school’s rules and to what is considered as a decent behaviour.

Söderström’s study shows the same result as Permer and Permer’s study from 2002, namely responsibility connected to the situation. Söderström includes that teachers have to take on the responsibility to practice their authority and to be aware of their own responsibility so pupils could feel that the teacher cares for them but also their own rights to freedom. In previous curricula, responsibility was considered as co-responsibility. Today it is considered as an individual responsibility. When pupils work independently, quantity becomes more important than quality, according to Söderström. Searching for information is more important than to have a deeper understanding of the investigated phenomenon. The consequences of pupils’ responsibility are, according to Söderström’s, study to do assignments but not to learn its contents (Söderström, 2006).

Dovemark’s study shows that teachers interpret responsibility as something that pupils should know what is expected of them. Pupils’ responsibility demand more planning and more structure. The teacher has to give the pupils a chance to take on responsibility. The basic conditions for pupils’ responsibility are that pupils know the goals and the timeframes of the assignments. The study shows that when giving pupils responsibility, their homework load increases and the pupils become more dependent on their family to help them to understand. A great demand is put on the pupils to decode what is demanded of them and to learn self-control. Children from homes of working class families have difficulties in decoding and consequently to learn self-control (Dovemark, 2004).

In another study by Dovemark, she investigates the question of democracy in the Swedish compulsory schools and the concept of responsibility. She found seven categories connected to responsibility. Two of them were responsibility initiated by teachers. Dovemark calls them ‘responsibility and freedom of action’, and ‘responsibility and duty’. These two are also the most dominant in the classroom. Even if the responsibility is initiated by the teacher, it is still individually adjusted to each pupil. In addition, the results show both positive and negative effects of pupils’ responsibility. Positive effects are that pupils participate more when they have the opportunity to take on responsibility. Moreover, pupils feel that they have a better chance to show the teacher what they can do and their knowledge. The negative effect is that
there is perhaps no consistency in teachers’ and pupils’ interpretations of responsibility (Dovemark, 2007).

How do Pupils Take on Responsibility?

There are a lot of research concerning different teaching methods that presuppose pupils’ responsibility, but research concerning responsibility with focus on the question how is rare. Bromö (2002) investigated if pupils’ motivation and responsibility increase by using different teaching methods. The findings show that if pupils get the chance to influence the teaching methods their motivation increase. However, Bromö is not sure if pupils’ responsibility increases when using different teaching methods, but if so in a limited extent.

Bråten et al. (2006) investigated a school based on Montessori pedagogies, which is characterized by planning and guidance. In a Montessori school pupils have to take on a great deal of responsibility, and how much responsibility is decided upon the pupil’s age. The interviewed teachers consider the school to be a source of inspiration in the matter of pupils’ responsibility and teachers should stimulate pupils to evoke joy for schoolwork. Österlind (1998) investigated pupils’ perception of planning their own work related to their social background. The results show that middleclass pupils see planning as an opportunity to control their own workload, whereas the working-class pupils see planning as another task, which is put on them by the teacher.

Why is it Important for Pupils to Take on Responsibility?

The importance of responsibility is a question which is frequently examined and receives a great deal of attention. Permer and Permer discuss a change in society in their study about the concept. Borders between the different economic classes are about to be erased and replaced by tensions between people who have access to information and those who have not. Work places require educated people, who are flexible, independent and able to take on responsibility (SOU 1992:94 as cited in Permer & Permer, 1994).

Dovemark deals with the question of why pupils’ should take on responsibility in her study. Several teachers in the study talk about a new teacher’s role when they discuss pupils’
responsibility. The new role includes individualising the teaching, teaching pupils to take on responsibility, teaching them to learn and to make decisions on their own. These teacher think that pupils need to practise in taking on responsibility and also that the level of responsibility should correlate to the pupil’s age. In one of the interviews a teacher point out that it is the teacher’s responsibility to form assignments for the pupil that create opportunities for pupils to take on responsibility. A headmaster implies that adults today have betrayed young people because they have pushed important decisions to the children which they are not mature enough to handle. Adults have to take on their responsibility to create opportunities for the pupils to take on responsibility (Dovemark, 2007).

Another study by Dovemark (2004) shows that the twenty-first century put more responsibility on the individual pupil. Consequently this could turn into personal problems for the pupil if s/he failes the assignments. Dovemark continues to discuss the immense responsibility young adults have today and how they have to make responsible decisions everyday. An interview with a pupil show how some young people might feel today. The pupil said that he wanted the teacher to tell him what to do and then he would do it. This shows that some pupils might be tired of all the responsibility they have to take on each day.

An interesting conclusion, arrived at by Dovemark, is that when pupils are responsible for their own learning it is the skilled pupils that benefit from it. These pupils know when to ask for help, but those pupils who really need help do not ask. They do not know how to take on responsibility for their own learning and do not know when to ask for help. This shows opposite effects of what is intended when using individualized teaching methods, because they are thought to create more time for the teacher to help those who need it. Dovemark’s results also shows that pupils’ results are determined by his or her educational traditions and resources within their families (Dovemark, 2004).

Carlgren (2005) thinks that ‘independent work’ is the Swedish School System’s contribution to the development of the late-modern society. Teachers at the investigated school in her study think ‘independent work’ functions as a preparation for pupils to take on responsibility for their own learning. The definition of responsibility is that pupils should know what the teacher and society expect of them. In addition, pupils should reflect and have self-knowledge about what they can do and what they need help with to do.

Carlgren discusses independent work in relation to the hidden curriculum, which mostly focuses on discipline in different ways. She argues that it is a shift of paradigm when it comes to the hidden curriculum. It is no longer the teacher who controls pupils’ processes and results; it is pupils’ planning books. She means that independent work developed because teacher had to individualise the teaching. Independent work solves the question of what teaching method to use. Finally, she highlights the issue of teachers having to adjust to the “new” pupils. These pupils, as all the ones before, bring the changes of society into school which forces the school and therefore also the teachers to change (Carlgren, 2005).

---

5 Swedish: eget arbete
Today’s society, a post-industrial, knowledgeable, and informational society, puts new demands on people. People should actively create their own lives in a constant shifting social surrounding. Individuals have to be automatic, flexible, put oneself into work, and follow up the results. Carlgren means that this creates problems for those who are used to be controlled; they cannot handle the freedom (Carlgren, 2005). Bergqvist argues that today’s society, as a modern, complex, cultural and informational society, makes it is impossible to know what kind of knowledge that is needed. Today, groups in schools are more heterogenic than before, with both different cultures and different ages in the same class. Because of this it is difficult to have teacher-centred lessons and individual teaching methods are preferred. Consequently, pupils work independently and are expected to take on greater responsibility and influence on the different assignments (Bergqvist, 2007).

Teachers, in a survey by Bråten et al. (2006), think it is important for pupils to learn responsibility to develop as human beings. They mean that pupils should become independent and learn how to make decisions about their own lives. Linde means that pupils should have an influence on their education and develop as self-controlled individuals who take on responsibility for their work and learning (Linde 2005 as cited in Bergqvist, 2007). Since the 1950s, curricula are characterized by principles of influence on and responsibility for one’s work. It is important to develop an ability to meet new situations and to analyze new problems. These ideas derive mainly from Dewey, which have had a great influence on the Swedish curricula. In conclusion, pupils cannot know everything and that is why it is important for them to be aware of their metacognitive competences, which in short is learning how to learn (Bergqvist, 2007).

Andréasson’s master thesis deals with how teachers can teach pupils to take on responsibility and she discusses the concept of learner autonomy. This type of learning will automatically teach pupils to be responsible for their learning. In a further perspective, this will also teach pupils to develop qualities that democratic citizens need. Responsibility prepares pupils for unexpected situations in life and learns them to be independent in their further studies and lives. Andréasson’s result shows that pupils take on responsibility if the school encourages them to do so. Influence, flexibility and trust are important factors in this matter (Andréasson, 2007).

To develop responsible pupils teacher have to take on great responsibility. Pupils need to have knowledge about how they learn, where the sources of knowledge are and how to use them, and knowledge about the goal. Pupils need to control the time and the amount of effort, and a possibility to anchor their knowledge in reality. However, most of all pupils need to have self-confidence and believe in themselves to accomplish tasks. Imsen means that pupils’ responsibility for their own learning fits well with a goal-oriented ideology where results and effectiveness are central aims (Imsen, 1999).
Postmodern Society

An important issue to keep in mind is the fundamental values of the Swedish curricula, which point out that it is the pupils’ parents (or guardians) who are primarily in charge of the upbringing and the schools only secondarily (Skolverket, 1994). The description of the postmodern society is divided into four subparts. Firstly, how the view on children and pupils has changed and where the influences of today could be found. Secondly, the phenomenon ‘the hidden curriculum’ will be described. Thirdly, a description of how the teacher’s role has changed through the times. Finally, a short description of how pupils learn English, mostly in the sense of self-assessment.

Enkvist (2002) has served as the main source in this section. She is known to criticise the Swedish school and its organisation. The author is aware of this but still Enkvist describes a reality, which many teachers in the Swedish schools meet today. Carlgren (2005) believes that changes in society are brought into schools, which consequently force schools and teachers to change, and that is why it is important to understand how society looks like today.

Different Views on Children and Pupils

The romantic view on human beings during the twentieth century is a legacy from Rousseau. He means that humans are born kind but society destroys them (Enkvist, 2002). This makes it important for adults to adjust to the children’s world, instead of forcing children into a world that they are not prepared for. The ideas from Rousseau aims to make the child submit to the adult’s will, but only if the child wants to submit, which Rousseau calls self-discipline (Hultqvist, 1990). Another influence comes from Durkheim who also means that children should control their own actions and become well-adjusted humans through self-discipline. In contrast to Rousseau, he means that pupils need freedom but also demands to be put on them (Enkvist, 2002).

