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Abstract

Previous studies have shown that teachers have limited competence in teaching English to multilingual students and that teacher students are lacking essential competence in teaching English in a multilingual classroom. Studies also show that the most common used approaches in English instruction in Norway have been and still are the monolingual and the bilingual approach, whereas the use of a multilingual approach is significantly rare. This current study investigates one teacher and her students’ experiences of an English lesson with translanguaging practices. The study was conducted in a lower secondary school located in East of Oslo, Norway, where the majority of the student population are multilingual and multicultural.

This thesis implemented a qualitative approach in order to investigate teacher and student experiences linked to translanguaging practices. The data was collected through two methods; observation and individual semi-structured interviews. Two lessons were observed. The first observation was a regular lesson without my intervention, whilst the second lesson was developed by me and included translanguaging practices. Also, eight semi-structured interviews were conducted: two with the teacher and six individual interviews with students.

The findings in this thesis suggest that the teacher and the students had a positive experience with the lesson that included translanguaging resources. Both the teacher and the students consider the use of the students’ native language as a resource in their English lesson. Whereas some students found the use of their L1 as supportive when learning English, other students shared that the use of their L1 in the English lesson increased their native language proficiency. Also, the results indicate that the use of the students’ identities and language in the English lesson contributed to a positive change in behavior, engagement and motivation. The findings also indicate that the teacher and the students perceived that the use of students’ L1 is deemed as a problem by the school.

The implication of this study suggests that there is a need for more focus to be put on the use of a multilingual approach when teaching and learning the English language. In addition to the importance of acknowledging and emphasizing multilingual students’ right to receive adapted education in relation to the English subject, it also suggests that the multilingual perspectives need to become a priority in the teacher education and in policy documents, preparing teacher students and allowing teachers, who supports a multilingual approach, to teach English in a multilingual classroom.
Sammendrag

Tidligere forskning har vist at lærere og lærerstudenter har lite formell kompetanse i å undervise engelsk i et flerspråklig klasserom. Studier viser også at de mest vanlige tilnærmingene i engelskundervisning i Norge har vært og stadig er enspråklig og tospråklig, mens bruken av en flerspråklig tilnærmning er betydelig sjeldne. Denne masterstudien utforsker hvordan en lærer og hennes elever erfarte en engelskundervisning med transspråklig praksiser. Studien ble gjennomført i en ungdomsskole som ligger i den østlige delen av Oslo, der majoriteten av elevbefolkningen er flerspråkige og flerkulturelle.

Denne avhandlingen benytter seg av en kvalitativ tilnærmning for å kunne undersøke erfaringene til læreren elevene sine, knyttet til transspråklige praksiser. Data ble samlet ved bruk av to metoder; observasjon og individuell semi-strukturert intervju. To timer ble observert. Den første observasjonen var av en vanlig undervisningstime uten min innflytelse, mens den andre timen var utviklet av meg og inkluderte transspråklig praksiser. I tillegg til det, ble åtte semi-strukturerte intervjuer gjennomført: to med læreren og seks individuelle intervjuer med elevene.

Funnene i denne studien viser at læreren og elevene hadde en positiv opplevelse av timen som inkluderte transspråklige ressurser. Både læreren og elevene betrakter bruken av elevenes morsmål som en ressurs i engelskundervisningen. Mens noen elever anså bruk av deres morsmål som en ressurs når de lærte engelsk, fortalte andre elever at bruken av morsmålet i engelsktimen økte morsmålsferdighetene deres. I tillegg til det, indikerer resultatene at bruk av elevenes identitet og språk i engelsktimen bidrar til en positiv endring i atferd, engasjement og motivasjon. Funnene antyder også at læreren og elevene opplevet at elevenes morsmål blir oppfattet som et problem av skolen.

Implikasjonene av denne studien er at det er et behov for å fokusere mer på bruken av en flerspråklig tilnærmning i engelskundervisningen. I tillegg til dette, fremhever oppgaven viktigheten av å anerkjenne og fremheve flerspråklige elever sine rettigheter til å motta tilpasset opplæring knyttet til engelsk faget samt at det flerspråklige perspektivet må bli en prioritet i lærerutdanningen og politiske dokumenter. Dette vil kunne forberede lærerstudenter og tillate lærere, som støtter en flerspråklig tilnærmning, å undervise engelsk i et flerspråklig klasserom.
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1 Introduction

While growing up as a child in Oslo in Norway, I learned four languages simultaneously; Somali, Norwegian, English and German. My home language was and still is Somali and I was later introduced to Norwegian in Kindergarten. In my first year of primary school, I was introduced to the German language through watching cartoons, whilst in my second year I was introduced to English. Now, years later, I am a Norwegian-Somali woman, teaching English and German.

My own diverse background has played a major role in this dissertation. Being multilingual and multicultural myself, my desire to contribute to this field of research began and grew tremendously since the beginning of my studies. My ambition to become a teacher began even earlier than that, while growing up with no role models reflecting the diversity I was told I was a part of.

Several years later, as a multilingual and multicultural teacher, I have realized that I also encounter challenges and experience regarding teaching English in classrooms with multilingual and multicultural students. After completing courses in Practical-Pedagogical Education (PPU), I was feeling more prepared to tackle different types of classrooms with different types of students. However, I did not feel prepared to teach English in a class filled with students speaking different languages with different backgrounds, giving them different tools, which could help them develop professionally and increase their desire to learn. This became evident to me first during my second year working as a teacher.

The realization of my own lack of skills when it comes to teaching English to a diverse group of students came during my second year as a teacher while substituting for a colleague. A student asked me what the word *greedy* meant, and I answered by giving him a Norwegian translation, which is “gjerrig”. The expression of confusion did not leave his face, and changed the term but kept the question: “What does *gjerrig* mean?”. For a second I was baffled, not knowing how to respond. I replied by explaining what it means to be greedy by using sentences and by doing hand gestures in order to visualize as much as possible. I saw a sudden comprehension, yet I was left with many questions, wondering about the process going on in his mind.
After this episode, my interest for this field of research grew and its importance is illustrated by statistics, which shows that immigrants and Norwegian born with immigrant parents make up for 17% of the Norwegian population and approximately ¼ of these are located in Oslo alone. In addition to this, multilingual students make up 39.1% of the student population in the capital, which makes research within this field highly relevant (Dzamarija & Steinkellner, 2018; Oslo Municipality, 2018). I began exploring studies related to challenges and opportunities, which are found when teaching English subject in multicultural and multilingual classrooms in Norway and I realized how little research that has been done in this field. However, I discovered previous research focusing on teachers’ encounters with teaching English as a third language. Dragana Šurkalović studied if and how teacher education for elementary school prepares future teachers to teach English as a third language, whereas Anne Dahl and Anna Krulatz investigated to what degree English teachers feel prepared to teach English in a multilingual classroom. Jonas Iversen inquired into the role and unsolicited use of minority students’ native language when learning English.

This research seeks to investigate how one teacher and her students experience a lesson, which requires the students to use their native language. It neither assesses nor measures their learning outcome in the given lesson. Instead, it aims to gain an insight into different experiences and thoughts from teacher and students, when the students are encouraged to use their native language to complete tasks in their English lesson.

1.1 Multicultural society in Norway

Norway has long been inhabited by indigenous peoples and ethnic groups such as Sami and Kven people. The Sami and Kven people have faced challenges, prejudice and deprivation of their language and culture from society, as several minorities and indigenous peoples around the world. In line with the growing nationalist feeling in Norway, the Norwegianization policy was introduced in the late 1800s. Through Norwegianization, assimilation of the Sami and Kven people became statutory and a reality. This type of policy is now considered illegal and is also a violation to our fundamental human rights. Despite of this, it is important to be aware of the fact that the anti-corruption policy was once legal. After years of opposition against the policies, the indigenous peoples restored their rights (Berg-Nordlie, 2015).
Because of increased immigration, the language situation in Norway has changed. War, poverty and job opportunities are some reasons why many minorities have fled to and settled down in Norway with hopes of a better life. Due to the immigration from different parts of the world, it has led to the Norwegian society becoming multicultural.

Immigration has become increasingly important, hence terms such as diversity and multiculturalism are more globally known. In addition to societies becoming enriched with different cultures, migration also led to societies becoming multilingual. Over the last decades, Norway has become highly multicultural. In line with developments in the Norwegian society in general, schools in Norway have become progressively more diverse over the past two decades. The capital of Norway is a good example of this. Statistics show that approximately 916600 out of roughly 5 million citizens are immigrants and Norwegian born with immigrant parents (Dzamarija & Steinkellner, 2018). While they make up for 17% of the Norwegian population, the degree of diversity differs greatly based on the geographical location. Roughly 1/4 of these are located in Oslo alone, and the division within the districts differs significantly. Whereas some schools in Oslo have a low, if not zero, percentage of students with minority background, several schools reach above 50%, and some even above 90% (Dzamarija & Steinkellner, 2018; Oslo Municipality, 2018).

Immigration has contributed to creating more cultural and linguistic diversity in Norway (Skrefsrud, 2015). The importance of education and participation in the society of course applies to all Norwegians and it can be said that the need of a multilingual approach in teaching has never been more significant. An important concept linked to teaching Norwegian classrooms is adapted education. The term may be explained as different measures used by teachers in order to ensure as much learning for all students (Kesälahti & Väyrynen, 2013). In order to ensure that students profit as much as possible when learning, the teacher need to possess skills to adapt the education in order for the students to perceive the education as relevant. As education contributes to increase the chance for success in many areas and thus become an active citizen, accommodation and adaptation in order to access education and employment is especially crucial to new citizens and the society (NOU 2010:7, 28, 33).
The need for a greater focus on adapted education is linked to the increasing immigrant population in Norway, which has led to a larger proportion of multilingual students in schools. With the growing population and a more diverse society several new questions, challenges and adaptation methods have risen. About 11% of students in Norwegian primary school are children of immigrant background, yet there are schools in Norway where these students with immigrant background account for 95% the school population. On national tests for 8th grade, the results show that Norwegian-born students perform significantly less than the majority students in English (NOU 2011:7; Statistics Norway, 2005; Šurkalović, 2014, p. 3; UDIR, 2012; Dahl & Krulatz, 2014). Studies conducted by UDIR (2012) also show that 1 in 3 students who have immigrated to Norway drop out in further education, and stating the reason for this with lack of motivation, "wrong choice, lack of apprenticeships, or repeated fails" (p. 24).

1.2 Previous and current educational policy in light of diversity

It can be said that the Norwegian school policy has throughout time changed in line with the society. An important aspect of the past and current perspectives is identity. Skrefsrud (2015) presents two educational policies, which illustrate the progress, or the lack thereof.

He argues that the principle of adapted education is in stark contrast to the national identity policy that aspires to restrict cultural diversity within the framework of the national state. He takes a retrospective glance on a previous education policy and naming assimilation and segregation as "the prevailing education policy strategies in the Norwegian unitary school", where the terms are understood as "adapting groups and individuals to the dominant culture" and "separation of groups and individuals from the dominant culture" (p.29). The segregation and assimilation policy aimed at identifying and separating students who did and did not fit into the framework of the normal school. In addition to this, they assimilated the Norwegian indigenous peoples and other minorities through the nation-building process, with the purpose of forming a common national identity. Teachers became an important mediator supporting this politics by excluding other cultures.
Great changes have been made in the education policy, emphasizing the importance of identity building and acknowledging them in light of the multicultural. However, Thor-André Skrefsrud (2015) argues that the assimilation politics is still present. He states that the difference between the previous one compared to the current one is its visibility and legitimacy, thus difficult to uncover. The argument Skrefsrud presents is based on the belief that the “education happens within the majority cultural horizon, which is neither problematized nor up for debate”, excluding the minorities [my translation] (2015, p. 30). Furthermore, he presents two reasons supporting this argument. The first argument portrays the schools as skill oriented, arguing that the climate of the education policy is characterized by their focus on goal-orientated management and competition. Consequently, it prevents the cultural horizons for teaching to be thematized leaving the majority culture as the considered natural framework. Secondly, he argues that the principle of adapted education must be seen differently. He states that adapted education is seen as “a quantitative differentiation principle, which shall realize the ideals about a competitive school”, and suggests that it must be seen in a broader perspective, which contributes to students recognizing themselves and their values, culture and skills during their lessons (Skrefsrud, 2015, p. 30). A way of realizing this is teachers using examples and drawing in subject matters which may invoke identification, recognition and actualize the students cultural and lingual background experience (Skrefsrud, 2015).

1.2.1 The status of English in Norway
In many countries including Norway, the view of English as a foreign language has, in correlation with the growing globalization, changed over the past decades. Traditionally, English was viewed as a foreign language in Norway. Scholars, however, argue that in many countries, including Norway, the status of English has changed from being a foreign language into a second language (L2) (Simensen, 2014; Rindal, 2013; Graddol, 1997; NOU, 2011:7). Researchers and regulations view English as an important communicative skill in the Norwegian society (NOU, 2010:7, 2010, p. 170; KD, 2006, 2013). Other language subjects such as German, French and Spanish are considered as foreign languages. For the majority students, one of these languages are regarded as their third language after Norwegian as their first language (L1) and English as their L2. Many of the previous research regarding L3 is characterized by focusing on foreign language teaching at
school. For many students however, English is at least a third language (L3), and only a few research has investigated minority language students’ complex meeting with English as L3 in school (NOU, 2010:7, 2010, p. 178). The results of the national tests in English in Norway shows that Norwegian-born students with a multicultural background score significantly lower in English than their fellow ethnic Norwegian classmates (UDIR, 2012).

Considering the global and local status of English in Norway, combined with the provided information about the results of the national tests, it is safe to say that there is a need for a broader focus on teaching English in multicultural classrooms in Norway.

### 1.2.2 Multicultural perspectives of the English subject

The English subject in Norwegian schools can be seen in relation to two multicultural perspectives; globally and locally (NOU 2011:7). A global multicultural perspective includes a focus on English as a world and communicative language, which is used in several different situations in one's own leisure, work and everyday life. It is clear that the English subject curriculum is characterized by this view. The curriculum has several subject areas, all serving a purpose to increase the students’ knowledge, insight and learning skills as a tool to communicate, interact and respect different cultures. One of the main subject areas is culture, society and literature, which focuses on “cultural understanding in a broad sense”, and is “based on the English-speaking countries” (KD, 2006, 2013). In addition to enhancing and improving language skills in different communication situations, different oral and written media are used to gain knowledge and understanding of the different cultures and ways of living in different areas in which English is spoken as either the primary or the official language.

A multicultural local perspective, on the other hand, can be explained as how the learning in the classroom is adapted to the diverse student group found in many Norwegian schools today. Research literature shows that recognition of culture and knowledge about language is strongly linked to a good learning outcome (NOU 2011:7). Thus, the outcome of recognizing culture and having knowledge about language, or the lack thereof, can be essential for the student’s learning in English classrooms. If teachers assume that everyone has the same prior knowledge, which is usually linked to their background, they will create lessons and tasks that fit the majority group. Consequently, the teacher may risk creating lessons and teaching
plans that might only challenge and be solved by some students. However, several good opportunities can be created by making a lesson that is adapted to the entire student group with different language backgrounds, in which students, regardless of language background, feel they can contribute their skills (NOU, 2010:7, 2010, p.170-171; Boeckmann et al., 2011). UDIR (2015) mentions several values that help describe adapted education. One of these is experience, which focuses on the students’ experiences, skills and potential, and how these can be used and challenged in the class.

1.3 Research question
On the basis of prior research, showing the importance of increased knowledge of multilingual approaches in the English subject among teachers and students’ unsolicited use of their native language to support their English learning, (Šurkalović, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Iversen, 2017), it would be interesting to investigate how a class experience a translanguaging practices in the English lesson.

In Norway, more research has been made on this topic. Previous studies have explored how English is taught and learned in introductory classes, consisting of newly arrived migrant students and teachers’ awareness of the positive role of multiculturalism and multilingualism (Burner & Carlsen, 2017; Krulatz et al, 2017). In addition to this, other studies have investigated how well English teachers feel prepared to work with multilingual students and how the teacher education prepares future English teachers to face and meet these challenges (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016; Šurkalović, 2014) Another study explored students’ unsolicited use of their native language and strategies used to support their English learning (Iversen, 2017). In addition, statistics presented by Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (UDIR) shows how multicultural and multilingual students score significantly less than ethnic Norwegian students (UDIR, 2012). All together, these findings illustrate how significant and influential it is for the students’ learning outcome, to integrate elements and strategies, where the students can use their own culture and languages to support their own learning in English learning activities. Pedagogical practices which integrates these diverse lingual and cultural elements and strategies are often linked to the term translanguaging, which is defined as a process where multiple language resources is used in order to make sense, shape experiences and gain knowledge, among other things (García & Li Wei, 2014).
Based on prior research and the statistic presented above, the importance of further research within teaching English to multilingual students is undeniable, especially on a local level. Locally, there have been no empirical studies of teacher and student experiences related to lessons that focus on this particular phenomenon. This brings me to the research question of this study, which is:

_How do multicultural and multilingual students and their teacher experience translanguaging practices in the context of English teaching?_

The aim for this study is to explore teacher and student experiences of a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, where the students are encouraged and required to use their native language. In order to answer the research question, I observed two lessons, where the first lesson was regular without my involvement and the second was a lesson with translanguaging practices. In addition to this, I also interviewed the teacher and the students. While the teacher was interviewed prior and after the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, six students were interviewed individually. The study is conducted in a lower secondary school.

1.3 **Structure of the thesis**

This master thesis consists of 6 chapters. In this first chapter, I have presented this thesis’ topic and the motivation for choosing it, as well as background information and studies related to this research. Chapter 2 will provide theoretical framework and prior research linked to thesis, whereas in chapter 3, a detailed description of the research methods used will be given an account for. Chapter 4 will present the findings, which will further be discussed in chapter 5. Lastly, chapter 6 will provide the conclusion, suggestions for further research and implications of this study.
2 Theoretical framework and previous research

In this chapter I will provide an overview of the research that comprises the theoretical background for the thesis. First, important terms and concepts within the scope of multilingualism will be presented (2.1). Secondly, I will introduce Richard Ruiz’s (1984) framework of language as a problem, a right and a resource (2.2). Thirdly, I present and discuss the term transnationalism (2.3). Fourthly, the core curriculum and English curriculum in light of multilingualism will be presented (2.4). Although the curriculum neither is theory nor previous research, it will be considered in this chapter. It mentions and defines concepts that are important and it provides information on the theory I use. Lastly, I will give an account on relevant studies linked teaching English to multilingual students (2.5).

2.1 Multilingualism

2.1.1 Bi-, Multi- and plurilingualism

Within the world of linguistics, there are many different terms used that are used when describing speakers’ repertoire of several languages: bilingualism, multilingualism and plurilingualism. The first-mentioned term, bilingualism, can be explained as “all language practices that include features beyond those described by linguists and educators as forming a single autonomous language” García, 2009, p.158). Others add to this definition, saying that bilingualism also refers to more than two languages (Fielding, 2015, Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). For the sake of simplicity, bilingual and bilingualism will in this thesis refer to the ability of speaking two languages only.

