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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate students’ understanding of the learning requirements for grade E in English in year 9 at a secondary school in the south of Sweden. Additionally, the student’s teacher is also interviewed to provide a context and setting for the study. The student data was conducted using open-ended questionnaires while the teacher was interviewed using a semi-structured qualitative approach. In their responses to the questionnaire, the students showed different degrees of understanding of parts of the syllabus. Some students were able to answer all questions and were capable to express themselves, however some students did not answer all the questions. Furthermore, a majority of the students felt that the language in the syllabus was difficult to understand.

The teacher believed that the language in Lgr11 makes it difficult for students to understand the text. Additionally, she believed that the language is difficult even for teachers.
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1. Introduction

Before the new syllabus (Lgr11) was implemented, the government published a report on how the Swedish school could improve. The report stated that teachers often have problems interpreting the curriculum, one reason being that the curriculum was difficult to understand and susceptible to different interpretations (SOU, 2007). Lgr 11 states that one obligation which schools and teachers have is to interpret and explain the curriculum to students and their parents. Furthermore teachers have difficulties understanding and interpreting the new curriculum (Lärarnas Nyheter, 2012-11-29). To help with the transition in implementing Lgr 11, The Swedish National Agency for Education published extra materials and comments on the curriculum to help teachers and schools interpreting it. It follows that curricula may be written in such language, including professional jargon, that even teachers may have problems understanding them. Moreover, what does this mean then when even students are expected to understand an educational policy document such as the syllabus for English?

In 2003 the Swedish National Agency for Education published an evaluation of Swedish schools, Nu-03 (Skolverket 2004). The evaluation sought to investigate to what extent teachers had been able to concretize and interpret the curriculum to students. According to the report, 65 % of students stated that they had a quite good or a very good understanding of the learning outcomes for English (Skolverket 2004). Which proved that a big amount of students were not aware of their learning outcomes. Furthermore, the National inspectorate published a report on the quality in of English in Swedish schools (Skolinspektionen, 2011). The results showed that in a majority of English classrooms, lesson plans and other learner materials were constructed by the teacher without any dialog with the students (Skolinspektionen, 2011). The report also included recommendations that schools and teachers should become better at clarifying the syllabus and giving students the opportunity to participate, take responsibility and have influence in their education (Skolinspektionen, 2011).

Furthermore, the Swedish National Agency for Education investigated students’ and teachers’ attitudes in the compulsory and upper secondary school. The results showed that students’ determination and perception of their ability to influence had dropped in comparison to previous studies (Skolverket, 2013). This shows that the students to some extent do not feel that they have any influence in school. However, to be able to evaluate, self-assess or to
influence their education, students must develop a deep understanding and knowledge of the curriculum and syllabus.

In addition Lgr 11 stresses the importance of learner influence. Students should be involved in everything that relates to them in school. Furthermore, the curriculum points out that teachers should plan and evaluate lessons together with their students. Therefore students should be informed about matters that concern them (Skolverket, 2011a). Different publications from the Swedish National Agency of Education and the National Inspectorate highlight an area of concern with regard to students’ influence in school. Further, the new curriculum underlines the importance of students’ ability to self-assess and become autonomous learners.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to investigate year 9 students’ understanding of the syllabus for English with regard to the knowledge requirements for production and interaction. The research data were collected using a questionnaire where a class of students read a quote in Swedish from the syllabus about production and interaction along with open-ended questions about their understanding of the content in the quote. Furthermore, the English teacher was interviewed. The interview served the purpose of including the teacher’s perspective on how the syllabus for English can be understood by students and the role of teaching to make this possible. There has been little discussion about and research on students’ understanding of policy documents, therefore I believe that this study is relevant for the field of education.

The research questions guiding the study were as follows:

- To what extent do year 9 students comprehend the syllabus for English with regard to how it describes the knowledge requirements concerning production and interaction?
- What are a teacher’s perceptions about students’ understanding of the syllabus?
2. Literature review and theoretical background

In this chapter, previous research on the topic is presented along with the steering documents used for this study. This study investigates students’ understanding of a text and therefore research on reading comprehension is presented in this section. The syllabus for English is formed by the government. However, it is interpreted by teachers, taught to students and students are assessed by the teacher. This dynamic relationship is presented using Biggs’s model of Constructive Alignment (2003).

2.1 Previous research on students’ understanding

Looking through scholarly articles about students’ understanding there is limited research done on students’ understanding of policy documents. The main area of research in the field focuses on students’ understanding of mathematical concepts such as geometry, equations and so on. Orton (1983) researched students understanding of differentiation and a more recent study by Lipowsky et al. (2009) investigated students’ understanding of the Pythagorean Theorem. The second major research focus is on different concepts such as the concept of time or different concepts in science, such as Nakhleh’s and Krajick’s (1994) research on students’ understanding of acid, base and ph concepts within science teaching.

One reason for this limited research on students’ understanding of policy documents could potentially be the decentralized model of Swedish education, where the education should be approached by not only school officials and teachers, but also by students and parents (Skolverket, 2011a). According to a European Commission report on school autonomy in Europe, the Swedish educational system is one of the most decentralized in Europe, where schools have full autonomy within the national and legal guidelines (European Commission, 2007). Comparing Lgr 11 to the National Curriculum in England (2013) and the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) in the US (2013) one can notice several differences. Lgr 11 provides the teacher with an overview of what to teach and does not
pinpoint specific parts that should be taught. However, the National Curriculum in England and CCGPS are constructed with clear goals for every subject. The Department of Education in England provides an appendix for the syllabus for English to clarify what is to be taught and examples of how to teach it. In year 3, students should learn the /ʌ/ sound spelt ou and the appendix provides the words young, touch, double, trouble, country along with how it should be taught. In the state of Georgia, the Georgia Department of Education provides teachers with similar appendices. However, in Georgia the appendix provides explanations and clarifications of every goal in the syllabus for a subject together with guidelines on how to teach it.

In the National Curriculum in England and CCGPS in the US there is greater emphasis on the teacher’s role of how and what to teach and not on the students as in Lgr11. Therefore, why should British or American researchers study students’ understanding of policy documents when such understanding is not called for in the National Curriculum in England or in the CCGPS in the US?

Beyond recognizing the importance of context and expectations towards students’ roles in their own learning, another factor affecting student understanding of curriculum documents concerns the readability or difficulty of the curriculum documents themselves

### 2.2 LIX

A way of measuring the difficulty of a text is through a readability index (LIX). LIX uses different variables such as sentence length, wording and common words, etc. to determine a text’s level of difficulty (Nationalencyklopedin). The Swedish LIX was developed by Carl-Hugo Björnsson, who tried to create a way of measuring a text’s level of difficulty. He has a mathematical approach to the text and uses the following formula:

\[ \text{Lix} = \text{Lm} + \text{Lo} \]

The formula is Lix = Lm + Lo, where Lm is the average number of words per sentence and Lo is the proportion of long words (words with more than 6 letters) expressed as a percentage. Lix varies between about 15 (easy) to 60 (severe) (My translation, Nationalencyklopedin)

The drawback of using LIX is that it is superficial and does not account for the complexity of readers making sense of a text (Nationalencyklopedin). However, it is still interesting to see what Lix means with regards to the difficulty of policy documents, and when analyzing Lgr11
using LIX we acquire a score of 62 which is classified as “very difficult” bureaucratic Swedish.

However, to understand a text at any level one has to develop a comprehension for reading.