Pedagogical ideas concerning the view of children will be highlighted very shortly. Piaget means that children have to be mature enough to handle certain things. He believes that children should be allowed to be children and knowledge should not be forced upon them. Vygotsky, on the other hand, thinks it would be best to challenge children to develop their abilities. Dewey thinks children should learn things by doing them, not only read about them. There are of course several other ideas on how to raise children, but they will not be discussed in this thesis. Some pedagogic ideas have a paternalistic attitude towards the child, all in good will of course. However, the consequences are that pupils do not have to adjust to rules, and they do not think they have to later on in life either (Enkvist, 2002).
As mentioned before, a survey from Swedish National Agency for Education shows that many teachers feel that pupils are less capable to take on responsibility nowadays (Skolverket, 2001). The reason could be that the responsibility has never been claimed. The result is that pupils at the upper secondary level do not make an effort to accomplish assignments. But when they discover that they will not pass the course, they or their parents complain to the teacher or even to the headmaster (Enkvist, 2002).

Pedagogical ideas that work well at university level are used at lower levels in the school system, where they do not work as well as at the higher level. These ideas work if the pupils have good basic knowledge, which they do not have at lower levels. Ideas of learner autonomy are self-evident at university level, but then pupils need basic knowledge from previous levels. Enkvist implies that many teachers think that learner autonomy means teaching without a teacher present. However, learner autonomy means that pupils should make the knowledge their own. To do so pupils have to work independently and see the purposefulness of each assignment (Enkvist, 2002). Bjorgén has already experienced the effects of wrong teaching methods or perhaps good teaching methods poorly used at lower levels. He thinks that students at the university level are incapable of taking on responsibility and he means that they are hoping to be served knowledge because they do not know how to find it and to make it their own (Andréasson, 2007).

Another problem concerning schools today is that everything is supposed to be fun all the time, which is a consequence of the postmodern age we live in, according to Enkvist. Postmodernism suggests that everything should be fun and pupils should not have to learn anything they do not want to. Consequently, this has changed pupils’ attitudes. It is not important anymore how to spell words or what they mean. Pupils (and even some students at university level) think that these matters are not big deal. In short, it does not matter. Durkheim means that it is wrong for pupils to think that everything should be fun and that they do not have to give in to the teacher’s demands (Enkvist, 2002). Naeslund agrees in this matter and means that the matter of treating pupils like young princes and princesses should be questioned (Naeslund, 2005).

The Hidden Curriculum

In the 1960s the American pedagogue Philip Jackson discovered and coined the concept ‘hidden curriculum’ when he performed observations in classrooms. He found things that were taught unconsciously, for instance to wait for one’s turn, to constantly be interrupted while working, to do things that s/he is not interested in doing, to ignore sounds from surrounding classmates and to submit to power. In short, learn to be patience. Broady introduced the concept of the hidden curriculum in Sweden. His interpretation of it is that pupils should learn to work individually, pay attention, wait, control oneself both physically

---
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and verbally, and subordinate oneself to the invisible authority of the teacher. Furthermore, Broady means that the problem with the hidden curriculum is the fact that it is actually hidden (Broady, 1980). Even if Broady wrote about the hidden curriculum almost thirty years ago, it is still very much present today.

Stensmo describes the hidden curriculum in the matter of three main areas, namely crowd, assessment and power. Crowd answers to pupils’ wait, rejections from the teacher, interruptions by the teacher, pupils, and/or other lessons, ignorance from other pupils and patience to cope with these different aspects. Assessment answers to the constant judgement of pupils’ work and behaviour by the teacher and other classmates. Power answers to teacher’s authority in the classroom as a right to decide what pupils should do. The most important mission of the hidden curriculum is to prepare pupils for their future life in society. The teacher’s job is to make the hidden curriculum visible together with the pupils and to make them aware of the control and upbringing, which take place in the classroom (Stensmo, 1997).

Egidius is of the opinion that the hidden curriculum is sometimes stronger than the official curriculum. He defines the hidden curriculum as all the rules that control pupils’ and teachers’ thoughts, emotions, motifs and reactions without them being aware of it. According to Egidius the hidden curriculum says it is better to remain silent than risk the chance to say something wrong and it is better to answer questions than to ask questions. He continues his interpretation by saying that it is cheating when a pupil helps a classmate and the grades decide a human being’s social value. Finally, it is better for a pupil to follow the teacher’s instructions than to come up with solutions on his/her own (Egidius, 2003).

The Teacher’s Role

The teacher’s role nowadays is about giving pupils the tools so they can form their own goals, plan their studies, analyze, value different material and evaluate conclusions (Axén & Näslund, 1994). Österlind (2005b) suggests that teachers have to adjust the guiding and coaching to the variety of pupils and pupils have to know the different roles of the pupil and the teacher. Sternudd-Groth head points on an important matter, which is that teachers have to help pupils to know how to learn. The teacher cannot abdicate even if pupils are supposed to take on responsibility for their own learning. The teacher has to guide them in the right direction (Sternudd-Groth, 2005).

The teacher’s role has to do with the control in the classroom, which is a process that concerns time, assignment and relations. To be more precise, how the time in the classroom is used, how the assignment is designed to live up to the steering documents and finally how teachers and pupils relate to each other. The control is expressed in rules and routines and includes consequences if the rules are not followed. Stensmo mentions individualisation, motivation and grouping as other important parts of management in the classroom. These four
are put together by a fifth part, planning. Stensmo discusses different types of management in accordance to these five aspects of management. Some types focus on an external control from the teacher and some focus on pupils’ self-control. Some management types are preferred before others depending on the pupils, if they are able to work independently or if they need to be controlled and supervised. Control is connected to power and where there is power there is always a fight for control. The teacher is always in a more powerful position than the pupils are. Some roles mean that the teacher has to teach pupils self-control and self-responsibility whereas others believe in external control (Stensmo, 2000).

The control of behaviour, in other words discipline, implies both positive and negative connotations. The positive connotations in the sense of good behaviour, and the negative connotation when wielding for power and submission. Positive discipline is needed to make the teaching work (Stensmo, 1997). According to C.M. Charles (1984 as cited in Stensmo, 1997) discipline characterizes by; pupils doing their job, pupils taking on responsibility and pupils creating and maintaining a good relationship to each other. Pupils’ responsibility are to do what the teacher expects them to do, namely concentrate on the assignment, have self-control and uphold lessons free from disturbance, show respect to other people’s rights and show consideration for the physical environment.

How to Learn English

Eriksson and Tholin (1997) write about teachers and pupils’ awareness of language acquisition, in the sense of individualism. Pupils are at different levels in their learning and therefore they have to have increased responsibility. The authors mean that pupils need the possibility to choose from different texts and assignments based on their own interests and abilities.

Research shows that learners who have had some training in self-assessment tend to develop more favourable views on their own work and the goals they are striving towards (von Elek, 1981; 1985 as cited in Oscarsson, 1999). The learner is in the best position to determine how good s/he is at a certain skill (Underhill, 1987 as cited in Oscarsson, 1999). There are several arguments for pupils’ self-assessment for example that pupils feel that their own assessment has a greater validity than teacher’s assessment. Research also shows that pupils’ self-assessment are comparable to teacher’s assessment even though some studies have found weak relationships between self-assessment and language test results. There are different ways of performing pupils’ self-assessment such as logbooks, diaries, journals and other introspective kinds of material (Oscarsson, 1999).

Self-assessment could produce beneficial spin-off effects, which in a longer perspective increase pupils’ motivation and awaken curiosity. Another argument for self-assessment is that pupils find it easier to influence classroom activities. A more pragmatic argument for pupils’ self-assessment is that teachers and pupils share the responsibility, which will perhaps
lessen the burden for teachers who will have more time for each pupil. A philosophical reason for self-assessment is that learners are in a unique position because they are the only ones who know how they feel. The empirical reason is that pupils have a reasonably realistic opinion about their achievement. Finally, self-assessment is normally needed in order for an individual to reach a higher level of awareness and to obtain real responsibility for his/her learning (Oscarsson, 1999).

A Summary of Previous Research

According to previous research, pupils should take on responsibility for the situation they are in, which includes that certain rules have to be followed. There have been some investigations about how to teach pupils to take on responsibility and these show that there are different methods that intend to increase pupils’ responsibility but it is difficult to measure is they really do. A lot of research has focused on why it is important for pupils to take on responsibility. Pupils have to be able to meet the expectations in society, to be good and democratic citizens but also to meet the expectations and goals of a life-long learning.

Different aspects of the postmodern society have been discussed to understand the context in which teacher and pupils live in. The view on children and pupils today is that they should not have to do something that they do not want to do. In addition, they are supposed to take on responsibility for their own learning. Pupils today do not make an effort to accomplish assignments if they do not find them interesting. The teacher’s role is to give pupils tools so they can form goals and plan their own learning. However, the matter of discipline is also considered important to make the teaching work. Therefore, responsibility seems to be a rather granted concept with hardly any reflections. Responsibility has become a method to reach good learning and not a goal on its own.
**AIM**

Based on the background and previous research, the aim of this thesis will now be stated.

*The aim was to investigate how teachers in English at upper secondary schools articulate discourses of responsibility.*

**Questions**

To investigate how discourses of responsibility are articulated the following questions were used:

* What is responsibility, according to teachers in English?

* How do teachers in English say they teach pupils to take on responsibility?

