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Abstract

The purpose of this degree project is to address upper secondary outdoor language education. It explores upper secondary EFL students’ attitudes and responses towards the teaching of English outdoors. The research has been based on data from qualitative research methods with an action research approach: peer observation, a reflective diary and focus group interviews. Peer observation and the reflective diary was used to recover information on four upper secondary EFL classes’ responses towards being taught outdoors. Focus group interviews were conducted on two groups of students from two of the classes on their attitudes towards being taught in outdoor English. The results from the data gathering are discussed using secondary sources which can be connected to outdoor education, and the research establishes that the students responded negatively to the instructions during the classes, many of them were active while some did not do what they were supposed to, and hardly no English was spoken. Even though mostly negative results were found the interviewees were generally positive to be taught outdoors and enjoyed it more than receiving education indoors, but some of them were aware that they did not learn much English since they hardly used it. This research provides ideas for how the lessons can be improved and acts as inspiration for future outdoor ESL classes.
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Traditionally language education takes place in the classroom environment, where the learning takes place inside the mind, but this is not the only alternative. There are subjects such as physical education where both mind and body are used to learn. Teachers in other subjects are also starting to let students interact with each other and different environments, using both body and mind. Atkinson (2010) states that recent researchers claim learning not only takes place in the mind; instead he argues learning takes place through interaction between the mind, the body, and the world. The aforementioned learning components are all stimulated by outdoor education, since the students can be able to work with both the mind and the body in various outdoor settings.

John Dewey (Ord & Leather, 2011) was important for the development of outdoor teaching and he believed in the idea of experiential learning, which means a learner needs to try and undergo something in order to learn it. This idea of active and explorative learning can easily be connected to teaching outdoors, by letting students interact with the nature and use it in the learning process. Outdoor education can give another dimension to language teaching and can work as a complement to traditional classroom teaching.

A considerable amount of research has been published on outdoor teaching for younger students, but there is hardly any done on upper secondary school students. Most of it covers subjects like PE and Biology, where outdoor education is a natural part of the teaching, and outdoor language education is seldom mentioned. The research that is published on upper secondary school students’ often focus on teachers’ attitudes towards outdoor education, but there is not much research published on students’ attitudes and responses on actual outdoor teaching.

The focus of this degree project is on the barely explored area of upper secondary outdoor EFL teaching. It emphasizes the students’ attitudes and responses towards my outdoor English lessons. The paper can work as inspiration and aid for teachers who use outdoor teaching, teachers who want to use it, and for people who have a general interest in the subject.
1.1 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this degree project is to fill the void in the upper secondary outdoor language teaching area. It aims to show how upper secondary outdoor English can be taught and present how students respond to this kind of teaching during lessons, which refer to how they act when being taught. The project also intends to contribute research on their attitudes toward outdoor education after being taught in outdoor English, aiming to find out what students think of being taught outdoors.

Based on these reasons I have focused on two main research questions:

- How do upper secondary EFL students respond to the teaching of English outdoors?
- What are the attitudes of upper secondary EFL students concerning the use of outdoor English teaching?
2 Theoretical Background

In order to understand why students’ responses and attitudes towards outdoor education should be investigated, one first needs to understand the background and definition of outdoor education, secondly know why outdoor teaching should be used according to recent research, and finally learn about its benefits by looking into other similar research. For this purpose data that in some ways can be connected to upper secondary outdoor EFL education was collected to give the reader a better understanding of these subject areas and to create a general understanding of the subject.

2.1 Background and Definition

Pedagogy, where theory and practice were used together in authentic situations, emerged in the end of the 17th century (Szczepanski & Dahlgren, 2011). This type of experiential learning is the foundation of outdoor education (Ord & Leather, 2011). John Dewey was a central figure in this context and argued for interaction of non-text based practices and text based practices (Szczepanski & Dahlgren, 2011). Moreover, Ord and Leather (2011) claim that to get a full understanding of outdoor teaching it is important to return to Dewey’s ideas.

Vygotsky theories about interaction (Schaffer, 1996) are also important for the development of outdoor teaching, since he stressed that children’s developmental progress came from interaction with their environment. He also believed a person’s social skills are developed through social interaction with someone else in a social context (Schaffer, 1996). Nature and the outdoors represent authentic environments which can be used for this kind of communicative learning.

Ideas such as these helped to form outdoor teaching, but what is it?
Szczepanski and Dahlgren (2011) claim that it is characterized by experiences that take place outside of the culture of texts, and is probably the only pedagogy which specifies the physical environment in which the learning should take place. They also state that there is no consistency concerning the definition of outdoor education is in Sweden.

2.1.1 Definition

Outdoor education can be difficult to define since it has many sub-categories, such as environmental education, recreational education and adventure education. The term outdoor teaching has, according to Ford (1986), a wider meaning than the sub-categories. She defines it as education that takes place outdoors, is about the outdoors, or both. This definition is used by Ford in order to be applied to all the different sub-groups of outdoor education. Gustafsson et al (2012) on the other hand see outdoor education as an approach where the purpose is to: “[…] foster learning through the interplay between experience and reflection, based on practical observation in authentic situations” (p. 68). This definition is more delimited and focuses more clearly on integration with the outdoor environment than Ford’s definition.

As mentioned there are several ways to define outdoor teaching and its definition can be unclear. Szczepanski and Dahlgren (2011) noticed this and therefore made a study to find out elementary school teachers’ (pre-school too year six) views of the concept. These teachers connected outdoor education to the actual physical environments, ways to learn outside, objects found outdoors and physical activity. Interaction with the outdoors and authenticity were factors which the participants saw as important. When it came to outdoor education as a way to learn, the participants emphasized bodily experiences in combination with the mind. They also saw body, ecology, the subject and nature as objects for outdoor teaching. Finally, many of the participants saw physical activity as a part of education outdoors and claimed that it had positive effects on students learning.
2.2 Why use Outdoor Education?

Outdoor education can be a good tool for teachers to vary their teaching and give it another dimension, but it can also affect learning aspects according to the elementary school teachers’ in Szczepanski’ and Dahlgren’s (2011) study. Participants in the study asserts that when there are no spatial limits the possibility of bodily learning increases. They claim that another form of social interaction occurs in learning which is generated outdoors than indoors, and the partakers also believe that the lessons outdoors are calmer than the ones indoors, because the students have the possibility to be physical.

2.2.1 Physical Activity and Learning

Outdoor education can give students the possibility to be physical; while this is not always guaranteed, it can have positive effects if it is included. Gligoroska and Manchevska (2012) present results from studies which claim physical activity can improve several learning related aspects, such as episodic memory, executive functions, attention and cognitive speed. Positive learning and developmental effects of physical activity and physical education were also found in Armour’s and Sandford’s (2013) study of disaffected youth. Their research of a physical activity program reveals that many of the participants improved in school. The pupils who only participated in the initial week of the program showed less improvement than those who continued, which shows that continuity could be needed to achieve positive results in development and learning.

Physical activity can be a tool for improving learning in outdoor education, but it is not a necessity to integrate it into the teaching because there are several other positive aspects of education outdoors.
2.2.2 Mental Health

Another positive aspect of using outdoor education is that it can have positive effects on boys’ mental health, in accordance to Gustafsson’s et al. (2012) study on elementary school students (pre-school to grade six). The study took place at two schools. One was a reference school where the teaching went on as usual, while the other school was an experimental school where the outdoor teaching intervention took place. The results were based on questionnaires and showed that the boys at the experimental school improved more than those at the reference school. The following mental health areas were improved: emotional symptoms, conduct problems, hyperactivity and peer problems. The research also showed that the girls’ results were inconclusive when it came to the researched mental health areas.

Based on the results the authors came to the conclusion that it is important to design educational programs that meet the needs of both boys and girls, and that several surveys need to be performed in order to find out if boys’ mental health gets more improved by outdoor education than girls.

As mentioned, the study did improve aspects such as conduct problems, hyperactivity and peer problems, which can lead to a better lesson climate which therefore might improve the students learning.

2.2.3 Learning Outdoors

Student learning can also be affected more directly by outdoor education, which can be seen in the comparative study conducted by Fägerstam and Blom (2013). This study shows that students who were taught more outdoors in Biology experienced a more contextualized learning experience as active participants, than the students who had less education outdoors. When asked about the lessons after five months, the students who had more outdoor classes talked about themselves performing science, while the students who were taught indoors seldom explained how they worked with different content areas and mostly talked about what the teacher did.
This type of contextual learning can be found in Eick’s (2012) narrative study of a third-grade teacher of science, and one of her classes on their daily activities and practice of outdoor education. The students in the study performed better on high stakes tests than other third grade classes in science, thus providing further evidence for the usefulness of outdoor education.

