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Preface

We decided to work with this degree project mainly via Skype, and before writing we divided the reading of books and articles. After gathering all the information needed we started to write in a shared document. Since we did not want to divide the writing, we chose to write the text together; one typing and the other dictating. This led to us participating equally in:

- the planning
- searching for articles and books
- reading the articles and books
- deciding the research questions
- executing the observation
- writing and editing the different components included in the degree project.
Abstract

The purpose of this degree project is to explore the use of multimodal resources in a second language classroom in Sweden. In recent years, multimodality has become more influential in education, as new technology and new media are taking over the role printed books once had. However, our data was collected from a classroom where the teacher only used space, gestures, gaze and language to present instructions. Therefore, we wanted to examine what resources were used, and how they were used in this specific situation. The multimodal transcription analysis revealed that even if the teacher did not use any kind of technology during this lesson, it was still multimodal. We found that being aware of your own use of multimodal resources is important for what you do and how you use the classroom for pedagogical purposes.
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1. Introduction

The term multimodality is used to describe when meaning-making is created through the use of different ways of expressions, such as, pictures, sound, and texts. In reality, every text is multimodal, and consists of different ways of expressions working together, for example the layout and font affect the written text (Edvardsson, Godhe & Magnusson, 2018, p.12). Every interaction is also multimodal; when speaking a person uses eye contact, gestures, speech and tone for example (Jewitt, 2006, p. 16-17).

During our teacher practicums (VFU) we have seen that teachers are very bound to textbooks, and the written word. This has also been claimed by Jewitt (2008, p. 248) who argues that schools often can be criticized for still being bound to print- and language-based notions of literacy. Since the written word still have the status of being the most capable of carrying information, pictures and sound are often used as a supplement (ibid.). Magnusson (2014, p. 20-21) argues that Swedish upper secondary students write and are exposed to multimodal texts outside of the classroom, however they are not encouraged to use those skills for educational purposes. The issue with this is that teachers do not usually explore the possibilities beyond the general or “traditional” texts, for instance other types of media or tools to convey information. This has led to our interest in how the teachers themselves use multimodality in order to make the students comprehend the content. In our case, we have focused on one second language classroom, where the teacher prepared the students for an argumentative speech. The argumentative speech is a part of the national curricula for both Swedish as a second language and English in upper secondary education in Sweden (Skolverket, 2011, a). Since both of us have English as a major and Swedish as a second language as our second subject, we chose to focus on second language learning in general. Our study, therefore, aligns with Lundahl (2012, p. 189) who states that second language learning and the research done in that area do not differentiate between English as a second language (in this study, ESL), and Swedish as a second language (in this study, SSL). Therefore, we argue that this degree project will be of use for us in both our subjects. Especially since the content of the lesson, an argumentative text and speech, is part of both our subjects.

The teacher in this study did not use any electronic devices during her lesson, she used only her voice, the whiteboard, gestures and gaze to convey information. According to Tang (2013, p. 34), teachers need to be more aware of how different modes can be useful
for different purposes. Moreover, he states that looking at the integration of meaning across multiple semiotic modes is crucial in the classroom for the students’ engagement.
2. The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of our degree project is to examine the use of multimodal resources in second language education in upper secondary school in Sweden. We are interested in how different modes such as gaze, space, gestures and language are used to present information to the students. To examine this statement the following questions need to be addressed and answered:

2.1 Research Questions

1. What multimodal resources are used by the second language teacher while giving instructions?
2. And how does the teacher use these multimodal resources?
3. Theoretical Literature Review

In the following chapter, theories and previous research regarding multimodality in language education will be presented. Further, we will define the key terms and continuously refer to them in this degree project. Unfortunately, there is not a lot of research on multimodality in upper secondary education in Sweden. What we, mostly, found about our subject, were articles by foreign authors/researchers. However, the “Swedish” research we found focuses mostly on younger learners. It may be that our subject is not as explored in upper secondary education, therefore we wish to explore the importance of it in this project.