* Why is it or why is it not important for pupils to take on responsibility for their own learning in English, according to teachers in English?
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

A discourse analysis has functioned as a source of inspiration to find the answers to this thesis’ questions and to analyze the results a theoretical framework has been used. The theoretical framework, social constructionism, and the methodology are closely connected to each other in this thesis. First, the theoretical framework will be presented. Second, the methodological point of departure will be presented in relation to the theoretical framework.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the thesis is inspired by a post-structuralistic approach, and in particular social constructionism. The reason for choosing a post-structuralistic approach is because the school is situated in the surrounding world and post-structuralism serves as a resource to understand the context in which the school, teachers and pupils are situated (Hargreaves, 1998). To understand post-structuralism a short description of structuralism is needed.

Structuralism

Structuralism searches for implicit rules and underlying dynamics that structure human activity. Structuralism means that an element cannot be analysed on its own, instead it has to be put in a context. It is only possible to examine and understand the investigated phenomenon when the context is outlined and the relationship between the context and the single element is established. Structuralism derives from the linguistic discipline and especially de Saussure’s distinction between actual language actions and language as a system. Saussure studied language as a system of socially shared signs with conjunctions to a pattern and a concept. The system is closed and the elements have to be connected to each other (Saussure, 2006).

Foucault studied the ideology of structuralism itself and thought it was part of a discursive practise. He means that structures themselves are historical products and they are always to be objects of historical and cultural investigation in a never-ending cycle. Human beings are only effects of the structure contained in society (Foucault, 2006). However, structuralism has not been able to reflect the complexity of the relationship between the individual and society (Lund & Sundberg, 2004).
Post-Structuralism

During the 1970s, Lyotard claimed that the major stories should be replaced by micro-stories. These micro-stories are always temporary and do not make any claims to be something more than they are. During the 1980s post-structuralism and post-modernism turned the traditional epistemological notions within social science and philosophy upside down (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008).

Post-structuralism was a reaction against structuralism. Post-structuralism has a strong belief that it is possible to reach a systematically built knowledge about the social reality even though post-structuralism was a reaction against structuralism. Epistemological premises according to post-structuralism are that knowledge is per definition a form of discourse analysis. In addition, all research contains a reading and rereading of a series of texts from a specific historical and epistemology point of view (Lund & Sundberg, 2004).

Social Constructionism

Social constructionism has borrowed ideas from social psychology and focuses on how human beings construct their own version of reality. Social constructionists believe that something exist beneath ‘the surface’. To find this, the researcher needs to see the world as created by human beings while using the language. An important concept within social constructionism is identity, which is considered as a socially constructed concept. Identity is created amongst other people (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

The social constructions of attitudes, social groups and identities are products of social interaction. Social constructionism means that the ways in which we understand and categorize everyday life are not reflections of the world, but products of historical and cultural notions of the world, which make them contingent. These notions are upheld by a social interaction between humans in everyday life. This also means that the world is not determined, that is nothing is given in advance. The meaning is within a discourse, which constructs our lived reality (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

Nowadays, the focus in educational science is on how the process of language is constituted and it always includes values. We constantly use language to value our surrounding environment and in the same time the surroundings:

[...] are historically specific, socially situated, signifying practices. They are the communicative frames in which speakers interact by exchanging speech acts. Yet discourses are themselves set within social institutions and action contexts (Fraser 1992 p. 185 as cited in Lund & Sundberg, 2004).
The comprehensive theoretical framework of the thesis has been outlined. In short, social constructionism means that human beings create their world while using language. These worlds could be seen as discourses, which mean that human beings create discourses while using language. The discourses have to be analyzed in relation to something. In this thesis, the previous research functions as one part of the analysis, and the second part by Bernstein’s theory, which will be presented below.

**Basil Bernstein**

The principles of Bernstein’s (1924-2000) theory are the integration code and the collection code. These two have opposite ideas on how the relation between society and school looks like (Bernstein, 1996). To understand these two codes other concepts need to be clarified.

*Classification* has to do with the relationship of power between different categories, or discourses. Bernstein makes no interest in the different categories, but the gaps between them. He means that one category is only understandable in relation to other categories. If the insulation of a category is broken, it could lose its identity. There is either a strong or a weak classification, which depends on the degree of insulation between the categories. A strong classification has a strong insulation, which means that each category has its unique identity. In the case of a weak classification, the insulation is weak (Bernstein, 1996; Säll, 2006).

Another important concept is *framing*, which has to do with the principles of control concerning communications in pedagogic relations (Bernstein, 1996). There is a weak or a strong framing, the same as with classification. Weak framing leaves several opportunities to influence what and how to learn and for how long, while a strong framing gives fewer opportunities to influence (Säll, 2006). These two concepts are used together to explain the relationships between society and school and they are embedded in each other. Power establishes legitimate relations between categories and control establishes legitimate communications (Bernstein, 1996). The criticism towards Bernstein is that he does not problematize his concept in a larger extent and has modified his theory several times (Imsen, 1999).

By using the concepts, classification and framing it is now possible to describe the theory of collection and integration codes. The collection code has a strong classification and framing, whereas the integration code has a weak classification and framing. With a strong framing, the teacher is an intermediary of knowledge, who makes the decisions concerning what, when, how long and the rules. With a weak framing, the pupils have the control concerning what, when, how long and the rules (Stensmo, 2000).

The collection code is also called visible pedagogy, which means that the teaching is traditional with the teacher teaching pupils how things are. The integration code or as it is also called invisible pedagogy has the idea of breaking up the borders between teachers and pupils. This code has recently been discussed when entering the new millennium and a “new” middleclass. Teachers should now learn from pupils in the same extent as pupils should learn
from the teachers. The teachers’ jobs are to guide, support and make learning easier for the pupil. The border between teacher and pupil, or adult and child, is more or less erased. The invisible pedagogy is also equivalent to the hidden curriculum (Egidius, 2003).

To sum up, visible pedagogy has a strong classification and framing with great control and less chance to influence. Invisible pedagogy has weak classification and framing with less control and great opportunity to influence. The invisible pedagogy requires a teacher in a guiding role and as an intermediary of knowledge (Säll, 2006). Bernstein also thought that language shapes human beings. Different social classes use language in different ways and he calls these elaborated and restricted codes. Those who have a higher education use an elaborated code, whereas industrial workers use a restricted code. Bernstein draws the conclusions that people with elaborated code have learned to be independent, and want to continue to be so when going to school and later on in life (Egidius, 2003). However, Bernstein implies that even if pupils have different codes the outcome for pupils might be the same anyway (Sadovnik, 2001).

**Methodology**

Post-structuralism tries to connect the structure with the practice in the same process. Structures are not something lying underneath but something that can be found in concrete discourses, which are always reproducing or transforming the structure. Although a separate study with discourse analysis, as this is, only examines a limited amount of concrete discursive expressions. Therefore, a discourse analysis needs a structure to be analyzed against, which in this case is both previous research and Bernstein’s theories. Another reason to have a theoretical framework and previous research as a background is because it is important to know what the concrete practice reproduces or changes (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

As said above, this thesis is inspired by a discourse analysis, which characteristics will be presented in this section. Social constructionism usually starts with something that is considered to be obvious, to be able to puncture it later on. According to a social constructionistic epistemology, there are no universal or objective truths only local truths. Therefore, social constructionism considers knowledge to be socially constructed and reality is a social construction (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008). With a discursive framework on pedagogy, focus is fixed upon systems of interpretations. Researchers look for how discourses regulate what people talk about and how they talk about it (Lund & Sundberg, 2004). The analysis of human interaction is seen as an expression for a world, which the participants create and the researcher does not include his/her own theoretical comprehension of the world in the analysis (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).
Discourse analysis resembles post-structuralism (and post-modernism) by considering human beings to be inconsistent and language as something that reflects external and internal conditions. Language is considered both to be constructed and constructive. Discourse analysis is interested in local discourses and variations in texts are emphasised and the underlying reality is disregarded (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008).

There are three levels of discourse analysis concerning how statements should be interpreted. Discursive level considers the use of language as a phenomenon by itself. The conception level is where the researcher pronounces conceptions, values and meanings of an interpretation of the statements in interviews. In addition, the last level, the action and relational level, is where the researcher pronounces relations, social patterns and structures without being objective however it is not reduced to a subjective performance by the interviewees (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008).

**Discourse Theory**

Laclau and Mouffe have constructed a discourse theory, which works well as a theoretical base for a social constructionistic framework with discourse analysis. Winther Jorgensen and Phillips (2000) mean that the discourse theory suits well together with other forms of discourse analysis. In discourse theory, a social phenomenon is the object and it is never considered to be absolute. This leaves room for constant development and social conflicts about definitions of society and identity.

Discourse theory is in a sense a post-structuralistic approach because the meaning is thought to be fixed even if it is just in a specific context. The aim of discourse theory is to chart the processes in which we fight about a subject’s meaning. This fight makes some meanings conventional which let us perceive them as natural. Important concepts within the discourse theory are significants, elements and factors. A significant is the smallest constituent of a discourse. An element is a significant that several discourses struggle to form its meaning. A factor is a significant with an ambiguous meaning within a specific discourse. This means that an analysis with discourse theory search for significants both as elements and factors (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

In short, the ideas of discourse theory are mostly oriented towards a post-structuralistic framework and mean that discourses have to be connected to previous structures to become understandable but also to stimulate change.

---

7 My own translation of the concepts in Swedish; ‘signifikant’, ‘element’, and ‘moment’.
Discursive Psychology

Another social constructionistic approach of discourse analysis is discursive psychology, which considers texts as constructions of the world. Language is a dynamic form of a social practice that forms the social world. Discursive psychology investigates the different contexts in which the use of language is developed. Two major figures within the discursive psychology are Potter and Wetherell. They mean that our way of understanding and categorizing worlds are not universal and consequently contingent. Discursive psychology differs from discourse theory by taking a distant from post-structuralism. Discourse theory analyzes discourses as abstract entities, the same as post-structuralism, and not as situated social practices (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000).