Outdoor teaching can be a complement to improve students learning as the research point out, but it is important to take into account that students can respond differently to teaching and can have different attitudes concerning how to be taught.

2.4 Responses and Attitudes

The research presented above describes reasons for using outdoor education; but what are students’ attitudes regarding outdoor education and how should it be taught? By studying students’ responses and attitudes concerning outdoor education, teachers can see how it affects students, what they think of it and how to improve their lessons.

Mygind (2009) conducted a survey on this subject about third graders that had 20% of their education in the forest, researching how they experienced the classroom and the outdoor setting. The research material was gathered with questionnaires, where the students could choose between different statements concerning their experiences of outdoor teaching. The survey showed that students’ social relations improved, they experienced less noise, and were more satisfied spending time in the forest than in the classroom.

Positive attitudes towards the outdoors were also found in Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) study of high school pupils’ attitudes towards learning biology and mathematics outdoors in comparison to indoor learning. Participants in the study mentioned variation as a reason for why they liked outdoor teaching. It was also perceived by many as more stimulating, fun and relevant than their usual school environment. Several of the students claimed it was a more interesting environment and exposure to fresh air made them feel more focused and alert. They also gave negative responses regarding outdoor education: for example, they had problems concentrating, hearing what the teacher said and reported that it was noisier and that the weather could be cold and wet.
However, both studies give a mostly positive description of outdoor education, and the lesson type was generally appreciated by the participants.
Qualitative research is a more open research strategy than quantitative research, and focuses more on words than on quantification when interpreting and analyzing data (Bryman, 2008). This degree project was based on qualitative research methods. It had a qualitative action research approach and used the following qualitative research methods for data gathering: observation, a reflective diary and focus group interviews. The results from the research were discussed using secondary sources.

3.1 The School and Participants

The participants in this project were four classes of upper secondary English 5 students and an experienced teacher who acted as observer. It took place at an upper secondary school in southern Sweden which has several vocational programs.

3.1.1 The School and the Classes

Bryman (2008) states that sampling in qualitative research is usually purposive sampling, which means that the choice of participants is directly connected to the research questions. This method was used to pick a school and classes for the project. The research was primarily aimed at two areas: upper secondary students and outdoor education. Therefore an upper secondary school was chosen and the particular school was selected because it has an area close to the school that is very nature like and is suitable for outdoor education.

The individual classes study English 5 for four semesters. English5 classes were surveyed since only one class at the school studies English 6.
Each English 5 class typically have 20 students, but only 63 of 80 students in total showed up for class when the observations were conducted: Class.A 17 mechanic students, Class.B 13 transportation students, Class.C 15 student electricians and Class.D 18 transportation students.

Trost (2010) claims the circumstance of the research are important when choosing the amount of participants for a qualitative study and factors such as economy and time can affect the study. Time was an important issue when choosing participants for this project and therefore only four classes were used. There was also a negative factor in choosing these classes, since they only consist of six girls and only three showed up for the lessons, which limits the possibility of generalization and decreases the width of the project. These groups were picked because they were the only English 5 students on the school that I had no prior knowledge of, which helped me to conduct the study in a more objective way.

The individual students used for the interviews were supposed to be sampled to create as Trost (2010) describes it, heterogeneity within the given homogeneity, which means in simple terms that the participants are supposed to be different from the general student in the research category (upper secondary English student), but not too different. He also proposes that researchers should only conduct a few interviews, about four or five, to be able to manage the material. The students that were interviewed were between 15 and 16 years old, which is the most common age group for English five students at autumn. A total of 15 students in three groups of five students were interviewed, where one group was interviewed as pilot study to ensure the right data were collected and two groups were used for the actual interviews.

Due to the time limit of the project the interviews needed to take place within ten weeks, and I needed to get the consent forms (appendix 6) from the parents since the students were not of age. Four groups were supposed to be used in the project to make the data gathering and the analysis of the data manageable, but only three were conducted because of problems with the consent forms. The consent forms caused a problem since only a few of them were returned to me (five in Class B and five in Class C) and in one class no consent forms were handed in (Class D), which made it hard for me to sample students that would create heterogeneity within the given homogeneity.
No consent forms were needed in Class A because they were only used to pilot the interview schedule and thereby was not sound recorded, and the data from that interview was not used in the project. The students more or less selected themselves since in the two classes where consent forms were handed in only five students could participate. Only one participant was a girl which fits the representation of the group as a whole, but still affected the gender balance of the project.

3.1.2 The Observer

The observer is an English and psychology teacher with several years of teaching experience, and is also my VFT supervisor. She is between 40 and 50 years old and has been teaching English for 19 years. She has been working at the school where the survey took place for the last 13 years. Her experience of outdoor education is limited, but she has used it on some occasions. We have known each other for four years and she is the students’ teacher, so she might have had some preconceptions when observing, but she was instructed to remain neutral and the comments on the instrument that were personal were omitted from analysis.

3.2 Action Research

Action research is a reflective approach, where the research is done by the researcher and is aimed at his own work (McNiff, 2002); in this case teaching. Heigham and Croker (2009) explain that the goal when practicing it is to use the material you have gathered at a local level to improve or change current practice in a certain situation. They also mention that there are many areas of interest a researcher can focus on. The projects area of interest was my outdoor teaching, and in order to know what needed to be improved was the students’ responses on and attitudes towards the teaching examined.

Action research was used in this study since it can be a good tool when it comes to collecting data involving actual teaching.
However, it can be difficult to be objective when using it (McNiff, 2002) because it is based on personal values and the focus is on the researcher himself. It was therefore important to keep that in mind when I evaluated myself and to be as objective as possible.

It is not only positive to work with action research, Nunan (2001) mentions several potential limitations, and two of them were found in this project: lack of time and lack of expertise. The study was affected by a time limit, which made it less extensive than it potentially could be and the lack of expertise also affected the use of time negatively, but it was still constructed in accordance to the time limit.

Nunan (2001) asserts that action research is hardly seen as research by some people, but according to him it could be justified on research grounds. It can be of great interest, not just as an evaluative tool; if it is published it can become of use for other teachers who have an interest in the same subject area, but the research does not always become available. Heigham and Croker (2009) state that the findings of action research are often not published, but they also argue that the trend is changing and more action research is increasingly available, which can be useful for teachers worldwide.

3.3 Qualitative Observation

McDonough and McDonough (1997) views observation as a broad umbrella term which has several interpretations and purposes. Heigham and Croker (2009) on the other hand define it more narrowly as an objective research method, where the researcher studies and examines a behavior in a naturalistic setting. Zieman (2012) adds that this method can be useful in gaining local qualitative material, which can be used to make pedagogical improvements and changes.

Peer observation was used in the survey and was carried out by an experienced teacher, since I could not observe when teaching. This type of observation is conducted on a person’s teaching by someone else or a person observing someone’s teaching for them (Heigham and Croker, 2009). This method was effective because one can focus on teaching without needing to observe at the same time, but it also resulted in me not having control of the observation, which can be negative.
The purpose of the observations was to find out how the students responded to the teaching of English outdoors. Furthermore, the lesson plan was the same for all the lessons to research the students’ responses to the same type of lesson in different classes, taught by the same teacher. Response in this context refers to responses triggered by the teaching and were narrowed down into three behavioral categories that were examined: how much English the students speak, how they respond to instructions and how active they are.

The observation schedule was based on these three aspects and had one slot for what to observe and one for comments on observed behaviors. If the slots were full the teacher had spare observation schedules to write on. The information collected from the observations was based on field notes that the teacher wrote down during the outdoor lessons. In order to make these results manageable a systematic observation schedule was used. According to MacDonough and MacDonough (1997) this type of scheme can be divided into different behavioral categories, which should be observed and written down when spotted. They also state that by using a systematic observation schedule the researcher can separate important events from the extensive amount of data available, and this makes it easier to find patterns in the observed material.

An observation schedule was used on five outdoor teaching lessons as part of a preliminary investigation. Responses were used to revise the observation schedule to more adequately capture student responses during the lesson. It did not provide answers to the research question and it was not clear enough. The observation schedule was revised (appendix1) and the observation focus were changed to better connect to the research questions. A clarification of what to observe (appendix2) was also added in order to make it easier for the observer. The changes made the results from the actual research clearer, easier to connect to the research questions and were more connected to the study as a whole.

