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Abstract


This thesis presents English-medium instruction (EMI) in the Swedish context, focusing on perspectives and practices in two schools. The research question is as follows: How and why is EMI offered, chosen, and practiced in the Swedish upper secondary school today? The aim is to explore the status of the educational option, the reasons for offering EMI to stakeholders, the stakeholders’ beliefs about and goals of EMI, and the implementation of EMI in the classroom.

A survey of all upper secondary schools in Sweden was conducted to ascertain the spread of content teaching through a foreign language. The educational context was studied from an ecological perspective using methods based in linguistic ethnography. Language alternation, academic language, and language hierarchy were all considered. Interviews were analysed for content; and classroom language use was analysed for language choice and function. The concepts of affordance and scaffolding together with translanguaging were key. The de facto policies of the micro contexts of the schools were examined in light of the declared national policy of the macro context of Sweden.

The results indicate that the option in Swedish schools has not increased, and also tends to only be EMI—not Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) or instruction through other languages. EMI is offered for prestige, an international profile, marketing potential and personal interest. EMI students are academically motivated and confident, and see the option as “fun”. 100% EMI in the lessons is not the goal or the practice. Translanguaging is abundant, but how language alternation is perceived as an affordance or not differs in the two schools. One focuses on how the languages are used while the other focuses on how much each language is used.

In conclusion, the analysis suggests that a development of definitions and practices of EMI in Sweden is needed, especially in relation to language policy and language hierarchy.
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Abbreviations used in this thesis

L1 = First language/mother tongue of a speaker
L2 = All languages learned after the first language/mother tongue
CLIL = Content and language integrated learning
SPRINT = Språk- och innehållsintegrerad inlärning och undervisning
          (Language and subject integrated learning and teaching)
EMI = English-medium instruction
T = Teacher
S/s = Student/s
FS/s = Female student/s
MS/s = Male student/s

Teacher X = “Teacher X” is used to protect the privacy of the teacher informants in some of the extracts. “Teacher X” can thus be any one of the eleven teacher informants and is not the same teacher every time the pseudonym is used.

Transcription conventions used in this thesis

/…/ = text has been deleted
[text] = added information about what is happening (not speech)
(text) = added text for clarity of speech
          (not spoken directly by the informant)
text = the “other” language
          (Swedish text in English utterances or English text in Swedish utterances)
<text> = translated text directly following original text
text = emphasised by speaker
TEXT = louder voice used by speaker
“text” = speaker is quoting someone else
‘text’ = text written on whiteboard in lesson
… = pause or trailing off of speech
"You can’t really survive out there with only Swedish.”

Leo and Malte, two students in their last year of upper secondary school in Sweden, are discussing their recent school trip to the States. They describe their experiences and adventures in detail, using English with great confidence. Their awareness of their own English language skills surfaces:

Malte: When we were in America pretty much everyone said, your English is so good, which felt pretty good actually. Ok, we do have good English.

Leo: But I just told them that well, it’s just kind of hard to find a Swede that doesn’t know English. It’s the truth of the matter.

Malte: Yeah, because you can’t really survive out there with only Swedish.

Leo: Exactly.

Malte: Lord knows, some people try.

Leo and Malte have chosen to study their upper secondary education partly through the medium of English and, like many Swedes, feel that the English language has a special place in Swedish society. Some even claim that English in Sweden is becoming a second language and is no longer a foreign language (Hyltenstam 2004:52). On the one hand, English has become commonplace, as Leo indicates above when he notes that it can be hard to find a Swede who does not know English. On the other hand, the role of English has become somewhat controversial in Sweden, sparking debates on domain loss as English spreads, perhaps as indicated by Malte above who notes that the Swedish language is not “enough” any longer. The special dual role of English is often discussed in Swedish media and academic circles, as seen in both popular and academic publications (e.g. The Swedish Language Council’s 2004 collection of writings by researchers exploring the role of English in different domains in Swedish society) as well as recent

---

1 Upper secondary school (gymnasium in Swedish) is roughly equivalent to the last three years of high school in the US school system and to Year 11 plus Sixth Form in the English system.

2 See Chapter 2 for a discussion on the uses of second language and foreign language.
doctrinal research on the role of English in the lives of Swedish youth (especially extramural English, e.g. Sundqvist 2009; Olsson 2012) and the use of English as a medium of instruction at different levels of education (e.g. Lim Falk 2008; Airey 2009; Söderlundh 2010; Edlund 2011). English, and its role in Sweden, was also the only foreign language specifically addressed in the language policy report with an action program titled *Speech* (SOU 2002).

Both popular and academic articles and reports are relevant to understanding the role of the English language in Sweden, and they suggest some of the current beliefs about English-medium instruction (hereafter EMI) in the Swedish context. EMI is an optional form of education that has reportedly increased in recent years (Stålhammar 2010:215), although the exact extent and scope of the increase has been unclear. Still, the option is without a doubt firmly established; and Lim Falk (2008:3) has identified three main beliefs about instruction through the medium of English in Sweden:

1) There is a common assumption that the more students are exposed to English, then the more developed their English skills will be.  
2) Internationalisation and globalisation are considered to be both the reason for and the goal of immersion schools.  
3) Municipal and independent3 schools believe that if they offer specialised schools, such as immersion schools, they will be better able to compete for students.4

These beliefs about and the resulting practices of EMI have been addressed by other Swedish researchers as well, including Knight 1990, Washburn 1997, Alvtörn 2000, Sylvén 2004, and Kjellén Simes 2008, who have all examined aspects of English-medium instruction in secondary and upper secondary schools. Some have been critical of English-medium instruction, finding that the students’ Swedish language suffers due to the schooling in English (Lim Falk 2008) or that students write Swedish less correctly than other students in traditional schools (Alvtörn 2002). Other researchers have indicated that the English language proficiency of students studying on these programs is not significantly more advanced than that of other comparable students in Swedish upper secondary schools (Knight 1990; Washburn 1997), or that the students are better in English even before they start an English-medium program (Sylvén 2004).  

It is a recurring comment in this Swedish research that the English teaching in these EMI schools lacks well-defined goals beyond the objectives of the curriculum and regular subject syllabus goals outlined for all students. In a 2001 report on instruction through the medium of a foreign language in

---

1 Note that as Swedish education is by law free for all, “independent” schools still offer free tuition for all students. The description “independent” refers to the fact that it is not the municipality running the school, but rather a free actor (cf. “free school” in the British context).  
2 All translations of Swedish text into English in this thesis are the author’s.
Swedish schools, the Swedish National Agency for Education (Skolverket) suggested that the goal is not a fully bilingual student⁵, but rather students with functional competence in the target language (Nixon 2001:20). It is not clear, however, how this competence differs from the goals of the regular English as a foreign language subject syllabus for all schools.⁶ Moreover, the various stakeholders—students, teachers, school heads and parents⁷—involved in this educational option may have their own objectives and goals, but how these are followed up at school (i.e. through teaching and evaluation methods) and if they are achieved is not clear. The lack of clearly stated goals is a problem Dalton-Puffer similarly emphasises in her work on instruction through the medium of a foreign language in the general European context, as she notes that neither teachers nor officials are clear about the actual goals (2007:275; 2011:185; also Nikula 2005).

As is evident in the brief discussion above, there are unanswered questions and unexplored considerations about the complex situation in which English-medium instruction is offered in the Swedish context. In the present research, various aspects of EMI in Swedish upper secondary schools today are explored, including the following: the relation of EMI in Sweden and the international context to what is referred as CLIL (Content and language integrated learning) or SPRINT in Swedish (språk- och innehållsintegrerad lärning och undervisning); how and why EMI has developed as an educational option in Sweden in recent years; how the different stakeholders express their goals and expectations of EMI; and how the practice of EMI unfolds in relation to the stakeholders’ implicit and explicit goals, expectations and experiences. These areas have been identified in previous research as needing additional investigation.

1.1 Aims and foci of the main research question

The basic understanding of what teaching content through a foreign language is and how it is practiced in the Swedish context currently lacks a complete description. This is in part due to insufficient current statistics on the scope and extent of the practice and in part due to the dearth of research

---
⁵ Compare to the Agency’s report in 2010 on EMI in compulsory schools in Sweden. At least half of the schools specifically indicated that bilingualism was the goal. More examination of these official national reports is found in Chapter 6.
⁶ Note that the national curriculum in Sweden stipulates that all students study English as a foreign language. This usually commences by Grade 3, when Swedish pupils are age 9, although many schools start earlier, for example in Grade 1 when the pupils are age 7. For more on English in the Swedish school system, see Chapter 3.
⁷ Dalton-Puffer (2007:58) includes education authorities, political entities, and professional organisations as stakeholders involved in this educational option, but this thesis focuses on the four identified above.
in the EMI classroom and on the stakeholders’ perspectives. Although one can argue that there are many stakeholders at different levels involved in teaching content through a foreign language, the focus for this thesis is limited to four: students, teachers, school heads and parents. These four groups have been deemed to be most affected by the EMI option as well as to be most directly involved in the EMI practice. This research aims to fill the gap in more fully understanding the option of teaching content through a foreign language in the Swedish context by contributing to the relatively small pool of empirical knowledge about this form of instruction, especially regarding the expectations and goals of the stakeholders, and the subsequent practice in the upper secondary school. The main research question of the present thesis is thus as follows: How and why is English-medium instruction offered, chosen, and practiced in the Swedish upper secondary school today?

This broad research question aims to offer both a description and an explanation of the current practice of English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school. This is attained through several sub-studies which together cover three main research foci, each with separate but complementary aims. These are outlined below.

1) Offering the option of English-medium instruction:
Exploring how the option has developed in Sweden and why English-medium instruction is offered to potential stakeholders.

2) Choosing the option of English-medium instruction:
Exploring the stakeholders’ beliefs about and goals of English-medium instruction in two upper secondary schools.

3) Practicing the option of English-medium instruction:
Exploring how English-medium instruction in the Swedish school is being implemented in two upper secondary schools, why it takes the form it does, and what the stakeholders’ experiences are.

Each of the research foci provides a basis for further insight into the present role of English as a medium of instruction as well as to what it means to teach and learn subject content through a foreign language. Understanding the background factors of how and why the educational option is offered and chosen provides a more solid understanding of how and why the option is practiced the way it is in the classroom. The focus is thus not on the language proficiency of the students or teachers and not on the academic out-

---

Note that this study does not address the teaching and learning of a foreign language (e.g. Spanish, German, French) in the Swedish classroom. This study is limited to non-language subject teaching through the medium of an additional language, specifically through the medium of English. See Chapters 2 and 3 for more on this distinction.
comes of programs teaching content through a foreign language. Rather, this thesis is limited to stakeholder perspectives and actual classroom practices. The aim is to contribute both towards an understanding of the definition and practice of content and language integrated learning in the Swedish context today and towards an understanding of the practice more generally.

1.2 Outline of thesis

The present thesis will first briefly describe teaching content through a foreign language. Selected contexts within the European Union are presented, along with different definitions and practices. The Swedish context is then described in greater detail, especially with a focus on the role of English in Sweden today and on previous research on schools offering instruction through the medium of English. The research design follows: the theoretical framework and the materials and methods. The present empirical research is divided into research outside the schools and research in the schools; and each part is presented separately, with the focus on research in the schools, which is considered to be the main study. Research outside the schools comprises a survey study, focusing on the extent and scope of the option of teaching content through a foreign language in Swedish upper secondary schools since the previous statistics reported by the National Agency for Education in 1999. This study is presented in Chapter 6. Research in the schools comprises the interview and classroom studies focusing on stakeholder perspectives (on offering, choosing and practicing the option) and practice (how the option can be implemented in the classroom). The thesis ends with a discussion of the results, which are explored with both the specific contexts of the two informant schools and the general Swedish context in mind.
2 Teaching and learning content through a foreign language

Teaching content through a foreign language means that students at any level engaging in non-language subject learning receive instruction through a language medium that is not their own native tongue. The understanding of what is meant by “through a foreign language” hinges on what is recognised as a foreign language in a context, and how this may differ from a second language. Any language learned after the mother tongue can be a second language (Ellis 1997:3), which means it can be any number of languages and not just the second one after the first. Baker uses the terms interchangeably when he writes of language learning in officially or unofficially monolingual environments, such as learning French in US compulsory schools. At the same time, he indicates that Scandinavian students become “fluent in […] English as a second or third language,” before further explaining that the high status of English and the personal motivation of students mean that “foreign language teaching may be more successful” (2011:218). While some see no difference between second and foreign languages (Ellis 1997:3), others do make the distinction, for example, Crystal, who distinguishes between English as a second language and English as a foreign language (2002:2). García (2014b:5; 2009) questions the use of the term second language, as it is part of a discourse favouring native speaker competence (also difficult to clearly define). Hyltenstam (2004:37) differentiates between the two terms: a foreign language is one which is not used daily outside the classroom in the learner’s regular environment while a second language is learned because it is needed in the daily life of the learner’s regular environment. Second language can thus refer to languages learned after a first mother tongue, or to the sociolinguistic function of a language, or to a language with an official status in a context (e.g. English in Malta). In this thesis, Hyltenstam’s delineation between a foreign language and a second language will be used, although the lack of consensus on the distinction is acknowledged.

The educational form of teaching and learning through a foreign language can take on many different and often very diverse forms in practice. For

---

García (2012:4) proposes that the notion of translanguaging disrupts the concept of second languages and native speakers. See Section 4.2.1 for more on translanguaging.
example, a Spanish student may learn biology through the medium of English or a French student may learn history through the medium of German. The language is usually one that is not an official language of the country or community. However, it may be an official language that is a minority or regional language in the context, such as content teaching through the medium of Catalan for Spanish-speaking students. There are many educational practices in which a student is learning through a language other than her own mother tongue\textsuperscript{10} or other than the community’s majority language. However, many of these do not represent the kind of non-language subject learning through the medium of a foreign language that is the focus of this thesis. In order to provide clarity, six of these other educational practices are presented here.

First, content learning through a foreign language is not the same as foreign language learning. In some contexts, foreign language learning does indeed take place in the target language (e.g. many modern languages in the Swedish upper secondary school are actually taught through the medium of the target language, such as French language as a subject lessons being taught in French). This is not content learning through a foreign language as defined in this thesis. Secondly, it is not the same as learning in the majority language of the community. In most contexts, schools will have some students arriving in the classroom with a mother tongue other than that of the majority or official language of the country (e.g. Syrian children arriving in Sweden may start school knowing very little or no Swedish\textsuperscript{11}). Sometimes these students have provision for transitional educational to help them move into the mainstream classroom with majority language instruction. Sometimes they start directly in their L2 (i.e. second language) classroom and have to manage on their own. Thirdly, there are also school contexts in which the students attend a school where instruction is conducted in a language foreign to the community but that is the students’ own mother tongue (e.g. schools for German-speaking students in many different countries, all following the same German-language curriculum). Fourthly, there are complementary schools, sometimes called Saturday schools, aimed at providing language instruction in a language not supported in the community but spoken as a home language by some members of that community (such as Cantonese and Mandarin language lessons for Chinese families in London, see e.g. Creese, Blackledge, Baraç, Bhatt, Hamid, Li Wei, … Yağcıoğlu 2010). Fifthly, mother tongue tuition is provided as a supplemental educational practice in some contexts, such as in the Swedish school system. This tuition involves the student receiving subject or language support in a mother

\textsuperscript{10} For more on the use of the somewhat contested term “mother tongue,” see Section 4.3.

\textsuperscript{11} According to official statistics from 2011/12, more than 20% of pupils starting compulsory school in Sweden have a mother tongue other than Swedish (Statistics Sweden, Report 22 2013:433).
tongue other than Swedish in the school setting (e.g. Arabic-speaking students may receive extra tuition in and through Arabic once a week). Finally, there are schools that offer the International Baccalaureate program at different levels, teaching subjects through the medium of English in a variety of contexts. These schools, however, are outside of the local curricula, whether the “local” in the specific context means it is national or regional. The focus of this chapter—and this thesis—is not on these six educational forms. The focus is instead on the optional educational form in which stakeholders (those usually already proficient in the majority language) make use of a foreign or additional language in content teaching and learning.

This chapter will explore the definitions of the educational option, illustrated with examples of practice and research from different contexts. As the focus of this thesis is English-medium instruction, the focus of this short overview will also be on English, which tends to be the main foreign language used for content teaching through a language other than the mother tongue (Eurydice 2006).

2.1 Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in Europe

There are 23 official languages in the European Union (hereafter, EU). In an effort to promote multilingualism, that is “at the very heart of European identity” (Eurydice 2006:4), the official EU policy encourages citizens to learn their own language plus two more as well. Both plurilingual competence and plurilingual awareness are goals of the Council of Europe Common European Framework of Reference for Languages of 2001 (Hélot 2012:220). As a means to this, the European Commission has been actively promoting content and language integrated learning since the 1990’s at all educational levels as a viable option for the acquisition of foreign languages (ibid.). Many researchers state that this option has steadily increased due to the EU call for multilingualism (e.g. Lorenzo, Casal, & Moore 2009:418).

How the integration of language learning in the content classroom may be defined and how it may be implemented are explored below.

2.1.1 Definitions

The accepted umbrella term throughout Europe for the educational option of teaching content through a foreign language is Content and Language Inte-

---

12 For more on the International Baccalaureate program in the Swedish context, see Chapter 6.
grated Learning\textsuperscript{13}, henceforth \textit{CLIL} (Eurydice 2006). The term CLIL was first coined by the Continuing Education Centre (UNICOM) at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland, and the European Platform for Dutch Education in 1996 (Darn 2006), although it was not entirely new, as the concept was similar to previous immersion programs in Canada, on which European CLIL was based (Eurydice 2006).

The Canadian immersion model is practiced through the medium of an official language that is not a mother tongue of the participating students. The official national ideology of bilingualism in Canada (Duff 2007:149) led to the development of French immersion programs in the 1960’s, with the French immersion option ranging from early (preschool) to late (secondary) start and either partial (≈50%) or total (Baker 2011). Originally, in the Canadian context, the aim of this optional form of bilingual education was “single immersion,” with the goal of French language proficiency for English-speaking students, although other immersion programs have since developed, such as dual French and Hebrew for English-speaking students (de Mejía 2012:203). In the early practice of French immersion, three principles were in focus: first, students should be proficient in their own first language before attempting second language learning; second, the two languages should be kept separate (“Bilingualism through Monolingualism,” meaning strict compartmentalisation of the two languages); and third, students should be informed of the benefits of bilingualism (ibid.2012:200, citing Swain 1982 and 1983). Although English-speaking parents played a major role in the inception of the programs (Genesee 1987:10), the programs were top-down, funded and supported by the government, and subsequently researched extensively. A recent review of the research on the potential benefits of the Canadian option indicated that students’ academic progress was not negatively affected and they “typically develop ‘native-like’ receptive school-based language skills in French by about 11 years of age and achieve high levels of proficiency in speaking and writing by graduation” (Lazaruk 2007:623).

Despite some general agreement by the European community about the use of the term \textit{CLIL}, the exact definitions as well as the practice as an educational option vary greatly from country to country and school to school (see Section 2.1.2 below for examples). Although there is neither one single definition nor one single practice for the concept of CLIL, the description of CLIL as “a joint learning practice of subject matter and foreign language” (Smit & Dafouz 2012:1) is applicable to most contexts. Dalton-Puffer (2011:182) also advises that CLIL is “an educational model for contexts where the classroom provides the only site for learners’ interaction in the

\textsuperscript{13} Note that in this section, the emphasis will be on the educational option defined as CLIL. Only research specifically focusing on and naming CLIL or EMI is included here— and not research on other forms or models of instruction through another language.
target language” (added italics), and thus does not include learning through the medium of an official language. Advocates of CLIL propose that the added value provides additional proficiency in the language of instruction as well as the expected subject knowledge, and is “obtained at no cost to other skills and knowledge” (Marsh 2002:24).

Both within a single context and between contexts, the option can and does take a variety of forms, from “full-blown immersion to occasional ‘language showers’” (Järvinen 2009:164). While the Canadian immersion practice introduced above may have been the model for much of the early CLIL in Europe, Dalton-Puffer says choosing to use the term immersion or the term CLIL today depends on both the characteristics of a program and the specific “cultural and political frame of reference” for the program (2011:183). Many suggest that CLIL is not the same as the original immersion educational option as practiced in Canada. For example, Lasagabaster and Sierra (2010:367) state that the terms CLIL and immersion, while “often used indiscriminately,” actually are more dissimilar than similar. Others think the distinction less clear-cut, however, e.g. Somers and Surmont (2011). Two ways CLIL differs from immersion are that the former is closely connected with EU language policy and that the language of instruction is usually not an official language in the context (Gardner 2012:253), though this is not the case with, e.g. Belgium, where CLIL can be practiced in French or Dutch, both official languages but not the mother tongue of all. Hyltenstam, drawing from Genesee (1987) among others, identifies the following features of immersion:

1) The option is a voluntary choice.
2) The language of the students has higher status than the medium language of instruction.
3) The students all share the same mother tongue.
4) The teacher is proficient in the students’ mother tongue.
5) The medium language of instruction is not a mother tongue of any students.
6) The students have already developed their own mother tongue.
7) The students are expected to have mastered/master literacy skills in their own mother tongue. (2004:66-67; see also Lim Falk 2008)

The main difference between CLIL and immersion is the second feature: The language of the students has higher status than the medium language of instruction. In an immersion context, such as French immersion in the US, the students’ mother tongue (English) will still have a higher status in the community. In most CLIL contexts, however, English is usually the medium of instruction, meaning the language of instruction may indeed have a higher status than the mother tongue of the students, as English has high prestige in

---

14 For more on the use of immersion in North American contexts, see Cummins 2009.
many educational and professional contexts. In some contexts, a further difference is that CLIL may commence before or at the same time as the students are developing their literacy skills in their own mother tongue (e.g. in Andalusia in Spain, where CLIL may commence in English, French or German already in primary school, see Casal & Moore 2009:39). However, in contrast, Dalton-Puffer (2011:184) maintains that in most CLIL programs, the students usually have already mastered literacy skills in their own mother tongue (the seventh feature), starting CLIL after primary school level.\footnote{Note that this may not be the case in post-colonial contexts, where the students may start school in an official language that is not their own mother tongue and thus not have acquired literacy skills before starting in immersion education. These educational practices are not usually considered CLIL and are not included in this thesis.}

In summary, there is no consensus on the exact definition of CLIL and the distinctions are not always sustainable. This may not actually matter. Rather, CLIL may be a useful umbrella term for the general European context—and one that needs to be adjusted accordingly to the specific contexts.

2.1.2 Practice

As seen above, the definition of CLIL can vary; and the contexts in which CLIL education is conducted can also diverge significantly. In some EU countries, such as Luxembourg, immersion is actually offered in all schools, while in others, such as Spain, Italy, the Netherlands and parts of the United Kingdom (i.e. Wales, where there is a second official language), the option of CLIL or immersion is widespread. The practice of bilingual education tends to have the longest history in countries with official multilingualism, such as Belgium, or with official minority languages, such as Wales\footnote{For a comprehensive overview of all EU countries and their implementation of CLIL revealing a wide variety of definitions, see Eurydice 2006, available online at http://ec.europa.eu/languages/documents/studies/clil-at-school-in-europe_en.pdf.} (Eurydice 2006:14). In contexts such as these two, the language of instruction may be an official one, although still not a mother tongue of the student. The research from these contexts with official policies of bilingualism may describe the educational option using a variety of terms such as bilingual education or CLIL or immersion—again reflecting the lack of consensus of definition.

Sylvén (2013) has outlined some of the key differences in context when examining CLIL in different European countries and has identified four main factors influencing the practice of CLIL in each: teacher education, policy framework, extramural\footnote{See Section 3.3 for more on extramural English.} English, and age of students. Each of these four factors varies according to context. For example, CLIL teacher education, through pre-service or in-service training, is firmly established in
Spain, Germany, and Finland, but absent in other countries. Specific CLIL curricula are rare in all contexts, although present in Andalusia in Spain. Also, the school policy on a system level in Spain, as well as Finland, is clearly defined, resulting in a stronger research base than found in the other contexts. Sylvén notes that the national school policies addressing CLIL differ throughout Europe. Norway, for example, has specific guidelines about teaching in another language (e.g. at least 30% of content instruction must be in an additional language to be labelled CLIL). As for the third factor, in Finland and The Netherlands, students have a greater extramural exposure to English than in other contexts, such as Spain, thus making exposure to the most common language of instruction in CLIL greater. Finally, the age of onset for CLIL education is much younger for some contexts, such as Spain. Some specific examples of different CLIL contexts today are presented below.

One European context where research on CLIL is abundant is Austria, where the option is seen as a bottom-up movement in schools, with some estimates indicating that up to 75% of schools have some form of CLIL, although there are no current official statistics (Dalton-Puffer 2012). There are no national guidelines for CLIL in Austria and very little in-service training, although it is clear that many teachers involved in Austrian CLIL programs have English as a foreign language (EFL) qualifications plus a subject. EFL starts at age 10 in the Austrian school system and is obligatory. English is the only officially required foreign language in schools, and sometimes no other foreign language is even offered in schools. At the tertiary level, CLIL is found in at least one course in all programs in Austrian technical colleges.

In Finnish schools, instruction through a foreign language was initially modelled after the Canadian immersion practice, with an original focus on Swedish, an official language (de Mejia 2012:203). The CLIL option has bloomed in the Finnish school context since the 1990’s. English-medium instruction is most common as the language has a high status as the most popular foreign language in Finnish schools; extramural English is also pervasive in Finland. However, CLIL is offered in other languages as well, such as German, Russian, and French; and Finnish CLIL can involve more than one foreign language in a school context (Marsh 2002:104). Multilingual immersion in Finland aims to meet the goals of the EU call for the mother tongue plus two languages (Björklund & Mård-Miettinen 2011:23).

In The Netherlands, schools have also been offering CLIL, especially English-medium CLIL for many years. English is moreover abundant in the Dutch society with proficiency levels generally high. In 2012, 125 of the 127 CLIL schools were English-medium and two were German-medium (de Bot 2012). CLIL is well established, with research and teacher training two active aspects of the educational context.
A final example from the European context is Spain. Some regions have top-down initiatives for the provision of CLIL, such as the ambitious local government plan in Andalusia to promote multilingualism through, among other strategies, bilingual education. English has no official status and is not widely used by students extramurally, with media such as television and films routinely dubbed rather than subtitled, but still remains a common language in the CLIL context of Spain. Regional languages, as well as other modern European languages, are also found in Spanish CLIL classrooms at all levels. There has been a considerable amount of research on CLIL in the Spanish and Basque contexts in recent years (e.g. Lasagabaster & Ruiz de Zarobe 2010).

While it is a common claim within the European CLIL community of researchers and teachers that CLIL provides a clear added value to a school option (Haataja 2012), there are some voices of criticism of the validity of CLIL studies of practice. For example, Burton says, “…there is a growing body of research into CLIL that is being conducted by investigators who seem to want to demonstrate that CLIL is necessarily a positive route to raising the standards of FL [foreign language] learning at primary and secondary levels in Europe” (2010:240). He suggests that some studies investigating the effectiveness of CLIL are biased from the start, with a risk of experimenter expectancies—meaning that researchers are clearly preferential to one form of schooling over another beforehand and may be looking for only the most positive results and aspects. In the same vein, Dalton-Puffer sees CLIL a “brand name” today (2012)\(^\text{18}\)—one that is often considered to equate with success by what she calls “CLIL activists.” However, she questions what is exactly meant by success. Do the practitioners mean that the stakeholders have positive attitudes about CLIL? Or does CLIL have success in more measurable ways, such as target language proficiency? If so, how do we know? (Dalton-Puffer 2011:186). Dalton-Puffer emphasises that there is actually little research results on the effects of CLIL, with both unclear evidence and contradictory evidence from the studies that have been conducted. Likewise, few policy documents specifically address CLIL in any context. As will be seen in this study, many of these questions as well as issues about the definition and practice of CLIL are echoed in the Swedish context.

Despite wide variation in definitions and practices, two beliefs seem to be certain in all contexts where CLIL is found: “the belief in the benefits of equipping every citizen with a knowledge of English and the belief that CLIL is the way to transcend the perceived weaknesses of traditional foreign language teaching” (Dalton-Puffer 2011:185). The emphasis on English is

\(^{18}\) In one context of language revival, The Welsh Language Board also sees Welsh as a “brand” to be promoted in schools in Wales (Edwards & Pritchard Newcombe 2006:142).
not unexpected—and the role of English as a medium of instruction more specifically will be in focus in the next section.

2.2 English as a medium of instruction

As seen from the brief overview above, there is a wide range of definitions and practices in the educational option of teaching and learning through the medium of a foreign language, yet English tends to be the most common language for all CLIL learning and teaching at all levels\(^\text{19}\) (Smit & Dafouz 2012:1). Indeed, some even ask if the term CLIL should not rather be CEIL or Content and English Integrated Learning, as the language is usually English in all contexts (Dalton-Puffer 2011:182). While previously, English-medium instruction may have been due to colonisation, currently EMI is seen as a means of increasing both “individual and national capital” (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:34). Gardner (2012:253-254) identifies three reasons English has dominated CLIL practice:

1) CLIL is believed to “produce fluent users of English.”
2) CLIL focuses on “the reality of global English” rather than the limitations of a native-speaker culture (i.e. American or British).
3) CLIL addresses the fact that many children are exposed to English outside of the classroom anyway.

The first two reasons resonate in Lim Falk’s three reasons for offering instruction through a foreign language in Sweden (see Chapter 1), with their focus on proficiency and globalisation. Dalton-Puffer (2007:45) also addresses the second reason when she states that CLIL tends to be in EMI in the European context due to the role of global English. Gardner’s third reason is reflected in recent research on the role of extramural English, such as Olsson 2012 (see Section 3.3), but actually contradicts Dalton-Puffer’s definition of the target language of CLIL as a language only used in the classroom—not extramurally.

English is both the most common language taught as a foreign language in primary schools and the most common language as a subject at tertiary level and in teacher education in Europe (Hélot 2012:218). When, how and why non-native speakers of English choose or are required to study English or study through English has been the object of much research. Even deciding what we mean by “English” (both whose and which variety) has been the

\(^\text{19}\) Although the vast majority of European research focuses on English-medium CLIL, there is a growing interest in what is known as CLIL-LOTE, or CLIL through languages other than English. See http://clil-lote-start.ecml.at. See also http://clilig.uta.fi/clilig/ about CLIL in German.
topic of debate (see e.g. Seidlhofer & Jenkins 2003). Deciding upon and applying labels to English-language learners and the varieties they use can be seen either as necessary or as limiting. One main distinction is between those who have English as a “native” language (ENL) and those who have it as a “foreign” language (EFL), although even these distinctions can be somewhat ambiguous in today’s ever more mobile population. Smit and Dafouz (2012:4) maintain that instruction through the medium of English, EMI, tends to focus on the content more than the language (citing Unterberger & Wilhelmer 2011:95), in contrast to the aims of integration practices of CLIL. Another label used is English-medium education, or EME, which is on the rise in higher education throughout the world. According to Gardner, who limits the term EME to tertiary levels, the increase in EME is due to three factors: 1) English is the language of scientific publications; 2) English facilitates greater student mobility (e.g. Erasmus exchanges between European universities); and 3) English is a natural language for tertiary education for students who attended EMI programs in their secondary schooling (2012:256-257). In English-language primary and secondary school contexts (e.g. the US or the UK), learners without English as a mother tongue are often described as ESL (English as a second language) or EAL (English as an additional language) students. Finally, while all of the above designations describe learners or education, one category outside of schools is ELF, or English as a lingua franca. ELF may be used by speakers of other languages in a variety of contexts (e.g. work environments).

In the EU, there are many reasons for the broad spread of English, among them the great demand for English in both personal (e.g. social media) and professional (i.e. employment and education) domains. The view of English as a global language even beyond the EU has two sides: “the increasing adoption and appropriation of English among communities across the world, as well as the growing belief that English has become the language for global communication” (Park & Wee 2012:3). The concepts of internationalisation and globalisation in relation to the spread of English tend to be used interchangeably, although there is indeed a difference:

*Internationalisation* is more concerned with foreign trade, language skills, trips aboard, and student exchange programs, but separate individual nationalities still form the basis for these exchanges. *Globalisation*, however, describes the process, by which our economic conditions, our ideas, our commerce habits, and identity are not determined within the framework of a nationality but rather by events that can take place anywhere in the world. (Josephson 2011:60)

---

20 For more on Erasmus exchanges within the EU, see [http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/erasmus_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/education/lifelong-learning-programme/erasmus_en.htm).
Both internationalisation and globalisation have been identified as reasons for the spread of CLIL and other forms of instruction through a foreign language (Lim Falk 2008; Dalton-Puffer 2007, 2008). Offering students the option of CLIL can ensure their possibilities “to stand their grounds in international contexts,” a main reason for the boom in this educational form since the 1990’s (Dalton-Puffer 2008:1-2).

2.3 Summary
This chapter has presented a brief overview of definitions, practices, and beliefs about teaching content through a foreign language, with an emphasis on CLIL and English as a medium of instruction. “Global English” is affecting “the identities, perspectives and everyday practices of children and teachers around the world” (Gardner 2012:248), not the least in the classroom—and Sweden is no exception, as will be explored more in the next chapter.
3 The Swedish context

The understanding of the role of the English language in Sweden contributes to the understanding of how English-medium instruction can be offered, chosen and practiced in the Swedish context. This chapter presents English in relation to language ideology and policy, education, and the lives of Swedish youth, followed by previous research on content instruction through a foreign language in Sweden.

3.1 English in Swedish society

3.1.1 Use and language ideology

The linguistic landscape of a context (such as advertising, place names, public information, and commercial shop names) reveals the role of languages within that specific context (Shohamy 2012). In Sweden, the English language is everywhere: on the television and radio, at the cinema, in social media, on the computer; and Swedish culture generally has an Anglo-American orientation. English is a common and often necessary part of everyday work life in Sweden as well. For example, one study reports that 29% of Swedes had actively used English at least four times in the last week (Kristiansen & Vikør 2006). The fact that English is prevalent in Swedish society like no other second language is a given, for both academics and the society at large (Josephson 2004:7). Swedes use English not only as a social language peppered with catchy phrases and quotes from films and celebrities, but also in academic texts where a researcher can easily decide to not even translate a quote from an English-language journal (ibid.11). Thus, Swedes are getting English both “bottom up” in popular media and “top-down” in academia (Nyström Höög 2013). The ubiquitous presence of English can be attributed historically to both an identity as and an ambition of Sweden as a modern nation (Oakes 2001), ready to meet increasing globalisation.

Swedes generally think they speak decent, if not good, English, regardless of their educational background (Nyström Höög 2005:173). Perhaps due to this confidence, Swedes also manage well in English. Hyltenstam (2004:53-54) lists four possible reasons for their English language proficiency:
1) Swedes travel widely and frequently.
2) English is heard and used daily in Swedish media, and access to English-medium media is abundant.
3) Swedes are generally interested in learning and using English.
4) Swedish and English are relatively close languages, making the acquisition of English fairly straightforward for many Swedes.

Another reason is possibly the fact that Swedish is often considered a “small language;” and with approximately 9 million speakers, Swedes will usually need to use another language when interacting with others outside of the country (e.g. in international business contacts), though it is possible for Swedes to interact in their own language with Norwegians and Danes.

Sweden has become more internationalised in the last decades²¹, with an increase in the number of citizens with mother tongues other than Swedish and an increase in the role of English in Swedish society (Josephson 2011:61). Today, at least 20% of Swedish students in compulsory schools are multilingual (Statistiska centralbyrån 2013:433), although this percentage increases dramatically in certain areas and schools. In the three large cities, Stockholm, Malmö and Gothenburg, around 32% of the students are multilingual, while in some schools the number jumps to over 90% (Lindberg 2007:57). Still, English has a much greater effect on the Swedish language than the increase in different mother tongues. As such, although there are more than 150 languages spoken in Sweden, concerns about foreign language dominance are limited to the perceived risks of English dominating in various Swedish domains (Hyltenstam 2004:49-50). Salö (2013:1), for example, argues that English has become a “linguistic problem” in Sweden: “That is, activities perceived as being national are understood as gradually becoming superseded by the sole use of English linguistic goods, which in turn devalues Swedish as a linguistic resource.”

There are three ways in which English affects Swedish (Josephson 2004:7-8; 2011:69):

1) New words are imported from English into the Swedish language.
2) Swedes tend to code-switch between English and Swedish in everyday language.
3) English is increasingly the language of choice in certain domains, such as large Swedish companies.

²¹ In 2012, 82,597 individuals immigrated to Sweden, with the largest groups of immigrants from Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia, Poland, Iraq, Denmark, China, Thailand, and Finland. (http://www.migrationsverket.se/info/2552.html). Last accessed November 2013.
Swedes of all ages express a resistance to the prevalence of English loan words in the Swedish language, yet they still tend to use them in their own speech (Nyström Höög 2005:77), albeit less in certain domains (such as religious contexts) and more in others (such as computers and Internet) (ibid.167). Josephson (2011:82), in his reflection on the place of English in Sweden, does not see the increase of English in Swedish society as a problem per se (wryly noting that it is a “victory for public education” that Swedes are so proficient in English), but the spread does become problematic if entire Swedish domains are replaced with English. He gives the examples of academic theses written only in English (87% of doctoral theses are written in English in Sweden, Salö 2010:23) or conferences held only in English, noting that if Swedish loses a domain, “This is how a language dies, not through loan words and code-switching.”

Kristiansen has been studying the role of English in Nordic countries since 2001(Kristiansen & Sandøy 2010:1), with a special focus on the attitudes towards English influence on the mother tongue in the community (e.g. Swedish, Norwegian, Danish) as evidence of language ideology. Kristiansen found that Swedes are most “positive to the idea of English as mankind’s only language” (2010:69), compared to other Nordic communities. However, he also notes that this is not as straightforward as it may sound, as Swedes were a little less positive when presented with examples of Swedish speech peppered with English loan words. Older Swedes are, in general, less positive about the influence of English on Swedish than younger Swedes (ibid.77). Age affects the attitudes towards English in Swedish society the most, although levels of education and regular use of a computer also play a role. In general, younger Swedes may be more positive to English simply because they are more used to using it on a regular basis (Kristiansen 2010:69). Still, while Swedes use English frequently both at work and outside of work, most do not think that the Swedish population in general would be able to use it as the language of communication for official civic information (Nyström Höög 2005:173).

Issues such as the ones presented above—language and identity, language use, and language change—are issues of language ideology (cf. Hyltenstam & Milani 2012). Language ideology “includes ideas, values and beliefs about language, and not only about specific languages/varieties or linguistic features, but also about other phenomena related to language and language usage” (Wingstedt 1998:24). Some opinions about language are taken for granted, meaning that they are deemed to be unquestionable “common sense” (Hyltenstam 2004:41). These common sense assumptions become normal to those in the context and only become obvious when challenged (Wingstedt 1998:16).

Despite the generally positive attitude towards English, there has been an active and sometimes heated debate about the role of English in Swedish society, much based on a common sense assumption about the dominance of
the language some researchers hold. For example, one debate has been on the proposal to mandate English as a foreign language already in the first year of compulsory schooling\textsuperscript{22}, one strongly opposed by several leading actors in the Swedish academic elite in an exchange in the daily national newspaper, \textit{Svenska Dagbladet} (December 2009). Their argument is that introducing a foreign language so early would harm the development of the pupils’ mother tongue, Swedish (that may actually be the student’s second language in areas with highly diverse populations). Lindberg counters that there is no support for the argument that early exposure to another language will harm the development of the mother tongue (2010:n.p). She also emphasises the need not only for English, but for other foreign languages to be introduced early in Swedish educational settings, especially in light of the EU goal that citizens learn two languages beyond their mother tongue.