Discursive psychology analyzes how discourses are constructed together with social actions. The focus is on how a discourse creates a world that looks real to the participants. Interpreting repertoire is an important concept when using discursive psychology. The meaning of that concept is according to Potter and Wetherell a limited number of concepts that are used in a particular stylistic and grammatical way. Every repertoire gives human beings resources to construct versions of reality. Interpreting repertoire is the same as discourse analysis but Potter and Wetherell prefer the former to move away from the idea of discourses as abstract entities. They believe in local discourses, but in their terminology interpreting repertoires. The aim is not to categorize humans but to identify the discursive practices where categories are constructed. Continuously, the aim of discourse psychology is not only to find constructions of discourses but also to find the functions of some articulations used to defend a certain opinion and also to consider the effects certain discourses have on one group’s interests on another group’s expense (Winther Jørgensen & Phillips, 2000).

Discourse Analysis

Before the thesis’ design is presented, a short summary of discourse analysis is considered necessary for two reasons. The first reason is to show the most important parts of the two approaches and the second reason is to show how these are used in this thesis.

A social constructionistic framework with a discourse analysis does not consider truths as universal or objective only local. Knowledge and reality are socially constructed in human interaction. Hence, the interaction expresses the reality. Even if the reality is considered to be socially constructed it has to have a theoretical framework to be analyzed against. In this thesis the theoretical framework is Bernstein’s theory. As mentioned above, there are three levels of discourse analysis. This thesis is focuses on the conception level and the action and relational level. These two will determine how the statements should be interpreted. The conception level aims to look for values and meanings of statements, and the action and relational level aims to look for pronounced relations, social patterns and structures without an objective performance.
Discourse theory and discursive psychology resemble each other a lot. Both are built up on the same post-structuralistic theory, but there are also some differences. Discourse theory has a strong theoretical anchorage when it comes to the analysis of collective identities. The problem with discourse theory is that it lacks tools to investigate discourses and therefore it has to be combined with another discursive analysis, such as discursive psychology. Discursive psychology contributes on the empirical level to the understanding of the subject as an agent in the dynamic discursive process of a social interaction (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

Discourse theory looks for a constant development and social conflicts that defines society and identity. When using discourse theory the meaning is thought to be fixed in a specific context. The aim is to chart discourses’ struggle within the discursive field to show the different discourses. The discourses are defined through articulations and these are presented as the results of the investigation. Discourse theory wants to find few and large comprehensive discourses and that is why this point of departure is combined with a discursive psychology.

Discursive psychology also considers truth as non-universal and contingent. Discursive psychology means to find the interpreting repertoire, which is the same as discourses. The repertoire gives human beings resources to construct versions of reality. Discursive psychology wants to identify the discursive practices in which categories are constructed. The aim is to demonstrate the effect certain discourses have on a group’s interests.

In this thesis, discourse theory and discursive psychology are used to identify the different discourses, which teachers in English at upper secondary schools articulate. To find the different discourses the transcriptions are read repeatedly. During the readings different discourses are found, some are kept and others thrown away after further readings. Discourse psychology is used to investigate the individuals’ constructions of their world and the discourse theory is used to be able to put the teachers’ constructions into a larger context.

Design

To find discourses of responsibility a qualitative method is necessary. The advantage of using a qualitative approach is that it is possible to expose the unexpected and to elucidate the unique. Another advantage is that it is possible to ask important and unpleasant questions about the school’s deepest assumptions, aims and apprehensions that are taken for granted (Hargreaves, 1998).

There are several types of qualitative methods but the one best suited for this thesis is scientifically qualitative interviews. Another alternative was group interviews but the disadvantage could be that some interviewees are more talkative than others are which could
affect the statements from the individual. Anyhow, interviews were chosen because the thesis’ aim was to discover and identify features in the interviewee’s world. This also means that the interviews were performed with no given answers in advance and the aim was not to find an absolute truth (Patel & Davidson, 2003).

A problem with interviews is that one person could give one version of reality in an interview and another one in an everyday conversation. Discourse analysis endeavours to use natural conversations and not scientifically interviews. However, if the interviews are semi-structured or un-structured they work perfectly well because the researcher is looking for variations and contradictions in the answers as signs of using different discourses. Since discourse analysis is interested in human language use, the question concerning the number of interviews is not important. Instead, the most important thing is to see how the discourses are constructed, which could be done with a few interviews. There is no certainly that more data could enrich the analysis, but perhaps only create more work (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000). Therefore, four interviews were considered sufficient in this study.

Previous studies concerning pupils’ responsibility have mostly focused on pupils and teachers at the compulsory school level. Therefore, this study is focused on teachers at the upper secondary school level. The teachers were selected by the means of their gender, two males and two females. There age was not taken in consideration, or the years of being a teacher. The criteria were that they had to work at an upper secondary school and teach English at the present semester. The teachers work at two different schools, but that was not a deliberate decision.

Before the interviews began, the interviewees received short information about the aim, method and theory of the thesis. This information was given in Swedish to eliminate any misinterpretations concerning the aim and the translation of the concept. The interviewees also received information about how the recordings and transcriptions were going to be handled and that their names would not be revealed. The interview was executed in accordance with the interview guide (see appendix 1). The guide was built up by themes and the interviewer had an opened mind to new and unexpected phenomenon (Kvale, 1997). It is important to emphasize that the interviews were performed in English, which could mean that the interviewees excluded some thoughts. To minimize the risk of that, the interviewees were told to use Swedish if they did not find the English word for what they were going to say, before the interview began. The interviews lasted for about fifteen to twenty minutes and where carried out at the teachers’ schools in a private and calm room.

When using discourse analysis statements are expected to be re-produced verbatim. The goal is to present multiple voices in a conscious subjective way (Nylén, 2005). The transcriptions of the interviews have to be done in a way that makes it possible to analyze it as if it was a social interaction. This means that both questions and answers have to be transcribed and the analysis should be based on both (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000). The interviews were transcribed verbatim, with both questions from interviewer and statements from the interviewee. Pauses were also marked even if they were not included in the analysis. The
object for the analysis is the transcriptions and not the actual interviews. Therefore, the interviewees are seen as agents for the different discourses they are in.

When analyzing the statements the search for other significants than responsibility was essential. The interviews were read repeatedly to find these concepts and while reading different structures and themes appeared. Statements with common points of contact were brought together in different categories. Categories were both kept and rejected. It was a constant struggle between the discourses when trying to find them. The analysis also included the functions of different statements and the consequences of them in a social practice. A constant reflection was included when constructing the different categories. The statements that are included in the result have been made more readable. Sounds and repeating words have been erased in the presentation of the statements. However, these eliminations are not considered to have altered the statement’s meaning.

Ethics

This section will highlight the ethic matters of using interviews as a method to gather data. When using interviews as a method to receive data humans are included and then there are some aspects that have to be taken in consideration. The different aspects are demands from the Swedish Research Council to minimize the informants’ risks of participating in research (Vetenskapsrådet, 2008). The initial information was given in Swedish to minimize any linguistic misinterpretation. The interviews were carried out in English.

Informed Consensus
The headmaster/mistress was asked about the teachers’ participation because the interviews were performed during teachers’ working hours. The teachers were asked for their approval before the interviews began. Both teachers and head master/mistress were informed about the thesis’ aim, method and briefly the theoretical framework. In addition, the teachers were also informed that their participation was voluntarily and they had the right terminate their participation whenever they wanted without any negative consequences for them. The interviews were recorded which were approved by the participating teachers before starting the interviews. The collected data will only be used in scientific purposes.

Confidentiality
The teachers also received information about how the material was going to be handled. No private data such as name and school are going to be published. Names and schools are not included in the transcriptions so the individual cannot be traced. The recorded discs will be thrown away after this thesis has been passed. In the meantime, they will be in the possession of the author.
Qualitative Study

Qualitative studies are not valued in the same way as quantitative studies because there are no countable data included in qualitative studies. Concepts such as credibility, transferability and conformability could be found in Nylén (2005).

Validity
In a qualitative study the validity corresponds to credibility. Credibility is about the researcher’s ability to communicate the process of research and the results to other researcher that is the communicative validity of the results (Patel & Davidson, 2003). The matter of transferability or pragmatic validity, which is how the results could be applied in other environments, is discussed up in the section of discussion. The design of this study has been described closely to be able to reproduce this study (Nylén, 2005; Kvale, 1997). This thesis has been discussed in reading groups among other teacher students and by the instructors, which increase the subjective validity of this thesis (Kvale, 1997).

Reliability
The reliability of this study concerns both the aspects of technical equipment and the researcher’s ability to carry out good interviews (Patel & Davidson, 2003). A camcorder was used, as technical equipment, even though it was only used as a sound recorder. The quality of the sound recordings was tested before the interviews. On one occasion, the disc was full and the last ten seconds were not recorded. The author’s experience of carrying out interviews is limited, which could have affected the results, but the reliability is considered as acceptable.

The matter of affecting the informants has also been taken in consideration. In addition, according to the theoretical framework of this thesis, the author is considered as a co-creator of the data (Patel & Davidson, 2003). The disadvantage with qualitative studies is that different interpretations could be true (Kvale, 1997). The aim of this study was not to find the absolute truth but to identify how four teachers in English articulate discourses of responsibility.