3.1 Theoretical Background

The following sections will explain the theoretical concepts that form the background and basis for our research: multimodality, social semiotics theory, multiliteracies and multimodality in second language learning

3.1.1 Multimodality

Before defining multimodality, mode needs to be defined. Mode is a culturally shaped resource for making meaning. Mode includes, but is not limited to, image, writing, sound, gesture, speech, and color. Modes help us communicate and represent the world. Modes are presented through a medium, such as a printed book, a computer program, a learning platform or a DVD (Vaish & Towndrow, 2010). Multimodal approaches are based on an assumption that different modes are always used and combined to make meaning (Kalantzis & Cope, 2012, p. 195). Figure 1 shows categories of modes of meaning and examples of what falls under each category.
Edvardsson, Godhe and Magnusson (2018, p. 46) state that today’s information feed is expressed in various ways and is conveyed by a number of different channels. According to Kress (2003, as cited in Edvardsson et al., 2018), images are, in many cases, replacing writing as a form of communication, and the screen is taking over the role that “traditional” media, such as text books, once had. Another change is that knowledge development is no longer clearly linked to formal learning in education, but to the informal, and it takes place in different platforms, for example in social media and in online games, that adolescents show great interest in. Research claims that school and education do not change at the same pace as informal platforms, thus it is difficult to offer learners the same possibilities that digital tools do (ibid.).

The curricula for ESL and SSL in Sweden do not specify what modes the teacher should use/work with. The term ‘text’ is used, and according to Skolverket (2011, b) they mean primarily written text, but could mean multimodal texts, such as pictures and audio. “In the syllabus, the term text is used primarily for written text, but could also mean multimedia texts, namely texts that combine for example text, picture and sound, is included” (Skolverket, 2011, b, p.3. Our translation). However, in the comments for the curriculum for ESL (Skolverket, 2011, c) ‘text’ means, literally, written text such as protocols, applications and reports. While in SSL the term ‘text’ is more flexible, which means it can be oral presentations and multimodal texts as mentioned above. In addition,
our focus is mainly on gestures and gaze combined with texts, both written and oral. This is not mentioned in the curricula at all. They do mention that students need strategies for speaking when their vocabulary is lacking, but these shortcomings are not further specified. Our interpretation of this is that the students need body language to complement their oral interactions. In addition, the curriculum does not focus on how the teacher should introduce content to the students, while Tang (2013, p.34) argues for the importance of teacher awareness of their use of different modes. This awareness is vital for students’ understanding and engagement.

Moreover, in communication between people, different modes are used, such as signs, voice, body language and writing. Säljö (2005, as cited in Edvardsson et al., 2018, p. 47) describes this as a development were these modes function as an external memory system, that has been able to store human experiences to different degrees. This development has continued to expand by supplementing traditional written media, such as books and newspapers with TV, computers, mobile phones etcetera. Through modern technology, the possibilities of building external memory systems, increases. Therefore, human communication and ways of expression, increases too.

3.1.2 Social Semiotic Theory

The multimodal theory is based on the sociocultural theory and the social semiotic approach/theory (Edvardsson et al., 2018). However, in this degree project we will not focus on the sociocultural theory since we are not looking at the interaction between students and teacher, or the students’ use of language in the classroom. We are only looking at the teacher’s use of different modes. In the social semiotic approach, the term ‘meaning’ is fundamental and is used in different compositions. The central starting point in multimodality is that the different modes create meaning through the use of resources in various ways. In the creation of meaning, the term “meaning-making” is used, which Kress (2010, as cited in Edvardsson, 2018, p.47) states is another expression for learning.

According to Kalantzis and Cope (2012, p.176-177), the term ‘semiotics’ explains the study of sign system or meaning-making. When we create meaning between signifiers in a sign system, they are aimed to correspond with the connection between things we are experiencing. A signifier could be anything that has a connection and correlation to what you are trying to express, like language, gestures, pictures etcetera. For example, our understanding of language is based on a connection between the word and the thing the
word represents. The signifier ‘dog’ refers to a signified kind of animal in English, while the same word has no meaning in other cultures. That specific signifier only works while speaking with someone who shares the same cultural understanding of the word ‘dog’. See Figure 2. This image signifies the same event through both language “I walked the dog down the street” and a picture showing a person and a dog walking.

![Diagram of signified and signifier]

Figure 2. Image adapted from Kalantzis and Cope, 2012, p. 176.

