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Abstract

An increasing number of schools across Europe offer education which integrates the teaching of content with that of language, sometimes known as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning), or the Swedish equivalent SPRINT (språk- och innehållsintegrerad inlärning och undervisning). In Sweden this type of learning often goes under the name of cross-curricular or interdisciplinary work. This dissertation is a case study of one such project that integrated content and English and that took place in year 9 at a secondary school in southern Sweden. The purpose of the investigation was to find out what the teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions were of the use and role of English in this particular cross-curricular project. Applying case study methodology, data was collected using triangulation through observations, a focus group interview with the teachers and a pupil questionnaire. The results show that all the involved teachers and a majority of the pupils were positive towards the integration of content and language, but not on a permanent basis. The teachers felt that the project gave pupils the opportunity to work with the language and develop communication skills. The pupils said that they had learned more speaking skills compared to being taught English as a separate subject, closely followed by writing and reading skills. However, some felt that they had not learned any grammar, which showed a view of English as a skills subject. The study shows that project-based cross-curricular work could be a successful way to integrate content and language, provided projects are well-planned and clearly structured.
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1 Introduction

Teaching content through the medium of a foreign language is becoming increasingly popular in Sweden and other European countries. With its roots in Canadian French immersion programmes, the methodology is now spreading across all stages of schooling in Sweden from primary to adult education. Sometimes known as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) or the Swedish equivalent SPRINT (språk- och innehållsintegrerad lärning och undervisning), it also goes under descriptions such as bilingual, content-based, cross-curricular or interdisciplinary work. However, very little is known about the effects on learning by this type of methodology and there is a great need for more research to help increase the understanding of it and develop support for teachers in the form of training and/or materials.

The role of the English language in Swedish society is an often-debated subject in the media. Some people fear that as the use of English increases at universities and colleges, the Swedish language suffers as a consequence, whilst others embrace this development wholeheartedly. At the one end of the continuum, there are schools where English is the only medium through which content is learned, such as the IB-programme.¹ At the other end, schools can be found where language and content are clearly divided into separate areas and rarely mixed. With English being one of the currently three core subjects in school, its place and importance cannot be questioned. It is generally acknowledged that English is a lingua franca and as such a necessary skill for anyone wishing to communicate with people all over the world. However, the most effective way of teaching and learning English is a topic of great interest and debate among teaching professionals all over the world.

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate a cross-curricular project which integrated content and English. The project took place in year 9 at a secondary school in southern Sweden during the spring term of 2008. The pupils produced music videos in English based on Shakespearean plays. During the process they wrote their own lyrics and music, they performed and recorded their song, filmed and edited the video and presented it in English at a two-day film festival at the school. The school has been of great interest to me for a number of years, mainly because of their way of organising their education into short cross-curricular projects. Initially, it was the enthusiasm of the

¹ The International Baccalaureate, available at numerous locations.
parents of a pupil at the school that caught my attention and imagination and a subsequent study visit inspired me further. Since then I have followed the development and different projects with great interest. It is my ambition that this dissertation will provide a contribution to the overall understanding of language learning in a cross-curricular context, as well as further insights for the school administration, the teachers, parents and pupils familiar with this particular project. As a step in my own development as a teacher of English, it will also undoubtedly help to further form my own theoretical base and future practice.

In this introductory chapter, it is my intention to give the reader the necessary background information in order to place the study in a wider context. This introduction is followed by the purpose statement and the research questions concerning the investigation. The concepts and terminology used in this text will be defined in the following section. The historical overview and research relevant to this dissertation will be presented in section 1.3, followed by a closer presentation of the school and the actual project. In chapter 2, I will describe the methodology used for data collection and in chapter 3, the result and analysis will be presented. Finally, chapter 4 includes a discussion on the findings and draws conclusions as well as provides suggestions for further areas of investigation.

1.1 Purpose and aim

The purpose of this investigation was to carry out a case study of a cross-curricular project, which integrated content\(^2\) and English. The project took place in year 9 at a secondary school in southern Sweden during the spring term of 2008 and was called “Shaking Shakespeare”. It was my ambition to gain an understanding of the use and role of English in the context of this project.

The over-arching question that I aim to answer with this dissertation is:

- What were the teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions of the use and role of English in the context of this cross-curricular project?

\(^2\) “content” from other school subjects, in this case music, art and Swedish.
My focus was particularly on the integration of content and English in a cross-curricular project, but in order to create a holistic understanding of the project I also looked at the context and process. My research questions therefore have a dual focus, as is shown below.

1) Understanding the cross-curricular context:

   a) What were the key phases in the process?
   b) What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English?

2) Understanding the use and role of English in this context:

   a) What was the use and role of English during the process?
   b) What were the pupils’ perceptions of the integration of content and English?

In accordance with case study methodology, I used a combination of data collection methods, which focused on different aspects of the project. The observations aimed to answer research questions 1a and 2a. This was followed by a focus group interview with the teachers relating to research questions 1b and 2a. Finally, a questionnaire focused on the pupils’ perceptions and aimed to answer research question 2b.

1.2 Definitions

The terminology associated with the field of content and language integrated learning and teaching is rich and varied. Similarly, schools that work with project- or problem-based methods use different words to describe their practices, e.g. interdisciplinary or cross-curricular. In order to place this study in its context, some definitions are therefore necessary.

The acronym CLIL is the umbrella term adopted by the European Commission and stands for Content and Language Integrated Learning. It covers a wide spectrum of descriptions of language education styles used in different countries, such as immersion,
bilingual education, content-based language education or content through the medium of a foreign language. In the next section, these will be discussed in more detail. Since the 1990s, the term CLIL is the most widely used in Europe, according to the Eurydice European Unit (European Commission, 2006), who describes it as the “platform for an innovative methodological approach of far broader scope than language teaching” (p.7). In its report Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe, the term CLIL is advocated, as it seeks to develop proficiency in and give equal weight to the learning and teaching of both language and content. In Sweden, the equivalent of CLIL, used by the National Agency for Education, is SPRINT, (Språk- och innehållsintegrerad inlärning och undervisning). As readers of this text may be familiar with either of these terms, I shall henceforth use the combination CLIL/SPRINT.

According to The Oxford dictionary of English (2005), the term “interdisciplinary” means “relating to more than one branch of knowledge”, and the term “cross-curricular” is defined as “involving curricula in more than one educational subject”. This last term is defined as particularly British. They describe more or less the same concept: the idea of investigating a phenomenon, a topic or a problem from different perspectives and subjects, using a holistic approach in teaching and learning about it, rather than treating it separately subject by subject. They are equally descriptive, however, in this dissertation, I will predominantly use the term “cross-curricular”.

In schools, learning and teaching can be organised in different ways using a cross-curricular approach, for example thematic or topic work, problem-based learning (also known as PBL in Sweden) or project-based work. Common for these methods is that they approach a problem or an area holistically and from many angles. At school, themes such as “space” or “the Vikings” could run for a long time and in my experience are more commonly found at the primary stages of school. The school featured in this investigation has in part opted for a cross-curricular approach where the schoolwork is organised into clearly defined short-term projects. Each project has its own goals, linked to the curriculum and relevant syllabuses, its own process and product. Further descriptions of the methodology will follow in section 1.6.

Language teaching and learning has been the focus of many studies worldwide for decades, if not longer. In the following, it is my ambition to provide some background information on previous research and development relevant to this study, on both an international and a more national level. I also include details of European language
policy issued by the European Commission and present the school and project description that is the focus of this dissertation.

1.3 Historical summary

The roots of CLIL/SPRINT are the immersion programmes started in Canada during the 1960s (Falk, 2001, p. 10), which offer native English-speaking pupils school education in French. The main objective is for learners to achieve as near a native competence in the target language as possible. During total immersion, 100% of the education is carried out in French, but partial immersion (50-100%) is also prevalent. The degree of immersion varies with differences in subjects, the time and at what age it is introduced, called “early” (5-6 years of age), “delayed” (8-10 years of age) or “late” (from 11 years of age). Studies have shown good results, especially for pupils subjected to total, early immersion programmes, according to Falk (ibid).

Canada is a country with two official languages, English and French, and is therefore in a different position compared to Sweden. The Canadian objectives have a political aspect in that immersion teaching is a way to strengthen the position of the French language in society. Another major consideration is that teachers in immersion programmes in Canada are fully bilingual. In Europe, Canadian-style immersion programmes (i.e. 50-100%) exist primarily in Finland and Luxembourg, whilst in Sweden, they can really only be found in Swedish-Finnish schools with monolingual Finnish-speaking pupils being taught in Swedish (Nixon, 2001, p. 227). More common all across Europe are partial immersion programmes or “language showers”. The Swedish objectives are different from the Canadian ones. Many Swedish teachers and school leaders are interested in modernising language teaching, improving international contacts and opportunities for pupils of studying and working abroad. The objectives are thus often pedagogical and individual rather than the achievement of total bilingualism. In line with the curriculum, communicative competences are stressed (Falk, 2001, p.10).

The first CLIL/SPRINT project in Sweden was conducted by Tom Åseskog in 1977 at Burgårdens gymnasium in Gothenburg, where the subject of electricity was taught in English. The results showed that the pupils increased their interest in English compared
to the control group and had a more positive attitude towards their own ability in English. However, according to the study, the differences between the groups were not significant (Falk, 2001, p. 11). Other studies during the 1980s and 1990s include Michael Knight’s study at Ebersteinska skolan (1987-88) and Lisa Washburn’s PhD in 1997 about a 1987-89 project at Röllingby gymnasium, which was the most extensive study done up to 2001. In 1992, Gun Hägerfelth, on the instructions of Svenska språknämnden, mapped out education through a foreign language at upper secondary school in Sweden. She concluded that pupils had become better at English, their terminology increased as well as both their written and oral competence including listening and reading comprehension. However, some less favourable consequences were recorded such as a perceived decrease in knowledge in Swedish and a lack of Swedish terminology in science subjects. Some pupils thought that the teachers’ knowledge in English was not satisfactory and this led to the situation that pupils actually spoke less English than they would normally, as they “avoid[ed] asking questions because it [took] longer to think up the question” (Falk, 2001, p. 14).

Since then there has been a steady increase in popularity in Swedish schools of content and language integrated projects and in the number of studies conducted. According to Falk (2001, p. 8), most CLIL/SPRINT projects in Sweden leading up to years 2000-2001 took place at upper secondary level, but this development has spread to both secondary and primary levels of compulsory school. Working on her doctoral dissertation, Maria Falk has recently studied two classes at the Natural Science Programme during their upper secondary education. One of the classes followed a traditional curriculum, whereby they were taught in Swedish and the other class was taught in English using CLIL/SPRINT methodology. Interviewed in Skolvärlden (Ericson, 2006), she admits to being sceptical in the beginning to the idea of teaching subject matter through the medium of English, but she has since discovered that the pupils’ linguistic awareness has increased. “They realise”, she says, “that they must have both languages” (ibid), and make an effort to develop their linguistic ability in Swedish as well. Some of the main criticism of CLIL/SPRINT language education has been the perceived lack of pupils’ development and knowledge in subject content and the Swedish language, and these questions have also been the focus of Falk’s research. Whilst these concerns are valid, she concludes that the perceived lack of development is

---

3 For more details of the Swedish studies, see Falk (2001).
temporary and does not normally cause a problem in the long term. She stresses however the importance of these questions being discussed among teaching professionals. Furthermore, it is generally known that development in the mother tongue is essential for any foreign language learning and acquisition. Falk is surprised that this knowledge has had little impact on CLIL/SPRINT education (ibid), and looks for clearer objectives and goals where this type of education exists. Another aspect to CLIL/SPRINT is that in Sweden, it can normally be found in the most challenging, theoretical programmes at upper secondary school, where pupils generally are highly motivated and ambitious with above average grades. Some pupils find the science subjects easy and view education in English as a positive challenge, according to Falk (ibid).

1.4 European language goals

In 1995, the European Commission White paper on education and training included the goal that all European Union citizens should master two foreign languages in addition to the mother tongue. It is the aim of EU language policy to “promote the teaching and learning of foreign languages in the EU and thereby create a languagefriendly [sic] environment for all Member States languages” (European Parliament fact sheet). Foreign language competence is considered a basic skill for every citizen in order to improve educational and employment opportunities, increase the movement of people between Member States and for personal development. Plurilingualism is also seen as a way of supporting cultural exchange and integration (ibid). To achieve this high ambition, the Commission has over the last 13 years instigated a number of support programmes and an Action Plan on Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity 2004-2006, which emphasised the areas of lifelong language learning, improving the teaching of foreign languages and creating a language friendly environment. One of the ways to achieve the goal of competence in two foreign languages could be through CLIL/SPRINT, according to the document European language policy and CLIL (European Commission), which presents CLIL/SPRINT

---

projects across Europe funded by the EU. It is thus not a coincidence that the teaching and learning of content through the medium of a foreign language is gaining in popularity in Sweden. The same development is taking place across Europe and is very much in line with the overall goals and ambitions of the European Commission.