The present language ideology regarding English in the Swedish context can be summarised as twofold: 1) On the one hand, English is welcomed, supported officially in education\textsuperscript{23} and used widely in the media, with Swedes confident in their own proficiency, 2) On the other, English is increasingly dominating several areas of everyday life, which some believe may render certain domains in the Swedish language at risk. Although one might say English has basically reached second language status in Sweden, as a second language is one that is needed by all members of a society in order to function in their everyday life (Hyltenstam 2004:52), this application of the designation is neither official nor undisputed, as seen from the discussion above. Still, English retains a special role in the Swedish context, as seen in language policy, presented briefly below.

3.1.2 Language policy

In 2002, the report with an action program \textit{Mål i mun: Förslag till handlingssprogram för svenska språket} (English title: \textit{Speech: Draft Action Programme for the Swedish Language}) was published, stating:

1) Swedish shall be a complete language, serving and uniting our society.
2) Swedish in official and public use shall be correct and shall function well.
3) Everyone shall have a right to language: Swedish, their mother tongue and foreign languages. (2002:2)


\textsuperscript{22} It should be noted that many compulsory schools already introduce English in the first year of their own initiative.

\textsuperscript{23} See Section 3.2 below.
English title: Language for All). In July of 2009, the government adopted Sweden’s first legislation regarding a principle language (SFS 2009:600), although this decision was not without debate (see Hyltenstam & Milani 2012 for an overview of the process and debate).

According to the official Language Council of Sweden, this language policy developed in response to the increasingly influential role of English in Swedish society and to the explosion of the number of citizens with mother tongues other than Swedish. The Language Act is “intended to protect the Swedish language and language diversity in Sweden, and the individual’s access to language” (2009:n.p.), meaning both access to Swedish, to any other mother tongue and to foreign languages. The Language Act also safeguards the use and development of the official minority languages (Finnish, Yiddish, Meänkieli, Romany Chib and Sami) and Swedish sign language. Therefore, the Language Act both promotes Swedish as the principle language of Sweden and promotes multilingualism in the present day society.

Although English has no official status in Sweden, it was the only foreign language to be specifically addressed in the original report Speech that eventually led to the Language Act: “English has won an increasingly strong position internationally, thereby also becoming a more and more important language in our country” (2002:1). The role of English in certain domains (e.g. education and research) was seen as particularly problematic, leading to the need for a plan of action:

If we switch to the exclusive use of English in certain connections, Swedish will cease to develop in these areas. In the longer term, this will give rise to domain losses; Swedish terms and concepts will no longer be produced and the position of Swedish in Sweden will weaken. At the same time, it is obvious that in many contexts it is necessary to employ English and that more and more people need increasing proficiency in English. What can we do to ensure that Swedish continues to develop as an all-round language, while not hindering the employment of English in all the connections in which its use is required, and making sure that everyone acquires the knowledge of English they need? (2002:1)

Thus, language policy in Sweden, with the declared aim of ensuring the status of Swedish, endorses multilingualism but focuses on the perceived domain struggle between Swedish and English (see, for example, Hult 2010), resulting in a policy aimed at including many languages other than Swedish (e.g. minority languages and foreign languages in schools) but in practice concentrating mainly on one (English). (See Hult 2004 for more on the policy in relation to minority languages.)
3.2 English in Swedish schools

Swedish students will need English to competently and competitively function in their future professional lives, both within and outside of Sweden (Hyltenstam 2004:38); and in response to this the Swedish education system provides English as a subject already from an early age. English has been a required part of the curriculum since 1962, as a core subject together with content subjects like Maths and Biology. English as a subject has one syllabus whilst all other “modern languages” (e.g. Spanish and French) are grouped together in one syllabus. According to the national curriculum, students are guaranteed 480 hours of instruction in English as a subject during their compulsory schools years (1-9), and there are official syllabi for Grades 1-3, Grades 4-6, and Grades 6-9. See Table 1 for an overview of English in Swedish schools at all levels.

Table 1: English as a foreign language subject in Swedish schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Compulsory school</th>
<th>Non-compulsory school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades</td>
<td>Primary 24</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades 1-6</td>
<td>Grades 7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>7-12 years</td>
<td>13-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Curriculum requirements</td>
<td>480 hours of English</td>
<td>English 5 required for all programs of study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National testing of English</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the upper secondary school is not a compulsory form of schooling in Sweden, most students choose to study one of the nationally recognised three-year programs and will be obliged to study at least 100 of hours of English language as a required course for all programs, i.e. vocational and university preparatory programs. (See Chapter 6 for a description of program in upper secondary education.) The general academic goals of English as a foreign language in the upper secondary school are as follows:

1) Understanding of spoken and written English, and also the ability to interpret content.
2) The ability to express oneself and communicate in English in speech and writing.
3) The ability to use different language strategies in different contexts.
4) The ability to adapt language to different purposes, recipients and situations.

24 Swedish children may start “0-Class” (förskoleklass in Swedish) the year they turn 6.
Three consecutive English courses are offered: English 5, English 6, and English 7. Each course comprises 100 credits, or 100 hours of study time (but not necessarily actual instruction time). English 5 is obligatory for all programs of study (together with other obligatory courses, e.g. Swedish, History, Maths), while English 6 is obligatory on university preparatory programs. English 7 is offered as an elective or a special area of study on university preparatory programs.

3.3 English and Swedish youth

Swedish youth have long performed exceptionally well in international studies on youth and English language proficiency in various countries (Hyltenstam 2004:54). In 2002, a random selection of 1,431 Swedish ninth graders participated in The Assessment of Pupils’ Skills in English in Eight European Countries, an assessment of the English skills (listening comprehension, accuracy, reading comprehension and writing) of youth in eight countries (Erickson 2004; also Alabau & Bonnet 2002). Along with the Norwegian students, the Swedish ninth-graders performed the best of all participants, with the exception of accuracy, as Finnish students excelled in this task. In general, the Swedish students judged the tasks as much easier than their peers from other European countries did (ibid.42). They considered their own proficiency in English to be high: 93% thought they could easily follow English radio and television programs (ibid.43). Erickson concludes that Swedish students have high proficiency in English, especially in receptive skills. This was confirmed in results of the European Survey on Language Competences conducted in 2011. Ninth-graders from fourteen countries participated and were tested on the two most commonly studied foreign languages in their own country (English and Spanish for Sweden). Together with Malta, where English is an official language, Swedish youth scored at top levels in English, with 82% reaching the level of independent users, compared to 14% in France for English and 9% in England for French (2012:5). In contrast, only 4% of the Swedish participants reached the same level in the second most common foreign language, Spanish.

English as a school subject may be classified as English as a foreign language (EFL) in the Swedish context, but in reality the students are learning much of their English outside of the classroom, as popular culture plays a large role in the spread of English everywhere (Gardner 2012:249). Sundqvist (2009:10) makes the argument that this distinction between learning English in the classroom or outside of the classroom means that any
labels of English as a foreign language are not as clear today as previously. She calls the out-of-class English use of Swedish students extramural English, “a term that covers aspects of both input and output” (ibid.25):

In extramural English, no degree of deliberate intention to acquire English is necessary on the part of the learner, even though deliberate intention is by no means excluded from the concept. But what is important is that the learner comes in contact with or is involved in English outside the walls of the English classroom. This contact or involvement may be due to the learner’s deliberate (thus conscious) intent to create situations for learning English, but it may equally well be to any other reason the learner may have. (ibid.)

In her study on Swedish ninth-graders (last year of compulsory secondary school) and extramural English, Sundqvist found that the majority of the students spend time in English-language activities. This exposure to English outside of the classroom can manifest itself in a variety of forms, such as computer games and social media. The most common activities include listening to music, playing video games, watching TV and films, and spending time on the Internet. Reading books, magazines and newspapers are least common. Swedish boys tend to use a wider variety of English media as well as engage in activities in English to a greater extent than Swedish girls (see also Oscarson & Apelgren 2005; Sylvén 2004). Both Sundqvist (2009:129) and Olsson (2012:124) found that the most usual activity for boys in English is listening to music with English lyrics. According to Olsson (2012:11), extramural English is associated with pleasure, thus increasing student motivation to use it. In general, the research indicates that those students who have a wide access to and a more frequent use of English outside of the classroom also tend to manage their English studies in school better, with better grades and wider vocabularies the positive consequence. Students often claim they learn more English outside of school than in school25 (Sundqvist 2009:201).

3.4 Teaching content through English in Sweden

In the early proposals for addressing the spread of English in Sweden, the Language Council of Sweden considered, among other things, the apparent increasing popularity of English-medium schools for Swedish students. In the educational context in Sweden, policy makers suggest that an increase may affect the status of Swedish negatively, with Swedish “less frequently perceived as a language for academic/research purposes, potentially leading

---

25 Compare this, for example, to Austria, where all film and television is dubbed in German, limiting extramural English contact to some popular music on the radio (Dalton-Puffer 2007:52).
to a loss of higher level Swedish use” (Hult 2005:75). In the 2002 proposition, education is specifically addressed in the following recommendation:

With respect to compulsory and upper secondary school, the action program contains the following measures:
1. In all schools in which classes are held in foreign languages (content and language integrated learning and teaching, or SPRINT), such programs shall be monitored closely and evaluated on a continuous basis.
2. In cases where SPRINT is practised extensively, the legal basis of this type of education shall be established by special regulations.
3. The regulatory framework for upper secondary school shall be amended to require schools to teach Swedish in all years of upper secondary education. (2002:3)

The council felt a need to call for all teachers in all Swedish schools—from primary schools through universities—to actually be proficient in Swedish. Swedish should be the only language for teaching and exams for undergraduate university studies. Furthermore, students wishing to study at the graduate level should know Swedish at a C level, a level specified on the Common European Reference Framework for Languages. For compulsory school students in bilingual programs, the Swedish requirements should be as strict as the English. Interestingly, very little action has been taken according to the recommendations above. There is currently no close monitoring of schools teaching content through a foreign language, no legal issues, and no regulation at all at the upper secondary level. However, there has been some monitoring of the compulsory school level and a report on the status of the option was published in November 2010 by the Swedish National Agency for Education (see Chapter 6).

Dentler, in her contribution to an overview of CLIL in the European context, considers content teaching in a foreign language to be controversial in Sweden, partly due to the high status of the English language and partly due to the perceived status of other foreign languages as difficult to learn (2007:166). The latter problem is not addressed clearly by the national government or the school authorities, allowing English to maintain its favoured position, especially among youth. Thus, she concludes, it is not so strange that the majority of schools choosing to offer the educational option are also choosing English-medium instruction. Most Swedes could consider having English as a language of instruction while only a few could consider other languages of instruction, such as German, French or Spanish (Wingstedt 1998:294-295). As Hyltenstam notes, in the Swedish context, English has a higher status than Swedish (globally if not locally as well), rendering English in schools a political question. Therefore, he questions whether English-medium instruction is an appropriate choice as the students may lose interest in maintaining a mother tongue with lower status if education can be offered in a language with high status (2004:69).
3.4.1 Previous research

Despite calls for the monitoring of EMI/CLIL, few researchers have investigated the option in the last 25 years. Four key doctoral theses are presented here, each with a focus specifically on English-medium instruction in the upper secondary school, followed by more recent research in the field.

Washburn (1997) wrote the first thesis to address content teaching through a foreign language in Sweden. Her informants were 25 “English immersion” students (native Swedish speakers) participating in a late partial immersion program of studies, plus one control class. Her two-year study was partially ethnographically inspired, including observations (informal) and interviews with teachers, parents, and students (random). Other methods included text analysis, oral production and analysis, background and attitude questionnaires, and English use questionnaires. Washburn found that the English immersion students were more fluent in writing and speaking, more confident in their language skills, and more motivated, but that there were no significant differences between immersion and traditional students in grades and actual proficiency in English. The EMI students believed, however, they would have done better in school with Swedish as the medium of instruction as they had lower grades than the control group, despite higher grades upon entrance into upper secondary school. Also, the EMI students did not actually earn better grades in English than the control group, despite their own confidence. Teachers believed that the students did not learn the subject matter as well in English. In general, Washburn’s study cannot be seen as an argument for or against EMI (Hyltenstam 2004:80), although the study is seminal in that it set the scene for Swedish research on the option.

Sylvén (2004) utilised a mainly quantitative approach, including vocabulary tests and error analysis, in her study of four schools (363 students) with content instruction through English (identified as CLIL schools) in mid-sized cities over the period of two school years. While Sylvén’s findings indicate that the CLIL students did indeed acquire a larger English vocabulary than the control group over the course of the study, she concludes that extra-curricular English is more important than school English and that CLIL students are already outperforming their peers from the onset. Other factors contribute to vocabulary acquisition, such as motivation and attitude. CLIL students also use different approaches than their peers when learning new words. Sylvén closes her study noting that there are many areas of this educational option still needing investigation, especially concerning the teachers’ language proficiency and the students’ active participation in the lessons.

Prior to Lim Falk’s study (2008), there were no larger studies about the effects that teaching content through a foreign language have on the students’ mother tongue, Swedish (albeit, there were some bachelor and masters theses on the subject). Lim Falk studied two classes, one with English
and one with Swedish as the language of instruction, in the same program at the same school and aimed to make this a study on the culture of Swedish CLIL. The longitudinal study (three years) included interviews, questionnaires, observations of classroom practice, and analysis of student texts. Some of the conclusions are that CLIL students use subject-specific language less confidently in English-medium content lessons than Swedish program students do in Swedish, that the Swedish language is needed for interaction, and that English is considered an “obstacle” by and for students in CLIL schools.

Edlund (2011) also investigated CLIL students’ language proficiency, with a focus on their written English from a genre perspective based in systemic functional linguistics. He compared a group of students on a CLIL program with those on the same program of study, but in Swedish, as well as with a group of Sixth Form College students in the UK with English as their mother tongue. An analysis of register awareness found no significant differences among the three groups. An analysis of lexical variation, however, showed a greater difference between the CLIL students and the students on the Swedish-medium program. While the CLIL students did not express the same lexical range as the British students, these two groups were on the same level as regards lexical variation in the texts.

More recently, Lim Falk (forthcoming) has investigated the relationship between CLIL and the Language Act of 2009, exploring how the declared language policy is reflected (or not) in the de facto, or practiced, language policies of the micro contexts of three different schools offering EMI. As seen above and in Chapter 6, as there are no official guidelines or mandates concerning the educational option in Sweden. The schools have no official local language policies, but she has identified three types of de facto policy according to their practice: monilingual English, bilingual English-Swedish, and “ad hoc”—or no consistent policy evidenced by practice (cf. Risager 2012 on de facto language policies at the tertiary level). Lim Falk maintains that offering instruction solely through the medium of an additional language (the monilingual policy) is incompatible with the Language Act. She calls for more research into the multiple layers of language policy in relation to the practice of the educational option.

3.5 Summary

No other language nears the status of English in Sweden. The English language maintains a special place in the Swedish society as seen in its presence in daily language use, language policy, the educational system and the lives of youth. The prevalence of English is reflected not only in popular views about the role of English in Swedish society but also in the views on how English pervades certain domains, not least the classroom.
4 Theoretical framework

The present research is exploratory, seeking to describe as well as to explain. The vantage points of the study moved from outside the classroom, through the schools and into the classroom, for a holistic view of English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school today. The theoretical framework of this thesis includes the ecology of language perspective and concepts addressing language use.

4.1 Ecology of language

The main theoretical perspective in the present study is ecology of language, an approach with a focus on language in a context (van Lier 2004:24). Three principles from this approach guide the present investigation (ibid.55-56):

1) Language surrounds the learner in all its complexity and variety.
2) Language is embedded in the physical and social world, and is part of other meaning-making systems.
3) Language learning and language use cannot be clearly distinguished from one another, and both form part of activity and interaction.

Ecology of language offers a sociocultural perspective with its focus on how actions are situated in a social context and with a clear emphasis on “place, roles, and uses of language” (ibid.49). While some theories of language learning view learning as originating from outside the learner, sociocultural perspectives view learning as co-constructed with other participants. The knowledge constructed in collaboration with others is internalised in the individual through the interaction with other participants and with the environment. Thus, both learning and development occur in and through participation in social practices (Säljö 2000:236). Tsui further elaborates:

Sociocultural theories of learning conceptualize the relationship between the learner and the social world as dialectical and mediated by cultural artefacts, among which language is primary. Learners are not just passive recipients of language input and teachers are not just providers of input. Rather, the learners, the teacher, and the sociocultural context in which the discourse takes place are constitutive of what is being. (2011:278)
As dialogical, language is no longer a mere *product* but rather a *process*, with participants “creating, co-creating, sharing, and exchanging meanings across speakers, time and space” (Candlin 2013:2).

By way of an ecological study, the aim of the present thesis is to investigate the dynamic relationships between languages (here, specifically Swedish and English), participants (i.e. learners and teachers) and the learning environment (both *in* and *with*). A study of these relationships looks for patterns, with a focus on “activity and perception, guidance and participation, emergence of language; physical, social and symbolic affordances; and socialization” (van Lier 2004:45). Three concepts positioned within the main ecological perspective are important to understanding the practice in Swedish upper secondary schools offering content instruction through a foreign language: context, affordances, and scaffolding.

4.1.1 Context

At the core of the ecological perspective is the centrality of context. Language is not just part of context nor is context just “something that surrounds language”—rather, language is “defined by it” (van Lier 2004:5, original italics). This description of context stems from ecology theorist Bronfenbrenner’s early descriptions of the four nested systems in the environment: micro, meso, exo, and macro (1976; 1979). Originally, this system of context was designed for understanding the child’s development over time, but the concept of context is also useful in classroom research. The aim of the consideration of context in ecological research is not to simply form neat categories of separate levels, i.e. macro or micro (the two levels in focus here). Context should not either be seen as linear relationships, which levels might suggest. Instead of layers defined as “that which surrounds,” context can be seen as interwoven threads (Cole 1996:135). The aim must be to see how the different parts and levels relate to one another and how these relationships can be seen in the light of the investigation at hand, as “context is potentially everything and contextualisation is potentially infinite” (Blommaert 2005:40, original italics).

The context in which language is embedded comprises three parts (van Lier 2010:599): 1) the physical world (objects and spatio-temporal relationships), 2) the social world (other people sharing the meaning-making), and 3) the symbolic world (e.g. thoughts, feelings, cultural practices). Although language ecology encompasses a sociocultural view, one difference between general sociocultural theory and the language ecology perspective is that within the latter, the context includes the physical aspect in addition to the social (van Lier 2004:18). In school-based research, the physical world includes the classrooms, school buildings, and tangible artefacts as well as the temporal aspects of lessons, terms, and school years. The social world is inhabited by participants, including students, teachers, and parents, who
together contribute to the meaning-making going on within the physical world. Least tangibly, the symbolic world encompasses the actual processes of meaning-making and social interaction taking place, with all of the influences from within the participants as well as from the outer macro context of school culture, community culture, national culture and more.

Regarding these different levels in context-based research, the goal is to understand events in this particular context—and not to compare the context with other contexts (van Lier 1988:2). Otherwise, the risk is that the focus is only on material that provides a clear differentiation between the two contexts, rather than a thorough analysis of the chosen context. When data is analysed taking the context in consideration, that data is both described and explained. The explanation comes from seeing how the data fits in the context and understanding how the action occurs in a context (ibid.11). Not only is everything the participants say and do influenced by everything that happened before, but it also influences the subsequent actions (ibid.9).

This study focuses on the macro level of Swedish society and the educational system and the micro level of the classroom and school. The macro level in this particular study was introduced in the background, prior to this chapter. The micro levels of the schools and classrooms are introduced in the next chapter. Studies of the macro context focus on the entire populations of individuals, while studies of the micro context focus on the social interaction between individuals (Turner 1988:14 in van Lier 2004:203). Beliefs that are socially and institutionally defined can affect learning in the classroom at the micro-level (Sullivan 2000:115). This may include common sense assumptions. In the present study, one aim is to understand how the actions, beliefs and attitudes of the participants at the micro level are influenced and shaped by those proposed or supported at the macro level, or not.

4.1.2 Affordances

The concept of affordances, first coined by Gibson (1979), refers to what is available in the environment for use by the participants. Affordances exist in all parts of micro and macro contexts (physical, social and symbolic) and can be described as action potential or a relation of possibility between perception and action, or as either an opportunity or an inhibition (van Lier 2004:4). This means that affordances can both offer possibilities within an environment as well as hinder them (e.g. a computer may afford possible ease of writing an assignment but may also afford an obstacle with the temptations of the Internet). All affordances are dialogical, as all involve the participant interacting with some potential in the environment (ibid.112, 115). The relationship between the perception and the action is reciprocal, as is the relationship between the learner who is doing the perceiving and the affordance that is being perceived (van Lier 2010:598; 2004a:96). Still, an affordance is only a “precondition for activity” and the presence of this pos-
sibility of activity does not mean that it will necessarily occur. Only after the relevant material or object is noticed by the participants may it be used or acted upon. Thus, participants detect certain possibilities in their learning environment and this detection leads to action.

Learning is dynamic and characterised by potential affordances, or “purposeful activity and participation by the learner and the perceptual, cognitive, and emotional engagement that such activity stimulates” (van Lier 1997:783). In the language classroom, language is both an affordance and a goal. However, affordances are not merely single items of language (words or phrases produced as instructions or directives) but rather “relations between the active learner and elements in the environment” (van Lier 2004:53)—indicating a focus on the process of languaging (see Section 4.2.1 below) rather than language as a product. Therefore, language as an affordance cannot be identified and counted as units of input, but rather refers to the relationship which exists between the participant and her environment.

In the present study, the focus is on the relationships between the participants in the classroom (i.e. students and teachers) and the actual classroom environment, including all “physical, social and symbolic affordances that provide grounds for activity” (ibid.4-5), but in particular on language practices such as translanguaging (see Section 4.2.1 below) as an affordance in the micro and macro contexts.

4.1.3 Scaffolding

While affordances offer a general potential for action in a context, scaffolding offers specific assistance in actions. Scaffolding can be defined as “a process of ‘setting up’ the situation to make the child’s entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilful enough to manage it” (Bruner 1983:60). Scaffolding was first used to describe the relationship between a parent and child and how a more capable adult assists a child, but has been extended to use in the classroom. In the classroom context, scaffolding offers specific support designed to provide the required assistance for learners to manage tasks that would otherwise not be possible to manage on their own (Hammond & Gibbons 2001). The notion has further widened from teacher-student assistance to include assisted performance of peers, who may or may not be on the same level (Lindberg 2013; Swain & Lapkin 1998).

Scaffolding has a place in the interactionist framework of Vygotskian theory (Hammond & Gibbons 2005:8). Although Vygotsky never used scaffolding himself, nor was he ever in the classroom, his idea of the zone of proximal development reflects the notion of scaffolding:

It [the zone of proximal development] is the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level
of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult
guidance, or in collaboration with more able peers. (1978:86)

It is in the interaction between the participants in a classroom context (learners
and learners or teachers and learners) and in this zone of proximal develop-
ment that new learning takes place as the interaction allows for internali-
sation (Vygotsky 1986). Scaffolding occurs when learners engage in collabora-
tive activity and subsequently co-construct linguistic knowledge (Swain
& Suzuki 2010:564). It needs to be both timely and temporary, meaning that
it is offered at the point of need but also only as long as needed to enable
more independent learning. However, it should not be misunderstood as
simply the teacher helping the students complete a task or as any teaching or
helping (van Lier 2004:15). Maybin, Mercer and Stierer (1992:188) elabo-
rate:

[Scaffolding is] help which will enable a learner to accomplish a task which
they would not have been quite able to manage on their own, and it is help
which is intended to bring the learner closer to a state of competence which
will enable them eventually to complete such a task on their own.

In this thesis, the role of scaffolding in patterns of language alternation is
explored, especially in relation to academic language.

4.2 Language use

It should be noted that much of the previous research on multilingualism in
the school has focused on language maintenance of minority language
speakers or on transitional schooling for second language speakers. In this
study, however, the students bring their majority language (Swedish) with
them to the school and encounter the “foreign” language of English in the
classroom, where it is used as the main language of instruction. This diffe-
rence in the informants and context is important to the understanding of the
present research and the role of the following key concepts related to lan-
guage use: language alternation, academic language and language hierarchy.

4.2.1 Language alternation

Language alternation26 in the classroom—whether the instruction is nomi-
ally in one or more languages—is a fact. Many studies of language alternation
focus on the notion of code-switching, defined by Myers-Scotton (1993:1) as
“alternations of linguistic varieties within the same conversation,” when

26 Research on language alternation is an enormous field and most aspects will not be covered
in this thesis.
speakers do not know a word or a phrase in one language or feel they can express it more effectively in another language. Researchers, however, are not in complete agreement as to what exactly code-switching encompasses in its definition and how it might differentiate from other types of language alternation (Gardner-Chloros 2009:12-13). It is known, however, that alternating language choices can occur at different levels, for example at clause boundary levels (also known as inter-sentential code-switching), within a sentence or phrase (also known as intra-sentential code-switching) as well as within a single word (such as conjugating a verb from one language according to the rules of another language) (Lin & Li 2012:470).

The role of language alternation in the classroom has not always been clear; and researchers and educators have debated the potential advantages or disadvantages of the practice. Traditionally, languages have always been kept separate in bilingual educational settings (Creese & Blackledge 2011:5). For some, there is a kind of “moral disapproval” of language alternation in both the language classroom and the content classroom (ibid.7), with certain researchers even “openly hostile” to the practice in the bilingual classroom (Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:27). Language alternation may be considered a “lazy” and undesirable practice, even by those who engage in it (Gardner-Chloros 2009:15). The practice has been discouraged in schools due to the belief that it will “influence one or both of the languages and lead to language decay” (Auerbach 1993:8, in Van der Walt 2009:31) and the belief that the practice reflects “the speaker-writers’ inability to express themselves properly in one ‘pure’ language or another” (Lin & Li 2012:470).

In the traditional view of code-switching, language is often considered as fixed codes or compartmentalised. **Languaging**, however, goes beyond this, seeing the use of language—including language alternation—as an activity. Speakers engage in languaging when they interact (Swain 2006; Swain & Suzuki 2010). Languaging as a process involves using language for “…solving problems about language, [and] explaining, reflecting on, describing […]”(Swain & Suzuki 2010:565). This concept of using language to learn language can be extended to using all one’s language resources for learning and even alternating languages in the process of learning, moving from **languaging to translanguaging**.

Translanguaging, from Welsh *trawsieithu*, was coined by Williams based on his experience with the Welsh school context and later broadened first by Baker (2011, also earlier works) and then by García (2009). It is a concept in opposition to monolingual instructional assumptions and is still under development (Canagarajah 2011a; Lewis, Jones, & Baker 2012b). It is clear, though, that translanguaging offers a move away both from a focus on language as a code to a focus on the speakers in a context and how they use language, and from compartmentalisation to concurrent use of two or more languages. From a theoretical vantage, the concept of translanguaging coun-
ters the implication of the term *code-switching* that indicates that there are actually specific different codes to switch, that languages are unique. Translanguaging, however, is more than the “concurrent use of two languages” (Lewis 2008:82). It is not simply switching between languages but rather the process of the development of two languages, with facilitation of the understanding of content in a classroom (ibid.). The practice allows for “… a deeper understanding than just translating as it moves from finding parallel words to processing meaning and understanding” (Williams 1996 in Lewis, Jones, & Baker 2012a:644); and it is just this possibility for processing the subject material that is key to the content and language integrated learning classroom.

In this thesis, translanguaging is specifically considered from a sociolinguistic perspective in relation to language alternation in the EMI classroom and explicitly to the functions of Swedish and English in content lessons. Using the concept may aid the focus on strategic language use and its role in the lesson phases of the English-medium classrooms. The decision was made to explore how this still-developing concept may shed light on how languages are used in the EMI practice in relation to the micro and macro contexts. There is no exact definition of translanguaging (Lewis et al. 2012a:641), and the present study seeks to contribute to the research on the practice.

### 4.2.2 Academic language

Academic language refers to the “disciplinary registers,” or the subject-specific language used in content teaching and for content assessment (Schleppegrell & O’Hallaron 2011:3), and is also described as “language that stands in contrast to the everyday informal speech that students use outside the classroom environment” (Bailey 2007:12). The delineation of everyday and academic language is not a simple dichotomy, however (see, e.g., Lindberg 2009 for a discussion). Academic language and everyday language are neither the same nor do they automatically develop simultaneously; still, there is no clear distinction between the two (Slotte-Lättge & Forsman 2013:19). Everyday language does tend to involve more contextual clues, whereas academic language tends to both be more cognitively challenging as well as more laden with uncommon terminology (ibid.). However, academic language is not limited to disciplinary language, but also includes non-specialised language that learners still need to know in order to manage academic texts. This includes words that may be everyday words that take on another meaning when used in an academic text, as well as words that are used across disciplines, for example *classify* (Bailey & Butler 2004:186). Thus, academic language can be specific to each subject as well as general to formal written language (Nygård Larsson 2013:580).
Learning to read, write, and interact using academic language requires support for language development that assists students in engaging with the communicative and literacy demands of disciplinary learning (Schleppegrell & O’Hallaron 2011:4). Competence in disciplinary registers includes both written and oral modes (ibid.11). Teachers can facilitate students’ acquisition of academic language and comprehension of subject material, for example, through reformulation or the use of multimodal resources (Nygård Lars-son 2008; 2011).

In this thesis, one aim is to understand the functions of language use and alternation in content teaching. In EMI lessons, two languages are used by teachers and students both to communicate and to acquire new content knowledge, and likewise new information, abstract ideas, and conceptual understanding (Bailey 2007:9). There is thus dual language use both with Swedish and English and with academic language and everyday language.

4.2.3 Language hierarchy

One aspect in the understanding of language use in the EMI classroom is how the participants perceive the value of the languages available, and how this may affect the local de facto language policies. According to Risager,

Language hierarchies may be strong explicit or implicit factors in the development of language policies that define the frames for the distribution of the use of different languages. Language policies, whether explicit or implicit, may differ very much as to what parts of the language hierarchies they promote and what categories of language they construct […]. (2012:112)

Risager identifies four levels of language hierarchy: “the global level, the regional level, the state level, and the institutional level” (ibid.118), and one can add the local level of the classroom to this description. One language may have a very different status at each level. This is also seen in Hyltenstam and Milani (2012:124), who employ Blommaert’s division of scales (2005; 2007) to describe three levels of Swedish according to hierarchy: first, Swedish is the dominant language of Sweden, in relation to both official minority languages and languages of immigrants; second, Swedish has an official status on the macro level of the European Union, albeit a lower one in comparison to dominant languages such as English and French; and third, Swedish holds a position in relation to the dominant global English in which it (Swedish) risks the dominance of English even in its own national arena.

The use of English or Swedish in the EMI classroom may reflect the perceived status of the languages. If the participants position the supposed benefits of Swedish against the same in English, this may affect how they then use the languages for different activities as well. In order to understand the
functions of their language choices in the classroom, it is important to understand how the roles of the two languages may be decided by the participants based on their perceptions of the placement of the languages according to real or assumed hierarchies. This thesis explores the roles.

4.3 Definitions of terms used in this thesis

Several definitions need to be addressed for this thesis.

There is a plethora of terms, concepts and definitions describing the practice of teaching content through a foreign language in any context, e.g. CLIL, SPRINT, immersion, bilingual education, and an all-encompassing immersive education (Le Pape Racine 2012). Many definitions do not reflect the complexity of the form of instruction, and the lack of standard terminology makes it “difficult even for specialists in the field to keep well informed” (Björklund & Mård-Miettinen 2011:17). In this thesis, CLIL and the Swedish equivalent SPRINT will be used when the research or the schools have identified themselves as such. EMI will be used for instruction through the medium of English, when the goal or the designation has not been specifically to integrate language and content, but only to teach the non-language content through the medium of English. That is, the term CLIL indicates equal focus on language and disciplinary content and the term EMI indicates the use of English to learn disciplinary content. CLIL is commonly used in the Swedish research context, but the decision not to use the term for all content instruction through a foreign language in this thesis is based on the definition of Dalton-Puffer (2011:183), who indicates that in CLIL practice, the foreign language of instruction is one that students will mainly encounter only in the classroom. By this, she means that extramural exposure is limited. Swedish students have vast exposure to English outside of the classroom. The decision not to use immersion is based on Hyltenstam’s criteria of immersion education (2004:68-69; also Section 2.1).

In this thesis, the decision has also been made to identify the first language of the informants as their mother tongue, even though there is some controversy on this term. For example, García (2009:57-58) cites several researchers who question the use of mother tongue, including Baker and Prys Jones (1998), who suggest that the term tends to imply a minority status (cf. Cummins 1986); and Kaplan and Baldauf (1997), who propose that a speaker may actually feel she is a native speaker of a language other than her parents; and Skutnabb-Kangas (1981), who suggests that the designation

---

27 This was, for example, the case during the pilot work for this thesis, when many students at an international school identified English as their mother tongue, even though their parents did not have English as a mother tongue nor did the students ever speak English with their parents in the home environment.
of one’s mother tongue may depend as much on criteria like language function or language competence as it does on language origin. Håkansson (2003:17) notes that the term has been used differently across Swedish educational history, and earlier was only a designation for Swedish as a school subject. The term is, however, used in official Swedish documents today, such as *Speech* (2002), by the National Agency for Education in Sweden (*modersmål*), and in EU documents on language learning, such as Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Usually, however, in the Swedish context, *mother tongue* refers to the first language of the immigrant population and is not usually used to denote Swedish as a first language in Sweden, as it was earlier in school policy documents. For example, “mother tongue provision” only refers to language instruction other than Swedish (Håkansson 2003:20).

The term *bilingual* is also not easily defined: Li Wei lists no fewer than 37 descriptions of what it means to be bilingual (2000:6-7). Is a bilingual individual one who has “native-like control of two languages,” an oft-cited description (Bloomfield 1933:55), or one who has “the ability to use more than one language” (Mackey 1962:52, both in Ng and Wigglesworth 2007:5)? The term *bilingual* can also mean that the speaker has the ability to use two languages receptively and productively in everyday situations (Baker 1993:13). This definition is accepted for this thesis; and as such, the Swedish informants are seen as bilingual speakers of Swedish and English. This also is supported by García’s definition of emerging bilinguals (2009:64) as individuals who develop their second languages later in life and not from birth (like most of the informants in this study). She explains, “Conceptualizing emergent bilinguals as sliding across a bilingual continuum enables us to move away from artificial categorizations such as second-language learner vs. fluent speakers—which are difficult to determine” (ibid.60).

Finally, for the purposes of this thesis, the abbreviation *EMI* will also be used as an adjective to characterise the stakeholders (mainly teachers and students) and the schools involved in the option. This has also been the practice, for example, in previous CLIL research (i.e. to identify students as “CLIL students,” Lim Falk 2008, or classrooms as “CLIL classrooms,” Dalton-Puffer 2007).
5 Materials and Methods

The general study is divided into two parts: research outside the schools and research in the schools. An overview is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Overview of methods in the general study

| Main research question: How and why is English-medium instruction offered and implemented in the Swedish context today? |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Chapter** | **Research outside the schools** | **Research in the schools** | **Research in the schools** |
| **Research questions** | 7. Perspectives | Why and how is EMI offered to potential stakeholders? | Why are stakeholders choosing EMI? |
| **How has the option developed in Sweden?** | | What is the stakeholder experience of EMI? | How is EMI implemented in two schools? |
| **Study focus** | Survey of development | Stakeholder perspectives: School heads and teachers | Stakeholder perspectives: Students and parents |
| **Survey of development** | Mixed methods based on linguistic ethnography | Stakeholder perspectives on practice: Students and teachers |
| **Approach** | Electronic survey of all schools | Language choice | Language alternation |
| **Material** | Survey answers plus previous statistics | Interviews: School heads Teachers | Interviews: Parents Students |
| **Analysis** | Descriptive statistics | Qualitative content analysis | Functional analysis |

Research outside the schools comprises one survey study: an investigation of the development of the educational option since the last national survey in 2000, with a focus on current statistics on the extent and scope of EMI in
upper secondary schools in Sweden. Research in the schools includes an investigation of stakeholders’ perspectives of EMI and an investigation of classroom practices. The general study is based on a mixed methods design and is both a multi-method and multi-sited study, as qualitative and quantitative methods were applied and the school studies took place in two research sites. The methodology as well as the methods is presented below.

5.1 Linguistic ethnography

In order to answer the main research question, *How and why is English-medium instruction offered and implemented in the Swedish context today?*, the research must provide both descriptive and explanatory results. To achieve this, the research design is situated in an interpretative paradigm with an approach based in linguistic ethnography, with primarily qualitative methods as well as some descriptive statistics, aimed at providing a broad view of the context studied.

The aim of linguistic ethnography is the study of both language and social life—-and how the two intersect (Creese 2008; Rampton 2007; Eckert 2000). Joining the fields of both linguistics and ethnography allows the researcher to focus on an analysis of specific language use in a specific social context, or for “tying ethnography down and opening linguistics up” (Rampton, Tusting, Maybin, Barwell, Creese & Lytra 2004:4). On the one hand, ethnography helps the researcher to identify both patterns and uniqueness in language use, while on the other, linguistics helps the researcher to systematically identify the structures of discourse (Creese 2008:233), allowing for a “close analysis of situated language use” (Rampton et al. 2004:2). To understand how people use language, the methodology in linguistic ethnography is rooted in qualitative inquiry with an emic perspective, although it may include the use of both quantitative data and analysis, as the methods often result in quantitative data in addition to the qualitative notes and descriptions generated (Walford 2007). The exact methods may vary, but there are four guiding principles central to linguistic ethnography: 1) an ethnographic approach, 2) an emic perspective, 3) researcher reflexivity, and 4) a description not only of the micro-context but also of the macro-social and/or cultural context (Söderlundh 2010:18). Each of these is presented below.

First, methods of ethnography allow for a “thick” description. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007:1) say that this approach “…involves the ethnographer participating, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions—in fact, collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the focus of the research.” However, ethnography should not to be confused with simply general “qualitative methods” nor should it be considered an approach with little substance, limited to “simply
a good description...created through gaining and maintaining rapport with the subjects” (Wolcott 1987:37). In other words, simply observing and getting to know a group of informants over a period of time is not enough. Rather, the ethnographic approach aims for the study of a culture using multiple methods with diverse form of data (Troman 2006:1). Material collected from a variety of sources, e.g. multiple informants, multiple sites, and multiple methods, allows for a broader picture of that culture.

The second feature of linguistic ethnography is an emic perspective, with high status granted to the participants. An emic, or insider, perspective offers the view of and from the participants in linguistic ethnography—a view that is not always easy to achieve. In ethnography, there is a tension between the emic perspective and the etic perspective, as the researcher tries to capture the participants’ perspectives and yet also view them together with observed actions using an analytic framework necessarily constructed by the researcher (Maybin & Tusting 2011:5). While the goal is to attain an emic perspective, the researcher’s own perspective must also be acknowledged for the role it plays in both the collection and the interpretation of the data, as seen in the next paragraph.