The approach adopted in this paper is derived from multimodal social semiotics, based on Halliday’s (1978) social semiotic theory, which perceives context and culture “as a set of semiotic systems, a set of systems of meaning, all of which interrelate” (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, p.4, as cited in Tan et al., 2016). In this approach, language is seen as one semiotic resource among many (image, gesture, sound) which together constitute culture. The social semiotic theory assumes that a text’s communication function is the results of specific choices made depending on which function the text serve, which can be divided into three different kinds of meaning. The first kind of meaning is ideational meaning, which consists of experiential and logical meaning, to structure our experience of the world and to make logical connections in the world. The second is interpersonal meaning to enact social relations and to create a stance towards the world. The third is textual meaning to organize experiential, logical and interpersonal meanings into coherent messages relevant to their context (Kress, 2014, p. 65). In multimodal research it is assumed that these metafunctions can be applied to every mode (Jewitt, 2006, p. 19) and help us understand the meaning potential in each mode.
In social semiotics, it is one thing to recognize the importance of different modalities’ role in meaning-making, but also to understand the equivalent of the modalities, in a non-hierarchical approach. Every modality can create meaning independently of other modalities, since every modality has a specific potential for meaning-making (Kress, 2014, p. 61). Every mode has a potential for meaning making, and people always have a choice regarding what mode they want to use. When someone wants to express something, they choose the signifier they consider most appropriate for what they want to signify (Jewitt, 2006, p. 20). For example, when showing with your hands how tall someone is to a child who might not know how much a meter is, while just telling an adult with language how tall someone is because they understand the correlation between the length and the words. Semiotic resources are deeply tied to cultures, for example a gesture will probably not signify the same thing in different parts of the world (Kress, 2014, p. 62). Societies select different signifiers as useful and therefore the semiotic resources are shaped and reshaped geographically and over time.

3.1.3 Multiliteracies

According to Edvardsson et al. (2018), ‘multiliteracies’ is an approach that promotes critical multimodal meaning making. The term multiliteracies originates from the New London Group (2000), and Kalantzis and Cope (2012) developed the term for educational purposes. Multiliteracies is the result of our digitalized world; the digital developments impact on education. With the help of multiliteracies, the complexity of meaning-making becomes more visible, since the learners will understand meaning based on cultural and societal context in different modalities and medias, instead of the traditional texts.

Kalantzis and Cope (2012) state that the multiliteracies approach describes what is still important in traditional approaches to writing and reading, and to complement it with knowledge of what is distinctive and new about meaning-making in the contemporary communication environment. The term multiliteracies refers to two main aspects of meaning-making. The first aspect is social diversity, which explains the variability of conventions of meaning in different social and cultural contexts. Depending on life experiences, social context subject matter etcetera., texts differ enormously, and these differences are becoming more vital in our interaction in our everyday lives, and the ways we create meaning-making. Therefore, literacy teaching should not only focus on the rules of one standard method of the national language (p. 1).
Moreover, the second aspect of meaning-making in multiliteracies is multimodality. Multimodality plays a significant role as part of the communication media and is the result of new information. Meaning occurs in ways that are multimodal such as, written-linguistic modes of meaning interface with audio, visual, gestural, oral, spatial and tactile patterns of meaning. Once, writing was considered the primarily way of meaning-making across times and distances; now this has shifted to where meaning-making can be replaced by or complemented by other modes as mentioned above. The writers claim that it is crucial to extend the variety of literacy pedagogy beyond alphabetical communication. Since, we live in a society where digital media takes up a huge part of education, as teachers we need to supplement the “traditional” methods with multimodal communications (Kalantzis & Cope, 2012, p. 2).

3.1.4 Multimodality in Second Language Learning

When learning a language, the students are negotiating meaning, and through the negotiation, new languages can be learned. According to Firth and Wagner (2003) it is easier to learn in a multimodal environment, and such a multimodal environment is more similar to how we learn our first language (p. 71). When a child learns new language, it is often not through language alone. Children learn, mainly, through seeing and experiencing what we talk about. Multimodality is an excellent way to re-construct a natural learning environment and can therefore be very effective when teaching language. Moreno and Mayer (2007, p. 310) state that students risk cognitive overload when just working with one mode, like reading a written text, and that the most effective way of teaching is to combine the verbal material through auditory modalities (spoken words) and the non-verbal material through visual modalities (pictures, videos, animations, etcetera.). They (p. 313) describe meaningful learning as the learners being exposed to relevant verbal and non-verbal information that is then connected to what they already know about the world. The different representations help form a coherent mental model of the content. Further, Morell (2018, p. 1) claims that teachers can benefit greatly from awareness of how the semiotic available to them could be combined to make and elicit meaning.
3.2 Key Concepts

For the multimodal analysis we will use the method presented in Morell (2018). She did a multimodal discourse analysis on one teacher’s use of classroom space, gaze, gestures, spoken and written language. In the following sections the terms needed for our analysis will be explained. The term space regards the teacher’s positioning in the classroom, gestures define different kinds of gestures and what they are used for, gaze regards who and what the teacher is looking at, and spoken and written language is defined. These modes are never used separately and together they form multimodal ensembles (Morell, 2018, p. 1).

