

Kandidatnummer 10018

Sara Natalia Bjarndal Gretarsdottir

FOU:

How is CALP language and vocabulary used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom?

Course code: MGLU3504 English 2 (5-10) Module 2

Spring 2022 - 16.05.2022

Abstract

Vocabulary is an extensive topic that has been researched before in terms of English learning in Norway. This paper investigates how CALP language and vocabulary is used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom. Qualitative observation was conducted on an English class in grade 8. I observed two English lessons in its natural setting as an observer-as-participant. The data was collected by eight pages of field notes taken during the observation and after. The output hypothesis and Jim Cummins definition on BICS and CALP in the theoretical framework serves as a basis to understand how vocabulary and CALP is used in the classroom.

The results suggest that vocabulary is used through introduction as a teaching strategy by the teacher, as well as revoicing. Both the teacher and students used revoicing when having discussions in class. Finally, the activities suggest that the focus is on oral activities mainly.

This study contributes to the understanding of English L2 vocabulary in Norwegian schools and sheds light on aspects that might need improving so as to better the vocabulary of Norwegian students, both in English and other languages.

Abbreviations

L1: First language

L2: Second language

BICS: Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills

CALP: Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

LK20: Læreplanverket for kunnskapsløftet fra 2020 (The Knowledge Promotion Curriculum Reform from 2020)

LK06: Læreplanverket for kunnskapsløftet fra 2006 (The Knowledge Promotion Curriculum Reform from 2006)

UDIR: Utdanningsdirektoratet (The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training)

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	1
ABBREVIATIONS	2
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. BACKGROUND	4
2.1 BASIC SKILLS	4
2.2 LITERATURE REVIEW OF VOCABULARY IN AN EFL CLASSROOM	5
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	5
3.1. OUTPUT HYPOTHESIS	6
3.2. BICS & CALP	7
4. METHODOLOGY	8
4.1. PARTICIPANTS AND SITE	8
4.2. OBSERVATION AND OBSERVATION PROTOCOL	9
4.3. DATA ANALYSIS	10
4.4. RESEARCH CREDIBILITY	10
4.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS	10
5. FINDINGS	11
5.1 INTRODUCING CALP WORDS	11
5.2 REVOICING	12
5.3 ACTIVITIES FOR OUTPUT	13
6. DISCUSSION	14
6.1 CALP LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM	14
6.2 LEARNING THROUGH ORAL SKILLS AND WRITING	15
7. CONCLUSION	16
8. BIBLIOGRAPHY	18
9. APPENDIX	20

1. Introduction

Vocabulary is an important part of learning a language and it gives learners access to many resources to further their learning. In today's society where internet and social media is present on every phone and computer, students have access to more sources than just their textbooks. In addition, series and movies are often not available in Norwegian if they were made outside of Norway, but they are most likely available in English. Norwegian students today have many resources to develop their English, and educators have to help them in doing so. The curriculum also mentions that students should be able to "express oneself with fluency and coherence with a varies vocabulary and idiomatic expressions adapted to the purpose, recipient and situation" (UDIR, 2020). In the curriculum, vocabulary is specifically mentioned and expected of the students. Therefore, it is important to research this topic further and understand vocabulary in today's classroom.

My research question for this study is: *How is CALP language and vocabulary used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom?* It is an important topic that all language teachers should have insight into and awareness of. It is highly relevant to research because 15% of students in Norwegian schools have an immigrant background (UDIR, 2017). This research can be applied to the Norwegian subject and students with an immigrant background have different resources and approach towards English vocabulary.

To answer my research question, I observed two English lessons and collected my data in fieldnotes. Using qualitative observation as my method, I gained insight into how vocabulary was taught and practiced by the students. This study will shed some light on what I learned.

2. Background

In order to research the topic of vocabulary and CALP further, it is necessary to have some background information first. Firstly, it is important to look at the basic skills included in the LK20 and compare it to the previous basic skills from LK06. Then, it is important to understand the previous research that has been done on the topic, so we will have a literature review, which will be discussed later in the study.