The third feature of linguistic ethnography concerns the role of the researcher, which in classroom studies may be described as “neither an unproblematic nor a very comfortable role” (Hammersley 2006:11). The researcher needs to be aware not only of his/her own role in the data collection process but also in the interpretation process, recognising how the claims made on the basis of the data interact with the role of the researcher’s own “positioning, interpretative capacities and theoretical framings in shaping research findings” (Maybin & Tusting 2011:13). The researcher is always making a choice. Everything the researcher decides to write down whilst collecting data is a choice, suggesting that observation is “necessarily selective and inferential” (Hammersley 2005:13). In addition, researchers should be aware of the consequences of their presence, maintaining a low profile in order to minimize this effect (Denscombe 1984:107). The researcher’s presence can make the informants stop and observe themselves and their daily routines in a new light (Lundstedt 2009:143). The extent of divulgement of the research focus can also be problematic in classroom studies, as the informant may say things that she normally would not (Ramsay 1987), perhaps in an attempt to appease or impress the researcher. Hill specifically cautions about “faking and observer effect” (Adler & Adler 1994 in Hill 2009), as people may change their behaviour when they know they are being observed or interviewed. If the teachers and students know exactly what the researcher is looking for, they may either unconsciously or very determinedly provide exactly that. This alteration in behaviour or speech is known as the “observers paradox” (Allwright & Baily1991:71; Labov 1972). On the other hand, if they do not know at all what the researcher is doing in the
classroom, they may feel uncomfortable and uncertain about the researcher’s presence in the classroom.

The fourth feature of linguistic ethnography is an aim to include consideration of both the macro and the micro contexts. Classroom research cannot be limited to what happens in the classroom, but must also take into account the wider, external context outside of the classroom, such as the educational institutions in which the instruction is taking place. Classroom ethnography must thus really be whole school ethnography. The ethnographic approach in the classroom facilitates the understanding of the micro context of the everyday discourse of the classroom within the macro discourse of educational policy and practice (Blommaert 2005). The micro cannot be separated from the macro, and the “ecological minutiae of interactional practices in classrooms [are linked to] the ideologies that pervade language choice and language policy” (Creese & Blackledge 2011:4).

Van Dijk (2007:4,10), while both arguing for the importance of situating the micro context within the macro context and at the same time cautioning that it is not feasible to consider all properties of social situations, only the relevant ones, presents the dynamics of the micro-macro relationship in educational research:

Table 3: Categories of micro and macro contexts in educational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro</th>
<th>Macro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of interaction (e.g. lesson)</td>
<td>Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific location (e.g. classroom)</td>
<td>Identities (e.g. science teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal period (e.g. school term)</td>
<td>Roles (e.g. teach biology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space (e.g. city in Sweden)</td>
<td>Relations (personal power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td>Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific action in context (e.g. explaining certain science terms)</td>
<td>Personal knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro</strong></td>
<td><strong>Macro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of interaction (e.g. lesson)</td>
<td>Temporal period (e.g. school term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific location (e.g. classroom)</td>
<td>Space (e.g. city in Sweden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Groups, institutions, organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identities (e.g. science teacher)</td>
<td>Identities (e.g. upper secondary school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles (e.g. teach biology)</td>
<td>Roles (e.g. education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations (personal power)</td>
<td>Relations (institutional power)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>Group goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal knowledge</td>
<td>Groups—shared social knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macro</strong></td>
<td>Language ideologies and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1-L2 relative status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macro act in context (e.g. providing education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Based on van Dijk 2007:10; van Lier 1988)

As illustrated, the aspects of setting, participants and action are all interrelated between and within the micro and macro contexts, which means, for example, that the study of one lesson should take into account not only the observable interactions, but also the lesson in relation to the school as a whole—and all the goals, policies, curricular demands and more that play a part in the macro context.
To conclude, linguistic ethnography was deemed the most appropriate methodology for the aims of this thesis. As an approach particularly applicable to educational research, linguistic ethnography is suitable for three kinds of inquiries in educational settings: 1) How language in classrooms provides indications of societal patterns and beliefs about language; 2) Contextually sensitive accounts of language and learning, informed by ethnographic study of students’ language experience in and outside of school; and 3) A focus on student voice (Maybin & Tusting 2011:6). These categories correspond to the present study. Still, while the methodology of linguistic ethnography offers a useful approach, it should be noted that the limitations of the research did not allow for a true longitudinal ethnographic study. Thus, linguistic ethnography is seen more as a useful framework than a strict methodological model. In the next section, the specific methods within linguistic ethnography chosen to address the research aims are presented.

5.2 Research outside the schools

The focus of research outside the schools was on understanding how the educational option has developed since the last report on the Swedish context. Research outside the schools thus addressed the first research aim concerning how the option of English-medium instruction is offered.

A survey of all upper secondary schools in Sweden was designed in order to determine the present extent of teaching content through an additional language, as well as to make comparisons with the earlier surveys conducted by the Swedish National Agency of Education over ten years ago. This survey was conducted using an electronic questionnaire created with Google Docs (docs.google.com) (Appendix 2). One aim of the survey study is to provide background on the macro-context of all upper secondary schools to the study of the micro-context of the classroom offering EMI, allowing for the research in the schools to be situated within that context. The results of the survey were compiled and summarised with descriptive statistics, which allowed the answers to the survey to be both summarised in numbers and described for trends at the time of the survey. The figures gleaned from the results were then compared to the first survey conducted in 2000, allowing for problematisation of the earlier study. These results are presented in Chapter 6.

5.3 Research in the schools

The emphasis of research inside the schools was on ethnographically understanding the stakeholders’ perspectives on the EMI option (their expectations and experiences) as well as how EMI may be practiced in the class-
room and why. Research in the schools thus addressed all three research aims concerning offering the option, choosing the option and practicing the option, and likewise comprises the main part of the present study.

5.3.1 Pilot studies
Pilot studies were conducted in the academic year 2010/2011 at two schools. Access to these schools was made possible through generosity on the part of the teachers to allow a researcher into the classroom. The aim was to talk with teachers and students about their experiences with English-medium instruction, to understand how lessons in English might be taught, and to further formulate the research questions for the main study after observation of the different contexts. A total of 11 lesson observations were conducted in the following subjects: English, Swedish, Religion, Biology, Social Studies, History, and Swedish as a Second Language. In addition to the observations and general school visits, seven teachers and six groups of students were interviewed informally. A student questionnaire on reasons for choosing EMI was piloted at one school as well. The results from the pilot studies are not included in this thesis.

5.3.2 Participants
The focus of the present research is the EMI option in relation to the “average” student and the “average” school in the Swedish school system. Thus an attempt was made to choose municipal schools that did not have high entrance requirements and that were mostly populated with students who were from the area and who had also gone to secondary schools with Swedish-medium instruction in the area. Two schools, given the pseudonyms Aspen School and Birch School, were chosen for the main study, based on the demographics of the schools, the location of the schools, and access to the schools—thus, a pragmatic selection. The two schools are both municipal schools, not independent schools, which again reflects the desire to include schools that are more likely to be characteristic of an average school in Sweden28. The main participants are the students and teachers at the schools and, to a lesser degree, the parents and school heads involved in the educational option. Table 4 below presents a summary of the participants in the main study.

---

28 However, there is no claim made that these two schools are statistically representative of Swedish upper secondary schools.
Table 4: Participants in the main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>School heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2.1 Aspen School

Aspen School is located in a mid-sized city. The school offers all eighteen national programs (see Chapter 6 for more on the programs offered in upper secondary school in Sweden), including twelve vocational programs and six programs designed to prepare students for university studies. In addition to the usual Swedish-medium programs, the school offers a Natural Sciences program and a Social Sciences program in English. The school website\textsuperscript{29} states that on these programs, most of the teaching as well as the course literature is in English. Additionally, the school promises an international perspective, which is partly gained through a two-week exchange with an upper secondary school in an English-speaking country in the third year of studies. The teachers on the program describe the decision to offer EMI programs as their own “bottom-up” initiative to offer a motivational perk for potential students.

Grade 1, the focus class at Aspen School, was comprised of 32 students: 11 boys and 21 girls. Thirty of the 32 students agreed to participate in the study (See the form of consent in Appendix 1). All of the students made an active choice for the English-medium Natural Sciences program, as there is a Swedish-medium option available to them as well. In Grades 2 and 3 the focus was on how one specific student in each class experienced a typical day in an English-medium program of study. Each of the specific students in Grade 2 and 3 respectively signed a form of consent and only data concerning that particular student, as well as teachers already in the study, were collected. Thus, Grades 2 and 3 as a whole were not investigated.

Informants from Aspen School included seven teachers, most of whom have been involved in the English-medium program for many years. Teacher E (English and Swedish), Teacher A (Maths and Physics), and Teacher J (English and Physical Education) have all been teaching on the English-medium program since the beginning. Teacher A and Teacher E are the mentors for Grade 1. The Chemistry and Biology teachers, Teacher D and Teacher L, joined in the first years, together with Teacher G who teaches Physics. At the time of this study, Teacher F was the newest teacher on the program, having recently earned her teaching credentials and taken a posi-

\textsuperscript{29} School websites are not revealed in this thesis in order to allow the schools anonymity.
tion as the Social Studies teacher. (For the purpose of anonymity, all teachers at Aspen School will be referred to as female.)

Both the principal and the head of regional upper secondary schools were interviewed. The material from their interviews provided insight into why the educational option is offered at Aspen School and what goals and expectations the school system has for the program taught in English. In addition, six parents were interviewed. The selection of parents for the interviews was based on volunteers, that is, those who were willing to be interviewed, and there is thus no random selection. Two of the parents were also involved in the school in a staff capacity, but their positions are not revealed here in order to ensure their anonymity.

5.3.2.2 Birch School

Birch School is also situated in a mid-sized city. Birch School offers two vocational programs and two programs aimed to prepare students for university studies. Previously, the school offered two programs of study through the medium of English: Social Sciences and Economics programs, both of which were also offered through the medium of Swedish. According to the principal, the decision to offer the programs was “top-down” as local school officials considered the option to be an attractive selling point in a competitive market, especially in this particular municipality, which is the home of several thriving industries with strong international networks. The Birch School website advertised the program as offering English-medium instruction on the basis of availability of qualified teachers—and thus made no promises as to the actual amount of teaching in English. However, the English-medium program has now been phased out after more than ten years, in part due to fewer applicants but mostly due to financing as well as difficulties finding qualified teachers who are willing and able to teach their subjects in English.

Grade 2 was comprised of 23 students, with 5 boys and 19 girls. Of 24 students, 19 agreed to participate in the study. The students made an active choice for the Social Sciences English-medium program, as an equivalent Swedish-medium option was available to them as well. Students in Grade 3 at Birch School were studying either the English-medium Economics program (9 students) or the English-medium Social Sciences (9 students), with three boys and 15 girls in the combined classes. Fifteen of the 18 students in this class agreed to participate in the study. The focus in both grades was on the Social Sciences program.

Four teachers were involved in the English-medium programs at Birch School: Teacher B, Teacher N, Teacher C, and Teacher I. Teacher C, who teaches English and Swedish, has been at the school since before the start of the English-medium programs. Although he has no subject teaching other than languages, he is actively involved as a mentor on the program. Teacher B teaches Biology and has been on the EMI program for over ten years.
Teacher I, a mentor for both Grade 3 classes and a qualified History, English and Spanish teacher, has been teaching at the school for six years. Although Teacher N has been at Birch School for many years, he has only sporadically been involved in teaching on the EMI. (For the purpose of anonymity, all teachers at Birch School will be referred to as male.)

In addition to the interviews with students and teachers, the principal at Birch School was interviewed. This principal has been working at the school since prior to the start of EMI, and was thus one of those who participated in the instigation of the program. The interview with the principal provided material for understanding why Birch School decided to offer the option and what they had for goals at the time. Also, the principal was able to offer an explanation as to why the program was in the process of termination at the time of the main study of this thesis.

5.3.3 Data collection

The two main methods for research in the schools are interviews and observations. At both schools, the informants (students, teachers and school heads) were generally positive to participation in the study and both willing to help as well as interested in the results. Still, the researcher needed to take into account the extent of access that seemed comfortable for the individual informants at different stages in the study, making a lesson-to-lesson decision on data collection methods for each research site.

Interviews offer these advantages in ethnographic studies (Denscombe 1984:109-12; Hammersley 2005:9): access to information, situations, and explanations not clear in a simple observation; the bulk of potential data available through interviews, including information occurring outside of the present situation (e.g. past events); “hard data” offered specifically for the record; convenience of data collection; and a greater degree of participant co-operation as they have greater control over the data collected. Also, as an aim of ethnography within educational settings is to interpret the informants’ experience in their context, interviews may be the only means of accessing this information (Hammersley 2006:9). A more thorough description of the interview process is found in Section 7.1.

For this study, participant observations were the key method chosen for investigating classroom practices. Although the participation was not active in the manner of taking on a role of teacher or assistant, the participation was active in that the students and teachers sometimes included the researcher in the discussions or when asking questions, both about language and content. Most of the observation time, however, was spent in the back of the classroom or at a student table, taking field notes, with the aim to be both open and structured.

Careful field notes were taken by hand for all instances of classroom observations, and selections transcribed into clean copy. Although the field
notes were approached with an open mind, ready to note anything happening in the classroom, a checklist for classroom observations was also used. For each lesson, the following basics were noted (based on Sotirin 1999):

1) Room layout with furniture: a map was drawn in the field notes
2) Other items in the room (e.g. school maps or lesson materials)
3) Placement of students (including genders of student individuals in each group at each table) and teacher (e.g. whether the teacher was at the whiteboard or moving amongst the students)
4) Language use (including the language choice, the speaker and some specific utterances)

Audio recordings were made of sixteen lessons, with the recorder placed on the table in front of the teacher, when the entire lesson was in focus or on the desk in front of the individual informant, when the focus was on a specific informant’s language use in the specific context. The recordings were made on a small mp3 device that allowed for easy transfer to computer files.

Video recordings were not made of any of the lessons for several reasons. The main reason was the fact that the researcher usually followed the class from one lesson to the next, and the different lessons with different teachers were not conducted in the same room. Thus, setting up and using the video equipment would have interrupted the observation periods, which were for reasons of practicality limited to certain days during the term. A second reason for not using video was that for many of the lessons, especially at Birch School, the students left the classroom to work in small groups. They would then be working in different rooms or at different tables outside of the classroom. A third reason is that not all of the students in each class agreed to participate in the study. Audio recordings and observations notes are less intrusive and less likely to accidentally include students who have not given their consent. Finally, the researcher determined that the teachers and students would be more comfortable during this relatively short study with less obtrusive methods of data collection.

Certain artefacts were collected during the classroom research. These included copies of students’ written assignments and copies of teacher handouts and exams. Most physical artefacts could not be taken from the classrooms so they were photographed instead. Items that were photographed include the following: posters in the hallway where most students in the EMI program have their lockers; posters in the hallway advertising extramural activities and study programs abroad; textbooks; notes taken by informants during the lessons; text written by the teachers on the whiteboards; and other texts in the environment (e.g. whiteboard text about clean-

30 Artefacts (also artifacts) can be seen as both physical and symbolic. Here, the focus is on the physical artefacts found in the classroom and school environments of the main study.
Thus, there was a record of some of the different kinds of text that the informants came into contact with during their school day. As the focus was not specifically on text analysis of written texts, these artefacts were used mainly as support to the analysis of language use and function in the classroom.

5.3.4 Analysis of data

5.3.4.1 Perspectives

The interviews with the stakeholders were analysed for content, with their views on their expectations of and experiences with English-medium instruction categorised into general themes across the data. The emphasis was on what they were saying and not on how they were saying it. Thus, the functions of English and Swedish use in their interview responses were not the focus, as they were in the analysis of their use in the classroom discourse; but rather, the focus of the analysis was specifically on their own opinions, beliefs, and descriptions. This qualitative content analysis of talk provides a catalogue of topics that interest or concern the stakeholders most, and thus offers a “passport to listening to the words of the [interview] text, and understanding better the perspective(s) of the producer of these words” (Berg 2007:242).

Content analysis is a tool for both describing and quantifying. The core of content analysis can be grouped into three areas of focus: qualitative or quantitative; inductive or deductive; and conceptual or relational (Elo & Kyngäs 2008:107; Berg 2007). Although traditionally, content analysis may be associated with quantitative analysis, in which the unit of analysis is counted and categorised, the tool is also useful and appropriate for qualitative analysis of texts as well, as it provides a means to categorise themes and identify characteristics in texts such as interview data (Stempel 1989:121; Berg 2007). Content analysis can be either a deductive process (comparing new data to previous data or theories) or an inductive process (creating new categories within a field that is relatively unknown or unexplored). In conceptual content analysis, the researcher focuses on identifying explicit or implicit concepts in the text as well as their frequency. In relational concept analysis, the researcher then identifies how the concepts of the text are related to one another. For content analysis, the unit of analysis must be defined, for example at the word or theme level. What will be examined and why? The data is first categorised through open coding, followed by categorisation into themes. Finally the results need to provide a “clear description of the context, selection and characteristics of the participants, data collection and process of analysis” (Elo & Kyngäs 2008:112) and should be illustrated relevantly with authentic citations from the analysed text.
The present study relied on a qualitative conceptual analysis for interview studies (albeit also with a minimal quantitative view), exploring the themes expressed by the stakeholders. The interviews with the stakeholders were transcribed and then coded for themes, with a special focus on the themes generated in the areas of the research questions: reasons why they offered EMI, reasons why they chose EMI, and how they experienced EMI. In this way, the categories investigated were both partially deductive, as certain themes were identified beforehand during the pilot work (observations and informal interviews) as well as the study of the previous research within the field in Sweden and beyond, but also inductive as the analysis was open to any possible emerging and previously unknown themes (Berg 2007:245). While the analysis was primarily qualitative, the prevalence of themes and descriptions across the stakeholders was also noted.

5.3.4.2 Practices
The classroom practice analysis investigated the organisation of language use and the language functions of English and Swedish in different phases of the lessons, with an aim of understanding the linguistic practices of the participants in the classroom micro context. The main focus was on the roles of English and Swedish in the classroom and the specific functions of language alternation realised through translanguaging. The analysis was concentrated on one teacher from each school (Teacher A from Aspen and Teacher B from Birch), with additional material from the other teachers providing understanding of each particular school context. Only material from the focus teachers was submitted to thorough analysis.

The organisation of language use in the selected EMI subject lessons was analysed in two ways: 1) for patterns of language use during different phases of lessons and 2) for patterns of language use according to the activity during the main lesson. The aim of the first analysis is to understand the language choices over the course of the lesson, especially in relation to content instruction and classroom management. Thus, the two languages were noted for their roles in relation to content instruction and classroom management. For this first part of the analysis, organisation of language use during lesson phases, the focus was on three phases of the lesson: Getting started, Main lesson, and Dissolution (based on Lemke’s basic lesson script, 1989, and Dalton-Puffer 2007, the latter in turn based on Christie 2000, 2002). For each of the phases, the speaker (teacher or student/s or both) was noted as well as the language (English or Swedish) and either what was said exactly or what the topic or activity was in general. The aim of the second analysis is to understand how language choices are made for the different activities with diverse constellations of participants. For this second part of the analysis, the organisation of language use during instruction according to activity was in focus. For the analysed lesson, the instances of each of the following different activity types were noted: whole class activity, activity in groups or
pairs, individual seatwork, student monologue, and teacher monologue (based on Dalton-Puffer 2007, in turn based on Christie 2002 and Hatch 1992). For each of the activity types, the language choice of the teacher and of the student/s was noted as well as which modes were being used (reading, writing, listening, speaking).

The language functions of English and Swedish in relation to the activities in the lessons were analysed with a focus on possible scaffolding and affordances. In order to understand the patterns and functions of language alternation, two models based on Fennema-Bloom (2009/2010) and Lewis et al. (2012b) were developed, focusing on pedagogical and non-pedagogical translanguaging. (The models and the categories are presented in Chapter 8.) Based on the analysis above of the language organisation of the lessons, instances of language alternation were analysed, examining the possible pedagogical function of the switch, as well as whether or not the language alternation was planned or was in response to the other participants or context. The functions of the alternation specifically in the EMI classroom were considered in relation to both content and language teaching and learning.

5.3.4.3 Transcriptions
The interviews were transcribed for content analysis (see the key to the transcription conventions on page xiv). Some of the interviews and classroom recordings were in Swedish and these were first transcribed in Swedish and then the representative sections translated into English for the purpose of reporting the results. Not all of the interview material was transcribed in detail, mainly for two reasons: firstly, some material was deemed off-topic and secondly, the focus of the analysis was on the content and not the language details. The first point means that the informants sometimes engaged in anecdotal stories or asides that were not directly relevant to the questions posed or to the topic being discussed. For example, when two informants were being interviewed about their class trip to an English-speaking country, they described in great detail some of the food they ate and liked. The second point means that not every word was transcribed even when the informants were discussing topics relevant to the study. For example, hedges and repeated words were not always included in the transcriptions. These would have been included if the aim of the study was to analyse their language proficiency in some way, but as the aim was to find out what they thought about EMI and why, the content—and not the language specifics—was key. Thus, taking both of these points into consideration, an active choice was made to focus on illustrative material and themes in the stakeholder interviews.

For the material from classroom observations, the field notes were first written up to indicate blocks of time, activities, participants, language choice, modality, and turn taking. Very little of the material from the audio files was transcribed from the classroom recordings, partly due to the fact
that group work and individual student work were often taking place, with teachers and students moving about, making exact transcriptions of the activity difficult. Instead, the audio recordings of some lessons were used to corroborate the findings in the field notes. (Note that audio recordings were also made of some out-of-class activities, such as lunch in the school cafeteria, but these were deemed to not add anything new to the results and not transcribed at all.)

5.4 Considerations in the general study

Validity refers to the “accuracy of measurement” (Hammersley 1990:55). The only goal of educational ethnography can be to produce knowledge, and validity can only be determined in light of this goal (Hammersley 2002:15). Threats to validity specific to qualitative research involve interviews and informants (Wibeck 2000:121). For example, validity can be threatened when the informants do not feel familiar and comfortable with the interview environment. Also, informants may say what they think the group or the researcher wants to hear. Participants can also feel threatened in an interview situation (ibid.115), either because they fear their true answers might reveal opinions or practices out of line with current popular thought or because their answers might divulge something considered vulnerable to their institution or own professional career. In response to these threats, efforts were made to make the informants familiar and comfortable with the researcher during the study and before the interviews.

Reliability refers to the “consistency of measurement” (Hammersley 1990:55). Reliability signifies that not only will other researchers be able to replicate the study and get similar results, but also that the same researcher will be able to do so (Wibeck 2000:119-120). In studies with an ethnographic approach such as this one, issues of reliability are complicated. For example, as the informants in ethnographic research are individuals, their behaviour cannot be easily replicated, if at all (Hammersley 1990:57). Also ethnography is often imprecise and relies on descriptions using fairly vague modifiers such as “often” and “frequently” instead of specific quantified statistics (ibid.9). However, this study makes no claim of intersubjectivity, but rather offers perspectives from two school cases in the classroom and from the Swedish context in the research outside schools. Still, as the results in this study are mainly qualitative and not directly replicable, an effort was made to be transparent as well as to offer enough description to at least make the study useful to researchers conducting similar studies.

The ethical guidelines of The Swedish Research Council were followed in this study, and all efforts engaged to avoid potential ethical problems. Hammersley (1990:131-35) defines several possible problems arising from ethnographic methods, e.g. the risk of deception due to only partial disclo-
sure by the researcher of the extent of the study; issues concerning what constitutes and differentiates private and public behavioural spheres; potential damages to the private or public reputation of the participants (individuals or institutions); and uncertain consequences on future research in the same field if researchers use unethical methods, thus prompting individuals and institutions to be reluctant to allow access to future researchers. These potential ethical problems were considered throughout the present study.

All efforts have been made to conceal the identities of the individual informants as well as the schools included in the study. The schools are identified by neither name nor city, and the details about the demographics of each school are considered general enough so as not to reveal the exact location of each one. The schools were randomly given the fictitious names Aspen School and Birch School. Each student informant was given a pseudonym, names appropriate for their gender but no other identifying traits were expressed in the names (e.g. ethnic background). The teachers were assigned a letter. In addition, all teachers, the school head and the principal at Aspen School are identified as female while all teachers and the principal at Birch School are identified as male, in order to further protect their privacy. All parents are identified as male. Also, as the student participants were all over the age of 15, parental consent was not required according to Swedish ethical regulations; however, it was, of course, required of each informant regardless of age. A signed form of consent was collected from each informant. Those students who did not wish to participate were not noted in the observations. One student volunteered for an interview only.

5.5 Summary

The methodology and the methods described in this chapter were deemed appropriate for the present study because they offer a means for understanding the particular context of English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school, and especially the participants and their practice. While not guaranteeing or claiming a complete picture of the current status and development of EMI in Swedish upper secondary schools, the mixed-methods and multi-sited approach do together offer a real contribution to understanding the educational option in its micro and macro context.
6 Research outside the schools: A survey

This chapter presents the results of the research outside the classroom: an investigation of how the option of teaching content through another language has developed since the last official statistics on the educational option. The chapter begins with a brief description of the Swedish upper secondary school and then a presentation of previous survey studies from 1999 and 2001. The results of the survey conducted for this study in 2012 follow. The chapter ends with a discussion and comparison of the studies.

6.1 The Swedish upper secondary school

The Swedish national school system dictates nine years of compulsory schooling, starting with Grade 1 the year the child turns seven and ending in Grade 9 the year the child turns sixteen. Upper secondary school is a non-compulsory form of schooling, although the majority of youth ages 16-19 are currently studying a program at this level. The most recent statistics on the percentage of youth choosing to continue their education at this level indicate that nearly 100% Swedish youth choose to start studies at this level (SOU 2013:13).

In the 2012/2013 academic year, there were 1,253 upper secondary schools in Sweden31 (485 independent, 751 municipal, 17 county). While there are a wide variety of schools to choose from, students are limited to a certain set of national programs comprising different areas of study. Currently, Swedish upper secondary schools offer eighteen national programs of study, twelve of which are vocational (e.g. Hotel and Tourism; Child and Recreation) and six of which specifically qualify students for further studies at the tertiary level (e.g. Social Sciences and Natural Sciences). All programs are three years in duration. Table 5 presents an overview of all students starting upper secondary school in the academic year 2012/2013, divided into the two main categories.

31 Current statistics in this chapter are from The Swedish National Agency for Education (http://www.skolverket.se/statistik-och-utvardering) and Kolada.se. Last accessed August 2013.
### Table 5: Number of students in Grade 1, 2012/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,841</td>
<td>65,646</td>
<td>125,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>15,062</td>
<td>34,986</td>
<td>59,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>21,779</td>
<td>30,660</td>
<td>65,911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a national level, the most popular vocational program is Building and Construction and the most popular university preparatory program is Social Sciences. In addition, there are a few other programs not included in these 18 national programs, such as those for elite sports and the International Baccalaureate program (which does not follow the Swedish national curriculum) as well as special education for students with disabilities and the remedial individual program for students needing to complete qualifications from secondary school. For current statistics on the demographics of students in the two types of lines of study (vocational or university preparatory), with delineation per program, see Diagrams 1 and 2 below.

![Diagram 1: Number of Grade 1 students on vocational programs 2012/2013](image)

[Diag 1]

32 IB refers to the International Baccalaureate program. See Section 6.2.2.1.
Although all schools are required to follow the curriculum for the specific national programs, a school reform in 1992 allowed for greater freedom for school heads at individual schools to decide how to follow national guidelines and reach the curriculum goals (Dentler 2007:167; Nixon 2000:3). This led to the increase of independent schools at the upper secondary level, as new actors in the field started single schools and chains of schools, providing national programs of study with their own methods. This in turn led to a greater focus on the part of schools to actively attract students. One way to attract students may be to offer instruction through an additional language, mainly English.

### 6.2 A survey of content teaching in a foreign language

#### 6.2.1 Previous statistics

Researchers often suggest that teaching subject content through the medium of another language (usually English) has increased in Swedish schools in recent years (e.g. Hyltenstam 2004; Sylvén 2004; Lim Falk 2008; Edlund 2011). At present, however, there are no official national statistics on the number of schools offering content instruction through the medium of a language other than Swedish. As seen in Chapter 2, this form of schooling is also known as **CLIL**, Content and Language Integrated Learning; and the
various terms to describe this educational option include schools with very different degrees of integration of language and subject studies, making the actual extent and scope of subject teaching in another language difficult to estimate. Only two or three schools offered CLIL in the 1980’s (Nixon 2000:8), and by 1992, ten upper secondary schools offered the CLIL option (Hyltenstam 2004:69). Dentler describes a “CLIL boom” from 1992 until 1999 (2007:167), during which up to 15 new CLIL programs were started every year. She attributes this to the new school law in 1992, referred to above.

By 2000, the Swedish National Agency for Education (henceforth, the Agency) reported that integrating content with language instruction can mean “anything” and that, while most schools at that time still chose English as the medium of instruction (when not choosing the mainstream Swedish), there were still differences in the role of English-medium instruction between individual lessons as well as between schools (also noted by Lim Falk 2008). Thus, content instruction through a foreign language was then and remains now a broad concept that had not been defined clearly in the Swedish school system. Indeed, a definition of CLIL by any name today is not only deficient—it is lacking altogether (Lim Falk & Strand 2009; Edlund 2011; Sylvén 2013).

In addition to noting the lack of a definition for this educational option, in the report more than a decade ago, the Agency called for greater documentation by schools to monitor the progress made by students as well as the methods used in teaching and learning through evaluation, yet neither has transpired. While a rigorous evaluation of the students’ progress may be a part of the immersion programs elsewhere, Swedish schools offering CLIL or EMI lack a thorough evaluation of results. There is currently no regulation at the upper secondary level regarding the language of instruction, as the upper secondary school in the Swedish system is not compulsory.

However, there has been some monitoring of the compulsory school level (obligatory education), where teaching subjects through English is still considered to be a trial initiated in 2003, as well as an option requiring the approval of the Agency. Originally, teaching a subject in a language other than Swedish was limited by law to 50% or less of all teaching on the compulsory school level. This requirement was waived in 2009. The 50% requirement now covers the entire school time, which means that a single subject may be taught entirely in English at the compulsory school level. The Agency recently mapped the spread of EMI in compulsory schools. This report pre-

---

33 The schools are not presenting thorough evaluation of results. Note that both Washburn 1997 and Sylvén 2004 investigated some results. Several forthcoming studies are also expected from the national research project CLISS, Content and Language Integration in Swedish Schools, funded by the Swedish Research Council, in 2014/2015.

34 Personal contact with the Swedish National Agency for Education, December 2009.
sented an assessment of public and independent compulsory schools (from pre-school through grade 9, ages 6 through 16) offering English-medium content instruction (2010). The results indicated that in the 2008/2009 school year, approximately 1% of all compulsory schools (42 schools) in Sweden offered some content instruction through the medium of English, with most of these schools found in larger cities. In these schools, the most common subjects taught in English included courses within social sciences (such as Geography) and natural sciences (such as Biology) in the secondary classes, i.e. Grades 6-9. The teachers were often native speakers of English. As with the previous report commissioned by the Agency, it was noted in the study of compulsory schools that there was a general lack of solid evaluation and documentation of EMI at this level.

There are many unanswered questions concerning the definitions and practice of teaching content through a foreign language as well as the scope and extent of the practice in the Swedish school system. There is little actual documentation from schools at any level, and most aspects of this form of education have not been researched to any great degree in Sweden (see Chapter 3 for previous research). Understanding how CLIL has developed since the last report in 2001 is key to understanding the context of EMI in Sweden today. In an attempt to do just this, a survey was conducted, as described further below. First, however, the original national survey from 1999 and its subsequent report on quality in CLIL are presented.

6.2.1.1 The Swedish National Agency for Education studies
As mentioned above, there are currently no official statistics about the present number of schools offering content instruction through a foreign language nor about the scope and extent of teaching and learning in a language other than Swedish in upper secondary schools, despite a widespread belief that English-medium teaching, especially, is increasing in Sweden at all levels (Stålhammar 2010). In order to understand why and how CLIL \(^{35}\), and in particular EMI, has developed and is practiced in the Swedish context, it is essential to know the actual statistics of a possible development. The starting point is the survey by the Agency, conducted in 1999 and reported in 2000.

The Agency commissioned a study in 1999 that resulted in a report that some form of teaching in other languages than Swedish—everything from the entire teaching of a subject in a foreign language to occasional theme days or projects conducted in other languages—was found in “over 20%” of Swedish upper secondary schools (Nixon 2000). This initial report was followed the next year by a more in-depth description of a selection of schools.

\(^{35}\) The Agency used the term CLIL in its English report on the survey as they included content instruction in all foreign languages, although English was by far the main target language in use (≈75%).
that had confirmed in the original questionnaire that CLIL was practiced in their schools. The results from these two studies have provided the baseline of the percentage of CLIL schools in Sweden, which most current research on content instruction in another language other than Swedish uses as a reference point. The description of “more than 20%” is often quoted in Swedish research on CLIL (e.g. Edlund 2011). A more detailed description of the two studies—as well as the interpretation of the results—follows.

In 1999, a questionnaire was sent to 6320 schools in Sweden, of which 724 were upper secondary. According to the report, the survey resulted in a 70% response rate total (i.e. compulsory school and upper secondary schools together), with 76% of all contacted upper secondary schools responding. The final results of the description of the extent and scope of CLIL at that time (for the most part EMI) established that 23% of all Swedish upper secondary schools self-reported that they had some content instruction in another language other than Swedish or that they planned to start with CLIL in the following school year, 1999/2000. This translates into 122 schools or 17% with CLIL already implemented and 44 schools or 6% with CLIL planned. This percentage was not based on the actual responses, however, but rather on the number of questionnaires sent to the schools (i.e. non-responding school were included as well). The actual number of upper secondary schools that answered yes was 122 out of 554 replies, or 22%. The actual number of upper secondary schools that indicated that they planned to start CLIL during the coming school year was 44 out of 554 replies, or 8%. This discrepancy in the reported totals is presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Results from the 1999 survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers in the final report</th>
<th>Yes, we have CLIL.</th>
<th>Yes, we plan to offer CLIL in the coming school year.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122 replies</td>
<td>44 replies</td>
<td>166 positive replies</td>
<td>388 negative replies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of CLIL schools in the final report</td>
<td>17% of 724 schools</td>
<td>6% of 724 schools</td>
<td>23% of 724 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual percentage of responses</td>
<td>22% of 554 schools responding</td>
<td>8% of 554 schools responding</td>
<td>30% of 554 schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, as seen above, the actual results indicated that in 1999, 30% of upper secondary schools either offered or were planning to offer some form of

---

36 Of the tallied responses for upper secondary schools, 17 of the replies were not responses to the questionnaire. These 17 schools did not answer the questionnaire but rather were contacted by phone; and their verbal responses were added to the final totals.
CLIL. (Note that in previous research, the oft-quoted percentage of schools offering CLIL, 23%, also comprises the schools already offering CLIL and the schools planning CLIL.) While the questionnaire did ask the informants to indicate the language of content instruction, there was no separation according to the amount of CLIL (i.e. if CLIL encompassed an entire program, entire subject courses, or single lessons).

This initial survey was followed up by a second, more detailed survey sent to 166 upper secondary schools, this time securing a response rate of 98 answers. The informants were those who had confirmed in the first questionnaire that they already offered CLIL or planned to offer CLIL in the near future. These additional replies indicated that 8% of the upper secondary schools had International Baccalaureate. It was also found that more municipal schools than independent schools offered CLIL, that CLIL schools were more common in bigger cities and municipalities than smaller, and that the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences programs were the most commonly offered national programs.

As another follow-up to the original survey from 1999, a field study was conducted in 2001, this time with some observations and school visits, resulting in the official report, Quality in SPRINT: Towards quality assessment and assurance in content and language integrated education. The same researcher, Nixon, conducted fieldwork at 11 schools, 7 of which were upper secondary. Of these seven, four were preparatory for higher education program, with two each of the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences programs. Three were vocational. Only municipal schools were visited. Nixon spent one day at each school, mostly to conduct interviews with teachers and students (mainly in English) and to collect questionnaires. Limited observations were also conducted on the same day in two of the upper secondary schools (one vocational and one preparatory for higher education program), as well as one secondary school.

Thus, the final results of the two studies surveying CLIL and attempting to describe CLIL in practice were based mostly on self-reports with very little time spent in the CLIL classrooms, in contrast to later studies such as Lim Falk’s extensive classroom research from 2008. The actual scope and extent of CLIL is difficult to determine from the results as well, as Nixon himself noted that the survey indicated that CLIL could “take a wide variety of forms,” without explaining this wide variety clearly in the survey report. A careful reading of the two reports does indicate that the range of what was considered CLIL at the time was very broad, encompassing everything from single occasional lessons to entire programs of study. In an attempt to understand the actual present extent and scope of CLIL as well as the possible

---

37 Scope in this study refers to the range of subjects and/or programs being offered in CLIL. Extent in this study refers to the actual amount of teaching in English in those subjects.
growth of CLIL in the last decade, a new survey was conducted, this time with more specific categories in the general mapping of the educational option, albeit also with self-reports.

6.2.2 Current statistics

A survey of all upper secondary schools in Sweden was designed in order to determine the present status of content teaching in a foreign language, as well as to make comparisons with the earlier surveys conducted by the Agency over ten years ago. Although the focus of this thesis is EMI, all teaching in a language other than Swedish was included in this survey. The aim of this survey was not to map the exact details of all schools offering content instruction through another language (e.g. which subjects, which languages, or the student demographics), but rather to produce a general picture of the current status of CLIL in Swedish upper secondary schools in order to set the scene for the main study of research in the schools.

Upper secondary school is not a compulsory form of schooling, and thus the Agency does not keep statistics on the schools offering instruction through another language. However, as upper secondary schools are required to follow the national curriculum guidelines and to reach the national objectives for the programs offered, the Swedish Schools Inspectorate (Skolinspektornen) does compile some statistics about the schools. Based on their statistics, Joacim Ramberg, a researcher in the Department of Special Education at Stockholm University, compiled an updated list of all upper secondary schools, with the exception of schools only offering special education, up to the start of the academic year 2010-2011. Ramberg’s original list, with 1049 schools, was used for this survey.

An electronic questionnaire was created using Google Docs (docs.google.com) (see Appendix 2 for the questionnaire). A short letter (see Appendix 3) explaining the aim of the survey was compiled and included in the e-mail to each school. This letter was edited and updated after each round of mailings. On the original list, most schools had the e-mail address of the principal listed, although a few listed a general address to the school, thus making it impossible to know who would receive the e-mail. Of the 1049 schools on the original list, 108 were not included in the first mailings. In some cases, this was due to the same e-mail address being used for multiple schools (for example, if one larger school was divided into four smaller units, each with their own listing), while other schools had no e-mail address or had not actually started their programs yet. Also, schools that identified themselves as only offering individual instruction (the remedial program described earlier) or special education were not included. The focus of the survey was thus only upper secondary schools offering the nationally recognised vocational degree programs and university preparatory degree programs.
The survey of all upper secondary schools in Sweden commenced in April 2011, with the first round of mailings sent to 941 schools as e-mail letters with a hyperlink to the survey. The schools were asked to respond within two weeks, although the reply function did not close after this period of time. The results were compiled, and some schools were removed from the list because the schools did not offer upper secondary education any longer or refused to answer due to school policy (note that some of these schools were followed up on individually with another request) or did not fit the intended target group. The second round of mailing was sent in May 2011, to 705 schools, again with the request to reply within two weeks. The third round was sent to 625 schools after the school summer holiday in September 2011, with a longer letter explaining the importance of the survey. The fourth round, 532 schools, was sent two days after the requested final date for round three, as a “reminder.” The total number of replies after four rounds was 404 of the original 941, or 43%. Some responses demanded an individual follow-up; for example, a teacher or principal would phone to ask what was meant by CLIL or write an e-mail for more information before answering the questionnaire. There were also many auto-replies indicating the original contact person for the school was on sick leave or had changed jobs, necessitating follow-up to find the correct contact person on the school website. The e-mail list was edited again with an individual web search for each school to confirm that the school still existed and that it fit the intended target group. A final list of 891 schools was determined. The fifth and final round was conducted in February 2012, for an ending total of 523 responses. These 523 responses were then controlled for duplicate answers from schools as well as for those that only offered the remedial program or special education. After addressing these considerations and adjusting the actual results (e.g. removing duplicate replies), in the end, a final response rate of 56% was achieved with 502 answers from 891 schools. These results of the survey were analysed using descriptive statistics and compared to the earlier results from 1999.