2.3 Reading comprehension

There are different definitions to what reading comprehension is. Comprehension according to the Oxford Dictionary is simply put as “the ability to understand something” (Oxford dictionary). Obviously this is a very broad term, Bråten (2008) takes his definition further and states that, reading comprehension as a process that occurs when the reader interacts with a text and creates an understanding of it. According to Hoover & Gough (1990) reading comprehension is divided into two equal important parts, decoding and linguistic comprehension. They argue that, despite the fact that reading comprehension consists of two components it is a complex skill. They state that:

The simple view holds that these two parts are of equal importance. The simple view does not reduce reading to decoding, but asserts that reading necessarily involves the full set of linguistic skills, such as parsing, bridging and discourse building; decoding in the absence of these skills is not reading. At the same time the simple view holds that decoding is also of central importance in reading, for without it, linguistic comprehension is of no use. (Hoover & Gough, 1990, p. 128)

Hoover & Gough (1990) stress that both these components should be seen as equals because it is impossible to comprehend a text if one component is missing. To explain the relationship between these parts they present the following formula: “Reading comprehension (R) = Decoding (D) x Linguistic comprehension (L)” (Hoover & Gough 1990, p. 132).

Bråten (2008) argues that in order to understand a text readers use prior knowledge and experiences about the subject. This makes reading an interaction where readers try to create understanding of a text to make sense of it by placing it into a context. Therefore, different readers understand the same text differently. It follows that no readers can understand a text exactly the same (Bråten, 2008). Furthermore, he highlights the importance of why we read. It can be a leisurely activity or studying for a test. This is another dimension that effects the interaction between the reader and text. In addition he argues that a reader’s self-perception also plays a part in how well a reader comprehends and interacts with a text. He states that
better self-perception the higher reading comprehension (Bråten, 2008). Other factors that affect readers’ comprehension, according to Stanovich (1980), is the interaction between reader and text, he argues that the meaning of a text is created by the reader.

The interaction between reader and text can be seen as a privat interaction but it is also bound to a wider context. Bråten (2008) states that, there are many social cultural aspects that influence the reader, such as school, family, friends and society. These different aspects also form and provide the reader with experience and knowledge about reading and this plays a part in how a reader interacts with a text. Within school context the focus is on the readers’ teaching environment, the teacher, the working environment and the class (Bråten, 2008). According to Bråten (2008), the teacher plays a large part in a reader’s interaction and their reading comprehension. Stanovich (1980) states that, a level of a reader’s proficiency can be seen in their ability to read between the lines and therefore can focus on comprehending and interpreting a text. Less proficient readers will often focus on decoding unknown words. Hoover & Gough (1990) argue that to assess comprehension of a text the reader needs to be able to answer questions about its content.

To determine and evaluate students’ understanding of curriculum documents and goals, the curriculum, teaching and assessment should be aligned with one another.

2.4 Constructive Alignment

Biggs & Tang (2003) present a model for schools and teachers to develop consistent teaching. They provide the idea of constructive alignment. Furthermore, when constructing learning outcomes, there is a need to “specify not only what students are to learn, as we always have, but what they are supposed to do with it and how they are to learn it” (Biggs & Tang, 2003 p,52). Therefore, constructive alignment is an effective tool and state that “[c]onstructively aligned teaching is likely to be more effective than unaligned because there is maximum consistency throughout the system” (Biggs & Tang, 2003, p.53). The model consists of three parts. First the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) where the set of outcomes that are intended for the students are written, these are usually found in the syllabus. The second part is the teachers teaching and learning activities (TLAs) in the classrooms. The tools provided by the teacher to the students so they can learn the outcomes stated in the syllabus. Finally, the teacher creates adequate assessment tasks (ATs) that tests the students’ knowledge of the
intended learning outcomes to see if they are achieved (Biggs & Tang, 2003). Biggs and Tang present their theory using the following model:

(Biggs & Tang, 2003, p. 59)

According to Biggs and Tang (2003), the first step is to define the ILOs then for teachers to look at the ILOs and decide on what TLAs will help the students in achieving the ILOs. This creates the first alignment between ILOs and TLAs. The next step in the model is to decide on ATs that can show the teacher how well a student has met the ILOs now all three parts are aligned (Biggs and Tang, 2003). Furthermore they argue that, if one part is not aligned with the other two there is a risk of having students not acquiring the ILOs at all (Biggs & Tang, 2003).
To adapt the constructive alignment model to Swedish context I have constructed the following model (which is based on Biggs and Tangs):

The main difference here is that the Swedish Government and the Swedish Agency for Education create the ILOs and then leaves the interpretation of ILOs and construction of TLAs and ATs to the teachers and schools. Furthermore, the Swedish Agency for Education states that, when creating suitable assessment tasks, there is a need for constructive alignment between the learning outcomes, teaching and assessment. To achieve this it suggests the creation of a chart with the different parts, making the key factors clear for students and teachers (Skolverket, 2011b).

Before constructive alignment can be achieved there is a need to look at and interpret Lgr 11 and its components for this study.

2.5 Lgr 11

Lgr 11 is divided into three major parts: Values, Goals and Guidelines and Syllabi and Knowledge requirements. These three parts of the curriculum, give schools the government’s intended idea of education.
For this study the text that will be used is part of the syllabus for English for year 9, namely the knowledge requirements for grade E for production and interaction as stated below:

In oral and written production, pupils can express themselves simply, understandably and relatively coherently. To clarify and vary their communication, pupils can work on and make simple improvements to their communications. In oral and written interaction in different contexts, pupils can express themselves simply and understandably and also to some extent adapted to purpose, recipient and situation. In addition, pupils can choose and apply basically functional strategies which to some extent solve problems and improve their interaction. (Skolverket, 2011a, p 35)

In my investigation into 9th graders’ understanding of this text, the quote is in Swedish. This was to facilitate the learners’ understanding of the questions and their ability to express themselves when completing the questionnaire.

2.5.1 Learner responsibility

The teacher has a leading role in schools and Lgr 11 outlines all the responsibilities of the teacher. An example of this concerns assessment. This must be entirely based on the syllabus of the subject (Skolverket, 2011a). The goals concerning responsibility, self-assessment and influence of students in the classroom, teachers are provided in the bullet points below. According to the syllabus teachers should:

• take as their starting point that the pupils are able and willing to take personal responsibility for their learning and work in school,
• be responsible for ensuring that all pupils can exercise real influence over working methods, forms and contents of education, and ensure that this influence grows with increasing age and maturity,
• work towards ensuring that both girls and boys have equally great influence over and scope in the education,
• be responsible for pupils having opportunities to try different working methods and forms,
• together with the pupils plan and evaluate the teaching, and
• prepare pupils for participating and taking responsibility, and applying the rights and obligations that characterize a democratic society. (Skolverket 2011a, p17)

The fifth bullet point states that teachers should plan the lessons and teaching with the students. The students should also be involved when evaluating the lessons and being able to evaluate or assess themselves. The Swedish National Agency for Education also states that teachers should, together with their colleagues, concretize the learning outcomes in the syllabus (2011b). In addition, students and parents should be able to understand the concretized outcomes and connect them to the syllabus (Skolverket, 2011b). The National Inspectorate reported that the Swedish schools and teachers should become better at incorporating the students when planning lessons (Skolinspektionen, 2011).