Multilingualism indicates the ability of knowing and speaking multiple languages (García & Li Wei, 2014). The Council of Europe defines multilingualism as “knowledge of a number of languages, or the co-existence of different languages in a given society” (Council of Europe, 2001, p.4). Both of these definitions considers speaking two languages as being multilingual. However, when referring to the terms multilingualism and multilingual in this thesis, it will refer to the ability to speak more than two languages.
Another similar term to the two presented above is plurilingualism. On the one hand, it is similar to multilingualism since both terms consist of mastering several languages. One the other hand, it has been suggested that plurilingual should be reserved for the individual’s “ability to use several languages to varying degrees and for distinct purposes” (Council of Europe, 2000 p. 168 referred in García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 11). The importance of the concept of plurilingualism has increasingly grown in the Council of Europe’s approach to language learning. The Council describes the plurilingual approach as:

“the fact that an individual person’s experience of language in its cultural contexts expands, from the language of the home to that of society at large and then to the languages of other peoples [in different social contexts], he or she does not keep these languages and cultures in strictly separated mental compartments, but rather builds up a communicative competence to which all knowledge and experience of language contributes and in which languages interrelate and interact. (2001, p.4).

In other words, a plurilingual person broadens his or her communicative competence by being able to switch between several languages and knowledge of different cultures.

When discussing about language and language learning, the terms explained above will be included. On one hand, the three concepts will be separated when presenting concepts. The terms, on the other hand, will also be gathered when the focus lies on the overall meaning of the words; multilingual/multilingualism.

The partakers in this study may be characterized participants with a minority background. From a Norwegian perspective, this term might be understood as being a minority language-speaking individual, which refers to individuals who have another native language than Norwegian, Sami, Swedish, Danish and English. Native language is understood as a synonym mother tongue (UDIR, 2016). Another term used to describe these participants is minority background, which is a collective term for immigrants and Norwegian-born with immigrant parents (Statistics Norway, 2017). Some of the students, are born abroad, but have thus far either completed all or a large part of their schooling in Norway.

Multilingualism and multiculturalism are two terms who are related to the ones presented above and central this thesis. Even though these terms are often linked together, there is a
difference in definition. As earlier presented, multilingualism is understood as the ability of speaking multiple languages, whereas multiculturalism typically refers to the presence of several cultures; a multicultural society refers to a society with different cultures, a multilingual individual has additional origins and affiliations. Though one could state that multilingual individuals are multicultural, one could argue that multicultural individuals are not necessarily multilingual. Since all of the participants in this study are both multilingual and multicultural, I have chosen to denote the student groups based on their important characteristics that unites them and is also fundamental to the thesis: their multicultural and multilingual competence. For the simplicity of this study, when talking about multilingualism and multiculturalism, the terms will be merged into one: multilingual. When the thesis calls for it, the terms will be distinguished from one another.

2.2 Language orientations

Language has throughout the time given human beings sense of belonging to their countries and regions and it can also be said to have contributed to globalization and thus communication within and across borders (Phan, 2008). In addition, countless cultural expressions have been created, preserved and developed in accordance with contemporary times through speech and written language. Despite the fact that, or rather because of, language being an important factor for identity, belonging, culture and participation in society, this has also been considered as a problem and within education (Ruiz, 1984).

Richard Ruíz (1984) has created a theoretical framework, which is considered a classic, where he presents three orientations towards language policy and planning. The influential framework not only reports different views and fortunate and unfortunate outcomes of previous language planning in the USA, but it also calls for a more positive outlook on language, where it is recognized as a resource. Orientation in this context refers to the “complex of dispositions toward language and its role, and toward languages and their role in society” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16). Language planning may be explained as “a body of ideas, laws and regulations (language policy), change rules, beliefs, and practices intended to achieve a planned change (or to stop change from happening) in the language use in one or more communities” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997, p. 3).
Ruiz argues that orientations establish the ways we speak about language and issues related to it, saying that they “determine the basic questions we ask, the conclusions we draw from the data and even the data themselves” (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16). Furthermore, he states that the orientations are related to language attitudes, determining what is “thinkable about language in the society”. (Ruiz, 1984, p. 16).

The three orientations presented by Ruiz function as a tool to approach language learning policies and are essential in this thesis. Thus, the three orientations will be presented below.

### 2.2.1 Language as a problem

The first orientation of Ruiz’s (1984) framework addresses problems linked to language. Throughout history and across national borders, language has been and still is until this day, one of several hallmarks of social status and background. Whereas the majority language is by many viewed as the important one, it could be argued that minority languages, has been and still are regarded as problematic and less in the society. Prohibition of speaking certain languages and assimilation of indigenous peoples and immigrant minorities is very much present in the history books, and, has unfortunately also been reoccurring. *Norwegianization* is an example of practices of language as a problem in Norway. What began as a missionary work in 1700s, turned into political and nationalistic agenda in the 1800’s. Norwegianization brought prohibitions and limitations, stripping them of their culture. Furthermore, Education Acts prohibited teachers to speak or teach Sami, and the students were only allowed to speak Norwegian, which forced them to assimilate into the Norwegian society (Berg-Nordlie, 2015).

The last decades, problems such as poverty, low achievement of education and low or no social mobility has been extensively associated with language minority individuals (Ruiz, 1984; Engen & Kulbrandstad 2004). Ruiz (1984) presents how languages are seen as a problem by presenting views saying that a multilingual society is associated with separation. Moreover, Ruiz (1984) presents a contradicting view by a former Secretary of Education in the Carter Administration, saying that linguistic diversity in the United States is a matter of fact, yet incompatible with unity, which is achieved through the ideal of monolingualism. Ruiz (1984) also presents education policies regarding bilingualism. As a matter of fact, a Bilingual Education Act was designed to function as a solution to this social problem, since bilingualism was perceived as a social handicap. Furthermore, Ruiz concludes that “language
problems are never merely language problems, but have a direct impact on all spheres of social life” and that the language-as-a-problem orientation may represent a more “general outlook on cultural and social diversity” (1984, p. 21). The significance of this statement is twofold. First, Ruiz (1984) states that the language problems are not insignificant, but rather has an impact on the individual and its participation in society. Second, he also argues that the language planning may also have an influence on how cultural and social diversity is perceived by societies, whether this is positive or negative.

Challenges with recognizing the value of languages that are found in the multicultural society, is arguably prominent and in Norway, this is no exception. Research has been conducted and the debates have been heated and many. Monica Melby-lervåg and Arne Lervåg published an article on Aftenposten, a nationwide newspaper, in 2013. Based on their research, they stated that multilingualism is a problem when it comes to language development among children attending day-care institutions and students attending schools (Melby-lervåg & Lervåg, 2013). In this article, they state that the students who speak another language than the language spoken in school and who have parents with little schooling are the ones suffering the most. These findings sparked a heavy and a public debate about the function and the value of multilingualism, or the lack of, in the Norwegian school system. Furthermore, the article in Aftenposten presented numbers from UDIR, showing that 7 out 10 students with Urdu as their native language receive adapted language education despite many of these being born in Norway (Slettholm, 2013). This has been regarded as a problem due to the fact that students who are not sufficiently proficient in Norwegian have difficulties following the regular lessons.

To sum up, Ruiz’s (1984) language-as-a-problem orientation views how native languages are regarded as less valuable and problematic in the society, whereas the majority language is considered as the important one. In the Norwegian context, debates about challenges and opportunities linked to minority language in education and society has been widely discussed.
2.2.2 Language as a right

The second orientation is language as a right, and it entails the view that language is a basic human right, which is can be traced back to the Post-Civil Rights Era Movement and is found in the European Convention on Human Rights (Ruiz, 1984; Schaefer, 2008; Baker, 2011). Moreover, this orientation confronts prejudice and discrimination linked to multilingualism (Schaefer, 2008). Ruiz presents two different kinds of language rights. The first right concerns freedom from being discriminated on the basis of language (1984, p.22), which entails "any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference which is based on language" (Maja, 2016, p. 300). Ruiz presents the second language right as “the right to use your language(s) in the activities of communal life” (1984, p.22). In other words, multilingual citizens have rights to speaking their native language and not be discriminated based on it.

From a Norwegian perspective, multilingual citizens also do have these rights (NOU nr. 35, 2008). Many citizens, including students, speak a different language at home than at school, and discrimination based on language is considered as a criminal act in Norway. In the following, language as a right will in relation to multilingual students in Norway, be seen in light of education.

From a Norwegian perspective, there are, to my knowledge, some policies linked to language as a right. First, The Norwegian Education Act states every student’s rights concerning adapted education. When it comes to teaching multilingual and multicultural students, this may include involving students’ language and background in the lessons (Education Act, 1998 §1-3). Furthermore, The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CERF), which has impacted the English Curriculum (Rindal, 2015, Simensen 2011), supports a plurilingual approach, which focuses on the interaction and interrelation between the student’s complex linguistic and cultural competence instead of being separated (2001). In the English curriculum, the students’ right to use language in language learning also appears implicitly as a competence aim. One of the aims for lower secondary school after year 2, 4 and 10, require the students to use their linguistic competence to reflect upon language, its use and strategies to improve their proficiency (KD, 2006, 2013). I will come back to this later in this thesis (2.5 The Curriculum).
To sum up, the language-as-a-right orientation supports the basic human right to speak and learn your native language. From a local perspective, all students in Norway are entitled to an education, which is adapted to the individual’s ability and aptitude. Furthermore, the English subject curriculum also requires the student be able to use their native language to learn English (KD, 2006, 2013). However, many students are not entitled to native language teaching and bilingual training, unless they are found to be sufficiently proficient in Norwegian (Education Act, 1998, Section 2-8). This might support the belief that the right to use native language is only explicitly included to support the majority language learning, and only until the individual is sufficiently proficient in the majority language. To my knowledge, there are no other explicit rights, which allow multilingual students, who are sufficiently proficient in the majority language, to use their native language as a support in Norwegian and English language learning.

2.2.3 Language as a resource

The third orientation is language as a resource. Ruíz (1984) states that the minority language speaking population are considered as a problem. He further shifts the focus to language as a resource, and how this may contribute to enhancing the status of subordinate languages and thus weaken the as a problem. This approach emphasizes how language culturally, socially, personally and nationally acts as powerful capital in society as well as in learning and teaching (Schaefer, 2008). There has been an increasing shift in attitude and language has been proven to be and acknowledged as a resource (Haukås, 2014). The acquisition of a language in addition to the majority language related to an academic or job-related reason is regarded as fruitful to society (NOU, 2011:7). This does not, however, apply to all languages. Even though the world has become more diverse and societies have become more multilingual and multicultural, one could argue that minority languages is still associated with being a barrier that interferes negatively in societies and not a resource.

The debate regarding language as a problem in Norway has been ongoing, and reports have been written and research has been conducted. The findings have been ambiguous, presenting different views indicating that multilingualism may and may not be regarded as a resource (NOU, 2011:7, Ryen & Simmonsen, 2015, Melby-Lervåg & Lervåg, 2013)
First, the Official Norwegian Report from 2011 nr. 7 with the title “Diversity and mastery” (my translation from Norw. *Mangfold og mestring*) supports the language-as-a-resource orientation. They call for a change of attitude in the education system as well as recognizing the value of multilingualism for individuals and for the society to succeed in the global market (NOU 2011:7).

On behalf of Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (Multiling), Else Ryen and Hanne G. Simonsen conducted a study and their findings opposed the myths about multilingualism, which were revealed in the public debate (2015). They concluded with the importance of “multilingual students receiving opportunities to develop language skills in both or all of their languages” and that their multilingualism should be “utilized as the resource it could be” (Ryen & Simonsen, 2015, p. 211). Thus the resource can be seen from an individual and a societal perspective.

**Language as a societal resource**

If you master multiple languages, both a minority and the majority language, they often have different functions and are therefore used in different contexts (Baker, 2011). From a linguistic point of view, it is not possible to measure the value of different languages. In contrast to considering one language having more worth than another, a language rights perspective supports the notion that all languages are valid (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1981) presents elite bilingualism and folk bilingualism. Elite bilinguals are defined as highly educated bilinguels and parts of their education have been in foreign languages, whereas folk bilinguals are categorized as minority language speakers. Speaking English is frequently considered a prerequisite for success in the global society today. School and universities all over the world value English and other language learning, and therefore also elite bilingualism, acknowledging the value of learning a language. Thus, these language skills are linked to a global and economic gain for society and is therefore valued. There is a negative view on folk bilingualism, where minority languages are associated with educational difficulties (Ruiz, 1984; Skutnabb-Kanas, 1981). Despite of this, its value and importance has been recognized. A report published by The Language Council of Norway, however, disagrees with this and refers to modern research literature, which shows that multilingualism contributes to increase the ability of creative thinking. Moreover, it has been established that multilinguals possess the ability to find creative solutions as well as avoiding seeing a matter
from one perspective only. The competence that comes with being multilingual strengthens their ability to think divergently (Vulchanova, et al., 2015).

In a regional newspaper in Trondheim named Adressa, an interesting article was published. The author of the article, Astri Holm, assistant professor at the Department of Teacher and Interpreter Education in the Region Sør-Trøndelag, asks “do we think it is a resource to get citizens in Norway who can master Arabic so well that they can communicate with people, culture and develop economic and cultural ties to a language community with over 170 million people?” (Holm, 2010). Through asking these rhetorical questions, Holm acknowledges different ways the society may benefit from the language competence among the minority-language speaking citizens.

**Language as an individual resource**

Language is also considered as a resource on an individual level (NOU, 2010; Baker, 2011). It “constitutes an essential part of people’s identity, and a well-developed language is almost a prerequisite for participating actively in today’s society” (NOU, 2010:7, p. 181, my translation). Most young students navigate through their everyday life trying to find themselves and where they belong. Many multicultural students find this phase especially difficult, due to having several cultures to respond to. Nevertheless, speaking several languages may bring along abilities such as different ways of thinking as well as other sets of values, all important components of one’s identity (Vulchanova, et al., 2015; Baker & Jones, 1998). These values may not only be beneficial for the society, but also in the classroom.

Since language and identity are strongly linked together, the school’s role as the source of knowledge and the formation of citizens is crucial. The Norwegian school is by law responsible and required to stimulate the pupils’ in their development of identity as well as social and cultural competence (Education Act, 1998, Section 1-2; UDIR, 2015a) By stimulating the students in their personal growth and identity, they learn how to “develop ethical, social and cultural competence” and the ability to understand the democracy as well as democratic participation (UDIR, 2015a).

When successful, this may lead to many positive consequences for the students’ perspective as well as their learning. Several studies have shown that young multicultural students, with a
A stronger relationship with family as well as placing emphasis on maintaining an ethnic identity, do very well in school, and by maintaining their native language and their ethnic identity they contribute to promoting social integration (Rumbaut, 1994; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). In addition, The Official Norwegian Report emphasizes how motivating and of great importance it is for students to get the opportunity to show several aspects of their own identity in school (NOU 2011:7).

Studies also show that multilingualism can contribute to metalinguistic awareness, which may be defined as the ability to reflect upon language itself and its structure as well as knowing if a written or an oral statement is correct or not, without necessarily being able to state the reason for why it is (Herdina & Jessner, 2002; Haukås, 2014). The term is said to be subordinate to the term metacognition which is referred to as “one’s knowledge concerning one’s own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them” (Haukås, 2014). Because, from a multilingual perspective, it is said that students that are multilingual have a stronger degree of metalinguistic awareness than those who do not (Haukås, 2014). Jessner (2006, referred in Haukås, 2014), suggests that “students’ first language is present with the students, no matter what” and that “the students always make a comparison between the languages, both knowingly and unknowingly” (p.4). Further research also shows how awareness of one’s own thoughts and knowledge make students better to learn and change. It makes the active students more equipped to evaluate what it takes to master a learning situation as well as assessing what types of strategies are needed to solve the task (Haukås, 2014). Vivian Cook (2001) supports this view, and also argues that the students’ L1 may be used as a tool to transfer their language competence to learning a second language, stating that the students’ use of their L1 does not prevent them from acquiring another language.

However, for multilingualism to be considered as a resource for the students when it comes to metacognition and metalingual awareness, Haukås (2014), argues that students have to be aware of what they already know and how this can be utilized for further learning. There needs to be an awareness of how they can use their knowledge in order to support further language learning and she suggests that it should be a part of the language teaching; an awareness of what resources are and how to use them (Haukås, 2014; NOU NR.7, 2011).

I have presented Ruiz’s (1984) language orientations, before examining the language as a problem, right and resource in a Norwegian context. Another interesting question that derives
from this is whose language orientations are relevant to classroom teaching? Research has argued that teacher themselves are language policy makers (Menken & García, 2010). This also includes English instructions in Norway. Since there are no official instructions in policy documents with respect to which language to apply or how much the English language should be present, the variation of language use in English classroom differ greatly (Brevik et al., forthcoming). These approaches will be presented later in this chapter (See 2.4 Language use in English classrooms).

### 2.3 Translanguaging

The term *translanguaging* derives from the Welsh word *trawsieithu* and was originally formulated by Cen Williams (García & Li Wei 2014). The original meaning of the word referred to an educational practice, where the students were asked to switch languages for receptive or productive use (García & Li Wei 2014) The term *translanguaging* is defined as a process that takes place when using one linguistic repertoire, which consists of all the linguistic tools in any language one masters, to make meaning, shape experiences and gain understanding and knowledge (García & Li Wei, 2014). The term is further explained as a linguistic process where both languages are “used in a dynamic and functionally integrated manner to organize and mediate mental processes in understanding, speaking, literacy, and, not least, learning” (Lewis et al., 2012, p. 641).

From an educational perspective, Garcia et al. (2006) on one hand define translanguaging as the use of several languages in a classroom, whereas Martin (2005), explains it as the use of two languages. One of them is the official community language and whereas the second one is the official language of the lesson. García & Li Wei (2014) on the other hand, dismisses this definition, and further regard translanguaging neither as two separate languages nor a synthesis of different language practices or to a crossing of two languages. It refers to mediation the identities and cognitive activities of the students, enabling them make meaning by the use of their language repertoire and thus expand it. (García & Li Wei, 2014).
“translanguaging refers to new language practices that make visible the complexity of language exchanges among people with different histories, and releases histories and understandings that had been buried within fixed language identities constrained by nation states” (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 21).

In other words, language as we know it is socially constructed and distinguished from one another. The idea of translanguaging, however, contradicts this division of languages. It involves the notion that there is one linguistic repertoire, instead of many separated into socially constructed languages.

For many, translanguaging is very closely linked to code-switching. As the term implies, the epistemological understanding of code-switching deals with switching from one language code to another (García & Kleifgen, 2018). One could argue, that the potential of using code-switching in language training has perhaps been underestimated. The technique has been considered as excessively violating the two accepted languages, which are seen as separate and autonomous. Furthermore, some argue that the use of code-switching is considered a lack of language competence instead of tool to make oneself understood in the given context (García & Kleifgen, 2018).

Despite the same elements in the conceptual explanations, researchers, who use the term translanguaging, typically distinguish concepts of translanguaging and code-switching from each other, hence the attempt to promote it. The epistemological understanding when it comes to translanguaging theory differs from the code-switching explained above, by suggesting that the aforementioned “switch” is non-existent. The reason why this “switch” is non-existent, lies in the fact that multilinguals are:

“selecting or inhibiting (or not) different features in their unitary repertoire based on the given communicative situation. In other words, when called upon to perform using what society calls “English,” bilinguals inhibit those features from their repertoire that are associated with Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, Vietnamese, and so on. But when bilinguals are among other bilinguals and in bilingual communities where their language use is not monitored by school authorities or other, they do not always have to exercise such restraint” (García & Kleifgen, p.62, 2018).
Furthermore, Ofelía García and Jo Anne Kleifgen (2018) argue that translanguaging within social contexts thus becomes the norm, where the speakers are free to speak and construct meaning using their entire language repertoire. García & Kleifgen (2018) present two different versions of translanguaging. The first version, by MacSwan (2017) posit that an emergent bilingual, which they explain as an individual speaking a language other than English in addition to not speak English very well, is *incomplete*, when the individual enters the classroom. This view argues that they still lack a second language system (MacSwan, 2017). The second version of translanguaging by García and Li Wei (2014) and Otheguy et al. (2015), on the other hand, suggest differently. They argue he or she is not *incomplete* but rather *full*, when walking into the classroom. Instead of being incomplete, he or she is in possession of a unitary and full linguistic system.