6.2.2.1 The results of the 2012 survey

The short electronic survey had one main multiple-choice question: Does your school currently offer content and language integrated teaching (i.e. subject teaching in a language other than Swedish)? In the accompanying letter, a short introduction explained the purpose of the questionnaire. The school’s name and municipality were requested, as well as the name and e-mail of a contact person. A space was available for comments or questions, which many respondents used. The main question procured the following number of responses from schools in each alternative, as seen in Table 7.
Table 7: Number of schools offering CLIL in the 2012 survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes: An entire program is taught mostly in another language (not IB)</td>
<td>5 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Some courses are taught mostly in another language</td>
<td>40 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: We have a few lessons or days when certain subjects are taught in another language</td>
<td>86 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: But we plan to offer instruction in another language in the near future (within 2 years)</td>
<td>15 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: We never have teaching in another language</td>
<td>336 schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: We have the International Baccalaureate Program</td>
<td>20 schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Note that this was not a separate alternative on the questionnaire. See below for more explanation on this category.

The results depicted above include the 502 responses from the returned questionnaires. The question was open enough to include any target foreign language and provided alternatives to cover several different specific arrangements of content and language integration. The percentages of each answer category are depicted below in Diagram 3, followed by a discussion first of the demographics of each category and then of some general observations about the responses.

![Diagram 3: Overview of the 2012 survey results](image)

Yes: An entire program is taught mostly in another language
Only five schools indicated that they currently offer one or more entire programs of study conducted in another language other than Swedish. The basic demographics of these schools are seen in the overview in Table 8 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Size of municipality</th>
<th>Size of school</th>
<th>CLIL programs</th>
<th>Language of instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Norrland</td>
<td>Large city</td>
<td>≈1700</td>
<td>Social Sciences + Natural Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Svealand</td>
<td>Suburban municipality</td>
<td>≈400</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Svealand</td>
<td>Metropolitan municipality</td>
<td>≈1350</td>
<td>Social Sciences + Natural Sciences (also IB)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Götaland</td>
<td>Metropolitan municipality</td>
<td>≈350</td>
<td>Social Sciences + Natural Sciences (also IB)</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Götaland</td>
<td>Metropolitan municipality</td>
<td>≈200</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Information found on individual school homepages and provided in the questionnaires.
2) Size refers only to the number of upper secondary students, even if the school includes other school forms.

These schools have been categorized simply as CLIL. Each of the schools offers an entire program taught mainly through the medium of English. As seen in the table, the most common program of study is the Social Sciences program, as all five schools offer this, reflecting the more general popularity of this program across schools in Sweden. The Natural Sciences program is close behind, though, with three schools also offering this national program. Two of the schools offer the IB program in addition to the usual programs of study that follow the national curriculum. The schools are spread across the country, with each one located in a highly populated municipality.³⁸

**Yes: Some courses are taught mostly in another language**

Although not many entire programs are taught in another language, 40 schools reported that they offer some courses taught mostly in another language. Two of these schools also offered an entire program taught in English, one an IB degree program and the other a Social Sciences program. A third school indicated that one teacher employed to teach on an individual program was not actually proficient in Swedish and thus taught courses in

³⁸Official classification of Swedish municipalities from www.kolada.se. **Large city** indicates a municipality with 50,000-200,000 inhabitants. **Suburban municipality** indicates a municipality in which at least 50% of the inhabitants commute daily to a metropolitan municipality. **Metropolitan municipality** indicates one of the three largest municipalities in Sweden, with over 200,000 inhabitants.
his native English instead. This might be considered a kind of “random” EMI. This response, however, was not included in the final results as it referred to the individual program, which was outside the scope of this study.

The 40 responses included here have been categorised as Partial CLIL. Several schools offered information on the subjects taught as well as the medium of instruction, which in all specifically reported cases was English. Courses included subjects within vocational programs such as Automotive Electronics and integration on vocational programs such as Industrial Technology. Content and language integration on the university preparatory programs included subjects such as International Communication, Economics, and History. At least three schools indicated that they offered more than 30% of instruction through the medium of English, with one school also reporting that English was the “working language” of the school.

Yes: We have a few lessons or days when certain subjects are taught in another language
The most common response from schools offering CLIL was from those that offer single lessons or days of integrated content and language learning, a category named Occasional CLIL in this study, with 86 schools reporting some integration. One school reported that this integration is more by chance, noting that the current integration of music and media courses with English is “not actually something we strive for.” In other schools, the integration is often due to international contacts and visitors or exchange students. Several vocational programs offer some instruction through English, in courses on the Hotel and Restaurant program as well as the Auto Mechanics program. Many reported that their schools regularly work thematically, and thus strive for integration of many subjects, including language and content. As with the categories above, those schools indicating a target language indicated English.

No: But we plan to offer instruction in another language in the near future (within 2 years)
The number of schools planning on offering some instruction through another language, a category named Planned CLIL, was almost three times that of the number currently offering entire programs: 13 schools plan to offer CLIL within the next two years. The exact extent and scope of the planned CLIL was not clear, however. Two of these schools specifically indicated that they planned to start International Baccalaureate programs, while another school reported the plan to offer more instruction through the medium of English. Another school that is not currently planning to implement CLIL commented, “Maybe something to consider!”
No: We never have teaching in another language
Finally, the vast majority of schools—336 responses—indicated that they never taught content through another language other than Swedish. Many schools gave reasons for this, including some that wrote that they did not “need it” and others that explained that there had not been an expressed interest. One school explained that they focused on international exchanges instead. Twelve schools also made it clear that modern languages (e.g. English, French, Spanish) are usually taught through the target languages. Thus, even though these languages are not integrated with a content subject, languages other than Swedish are being used daily even in upper secondary schools not offering CLIL.

Yes: We have the International Baccalaureate Program
There were 31 schools offering the English-medium International Baccalaureate (IB) degree program at upper secondary level at the time of the last round of questionnaires in 2012. Of these, 20 responded to the questionnaire, choosing the option Yes: An entire program is taught mostly in another language and then indicating in the comments box that they offered the IB degree program. Two more schools responded that they were planning to start IB within two years, one of which has now done so. A third school indicated that their IB program was moving to another school the following school year, which did transpire. The IB responses were then re-categorised to indicate the difference between the IB programs and other Swedish schools responding that they offer an entire program in another language. This was done because the IB program actually follows a separate curriculum—and not the Swedish national curriculum—rendering the IB schools outside of the target group of the survey.

Schools offering IB are situated around the world. The IB organisation does not actually own or govern the schools, instead they cooperate with local schools that both pay a fee to the organisation and follow the organisation’s curriculum and assessment routines (Kjellén Simes 2008:16). The results are included here to complete the picture of how many Swedish schools are involved in content instruction through an additional language. While the number of upper secondary schools offering IB in Sweden has increased over the years, the number of schools interested in starting with IB has now started to decline, with only two reporting interest in 2012. Diagram 4 presents the number of upper secondary schools offering IB, while Diagram 5 presents the number of interested schools. The statistics from the two diagrams suggest that interest has levelled off.

39 As of June 2013, there are 32 IB degree programs (www.ibo.org).
6.2.2.2 Understanding the results of the 2012 survey

Analysing the responses to the short questionnaire that formed this survey proved difficult. A major finding in the analysis is that very many responses indicated that the teacher or principal responding to the questionnaire did not understand what “content and language integrated learning” meant, although the letters explicitly explained the concept and the one question asked emphasised *subject instruction in another language other than Swedish*. Thus, part of the analysis included sifting through what can be considered misplaced answers. Four main “problem areas” were identified, involving modern languages, mother tongue instruction, Swedish language support, and
Finally missing answers from schools known to offer content teaching through a foreign language. Each problem is described below.

Several schools reported that yes, they offered some integration but then indicated that a school’s modern languages and/or English as a foreign language instruction were taught through the target language. This might be categorised as “Spanish-medium” or “French-medium” but cannot be considered “content and language integrated” if the only subject being taught is the language. This implies confusion with the difference between content instruction and language instruction as well as a lack of understanding of what integration of the two might be. Thus, these schools were not included in the CLIL category.

The survey answers were also analysed in order to remove answers that indicated information about an individual school’s mother tongue tuition. In the Swedish school system, extra mother tongue tuition is offered to all students who actively use another language other than Swedish at home. This is an additional language subject and should not be confused with modern languages or English as a foreign language. Mother tongue support will likely be given in the mother tongue, but the purpose of the survey was to glean information about actual subject content being taught in a foreign language other than the mainstream Swedish that most students have as a native tongue. One respondent asked if sign language is included in the CLIL concept, and this is also interpreted here as a language of support as it is not being used as a foreign language for non-signing students to learn content.

Several respondents also wrote that they do not “need” CLIL because all or the majority of the students in their school have Swedish as their mother tongue or because they are a very small school. Some replied that they would offer Swedish language support if they had newly arrived students not proficient in Swedish, but that the need did not currently exist. These responses indicate the lack of understanding that the option to offer instruction through a foreign or additional language for any and all students exists.

Finally, it is known to the researcher—and easily found online—that at least two more schools offer entire programs with subject instruction through the medium of another language (English in both cases). These schools did not answer the survey and are not included in the results. Their lack of participation highlights the main difficulty with this survey: the results are only an indication of CLIL/EMI in the Swedish upper secondary school as it is impossible to know how many of the other schools that did not respond do indeed offer some form of this option.

The responses above also suggest that many school staff (school heads, such as principals and administrators, and teachers all answered the questionnaire) do not understand the concept of CLIL/EMI themselves. This may be due to the absence of any official definition as well as to the lack of both extensive research in the Swedish context and of widespread dissemination of the results of the research that has been conducted on CLIL and EMI in
Sweden. The responses may also suggest that a high turnover rate of school heads and staff means that colleagues are often unaware of others’ teaching practices. This high turnover rate was made evident in the attempts to track down principals and teachers for e-mail addresses for the questionnaire, as many mails were returned with information about the staff member no longer working at that particular school or being on leave of absence. These responses above and the four main problem areas also suggest that the final results may be a bit misleading as there were many schools that did not give information about how they offer Partial CLIL or Occasional CLIL, and these schools may also have meant modern languages and/or mother tongue provision.

The scope of the 2012 survey was limited and it was not intended to be the main study of the present thesis, but rather to provide understanding of the context for the classroom research. Thus, there are inevitable weaknesses. The survey was limited by the response rate of 56% and cannot be used for greater claims about the development of CLIL or EMI in Sweden since the last survey. The results can only indicate the current status and point to possible changes over the last decade. The 2012 survey did not delve into any details of the responding schools either, keeping the results at a very general level and relying mainly on self-reports. Finally, the focus was on whether or not content and language integration was offered at the schools, with no focus on the student or teacher perspectives. That particular focus was narrowed to the two schools in the main study (see Chapters 7 and 8). Still, the procedure of conducting the survey and the responses from the schools, especially in the voluntary comments section, provided a wealth of data that facilitates the understanding of the current status and knowledge about CLIL in Swedish upper secondary schools today. In the next section, the results and insights from the 2012 survey are compared to the 1999 survey.

6.3 Two surveys: a discussion

6.3.1 Comparison of the 1999 survey and the 2012 survey

In order to determine if there has possibly been an increase or change in content teaching through a foreign language in the Swedish upper secondary school context, a comparison was made between the original studies commissioned by the Agency and the survey from 2012. The original 1999 survey was the basis of the comparison as the subsequent 2001 study on quality in CLIL was limited to 11 focus schools. Both the 1999 survey and the 2012 survey aimed to reach all upper secondary schools in Sweden, with the former also including other levels of education and the latter only
focusing on upper secondary schools offering the 18 national degree programs. Thus, a difference was that the 1999 survey included all programs of study while the 2012 survey focused only on vocational and preparatory for higher education programs, excluding individual study and special education programs. Another difference is that the reported results of the 1999 survey were based on the total number of schools contacted, and not the total number of actual responses. The results from the 2012 survey only indicate the statistics gleaned from the actual responses.

Both the initial 1999 survey and the 2012 survey involved simple questions intended to be answered quickly, with an aim to simply determine if content and language integrated instruction was offered at the school or was planned to be offered within a short timeframe. In 1999, there was also a question about the target language used for instruction in another language. While the initial 1999 questionnaire did not aim to determine the extent or scope of CLIL, in the follow-up focus study of 2001, the schools were identified as having either “limited” or “extensive” CLIL, according to the hours and subjects taught in another language and based on the questionnaires and interviews conducted at the schools (Nixon 2001:12). The 2012 survey did ask informants to indicate the extent of CLIL, but for the purposes of comparison, all schools offering some form of CLIL have been compiled into one category of CLIL and the Planned CLIL category remains. An overview of the two surveys is presented in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999 Survey</th>
<th>2012 survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>502¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target group</td>
<td>All upper secondary schools²</td>
<td>Only upper secondary schools offering the 18 national programs of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Note that 523 responses were received but 21 deemed unusable. See Section 6.2.2 above.
² The 1999 report aimed to survey all school levels in Sweden—from elementary through adult education—but in this comparison, only the results for the upper secondary schools are used.

Diagram 6 below presents the comparison of results based on actual responses to the two questionnaires. Interestingly, the total number of schools offering and planning to implement CLIL remained constant from 1999 to 2012: 166. A big difference can be seen in the category Planned CLIL. In 1999, 44 schools planned to offer CLIL within the coming school year, while in 2012, 15 schools planned to offer CLIL within two years. The difference between the two surveys is 29 schools, and in 2012 there were actually exactly 29 more schools offering some form of CLIL. Unfortunately, it is impossible to claim that these are the same schools, as the specific schools...
from 1999 are unknown, although this would be a very interesting follow-up study to the 2012 survey. Despite the fact that there were 167 more upper secondary schools in Sweden in 2012, the actual number of schools with no CLIL was lower than in 1999. However, the response rate in 2012 was also lower than in 1999.

As it is known that some schools offering content teaching through a language other than Swedish did not respond to the survey, it is clear that the results cannot be understood as an exact representation of the current status of this option in Sweden today. It can also be assumed that the results of the previous report were missing such information as well.

There are some specific similarities between the two surveys. In the 1999 survey, more municipal schools offered CLIL than independent schools. This was the case for those schools offering entire programs in 2012, but the difference is slight (3>2). In 1999, most CLIL schools were found in bigger cities and municipalities and this was true of the five CLIL schools in 2012. Finally, Natural Sciences and Social Sciences programs were the most commonly offered national programs in 1999 as well as 2012. Diagram 7 below illustrates the changes from 1999 to 2012, as indicated by the actual replies to both surveys.
Some questions about differences remain, however. Nixon identified 43 schools that offered the CLIL option for all 6 terms, compared to only five in the current study. However, the scope and extent of each term is not identified in Nixon’s study, so this may actually fall into the category of Occasional or Partial CLIL, as indicated by some examples of responses (e.g. 2000:35, which includes a quote from a school describing its theme work with content and language integrated learning). Also, in Nixon’s report, most upper secondary schools started with CLIL in Grade 2 (Nixon 2000:17), while in the five identified in the 2012 study, all start with CLIL or EMI in Grade 1, also rendering a complete understanding of the development difficult.

6.3.2 Teaching content through a foreign language: changes?

Despite the fact that many claim that teaching content through a foreign language, and especially English, is on the rise in Sweden, the actual interpretation of what that means needs to be more thoroughly understood. The analysis of this survey suggests that the number of schools offering instruction through a medium other than Swedish is not actually increasing. It also suggests that the concept of CLIL—as well as what it might mean to teach a non-language content subjects through the medium of a language other than Swedish—is not well understood by school personnel. Two things are clear, however: first, there has not been a dramatic increase in schools offering instruction through a language other than Swedish, and second, those schools that do choose to offer this option also choose to do so almost exclusively in English.
6.4 Conclusion

The most common form of CLIL in the European context is Partial or Occasional CLIL, where CLIL provision can encompass everything from an hour a week to 50% or more of the instruction time (Eurydice 2006). If, as the 2012 study has indicated, Partial or Occasional CLIL may be increasing in the Swedish context, further studies into exactly which courses are taught partly or occasionally in a foreign language—and how—are needed for a more in-depth understanding of the status of CLIL today. Although some studies have addressed this (such as the present one of two schools as well as the upcoming reports from the longitudinal CLISS project covering three schools), this form of instruction is an under-researched area in the upper secondary school.
7 Research in the schools: Stakeholder perspectives

The research in the schools offering EMI is twofold: an investigation of the stakeholder perspectives on the EMI option and an investigation of classroom practices. The exploration of stakeholder perspectives comprises three investigations: how and why the option is offered, why the option is chosen, and how the practice of the option is experienced. The focus is on how the stakeholders’ perspectives on their expectations and experiences reveal a discourse about the EMI option in the Swedish context. The results of each investigation are presented separately after the overview of the interviews.

7.1 Investigating the stakeholder perspectives

The method used for the investigation into the stakeholder perspectives on English-medium instruction is the semi-structured interview (see also Section 5.3.3). A general interview guide was created for each of the stakeholder groups. The interview guide served as just that: a guide. It was not adhered to slavishly during the interviews but rather guided the questions, so as to ensure that the general areas of interest were covered. The interviewees’ responses determined the exact order of the questions for each specific interview, as their stories, explanations and tangents were used as signposts to signal the direction of the conversation.

The selection of informants for interviews was based on personal contact at the schools or on volunteers in response to the teachers’ requests on behalf of the researcher. For each interview, the informants were informed of the purpose of the study and were given time to ask questions about the present research. Most were conducted in Swedish, although some students and two teachers chose to be interviewed in English. All interviews were audio-recorded with the informants’ permission. The interviews were transcribed in their original language, with extracts translated as necessary, and analysed qualitatively for themes.

40 In the extracts presented in this thesis, some of the English language errors are silently corrected, as the focus of the transcripts is on the stakeholder views and not on the stakeholder language proficiency. These corrections are not noted in the extracts unless they are relevant to the analysis results.
The unit of analysis was the entire utterance. The qualitative content analysis aimed to find patterns of recurring themes across the stakeholders’ interviews, but also other enlightening information that added to the understanding of how and why EMI is offered, chosen and practiced in Swedish upper secondary schools today. Due to the nature of the semi-structured interviews with certain questions leading the conversation, some themes were naturally present (e.g. the perceived advantages and disadvantages). However, the specific examples and personal perspectives still presented new information during the interviews; and some unexpected themes were revealed as well.

7.1.1 School heads

Three school heads were interviewed: two principals and one school head with responsibility for a several upper secondary schools, including one of the schools in the study. The interviews aimed to cover three main areas: the school head’s own role, the school head’s experiences in his/her own school context, and the school head’s opinions about the option in the wider Swedish context. See Table 10 below for an overview.

Table 10: Overview of interviews with school heads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School head interviews</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Y</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Q</td>
<td>35 min</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of schools: School head Z</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general guidelines for the interviews are found below.

School head interview guide
1. How did EMI start at your school?
2. What is your role in EMI at your school?
3. Why do you offer EMI? What is the goal?
4. What is your view of EMI? What are the advantages and disadvantages of schools with EMI?
5. Who is the EMI student?
6. What do your students do after their EMI program?

---

41 This is not a study of the results of EMI instruction. Thus, the focus of the interviews is not on whether or not the students achieve good results (e.g. high proficiency or grades).
42 For all interviews and observations in this thesis, only the month and year are given. The exact dates, times, and places are not included here. Also, the number of minutes has been rounded off to the nearest 5-minute mark as part of the effort to keep the informants anonymous. School head and teacher informants have been given random letters instead of names for pseudonyms.
7. Should more schools in Sweden offer EMI? Why or why not?
8. How do you view the possibility of a different language for medium of instruction (other than English)?
9. Would you recommend EMI to other schools? Why or why not?
10. What do you think the general public should understand about EMI?

7.1.2 Teachers

Eleven teachers were interviewed: nine content teachers (e.g. Biology, Social Sciences, Physics) and two English and Swedish language teachers. All of the teachers were interviewed after time had been spent in their classrooms and at the schools, so that the interviews could be partially based on what was seen during the lessons. Many hours were also spent in informal conversation before and after the lessons with the teachers as well as during coffee breaks and lunches, with some notes taken on these exchanges. For an overview of the teachers, their subjects and the time, see Table 11 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher interviews</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies: Teacher N</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology: Teacher B</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Swedish: Teacher C</td>
<td>70 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/English: Teacher I</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths/Physics: Teacher A</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Swedish: Teacher E</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies: Teacher F</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Physical Education: Teacher E</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics: Teacher G</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology: Teacher D</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry: Teacher L</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aims included understanding how they started teaching in English, why they think their school chose to offer the option, and who the target student is. The interview guide is found below.

Teacher interview guide
1. How did you start with EMI?
2. How are teachers at your school supported in EMI?
3. Who is the EMI student?
4. Is EMI for all students?
5. Would you recommend EMI to other teachers?
6. What strategies do you have for EMI?
7. Are you the same teacher in English and Swedish?
8. How do you see the roles of Swedish and English in your classroom? Are students allowed to speak Swedish in your lesson? When and why?
7.1.3 Students

For the present study, a total of 25 students were interviewed in 12 interview situations (individual, pairs, or groups). Table 12 below presents an overview of the interviews with the students divided by grade.

Table 12: Overview of interviews with students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student interviews</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FSs</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FSs + 1 MS</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FS + 2 MSs</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FSs</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FS</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS + FS</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FSs</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 MS</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>February 2012</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MSs</td>
<td>70 min</td>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 FSs</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS + FS</td>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 FSs</td>
<td>50 min</td>
<td>March 2013</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FS = female student and MS = male student
1) This student was interviewed both individually and in a group. The individual interview took place after spending an entire day with this student. See footnote 43 below.

At Aspen School, where the focus was on Grade 1, eleven students from the 30 participating students were interviewed, with one student interviewed twice. In addition, one student in Grade 3 was interviewed as part of a case study. At Birch School, where the focus was on Grades 2 and 3, four students from the 18 participating students in Grade 2 were interviewed and nine students from the 16 participating students Grade 3. (Two of the male students in Grade 3 were also interviewed during pilot work when they were in Grade 1.) Three female students were interviewed in Grade 3, after being observed during their Grade 2 lessons. They were thus interviewed a year after the time spent in the classroom with them was completed. These interviews were deemed desirable after the analysis of the classroom practice.

The students were asked about choice and about practice. At both schools, informal conversations with students before and after lessons as

---
43 The case study at one school involved the researcher following three students, one each in Grades 1, 2 and 3, for an entire school day, with the aim of observing how the students encountered English throughout a typical day on an EMI program. This multiple case study is not reported in this thesis as a separate study.
well as during lunch also provided some insight into how and why the students chose the EMI program. See the interview guide below.

Student interview guide
1. How and why did you choose this program?
2. What were your expectations of this English-language program?
3. Did you have any specific goals?
4. Do you think there should be language requirements for this program? If yes, what kind?
5. Did your decision to choose a program with English-medium instruction depend on goals after upper secondary school?
6. How did your parents affect your choice of this program?
7. What is the reputation of this program?
8. How did the trip abroad influence your decision?
9. What is hard/easy about this program?
10. How do you handle language problems/difficulties?
11. How do you handle switching between English and Swedish?
12. How do you use English with your classmates?
13. How do you use English outside of the classroom?
14. Do you use as much English as you expected? Why or why not?
15. Why do you think some students choose not to use English in the classroom even though they chose to study an English-language program?
16. Would you recommend this program to others? Why or why not?
17. Are programs like this one in English necessary in Sweden?
18. Anything else you would like to say about studying in English?

All students were asked personally at the school if they would like to be interviewed and volunteered readily. Most chose to be interviewed with friends, while only a few were randomly paired with classmates. The students were familiar with the interviewer prior to the actual interview situation. While most of the interviews were conducted in Swedish, one single student in Grade 3, two pairs (one each in Grade 1 and Grade 3), and two groups of three students in Grade 1 chose themselves to be interviewed in English, as seen in the overview above. Students who chose to be interviewed in English were informed both that they could use Swedish at any time and that their opinions and experiences were the key components of the interviews—not their language proficiency. Many of the students did use Swedish to varying degrees during the English interviews.\(^\text{44}\)

\(^{44}\) Note that here, as with all stakeholder interviews, the informants’ English has been silently corrected for grammar. Single Swedish words and phrases have not been noted in the quotes, with the exception of items that are deemed key to the analysis of the utterance.
7.1.4 Parents

Six parents were interviewed\(^{45}\). Table 13 below presents an overview of the interviews with the parents. All interviews were conducted in Swedish.

Table 13: Overview of interviews with parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent interviews</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent 1</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 2</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 3</td>
<td>25 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 4</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 5</td>
<td>90 min</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent 6</td>
<td>30 min</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the informants were either contacted personally or volunteered when the class mentor teachers sent e-mail requests to all parents in one EMI class at one school. Three of the parents had children studying on the EMI program at the time of the interview. One had a child who very recently graduated, while two had children who graduated from EMI programs some years prior to the interview. One had more than one child who had studied/was currently studying the program, while others also had children who had chosen other programs of study through the medium of Swedish. During the longest interview, the parent was very interested in discussing not only the child’s choice of school, but also the child’s language learning and use in general as well as extramural activities, family language use, and future plans. Thus, there was a mix of backgrounds and experiences, as well as involvement in the EMI program.

The guide below was used during the interviews, and as with the other interviews, parents were encouraged to bring up other topics or experiences they felt were relevant to them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent interview guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you view your child’s choice of an EMI program of study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How much were you involved in your child’s choice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of schools with EMI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How does the EMI choice affect your child’s future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would you recommend this program to others?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{45}\) Several of the parents also have other roles as stakeholders. Their interviews thus covered both their roles as parents as well as their other roles in the educational option. The exact minutes that each informant discussed his role as a parent are not given here, but generally speaking they only spoke as parents during part of the interview, focusing instead on their other roles. In order to make them as anonymous as possible, the exact division is not given here, although it was noted in the analysis. Also, all parents will be referred to as males, even though both mothers and fathers were interviewed.
7.2 Offering the option

Since the national school reform opened the doors to greater freedom for independent schools in Sweden in the mid-1990s, upper secondary schools have increasingly been an open market. Students leaving the compulsory school system in Grade 9 have a broad spectrum of choices available throughout the country if they choose to continue their schooling at the non-compulsory upper secondary school level, which most do (see Chapter 6). Each upper secondary school thus aims to find means to attract students in a competitive school market. Some schools offer computers or driving licenses to students, while others might offer fantastic school excursions. Schools also use websites, brochures, and advertising in the local media to attract pupils. At an annual exhibition fair in Stockholm, schools showcase their programs with splashy booths, often with current students or staff present to promote the school\(^{46}\). In the open market for upper secondary education, the schools by necessity need to “sell” their education in a persuasive manner; and some schools find that if they can offer an added value of some kind, they have a greater chance of attracting high calibre students. In the fight for students in the upper secondary school market, offering EMI may be an “attractive selling point” (Josephson 2011:139), as also seen at the compulsory level when one municipal official “ordered” a school to offer English-medium instruction in an attempt to stave off the competition from newly established independent compulsory schools in the area (Skolverket 2010:26).

At the upper secondary level, two of the recommendations for further enquiry in the 2001 report of quality in schools offering instruction through a foreign language (see the previous chapter) were the following: 1) *Who is the content and language integration intended for?* and 2) *What information about the school’s provision of content and language integrated learning is it important to distribute to potential learners, their parents, schools, etc.?* These recommendations suggest the importance of knowing who the target students are as well as how the schools might reach them. While some recent research has investigated the role of marketing and targeting certain stakeholders in the general upper secondary school arena (e.g. Forsberg, forthcoming), there is little understanding of why EMI programs are offered, who the intended student on an EMI program is, and how these schools present the option.

This section presents the study on offering the option of English-medium instruction. In order to understand why schools may choose to offer English-medium instruction, school heads and teachers involved in the option at the upper secondary level were interviewed. Previous investigations of EMI in Swedish upper secondary schools have not included the voices of school

\(^{46}\) This was witnessed first-hand when attending the annual school exhibition in 2010.
heads. School heads may not always be directly involved in the day-to-day decisions about the practice of EMI in the classroom, but they are usually involved in decisions concerning the budget for the programs as well as hiring of teachers and marketing the programs. Still, teachers may play a bigger role. According to the Agency study on compulsory schools offering EMI, the initiative to teach in English came from individual teachers themselves in the majority of cases, with 14 of 20 municipal schools falling in this category (2010:24). While the exact role of upper secondary teachers in both choosing to teach in English and in developing existing programs in English is not clear, the presence of engaged teachers was deemed a key factor in the Agency’s reports from 1999 and 2001.

7.2.1 Expectations and experiences

Three areas were considered in the analysis of the interviews with school heads and teachers about how and why the EMI option is offered: the schools, the teachers, and the perceived target student. The results are presented thematically in each of these three subdivisions with extracts from the interviews.

7.2.1.1 Offering a program with EMI

When considering the role of the school, three themes emerged: the initial experience of offering an EMI program, the view of EMI as an elite program, and thoughts on how the program is marketed.

The two informant schools in this study have been offering EMI for many years, about 15 years each at Birch School and Aspen School, with commencement at both schools shortly after the national school reform of 1994. Several teachers, such as Teacher C and Teacher E, see EMI as a trend, one that took off during the same period that their schools began offering EMI in the late 1990’s. Independent schools had not yet established themselves on the market, so the “same clientele with ambitious parents,” as Teacher C puts it, were attracted to programs taught in English. At both schools, there are still school heads and/or teachers present who initiated the programs. The informants presented some similar reasoning behind their decisions to start EMI as well as some disparate.

At Aspen School, the initiative to start EMI was bottom-up, coming from the teachers themselves, especially Teacher A and Teacher E. Teacher A acknowledges that the decision to have Swedish teachers teach in English may seem a little strange to outsiders, but also emphasises the role of English in Sweden today, maintaining that offering English-medium programs in upper secondary school is a sign of the times, as she explains below.
1. As time has passed, I think it is more and more fitting (with English-medium programs). Whether we want it or not, English is more and more a part of the Swedish language.

Principal Q feels the program was an obvious choice for Aspen School. She emphasises the fact that the students should be given a choice, and if they wished to study in English, then let them. As she says, “Why does everything have to be the same?”

The municipality was actually the instigator of the commencement of the program at Birch School, which Teacher I notes is unique. When Birch School commenced with EMI, the goal was specifically to offer a program that was not offered elsewhere in the region. In order to reach a wider market, the school offered their program on a national level, meaning that students from all over Sweden could apply. This lasted only the first few years, until the regulations for offering national intake changed in Sweden; but during the initial period, they did attract students from outside of the municipality, albeit mostly from the closest municipalities.

School head Z notes that the decision to offer EMI or not is essentially a political decision, one in which she as a school head is necessarily involved. School head Z says that the option has been discussed at the political level in the municipality and she sees her role as ensuring that the conditions for the school are as ideal as possible for them to continue with their teaching in English. She does not, however, feel the discussions about the option are negative, but on the contrary tend to be very positive.

Each of the stakeholders was asked about the potential risks and difficulties the school might encounter with starting an EMI program. From a very practical point, all of the school heads pointed out the fact that an EMI program can be costlier than a regular program in Swedish, in large part due to the trip abroad that both schools in this study offer. Another potential cost is in-service training. Several teachers feel the schools need to offer more support and more in-service training for the subject teachers, especially considering that none of them have higher education in English or language teaching (with the exception of the language teachers). Finally, a disadvantage can be the necessary compromise between hiring qualified subject teachers and highly proficient English speakers—when the school cannot manage both, it may be difficult to offer a program with as much English-medium instruction as advertised or as planned. School head Z concludes that any school offering EMI should aim to provide information about potential disadvantages, as well as advantages, for parents and students from the start.

One advantage of the program is its reputation for high quality. Although Teacher C acknowledges that sometimes the other teachers at Birch School see the EMI program as a “sheltered setup,” many remark that they never hear any negative comments about the program. Instead, EMI programs generally have high status, according to all the stakeholders. This high status
affects the general feeling at the two schools that the program in English is an elite program. The positive reputation of the program affects how the teachers and school heads feel about their work as well. Teacher E notes that the fact that the teachers feel proud of their program has clear advantages. She sees that the pride they take in the program has an affirmative effect: if they think they are great, then it is easier to be that great. There is a feeling that the schools are offering the students something extra, above and beyond the offer of an upper secondary school diploma. As School head Z says,

2. The international program is without a doubt the elite class of the region. It’s like a little jewel for us.

Choosing to offer EMI has several other advantages for the schools, according to the stakeholders. School head Z says that offering EMI also opened the door to accepting more exchange students from abroad, making their year in Sweden more meaningful when they can access the learning more quickly and easily through English than they can with Swedish. She shares another example of possibilities when she relates the story of a businessman from Europe who only accepted a high-level job in the region when he realised that an EMI program was available for his teenager. Also, for Aspen School, the original decision to offer the Natural Sciences program in English was actually a way to attract girls to a male-dominated program. According to Teacher E, this works, as the EMI program usually has 70-75% girls in each class

Both Aspen School and Birch School have relied mainly on open houses for the public for marketing their programs. Aspen School has also hosted visitor days for potential students from secondary schools to visit the Natural Science classes. Students themselves participate in these open house evenings and the visitor days, which Principal Q sees as especially positive since the students are “very satisfied with their education.”

A clear goal for both Aspen School and Birch School from the beginning was to offer the students a class trip to an English-speaking country. The class trips for both schools play an important role in marketing to the target student. Most potential students either already know about the trip abroad when they choose to visit the school or they find out at the open house. Many even choose this program in order to go on the trip abroad, according to Teacher I. Principal Q emphasises that the trip is “very important,” not only as a trip abroad but as part of the students’ general education.

---

47 This can be compared to the International Baccalaureate program. In 2012, there were 1,158 students on IB upper secondary programs in Sweden. 720 (62%) of these students were girls and 438 (38%) boys. These figures are comparable to the Grade 1 class at Aspen School as well as national statistics, as more girls than boys chose Natural Sciences in 2012/2013.
In summary, despite having quite different start-ups (top-down for Birch School and bottom-up for Aspen School), the two schools have similar views on the marketing advantages of offering EMI: they can offer an elite program with a good reputation. The issue of language, e.g. if they think they will have enough students who can manage the English, in relation to the choice to offer the EMI option is not evident; but it does surface in the theme of offering content-teaching through English, as seen below.

7.2.1.2 Offering subjects with EMI
The role of the teachers in schools making the choice to offer EMI is key, according to both school heads and the teachers themselves. Two main themes about the teachers emerged in relation to offering EMI: the difficulties involved in finding English-proficient subject teachers and the lack of support and pre/in-service training.

English skills are an issue. Principal Y stresses the difficulty in finding qualified content teachers who are also highly proficient in English, which Principal Q also underscores as a risk to the quality of an EMI program. The dilemma in the choice between a qualified subject teacher and a highly proficient or native English-language speaker was addressed early in the years of the program at Birch School; and Principal Y emphasises that trying only to recruit native speakers was not always the best strategy. In the beginning, he says, the students complained that the Swedish content teachers did not speak English well enough. The school heads then hired native speakers who were not qualified teachers—but the students soon realised that the language only was insufficient. Then they worried that they were not getting enough of the content with the native English speakers who did not know the subjects well. As Principal Y puts it, “They realised that it was better with us Swedes who spoke a little worse English, and that it didn’t need to be English all the time, either.”

Recruiting a teacher who is qualified in the subject and can teach that subject in English, however, is not an easy task. Principal Y explains that Birch School has struggled throughout the entire existence of the EMI program to secure qualified teachers with highly proficient language skills. It is not enough to be comfortable in subject-specific English. Presenting a lecture in English is not a difficult task, according to Principal Y. He believes the real difficulties emerge during the conversations taking place between the presentations of the content. Questions outside of the subject matter, in the periphery, can be taxing for a non-native speaker. Teacher I also stresses that teaching in English should not be taken lightly:

3. It’s like, well, can you do it in economics? To be honest, if you are an English teacher, it’s important. It’s not like, “Oh, I am going to learn a little terminology and then I am going to teach you economics in English.” It’s one thing to learn a little terminology and plan a few lessons
and then do it in English. It’s a whole other thing when the students are asking you in English and you have to explain it. I mean, I am a Spanish teacher and if someone asks me, can I do History in Spanish? Well, no.

Quality in relation to language skills is likewise a matter that all three school heads raise as an issue in the decision to offer EMI or not. Principal Y further explains that the teachers’ English language skills are often featured in the quality discussions at the school management level, highlighting the concern for the need to ensure a high level of proficiency. At one school, the principal rationalises that it is better to drop the goal of an English-only program if a qualified subject teacher who is also highly proficient in English cannot be hired. “It is better to have the lesson in Swedish then, rather than Swenglish.”

Despite the declared focus on quality in the interviews, in-service training is not prioritised. In the beginning, prior to commencement of the program, Birch School invested heavily in in-service training for the content teachers, sending them on extended language study trips to the US and England. Teachers were offered extra support with an English teacher, later with a native speaker, in order to “keep up the fluency,” says Principal Y. Funding for such in-service training was not an option in the long run, however, and this lack had severe consequences. Principal Y explains that the top-down directive has often been difficult, as the school was ordered to continue the program for many years, whereas they often feel that they were not given the resources to properly execute this undertaking. The municipality was insistent that the school administrators maintain the EMI program, despite protests from the teachers that funding was insufficient, which several at the school feel has contributed to the demise of the program. For example, spending time abroad in an English-speaking country, whether on courses or with the class on the school trip, would also help the teachers, although this is seen as a luxury not always available to all as funding for in-service training is nearly non-existent for both Birch School and Aspen School today.

Principal Q also acknowledges that teaching in English is more work for the teachers, as they often need to create their own materials or find suitable texts for their students rather than just depend on the readily available Swedish textbook. Teaching in English simply takes more time than teaching in Swedish, a sentiment repeated by nearly all of the stakeholders. Principal Y says that the school cannot afford to give them the time they need.

4. According to our estimates we made in the beginning, it takes 50% more time for a Swedish teacher to teach a lesson in English compared to teaching in Swedish.

Some of the informants have had slightly reduced teaching hours compared to their colleagues in Swedish-language programs, but none of the teachers
said they had any perks in time or higher salary at the time of the study. Thus, although the Eurydice overview of CLIL provisions in 2006 indicates that Swedish teachers receive a higher salary in the initial stages of implementing a program in another language, this is not actually so in this case.