As mentioned above, one of the learning outcomes in Lgr 11 concerns self-assessment. As the term suggests, self-assessment is a way of assessing one’s own work. Harmer (2010) argues that it is a powerful tool that students should develop in school. According to Harmer, students are often aware of their own abilities in school and through self-assessment they can gain a deeper understanding and knowledge of a subject. Harmer provides examples of how this can be done, for example by asking questions to students and using learning logs. Lundahl (2009) states that self-assessment aims at making the students more aware of their own learning. Harmer (2010) argues that self-assessment has the potential of increasing students’ understanding of teacher feedback. However, this presupposes that they understand what the goals are (Lundahl 2009).
3. Methodology

The methodology for this research is presented and discussed in this section. The research context and the participants are also introduced.

3.1 Research context

The research was carried out at a compulsory school in a small town in the south of Sweden. The school is in a suburban area and it has around six hundred students. The classes span from year 1 to year 9. Most of the students live in the vicinity of the school and a majority of the parents have an academic background.

There are four English teachers in the English department. The English lessons are often textbook-orientated, and the students listen to texts, translate them into Swedish and then work in the workbook by themselves or together with a classmate. The textbook is used in the majority of English lessons, but sometimes the students use other texts for smaller projects.

At the start of every semester those teaching the same subject come together to make a pedagogic plan based on the syllabus.

I am closely connected to the school through my teacher practice and I have been at the school during different stages of my four years at university. During those four years the school has changed a lot. Almost half of the staff have been replaced. I have a new supervisor and many students have moved to other schools for their educational needs. Today the school has a math and science profile to attract more students in the area. Due to the high turnover of students and staff this could have an effect on the outcomes for this study, this because of lacking consistency in their education. From my experience at the school, students in English only come across the syllabus at the start of a unit and sometimes at the end of it. Usually the syllabus appears as it is when presented in class. Consequently, the teachers do not simplify the language or work on concretizing it. The students receive instructions on a piece of paper on the unit alongside with quotations from syllabus concerning what is going to be covered.
However, when assessing a unit, teachers often provide rewritten knowledge requirements in the form of concertized goals that better reflect the content of the unit.

One reason for choosing this school for this research originates from the assumption that the students would be more relaxed and if they felt at ease when responding to my questions, they would provide me with useful data. The second reason for choosing this school was because it is accessible to me. This made the research feasible within the time frame available.

### 3.2 Open-ended qualitative questionnaires

This study used a questionnaire as one of two ways of collecting data (see appendix 3). The questions were open-ended, and the participants were thus invited to express their thoughts, opinions and understanding of the knowledge requirements in the syllabus. This section will therefore focus on the design of open-ended questionnaires.

Heigham & Croker claim (2009) that open-ended questionnaires are used to help researchers to understand what participants think since they provide them with space to elaborate their thoughts in comparison to being provided with a set of answers (Ibid).

According to Heigham & Croker, such questionnaires may also provide rich varied data for the researcher. McDonough & McDonough (1997) state that open-ended items on questionnaires make the participants feel part of the research to a higher extent than closed questions do. They also claim that such questionnaire are versatile and can be used in different settings as well as sent out and collected in different ways.

Dörnyei (2007) is more critical of questionnaires. He argues that open-ended questionnaires are not very suitable for qualitative research since participants are only able to engage in the research briefly. He also adds that due to the risk of superficial answers no profound data can be collected.

The questionnaire (appendix 3) for this study was constructed with specific open-questions that give the participant information on what they should focus on. The questions were based upon the research questions. In accordance with McDonough’s & McDonough’s advice (1997), the questionnaire was only two pages long. The questionnaire was written in the participants’ mother tongue to make it more approachable for them (McDonough & McDonough, 1997).

Some of the questionnaire questions were as follows:
• In what ways can you adapt your English for purpose, recipient and situation
• What do you think of the wording and language in the text?
• Explain what “functional strategies” is according to you and how these to some extent solve problems and improve the interaction

3.3 Qualitative interviews

For this study I also chose to interview a teacher at the school. The interview focused on the teacher’s thoughts and beliefs about the syllabus and her perception of the students’ understanding of it.

According to Hatch, interviews are a good way of collecting data when the research aims at capturing an interviewee’s perspectives and thoughts (2002). Dörnyei (2007) claims that interviews are a familiar genre to many and therefore a tool that participants feel at ease with. He also states that even inexperienced researchers can collect quality data for their research by interviewing (Ibid). Bell argues that the strength of interviewing lies in it being adaptable and in direct connection with the interviewees (2008).

The interview was conducted using a qualitative semi-structured approach since it gives the interviewee the possibility to depart from the interview schedule while giving the interviewer room to ask follow-up questions (Dörnyei, 2007). Additionally, semi-structured interviews allow interviewers control of the interview since they can choose when to proceed with the next question from the interview schedule (Heigham & Croker, 2009).

Interviewing also has its limitations. To begin with, the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee plays a part in the interview since the interviewee is not anonymous (Dörnyei, 2007). Secondly, participants can decide to alter their response or choose not to disclose certain information (Ibid).

Schröder et al. (2003) mention that the location of the interview is important because the interviewer wants to make the interviewee feel calm and comfortable in order to receive quality data. Dörnyei adds that interviewees may have difficulties expressing themselves, being shy or talking out of context. If so, the researcher is provided with data that are useless (2007).
I chose to divide the interview schedule (appendix 1) into three typologies. The interview questions were constructed based upon the research questions for this study and the syllabus for English. Some of interview questions were as follows:

- What are your thoughts about students’ understanding of the syllabus?
- To what extent do you believe students use the syllabus as resource?
- To what extent do you believe students understand the syllabus?

3.4 The participants

The participants for this study are the teacher of English and her students in a year 9.

The teacher has worked at the school for five years and as a teacher for ten years. I approached her via email to see if she was interested in participating in the study and her first response was hesitant since she had concerns regarding anonymity and time issues. To ensure confidentiality we agreed on an alias for the teacher. For this reason the teacher will from now on be referred to as “Malin”.

The time and date were decided on based on Malin’s schedule. The interview questions were sent in advance to provide her with time to reflect on her answers before the interview.

As stated before, the school was chosen due to convenience. Hatch (2002) provides a list of different ways of sampling participants for the purpose of research. The participants were chosen using convenience sampling. In the name of trustworthiness, I chose to exclude any participants that had had any prior relationship with me. None of the participating students had been taught by me and the teacher had not had any previous interaction with me.

The students were chosen based on their school year, because this study focuses on year 9. Gaining access to the class became possible once Malin agreed to participate in the research. The majority of students in the class have a Swedish background and all of them have Swedish as their mother tongue.

Thomsson (2010) outlines different advantages of having research participants that are known to the researcher. As a consequence, the participants can be more comfortable in the interview situation and therefore provide the researcher with useful data.
3.5 The procedure

In this section the procedure of the data collection is discussed. The section is divided into three parts, first the interview with the teacher, the collection of questionnaires and finally the researcher's perspective.

3.5.1 Interview with the teacher

The interview took place on the 30th of September 2013 on a Monday afternoon after the teacher’s final lesson. The teacher decided the time for the interview which was conducted in English. There were no time issues since the teacher had allocated a whole hour of her time at the end of her day for the interview. During the interview there were no interruptions and the interview took 20 minutes to conduct.

The interview was conducted in an empty classroom. There was thus a low risk of being interrupted during the interview. According to Thomsson (2010), the location should involve a safe and comfortable environment for the interviewee. The interview was digitally recorded and this was agreed upon beforehand. The teacher was again asked whether she still agreed on being recorded. According to Bell (2008), recording interviews enables the interviewer to focus on the interview itself and not on taking notes on what is said. In addition, the interviewer can make notes on facial expressions, body language and moments where the interviewee emphasizes something.