3.3.1 The Lesson Plan

Four upper secondary EFL classes were taught on one 45 minutes long outdoor lesson per class by me.
The purpose of the lessons were to show how upper secondary students respond to outdoor teaching by exposing them to an outdoor English task, with a connection to the English5 syllabus (Skolverket, 2011). The lesson plan was created to fit into Fords loose definition of outdoor teaching (1987), to give me the possibility to be creative and not be limited by a stricter definition. It was also based on Vygotsky’s (Schaffer, 1996) ideas of learning through social interaction and interaction with the environment.

The task (appendix4) was built in the following way:
- The students were divided into groups of six.
- They had 30 minutes to create a two minute long play based on a genre of their own choice and their profession.
- All the plays were supposed to contain six different types of characters.
- The students were instructed to integrate a predetermined outdoor scene/environment into their play.
- They were told to only communicate in English and everybody in the groups needed to say something.
- Key words and scripts were supposed to be written down to make it easier for the students.

The task was connected to the core content described in the syllabus for English5 (Skolverket, 2011), which states that English5 can be taught by letting students use spoken language, and that oral production and interactions can be used, which is the case in the task. The syllabus also states that the communication in the course should contain contextual areas that are connected to students’ education and societal/work life. This can be seen in this task since the students were supposed to connect the play to their profession.

### 3.4 Reflective Diary

Diaries can be a good way to capture an individual’s perspective of a situation. McDonough and McDonough (1997) describe it as not only being a recreation of something experienced, but also a written record that is structured, formulated and can be used to react to an event. They also mention that the material can be analyzed and reflected on afterwards.
Heigham and Croke (2009) claim diaries can work as a good data collection method for language teachers and is often used in action research. They also mention some negative aspects of using diaries, for example that they are based only on subjective data and that it can be questionable if a researcher can analyze all possible aspects of one’s own language teaching.

A diary (appendix 4) was used in the study to collect data on my interpretation of how the students responded to my teaching. I completed a diary entry after each of the four lessons, which was a good way to help me remember my experiences, feelings and thoughts from the lessons, when interpreting the data. The writing of the diary was done before looking at the observer’s notes and was used immediately after the lesson was over.

The type of diary used in the project is what Heigham and Croke (2009) refer to as a reflective journal. This type of diary should capture things like the teacher’s feelings, thoughts and insights soon after a lesson in order to process what happened during it. A framework for the reflective journal was used to retrieve this material in an organized way, and was based on the observation areas from the observation schedule. The framework made it easier for me to analyze and make sense of the retrieved material.

3.5 Qualitative Interviews

Qualitative interviews can be used to see the world from the eyes of research participants and to extract content from their experiences (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). They are based on simple and straightforward questions, which can result in complex and extensive answers (Trost, 2010). These answers can in turn result in extensive and rich research material (Trost, 2010).

The purpose of using interviews in this project was to find out the students’ attitudes regarding outdoor teaching and both present the data on its own and use it when analyzing the responses. Attitudes in this context means what they think of and how they feel about being taught outdoors on a specific lesson. They were all performed in Swedish, since that is the native language of the students and thereby made it easier for them to discuss the questions, but the answers were translated when cited.
The estimated time for the interviews was ten minutes. They all took place after the lesson in a classroom environment the participants were used to.

A semi-structured interview schedule was used (Appendix 5) for the interviews. Heigham and Croker (2009) explain that these kinds of schedules contain main questions that are supported by a set of follow up questions, which are based on how the interviewees can responded to the main questions.

All the interviews were focus-group interviews consisting of five students per group. The goal of this type of interview is to bring up different opinions on a matter and for the moderator to create discussion questions that result in a good exchange of views (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

Focus groups were used in this study to bring forth interesting and deep answers from the discussions. This method was also chosen since it is a good way to gather information from several students at the same time. There are however some negative aspects of using focus groups as well. Bryman (2008) argues that the researcher has less control over the turn of events, the data can be difficult to analyze and focus groups are hard to organize.

The interviews were sound recorded, in order to get as extensive material as possible. Trost (2010) claims that sound recording interviews can be of use since one can listen to intonations and word use. He also states that it can make the students focus on the questions; instead of writing down answers. Trost mentions negative aspects as well: it is time consuming and you cannot analyze visual data afterwards.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

When conducting research one battles with various ethical issues and tries to make as ethical choices as possible. The ethical considerations in this research project are based on Vetenskapsrådets/”the Swedish research council’s” (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) ethical guidelines for how to conduct research in social sciences and humanities research. The Swedish research council is a government agency which purpose is to support and promote Swedish basic research from all scientific fields.
The ethical guidelines (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) mention four areas of ethical considerations that need to be taken into account: information, consent, confidentiality and use of collected data. All these areas have been considered and have been taken into account when working with the project.

According to the considerations regarding information (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) the participants taking part in research should be informed of their part in the study and the conditions for their involvement. The participants are also supposed to be told that their participation is voluntary and they can withdraw from the project whenever they wish. When gathering data for this project all participants were given this information and knew that they did not have to take part in it if they did not want to.

The considerations regarding consent (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) concerns the participants’ approval of being a part of a study, and that they can decide on what terms they participate. In the guidelines it is also stated that there are cases when parents’ consent is needed, for example if the research is of a sensitive nature. They also claim that there should be no dependency between researcher and participants. The participants in the project were given this information and gave their consent to be in the project. A consent form (appendix 6) was handed to the students to give to their parents, since they are minors and were sound recorded.

The Swedish Research Council’s (Vetenskaprådet, 2002) guidelines regarding confidentiality describe that only the researchers should get access to the information from the project, and it should be practically impossible for other people to take part of the information. They also state that all sorts of gathered information should be stored in a way were no outsiders can take part of the information, especially if it is ethically sensitive. No other researcher was given access to the gathered data from this study and the material was destroyed/deleted after the study was published.

The last area to take into account (Vetenskapsrådet, 2002) is use of collected data, which revolves around how the material is used. Gathered research data about individuals may not be used or borrowed for commercial or scientific reasons. The material from this project was only handled by me, besides the observation schedules which were used by the observer and handed in to me immediately after the lessons. She had no access to the data after the lesson and had no other part in the study other than being an observer.
4 Results & Discussion

The results regarding the students’ responses and attitudes towards outdoor teaching are presented and discussed separately to focus on one area at the time. Furthermore, the results and the discussion concerning the responses emphasize the material from the peer observation, the reflective diary and the respondent’s attitudes. Moreover, the results and the discussion about the attitudes are on the other hand mainly based on the results from the interviews. Finally, the results from the qualitative research are discussed using relevant theory.

4.1 Responses towards Outdoor Teaching

When conducting the study there needed to be a focus on some types of responses in order to make it manageable. Three categories were chosen: responses towards the instructions, activity and the extent of English used. The students’ responses towards receiving instructions outdoors were observed to see if the participants understood what to do and acted accordingly during an outdoor lesson. Moreover, the activity level was studied to see if the students did what they were supposed to and if the teaching made them work actively, when being taught outdoors. Lastly, the extent of English used during the classes was observed to examine what effects the outdoor task had on the amount of English used by the students. The different responses are dealt with separately in different sections.

4.1.1 Responses towards the instructions

Instructions are an important part of teaching since they inform students about what they are supposed to do and how they should do it.
How students respond to instructions in outdoor EFL classes were researched to examine how the outdoors affected the instructions, and how their understanding of a task could have an impact on the other researched responses.

When conducting the lessons the instructions were given both in verbal and written form to make it as clear as possible for the participants. However, it became clear to me when I was guiding them that they did not fully understand the instructions. Some of the students asked me to instruct them in Swedish since they did not understand the explanation in English, and some did not conduct the task in accordance to the instructions, at first. The observer did also notice that many students did not understand what to do in the beginning of the lessons. To make it clearer for the students I tried to repeat the instructions and explain the parts they did not understand, which resulted in that all students besides two completed the task.

Even though most of the students were able perform their plays, there were still some aspects of the task that were not completed in accordance to the instructions: The presentations were shorter than instructed, the outdoors was rarely integrated into the acting and hardly no English was used throughout the task. Nevertheless, it is difficult to know how much the outdoor environment affected how the students responded to the instructions, since other factors could have had an impact on their responses as well, such as their willingness to speak English and the amount of time they had to prepare.