3.2.1 The Types of Space in the Classroom

When discussing the teacher’s use of space, we will use the terms presented by Lim et al. (2012, p. 237-239). They investigated how two teachers used the classroom, and how that impacted the learning environment. Depending on the patterns the teachers created in their usage of space, different parts of the classroom acquired different meanings.

The space around the teacher’s desk, front and center of the classroom, is described as authoritative space. This is where the teacher conducts formal teaching, gives instructions and is furthest away from the students in terms of proximity.

When a teacher is pacing down the rows of students, without them seeking help and support, it is often for supervision. This often happens during student activities where the students are supposed to work individually or in groups to ensure that they comply with the task. The surveillance space is located within the supervisory space, in the back of the classroom. The teacher can sometimes stand at the back of the classroom surveilling the students. By standing still in the back of the classroom, the teacher can see all the students, what they are doing on their laptops, or books, and through doing this assert a sense of permanent visibility.

However, the meaning of a space in the classroom can be redefined and changed by the activities and interactions taking place there. During student tasks the teacher is, as mentioned, often moving along the rows, however, when the teacher stops to provide consultation and talk to the students, they are moving in the interactional space. Reducing the distance to the students gives the teacher a chance to interact with them one-on-one and offer guidance.
The authoritative space can also be defined as the teacher's personal space where they prepare, evaluate, and prepare the next part of a lesson. This space can change from being a personal space to an authoritative space and back throughout the lesson when the teacher sits down to prepare the next stage, stands up to teach and so on.

3.2.2 The Use of Gestures

When discussing gestures, we will use the terms presented by Tan et al. (2016, p. 257-258) in their study of a teacher’s use of gestures combined with written and spoken language. This interpretation of gestures is based on Halliday’s social semiotic theory and each kind of gesture helps construct meaning in different ways.

Interpersonal gestures include regulating gestures such as when you point towards the next speaker, signaling turn-taking, or nodding to show that you have understood the message. It also includes symbolic gestures such as nods to show approval. Interpersonal gestures enact social relations.

Experiential gestures include gestures that illustrate what is being said, like showing with your hand how tall or short someone is compared to you, moreover, writing on the whiteboard is also an experiential gesture. Experiential gestures help you structure your view of the world and make logical connections.

Textual gestures include pointing to an object or giving directions or using your fingers to enumerate. Textual gestures are meant to organize and make the message coherent.

3.2.3 The Use of Gaze

When discussing gaze, we will use the method used by Morell (2018) and Tan et al. (2016) Morell (2018, p. 5) analyzed gaze by reporting on what or who the teacher was looking at while simultaneously using other modes, for example the teacher’s gaze was on all students, on the screen, or at specific students. Tan et al. (2016, p. 258) analyzed the teachers gaze using three types of gaze: engaged; when the participant is focused on a person or the task, disengaged; when the participants gaze is disengaged or unfocused, and indeterminable; when the participants gaze cannot be determined. However, in their (p. 262) results only engaged gaze is used by the teacher.
3.2.4 The Use of Language

The teachers’ use of language will be divided into written language and spoken language. Printed language can in this case be what the teacher writes on the board, or slides used. Spoken language will be what the teacher says. These are differentiated due to the differences in sensory modalities (Moreno & Mayer, 2007, p. 310) used. Sensory modalities refer to the senses used to receive the information presented, for example you see written text, using the sense of sight, while you hear music using the sense of hearing. When the teacher writes something on the board the students can see the word. When the teacher speaks and refers to what is on the board, the students must listen.
4. Method

In the method section we connect our research method to previous research, and explain in detail our approach to the observation, transcription and data analysis. We based our method on Morell’s (2018) multimodal analysis and recommendations made by Jewitt (2006) for multimodal research.