Since Malin had received the interview schedule beforehand, I could start the interview by asking her whether she had any comments or last-minute questions. To make the interviewee not feel overwhelmed I chose to start with some background questions. The interview schedule helped me to stay in control of the questions and the interview. I was able to ask follow-up questions on areas of interest.

After conducting the interview I transcribed and analyzed the data through the typologies from the interview schedule. In the following sections some passages from the interview are presented. The passages used in this paper appear in one document (See appendix 2).

3.5.2 Questionnaire procedure

The questionnaire was collected on the 30th of September 2013 on a Monday afternoon during the students’ English class. The students had been informed beforehand that they would be a
part of this research. However they did not see the questionnaire prior to the day they participated.

The class consists of 24 students, 14 female and 10 male. Only when I turned up to hand out the questionnaire did I learn that 7 students would not be present for the questionnaire due to a field trip. The remaining 17 students completed the questionnaire. Due to a strained time frame for this project it was not possible to return to collect more data. I believe that 17 responses are enough for the size of this study.

In the classroom the teacher introduced me and I presented myself to the class and explained why I was there.

To lower any pressure on the students I stressed the fact that there were no “right” or “wrong” answers and that these questionnaires were anonymous (Heigham & Croker, 2009). I distributed the questionnaires to the participants and went through the questionnaires with them once more. I emphasized that any question they may have during the process should be directed to me and not their teacher. I also informed them that this was an individual process and that they therefore could not discuss any answers with their peers.

During the process the class was quiet and seemed focused on the questionnaire. Dörnyei (2007) discusses different approaches to make participants interested in completing a questionnaire. He states that teachers help the researcher in conveying the importance of participating. Additionally he states that students often will complete questionnaires and tasks because they are told to do so.

Some students asked me to clarify some questions. Other students wanted to check whether their answer was correct. When they did, I repeated that there were no right or wrong answers to these questions.

After collecting all the questionnaires I organized and analyzed the data in accordance with Heigham & Croker (2009). I photocopied the answers to prevent any mishaps to the original data. The first process was to read though the answers and transcribe them into one document in order to make the data analysis easier (See appendix 4). Heigham & Croker (2009) provide different approaches researchers can undertake when analyzing data. One recommendation is to write the answers on pieces of paper and then laying them out on the floor, making it easier to sort and analyze. After the data was transcribed the different responses were placed into different themes that emerged during the process. The data is presented in the following sections using those themes.
3.6 Ethical considerations

The research data were gathered according to ethical aspects that are brought up by Vetenskapsrådet (1990). The respondents to the questionnaire were anonymous and the interviewee was provided with an alias to vouchsafe anonymity. All the participants were informed of the purpose of the study and their role in it. They were able to ask questions about the research prior and during their participation. The participants were also informed that their answers would be kept by the researcher and not shared with others, only presented in the research. Additionally, the participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and they could choose not to participate (Vetenskapsrådet, 1990).

3.7 Researcher's perspective

Having only conducted three interviews prior to this research, I am quite inexperienced at interviewing people. During the teacher interview I felt lost at first and nervous because I was interviewing a stranger who I did not have any prior relationship with. I found it hard to write observations on paper while conducting the interview. However, after a couple of questions I felt more comfortable with the interview situation. The interview schedule provided me with a tool to pace the interview. I tried to let the participant speak freely and give her the time to develop her answers. After the interview I felt pleased, however during the transcribing process I noticed that I expressed a lot of utterances like "mhm" that could have been distracting for the interviewee. The transcription if the data was time-consuming but the resulting data provided an easier access to the data.

Prior to conducting the questionnaire I had concerns if the students would not understand the questions or not take the questionnaire seriously. However, when conducting the questionnaire I felt that I had control and noticed that all the students seemed focused on answering the questions.
4. The Results

This section presents the results of the data collection. It is divided into three parts: the students’ responses to the questionnaire, the teacher interview and a discussion where previous research is connected to the results.

4.1 The results of the questionnaire

The results are presented using typologies that emerged during the coding of the questionnaire responses. As mentioned in previous chapter, all questionnaires were coded by using different IDs to distinguish them.

4.1.1 Recognizing the text

The questionnaire asked the students whether they had seen the quote before and if so, where they had seen it. Fourteen of the students recognized the text. However, fewer were able to pinpoint where they had come in contact with it or where it could be found. One student responded that he recognized the text but did not know from where. “I recognize the text but I do not know where from” (S14, my translation).

Another student provided an answer where she showed clearly that she was aware of the text and also knew what it was for. She wrote as follows: “Yes, from the syllabus, to know what it takes to achieve different grades” (S1, my translation). Even though 9 students could not give a clear response regarding where they had seen the text, 13 students mentioned that they had seen it in the school context. So the students knew that this piece of text had a relation to the school and their education.
4.1.2 Wording and language

Looking at the words in the text and the way it is written the students gave similar responses. Twelve students highlighted that the text is complicated with regards to both language and wording. However nine students stated that even though the text is difficult, they still understood the content. S17 wrote “One can understand but it was complicated, the words are not easy but I understood what it meant” (my translation).

With regard to wording these students believed that the words were too complicated and could be replaced with easier words to make it more comprehensible. S11 pointed to this and wrote “Some things are hard to understand, one could exchange some words to easier ones” (my translation).

Out of the 17 participants, 11 students wrote the word “complicated” when giving their answers regarding wording and language in the quote. Two students wrote different answers that stood out from the rest. S6 wrote “I think it is written in a way that only older people understand” (my translation) and another student stated that “Boring word choice, a text that makes one lose interest right away” (S9, my translation).

However, six of the students in the class stated that the text was easy to understand but with some difficult words. S14 highlighted this issue: “I thought it was well written, that it was easy to understand with a couple of complex words” (my translation). In sum, six students thought that the text was easy while eleven students had a difficult time comprehending it.

4.1.3 Ways of adapting the language

One item on the questionnaire focused on the students’ knowledge of adapting their English with regard to purpose, recipient and situation. The question sought to find whether the students knew how to use different strategies, for example talking slower, rephrasing words and sentences, or using fewer idiomatic expressions to successfully communicate with someone. Fourteen students provided an answer that showed some understanding of the meaning of this. S5 focused on the relationship with the recipient and wrote that one is able to adapt the language depending on who one talks or writes to. S5 wrote “If I write to a friend then maybe it is mostly how I speak but if it is to a teacher then I write more appropriately” (my translation). Another way of adapting one’s language was by using simplified language, especially when talking to people who are not very proficient in English. S14 highlighted this as follows: “When I talk to someone who is not so good at English then I should try to use
simple words and a lot of body language” (my translation). S1, S10 and S13 all wrote that talking slower when communicating with a recipient is another skill that aids communication.

In sum, the data show that not all the participants knew the meaning of adapting one’s language to purpose, recipient and situation. However, fourteen of the students provided answers that named at least one skill. Only one student misunderstood the question altogether and provided an answer that was irrelevant to the question.

4.1.4 Understanding concepts

Two of the questions on the questionnaire focused the students’ understanding of different concepts that they may come across in English. The questions will be accounted for one at the time. The first question focused on the production of the students’ language and how “In oral and written production, pupils can express themselves simply, understandably and relatively coherently” (Lgr11, p35) and what this meant to them. The second question focused on their understanding of functional strategies and how these can solve problems and improve their interaction in English.