Objectivity
The author’s apprehension of pupils’ responsibility in schools is affected by her own schooling, which was characterized by strict teachers mixed with new teaching methods. However, most of the apprehension of pupils’ responsibility originated from the teacher education and teacher practices during the years to become a teacher. The author has met several pupils who are not capable of taking on responsibility, which is also the reason why the author finds this thesis important to carry out.
In this section, the results and analysis will be presented. It is divided into three subparts, namely the questions concerning what, how and why. The interviews were carried out individually but are put together to show the context as well as contradictions and similarities among the teachers. The interviewees are Sara, David, Anna and Carl, which are not the interviewees’ real names. The interviewer is Frida. The italicised words are significant that will be discussed in relation to the different discourses.

What

The Concept of Responsibility

Articulations of responsibility are miscellaneous; the teachers show several contradictions not only among each other, but also in their own statements. At first, some of the teachers thought that pupils’ responsibility was a somewhat obvious and granted concept. Carl shows this by supposing that everyone have the same interpretation of the concept.

Carl: I suppose the way everybody does, that a pupil should be responsible for what he does, doing his homework, well improving his English and all that. I do not know if there is any other way you could interpret it.

Carl is relatively sure about what pupils’ responsibilities are. Pupils should be responsible for what they do, which could account for as a general interpretation of responsibility. He exemplifies it with homework and improving ones English. Sara expresses a more specified interpretation about what she thinks responsibility is, though self-studies could be a rather vague meaning of responsibility.

Frida: Do you assume that they [the pupils] know how to take responsibility?
Sara: In some areas, for example they need to bring a piece of paper and a pen. That is one sort of responsibility but it is a higher level at the upper secondary school and depending on if it is English A or English B. In English B, you could have longer projects … and more self-studies.

Anna brings up the question of pupils’ obligations when she tries to explain what she means by responsibility.
Anna: People usually talk about the rights of the individual but they never talk about the obligations. … and sometimes you know you think about the word responsibility it got a negative touch somehow and so well I do not know but I do not think they like the word and I do not think they like the meaning of it.

Anna’s articulation resembles Carl’s in a way. Both express something that is presupposed but Anna also emphasizes a negative connotation to the word ‘responsibility’. Pupils might not like the word because they could consider it as their duty to do something, according to Anna.

Anna means that pupils should take on responsibility for what they learn and when they learn. However, it is the pupils’ duty to figure out what and when to learn. This is comparable to Sara who expresses responsibility for time.

Anna: Figure it out on your own when to study and what.

Sara: It is up to the person to get things done in time.

The concept of responsibility articulates through obligation, negative touch and suppose. A consequence of responsibility as something presupposed could be that teachers and pupils might not have the same interpretation. Thus, teachers might think pupils do not take on responsibility, but the pupils think they do, according to their own interpretation of the concept. The teachers’ interpretations of responsibility also answer to contents and time. Responsibility articulates through what, homework, bring a piece of paper and a pen, self-studies, when and get things done on time. Obviously, the teachers think pupils should take on responsibility, but do they give them the opportunity to do so?

Responsibility in English

The previous category concerns responsibility in general, but this category focus on responsibility in English. The statements in this category could perhaps have been placed in the previous category but they specifically concerned English, which made it appropriate to put them in a category of their own. Anna expresses some sort of indolence by some pupils.

Anna: When it comes to English … well they usually think that they are very good at English when they enter the upper secondary school because they are surrounded by English all the time by the media and so on so they think well ‘I will get a MVG it does not matter what we learn in class’ and so on.

This statement shows that pupils’ indolence could perhaps be one reason why pupils do not take on responsibility, if they are given it. They do not see the importance of taking on responsibility because they already know everything. Both Anna and Sara point out that pupils should learn English outside school. The difference is that Anna says she actually tells them to do so, whereas Sara more assumes that it is something they should do.
Anna: I tell them not every week maybe, but pretty often that they have to … they should watch TV with the English subtitles maybe and read English magazines … speak English in class because this is almost the only opportunity for them to use their English.

Sara: They can take responsibility … by learning English outside of the school, listening to English music and watching television with English subtitles, but take responsibility within the school, the classes, by focusing on the tasks that they are doing, showing up on time and doing their best.

Sara ends her statement by thinking about what pupils should take on responsibility for within the school. Anna argues that pupils’ responsibility is when they work on their own and plan how much they have to work to finish the assignments on time.

Anna: Work on their own with it and take responsibility and … think about ‘how much do I have to read in this book to be able to finish the assignment for next week’.

As seen in above statements, Anna and Sara have more of examples on how pupils could take on responsibility whereas Carl, as seen below, has an idea of including responsibility in everything pupils do.

Carl: I think it should be included in everything really. I mean ‘this is what I expect of you and this should be done by the 13th or whatever and now you have to do that. Like when they hand in something, I grade or mark, mark rather than grade perhaps. I always have a comment to them ‘this is what you need to improve’, ‘you have to check on this, check on that’, ‘learn to spell these words’ and so on, and that is their responsibility as well.

On the question when he gives pupils the opportunity to take on responsibility, he answers:

Carl: I mean practically all the time when handing out … handing out this week’s homework or whatever and I try to do it as much as possible of course.

Carl means that pupils have to improve their English by looking at his comments and practise the areas, which he finds useful for them. Anna addresses the matter of control in the classroom. She means that she should only supervise the pupils when they work on their own and the higher grade a pupil aims at the more s/he should manage on their own.

Anna: I think it says in the syllabus that they have to for at least VG they have to work pretty much on their own with that just … just me supervising them, not giving them too much help so they have to plan their own learning those two weeks and I think it is okay with two weeks at least in the beginning.

Articulations concerning responsibility in English are does not matter what we do in class, watch TV with English subtitles, read English magazines, speak English in class, listening to English music, focusing on the tasks, doing their best, work on their own, included in everything, all the time, as much as possible, supervising and plan their own learning. All of these articulations correspond to ‘work on their own’. The teachers show agreement
concerning what pupils should do to show responsibility. Pupils have to work on their own and it should be included in every assignment. A risk could be that pupils are abandoned to work on their own, even if the teacher controls their achievements occasionally. Because of pupils’ nonchalant attitudes, which Anna’s statement shows, could it be a disaster for pupils’ development in both knowledge and manner, even if they do not know it at the present.

Responsible Behaviour

Some of the teachers express pupils’ behaviour as something connected to their responsibility. Pupils should take on their responsibility as fellow human beings. Sara believes pupils practice responsibility when they have to work in groups.

Sara: … by working in different groups that I mix I have put them in different groups with different sorts of persons in the group.

Sara: Even if someone is not doing what he or she should do in the group … the others can take responsibility for him.

Sara thinks that pupils practice in taking on responsibility if they work in groups to solve a common problem. Pupils have to be able to work with other pupils and she means that they have to take on responsibility for each other to finish different assignments. If somebody in the group is not doing his or her part, someone in the group could help him/her. David articulates a similar thought but focuses on the classroom situation.

David: Generally, the group as such is able to handle those situations if someone is too loud and is not paying attention. The others in the group will react in a negative way to this behaviour because the majority is responsible enough to understand what is expected from them.

David thinks that pupils should take on responsibility for their own behaviour, and if somebody else disturbs too much the other will tell him/her to stop (and to behave instead). He also means that pupils have a responsibility towards themselves.

David: I would like them to have responsibility towards themselves first of all.

David is the only one of the interviewed teachers that expresses pupils’ responsibility as something towards themselves. This is also the first he comes to think of in the interview. He would like them to have responsibility towards themselves and respect others by following the general rules of the school.

David: I was thinking about that to follow the general rules of the school. We have a few basic rules like arriving on time and bringing the right material to the classroom, not using the cell phone in class that is what I expect them to follow, to be that responsible and not to disturb the classroom situation.
David expresses that pupils should be responsible towards themselves but also to others in forms of respect. To not to disturb the classroom situation could mean that pupils should not speak if s/he is not addressed, raise his/her hand if wanting to say something, and remain sited throughout the lesson. As said in another category above the teachers expect pupils to know what s/he demands, which in this case is to follow this unsaid rules.

Articulations concerning responsible behaviour are working in different groups, others can take responsibility for him, responsible enough to understand what is expected from them, towards themselves, follow the general rules, and not disturb the classroom situation. Pupils should live up to these expectations to show that they are responsible pupils. This might be difficult for some pupils, because some of the teachers express that responsibility is something they presuppose or expect pupils to know. However, on some occasions the responsibility is not presupposed which leads up to the question, how teacher say they teach pupils to take on responsibility.

How

Responsibility but How and How Much

The teachers have previously articulated ambiguous meanings of what responsibility is. This category contains articulations concerning how much responsibility pupils should take on at the upper secondary school level. The majority of the teachers think that pupils should take on responsibility gradually.

Anna: Somehow, work with responsibility by taking it step by step.

David: Many of the students are not that mature yet anyway.

David: When you start here, you are 15 years old and when you go away from here you are 18 years old, there is an enormous development. You can really see that third years’ students are adults really, but I do not know in what degree we teachers or the school are responsible for this or if it comes any way but they do mature very much.

These statements show that the teachers consider some pupils not to be mature enough at the upper secondary schools to take on responsibility. Even so, both David and Anna express that pupils will mature eventually. Anna also thinks that it is best for the pupils to start as soon as possible to take on responsibility.

Anna: I think you have to start as soon as possible to take responsibility.
Carl thinks that some pupils do not have the ability to see two years in advance and he does not really see the point in giving pupils responsibility.

Carl: Some of them do not have the ability to see two years in advance, and think ‘okay if I do this and if I do not, this will happen’. It does not matter, it is like the ostrich putting his head into the sand, you know.

According to Carl, pupils lack the ability to see the use of knowing how to take on responsibility and David considers some pupils to be less disciplined.

David: Some are a bit less disciplined, a bit louder, which is not all together negative but it is good to get a response.