4.1 Case Study

In order to answer our research questions, we have observed a teacher during a SSL lesson. In this degree project we only focused on this specific teacher and this specific lesson, therefore this lesson will function as the only case in our study. According to Alvehus (2013, p.75), a case study is a way to show one case amongst others, meaning that there could be many such cases, but the researcher chooses to focus on one in particular. A case is unique and distinct from others but could still point to a bigger context. The point is often to illustrate a common phenomenon. This case study gave us the chance to look closer into one classroom and one teacher, and therefore analyze the specific context she teaches in.

When doing multimodal research, Jewitt (2006. p. 32) recommends video recording the classroom. Video gives the researcher a chance to record and capture the combination of semiotic modes that “just” observing does not. We used more than one camera in order to capture both the entire classroom and a more focused view of the teacher in front of the board. This is according to Jewitt (p. 35) a way to capture both the way the teacher moves through the room, and capture a more detailed view of the teacher’s subtle movements. We also considered when to start the camera, Jewitt (p. 36) explained that teachers often expected her to wait until they start the lesson before she began recording, and we took this into consideration and let the teacher give us permission before we started recording.

The selection of teacher was a strategic selection and a comfort selection, since we chose to contact our partner schools and teachers we already knew. However, the selection was limited by our focus on second language teachers and their use of multimodality. We only had opportunity to observe one SSL lesson due to time restraints,
and availability. Yet, it benefits our knowledge in both our subjects, since both our subjects are second language subjects in Sweden.

The lesson we observed was focused on how to write and present an argumentative speech. The first 25 minutes of the lesson, the teacher explained the components of an argumentative speech and what they will be assessed on. During the rest of the lesson, the teacher walked around, helping the students with their writing. When transcribing the recording, we chose to limit our transcription to only the first 25 minutes of the lesson. Due to difficulty in recording sound and picture without including the students we excluded the second part of the lesson in our analysis concerning gestures, gaze and language. However, her movement through the classroom could be filmed without filming the students.

4.2 The Classroom

The teacher we observed is a Swedish, SSL and ESL teacher. Therefore, her participation is of value for our research. She is one of the author’s supervisor during teacher practicum and we knew that she qualified for this project. We emailed her at the beginning of the project, and after we discussed consent forms and getting the principal's approval, we scheduled the observation. During this project we will refer to the teacher with a fictitious name, Pernilla. She works at a big communal upper secondary school in Skåne.

The lesson we observed was a year 2 SSL lesson. The students were enrolled in different programs, such as social science, natural science and technical. There were 15 students in the class and everyone attended. See Figure 3 for an overview of the classroom.
4.3 The Observation

Before we entered the classroom, the teacher signed a consent form (see appendix 1) where she agreed to be recorded and being part of our study. We informed her of her rights to anonymity and asked if we could use anonymized images of her to show gestures.

We set up the cameras, computer and the audio recorder before the lesson started. The students had been informed of our observation the week before, and the class decided that one corner of the classroom should not be recorded. Therefore, we made sure that there was a blind spot on the right side of the classroom. See Figure 4. Camera 1 was standing on a tripod at the back of the classroom, facing the board and the middle, and the left rows of tables. Camera 2 was placed on a windowsill closer to the whiteboard, facing the whiteboard and the podium. The audio recorder was placed on the teacher’s desktop. The computer was placed next to camera 1 as a security measure in case the camera malfunctioned. However, after the observation we noticed that the audio recorder did not work, therefore we have only used the material collected through the cameras and computer.

Before we started any recording devices, we informed the students about our project and what the recordings are used for. They were also informed that what they do and say will not be a part of the empirical material, and that the recordings will be deleted. After
the information, we handed out a consent form (see appendix 2) where the students agreed to our presence in the classroom. After collecting the consent forms, we started recording and then sat down at the back of the classroom, taking notes by computer and pen and paper.

![Diagram of classroom setup](image)

**Figure 4**

### 4.4 Analysis Method

We used the transcription method described in Jewitt (2006, p. 38), which she calls multimodal transcription analysis. We transcribed the first 25 minutes of the lesson; but, we excluded the students’ comments and questions, and only transcribed the teacher’s gaze, gestures, spoken language and written language. We made a table where time, gaze, gesture, spoken word and written word were included as the main topics. For each mode we paused the recording and wrote down time to screenshot the picture to be able to show the teacher’s gestures and gaze. When we had chosen the pictures, we used an application to blur the teacher’s face.
4.5 Ethical Considerations