Perhaps due to the lack of support, most of the stakeholders actually pause when asked if they would recommend EMI for other schools. The teachers are not keen on a general recommendation for all schools when it comes to English-medium instruction. Teacher C says that he would definitely recommend EMI—but only if the program could function well with teachers who are highly proficient in English. Most emphasise that so much depends on the teachers: they need to both be qualified in the subject and highly proficient in English. Teacher J elaborates below.

5. You need teachers who walk the line and don’t get lazy, cut back on or give up the English. Rather, really go for it all the time and be willing to give students the extra help and support they need in English.

The school administrators must be willing to provide high quality in-service training for the teachers, which is also costly. So if a school plans to start a program with EMI, the financial aspect must be secure, according to Principal Y. If a school does decide to offer EMI, Principal Y warns against promising too much. Schools need to be clear about what they can actually offer. Teacher E agrees:

6. I think you should say what you can offer. /…/ You need to be clear and say, “This is what we have and this is our goal.” If you have English in most of the subjects, then you should say you have English in most of the subjects and not all.

Finally, Teacher E stresses that it is hard to recommend a program with English-medium instruction when there are no standards or commonly accepted definitions of what it means to teach in English in a Swedish school. This would be a job for the National Agency for Education in Sweden—a job she feels is not being done properly.

To summarise, the schools emphasise the importance of teachers in the decision to offer EMI: both in recruiting qualified teachers who can also teach in English and in maintaining quality through appropriate in-service training. With virtually no in-service training or perks for staff at either school, the programs rely on dedicated teachers.

7.2.1.3 Offering EMI to a target student

The final area of the consideration of offering EMI is the target student. In order to formulate a description of the EMI student, the stakeholders were asked to describe the typical intended student. Three main themes arose: students with academic motivation, students who are interested—but not
necessarily brilliant—in language, and students with clear goals for the future.

Teacher E states that, in general, the students who manage the best in the school are the students on the EMI programs. Principal Q feels these ambitious students need the challenges offered by EMI. She maintains that there are many programs in Swedish education designed to help those who need extra support, and not enough programs for those capable students who need challenges, or “a little extra.” EMI offers these students just that. Principal Y agrees that the program is designed to attract students who are serious about their studies.

7. The goal was to have a top education that appealed to students who wanted to go on to studies at the tertiary level.

Both schools have chosen to offer an English-medium program in Social Sciences (although the program at Aspen is not included in this study); however, both school principals suggest that, in general, students choosing Social Sciences are not as goal-oriented as those choosing Natural Sciences. Rather, the Social Sciences program is seen as a default backup for many. The Social Sciences program in English may attract those motivated students who are not interested in science but are interested in studying further, according to Principal Y.

8. I think we need to attract students who are highly academically motivated back to the Social Sciences program. The program has become one that students choose because they think they might want to go to university in the future. We want them to choose the program because it prepares you for future studies.

The two municipal schools offering EMI in this present study do not require a certain level of English for students choosing this program. While other programs with special profiles, such as dance or music, may demand a certain level of ability of their students, the EMI programs rely on the usual procedure in Swedish upper secondary education, that the students with the highest grades applying to any program will be accepted first.48 However, as School head Z argues, the EMI programs tend to be self-regulating as far as language demands are concerned, as students with low grades in English in secondary school are less likely to apply for the EMI program in upper secondary school.

9. I have a hard time thinking anyone with just a passing grade in English from secondary would choose the international program. The presuppo-

---

48 Note that in the Swedish system, the scale for acceptance onto a program changes yearly as it is based on the actual applicants each year.
position is that you have the highest or next to highest grade if you are going to manage.

Thus, the students who do choose EMI also tend to be the students who are highly academically motivated and who have managed their studies well in the past and generally have strong chances of continuing to excel in school. As one school head puts it, “It’s easy to have good results when you have strong students.” Teacher L elaborates:

10. These students are very highly motivated. It is not exactly an advantage to study chemistry in English. Rather it is more difficult for a student with Swedish as a mother tongue.

Teacher J describes another advantage for students who choose EMI: they are no longer the odd ones who like to be studious.

11. Many of these students come to us from secondary schools where they have been the odd ones focusing on their studies. It’s not easy if you have always been the nerd. Every year students tell us they have been the nerds and then they come here, and everyone is the same! It’s ok to study here.

While Principal Q says that the typical EMI student is more ambitious than the average student, Teacher C points out that not only is the student ambitious, but the parents tend to be ambitious as well. Several teachers suggest that students who choose EMI often have support from home, perhaps not specific encouragement to choose EMI but definitely encouragement to choose studies that lead to greater possibilities in higher education. Many note that students come from homes where there is a tradition of focusing on education (see also Section 7.3).

Despite the aim to attract ambitious students, several teachers say that not all the students who choose EMI are the best in English and not all arrive with high grades from secondary school. However, this is not seen as problematic, according to Teacher G.

12. No, that is what is so fun. Many are not very strong in English, but they still choose this program. I suppose they think it is fun. It adds a little glitter to daily life in some way!

While some students struggle and a few have even quit the English-medium program in favour of the Swedish-medium counterpart, those who do choose EMI have one thing in common: they are interested in English. As Teacher G says, some of the students may not be the best ones, but they do think English is fun (this particular description, fun, is repeated by all of the stakeholders in the study). So even though the choice of program, Natural Sciences or Social Sciences, should and does often come first, Teacher J states, “Of
course they should be interested in English.” Teacher E agrees, noting that
the academic motivation goes hand in hand with the willingness to work
hard in an area of interest.

13. EMI doesn’t work if the students are not academically motivated. They
have to be interested in languages and interested because it is harder. No
getting around it.

While the typical EMI student may enjoy English, they still need to focus on
going beyond informal everyday English to academic English and they have
to manage the subjects on the program. Unlike some of her colleagues,
Teacher A feels strongly that it is not enough to target students who like
English—they have to have solid grades in Maths and Physics as well. The
demands of the program in Natural Sciences supersede the general interest in
languages. Teacher B mentions this interest the students have for English,
too, but sees another key ingredient to the target student: they have to dare.

14. You have to dare: dare to read, write and speak English. If you get it
wrong, it doesn’t matter.

Besides aiming to offer English to students who like English, all of the
stakeholders talk about what the program can offer the target student for the
future—both future studies and future careers. Although neither school has
conducted any formal studies on what their students have done after their
upper secondary education, all three school heads describe some anecdotal
information about their students. Principal Y mentions that many of the pro-
gram students have chosen to study international economics at the tertiary
level. School head Z stresses the need for English in all future studies and
work life.

15. Good proficiency in English is the prerequisite for all further studies
and for entering the workforce. It really is a requirement from all em-
ployers after a university degree.

Teacher D describes the target students as being “on their way,” meaning
that most of them know already before they start upper secondary school
that they will continue their studies at university level. Teacher I agrees,
saying that the students who choose this program have “ideas about their
future.” The goals the students have may not necessarily be only for future
studies, but Teacher I means that the students generally have a plan for their
future—whether that means knowing they want to work in a certain field or
that they want to live abroad. Principal Q concurs:

16. The goal is for students to be better prepared for their future. /…/ Most
students who choose EMI have clear goals.
Principal Q clarifies that she means both for future studies at universities, where much of the literature is in English even on Swedish-medium courses, and for future work life. Principal Y echoes the goal to specifically prepare students for university course literature in English; and one goal of the EMI program is thus specifically to provide the students with experience in reading subject literature in English. Teacher J says that many former students have said that they have an advantage starting university studies, because they are used to both subject terminology and to expressing themselves in English. As Teacher G says:

17. Sometimes I think about my own university education in Physics. I remember that I felt awful in the beginning because it was hard enough just learning quantum physics. Then I usually think, boy are they lucky, they don’t have to think about all this (English vocabulary).

Teacher F is convinced that upper secondary students today will be more mobile in the future than earlier generations, and a solid base in English will only be an advantage. On a level even beyond the school, Teacher F says if Swedish students can get even better in English than they already are, the potential human capital is enormous. Teacher N maintains that EMI programs prepare the students for a global future, ready to meet any challenges anywhere in the world:

18. Their world has to be anywhere, not only Sweden.

To sum up, both Aspen School and Birch School indicate they are offering EMI to the same target student: a motivated, academically strong student who knows what she wants for her future education and career. The school heads and teachers feel the offer of EMI meets the goals and ambitions of these elite students. This is also reflected in Section 7.3 below on why students choose EMI.

7.2.2 Offering the option: A discourse

This section has presented the perspectives of school heads and teachers on offering the option of EMI. Nixon (2000:63) previously maintained that the main goal of EMI in Swedish upper secondary school was to improve students’ proficiency in English. This goal is not reflected in the discourse of the present stakeholders. The focus is rather on offering an elite program for academically motivated students and to give them something extra to ensure a successful future. According to Dalton-Puffer, those who decide about EMI or CLIL (e.g. policymakers or school heads) often have a discourse of “more of everything.” That is, they see the educational option has providing wide benefits and “generally enhanced learning outcomes” (2007:275). The
discourse of the school heads and teachers at these two schools aligns with this claim. There is a great focus on the assumed benefits that the elite program will offer, both as a refuge for bright students and as a guarantee for the future demands of English.

In the early reports conducted by the Agency, top reasons for offering EMI included increased communicative competence for students and opportunities for school internationalisation. The future employment and education of students were also given as reasons to offer EMI. Interestingly, the fourth most common reason was to promote the school’s profile (Nixon 2000:38). In their presentation of declared advantages, both schools here focus on the option as an extra perk for the school or the region, as much as for the potential student. School heads see offering EMI as a way to attract students through enhancement of their school’s “profile and customer appeal” (as Dalton-Puffer indicates is the case in Austria as well, 2007:47).

The EU report on CLIL in 2006 maintains that Swedish schools offer a curriculum with instruction through a foreign language with a “focus more on socioeconomic aims” (23) for the student. Such aims are not part of an official goal outlined by Swedish educational policy, but are still mentioned both explicitly and implicitly by the stakeholders, who frequently mention the educational and professional advantages the EMI students will have in the future. However, schools actively—and successfully—market the option based on common sense assumptions and not necessarily on empirical research (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:34). One assumed advantage of EMI in many contexts is that the option provides more than just linguistic capital; English is seen as equivalent to “being educated and internationally mobile” (Gardner 2012:250). While the contexts Gardner describes tend to be former colonies, the attitude is reflected in the stakeholders’ discourse here. As in other contexts, English is equated with “ideas of success: entrepreneurship, mobility, luxury” (Blommaert 2005:212).

The discourse of offering EMI also presents the problems of increased workload and lack of support, yet the stakeholders do not indicate that this deters them. While in some contexts, such as Spain and several Eastern European countries, teachers or schools are allocated extra resources for the implementation of CLIL or EMI, teachers in most contexts do not usually choose to teach in EMI programs for the economic or professional benefits, as “the gratification of CLIL teachers is almost exclusively symbolic, the satisfaction deriving largely from meeting a professional challenge successfully. There are no financial rewards, no reduced teaching hours and sometimes not even extra funds for additional teaching materials” (Dalton-Puffer 2007:47). García concurs:

Many CLIL-type programs in Europe depend on the good will and enthusiasm of the teachers willing to take the plunge in adapting to working through
a weaker language (both for them and their students) of instruction. 
(2009:150)

If this is the case, why then teach in English? The implicit reward described in the discourse of the interviewed teachers is their participation in an elite program with the advantages of teaching clever, motivated students. All reports on EMI in the Swedish context report that the students who choose the option are the ones who are already academically motivated and goal-oriented (Hyltenstam 2004:91). This is reflected in the discourse here, albeit without explicit concerns about the students’ language abilities. Instead, EMI teachers and school heads imply that academic motivation is sufficient preparation for managing the demands of content learning through English. This can be compared to Lim Falk’s study as her informant teachers do not even mention whether or not the students have the necessary proficiency in English to manage their studies in EMI (2008:253).

In this study, there is clearly a discourse extolling the value of English as a language of the future: none of the stakeholders in this sub-study mention the possibilities or potential advantages of other languages for this option. When asked specifically, they focus on the fact that English already has a given place in the linguistic life of the students, which other languages do not in the Swedish context. This has three implications: first, that the students (and teachers) are considered functionally bilingual in English; secondly, that they do not see the EMI option as adding English to the students’ linguistic repertoire, but rather only supporting it; and thirdly, that the school heads and teachers do not reflect on the implications of EMI in relation to the Swedish language policy of multilingualism. These facets are included in the discourse of the students, as seen below in the investigation on choosing the option, and are further considered in the discussion in Chapter 9.

7.3 Choosing the option

All potential upper secondary school students in Sweden must make a choice for their program of study, as explained in Chapter 6. Students are free to apply to any school in Sweden, although most choose to study in their own or a neighbouring municipality. For some students, this choice may also involve the choice of the language of instruction on the preferred program of study if the EMI option is available. As all schools offering EMI also offer the same program solely through the medium of Swedish, the choice of EMI is an active, voluntary choice. Although student voices have been investigated to some degree in previous research (e.g. Washburn 1997; Lim Falk 2008) in order to understand their experiences with EMI in Swedish schools, their views on the initial choice of the option are relatively unexplored.
The role of parents in the choice of an English-medium program of study at the upper secondary level has rarely been addressed in previous Swedish research, although Washburn includes limited parent perspectives (1997). Parental involvement in the EMI option is included in the Swedish National Agency’s report on compulsory schools from 2010; and in at least one municipal school, English-speaking parents in the community requested that a bilingual program be started, which transpired (2010:24). The same study also indicates that some parents want EMI at the compulsory level because they think it is a better study environment with more motivated students than a regular municipal Swedish school (28). While parental influence is not the main focus of the present study, the guidance the parents may or not have provided for their children in this choice is of interest to the understanding of the students’ own expectations.

This section presents the study on choosing the option of English-medium instruction. In order to understand why students may choose to study English-medium instruction, both students and parents were interviewed.

7.3.1 Expectations

Four themes emerged in the investigation of student and parent perspectives on choosing the EMI option: their portrayal of the typical EMI student, their choice of program, their choice of language and the EMI choice in relation to their future. Each is explored below.

7.3.1.1 Who is the “EMI student”?

In their explanations of why they chose the EMI program, two descriptions of the EMI student echo across the informants’ perspectives: first, that they already know English and only wish to improve; and second, that they see EMI as an option for those who are already more motivated in school.

None of the students say that they chose the EMI program to learn English, but instead many declare that they expect to improve their English rather than learn English, as suggested by Molly and Tindra below.

19. **Molly**: I wanted to develop my English and, like, use it for more than getting a grade in English class.

20. **Tindra**: I chose this program because I wanted to improve my English and to speak fluently, so it wouldn’t be so choppy when I am abroad and trying to speak English. I can explain more thoroughly what I mean and not be misunderstood.

This sentiment resonates in the parents’ beliefs in their children’s language proficiency, as none express any doubt that their child can manage a program in English.
21. **Parent 5:** I think it is quite natural for him to choose an international program because he knows English well.

When asked about their experiences with English before starting upper secondary school, many indicate that they do not have such wide exposure beyond some extramural use. Here are two students discussing how much they used English before starting the program.

22. **Nancy:** I read some books, watched some movies, and my father had some friends in the US that I keep in touch with.

23. **Tyra:** Not really much, I guess. I have a friend who likes to watch movies as much as I do, so we like, quote the movies and stuff.

Neither Nancy nor Tyra present their previous use of academic English as an important factor to their English use before upper secondary school, but instead focus on random extramural English practices. Some students, however, do mention their English lessons in secondary school and the preparation these provided—or not—for making the EMI choice. This belief in the students’ proficiency extends to the general opinion that the students are already academically motivated and will do well in education anyway, as also indicated by the teachers and school heads in the previous section.

Students on the EMI programs have a reputation of being “smart”—or even “nerdy,” as many of the students put it. Svante says that EMI students are not only seen as studious, but also as better in English from the start, a reputation that several of the other students recognise.

24. **Tyra:** When you tell someone what program you are in, they, like, oh pluggis?!

25. **Esther:** They think it’s hard, oh this is very hard and I am international and we study everything in English and they are like, “Are you crazy?”

Some students explain that they have always done well in school and saw the EMI option as a natural choice for them. Parent 2 says that his daughter was “goal-oriented since she was ten,” so the choice was a natural one for her. Another example is Minna, who relates that already in compulsory school, she came across information about the EMI program in her study counsellor’s office and decided then to aim for it.

26. **Minna:** When I was in sixth grade, there was a paper with the entrance qualification points for all the upper secondary school programs. The

---

49 *Pluggis* is a Swedish slang term for a student who spends a lot of time studying.
EMI program had the highest points, and so I thought, “That must be good!”

Parent 5 says that when his son started the program, he (the son) was very pleased right from the start, in a large part due to his feeling that the students are all serious.

27. Parent 5: He came home and said, “Do you know what? Everyone is smart!”

Ella says that the teachers have higher expectations of the students on EMI programs right from the start, because they have a reputation of being academically motivated. Students do see motivation as key. According to Svante: “You don’t have to be good in English but you have to be motivated.” Parent 4 also thinks that the students need to be academically motivated if they are going to manage, as well as keep up with the other students.

28. Parent 4: You lose motivation if you are not as clever as the others.

To summarise, the students and parents indicate that the student who chooses EMI is already proficient in English and already academically motivated. This reflects the school head and teacher views on the target student as well.

7.3.1.2 Making a choice for a program

In this study, the students are either studying the Natural Sciences program (Aspen) or the Social Sciences program (Birch). Two themes centred on the choice of the program of study: first, choosing the program in relation to the choice of language, and second, making the choice independently, with little influence from others.

At both Aspen School and Birch School, the EMI programs are also offered in Swedish. In explaining their choice of program, students at both schools emphasise the fact that both Social Sciences and Natural Sciences are considered “broad” programs, offering the students a wide variety of choices at the university level, with qualifications for many programs of study at the tertiary level. If they choose a vocational program, for example, they may be required to complete pre-requisites at a municipal adult education school (known as komvux in Swedish) before continuing to university studies. Still, even though they may be choosing their program based on the fact that it is “broad,” they are still making that active choice for the English-medium option and not the Swedish-medium option. The question is thus, why do the students then choose the EMI program? Some see that the com-

---

50 In the Swedish system, students earn points from their grades in secondary school. When they apply for a program in upper secondary school, the quotas for each class are filled starting with those with the highest number of points.
bination of a broad program with the added value of English as one with higher status, as seen in Malte and Leo’s comments below.

29. Malte: Normal Social Sciences has this stigma of being too soft. The English-speaking program sounds a bit better and I do think it’s a bit harder and since not everyone goes here, it is stricter.
30. Leo: Yeah, I would say that.
31. R\(^{31}\): So it is not just that it is a Social Sciences program, but that it is Social Sciences in English?
32. Both: Yeah.
33. Malte: In English and a bit harder.

Students were asked which was more important: the program choice or the language choice. Diagram 8 below illustrates how students made their program choice, by focusing either mainly on the academic program or primarily on the English-medium option when making their choice.

As seen in the diagram, some students are primarily choosing the program first (Natural Sciences or Social Sciences), with the choice of studying that program through the medium of English only a secondary consideration, while for others it is the opposite. Students at Aspen School, who study the Natural Sciences program, are more likely to think the program itself is most important. In the interviews, those who stated that they feel the program was the primary choice also indicated that if the English-medium option had been offered only in another program of study (e.g. in a vocational program instead of the university preparatory), then they would not have chosen EMI.

\(^{31}\) R = researcher in the interviews.
Several students at Aspen express their emphasis on the program choice first below.

34. **Alvin:** I think the most important fact is that it is Natural Sciences. Natural Sciences, not language.

35. **Vera:** I didn’t think about the school. I chose the program first and then I thought about, like, would I take English or Swedish?

On the other hand, at Birch School, most students feel the English language option was the most important consideration when making their choice. The students who say that the English language option was the most attractive aspect of their choice also indicate that they would have chosen a different program if that was the only EMI choice: for example two students at Birch School say they would definitely have chosen English-medium Natural Sciences instead of Swedish-medium Social Sciences if that had been the only EMI choice. Some students at both schools indicate that the option of their chosen program together with English was key.

Only one student in this study says s/he would choose whichever program was offered in English, as s/he feels a lack in language skills. This student did not think it would be manageable to study an entire program only in Swedish, his/her second language. The student thinks the English-medium option offers a chance to study difficult subjects despite limited Swedish proficiency.

36. I could not speak Swedish fluently, that was the first reason and the second (reason) was because I am interested in English.

However, some students in this study who have another mother tongue other than Swedish still stress the importance of the program choice over the language choice. One, for example, knows s/he wants to be a dentist and that the university program for dentistry in Sweden is a more viable option with an upper secondary degree in Natural Sciences.

37. Well, I was not fluent in Swedish […] so it was easier for me to study in English, but I mean Natural Sciences… I want to be a dentist so I have to take these subjects either way.

Not all, however, are as focused in their decision-making as others may be, as a few students chose the program seemingly by chance. At least two students mention practicalities such as the location of the school or the ease of commute to the school, while minimising any intentional choice for an English-medium program.
38. **Lova:** I chose the school because it was close to my home […] and the program based on the fact that I don’t know what I am supposed to do after and it’s broad.

39. **Nancy:** It didn’t matter what program I would choose anyway, I would still have to take the bus every morning.

Another student says she chose the program simply because she wanted to avoid attending the upper secondary schools closer to her home. Her study guidance counselor told her there were two programs with spaces available at the school in the next town, and the English-language Social Sciences was one of them.

40. **Gabriella:** I didn’t really care what I would study. It didn’t matter. /…/ I didn’t really know (about the English), I mean I really didn’t know anything about the program. I hadn’t checked it out so it really was a shock for me.

Despite not actively choosing an EMI program and then discovering that her secondary English lessons did not prepare her well for the English-medium lessons, Gabriella decided to stay on the program. Thus, for some students, the choice for an English-medium program is not seen as a major one with serious consequences, but rather almost as an afterthought in their process of choosing a school. This laissez-faire attitude towards the active choice for English is also reflected in the fact that many students do not see the need to be highly proficient in English before applying for the EMI program, as seen in the previous section.

Most students did make an active choice, however, and say they made their own final decisions and that their parents were not involved much, although many had opinions about the English aspect (see the next section below). Parent 6 relates that his involvement in his son’s decision was not to exert influence over his choice of program, but he did explain that if his son wished to be in an environment that was conducive to studies, then the EMI program was a good choice. He says that because many of the students are ambitious and academically oriented, students find it easier to devote themselves to their schoolwork without feeling like “super nerds” for doing so. He concludes, “It’s a good environment.” Likewise, Selma says her parents, while they did not directly influence her choice, were happy that she “ended up on a serious program.” Parent 2, on the other hand, says that his son was probably more influenced by his older siblings, both of whom had chosen the EMI program for their own studies earlier. (According to Teacher A, many siblings choose the program, describing one family with four students choosing the EMI program, one after the other.)

For some parents, the program was the primary concern and not the language of instruction.
49. **Tyra:** They (her parents) wanted me to go this program.

50. **R:** Natural Sciences or EMI?

51. **Tyra:** Natural Sciences, but in English or not, they didn’t care.

In summary, the importance of the program of study (Natural Sciences or Social Sciences) is a key factor for most students at Aspen School, but few at Birch School. Most students feel they made their own choice.

7.3.1.3 Making a choice for a language

The next theme on choosing the option centres on how the students and parents see the specific choice of English as a medium of instruction. The students feel that English is a natural choice because it is “fun” and that EMI offers them the language “for free.” The parents, however, are more cautious and outline some of the potential risks with the option.

As indicated above, the students see themselves as functionally bilingual even before they start the program, as none of them suggest that they ever believed they would not manage. Similar to the discourse of the school heads and teachers, the students emphasise interest and enjoyment as key.

52. **R:** Whom does this program suit?

53. **Tindra:** You have to like English.

54. **Ville:** You have to be interested in English.

55. **R:** Is it more important to like it or to be good at it?

56. **Both:** Like it!

Students overwhelmingly feel that high levels of proficiency in English are not required for applicants to the EMI programs. A great interest in language is, however, deemed a necessary pre-requisite. Many students underline that those who apply should at least like English or be very interested in it as a language.

57. **Selma:** You have to at least be really interested in order to manage.

This interest in the English language is also expressed by students in their descriptions of the English language as being “fun.” The word *fun* in relation to the English language is mentioned 23 times in total in the 12 interviews with the students, and many times in the interviews with the parents as well. At least once in every interview, a student mentions thinking English as a language is fun or that it is fun to speak English or that taking a program in English is fun.

58. **Leo:** So, it is still Social Sciences, so, and pretty broad, yeah, in that way, so yeah, well, English could just make it more fun, I thought.

59. **Alva:** Yeah, I had thought to study the regular Social Sciences program but when I talked with the study counsellor, she said, “You seem to
think English is fun and there is a program in English.” Then I thought, well, I could do that because it sounds like fun.

This description is also echoed in the parent interviews.

60. **Parent 4:** She (his daughter) said she thought it was fun that it was in English.

This belief in the “fun” part of EMI indicates that the students do not see the choice as necessarily more academically demanding, but that instead they feel quite confident with their own language skills. This confidence, according to many students, stems from their long-time use of English outside of the classroom. For example, Ella says she is not a “language person,” but that English is different than other languages.

61. **Ella:** It is so natural in Sweden. We grew up with TV programs, movies, and American movies: everything is in English. When you listen to music, it’s English.

Parents also indicate a great belief in their children’s possibilities to manage a program through English. Parent 2 is sure that students will “get used to English” even if they initially struggle academically with the adjustment to EMI. Another parent, Parent 4, however, argues that the program is demanding and that it is not enough for the students to think English is fun. They should be interested, but also have solid proficiency and support from home.

62. **Parent 4:** This program is not for just any student. It doesn’t suit all students just because they think it is fun.

When asked specifically if there should be language requirements for students applying to the EMI program, most students said no, with few exceptions. Ella notes that those students who are not very strong in English are also not likely to choose the program in English, or as she says, they are “weeded out automatically,” similar to the sentiments expressed by School head Z on weak English-speakers not applying (line 9 above). However, in line with Parent 4 above, Ella says that perhaps students should be “warned” when they choose EMI, so that students are not misled into thinking that it is enough if they think English is fun.

63. **Ella:** /.../ that you warn, ok, maybe not warn, but that you say that it is going to be a lot of work if they choose EMI. Or else, they can discover it themselves but then it is tough for them if they think that (it is easy), because that is exactly what they (the teachers) said, that you don’t need to be so super great in English, that you will learn.
Students at both Aspen School and Birch School overwhelmingly feel that English is just a “bonus.” They do not expect studies through the medium of English to be a hindrance, and instead express a sentiment of *why not?*

64. **Noel:** If you like Maths and you’re into science, then why not? It’s not as hard as some people claim.

65. **R:** Why English? You could have chosen the same program in Swedish.
66. **Lova:** Yeah, but you get the English for free.
67. **R:** Do you think it is for free?
68. **Lova:** I don’t know. Just a little plus.

For some students, extramural English—that is, English used in everyday situations outside of the classroom—played a major role in their choice of an EMI program and continues to play a role in their lives throughout their upper secondary years. Many students also feel that this extramural English was enough preparation for their studies, stating for example that computer games prepared them for English-medium instruction.

69. **Noel:** An older friend played a lot of computer games, so he said, “You play video games, right? So then it (EMI) won’t be a problem.”

70. **Svante:** I really like English and it’s very easy for me. It started when I started playing computer games when I was ten. I play a lot of computer games in my free time and a lot of those are in English.

Students also mention that they use English in daily life outside of school.

71. **Noel:** I don’t know. I get exposed to all these American TV shows and almost all of Internet is in English and that is about that. Everything is in English.

72. **Tindra:** I only read books in English and I read a lot of books.

Several parents also see the use of English as unproblematic. Parent 4 sees that the transition between secondary and upper secondary school has been a big jump for his daughter, but points out that she [the daughter] does not find the English problematic “at all.” Parent 5 agrees, “It is not all that difficult to study through another language.” Most parents were positive about their language choice.

73. **Lova:** I guess they were impressed, they didn’t think I would choose this because we do not use English at home in anything so they were like, oh, fun. They were happy.

74. **Parent 3:** I definitely encouraged her to apply for this program. We saw pretty early on that she was good at languages and her teachers thought
she was gifted. We thought that made her well prepared to study the EMI program.

Meja’s parents were encouraging due to their positive attitude towards the English language.

75. **Meja:** My dad was like really excited because he thinks he is like the best Swedish person to speak English, so he was like YES!

76. **R:** So he thought it was good?

77. **Meja:** Yes, he thought it was good and he thinks he is good in English so he was, like, he was going to help me. Then we got our physics book and I was, like, do you know the meaning of this? And he was, like, hmmm…and I was like ha ha you don’t know everything!

Parent 2 is very positive to the EMI choice but says that there may be parents who are less convinced. He suggests that parents who are perhaps “afraid” of foreign languages themselves may not think it is a good idea for their children.

78. **Parent 2:** I can imagine there are parents who think that programs in another language should not exist in the Swedish upper secondary school, but I think it has more to do with the fact that they live in a smaller world. [...] We do not use English as a family, but we have travelled a lot and I read a lot. My children think it is natural to be interested in other languages.

Not all students say their parents were keen on the program choice. One student, whose home languages do not include Swedish, explains what happened when s/he chose EMI.

81. **S:** My father didn’t actually care but my mother thought I would not get the Swedish words. But because I love English so much, I told her we are probably going to speak Swedish sometimes and we do. We just have to ask the teacher for the Swedish word and he can tell us. So we had a little conflict about that.

While most informants acknowledge that there are some potential risks to providing instruction through the medium of English, they overwhelmingly consider the benefits as outweighing them. Parent 5 sees “no risks” with EMI says that the teachers were clear from the start that the students would be learning through both Swedish and English, thus eliminating the commonly held belief that the students’ Swedish would suffer. He thinks that the students learn most of the key subject-specific terminology already in secondary school. Both Parent 5 and Parent 4, however, feel that native speakers are needed on EMI programs in Sweden, and see the fact that they [native speakers] are lacking in most EMI programs as a disadvantage. As Par-
ent 5 says, the English the students hear might not ever be “real English.” At the same time, he does not see this risk of non-nativeness as a hindrance.

82. **Parent 5**: Of course, they (the teachers) have a Swedish dialect. /…/ But I don’t think it really matters if you speak with a Swedish accent when you are abroad.

Parent 4, on the other hand, does see risks in having too many native Swedish speakers teaching subject matter through the medium of English.

83. **Parent 4**: We have heard that there are teachers without English as their native tongue. We think that if you are going to teach in English, then you should have teachers who have English as their mother tongue so it’s correct. You can’t convey a language if it isn’t your own.

He feels that EMI programs must invest in more native speakers if they are planning on succeeding in the long-term. Parent 2 disagrees and does not see the lack of native English speakers in most subjects as a problem, focusing instead on the students’ extramural exposure.

84. **Parent 2**: It’s not so important. Sure, it would be positive if there were a possibility to hear different dialects. /…/ But they get so much English in the media, from TV programs and such anyway.

Another risk, according to Parent 4, is that the parents of students on EMI programs will not be able to support their children academically because they do not know the English terminology themselves.

85. **Parent 4**: How am I supposed to explain Maths in English?

Parent 2 acknowledges that there may be a risk that EMI students miss out on some of the content details in a lesson. He says they may get “the big picture” whilst still struggling with the vocabulary. Both Parent 2 and Parent 4 speculate on the risks involved if a student with Swedish as a second language chooses EMI. For example, Parent 2 remembers that one of his son’s classmates who never really learned Swedish because he chose the EMI program during his temporary stay in Sweden. Parent 4 also wonders how the Swedish-as-a-second-language speakers manage with their Swedish language development. So while the choice of EMI may offer possibilities for these students, there may also be hazards involved.

86. **Parent 4**: If you don’t do it the right way, then maybe you miss out on something in the mother tongue. Then it may be more difficult to continue your studies.
To summarise, it is apparent that the students and parents have diverging discourses: students see free, easy English and parents see both benefits and risks. At the same time, neither group seems concerned about possible difficulties with the demands of academic English, instead focusing more on enjoyment of English and fluency.

7.3.1.4 Making a choice for the future
Many students mention the fact that they knew already before they started upper secondary school that they want to live, work, or study abroad when they graduate. Like the school heads and teachers, both the students and parents unswervingly support the opinion that English is only an advantage for future education and “international” life in general, as seen in Miranda’s comments about her parents’ perspective on her choice of EMI.

87. **Miranda:** They said, yeah, do that because it is good for your future, yeah do that.

Concerning future education, like the teachers (see 7.2), Parent 2 thinks that the exposure to course literature in English is a one reason to choose an EMI program; and this is a point he brings up many times during the interview. The students will benefit if they continue their university studies, either in Sweden or abroad. He feels all students would profit from using course literature in other languages as much as possible, to create a habit of reading in other languages and to have access to newer publications than possible in Swedish. His daughter, for example, has had to read course material in German at the tertiary level in Sweden. He himself feels he struggled with literature in other languages as a university student.

88. **Parent 2:** A lot of literature at university is in English. I think they (students on EMI) have a big advantage if they are already used to it from upper secondary school. My first son is studying to be an engineer and my daughter is studying to be a doctor. There was nothing strange about them starting to read textbooks in English.

Considering the fact that the majority of students on these university preparatory programs, such as Social Sciences and Natural Sciences, will continue to study at the tertiary level, these reflections on course literature and course work in English even with the Swedish system are warranted. Parent 3, whose daughter had recently graduated from an EMI program, says he feels she has an advantage in her university studies in Sweden. While he knew she wanted to study Natural Sciences, he has seen that her choice of the English-medium program has given her a “solid preparation” for university studies. He says, “She knows more than her classmates, actually.” This preparation for university studies is mentioned by nearly all of the students.
89.  **Noel:** I think I chose this program because I wanted to have as many choices, I mean as wide a range as possible to choose from when I wanted to go to college or university. Also I think that most of the literature for studying in university and college is mainly in English.

90.  **Vera:** I thought I would probably want to go to another country after these years so I thought English would be best, because most of the books are in English at universities.

Interestingly, though, all of the students feel confident about their ability to study through the medium of Swedish in higher education and seem almost baffled when asked if this will pose a problem in the future. They say that they feel ready to study through English or Swedish, and instead focus on the fact that their program of choice—not their language of choice—has prepared them well for Swedish tertiary education.

91.  **Leo:** I don’t see where the difficulties, you know, going from English to Swedish, would exist, since a lot of terms these days are pretty much universal. You will usually have both languages at some point anyway.

The students see using English as the language for learning as a natural part in their modern world, some even minimising the need to learn Swedish at an academic level.

92.  **Ella:** Why not? The world is getting smaller, as we say all the time. I think I don’t place a lot of importance on Swedish. Why do you need to be good in Swedish? If you want to get out in the world, you need English, Spanish or French or German.

93.  **Selma:** Swedish feels more like something you need for oral communication and in everyday life. That is, if you don’t want a career where they require you to know correct Swedish.

94.  **Tindra:** If you choose the English-language program, I think you have a bigger, like a wider program. I mean life gets easier.

Besides considering their future university studies, international plans are a part of many students’ goals involving English. The students often use the word “international” to describe the EMI program. They feel that an international spirit permeates the group, as many of them have contacts abroad through family or travel, keeping in touch with them through social media, often in English.

---

52 In contrast, one student in the pilot study at a school with 100% English-medium lessons (not Aspen or Birch) stated that she felt she had "a lake of ignorance," indicating that she did not feel prepared to study at a Swedish university but was compelled to apply to English-medium universities in order to manage higher studies.
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95. **Leo:** It’s very much international and you gain a lot of contacts abroad that you can use later in life, of course. So that’s another good thing, that we are so international.

The students see English as not only functional for education and jobs, but also for other future endeavours and travel. Others have very specific plans to move abroad and see the choice of EMI as the first step in reaching that goal.

96. **Ella:** I think I was born in the wrong country. I want to live in the USA.

97. **Neo:** Maybe go to England, but I don’t know, but I think I want to travel. English will be great, I guess. And with SCIENCE, I think I will work with that, I mean that the science IS in English, so...that’s good.

They see the international profile of the EMI schools and the trips to English-speaking countries as one positive step towards their goals.

98. **Selma:** I have always wanted to travel and learn about other cultures and languages and everything. I think that is, like, the meaning of life.

Parent 2 feels the exposure to English may make the students more open to the world in general. He also thinks that they will find it easier to move abroad and find a place in a different society. Parent 5 says that his son may not necessarily want to move abroad when he graduates, but rather he wants to “live internationally.” Parent 4, on the other hand, says his daughter has specifically indicated that she does not want to stay in Sweden; so learning through English is a good preparation for life abroad. He thinks that learning through English will benefit all of the students later in life, as a language “so many people speak.”

In brief, stakeholders in the two schools express similar reasons for choosing when related to education and an “international life.” The students are clearly aware of the fact that a lot of course literature is in English at Swedish universities and abroad. They also tend to feel very positive about possibly moving for work or studies abroad in the future. Only one student, Tindra, says she wants to be an English teacher in the future, which suggests that students do not choose English in order to keep studying English in the future or for goals to work with the language, such as teaching. They choose it for other reasons.

7.3.2 Choosing the option: A discourse

This section has presented the stakeholder perspectives on choosing the option of English-medium programs of study. The reasons given for choosing EMI are similar to previous research (e.g. Lim Falk 2008): mainly that Eng-
lish seems like a “fun” bonus and that English is good for the future, but also that the choice of program (Natural Sciences or Social Sciences) is more important as the language of instruction for many of the students. English is a given (program first and then why not in English), and the choice is seen as both key and natural.

While students generally state that strong language proficiency is not necessarily needed for the EMI program, their discourse suggests a solid belief in their own proficiency. This discourse of confidence leads to faith in their language skills; and they believe that interest can outweigh the need for proficiency. Rather than addressing the potential problem of students not managing the English, they feel it is up to the students to opt in or opt out, making a judgement call themselves on their language abilities. The students feel confident enough to access English as a linguistic resource. This discourse aligns with the question of self-selection, as EMI students in the Swedish context do indeed tend to be more motivated as well as generally already more proficient in English. Josephson (2004:14), reflecting on the option in Sweden, sees this situation as potentially creating a paradox: the brightest students choose the English-medium program for its reputation and its promise of English for the future, while some research indicates that these students then may be “worse” students on the EMI program, either suffering lower grades in subjects (cf. Washburn 1997) or writing “poorer” texts in Swedish (cf. Lim Falk 2008). He suggests, “They get both less intelligent and more elite at the same time.” Although some students touch on this potential quandary in their discourse on grades and EMI (see Section 7.4.1.2), their implied belief is that the benefits outweigh the drawbacks.

Swedes are inclined to overestimate their own English language proficiency (Hyltenstam 2004:57; see also Nyström Höög 2005), thinking that they can manage “just as well in English as in Swedish.” This is also the discourse of the students in this study. The students do not share this discourse with their parents, who tend to be more cautious. The attitude of “English or Swedish, it does not matter” is, however, echoed in the parents’ as well as the students’ views of choosing the option, as an emphasis on interest and enjoyment often prevails over the view that the language may pose difficulties.