The adaptation of these two versions of translanguaging has different pedagogical outcomes. On the one hand, MacSwan’s (2017) view could lead to teachers being responsible for having to add a second language to students, which they regard as lacking. On the other hand, the view of Otheguy et al. (2015) present the belief that the teachers establish the affordance in the classroom in order for the students “to have social opportunities to acquire new features to incorporate into their own linguistic system and expand it” (García & Kleifgen, p. 64, 2018). Furthermore, this view enables the students to obtain new features and add and incorporate them into their unitary linguistic system. Moreover, the students will be able to use different features and obtain new ones, resulting in improving the student’s linguistic skills. To sum up, the starting point of this view can be divided into two. (1) The students’ rich unitary language system is expandable, and (2) it is also capable of adapting to new sociolinguistic situations. When speaking of translanguaging and translanguaging practices in this thesis, it will refer to mediating students’ identities and cognitive activities by enabling the students to make meaning by using their language repertoire and thus expand it (García & Li Wei, 2014).

### 2.3.1 Translanguaging in education and as a concept to teach

Why is translanguaging pedagogy in educational context so important? García and Li Wei (2014) argue that this type of pedagogy contributes to building on minority language students’ linguistic strengths. Furthermore, they argue that it also “reduces the risk of
alienation at school by incorporating languaging and cultural references familiar to language-minoritized students” as well as contributing to learn meaningfully (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 92).

Translanguaging in teaching is not a well-known concept among teachers in the Norwegian school system but one can argue that the use of this pedagogy still is present in Norwegian classrooms. In terms of research literature, the first reference, that to my knowledge uses the term translanguaging is Dewilde & Igland (2015). In our neighboring country Sweden, however, the term has become widely known and has even been employed by the Swedish National Agency for Education, which is subordinate to Swedish Ministry of Education and Research. In light of English teaching in Norwegian classrooms, it can be said that it is not unusual to switch between the languages English and Norwegian. However, these languages are the ones dominating in the classroom and thus limits potential learning opportunities that can be created by using other languages spoken by the students (Brevik et al., forthcoming). Research emphasizes the importance of translanguaging pedagogy for minority students, arguing that it “builds on students’ linguistic strengths” and “reduces the risk of alienation at school by incorporating languaging and cultural references familiar to language-minoritized students” (García & Li Wei, 2014, p. 92).

When it comes to using translanguaging to teach, it can be done both naturally and officially. García and Li Wei (2014) distinguishes these terms saying as follows:

“Natural translanguaging refers mostly to acts by students to learn, […], although it may also include the teachers’ use of translanguaging with individuals, pairs and small groups “to ensure full understanding of the subject material” […]. In contrast, official translanguaging is conducted and set up by the teacher. An official translanguaging pedagogy includes more planned action of the teachers in interaction with students” (p. 91).

These can be realized in several different ways in the classroom. First, natural translanguaging is exemplified as using as well as shifting between two languages as support to learn one language. Secondly, implementing official translanguaging may include using different languages to “deepen explanations to the class of complex parts of the topic being taught” or teachers encouraging and awaiting students to give an account of what they have
learned through using their entire language repertoire (García & Li Wei, 2014, p.91). By doing this, the students will be able to show a complete understanding of the learning objectives (García & Li Wei, 2014). Since this study uses a lesson with translanguaging practices was created, and official translanguaging pedagogy has been implemented. The English lesson encouraged the students to use their native language and background to complete the given task.

2.3.2 Language use in English classrooms

English instructions in Norwegian classrooms varies between these approaches: monolingual, bilingual or multilingual approach (Breivik et al., forthcoming). The choice of which approach each teacher uses is usually linked to an ideology they believe is the most efficient for their students’ English learning. Moreover, the approach that each teacher prefers and selects to use may have a decisive effect on students in the classroom. In an ongoing research conducted by Brevik et al. (forthcoming), these approaches are presented in light of English instruction in Norway.

The monolingual approach supports the idea of using only English in the classroom is the best way to learn the language. This approach believes that speaking, hearing and reading English will improve the students’ English proficiency (Brevik et al., forthcoming). Vivian Cook (2001) states that many methods used when teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) focuses on the idea of eliminating the presence of L1. Moreover, in Norway, the monolingual approach has been a leading trend when it comes to English instructions and is still a practice and ideology that teachers and teacher students strive to carry out (Brevik et al., forthcoming).

The bilingual approach is also regarded as a leading practice in English classrooms in Norway, and refers to teacher and students’ use of another language in addition to English. Classroom practices linked to this approach may happen spontaneously or consciously in different sematic forms (Brevik et al., forthcoming). Furthermore, the bilingual approach supports the idea of using majority L1 in the classroom, arguing against the assumption that the use of L1 prevents them from acquiring English (Cook, 2001; Brevik et al., forthcoming). Research shows that the practice, where students and teacher are switching between English
Lastly, the multilingual approach refers to recognizing an including the use of L1 in the English lesson. This approach differs from bilingual approach by not only using Norwegian as L1 strategically, but also other L1 present in the classroom since the multilingual approach also recognizes the diversity when it comes to the students’ language background. (Brevik, forthcoming). Moreover, the multilingual approach supports the notion that multilingual students have stronger degree of metalinguistic awareness, which may contribute to students becoming better language learners (Haukås, 2014).

To sum up, the different approaches have different views on which language or languages should be used as a support in the English lesson. The monolingual and bilingual approaches are the most frequent used ones in Norway, where the first-mentioned refers to the use of English exclusively, whereas the latter-mentioned refer however they do not include the students’ L1, which thus excludes the

### 2.4 The curriculum

The purpose of the Education Act (1998) is to ensure that all students’ rights are taken care of and is reflected in all steering documents used in schools. The core curriculum, which focuses on the role of education when it comes to forming responsible citizens, elaborates the statement of the legislative purpose (§1-1) and it consists of value-based, cultural and knowledge-based foundation for primary and secondary education (UDIR, 2015; Education act, 1998, §1-1).

In this study, Section 1-3 in the Education Act (1998) is central. It deals with *adapted education* and it says as following:

*Education shall be adapted to the abilities and aptitudes of the individual pupil, apprentice and training candidate.*

Norwegian schools are legally required to adapt the education by implementing different methods to ensure as much learning as possible for students. Since the study focuses on
multilingual students, the concept of adapted education in the core and English curriculum, will be seen in light of multilingualism.

Firstly, when it comes to the core curriculum, which focuses on collective learning values across subjects, it mentions the importance of personal development and diverse interpersonal relation. In addition to this, section 1-3 is present, stating that teachers and the lessons should meet the students’ abilities in the classroom (UDIR, 2015a; Education Act, 1998, section 1-3). Even though it mentions the importance of a positive view on diversity, terms such as multilingualism and multiculturalism are absent.

Secondly, we have the English subject curriculum and is divided into four main subject areas; Language learning, Oral communication, Written communication and Culture, society and literature. There English subject has several competence aims linked to the fourth, seventh and tenth grade in lower secondary school. In upper secondary school, it is after year 1 in specialization in general studies and after year 2 in vocational studies (KD, 2006, 2013). Language learning is in this study the most relevant main subject area and will be investigated further in light of section 1-3 multilingualism.

The main subject area Language learning mentions that learning English contributes to multilinguals that learning language can be an important part of our personal development (KD, 2006, 2013). In other words, language is a strong instrument for achieving and strengthening insight, knowledge and understanding of one’s own language learning, other cultures and language usage. An important point that the curriculum emphasizes, is the use of one’s native language when learning English:

The main subject area Language learning focuses on what is involved in learning a new language and seeing relationships between English, one’s native language and other languages. It covers knowledge about the language, language usage and insight into one’s own language learning. The ability to evaluate own language usage and learning needs and to select suitable strategies and working methods is useful when learning and using the English language (KD, 2006, 2013).

In short, this main subject area emphasizes on reflecting upon language beyond just speaking
it. It focuses on seeing languages in relation to each other as well as evaluating the use of language and the use of strategies to improve their language learning and ability.

One of the competence aims after year 10 within this main subject area states that the students should be able to “identify significant linguistic similarities and differences between English and one’s native language and use this knowledge in one’s own language learning” (KD, 2006, 2013). The concept of adapted education is clearly anchored in this main subject area, and the competence aim does not limit multilingual students to only see English in relation to the majority language, but expects the students to use their multilingualism.

2.5 Prior research

Previous research has studied multilingualism as an approach and competence in the Norwegian school context (Burner & Carlsen, 2017; Krulatz & Torgersen, 2016; Krulatz, Steen-Olsen & Torgersen, 2017). To knowledge, three master theses within this topic have been written (Nesse, 2008; Iversen, 2015; Pedersen, 2016). I have included three prior research in my thesis, that are relevant for thesis and will be presented below.

Šurkalović (2014) looks further into to what degree future teachers are able to meet the linguistic diversity in schools, teaching English to students who do not have Norwegian as their native language. This is especially linked to one particular competence aim in the English subject curriculum, that states the importance of seeing the learning process of English in relation to one’s own native language and other languages. Šurkalović used a survey measuring student teachers’ knowledge and competence to guide students in order for them to reach the aims in the subject curriculum. The participants of the study were students who were in different phases of the education process. The results showed that the majority of the students lack the necessary knowledge and competence to teach English in a multilingual classroom. Šurkalović (2014) calls for a change in the teacher education, and provides suggestions to how the education may improve in order for teacher students gain knowledge about teaching English to multilingual students.

The research conducted by Dahl and Krulatz (2016) continues the research made by Šurkalović by studying working teacher. They investigate what kind of education and knowledge about multilingualism English teachers in Norway have. In addition, they also
examine the extent to which English teachers in Norway are prepared to work with multilingual students, both in teaching English to multilingual students, and in terms of exploiting the potential of multilingualism in the classroom (Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, p.2). The results show that English teachers working with multilingual students have little formal competence when it comes to teaching them English. When the teachers were asked whether they felt prepared to work with multilingual students, more than half answered “Fairly prepared”. However, when they were asked whether they had education or training in working with multilingual students, a clear majority answered “No”. The study, nevertheless, shows that there is a willingness among teachers to learn more within this field, with more than half answering “Yes”.

Finally, Iversen (2017) examines minority students’ use of their L1 in an English classroom in Norway. Firstly, he investigates whether the minority students find the use of their L1 prolific when learning English. He further investigates how these students make use of their L1 when learning English. The study shows how some students saw their L1 as useful in their English classroom, yet the majority did not see their L1 as beneficial in their English language learning. Despite that, the minority students who saw their L1 as useful was able to explain how they made use of it by giving examples. The study also discovered teachers’ lack of support concerning the minority students’ use of L1 (Iversen, 2017).

My research will investigate how multilingual students and their teacher experience challenges and opportunities in a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, when both the teachers and the students are encouraged to practice strategies that include the use of the students’ native language.
3 Methodology

In this chapter, I will present the methods I have used in order to investigate how a teacher and her students have experienced translanguage practices in their English lesson.

This chapter begins with introducing the research design (3.1) and research tools (3.2) used in this study. It is followed by a presentation of the participants (3.3). Then, a description of the methods used in the data collection (3.4) and analysis is given (3.5). Lastly, this chapter addresses the credibility and validity of the study (3.6).

This thesis reports on a qualitative study, which is conducted in a lower secondary school in Oslo, Norway. A lesson with translanguageing practices was developed and executed and the data extracted from this lesson has been gathered using different methods. In addition to having two classroom observations, several individual semi-structured interviews with teacher and students were conducted.

3.1 Research design

The aim for this study is to explore how the students’ and their teacher experience a lesson that builds on translanguage as a resource, I have therefore chosen qualitative research approach, which is, according to Kvale & Brinkmann (2009), a rather useful design when the aim is to get an insight into the participants own perspectives. There are only a few studies related to English teaching in multicultural and multilingual classrooms in Norway. However, as presented in the theory section, previous studies have mainly focused on exploring the extent teachers (1) and student teachers (2) feel qualified to teach English to a multilingual classroom, as well as (3) the role of the students’ L1 when learning English (Chapter 2). An interesting focus, however, is to explore teacher and student experiences linked to the practice of a multilingual approach and its possibility in English lessons. Therefore, an exploratory research with a qualitative approach is necessary in order to acquire insight into this relatively unexplored field. Victor Jupp (2006) defines the term as following:
“Exploratory research is a methodological approach that is primarily concerned with discovery and with generating or building theory. In a pure sense, all research is exploratory. [It is] wedded to the notion of exploration and the researcher as explorer.” (p. 110).

Marlow (2005) also adds that exploratory research “develops questions to be investigated by more extensive studies” (p. 334). My aim, however, is not to build or develop theory, but to gather information in order to investigate and gain better insight into the given matter of research. Another additional goal is to shed light on experiences from teacher and students and also possible opportunities that teachers may take advantage of. Since previous research has shown that teachers do not feel qualified to teach in this context, the descriptions found in this study may provide rich data description (see 3.5.1 validity) of the practices and experiences of students’ and their teacher. An investigation based on a qualitative approach is therefore particularly suitable in this research.

The previous research presented earlier, shows that the translinguaging in Norwegian school is not completely new. However, investigations of attitudes and experiences linked to lessons builds on translinguaging as a resource are left unexplored. Thus, this research may be regarded as an exploratory research. In qualitative studies, it is common to collect information using several methods and in this study, interview and observation have been combined in order to give rich information. The combination of these methods contributes to give rich data, which Maxwell points out as “data that are detailed and varied enough that they provide a full and revealing picture of what is going on” (2013, p. 126).

This study focuses on gathering different experiences linked to translinguaging practices in an English lesson, which was created by me and adapted to the class with the help of their teacher. Initially, the purpose was not to use observation as the main method to generate data but for contextual methods. However, when I observed the lessons I discovered equivalent important data, which could help give more depth to the interview and thus triangulate some of the interview data (Maxwell, 2013). I have therefore chosen to use results of observation as secondary data.
The purpose of the observation was to select a sample to interview. During my stay, I observed two lessons. In an attempt to gain an insight to the classroom dynamics and how the lessons usually are, I chose to observe an English class prior to and addition to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. Being present during the lesson with translanguaging practices, gave me the opportunity to observe the activities during the class and thus select participants.

Altogether, one teacher and six students were interviewed. Both the teacher and student interviews were semi-structured. First, I chose to interview the teacher twice, both before and after the lesson was conducted. The questions asked during the first interview session focused on gathering background information about the teacher as well her expectation before the lesson. The purpose of the second interview session was to gather information about how she experienced the lesson. Secondly, I chose to interview the students individually, asking them about their language skills as well as their experiences lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. I will come back to this later in this chapter.

This study allowed me to use several different methods to gather data. This has helped me gain deep insight into how Elisabeth and her students have experienced the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. By using these research strategies, it has helped me to verify my findings and establish validity to my research. The data collection was done during October and November 2017.

![Figure 1: The research design of the study, illustrating the steps of the data collection](image-url)

Figure 1 illustrates the research design used in this study. In the first step, which is marked green, data is not collected. However, it is included due to the development of the lesson, that
builds on translanguaging as a resource, being a comprehensive and important step of this study. The rest, which is marked blue, are the steps to the actual data collection.

3.2 Research tools

In order to detect occurrences and investigate experiences of a particular lesson, I have chosen to use several tools, which act as supportive and reinforcing for understanding the topic at hand. There are two methods that are both appropriate and necessary tools to investigate my research question: (1) observation and (2) interviews. These methods accommodate flexibility of the data collection as well as allowing me to triangulate and thus increase the credibility of my data (see 3.6 Research Credibility).

3.2.1 Interview

As earlier mentioned, both students and teacher has been interviewed. Patton (1990) presents a loose and general definition of interviews, saying that it enables the possibility for the interviewer to find out what is on the interviewees’ mind. Lisa M. Given (2008) further explains and define in person interview, saying that it is: “a data collection method where the researcher is in the same location as the participant and ask question to which the participant responds” (p. 432). In person interviews has come to be very beneficial for this research. Several of the student participants expressed themselves more with their body language than orally. Thus, in person interviews allowed me as a researcher to observe more than reading the transcript.

So, interviews help me facilitate an arena where the interviewees are able to express themselves and thus the interviewer gets to know the participants’ experiences and to “learning details about their views” (Given, 2008, p. 432). In order for the researcher to the gather relevant information in light of the given thesis statement, several measurements may be taken.

3.2.2 Semi structured interviews

The interview method I have deemed fruitful for this research, both with the teacher and students, is a semi-structured interview. The first interview conducted with the teacher is considered as a semi-structured narrative interview since the participant is asked to remember
her previous experience linked to teaching English to multilingual students and adapting the lesson so that the students get to use their L1 (Flick, 2014, p. 265).

The second teacher interview and all of the student interviews are semi-structured. Allowed the teacher and the students to share their experiences concerning the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. The semi-structured element on this type of interview, which is considered as highly flexible, supported me with two key points. First, it is adequately structured to address the specific dimensions of my research question. Secondly, it left me room to step out of the guide to further study the participants and thus explore interesting issues, which made it possible to offer new meanings to the matter of study (Galletta, 2012). It made it possible for me to be flexible and to further explore opinions and experiences, by asking new unprepared questions based on given answer (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). More about the conducting of the interviews will be presented later in this thesis.

3.2.3 Observation
According John Sharp (2012) observation in education is used to capture dynamics and complexities of specific activities and events as it happens. Moreover, he states that the aims of employing this tool are two. Firstly, it is to gather comprehensive information about what participants actually do in the original situation by both watching them and listening to them, instead of asking them. Secondly, this tool functions as a mean to investigate the participants’ actions, interactions and other behavior in close detail. In this research, observation provides an opportunity to witness and apprehend how the students and teachers meet and engage during the lessons. This also functioned as a tool to select participants for the interview as well as adding new questions to the interview guide.

3.3 Participants
3.3.1 Choice of school
The Norwegian school system reflects the multicultural society Norway is and consists of students from many different backgrounds. Statistics from Oslo Municipality provides numbers that show multiculturalism in schools in Oslo. It shows that in school year 2017/2018, 24767 out of the 63904 students in Oslo, were minority language-speaking students in Oslo. In other words, multilingual students make up 39.1% of all the students in Oslo and the numbers have increased by 0.3% since 2015 (Oslo Municipality, 2018).
However, some schools have a significantly higher proportion of multilingual students than others. Statistics, that are publicly available, presents numbers from two schools located on each end of a continuum. They illustrate the immense differences in the percentage of multilingual students in Norwegian schools. Rommen School is located in east of Oslo, and 98% of the students attending are speakers of a minority language, whereas Berg School is located in West of Oslo and has 0% Oslo Municipality, 2018). The map presented below, shows the numbers presented above are no coincidence. And there is a clear pattern. While schools in the East have a larger proportion of schools with a high percentage of students with minority backgrounds, we see the opposite in schools in the west, where they have a very low proportion of students with minority background if no students at all.

Figure 2: Speaker of minority language in Oslo, TV2 (2015).

Since the matter in this study deals with multilingual and multicultural students, it was therefore most appropriate to conduct research at a school in the East. There are approximately 50 multicultural schools in Oslo. As my workplace is a school with a high proportion of multilingual, I chose, for simplicity, to carry out the research there and thus made it easier to find willing participants. However, it is important to clarify that neither the class nor student participants were or are my students.

The participants in this research are multicultural and may be divided into three categories:
the teacher (1) student participants (2) and the class (3). The teacher and student participants were interviewed, whereas important observations were made of the class, and has thus been included as secondary data.