It seems as David’s pupils appear to have some difficulties in knowing how to behave, but that could perhaps be a sign of not knowing what the teacher demands. Sara and Anna articulate that pupils perhaps want to but cannot always take on responsibility for different reasons.

Sara: Perhaps they want to, but many students need help how to take responsibility.

Sara: If they do not have big difficulties in the subjects they can easily plan what they are doing. The students that are not that good in English might need some tools on how to plan their own work and how to get better in English and what they can do.

Anna: Some pupils want to take responsibility and they can take responsibility, but then there are perhaps students who have difficulties at home or are lazy and so on and those are factors that affect the responsibility.

Sara means that if pupils cannot take on responsibility, it could be because they have difficulties in English. In contrast, Anna means that if pupils cannot take on responsibility it could be related to their home situations.

Some of the teachers express the matter of how much responsibility the pupils should take on or be given. Sara means that the teacher has to balance the level of responsibility depending on what pupils she teaches.

Sara: Depending on how much responsibility you give them. If you give them, too much, they cannot handle it and it maybe just leads them to a failure. And if you do not give them enough responsibility they may feel that they there are like stuck.

The teacher cannot give the pupils too much responsibility because they cannot handle it, yet pupils need enough responsibility because otherwise they might feel that they have difficulties. Carl makes a distinction between different pupils and how they are capable to take responsibility.

Carl: I mean it all depends on what pupils you are talking about. … I teach primarily pupils at the technical programme and would find quite a few of them who are not capable of doing it, whereas
if I teach certain other classes that I do not work with right now I mean then it would be right. I have for example the sequels in English, and there you will find quite a few who are responsible and can take responsibility. Having said that, I have also taught quite a few of the vocational programmes and I would say very few in some classes are showing any kind of responsibility when it comes to improving their English they just go there to be told what to do.

Carl describes different pupils and how some of them are responsible whereas other is not. He expresses a sort of level of responsibility; some pupils at the vocational or technical programmes are not capable to take on any kind of responsibility. However, some of the pupils who read the sequel in English show that they can take on responsibility. Additionally, Anna also expresses a distinction between certain pupils.

Anna: There is a difference; students from independent schools are more used to take responsibility because they work in projects. And those from compulsory schools they are not used to that. There is a huge difference I have noticed that in every class.

Anna thinks that pupils who are used to work with longer projects have an advantage when it is required to take on responsibility. To her it seems as pupils from independent schools are more capable of taking on responsibility because they are used to do so. When discussing how much responsibility the pupils should take on the questions of grading becomes of interest. David articulates responsibility as something he cannot grade, whereas Sara is slightly more ambivalent.

David: But that is of course nothing that I as an English teacher can grade or measure in any way.

Sara: But I use it when I grade students but it is not specific but…

Articulations about how pupils should learn responsibility are step by step, not that mature yet, enormous development, as soon as possible, do not have the ability to see two years in advance, less disciplined, many students need help how to take responsibility, might need some tools on how to plan, want to take responsibility, can take responsibility, not capable of doing it and be told what to do. Carl and Anna express different pupils in their ability to take on responsibility. Carl who mainly teaches at vocational programmes thinks that pupils are not capable of taking on responsibility, whereas Anna who mainly teach at theoretical programmes has discovered that pupils from independent schools are more used to taking on responsibility and therefore they have easier to do so at the upper secondary school level. David and Sara show contradictions concerning if responsibility should be graded or not. David says that he cannot use it when he grades pupils, whereas Sara takes it in consideration when she grades pupils. The teachers stress some factors that might prevent pupils to learn responsibility. It seems as the teachers have easier to see the obstacles and disadvantages of teaching pupils responsibility than the possibilities and benefits. Sara expresses the teacher’s ability to balance the level of responsibility, not too much but too little. To balance the amount of responsibility could be a difficult task for teacher if they let the obstacles prevail the possibilities.
Responsibility and Influence

Teachers should give pupils the opportunity to take on responsibility according to the curriculum. David describes a rather usual situation when he is trying to give pupils the opportunity to take on responsibility.

David: To some extent we do discuss what we ought to do in this course … I mean we look at the curriculum [syllabus] together and what can we do to reach these aims but that does not work that well in the first year, it gets better.

This is a common situation when teachers say they give pupils an opportunity to take on responsibility and also influence the teaching. Teacher and pupils look at the syllabus together and pupils should take on their responsibility and come up with ideas on how to fulfil the aims. However, David also says it is difficult for pupils do so in the first year. Carl expresses a reason why he does not include pupils in the decisions about what to learn. He thinks that pupils probably have other more important things to deal with than dealing with English.

Carl: I suppose they just do not care. I mean it is, well I do not know, it seems like all people in charge think pupils go to school because they are so interested in going to school, whereas they have so many other things, which are more important in life than dealing with English homework or taking part in the planning or anything like that.

He expresses a rather negative view on pupils’ willingness to take on responsibility. He does not think pupils want to take on responsibility but it seems as if he does not want to give them a chance to do so. In contrast to Carl, Anna expresses a more positive view on pupils. Although she is of the same opinion as Carl, she implies that a reason for not taking on responsibility is if they have had the chance to influence the assignments or not.

Anna: They do know they have to do it and sometimes they hand in those assignments a bit late because it was not that fun. And the reason is of course they did not decide what we should do. Before we did this book project, we had a music project. We worked for two week with that project as well, 1 ½ week. And they thought it was really fun and they worked really, really hard and they were so eager and excited and was yeah … I loved it I really enjoyed being a teacher then … so I think they work better if they can influence what to read and so on.

Anna expresses a positive view on pupils and thinks it is fun to be a teacher when pupils influence on the assignments. She sees a difference in commitment and effort if the pupils influence what to do. She has experienced when pupils hand in assignments too late because they were not given the opportunity to influence the assignments. On the other hand, Carl does not see any difference of the pupils’ achievement whether they have influenced the assignment or not.

Carl: I have had quite a few who are not interested in it at all so. It would not matter whether I asked them ‘if this is a project, you like you can choose between these’ or whatever then the result should be very much the same among certain pupils whereas other would definitely work with more responsibility.
It seems as if he does not even bother himself to ask the pupils what they want to do, because he already knows that they are not interested in influencing the assignments. The difference between Carl and Anna seem to be that Carl means that pupils lack the ability and interest to take on responsibility whereas Anna means that the opportunity to take on responsibility is missing. Anna sees herself as the cause if pupils do not take responsibility while Carl considers the pupil to be the cause.

Pupils’ ability to take responsibility depends on their interest in English and ability to influence. This articulates through *we do discuss what we ought to do, do not care, they have so many other things, they hand in those assignments a bit late because it was not that fun, they work better if they can influence what to read, not interested in it at all, it would not matter whether I asked them, and the result should be very much the same among certain pupils*. These articulations show obvious contradictions. Some teachers consider pupils to be the cause whereas others consider the situation and perhaps the teacher to be the cause. This could perhaps affect the teaching in various ways, not only concerning responsibility, but teaching in general.

**Responsibility and the Teacher**

As seen above, pupils’ responsibility could depend on the teacher’s attitude. Some of the interviewed teachers expressed their way of interpreting their role in getting pupils to take on responsibility. Anna thinks it depends a lot on the teacher.

Anna: *It depends a lot on the teacher I think if you are interested in to co-operate with the students. And together try to … together I mean try to work together. I think that they … will put down a lot more effort and … or at least try to take responsibility.*

Anna’s articulation shows if the teacher lets the pupils participate in the decision-making they will put down more effort on the tasks. She considers the teacher’s attitude as an important part to give pupils responsibility. She continues and means that pupils will be more motivated to accomplish and finish the chosen tasks.

Anna: *I actually like when they influence the teaching and what to work with and so on and then you actually see that they take responsibility because they have chosen that and they will finish it.*

Anna describes the teacher’s role as giving the pupils the opportunity to influence and therefore take on responsibility. David describes his role more as a role model. If he shows responsibility and respect towards the pupils, they will hopefully act in the same way.

David: *Maybe, I am supposed to be kind of a role model for them so it is important that I live up to these rules that I show responsibility and respect towards the students.*
An interesting thing to point out is that Carl did not show any signs of reflections of his own part in learning pupils responsibility, and for that reason is he not included in this section. The teacher’s role in teaching pupils responsibility articulates through *it depends a lot on the teacher, if you are interested in to co-operate with the students, because they have chosen that and they will finish it, role model and show responsibility and respect towards the students.* It seems as the teacher has to take on a lot of responsibility to get pupils to learn how to do the same. The teacher should be a responsible role model and treat the pupils with respect to get responsible and respectable pupils.

**Why**

**The Importance of Responsibility**

A majority of the teachers express the importance of responsibility. It is expressed as a long-time ability; the pupils need to have a long-time ability to be responsible later on in life. Anna expresses the importance of responsibility by talking about pupils’ lives after their graduation.

Anna: … *be aware of the fact that you have to *take responsibility* for your actions and for things in school* and so on … and that is something that they have to learn because when they finish school they *have to take responsibility in, I do not know in, everything.*

Carl articulates the importance of responsibility by mentioning the teachers’ reasons for being in schools. He answers the question ‘do you think it is important for pupils to take responsibility’ by saying:

Carl: Absolutely, that is what we are there for to *teach them to do that.*

Another aspect of the importance of responsibility in English is the potential self-efficiency that comes along. Sara argues that:

Sara: … when they meet a foreigner that speaks English they *have the guts* to go and talk to them when they take responsibility. Because that is not what I … I do not tell them to go and speak to them but they do it on their own will.