2.1 Basic skills

In the LK20 there are four basic skills that the English subject is supposed to cultivate during the 10-11 years of teaching (UDIR, 2020). These four skills are oral skills, writing, reading and digital skills. Under each skill there is a description of what it entails and describes

various examples that might be relevant for teaching each skill. Two of the four skills mentioned are output skills, oral skills, and writing, one is an input skill, writing, and one can be an input and output skill, digital skills. Previously, in LK06, the basic skills included numeracy in the English subject (UDIR, 2013). Teachers were expected to teach students relevant mathematical concepts such as units of measure statistics in English. This is not included in the basic skills in LK20, there the focus seems to be on digital skills in addition to language processing skills. Although numeracy is important and processes language, the LK20 appears to give more attention to four basic skills rather than five. Numeracy is a skill that can be incorporated if the individual teacher wishes to when teaching about the English-speaking world for instance.

2.2 Literature review of vocabulary in an EFL classroom

To get a broader perspective on how vocabulary is used in the classroom, it is helpful to look at previous studies done in the field. Thankfully there have been studies in Scandinavia regarding content and language integrated learning (henceforth CLIL) and language proficiency in L2. Those studies are highly relevant due to them being done in school systems resembling the one this study was done in. Two studies were done in Norway on the subject CLIL (Mahan et al., 2018; Mahan, 2020). Sylvén did a study on L2 proficiency in Sweden (2012) and Rindal did a study on L2 attitudes in Norway (2013). These studies varied in age group, but most found that there were numerous opportunities for students to speak, but few opportunities to write and read (Mahan et al., 2018, p. 407) and that students' vocabulary knowledge improves from more exposure and practice (Sylvén, 2012, p. 313). By looking into these studies deeper, I gained insight into attitudes on English L2 vocabulary and what to expect from my own study.

3. Theoretical framework

In order to understand my findings later in this study, I have chosen theory that focuses on different aspects of spoken language. The first theory is output hypothesis and discusses some of the cognitive processes that may occur when producing output in a second language. This is an important theory to understand regarding second or foreign language learning.

Furthermore, it is a good foundation for understanding BICS and CALP. This theory is the main theory relating to the research question and will clarify the definition of BICS and CALP used in this research.

3.1. Output hypothesis

There are many theories regarding what is needed in order to learn a second language, one of those is the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985). The output hypothesis suggests that comprehensible output provides contextualized use which in turn can help a learner test out their hypothesis regarding the target language (Swain, 1985, p. 252). This means that a learner has a greater chance of understanding the L2 when having a conversation with a native or another L2 learner and is able to hear their own grammar and sentence structures as well as receive help from social cues and body language on whether they are speaking correctly or not. This would also mean that a learner has a greater chance of evolving their understanding of the L2 through oral output in addition to the written output.

After first proposing the output hypothesis, Swain has broadened its scope and identified three different functions of output: (1) the noticing function, (2) the hypothesis-testing function, and (3) the metalinguistic function (Swain, 1995, p. 125-126). The first function is *noticing* and occurs naturally when a learner doesn't know or remember the necessary vocabulary, grammar, or structure of the L2 (Swain, 1995, p. 129). This prompts the learner to notice the gap since it abruptly the flow and it difficult for the learner to express themselves in the L2. Once the learner has noticed this gap in their own vocabulary, grammar, or structure, their attention will focus on that which can result in a cognitive process were the learner might form a hypothesis on what is the right solution based on their L1 for instance (Swain, 1995, p. 130). In addition, the learner might try to fill in the gap by turning to tools such as dictionary or grammar books or asking their teacher or peers (Swain, 2000, p. 100). The second function is the hypothesis-testing, and it suggests that output gives the learner an opportunity to test out their hypothesis relating to the L2 (Swain, 1995, p. 130-131). This means that the learner has a hypothesis regarding how the L2 works, regarding vocabulary grammar, or structure. When the learner is met with uncertainty or asked for clarification when testing out a hypothesis, they might respond by revising their hypothesis and changing their output (Swain, 1995, p.131). The third and last function of output is the metalinguistic function, and it occurs when a learner uses L2 to negotiate meaning to their hypothesis (Swain, 1995, p. 132). This essentially means that when a learner has a hypothesis regarding the L2 and try to explain it to a classmate using the L2, they start to negotiate meaning in order to convince their classmates that their hypothesis is correct. In this function the output itself is the hypothesis since it is an explanation of a learner's hypothesis, only with negotiated meaning.