### 3.3.2 Teacher participant
The teacher was chosen based on two criteria: (1) the teacher should be an English teacher and (2) she should teach a multilingual and multicultural classroom. Since every class in the school fulfill the last criteria, I only needed to find a willing English teacher to participate. After a meeting with my colleagues, I found teacher and a class that did not collide with my own lessons. The teacher participant teaches several English classes and could therefore choose between year 8 to 10, in depth studies of English or regular English. Finally, we found a suitable class.

The teacher, which will further be referred to as *Elisabeth*, is American with a Mexican background and speaks four languages, including Norwegian. She has education and experience within teaching both from the US and Norway. In addition to having a Bachelor’s degree from the US she also finished her Masters from the University of Oslo in Norway. Furthermore, Elisabeth has over 20 years of experience working as a teacher in addition to experience of teaching multilingual students both in the US and in Norway.

### 3.3.3 Student participants
The male students make up the majority of the class, which consists of 18 students in total. Whereas 14 of the students are male, only 4 of the students are female. However, the sample includes both genders in order to reflect the gender diversity in the classroom. The student participants of this study were selected on the basis of two criteria. Firstly, the participant must have given consent through filling in the declaration of consent. Secondly, I chose 6 students, among those who accepted. The levels of the students are in this study irrelevant. However, due to a desire to gather different experiences, I observed the activity among the students during the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, in order to choose students who were active to a low, mediate and high degree. By doing this I attempt to ensure a variation of feedbacks and experiences, which is also referred to as *negative cases*. Also, an effort of interviewing different students with different native languages has been made in
order to avoid experiences related to the language, but rather encountering different experiences which may be linked to different languages and thus increase the validity.

All of the students have gotten a female pseudonym; Nosheen, Aisha, Kaaveri, Thien, Dalisay and Hayat will be presented later in this chapter. The first student to be presented in this research is Nosheen. She is a student with a Pakistani background and her native language is Urdu. In addition, the student also mentions Norwegian and English.

The second student is Aisha. She has also a Pakistani background. As well as speaking Norwegian, English and having Urdu as her native language, Aisha also speaks a little Punjabi. When asked about all the languages she speak, Aisha also includes Spanish as one of the languages she barely speaks.

The next and the third student is Kaaveri. Her native language is Tamil, and also speaks Norwegian and English. Just like Aisha, Kaaveri also adds Spanish to the list on which languages she speaks.

The fourth student is Thien. She has a Vietnamese background and has thus Vietnamese has her native language. In addition to this, she also speaks Norwegian and English.

Dalisay is a student with a Filipino background. As well as speaking both Norwegian and English, she also speaks Tagalog and Ilokano. Both Tagalog and Ilokano are languages spoken in The Philippines.

The last student to be presented in this chapter is Hayat. She has Arabic as her native language, and additionally speaks Farsi, Norwegian and English.

3.4 Data collection

As illustrated in figure 1 (see Research design 3.1), step 1 of the data collection illustrates the methods used in order to conduct this study are interviews and observation. Initially, interviews were supposed function as the only data collecting method in this study. However, since I discovered several interesting and important findings in the observation, I have chosen
to include these. Therefore, the follow-up interviews are my primary data (1), whereas my the observations of lessons are my secondary data (2). This study observes and explores students’ and teacher’s experience of the lesson with translanguaging practices. Since the data collection is linked to experiences related to this lesson, this has been created and developed, before these procedures were carried out.

The collection of data used in this study took place over a period of 2 weeks. As illustrated in figure 1 (see 3.1 Research design), step 1 entails the development of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. This procedure does not collect data in itself, but has, due to its importance in this study, been included.

The procedure of the actual data collection consists of 3 steps and beings with step 2, which is pre-observation teacher interview and focuses on investigating the teachers’ background, her previous experience and expectations conducting a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. Step 3 is classroom observation and the aim is to observe the classroom dynamics in a usual lesson. Step 4 is classroom observation of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, which mainly focused on selecting participants. Step 5a is post-observation student interviews, whereas 5b is post-observation teacher interview, which both focus on gathering information about their experiences linked to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource.

3.4.1 Step 1: Developing and executing the translanguaging lesson

The first step was to develop a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. The comprehensive process consisted of reading relevant theory (see García & Li Wei, 2014), examining studies linked to translanguaging (see, Dewilde, 2018) and then developing the lesson. In addition to this, I also got the opportunity to attend 2017 Einar Haugen Lecture given by Ofelia Garcia at the University of Oslo, where she gave an introduction of the notion of translanguaging pedagogy. These steps have given me more knowledge and insight into this field and existing practices, which has influenced the making of a lesson built on translanguaging as a resource. In addition to this, I also received valuable feedback from my supervisors that helped increase the quality of the lesson. Overall, the process of developing the lesson was comprehensive, challenging and very interesting.
Since aim of this study is to explore the participant’s experience linked to translanguaging practices, the students’ identity linked to language and background had to be both present and central during the lesson. My starting point for developing this lesson, was to follow the school’s practice in terms of the structure of the lessons. After a general plan for the lesson was made, the next step was for me and Elisabeth to adapt it to the class and integrate it with the theme and topic which already has been planned by the English teacher.

The development of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource also required me to use my multilingual network. After an extensive round of looking words up in several dictionaries and finding a suitable translation, I received help from friends and acquaintances who speak the languages spoken in the classroom. They proofread the words to see if it was correctly translated into the different languages. Whereas some suggested different spelling of the words, others gave me another more suitable translation.

The next step was to give the students their homework, which would be used in the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. They were given the homework during the lesson prior to the lesson with translanguaging practices, and Elisabeth explained the homework carefully. They were supposed to ask one of their parents or their siblings about a hero or a person who has helped the poor. They were told to write notes as the story was told in their native language and write more about it. In addition to drawing anything linked to the story, they also had to prepare to share the story in English the next lesson. To prepare themselves, they had to translate their notes into English. Figure 3 illustrates the form of the sheet.
The lesson was divided into three phases. The initial phase is called a “starter”, which is a task the students meet when they first do when they arrive to class. The school has a protocol where each lesson has to begin with a “starter”; a challenging yet solvable task whose purpose is to activate students’ prior knowledge while at the same time can be solved by all students, despite the various levels of knowledge present in the classroom. As illustrated in the Figure 3, the students were given a set of English words connected to Robin Hood, and a table of the words translated to all the languages present in the classroom. The students were encouraged to suggest a better translation if there was a need. An error was detected during the lesson. The students were supposed to fill in the blank row, with the given English words. However, there are five column and only for words. How this played out will be presented later in observation data (See 4.1.2. A lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource).
The second phase, as illustrated in figure 4, was based on an oral activity, where the students shared the stories brought from home with their learning partner. Furthermore, they were told to elaborate why they do or do not like the story they had brought from home. In addition to this, they were also told to explain their drawing linked to the story.

Lastly, the third phase required the students to write and to be orally active. To ensure linguistically mixed groups, a map of the classroom was made for this activity.
The task was divided into three. In the first exercise, the students were supposed to repeat the starter (see figure 6), but now only choose to translate 2-3 words in their notebook. Secondly, the students were supposed to write down an explanation of each of the words. Thirdly, in groups, the students introduced the word in their native language and then proceed to explain the word in English. Without any support from the sheets given, the students listened carefully to the explanation given, until one answered with the correct English term.

Alongside developing the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, I also developed two interview guides, where each was adapted to the teacher interviews and the student interviews. The interview guide created for the teacher and the student interviews is divided into three parts, which provided structure to the interview process. Furthermore, the structures will be presented in the following sections. Moreover, the complete interview guide is included in Appendix 2.

3.4.2 Step 2: Pre-observation teacher interview

In step 2 the teacher participant was interviewed prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, and was mainly divided into two themes; background and expectation. In addition to gaining insight into the teacher’s knowledge, background and previous experience concerning teaching English to multilingual students, the purpose of this step also included to explore her expectations regarding challenges and opportunities as well as her thoughts about how the students will experience the lesson.
During our time working with adapting the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource to this particular class, me and the interviewee became used to communicating with each other while mixing Norwegian and English. The initial plan was to conduct the interview in Norwegian. However, the interviewee is a native-English speaker and she was told that she may answer in English as well, and thus did accordingly. The interview was both conducted in both languages without it interfering negatively with the interview and the teacher mainly answered in English.

3.4.3 Step 3: Classroom observation

Step 3 focused on observing a lesson prior to the lesson with translangauing practice. This lesson was developed by the teacher herself, as opposed to the second lesson with translangauing practices, which was developed by me. The first and most important aim of this step was to get an insight into the classroom dynamics in order for me to view the two lessons in relation to each other. Therefore, this observation round was unstructured and no themes were made beforehand. In relation to the Step 4, observational notes from this lesson have proven to be both interesting and relevant for this research and has consequently been included. In the beginning of the lesson, the class was given information about my presence and my role in the coming weeks. I observed the lesson by sitting in the back of the classroom. The purpose behind my location in the classroom was to reduce any reactivity and observer effect caused by presence.

3.4.4 Step 4: Observation of a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource

Step 4 consisted of observing the teacher conducting the developed lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. I was more active during this lesson, compared to step 3. As the tasks were given, I walked around the classroom to observe the student activity and listen to the pair and group conversations between the students. I engaged once, with a group consisting of Arabic speaking students, asking them factual questions out of curiosity. In addition to the student text, which they brought from home (see figure 3 on 3.4.1 Step 1: Developing the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource), this observation proved
to be rather important for step 4: the interviews. The participants were chosen on the basis of their activity during the class. In addition to this, observations from this lesson has shown to be important for this research and has therefore been included as secondary data.

3.4.5 Step 5a: Student interviews

The purpose of this interview sequence was to gather students’ experiences of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. If the interview was conducted in English, it could be problematic and limiting for the students to express themselves. To avoid this, it was considered appropriate and efficient to conduct the interview using Norwegian since it is the language of schooling. The interviews were semi-structured and were conducted individually. In addition to following the interview guide, the semi-structured interview allowed me to form new follow-up questions along the way, based on responses and comments that I considered relevant to the research question.

Prior to the interviews, I told the students about my intentions with the interviews. They were assured that other information linked to level of achievements during this lesson or in general is meaningless for this research. Furthermore, I stressed that it was their experiences and views related to the lesson that was important for me to learn. Despite being told and assured that the interviews will be conducted in Norwegian, some students still believed that it would be held in English, which seemed to make some of them nervous. Consequently, this was clarified before the interview started, which seemingly made the ambience more comfortable.

The structure of the interview guide for the student interviews, which are divided into three, are arranged thematically; background, experience and additional information. All of the questions are open-ended questions, and the first question within the divided themes allows and prepares for a wide range of answers, whereas the subsequent follow-up questions are more limited in terms of what can be considered as an answer to the question. The first part of the interview, consisted of a few questions related to their language background; what languages do they speak and which one is their native language? Next, they were asked the vital questions concerning their experience related to the lesson. I wanted to know about their experiences and views related to this lesson and how it felt to be able to use their own native language in English lessons and whether they considered the use of it as helpful or useless. Lastly, they were asked what they thought about getting the opportunity to use their native
language and other languages they may master, in the future. Towards the end of the interview, I asked students if there was anything else they wanted to add, thus giving the students the chance to answer questions profoundly as well as to share new information, views or comments that they did not get to communicate. When interviewing some of the students, I found it challenging to elicit answers. The student interviews were relatively short compared to the teacher interviews, and lasted about 5-10 minutes. The data material from the student interviews itself is not as in-depth as I intended it to be. However, there are several important and relevant findings that are included in this research, along with the findings found in teacher interviews and observation.

3.4.6 Step 5b: Post-observation teacher interview
The purpose of this interview was to explore the teacher’s experience linked to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource and how it was linked to her expectations, which she shared in the interview before the lesson was conducted. Further, I asked the teacher to share her own observations regarding how the students received the lesson since she knows the students well and therefore would be able to see any change in activity. In addition to this, I was also very interested in knowing about the opportunities and challenges she observed during the lesson. In light of the use of multiple languages in the English lesson, the teacher was also asked about how she felt about the students using their native languages actively, without understanding them. The interviews with the teacher lasted 15-20 minutes, which are relatively longer compared to those conducted with the students.

3.5 Data Analysis
One of the most comprehensive processes during this research, was working with the transcription of the interviews. The processes of gathering interview data, transcribing the audiotapes and finally processing and coding data was demandin
g and time-consuming. Another interesting part of working with the transcription was analyzing the data. According to Marshall and Rossman (1990), the data analysis is a “the process of bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data” (p. 111). In the next two sections, the data analysis related to interview and observation will be accounted for using Creswell’s (2014) process of analyzing data.
3.5.1 Interview

The primary data in this research is the teacher and student interviews and the same analysis approach has been applied to both data sources. The analysis procedure was comprehensive, and consisted of several phases, which involved discovering patterns and thus creating categories or themes, as well as working back and forth to see whether more evidence can be found to support the themes (Creswell, 2014).

In order for the interview data to be analyzed, I first organized and prepared the data by transcribing them myself and I made sure to listen to the audiotapes, both before and while transcribing (Creswell, 2014). It consequently made the process of analyzing the data easier as well as the data more developing for me to thoroughly analyze it (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). Second, I read through the transcription numerous times in order to get an overview of the information gathered. Third, I began to code the transcript. I printed the transcript and read it thoroughly to acquaint myself with the data material and made notes on the margin of the transcription as well as underlining interesting and reoccurring findings. This process involved discovering patterns and thus creating categories or themes. My interview guides were already structured into themes, which made it natural to initially follow these (Miller & Crabtree, 1999). However, as already established, this research is exploratory, that allows me to investigate other interesting findings, that did not necessarily go with the already established themes. Consequently, new themes that were both central and interesting appeared. In addition to organizing all of the codes, I read the transcripts again to see whether more evidence could be found to support the established themes (Creswell, 2014). Lastly, the final phase of processing the interview data concerned assessing the interesting themes and selecting the ones presented and interpreted as findings in the result (see Results, chapter 4).

3.5.2 Observation

The two sequences of observation were mainly conducted for two reasons. Firstly, I wanted to get insight and information about the class and their dynamics. Secondly, I used it as a tool to select participants to the interview. Initially, observation was not supposed to be used as a method to generate data but assist as contextual method. Nonetheless, due to relevant findings emerging, observations have been included as secondary data.
The analysis procedure implemented on the observation was similar to the one carried out for the interviews. First, I wrote out my notes from both observations after a short period of time, after each of the lesson was conducted. As opposed to preparing the interview data for analysis, where I transcribed the interviews verbatim, observation notes allow me to give descriptions of classroom behavior, activity and conversations. Second, I went through the written data several times, getting an in-depth view of the observation data. Next, I coded the findings from the observations, using some of the same themes as the ones created while analyzing the transcript as well as creating new codes. Finally, all of the interesting themes were considered in the light of the research, where the key themes were used as results and the rest eliminated.

3.6 Research Credibility

In the following section, I will discuss the credibility and the ethical consideration of my MA study. First, I discuss validity (3.6.1), its threats and what has been done to prevent it. Second, I will discuss reliability (3.6.2), in light of observation, interview and audio recordings.

3.6.1 Validity

Qualitative research consists of investigating a given situation or a phenomenon, while collecting data using different types of qualitative methods such as interviews and observation. One of the most, if not the most comprehensive work, is the examination and the interpretation of the results in order to draw out the main findings. In addition to being an instrument for gathering data, you as a researcher must also to process the data and evaluate its relevance for the research at hand. As the result of the researcher’s important role when it comes to gathering and processing the data, it is important to identify the validity threats that may occur in the study in order to increase it. The term validity refers to whether you are measuring what you claim to measure, regardless of whether the results are credible or not (Dressel, 1954; Callara, 2008). In order to increase validity, threats need to be identified. A way to do so is to carry out a validity test, which will consequently increase the credibility. In the following, I will identify some of the threats and share the measures
**Researcher bias** concerns “the selection of data that fit the researcher’s existing theory, goals, preconceptions and the selection of data that “stand out” to the researcher”, which involves “the subjectivity of the researcher” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 124). The researcher, in other words, focuses and emphasizes findings supporting already existing presumptions. In order to avoid potential researcher bias, and thus increase the validity and credibility of the findings presented in this study, member checking was used, which I will come back to later in this chapter. The same threats of researcher bias may also occur when using observation and interviews as methods to collect data. To prevent the observational findings reflecting my bias, I have used other data to triangulate these results, which further validate the findings. Moreover, researcher bias may also affect my interview notes and findings I choose to present. To prevent eliminating diverse types of opinions and experiences and only to presenting the findings supporting my theory and preconceptions, I chose participants of the student interviews based on their activity in the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource in order to collect data reflecting different experiences.

When the data gathered is categorized as varied and detailed, as well as providing a “full and revealing picture of what is going on”, the data may be referred to as **rich data** (Maxwell, 2013, p. 126). Since the data is comprehensive, “it allows the researcher to gain a deep understanding of the topic of interest” (Braun & Clarke, 2013, p. 34). There are different ways of doing as such. In this study, multiple data collection methods have been used. The research tools that I have used, in order to ensure rich data, are observation and interviews. For observational data to be regarded as rich, the notes cannot be superficial, but rather in-depth and detailed, which depicts the setting, behavior and incidents. It “provides a direct and powerful way of learning about people’s behavior and the context in which this occurs” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 103). To ensure to gather rich data, I made sure to take notes during and after the observations. In addition to this, I took time to look at the notes after the lesson was over and thus made new and more elaborate notes after the observation. This gave me a chance to create new questions for the later interviews.

When using interview as a research tool, the purpose is to apprehend the perspectives of participants. Maxwell (2013), points out several ways of doing such by using this research tool. He says that interview firstly gives us access to the observations made of the participant. Secondly, it provides us with supplementary information that could not be seen in observation. In addition to this, interview may be also used as a tool to check the
accurateness of the observation. To gather information of this kind, I audiotaped the interview and made rough notes during the interviews. However, the data should not consist of rough notes only, but there should be a verbatim transcript of the audiotape. Consequently, in addition to taking handwritten notes during the interview, I also transcribed the interviews (see Appendix 4). By doing the following helps to make the comprehensive process of handling and working with data much easier and more thorough (Maxwell, 2013).

The purpose of this, is to explore experiences of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource and to investigate whether my observations resemble with the students’ and teacher’s experiences (Lewis-Beck et al., 2004). In order to do so, I need to triangulate. In this research, I have triangulated several data sources collected from different method in an attempt to strengthen the quality of the findings. By using multiple sources, which in study consists of teacher interviews, student interviews and classroom observation. I have reduced the belief that the conclusions only reflect the biases of a certain method. By triangulating my classroom observations with the student and teacher interviews, it has allowed me as the researcher to obtain a more reliable understanding of the investigated topics through congregating different sources. Thus, the process established conjoint finding, which can be said to add validity (Maxwell, 2013; Flick, 2014; Creswell, 2014). In addition to my findings being strengthened due to different data pointing to the same findings, triangulating my data has allowed me to increase the range of understanding within this field (Fielding & Fielding, 1986; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Fielding & Schreier, 2001).

Another measurement taken in this study in order to increase its validity is member checking and entails having a dialogue with the participants, where they were presented the data collected from them. Member checking was implemented along the way, due to its necessity and importance. After the interviews were conducted, the student and teacher participants were given the chance to know how their answers have been interpreted. I asked them, based on my key notes, if I had understood them correctly, which allowed them to confirm that the answers have been correctly understood as well as creating an arena for them to express themselves if the answers they had given had been interpreted incorrectly. I also had the opportunity to speak with the students after listening to the recordings. In the following English lesson, I was able to speak with some of the students I had interviewed, and I asked them explanatory questions related to recordings. By using this method, it
ensures that the data has been correctly understood and thus increases the validity of the findings (Creswell, 2014).