1.5 Aspects of teaching content and language

Over the last thirty or forty years, research and development in the field of second language learning and acquisition have produced a wealth of approaches, methods and techniques that each claims to be an improvement on the last and to provide better learning opportunities for pupils. The current paradigm guiding language teaching and curriculum design is focused on communicative competence, which can be described as a “meaning-based practice … [with] opportunities to use the second language in creative and spontaneous ways” (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 144). The main focus is, as the name suggests, on communication in meaningful contexts. The impact on pupils’ fluency has been considerable in comparison to older methods such as the grammar-translation method, where learners instead focus on reading and writing. The communicative approach has given birth to a number of different methods, e.g. content-based or task-based instruction\(^7\), where in addition to focusing on communication, pupils are taught content from other subjects, such as geography or history. They have clearly defined tasks to be accomplished and the language learning is thought to occur in the process of solving of the task.

A number of different studies show that, whilst the communicative approach is highly successful and indeed crucial in language learning, it focuses on developing learners’ fluency but not necessarily accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 1999). The Canadian French immersion programmes have had similar results, in that learners have considerably improved their communicative competence, but not necessarily to a native level. It is therefore currently recommended that communicative language programmes should also include some form-focused instruction and corrective feedback in order to develop learners’ accuracy too. The objective is to find a balance between fluency and

\(^{7}\) For further details, see e.g. Larsen-Freeman, 2000, chapter 9.
accuracy, according to Lightbown & Spada (1999, p. 151) and the form that this takes depends on the characteristics of the learners.

With the growth of practices that integrate content and language teaching across Europe, there is need for a descriptive framework, according to Davison & Williams (2001, p. 57). However, due to the fact that the concepts content, language and integration are defined and interpreted differently depending on context and theoretical background, this is a problematic area. Language has “traditionally been interpreted to mean ‘communicative competence’” and content as “the meanings that are made” (ibid, p. 54). This would mean that language could be defined as how something is said and content as what is being said. This separation of content and language is challenged by many, notably Mohan, who suggests that:

A language is a system that relates to what is being talked about (content) and the means used to talk about it (expression). Linguistic content is inseparable from linguistic expression. (1986)

Proponents of this view also question how you can integrate something that is already integrated (Davison & Williams, 2001, p. 54). This is a question of interpretation and theoretical debate. The reality is that most schools have traditionally separated the teaching of content and language. With current European language goals and the recent increase in CLIL/SPRINT projects, the need for further discussion and framework is called for. What does it mean to integrate content and language? Is it possible, or even desirable, to achieve an equal balance between content and language? Or does it fall naturally that any project is weighted in either direction, often referred to as content-driven or language-driven education? Nixon suggests describing the interrelationship between content and language as a continuum (2001, p. 226). At the one end of the continuum is immersion, where all teaching is done through the medium of the foreign language. At the other end is study of the language as a subject (LAS), isolated from other subjects and without content influence. This is still the most common approach of language education in Swedish schools. Content-based language learning would be placed nearer the LAS end because the focus would be on language learning, albeit with some content, that may or may not be related to what is being done in other subjects. It follows then that all practices, except LAS, integrate content and language to some degree. CLIL/SPRINT projects would normally be considered nearer the immersion end.
of this continuum, as equal focus is placed on learning of content and English. However, this discussion exemplifies the fact that the mere CLIL/SPRINT acronym is subject to interpretation and is likely to have as many meanings as there are projects. As an umbrella term for the many different and unique projects that integrate content and language to some degree it is however useful.

We can perhaps say that we are in the middle of a paradigm shift regarding language learning and education. Many language teachers are looking to develop their practices beyond communicative competence and CLIL/SPRINT could be one way forward. However, more research is needed to be carried out and shared among teaching professionals in order to help the general understanding of this phenomenon, in creating frameworks and in curriculum and syllabus design.

Some of the main factors brought up in recent research include the balance between the learning of subject matter and language. If too little attention is placed on the coherence of the subject matter this could lead to “Flat earth theories” (Davison, 1992), which means that “the subject matter is fragmented or fatally flawed, because fundamental concepts underpinning certain content are not established” (Davison & Williams, 2001, p. 66). The opposite could be said to be true if too little attention is placed on the coherence of the language components, creating what Davison calls either “Hole language” (1992), where significant gaps appear in the language development, or that language becomes contextualised to such an extent that it is difficult for pupils to transfer skills across contexts (Davison & Williams, 2001, p. 66). One way to deal with this dichotomy is to strive for a balance in the curriculum “by systematically varying the curriculum focus within a unit or course or by choosing a mix of approaches from different ends of the language-content curriculum” (ibid). The perspective should be “diachronic rather than synchronic”, according to Davison and Williams (ibid), i.e. over time as opposed to focusing on one instant.

Similar concerns regarding CLIL/SPRINT education are voiced by Maria Falk (Ericson, 2006 and Falk, 2001) following her Swedish study. Firstly, what happens to the development of learners’ knowledge of subject matter? Are pupils able to express their knowledge freely or are they hindered by the lack of terminology knowledge in the target language? Secondly, what happens to their knowledge and development of the

---

8 Davison & Williams (2001, p. 58f) present an excellent overview of approaches to integrated language and content teaching, taking into account e.g. the function and focus of the curriculum, theoretical models and teacher roles.
majority language, Swedish, whether this is their mother tongue or not? If pupils are taught in English, how will they learn important terminology in Swedish? And finally, concerns about teacher competence in the target language and methodology are brought up. What requirements are there in terms of teacher training and/or materials needed in order to carry out CLIL/SPRINT education to the satisfaction of everybody involved?

Set against these concerns are of course many positive aspects of content and language integrated learning (Nixon, 2001). According to many language teachers who work with pupils of different ages, pupils are “not only more easily motivated but also come to exhibit a greater awareness of language itself” (ibid, p. 230). This implies that it is possible to talk about features of the language at a higher level than would be possible otherwise. Language teachers often cite the pure mathematics of CLIL/SPRINT, according to Nixon (ibid, p. 231). If the pupils are exposed to the target language not only during language classes, but also during other classes where the focus is on content, or indeed in cross-curricular projects, this increases the opportunity of language use and development and thereby learning.

As we have seen, the objectives of CLIL/SPRINT in Sweden are usually not the achievement of complete bilingualism, but rather to increase motivation, improve attitudes towards the target language with learners and to improve language education. At upper secondary school, targets are generally set higher with ambitions to achieve an increase in knowledge and communicative competence, internationalisation and an improvement in individual opportunities of education and work abroad. Generally, pupils that choose schools offering CLIL/SPRINT methodology are high-achieving, motivated pupils with an interest in languages.

Research up to the present day is inconclusive. However, Falk states in her report SPRINT – hot eller möjlighet? (2001, p. 39), that the prerequisites for a successful CLIL/SPRINT education are clearly stated goals and aims as well as focusing on the three important areas of content knowledge, Swedish knowledge and target language knowledge. Teacher competence, a carefully thought out methodology including a structured plan are also important factors.

Bridging the perceived gap between the learner’s cognitive abilities and linguistic level is a challenge faced by all practitioners of content and language integrated education, as outlined above. The question then becomes one of curriculum and syllabus design. Often cited in this connection is Jim Cummins’ model of the “relationship between task level and context” (Coyle, 1999, p. 49).
Figure 1: Cummins’ model of the relationship between cognitive demands and context

This matrix could be a help in designing tasks for use in the integrated classroom. Tasks in the “A” quadrant are highly-contextual but have low cognitive demands, e.g. concrete tasks with a high proportion of visual aids or the use of role-plays. Tasks in the “B” quadrant can be described as reproductive being both context-reduced and of low cognitive demands, e.g. copying or rote learning. Whether there is any learning potential with this type of tasks is questionable. A progression is therefore desirable into quadrant “C”, where highly demanding but context-embedded tasks include e.g. seeking solutions, comparing and contrasting, and finally into quadrant “D”, with tasks that could be described as more academic, encourage more abstract and therefore cognitively demanding thinking. This model can be used to raise teacher awareness of task design and help evaluating practices (ibid). Coyle continues:

… if tasks are contextualised and language is supported, then learners will have access to cognitively demanding work and thus challenge their thinking as well as their linguistic skills: a case of amplify not simplify! (ibid)

Drawing on recent research on bilingual and content and language integrated education, Do Coyle offers a practical way forward for teachers interested in pursuing this route. One of the major challenges in CLIL/SPRINT classrooms is how to encourage linguistic progression at the same time as developing cognitive abilities and knowledge in the subject matter. Research done on Canadian immersion programmes and based on nineteen immersion classes shows that “81% of all pupils’ utterances were found to be no longer than one word, phrase or clause” (Swain & Lapkin, 1986). This is not in line with current thinking in language learning and acquisition, which stresses the importance of interaction for learning to take place. Moreover, as we have seen above,
teachers of content voice concerns about pupils being held back in their development of subject knowledge and cognitive abilities due to linguistic problems, i.e. by not being able to express and show their knowledge simply because they do not have the words. Coyle sees a complex interrelationship between content, cognition, communication and culture – “the four Cs”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Progression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1999, p. 53)

For learning to take place there must be a progression in content development, from early context-embedded material to increasingly more abstract knowledge, such as an ability to argue, evaluate and interpret. Learners must engage with the content on offer in order to develop cognitive processes and this engagement could come from reasoning gap or opinion gap tasks (Prabhu, 1987). Thirdly, communication in the classroom should be “real” and meaningful and provide ample opportunity of interaction, and finally, Coyle suggests that in the CLIL/SPRINT classroom, a cultural awareness can be built by “articulating alternative interpretations of content rooted in different cultures” (1999, p. 53). If these guiding principles are used by practitioners in the planning and evaluation process, they “have the potential to make a difference to what goes on in our classrooms” (ibid, p. 59), according to Coyle. Below follows a description of one project that integrated content and language.

1.6 Integration in practice - the cross-curricular project

The school that is central to this dissertation has in part opted for a project-based methodology. Similar to other communicative, content-based methods, the inspiration largely comes from the progressive, pedagogical movement initiated by American John Dewey at the beginning of the last Century (Andersson Brolin, 2001, p. 17). Colleague of John Dewey and professor at Columbia University, New York, William H. Kilpatrick, presented his ideas in the book The project method, although in his book
Projetarbete läroboken, Andersson Brolin describes Kilpatrick’s approach as an attitude to knowledge, learning and teaching, rather than a method (ibid, p. 18). Project-based methodology can be described as an experiential pedagogy focusing on learner autonomy. Projects should be meaningful, often based on pupils’ own experiences and be problem-oriented rather than subject-oriented. In addition, the pupils take an increasingly active part in goal-setting (ibid, p. 17). Professor Christian Berggren defines that a project “has a clearly defined goal, is limited in time and is non-recurrent …” (Friberg & Lindgren, 2007, p. 7). Project-based work is a way for different competencies and knowledge areas to come together in order to create new knowledge, with co-operation, team spirit and a proficient supervisor being key components in this process (ibid).

The Swedish curriculum for the compulsory school system (Skolverket, 2006, Lpo94), encourages cross-curricular activities: “The teacher shall […] organise and carry out the work so that the pupil […] has opportunities of in-depth study of a subject, a general view and coherence, and has opportunities of cross-curricular work” (p. 12f, my translation). Furthermore, it is written that school should aim for every pupil to:

- learn to listen, discuss, argue a point and use his or her knowledge as a tool in order to
- formulate and try out hypotheses and solve problems,
- reflect over experiences and
- critically examine and evaluate statements and relationships (p. 10, my translation)

These are a few of the points in the curriculum that are in focus during cross-curricular work. There are others, such as fostering democratic values, learning to take responsibility, experience working in groups and taking an increasing responsibility in planning work.