The results from the observations and the reflections portrayed the instructions in a negative way. The interviewees did not entirely share this view. They generally thought the instructions were clear and said they understood them. Anyhow, some negative aspects concerning the instructions were also expressed during the interviews. Several students said that they did not fully understand the instructions in the beginning. Interviewees from both groups expressed that the instructions should have taken place indoors, which was described as calmer as calmer environment.

The idea to use the indoors to prepare for outdoor education could be a key to make them respond better to the instructions. This can be connected to Dewey’s (Szczepanski & Dahlgren, 2011) idea of interacting non-text based and text based practices, where the indoors work a as an area for text based practices and the outdoors as an arena for non-text based practices.
These ideas could have been used to shape the study. Text based practices indoors could have been used for preparation and giving instructions, while non-text based practices outdoors could have been used to try out the play and as a stage for the final performance. The teachers in Mygind’s (2009) survey were able to create this kind of integration, and used indoor lessons based on theory to prepare and plan for the once taking place outdoors. Most of the teachers in Szczepanski’s and Dahlgren’s (2011) study expressed that this kind of integration is useful and important when using outdoor education. If teachers do this they have the possibility to use strengths from both environments and teach in a more diverse way.

There still was positive sides of giving the instructions outdoors, even though mostly negative responses were found, for example was a lot of time saved by teaching in the same environment throughout the lessons, and it gave me the possibility to show the students the environment they were supposed to use in their plays. Instructing outdoors has some advantages and might have worked better if I would have instructed the participants in a more structured way and in a calmer outdoor environment.

The students responded mostly negatively to the instructions and the outdoors could have been one of the reasons for these responses, but it is hard to know to what extent it affected the responses.

4.1.2 Activity

The students’ activity level was observed in order to see if the outdoors made the students work actively with the task. In this context the word active means that the students were doing what they were supposed to do: work with the task. The observer was instructed to observe the following: If the students did what they were supposed to, what they did if they were inactive and how their behavior changed when I was there to instruct them.

The results from the observations and my reflections revealed that many of the participants tried to be active and work with the task, with some exceptions. Some students in Class A and Class C did not focus and played around instead of doing what they were supposed to do.
The observer did also notice inactivity among some students in Class C. There were some difficulties concerning participation in Class B: We both noticed that one student decided to not participate and that another got in a verbal argument with a classmate and left. In Class D most of the participants played around when I was not there to help and inspire them, except for one group of students. Nonetheless, the observer noticed activity in Class D and the only negative observation she found was that one group needed to spend more time on preparations.

Most of the participants responded well to the task and worked with it actively. This positive response could be linked to the interviewees’ positive attitudes towards the task. If they enjoy doing something it is quite probable that they will do it. One could also connect the negative responses to the outdoor environment, for example that some students were playing around and not working with task. This behavior could be an effect of them being in a less strict environment, since they stand up and move around, instead of mostly remaining seated.

Some of the interviewees notice that a few students were playing around, and many of them stated that it was noisy outdoors. In Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) survey the students also perceived the outdoors as noisy and claimed that it was harder to concentrate in that environment. These descriptions portray outdoor lessons as noisy and unstructured. In order to change the students responses more structure could be needed to make it easier for the students to concentrate and focus on the task. Some structural improvements could be made: The instructions could have been given to the students in a calmer environment, there should have been less students in the groups and a smaller outdoor area should have been used.

The actual outdoor area that was used for the task could be connected to the negative responses. It is bigger than a normal classroom, which made it hard for me to have control over and help more than one group at the time. These circumstances required the participants to be able to work independently. Sadly, this was not the case in all the groups since some of them stopped working with the task when I was not there. It might have been easier to use a more limited outdoor area, where I could have had an easier time to move between the groups and keep them active, since most of them needed assistance to keep on working.
There were efforts made to get the students to work on their own and to boost the activity level: Giving encouragement, correcting them when they were misbehaving and giving inspiration concerning the play. These actions only gave temporary results on the inactive groups since they stopped working as soon as I left.

Some of the interviewees’ claimed that by decreasing the group sizes the structure would get better, and one student believed that it would increase their activity level. Smaller groups could have made it easier for the students to cooperate and be more effective.

Another thing that could have made the students more active is physical activity. It can have positive effects on cognitive speed and attention (Gligoroska & Manchevska, 2012). This could have made it easier for the students to focus on and work with the task. If physical activities are conducted regularly they can have positive effects on learning and development (Armour & Sandford, 2013). Physical activities could easily be integrated into outdoor teaching, but it would not fit in this study. Nonetheless, one could have used minor physical activities in the beginning of the task to increase the students’ focus and thereby get better responses.

There were a lot of students who misbehaved in the classes, especially among the boys. This kind of behavior would decrease if the students were taught outdoors regularly according to Gustafsson’s et al. (2012) survey, which showed that misconduct among elementary school boys decreases when they are being taught outdoors for 12 months. This change in behavior could make the boys behave better and the possibility for calmer lessons would increase. Calmer lessons can in turn make it easier for the students to focus and work with what they are supposed to, which can help the students to learn better.

The outdoors could be connected to both positive and negative responses, but the results do not show any clear evidence that it was the outdoors that induced them.
4.1.3 Extent of English used

The students’ use of English was an important response to research, since the task was built on Dewey’s (Szczepanski & Dahlgren, 2011) idea of students learning by using the language practically and on Vygotsky’s (Schaffer, 1996) idea of learning in social environments/context. It was therefore important to make the participants use English during the classes.

The students were instructed to not use Swedish and only English when working with the task. According to my reflections, the students still hardly spoke English when working with it, but they used it frequently during their presentations, with only a few exceptions. They generally used Swedish and had to be encouraged to use English, but spoke it if they were told to. The observer also noticed this pattern.

The students’ response to not speak English during the task could be connected to the outdoor area where the study took place. It was located next to the school which meant that students from other classes walked by. This situation could have made some students too embarrassed to act and talk English. It might have been better to use an outdoor area where the students are not distracted by other people.

Another thing that could have affected the students were their prior knowledge of English. If some students have a very limited vocabulary when it comes to describing the outdoors and their profession they will most likely have problems to speak about these topics. By letting the students get more time to prepare and learn words that fits into the context, they will be better prepared to speak English.

It is difficult to know how much effect the outdoor area had on the students’ use of English when observing the results, but one thing was clear: it was difficult for the students to learn English through interactive learning since they hardly spoke any English. The social learning which Vygotsky (Schaffer, 1996) speaks of did probably occur during the lessons, but it probably had more effect on the participants Swedish than their English. I tried to affect the students’ use of English by encouraging them to speak more and to make them try out the play a few times, since they spoke English when acting. My efforts to inspire them to speak more English did not have much effect.

It would be interesting to conduct a longer study on this subject in order to see if the students’ English results would get better if they were taught outdoors on a regular basis.
Their oral learning would probably depend on the amount of English spoken during the lessons. The participants use of English and in turn their learning could increase by using the indoors for preparation and giving instructions, having smaller groups, adding physical activity to the lessons and use a more isolated outdoor area. However, in its current condition the task probably had no positive effect on the students’ English.

4.2 Attitudes towards outdoor education

The students’ attitudes towards outdoor teaching were divided into two main sections to make the material easier to handle: “Attitudes towards being taught outdoors” and “comparison between indoors and outdoors”. The attitudes towards being taught outdoors were examined because the data could give an understanding of what the participants’ think about different aspects of the subject, and this information can in turn provide data on how to improve outdoor English lessons. Furthermore, the indoors compared to the outdoors were researched to find positive and negative factors from the students’ point of view. This information could be used for finding positive elements from both studies.

4.2.1 Attitudes

When the students were asked what they thought of being taught outdoors, most of them answered that they enjoyed it, and many of them answered that it was fun. These are some of the positive aspects that were mentioned: “it was fun and inspiring”, “not having to sit in a classroom falling asleep”, “better than indoors”, “There was more fresh air […]” and “you had more space outdoors”. These results can be compared to Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) survey, where many of students thought that it was fun to be outdoors and that the exposure to fresh air made them feel more focused and alert. The results from the studies show that the outdoors can give students positive experiences, which in turn could motivate them to work better.