To sum up, the data collection can be divided into two: primary and secondary data. The primary data consist of the student and teacher interviews, investigating their experiences, whereas the secondary data is providing rich description of attitudes and activities, as well as preventing misunderstandings and strengthens results found in the interviews.

### 3.6.2 Reliability

Whereas some scholars regard reliability’s relevance and compatibility in qualitative research as inapt and is therefore also avoided, others argue for its rightful place within qualitative research, saying that reliability, alongside with validity, both are crucial and effective means when it comes to assessing the quality of the research. In this study, reliability is concerned with demonstrating that the researcher neither “has invented or misrepresented the collected data”, nor has been “reckless in data recording or analysis” (Thomas, 2011, p. 38).

Reliability is being discussed differently based on the different data collection methods. In the following, I will therefore mention factors, which may either increase or threaten the reliability of the methods used in this study and further discuss what I have done to enhance the reliability in this research.

**Observation reliability**

Observation reliability may be increased and threatened all depending on the observational techniques and how they are used. When it comes to observation, reliability may be enhanced through strategies, which Brassard et al. (2007) present. The first way it can be enhanced is through practice. Through training, the observer will become better at observing, and knowing how to do so, as well as how to record the observations (Brassad et al. 2008; Ary et al., 2010). Despite not having had any extensive courses concerning observation, I do have throughout the years as a student teacher, had several field placements and observation sequences, which thus have contributed to developing my observation skills.

A second way of enhancing the reliability within observational research is to have another observer present (Ary et al., 2010). By having two observers present, they will be able to
present findings that occurs in settings they both take part in. However, due to limitation of this research is that it is conducted by me only.

Another way of enhancing the reliability is through observer effect also called reactivity, which refers to “the influence the researcher [has] on the setting or individuals studied” and “occurs when the process of conducting research alter the behavior of the participants” (Maxwell, 2013, p. 124; Aurini et al., 2016, p. 62). I observed two lessons altogether; the first lesson, which was prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, had purpose to give me an insight into the dynamics in the class. In attempt to avoid the students behaving differently because of my presence, I stayed in the back of the classroom. The second observation was during the main lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource and the teacher reminded the class of my role, and that I would walk around and observe.

One of the main reasons for observing the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource and thus deeming it necessary to walk around the class, was not to evaluate activity connected to grade levels, but rather see the level of activity in the classroom and consequently pick student interview participants who were active to a low, average or high degree. The increasing degree of my visibility in the classroom compared to the first lesson, might have contributed the students to improve their behavior and “work harder”.

**Interview reliability**

Interview reliability refers to the consistency and accuracy of the collected data; would interview yield the same answer if the interview were conducted by two different people? (Gerrish & Lacey, 2010; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). However, since the interviews in this study are semi-structured, which gives me, as the researcher, the flexibility to explore interesting topics by asking new question linked to their answers, it would be very unlikely for another researcher to repeat the interview by asking the same follow-up questions and yield the same answers.

**Audio recording**

There are several methods a researcher can use to document the answers the interviewees provide. Due to human memory being “prone to partial recall, bias and error”, relying on vaguely written notes as the only way of documenting answers may not be considered as highly reliable (Denscombe, 2014, p. 196). In order to eliminate this reliability threat, I relied
on audio recordings. This way, I collected all the information and experiences voiced during the interview. The downside with this is according to Denscombe (2014), is the fact that audio recordings only captures the speech and thus excludes vital non-verbal communication and contextual factors. Consequently, notes during the interview were therefore taken along the interview. Moreover, I could rely on listening to the audio several times instead of relying my memory of the interview.

### 3.6.3 Ethics and limitations

As a researcher investigating the participants’ experiences, there are several areas related to research ethics that need to be considered. Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) mention four areas, which are considered important to deem when conducting interview: informed consent, confidentiality, potential consequences and role of the researcher.

The students were invited to participate in this voluntary research. In addition to getting information about me and my role in the classroom, the students received a consent form, which was explained to them. Moreover, all important information was thoroughly explained, including the background and purpose of the study, what participation in the study entails and what happens to the information that is collected. It informs that the gathered information will be anonymized and that their identity is held confidential. In addition to this, my contact information was included in case the student or guardian would have any questions regarding the research. The fact that the participation was voluntary was also stressed. The students chose themselves whether they would be interviewed or not. In addition, the students needed the approval of their parents to participate, due to the fact that they below the age of fifteen years, and thus had to read and sign the declaration (Balto et al., 2006). Furthermore, the form demanded that both the student and a guardian had to sign the decision taken.

Research projects that process personal information must be reported to Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD) and thus be approved before conducting the study. A student’s native language, which is mentioned in this study, is regarded as a background variable. After consulting with NSD, I was told that my research did not trigger the reporting obligation and confidentiality was ensured if I did the following; First, the students’ native languages are not combined with other background variable such as age, gender and school and measurements for example giving all the participants in this study a female pseudonym. If this information
is combined, it will be a decrease of anonymity considered as personal information and thus the obligation to report will be triggered. Second, there are no names or other personal information on audio recordings or the transcripts. In the beginning of the interview, the students received names such as student 1 and student 2.

This research, however, has its limitations. Firstly, as an unfortunate result of some students’ answers being relatively vague, close-ended questions were made use of. Some of the reasons to why the students answered vaguely, might be due to a combination of taking audio recordings and my role as a teacher in their school. A second limitation, which is also linked to the vague answers, is making use of close-ended questions, which might be considered as leading. Secondly, due to personal unforeseen obstacles, a fair amount of time went by between finishing transcribing the interviews and coding it for analysis.
4 Empirical data: Results

In this chapter, I will present my findings. When working with the data material, several interesting findings were discovered. The two most important findings found are (1) teacher and students find it fun and useful to work with their native language as a tool and (2) students and teacher experience that the school regards language as a problem.

In this study, the participants consist of a class and one English teacher. The observation data reflects the class as a whole, whereas the interview data consists of six student interviews and two teacher interviews. Together these findings illustrate the teacher's expectations linked to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as well as the experiences of the teacher and her students. Due to the teacher’s knowledge, previous experience as well as possessing the ability to express experiences thoroughly, the length and depth of the answers given differed greatly.

Multiple questions were asked in the interviews and the length and the depth of the answers varied greatly between the teacher and the students, and among the students themselves. The teacher offered consistently long answers that were both characterized by previous experience and knowledge about teaching English to multicultural students.

Each of these sections include extracts from the interview data or description from the observational data, which have been translated by me. First, I will present observational data (4.1), where I present the findings from the lesson prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource (4.1.1) and the actual lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource (4.1.2). Second, I will present the findings found in the teacher interviews (4.2), which was held before the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource (4.2.1) and after the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource found place (4.2.2). Thirdly, the findings from the student interview data will be presented (4.3). Unlike the rest of the results presented in this chapter, the results linked to the students are presented thematically.
4.1 Observation data

In this section, the findings made in the observations will be further presented. It consists of the observations made in a lesson prior to the one building on translanguaging as a resource, followed by the observations made in a lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. My main finding from the both of the observations, indicates a change of attitude among the students, where they first usual lesson, without my intervention, was filled commotion, whereas they were active and engaging during the second lesson with translanguaging practices.

4.1.1 A regular English lesson

As mentioned earlier, the first lesson I observed was an ordinary English lesson with no intervention from my end. was done prior to the lesson that builds on translan- guaging as a resource. The theme for this period was Heroes, and the lesson was an introduction to the Robin Hood, where the students also were oral tasks followed by a written assignment, ending the lesson with a grammar pamphlet. A significant finding found here is commotion in the classroom. The observation of this lesson showed that numerous students were not interested in joining and participating in the activities given during the lesson. Furthermore, several of the students therefore chose to be distracting to some fellow students as well as disturbing the whole class. First and foremost, the students’ participation in the class varied widely. Some students behaved, paid attention and did the tasks that were given. However, several students lost their focus quickly as soon as the oral activity was given, and the rest of the class bore evidence of noise and commotion. Some students started to loudly communicate across the classroom, whereas one student left their seats. In addition to this, objects were thrown by several students. Commotions after been given a warning, resulted in several students being sent to the school counselor.

4.1.2 A translanguaging lesson

The second lesson observed was the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, where the students were given exercises involving the use of their native languages. Several findings were discovered in the data analysis. In comparison to the first lesson, the students seemed to have had a change of attitude towards the lesson. Whereas the first lesson may be described as being filled with low student engagement and noise, the students seemed more
active and more involved. As the task was given, the students seemed attentively and worked diligently.

During the “starter”, I noticed that some students seemed confused and excited as the students look at their sheet. One student even commented the fact that neither of the column had English words. The task was further explained thoroughly, and the PowerPoint slide with the English words and the instructions was shown on the screen. In addition to the noise in the classroom becoming reduced, the student activity seemingly increased compared to activities observed during the first observation. Within a couple of minutes, many of the students raised their hands. She asks the whether the questions are linked to the task. The students seem to notice that one word on their sheet differs from one word on the table on the PowerPoint slide, as well as words given in English. Some students asked each other if the same occurred in their language. As the teacher tried to help the students, who raised their hands, she asked in plenary whether the remaining hands had the same questions, to which the students responded “yes”. Consequently, the teacher told them to try to translate that word into English, since the translation was missing. No student had thus far gotten a warning for either inappropriate behavior or commotion, unlike the first lesson where several students were sent to the school counselor. All of the students seemed to have received the exercise in a good manner.

During the second phase of this lesson (see figure 4), the students were orally active, sharing the stories they brought from home. In one group, Nosheen and another student with Urdu as native language, brought similar texts about their parents’ hero Muhammad Ali Jinnah; an Indian and Pakistani politician who fought for an independent Pakistan. Although they both brought a story about Jinnah, their presentation of him were seemingly different. Some of the students exchanged between the use of their native language, English and Norwegian. Later during the same activity, I witnessed some students leaving their seats and creating new groups, where they re-told their stories. This group consisted of Arabic speaking students, from different Arab countries. Despite speaking the same language, the students’ backgrounds were rather different. At one point, the group of 3 started discussing about dialects. I entered the conversation slowly, asking about what they were talking about. One of the students tell me that they all speak Arabic, but they are from different countries and
different continents even. She further told me that they could understand each other, but that there are some differences when it comes to intonation.

As the teacher monitored the original and new groups, one of the students from the Arab speaking group initiated a conversation outside her group and with the teacher. Hayat is one of the student participants that has been interviewed. She asked Elisabeth, in English, whether she knew what “marhaba” (مرحبا) meant, to which the teacher answered no. The student proceeded to explain that it means “hello” in Arabic. Receiving this new knowledge, the teacher thanked the student and continued telling the group that her best friend is from Syria, and that she will try to remember to greet her using the word she was just taught next time they meet. The student suddenly became the one who taught the teacher, and was seemingly happy and proud to be able to share her knowledge with her teacher.

4.2 The teacher interview data

Two interviews with the teacher were completed. The first one was conducted prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, whereas the second was found place after the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. Several findings were revealed, including the two main findings; 1. The teacher has a wide repertoire when it comes to teaching English using the students’ native language. 2. The teacher had a positive experience to the lessons. The findings found in the two interviews will be presented separately.

4.2.1 Pre-lesson interview

The first interview was held prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging, and the purpose of the questions were to uncover as well as get an understanding of the teacher’s (1) experience and (2) expectation. This interview sequence indicates that the teacher has an extensive repertoire teaching English to multilingual students, as well as having a positive viewpoint towards the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource.

In light of the theoretical framework and themes included in the interview guide the findings will be thematically be presented below. In the transcriptions, “I” stands for the interviewer.
Prior experience

When asked about experience with creating any lessons, which allows students using their native language as a supporting tool in their English learning, Elisabeth shared her prior practice, which nevertheless were from schools and institutions abroad:

Elisabeth: Eh, well, yes. But not in Norway. In the United States, [...] We had something called sheltered English for some of these students. [...] Their knowledge of English is limited. And because most teachers do not speak the student’s second language. Then we had this possibility. Because I spoke Spanish and some of my students were Spanish speakers, there was something in the US, and I don’t think it’s legal anymore. It was, it happened: I had the possibility teaching my [students] how to read in Spanish. So, they used Spanish very often in class as a way to explain English [unclear] because they were aware that English was the main language that we were supposed to speak. But because I was bilingual myself, at that time I was fortunate to do that. Yes.

I: You did that quite often?

Elisabeth: I did it often by myself, but it was just because I could speak the second language the student spoke. I had some students from Laos and from Vietnam and other countries and I couldn’t speak those languages. Unfortunately, I had to act out whatever it is they needed to learn. Draw, act out, whatever I could.

Here, Elisabeth explained how she used her bilingual skills as a tool to teach Spanish students how to read in their native language. This, however, could not be done with other students speaking other native languages than Spanish, due to the fact that she did not master all the languages present in the classroom.
In addition to this, Elisabeth also shared how she met difficulties regarding the low level of motivation among the students. She observed a strong correlation between low motivation as well as the text’s content. How she tackled these difficulties. The teacher elaborates on the problematics and the solution she used.

**I:** Do you think that [multilingualism] should [...] be discussed more? [The] use multilingualism in Norwegian school?

**Elisabeth:** [...] [There] was a problem with the motivation with my Spanish speaker. They were not interested, because you know in a way they had to learn to read in Spanish, but their characters were John and Mary. They had, you know, blond hair with blue eyes. They had nothing to do with my kids. So, I understood that you know, because I am multilingual, and thought if I were these kids, I can understand that I wouldn’t really be specially excited about them. They have, no, nothing to do with what the kids were interested with, not even the food that they presented in the books was of any interest. So I went to a book shop and I was able to find a book, you know, some books, they were quite expensive, with legends of their countries. Different countries in South America. In Latin America. And I bought these books, and they were quite expensive, and the school wouldn’t help me, because they just thought that I was being fancy and fussing, you know, that I was wasting my time. But I brought those books in, and some of the stories were really kind of long and difficult. So, I copied parts of them and started and my students were so motivated. It was unbelievable. “Oh, I remember my grandmother told me that!” “I know that story”. And so even though the stories were a much higher level, they were so motivated that they learned the words in English. So, it was great, so I completely agree. We never did any study, I mean I wasn’t doing any study at the time. I just felt that it would work and it did work.
Because of the difficulties, Elisabeth met regarding low motivation among the Spanish speaking students, the teacher seemingly learned that students’ motivation may be linked to the learning material and whether the students could relate to it or not. The language alone was not motivational factor.

Adversity
As shown in the excerpt above, Elisabeth shared how she encountered adversity when trying to find resources. After acknowledging the importance of the relations between motivation and the ability to relate, Elisabeth faced challenges linked to the limited willingness to cooperate, getting these resources, which would help motivate her students. She shared details about how she had to go out of her way to obtain material she could use to teach English, while using the students’ language. The workplace was not willing to support her financially, as they voiced their opinion about this matter. In addition to considering this effort a waste of time and did not see the value of it.

I: Is it correct to say that you constantly feel that when you try to adapt your classes for the students who are multilingual, you almost have to go beyond the frame that in a way the school allows you?

Elisabeth: Yes, correct. Yes.

I: Both in the United States and here?

Elisabeth: Yes, same thing. They didn’t have any understanding of the different cultures, and I think we, when people didn’t understand we have a tendency to kind of ignore the culture and I can say put it down a little? You know what I mean? Or [inaudible] not interested in what somebody has to say, or story. […] Anyway, and I think it is important that we sort of look at ourselves as educators and start being a little more open to what kind of contribution the students might give us. And it’s not going to make them learn less Norwegian, on the contrary. Because they will be more motivated. They will feel heard so they will be more eager to do something here. I think people, it’s like, they have a feeling that: okay if I allow them more of their language, they will learn less. [Right]? There is no limit to what a kid can learn.

[…]
When I worked in the US, I was a class teacher. I got the group that they labeled “hopeless”. In those days, it was possible for you to have a classroom with half English speakers and half Spanish speakers, if you can believe it. And the teachers were supposed to teach math in the original language, and reading in the original language. So that’s what I did. Then I taught math to the English speakers in English and reading in English with totally different approaches. If you know English and Spanish, they’re completely different languages.

When asked if she has done anything similar here in Norway, she stated no, telling that there is an emphasis in speaking either Norwegian or English due to the fear of situations getting out of hand.

I: Have you done it in Oslo? Norway as well while you’ve taught. Have you tried doing the same [interrupted]
Elisabeth: No.
I: You haven’t.
Elisabeth: No. I haven’t done that here, mostly because we, in this school, we work with a special population. And I understood that there is an emphasis here in speaking Norwegian or English. We are a little bit afraid of things getting a little bit out of control, because we don’t know what they are speaking. We have an issue here in this particular school that has to do with behavior.

Interestingly, Elisabeth states that she has competence and experience in teaching multilingual students English. However, due to an emphasis in either speaking Norwegian and English in their school, Elisabeth has not implemented a multilingual approach in her English lessons.

**Expectation**

The first round of the interview also explored the expectation Elisabeth had towards the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. In addition to the questions exploring the challenges the teacher believes she may face, they also explore her thoughts linked to the
possible opportunities the lesson may create.

First, Elisabeth anticipated that the students will experience the lesson in a positive manner and that it will be to their taste. In addition to sharing her anticipations linked to the students’ positive interest in participating, Elisabeth also estimates that they will be very eager about the lesson.

I: […] The first question is: what are your expectations for this lesson. How do you think it will go?
Elisabeth: Well in this particular... No, I think it will go well. I think students will be very interested in participating. I estimate that they will be really excited about it.

Second, Elisabeth was asked about challenges that may occur linked to the lesson. She pointed out difficulties linked to focusing on the task as well as understanding what the tasks requires them to do.

I: What kind of challenges do you think that you as a teacher will face?
Elisabeth: I think that the challenge is to have students focus on the task at hand. And understand what they’re supposed to do.

Third, Elisabeth is asked about the possible opportunities the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource may provide, and she connected all possible opportunities to how it may contribute positively to how the students feel and ends with a statement. Firstly, she stated how the use of the students’ native language may lead to making the students happy. Secondly, it will contribute to making the students feel respected and challenged. Thirdly, it will lead to making them feel proud to their native language. Lastly, Elisabeth ends her answers, which focuses the possibilities of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, with a statement concerning the lack of multilingual practices in Norway.

I: [W]hat kind of opportunities do you think this lesson will give [for the students]?
Elisabeth: Well I think that the students will feel first of all, they will feel very happy. I think they will feel let’s say respected and challenged in many
ways. I think they will feel proud to be able to share their original language, which is something we don’t do often enough in Norway at all.

When asked about the opportunities the translanguageing lesson might bring, Elisabeth mentions how it will make the students feel. She believes, that the students will receive the lesson in a positive manner and further elaborates how she believes that the students will feel respected, challenged and proud to share their native languages.

4.2.2 After lesson that builds on translanguageing as a resource

The second round of interviewing the teacher, was held shortly after the lesson, and the aim was to investigate the teacher’s experiences of the lesson that builds on translanguageing as a resource. Compared to the questions asked during first round of interview, however, the second round did not differ significantly. The interview prior to the lesson that builds on translanguageing as a resource dealt with her expectations linked to the lesson, challenges and opportunities she might meet, as well as her thoughts regarding how the students will perceive the lesson, whereas the second interview focused on the same themes, only this time, her experience and perception linked to the lesson that builds on translanguageing as a resource.

When Elisabeth was asked about how she thought the lesson went, she shared a positive change of classroom activity behavior. In addition to this, she also reports that the students gave more effort than they usually.