3.2. BICS & CALP

Initially the distinction between BICS and CALP was that BICS communication where meaning was strongly supported by contextual or interpersonal cues such as body language facial expressions and tone and that CALP was more context-reduced (Cummins, 2008, p. 74). Given this distinction, all communication made face-to-face would be BICS and CALP would only relate to things as reading a textbook for instance. This, however, is very limited, considering the various cognitive demands discussions and textbooks can have. A discussion regarding recreational activities is less cognitively demanding than a discussion about biology or physics. As Cummins (1981a) pointed out, the dimensions that are present in BICS/CALP are impossible to specify because “context-embedded” and “cognitively demanding” vary from learner to learner. These dimensions vary also for a learner in different languages. A learner can find it cognitively demanding to discuss recreational activities in their L2, but not at all in their L1. Age can also be a factor to decide what is cognitively demanding and what is context embedded.

As Cummins (2008, p. 72) described, a twelve-year-old and a six-year-old have enormous variation in their ability to read and write as well as their vocabulary. Most twelve-year-olds can read and write a variety of texts without it being cognitively demanding, however, reading and writing one word, can be very demanding of a six-year-old. In addition, their vocabulary varies due to their input and output. A six-year-old will have great fluency in everyday language, or BICS, but will have very little vocabulary regarding academic language, CALP. Other aspects of language such as phonology, are similar for the six-year-old and the twelve-year-old. This means that some aspects of children’s L1 are constantly evolving, while other aspects do not.

Gibbons’ (1991, p. 3) distinction between *playground language* and *classroom language* addresses the lack in the original distinction of BICS and CALP. Gibbons’ notes that playground language gives children opportunity to make friends and take part in games and the social life, while classroom language engages children in cognitive demanding thinking skills, such as evaluating, predicting, and generalizing (Gibbons, 1991, p. 3). In order to have a classroom discussion about different prediction, the students need to use cognitive demanding thinking skills, then try to formulate their predictions in an L2. Given the distinction previously mentioned about CALP being more cognitively demanding than BICS, this definition of classroom language could also be identified as CALP. This gives a clearer and more detailed distinction between BICS and CALP. Language that often occurs

face-to-face or in a social context can be considered BICS and language often used in the classroom that is more cognitively demanding and employs thinking skills, such as reflection and generalizing, can be considered CALP. This is the distinction that will be used throughout this study, with the understanding that within the classroom there can occur conversations with a social aim, and the language used, might therefore shift between BICS and CALP.

4. Methodology

To be able to answer my research question of how CALP language and vocabulary is used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom, it was important to see what students actually did during English lessons and what kind of activities they had. In gathering data, I chose qualitative observation as my method, and it was collected in a natural setting. The was collected by writing field notes during and after observing the lesson. I observed in total two lessons with the same class over a course of two weeks and the data consists of eight pages of field notes.

4.1. Participants and site

This study was performed in an 8th grade, English class in Norway. This class was taught by my practice group in Norwegian and social sciences. The students had been in contact with me as an observer in both classes as well as teacher in some Norwegian classes prior to my observations in English. This meant that the students were familiar with my presence in the classroom, and I was familiar with observing these students. The class consisted of 24 students; however, one student was taken out of class during all English lessons and taught individually. Therefore, the class consisted of 23 students during English. There were two adults present in the classroom during all lessons, including English. One was an English teacher, and the other adult was an assistant. The students had assigned seating and sat together in pairs. In English, this meant that one student sat alone due to their partner having individual instruction. The chapter that the class was working on during the weeks of observation, was science. The teacher explained prior to observing the class that they would be working with new vocabulary relating to the subject. They often worked with vocabulary in forms of discussions as well as writing and explaining to their partner later. Therefore, the students were used to speaking in English class, at least with their assigned partner.

The school was in its first year of online textbooks only, meaning that the authorities had decided that they wanted to digitalize the schools in this town and had not allocated any budget towards books, only an online platform published by Gyldendal. This system is called Skolestudio and contains all the textbook digitally. The school experienced some difficulties related to the platform due to not having access to all the textbooks. This is because the authorities had only bought one of two books in each subject. In English, this meant that the students and teachers lacked access to the grammar textbook.

4.2. Observation and observation protocol

The data in this study was collected over a period of two weeks and the method used was observation. In order to analyze how students use their already existing vocabulary and new vocabulary it was essential to observe students as they were speaking or writing.