A positive aspect was that most of the students believed they learned something from the outdoor lessons, such as learning to cooperate and come up with ideas.
The things they claimed to learn can be connected to social relations, which was one of the factors that was improved in Mygind’s (2009) study. It is based on statements about outdoor education from third graders who attended outdoor classes twice a week for three years. Even though his research was about third graders one can see that by teaching in an open and less strict outdoor setting, students could have the possibility to develop their social skills no matter how old they are. These types of social skills can improve the students’ communicative skills, which could be useful when speaking English.

Negative aspects were also mentioned by the students: One thought that they did not get much work got done, students from Class B stated that not much English was used and a participant claimed that he was feeling cold. It already became clear during the observations that a low amount of English was used and that all students’ were not active, therefore it was not surprising that some students said that hardly no English was used. The students’ answered a question about what they learned, which means that they were aware of the need to use English in order to learn it. One can therefore wonder if they were motivated to learn English. It was at least clear that the outdoor task did not motivate them.

Another feature that could have had an effect on the outdoor lesson is bad weather. In Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) study, some students complained about this. Anyhow, this was not a common problem in Mygind’s (2009) case study, since the students learned how to dress depending on the weather and therefore learned how to keep warm. This kind of learning was hardly possible in this project since it was too short, but it could have been needed if the project was longer since bad weather could make the students cold and wet, which in turn could remove the focus from the task and make the students less motivated to learn. Furthermore, the students were able to dress in accordance to the weather since they knew that they were going to be outdoors and the sun shone during all the lessons. These factors probably reduced the weather's effect on the class and only one interviewee said that he was cold. Moreover, if a teacher works with outdoor education regularly it is important to make sure that the students learn to adapt to the weather.

The interviewees had a positive attitude towards the outdoors and thought the task was amusing, but they also acknowledge that almost no English was used. One should find ways to use the positive attitude in order to inspire the students to use more English and thereby learn more.
4.2.2 Comparison between indoors and outdoors

When examining the results from the interviews it became quite clear that the students enjoyed being indoors more than being outdoors. Some of the students said that it was easier to concentrate outdoors: “you do not get tired and bored”, “you talk instead of writing all the time and “it is nicer to be outside”.

Their positive attitudes towards the outdoor lesson can depend on that it was “newer” as one student described it. Another student was on the same track and thought it felt special to be outdoors since they “never” are in other classes. If they would have been taught outdoors regularly their attitudes might have changed. Nevertheless, both in Mygind’s, and Fägerstam’s and Blom’s studies the students still enjoyed the outdoor lessons even though they were educated outdoors regularly, but a majority of the students lessons were still taught indoors. This way the outdoors becomes something special that is not a part of every class. It can be used to create variation, which was one of the reasons to why the participants from Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) study like outdoor education. Outdoor teaching could work as a complement to ordinary teaching and provide something different.

Indoor lessons can be conducted in many ways, but according to the interviewees their lessons were mostly related to writing, reading and answering questions. The participants in Fägerstam’s and Blom’s (2013) study also connected the indoors to reading and writing. If the indoors is seen as an area for reading and writing then the outdoors could be used for speaking and listening. By integrating indoor and outdoor teaching one can give students a diverse education, based on variation instead of repetition.
5 Conclusion

The purpose of this degree project was to examine upper secondary EFL students’ attitudes towards outdoor English teaching and research how they respond to outdoor teaching, by using an action research approach. The results concerning the attitudes focus mainly on the results from the interviews, while the results concerning the responses were based on material from peer observation, a reflective diary and the respondent’s attitudes.

5.1 Responses

When conducting the study, three types of responses were chosen to make it manageable: responses towards the instructions, activity and the extent of English used.

The students’ did not respond well to the outdoor instructions, because they did not understand what to do at first and some of them needed to be instructed in Swedish. In order to create a better understanding of the instructions I repeated them and explained the things they did not understand, which resulted in almost all the students completing the task. Even though most of them completed it; it was not performed in accordance to the instructions. The presentations were shorter than they were supposed to, the outdoors was rarely integrated and hardly no English was used.

A key to make the students respond better to the instructions when using outdoor education could be to let the student prepare and be instructed indoors, and thereby integrate the two environments. There were however some positive aspects of instructing the students outdoors as well: it saved time and I could show them the environment they were supposed to use in their plays. However, the students responded mostly negatively to the instructions, but it is difficult to know the effect the outdoors had on the instructions, since other factors could have played in.

The outdoors had both positive and negative effects on the students’ activity level.
It was observed that many of the participants tried to be active and work with the task. Sadly some students responded negatively to the task by playing around, not doing what they were supposed to, being inactive and not participating.

The interviewees were generally positive towards being taught outdoors and this positive attitude could have been what made most of the students respond well to the task. Furthermore, the negative responses might also have connections to the outdoors.

When the students were outdoors they were standing still and moving around instead of sitting down, which could have encouraged some students to play around. In some of the groups there were students who stopped being active when I was not around to control and help them. If the outdoor area would have been smaller I could have had more control and might been able to keep the students active.

There were efforts made to increase the students’ activity level during the lessons by encouraging them, correcting them when they misbehaved and inspire them. Moreover, there were other changes that could have been made to improve the quality and structure of the task: Decreasing the group sizes, giving the instructions in a calmer environment, use a smaller outdoor area and include some sort of physical activity. The outdoors could have connections to the students’ activity level, but there is no clear evidence that reveals if it was the outdoors that was responsible for the different responses or if it were due to other factors.

The extent of English used during the task was important to study since the task was built on the ideas of learning by doing, and learning through the use of social environments/contexts. Hence was the students instructed to only use English when working with the task, but hardly any English was spoken when they worked with the task, except during the presentations where it was used frequently. The response to not speak English could have been connect to the fact that the outdoor area was close to the school, which might have made the situation embarrassing for the students. Another aspect which could have affected the students was their prior knowledge of English words connected to the outdoor environment and to their profession. Thus, it is not clear to what extent the outdoors affected the students’ use of English.

The social language learning that was supposed to occur probably did, but it most likely affected their Swedish more than their English, since Swedish was the main language used during the lesson. I tried to encourage the students to speak English, but it had no noticeable effect.
The students use of English and thereby their learning could increase if: the indoors was used for preparation and giving instructions, using smaller groups, adding a physical activity to the lesson and use an outdoor area that is more isolated.

5.2 Attitudes

The students’ attitudes were divided into two groups: attitudes towards being taught outdoors and comparisons between indoors and outdoors. They were mostly positive to be taught outdoors; many of them described it as special and experienced it as fun. Most of them also claimed that they learned things from the experience, but these traits were connected to social relations and not English.

The weather factor could have affected the students, but it only affected one of the interviewees. This can depend on that the sun shone during all the lessons and because the students were told to adapt their clothes to the weather.

Some of the students were aware of that they did not learn much English since they hardly used it. One can therefore question if they were motivated to learn. The students’ positive attitudes towards the task should be used to inspire them to use more English and thus learn more.

The students enjoyed being taught outdoors more than being taught indoors and the lesson was referred to as special. The outdoors could be a complement to ordinary teaching and be a tool to create varied lessons.

The indoors was related to writing, reading and answering questions according to the students. They mentioned some positive aspects of being taught indoors as well: quieter and you get more things done. The outdoors and the indoors could be integrated by letting indoor lessons work as a quiet place to exercise reading and writing, while the outdoors should be seen as a social arena where the students can develop their listening and speaking skills in English. By integrating the environments students can get a varied education, instead of getting the same experiences every lesson.
5.3 Limitations

There were three major limitations when working with this project: lack of sources, time and coworkers. When searching for information about upper secondary outdoor EFL teaching no information was found. There were hardly any studies made on outdoor teaching for older students and the studies which existed were aimed at adventure education, which did not fit into this study. This created a situation where one had to look into studies on younger students/children, which were not always relevant. This degree project would benefit from having suitable and relevant sources when discussing the results.

This project had a timeline that needed to be followed, which limited it considerably. If there would have been more time to complete the study, then more lessons could have been performed and more students could have had the chance to hand in consent forms from their parents. By adding more lessons one could have the chance to see if the students’ English knowledge was developed by outdoor teaching. It would be useful to get more consent forms handed in, since that would increase the amount of students that could be interviewed, which in turn would make the sampling better and easier.

Finally, it could have been beneficial to have a coworker when working on this project, because that person could have acted both as teacher and observer. This could have made the research more objective since no external observer would have been needed and the other person could reflect over the students’ responses from a different perspective than my own. It would also reduce the amount of work.