Elisabeth: “[C]onsidering the class and the way they normally behave, I think it went okay. It went well. OK PLUS in a way. It was well, but was more than they would normally .. let’s say .. give. Yeah. They tried.”

Moreover, Elisabeth was also questioned about the challenges that she met, and thus answered that the instructions given to the students were too many, which she prior to the lesson predicted would be a challenge. Furthermore, Elisabeth linked these challenges with the students’ levels, referring to the newly arrived results of the National tests. The challenges...
were attached to information given, which is crucial for the students’ understanding of the assignment in addition to its feasibility. All in all, the major challenge, according to Elisabeth, were related to the degree to which they completed the task.

**Elisabeth:** I think there were many instructions. The big challenges are most of the students, 52% of the students in that class are in levels 1 and 2 on National Tests. So, they are not very strong academically. So, it was a challenge for them to understand the instructions, to behave and to bring the papers back. So, these were challenges that have to do with the academic level of the students.

In addition to being questioned about the challenges, Elisabeth was also asked about the possibilities that were met. She shared her thoughts about how the students perceived the lesson that builds on translinguaging as a resource as positive, sharing her own observations link to the students’ body language. Furthermore, Elisabeth elaborated why she believed the students had a positive experience of the lesson and stating that it is linked to the presence of the students’ culture in the English teaching.

**Elisabeth:** No, I think that many students felt very, very, very positive.

[ …]

**Elisabeth:** Okay, I think that, as I said, I think a lot of the students were happy that their cultures were somehow were included in the teaching. I think so. I think that they were smiling. So, their body language were really positive to the whole experience. They talked a little about the experiment the next class. And so I think it was, it left a good taste.

Since the lesson encouraged the students to actively use their native language, I also asked how she felt being among the students without necessarily understanding the conversations among the students. Elisabeth emphasized that she does not feel insecure, but rather very satisfied since the students made sure to translate to her. In addition to observing the students’ demeanor, which showed that they were doing working, she also described the student activity during this lesson as engaging as well.
I: So how did you experience this lesson regarding that the students were speaking a language which you may not master.

Elisabeth: Actually, I was happy. I don’t feel insecure when that happens. I was very happy, because I looked at them and some students were concerned enough to translate to me, what they were saying. So, I felt very good. I didn’t feel... Because they actually were engaging in the activity, they were paying attention. So, there was no... Even though I did not understand what they were saying, you can tell by their demeanor, that they are doing something that’s not just you know playing around.

To sum up, the results of the teacher interviews indicate that the teacher has prior experience teaching English to multilingual students in the US, however under adversity. She believes that language is perceived as a problem both in Norway and in the US. Furthermore, the results show that Elisabeth’s expectations of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource are positive, believing that the lesson will be well received among the students. In addition to this, the results show that Elisabeth’s experience of the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource were very positive. The results also indicate a change in classroom behavior.

4.3 Student interviews

In this section, I present interview data from the students, which was collected after the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. The findings are presented thematically, where themes are either based on the student interview guide or themes derived from the analysis and the theoretical framework. The main points found among these finding can be summed up into 2 points. On one hand, some of students felt that the use of their native language would function as beneficial tool for them due to their lingual skills (in their mother tongue) and lack thereof (Norwegian). On the other hand, some students thought it was pleasant and interesting to able to use their own language. However, the students did not see this as a beneficial tool to become better themselves, but for others who have short residence
time in Norway. These findings from these interview sequences will be thoroughly presented below.

**Positive experiences with the lesson**

After the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, the students were interviewed individually. This part of the interview focused on hearing and gathering their experiences regarding the lesson. When students were asked about how the lesson went, the answers were characterized by positivity. In summary, the six students experienced the tasks as interesting and fun, highlighted different parts and exercises of the lesson.

Nosheen expressed that it went well. Despite having difficulties to express herself, the student managed to express herself to a certain extent. When Nosheen was asked to specify what she thought was fun, she pointed out one sequence the written part of exercises. She believes that it was good using her native language, because she rarely writes in her native language.

**Nosheen:** The fact that we did to do your exercises. Getting some new types of exercises.

**I:** New types of exercises? Have you done something similar before?

**Nosheen:** No.

[…]

**I:** I see. I also want to ask: How did it feel to be able to use your native language in class? … Because … I see that you have written it in Urdu. I see Arabic letters, but it’s Urdu?

**Nosheen:** Yes.

**I:** What do you think about it? What do you think about using your native language?

**Nosheen:** Good.

**I:** It felt good?
Nosheen: Because I don’t write Urdu that much.

Aisha also had a positive affiliation to the lesson. She found the exercises using their native language enjoyable and she further stated that they have not done anything similar to the exercises given during this lesson.

I: I will now ask you questions about the lesson. What are your thoughts? You remember the lesson, right?

Aisha: It was very fun to do exercises, using our mother tongue, since we’ve never done it in school. I thought it was fun and nice to work with something like that.

I: Was there anything in particular you found interesting or boring?

Aisha: Actually, there was nothing that was boring. I think everything was fine and okay and good. Because you learn something from it.

Furthermore, Aisha was asked about what she believes about being able to use her native language and culture in their English lesson in the future, in order to learn English. The student responded with explaining how being able to use Urdu to learn English would be fun. Furthermore, she also stated that being able to use both Norwegian and Urdu during the English lessons would feel “different”.

Aisha: I think it’s going to be fun. Yes, it’s okay to speak your own mother tongue at school too. It’s almost never allowed.

I: Is it indifferent to you if you are allowed to use Norwegian and Urdu?

Aisha: It is the same, but it would feel a bit different.
Aisha also shared how she learned a new word in her native language during the lesson. When Aisha was asked about how she felt about this, she answered that it felt pleasant to learn “a bit of her native language”.

**I:** How does that feel?

**Aisha:** It feels pleasant...

**I:** It feels pleasant that you didn’t only learn English but also …?

**Aisha:** Yes, right? But also a little bit of my native language.

**Dalisay** was also asked about her thoughts regarding the lesson and also she had a positive experience of the lesson. The student shared that she felt the lesson was amusing and further elaborated by pointing out one reason in particular, which was the possibility to use her very own native language.

**Dalisay:** Amusing, to use my own language, to put it that way.

**I:** You thought that was amusing?

**Dalisay:** Mhm.

When Kaaveri was asked if there was anything else the interviewee wanted to share, she, unsolicited, shared her detailed observation concerning a change of the classroom behavior. The student recognized that the class seemed more active and happier, while completing the exercises requiring the use of their native languages as well as English.

**Kaaveri:** Yes, many always.. If we learn a new language or have our own.. There a lot of good [things, which can come out] by using [other languages other] than English and Norwegian only. And as you know, before, it used to be very noisy during the lessons. But when we used our native languages, everyone was.. everyone almost spoke their mother tongue and were happy.
When Hayat was asked about what she thought about doing a task, where they not only have to use English and Norwegian, but also their native language, Hayat shared that her linguistic skills differs greatly when it comes to speaking and writing. On the one hand, she says that her Norwegian writing skills is better than her Arabic writing skills, whereas her Arabic oral skills, on the other hand, is better than her Norwegian oral skills. Furthermore, Hayat expresses how it would be good to be able to use her native language as a linguistic tool in language learning, since she feels that there is only room to use Norwegian in school.

Hayat: I know more Arabic than I know Norwegian. But I can write better in Norwegian than Arabic. But if we are allowed to use Arabic, it would be… I think it would be very good. Because here in Norway, we only use Norwegian in school and stuff.

LANGUAGE AS A RESOURCE

During the interviews, the students shared their thoughts regarding the usefulness of their native languages. On one hand, some of the students voiced their opinions on how the use of native languages can be a resource, when they were asked about it. The other students, on the other hand, shared their unsolicited thoughts on the same matter, throughout the interview. Some of the students found it as helpful for their own learning, whereas the majority of the students found the use of their native language as a useful tool for others but themselves.

Thien was asked what she thought about the lesson. Instead of highlighting what she found interesting, fun, difficult or tedious, Thien shared how the words in English initially were difficult to understand. However, the use of Vietnamese helped her understand more as well as making the exercise easier to understand.

Thien: There were a couple of words in English, which I did not understand, but then I learned what it meant in my native language. Then I understood more. It’s a bit easier to understand.
She later was asked whether she thought the use of her native language is a useful tool. She expressed that she not only sees the use of NL in English lesson as beneficial for those who do not speak well Norwegian, but also for herself, who speaks all of these three languages very well.

**Thien:** It is useful for those who aren’t good at speaking Norwegian.

**I:** Did you feel it was useful to you?

**Thien:** A little bit, because I speak English and Vietnamese very well, so.

[...]

**I:** What do you think about being able to use your native language in your English lesson in the future? [...]

**Thien:** It would make it easier to understand things.

As earlier presented, Dalisay found it amusing to use her native language during the lesson. On the other hand, she did not value this tool as useful for herself. She states the reason for the with her assessment of how well she mastered her mother tongue. Dalisay, however, did not disregard this tool completely. As a matter of fact, just as Thien, Dalisay pointed out how this tool might be a useful instrument for other students who do not speak well Norwegian.

**Dalisay:** I wasn’t that enthusiastic about it, because I don’t speak my language that well, my native language. But it went good

**I:** Do you think it was useful?

**Dalisay:** Eh, not for me. Probably for those who just arrived from another country and can’t speak English. Then it would be of great help.

Aisha explained how she encountered a new word in Urdu, which she prior to this lesson was not familiar with. Thus, Aisha learned what the word “Mujrim” (criminal), means, and consequently learned a new word in her native language as well.
I: Is it Urdu?

Aisha: Yes.

I: Can you show me? [shows me where on the sheet] Oh, I thought it was the same as Arabic too..

Aisha: [In] Arabic it’s something different. ”Criminal” is the same in Arabic

I: I see... So you went home and asked your mother about ”Mujrim” (criminal). And she told you it was ”Criminal”?

Aisha: [Nods yes]

I: So now you have learned a new word in Urdu?

Aisha: Yes

When Nosheen was asked about how her thoughts about being able to use Urdu during lessons in the future. In addition, she also answered positively, when asked if it would be a useful tool for her. Furthermore, Nosheen explains that she does not consider her Urdu language skills as “very good”, and thus sees this as an opportunity to not only learn more English, but also learn more of her native language at the same time.

Nosheen: I think it would be good.

I: Would it be useful for you, you think?

Nosheen: Yes.

I: You think so? How will it be useful for you? Can you think of a reason?

Nosheen: Because I’m not very good at speaking Urdu.

I: You’re not so good at speaking Urdu? So do you feel you learn Urdu a [interrupts]

Nosheen: … and English in the same situation.
Kaaveri was asked if she felt that using Tamil was useful, to which she replied yes. In addition, the student elaborated her thoughts regarding what she felt about the lesson. Kaaveri found it interesting to meet, hear and even learn the different languages present in the classroom. In addition to this, she also pointed out and reflected upon the opportunities the use of native language brings into the classroom, when it comes to learning English.

**Kaaveri:** Everyone spoke their language. They got to speak it properly. Some people can’t speak Norwegian, right? But they speak somali or something like that. They can speak it, and it’s better for them and us, right? […] We understand more […] We get to hear sounds, we can see the language, we can write it. Different things. Yes, it was a really nice lesson.

Summing up, the results of the student interviews show that the students experienced the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as positive, referring to the translanguaging practices in the English lesson as the main reason. Even though all of students regarded language as a resource, the students had different opinions to whom this could be a resource for. First, some students considered it as a resource for their own English or native language learning, whereas others, while others find it helpful to use their native language in addition to Norwegian, as support to learn English. Second, students, who also had a positive experience with the lesson, regarded it as a resource for other but themselves.
5 Discussion

In this chapter, the findings of this master thesis will be discussed in light of prior research and relevant theory (see chapter 2), based on the research question:

*How do multicultural and multilingual students and their teacher experience translanguaging practices in the context of English teaching?*

Throughout this chapter, I discuss how multilingual students and their teacher has experienced teaching and learning activities in an English lesson designed following translanguaging perspectives. This field of research is relative new in a Norwegian context and I argue that the findings and the discussion in this study offers demonstrate how crucial and useable opportunities of translanguaging practices are in the English school subject. Previous research have focused on teacher students and teachers’ self-evaluation regarding their qualifications in teaching multilingual students, as well as students’ unsolicited use of their L1 as a support in their English language learning (Šurkalović, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016, Iversen, 2017: Burner & Carlsen, 2017; Krulatz et al. 2016). To the best of my knowledge, there have been no previous research exploring teacher and student experiences linked to conducting and participating in an English lesson with translanguaging practices, where the lesson explicitly required the use of students’ L1.

Ruiz’ (1984) framework concerning three orientations in language planning (language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource), is central in this chapter. First, I discuss language as a problem and as a right related to multilingual practices in school and in the English subject. It has been discussed in light of the Norwegian legislation and a competence aim in the English curriculum (5.1). Secondly, the participants’ experiences of and views on how language is a resource will be discussed (5.2). Within this section, language as a resource to language learning will be discussed from the teacher’s perspective (5.2.1), and from the students’ perspective (5.2.2). Furthermore, languages as a resource will also be discussed in terms of classroom environment (5.2.3) and involvement of culture and identity (5.2.4). Throughout the discussion, I will investigate the multilingual perspective in light of the English subject.
5.1 Language as a problem and a right

From an educational perspective, challenges tied to minority languages have long been both globally and locally discussed (Ruiz, 1984; Cook, 2001; Haukås, 2014, Jessner, 2006). One of the results of this MA thesis show how one teacher and several students experience how language has been and still is perceived as a problem. Hayat said that Norwegian is the only language allowed in Norwegian school. In the interview with Aisha, she stated that they have never gotten the chance to use their native language in any class. She expressed that it would be fun and that it is almost never allowed to speak their native language and interestingly, her thoughts about the implicit policy against the use of native language in school aligns with the teacher’s understanding that there is an emphasis on the students speaking either Norwegian or English in school. She further referred to behavioral issues in school, and the fear of situations getting out of hand due to the use their native language and not being able to control what is being said. These impressions of the implicit school policy align with Ruiz’s (1984) language-as-a-problem orientation.

Ongoing studies suggests that there are no official instructions in policy document, and thus the English instructions in Norway vary to a great extend between monolingual, bilingual and multilingual approach (Brevik et al., forthcoming) In addition to this, earlier research also indicates that both teachers and teacher students do not feel qualified to teach English to multilingual students (Šurkalović, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). This is a real challenge that is highly relevant in Norwegian school context and must not be diminished. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that the challenge in the context of this study is not as to whether the teacher feels fit or lacking knowledge in this field. On the contrary, Elisabeth has both broad competence and experience in adapting teaching for multilingual students and does not regard the students’ L1 as a problem. However, she indicates that the general understanding of the school limits her multilingual practice in her classroom. If school policies explicitly embraced the multilingual approach in school, one could argue that it could lead to fortunate learning outcomes for the students (García & Li Wei, 2014). As presented earlier, research shows that integration of diverse cultures and languages into language learning bring positive learning outcomes through increased motivation and metacognitive awareness (NOU 2011:7; Haukås, 2014). Since there are no official instructions in policy documents, when it comes to language instructions in the English subject, the importance of increased knowledge among school leaders and teachers in terms of multilingualism and learning, especially related to
language learning, may be significant (Brevik et al., forthcoming). If schools have a clear and positive attitude towards language, which allows and encourages students to use their L1 in school, it might affect teachers’ view on students’ use of their L1 and thus affect their classroom practices, regardless of whether they have competence or not. Furthermore, this might lead to the students’ considering and thus using their native language as an individual and societal resource.

During the interview, Hayat shared how her language proficiency in Arabic and Norwegian differs. Whereas her written proficiency is better in Norwegian, her oral proficiency is better in Arabic. In addition to this, Nosheen also shared how using English and her native language will help improve his language proficiency in both languages. In light of Norwegian legislation and policy documents, Hayat and Nosheen have, as multilingual students, rights linked to adapting the training (UDIR, 2015ab Education Act, 1998, section 1-3). The policies, however, do not mention any aspects into multilingualism. The Education Act confirms the right to adapted education, but it does not explicitly state the right to use their native language as a support in Education. The English curriculum, on the other hand, consists of important skills and knowledge linked to multilingualism, which the students are supposed to acquire through the training (KD, 2006, 2013). However, some might argue that the students’ rights related to adapted learning for multilingual students are not fulfilled to the same extent as multicultural society in Norway calls for. In addition to research showing that teachers do not regard themselves as qualified to teach English to multilingual students (Šurkalović, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016), another study conducted by Iversen (2017) shows that some students use their L1 to support their English (L3) learning, receiving support from home and classmates but not the teacher. The conclusions drawn in this research indicate that these tools are only used by some of the students, who use it on their initiative (Iversen, 2017). A possible consequence of students perceiving their native language as a problem in school might be that they automatically use the majority language and thus avoid considering the use of their L1 even when the subject calls for it.
In the English subject curriculum, we find competence aims that students are supposed to acquire through and in the English lessons. In *language learning*, which is one of four subject areas found in the English subject curriculum, one of the competence aims states that after Year 10, the students should be able to:

- identify significant linguistic similarities and differences between English and one’s native language and use this knowledge in one’s own language learning

The objective of this competence aim focuses on metalinguistic awareness and skills. A student should be able to identify both similarities and differences between English and their own native language and to further use these skills in their own language learning. Specifically, the aim does not confine itself to the majority language only, but specifically includes all the native languages found in the classroom. Therefore, if multicultural students should be able to acquire this competence aim, they must use their native language. Since it is a competence aim, one could argue that the use of native language is a right. Therefore, the previous presented research related to current and future educators’ assessment of their own qualification in teaching English to multilingual students, may indicate that many teachers do not feel qualified enough to support the students acquiring this competence. These points support the argumentation of the great potential we have in terms of the multicultural perspective in English teaching in Norwegian schools. A point worth mentioning, however, is that the curricula in Norway are currently being renewed. The English curriculum is currently in a state of transition, and the competence aims presented above will only be in force until 2020.

For all students to acquire the above-mentioned language learning competence aim, especially the multilingual ones, one could argue that the teachers need be open to a multilingual approach in the English classroom. The use of a monolingual and bilingual approach do not support the use of the multilingual students’ L1. However, if the use of native language in English is seen as applicable among teachers who usually desire a monolingual or a bilingual English classroom, it may assist multilingual students to achieve the above-mentioned competence aim as well as their right to adapted education. A possible outcome if school leaders do recognize and embrace a multilingual perspective, might be that they most likely will influence the practice in each class, allowing the presence of the multilingual students’ native language and thus enabling the students to gain competence and
further develop. In addition to this, one could argue that a multilingual perspective and approach need to be integrated into the school policies and the way we teach subjects, including and especially English.

5.2 Language as a resource

Research literature shows that language is both an individual and a societal resource (Ruiz, 1984; Haukås, 2014; Jessner, 2006; NOU, 2011:7; Cook, 2001). Drawing inspiration from Ruiz’s (1984) orientation to language as a resource implies, that the use of methods in order to adapt and support language learning is beneficial. However, in this thesis, the term explores experiences and the necessity of its use.

5.2.1 A teacher’s perspective

Lack of qualifications when teaching English for multilingual students was not the case for Elisabeth. As a matter of fact, the results of the interviews showed that Elisabeth has competence in teaching multilingual students and thus is a resource. While teaching L2 English in the USA, Elisabeth said that her assigned class were multilingual and thus labelled as “hopeless”. While other teachers saw the students’ multilingualism as a problem and a barrier, Elisabeth acknowledges the importance of the students’ L1 and background when learning. Furthermore, she faced adversity, having to find and provide resources, and adapting the lessons with a more multicultural approach. In addition to using her own multilingual competence in teaching, she also, during the interview, shared different translanguaging strategies she used when teaching English to students with a different L1. In addition to having experience in using her own language skills to teach, she also has experience in using other strategies to teach English to minorities speaking languages that she does not master. Over the years in teaching English in the USA, it has given her insight into the importance of adapted education for the students and drawing on their identity and culture.