This study focused more on the actual vocabulary of the students and observation is an important way of collecting information about people's behavior or language (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 211). The observations were done as naturalistic observation meaning that the observations were carried out in the environment where the behavior of the students occurred naturally (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). In this study that means that the observations occurred in the classroom and that was to ensure that the observations reflected the students' usual behavior and vocabulary. Johnson & Christensen (2008, p. 212) define qualitative observation as observing all relevant behavior or language for instance and taking extensive field notes without having specified exactly what to look out for. This is what I have done in this study by sitting in the classroom close to a group of students, yet in the background. I observed the students and took field notes without participating in their discussion or process. Before observing a lesson, I received information on the topic, materials and a few other details from the teacher. During the lesson I took field notes on each part of the lesson, introduction, main activity, and conclusion. The field notes included everything that I thought might be relevant, i.e. dialog and body language. In this study my role as a researcher is what Gold (1958, p. 221) describes as the observer-as-participant. In this role the researcher has limited interactions with the students of the study, yet they know that they are part of a research study. In this role, the researcher is more easily objective than a participant-as-observer.

4.3. Data analysis

The qualitative data for this study were the field notes gathered during my observation. The observations were analyzed through thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a method for systematically organizing and identifying themes across a data set (Braun & Clarke, 2012, p. 57). These themes often unite data that otherwise might appear unrelated (Braun et.al., 2019, p. 845). By analyzing the field notes from the observation, I found some patterns and themes in throughout the English lessons. These main themes were introducing CALP vocabulary, code switching and oracy. I then narrowed down my field notes to into these three categories and looked at strengths and weaknesses compared to theory on BICS and CALP.

4.4. Research credibility

A weakness can be that in choosing observation, the data lacks insight into students' attitudes and ideas of their vocabulary. It also lacks the teachers' thoughts on the output and vocabulary in the classroom. In addition, to preserve the students' anonymity, the research relies heavily on the observer noticing and hearing the behavior and output of the students and teacher, while also writing down the observations made in the field notes, since the students cannot be recorded. However, by observing the findings reflect the actual behavior and output of the students and teacher, rather than their ideas of themselves in the classroom. Moreover, the observations were done over a period of two lessons during different weeks, meaning that the behavior and output produced during both lessons provided a larger sample and limited the risk of the observations to be affected by the researcher's presence in the classroom.

4.5. Ethical considerations

There are numerous ethical considerations that must be made such as consent from participants and their parents, objectiveness during observation and the observer effect. The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees mentions that consent presupposes a person's ability to fully understand and give consent (NESH, 2019). In this study that means the students being observed can choose to not give consent. However, the student's consent is not sufficient. The consent from the parents or guardians is also needed due to the student's age. Additionally, in this study anonymity was important and nothing could therefore be recorded. The observer is the only data-collector, and it is therefore important that the researcher writes down anything that might seem important, both during and after observing.

Since the data collection relies solely on the observer, the data is affected by the perception of the observer in the moment and moments after.

5. Findings

The observations revealed three main findings. The first one being introducing CALP words. During the first lesson the class created a mind map of words that was used in both lessons. The second finding was revoicing, where both the teacher and students revoiced themselves in order to be understood or explain something. The last main finding is that the activities during both lessons focused mostly on output rather than input.

5.1 Introducing CALP words

During my first lesson observing, the class was having their first lesson in a new chapter. The chapter was called science and the teacher began the lesson by asking the students what they thought science was. The students got a few minutes to think and write down their answer in their book before the teacher proceeded to create a mind map on the board. The teacher wrote science and made a circle and proceeded to ask the students again what they felt science was. One student said that technology was science and gave examples of technology such as computers and phones. Another student suggested biology and the teacher asked them why they felt that it was science. The student explained their reasoning. Many students shared their ideas and examples of science and the mind map ended up consisting of these words: technology, phone, computer, biology, chemistry, inventions, plants, doctor, medicine, machines, animals, mathematics, stars, and spaceships. Some of the words on the mind map were new to some students, while other words were not, and the teacher explained to the class that the mind map would stay on the board for the entire lesson and that they could use it for help, and they could add on it during the lesson.