Students in general tend to believe in English as offering a widened potential when they make the choice (Hyltenstam 2004:93), as also seen in previous research on the option. Making a choice for EMI may be equated with making a choice for “an edge in the competition for employment” (Li 2002, cited in Dalton-Puffer 2011:184). For example, EMI is seen as a means to higher education and international mobility (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:34). García states that “Bilingualism is a form of capital” (2009:97, citing García & Otheguy 1994:100), but in the declared language goals in this study, there is little mention of multilingualism or even academic lan-
language in two languages. Rather, the discourse is limited to the perceived benefits of English for their life now and after upper secondary school.

As seen in Section 3.3 on extramural English, Swedish youth are already actively engaged in using English in a wide variety of contexts—including school—and see themselves as proficient speakers. Even limited extramural English or purely social extramural English, such as computer gaming, is felt to be enough by these students, denoting confidence in their own proficiency.

7.4 Practicing the option

The final research aim of the present thesis is to investigate the practice of the EMI option. To understand the context of the classroom, teachers’ and students’ perspectives are considered in relation to the observed practices. The practice of EMI is presented in two parts: the views that the stakeholders have on the classroom practice and the actual language use in the classroom. This section presents the views.

The investigation of teacher perspectives on the *why* and *how* of teaching subject content through a foreign language is an under-researched area in the field in all contexts (Hüttner, Dalton-Puffer & Smit 2013). Nikula calls for more research on the effects of CLIL in the classroom, stating, “…the question about how a switch over to a foreign language affects teachers’ language use has not been studied much” (2010:106). This area of research is especially important considering the fact that previous research (e.g. Moate 2011) has indicated that teachers feel that teaching in a CLIL classroom can have adverse effects on their teaching style and identity. One study, for example, found that non-native teachers using English as a medium of instruction may experience “certain negative effects,” as described below:

> These experiences include linguistic limitations, a reduced ability to improvise, and an increased workload in term of preparation and (mental) energy, a less favourable view of their instructional quality, and an increased importance of their teaching skills. (Vinke 53 1995:140 in Westbrook & Henriksson 2011:190)

These effects can be considered in light of the Swedish context. All of the teacher informants in the present study indicate that school heads and teachers need to be aware of the fact that the choice to offer EMI will also lead to an added workload. Added workload and the other issues enumerated above—experienced limitations in language and in improvisation in the classroom as well as a need for increased focus on teaching practices—have

---

53 Vinke’s study focused on Dutch teachers teaching in English at the university level.
also been noted by Lim Falk (2008) in Swedish research on classroom practices. Nikula addresses teacher talk in relation to instruction in a CLIL classroom (2010), with a study grounded in discourse analysis and pragmatics and a focus on classroom interaction, investigating both what the teacher says as well as how interactional patterns of discourse develop in the CLIL classroom. Her results suggest that teaching in CLIL does indeed affect interaction, because the English turns tend to include more varied patterns as well as to be more dialogic, as “…the use of a foreign language seems to somewhat restrict the teacher’s opportunities to act as an all-round expert and makes the interactional give-and-take more symmetrical as the students have their share of expertise in English” (2010:114). This can be positive as the students take on a different, more active role than they do in the Finnish-medium lessons. Lim Falk (2008), however, also observed the same restrictions in teacher language use, but instead noted that the students were less active using English in lessons. This in turn affected the teachers’ language use, with teachers indicating that EMI lessons are less dynamic and more boring.

Students comprise the other group of participants in the EMI lesson. Two major studies have addressed aspects of the student experience of instruction through a language other than Swedish in the upper secondary school: Washburn (1997) and Lim Falk (2008). Although Washburn’s focus is on English language skills, she also includes some results on student attitudes on their experiences, gleaned from material she collected via questionnaires and “random student interviews.” In Washburn’s study, students indicate that they are generally very positive about their EMI studies, especially when asked during the first term, as 100% specified they liked their classes and they liked being taught in English. This general satisfaction decreased by the end of the two-year experimental period, with half the class indicating that they thought their class spirit was “lousy” and that the class had become too competitive with petty cliques causing division (1997:288). Still 60% feel their participation in the EMI project had been overall positive and just over half would have liked to continue their subject studies through the medium of English (ibid.294). Lim Falk also focuses on student language proficiency, albeit in Swedish, but her research includes a section from her interview study on the attitudes and experiences of four focus students. These four students are generally satisfied with their EMI choice, although they do feel it had been difficult and that the English language had hindered them at times. Some of the results from both Washburn’s and Lim Falk’s studies can be compared and contrasted to a certain degree with the experiences of the 25 student informants in the present study.

This section presents the study on stakeholder perspectives on practicing the option of English-medium instruction. The interviews were conducted with the aim of capturing their experiences as well as understanding their participation in the practice in action. The presentation of their perspectives
here is based only on what the informants say. What they do is presented in the next chapter.

7.4.1 Experiences: Students

The practice of EMI in the classroom was investigated with a focus on each student informant’s experiences and views of lessons taught in English. The aim was to access a wide range of perspectives, as the students had been involved with the option in time periods ranging from just a few months to almost 3 years. Three themes elicited from the interviews are explored here: how students experienced the transition from secondary school to an EMI upper secondary school, how they experience the lessons, and how they view language proficiency in relation to these lessons.

7.4.1.1 Making the switch to EMI

Making the adjustment from a Swedish-medium secondary school to an English-medium program in upper secondary school was perceived as more difficult than expected by the students. Although all of the students had previously studied English as a language subject for at least six years in secondary school, as mandated by the national curriculum (see Section 3.2), several students mention that they were not accustomed to actually using English in the classroom, as they did not regularly use it in those English lessons in secondary school. This is despite the fact that the national syllabus for English in the compulsory school stresses the goal of communicative competence. In the EMI program, they experienced both the novelty of content subjects being taught through English as well as English language lessons taught more consistently in English. Lova thinks the biggest leap from secondary school to the EMI program was the amount of talking required during the lessons, noting that previously students mostly had to only listen at her school. Neo and Nancy describe their experiences:

99. Neo: It was a very big step (from ninth grade English) because we never spoke English and like, she (the English teacher) said what we had to do but she wasn’t very active during the lessons. Some lessons she wasn’t even there.

100. Nancy: It was big, because now they spoke English in the lessons and they never did before.

At the same time, the students focus only on the need to use English in the classroom more—and they do not focus on the fact that they are actually using English in a different way than they did in English language lessons in secondary school or they do outside of school. However, some specific aspects of the adjustment included the amount of and level of reading in the subjects taught in English.
101. **Gabriella:** The worst was the reading. We had History and we had that big thick book and I had never read (in English). So you got that and you didn’t understand what was in it. It takes more time. You have to spend a lot of time on it.

Writing was another difficult aspect in the beginning. For example, although Svante feels he has gotten “better and better” in English, he remembers that it was very hard to write in English in the beginning. He was both learning how to write longer assignments in the various subjects and how to write them in English. Ella shares a story from her first year on the program when she felt overwhelmed by an assignment that needed to be written in English.

102. **Ella:** It wasn’t easy. There were completely new concepts. I remember I just threw papers around; I was so angry. I said, “Am I supposed to sit here and translate everything on Google translate now? It is going to take a thousand years!” So I just waited to do it. I was stuck. Then my grade suffered.

In Grade 3, she felt the same hopelessness as she approached a major assignment in History, feeling it would become “double the work” to write it in English. She started writing it in Swedish instead, but then her History teacher said, no, it would not be fair to the others who were writing their assignments in English.

103. **Ella:** I get it. And of course, you choose the English program yourself. But sometimes, I think, oh, now my grades are suffering. [...] I want to write in Swedish because I am more confident in Swedish. When I write such a big assignment, I want the language to be good. It shouldn’t be simple, but my English is not so advanced so automatically, it will be a simple history paper if I don’t write it in Swedish.

104. **R:** Will you write it in English or Swedish?

105. **Ella:** English. So now it will have to be simple English. I don’t have a good vocabulary and it will take a thousand years to find all the synonyms that I get automatically in Swedish, but that I don’t have in English. So I will have to take the first best one.

Another factor contributing to their early apprehensions was the uncertainty as to how much English was actually expected of them in the classroom. At Birch School, for example, some of the teachers are stricter about the language use in the classroom in Grade 1 than they are in later years. Ella says that Teacher I would often remind them “English!” if they tried to use Swedish during the content lessons. With perceived expectations to be fully competent users of English, the students were still uncertain about how much English was expected of them.

106. **Molly:** In the beginning everyone was super scared that the teacher would get angry if we didn’t speak English.
107. **Alva:** The first few days, I was so worried, (thinking) “Oh, now I have to be the best in the class in English. We are going to speak English all the time.”

Despite their qualms, the students make the switch to English with relative ease and with both self-proclaimed confidence as well as observed confidence in some cases. Many of them claim that their initial doubts dissipated quickly as they adjusted to the English-language environment.

108. **Tyra:** You felt a little strange, like, the first lessons, but then it was, like, you didn’t notice if he (the teacher) spoke Swedish or English.

109. **Alva:** If we speak English, even if you think it sounds strange when you speak English, you just do and in the end, you don’t even think about it.

As seen in the previous section, they often feel that interest—and not necessarily competence—is enough when choosing EMI. Likewise, this interest may be enough to sustain them through their three years of studies, as some express that their English language development occurs without much effort on their part, beyond determination and practice. No one considers that they may require assistance to make the transition, and perhaps their “good” English hides the fact that they may benefit from support (although one student at Birch School mentions that coaching in Grade 1 would have been useful). Some students think the effort to use English even when it feels difficult or strange is something they can struggle with, while in contrast, other students emphasise that they only get better when they make that decision to make an effort to use as much English as they can.

110. **Ella:** You get better in English without really noticing it.

111. **Leo:** In Grade 1, we were more determined than confident, but as we said, practice makes perfect.

112. **Alva:** You have to just talk, talk, talk and not care if you say the wrong thing or not, because you will eventually get good.

They downplay the difficulties and emphasise simply *using* English as a goal.

113. **Viggo:** The idea is not that we get a perfect British accent. We just need to get used to hearing and using English.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{54}\) Angelina, however, disagrees with Viggo. See line 149.
Not only do they feel that the changes were manageable, but also, reflecting their views on choosing the program in the first place, some students indicate that the new challenges of EMI were *fun*.

114. **Selma:** The whole concept was pretty unusual the first few weeks and then you got going with it. We had History and Geography in English, and I had never had that before. I thought the English lessons were the same as before, except more fun.

115. **R:** Why?

116. **Selma:** Because they were in English! [laughing] And everyone was interested! I have never been in a class where everyone is interested in English. It’s always been, like, “Oh, no, I can’t do it.” Now it was 100%. That was fun.

To summarise, in their descriptions of starting an EMI program, the students present a conflicting discourse: on the one hand, they found the adjustment intimidating and uncertain, while on the other hand, it was exciting and enjoyable. This is also reflected in their view of the program as being both easier than expected and more demanding than other programs, as further explored in the next section.

7.4.1.2 The EMI experience

In the present study, 24 of the 25 students interviewed are positive about their EMI program, six very enthusiastically so and two with some reservations. The two girls (Angelina and Engla) who are not as keen as the rest are, perhaps not surprisingly, also the students who complain the most about their teachers’ language proficiency and teaching style. They are in general dissatisfied with their educational choice. At the same time, these two students also believe that their English skills have in fact improved due to EMI.

117. **Angelina:** I think I have become more confident. It feels more natural to speak English.

118. **R:** Is that because of the program or would you have become better anyway?

119. **Engla:** I think it is both, because you are discussing things in English in both subject classes and English classes, and I think you wouldn’t do it in the same way if you didn’t have lessons taught in English.

Only one student expresses great dissatisfaction with the EMI program, and her discontent is rooted both in the teachers’ classroom practices as well as her expectations about their English fluency.

120. **Sally:** I am super unhappy with this program! I thought all the teachers would be much better in English. Most of them are Swedish!
These three girls above are also the students who consider the program extra demanding. The majority of the students instead claim that it is a myth that the program is hard (cf. Teacher A below in line 197), or that it is much harder than a regular Swedish-language program of study.

121. **Tindra**: It isn’t so difficult. There are a lot of people who think EMI is really, really hard and that you have to be really, really good in English but it isn’t true. /…/ As long as you are interested, you will be fine.

122. **Tyra**: I thought it would be worse, I thought it would be hell [laughing] but it’s not.

Despite their assertions that the program is not especially hard, several of the students complain that the demands on them are so high that their grades may suffer. For example, Ella and Selma declare that their grades in English language would have been the highest possible if they had been on another program of study, but as most of the EMI students are highly academically motivated and proficient in English, the demands are higher, they feel.

123. **Selma**: We who are on the EMI program are supposed to be the best. If I had another English teacher, I would have top grades all the way through, but I think that our English teacher is really on us and expects too much.

124. **Ella**: The bar is automatically set higher. We have classmates who are really good in English and suddenly there is more pressure and comparisons all the time about who is performing the best. If we had chosen the regular Social Sciences program, we would have higher grades in English.

While Ella and Selma say that they think the demands may be too high on them, they also maintain that this extra pressure will actually be to their benefit when they start their studies in higher education. They say that those who study “easier” programs will find the transition more difficult.

125. **Ella**: They are going to be pretty shocked when they get to university and maybe not manage the same way as those who have had more pressure.

126. **Selma**: I think we have had just enough pressure, then.

127. **Ella**: In the end, EMI is better preparation for higher studies than anything else.

In response to this pressure, Gabriella feels there is a risk that grades can suffer in the content courses as well, partly due to the higher demands placed on the high-performing students and partly because they are producing work in English, which Gabriella says takes “twice as much effort” in such an academically motivated class.
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128. **R:** Is this program more difficult?
129. **Gabriella:** Yes, I would say so, especially in English. /.../ It is really hard to get top grades because you have to be perfect. They compare you with everyone else.

Gabriella says that she thinks she would have earned higher grades in a Swedish-medium Social Sciences program (cf. Ella in line 102), but that there are so many other things that they learn from studying through English, that perhaps it is worth it. She describes how some students complain that there is so much English, a complaint she does not think is justified, noting, “You choose the program yourself.” She stresses that students need to expect that there really will be a lot of English on an EMI program. This is a complaint others students contradict as most also say there is less English than expected on the EMI program (see Section 8.2).

Some subjects are more difficult than others, according to the students. Miranda, for example, thinks that subjects involving discussions are the most difficult to have in English.

130. **Miranda:** Social Studies is all about language.
131. **Esther:** No, it’s interesting I think.
132. **Miranda:** It’s very interesting but it involves very much language.

Tindra says that in some subjects, like Biology, it did not really matter if the lessons and terminology were in English or Swedish in the beginning. It was all new material for her so it could just as well be in English. Tyra also considers Maths to be like a third language. Others find other subjects challenging. Noel thinks that Physics would have been easier in only Swedish, but also notes that dividing the lessons (usually in both English and Swedish) and labs (usually only Swedish) into language blocks helps. Miranda says that it does not matter if Maths is taught in English or Swedish55, but that she would also prefer that Physics be taught in only one language.

133. **Miranda:** Yeah, Physics is not like Mathematics, you have to know what you are doing and you have to understand the concepts and you have to know everything but Maths is like, it doesn’t matter if it is in Swedish or whatever, but Physics must be something you (learn)…
134. **Esther:** In one language!
135. **Miranda:** If you do not understand the concepts…
136. **Esther:** You will not know what you are doing!

Some students instead claim that certain subjects are easier to learn in English than Swedish. Molly, for example, thinks History is easier in English:

---

55 The students reveal a common assumption about Maths as an "international language" that does not require mother tongue competence. Research refutes this myth, e.g. Kantner 2008 and Svensson 2002. See also Barwell 2008 and Cummins 2007b for overviews in this area.
“You understand the whole picture better.” Wilmer, on the other hand, thinks that using English to study any of the subjects actually makes him focus more on the content.

137. Wilmer: It is good to have to concentrate more and then, it can be that you actually understand the subject better.

In brief, it is evident that the students have a wide range of opinions on their EMI experiences, with various levels of satisfaction and differing judgments on both general demands and specific subject difficulties.

7.4.1.3 EMI learners and proficiency
The students see themselves as proficient English speakers, who do not need the teachers to be the ones to teach them English. At Birch School, it is a recurring comment that some students believe they actually have stronger proficiency in English than the teachers.

138. Sally: Teacher X just doesn’t know English.
139. Angelina: Teacher X just gets confused and mixes up the languages.
140. Engla: Sometimes it is really hard to understand what X means and what Teacher X is talking about. So there are a lot of people who just sit and stare at Teacher X.
141. Angelina: I usually correct Teacher X.

Sally stresses several times during the interview that she thinks it is strange to speak English with other Swedes, although noting that speaking English with a native English-speaking teacher is not a problem, in her opinion. Malte has a different opinion.

142. Sally: When I started this program, I thought all the teachers would be English teachers. This teacher speaks bad English. I can’t be bothered to ask in English because I think it is silly to talk English with Swedes.

143. Malte: The teachers who choose to teach in English are good.

Many students feel the program would benefit from more native English speakers or teachers with more English language training of some kind. Birch School has one native speaker and Aspen School has none.

144. Gabriella: I think it is really important.
145. Svante: It is easier somehow.
146. Gabriella: You get to hear a dialect and not just “school-English.”
147. Svante: You can trust that the teacher knows what he is doing.

148. Engla: If you have a native speaker then you have more pressure to use English. Maybe you cannot even use Swedish because they would not understand.
149. **Angelina:** You would get to hear a dialect that is not so Swenglish. I mean, anyone can speak Swenglish. If you choose the EMI program, then you want to speak like an Englishman or an American and erase your Swedish dialect.

Several students mention that most of the content teachers on EMI programs have very little or no formal qualifications in English; and the students consider this to be problematic (cf. the teachers in Section 7.4.2.1).

150. **Ella:** I think it should be a requirement that the teachers on an EMI program are educated in English.

151. **Sally:** It feels awful to talk in English with the others when the teachers are, like, worse in English than you are.

The students say that if a content teacher’s proficiency is lacking, then the lessons become “unbearable,” especially if the teachers lack a natural fluency beyond the lecturing.

152. **Ella:** This course really has suffered because Teacher X cannot speak English. Or, Teacher X can speak English but doesn’t have any flow.
153. **Selma:** Teacher X just lacks flow.
154. **Ella:** It’s more likely that X asks us, “How do you say this? How do you say that?” Then I think you can just as well skip the English and the books, because it just ends up a lot of bla-bla-bla.

However, students have a hard time distinguishing between teaching practices and teaching in English. Sometimes in the interviews, the students first state that a teacher is a poor English speaker but then their complaints are actually focused on the teacher’s teaching style or assignment demands, which may or may not be due to the fact that the lesson is taught through the medium of English. For example, several girls complain that one teacher uses poor English in the lessons and teases the students for their lack of English skills.

155. **Engla:** Teacher X always says that s/he is so much better than we are in English.

After further probing, the girls say that one problem is that the teacher tends to go off on tangents and not stay focused on the subject material. They criticise the teacher’s lack of proper study material in English as well as the lack of help with English terminology. Thus, their critique really is about the teaching style and not about language proficiency. Still, some students feel there is a sense of haphazardness concerning who teaches in English, especially at Birch School.
156. **Malte:** It has never been really solid. The EMI program has always been a little like, yeah, what are we going to do? We have this teacher from here; let’s get him in here.

Finally, the students were asked about their own Swedish language proficiency and how it may be affected after their time on the EMI program. The students maintain that they do not suffer domain loss in Swedish when the teacher uses both Swedish and English in the classroom in a strategic manner. Some dismiss the notion that their Swedish may suffer.

157. **Leo:** Swedish is for most of us our native language. We have spoken Swedish for fifteen, sixteen years, and then we start first grade. Would our Swedish be lacking then after three years going to this program? I don’t know about that, I don’t believe that criticism at all.

Others focus on how their Swedish language has actually flourished during their time on an EMI program, as they say.

158. **Malte:** Well, no, yeah, and that’s also the thing since it is kind of challenging still in the Swedish classes even though it is our native language. It is a lot of vocabulary and grammar and even though maybe we should know all this since we are 18 and it’s our native language, but still so much.

Still, several students also acknowledge that they notice negative changes in their Swedish.

159. **Alva:** There are certain things I cannot quite explain in Swedish.

160. **Svante:** Maybe I have been damaged a bit by English. For example, I was taking a Psychology test (in Swedish) a few weeks ago, and I was going to write *chans* <chance> in Swedish. I completely forgot how to spell it in Swedish, so I had to write *chance*.

Other students feel their own language skills can hinder them from participating in the classroom, which contradicts their discourse of confidence.

161. **Tyra:** The tricky thing can be when you learn stuff in English and then he says something in Swedish and you don’t know what it is and, like, then he says what it is in English…we know exactly what it is.

162. **Minna:** The hard part is getting the English out. Sometimes the teacher can ask a question and you know directly what the answer is in Swedish. But then you have to think about it, how can I say this in English?

In summary, some students consider the teachers’ language proficiency to be problematic, although they do not think the same of their own. Interestingly,
language was highlighted for the most part in the interviews with the students at Birch School and less so with the students at Aspen School.

7.4.1.4 Practicing the option: The student discourse
This section has presented the student perspectives on the EMI option in practice. The discourse of the students in their descriptions of starting and studying on an EMI program offers conflicting perspectives. Their initial trepidation about the use of English in the early days of their program, when they say they did not feel so confident, contrasts with their beliefs that they are proficient enough to choose a program in English just because they are interested or think it is fun. They see themselves as competent users of English (even better than their teachers), but seem unaware of the different demands that academic language place on them. They think it is a myth that studying in English is harder, but are also surprised as the “unfairness” of the program they chose.

The students elaborate on the differences between secondary and upper secondary English and touch on learning to use English as a language of learning, yet also present a conflicting discourse on the ease of transition. On the one hand, they bemoan the challenge of the adjustment, especially in terms of the perceived language demands, while on the other hand they still emphasise the “fun” aspect. In their discourse, the students (e.g. Molly and Alva in lines 106-107) focus on the simple production of English and not explicitly on academic language, although these fears may reveal an underlying concern for the content vocabulary. Now they must learn through English, and not just learn English. This is a distinction that is absent in their discourse on the transition. They do, however, mention certain receptive and productive tasks that proved difficult (e.g. line 101).

In her comparison of CLIL and EFL classrooms, Dalton-Puffer ascribes the general confidence felt by CLIL students to their familiarity with the environment: the context of the content classroom. She suggests this experience is “a decisive asset in foreign-language CLIL” (2007:12, 195).

Considering all the factors involved (persons, places, purposes), we may note that the “social matrix” of CLIL classrooms is actually very well known to the learners and, importantly I think, it is almost indistinguishable from that in EFL classrooms: both CLIL and EFL take place within the same institution, in the same rooms and buildings, at the same times, with the same students and teachers. This brings us to the important realization that CLIL and EFL are also the same in many respects, as well as being different. (ibid.279)

Students are familiar with both classroom practices and classroom discourse, knowing both the general rules and lesson format (Lindberg 2005:80), and making the switch “only” for language.

As seen in their discourse, the students start school with an identity as an English speaker in place (cf. van Lier 2004:130)—one that makes them feel
confident that they will manage studies in English. This identity may be that they were “good” students in secondary school or that they are “interested” in English. They do not talk about wanting to learn English, but rather about wanting to learn English better. This sureness is also reflected in Swedish secondary students in general, as Erickson (2004:43) says that Swedish youth display great confidence when faced with tasks in English. Thus, the strong beliefs in their own English language proficiency and capabilities is a reflection of the general Swedish context (see Section 3.2), and perhaps not unique to EMI students. Although using language in real and meaningful activity may allow the teacher in an EMI school to encourage the EMI student to further develop her own identity as an English-speaker, the students’ view is that the teachers only need to focus on the subject teaching and provide exposure to English, and like previous studies on EMI (Nixon 2000:31), some students are critical of their teachers’ English. In general, these students have had and continue to have a much greater exposure to English both through studies and extramural activities, and some thus view themselves as being the more proficient speakers in the classroom (cf. Nikula’s 2010 study on the active role Finnish students take in EMI).

The students are also contradictory in their discourse on the EMI experience once they have adjusted, with both positive and negative experiences, especially concerning the workload. They declare that English feels normal and easy as a language of learning, yet also express concerns that some subjects are harder in English than Swedish or that they are assessed unfairly. However, they claim it is harder to get good grades because of the academically motivated class—not necessarily because of EMI. This feature of their discourse confirms their confidence in English, as they do not even consider that the language demands (especially academic language demands) might be the cause of difficulties. They instead focus on general high ambition in the class.

The students also do not feel their Swedish suffers, although some concede to some minor difficulties. This is similar to previous research that has indicated that EMI students feel their program of study does not “extensively or permanently harm” their Swedish, but they do admit to encountering “temporary difficulties caused by not finding the right word in Swedish for what they wanted to say” (Nixon 2001:38). Likewise, other studies on EMI (Ekman: no date) have reported that students felt both that they became highly proficient in English and that their Swedish did not suffer whilst on the EMI program. In the present study, there is little evidence that the students consider the effects on their Swedish at all.

The matter of the teachers’ English-language proficiency is key to some students’ discourse of the classroom experience. Many students say that it is a major adjustment to speak English with Swedish content teachers, with some positive and some negative views. Students at Birch School include more critique of the teachers’ English and more consideration of the need (or
not) for a native speaker in their discourse than the students at Aspen. Interestingly, in their discourse, the students focus on the fluency advantages: hearing a dialect, avoiding Swenglish, and sounding like a native speaker. They do not stress the advantages a native speaker might have in teaching their subject through the medium of English. This is the same focus on everyday English and the same lack of focus on academic English as seen above.

Some of these themes on experience that emerged from the student interviews are similar to those of their teachers, as seen in the next section.

7.4.2 Experiences: Teachers

This section presents the perspectives on EMI in practice as expressed by the teachers at Aspen School and Birch School. The teachers in the English-medium program were interviewed in order to investigate their views on language practices and teaching strategies in their classrooms where content teaching in a language other than Swedish is taking place. The teachers’ views on EMI in the Swedish context in general were also explored, especially in light of the different experiences of the teachers (i.e. some have been teaching through the medium of English for many years whilst others are very new).

Subject teachers who choose—or are told—to teach on EMI programs in Sweden usually have neither university-level qualifications nor in-service training in teaching in English. This is also the case for most teachers at both Aspen School and Birch School. Of the informants in this study, all but two of the eleven teachers are native Swedish speakers—and those anomalous two, one of whom is a native English speaker, are highly proficient in Swedish and normally also teach their courses in Swedish outside of the EMI program. Two teachers, Teacher J at Aspen (Physical Education and English) and Teacher I (History and English), have teaching degrees in English, as do the two language-only teachers. None of the other content teachers in this study, however, have specific qualifications in English—although all are qualified to teach their subjects. Some do have limited in-service training focused on teaching their subjects in English. Table 14 below presents the English language qualifications of the teachers in this study\textsuperscript{56} and is offered to place their perspectives in context.

\textsuperscript{56} Note that all teachers have studied English at the upper secondary school level, meaning that together with compulsory schooling, they would have had 6-9 years of school English, depending on their age.
Table 14: English language qualifications of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Subjects taught</th>
<th>English language educational background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher E</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English teaching degree (university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Maths + Physics</td>
<td>No formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher L</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>No formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher G</td>
<td>Maths + Physics</td>
<td>In-service subject course taught in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher J</td>
<td>English + Physical Education</td>
<td>English teaching degree (university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher D</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Short in-service training courses in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher F</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>No formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher C</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English teaching degree (university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>No formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher N</td>
<td>International Relations + Social Studies</td>
<td>Attended EMI schools as a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher I</td>
<td>English + History</td>
<td>English teaching degree (university)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Native speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In light of the interviews together with the points identified by Vinke (1995, see Section 7.4), three areas from their interviews are considered here: language proficiency, instructional strategies, and potential advantages and disadvantages of teaching content through the medium of English.

7.4.2.1 Language proficiency

In the consideration of language proficiency, themes concerning confidence, the value of native speakers and possible limitations emerged.

The content teachers readily recognise that they lack formal English language training, but in general feel that they can manage teaching in English due to their own private and professional interests as well as their many years of experience. Many teachers focus on their general interest for English both in and out of the classroom, suggesting ease in use in all domains. For example, they stress that they like English very much and that they have always used it privately, reading books in English for pleasure or choosing to travel to English-speaking countries on holiday.

Teacher E, the Swedish and English language teacher at Aspen School, does not think it is enough to have read course literature at university in English or to have travelled a lot in English-speaking countries. She thinks that teachers do not always have the language skills necessary, despite their own strong beliefs in their own proficiency. She was actually quite negative to the idea of EMI in the beginning because she was not convinced that the teachers had the right level of English proficiency. She believes though that the teachers were very engaged and keen to improve their language skills as well as to be the best teachers they could be in English. Otherwise, she caution against teachers overestimating their own language abilities.

Teacher A has been teaching Physics and Maths for more than 30 years and has nearly 15 years of experience teaching these subjects in English at
Aspen School. Although she has not had any formal training or university studies in English, Teacher A feels “pretty comfortable with the English language.”

163. I feel right at home when I go through the lessons or when I talk to them in English. I think I'm pretty fluent after all these years. It's always been pretty easy. It's natural.

Teacher D describes teaching in English as an “interesting little detail.” Although Teacher D has never had any formal education in English beyond upper secondary school studies, she jokingly says her English teaching skills lie in the combination of the fact that she “always thought English was fun” and that she has “poor self-awareness” when it comes to her own language proficiency. Now Teacher D feels at ease teaching in English after working at Aspen School for many years and says she can keep up with English skills through relevant science journals from Britain.

Both Teacher L and Teacher G actively sought to join the EMI team due to a great interest in English and a desire to do something more challenging with teaching. Teacher G remembers being very nervous about teaching in English in the beginning, but notes she feels confident now.

164. I thought it was super awful. I felt silly in the beginning but now I don’t, actually. Maybe I should, but I don’t.

Several teachers at Aspen, for example Teacher G, include anecdotes on their increased social use of English due to the EMI program, such as through contacts that have become friends on the class trips abroad to English-speaking countries. They see this extramural use as a means of increasing or maintaining proficiency, similar to the students’ views on extramural English. Teacher F, however, stresses that it is important that the teachers have high levels of proficiency and not just a “hobby level,” in an effort to achieve “language quality.” Strong proficiency can be attained with support, something Teacher F feels the teachers need on a continual basis. Ideally, the teachers would get specific support for teaching their subject through the medium of English.

Like several of the teachers at Aspen School, Teacher B at Birch School also applied for a teaching post in an EMI program because it sounded “fun” and he feels confident in his skills.

165. I have always thought English was fun, and English has always been easy for me.

Teacher C, the Swedish and English teacher at Birch, disputes this discourse of confidence that many EMI teachers have. He describes a situation in
which another teacher, Teacher M\textsuperscript{57}, on the EMI program resigned due to the demands of English. Teacher M had explained that it was “too difficult” to teach Grade 3 in English. Teacher C says that this has happened before, for example when a teacher in Economics was hired to teach in English and then refused to do so. As Teacher C explains, ”Teachers think teaching in English is easy but it’s not. It’s a lot of hard work.”

The question of the need for a native English speaker, possibly to improve the English proficiency of the Swedish teachers, surfaces several times in the interviews at both schools. A real risk, according to Teacher L, is that if all the subject teachers are also native Swedish speakers just like their students, then the language can take on a life of its own and develop into a strange English—or Swenglish—in the end. She gives an example from her own teaching.

166. It may not be such a big deal but if there are words I have never heard spoken before, but that I have read, I may actually end up discovering that I have unwittingly been pronouncing them incorrectly. Like hydrol-
ysis. For many years I said hydrol-I-sis. These words with Greek origin can be hard to pronounce.

As a native English speaker, Teacher I is seen as a huge asset by both the staff and the students at Birch School. He stresses that EMI programs benefit from having native speakers teaching content.

167. I honestly really, really believe it is really important (with a native speaker)...incredibly important. The students are so good in English that they expect their teachers to be really good, if not much better, and that is not necessarily always the case.

However, Teacher B feels that being a native Swedish speaker an advantage when teaching difficult subjects in English, saying he can better assist the students in content comprehension if they can use Swedish to do so.

168. My subject is difficult. It is an advantage being Swedish because I can explain the subject in Swedish, too. The students used to have a teacher from Canada but he couldn’t explain things well in Swedish, too.

So while the majority of the teachers feel confident in their own language proficiency, they are not quite in agreement about whether the program would benefit from a native speaker.

Five of the six Aspen teachers state that they do not feel they experience any linguistic limitations when they teach their subjects in English instead of

\textsuperscript{57} Teacher M originally agreed to participate in the present study but left the school after the pilot study and initial contact visits were complete. Interestingly, the students are very positive about Teacher M as an EMI teacher in their interviews.
Swedish. All five of these teachers have both been teaching their subjects and been involved in EMI at Aspen School for many years. Their sense of comfort with their own classroom routines and own subject-specific language is apparent. Teacher A suggests the English-medium lessons are not linguistically problematic for any of the participants in her discussion of the “myth” of the difficulty (line 197). Only one teacher at Aspen School specifically indicates that teaching in English is limiting: Teacher F. This teacher is also the newest as both a teacher (in the first year of teaching after earning qualifications) and the newest on the EMI program (interviewed in the first term of EMI teaching).

As a teacher, Teacher F feels somewhat limited by teaching in English, finding it harder to get into deep discussions with the students and experiencing reduced ability to improvise. She indicates that an investment in more English language studies is desirable if she will continue teaching in English. Instead, now Teacher F tries to steer the current classroom discussions in directions where the English vocabulary feels comfortable.

169. In the beginning I was pretty stressed myself. What if I can’t find a word? What if I don’t know a concept and have to go around it to explain it? The students may not have ever heard the concept so it’s hard for them to come up with tips!

This stress can lead to a tendency to plan the lessons around her own perceived English proficiency level.

While the teachers at Aspen School generally do not experience limitations, at Birch School, opinions seem more doubtful. At Birch School, Teacher B considers the subject Biology particularly challenging to teach in English, reiterating several times that the subject is difficult (e.g. line 168). He also says that English can be difficult in certain areas, such as grammar. Teacher B notices that the students’ proficiency improves dramatically over their three years at Birch, remarking that they surpass the teachers in competence.

170. The students do get really good through studying in English. In the beginning in Grade 1, they are worse than me. Then when they leave Grade 3, they are better than I am, as far as the language goes. They are studying the English language at the same time and getting grammar and such. Sometimes they correct my English, which isn’t fun but something I just accept.

Despite twelve years of experience teaching EMI, Teacher B still feels like the speech outside of the planned lesson is the most difficult aspect of teaching in English and can be affected by linguistic limitations. Although casual and unplanned conversations are the hardest in English, unexpected on-task questions or discussions can also be difficult.
Of the three content teachers at Birch, Teacher N is the least reflective of his own language and teaching, focusing more on the demands and limitations EMI places on the students. He likens their choice as requiring a “performance” every day. Teacher N sees the teacher’s role as providing encouragement to the students with opportunities to dare to use English.

Finally, none of the teachers at either school specify how they address any potential resulting problems or perceived limitations, beyond perhaps keeping up to date with subject-specific journals or leisure time interests.

7.4.2.2 Instructional strategies
There is no macro policy for EMI practice in the Swedish context so teachers need to create their own micro policy for their own local context. Here the two schools diverge in their declared instructional strategies. The instructional aims of teachers at each school are presented here, with the focus on what they say they do58.

Aspen School
Aspen School appears to have a clear policy: Subject first, language second; and only one of the six content teachers interviewed at Aspen School aims to use English exclusively. At Aspen School, a mix of English and Swedish in the classroom is usually the result of a considered strategy. They stress the need to ensure that the national curriculum goals are fulfilled and that the subject instruction does not suffer due to English. Teacher J says:

171. We have to make sure that students learn the subjects first. If this affects the English, so be it, because we cannot let the students complete a program here and not learn what they should. So subject knowledge first. We have to make sure we are clear about this at parent meetings and such so that people don’t think English is the main focus.

Since the inception of the English-medium program and since the early years of a complete English immersion, Teacher A’s teaching strategies have developed; and she concludes that the students gain better results and more satisfaction with the use of both English and Swedish in the classroom. Teacher A describes two main strategies concerning language use in the lessons: 1) no random mixing of Swedish and English, but rather separate and yet complementary use; and 2) subject material and subject-specific terminology in both Swedish and English, to allow students to follow the lessons in English as well as to partake in Swedish-medium assessment (the exams in her subjects and the Swedish national exams). In both the Physics and Maths lessons, Teacher A aims to present the subject material first in English at the whiteboard in front of the class, and then switches to Swedish

58 As a reminder, seven teachers were interviewed at Aspen and four at Birch, meaning that there is more material from the interviews at Aspen.
when helping students individually at their desks when they are working on their tasks. The languages are usually divided into blocks of time based on the phase of the lesson, separate and yet integrated.

172. You don’t want to be talking Swenglish all the time either! It is better for them and better for me, I think, if we can find a good mix of Swedish and English actually. So if I go through the material in English and have discussions with the class in English, they get quite a lot out of it. Plus we have a Swedish and an English book that they use. And then when we're talking to everyone about their particular problems and solving tasks, I think I have found that it is possible to divide (the languages) rationally and be faster and more efficient in Swedish.

Even though Teacher A feels she is able to “give them both” when asked if she is teaching Physics through English or English through Physics, she is clear that the subject must come first. Swedish has a natural place in the EMI classroom at Aspen. Teacher A makes this strategy transparent to the students and to the parents right from the start. Teacher E, who has many years of experience mentoring the EMI students at Aspen, agrees that the optimal program is one that offers a balance of Swedish and English.

173. I think you can decide, ok, we will do it like this: during the lesson, we are going to speak English and you will ask questions in English. That will be our goal. Then you can say that during lab work, they can speak Swedish together if they like. You can also decide that you will go through certain parts of the lessons in both Swedish and English. You need to find a balance but at the same time use a lot of English. I think it would be wrong to be consistent in English, English, English.

Teacher A understands that some students may wish for 100% English, as she explains that despite the present focus on the subject, in the beginning, she did believe that the lessons should be in English 100% of the time. Teacher A spoke only English with the students and other staff, a strategy shared with the other teachers on the Natural Sciences program in English:

174. In the beginning everything was really 100% (in English), and the idea was that even our teachers’ meetings would be in English! Well, we were rather over-ambitious in the beginning. I remember we had a Mrs. X, who had an English course with us in the beginning when we were brand new at this and she said that we would get spanked if we spoke Swedish. [laughter] So she was really 100%.

As the newest teacher, this was not initially clear to Teacher F. She explains that she originally expected that all teaching needed to be in English.

175. I had this impression that, yeah, let’s go in English! But I noticed that they had a bit of a hard time carrying on discussions and that they didn’t
always dare to bring things up. /.../ I felt like they were pretty stressed thinking I had really high expectations because I was only speaking English and expecting them to understand.

She describes the great relief felt after consulting with Teacher A and finding out that teachers in the EMI program could choose other strategies. Teacher F feels that this freedom allowed for assistance for the students in a different way than when the goal was English all the time. She has also noticed that the entire classroom environment has changed with the introduction of Swedish into her lessons.

176. Now they can handle the stress of the lecture, and if there is something they didn’t get, then we can take it in Swedish. Or we can take it in English and Swedish.