The purpose of cross-curricular project work is to create a holistic view and coherence of the world, rather than separating phenomena into traditional school subjects, recognising that this is a human construction (Krantz & Persson, 2001, p. 22). Instead the “problem” is in focus, such as a particular time period involving school subjects history, music, art and Swedish; a scientific phenomenon involving physics, chemistry, maths and Swedish and concepts like democracy, sustainable growth or fair trade, to name but a few of the ideas and projects recently carried out at this school. A flexible schedule is one of the necessary prerequisites for this type of work along with a
team of teachers with the opportunity and will to work closely together. In practice, the teachers at this school try to balance projects so that different teachers carry the main responsibility for a project at different times, allowing for planning and evaluation of projects in between. Increasingly throughout their secondary education at this school, pupils are invited to plan projects together with the teachers. Assessment and evaluation always form part of every project.

1.7 School background

Situated in an affluent area just outside a large town in southern Sweden, this F-9 school is popular among parents and pupils, the majority of whom can be described as high-achievers. Formerly an F-6 school, the secondary part of the school was added in 2003 and in the academic year 2006/07, the school was able to offer a full year 7-9 secondary education. The secondary teachers are organised into two teams, one of which teaches years 7 and 9 and the other year 8. There are currently 400 pupils at the school (2007/08), of which 146 are in years 7-9. This is split as follows: 40 (year 7), 58 (year 8) and 48 (year 9).

In the school’s official work plan, the methods used are described as follows (my translation):

- **Project-based and thematic, cross-curricular working method**
  The pupils have a large individual responsibility for and influence on the school work, which increasingly is organised into projects with a thematic, cross-curricular emphasis. Each Monday morning pupils and teachers meet to plan the activities and work for that week.

- **Additional English**
  The English language will increasingly become a second working language. English conversation is a priority.

[...]

The pupils in grade 9 are consequently accustomed to working in project-form, having done so for two and a half years. The projects are always cross-curricular and include various subjects on different occasions, albeit with an emphasis on science, civics and Swedish. English has been included in a limited number of projects, on average 1-2 per
year, but until now always parallel to the “main” project, as a small part of the overall goals of the project. This was the first time English was given a predominant role in a project.

1.8 Project description

Every project description is built roughly along the same lines, containing an inspirational “story” that provides the setting, the specific goals for that project and the subjects included, a schedule detailing important check-points and dates along the way, instructions on the “product” and presentation forms, a grading and evaluation matrix, information on groups and other project-specific information. Worth noting is that the goals for each project relate to the “goals to aim for” rather than the “goals to attain” in the curriculum for compulsory school system (Lpo94) and are thus set at a high level. In the grading and evaluation section, the goals are then broken down into more concrete “goals to attain”.

“Shaking Shakespeare” was the name given to the project carried out in grade 9 during almost four weeks in the spring term of 2008. The 48 pupils were divided into groups of four by the team of four teachers responsible for this project. The teachers spent a considerable amount of time ensuring the group compositions were as effective as possible. The subjects included in the project were music, art, Swedish and English and the overall goal for each group was to produce a music video in English with the starting point being one of Shakespeare’s dramas and the historical context. This included writing lyrics, producing music, storyboards, performing, recording/filming, editing and presenting.

According to the project description (see appendix 1 and Skolverket, Kursplaner och betygskriterier, 2007 and Lpo 94, 2006), the goals for the “Shaking Shakespeare” project were as follows:

The goals that all pupils should strive towards are:

To develop their ability to consciously form and express ethical standpoints based on knowledge, personal experience and to respect the intrinsic value of other people.
The goals pupils aim for in:

Music: are to become familiar with the interaction between music and other areas of knowledge and develop the ability to combine music with other representational forms such as pictures, text, drama, dance and movement.

Also to develop the ability to create their own music to communicate their thinking and ideas and to use their knowledge of music to play and sing together. Thus develop responsibility and co-operation skills.

Art: are to develop their ability so that they are able to enjoy creating their own pictures with the help of handicraft-based methods and techniques, as well as methods using computers and video technology.

Swedish: is to develop [their] imagination and a will to create with the help of Swedish, both individually and together with others.

English: are to develop their ability to read different types of texts for pleasure and to obtain information and knowledge. Also to develop their ability to use English to communicate in speech and writing.

Various forms of input were offered by the teachers and people brought in from outside the school in order to help the pupils in their learning process. To aid in the understanding of their Shakespearean drama, each group was handed a summary of the story in Swedish produced by the Swedish Shakespeare Society (/www.shakespearesallskapet.se/). The pupils were recommended other internet sites, in both English and Swedish, where they could find more in-depth information on for example the interpretations of and any underlying themes in the drama (see “Project description”, app. 1). In addition to this, they were encouraged to watch a filmed version of it. It was very much up to the group to decide how much input they needed or how easy or difficult they wanted to make it, i.e. whether they decided to watch the film and/or read the actual text or just a summary of it and if they did, in which language. Some groups had extra sessions with the teachers to discuss their drama.

A lecture in English on Shakespeare’s life and times was given by one of the teachers and more historical background was offered through a factual text called The great days of Elizabeth. Further scaffolding was offered in Swedish on lyric writing, film-making and music video-making by one of the teachers. Two lecturers were also brought in from outside the school, one a media teacher employed by the town council as a school resource, the other a freelance photographer with experience in music video production. A music recording studio was set up in a group room and a schedule produced, giving each group approximately two hours’ coaching by the music teacher plus recording time. The school is well-equipped with laptop computers, but additional equipment, in
the form of iMac computers, digital video cameras and tripods, was also borrowed from
the Media central.

Each group was given one of the following Shakespearean dramas:

**Comedies**
- *A midsummer’s night’s dream*
- *The merchant from Venice*
- *The tempest*
- *Much ado about nothing*

**Tragedies**
- *Macbeth*
- *Romeo and Juliet (two groups)*
- *Hamlet (two groups)*
- *Othello*

**Histories**
- *Richard III*
- *Henry V*

In addition to the group work, each pupil was to keep an individual logbook, with the
instructions to “keep an account of your learning”, (see “Project description”, app. 1).
The logbook was to be kept in English and it had several purposes; firstly as a record of
tasks issued, e.g. questions following the lecture or on the text *The great days of
Elizabeth* (reading comprehension). The pupils were also to show that they had
understood the story of their drama. Secondly, the logbook was also a form of
documentation of the working method; what, where, when and how; and finally, pupils
were asked to write down their thoughts freely about the process, the problems
encountered and how they were solved or simply about their learning process. The
logbook was handed in at the end of each week and feedback and comments were
written in English by the English teacher.

The logbook formed part of the individual examination, whilst the group
examination took place during a two-day “film festival”, when each group showed their
music video (twice) and then used a PowerPoint presentation to describe their drama
and to show how their text and their understanding of it connected to the lyrics and the
film. All the presentations were in English and questions by the audience were
encouraged. Following the presentations, the teachers sat together and assessed all
groups and individuals according to an assessment chart (see *Bedömningsmall*, app. 1),
which formed part of the project description.

In the next chapter, I will present the methodology used for my investigation,
followed by the results in chapter 3.
2 Methodology

One of the philosophical perspectives regarding qualitative research is that the world is not an objective reality that can be measured and controlled. Reality is in fact highly subjective and dependent on perceptions and the interplay between people and it needs to be interpreted (Merriam, 1988, p. 31). When the focus of the research is a specific phenomenon or situation, e.g. a programme, a person, an event or a teaching method, a qualitative case study could be the optimal choice. Case study research is a systematic collection of data from the one case with the purpose of “insight, discovery and interpretation rather than hypothesis trial” (ibid, p. 25). The emphasis is on discovering and understanding new concepts and the complex interplay between people and situations in a particular context. Due to the fact that a case study is unique, this type of research is often referred to as “interpretation in context” (ibid). In order to achieve an in-depth understanding of the case in question, it is customary to use several different forms of data collection, called “triangulation”. The reason for this is that each method has its own advantages and disadvantages and used in combination the picture will be more complete than it would be otherwise. In case studies the primary forms of data collection are normally interviews and observations (ibid, p. 85).

A project with specific boundaries both in terms of participants and time and with clearly defined goals, “Shaking Shakespeare” was suitable for case study research. Clearly, there are many aspects of interest in a project like this, but the focus of this investigation was to find out about teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions of the role and use of English in the context of this cross-curricular project. In line with case study research methodology, the data collection methods used for this investigation included observations, a focus group interview with the teachers and a pupil questionnaire. Questionnaires are normally used in quantitative research, but in this case it was a practical and feasible way to find out about the pupils’ perceptions. It was my ambition that the methods together should provide both breadth and depth and enable me to present as holistic a picture as possible.

In this chapter, I will present the rationale and process of each of the data collection methods, after first presenting the selection process. I will conclude by discussing aspects of validity and ethics.
2.1 Selection

The selection process was clear and straightforward. Since the school, and the teaching method of this team of teachers, had been familiar to me and of considerable interest for a number of years, I approached them during the autumn term for initial discussions. My plans and ideas of studying one particular project where the subject English was integrated were met with a positive attitude and support from the team of teachers as well as the school head and deputy head. Liaising with the teachers once their plans for the term had been finalised, it became clear that the project “Shaking Shakespeare”, planned to run for almost four weeks between the February and the Easter holidays, would be ideal for my study. The participants in the project consisted of 48 pupils in grade 9 led by four teachers and one assistant.

2.2 Observations

Together with interviewing, observation is a key method of data collection in case study research. When it has a “clear purpose, is planned, systematically recorded and subject to control of validity and reliability”, it can be a useful scientific tool (Merriam, 1988, p. 101). Critics say that it relies too much on subjective perception and is therefore unreliable, but on the other hand it is the only method enabling researchers to “catch the moment” (ibid, p. 102). Furthermore, the observer can notice things that may normally be taken for granted or that are considered too sensitive or difficult to discuss in an interview situation (Hatch, 2002, p. 72). Depending on the case being studied, the observer can use different approaches during the data collection, ranging from being a “complete observer” (e.g. being anonymous in a public place) to a “complete participant”, where the observer is a member of the group being studied. In this investigation, my role as researcher could be described as “observer participant”. My reasons for being there were made clear to the group and my primary task was data collection rather than participation in the activities (Merriam, 1988, p. 106). However, even if I chose not to participate in the activities I recorded, it is still important to note that my presence may have had an effect on the participants. It is also essential that the observations are guided by the purpose of the investigation and the research questions.
Being clear about what to look for and what to record is important, as it is impossible to record everything that happens in a situation.

Initially, my main objective with the observations was to remain as broad as possible and try to “capture the story” (Nilsson, lecture 2008), focusing on familiarising myself with the project and the participants. My approach then changed to having a dual focus in line with my research questions. Firstly, I tried to capture as much of the different phases of the project as time and schedules allowed, since it was my aim to create an understanding of what was involved in the project (research question 1a). Secondly, I focused on the role and use of English evident during the process (research question 2a). Throughout my observations I tried to keep an open mind so that if anything unexpected occurred this could be followed up later in the interview.

The observations took place on five occasions between 25th February and 19th March 2008. The length of each occasion varied as well as the activity recorded and the people present, as can be seen from the Observation Log below. On the first occasion the whole class was present and I was introduced as a student teacher and researcher with a special interest in English in cross-curricular projects. The pupils were asked and they agreed to my being present observing the activities during the project.

### Observation Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/2</td>
<td>10:00-11:10</td>
<td>Project introduction, goals</td>
<td>All teachers, majority of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/2</td>
<td>09:15-10:15</td>
<td>Studio meeting, group</td>
<td>1 teacher, 1 sp.needs teacher, 4 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>08:15-08:45</td>
<td>Lecture, music video production</td>
<td>2 lecturers, 2 teachers, majority of pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/3</td>
<td>08:10-09:10</td>
<td>Recording studio, group</td>
<td>1 teacher, 4 pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/3</td>
<td>09:40-15:30</td>
<td>Group presentations, day 2</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Observation Log

A more detailed summary of my observations is presented below.
The first observation point lasted for one hour and ten minutes and consisted of a project introduction event, where practically all the participants were present. The teachers started by showing a music video that they had produced themselves. They showed the video twice and brought up different aspects such as melody, text and picture quality and colour. The project descriptions (see app. 1) were handed out and discussed in some detail. After 50 minutes the group was split and I followed a group of nine pupils, one teacher and the assistant into an adjoining classroom. The teacher handed out logbooks and went through the project description text and glossary in more detail.

The second observation lasted for one hour and also consisted of two parts, firstly a “studio meeting” with one group of four pupils and the music teacher. Present was also a Special needs teacher, allocated to one of the pupils. This was followed by group work by the same four pupils on their own. During the “studio meeting”, the group discussed their thoughts about what kind of music genre they wanted for their song, aided and encouraged by the teacher, who used a synthesizer to illustrate. Back in the classroom, the group brainstormed ideas about their allocated play and themes associated with it.