This activity seemed to help many students reflect on the new theme and many students were engaged during the process of making the mind map. Since the teacher wrote all the terms that the students mentioned, others were encouraged to try sharing their thoughts as well. Even though terms such as phone would be categorized as a BICS term given the age of the students and observing their response to the word, the teacher wrote it on the mind map. For the students that were more familiar with the topic in English, this seemed to be a good activity to showcase their knowledge as well as help their classmates extend their vocabulary. When terms like biology and chemistry came up, not all students had heard them

before and wrote them down in their own syllabus books. Some students wrote down an explanation of one or more terms, while some only wrote down the terms.

The next lesson I observed, the mind map was on the board during the entire lesson again. This mind map included even more words such as bridges, laboratory, nanotechnology, germs, and atom. All these terms had been added during English lessons I had not observed, and students had come to class and wanted to add a term and explain what it was to the class. As the students were preparing a short presentation of an invention they had come up with, I observed students turn to the mind map and actively use it to incorporate CALP terms relating to science.

5.2 Revoicing

I observed during multiple occasions the teacher and students using revoicing as a strategy. This strategy was used when students explained a term using everyday language or when the teacher was explaining a CALP term that the students did not know.

One example of this strategy was when the class was creating the mind map and one student said that an example of science was when a person mixed two types of liquids together. The teacher asked if the student was thinking about chemistry, to which the student replied yes and wrote down the word chemistry in their book. This way of revoicing when the class is having a plenary discussion seemed to be a teaching strategy from the teacher's perspective and the student didn't receive any negative notions for not knowing the word chemistry in English. Instead, the student learned a new term for something they were familiar with prior to the lesson.

During both lessons the class listened to a text from Skolestudio, the virtual textbook that the school used. While listening to the text the students wrote down words that they were not sure what meant or words that they had not heard before. Afterwards, the teacher went through all the words that the students had written down as well as words that the teacher had written down beforehand themselves. The teacher asked the students what the word meant or if they knew of "any words that meant the same", meaning synonyms. Either a student or the teacher then explained in English what the word in question meant using simpler language. One of the words that a student wrote down was recreational, which was used in a context of recreational vehicles. When the teacher asked the class what they thought recreational meant, there was no response. However, when the teacher explained that the word recreational could also be used for something you do in your spare time, three students raised their hands and one student asked if recreational could mean something similar to the word hobby. The

teacher said that hobby was a good word to explain recreational, but that words like fun and entertaining could also work. I observed two students writing in their books the synonyms next to recreational.

The third strategy I observed was how the teacher and students explained a CALP term using BICS. When a student expressed confusion regarding the term “nanotechnology” when a classmate was explaining an invention they wished existed. Their classmate explained the term using language that they thought their partner knew and I observed them ask their partner twice during their explanation if they understood so far. The classmate explained nanotechnology as little robots that were so small that they couldn’t be seen without a microscope. In this explanation the classmate combined BICS and CALP by saying “so small” instead of “microscopic” in their original presentation and “microscope” which was a term the student seemed to understand. This shows that both the teacher and the students

5.3 Activities for output

Another main theme amongst the observations was the opportunities the students had to practice vocabulary. The teacher gave the students different settings and activities to practice their oral skills. The students seemed to prefer using CALP in certain activities and BICS in other activities. The different activities varied in difficulty and group size, which might have made an effect on the students’ choice in vocabulary.

During the two lessons I observed the students work individually, in pairs, in groups varying in size from four to six students and in plenary. The teacher gave the students permission to discuss with the person sitting next to them during individual work if both students were comfortable with that, as long as the students spoke English. This seemed to encourage the students to practice their spoken English even during individual work. I observed many students talk with their partner and practice their oral English, and it didn't seem to disturb the learning environment even when there were several students having conversations about the activities. During these individual activities, the students were supposed to write, and when the students spoke to their partner during these tasks, I observed that they didn’t write much down in their books. Those students who chose to work individually seemed to produce varying amount of text, as I observed some of them writing nearly the entire time allocated to the activity and some looked more at the mind map on the board and the handout rather than writing in their books. This prompts the question if the students can remember new vocabulary and what they thought during different activities if

they do not write it down. Therefore, when an activity is meant to be individual, the decision to allow students to work together orally is something that should be thought about carefully.

6. Discussion

This study has tried to shed light on how CALP and vocabulary is used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom. This topic is broad and there are many points relating to vocabulary and how CALP is used that should be researched further. This topic is also constantly evolving and should always be researched to uncover new perspectives and ideas. The findings in this study suggest that CALP language was used in different activities and that output was a focus for learning and practicing vocabulary. Specifically, oral output was mostly used in the classroom. That highlights the lack of focus on input and writing. Considering my findings, I will discuss how CALP is used in the classroom by the students. Later, I will discuss the benefits and the disadvantage of focusing primarily on output.