Before the observation we informed the teacher and the students that the lesson will be filmed and recorded only for the purpose of our research. We also informed them that the data will be deleted after the project is over. The participant has the right to not be included in the research and she also has the right to end her participation whenever she wishes to. All the students in the classroom were over 15 years old, and therefore we did not need their parents’ consent. No names will be included in the degree project. However, the teacher will be given a fictitious name. Since none of us work at the school or have any relationships with the students or teacher participating in the study, there is no dependence or pressure to participate. After the observation we gave the teacher a chance to watch the tape before using it as data. This is in accordance with the Swedish research council’s (2017, p. 27) recommendations in God Forskningssed.
5. Results and Discussion

Our research questions are the following: 1) what multimodal resources are used by the second language teacher while giving instructions? and 2) how does the teacher use these multimodal resources? The results will be presented based on the observation, and our transcription of the first 25 minutes of the lesson. This chapter contains different multimodal categories regarding the use of space, the use of gestures, the use of gaze, and the use of language. Each category is thoroughly described with connection to relevant research and examples from the observation. Moreover, after each presented result, a discussion is included.

5.1 The Use of Space

The first multimodal resource used by the teacher was space. During the 25 minute introduction, Pernilla stayed in the authoritative space (Lim et al. 2012), and walked between the desk, the podium; at the left side of the room, the board and the bright side of the room as seen in Figure 5. She did not leave the authoritative space until the introduction was over. Then she began moving along the rows and talking to the students one-on-one and help them with their specific questions. She also offered help by asking how the work was going, she constantly moved around to offer help and therefore we conclude that the second part of the lesson was spent in an interactional space. This is in line with what Lim et al. (2012) found, where the teachers were in the authoritative space while conducting “traditional” teaching, and in interactional space while the students were supposed to work independently. Neither Pernilla or the teachers observed in Lim et al.’s study spent any time in supervisory space.

The two teachers, Wilson and Adeline, who participated in Lim et al’s. (2012, p. 242) study positioned themselves to the right or left of the desk while in authoritative space. Wilson stood to the right most of the time, like Pernilla, who stood to the left most of the time. This was interpreted as an attempt to downplay the power conveyed through standing in authoritative space. However, when Pernilla stood by the podium, like when Adeline positioned herself half behind her desk, they constructed a sense of formality and professional distance between them and their students (p. 244). In addition, like Adeline, Pernilla displayed less movement, and she delivered her introduction, mostly, from a
static position. The lack of pacing in Pernilla’s introduction could lead to the students paying more attention to the meaning she was making with other semiotic resources, such as language and gestures (p. 245).

In Morell’s (2018, p. 4) study, the teacher left authoritative space while giving instructions and eliciting answers; however, Pernilla did not. That could be due to the classrooms’ different organizations. The classroom Morell observed was organized in a U-shape, where the students were sitting along the walls facing the middle of the classroom, making it easy for the teacher to move around in the middle of the U. While Morell’s teacher could move freely in the middle of the classroom, Pernilla would not be as visible to all the students if she moved along the rows.

5.2 The Use of Gestures

The second multimodal resource used by Pernilla was gestures. As mentioned in the method section, we have chosen to base our analysis of gestures on the research done by Tan et al. (2016). Therefore, we have divided the gestures into three subsections: interpersonal gestures, experiential gestures, and textual gestures. By using interpersonal gestures as in example, A and B, in Table 1, Pernilla signaled to the students who had the word or who she expected to answer her question. When signaling turn-taking she used her hand, finger, and pen, or sometimes nodding (which was impossible to capture in a
still picture). By using experiential gestures, the teacher made her spoken language clearer by using her hands to emphasize the word ‘back’, as seen in example C, and the word opening, as seen in example D. She was also continuously adding the students suggested words and phrases to the bullet list on the board. The last gesture, example E and F, were textual, and show how the teacher was constantly pointing to the board and the part of the text she was referring to. She continually used the board to show how the different parts were connected, making the content more coherent for the students. During the introduction, she used mostly experiential and textual gestures which can be connected to the authoritative space; Pernilla was the one leading the lesson by referring to what she had written on the board, and the learning objectives. These results were similar to Tan et al.’s (2016) conclusions where the teacher used mostly textual gestures while in authoritative space.