The third observation point was the shortest, consisting of 30 minutes. Two lecturers had been brought in from outside the school; one a media teacher employed by the town council as a school resource, the other a freelance photographer with experience in music video production. Two teachers and all the pupils were present and I observed the first 30 minutes of the session. Several music videos were shown and discussed, highlighting special features and effects.

On the fourth occasion, my observation lasted one hour and consisted of a different group of four pupils in the “recording studio” and one teacher. The pupils agreed to me being present during the discussions but not during the actual recording of their song, so I left them after one hour. The pupils had their lyrics more or less ready, but were unsure about the genre of the music. Little by little, and in co-operation, the song took form.

The final observation was the longest, lasting nearly six hours (from 09:40 to 15:30). This was also the culmination of the project being the group presentations or “film festival”. Everybody involved with this project was present. This was the second day of presentations and included the final six groups to present. The procedure was identical

---

9 There was a small group of pupils missing, who had lessons elsewhere and were given an introduction later that day.
for each group; first the group showed the music video. By using PowerPoint the group members then presented the lyrics, explaining their thinking behind them and how they had interpreted the drama. This was followed by questions by the audience and then the group showed their music video one final time. At the end of the day, I observed the team of teachers grading and evaluating the groups we had seen that day.

The observations were recorded in an observation schedule in a notebook, where I left a blank page next to each page for my own comments and reflections to be added. The result and analysis of my observations will be presented in chapter 3. Some of the events that I recorded during my observations were later brought up during the interview with the teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(text)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Observation Schedule

The observations focused on the process of the project and aimed to answer two of my research questions: What were the key phases in the process and what was the use and role of English during the process?

2.3 Focus group interview with teachers

Interviewing is along with observation the primary form of data collection in a qualitative case study. The method can give interesting and valuable information about perceptions and attitudes that is difficult to get by observation only, for example about teachers’ views on various aspects of teaching (Johansson & Svedner, 2006, p. 41). In addition, Hatch writes that “used in conjunction with observation, [interviews] provide
ways to explore more deeply participants’ perspectives on actions observed by researchers” (2002, p. 91).

Qualitative interviews range from informal, spontaneous conversations to formal and structured ones. For my investigation, I decided that the interview should be semi-structured and conducted in a focus group setting. A semi-structured interview is guided by a number of questions to be explored (see app. 2), but allows for the informants’ own thoughts and reflections to be brought to the surface. In this way, it is possible for the researcher “to respond to the situation as it unfolds, to the informants’ picture of the world and to new ideas that turn up” (Merriam, 1988, p. 88). One of the advantages with a focus group interview is that for people with “similar characteristics or having shared experiences” (Hatch, 2002, p. 24) there is much to be gained from the dynamics of the interaction between them. By choosing a focus group interview, there was a risk of not accessing more personal thoughts or reflections. However, I decided that a group discussion about the shared experiences from the project would allow for a more dynamic interaction and development of ideas to come forward.

The interview lasted one hour and took place on one occasion less than two weeks from the end of the project. The location was a quiet group room at the school. Apart from myself, each of the four responsible teachers were present. The pupil assistant was offered to join the interview, but was unable to do so. The interview was recorded on tape and later transcribed by myself. The teachers have been given fictitious names throughout this dissertation and are all in the age bracket 35 to 45. Anna teaches Swedish and social studies and has been a teacher for 14 years. She has been working at the school for six months. Björn is a teacher of Swedish, art and music and has been working at the school for four and a half years out of 12 as a practicing teacher. Christina teaches English and home economics and has taught at the school for four years out of 12. Finally, David teaches social studies and physical education and has been at the school for two out of his four years as a teacher.

The two research questions that I aimed to answer with the focus group interview included:

1b) What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English?
2a) What was the use and role of English during the process?
2.4 Pupil questionnaire

The final form of data collection was a pupil questionnaire (see app. 3) administered by myself almost six weeks after the end of the project. The time lapse was due to mainly practical factors, such as the national test period and other activities for the class that took priority. However, this may not necessarily have had a negative effect on the result, as time had potentially allowed the experiences and reflections on the project to mature. I administered the questionnaire in three groups during the same morning to those pupils present (41 out of 48). The questionnaire consisted of different parts: the pupils’ thoughts and experiences of English as a school subject, thoughts about the integration of English in the project “Shaking Shakespeare”, what they thought they had learned during the project, comparisons between learning English in a cross-curricular project as opposed to separately, goal attainment and finally whether they would be interested in using English as a medium in other projects/subjects, and if so, what subjects.

The aim of the questionnaire was to answer the final of my research questions: what were the pupils’ perceptions of the integration of content and English?

2.5 Aspects of validity and ethics

There is always an element of interpretation in any form of research. How can we tell that the results presented are a “true” picture of reality? Any qualitative data and even figures presented from a quantitative survey is a representation of reality and not reality in itself (Merriam, 1988, p. 177). Qualitative research is guided by the view that reality is “holistic, multi-dimensional and subject to constant change. There are no fixed and objective phenomena waiting to be discovered, observed and measured” (ibid, p. 178). Reality is a construction made by individuals and in qualitative research the focus is on how people perceive the world. In case study methodology the researcher tries to “capture and present reality as it is perceived by the people in it” (ibid). By using a combination of data collection methods (triangulation), being clear about the choices I have made and open about my results, this has also been my aim during this work.
In accordance with the rules issued by Vetenskapsrådet in their publication *Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning* (1990), my study adhered to the four main requirements of information, consent, confidentiality and usage. Consequently, all the informants were told of the reasons for my research and that their participation was strictly on a voluntary basis. This decision was entirely their own and they were told that they could discontinue their participation at any time and without any consequences. The informants were also ensured of anonymity, as far as possible. Steps have been taken to avoid the identification of the school in question and the teachers have been given fictitious names in this dissertation. Since this project was a one-off, it would not be too difficult to identify the teachers or the class for those familiar with the project, however, since the data collected for this study is not of a sensitive nature, and with the consent of the teachers, this is not deemed to be an obstacle. To ensure pupil anonymity I have avoided mentioning individual pupil names. Finally, the informants were ensured that any data collected in the form of tape recordings, notes or questionnaires would only be dealt with by myself and destroyed after the completion of this dissertation.

In this chapter, I have presented the methodology behind my qualitative case study. The rationale and process with each of the data collection methods – observation, focus group interview and pupil questionnaire – was explained along with details of the selection process. In the next chapter, the results of this data collection will be presented and analysed.
3 Results and analysis

The aim of this investigation was to find out what the teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions were of the use and role of English in this particular cross-curricular project. To do this, I was guided by the following research questions:

1) Understanding the cross-curricular context:

   a) What were the key phases in the process?
   b) What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English?

2) Understanding the use and role of English in this context:

   a) What was the use and role of English during the process?
   b) What were the pupils’ perceptions of the integration of content and English?

Some of my data was collected during the process of this project (observations) and some was collected after the completion of the project (interview and questionnaires). In this chapter, I will present my results by each of the four questions above. Data relating to the first question was collected by observations. The second question was answered in the focus group interview, the third by both observations and interview and finally the fourth question relates to the pupil questionnaire.

3.1 Key phases

This section aims to answer the research question: what were the key phases in the process? Although not directly linked to my over-arching research question, it is I believe a necessary part in creating an understanding of the project as a whole and as an example of the integration of content and English in practice. This data was collected by observations that took place on five occasions of varying length between 25th February and 19th March 2008 (see figure 2 on p. 27).
Introduction
The project was introduced by an event where the teachers showed a music video they had produced themselves. This video functioned as the focus of discussions and questions about the project, e.g. about the text, the melody, the pictures and the atmosphere created by visual effects. The teachers asked the pupils questions, such as: Were you aware of the music chord? What was special about the pictures? Was the music synchronised with the singing? They talked about their own process during the production of their video and advised the pupils not to make theirs too complicated but to use what was around them. The pupils were attentive and responsive and asked questions relating to how it was done (observation 080225).

The importance of the introduction event cannot be over-estimated, not only as a point of motivation and inspiration, but also as an effective means to lower any other affective filters (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 39f) the pupils may have. The group as a whole had a shared experience and a common starting point in the project; the teachers were prepared to laugh at themselves and to show an example of how it *could* be done. The video became a very concrete talking point and gave rise to many questions, as it became clear with the pupils that they were also going to produce a music video. Along with the project description that was later introduced, the video was in focus during this negotiation of meaning in the room. It was an opportunity to create a general agreement about and understanding of what this project was all about. However, it is also important to be aware of the fact that the opposite could be true. Had the teachers’ video been of a very high standard technically, musically or visually, this could have had the effect of setting a standard or being too prescriptive and thereby difficult for the pupils to live up to. We cannot be certain that this did not happen, but I perceived the teachers being aware of this aspect and that the purpose of the video was not to “show off” but rather to inspire and motivate.

Studio meeting
The calm atmosphere hits me when I arrive today. There seems to be study peace and groups are sitting in different places seemingly busy with the project. Everybody is doing different things, e.g. discussing, somebody is playing the guitar, somebody else is playing the synthesizer, but it looks focused (observation 080228).
I joined a group of four pupils heading off for their first “studio meeting”. Their teacher Björn told them that the purpose of their meeting was to give them ideas about their song and wondered if they had decided what genre their song was going to be. “Do you want rock or synth?” he asked, and the pupils explained that they wanted a “heavy song but yet not heavy, a calm song yet still aggressive”. They tried to explain the feeling they wanted to achieve in the music and they mentioned different concepts like “justice”. Björn told them to think in simple terms and that something could be created quite easily with a few chords. The atmosphere was positive and inclusive with plenty of laughter (observation 080228).

Prior to this episode on day four of the project the pupils had been offered different inputs. After the introduction on Monday, they had had lectures in English on Shakespeare and in Swedish about lyric-writing and film-making. I reflected that it seemed clear that the different teachers took individual responsibility for “their” bit of the project in an easy and natural way, whilst there was a shared responsibility for the progression of the project as a whole. Together by their presence the teachers made sure that pupils were focused on the project and they were available to help all groups with practically anything.

**Group work**

I followed the same group of pupils into one of the classrooms and asked them what they had been doing up to then. They showed me their mind-maps and told me that they had watched the film and received a short summary in Swedish of their play. Following that they had searched the Internet for famous quotes from their play and chosen one they wanted to use. During their group work they discussed the different concepts brought to the surface by their play, such as hatred of the Jews, greed, revenge, mercy, deceit and trust (observation 080228).

’Ska vi spara den biten till redovisningen?’, Johan asks. ‘Ja, för man måste va’ kreativ’, Klara replies. She goes through it summarising and talks about power and justice. ‘Är ni med nu?’ she asks. Stefan and Calle talk about something else. Calle leaves the group to collect a piece of fruit. ‘Är ni med eller?’ Klara asks again. They both answer yes. Suddenly, Klara’s mobile phone rings and she checks it. She has a dentist’s appointment soon. She puts it down and states: ‘den övergripande handlingen är rättvisa’. The pupils try to sort the concepts in their mind-maps. They discuss whether it is about good versus evil (observations 080228).
This episode was but one example of ‘work-in-progress’. The pupils discussed different concepts they had come across during the first few days of the project and it was clear to me that these concepts and the discussion of them related to the play and film as well as their own reality. There was negotiation of meaning between the members of the group as the pupils tried to understand the concepts and try that against their own understanding of the world. It became clear that the purpose of this project was not to read the Shakespearean texts in English, but to actually understand what they are about, a necessity in order to relate to it and make it your own. During the English lecture on Shakespeare’s life and times, the focus similarly lay with trying to help the pupils engage with the stories by discussing what Shakespeare might have been like if he had lived today.