6.1 CALP language in the classroom

The distinction between BICS and CALP used in this study was that BICS often occurs face-to-face or in a social context, while CALP is language that is often used in the classroom and is more cognitively demanding (Gibbons, 1991, p. 3). This means that when the class was explained that the word recreational could also mean hobby, they were employing thinking skills and that language was therefore CALP. The lessons gave students many opportunities to employ thinking skills and challenged many students cognitively. They had activities such as creating a short presentation of a new invention, which demanded great thought in regard to the kind of vocabulary that was to be used in order to present it properly, while not making it too difficult to understand.

The theme of the chapter that they were working on was a challenging theme and included a lot of challenging and new vocabulary. Although science is a difficult theme to work with due to many new words and the potential complexity of some concepts, it can also provide a great learning opportunity. Many students were challenged regarding discussions and had many opportunities to notice the vocabulary that was new to them. Even the most proficient students were challenged and were able to experience English L2 in a similar way as some of their classmates. Since the definition of what is cognitively demanding varies from student to student (Cummins, 1981a), it is important to create opportunities for everyone to be challenged. The variation of the lessons was an important factor to create

these opportunities. By listening and reading a text and identifying which words are unknown, each student can identify their own needs regarding vocabulary in science. They can decide what they wish to focus on and what they need to improve their vocabulary. This also forced the students to recognize certain words and think more thoroughly on whether they really knew what it meant even if they had heard the word before. Most of the words mentioned were cognitively demanding to explain and could therefore be categorized as CALP vocabulary, given the definition for this study.

Group discussion can also be beneficial to practice new vocabulary, as long as the students challenge themselves. In my observation I observed the students challenge themselves and try to communicate despite a lack of vocabulary in some instances. In doing so, the students learned new terms that were relevant to the topic and classmates were able to practice explaining terms and define ideas when helping their peers. The various activities promoted CALP and students used both CALP and BICS to explain their thoughts on the topic.

6.2 Learning through oral skills and writing

As previously mentioned, the LK20 mentions four basic skills that the English subject should focus on (UDIR, 2020). Two of these skills are oral skills and writing, and these skills focus output and not input. This means that the students are producing more text or dialog than receiving as input such as reading and primarily listening would. Swain identified three different functions of output that could help a learner with their L2 proficiency (Swain, 1995, p. 125-126). I observed students experience the first one mentioned in the output hypothesis, the noticing function. This happened several times during my observation, that students were speaking in plenary, groups or pairs and they noticed that they did not know a specific term in English. Most often, the students had the ability to explain using existing vocabulary or their classmate was able to explain the to them when a student heard an unfamiliar word from a classmate. When another student knew the term that their classmate lacked, they helped them out by informing them of the term in English or asked the teacher. The teacher was also reminded students that they had access to dictionaries that might be of help. According to Swain, when a learner notices the gap in their vocabulary, they focus their attention on that and are more likely to form an hypothesis on what the right term is (1995, p. 130). When a student then hears the correct term, they have either confirmed their hypothesis or disprove it. Either way, the student has their attention on that term and learn it because they know that is a gap in their vocabulary.

Another function that I also observed was the hypothesis-testing function (Swain, 1995, p. 130-121). During my observation I was that the students in this class were able to test their hypothesis relating to vocabulary and received the correction or confirmation they needed when doing so. The students were able to look to the other students and the teacher for help when stepping out of their comfort zone in English L2. This class was able to do that, and most students seemed comfortable to push themselves and test their hypothesis in class, and I did not observe anyone experiencing negative reactions when testing them. This is not something that can be expected in every class given that the classroom environment and dynamic between students affect how comfortable students can be in testing themselves amongst their peers. Because students were able to test their hypothesis, hopefully they are able to move on to the third function of output, the metalinguistic function (Swain, 1995, p. 132). If their hypothesis is correct, the students can try to explain why it is correct based on their reasoning for the hypothesis (Swain, 1995, p. 130). If their reasoning was based on their knowledge of the word in their L1 or several languages, they can use that in explaining that to classmates.