In the first question eight of the students provided answers that had a connection to the question. S9 wrote that “That you as a student can express yourself simply so that others can understand, and in such a way (although not fully developed) that there is a context with what you say” (my translation). Several these students’ answers focused on producing language that is coherent, simple and with a context. S1 provides clear definition:

That I, in an oral or a written assignment can get the "reader" to understand, with ease, and read what I try to convey. It should be in a way that everyone can understand my language and choice of words. There should also be a ‘context that there is some sort of structure in it (S1, my translation).

Even though these eight students provided a clear answer of their thoughts, the other students were more confused. S15 wrote “I believe it means how the student appears” (my translation) and does not provide more input regarding what is meant with “appears”. S2 and S3 also provided uncertain answers that do not really cover the concepts. S2 wrote that “In oral it is easier to talk and in written one expresses more vocabulary” (my translation).

Looking at the responses for the second question, there were twelve that did not comprehend or know what functional strategies were and how these could solve problems and
improve their interaction. Three students wrote “don’t know” (S3, S4, S5) as their response and S2 left a blank response. Four students focused on the classroom and relation between teacher and student in their answers, as seen in S1’s response “a plan that works for both teacher and student and that the student is involved in everything that goes on” (my translation). S16 gave a response based on how she/he prefers to learn English in school. S14’s answer is very broad and does not provide a relevant answer he/she writes: “An effective strategy is a strategy that works well for most and can solve many potential problems and can stop what you want to avoid” (S14, my translation).

However, there were students that provided an answer that was connected with the question. S10 focused on strategies such as using body language and explaining words that you do not know by describing its features or what it is. S12 added that one strategy is to be consistent with the use of English even if one does not know a particular word. S9 wrote about strategies in discussions and answered:

One uses an approach that you know works for example in a discussion, it might help those who do not say much in a discussion by asking ‘easy’ questions to that person. Which can improve the whole discussion or whatever it is. One tries to add things, comments, questions, reflections, etc. to make it more qualitative. (S9, my translation)

The results of the questionnaire provided valuable data. Some items were answered in a similar fashion by all the respondents while other specifically the ones concerning concepts gave more diverse answers from the students.

4.2 The teacher interview

The results of the teacher interview are divided into two separate categories that follow the interview schedule. The background questions are not accounted for due to irrelevance. The interviewer is referred to as I and the teacher as Malin.

4.2.1 Teacher’s thoughts on the English syllabus for year 9

The first question concerned Malin’s work with the syllabus in her classroom. She mentioned that all of the English teachers usually work together with the syllabus to jointly come up with
ideas for lessons and projects to achieve the different goals stated in the syllabus. During projects her students are often provided with a sheet of paper with different goals that they will or are supposed to achieve for that particular section. However, when asked whether she has the same approach when working from a textbook she said:

Well, sometimes, often I do try to highlight the different goals in the syllabus, but other times those things are not covered as much [short pause] it really depends on the workload (Interview with Malin, 130930)

The next question focused on her work with the syllabus during her ten-year-long career and whether her approach had changed. She answered that experience played a big part in her understanding and that nowadays she believed it was easier for her to understand the syllabus in comparison to when she graduated.

The next question focused on Malin’s thoughts about the syllabus and its use in the classroom. Malin said that:

Hmm [short pause] my perception is that it is useful as a justification for what we are doing in class, but at the same time, it is quite formal to just present to the students (Interview with Malin, 130930)

She added that she and her colleagues try to simplify some of the content in the syllabus to some extent before presenting it to the students. However she also highlighted that from her experience the students rarely show much interest in the syllabus:

Often the students are not very interested in the syllabus and the information just goes in one ear and out the other. At the start of every school year I always run though the syllabus for English and every year just a fraction of the students actually ask question or need clarification on something (Interview with Malin, 130930).

Looking at the syllabus with regard to content and wording, Malin provided a clear opinion on the matter. She said that, these types of texts are very formal and at times difficult even for teachers to understand. This is why the teachers at her school often work together when working with the syllabus. Content-wise she said that the syllabus covers all major parts of how a school should function in Sweden and provides guidelines for everything.
4.2.2 Teacher’s thoughts on the students’ understanding of the syllabus

As for Malin’s thoughts about her students’ understanding of the syllabus, she mentioned that she believes that the students understand the syllabus and can say what it is. However, she also believed that they do not think about it and hardly ever question what they are doing in class. As for whether the students used the syllabus as a resource, she believed that her students do not use the syllabus as a resource. However, there are also times when her use the syllabus:

When I have given a grade at the end of a course or sometimes on an assignment, I will have students who, are not happy with a grade, come up to me and ask for clarifications on how I have graded them. Then often they have looked in the syllabus and feel that they have achieved this or that. Then we have a discussion about it and I explain why they got a certain grade.

(Interview with Malin, 130930)

The last question asked Malin about to what extent she believes that her students understand the syllabus. She answered that she believes that this class has a pretty good idea of it. However, she also mentioned that she needs to point out what parts or goals of the syllabus they are working on. She added that understanding the text in the syllabus might be too difficult, especially when it comes to making sense of it all: “I believe that it (the syllabus) is written in a language that is above the students’ level” (Interview with Malin, 130930). When I asked her if he had any suggestions on how to resolve this issue, she highlighted that the students are usually provided with a syllabus that is interpreted locally. She thus gives her students her interpretation. In addition, she felt that it would be beneficial if the Swedish Agency of Education would create different versions of the syllabus that were targeted to different age groups.

4.3 Analysis and discussion

Lgr11 states that the one of the teacher’s obligations is to interpret and explain the syllabus for the students (Skolverket, 2011a). However, the teacher interview revealed that it can be difficult to interpret the syllabus for teachers and this is an area of concern. Reason may be
that, if the syllabus is broad and open to interpretation, students might be provided with different interpretations some which might not be in line with the intended syllabus provided by the Government and the Swedish Agency of Education. According to Biggs and Tang (2003), not having constructive aligned curriculum could be an obstacle for students resulting in not learning the intended learning outcomes.

At Malin’s school they usually provide the students with simplified versions of the syllabus to make it easier for the students to understand. In addition she stated that these types of documents are formal and therefore difficult to comprehend for students and to some extent for teachers as well. In Stanovich’s (1980) model he argues that, the reader creates the meaning of a text, in this case Malin and her colleagues provide students with their interpretation and of the syllabus and the students will then interpret and interpreted version of the original document.

The result from the student questionnaire showed that the students felt that the words in the syllabus were very complex and hard to understand. So there might be a need for teachers to simplify the syllabus as done at this school.

During the interview Malin stated that experience, according to her, is key for her understanding of syllabus. Working with school policy texts has provided Malin with the knowledge and experience to understand and interpret it. This is what Bråten (2008) mentions, that to understand a text of a certain kind one needs to gain exposure to such texts, Malin has been exposed to the language found in the syllabus and therefore felt more confident when reading it than she did as a newly graduated teacher. Looking at the questionnaire, fourteen of the students did claim that they recognized the syllabus and twelve of them provided the school as an answer regarding context. However, there was a gap between the students. Six of the students showed understanding throughout the questionnaire, while the rest focused on the first set of questions and missing out on the questions regarding concepts. These eleven students might need more exposure to the syllabus to really acquire experience and knowledge of it in order to comprehend it. However, according to Bråten (2008) it is unlikely for readers to understand a text in the same way. This also shows that, the syllabus takes time to comprehend and students achieve comprehension at different speeds. Therefore the syllabus cannot only be provided at the start of the semester to later be forgotten about, it needs to be present throughout the students’ education. Malin stated in the interview that she tries to incorporate the syllabus as much as possible especially at the start of every semester. However, she added that on occasion she will not present it in class due to time constraints.
Malin mentioned that in her school, teachers of the English department usually work together in the process of interpreting the syllabus and planning lessons. This is in line with what the Swedish Agency for Education states, that teachers should interpret the syllabus together with their colleagues (Skolverket, 2011b).