Recording studio
I accompanied a group of pupils to the “recording studio” on my fourth visit. The group had finished preparing their lyrics and their teacher Björn started by saying: “that’s where we must start – reading the text and finding its rhythm”. With the help of the synthesizer, Björn started looking for drumbeats, which he played to the group and they discussed together. Björn was very active making suggestions about drumbeats and music chords and whilst the group members did not seem to have clear ideas about what they were looking for, music-wise, they seemed open and responsive. Björn made suggestions about the music and instructed the group to start singing the text: “har ni en penna så ni kan stryka ord som inte behövs?” he asked, and the pupils focused on the task. Björn proposed an extra line: “nå’t som rimmar på ‘life’”, he said. “Wife”, one of the pupils suggested and Björn asked the pupils about the content of their lyrics: “hade han någon ‘wife’?” he asked and then joked about Henry VIII who “beheaded sin wife”.10

There was plenty of interaction and negotiation of meaning in this episode. The needs of each group were very different and therefore the amount of assistance and support during this creative stage in the process varied enormously. Some groups came to the “recording studio” with clear ideas of what they wanted and others needed more help, as was the case with this group. However, with a strict schedule each group only

---

10 See p. 40ff for a discussion on code-switching.
had two hours allocated to the recording of the song and this must have helped them to focus on the task.

Final presentations – film festival

The group first presents their own thoughts about their play. Then they talk about their text. They explain how they thought about it. They talk about egoism and how it can be both positive and negative. They draw parallels to the film and explain the symbols of the colours. It shows that they have actually thought about the whole process (observation 080219).

During the final presentations, several groups showed a deep understanding of their allocated play. It was not simply a reproduction of the story which the pupils told; on the contrary they seemed to relate to the themes of the play. Several groups talked about metaphors and symbols and I was told that they had worked previously with this. One group explained how their use of the red and white roses represented the York and Lancaster families. One of the boys in this group talked freely and made several comparisons between his group’s video and both Hitler and Swedish history.

The project seems to have given pupils the opportunity of engaging with the plays and relating the themes and concepts to the world around them. Whether this has been the case for each and every pupil is perhaps difficult to say, but it was obvious to me that pupils somehow had to relate to the play in order to use them for their own texts. During the presentations, individual pupils could step forward and show their ability to draw conclusions from their work and make comparisons to other events in history, which I believe was a sign that pupils had adopted a more holistic approach in their work. Having to present their thoughts in English led to a combination of cognitive and linguistic development.

3.2 The teachers’ rationale

This section aims to answer the second research question: What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English? The data was collected by a focus group interview and, together with the observation results above, attempts to create an understanding of the context of this cross-curricular project.
The four teachers interviewed included Anna (Swedish and social studies), Björn (Swedish, art and music), Christina (English and home economics) and David (social studies and physical education). The interview was held in Swedish and transcribed and here translated by myself. In this process I have endeavoured to remain as objective as possible, but the interpretations and conclusions are my own.

**Breaking new ground**

The project “Shaking Shakespeare” was a first of its kind at this school in that it was the first time that the subject English took on a major part in a project. Although English had been included in previous projects, it had always been parallel to the main project, the difference now being that it was the “first time that English was the main language in a project […] where the presentations and most of the materials were in English” (Björn). The reasons for this development were many; the official documents (the curriculum, the syllabus for English, the school plan) always steer the work, but the design of projects also comes down to logic, teacher competence and availability. Christina explained: “The main purpose was that we have a profile in this school where English should be included as a […] working language” and Björn added: “English is supposed to be a second working language so that pupils get used to using English more than simply in English lessons […]”. In addition to the school profile, Christina added that the national goals govern the work to a large degree: “the goals that we have worked with and those that we feel we need to work with”. Often, pupils are involved in this process too, as Björn explained: “they had had very little art and they weren’t that pleased about that and they hadn’t had any video production, which is in the syllabus, so that was another reason for making videos”.

The design and development of projects seem to be a long process involving both teachers and pupils:

D: it was also that we were going to work with Shakespeare …
C: yes
B: we started talking because I knew I was going in to have music and art and then I think we started talking about …
A: it was also a little about history of literature and that I think …
B: yes
B: I think I was thinking about doing music videos last year
D: yes, we talked about that last year
C: the pupils had wishes about making films following the fair trade project and they really wanted to do it [again] so one thing led to the other …
 […]
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The design and development of this project grew from initial vague ideas about a need to include music, art, film-making, English and Shakespeare. Some of these originated from the syllabuses or school plan, some were ideas that came from teachers or wishes from pupils. But projects also depend on teacher availability: “When we decide we try to a great extent to involve pupils, but also, as was the case here, it depends on the people available and the competencies we have in the group” (Björn). The successful design and development of projects is also dependant on the interactivity between teachers. Anna explained: “this goes to show how important it is that there are many people planning and talking and discussing since that’s how the ideas grow”.

The teachers prepared practically for the project long in advance: equipment needed to be booked months in advance, the music equipment needed to be in place and the teachers’ own video to be produced. The long planning and preparation phase led to the teachers’ having high expectations of the pupils returning this effort by working hard. The pupils were prepared mentally for the project in advance too: “we talked a lot with the pupils before so they knew too that this was going to happen […] because otherwise it takes a week to get them started I think …” (Björn).

Since each project carried out is unique and dependent on many factors present at the time, this way of organising education does not appear to be easy. I understood from the teachers that the designs of projects depend on the group of pupils, on the availability and competence of individual teachers and on the opportunity for teachers to work together with flexible schedules. It is a necessary prerequisite to have very clear goals and a solid structure enabling pupils to achieve a great many things in a short space of time, as was the case here. However, the potential is there for great benefits for both pupils and teachers. The teachers said they believe that the pupils enjoy school more and learn to view things more holistically. Björn explained: “we exist in a view of knowledge where we see that the over-arching approach is more important, to learn how to think and analyse and it doesn’t matter whether it is English or social studies or Swedish or art but it’s more about learning to use one’s knowledge and not just about stuffing facts [into your head]”.

All the teachers concluded that they were very happy with the outcome of the project and that the results were beyond expectations. Most of the groups worked well and
every group completed the task of producing a music video in English. A cross-curricular project is a complex phenomenon, both during the planning and design stage as well as during the process itself. Through the observations and interview with the teachers, it was my aim to create a holistic understanding of this particular context and answer the first two research questions:

a) What were the key phases in the process?

b) What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English?

3.3 The use and role of English

This section aims to answer the research question: What was the use and role of English during the process? In order to answer this question I collected my data using two methods, observations and a focus group interview with the teachers. There were several aspects concerning the use and role of English during the process of this project that were observed and/or brought up during the interview, including the pupils’ previous experience of language education, vocabulary learning, communication in English and the use of the language. The results will be presented according to the following two typologies: the use of English and the role of English and include data from both the observations and the focus group interview.

The use of English

During the introduction event the language of communication was initially only Swedish. Once the teachers’ video had been shown twice and discussed, the project descriptions (app. 1) were handed out to the pupils and the English teacher Christina took the lead and started speaking in English. She explained that: “the ambition is to use English as much as possible” and continued to talk about the quote from Hamlet that appears on the first page of the project description. She then carried on reading the goals of the project in English. An exchange followed between teachers and pupils in both English and Swedish:

[...]

Björn [Swe]: “hängde ni med?”
In this episode, the language of communication switched between English and Swedish, also known as code-switching. It was made clear in the beginning that the ambition was to speak English as much as possible, yet in practice, Swedish became the main language of interaction. Christina, the English teacher, spoke English most consistently during this episode, however, later when the schedule and groups were discussed, she too switched to Swedish and stated: “because this is important”. Interaction and communication are complex processes and there may be many reasons for the code-switching. The teachers may worry that many or some pupils may not understand what is being said, there may be a feeling that it is easier to express oneself in Swedish or that it has to be Swedish if it is important so that everybody understands. But does this underestimate the abilities of the pupils? Does it depend on the fact that the teachers had not made an explicit agreement beforehand that they were only going to speak English? Or is it simply a fact that conversation takes the most natural route, be it Swedish or English? This is an area that was later discussed at great length during the interview with the teachers.

On the second day of the final presentations, the main language of interaction and communication was Swedish. The pupils did their presentations in English, as was required of them, and at the end, Christina asked questions in English relating to the understanding and interpretation of their play, which the pupils answered in English. Other questions or discussions about content or to do with technical matters were in Swedish. However, suddenly, one of the pupils in the audience asked the group a question in English. This was an obvious break in the norm and I noticed several other
pupils at the back near me exchanging glances and sighing. The group, however, answered the question in English. This exchange was followed by other identical ones and several different pupils asked questions in English, which were always answered in English (observation 080319).

This episode struck me as being very interesting and I decided to bring it up with the teachers at the interview. Who sets the tone in the classroom? It was so clear that the group presenting answered the question in the same language as was used in the question, every time. It did not seem to make any difference whether it was Swedish or English. Curious about the code-switching I therefore asked the teachers about their thoughts on the use of English as the main language of communication. David thought it is only natural to answer a question in the same language; otherwise it would be a “strange conversation”. Christina offered another explanation:

… but it’s also that we ourselves are unclear because if we decide beforehand that now we’re only going to speak English and everybody speaks English then it will be English, but if we allow Swedish then you use Swedish because it’s easier to express yourself (interview, 080331).

David added his thoughts by saying that they were more consistent at the beginning of the presentations, but then there was a group that they knew was weak in English and they then switched to Swedish. The teachers had not made an explicit agreement about which language to use during the presentations and therefore they each used different strategies. Following each group’s presentation, Christina started by asking the group questions in English about the content of their play and lyrics. At the last minute before presentations, Anna and Björn had had an informal discussion and decided that they would ask questions in Swedish that related to e.g. technical aspects about the film.

The teachers expressed a difference of opinion regarding whether or not English should be used exclusively as the language of communication. Christina said that she strongly believes that the pupils would cope and help each other if they got stuck. David was open to using English as the medium of teaching social studies, he said, but questioned what would happen in cases where pupils are weak in English and their results might be lower due to their linguistic limitations. He said that this would prevent him from doing it too much. Björn agreed:
I think it’s about deciding [that we’re going to use English] and being consistent, but I also believe that you have to look at specific goals that perhaps are more aimed at English instead […] it wouldn’t be acceptable that just because they don’t know enough English they would miss e.g. a goal in Social studies … (Björn, interview, 080331).

Drawing on her own experience in working with Arabic-speaking children being taught maths in Arabic, Anna pointed out that there is a large difference between being taught in your mother tongue versus a foreign language, especially when it comes to building your thinking processes, your concept awareness and abstract thinking.

The role of English

Christina explained that it was her intention from the start to expand the pupils’ vocabulary beyond tourist English by writing the project description (app. 1) in English. Having decided to supplement it with a vocabulary list for scaffolding, she presented it to the pupils and:

… the first thing I get from the pupils is ‘when are we going to have a test on these words?’ ‘We’re not going to have a test’, I say, and many of them are disappointed because they want some kind of receipt that they learn English all the time … (Christina, interview, 080331).

The pupils have one foot in the new system and one in the traditional language study of textbook and vocabulary lists, she explained and continued:

Of course I could make up a test, but I feel that they work with the project description during these weeks […] and they read texts, they write down their thoughts in English and then they present it in English. They still manage to include all the strange words anyway (Christina, interview, 080331).

Anna agreed that the texts the pupils produced were not poor in any way; on the contrary they were “relatively advanced considering their level of English”. The teachers believed that the pupils worked with and used English rather a lot during the project:

… they have really used the language that is to say partly expressing through the lyrics […] partly understanding the play, understanding it in English, and get that down, concentrate it
in some way, understanding the content and expressing that in English, and then writing about it in the logbook … (Anna, interview, 080331).

I think they have used English an enormous amount […] I noticed that when they came in here to do the music thing and were to bring their text and then they were going to use the text and put music to it and it becomes very clear if they have what should you call it aptitude for language or the rhythm in the language, because some of them had really worked with syllables and rhymes and knew how to make the language flow whilst others hadn’t thought about it much … (Björn, interview, 080331).

Christina noticed that many pupils thought some aspects of the logbook writing challenging. There were not any problems with writing answers to questions on the text they were given, the pupils had plenty of previous experience of this type of activity, but expressing themselves freely in English proved more of a challenge. This demands more thinking as they cannot just borrow words from the text in front of them, but need to come up with the words themselves or look them up, which involves greater effort, Christina concluded.

The school was unusually quiet during the project due to the fact that the grade 8 pupils were away on work practice. The groups were therefore able to spread out and work in different classrooms and group rooms. I found one group in a corner on some soft furnishings and among books on shelves. Two girls were sitting together working on their text on a laptop computer. The girls tried out different rhyming words in English and discussed their text intensively, interacting with their teacher Christina, who was sitting on a sofa nearby working. The language of communication was mainly Swedish, although English was interwoven in a natural way, when they discussed the meaning of words (observation 080228). Another group was also interacting and working with vocabulary:

The classroom becomes quiet. Calle walks in and leans over the table. He says: “what does ‘withal’ mean?” The answer from the other two is: ”No idea”. ”There are lots of difficult words”, Johan says. They go to the computer to look it up (observation 080228).