5.4 Suggestions for further research

It is quite obvious that more research needs to be made on upper secondary outdoor education in general and especially with an EFL approach, since there are no published research in this area. This additional research could assist in finding answers for how and why outdoor education should be taught. Another interesting approach would be to further research students’ responses towards outdoor English, but only focus on one class for several lessons.
By researching one group of students for several lessons it could be possible to adapt ones teaching to students’ responses and improve my ability to teach outdoor English. Finally, it would also be of interest to research a larger number of upper secondary students’ attitudes towards outdoor teaching by using quantitative methods. This data could show if students want to be taught indoors as usual or if they want to vary their lessons and move some of them outdoors.
Sources


### Appendix 1: Observation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do the students respond to the trainee’s instructions concerning the activity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what degree are the students active during the lesson?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent of English used during the lesson.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Clarification of the observation schedule

**Observation area 1.**
How do they respond: Do they show understanding; do they act in accordance to the instructions; do they ask me to explain if I am unclear; do they ask me to explain in Swedish; and so on.

**Observation area 2.**
Activity level: Are they doing what they should; if not what are they doing instead; do their behavior change if I am not there; and so on.

**Observation area 3.**
The extent of English used: How often do they speak English; when do they speak Swedish; when do they not speak at all; and so on.
Appendix3: Written Instructions

**Acting outdoors**

You will be divided into groups of six.

The groups have 30 minutes to create a play and two minutes to conduct it.

Each group will choose a genre that their play will be about.

All the plays will contain six different types of characters such as: a hero, a storyteller, someone who is intelligent, evil and so on.

It should be a tale about your future profession.

You should integrate it with the outdoor environment that was chosen for your group. Both use words that describe the environment and use the actual area in your play.

It should be written down by using either key words or whole sentences. Everybody in the group needs to say something.

All communication before and during the play will be in English!!
Appendix 4: Reflective diary

Reflective diary

Diary 2013-10-01 Class A

Response to instructions

*How did the students respond to my instructions?*

They responded quite well, some confusion seemed to occur at first and I needed to be clearer to get them to understand me. Some of the students asked me to explain in Swedish, but their fellow students explained it for them almost immediately.

*What did I do to change their response?*

I needed to repeat the instructions a few times in the groups to make the task clearer.

Activity level

*How active were the students?*

All students took part in the task and they tried to do their best. Most were doing what they should do, but some students played around and did not pay much interest. The students tried to be active, but focusing on the task seemed to be the big problem.

*What did I do to boost the activity level?*

Encouragement was used to make the task look more interesting and fun for the students. I tried to inspire them by giving them ideas on how to do the task and what to do when they got stuck in the construction of the task.

English Use

*To what extent did the students speak English?*

They did hardly speak any English when constructing the task, but they spoke it when acting. The students’ spoke Swedish when I did not say anything and English if I encouraged them to use it.

*What did I do to make the students talk more English?*

I told them to speak more English sometimes, but I Sadly I feel that I should have encouraged them to speak more. It also felt as I could not reach out to some of the students.
They were also encouraged to try out their play in order to make them speak English and thereby learn more.

Diary 2013-10-01 Class B

Response to instructions

How did the students respond to my instructions?
They responded well and understood the meaning of them after some explanation.

What did I do to change their response?
I tried to repeat myself when necessary and explain closer.

Activity level

How active were the students?
Most students took part in the activity and seemed interested. They were doing what they should and tried to act in accordance to the instructions. One student did not participate even though I tried to encourage him and make him interested. Another student left after getting in a verbal argument with a class mate.

What did I do to boost the activity level?
I tried to encourage the students support them and make it more interesting. Some students reacted positive to this and became more active, while two of them did not react.

English Use

To what extent did the students speak English?
They did not speak much English, but they spoke it all the time when acting and some of them spoke during the preparation. The students’ spoke Swedish when I did not say anything and English if I encouraged them.

What did I do to make the students talk more English?
I told them to speak more English and that they had to use it in both the preparation and in the play.
They were also encouraged to try out their play in order to be better at using English.

**Diary – 2013-10-02 Class C**

**Response to instructions**

*How did the students respond to my instructions?*

They seemed to understand them and got to work almost immediately. However, they did not understand that they were supposed to integrate their profession into the play.

*What did I do to change their response?*

I explained a second time that they had to integrate their profession into the play.

**Activity level**

*How active were the students?*

The activity level was high and all the students tried to take part in the play; some more, some less. They did what they were supposed to do when they understood what to do. Some students had a hard time to focus on the task and played around instead of doing what they were supposed to.

*What did I do to boost the activity level?*

I tried to support them since it seemed that they were more active when I was there than when I was not. When I saw that they did things that they were not supposed to do; I told them so.

**English Use**

*To what extent did the students speak English?*

A low extent. They used it all the time in the play and everybody said something. Few of them used it as a work language, and almost everyone who did only talked English when I told them to.

*What did I do to make the students talk more English?*

I encouraged them and more or less forbade them from speaking Swedish. They were told to speak English and started did when they were told.
Diary 2013-10-11 Class D

Response to instructions

*How did the students respond to my instructions?*

The students seemed to understand what to do at first and told me that they understood, but when I spoke to them in the groups they asked me to explain in Swedish because they said that they did understand what to do.

*What did I do to change their response?*

I explained to them more closely what they were supposed to do in very simple English and the students seemed to understand the task better.

Activity level

*How active were the students?*

Most of the students did not do what they were supposed to. They played around, and rarely did what they were supposed to do. One group seemed to work with what they should when I was not there, but the other two did not. Some of the students were wrestling in the grass and some just stood and talked.

*What did I do to boost the activity level?*

I tried to change their behavior by telling the students to start doing what they should and stop goofing around. This worked only momentarily and they started to misbehave soon after the correction. I also tried to help the students by giving them inspiration on what roles they could pick and give them ideas for the play, because they were misbehaving when they were stuck in the production of the play.

English Use

*To what extent did the students speak English?*

To a very low extent, all of the groups spoke some English during the plays, but most students did not say much. In one group every student spoke English while performing the play and in another they hardly spoke at all during the play. Almost no English was used as a work language and they only spoke when I was present.
What did I do to make the students talk more English?

I told them to try to take it in English when they used Swedish. Give them inspiration on how to conduct the play and what to do. The effort did not help very much since they hardly used it.
Appendix 5: Interview schedule

- Vad tycker ni om att bli undervisade i engelska ute?
  - Lärorikt?
  - Roligt?
  - Hur var nivån?
  - Något mindre bra?

- Hur skiljer lektioner utomhus sig från de ni brukar ha inomhus?
  - Stökighet?
  - Aktivitet?
  - Struktur?

- Vad kunde jag gjort annorlunda?
  - Övningarna?
  - Struktur?
  - Tydlighet?
  - Förstod ni instruktionerna.
Hej

Mitt namn är Daniel Larsson och jag går på Lärarutbildningen i Malmö. Jag håller på att göra en undersökning inom ämnet engelska som kommer att fokusera på elevers attityder rörande utomhuspedagogik och det praktiska utförandet av utomhuspedagogik. Undersökningen är en del av mitt examensarbete som jag håller på att skriva.

Jag skulle uppskatta om ni tillåter er son/dotter att bli intervjuad med ljudupptagning som del av detta arbete. Alla etiska principer kommer självklart att iakttas om så görs; inga namn på elever eller skola kommer att publiceras, det material som jag använt för att dokumentera kommer att förstöras när arbetet slutförts och ingen obehörig kommer få tillgång till ljudupptagningen under arbetets gång. Examensarbetet kommer att publiceras, men publikationen kommer inte kunna kopplas till varken skolan eller ert barn.

Om ni har några frågor angående detta arbete får ni gärna kontakta mig.

Med vänliga hälsningar Daniel Larsson

---------------------------------------------------------------
Klipps ut och lämnas till Daniel Larsson på engelska lektionen V39
Jag godkänner att ______________________________________(namn på eleven) får medverka i denna undersökning.

________________________________________
Signatur (målsman) Namnförtydligande (målsman)
Appendix 7: Transcription of interview, Class B

Interviewer: Då kör vi igång intervjun idag. Först och främst, vad tyckte ni om att bli undervisade utomhus?

Student1: Det var roligt.

Student2: Det hände lita mer.

Student1: Mer skratt också.

Student3: Det var roligt och inspirerande. Inte behöva sitta och somna i ett klassrum.