Looking at Lgr11 it states that teachers should lesson plan together with students and receive their input. However, during the interview Malin did not mention that she does this, she stated that whenever she does incorporate the syllabus in her classroom the students rarely show any or no interest at all.

In order to understand a text the context plays a big part (Bråten, 2008). For Malin the context comes naturally because it is within her profession to know and work with the syllabus, however it is the teachers’ and school’s responsibility to provide such a context for the students.

Stanovich (1980) argues that one difference between strong, proficient readers and weak readers is their ability to read between the lines and focus their attention on comprehending the whole text and not get stuck on understanding words. Highlighting what Stanovich argues and comparing it to the questionnaire results, there is a clear difference of how the students performed. S17 stated that even though the words were difficult to understand the syllabus was still comprehensible. While S11 stated that the words were difficult and could be substituted with easier words.

One other dimension presented by Bråten (2008) is the question of why we read a certain text. Malin and teachers read syllabi as a part of their profession and it is a text that should create a basis for their teaching. Therefore teachers have a different interaction with the syllabus than the students do. Here is where the teachers need to create meaning for the students so that they find an interest in the syllabus and interact with it. Two students highlighted this in their answers. S6 believes that the syllabus is written in a language that only “old people” can understand. While S9 answers that the language in such a text is boring and makes one lose interest in reading and understanding it. Malin also believed that the syllabus is worded in a language that is above the students’ own level.

Malin stated that the only time her students use the syllabus and look at it is when they feel that they should have achieved a different grade. Learner responsibility, influence and self-assessment are things that are highlighted in Lgr11 and for this reason it is important for students to interact more with the syllabus than what they are according to this study. If, like in Malin’s class, students want to have a dialog with the teacher about a grade they need to have a deep understanding of the goals. Lundahl (2009) states that for self-assessment to work
in schools it is imperative that students have a clear and deep understanding of what they are supposed to learn in that particular subject.

The overall impression that Malin has towards Lgr 11 can be seen as it is a useful document which is rather difficult to approach without prior knowledge and difficult to comprehend not only for students but also for teachers. The National Curriculum in England and the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards provide teachers with a curriculum that is centered and steers the teacher towards teaching certain content (Department for Education in England 2013, the Georgia Department of Education, 2013). Due to the fact that Malin and the students feel that Lgr 11 is difficult to interpret, a mixture between the Swedish and English model could potentially be an interesting way of presenting a syllabus. Providing examples of how to teach along with clear learning outcomes that are explained could help the teachers in deciding on how to teach and assess. This could be one step in creating a school and teachings that are constructive aligned as presented by Biggs’s and Tang’s (2003) model and potentially implement the intended curriculum provided by the Government and the Swedish Agency for Education.
5. Discussion and conclusion

In the final section I discuss the results of this study and account for the research questions that served as a basis for this study. Furthermore I will also provide possible areas for future research in the field. Finally I will present conclusions made from this research.

5.1 Discussion

For this degree project, the students’ understanding of the syllabus for English in year 9 was investigated. Furthermore, the students’ teacher’s thoughts on her students’ understanding of the syllabus were also investigated. The gathered data were collected using a qualitative approach. The teacher was interviewed using a semi-structured approach while the student data were collected by using an open-ended questionnaire. The students were provided with a quote from the syllabus for English in year 9 along with open-ended questions to answer. This study was conducted at a secondary school in the south of Sweden.

Through the results of the interview on the teacher’s thoughts about the syllabus, the teacher believed that the syllabus provided a well-structured basis for the teacher’s teaching however she added that the same document is difficult to interpret. Malin highlighted the fact that even she and other teachers at her school have problems understanding and teaching the syllabus to the students. In addition she stated that, for her, the main tool for understanding this sort of text is through experience and working actively with it. With regard to the syllabus in connection to her students, Malin stated that it is her understanding that the syllabus is not very easy to understand for students in year 9 due to the language and complexity of this type of text. According to Malin, with exception for the occasional student, the students do not express much interest in the syllabus when they are presented with it in class but rather do not pay much attention to it. Moreover, the only time Malin has had students come up to her to talk about the syllabus is when a student felt that he/she deserved a different grade or felt that they have achieved a certain goal in the syllabus.

The results of the student questionnaire provided many interesting insights into what and how the students felt and thought about the syllabus. Generally the students believed that the words in the quote were difficult to understand. Some students felt that the wording could
have been easier in order for them to comprehend the text. Furthermore, the results showed that within this class there were many different levels of comprehension. Some students were able to read between the lines and understand the context and what the text sought to inform about without understanding all the words, whereas some students focused more and got stuck on the difficult words making it very difficult if not impossible for them to make sense of the text. Other feelings that were expressed by the students concerned the language of the text. Some students felt it was dated and aimed at an older population. Other students felt that this sort of text makes them lose interest in reading it.

Research on reading comprehension shows that the understanding a text is related to different factors, for example the setting, students’ prior experiences and feelings, their prior knowledge, the task requirements and the interaction between reader and text. These factors all play a part in a reader’s comprehension of a certain text.

More research is needed regarding students’ understanding of policy documents. There are different areas that are worth exploring further. One concerns the investigation of what happens when schools and teachers plan and create lesson plans. Another aspect that would be interesting is to look at concerns high-achieving and low-achieving students and their understanding of the syllabus. Do grade A students have a deeper understanding of the syllabus than grade E students? Finally, there is also need for comparative research on school curricula and syllabi for English from different countries. To what extent is learner responsibility highlighted in curricula in different countries, and do teachers have different roles in different countries?

5.2 Conclusion

This study sought to investigate students’ understanding and a teacher’s thoughts of the syllabus in English in year 9.

The results show that not all of the students in this study had a clear understanding of the syllabus and that the level of understanding varied within the group. In addition, only some of the students were able to answer all of the questions. Furthermore, the teacher believed that the syllabus is a difficult text which is challenging to understand for anyone. Furthermore, the teacher highlighted that sometimes the relation between teaching and the syllabus is not explained to the students.
Based on the results from the collected data for this research and the literature review, I argue that students must be exposed to the syllabus more than they often. One way of achieving this is to involve the students in working actively with the syllabus. When planning lesson and structuring the forthcoming semester, teachers should sit down with students and plan together. Furthermore, I believe that if the students become more exposed to the syllabus and curriculum their knowledge and capability of understanding such texts will increase. Therefore teachers should be more consistent and try to find more ways of incorporating the syllabus than shown in this study, not only presenting it at the start of a semester but using it as much as possible.

At the national level I believe that the Swedish Agency for Education should look into writing a syllabus that is more clearly aimed at students in different grades. In addition, the Swedish Agency for Education along with the Swedish government could review the National Curriculum in England and produce similar appendices that British teachers receive to distribute to Swedish teachers. This study shows that even teachers have issues when interpreting the curriculum and the syllabus. Therefore providing teachers with a more standardized approach would help teachers to achieve the intended goals and make sense of the intentions that the Swedish government and the Swedish Agency for Education have for the Swedish school.