Focusing on output in the way that the observation class did can have its benefits regarding testing out and expanding the learner's vocabulary as well as practice speaking and writing in L2. When producing a lot of output, it can seem less frightening to try speaking or writing knowing others will hear or read what is being produced. This in turn will help expand the knowledge in the L2, making the learners confidence in using the L2 greater. This can create a positive cycle that increases the learner's knowledge and confidence simultaneously. However, some learners are not comfortable pushing themselves so much and need a certain level of confidence to try producing output in the first place, especially oral output. These learners might not experience the same amount of confidence when having the lessons I observed. In addition, when students opted to work together during individual work, they did not produce much text in writing and therefore risk forgetting their thoughts and ideas regarding the activity later on.

7. Conclusion

In this study I have looked closer at how CALP language and vocabulary is used in the English subject in a Norwegian classroom. There has been research relating to vocabulary in Norway before and is an important topic for educators of English as a second or foreign language as well as all language teachers. Because vocabulary is what enables students to

express their opinion, language teachers need to understand how that can be improved and encouraged amongst the students. In order to do that, we first need to look at what language is used and how vocabulary is used in a classroom today. Two lessons were observed to answer the research question. The main findings were that CALP words were introduced to the class at the beginning of each lesson, revoicing was used when a student lacked a word or did not know a word that was mentioned or used and activities during lessons were mostly focused on producing output, mostly oral output. The findings suggest that the teachers should focus more on producing written output as well and input. It surprised me that during individual work, students were allowed to work together, discussing the work instead of writing it down. The teacher could check the work after to make sure that all students practice writing in English as well as speaking. There could also be more focus on reading a text, considering that is also a basic skill in the English subject and should be promoted too. I think that different activities help students with different needs evolve their vocabulary, even though I am not sure that the lessons I observed would suit every class. I think that this topic should be researched further, so that educators can adapt their teaching of an L2 better to the different needs of students.

8. Bibliography

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2012). Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57–71)
- Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Terry, G. (2019). Thematic Analysis 48. In Liamputtong, P. (Ed.). (2019). *Handbook of research methods in health social sciences*. Singapore: Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. *Encyclopedia of language and education*, 2(2), 71-83.
- Gibbons, P. (1991). *Learning to learn in a second language*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gold, R. L. (1957). Roles in sociological field observations. *Soc. F.*, 36, 217.
- Mahan, K. R. (2022). The comprehending teacher: Scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(1), 74-88.
- Mahan, K. R., Brevik, L. M., & Ødegaard, M. (2018). Characterizing CLIL teaching: New insights from a lower secondary classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sylvén, L. K., & Sundqvist, P. (2012). Gaming as extramural English L2 learning and L2 proficiency among young learners. *ReCALL*, 24(3), 302-321.
- The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Learning. (2020). *Competence aims after year 10*. (ENG01- 04)

<https://www.udir.no/1k20/eng01-04/kompetansemaal-og-vurdering/kv4?lang=eng>

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Learning. (2020). *Core elements* (ENG01- 04)

<https://www.udir.no/lk20/eng01-04/om-faget/grunnleggende-ferdigheter?lang=eng>

The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Learning. (2012). *Framework for Basic Skills*.

(ENG01-03)

https://www.udir.no/contentassets/fd2d6bfbf2364e1c98b73e030119bd38/framework_for_basic_skills.pdf

Barn, unge og voksne med innvandrerbakgrunn i grunnopplæringen

<https://www.udir.no/tall-og-forskning/finn-forskning/rapporter/barn-unge-og-voksne-med-innvandrerbakgrunn-i-grunnopplaringen/>

The Norwegian National Research Ethics Committees:

<https://www.forskningsetikk.no/en/guidelines/general-guidelines/>

9. Appendix

Classroom Observation Protocol

Pre-Observation Data

Date:

Observer:

School (1-7/8-10):

Grade/Level:

Program:

Class period and time of class:

Topic or topics:

Purpose of the lesson(objectives):

Materials used (books, computers, tablets, presentations, hand-outs, notes):

Which basic skill is the main focus?

Classroom Activities

(Fill this out during the classroom observation.)

Introduction: Content, nature of activity, students' role, teachers' role, interactions

Main activity: Content, nature of activity, students' role, teachers' role, interactions

Conclusion: Content, nature of activity, students' role, teachers' role, interactions