Student4: Skit bra, bättre än med Lena.

Student3: Ja.

Interviewer: Hur var det. Tyckte ni det var, hur tyckte ni läromässigt, var det lärorikt på något sätt.

Student1: Det beror på vilken grupp man var med i.

Interviewer: Okej

Student3: Ja men man lär ju...

Student4: Jag tyckte det var väldigt lärorikt, jag satt bara på en bajsstolpe (ironi i rösten).

Student3: Ja men, men lär ju sig samarbeta och...

Student2: Nån engelska vette Sören om man använde, då blir det ju att vi han inte med att göra något redigt. Det va ju lita tradigt.

Student1: Det var ju inte så mycket engelska ändå.

Student2: Ja men det var ju roligt med samarbete.

Student1: Jo och komma på grejor.

Student2: Det var en rolig lektion, men.

Interviewer: Tyckte ni att det var för lite tid?

Student2: Ja

Student3: Ja lite grann.

Student2: Om man, jo det skulle man kunna sä. Jag skulle kunna tycka att man skulle varit i klassrummet först och skriva något.

Student3: Först kommit på något och sen gått ut. Det blev väldigt flummigt och..

Student1: Det var många som inte skärpte sig tyckte jag.

Student3: Många stod i ett hörn liksom, och inte gjorde nånting. Dom stod bara tysta också sa man kom på dina repliker, så stod dem fortfarande efter en kvart, jag har ingen replik.
Student5: Hos oss var det så att det var en person och han kom på en jävla massa idéer och sen fick man ju hålla med: det är bra och det är inte bra.

Student4: Det var Simon.

Student5: Simon där ja, också fick man ju hålla med och så drog han ihop en massa idéer sen gör vi detta skit så. Om alla hade deltagit lite mer så hade det nog gått lite bättre tycker jag.

Student3: Ja, det tycker jag också

Interviewer: Okej, Ja hur tyckte ni annars, hur var nivån på det, var det, hur var det, var det roligt, var det tråkigt. Vad var det mer jag tänkte på, generellt.

Student4: Jag hade ju kunnat få en bättre roll än att sitta på den där jävla stolpen.

Student1: Du kunde ju bara sä nått.

Student3: Nej men, ag tyckte det var roligt.

Student1: I början kändes det lite barnsligt, men när man väl kom in i det var det okej.

Student2: Nej det var barnsligt hela vägen, men det var roligt också.

Interviewer: Okej, så det är roligt att vara barnslig ändå.

Student2: Ja ibland är det.

Student1: I vissa sammanhang.

Student5: Som allt annat, roligare än att sitta i klassrummet.

Interviewer: Hur var nivån då? Tyckte ni att det kunde vatt en högre nivå? Under lektionen i sig, eller?

Student4: Ja det tyckte jag.

Student3: Mer att alla var delaktiga och att några gjorde vad dem ska.

Student2: Det var därför man skulle suttit inne först, så kunde alla kommit på nån roll, så kunde alla suttit och diskuterat, och fått en roll var och diskuterat själva. För nu blev det så att vi var tvungen att sätta ihop den och nu måste det va. Så var där en kille som tog över bara så, det blev inte bra.

Student3: Men typ tre i vår grupp bara stod där och gjorde ingenting, och sen var där två som gick ifrån och bara stack, men de som var delaktiga hade roligt.

Student1: Vi hade ju Simon och det kan jag sä att hans fantasi är rätt flödig och det var inte så bra.

Student4: Hans fantasi flödar ju på.

Student1: ja, han skulle ju fan bli transformer och all sån skit

Student4: Ja transformers.
Student5: Och fan och hans moster.
Interviewer: Var där nått som var mindre bra med övningen eller bli undervisade utomhus då.
Student2: Nej.
Studenten1: det var fint väder, så man ska inte klaga.
Student3: Det enda var att man skulle suttit inne i början
Student2: Det är förberedelserna, kunde varit lite bättre, men man har det ju rätt bra därute.
Student1: Man jobbar ju inte så mycket ute nu.
Student2: Nej.
Student5: Man vågar väl göra mer utomhus, tycker jag. Om man är indelade i små grupper kanske dom som e riktigt blyga vågar säga nånting. Än att i ett klassrum där allting hörs.
Student3: Ja, men inne i ett klassrum sitter du mer tyst.
Student2: Så det är skönare att vara ute.
Student4: Frisk luft.
Interviewer: Hur är det med stökighetsnivån allmänt?
Student1: Det beror på vilken lärare vi har.
Interviewer: Jaha okej.
Student3: Men alla kan ju prata om man säger så.
Interviewer: Jag tänker mer skillnaden, hur det skiljer sig …
Student3: Utifrån och inifrån. Det blir ju mer stökigt ute.
Student3: Det blir att många ser det som rast.
Student2: Ja.
Interviewer: Hur ser ni det med aktivitetsnivån, är det mer aktivitet inne än ute.
Student1,2 & 3: Ute.
Student5: Det beror på vad du menar med aktivitet. Typ när man gör uppgifter eller om man gör som vi gjorde.
Interviewer: Asså, det jag menar med aktivitet är hur mycket ni jobba, eller gör grejor, eller är aktiva, både, men framförallt det ni ska göra.
Student1: Det beror ju också på.
Student2: Vad det e för något. Ska man skriva en uppsatts så är det nog bättre inne.
Student3: Ja ska du göra en pjäs så är det nog bättre ute.
Student1: Det vi gjorde nu där, där vi skulle prata om ett ämne i verkstan. Det var ju många som jobba på då.
Student2: Ja.
Student3: Mm
Interviewer: Yes, hur ser ni det med strukturmässigt, är det bättre struktur inne än det är ute?
Student2: Vad är struktur?
Interviewer: Struktur betyder uppbyggnad, du vet det här, hur det är upplaggt.
Student1: Du menar formellt.
Interviewer: Ja, de är typ motsatsen till kaos.
Student1: Jag tycker att inne är mer lugnare.
Student2: Därför är det bra om man förklarar litta i början det blir lite mer att alla sitter och lyssnar. Nu blir det mer, om nån ska förklara nu blir väll mer att alla springer rundor och skiter i vilket. Kan jag mycket, tänka att det blir så.
Student3: Jo, men det e ju både och. Inne i ett klassrum om några sitter och pratar så kan du ju inte komma ifrån det, men utomhus fast nån pratar så kan du gå bort en bit och jobba själv.
Interviewer: Okej, sant. Okej, nu kommer vi gå in lite på att några grejor kanske upprepas lite. Vad kunde jag gjort annorlunda, med övningarna då? Förutom att ni kunnat börja skriva inne som ni redan har nämnt. Är där nått annat ni kan tänka på?
Student5: Bättre kommunikation.
Interviewer: Okej bättre kommunikation. Från min sida då eller?
Student2: Bara haft en, bara haft en grupp i taget.
Student3: Det skulle varit mindre grupper för att det var så många som inte fick nänting att göra och då sitter de bara och snackar och brydde inte sig.
Student2: Eller bara en grupp så du är där och snackar och hjälper oss hela tiden.
Student1: En grupp hade varit lite väl jobbigt.
Student2: Nej men jag menar asså, en halvan då, asså den gruppen vi hade, bara den gruppen, så tar man den andra senare.
Student1: Ja, ja.
Student2: Så du skulle vatt och hjälpt hela tiden. Det hade blivit mer ordning, istället för om man ska gå iväg så blir det lite annat sånt.
Student3: Det är samma i princip som att hålla.
Interviewer: Så när jag går så blir det stökigare sen.
Student2: Ja.
Student3: Ja det blev väldigt stökigt. Ja.
Student2: Två lärare eller en grupp i taget.
Interviewer: Vad tycker ni om strukturen allmänt annars? Jag tänker som, där har vi en struktur grej som att ha fler lärare. Är där nått annat med strukturen som ni kan tänka er?
Kunnat ändra i grupperna till exempel.
Student5: Fler grupper.
Student3: Fler och mindre grupper, ja.
Student1: Sen är det ju inte så jävla lätt, du känner ju inte oss och vet ju inte hur vi e. Så det är svårt och, att det är bättre att du är med i den gruppen för att ni, du är på ett sätt och du e på det. Det är svårt
Interviewer: Absolut, Så ni tror så här att hade man känt gruppen lättare så hade det vatt lättare att fördela ut det.
Student3: Ja.
Student2: Det är ju inte alla som känner, ingen som känner varandra.
Student5: Det är knappt så att lärare känner oss.
Student2: Så det är inte så lätt.
Interviewer: Nej kunde jag varit tydligare på nått sätt? Eller var övningen tydlig annars?
Student2: Asså det var rätt tydligt vad vi skulle göra, så det tror jag inte.
Interviewer: Vad tycker ni andra?
Student3: Nej, jag tycket du var tydlig.
Student4: Ja.
Interviewer: Tyckte du också att jag var tydlig. Sista frågan nu, då en sidofråga. Hur var det med instruktionerna?
Student4: Det var tydligt.
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Interviewer: Det var tydligt.
Student1: Jag tyckte att det var lite krångligt i början men när man fick grepp om det så var det hyfsat. Så.
Student2: Jag tyckte också dom var tydliga.
Student3: När man väl läst igenom allt så fattade, vad man skulle göra.
Interviewer: Så ni tyckte att det var bra att jag hade både papper och pratade.
Student3 & 5: Ja.
Interviewer: Det underlätta lite.
Student3: Ja, då kunde man gå tillbaka till det man hade glömt.
Interviewer: Detta kommer att handla om utomhuspedagogik och utomhusinlärning. Det var lite det vi körde nu i en kortare variant i den lektionen vi hade precis. Jag kommer börja att ställa en fråga om den lektionen allmänt. Vad tyckte ni om att bli undervisade utomhus?