The teachers were positive about the integration of English and content in this project and would do it again, but not on a permanent basis:
I think it’s great to put aside four weeks to do something like this but I don’t think it would work all the time (Christina, interview, 080331).

… you can have certain projects where English is the working language to lift it and then I think it would lead to many spin-off effects. They get used to it, they become less scared of talking […] but I don’t think you should do it all the time […] you could lose a certain depth in [subject] knowledge if it becomes all language, the pronunciation or something that is in focus. Then they only learn that it’s not so much what I say but how I say it. But it’s a balance (Björn, interview, 080331).

The teachers’ perceptions appeared to be in line with recent research on CLIL/SPRINT education with regard to the balance between cognitive and linguistic development. They were all positive towards the integration of English in future projects, however, not on a permanent basis. The English teacher (Christina) was most positive regarding English being the main language of communication and also concerning the pupils’ abilities in this area. The other teachers also showed a positive attitude towards this as long as goal achievement in other subjects would not suffer. The English teacher noticed that the pupils were used to a different style of lesson which normally includes textbooks and vocabulary tests. Finally, the teachers believed that the pupils had developed their communicative competence in this project both in terms of oral and written production and working with vocabulary.

3.4 The pupils’ perceptions

Since it was my ambition to gain as much knowledge about this project as possible, it was important also to hear the pupils’ voices. After all, it was for them that the project was designed and planned and it was they who went through the process. In this section of the dissertation I will present some of the results of the questionnaire. For the full results, please see appendix 4. The main aim is here to present the pupils’ perceptions of the integration of content and English.

The majority of these pupils like or enjoy English as a school subject. 18 out of 41 (or 44%) pupils said they like it “quite a lot” and another 16 pupils (or 39%) like it “very much” (see question 1, app. 4). It follows perhaps that the majority also finds English “easy” or “very easy”, as can be seen below from question 2.
Question 2: “How easy or difficult do you find the following aspects of the subject English?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very easy</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>19 (46.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>22 (55%)</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>22 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>41 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The pupils’ attitude towards English

39 pupils (95%) find reading in English “easy” or “very easy” and the equivalent figure for writing was 36 pupils (88%), for speaking 34 pupils (83%) and for listening 32 pupils (78%). Learning grammar had the widest spread of opinions among pupils, where 9 pupils (22.5%) said they find grammar “difficult” and 3 pupils (7.5%) “very difficult”, although 22 pupils (55%) find it “easy”. There were 3 pupils (7%) who said they find vocabulary “very difficult” whilst 22 pupils (54%) find it “easy”. However, it is perhaps significant for this study that the majority of pupils are positive towards English as a subject.

Question 3: “How do you feel about English being integrated in the project ‘Shaking Shakespeare’?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The pupils’ perceptions of the integration of English in this project.

In line with the general attitude towards English, the majority of pupils were also positive about the integration of English and content in this project, where 18 pupils (45%) said it was “good” and 15 pupils (37%) were of the opinion that it was “very good” (see table 2 above). However, 7 pupils (17.5%) were negative towards this integration and gave reasons such as: “I didn’t learn anything new”, “unnecessary”,
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“a little strange” and three pupils thought it was “boring”. Two pupils mentioned that they thought the logbook was a bad idea. The positive sentiments were, however, more frequent among the pupils, saying e.g. “it was fun” and “good to present in English”. Several pupils mentioned learning more English; five of them particularly mentioned speaking and five said that they had learned more words. Two pupils thought it was logical to include English, since “Shakespeare was from England” and four said it was fun to record a song in English. One pupil wrote that the English could have been more advanced.

I also asked the pupils how much English they thought they had learned in the different areas of the project (see question 4, app. 4). Perhaps not surprisingly, a majority of 30 pupils (75%) thought that they had learned “quite a lot” or “a lot” of English doing their presentations. Second to this was writing their own thoughts in the logbook, where 21 pupils (51%) said that they had learned “quite a lot” of English. In the other areas, most of the pupils felt that they had learned “a little” or “quite a lot”, except when it came to reading the Shakespearean texts, where 13 pupils (34%) thought they had learned “very little” English and watching the film where 11 pupils (27.5%) had learned “very little”. It is not clear whether this depends on the fact that they did not actually watch the film or read the text, or whether they did not read the text in English.

Question 5: “What is it you have learned?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The pupils’ perceptions of what they learned.

On the question “What is it you have learned?” (table 3), it seems that the majority of the pupils felt they had learned most English in the three categories writing, speaking and listening, with 20, 23 and 24 pupils respectively out of 41, who said they had learned “quite a lot” or “very much”. This is perhaps not too surprising since those were the skills that were mostly practised during the project. With regard to grammar, 15
pupils or 36.5% felt that they had learned “nothing” and another 15 pupils said that they had learned “a little” grammar. Is that because there were no traditional grammar activities or were pupils not made aware of any grammatical structures in the language whilst working with it? 21 pupils (51%) felt that they had learned “a little” vocabulary; however this category was fairly evenly spread with 7 pupils (17%) saying that they had learned “quite a lot”, 6 pupils (15%) had learned “very much” and the remaining 7 pupils had learned “nothing”. Presumably, this was very much up to the individual.

When asked to describe in their own words what they had learned, 15 pupils mentioned speaking in front of a crowd and six pupils said that they had learned vocabulary. Listening, writing and understanding were also areas where learning had taken place, according to the pupils. One pupil said: “I have developed my English so that I can have a good dialogue. It was also good to write the logbook every week”. However, some pupils were negative about the project and said that they did not learn very much, if anything at all. It is difficult to say whether these comments were truly meant or showed a negative attitude towards the project or indeed the questionnaire. One pupil said: “during this project I felt that I didn’t learn very much, mostly understanding ‘old’ English”. Another wrote: “I miss grammar and reading. We do not work with this a lot”. These comments show some of the pupils’ perceptions of English as a school subject. The complexity of learning can be exemplified by this pupil’s statement:

I feel I have learned a little, but at the same time it feels like I didn’t learn so much, I just used English a lot. (Pupil questionnaire)

**Question 6: “How much English have you learned in the project compared to having English as a separate subject?”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot less</th>
<th>A little less</th>
<th>As much</th>
<th>A little more</th>
<th>A lot more</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The pupils’ perceptions of CLIL/SPRINT versus LAS.
In question 6, I asked the pupils how much English they felt they had learned in the project compared to having English as a separate subject (see table 4 above). This is perhaps rather a difficult question to answer because it depends on what the pupils perceive as “normal lessons”. The results were therefore spread out and not conclusive. A majority of pupils (12 pupils or 29%) felt that they had learned “a little more” reading, however, nearly as many felt that they had learned “as much” or even “a little less” reading compared to traditional lessons. There seems to be a clearer majority of 15 pupils (36.5%) learning “a little more” writing and an even clearer majority learning speaking, with 14 pupils (34%) learning “a little more” and 8 pupils (20%) said that they had learned “a lot more” in comparison. Listening was fairly evenly spread out, as was vocabulary learning, but, as previously presented, a majority of pupils felt that they had learned less grammar than “normal” with 22 pupils (54%) saying that they had learned “a little less” or “a lot less”. However, even here 9 pupils (22%) felt that they had learned “as much” grammar and another 9 felt they had learned “a little more”.

Having now had the experience of a project that integrated content and English, I wanted to find out how many of the pupils would be interested in having more projects of the same kind. 24 pupils (60%) said that they would be positive to this, 13 (32%) said “no” and three were undecided. Some of the positive comments were:

- Yes, because I want to learn more English!
- Yes, because it’s fun to work with English in different contexts.
- You become more secure, especially if you get to present orally.
- Yes, everything is much easier in project form. You get an understanding of the connection between subjects.
- You learn a lot doing this, since you talk more English all the time and then it becomes more like everyday life. (Pupil questionnaire)

Some of the negative comments included:

- No, at the moment I want to learn basic knowledge.
- English works best according to me when it’s NOT integrated.
- It depends on the project.
- Not the best subject in the world.
- No, you don’t learn nearly as much. Have lessons where you improvise about an object.
  (Pupil questionnaire)
It is clear that the pupils’ perceptions were varied and included aspects of personal attitude towards English as a subject and perhaps aptitude as well. It is likely that a pupil who finds English difficult would have the same experience if English was integrated with other subjects, perhaps even more so. The comments above exemplify some pupils’ views of English as a subject as either suitable or not suitable for integration with other subjects. In addition, the comments above also show that some pupils are used to and see the advantages of working in project form. Interpreting the result of this question, one has to bear in mind that it was asked only a couple of months before the end of year 9 and thereby compulsory school for these pupils, which may have had an effect on the answers insofar as the pupils knew this would probably be the last project integrating English and content.

Finally, in the interest of CLIL/SPRINT education, I asked the pupils how they would feel about other subjects being taught through the medium of English. The result was balanced between 21 pupils being positive and 17 being negative (1 undecided). Some of the comments included:

No, it would be strange and even more unclear unless they describe things better and are clearer.
No, because I don’t understand anything. If I don’t get it now I won’t get it later either.
Yes, I would like to learn different English like it would be in that kind of teaching.
It would be fun to try it.
It would be difficult to understand unless the social studies/science teacher was very good at English.
Yes, you develop your vocabulary and become prepared for international studies.
It wouldn’t have worked in science as there are so many difficult terms.
Today almost all communication is in English and I would like to know more English in the different subjects.
Extended English would be great. I think this school should try only teaching in English for two weeks.
I like it the way it is. In Swedish. (pupil questionnaire)

Several pupils mentioned science as being the subject most unlikely for integration due to the difficult terminology, whilst social studies seemed most popular. Whilst the result to this final question does not relate directly to the purpose of this dissertation, I believe it is still of interest in the wider context of CLIL/SPRINT projects. Some pupils were very positive and could see the long-term effects whilst others perhaps were fearful of
the complexity and challenge of studying e.g. science in a foreign language. This is perhaps also linked to the individual attitude and aptitude of each pupil for English.

3.5 Summary of findings

The results show that a project like “Shaking Shakespeare” is a complex process involving learning and interaction in many different ways. Here follows a summary of the main points that relate to the purpose of the investigation.

Understanding the cross-curricular context

- The introductory event had several functions: it enabled the development of a common understanding of what the project was about and provided both inspiration and motivation.

- During the process there was evidence of interaction and pupils’ negotiation of meaning, both relating to the understanding of their play and working with language.

- During the final presentations some pupils showed a deep understanding of themes and concepts and related these to contemporary times.

- The rationale behind integrating English in this project showed a complex process consisting of a combination of formal goals and requirements, pupils’ wishes, teachers’ ideas, teacher availability and competence and the interaction between teachers.

- Choosing a project-based working method is demanding work requiring careful planning and preparation, organisation, a flexible schedule, clear goals and structures along with close co-operation between teachers.

- The teachers said that some of the benefits are that pupils enjoy school more, get used to a more holistic view and coherence and learn to think and analyse rather than reproduce facts.
Understanding the use and role of English

- Even though English was used more than normal, Swedish was the main language of communication. During the presentations, however, both pupils and teachers code-switched between Swedish and English.

- Being the first project where English played an important role, the teachers could see that pupils were used to a different style of lesson which normally includes textbooks and vocabulary tests.

- The teachers felt that the pupils had “really worked with the language”, e.g. in understanding the play, logbook writing, presentations and “the rhythm and flow of the language” when writing lyrics.

- The teachers had different opinions about whether English should be used exclusively as the language of communication. Pupils’ grades in non-language subjects must not suffer because of linguistic limitations, however, it was also felt that the pupils could be challenged and would cope.

- The teachers were all positive about the integration of English in this project and would do it again, but not on a permanent basis. The benefits of this increased exposure of English would be enormous, but there would have to be a balance with other needs and requirements.

- A majority of the pupils (34 out of 41 or 82%) were positive towards the subject English. Most of them also said they find English “easy” or “very easy”.

- 33 pupils (82.5%) were positive towards the integration of English in this project.

- The pupils felt they had learned most English doing their presentations in English. Some pupils expressed concern that they had not learned any grammar and very little vocabulary, although this opinion varied among pupils.