Finally, it is important to emphasize that he results of this study only provide a limited insight into students’ understanding of policy documents. This study is also limited to one group of year 9 students and their teacher at a school in the south of Sweden.
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Appendix 1

Interview Schedule: English teacher

Background
1. Tell me about your background as a teacher.
2. Why did you decide to become a teacher?

Teacher’s beliefs about the English syllabus for year 9
3. How do you go about working with the syllabus in your classroom?
4. To what extent has your way of working with the syllabus changed during your career?
5. What do you think of the syllabus as a document to be used in the classroom?
6. What do you think of the syllabus as a document, with regards to content and wording?

Teacher’s beliefs about the students understanding
7. What are your thoughts about students’ understanding of the syllabus?
8. To what extent do you believe students use the syllabus as resource?
9. To what extent do you believe students understand the syllabus?
Appendix 2

Interview

130930 Interview with the teacher

Transcription

The passages that are used in the paper are transcribed and presented here.

I = Interviewer
M = Malin

I: So how do you go about working with the syllabus in your classroom?
M: Well...[Silence] hmm, I guess as everyone else at this school [laughter]. All of us English and language teachers, to be honest with you, work in a similar way. At the start of every project in English I provide the students with the goals that they are supposed to achieve along with a short overview of the project.
I: Okay, I understand, do you do this for every new thing you do in class, even if you start a new unit from the textbook for example?
M: Well sometimes... [Short pause] often I do to highlight the different goals and things in the syllabus. But other times those things are not covered as much.
I: Mhm
M: It really depends on the workload, it is not always easy to be a teacher. [Smiles]
I: Next question, you said that you have been working as a teacher for 10 years, in those years to what extent has your way of working with the syllabus changed?
M: Hmm, how has it changed?, I haven’t really thought about that. Do you mean in the classroom or in other situations?
I: No, just your approach to the syllabus, do you do something else today than when you started off as a teacher?
M: The biggest difference must be that nowadays I work a lot together with my colleagues in making the syllabus comprehensible. For example looking at the content and trying to find
and come up with different assignments for the students that are connected with the syllabus. But also with experience I believe that the steering documents are a bit easier to understand for me today.

I: mhm, what do you think of the syllabus as a document to be used in the classroom?
M: That is a tough question [laughter] hmm, my perception is that it is useful as a justification for what we are doing in class, but at the same time, it is quite formal to just present to the students, we try to simplify some things before I present it to the class, or rather I provide clarifications.

I: Mhm
M: Often the students are not very interested in the syllabus and the information just goes in one ear and out the other. At the start of every school year I always run through the syllabus for English and every year just a fraction of the students actually ask question or need clarification on something”
I: So some students just sit there and nod their heads?
M: Yes, precisely
I: The next question actually covers a bit of this so let’s move on to the next question.
M: Okay, sure
I: What do you think of the syllabus as a document, with regards to content and wording?
M: It is not a secret that the steering documents are hard to understand even for some teachers. It leaves a lot of room for individual interpretation. This is why we try to work together do see whether someone else has a different understanding of a goal or learning outcome.

I: Mhm
M: These documents are political, so this is why they are written in a specific language. What was the second part of the question?
I: Hmm [Short silence] oh yes about the content in the syllabus.
M: Content wise I believe it covers all major aspects of the school. It dives into all the different parts of the organization and provides guidelines. Obviously sometimes work needs to be put in to understand the text and language but they have covered almost everything.
I: Okay, if we now switch focus and look at your students. What are your thoughts about students’ understanding of the syllabus?
M: Yes it is hard to say [pause] they are probably aware of it and what it is but not more than so. I think that they don’t think about it, they just come and sit and do their assignments,
sometimes they ask why are we doing this or that. But students do not come up to me with the syllabus and ask when are we going to do this or reach this goal, and so on.

I: Mhm, okay, to what extent do you believe students use the syllabus as resource?

M: It really depends, I don’t believe the students sit and look though the syllabus and compare it to the lessons. The only time is if I have provided quotes from the syllabus or even a part of the syllabus, sometimes simplified quotes and tell them to look at it, then they might come with questions about it.

I: So if you don’t give them the syllabus they will not look at it?

M: Well not really except when I have given a grade at the end of a course or sometimes on an assignment, I will have students who, are not happy with a grade, come up to me and ask for clarifications on how I have graded them. Then often they have looked in the syllabus and feel that they have achieved this or that. Then we have a discussion about it and I explain why they got a certain grade.

I: To what extent do you believe students understand the syllabus?

M: I believe that this class has a pretty good picture of what we do and what is expected from them, but that is what we teacher should do, to provide the students with a ground work. Sometimes I need to point out that we are learning this or that or about this area. But looking at the language, I don’t believe the students understand that much. Maybe the some words but not the whole context. I believe that it is written in a language that is above the students’ level.

I: Can you see a potential solution to this?

M: That is very hard to say, if I give my interpretation to the students then than they have one understanding, then they may change classes or schools and a new teacher will give them a different interpretation. I belive that if there was a document provided by Skolverket for the students as a complement for the syllabus, written to students in different grades then it could perhaps be easier to work with.
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Eleversförståelse av kunskapskravet

Bakgrund

Kön:

Instruktioner

Läs nedanstående citat och sedan svara på frågorna. Ta god tid på dig och reflektera över dina svar.

"I muntliga och skriftliga framställningar i olika genrer kan eleven formulera sig **enkelt, begripligt och relativt sammanhängande.** För att förtydliga och variera sin kommunikation kan eleven bearbeta och göra **enkla** förbättringar av egna framställningar. I muntlig och skriftlig interaktion i olika sammanhang kan eleven uttrycka sig **enkelt och begripligt** samt i **någon mån anpassat** till syfte, mottagare och situation. Dessutom kan eleven välja och använda sig av **i huvudsak fungerande** strategier som **i viss mån löser problem** i och förbättrar interaktionen.”

1. Känner du igen texten? Om, JA, Varifrån?

2. Vad tycker du om texten? (Svärt, lätt, komplicerad, etc.)

3. Vad tycker du om ordvalet och språket som texten är skriven i?

4. Vad betyder meningen "I muntliga och skriftliga framställningar i olika genrer kan eleven formulera sig **enkelt, begripligt och relativt sammanhängande**”, för dig?

5. På vilka sätt kan du anpassa din engelska till syfte, mottagare och situation?

6. Redogör med egna ord för vad ”fungerade strategier” är enligt dig och hur dessa ”**i viss mån löser problem** i och förbättrar interaktionen”
**Appendix 4**

**Questionnaire questions**

7. Känner du igen texten? Om, JA, Varifrån?
8. Vad tycker du om texten? (Svår, lätt, komplicerad, etc.)
9. Vad tycker du om ordvalet och språket som texten är skriven i?
10. Vad betyder meningen ”I muntliga och skriftliga framställningar i olika genrer kan eleven formulera sig **enkelt, begripligt och relativt sammanhängande**”, för dig?
11. På vilka sätt kan du anpassa din engelska till syfte, mottagare och situation?
12. Redogör med egna ord för vad ”fungerade strategier” är enligt dig och hur dessa ”i viss mån löser problem i och förbättrar interaktionen”

**Questionnarie answers**

**S1**
7. Ja, från läroplanen för att veta vad som krävs för att uppnå olika betyg
8. Den är lätt att förstå, finns vissa ord som kan behöva förklaring
9. Det är ett bra ordval och språk
10. Att jag i en muntlig eller skriftlig uppgift kan få ”läsaren” att enkelst kunna förstå och läsa vad jag vill få fram för budskap. Det ska vara på ett sätt så att alla kan förstå mitt språk och ordval. Det ska dessutom finnas en ”röd tråd” alltså att det finns någon sorts struktur i det
11. Genom att förklara vad jag menar, fråga om någon inte förstår, använda enkla ord, prata lungt och se till så att alla hänger med.
12. Att man lägger upp en plan som fungerar för både lärare och elev och att eleven är delaktig i allt som pågår

**S2**
7. Ja, I wieselgrensskolan
8. Komplicerad
9. Komplicerad text
10. Imuntliga har man lättare att prata och i den skriftliga så uttrycker man sin ordförråd mer
11. Skriva lätt ord så läsaren kan förstå
12. 