Teacher D says her aim is to mostly use English in the classroom. Occasionally, students will ask a question in Swedish, but she usually answers in English. However, with the subject emphasis, Teacher D allows the students to use Swedish-English dictionaries during exams. Students are also allowed to ask for the English word during exams and they may fill in their texts with Swedish words if they cannot find the English word they need. Teacher D stresses that the students must know the Swedish terminology, saying it would be a “little backward” if they only knew terms in English. For example, Teacher D offers clarifications in Swedish when she thinks the students may not understand the material presented in English.

177. Not a whole summary, but if I say “the bedrock consists of so and so” then I can say the word berggrund <bedrock> in Swedish so they understand the word. So little support words. Sometimes I stop and ask a question to get an idea of how much they are following. /.../ First and foremost, they need to understand. Then if they also understand in English, that’s good. Subject first, not language.

Likewise, Teacher G presents new material in English only, but then writes the key concepts on the whiteboard with the Swedish term in parentheses next to each one.

178. Then I say in Swedish, “In Swedish we use this word” and I write them. Sometimes this is quite easy because the words are so similar but sometimes the words are very different and it is important that they get both.

Unlike the teachers above, when Teacher J has the students in Physical Education, she aims for consistent English and avoids Swedish.

59 See also Söderlundh 2012 for similar exam strategies observed at the tertiary level in EMI courses.
They (the students) came here because they wanted to study in English, so then it should be in English. Nothing else.

Despite this determination to use only English, Teacher J agrees with her colleagues that the subject is most important and thus the students’ comprehension is key. Very occasionally, Teacher J provides the Swedish terminology, especially if the concept is complicated or very different than its English equivalent. If a student does use Swedish during her lessons, Teacher J “doesn’t hear” what they say.

I always ask or say “Sorry?” or “Say it again?” Then they understand that they should speak English so they say it in English.

However, Teacher J also acknowledges that sometimes students might not dare ask their question in Swedish and they say “I have to say this in Swedish.” She lets them do this only on exception, finding that this is mostly in the beginning when the students are afraid they will say the wrong thing. Teacher J emphasises that she is not grading them on their English-language proficiency in the Physical Education lessons.

I don’t judge their English in Physical Education in the least bit. Grading is only based on their knowledge in the subject. But I can’t help it as an English teacher to correct them sometimes if they are way off, like if they say, “How much is the clock,”

Teacher L feels that speaking in Swedish to the students on a one-to-one basis ensures they learn the Swedish terms. She says the language use is a bit “willy-nilly” in lessons.

If I am addressed in Swedish, I answer in Swedish. That is pretty much my strategy. They are allowed to ask in Swedish, but very few ever ask in Swedish during the whole class lesson. If we are talking as a class, most of them keep to English. When I go around and help them, it is often in Swedish. Then they learn the terms in Swedish, too, which is not entirely wrong. It would be a disadvantage is they didn’t know the terms in Swedish.

Teacher F is determined to include a high level of academic subject language. She stresses that this is important even in Swedish-medium teaching, but becomes especially important in another language. If the language is sloppy or inconsistent, then the students will be confused—and this will be even more tangible in English, according to Teacher F.

“How much is the clock?” is a literal translation from the Swedish Hur mycket är klockan? It should be “What time is it?”
Because the teachers stress that subject content must come first, they were asked if certain subjects were more suitable for English-medium teaching or if certain subjects required more Swedish to ensure student comprehension. Teacher F describes a former student on a different EMI program who can not discuss politics or government issues with ease in Swedish—something she sees as a risk in her subject, Social Studies. This is a risk she does not want her students to encounter, so she sees Social Studies as a subject requiring Swedish.

183. This is after all a Swedish context, so it is really important that the students get the Swedish concepts. They are still in Sweden, you know.

Only one teacher, Teacher E, the Swedish and English language teacher who has been involved in the EMI program at Aspen School since the start, explicitly underlines the need for acquiring academic language in both Swedish and English in the content lessons.

184. I think it is very important that you get both so you understand. It is not especially easy to adjust to the fact that the teacher is standing there speaking English. As far as the students’ academic language is concerned, partly they do not have the Swedish academic language mastered yet and then they are also going to become proficient in the English academic language at the same time. It’s hard for them.

She specifically addresses the fact that the students are experiencing a development of academic languages in two languages at one time.

**Birch School**

Swedish is also present at Birch School, although it is not part of an implicit or explicit policy. According to Teacher B, the EMI lessons at Birch have included increasingly more Swedish throughout the years. This is mostly due to the lack of teachers willing and able to teach their subjects in English, resulting in a decrease in class time with English-medium teaching.

185. The number of subjects taught in English has decreased. We have demanded to have teachers who can teach in English, but that is up to the administrators. In the beginning, almost everything was in English, except for Swedish and English language lessons. Now, it’s mostly just Teacher I and I who have English-medium lessons. The students lose the habit of English. It’s a huge disadvantage. I think the teachers should use English. My subject is hard in English, but it gets even harder if the students are not getting English elsewhere.

Teacher N notes that it would be useful if the teachers could agree on a strategy for English language use. He also emphasises that the teachers cannot run an efficient program if they are not supported:
It works better, when all teachers agree on how we are going to handle them and that kind of thing. /…/ The school leaders, if they do not have enough support for us because we have to have the teachers, we have to have a plan. We have to say, yeah, we all demand the same thing.

However, the teachers at Birch School do not express a unified approach, although they do note their own aims. Teacher B, for example, does not have clear-cut strategies in the classroom, with intentional language choices for different activity types in the lesson. This is despite his own awareness of the advantages his native Swedish can have for the students’ subject comprehension (see line 168). Teacher B aims to first present new material in English and then to keep the lessons in English, but to conduct the lab work in Swedish. Usually, he tries to lead the lesson in English, while the students in the class tend to respond with answers and questions in Swedish fairly consistently with the exception of only a few. Over time, Teacher B has noticed that if he writes “too much” on the whiteboard, the students only copy what the text without getting involved in the lesson. He thinks the students will reflect more and also participate more in discussions if less text is written on the whiteboard. Teacher B presently uses English textbooks but says he needed to use both Swedish and English in previous years when he could not find a good textbook that matched the syllabus. He finds working with the subject-specific terminology the easiest part of teaching in English, mostly because he had course literature in English when he studied at the university level. Still, he maintains that in science, there are a lot of difficult terms.

You know, I am Swedish. My subject is tough. All the terms.

Teacher I, however, dismisses the idea that some subjects, such as History and Social Studies, demand more Swedish (cf. Teacher F in the previous section).

It’s not really that the kids don’t want to do it in English. It’s that the teacher doesn’t want to do it in English.

He further explains his reasoning: if the students go abroad, the first thing people are going to ask is “What’s it like in Sweden?” He believes that students thus need and even benefit from being able to explain in English subject matter identified as “too typically Swedish” by other teachers.

According to Teacher B, the ideal program needs to attract students who really try to speak English. The teachers play a role in this, says Teacher N, and they need to be consistent and make similar demands on the students. He feels that by demanding “the same thing,” then the expected language use in the classroom will be clear to everyone. This would ensure a program where the goals to use English as a classroom language are met. Teacher N
says the students are more likely to “get into the trap” of speaking Swedish if they know the teacher is also a native Swedish speaker, noting the need for “more teachers who talk English.”

The teachers do agree that the role of English needs to be clear in the ideal program, as the teachers express the need for continuity if an English-medium program is to be a success. Students can complain if “not everyone is doing it all the time in English,” according to Teacher I.

189. I think that if they want it in English, the more they get, the better it will be.

Although the teachers emphasise that this does not mean that Swedish has no place, there is still a call for consistent English input with stable practices that are clear to the students. As Teacher B says, more English in more subjects leads to students who are used to speaking English. This in turn makes it easier for the students to study difficult subjects in English, like his own Biology courses. Teacher C, the language-only teacher at Birch, agrees that the roles of languages should be clear, but he does not think that this equates with more English.

190. I do see a danger in having everything in English. We don’t have that problem, but that would mean that students lack concepts or discussion possibilities. But then it would have to really be all English.

Teacher C recommends that all core courses on the specific line of study be conducted in English. For the Social Sciences program, this would mean Social Studies, International Relations, as well as the basics such as Maths and Science. He thinks that if the program is to be called “English-medium” then at least 2/3 of the instruction should actually be through the medium of English. He believes that otherwise some students may experience uncertainty, leading to unwillingness to actually speak English in class, as has happened in some lessons at Birch School.

191. They think it is embarrassing to speak English with each other. It is obviously lack of confidence. They know how to formulate their ideas and opinions, yet they think it is a little silly to speak English. /…/ They aren’t used to it because we have too little English.

Teacher I feels that English should play a role even outside of the classroom on an EMI program. Speaking more English outside of the classroom, such as in the corridors or at lunch, would take the pressure off students in the lessons. They would feel more comfortable with English “just getting the English going in the corridor.” This language use would ensure a more ideal program where English language use is abundant and free. Teacher N also focuses on the self-confidence of the students as English speakers, returning
repeatedly to the teachers’ role in encouraging the students to dare to use English in class. He reasons that instilling confidence together with just enough academic language in the subject will encourage the students to actually use English.

192. The first year, the important thing is that you can give them that self-confidence with certain words that are connected to the subject, which gives them a little strength so they can use that kind of word and they can use English.

While Teacher N mentions the need for those “certain words,” the emphasis is still on motivation and willingness to speak—not vocabulary.

7.4.2.3 Perceived advantages and disadvantages
Teachers at both schools suggest two main disadvantages that EMI practice incurs for them: an extra workload and problems finding appropriate material. Most of the teachers in the present study indicate that the added workload is due to the need to create or acquire materials in English that may not be readily available in Swedish schools, which all of the teachers at both schools describe as problematic. They explain that a quandary is created when using English-language material that is designed for the native English-speaking student studying according to another curriculum. An important point is that the material in English is not enough—it must also meet the demands of the Swedish curriculum.

Teacher I, from Birch School, believes that the lack of curriculum-appropriate material may be the reason many teachers use more Swedish in their nominally English lessons, as the right material can be difficult to find or difficult to translate. The variety of English (i.e. British, American or other) chosen for the materials also affects the perspective on the materials, especially in subjects like History, which Teacher I teaches. The teaching materials in English may be specifically geared to certain contexts, meaning that a British or American textbook may not be appropriate for the Swedish student. Thus, Teacher I feels it necessary to use Swedish-language resources in those cases, even though he thinks that using both languages in the subject feels wrong.

193. It’s always a difficulty finding something. Unfortunately it’s a question of whether I should get an American book or a British book or an Australian book. Nobody writes textbooks for students who are studying history or any other subject in English.

Acknowledging the need to match the Swedish national curriculum, Teacher L at Aspen School says that even when they do find material on the appropriate level for both language and subject, they can never use a book straight through a term because the syllabi for schools in different countries are so
different. She, along with many others, has been forced to create her own guides in English to complement the British material she uses for her Biology lessons. She gives one example of a difference: in the British chemistry textbook she uses, there is much less Maths than in similar Swedish textbooks. Teacher L assumes this is due to a different order in the British curriculum and that perhaps British students have not had the same level of Maths by the same grade as the Swedish students have. This difference requires her to not only make adjustments in the use of the textbook but also to supplement it for the level of Maths her Swedish students have attained.

Teacher L provides old chemistry textbooks in Swedish for the students in order to ensure they have access to the Swedish terminology. She also tells them which chapters correspond to the British textbook they use, so that they can use the Swedish books as an extra resource. Most students do this, even though they mostly focus on her guides in English, according to Teacher L. She has written an English guide for the students and translated some Swedish material that matches the Chemistry syllabus better to supplement the book. Creating the guide and translating the Swedish material was such a big job that she has kept the same material since starting on the EMI program. Others have also have spent many extra, unpaid hours creating their own compendiums, handouts, and workbooks for their lessons. Teacher J, for example, has had to create much of her own material.

194. I had to produce my own compendium for Physical Education in English. It was a lot of work. I worked with that compendium for a whole year.

Teacher G finds a lot of material online for Physics lessons and aims to use British school material so that the students recognise the variety when they spend time at other schools during their study trip in Grade 3.

Another disadvantage can be the extra work the actual instruction situation entails. The Aspen School teachers do not feel they teach much differently in English than they do in Swedish, with the exception of Teacher J. When asked if there is a difference between teaching in English and Swedish, Teacher J quickly replies, “Yes, there is.”

195. You have to think more, quite simply. You have to learn a lot of subject-specific terminology that doesn’t come naturally. Sometimes you have to read about it or learn how you talk about this or that (in English).

While Teacher J stresses that there is a difference in teaching in the two languages and that she needs to make sure she can talk about the subjects in English, she does not indicate that it is necessarily more difficult, just more work. The other teachers at Aspen School, with their years of experience both with teaching and with EMI, focus more on the strategies they feel
work for them than the perceived difficulties. The best tools, Teacher G says, are “my head, my spontaneity, and a good memory.” The new Teacher F, however, offers reflections on and concerns about how she considers instructional quality and teaching skills with an emphasis on maintaining the same level in the English-medium lesson that she strives for in the Swedish-medium lessons.

Teacher F expected the students to know more Social Studies concepts in English when she started teaching them. In the beginning, this assumption caused some strife as the students did not participate as expected. Teacher F realised she needs to provide them with more concepts in English ahead of time so that they can follow the lessons. This differs from lessons in Swedish, where Teacher F feels the need to focus on explaining basic concepts is not as great. One reason this has been a problem is that there is no English textbook for them to read in preparation for the lessons. Teacher F has adapted her strategies and now prepares the students with lists of important concepts in English written on the whiteboard. The students need to make sure they know the terms, and if not, either find out or bring them up in the lesson. Now that Teacher F has taught for a while, she feels more confident and relaxed, both in language abilities and in classroom strategies. Teacher F says that as a Social Studies teacher, she feels confident, but as an English-medium teacher, the job is harder.

196. You have some pride in your profession. You don’t want to ruin the subject. You want it to be as good as possible, both in the subject and with the language.

Teacher A also acknowledges the fact that using both languages eases the work burden, since Teacher A no longer needs to translate all material and exams, noting, “I have to think about my work situation, too.” Together with other Physics and Maths teachers on the Swedish-language programs, exams are developed and used for all students. Whether or not the English-medium program is more work for the students is another question. Teacher A argues that studying in English is not much harder than studying in one’s own native Swedish. This belief in the difficulty of studying subjects through another language is a myth that Teacher A is to trying “pretty hard to dispel.”

197. It’s a myth that, wow, Natural Sciences is so hard, and then in English, too, it must be very difficult! It is not, because you talk a lot and then the words come. “Denominator” and “numerator,” they sound awkward the first time you say them, but you say them two or three times during each lesson for a few weeks, and then it is more natural.

Teacher D notes that some students can seem very hesitant to use English. She sees a real risk in knowing whether or not the students understand all the material presented to them in English.
Sometimes I wonder if they understand what I present. I usually repeat some of it in Swedish for clarification. I imagine the risk is that they don’t understand everything you go through during the lesson.

Teacher D also feels a potential disadvantage the student may encounter is in examinations. If they are not able to express themselves as well in English as they can in Swedish, they may have a hard time finding the words they need. A frequent comment is that perhaps the students’ Swedish language proficiency will suffer on an EMI program, a fear Teacher C dismisses, partly because he as the Swedish teacher knows that they still have a demanding language class with him. He says he is adamant about ensuring that their Swedish is up to par in his lessons.

I don’t at all believe that their Swedish suffers. I think they just get more inspired. /.../. Research shows that if you know your own language well, you can learn other language well, too. You can have several languages in your head at once.

Teacher B also rejects the premise that EMI will cause students to miss out on Swedish terminology, arguing that all students today struggle with the terminology in science subjects—even those who only study in Swedish. He suspects this may be due to changes in the syllabi at the secondary level, meaning that all upper secondary students are lacking the vocabulary they need to manage their studies smoothly, not just the EMI students.

As far as potential advantages are concerned, the teachers at Birch School do not express that they find any advantages for their own teaching when they teach in English, instead focusing on the challenges of encouraging language use and the goals of using more English. At Aspen, Teacher G does not feel that teaching in English requires more work, as it did in the beginning, with the minor exception of keeping up with new vocabulary. Instead, she sees a real advantage to teaching in English, as she explains that she is more meticulous about language in English, choosing words more carefully.

In Swedish, I tend to babble on and on quickly, but in English I am slower, with more enunciation and pauses. So I think I have a different teaching style.

Teachers G feels her instruction would benefit from only teaching in English, as she is then on one linguistic track, so to say. This confidence is also reflected in her views of her own instructional quality. Teacher G feels she is a better teacher in English.

To summarise, teachers at both schools see the added workload as problematic. The lack of appropriate material contributes to this workload, as does the need to adjust instructional practices.
7.4.2.4 Practicing the option: The teacher discourse

This section has presented the teacher perspectives on the EMI option in practice. The discourse of the teachers at the two schools differs to some extent, but converges on some themes. As regards the potential negative effects on teaching described by Vinke (1995) in the introduction to this chapter, one can see that teachers at Aspen School and Birch School are in agreement with each other to a degree—but not with the informants of the Dutch study. The teachers do not claim to offer 100% EMI (although Teacher J aims for it); and Aspen School teachers explicitly stress the advantages of including Swedish in the classroom. At Birch School, they instead stress problems with offering and using as much English as they would like.

Teachers at both schools emphasise that they think teaching in English is “stimulating,” “fun,” and “challenging” in a positive way. Many of the teachers mention that they like to travel in English-speaking countries, have English-speaking friends, and/or like to read in English. None of them have been ordered to teach in English, but rather all of them actively sought to join the team of teachers involved in EMI, usually through a job application or contact with the EMI teachers.

The teachers’ discourse may not suggest overestimation of their own proficiency, but it does suggest confidence gained from both interest and experience, especially at Aspen School. Most do not have any specific in-service training teaching through English. The teachers’ language qualifications are quite the norm for content and language integrated learning in the European context as well. Most school systems throughout Europe do not have any language requirements of their subject teachers offering instruction through a foreign language, with the exceptions being Finland, France, Spain (for regional languages), Hungary, Slovenia, and Belgium (Eurydice 2006:42).

Many teachers who have been educated for monolingual schools are required to learn how to adapt to new or evolving bilingual programs once on the job, by trial and error. This lack of training may well account for many of the past inadequacies in outcomes, but even in successful programs, teachers are left to fend for themselves. (2009:150)

In general, teachers in dual language programs are sorely lacking in specific training for working with two languages in the classroom. This is similar to teachers who teach in EMI schools at the compulsory level in Sweden, as the National Agency for Education reported that only 39 of 349 EMI teachers surveyed at the compulsory level in 2010 had any kind of in-service training for integration of language and content in their subject teaching (2010:37).

This lack of specific language education is not seen as necessarily problematic by all of the stakeholders. However, some, such as Teacher E above, express concerns with the language proficiency of the content teachers. In
previous research, Hyltenstam, for example, says, “One is surprised at how
the students can accept and adjust to the fact that many of their teachers
express themselves in broken English” (2004:92). Students can complain
about their teachers’ English language proficiency and lack of formal qual-
ifications in English, as seen in Section 7.4.1.3 above. This is perhaps one of
the most common criticism of the such programs (Ekman, no date).

Nygård Larsson suggests that learning the subject-specific language (e.g.
“biology language”) in content courses is akin to learning a second lan-
guage, a process that takes longer than learning everyday language
(2008:74). Although the discourse of the teachers implies an awareness of
academic language (e.g. the advantages of learning content terms in English
as preparation for tertiary studies), few teachers explicitly expound on how
they teach academic English in their subjects. Teacher B does emphasise the
difficulty in explaining biology. This can be compared to one teacher’s
views on Physics compared to Maths in Lim Falk’s study (2008:247). He
thought that Maths as a subject could be understood in any language where-
as Physics demands “more language” in order to understand the problems.
Maths is an “international language” (cf. footnote 55).

Vinke (1995) indicates that teachers teaching content through a foreign
language might be concerned with their instructional quality and subsequent-
ly feel that their teaching skills demand more attention than when they teach
in their own L1. The concern with diminished quality was largely absent
from the teachers’ discourse here, with the exception of Teacher F who feels
stressed by the language demands (cf. Lim Falk 2008, whose teacher in-
formants expressed similar limitations). Others, like Teacher G, felt like
better teachers in English. The perceived advantage in her EMI lessons is
quite different to Vinke’s study as well as earlier reported experiences in, for
example, Lim Falk’s 2008 study. Lim Falk interviewed five teachers, who
felt that their lessons were affected negatively when they taught their su-
bjects through the medium of English and reported that their teaching tended
to be less dynamic, with more one-way communication (246).

The indication that EMI creates an added workload is noted in previous
research as well, as other practicing teachers involved in the EMI option
express similar sentiments (Lim Falk 2008:245). In Lim Falk’s study, the
teachers explained that the added workload was focused more on the need to
find the exact subject-specific English vocabulary for the lessons, which
they experienced as taxing. Most of the teachers in the present study, how-
ever, limit the added workload to the need to create or acquire materials in
English that may not be readily available in Swedish schools.

7.4.3 Practicing the option: A discourse

This section has introduced the presentation of the investigation of the prac-
tice of EMI in the classroom with an exploration of the student and teacher
perspectives on the said practice. The thematic analysis of the interviews suggests that the stakeholders do not fear that English as a medium of instruction will negatively affect the students’ Swedish language development or the teachers’ instruction. The majority of the stakeholders indicate that being interested in English is enough to make the program manageable, with neither teachers nor students focusing explicitly on potential needs for academic language in English. The teachers, like the students, see themselves as competent speakers who only need a little help (e.g. media, TV, journals, interest) to manage academic English in lessons. Similar to the students, the teachers generally consider that it may be enough to think English is fun, if one is to teach in English.

Strikingly, issues concerning language learning are largely missing from the discourse of both teachers and students. The focus tends to highlight the value of English as an elite program for academically motivated students and the value of English for future academic endeavours and an international life. More specifically, academic English and integration of language and content are not often explicitly addressed.

Both students and teachers mention terminology as single content words, but not the demands of subject-specific language beyond the concept level. For example, as illustrated in Ella’s quote above (103-105), despite the students’ focus on the struggle of reading and writing in English, they do not actually specify difficulties with subject disciplinary language—which may have been expected considering the differences between everyday language and academic language (Cummins 1979). This begs the question if the students make any differentiation between the two themselves. Previous research (e.g. Thomas & Collier 2002) about the importance of the length of time learning in a second language before academic achievement can be attained in that language tends to address students with a L1 that is not the majority language. However, unlike students entering an EMI classroom with no previous English exposure (e.g. ESL students in the US context), these Swedish-speaking students have had many years of instruction in English as a language subject, albeit with greatly varying exposure and use in the compulsory school classroom. More importantly they have academic literacy in their own first language, Swedish. Thomas and Collier (2002:7) emphasise L1 literacy as key: “The more L1 grade-level schooling, the higher the L2 achievement.” These Swedish upper secondary school students, with their 9 years of formal schooling in their L1, their minimum of six years of English language lessons and their wide exposure to extramural English, are neither the typical second language learners (i.e. entering the classroom with a different mother tongue than the majority language) nor the typical bilingual individual (i.e. bilinguals living with two languages at
home or in an official dual language context) as assumed by much of the research. These students are somewhere in their own category, making the adjustment to EMI both difficult at first, but also manageable, as expressed by the informants in this study.

Goals for the actual integration of content and language tend to be “curiously unspecified” in most schools offering EMI, although Dalton-Puffer says there must be language goals in the EMI classroom, or “What would be the point of doing CLIL at all?” (2007:6; see also Hüttner et al. 2013). The discourse of the present interviewed stakeholders reflects this lack of integration goals as well. The emphasis on using English is on material rewards possible through the acquisition of linguistic capital that EMI provides (e.g. high status, good reputation, success in university studies, possibilities for international lifestyles). Although all of the stakeholders see the students and teachers’ language proficiency as functionally bilingual, there is also no discourse on the dual language development of the individual, with the exception of Teacher E’s perspective (line 184). Instead, the English language proficiency is a given, there is a clear discourse of confidence, and the focus lies on goals outside of specific language learning.

7.5 Perspectives: Conclusion

Chapter 7 has focused on the perspectives of four stakeholder groups involved in the EMI option—schools heads, teachers, students and parents—and how the themes that emerge reveal a discourse. While the views of a selected number of stakeholders involved in English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school cannot be expected to represent all of those involved in the option today, the themes that clearly emerged offer a deeper understanding of the context of EMI. It is of interest both what the participants say about their use of English as well as how they use English (cf. Milani 2013:343). These interviews in the main study allow the stakeholders’ perspectives to be heard and considered in relation to the actions in the classroom. The next chapter continues with the results of the study of the classroom, with the study of the observed language use during EMI lessons at the two schools.

---

61 This is, of course, a generalisation about the average Swedish student in this study. There are certainly students in Swedish EMI schools with other mother tongues than Swedish and students who use more than one language at home.
In the early years of CLIL research, the focus was on outcome studies. In the Swedish context, several researchers have focused on the results of the students on EMI programs and made comparisons between them and those on Swedish-medium programs, e.g. Edlund’s 2011 study on how students write in English, Kjellén Simes’s 2008 study on student writing as well (albeit in an IB class), and Sylvén’s 2004 study on vocabulary development. Fewer have focused on the actual classroom practices. However, observing lessons and spending time in the schools allow for a focus on both practice and process, as results only from tests rarely enable a broad understanding of an environment (van Lier 2004:210); and thus CLIL research has recently started to shift the focus to classroom discourse, especially teacher-led lessons and whole-class interaction (Nikula, Dalton-Puffer, & Llinares 2013:73). Some researchers have addressed classroom language practice in CLIL school contexts, e.g. Nikula’s 2010 study on a teacher’s language use in Finnish or English in CLIL biology lessons and Schuitemaker-King’s 2012 study on the differences between teachers’ language use in CLIL lessons and foreign language lessons in the Dutch context. Dalton-Puffer’s seminal work from 2007 investigated classroom discourse in the Austrian CLIL context, focusing on the roles of questions, academic language, directives, and correction. The most recent Swedish research includes Lim Falk (2008), who focused on interactional patterns in CLIL lessons, finding that students were less involved verbally during English-medium lessons than they were in Swedish-medium lessons.

The final research aim of the present thesis is to investigate the practice of the option through an exploration into how English-medium instruction in the Swedish school can be implemented and why it takes the form it does. The main focus is the investigation of actual language use in the classroom, with an emphasis on the roles and functions of each language, with the teacher and student discourse of EMI in practice providing the context (see the previous chapter on perspectives). This chapter presents the option in practice in the two schools in this study: Aspen School and Birch School. The classroom language use at these two schools was observed and analysed, with the primary focus on linguistic practices in the classroom and the functions of language alternation in the classroom.
8.1 Investigating the classroom practices of EMI

In order to investigate how English-medium instruction can be implemented, lessons were observed during 2011-2012, using an ethnographic approach. (See Chapter 5 for a description of the methodology and see below for a specific overview of the lessons observed at each school.) A total of 59 lessons were observed. These observations included lectures, labs, group work, films, student presentations, and an outdoor ski session—thus a broad range of teaching and learning situations.

An effort was made to make the students in both schools familiar with the researcher in their environment. This was accomplished through multiple visits over a period of time, ensuring that the presence of a researcher was not a hindrance to the natural flow of the school day. Also, formal data collection methods were introduced slowly, so that first visits focused on only talking informally with informants and spending time at the schools, before beginning with the interviews. Audio-recordings started about halfway through the study when the students and teachers were comfortable with the presence of a researcher in the classroom and school environment, and only in some lessons. These recordings were secondary to the field notes, providing confirmation of what was noted in writing. The purpose of the study was made transparent to the informants. At both schools, the students were informed of the study and how research would take place in their classrooms. At Birch School, a presentation of the study and its aims was made at a staff meeting, which included teachers outside of the focus group but who were involved in the two classes in the study. At Aspen School, research colleagues conducted a similar presentation for the teachers involved in the main study.

At Aspen School, 35 lessons were observed, with the focus on the first year of the program, during the academic year 2011-2012 and autumn term 2012. While most lesson observations took place in the EMI lessons for Grade 1, some lessons in the Swedish-medium program (Grade 1) were also observed, as well as lessons from the EMI lessons for Grades 2 and 3, as seen in the overview. Observations in Grades 2 and 3 were conducted over the course of two days, following one student in each class for an entire school day (see footnote 43). With the additional observations conducted outside of Grade 1, it was possible to observe all EMI teachers on the program at Aspen School. The focus of the analysis and presentation of teacher practices from Aspen School is on Teacher A. Extracts from the other teachers’ lessons are, however, included in the examples and discussion of practice. Table 15 presents an overview of the lesson observations conducted in

---

62 Colleagues were conducting research at the same school during the same period of time as the present study.
Aspen School, with information about the subject lesson observed, the date and the length of the lesson.

Table 15: Overview of lesson observations: Aspen School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade and subject</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>111215</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>111216</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>120203</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>120229</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>111018</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>111216</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>120228</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>120228</td>
<td>110 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>111017</td>
<td>95 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>111018</td>
<td>65 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>111107</td>
<td>95 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120228</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120229</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120521</td>
<td>95 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>111018</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics lab</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>111109</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120203</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120228</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Swedish-medium program)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>111108</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Swedish-medium program)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>121128</td>
<td>100 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>111108</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>111215</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>120202</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>O¹</td>
<td>120202</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>120202</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>120202</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>111108</td>
<td>80 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>120201</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>111215</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>111216</td>
<td>90 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>120201</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (Swedish-medium)</td>
<td>H²</td>
<td>120201</td>
<td>40 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) The EMI Physics lesson in Grade 2, normally taught by Teacher G, was taught by a substitute in Swedish. This teacher is not included in this study.
2) Teacher H teaches in Swedish and did not participate in this study.

Table 16 presents an overview of the lesson observations conducted in Birch School. A total of 24 lessons were observed, mostly during the spring term.
of 2012. Time was also spent at the school in the academic year 2009-2010 for pilot studies, as well as in the autumn of 2011. Fewer lesson observations were possible at Birch School, compared to Aspen School, mainly due to fewer subjects being taught in English: two in Grade 2 and two in Grade 3. The schedules for two of these subjects overlapped as well, making observations in both on the same day impossible. Also, the nature of the Social Sciences Program was such that there was more group work and individual work, with less classroom teaching. The focus of the presentation of teacher views and practices from Birch School is on Teacher B. Extracts are also included from Teacher I’s and Teacher N’s lessons.

Table 16: Overview of lesson observations: Birch School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade and subject</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120123</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120220</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120305</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120319</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>120423</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120123</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120220</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120305</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120319</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120423</td>
<td>70 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>120124</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>120207</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>120306</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>120320</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120124</td>
<td>55 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120207</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120214</td>
<td>65 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120306</td>
<td>50 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120124</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120207</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120214</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120306</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120320</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>120424</td>
<td>75 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Agency in language choices

While motivation might be central to the choice for EMI, how committed the participants are to using the target language may vary greatly (Dalton-Puffer
2011:191), as also seen in previous Swedish research (Lim Falk 2008) and in the interviews presented in this study. In an ecological view, the interdependence of the different participants is key. Each one makes language choices, including which language to use and when; and these choices are both influenced by and influence the others as they make their choices. When and how they use English or Swedish is affected by several factors: their micro context (van Lier 2004:139, for example, emphasises that one cannot only talk about the use of L2 in the EMI classroom, but must also consider the social context); the local language policy (either explicit or implicit in the school); the linguistic background of the participants; and the teachers’ and students’ own understanding of what EMI is. Although, as seen in the teacher perspectives above, the focus of these EMI lessons is often on the content and not the language, English is still the declared language of subject content instruction, as well as an L2 the students are required to use daily. The aim of this section of the study is to investigate who is making the language choices, according to the participants themselves, with a focus on the students.

Tables 17 and 18 below show the general language choices observed in this study. When both languages are noted, they were used fairly equally, although the language used most is listed first. When Swedish was used more or less in the different lessons, but English was by far the main language of instruction, Swedish is listed in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17: Language choices in the classroom: Aspen School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen School content lessons: Language choice in lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most European CLIL programs do not actually offer more than 50% instruction through the target language (Dalton-Puffer 2011:184), meaning that Aspen School thus offers more English than usual and Birch is a fairly typical school in this description. Many students say they wish they had more English-medium instruction, both in the lessons that are currently nominally English and in other lessons that are not offered in English (both schools have some subjects only taught in Swedish). All indicate that they believed there would be more English in general on their programs, both in and out of the classroom, such as Alvin who adopts the subject-first discourse of the teachers at Aspen School.

201. **Alvin:** I thought we would speak more English.
202. **R:** When? During the lessons?
203. **Alvin:** Yeah, during the lessons and so on.
204. **R:** Why do you think there is less English?
205. **Alvin:** It is because language should not be an obstacle for the instruction.

At Birch School, students relate a similar belief that there would be more English.

206. **Selma:** I think we have had about 50% in English, if even that.
207. **Ella:** I thought we would have more.
208. **R:** Did you want more?
209. **Selma:** Yes, preferably 100%.

Selma says if she were to choose again, she would choose a program with a goal of more English, such as the International Baccalaureate.

210. **Selma:** [sighing] My god, it sounds cool. If you compare that to here, it feels rather mediocre here. It’s too bad it wasn’t as extreme as I thought it would be, but it is still better than a regular Swedish program. It’s still an advantage here, I think.

The following sections offer a discussion on how the stakeholders view the decision-making of which language and when.
8.2.1 Teachers making the choice

Students in dual language classrooms generally follow the lead of the teacher when it comes to language choice (Lin & Li 2012:472). In her 1997 study, Washburn investigated how the teachers said they made language choices on the EMI program. Using a questionnaire, she asked four teacher informants about their language use in the classroom. Three indicated they used Swedish “on occasion to deal with practical matters and also when students asked them to explain something in Swedish” (297), while the fourth claimed to never use Swedish in the classroom (note that formal classroom observations were not part of her study). At the same time, the teachers said the students were allowed to use Swedish and that the classroom practices were “not very strict” (298). Likewise, in her studies on English-medium lessons in the Swedish context, Falk observed great variation in extent of language use, both between schools and within schools (teachers, lessons, subjects) (2000; 2002). This was the case for the present study as well. There is some variation in the individual teachers’ language choices, although the teachers at each school tended to have similar language use patterns as their own colleagues. Students also vary in their patterns of language choices; however, a teacher’s language choice usually determines the students’ language choice. If the teacher is consistent with his/her strategies, then the students find it easier to use English as well, as the language use becomes “something like house rules for the students” (Dalton-Puffer 2011:191; also Dalton-Puffer 2007), as illustrated in the student comments below.

211. Ella: Teacher I is unwaveringly consistent (with English): “Now we are going to speak English,” and Teacher I is comfortable with that, so we don’t drift over to Swedish. We have other teachers who drift over to Swedish /…/ and it ends up being a lot of Swenglish.

212. Alva: I think it is great that even if students speak Swedish, Teacher I continues to speak English. It is pretty quick that you get back to English if you got distracted and started speaking Swedish in that class.

This is seen in one English lesson (January 2012), when a student asks a question in Swedish about dialects. Teacher I answers in English. Two minutes later, the same student adds to the discussion, this time using English. In another lesson (History, February 2012), Teacher I starts by presenting practical information about a visitor due to arrive during the lesson. He speaks English. Several students ask questions about the visitor in Swedish, and Teacher I continues in English, answering their questions. When the lesson starts, the same students switch to English to engage in the content discussion. However, in another lesson conducted in English, when Teacher I discusses practical matters about the schedule, the students switch to Swe-
dish to ask questions about it, even though Teacher I uses English (see more on the use of Swedish for classroom management in Section 8.3.2).

The teachers need to want to speak English, according to Selma, and not just “stand there, spewing out (English) when they don’t want to.” According to Molly and Alva, the students being determined and making the decision to speak English is not always enough, because the teachers play a bigger role.

213. **Molly**: Some teachers don’t encourage us to speak English even though we actually do want to. It’s partly due to our class, too. In X-subject, we usually try to speak English and the teacher does, too; but then a lot of people speak Swedish, so it ends up being Swedish anyway.

214. **Alva**: Except for Molly and me.

215. **Molly**: And then you feel really stupid.

Engla agrees with the importance of role of the teacher.

216. **Engla**: Some people are, like, we are on the EMI program so we are going to speak English. But others are, like, the teacher speaks Swedish so we can, too.

If the students want to speak English, but feel the teacher’s use of Swedish is an obstruction to this, conflicts can arise. For example, two students are discussing the language use in Teacher X’s lab lessons. The teacher has decided to conduct the labs in Swedish, but these two students want to use English during these lessons as well. One says that he tries to speak English but everyone else looks at him “strangely.”

217. **S1**: “What are you doing?” [playing the role of the classmates in a fake accusing voice]

218. **S2**: And sometimes Teacher X would look at you like, “Why?”

Come on, Teacher X!

219. **S1**: Like, “Oh, really, we don’t need to do this!” [in a sarcastic voice]

220. **S2**: Like you don’t need to speak English because this is the lab.

When Teacher B is making the language choice, he often uses the word *okay* to indicate an expected language alternation, usually his teacher-directed switch back to English after the student-directed use of Swedish during the instructional phase of the lesson. Teacher B will usually emphasise the word, using English pronunciation, making it a marker in the classroom interaction, as seen in Table 19 (March 2012).
Table 19: Example of Teacher B directing language choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS asks a question</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B: OKAY? asks questions</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss respond yes yes ok</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B: asks question about definition</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS answers</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B gives a definition</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B gives practical lesson information</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS asks a question</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B: answers</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS + Teacher B engage in several turns of IRF</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B: OKAY? asks questions</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this particular lesson, he uses the marker *Okay!* five times and *Alright!* once to indicate language shift.

Although there is a general agreement both in the previous research and with the stakeholders of this study that the teachers direct the language choice in the classroom, students play a very active role as well, as seen in the next section.

8.2.2 Students making the choice

The teachers on the EMI program, especially at Birch School, feel the students’ willingness to use English plays a large role on the language use in the classroom.

221. **Teacher I:** Some of them have it, like that gear. Others just don’t.

222. **Teacher B:** If a class starts speaking Swedish, then those who might have dared to speak English otherwise speak Swedish, too. There are always a few who don’t dare and then a few who dare a little. But if they do it in Swedish, then the others do it in Swedish.

Molly and Alva relate another situation in which the students make the language choice, much to Molly and Alva’s dissatisfaction.

223. **Molly:** The gym teacher can say, “I am not speaking English unless you speak English with me. So you need to get with it or we will have to speak Swedish.”

224. **Alva:** He said, “Ok, we will vote, who wants to speak English?” Everyone except two raised their hands. “Yeah, great, we will speak English during the lesson.” Then it was like, we were throwing the ball to each other and not talking a whole lot, just like ”Yay, you got it yay, you are so good at this.” So everyone was like, ok, Swedish then. It was too bad because we did actually choose to speak English and then it is sad that only a few actually choose to use it.
Likewise, several students express not having much patience for their classmates who are unwilling to speak English in the classroom.

225. **Leo:** We don’t want to be rude, but we think people should speak English.
226. **Malte:** I tend to speak English when the class is in English. They keep speaking Swedish but I don’t care. I keep speaking English whatever they do.

The perceived lack of effort in their classmates who speak Swedish in the nominally English lessons is a source of irritation and frustration for some students, who complain about the fact that others are not using English in the EMI lessons.

227. **Leo:** I think it is a shame actually, because people think. “We don’t need to do this, so why do it?” Well, we don’t need to do this but if we do this, we will learn more (and) we will gain more from it.
228. **R:** Like seeing it as an opportunity?
229. **Leo:** Exactly. An opportunity more than a burden.