The importance of responsibility articulates through *be aware, take responsibility for your actions and for things in school, have to take responsibility in everything, teach them to do that and have the guts.* The teachers think it is important for pupils to take on responsibility because they have to take on responsibility later on in life. It is even expressed that the teacher’s probably most important mission are to teach pupils how to take on responsibility.
Inability to Take on Responsibility

The teachers mention that it is important to learn to take on responsibility in compulsory schools to be able to take on responsibility later on in upper secondary schools. Anna mentions the compulsory school teachers’ different pedagogies compared to the upper secondary school teachers’ pedagogies and how those might affect pupils’ ability to take on responsibility.

Anna: I think it is not that easy for students in the first year to know what responsibility is because in the compulsory years the teachers usually say ‘ah you have to study this for next week’ and so on but at this level you have to figure it out on your own...

According to Anna, a source of the problem seems to be the teachers in compulsory schools. They let pupils get away too easily if they do not take on responsibility. In addition, Carl also considers the problem to be the teacher in compulsory schools.

Carl: I am not the one to complain about them because I know their work is not very easy in many cases. But it seems to me that too many pupils are too used to being pushed all the time I mean you got the teacher who says ‘if you do not do that then’ and ‘if you do not do that then’ but nothing happens. And when they have reached the upper secondary school with the courses, and with the grading in the end of the course, what happens is that when it is time for the grading they get not passed they are chocked. ‘What can I do then’, ‘nothing the course is over, sorry’. I mean I think that they are too used to being pushed all the time you know.

However, Carl even thinks that headmasters/mistresses are too gentle if pupils do not take on their responsibility.

Carl: You will find quite a few head masters who are quite contrary to this concept because they keep talking about how important it is to give pupils responsibility. But once the pupils do not take their responsibilities there are too many head masters who are there to help them in all ways urging the teachers to help them. So it is very contradictory in a sense but I think I am quite adamant at this point I do not give in to anything like that ‘now you had your chance to bad come back and do an exam in August’, that is it.

He knows that he could be considered as adamant, but this is an important issue which he brings up. Pupils have to take the consequences of not taking on responsibility because otherwise they will never learn. It is even more important at the upper secondary school since this could be the final education pupils attend. Anna does not explicitly mention consequences but she thinks that pupils should be aware of the fact that they have to take on responsibility.

Carl has expressed that teachers at compulsory school do not make pupils understand the importance of taking on responsibility, neither headmasters at upper secondary school. Carl thinks it is very important for pupils to take on responsibility. He even considers it to be what teacher should mainly teach pupils.
Carl continues his criticism towards other teachers at upper secondary schools. He means that some teachers help pupils too much.

Carl: I also think it is important for the pupils experience the fact that if you do not take your responsibility you should have to take the consequences, like ‘you have not done it sorry, that is it’. ‘You had the chance’ but then again I think too many teachers are too much of parents to them all the time and that is quite contrary to what is says in the curriculum really, about teaching to take responsibility because you will never learn to take responsibility if you do not take the consequences do you.

Inability to take on responsibility articulates through in the compulsory years they usually say, at this level you have to figure it out on your own, too many pupils are too used to being pushed all the time, who are there to help them in all ways urging the teachers to help them, you should have to take the consequences, too many teachers are too much of parents to them all the time and you will never learn to take responsibility if you do not take the consequences. These articulations enlighten consequences if pupils do not have to take on responsibility in the early ages or perhaps more accurately the results if they are not forced to take the consequences if they did not take on the responsibility as they should have. That is why it is important for all teachers, no matter where in the Swedish schools system they teach, to make pupils take on responsibility and pupils should learn to take the consequences of they do not.
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section the thesis’ results are about to be tied together with the theoretical framework and the methodology. Criticism towards the choice of methodology will also be discussed in this section. Moreover, the conclusion will be elucidated at the end of this section, but first the aim will be repeated and answered.

The aim was to investigate how teachers in English at upper secondary schools articulate discourses of responsibility.

Discourses of responsibility have been investigated and the analysis of the empirical data shows eight constructions of responsibility. They are The Concept of Responsibility, Responsibility in English, Responsible Behaviour, Responsibility but How and How Much, Responsibility and Influence, Responsibility and the Teacher, The Importance of Responsibility, and finally Inability to Take on Responsibility. These constructions with their different sets of concepts are what discursive psychology would call interpreting repertoires. The interpreting repertoires are constructed within a discursive practice, which could be seen as a larger discourse that decides how the interpreting repertoires should be constructed. In the same time the repertoires also construct the discursive practice.

One discursive practice of responsibility could be Responsibility as Duty, where smaller discourses such as the concept of responsibility, responsible behaviour, responsibility and the teacher, the importance of responsibility and inability to take on responsibility could fit in. These express responsibility as something you have to do and if you do not you have to take the consequences. Another discursive practice could be Responsibility as Method, where the other smaller discourses, such as responsibility in English, responsibility but how and how much and responsibility and influence fit in.

‘Responsibility as Duty’ pictures both pupils’ and teachers’ duties. Both of them have to take on responsibility towards themselves but also towards each other. However, at the same time pupils should figure out on their own how to behave to show their responsibility. This could affect both teachers and pupils in a negative way, together with misinterpretations about what responsibility is. ‘Responsibility as Method’ pictures both a positive side and a negative side within the larger discourse. The positive side mostly concerns the possibilities which pupils’ responsibility can generate. The negative side mostly concerns the negative effects of pupils’ responsibility can cause but also factors that might prevail pupils’ ability to take on responsibility.

To sum up, teachers in English at upper secondary schools articulate the discourse of responsibility as ‘Responsibility as Duty’ and ‘Responsibility as Method’.
Methodology

Criticism towards discourse analysis is mostly focused on its post-structuralistic founding which means that the same phenomenon could be described in different ways and give various results. Sometimes discourse analysis is criticised for trivializing research and forgets to see to the underlying interpretations (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2008). Discourse analysis makes it impossible to decide whether the results are good or bad and social constructionism means that all meanings are contingent. This makes it possible to ask the same questions again but perhaps receive another result. Social constructionism do not accept the objective scientifically demands of validity but believe in other criteria, which are discussed in the section named qualitative studies (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

It could be quite troublesome to know where one discourse ends and where the next starts. In this context, the discursive practise is a useful concept which is a common platform for several discourses. The most basic idea of discourse analysis is how the subject elucidates the surrounding world and what social consequences this might cause. In an area consisting of several discourses and each of them giving their interpretation of reality, it is interesting to investigate what consequences the different interpretations might have which are attempted in this thesis (Winther Jorgensen & Phillips, 2000).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the thesis is inspired by social constructionism, which considers the school as an institution situated in a larger context. The results will therefore be discussed in relation to Bernstein’s theory which concerns the visible pedagogy with a strong classification and framing with great control and fewer chances to influence and the invisible pedagogy with weak classification and framing, with less control and great opportunity to influence. The invisible pedagogy requires a teacher in a guiding role and as a intermediary of knowledge. The results of this thesis show that Bernstein’s theory about classification and framing could be transferred to this context. The results show that some of the teachers prefer a great deal of control and less influence from pupils, and some the opposite.

It seems as Carl prefers a strong classification and framing or a visible pedagogies. His statements are the most obvious to show this and will therefore be used to exemplify the theory. Classification has to do with power and Carl’s statements show that he prefers to have the control because some pupils are not mature enough or not interested enough to take control or profit by the use of control. It is also possible to relate this to Stensmo’s ideas about different teaching methods (Stensmo, 1997; 2000). The visible pedagogies prefer teaching methods that favour external control if the pupils do not seem to be able to handle for example independent work. Instead they need to be controlled and supervised by the teacher.
In contrast to Carl, Anna uses invisible pedagogies even if it should be said that Carl also uses this when he have pupils who can handle self-control but mostly he does not teach these pupils according to himself. Therefore, will Anna serve as an obvious example of a teacher who uses invisible pedagogies. David and Sara are somewhere in the middle of the continuum of the different pedagogies and teaching methods. It is a continuum because it is difficult to only use visible or invisible pedagogies; it all depends on what pupils you teach and how you yourself are as a teacher.

Anna thinks pupils should influence a lot and that pupils are capable to handle the control that comes along with influence. She thinks it is fun to be a teacher when pupils influence the assignments. She sees a difference of commitment if pupils influence what to do or not. This could, according to Bernstein, be described as teaching with a weak classification and framing. According to Stensmo, pupils with self-control and influence require a teaching method that believes in pupils’ self-control. However, this is best used if pupils can handle the power they receive with a weak classification. Anna does not see any larger problems by allowing pupils to decide what to in class, which is also connected to a weak framing.

A possible reason for Carl’s adamant attitude is that he has worked as a teacher for about thirty years whereas the other interviewed teachers have worked for about five years. Carl might have tried the invisible pedagogies but has discovered during the years that it does not work and certainly not with those pupils he usually has. Anna, David and Sara might be considered as newcomers in the profession compared to Carl and that could be a reason why they strongly believe in pupils’ self-control. They attended the teaching education in post-modern age, where they were introduced to the ideas of invisible.

The teacher decides whether s/he should use visible or invisible pedagogies but the choice might be affected by what Bernstein calls the elaborated and restricted codes. This theory shows why some pupils manage better in school and why some do not. People with higher education use an elaborated code when they speak whereas industrial workers use a restricted code. Once again, Anna’s and Carl’s statements show good examples of these two codes. Carl means that pupils at the vocational or technical programmes are not capable to take on responsibility in the same extent as pupils at the more theoretical programmes. In contrast, Anna expresses that pupils from independent schools are more capable of taking on responsibility because they are used to do so.