Student1: Det var bättre än att sitta inomhus.
Student2: Och rör på sig lite.
Student3: Man fick mer fritt utrymme.
Student2: Det var mer luft också där ute.
Student4: Ja det var rätt kul.
Student1: Ja
Student2: Ja
Student5: Ja
Student3: Ja. Lite tramsigt ibland, men annars.
Student4: När man gör något så.
Student2: Man fick också lära sig att komma på egna meningar och inte skriva ner dom utan bara komma på dem direkt från huvudet.
Interviewer: Det var smart. Hur var det med, tyckte ni där var nånting som var mindre bra?
Student3: Ja, det skulle varit lite längre tid.
Student5: Ja lite längre tid.
Student2: Ja och jag frös lite.
Interviewer: Frös lite, ja det är ju förståeligt. Tyckte ni det var roligt?
Student1: Ja.
Student5: Ja faktiskt.
Student1: Ja min grupp hade roligt.
Student2: Ja min också
Student3 och 4: Ja vi hade lite roligt.
Interviewer: Hur var nivån på det? Var det okej eller var det för låg nivå eller?
Student1: Jag tycket vår var okej.
Student5: Lite högre än okej.
Student3: När vi väl kom igång så gick det jätte bra, men det var när det var tio fem minuter kvar. Det var då vi började jobba. Då blev det bättre och bättre.
Student2: Det var nog inte så bra att börja med krig.

Interviewer: Nej det är svåra grejer det där med krig. Hur skiljer detta sig från att jobba, asså hur skiljer sig detta från de lektionerna ni bruka ha inomhus?

Student4: Man kan koncentrera sig bättre utomhus tycker jag.

Student1: Man kan komma på fler saker ute.

Student3: man blir inte trött och uttråkad.

Student5: Man pratar mer istället för att skriva hela tiden.

Interviewer: Var där några. Kan ni säga att där var några nackdelar med att ha lektionen ute.

Student1: Man kanske inte lägger lika mycket tid på arbetet som inomhus.

Student5: Inomhus har du inget annat att göra, du bara skriver. Ja om du inte har datorn.

Interviewer: Så ni tycker att det är mycket, framförallt mycket skrivande inomhus?

Student2-5: Ja.

Student1: Ja, skriver ner det i en bok eller nått sånt.

Student3: Läser en text och skriver eller svarar på frågor.

Interviewer: Hur skiljer det sig i stökighetsgrad? Är det stökigare ute än inne?

Student 3-4: Ja det är det ju.

Student1: Ja, med vår klass vet jag inte.

Student4: Det är nästan stökigare inne tycker jag. Då blir det som att ingen vill liksom jobba där inne.

Student3: Ja, jag vet inte med denna, där har varit stökigare lektioner, men där har också varit lugnare lektioner.

Student1: Det beror på lite vilken lärare man har.

Student5: Det beror lite på vad man gör också

Student3: Man ska hitta på så mycket som möjligt på så kort tid, inte på så kort tid egentligen. Man ska hitta på så mycket som möjligt på kort tid. Lite stökigt var det. Det blev bra till slut.

Interviewer: Vad tyckte ni hur det är med aktivitetsnivån och göra vad man ska och så. Var den högre inne än ute eller?

Student3: Det var nog högre aktivitet ute.

Student5: Definitiv.

Hur kommer det sig?

Student2: Man är typ aldrig ute på lektioner så när man väl kommer ut
Interviewer: Så blir det lite speciellt liksom?
Student2: Ja.

Interviewer: Hur funkar det, en annan grej, hur är det med strukturen ute och inne och vad säger ni om det?
Student3: Det är nog mer struktur inne, skulle jag säga.
Student4: Ja om vi jämför med denna som var, så brukar det nog vara mer inne.
Student1-2 & 4-5.

Student3: Man vet ju inte hur dom e, ja.
Student2: Dom, andra fattade det nog så.
Student3: Men om dom hade fattat att dom skulle göra det, det, så skulle det nog gått snabbare direkt asså bara.
Interviewer: Mm, Ja. Ni hade lite, hade det med instruktionerna och så att göra.
Student3: Nej, jag vet inte.

Student4: Nej, det var väl svårare.
Student3: Det är mest svårt att komma på saker.
Student4: Komma på som funkar tillsammans, så att man kan bli mer överens.
Student1: Så man kommer på en god grund.
Student3: Ja. Vem som ska säga vad och sen det funkar inte, man måste komma på något nytt och sen blir det första fel och sen ja.
Interviewer: Yes, nästa fråga. Vad kunde jag gjort annorlunda? Vi börjar först med övningen.
Student1: Vi skulle fått lite mer, åsikter, vi kunde skrivit eller arbetat här inne för att få ihop lite mer.
Student3: Man kunde ha tatt instruktionerna här inne: Ni ska ut där ute, ni ska få en plats, sen ska ni asså, göra det och det och det.
Student1. Ja.
Student3: Också kommer man ut och då vet man vad som, förmodligen vad man ska göra.
Student5: Det är också lite lättare när man skriver ner, så alla vet också vad man ska göra.
Student3: Ja.
Student5: Istället för att bara komma på allting. Så.
Interviewer: Ja. Vad kunde jag gjort bättre för att förbättra strukturen?
Student1: Om du skulle känt oss så skulle du nog delat in grupperna lite annorlunda.
Student3 och 5: Ja
Student1: Det skulle nog varit en rätt bra grej.
Interviewer: Det är mycket gruppdynamik, asså det här hur grupperna ser ut.
Student1: Ja, hur folkén är som person och hur dom kommer tillsammans.
Student2: Ja.
Student5: Dom skulle.
Student3: Det gick faktiskt helt okej. Vi hade många förslag. Vi hade jätte många förslag. Sen var det, det att vi skulle göra det inom el.
Student 1-2 & 4-5: Ja
Student3: När vi skulle göra det inom el så bara.
Student2: Ja och vår skulle vara om nazister och fransmän. Det var kanske inte riktigt vad vi skulle ha igenom.
Student3: Nej.
Student1: Ändå höll vi kvar vid idén att vi skulle bli rånade.
Student2: Ja
Interviewer: Sen nästa grej, hur var det med tydligheten, vad tyckte ni att jag kunde gjort för att vara mer tydlig?
Student3: Vad du kunde gjort vet inte.
Student1: Jag missade där i början att det skulle ha med el att göra.
Student3 Ja mm.
Student1: Jag tycker man skulle haft det inne, då sitter man bara så och lyssnar.
Student4: Alla fick ju reda på det i efterhand ju och då hade vi redan kommit på en massa ju, sen kör man ju fortfarande samma plan ju. Det blev lite…
Student2. Vi hade en, sen får vi göra nytt så bara, så fick vi göra efter det, lite.
Interviewer: Yes, hur var det med instruktionerna, förstod ni dom annars?
Students: Ja.
Student2: Instruktionerna var rätt så klara, tyckte jag.
Student5: Det var bara att komma på vilket ämne man skulle ha.
Student3: Så försöker man komma på, hur kommer det att se ut.