There are many reasons to why teachers of English in Norway might not embrace and implement a multilingual perspective. Two reasons based on research shows that, firstly, teacher and teacher students do not feel qualified to teach multilingual students (Šurkalović, 2014; Dahl & Krulatz, 2016). Secondly, many teachers believe in and thus implement a
monolingual or a bilingual approach (Brevik et al., forthcoming). In this case, the problem is
not the teacher’s qualification, but rather the practice and the implicit policy preventing her to
use her competence. Thus, the teacher is an important yet unused resource in the
multicultural school.

5.2.2 A student perspective

Even though the aim of this study is not to measure how much the students have learned in a
lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, the students’ views on their own native
languages being used as a resource in the English classroom are very interesting. The study
conducted by Iversen (2017) showed how some students saw their L1 as useful in their
English classroom, yet the majority did not see their L1 as beneficial in their English
language learning. My findings from the student interviews show that students who were
active at low, medium and high degrees, found the use of L1 as a resource when during the
English lesson.

The student participants in my study who considered L1 as a resource for themselves, are
students that both somehow feel that they are lacking Norwegian proficiency or students that
master the Norwegian language quite well. Two of these are Hayat and Thien. Whereas
Hayat points out opposing strengths and weaknesses in her Norwegian and Arabic language
proficiency, Thien regards her language skills in Vietnamese, Norwegian and English as
quite good. The common denominator, however, is that they, regardless of their Norwegian
proficiency, do regard their native language as a resource. As earlier mentioned, there is a
prominent variation when it comes to Hayat’s oral and writing proficiency in Norwegian and
Arabic. While reflecting upon the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, Hayat
pointed out strengths and weaknesses related to her linguistic skills. On one hand, her oral
skills in Arabic is better than her Norwegian oral skills. On the other hand, Hayat’s writing
proficiency in Norwegian is better than in Arabic. These findings indicate that she has a rich
vocabulary in Arabic, but has limited skills when it comes to producing text in Arabic script.
Nevertheless, her Arabic vocabulary is valuable in the English classroom. This argument
aligns with Cook’s (2001) view, which believes that Hayat’s native language, may be useful
tool to transfer her competence to learn English. Therefore, the use of her native language
and to the majority language will complement each other and assist her English language
learning and acquiring competence.
Thien, who also considers the use of her native language as a resource, says that it would make it easier to understand things if she was given the opportunity to also use Vietnamese in the future. This statement is in line with previous research showing how multilingualism contribute to language learning. Jessner (2006, referred in Haukås, 2014) and Haukås (2014) argue that the students’ L1 is always present in language learning and that the students always knowingly or unknowingly compare between languages. Furthermore, Cook (2001) states that students’ L1 do not prevent the them from acquiring another language, which further supports the notion of translanguaging.

Interestingly, two students saw this lesson as beneficial when it comes to their L1 learning as well. First, Aisha shared that she learned a new word related to the topic in her native language and that it felt pleasant. In light of translanguaging, a new word was added into her unitary language system (García & Li Wei, 2014). Second, Nosheen feels like her Urdu language proficiency is not good and stated further that the use of their L1 during the English lesson will be a useful tool. According to Nosheen, the use of both languages while learning English will not only help improve her English language skills, but also Urdu at the same time. Furthermore, the statements indicate how language increases the students’ general language proficiency, and is therefore a resource. These findings support the argument, that multilingual students’ unitary language repertoire may function as an essential tool in English language learning, instead of limiting these students to only use the majority language (García & Li Wei, 2014). Thus, these findings may be seen as a contribution from this study.

Although several students recognized language as a resource in the English classroom, many of these valued the use of L1’s as more useful to other students than themselves. Thien, Dalisay and Kaaveri point out how the use of L1s in the classroom might benefit other students in their class who either speak Norwegian poorly or have newly arrived in Norway. They are aware of the linguistic value of having an L1 as support to acquire another language (Cook, 2001). Nevertheless, the findings indicate that use of the students L1 seemed to be a motivating resource in the lesson.
5.2.3 Classroom environment

Another interesting finding, which emerged from the data analysis was how the translanguaging practices contributed to the classroom environment. The presence and use of student identities and languages in the English lesson seemed to be an intriguing and motivating experience and thus functioned. The first observation sequence was characterized by unfocused students, noise and low professional activity, and Kaaveri described their usual English lessons, including this one, as very noisy. In the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, on the other hand, the findings showed that the noise level was greatly reduced, the students seemed more curious and motivated to work. Compared to the first lesson, the students were highly engaged and active during the lesson. My observational data aligns with Kaaveri statement, affirming this positive change. Kaaveri explained that the use of the students’ native language leads to many positive outcomes and she described the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as positive. According to her, everyone in the class seemed happy, stating the reason for this being the student’s use of L1. Elisabeth’s statement also aligns with the observational data and is almost identical with Kaaveri’s statement. In addition to this, the teacher stated that many of the students seemed happy that their culture were included. Furthermore, Elisabeth affirmed that the lesson went well and reported a change in behavior and activity, saying that they behaved better than they normally do and that they gave more effort than usual. Additionally, the students were paying attention and were more engaged in the activity. The teacher pointed out that she did not feel uncertain about their use of their L1, but appreciated their attempt to include her. This supports the notion that the use of the students’ native languages as well as involving multicultural elements may contribute positively to student-teacher relations. These findings emphasize how motivating it has been for students to get opportunities to show aspects of their identity in school, where their multilingual competence acknowledged and included (NOU: 2011; Skreftsrud, 2015). Such practice might carry positive and beneficial consequences for the multilingual students in the long run, where their background and identity is present in the English lesson. Language constitutes a fundamental part of the students’ identity, and its presence in the English lesson may contribute to develop their social, cultural and ethical competence (NOU 2011; UDIR, 2015). Furthermore, the presence of their identity and culture might contribute as a motivating factor to make the English lesson more relevant for the students as well as developing their skills.
5.2.4 Culture and identity

Language is one of the most essential and strongest identify marker an individual has (NOU, 2010:7, p. 181). Based on the multilingual composition in the Norwegian society and classrooms, the importance of adapted education is particularly significant. The monolingual and bilingual approaches can be said to leave the minority student population out. Prior to the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, Elisabeth shared her thoughts regarding teachers having a tendency of ignoring and devaluing students’ language, background and story. She also believes that there is common conception among educators that allowing students use more of their native language will lead to a decrease of multilingual students’ English language learning. Elisabeth argues against this, saying that it will increase their motivation. Some would also claim that it is difficult to control learning and professional activity if the students’ L1 is present in the English lesson. Elisabeth, however, does not feel insecure when it comes to letting students use their native language. While sharing her experience from the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource, Elisabeth shared that she felt happy when the students were using languages she did not master herself. Despite not knowing their L1, she could tell by the students’ demeanor that they were professionally active and not playing around.

The lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource required the students to re-tell a story about their parents’ or siblings’ hero. Several of the stories were influenced by central people who have contributed positively to their native country. This lesson contributed to releasing different stories linked to their background and sharing these with other students in their class (Skrefsrud, 2015). The implementation of a multilingual approach in the English lessons allowed identity and culture to enter the classroom, and thus possibly legitimizes and shows the identities of the students, which supports the notion of translanguaging (García & Li Wei, 2014).

In addition to the lesson requiring to re-tell the story, it also required the students to use their native language and the exercises were received well among the students. Nosheen experienced the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as fun and referred to the exercises given, which she described as new types of exercises. Aisha also shared her thoughts of the lesson, describing it as enjoyable. Interestingly, she regards her language proficiency in Urdu and Norwegian as good, but stated that it would feel different to use her
native language. The emphasis on the word “different” was during the interview perceived as positive. Dalisay views her native language proficiency as low and did not see her native language as a resource during the lesson. However, she thought it was particularly interesting to use her own native language. The lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource drew on students’ background, which seemed refreshing, exciting and motivating for the students.

An important prerequisite for learning among students is adapted education. The lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource adapted it to the multicultural population in the classroom and gave the students an opportunity to attend and participate in school days, where lesson was based on the students’ socio-cultural background and their linguistics skills were used to participate in the lesson (Skrefsrud, 2015). UDIR (2015b) mentions several values that help describe adapted education. Experience, which is one of the several values used to describe adapted education, focuses on students’ experiences, skills and potential. The lesson, that built on translanguaging as a resource, used and challenged their lingual skills. In groups, students explained words written in their native language in English, whereas the other students guessed the English word.

Also, one of the findings during the lesson that showed how a Hayat taught her teacher a word in her native language. The teacher recognized the knowledge she gained from the student as valuable and applicable to herself. As a result, the student was seemingly proud and happy to teach Elisabeth part of her native language. As discussed earlier, several students, including Hayat, believe that their use of L1 is regarded as a problem. In this situation, however, Elisabeth did not regard Hayat’s multilingualism as a problem but rather as an applicable resource. But most importantly, the teacher acknowledged the students cultural background and linguistic identity.

Overall, this chapter has in light of theoretical framework and prior research, discussed the results from the observation sequences as well as the teacher and student interviews. This chapter has investigated one teacher and her students’ experience of a translanguaging practice. The discussion has shown how the teacher and her students consider language as a resource, but that there is a difference in how language served as a resource, where it serves as a resource for language learning and motivation. In the following chapter I will conclude this research by answering the research question and present the implications of teaching with a multilingual approach. Finally, I will give suggestions for further research.
6 Conclusion

This thesis has investigated the use of translanguaging practice in an English classroom and more specifically how one teacher and her students in lower secondary school experienced the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. Two lessons were observed, one prior and one during the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource and eight interviews were conducted; six students once individually (two high, two middle and two low in terms of activity level) and one teacher twice, one prior and after the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource. Both methods provided rich data regarding how the lesson had been perceived by the class, by six students and one teacher. The qualitatively analyzed data showed that the experiences of the teacher and her students were similar. Together with the teacher and student interviews, the observation data assisted me with answering the research question:

*How do multicultural and multilingual students and their teacher experience translanguaging practices in the context of English teaching?*

In this final section, I will conclude my research and present some possible implications of translanguaging practices in relation to teaching and learning English (6.1). Secondly, I will suggest topics for further research (6.2) and finally make concluding remarks (6.3).

The results of the study have provided three main findings to the research question:

1. The students and their teacher had a positive experience with the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource.
2. The students and the teacher consider the students’ native language as a resource in their English lesson.
3. Teacher and the students perceive that native language is deemed as a problem by the school.
First, based on the results, the present research found a positive change in the classroom. The analysis from the observations made prior and during the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as well as the transcriptions of the student and teacher interviews all indicate that they had a positive experience of the lesson. The activities contributed to a positive class environment. Second, the findings show that the students and the teacher consider the students’ native language as a resource, though in different ways. Firstly, the findings from the student interviews shows that some students perceived the native language as a useful tool for students who cannot speak English sufficiently. Nevertheless, the students view the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a resource as fun and new, stating the main reason for this as the use of their native language. Secondly, some students found the lesson that builds on translanguaging as a useful resource for their own English and native language learning. Thirdly, one student stated that her oral and written language proficiencies in her native and majority language vary, and the use of both will complement each other and further support her English language learning. Lastly, the teacher shared her view on how the students would perceive the lesson, describing how they would feel happy, respected, challenged and proud in many ways. One of the students also stated that she masters both Norwegian and her native language, but it would feel different to use Urdu. These findings demonstrate several positive consequences of students’ L1 in the English classroom. They indicate that the use of translanguaging practices have the potential to promote student learning by acknowledging and including students’ multilingual and multicultural competence in English teaching (Skrefsrud, 2015).

In addition to this, an interesting view of how language is seen as a problem was discovered in the student and teacher interviews. Two students expressed their views on how the school regard the use of native language and further categorized it as a prohibited tool, where the majority language is allowed. Furthermore, the teacher stated that she does not implement a multicultural approach in her lesson due to an emphasis on speaking either Norwegian or English in school, to prevent behavioral issues and situations getting out of hand.
6.1 Implications

The major conclusion that may be drawn from this thesis is that more focus needs to be put on the use of a multilingual approach in English learning. The results from this present study supports the importance of acknowledging and including students’ language and identity in English lessons as it contributes to developing individual and societal resource (NOU, 2010:7; Skrefsrud, 2015).

Firstly, it is important to acknowledge and emphasize multilingual students’ right to receive adapted education in relation to the English subject. In addition to this research showing several positive consequences as a result of implementing a multilingual approach when teaching English, it also indicates how serious the consequences of ignoring this approach may be. The use of a multilingual approach has shown to be motivating and may also be educational. However, the lack of it may prevent multilingual students from acquiring and mastering a competence aim linked to drawing similarities and differences between English and one’s native language.

Secondly, the results from this thesis support Šurkalović (2014) and Dahl & Krulatz’ (2016) research concerning teachers and student teachers’ qualification to adapt the English lesson to multilingual students. In order for educators to fulfill multilingual students’ rights related to adapted education in the English subject as well as assist them to acquire competence and develop metalinguistic skills, they should have a formal qualification preparing them with knowledge and a resource-oriented attitude. Therefore, this research emphasizes the importance of developing teacher education in line with the growing diverse student population, preparing the future teachers to support the students’ English language learning on an individual and societal level.

Thirdly, this study has shown the consequence of the perception of language as a problem in schools, where it has prevented a teacher, with competence and experience in teaching English to multilingual students, to practice a multilingual approach and thus adapt the lesson. It further shows how essential it is for school leaders and teachers to have sufficient knowledge in this field so that these resources are not overlooked but utilized. Therefore, in
order to change practice in Norwegian school, we need new regulations and language planning, which includes multilingual speakers. As earlier mentioned, the English curriculum is being revised, and “multilingualism as a resource” is explicitly mentioned as one of new the core elements. It will be exciting to see the further development of the multilingual perspective in English subject in Norway.

6.2 Suggestions for further research

As the present research only offers data from two observation sequences, consisting of six student interviews and two teacher interviews, my primarily suggestions for further research would be to conduct and further investigate how students and their teacher experience translanguaging practice in their English lesson, however, this time with a larger sample of participants In this way, we will be able to gain insight into opportunities and challenges teachers meet, when adapting the English subjects to multilingual students as well.. Another suggestion for further research that arises from this study, which could not be done due to limitation of time, is in what ways freedom to use students’ full linguistic repertoires might affect their learning. To my knowledge, this is completely unexamined in Norway and it would be interesting not only to examine experiences but also learning outcomes. Secondly, it would also be interesting to conduct a long-term, qualitative case study of how a more frequent use of multilingual approach in the English subject may affect multilingual students’ perception of the English subject as well as motivation in learning English.

6.3 Concluding remarks

The last year and a half writing this thesis has been very educational for me and has made me, as a teacher, better equipped to teach students with multilingual backgrounds. My initial intentions/thoughts in the beginning of this study linked to the outcome of this research did not match the actual results. The findings turned out to be positive in many other ways than expected. I have become more aware of the power of welcoming students’ identity and background into the classroom, as the positive consequences were many. It has also changed my own practice in my English classroom as well, and I further hope that my study may inspire English teachers to view the multilingual approach in English teaching as the asset it is.
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Appendix

Appendix 1 – Information letter

UiO: Universitetet i Oslo
Utdanningsvitenskapelig fakultet/Institutt for lærerutdanning og skoleforskning

"Flerspråkelig praksis i flerspråklige klasserom"

Bakgrunn og formål
Jeg er en mastergradsstudent i engelsk fagdidaktikk ved Det utdanningsvitenskapelige fakultet ved Universitet i Oslo. Jeg skal utføre et mastergradsprosjekt om bruk av flere språk enn kun norsk i en engelsktime i et flerkulturelt klasserom. Målet med prosjektet er å undersøke hvordan lærere og elever opplever bruken av ulike språk i engelskundervisning.

Hva innebærer deltakelse i studien?

Hva skjer med informasjonen om deg?
Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Kun jeg og mine veiledere vil kunne ha tilgang til dataene. Deltakerne vil ikke kunne bli gjenkjent i publikasjonen av denne avhandlingen. Prosjektet vil bli gjennomført i henhold til gjeldende lovverk for personvern og forskningsetiske retningslinjer, og skal etter planen leveres 15.05.18. Datamaterialet skal anonymiseres ved prosjektslutt og opptak vil bli slettet.

Frivillig deltakelse
Det er frivillig å delta i studien, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten å oppgi noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger om deg bli anonymisert.
Samtykke til deltakelse i studien
Samtykke til deltakelse i ‘Flerspråklig praksis i flerspråklige klasserom”

Elevens navn: ____________________________________________

Elevens alder: ____________________ (under 16, vennligst inkluder foresattes underskrift nedenfor)

☐ Ja, jeg godtar å være med i studien. Jeg samtykker til følgende:
  ☐ Observasjon i klassen
  ☐ Lydopptak

☐ Nei, jeg vil ikke delta i studien.

______________________________
Dato

______________________________
Sted

______________________________
Elevens underskrift

______________________________
Foresattes underskrift (ved deltakelse av elever under 16 år)

All deltakelse i prosjektet er frivillig, og du kan når som helst trekke ditt samtykke uten noen grunn. Dersom du trekker deg, vil alle opplysninger bli slettet.

Dersom du har spørsmål til studien, ta kontakt med meg på e-post hafsaw@student.uv.uio.no eller telefon 91618544.
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Intervju før timen

Bakgrunn:
1. Hvor mange års erfaring har du i å undervise flerspråklige elever i norsk skolesammenheng?
2. Kan du huske å ha utarbeidet og gjennomført undervisningsopplegg som gir elevene muligheten til å benytte seg av morsmålet sitt som en støtte til språklæringen i Engelsk?
   a. Oppfølgingsøørsmaal
      i. Hvor ofte?
      ii. Hvorfor så ofte/lite?
3. Hvilke typer kunnskap har du om
   a. Flerspråklighet?
   b. Undervisningsstrategier i flerspråklig klasserom?

Forventning:
1. Hvilke forventninger har du til timen?
2. Hvilke utfordringer tror du vil møte på?
3. Hvilke muligheter tror du denne timen vil by på?
4. Hvordan tror du elevene vil møte timen?

Intervju etter timen

Erfaring
1. Hvordan gikk timen, syns du?
2. Hvilke utfordringer møtte du på?
3. Hvilke muligheter så du?
4. Hvordan opplevde du å lede en time der elevene bruke språk som du kanskje ikke forstår?
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Elevene – etter fullført time

Bakgrunn
1. Hvilke språk kan du?
2. Hvilket er ditt morsmål?

Erfaringer
3. Hva syns du om timen?
   a. Oppfølgingsspørsmål:
      i. Hva syns dere være særlig bra/morsomt/kjedelig/utfordrende etc.?
4. Hvordan føltes det å bruke sitt eget morsmål i engelsktimen?
   a. Oppfølgingsspørsmål
      i. Var det nyttig/vanskkelig?
      ii. Hvilken del syns du var mest nyttig/vanskkelig?
5. Hva syns dere om leksene dere fikk?
   a. Hva syns du om den delen der du skulle tegne noe?
   b. Hvordan fant du frem til fortellingen om helten?
      i. Spurte du foreldrene dine?
      ii. Hva syns du/de om det?
      iii. (Hvordan var det å jobbe med helter fra din egen kultur før vi jobbet med Robin Hood?)