- 24 pupils (60%) said that they would be positive to more projects that integrated content and English.
4 Discussion and conclusions

In the previous chapter I have presented the results from my research. Trying to capture and analyse learning in any form is a huge challenge. It is a complex process. Along the way I have had to make choices and judgements about what to focus on, which questions to ask and in the end what to present. I make no claims about this being the one and only “true”, or complete, picture about this project, but it is my story about the “Shaking Shakespeare” project, where I have focused on certain aspects of the project to the best of my abilities. I have tried to be as clear as I possibly can describing what I have seen and what teachers and pupils have told me, but naturally the interpretations and analyses are entirely my own. The purpose of this investigation was to find out what the teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions were of the use and role of English in the context of this cross-curricular project. This was done through the following research questions:

1) Understanding the cross-curricular context:

   a) What were the key phases in the process?
   b) What was the teachers’ rationale for the integration of content and English?

2) Understanding the use and role of English in this context:

   a) What was the use and role of English during the process?
   b) What were the pupils’ perceptions of the integration of content and English?

But what does this mean in the wider context of language teaching and learning? Where can we put this project on the content-language teaching continuum? Where does the project stand in relation to CLIL/SPRINT?
4.1 The languages of communication

It’s not so much what I say but how I say it. (Björn, interview, 080331)

This quote by the music teacher encapsulates many of the concerns voiced by teachers of content when subjects are integrated with language learning. What happens to the pupils’ development of subject knowledge? Are they held back because of linguistic limitations? This concern is one that Maria Falk has often come across in her research (Ericson, 2006 and Falk, 2001) and it was also discussed by the teachers in my interview. The fear of being unfair to those pupils who might find it difficult to express their knowledge in a second language is understandable and obviously pupils’ grades must not suffer because of this, but I suspect there is more to it than that. Clearly, pupils must be given the opportunity of communicating their knowledge, as is required in the syllabus. In the interview, the teacher David remembers a Hungarian pupil he had in his class, who he was convinced was very capable, but he was unable to give her a grade at all, since they could not communicate in any language. This is perhaps an extreme case, as normally ways would and could be found to a shared language.

In a world with ever-increasing mobility, perhaps we must adapt our view of what constitutes “perfect” communication. Many people communicate daily in languages other than their mother tongue and it is the need to communicate that drives the expression and learning. Perhaps this theory could also be applied to pupils in school? One could argue that by teachers being too lenient, pupils, like people in general, choose the easy option and use their mother tongue when offered the option. I agree with the teacher Christina in the interview that people can normally be pushed to achieve more than they think they can, and if there had been an overall agreement that English was the only language to be spoken perhaps more English would have been used during the process. But at the same time I believe this is simplifying the matter. I have also experienced the feeling that “this is important so I’ll say it in Swedish” (observation 080225). Rather than restricting the discussion to a question of whether the language of communication was English or Swedish, why not adopt a more holistic view of what constitutes a “language”? This enlarged view of linguistic ability of course needs to be balanced with the goals and ambitions of every project. In this case there were several linguistic goals, which included English, Swedish, music, video and an oral presentation, giving pupils a chance to express themselves in several ways and an
opportunity for different pupils to step forward at different stages. English as the only language of communication was not one of the stated goals in the project and it is perhaps therefore unreasonable to expect it to be. However, as a first time project where English was given a predominant role it was an excellent opportunity not only to give pupils an increased exposure to the language but also to put this issue on the table for discussion for future projects.

4.2 Content and language integration

“Shaking Shakespeare” was a project that integrated content and language. It is neither constructive nor helpful to try to place the project along the content-language continuum in order to ascertain whether it was a “true” CLIL/SPRINT project or “merely” a content-based, language driven project. This depends on the interpretation of the concepts (Davison & Williams, 2001, p. 54). The goal of content and language integration is for pupils to learn content and language at the same time and to achieve the same cognitive development as would be reached if the subject matter had been taught in the first language (Lundahl). The question is whether it is possible, or even desirable, to achieve a perfect balance between the learning of subject matter and language? I believe it is a question of perspective. Language teachers seem to be driving the development of CLIL/SPRINT projects and this is perhaps not surprising. An increased exposure to the target language combined with meaningful content is bound to increase and speed up the learner’s linguistic competence. On the other hand, mainly teachers of content voice concerns that pupils may not reach or be able to express the same cognitive knowledge if taught through a foreign language (Ericson, 2006 and Falk, 2001), leading to “Flat earth theories” (Davison, 1992) with fragmented or flawed subject knowledge. Even if content and language are integrated, teachers would naturally focus mainly on their area of expertise, i.e. the learning of content or language. In addition, some studies have shown that in integrated classrooms pupils become more passive (Swain & Lapkin, 1986).

But CLIL/SPRINT methodology is growing and that would suggest that there are greater perceived benefits associated with it than perhaps this discussion shows. In Canada and some European countries, bilingualism is a natural part of everyday life.
This has not been the case in Sweden, where Swedish is a majority language, but this situation is perhaps changing? Perhaps we are too restrained and limited by a view of learning as compartmentalised?

Researchers conclude that there is a need for structure and clear goals (e.g. Falk, 2001, p. 39) in integrated learning. Davison & Williams suggest a balanced view in the curriculum so that the focus of projects can vary from content-driven to language-driven (2001, p. 66). Do Coyle writes that for learning to take place in the integrated classroom, there must be development in all the areas of content, cognition, communication and culture (1999, p. 53). Cross-curricular projects like the one described in this dissertation could be one way of integrating content and language. The teachers, although focusing on their area of expertise in goal-setting and grading, work together in a team with an overall shared responsibility for the project as a whole. In this project, the goals in each subject were clearly stated from the start and in the questionnaire a clear majority of the pupils said that they had met the goals to a “fairly large” or a “very large” degree (see app. 4, question 7). This varied in each subject and ranged from 29 pupils (74%) to 32 pupils (84.5%) reaching the goals in English and 37 pupils (95%) reaching one of the music goals, which must be considered high. Self-evaluation takes on an important part in project-based work and helps to create awareness in pupils of what they have actually learned.

The “Shaking Shakespeare” project offered pupils great opportunities of engaging with their school-work. They had clear goals from the start, a well-planned structure to help them during the process and a very clear deadline with the presentation of a well-defined product. In addition, the design of the project, i.e. producing a music video, was appealing, as it is a language familiar to and popular with most young people. The seemingly free way of working, with groups spread out in various places and doing different things, could be a temptation for pupils to escape from the work, but working with projects was not new to the pupils and the fairly demanding schedule made sure that the focus remained on task and if not, the checkpoints were frequent reminders.

Coyle also suggests that in content classrooms cultural awareness can be built by “articulating alternative interpretations of content rooted in different cultures” (ibid). This project proved a link between historical and contemporary cultural knowledge, not only in the form of having to relate to Shakespeare’s texts and cultural context, but also to express the insights in the highly contemporary form of a music video.
When designing and developing this project, the teachers did perhaps not consider Coyle’s four C’s of content, cognition, communication and culture, but by coincidence or intuition, they were moving in these areas.

### 4.3 The view of English as a subject

The perceived success or failure of a content and language integrated project could be influenced by teachers’ and pupils’ view of English as a subject. In the interview, Christina said that she could tell that the pupils were used to a different style of lesson, a more traditional one comprising textbooks and vocabulary tests. She said the pupils wanted some kind of receipt that they had learned certain words and this is not surprising as they would have had at least six years of previous experience of this. In spite of this, 33 pupils (82.5%) thought that it was a “good” or a “very good” idea to include English in this project. The majority of these pupils had a positive attitude towards the subject English, however, when asked if they would be interested in integrating English in future projects only 24 pupils said yes. It is still a majority, but I wonder why nine pupils had changed their minds? There could be many explanations, e.g. it was “safe” to be positive afterwards as they already knew the outcome of this project, while it may have been difficult to imagine what other projects integrating English might entail. Some pupils expressed this uncertainty in their own words: “it depends on what it is”. But others were clear about their views: “English works best according to me when it isn’t integrated”.

We have also seen that many pupils felt that they had learned speaking skills more than anything during the project. This is in line with the goals for the project and indeed the syllabus for English, which emphasises communicative competence. However, as previously stated, the current recommendation in language teaching is not only to focus on fluency, but also on accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 151). This was reflected in some pupils’ comments: “I miss grammar” and “at the moment I want to learn basic skills”. These comments suggest that some of the pupils have a view of English as a skills subject where the primary objective is to practice and develop skills in the different areas and where grammar is separated from content. This is in contrast to the integrative, holistic form of learning described in this dissertation, where the subject
English could be considered as a communication subject and as such a tool or a “servant to the learning process” (Lundahl). If, as in Björn’s quote above, the focus is on how something is said, the what becomes secondary and the subject is reduced to a selection of skills. The integration of English in this project is a meeting of the views of English as a skills subject and as a communication subject. This in turn is tried against the background of project-based methodology as experiential with a strong focus on learner autonomy, both signs of a progressive approach to learning (ibid).

4.4 Conclusions and further research

The aim of this dissertation was to find out what the teachers’ and pupils’ perceptions were of the use and role of English in the context of this cross-curricular project.

I am grateful to the school, the teachers and the pupils for allowing me to get involved with and study their project and would like to take this opportunity of thanking them. It has been a hugely enjoyable and interesting process and I feel privileged to have been a part of it.

Following this research, I believe that project-based cross-curricular work could be a successful way to integrate content and language, provided projects are well-planned and clearly structured. The project goals would have to be clear in both content and language subjects so that there would be both cognitive and linguistic development.

The teachers and pupils were positive towards the integration of content and English in this project and would be interested in doing it again in future projects. Through the increased exposure to English, there was a perceived increase in pupils’ language learning, particularly in the development of communication skills. This project was a first of its kind at this school and it is therefore not surprising that different views of the subject English came together. But it was an important first step in the direction of developing language learning and perhaps of a new view of English as a subject.

I believe that this study shows that there is great potential for the development of English as a subject as well as in integration with content areas. This is in line with recent research recommending a balanced approach in curriculum design (Davison & Williams, 2001, p. 66) and simultaneous study of English as a subject parallel with integration (Nixon, 2001, p. 227). The content from a project could be further developed
in a LAS-classroom focusing on language features and structure. Likewise a subject dealt with in an English class, e.g. in an essay could then be the focus of a future project looking at the “problem” holistically. I believe this interdependency could be beneficial for both content and language learning and help develop English as a subject that promotes cultural awareness and democracy (Lundahl).

Finally, I am of the opinion that stories about methods and projects must be told for the benefits of everybody interested in developing not only language education, but education in general. Through this snapshot of one particular project carried out at one school, I hope that I have managed to add to the common understanding and development in the field of content and language integrated learning. One of the reasons why we know so little about this type of methodology is because practices are so varied and contextual that it is difficult to draw any general conclusions. I would therefore encourage further research in this area, e.g. it would be interesting to investigate whether there is a correlation between pupils’ attitudes to integration and their aptitudes for English. Another interesting aspect would be to study the role of English in a project where pupils expressed their views about a subject not as obviously linked to English as was the case here. Research into teaching materials or scaffolding especially supporting pupils who find English challenging would be another area. More stories of cross-curricular practices need to be told so that we can increase our understanding of content and language integrated learning.
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Appendix 1 – Project Description

[identifying information has been removed: author’s comment]

Shaking Shakespeare
"to be or not to be: that is the question"
(from Hamlet)

The goals that all pupils should strive towards are:
to develop their ability to consciously form and express ethical
stand points based on knowledge, personal experience and to
respect the intrinsic value of other people.

The goals pupils aim for in:

**Music** are to become familiar with the interaction between music and other
areas of knowledge and develop the ability to combine music with other
representational forms such as pictures, text, drama, dance and movement.

Also to develop the ability to create their own music to communicate their
thinking and ideas and to use their knowledge of music to play and sing
together. Thus develop responsibility and co-operation skills.

**Art:** are to develop their ability so that they are able to enjoy creating their
own pictures with the help of handicraft-based methods and techniques, as
well as methods using computers and video technology.

**Swedish:** is to develop your imagination and a will to create with the help
of Swedish, both individually and together with others.

**English:** are to develop their ability to read different types of texts for
pleasure and to obtain information and knowledge. Also to develop their
ability to use English to communicate in speech and writing.

**The working methods:**
In **groups** of 4 people you will create a music video in English..
Individually you will keep an account of your learning in a logbook (LB) in
English.
This will be handed in once a week.

**The class**
All of you will take part and be inspired in study groups, by lectures, film
showings and film making lessons.

**The Examination**
In **the group** a music video presentation in English.
Individually a logbook to be kept in English giving a full account of what and how you have learnt during the project during the last three weeks.