A possible speculation could be that Carl’s pupils might have parents who work as industrial workers and Anna’s pupils might have parents with a higher education. This is a speculation but it is important to be aware of the fact that some pupils cannot handle the power and self-control in the same extent as others because they are not used to do so. Whereas other pupils cannot really handle the situation when the teacher has the control and decides what to do. It is important to have this in mind when deciding on what teaching method to use which all depends on what pupils you have. If the teacher uses appropriate method for pupils the outcome for all pupils should be the same no matter the different codes, according to Bernstein’s theory.
Nevertheless previous research also shows that pupils from the working class have difficulties in decoding and consequently to learn and to have self-control (Dovemark, 2004). Österlind’s thesis shows that middleclass pupils consider planning as an opportunity to control their workload, whereas pupils from the working class think the opposite (Österlind, 1998). However, Dovemark argues that greater responsibility could turn into personal problems for the pupil if s/he fails the assignment. Interviewees in Dovemark’s study describe some pupils as being tired of all the responsible choices they have to make each day (Dovemark, 2004). In this thesis Carl expresses the same thought while Anna expresses an opposite point of view, where the pupils want to take on great responsibility. Sara expresses potential problems for the teacher to know how to balance the amount of responsibility.

Results and Analysis

The following section will show how the separate questions have been answered. The thesis’ questions were:

* What is responsibility, according to teachers in English?

* How do teachers in English say they teach pupils to take on responsibility?

* Why is it or why is it not important for pupils to take on responsibility for their own learning in English, according to teachers in English?

What
The four teachers have fairly the same philosophical interpretations of responsibility. The most obvious might be the humanistic interpretations namely human beings are responsible for what they do because they have a free choice to decide what to do. This means that pupils should take on responsibility for what s/he does. The political and juridical interpretation, mostly expressed by Carl but also the others although in a lesser extent, suggests that pupils should take the consequences if they do not take on their responsibility. Dovemark’s (2004) study shows that pupils’ workload increase and they become more dependent on their families to help them to understand. A consequence of responsibility as something presupposed could be that teachers and pupils might not have the same interpretation of the concept. Thus, teachers might think pupils do not take on responsibility, but the pupils think they do, according to their interpretation.

The pupils’ ability to take on responsibility could be correlated to their interest in English. Wiberg (2001) means that pupils, nowadays, do not find any interest in school and their attitudes have changed. Because of pupils’ nonchalant attitudes, it would be a disaster for the
pupils’ development in both knowledge and manner if the teachers abandon pupils to work on their own. The teachers have to take charge of the classroom situation.

How
The matter of how the teachers thought pupils learned responsibility was very similar to each other. They thought it would be best to take it gradually, but they also stressed factors that might prevent pupils from learning responsibility. These had mostly to do with pupils’ maturity but also their knowledge in English. Permer and Permer (2002) think that pupils’ responsibility is preferred to be taught gradually. Anna thought pupils were more eager to finish an assignment if they have had the opportunity to influence. Bromö’s (2002) investigation shows that if pupils get the chance to influence the teaching their motivation increase. Anna thought pupils became more responsible when they could influence the teaching and more eager and excited.

Sara expressed pupils’ self-studies as one way of learning responsibility. This could be compared to learner autonomy, which aims to increase pupils’ awareness in how they learn. During self-studies pupils are required to take on responsibility to finish the assignment. When pupils work on their own this usually includes searching for information on the Internet. The problem of allowing pupils work too much on their own is that they might not acquire a deeper understanding of the investigated phenomenon, which leaves the question of what pupils learn when they work on their own.

The teacher’s role changes when using an invisible pedagogy. The teacher should be interested in to co-operation with the pupils and allow them to influence the teaching. To do this the teacher has to take on his/her own responsibility to let pupils make an influence. The teacher should function as a responsible role model and treat the pupils with respect. Söderström (2006) means that teachers have to be aware of their own responsibilities and allow pupils the right to freedom. If the teacher shows responsibility and respect towards the pupils, the pupils might feel that they should make an effort to finish the assignments.

When analyzing the statements concerning how teachers think pupils learn responsibility the question is if the different methods used to teach responsibility only give the pupils the opportunity to show responsibility, and not really learn how to take on responsibility.

Why
The teachers expressed the importance of responsibility as a life-long investment. Pupils have to learn responsibility so they can take on responsibility later on in life. Teachers in Bråten’s et al. (2006) study think it is important for pupils to learn responsibility to develop as human beings. They mean that pupils should become independent and learn how to decide their own lives. The reason for teachers’ unawareness might be that the concepts in the curricula are not properly introduced to them. This means that the Swedish National Agency of Education might have to clarify the concepts to teachers in a more available way.
In this study some of the teachers expressed ideas and thoughts about the post-modern pupils. Anna thought that some of them were good in taking on responsibility because they were used to do so. Whereas Carl thought that, many teachers are too much of parents to them and consequently pupils at the upper secondary school level do not make an effort to accomplish assignments. Hence, when they discover they did not pass the course they are choked and wonder what they can do to pass the course. Or as Enkvist (2002) says pupils or their parents complain to the teacher or headmaster and the teacher has to help the pupil to pass the course even if the course is over.

Those pupils who have been gently pushed all the time have not learned to take the consequences for their actions because they have never been forced to. Carl outlines a picture of compulsory schoolteachers who do not interfere in children’s life because that might only destroy them. Instead, the teachers should adjust to the children and not force children to do anything they do not want to, all in the sense of Rousseau.

The matter of pupils’ self-control, which is expressed by nearly all teachers in the study, correlates to Durkheim’s idea of self-discipline. Children have to control their actions so they can become well-adjusted human beings. In contrast to Rousseau does Durkheim not mean that pupils only should do things that they consider fun. Instead, pupils should give in to the teacher’s demands and the teacher should not, as Naeslund (2005) says, treat pupils as young princes or princesses.

Postmodern Society

Different pedagogical ideas affect pupils’ and teachers’ relation, in both a downward and an uprising spiral. Teachers who believe in Piaget’s idea wait until pupils are mature enough to take on responsibility. Teachers should not force pupils to do anything which is above their maturity level, but by then it could already be too late. Teaching according to Dewey’s ideas let the pupils experience the consequences for what s/he did. Lastly, teaching according to Vygotsky challenge pupils to develop their abilities. This is of course hard-drawn lines between the different ideas but still when learning responsibility the author of this thesis thinks Vygotsky and/or Dewey are best suited.

None of the teachers in the study mentioned pupils’ self-assessment as a method to learn responsibility. The idea of self-assessment relates to learner autonomy whose aim is to make pupils aware of their own learning. Enkvist (2002) means that the concept of learner autonomy has been misinterpreted to something like pupils should work on their own. However, the basic idea is to make pupils aware of their learning, which is difficult for pupils to figure out on their own. Research shows that learners who have had some training in self-assessment tend to develop more favourable views on their own work and goals. There are several methods to help pupils with their self-assessment such as logbooks, diaries and
journals. Self-assessment could have positive effect for the pupils, concerning their motivations and perhaps curiosity. Arguments for pupils’ self-assessment are that it could be easier for pupils to influence the teaching, teachers and pupils share the responsibility, and research shows that pupils have a reasonably realistic opinion about their own achievement.

Pupils’ responsibility could be found in ‘the hidden curriculum’. When teachers say that pupils have to be responsible it could actually be the hidden curriculum they are talking about. The hidden curriculum is important to teach pupils, even if it has to be adjusted to the post-modern pupils. Österlind suggests that teachers have to adjust the guiding and coaching to the various pupils. And because of the results of this thesis, teachers have to create opportunities and teach pupils how to use the different methods, such as logbook, group work and so on, to reach the goals in all courses.

Conclusion

The conclusions are that teachers seem to have some difficulties to concretize the concept of pupils’ responsibility. However, even if responsibility is an ambiguous concept, teachers have to work with it. Discussions in schools are needed to find active methods to make pupils aware of their own learning and responsibility. Teachers cannot assume that pupils know what responsibility is and that they can take on responsibility. Even teachers at upper secondary schools have to teach pupils different methods to learn responsibility and not assume that they already know how to do it. Teacher should insist on getting pupils to think about their own awareness concerning both knowledge and manner. This will probably take a great deal of time from the “usual” teaching but if teachers succeed in increasing pupils’ awareness, the pupils will also learn how to learn which is a comprehensive goal all pupils should achieve when leaving school. Therefore, the final conclusion is to get pupils to take on responsibility the teacher has to take on his/her responsibility to increase pupils awareness and thereby their responsibility.

The author hopes that the results of this thesis will contribute to a new perspective on discourses of responsibility. Furthermore, that these results will contribute to important discussions in schools about the concept of responsibility, not only in English but all subjects in schools.

Further Research

Further research on the subject could be to investigate the concept of responsibility in classroom observations. It would be interesting to find out how teachers really teach pupils responsibility. It could also be interesting to find out what pupils consider their responsibility to be. Another aspect could be to observe classrooms to investigate the hidden curriculum, how it looks like and how the teacher and pupils work with it.
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INTERVIEW GUIDE

Theme 1 - WHAT
What is responsibility?

Questions
How would you interpret the concept of responsibility?
- In general
- Curriculum, Lpf 94
- Syllabus, English A-C

How do you think pupils interpret the concept?

Theme 2 - HOW
How do you teach pupils to take on responsibility?

Questions
When do you give pupils the chance to take on responsibility?
How do you give pupils the opportunity to learn to take on responsibility in English?

Theme 3 - WHY
Why is it or why is it not important for pupils to take on responsibility?

Questions
Do you think it is important for pupils to take on responsibility?
Do you feel that pupils are capable to take on responsibility?
Is it possible to grade responsibility?
Advantages or disadvantages with pupils’ responsibility?

Something you want to add.