Annet:
6. Hva syns du om å få muligheten til å bruke morsmål i engelsktimene i fremtiden?
   a. (Hvilke gode/vanskelige sider ser du ved det?)
7. Har du noe annet å dele?
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In this appendix, you will find all the excerpts from the interviews used in this research in English and Norwegian.

Teacher interview prior to the lesson

Elisabeth

English: Eh, well, yes. But not in Norway. In the United States, […] We had something called sheltered English for some of these students. […] Their knowledge of English is limited. And because most teachers do not speak the student’s second language. Then we had this possibility. Because I spoke Spanish and some of my students were Spanish speakers, there was something in the US, and I don’t think it’s legal anymore. It was, it happened: I had the possibility teaching my [students] how to read in Spanish. So, they used Spanish very often in class as a way to explain English [unclear] because they were aware that English was the main language that we were supposed to speak. But because I was bilingual myself, at that time I was fortunate to do that. Yes.

Interviewer

English: You did that quite often?
Norsk: Så du gjorde dette veldig ofte?

Elisabeth

English: I did it often by myself, but it was just because I could speak the second language the student spoke. I had some students from Laos and from Vietnam and other countries and I couldn’t speak those languages. Unfortunately, I had to act out whatever it is they needed to learn. Draw, act out, whatever I could.


Interviewer

English: Do you think that [multilingualism] should […] be discussed more? [The] use multilingualism in Norwegian school?
Norw: Tror du at [flerspråklighet] burde […] bli diskutert oftere? Bruken av flersråklighet i norsk skole?

Elisabeth

English: […] [There] was a problem with the motivation with my Spanish speaker. They were not interested, because you know in a way they had to learn to read in Spanish, but their characters were John and Mary. They had, you know, blond hair with blue eyes. They had nothing to do with my kids. So, I understood that you know, because I am multilingual, and thought if I were these kids, I can understand that
I wouldn’t really be specially excited about them. They have, no, nothing to do with what the kids were interested with, not even the food that they presented in the books was of any interest. So I went to a book shop and I was able to find a book, you know, some books, they were quite expensive, with legends of their countries. Different countries in South America. In Latin America. And I bought these books, and they were quite expensive, and the school wouldn’t help me, because they just thought that I was being fancy and fussing, you know, that I was wasting my time. But I brought those books in, and some of the stories were really kind of long and difficult. So, I copied parts of them and started and my students were so motivated. It was unbelievable. “Oh, I remember my grandmother told me that!” “I know that story”. And so even though the stories were a much higher level, they were so motivated that they learned the words in English. So, it was great, so I completely agree. We never did any study, I mean I wasn’t doing any study at the time. I just felt that it would work and it did work.


**Interviewer**

**English:** Is it correct to say that you constantly feel that when you try to adapt your classes for the students who are multilingual, you almost have to go beyond the frame that in a way the school allows you?

**Norw.:** Er der korrekt å si at du konstant føler at når du prøver å tilpasse timen for elevene som er flerkulturelle, at du nesten må strekke deg lengre enn det skolen tillater deg?

**Elisabeth**

**English:** Yes, correct. Yes.


**Interviewer**

**English:** Both in the United States and here?

**Norw.:** Både i USA og here?

**Elisabeth:**

**English:** Yes, same thing. They didn’t have any understanding of the different cultures, and I think we, when people didn’t understand we have a tendency to kind of ignore the culture and I can say put it down a little? You know what I mean? Or [inaudible] not interested in what somebody has to say, or story. […] Anyway, and I think it is important that we sort of look at ourselves as educators and start being a little more open to what kind of contribution the students might give us. And it’s not going to make them learn less Norwegian, on the contrary.
Because they will be more motivated. They will feel heard so they will be more eager to do something here. I think people, it’s like, they have a feeling that: okay if I allow them more of their language, they will learn less. [Right]? There is no limit to what a kid can learn.

[...]

When I worked in the US, I was a [class teacher]. I got the group that they labeled “hopeless”. In those days, it was possible for you to have a classroom with half English speakers and half Spanish speakers, if you can believe it. And the teachers were supposed to teach math in the original language, and reading in the original language. So that’s what I did. Then I taught math to the English speakers in English and reading in English with totally different approaches. If you know English and Spanish, they’re completely different languages.

Norw.: Ja, samme greie. De hadde ingen forståelse for forskjellige kulturer og jeg tror vi, når folk ikke forstår, vi har en tendens til å på en måte ignorere kulturen og kan jeg si sette dem litt ned? Forstår du det jeg mener? Eller [uhørlig] ikke interessert i hva noen andre har å si, eller historie. [...] Uansett, og jeg tror at det er viktig at vi på en måte ser på oss selv som lærere og begynne å bli litt mer åpen til hva slags bidrag elevene kan gi oss. Og det er ikke sånn at de kommer de å lære mindre norsk, tvert i mot. Fordi de vil bli mer motivert. De vil føle seg hørt sånn at de blir mer ivrig til å gjøre noe her. Jeg tror at folk, det er som, de har en følelse at: okay, hvis jeg lar dem snakke sitt språk, vil de lære mindre, ikke sant? Det er ikke grenser på hva et barn kan lære. [...] Når jeg jobbet i USA, var jeg kontaktlærer. Jeg fikk gruppen som de merket ”de håpløse”. I de dager, var det mulig for deg å ha et klasserom, der halve er engelsktalende og halve spansktalende, om du kan tro det. Og lærerne var ment til å undervise matte i originalspråket og lese i det originalspråket. Så det var det jeg gjorde. Da underviste jeg matte til de engelskspråklige på engelsk og lesing i engelsk med to fullstendig forskjellige tilnærminger. Om du kan engelsk og spansk, det er to fullstendig forskjellige språk.
**Interviewer**

**English:** Have you done it in Oslo? Norway as well while you’ve taught. Have you tried doing the same [interrupted]

**Norwegian:** Har du gjort det i Oslo? Norge også mens du har undervist. Har du prøvd å gjøre det samme [avbrutt]

**Elisabeth**

**English:** No.

**Norwegian:** Nei.

**Interviewer**

**English:** You haven’t

**Norwegian:** Du har ikke

**Elisabeth**

**English:** No. I haven’t done that here, mostly because we, in this school, we work with a special population. And I understood that there is an emphasis here in speaking Norwegian or English. We are a little bit afraid of things getting a little bit out of control, because we don’t know what they are speaking. We have an issue here in this particular school that has to do with behavior.

**Norwegian:** Nei. Jeg har ikke gjort det her, for det meste fordi vi, i denne skolen, jobber vi med en spesiell befolkning. Og jeg forsto det som at det er lagt vekt på å snakke norsk eller engelsk. Vi er litt redd for at situasjoner går ute av kontroll, fordi vi ikke vet hva de sier. Vi har et problem her i denne skolen som har med atferd å gjøre.

**Interviewer**

**English:** […] The first question is: what are your expectations for this lesson. How do you think it will go?

**Norwegian:**[...] Det første spørsålet er: hva er dine forventninger til denne timen. Hvordan tror du det vil gå?
Elisabeth  
**English:** Well in this particular... No, I think it will go well. I think students will be very interested in participating. I estimate that they will be really excited about it.

**Norw.:** Vel i akkurat denne... Nei, jeg tror det vil gå bra. Jeg tror at elevene vil være veldig interessert i å delta. Jeg anslår at de vil være veldig spent på det.

**Interviewer**  
**English:** What kind of challenges do you think that you as a teacher will face?  
**Norw.:** Hvilke utfordringer tror du at du vil møte som lærer?

Elisabeth  
**English:** I think that the challenge is to have students focus on the task at hand. And understand what they’re supposed to do.

**Norw.:** Jeg tror at utfordringen er å få elevene til å fokusere på oppgaven. Og forstå hva de skal gjøre.

**Interviewer**  
**English:** [W]hat kind of opportunities do you think this lesson will give [for the students]?

**Norw.:** [H]va slags muligheter tror du denne timen vil gi [elevene]?

Elisabeth:  
**English:** Well I think that the students will feel first of all, they will feel very happy. I think they will feel let’s say respected and challenged in many ways. I think they will feel proud to be able to share their original language, which is something we don’t do often enough in Norway at all.

**Norw.:** Vel, jeg tror at elevene først og fremst vil føle, de vil føle seg veldig glad. Jeg tror de vil føle, la oss si respektet og utfordret på mange måter. Jeg tror de vil føle seg stolte over å kunne dele sitt originalspråk, noe som vi ikke gjør ofte nok i Norge i det hele tatt.
Elisabeth

English: Considering the class and the way they normally behave, I think it went okay. It went well. OK PLUS in a way. It was well, but was more than they would normally .. let’s say .. give. Yeah. They tried.


Elisabeth:

English: I think there were many instructions. The big challenges are most of the students, 52% of the students in that class are in levels 1 and 2 on National Tests. So, they are not very strong academically. So, it was a challenge for them to understand the instructions, to behave and to bring the papers back. So, these were challenges that have to do with the academic level of the students.

Norw.: Jeg tror det var mange instruksjoner. De store utfordringene er de fleste elevene, 52% av elevene i den klassen er i nivå 1 og 2 på nasjonale prøver. Så, de er ikke veldig sterke akademisk. Så det var en utfordring for dem å forstå instruksjonene, å oppføre seg og ta med papirene tilbake. Så dette var utfordringer som har noe med elevenes faglige nivå å gjøre.

Elisabeth

English: No, I think that many students felt very, very, very positive. […]
Okay, I think that, as I said, I think a lot of the students were happy that their cultures were somehow were included in the teaching. I think so. I think that they were smiling. So, their body language were really positive to the whole experience. They talked a little about the experiment the next class. And so I think it was, it left a good taste.
Norw.: Nei, jeg tror at mange studenter følte seg veldig, veldig, veldig positive. [...] Ok, jeg tror at, som sagt, tror jeg at mange av elevene var glade for at deres kulturer var på en eller annen måte inkludert i undervisningen. Jeg tror det. Jeg tror de smilte. Så, deres kroppsspråk var veldig positivt til hele opplevelsen. De snakket litt om forsøket neste time. Og så jeg tror det var, det forlot en god smak.

Interviewer

English: So how did you experience this lesson regarding that the students were speaking a language which you may not master.

Norw.: Så hvordan opplevde du denne timen knyttet til at elevene snakket et språk som du kanskje ikke behersker.

Elisabeth

English: Actually, I was happy. I don’t feel insecure when that happens. I was very happy, because I looked at them and some students were concerned enough to translate to me, what they were saying. So, I felt very good. I didn’t feel… Because they actually were engaging in the activity, they were paying attention. So, there was no.. Even though I did not understand what they were saying, you can tell by their demeanor, that they are doing something that’s not just you know playing around.

Norw.: Egentlig så var jeg glad. Jeg føler meg ikke usikker når slikt skjer. Jeg var veldig glad fordi jeg så på dem og noen elever var bekymret nok til å oversette for meg, hva de sa. Så jeg følte meg veldig bra. Jeg følte ikke... Fordi de faktisk var engasjert i aktiviteten, de var oppmerksom. Så det var ikke... Selv om jeg ikke forstod hva de sa, kan du se det på deres opp trende, at de gjør noe som ikke bare er å tulle rundt.
Student interview

Nosheen

Nosheen

English: The fact that we did to do your exercises. Getting some new types of exercises.
Norw.: Det at vi fikk gjøre oppgavene dine. Fikk noen nye oppgaver.

Interviewer

English: New types of exercises? Have you done something similar before?
Norw.: Ny typer med oppgaver? Har dere gjort noe liknende før?

Nosheen

English: No
Norw.: Nei

Interviewer

English: I see. I also want to ask: How did it feel to be able to use your native language in class? … Because … I see that you have written it in Urdu. I see Arabic letters, but it’s Urdu?
Norw.: Riktig. Og så vil jeg gjerne spørre. Hvordan føltes det å kunne bruke mormålet ditt i timen... Fordi .... her ser jeg at du har skrevet på urdu. Jeg ser arabiske bokstaver, men det er på urdu?

Nosheen

English: Yes
Norw.: Ja
Interviewer
English: What do you think about it? What do you think about using your native language?
Norw.: Hva syns du om det? Hva syns du om å bruke morsmålet ditt?

Nosheen
English: Good
Norw.: Bra.

Interviewer
English: It felt good?
Norw.: Det føltes bra?

Nosheen
English: Because I don’t write Urdu that much.
Norw.: Fordi jeg bruker ikke å skrive på urdu så mye.

Nosheen
English: I think it would be good.
Norw.: Jeg tror det blir bra.

Interviewer
English: Would it be useful for you, you think?
Norw.: Vil det være nyttig for deg tror du?

Nosheen
English: Yes
Norw.: Ja
**Interviewer**

**English:** You think so? How will it be useful for you? Can you think of a reason?

**Norw.:** Du tror det? Hvordan vil det være nyttig for deg? Kan du tenke på en grunn?

**Nosheen**

**English:** Because I’m not very good at speaking Urdu.

**Norw.:** Fordi jeg er ikke så flink på Urdu.

**Interviewer**

**English:** You’re not so good at speaking Urdu? So do you feel you learn Urdu a

[interrupts]

**Norw.:** Du er ikke så flink på Urdu? Så føler du at du lærer urdu o [avbryter]

**Nosheen**

**English:** … and English in the same situation.

**Norw.:** … og engelsk i samme situasjon.

**Aisha**

**Interviewer**

**English:** I will now ask you questions about the lesson. What are your thoughts? You remember the lesson, right?

**Norw.:** Da kommer jeg til å spørre deg om timen. Hva syns du om den? Du husker timen ikke sant?

**Aisha**

**English:** It was very fun do exercises, using our mother tongue, since we’ve never done it in school. I thought it was fun and nice to work with something like that.
Norw.: Det var veldig gøy å jobbe med oppgaver med morsmål, siden vi aldri har gjort det på skolen. Jeg syns det var gøy og greit å jobbe med noe sånt.

Interviewer

English: Was there anything in particular you found interesting or boring?
Norw.: Hva syns du var særlig bra eller kjedelig?

Aisha

English: Actually, there was nothing that was boring. I think everything was fine and okay and good. Because you learn something from it.
Norw.: Egentlig var det ikke noe som var kjedelig. Jeg syns alt var greit og okay og bra. Fordi man lærer noe ut av det.

Aisha

English: I think it's going to be fun. Yes, it's okay to speak your own mother tongue at school too. It’s almost never allowed.

Interviewer

English: Is it indifferent to you if you are allowed to use Norwegian and Urdu?
Norw.: Er det det samme for deg om du får bruke norsk og urdu?

Aisha

English: It is the same, but it would feel a bit different.
Norw.: Det er det samme, men det kommer til å føles litt annerledes.

Interviewer

English: How does that feel?
Norw.: Hvordan føles det?
Aisha
English: It feels pleasant...
Norw.: Det føles greit...

Interviewer
English: It feels pleasant that you didn’t only learn English but also…?
Norw.: Det føles greit at du ikke bare lærte engelsk men også..

Aisha
English: It feels pleasant that you didn’t only learn English but also …?
Norw.: Ja ikke sant? Litt av morsmålet mitt.

Interviewer
English: Is it Urdu?
Norw.: Er det Urdu?

Aisha
English: Yes
Norw.: Ja

Interviewer
English: Can you show me? [shows me where on the sheet] Oh, I thought it was he same as Arabic too..
Norw.: Kan du vise meg? [Viser meg på arket] Åja, riktig. Trodde det var arabisk også..

Aisha
English: [In] Arabic it’s something different. ”Criminal” is the same in Arabic.
Norw.: Arabisk er det noe annet. Kriminell er det samme på arabisk.

Interviewer
English: I see... So you went home and asked your mother about ”Mujrim” (criminal). And she told you it was ”Criminal”?
Riktig. Så du gikk hjem og spurte mamma om ”mujrim”. Og så fortalte mamma deg da at det var kriminell?

Aisha noder ja / Aisha nicker ja.

**Interviewer**

**English:** So now you have learned a new word in Urdu?

**Norw.:** Så nå har du lært et nytt ord på urdu?

**Aisha**

**English:** Yes

**Norw.:** Ja.

**Dalisay**

**Dalisay**

**English:** Amusing, to use my own language, to put it that way.

**Norw.:** Morsomt, bruke mitt eget språk for å si det sånt.

**Interviewer**

**English:** You thought that was amusing?

**Norw.:** Det syns du var gøy?

**Dalisay**

**English:** Mhm

**Norw.:** Mhm

**Dalisay**

**English:** I wasn’t that enthusiastic about it, because I don’t speak my language that well, my native language. But it went good.

**Norw.:** Jeg va’kke så begeistret, fordi jeg ikke klarer å snakke selve språket mitt, morsmålet. Men det gikk greit.
**Interviewer**

**English:** Do you think it was useful?

**Norw.:** Syns du at det var nyttig?

---

**Dalisay**

**English:** Eh, not for me. Probably for those who just arrived from another country and can’t speak English. Then it would be of great help.

**Norw.:** Eh, ikke for meg. Sannsynligvis hvis du kanskje nettopp har kommet fra et annet land og ikke klarer engelsk, så vil det være en stor hjelp.

---

**Kaaveri**

**Kaaveri**

**English:** Yes, many always.. If we learn a new language or have our own.. There a lot of good [things, which can come out] by using [other languages other] than English and Norwegian only. And as you know, before, it used to be very noisy during the lessons. But when we used our native languages, everyone was.. everyone almost spoke their mother tongue and were happy.

**Norw.:** Ja. Mange alltid.. Hvis vi lærer et nytt språk eller har sitt eget... Det er mye bra [som kan komme ved] å bruke [andre språk] enn bare engelsk og norsk. Og før var det sånn bråkete i timene, det vet du. Men sånn nå når vi brukte morsmålet vår var alle.. snakket alle nesten morsmålet og var glad og sånt.

**Kaaveri**

**English:** Everyone spoke their language. They got to speak it properly. Some people can’t speak Norwegian, right? But they speak somali or something like that. They can speak it, and it’s better for them and us, right? […] We understand more […] We get to hear sounds, we can see the language, we can write it. Different things. Yes, it was a really nice lesson.

Hayat

Hayat
English: I know more Arabic than I know Norwegian. But I can write better in Norwegian than Arabic. But if we are allowed to use Arabic, it would be… I think it would be very good. Because here in Norway, we only use Norwegian in school and stuff.

Norw.: Jeg klarer mer arabisk enn det jeg kan norsk. Men på norsk så kan jeg skrive bedre enn arabisk. Men hvis vi får lov til å bruke arabisk, så er det... Da syns jeg at det er veldig bra. Fordi her i Norge så bruker vi bare norsk på skolen og sånt.

Thien

Thien
English: There were a couple of words in English, which I did not understand, but then I learned what it meant in my native language. Then I understood more. It’s a bit easier to understand.

Norw.: Det var noen ord på engelsk som jeg ikke forstår, men så fikk jeg vite hva det betydde på morsmålet mitt. Da skjønte jeg litt mer. Det er litt lettere å forstå.

Thien

English: It is useful for those who aren’t good at speaking Norwegian.

Norw.: Det er nyttig for de som ikke er så flink i norsk da.
Interviewer

**English:** Did you feel it was useful to you?

**Norw.:** Følte du det var nyttig for deg?

**Thien**

**English:** A little bit, because I speak English and Vietnamese very well, so.

**Norw.:** Litt. Fordi jeg kan jo engelsk og vietnamesisk veldig bra da. Så.

**Interviewer**

**English:** What do you think about being able to use your native language in your English lesson in the future?

**Norw.:** Hva syns du om å få muligheten til å bruke morsmålet i engelsktimene i fremtiden?

**Thien**

**English:** It would make it easier to understand things.

**Norw.:** Det gjør det enklere å forstå ting.