In contrast to the teacher in Morell’s (2018, p. 4) study, Pernilla used gestures instead of approaching the students in interpersonal space to elicit answers. Morell’s classroom was organized differently, which may have affected how the teacher chose to use the space and the different modes available. In our case the classroom was organized in a way that made it more difficult to move around and talk to students individually. Therefore, when Pernilla talked to a specific student she remained in authoritative space and used interpersonal gestures to indicate who she was talking to. This is in line with Jewitt (2006, p. 20), who claims that the teacher always has a possibility to choose which mode is most appropriate for the situation.

Table 1. Examples of gestures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Gesture</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Spoken Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td><img src="example.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Examples of gestures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Gesture</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Spoken Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td><img src="example.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Yes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Why is that? Yes, firstly, an argument?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But, in the third argument we are coming back to persuade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can you begin? If you just say an opening phrase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>But here, then? Counter argument?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 The Use of Gaze

The third multimodal resource used by Pernilla was gaze. As in Tan et al.'s (2016) results regarding gaze, Pernilla’s gaze was, mainly, engaged during the lesson (75 % of recorded time). She was mainly focusing her gaze on the students, even when she was pointing to the board, like in position 1 in Figure 6. The only time her gaze was on the board, was when she was writing something (19 % of recorded time). However, we noticed that her gaze was mostly on the students sitting on the left side of the classroom (41.2 %), like in position 1 and 2. This could be because a), she told us that the students usually prefer to sit by the windows, b) as visitors in the classroom, Pernilla might have felt less comfortable looking at us, sitting in the right, back corner, or c) the cameras were pointing to the left side of the classroom, making the right side invisible and thus, she may have been trying to be accommodating for the sake of the study.
While giving instructions, she used gaze and silence to signal that she wanted the students to be quiet or to pay more attention to her, like in position 3. This happened a couple of times when the students sitting on the right side talked and was disengaged. Pernilla signaled that she wanted silence by standing on the right side of the classroom, closer to the students, and looked straight at them without saying anything. The students understood this signal and calmed down without her having said anything.

When a student spoke to her, generally to answer a question or make a comment, she stood still, gazing at that student and keeping eye contact. After the student finished, she generally moved to the board and pointed to a relevant part of the text or wrote the answer down as another part of the bullet list. Usually when she wrote on the board, she gazed at the board, but her body was facing the students. When she was done writing she quickly turned her gaze back towards the students. This is in accordance with Tan et al’s (2016) results regarding their teacher’s use of gaze in authoritative space. Both Pernilla and their teacher used engaged gaze throughout the introduction and their gaze was either directed at the board or the students.
5.4 The Use of Language

The last multimodal resource used by Pernilla was language. At the start of the lesson, there was already two bullet lists on the board (see Figure 7) describing what the students speeches will be assessed on, and the second bullet list described the disposition of an argumentative speech or paper. During the introduction Pernilla invited the students to participate by answering questions and comment what was written on the board. She wrote down what the students said and created an additional bullet list based on the students’ answers. At the end of the lesson, there was a brief instruction for the students on the board: what to include in the speech, what to keep in mind while writing the manuscript, and the time limit for the speech (see Figure 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Introduction + Background</th>
<th>Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>Dramatic pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Argument 1</td>
<td>Linking words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content: Sustainable</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>-firstly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>Argument 2</td>
<td>Rhetorical question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>According to =&gt; Attributive tags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- on the other hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argument 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to conclude lastly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. The board: before**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Introduction + Background</th>
<th>Manuscript: Add sources at the end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Argument 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content: Sustainable</td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believable</td>
<td>Argument 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counter argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- on the other hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argument 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to conclude lastly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 8. The board: after**

When she started the introduction, she started out by asking *What is it we see here?* while pointing at the board. After getting an answer from a student, that this is the template, she
began the introduction. The two bullet lists were the basis for her introduction and she always referred to some part of the list while speaking. She made the connection between what she said and what she had written by pointing to the relevant part of the board.

We conclude that her chosen signifier was spoken language (Jewitt, 2006) and the written words and phrases on the board worked as an anchor for what she said. Pernilla created meaning by using the board as a base which she constantly referred back to by using signifiers that were aimed to correspond with things the students were familiar with in order to create coherence (Kalantzis & Cope, 2012)

According to Moreno and Mayer (2007) it is more efficient to present verbal content through auditory modalities and this is what we have seen during our observation. Pernilla used spoken language to offer information and combined it with visual, non-verbal signs such as gestures and gaze.
6. Conclusion

In this degree project we have explored the following questions: 1) what multimodal resources are used by the second language teacher while giving instructions? and 2) how does the teacher use these multimodal resources? In order to answer these questions, we conducted a case study, in the form of an observation in a second language classroom, at an upper secondary school. We concluded that the teacher used multiple modes to present the content of her introduction. Edvardsson et al. (2018) claim that multimodality is a new approach to teaching. Computers and other digital tools are taking over the role that the printed book once had. However, the teacher we observed did not use any digital tools while teaching, but our analysis of her use of space, gesture, gaze, and language shows that her lesson was nonetheless multimodal.