**What we are going to do and what you need to think about:**
In Music, Art, Swedish and English you are going to make a three minute long music dvd with about 10 picture frames per minute. For your music you will be allocated 2 hours in the studio. The lyrics to your song can either be your own interpretation of the work you have of Shakespeare where you have written the lyrics yourselves, or have taken the text as Shakespeare wrote it. Whatever you decide to do it must be in English. You won’t have time to depict a dramatical story so incorporate a lot of emotions and anything else that can help you to visualise the music.
Your logbook can be written whenever you have time to spare in class or at home and must answer the questions what, why when and how? This documentation will help you to remember and also to understand your individual role in the project. Hand in every Friday during weeks 9, 10 and 11.

**The Examination**
Your presentation of your music dvd week 12 will even include a power point presentation. Include the following points:
- The presentation will be in English.
- The presentation of the literary work you have been given. What is it about? What do you know about it and why and when is it written?
- What is your interpretation and what made you decide this?
- What are you trying to express in your music dvd?
- How is it coupled to your play?
- Show your film!

**Your timetable.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W 9 Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for your picture manuscript, song lyrics and melody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NN mediapedagog gives us some advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand in LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress discussions 12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; of March</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand in LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Checkpoint –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B E D Ö M N I N G S M A L L  "Shaking Shakespeare"

Namn:

Godkänd

1. Att du kan redogöra för huvuddragen i er pjäs, er DVD på engelska genom att redovisa och föra en loggbok.
2. Att du kan skapa egna musiktexter på engelska utifrån en given text.
3. Att du kan skapa en musikvideo som förstärker det budskap som du vill framhålla.
4. Att du genom sång och musik kan framföra de texter som gruppen skapat.

Väl Godkänd

1. Att du med ett varierat språk kan kommunicera, både skriftligt och muntligt, dina tankar och idéer på engelska.
2. Att du kan skapa egna musiktexter med en språklig rytm och innehåll som överensstämmer med musiken.
3. Att du med er musikvideo kan kommunicera idéer och tankar i bestämda syften.
4. Att du utvecklar och prövar olika idéer i gruppens skapande av musik.

Mycket Väl Godkänd

1. Att du kan se, analysera och sätta in budskap från er pjäs i ett historiskt och samhälleligt perspektiv.
2. Att du kan skapa egna musiktexter med ett språk som innehåller flera bottnar.
4. Att du är positivt drivande och kreativ i processen att skapa musik.
Appendix 2 - Intervjuguide lärare

Namn:
1)_____________ 2)______________ 3)_____________ 4)_____________
Fingerat namn:
1)_____________ 2)______________ 3)_____________ 4)_____________
Ålder:
1)_____________ 2)______________ 3)_____________ 4)_____________
Antal år på skolan/år som lärare:
1)______/_______ 2)_______/_______ 3)______/_______ 4)______/_______
Ämnen:
1)_____________ 2)______________ 3)_____________ 4)_____________

Introduktion
Syfte med studien: studera upplevda för- och nackdelar i samband med undervisning och inlärning av engelska när integrerat i ämnesövergripande projekt.
Tacksam för att ni ställer upp – det är frivilligt och era tankar är värdefulla.
Ni kan när som helst avbryta eller ställa frågor.
Dokumentation: bandspelare. Ingen annan kommer att lyssna på banden och de kommer att förstöras när arbetet är slut. Er anonymitet skyddas.

Purpose Statement
The purpose of this study is to learn about the perceived benefits as well as problems connected to the teaching and learning of English when integrated into a cross-curricular project.

Research Question 1
• What were the teachers’ reasons for including English in this project and were they satisfied with the outcome?

Typologies: Reasons/Outcomes/Benefits/Problems

1. Är det här första gången ni har arbetat med projekt där engelska har varit integrerat?
2. Varför valde ni att integrera engelska den här gången? Fanns det någon pedagogisk anledning till inkluderingen?
3. Hur tycker ni att det gick?
4. Uppfyllde projektet era förväntningar? Om ja, på vilket sätt? Om nej, varför inte?
5. Vilka för- och nackdelar kan ni se med att engelska integreras i projekt? (under någon särskild fas?)
6. Vilka problem upplever ni kan uppstå när engelska integreras?
7. Hur ser ni på elevers utveckling av att tala, skriva, lyssna och läsa på engelska när det integreras i projekt?
8. Vad anser ni om engelska som arbetsspråk i projekt? När fungerar det/fungerar det inte och varför?
9. Har ni några andra tankar som ni vill dela med er av?
10. Kan jag komma tillbaka till er med fler frågor vid behov?

Till sist: elevernas utvärderingar
Skulle det vara ok om jag vid behov genomför en enkät/intervjuer med elever?

Tack!
Appendix 3 - Enkätundersökning – engelska integrerat i projektarbete

Besvara frågorna genom att ringa in en siffra eller ett svarsalternativ.

1. Vad tycker du om engelska som ämne i skolan?
   Inte alls 1
   Inte så bra 2
   Ganska bra 3
   Mycket bra 4

2. Hur lätt eller svåra tycker du att följande delar av ämnet engelska är?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket lätt</th>
<th>Lätt</th>
<th>Svårt</th>
<th>Mycket svårt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordkunskap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Vad tycker du om att ämnet engelska var integrerat i projektet ”Shaking Shakespeare”?
   Mycket dåligt 1
   Dåligt 2
   Bra 3
   Mycket bra 4

Förklara ditt svar!

4. Engelska fanns med i olika former i projektet. Hur mycket engelska tycker du att du lärde dig inom de följande områdena:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket lite</th>
<th>Lite</th>
<th>Ganska mycket</th>
<th>Mycket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa Shakespeares dramer på engelska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titta på filmen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Föreläsningar på engelska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggboksskrivande, fakta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggboksskrivande, egna tankar om processen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Läsförståelsetext: ”The Days of Elizabeth”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textskrivande till låten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjunga på engelska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation på engelska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Vad** är det du har lärt dig?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inget alls</th>
<th>Lite</th>
<th>Ganska mycket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordunkenap</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Förklara med egna ord var du anser att du har lärt dig mest.

6. Hur mycket engelska har du lärt dig i projektet jämfört med när du har engelska som enskilt ämne?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket mer</th>
<th>Lite mindre</th>
<th>Lika mindre</th>
<th>Lite mycket</th>
<th>mer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordunkenap</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Till vilken grad anser du att du har uppfyllt målen för projektet?

a) **Musik**: utveckla din förmåga att själv skapa musik för att kommunicera tankar och idéer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket</th>
<th>Ganska</th>
<th>Ganska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mycket</td>
<td>Liten</td>
<td>stor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liten</td>
<td>liten</td>
<td>stor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Litien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | 1 2 3 4     |        |        |

b) **Musik**: bli förtrogen med musikens beröringspunkter med andra kunskapsområden och utveckla förmåga att kombinera musik med andra gestaltningsformer som bild, text, drama, dans och rörelse

|     | 1 2 3 4    |        |        |

c) **Musik**: använda musikkunskaper i gemensamt musicerande och därigenom utveckla ansvar och samarbetsförmåga

|     | 1 2 3 4    |        |        |

d) **Svenska**: utveckla fantasi och lust att skapa med...
hjälp av språket, både individuellt och i samarbete med andra

1 2 3 4
e) **Engelska**: utveckla din förmåga att använda engelska för att kommunicera i tal och skrift

1 2 3 4
f) **Engelska**: utveckla din förmåga att läsa olika slags texter för upplevelser, information och kunskaper

1 2 3 4

8. Skulle du vilja ha fler projekt där engelskan var integrerad? Ja Nej
Varför/varför inte?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

9. Skulle du kunna tänka dig att även använda engelska språket som undervisningsspråk i andra ämnen/projekt, som t ex SO eller NO? Ja Nej
Förklara ditt svar.

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

10. Om du har svarat ja på fråga 9, vilka ämnen skulle det i så fall vara?

______________________________________________________________________

**Tack för din medverkan!**


Med vänlig hälsning

Petra Henderson
Appendix 4

Resultat av Enkätundersökning – engelska integrerat i projektarbete

41 elever svarade på enkäten (19 män och 22 kvinnor)

1. Vad tycker du om engelska som ämne i skolan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inte alls</th>
<th>Inte så bra</th>
<th>Ganska bra</th>
<th>Mycket bra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Hur lätt eller svåra tycker du att följande delar av ämnet engelska är?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket lätt</th>
<th>Lätt</th>
<th>Svårt</th>
<th>Mycket svårt</th>
<th>Totalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>19 (46.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>22 (55%)</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordkunskap</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>22 (54%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Vad tycker du om att ämnet engelska var integrerat i projektet "Shaking Shakespeare"?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket dåligt</th>
<th>Dåligt</th>
<th>Bra</th>
<th>Mycket bra</th>
<th>Totalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>18 (45%)</td>
<td>15 (37.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Engelska fanns med i olika former i projektet. Hur mycket engelska tycker du att du lärde dig inom de följande områdena:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket lite</th>
<th>Lite</th>
<th>Ganska mycket</th>
<th>Mycket</th>
<th>Totalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa Shakespeares dramer på engelska</td>
<td>13 (34%)</td>
<td>18 (47%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titta på filmen</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>19 (47.5%)</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Föreläsningar på engelska</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>17 (41.5%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggbokskrivande, fakta</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggbokskrivande, egna tankar om processen</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Läsförståelsestext: &quot;The Days of Elizabeth&quot;</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textskrivande till låten</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sjunga på engelska</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation på engelska</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>21 (52.5%)</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ställa frågor på engelska</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svara på frågor på engelska</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>16 (39%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Vad är det du har lärt dig?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inget alls</th>
<th>Lite</th>
<th>Ganska mycket</th>
<th>Mycket</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>17 (41%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>18 (44%)</td>
<td>6 (14.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordkunskap</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>21 (51%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Hur mycket engelska har du lärt dig i projektet jämfört med när du har engelska som enskilt ämne?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket mindre</th>
<th>Lite mindre</th>
<th>Ganska mycket</th>
<th>Lite mer</th>
<th>Mycket mer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Läsa</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skriva</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>8 (19.5%)</td>
<td>15 (36.5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tala</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>14 (34%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyssna</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (24.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatik</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordkunskap</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>13 (32%)</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Till vilken grad anser du att du har uppfyllt målen för projektet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mycket liten</th>
<th>Ganska liten</th>
<th>Ganska stor</th>
<th>Mycket stor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) <strong>Musik</strong>: utveckla din förmåga att själv skapa musik för att kommunicera tankar och idéer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>19 (49%)</td>
<td>18 (46%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) <strong>Musik</strong>: bli förtrogen med musikens beröringspunkter med andra kunskapsområden och utveckla förmåga att kombinera musik med andra gestaltningssformer som bild, text, drama, dans och rörelse</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>24 (62%)</td>
<td>9 (23%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>Musik</strong>: använda musikkunskaper i gemensamt musicerande och därigenom utveckla ansvar och samarbetsförmåga</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>21 (54%)</td>
<td>9 (23%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) <strong>Bild</strong>: utveckla ditt kunnande för att främja lust och vilja att på ett personligt sätt framställa bilder med hjälp av hantverksbaserade metoder och tekniker samt metoder inom dator- och videoteknik</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>14 (38%)</td>
<td>14 (38%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) <strong>Svenska</strong>: utveckla fantasi och lust att skapa med hjälp av språket, både individuellt och i samarbete med andra</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>18 (51.5%)</td>
<td>11 (31.5%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) <strong>Engelska</strong>: utveckla din förmåga att använda engelska för att kommunicera i tal och skrift</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (13%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
<td>13 (34.5%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) <strong>Engelska</strong>: utveckla din förmåga att läsa olika slags texter för upplevelser, information och kunskaper</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15.5%)</td>
<td>18 (46%)</td>
<td>11 (28%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Skulle du vilja ha fler projekt där engelskan var integrerad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nej</th>
<th>Nja</th>
<th>Totalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Skulle du kunna tänka dig att även använda engelska språket som undervisningsspråk i andra ämnen/projekt, som t ex SO eller NO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ja</th>
<th>Nej</th>
<th>Nja</th>
<th>Totalt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(43%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Om du har svarat ja på fråga 9, vilka ämnen skulle det i så fall vara?

- NO: 8
- Matte: 6
- So: 17
- Alla utom matte: 1
- Teknik: 3
- Slöjd: 1
- Bild: 3
- Musik: 3
- Idrott: 3
- Alla ämnen i en period: 1
- Alla: 1