**S3**
7. Ja, i min gamla skola Wieselgrensskolan
8. Komplicerad
9. Den är komplicerad text
10. I den muntliga så har man lättare att sncka och i den skriftliga så uttrycker man sina ord mer
11. Skriva lätt ord som läsaren kan fatta
12. Jag vet inte

**S4**
7. Nej
8. Lite komplicerad?
9. Kunde ha gjort det lättare att förstå
10. Att man kan beskriva olika genom att man skriver och tar det muntligt
11. Kroppspråk?
12. Vet inte

S5
7. Jag känner igen texten från när man har gjort ett prov eller läxa så frå man reda på hur
   man förklarade på provet
8. För mi så tyckte jag texten både var svår och enkel att förstå, vissa ord är svåra att
   förstå
9. Eftersom jag har svårt med ordvalet i texter så är det svårt men vissa ord att förstå vad
   som menas. Som tex. ”relativs sammanhängande” ”i huvudsak”
10. Det kanskte betyder ”i muntliga och skriftliga uppgifter i olika genrer? Kan eleven
    förklara sig enkelt, förstående...
11. Om jag skriver till en kompis så kanske de e mest talsätt men om det e till en lärare så
    e jag mer ordenlig med hur jag skriver
12. Jag vet inte

S6
7. Skolan
8. Komplicerad, svår
9. Jag tycker att den är skriven på ett sätt så att bara äldre människor förstår
10. Att man ska uttrycka sig så man lätt förstår och man inte ska bli förvirrad
11. Jag kan anpassa språket efter hur gammal mottagaren är och kanske tala, skriva med
    halvdålig/svengelska om personen inte är så duktig på engelska
12. ”Fungerande strategier” enligt mig är nog om man kommer på ett eget sätt (?) att tex
    lösa en uppgift eller hjälper till så att man förstår

S7
7. Ja från en matris
8. Ganska lått
9. Komplicerat men förståligt
10. Att man kan bli förståd enkelt, bra och mycket bra muntligt
11. Om tex någon har A i engelska och ska snacka med en som har E måste den personen
    anpassa sig och använda låta ord
12. Fungerande strategi då fungerar engelskan alstå den är begriplig. I viss mån läser
    problem då kan man lösa problem bra men inte jätte bra

S8
7. Jag tror det, isåfall skolverket
8. Jag förstå men ändå lite komplicerat
9. Vissa ord är lättare än andra
10. Det betyder är hon/han kan prata/berätta/beskriva enkla meningar så man ändå förstår
    och så att det hänger ihop relativt
11. Jag kan anpassa min engelska om jag jobbar med någon som har jätte svårt för det så
    kan man prata lite enklare engelska så att personen förstår, även hjäpa till med
    ordspråket osv.
12. Jag lär mig bäst om man gör olika saker. Iblad gå du igenom saker på tavlan att man
    ibland får jobba själv och även i grupper. Jag hatar verkligen att prata engelska inför
    hela klassen. Men att redovisa eller prata i mindre grupper gör inget.

S9
7. Inte texten som helhet, men delav utav den, från matriser med kunskapskrav ifrån min
   förra skola.
8. Man förstår texten om man läser noga , men den är onödigt ”komplicerad”/tråkig
9. Tråkigt ordval, en sån text som gör att man tappar intresset direkt
10. Att man som elev kan uttrycka sig enkelt så att andra förstår, och att man på ett sätt (dock ej fullt utvecklat) gör så att det finns en "röd tråd" med det man säger.


S10
7. Ja, det kommer från en matris och det är vad vi måste kunna för att få x betyh
8. Tydig
9. Begriplig
10. När du skriver och pratar har du ett enkelt förståligt språk med någerlunda röd tråd
11. Jag kan välja lättare ord prata längsamtare eller skriva tydligare

S11
7. Det är en matriss från något ämne
8. Vissa saker är svårt att förstå
9. Vissa ord kan dom byta ut till lättare
10. När eleven ska prata eller skriva i olika tillfällen kan eleven använda sig enkelt, försåndligt
11. Jag vill helst inte prata i någon större grupp. Jag vill att läraren lär ut på ett roligt sätt för då vill man lära sig mer
12. Hur man arbetar, om man tycker att det sättet är bra.

S12
7. Engelska matriser
8. Lätt
9. Lite för komplicerade meningar
10. Att man flytande kan prata och skriva enkelt så att andra kan förstå
11. Prata/skriva med enklare ord så alla kan förstå
12. Att alltid försöka förklara saker på engelska även om man inte kan ordet.

S13
7. Läroplanen
8. Den är komplicerad kunde ha varit mer skriven på dom ”vanliga orden”
9. Komplicerat
10. Betyder typ att eleven kan uttrycka sig enkelt och lätt men ändå ha ett samanhag i olika uppgifter som skrivs

S14
7. Jag känner ingen texten men jag vet inte varifrån
8. Jag tyckte den var relativt lätt
9. Jag tyckte den var bra skriven, så att den var lätt att förstå med lite ”komplexa” ord
10. Att eleven är lätt att förstå och att han gör ett bra jobb både skriftlig och munligt
11. Ska jag snacka med någon som inte är så bra på engelska för jag du försöka använda enkla ord och använda mycket kropps språk.
12. En fungerande strategi är ju en strategi som funkar bra för dom flesta och som kan lösa många möjliga problem och kan stopa det man vill undvika

S15
7. Nej
8. Lätt
9. Det är svåra ord, (förfinad svenska) men ändå begripligt
10. Att personen ska kunna göra sig förstådd i olika stitutioner
11. Inte använda komplicerade ord, utan att vara rak på sak på så enkelt sätt som möjligt
12. ”Fungerande strategier” att hålla sig till den plan som verkar mest logisk. ” iviss mån löser problem i och förbättrar interaktionen” en tillfällig lösning.

S16
7. Nej
8. Komplicerad
9. Svåra ord, svåra att förstå
10. Jag tror det betyder hur eleven framstår
11. Om jag behöver hjälpa någon genom att prata engelska kan man vissa med kroppen vad man menar om personen inte förstå vad du menar
12. Jag lär mig bäst om jag får glosor från en text som jag har läst. Och om jag från något som jag ska prata om inför en grupp

S17
7. Nej
8. Man kan förså, men den var komplicerad
9. Orden är inte lätt, men jag förstår vad som menar i all fall
10. Både muntligt och skriftligt i olika sammanhang, kan eleven uttrycka sig enkelt, begripligt och relativt sammanhängande.
11. Ifall jag pratar engelska med en person som inte är så bra på det, så kan jag prata på ett enklare sätt.
12. Fungerande strategier = ”Begripligt” I viss mån löser problem i och förbättrar interaktionen = ”På något sätt löser problem och förbättrar sig”