Pernilla used authoritative space throughout the introduction, which is the front of the classroom around the teacher’s desk. Although, her use of space was authoritative, she positioned herself in both formal and informal ways; by the podium to create distance to the students, but also to the side of the teacher’s desk, to downplay the power conveyed through authoritative space. The gestures used were mostly interpersonal and textual gestures. Since she never left authoritative space during the introduction, she used interpersonal gestures to indicate which student she gave the word to. She used textual gestures when pointing to the board, referring to a specific part of the text. The times she used experiential gestures were when she wanted to highlight what she was talking about. Pernilla’s gaze was on the students almost throughout the introduction, the only time she gazed at the board was when she wrote something. Then, she quickly turned back towards the students. Her gaze was mainly on the left side of the classroom, and sometimes on the right side, especially when she signaled silence. Spoken language was used as the main signifier while written language on the board was used as an anchor to the spoken language. The bullet list on the board was partly written in collaboration with the students to encourage understanding. The use of auditory modalities combined with other non-verbal signs are effective in second language classrooms (Moreno & Mayer, 2007). She used all the modes available to her to show the students how to perform and write their argumentative texts, she also gave the instructions in a multimodal way, and not only in the traditional way of a written instruction.
This degree project has increased our knowledge and awareness of our own use of multimodality in our classrooms. Being aware of our own use of classroom space, gestures, gaze and language is important for our future teacher roles (Morell, 2017, Edvardsson et al. 2018 & Tang, 2013). Doing this kind of study would have positive effects if done during teacher practice, due to gaining a broader perspective on different modes in the classroom.

A case study allowed us to look deeper into one specific classroom situation and we assume that our results can be applicable to other, similar classrooms with the same circumstances. We have also seen similarities to previous research done in similar ways, which we based our method and analysis on. The teacher we observed did not use any kind of technology during this particular lesson, and this may have affected her use of modes. For example, her use of gaze might have been different if she had a computer in front of her. Her use of space might have been different if she used a projector, for instance it might be more difficult to move around in authoritative space while the projector is on and its light is on the board.

We have seen a lot of research done on multimodality and technology in Sweden, however, all the research done on teachers use of non-digital multimodal resources have been done by foreign researchers. Therefore, we would like to see this kind of research to be a part of teacher education in Sweden, because multimodality is becoming more significant both outside and inside the classroom. We would also like to see more of this kind of research done in Swedish educational contexts as well. It would be especially interesting to see how the increased digitalization affects the use of multimodal resources available in the classroom.
7. References


Skolverket (2011), b, Om ämnet svenska som andraspråk: kommentarsmaterial.
Skolverket (2011), c, Om ämnet engelska: kommentarsmaterial.


Samtycke till lärares medverkan i studentprojekt


Lärarens namn: …………………………………………………

Lärarens underskrift: …………………………………………………

Datum: ……………………………

Kontaktuppgifter:
Telefonnummer
E-postadress

Kontaktuppgifter Malmö universitet:
www.mau.se
040-665 70 00

Tack för din medverkan i vår studie! 😊

Tamara Mehdi och Hanna Fristedt.
Appendix 2

Samtycke till inspelning av lektion i studentprojekt

Vi håller på att skriva vårt examensarbete och behöver filma er lärare under lektionstid. Genom att skriva under den här blanketten samtycker Du till vår närvaro i klassrummet och inspelning av läraren. Detta innebär att du inte kommer att vara en del av arbetet samt att din identitet är helt skyddad.

Elevens namn: ……………………………………………………………

Elevens underskrift: ……………………………………………………………

Ansvarig lärare: ……………………………………………………………

Datum: ……………………………

Kontaktuppgifter Malmö universitet:
www.mau.se
040-665 70 00

Tack för att vi får låna ert klassrum! ☺

Tamara Mehdi och Hanna Fristedt.