Tindra feels the refusal to speak English is unnecessary considering their level of proficiency, saying “They don’t want to speak English (even though) everyone is good in English,” again highlighting the general belief in the students’ competency evident in the discourse of confidence. Others say that it should be a given that the students use English when they have made an active choice for the program.

230. **Lova:** Yeah, if someone asks you in English, you have to answer in English. Some people don’t want to do that, but if they chose this program, they have to be prepared to answer in English as well.
231. **Tindra:** I think it is fun that we have English and then you want to, like, encourage it. But there are a lot of people who don’t care very much.

232. **Ville:** You get more out of it if you speak English.

Why do not all of the students choose English in the classroom when they have chosen the EMI program? When asked about this, those who do not use English willingly, such as Sally, focus on the perceived deficient language of the Swedish teachers as being the reason (see Section 7.4.1.3). Those who do actually use English, such as Leo, focus on the self-confidence or resolve of their unwilling classmates.

233. **Leo:** I think maybe they are not confident in their English. /…/ I don’t know why they won’t do what I did in first grade. I pushed myself.
Language choice in the classroom is thus related both to the language use of the teacher and to the determination—and not the proficiency—of the student, according to their peers. Not all students may be able to “push themselves” like Leo.

Sometimes the teachers seem to be making the choice but actually the students are. For example, in one ten-minute class discussion (February 2012), Teacher N only speaks English and the students only speak Swedish in return. After four long turns like this back and forth, Teacher N also switches to Swedish for his presentation of material. Then one student uses English again (one who is fairly consistent with English in the lessons); and Teacher N takes the cue and switches back to English.

In summary, despite the fact that the program is nominally English-medium, students and teachers are making choices everyday in the lessons about which language to use. Some teachers and students are consistent in their language use, while others are not, which can lead to frustration among students who desire more English.

8.2.3 Outside of the classroom

Students in CLIL programs tend to use their L1 as soon as they are outside of class (Dalton-Puffer 2007). Previous Swedish research (Nixon 2001) has also indicated that students in EMI classes tend to only use English when actually in the classroom, usually with the teacher but maybe with the other students as well during the lessons. In the present study, none of the teachers were observed speaking English with the students outside of the classroom, with the exception of Teacher I on occasion. At both Aspen and Birch, Swedish is used nearly exclusively for all social interaction both in and out of the classroom by all. Before, during and after the lessons, the students choose to speak Swedish with classmates. In Grade 3, Noel is observed using English with a classmate as they leave their English lesson (February 2012). She does the same. He then abruptly stops on the stairs and turns to the researcher and explains that this is not what he usually does. He switches to speaking Swedish with his classmate and she follows his lead.


At Aspen School, only a few of the students—those with a mother tongue other than Swedish—use English together outside of the classroom. At Birch School, three boys in one class (all with Swedish as a mother tongue) regularly use English together even outside of the lessons, and occasionally

---

63 Note that they do not share the same mother tongue either.
other students will join them. The other students, however, will rarely speak English together outside of lessons otherwise. Many see it as either strange or amusing to even think about speaking English together with their other Swedish classmates outside of the lessons.

235. **R:** Do you speak English together outside of the classroom?
236. **Molly:** Not so often.
237. **Alva:** It happens.
238. **Molly:** It happens.
239. **Alva:** And sometimes, we don’t even notice it until, whoops! We are speaking English together [laughter].

Most actually laugh when asked if they ever do.

240. **R:** You three all have Swedish as your mother tongue. Would you ever speak English together (outside of class)?
241. **All three:** No, no. [laughter]
242. **Minna:** That would just feel wrong.
243. **R:** Why?
244. **Minna:** It is in our nature to speak Swedish.
245. **Wilmer:** We don’t know English as well as Swedish.
246. **Alvin:** It would sound snobby, too, if we are on the international program and go around speaking English. [laughter]

The students thus see English as a natural school language but not as a personal social language to be used with other Swedes. Still, Ella also says she wishes the program would have been more like their “own world” where everyone speaks English in the corridors and at lunch, something that may have been possible if they had students who did not speak Swedish or if they had more native English-speaking teachers.

247. **Ella:** We are all Swedish speakers, so it is almost nerdy if we speak English in the cafeteria.

In brief, teachers and students usually choose Swedish outside of the classroom and do not indicate that they see English as a personal social language.

### 8.3 Functions of language alternation in the classroom

An investigation of language alternation in the classroom may focus either on a quantitative study of the amount of time or number of utterances each language or on the functions of each of the languages in the interaction (Lin & Li 2012:472). One of the aims of the present study is to examine the functions of language alternation in the EMI classroom, analysing how English and Swedish are used and for what purpose. This focus is in response to
previous research that has indicated that code-switching is prevalent in content and language integrated programs in the Swedish context (Lim Falk 2008) and to research indicating that speakers benefit from using all their linguistic resources in dual language programs (García 2009; Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010). When the L2 target language is expected but the student instead uses her own L1—or vice versa—then the utterance may be deemed an error or an “unsolicited use of L1” (Lyster 1998:196). In this study, the language use of the participants is not classified as errors based on use straying from the expected. Instead, these utterances are considered for function in the context of the exchange between speakers in the classroom. The question is how language alternation in the Swedish EMI lesson is possibly used as a resource in the classroom.

The organisation of language use in the observed EMI subject lessons was investigated for patterns of language use according to general classroom practices and for language alternation according to function. One objective is to understand the flow of language use over the course of a lesson, especially in relation to the functions of each language in content instruction and classroom management. The second objective is to understand how language choices are made for the different activities with diverse constellations of participants. A final objective is to consider the language patterns of the classroom in each micro context in relation to the discourse presented in Chapter 7.

In the tables below, the following is noted about each teacher at each school: subjects taught and languages used for each area of practice, i.e. instruction, materials, tasks, exams, and classroom management. If both languages are given, then the first is dominant. If one language is in parentheses, then it is not the main choice but is an option available to the students. Instruction refers to the actual teaching or lecturing that the teachers conduct (teacher monologue and teacher-student interaction during lecturing). Materials here indicates the written materials observed in the classroom or described by the teachers (e.g. textbooks and hand-outs). Task assistance refers to help given to the students at their desk during individual or group work as well as task-specific help given by the teacher before or after lessons (or, for example, when individual students request help while the class is engaged in group work). Exams refers to the exams given by that teacher for that subject64. Finally, classroom management indicates the regulatory language. These tables indicate the teacher-directed language patterns, that is, what they are offering in each language.

---

64 Standardised national subject exams are routinely given in Swedish, although students may also choose to take them in English.
Table 20 below presents an overview of the EMI practice of the content subject teachers at Aspen School, as indicated in their interviews and as seen in the lesson observations.

Table 20: Overview of general language allocation for Aspen School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Subjects taught</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Task assistance</th>
<th>Exams</th>
<th>Classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A</td>
<td>Maths + Physics</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English (Swedish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher L</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher G</td>
<td>Maths + Physics</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English (Swedish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher J</td>
<td>English + Physical Education</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher D</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher F</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>English (Swedish)</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the teachers at Aspen School aim to use mainly English for instruction, with the exception of Teacher F who introduced some Swedish into the Social Studies discussions. Task assistance, however, is given in both languages in many lessons, often in response to the students’ language use. The Maths and Physics teachers use the same exams as they use for their Swedish-medium classes. The teachers generally use English for classroom management, but Teacher A does give practical information about Swedish exams in Swedish. All of the teachers, with the exception of Teacher J, deliberately use or provide materials in both languages.

Table 21 below presents an overview of general classroom language practices at Birch School for the three content subject teachers conducting their lessons through English. As indicated in the interviews, all three teachers aim to teach in English, but for Teacher B and Teacher N, Swedish is present as much as English is. (Teacher B also indicates that all Biology labs are taught in Swedish, but these lessons were not observed for this study.) Teacher I, the native speaker, is very consistent in using English in his lessons, with only occasional use of Swedish. All three content teachers tend to use Swedish for regulative functions (taking roll, scheduling, computer problems). For task assistance, the teachers usually respond to the students’ language use and offer help in the same language. All teachers use materials in both Swedish and English. The students, especially in Teacher N’s les-

---

It should be noted that this information is based on both interviews and class observations, but two teachers (L and D) were only observed once each at Aspen School.
sons but also to some degree in Teacher I’s lessons, consistently use Swedish websites for their group work, even when the assignments are then written in English. Teacher N leaves the students to do group work on their own for most lessons and then they use mostly Swedish sites for material and Swedish amongst themselves, only using English when they dictate to one another for the written assignment. Teacher I usually floats among the students when they work on group tasks on the computer, asking questions and giving advice in English. The students then tend to use more English sites for material. Finally, the testing is usually conducted in English, and this includes larger written assignments.

Table 21: Overview of general language allocation for Birch School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Subjects taught</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Task assistance</th>
<th>Exams</th>
<th>Classroom management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English (some Swedish)</td>
<td>Swedish + English</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher N</td>
<td>International relations + Social Studies</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Swedish + English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher I</td>
<td>English + History</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section considers examples of language alternation. The focus is on the language use as a process and the functions the language choices may fulfill. As indicated in Chapter 4, the notion of translanguaging is applied to the analysis of the language alternation in the EMI classroom. More specifically, pedagogic translanguaging and non-pedagogic translanguaging are considered respectively in the investigation of language use during content instruction and outside of content instruction.

Translanguaging in the classroom can be either teacher- or student-directed, as noted in studies on the Welsh context (Lewis et al. 2012b; Lewis 2008:82). When translanguaging is teacher-directed, the teacher decides the language of input, for example by lecturing in English or providing tasks in Swedish for the students to complete. The students, in turn, may be expected, either with implicit or explicit instructions, to produce one or the other language as a follow-up to the original input. When the translanguaging is student-directed, the teacher is not necessarily involved as the decision-maker for language use. For example, the students may be working on subject assignments and looking for information on the Internet in Swedish, but then writing their task in English. Based on previous models (Lewis et al. 2012b:665), the following learner-focused model is proposed for this thesis (Table 22):
### Table 22: Translanguaging model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translanguaging model</th>
<th>Input medium (receptive language skills: listening/reading)</th>
<th>Output medium (productive language skills: speaking/writing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-directed</td>
<td></td>
<td>English→ Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translanguaging with teacher support for students on the English-medium program</td>
<td>English and Swedish→ English and Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-directed</td>
<td>Swedish→ English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Translanguaging undertaken by students on the English-medium program with minimum teacher direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model is considered *learner-focused* as the focus is on how students in the EMI classroom are engaged in content learning through the use of language to provide input (e.g. listening to a lecture or reading a text) and to produce output (e.g. discussing the material in Swedish and writing an assignment in English). The borders between the languages in the model are not exact or set, but rather the movement between phases of translanguaging should be seen as a flexible. Thus, the model should not be read as an indication of strict boundaries designed to keep the languages separate. The languages may be used fluidly.

An example of teacher-directed translanguaging strategy observed in this study is seen in Table 23. Teacher A employs this same strategy for every Maths and Physics lesson. Teacher A offers the students opportunities to process the subject material in both languages. The teacher is making the language choice, affording the students the opportunity to engage in productive and receptive language practices in both Swedish and English, including working with subject-specific vocabulary as the lesson moves from teacher monologue, to class discussion, to seatwork.

### Table 23: Example of translanguaging process: Teacher A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translanguaging model</th>
<th>Input medium</th>
<th>Output medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-directed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content instruction</td>
<td>English→ Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher A presents the lesson material at the whiteboard in English. Students process lesson in English.</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher A offers help and discusses tasks in textbooks with students in Swedish. Students use Swedish with Teacher A to work on problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teacher B does not have the same planned strategies as Teacher A, but aims for English instruction with discussion followed by in-class task in either Swedish or English. In his lessons, the translanguaging tends to be more student-directed, as seen in the example below in Table 24.

Table 24: Example of translanguaging process: Teacher B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translanguaging model</th>
<th>Input medium</th>
<th>Output medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-directed</td>
<td>English and Swedish→ English and Swedish</td>
<td>Teacher B presents the lesson material at the whiteboard in English, with some Swedish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students process lesson in English.</td>
<td>Students work on tasks in English textbooks, and receive help in Swedish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translanguaging in Teacher B’s lessons is usually student-directed. Teacher B aims for English-medium instruction, but usually responds to the language choice of the students, albeit not always in the first turn. Both languages are present in both the input and the output of the lessons.

The two models for Teacher A and Teacher B represent their general translanguaging processes. More specific examples from their lesson phases and activities follow in the next section.

8.3.1 During content instruction

This section first presents examples of language alternation in phases and activities and then more specific instances of language alternation with an analysis of the function they may provide in the lesson. As a reminder, the focus is on Teacher A from Aspen School and Teacher B from Birch School, although other teachers are included to some degree.

Teacher A aims to alternate languages based on different phases in the lesson. She presents the material first in English at the whiteboard, and then switches to helping students individually as needed at their desks in Swedish when they are working on their tasks. In the Maths and Physics lessons, it is almost as if she has a line drawn on the floor between the whiteboard and the rest of the classroom: at the whiteboard, Teacher A is teaching in English and expects the students to use English as well. Once she crosses this imaginary line and meets them at their desks, they use Swedish together. This is illustrated in Table 25, where the language chosen is clearly related to the place of instruction (February 2012).
Table 25: Example of main lesson phase in a Physics lesson: Teacher A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson phase: Main lesson</th>
<th>Teacher A</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opens lesson</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and speaking on the day’s lesson topic</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF with students</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A writes Swedish support words</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work on tasks in Swedish book</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A floats and helps students with tasks</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student comes to whiteboard for help</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ask for help from their seats</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A floats and helps students</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher A goes through tasks with all</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this sequence of instructional periods in the main lesson, Teacher A only uses Swedish once at the whiteboard: when presenting the Swedish subject-specific terminology to support the English concepts covered in the lesson. The students follow the lead in language use when engaging with her during the presentation of material. The students then ask for help in Swedish when they are working on tasks at their desks and Teacher A assists them there.

Teacher A has made the language choice to use Swedish with students when they require individual or small group assistance on in-class tasks, and English when she is addressing the class as a whole, as seen in Table 25 above. She says this is an effort to ensure subject comprehension, which she can more easily do on an individual or small group level than she can with the whole class. Table 26 below illustrates how the language choice can shift according to activity with a sequence flow from a Maths lesson (October 2011).

Table 26: Example of language use according to activities: Teacher A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity: Teacher A</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps the students individually at their desks</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decides to show a problem on the whiteboard, with a few students</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses whole class: “Look if you are interested, otherwise, keep working. You might learn a new word.”</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half of the students work on problem together with Teacher A at the whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Teacher A wants to offer one-to-one support, she conducts this in Swedish, as she also does when only a few students express the need for extra help with a maths problem. When she invites the rest of the class to join the problem solving, the language switches to English. Not all of the students join her, but as the group is larger and she is no longer able to keep track of individual needs, Teacher A carries out the instruction in English.
Teacher B also alternates between English and Swedish in his lessons. He generally uses English during the presentation of material, with switches to Swedish frequently in response to the students. Table 27 (February 2012) presents an example.

Table 27: Example of main lesson phase in a Biology lesson: Teacher B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson phase: Main lesson</th>
<th>Teacher B</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opens lesson</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting day’s lesson topic</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF with students</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B writes English text on whiteboard</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B explains terms</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One student asking questions (several turns)</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B explains terms</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another student asking questions (several turns)</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B explains terms using a model</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRF with students</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B assigns task in English textbook</td>
<td>whiteboard</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students ask practical questions on task</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher B offering assistance</td>
<td>desks</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher B thus does not have strategies as clear as those observed with Teacher A. In the sequence of instructional periods in the main lesson, he focuses on using English himself, but also follows the lead of the students in language choice. This is the same pattern during task work. Teacher B does not have observable strategies for language use for the lesson activities (although he does plan for only Swedish during lab work). He usually starts with English when he is addressing the class as a whole, and switches readily to a mix for whole group, individual or small group assistance on in-class tasks.

Table 28: Example of language use according to activities: Teacher B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity: Teacher B</th>
<th>Language used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engages whole class in IRF</td>
<td>English + Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the students individually at their desks</td>
<td>Swedish + English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps the students in small groups at their desks</td>
<td>Swedish + English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The patterns of language use above illustrate the fact that both Swedish and English are consistently used in the EMI classrooms in these two schools,
albeit differently. Specific instances of language alternation have been analysed to determine how the languages are being used, with examples from both Teacher A and Teacher B as well as their colleagues. The following categories of language alternation were identified in the lessons: reformulation, explanation, language awareness, lesson participation, and group work. These are charted in Table 29.

**Table 29: Translanguaging during content instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>Single content words or phrases with no explanation</td>
<td>Facilitation of content learning through direct but minimal translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Explanation of content concepts (words or phrases)</td>
<td>Facilitation of content comprehension through inserted brief explanations during the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language awareness</td>
<td>Interruption of content instruction to focus on linguistic item</td>
<td>Facilitation of language learning and metalinguistic awareness outside the content instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson participation</td>
<td>Student on-task switch during active participation in content lesson</td>
<td>Facilitation of participation in the content learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>Student switches during on-task group work</td>
<td>Facilitation of task completion or group management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


8.3.1.1 Reformulation

Single content words or phrases offered in the other language with no additional explanation constitute reformulation. Through reformulation, content learning may be facilitated through direct but minimal translation by teachers or students and can occur in both directions. The strategy of reformulation is observed in all of the teachers’ lessons, with the exception of Teachers F and J (although each says she may offer the Swedish words as needed). Some teachers present the Swedish terms verbally or check comprehension verbally as seen in Extracts 1 and 2.

248. **Teacher A:** Do you know these in Swedish?
249. [Students call out names of terms in Swedish.]

*Extract 1: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

250. **Teacher G:** Have you heard the Swedish word *svetsning*? Weld? This is what we are doing.

*Extract 2: Physics (Grade 3, Aspen School, December 2011)*

The students frequently request the terminology in both languages. Teacher B often offers the single terms to them already during the course of instruc-
tion, giving them temporary, specific assistance when he perceives their need.

251. **Teacher B:** This is the pelvis. Bäckenben. *<Pelvic bone>*

*Extract 3: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

Teacher I verbally provides vocabulary in History lessons, for example, offering the translation of key terms like “viral medication” as bromsmedicin and “tribal” as bystämma in the context of a discussion on Africa, but without a discussion beyond the reformulation (February 2012). Reformulations, however, can also appear in verbal interaction as seen in Extract 4. Teacher B supplies the students with the subject-specific terminology they may not yet know.

252. **Teacher B:** How many bones do we have in the body?
253. **S1:** 206. [in Swedish]
254. **T:** 206. [in English] And the biggest bones are…?
255. **S2:** Hip?
256. **S3:** Lårbenet? *<Thigh/femur>*
257. **T:** What are the biggest bones? Femur.

*Extract 4: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

First, in line 253, Teacher B repeats the student’s correct response to the question, which she gave in Swedish. Teacher B does not have time to respond to the suggestion of “hip” for the answer to the next question. The third student answers the question correctly in Swedish in line 255. Here, the Swedish word is both the everyday word and the subject-specific terminology (i.e. there is only one word), whereas the English words differ (i.e. there are two possible words). Teacher B repeats the question, perhaps in acknowledgment that S2 does give the correct name of a bone, but not the largest bone, before reformulating the subject-specific term in English: “femur.”

In a similar instance of reformulation, the class has English-speaking visitors. A student, who normally is very consistent with speaking Swedish in all of the other lessons, is actively engaged using almost only English. In Extract 5, she answers Teacher B’s question with a Swedish word, with half-English pronunciation. Teacher B quickly identifies it as Swedish, gives the student the correct term in English and moves on with the lesson.

---

66 While the students are identified by a pseudonym in all sections presenting the interview results, the students are only identified as S, FS or MS in the sections presenting actual language use in the classrooms. This is in order to protect their privacy and to ensure them as informants that the data is not revealing anything about their individual language proficiency.
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258. **T:** Why? [asking about blood cells]
259. **S:** They get more red *blodkroppar.* <blood cells> [pronounced “blood-kroppar”]
260. **T:** That’s Swedish. Red blood cells.

*Extract 5: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

Teacher B provides the missing word and to keep the lesson moving, while at the same time acknowledging the student’s understanding of the subject-specific concept. The student can then leave the lesson knowing both terms. In another lesson, a student indicates that she understands the concept being taught, but she lacks the English term:

261. **S:** It *sliter mer.* <It is more stressful.>
262. **T:** It is more stressful.

*Extract 6: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

Here again, the teacher provides the word without hindering the lesson. Teacher B also checks the students’ understanding of the lesson material through elicitation of reformulations, as seen below.

263. **T:** Muscles are antagonistic. What is that in Swedish?
264. **S:** Bad guy.
265. **T:** *Fiende.* <Enemy>

*Extract 7: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

In line 263, Teacher B uses a difficult, subject-specific term, “antagonistic” and follows this up with a comprehension check. The student offers an informal term in English in line 264, in a sense translating the word from academic language to everyday language. Teacher B provides a more formal Swedish word in return, both acknowledging the correct response but also presenting the student with an appropriate equivalent of the English term.

Many teachers offer reformulation in writing on the whiteboard as they give the terms to the students. In Figure 1, Teacher A has written the Swedish subject terms in parentheses after she presented the new English terms.
Teacher B also uses reformulation to help the students distinguish between Swedish and English academic language in the terminology. In Figures 2a and 2b below, he has written the terms in Swedish next to the new terms in English.

Here, he focuses on providing the terms that may be new or unusual for the students. Thus, Teacher B has not written the Swedish words for “glass” or “plastic” or “wood,” as these would likely be familiar to the students. He has instead concentrated on the subject specific words like “conductors” and “insulators,” as well as an everyday word that still may not be recognisable to students: “ceramic.” While text on the whiteboard is a common part of instruction in many school subjects (see e.g. Danielsson 2011), mostly for students’ note-taking, in the EMI classroom, the text takes on a new meaning as the provision of both languages offers scaffolding for the content learning. The students can hear, see and write the subject terminology. The students make use of this scaffolding mostly in the first year, as seen in one Grade 1 student’s notes in Figures 3a and 3b below.
In the top figure, the student has written “v₀ = initial velocity = start-hastighet” in the top line and “v = velocity = hastighet” in the middle line. In the second figure, she has written “fysikalisk storhet” in Swedish over the terms “Physical Quantity” and “enhet” over “unit.” Although she does not spell some of the English terms correctly (e.g. “temperatur,” which is the correct Swedish spelling), she does not write a Swedish equivalent for these words that are similar to everyday Swedish words. In Grades 2 and 3, students are not observed writing the support words provided by their teachers in their own notes. They write notes in the language that the teacher writes on the board or in the language of instruction, usually English in both cases. Thus, there was a difference in note-taking in Swedish between the grades. There were also changes over the course of the school year for the Grade 1 student observed here. She showed her notes from Physics, starting in August at the start of the academic year. She wrote more notes for herself in Swedish when the material was presented in English in August than she did in February, when these photos were taken. Lim Falk, in her discussion on how students use the two languages (2008:263), said that the CLIL students in her study generally did not write much at all in English. This is not the
case with the informants of this study, as many observed students write at least some class notes in English.

8.3.1.2 Explanation

The second category of language alternation observed during content instruction is explanation. The explanation of content concepts (words or phrases) facilitates comprehension through inserted brief explanations during the lesson. Unlike the single word reformulations above, this kind of language use is not prevalent in the observations of classroom interaction. This may in part be due to the fact that when students have questions about terminology, it can be unclear if they are only asking for the Swedish word or if they need more scaffolding to understand the concept as well, as seen in Extract 8.

266. **Teacher L:** Today we’d like to look at ions, because our next lab work will be on ions.
267. **S1:** On what?
268. **T:** Ions, we can call it detection of ions. [writing it on the whiteboard]
269. **S2:** What’s detection?
270. **T:** Jo, hur man känner igen något. <Yeah, how you can recognise something.> [teacher setting up equipment]
271. **T:** There are different ways…[she continues the lesson in English]

*Extract 8: Chemistry (Grade 3, Aspen School, February 2012)*

Teacher L offers an explanation of an English word that may be difficult for the students. One might wonder why she did not first try to explain it more in English before switching to Swedish, but speculations can be made that she knew it was a completely new term for the students, that she knew this particular student would benefit most from a Swedish explanation, or that she interpreted the question “What’s detection?” as the second request for linguistic help. (An exit interview could have confirmed one of these hypotheses but was not possible in this instance.) After the brief explanation in Swedish, Teacher L continues the lesson in English. In a similar example found in Extract 9, two students are discussing a term that one student needs help with.

272. **S1:** Vad är distinguished? <What is…>
273. **S2:** Distinguished? Teacher C säger det all the time <says it >

*Extract 9: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

It is unclear if S1 does not know the Swedish translation of the word or if she does not know the meaning of the word. S2 uses a chunk of English in her choice of “all the time” but then goes on to help S1 in Swedish with the definition after this exchange.
8.3.1.3 Language awareness

The third category of alternation offers attention on language awareness. The content instruction is interrupted to focus on a linguistic item, thus facilitating language learning and metalinguistic awareness during the content instruction. This is usually teacher-directed and is rare in the lesson observations, as in the EMI programs in this study, the main focus is almost always only content, with very little integration of language teaching. While reformulation into Swedish is common, few metalinguistic clues or comments are offered in English. Some instances are noted, however, such as when Teacher B interrupts the Biology lesson to explain the differences between *jeans* and *genes* (March 2012). Sometimes this scaffolding involves the call to notice similarities or differences in the two languages, such as in Extract 10.

274. [Teacher A demonstrates materials and refers to books in Swedish, followed by IRF on task in Swedish. Teacher A writes terms on the whiteboard in both languages.]

275. **T:** That is the advantage of studying in English—the terms come from English.

*Extract 10: Physics lab (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

This extract is from the Physics lab, which is normally Swedish-medium for Teacher A. After she writes the subject-specific terms on the whiteboard in line 274, she brings the students’ attention to the fact that most physics terminology in Swedish comes from the terminology in English. Thus Teacher A is calling the students to notice the linguistic similarities. She continues the lesson in Swedish, writing letters representing different physics concepts on the whiteboard. In a similar instance, Teacher B draws the students’ attention to the similarities between the two languages.

276. [Teacher B writes the terms ‘exoskeleton’ and ‘endoskeleton’ on the whiteboard.]

277. **T:** Det är samma på engelska och svenska: exo- och endoskelett. <It’s the same in English and Swedish: exo- and endoskeleton.>

*Extract 11: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

Both Teacher A and Teacher B give the students access to a broader understanding of the terms as well as access to a learning strategy for new terms: that is, they bring the languages closer together in a sense. If the students can realise that what they know from one language may help them know the terms in the other language, then their access to the subject knowledge may also be assisted. Another instance is found in Extract 12.

278. [Teacher A returns to whiteboard and instructs Ss to work on a problem with their calculators in English.]

279. **T:** Have you seen…? [T draws the symbol ∞ on the board.] What is it?
280. **Ss:** Yes. Yes.
281. **S1:** Infinity.
282. **T:** What is this?
283. **S2:** Oändligt. <Infinite.>
284. **T:** Oändlighet. <Infinity.> [She writes oändlighet on the white board and makes a reference to a Swedish grocery store chain that uses the symbol in their logo.]

*Extract 12: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

In Extract 12, Teacher A first presents the students with a maths symbol that can be used in Swedish or English. She directs their attention to the symbol to check their comprehension. A student correctly identifies it in English, and Teacher A asks again. It is unclear here if she wants to elicit the Swedish term or if she wants the students to explain the term, but another student offers a Swedish equivalent, albeit she provides the wrong word class (*infinity* instead of *infinity*). Teacher A scaffolds her Swedish reply by providing the correct word class *oändlighet* <infinity> and also writing it on the board, before continuing the lesson in English.

Alternation focusing on language awareness may involve the fundamentals of pronunciation and grammatical form. In general, language correction is non-existent in these two EMI programs in the content subject lessons. One example of pronunciation repair, however, is seen in Extract 13.

285. [Teacher A calls on S to work on a problem on board in English.]
286. **T:** What is “n”? [referring to equation]
287. **S:** Integer. [mispronounced with Swedish pronunciation]
288. **T:** Right! Integer. [pronounced correctly]

*Extract 13: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

The teacher provides both positive feedback (“Right!”) and language scaffolding through a recast with the correct pronunciation of the word as it is repeated in English. This kind of language repair is not common in Teacher A’s lessons. She can, however, sometimes focus on the similarities or differences between the meanings of English terminology and everyday Swedish words when the pronunciation is similar. For example, in a Maths lesson (November 2011), she explains that the Maths term *sin* is pronounced *sine* and should not be confused with Swedish *synd* <sin>.

Finally, although the students complain that they need to “correct” the teachers at times (Section 7.4.1.3), instances of this are rare in the observations. In one case, however, a student offers language scaffolding for a teacher who pronounces *swine flu* incorrectly, mixing the Swedish and English pronunciations.

289. **Teacher X:** You can also check about *svininfluensa* <swine flu>. Sween-flu [sic].
Neither the student nor the teacher reacts after the correction and the lesson continues.

8.3.1.4 Lesson participation
The fourth category of language alternation involves the facilitation of lesson participation. Students can engage in language alternation when they use Swedish in an English lesson to indicate that they are following the lesson content but either do not know the vocabulary, would like more explanation about the content (either in Swedish or English), or simply choose to use Swedish for other reasons. In this study, some students clearly prefer to speak Swedish whilst participating in the lesson, although it is clear they are quite proficient in English as their English language use has been observed on other occasions (e.g. when English-speaking visitors participate in lesson or when they have English language lessons). The language alternation in the lessons is often observed to indicate a shift in the participants, as certain students consistently choose English in the EMI lessons while others consistently choose Swedish. In the instances facilitating lesson participation, the students show that they are actively following the lesson—yet they choose the other language to do so, as seen in Extract 15.

Although the student adds a chunk in English in line 294 (“My god!”), she chooses to participate in the lesson in Swedish, while Teacher N continues in English. In some cases, however, it is unclear why student chooses Swedish, as seen in Extract 16 below.

---

67 Here the student is using a louder voice as seen in the capitals. See page xv for a key to the transcriptions.
68 The students who are most consistent in speaking Swedish during the EMI lessons were asked about their preference for Swedish. This is explored in Section 8.2 in the investigation of who makes the language choice.
It is clear that the student understands what Teacher B is saying in English and that she can actively engage in the lesson. In line 296, however, one can question whether or not she is asking what colon means in Swedish or what the term means in general. Teacher B obviously interprets her question, “What is that?” to mean “What is that in Swedish?” as the Swedish term is provided, but he does not further explain the term as a biology concept in English. When the exchange continues and the student continues to actively participate, Teacher B answers her Swedish question about a biological concept with everyday language in English, using number one for excrement (Note: The informal child’s term would usually be number two). The student in turn responds in line 302 with the Swedish term most commonly used by small children, bajs, showing that she follows his slang use of number one. Only then does Teacher B use subject-specific terminology, excrement, offering scaffolding through reformulation, to which the student responds with the corresponding Swedish term avföring, again showing her on-task participation and comprehension of the subject-specific terminology the teacher is offering. She also illustrates her mastery of both everyday language and academic language in both languages. Teacher B then confirms this in line 305.

In another example from Teacher B’s lessons, a student uses Swedish to actively participate and to confirm what is being said in English.

306. **Teacher B:** [explaining about bones in English]  
307. **S:** Var är vi nu? <Where are we now?>  
308. **T:** [continues explanation with drawings on board, in English]  
309. **S:** Vad kallar du det för, flat bone? <what did you call that?>  
310. **T:** [answers in English and continues explanation in English, talking about red in bones]  
311. **S:** Red? Röd? <red?>  
312. **T:** RED. Alltså röd. <That is to say, red.>

Extract 17: Biology (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)

This particular student, the same one as in Extract 16 above, is active in exchanges during the presentation of the material, but chooses to use Swe-
dish in response to Teacher B’s English. Although he often continues in English, he does confirm her Swedish question from line 311 about the term used, red, in line 312 when he confirms the term with emphasis in English first and then reiterates in Swedish.

Finally, a student may direct language alternation to indicate what she needs for the lesson to continue. For example, two students are discussing an in-class task with Teacher B in English during a Biology lesson. All three are speaking English, when one student inserts, Jag förstår inte <I don’t understand> (February 2012). The student may be emphasising that she needs help and chooses Swedish to make it clear to the teacher. All three continue in English.

8.3.1.5 Group work

The final category of language alternation observed is group work. Language alternation can be situational, a practice so common in bilingual communities with diglossic language use that, according to Lin and Li (2012:471), “a switch triggered by a change in situation is almost predictable.” Group work is one such situation. Instances of student-directed language alternation in the classroom occur most frequently during group work in this study. Students tend to use their own L1 when working in groups in the CLIL classroom (Dalton-Puffer 2007:30), and this is also the case in these EMI classrooms, especially at Birch School where group work is prevalent in the Social Sciences subject lessons. For example, in one Biology lesson (January 2012), students are given a task in English (on a paper) and then they do their group work, using English language sites, but speaking only Swedish together.

In Teacher N’s class, the students use Swedish nearly exclusively for all group work, often engaging in student-directed translanguaging, for example when looking for resources online. Without specific teacher direction about how to find or use online material in English, the students usually look for Swedish material that they then translate to English for their written work for him. An example of this is seen in Extract 18, when two students are working on a group task on a computer.

313. S1: Vi får skriva på engelska. <We have to write in English.>
314. [S2 spells out the words in English as S1 writes them on the computer.]
315. [S1 swears in English when she makes mistakes.]
316. S3: Hur går det? <How is it going?> [calling out from another table]
317. [S1 and S2 complain in Swedish about the task.]
318. S3: Men leta på engelska! <Well search in English!>

Extract 18: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, January 2012)

In general, in this lesson and in all group work, students chat in Swedish, check pages in English, talk about the information in Swedish, and then
write the task in English. This pattern of translanguaging is observed in all of the group work in Teacher N’s lessons, but also in group work in other lessons at Birch School. The students complete the tasks in English (usually written or oral presentations), but use both languages as resources to progress from the assigned group task to the final completed assignment. They engage in a non-linear cycle of input and output in the two languages to accomplish their goal, as illustrated in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: Student-directed translanguaging flow](image)

8.3.2 Outside content instruction

The lessons also involve language alternation outside of the content instruction. Teachers and students use both English and Swedish for classroom management and in social interaction.

8.3.2.1 Classroom or task management

Language alternation outside of content instruction may be teacher-directed, such as the regulative language that facilitates routines through instructions or directives, or student-directed, such as the language concerning practical aspects of task work or group work (as seen above). Teacher B, for example, only uses Swedish for classroom management, such as taking roll call or asking where an absent student is. Teacher A, on the other hand, uses only English for this kind of classroom management at the beginning of the lesson, but uses Swedish sometimes at the end of the lesson for giving practical
information. (Note: All of the English language teachers only use English for all classroom management, just as the Swedish language teachers only use Swedish.) Subject teachers, however, may use English to indicate that the lesson is starting. For example, usually in direct relation to the instruction, Teacher A will use English, such as when the students are still talking when she is ready to start the lesson and she is trying to bring them to order.

319. [Students chat in Swedish as they arrive.]
320. **Teacher A:** Are you finished? Can it wait?

*Extract 19: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, October 2011)*

At Birch School, Teacher N engages in alternation to ensure comprehension of in-class task directions. In one observation (Social Studies, Grade 2, January 2012), Teacher N has conducted a 25-minute lesson in English and gives directions in English for group work and the students start. One group stays behind in the classroom and asks for clarification, which he gives in English. Another group returns to the classroom with questions about the task, in Swedish. Teacher N then explains the task in more detail in Swedish.

Students may alternate to indicate on-task and off-task language. In one instance, two girls are working on group work in Teacher N’s lesson. He asks in English if they are going to write their answers directly on the computer. One student engages in the exchange with Teacher N in English, before immediately turning to her classmates to use Swedish in the next turn.

321. **S:** No, we will get our info here. [directed at teacher]
322. **S:** *Kan någon annan logga in?* <Can someone else log in?> [directed at classmates]

*Extract 20: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, January 2012)*

The student uses English with the teacher when discussing the task, but Swedish with her classmates for the management of the group work. Students can also alternate to English from Swedish for regulative language, as seen in the example below from one of Teacher N’s lessons.

323. **S:** Shall we start here? Yes! Here! [exaggerated British accent]
324. [The students start the task in English, and when one uses the Swedish word *sammanställa* <compile>, all switch to Swedish.]
325. /…/
326. **S:** Who wants to search first? DEMOCRACY!
327. [All switch back to Swedish and get back on task.]

*Extract 21: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, January 2012)*

In Extract 21, the students alternate depending on the task or other speakers. The task above involves a group assignment they will write in English and
they choose to start in English as well, playing with accents (cf. Extract 33, note that these are not the same students). A Swedish word triggers their switch to Swedish, which they use for the rest of the period when working on the task, with the exception of group work management, such as deciding who will use the computer to search for information in line 326. Thus, the students are both playing with English (social language alternation for identity formation and confirmation) and choosing to use English for practical group management but Swedish for content work. In a similar example, two students work on a task in Swedish but switch to English for practical decisions.

328. [The two students are discussing the assignment in Swedish.]
329. **S1**: Can you print it? [sing-song voice]
330. **S2**: Yes! I can print it! [sing-song voice]
331. [One runs to the printer and comes back with the papers and they return to working in Swedish.]

*Extract 22: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, January 2012)*

They are working at a computer on a Social Studies assignment on the EU, looking for relevant information for their topic. Although the task was assigned in English and will be presented in English, they are using Swedish to complete it. They use their play voices (varied intonation and exaggerated enunciation) in English to switch to the practicalities of printing their document, thus using English both for social language and for management of the task. Later in the same lesson, S2 returns to this playfulness, again saying “Shall I print this?” with the self-reply, “Yes! I run again!” in English.

The above examples occur when the students are actually working on a task that is to be written or presented in English—meaning that the lesson is nominally in English but the students are first choosing to speak Swedish for the group work and then choosing English for the regulative language of that group work—thus student-directed. However, even in Swedish-medium lessons, such as the Physics labs at Aspen School, which Teacher A has decided will be taught in Swedish, the students can choose to switch to English for the management of group work, as seen in Extract 23.

332. [Ss work on a task in pairs in Swedish. They need to raise their heartbeats as part of the task.]
333. **S**: Let’s go run on the stairs!

*Extract 23: Physics lab (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

In general, language alternation for classroom management may seem random when student-directed, but the students use it to access another kind of language outside of the academic language of the assigned tasks. In group work management, English is specifically focused on the practical steps.
needed to complete the task. The students may use sing-song voices as well, but they are not adding extraneous words or phrases. In Extract 24, however, the students first use English in immediate response to Teacher A’s English instruction at the whiteboard. They then switch to Swedish when they continue with their comments that are not directly about the task at hand, but rather about their related homework. S2 actually makes this switch herself between two sentences in the same utterance, and then S3 continues in Swedish.

334. [Teacher A starts writing on board in English.]
335. [Teacher A and students engage in IRF in English.]
336. [Teacher A calls for volunteers in English.]
337. **S1:** Can’t we have time to do it first?
338. **S2:** We’ve already done it. *Vi hade ju läxa.* <We had this homework you know.>
339. **S3:** Jag har redan gjort det. <I have already done it.>

**Extract 24: Physics (Grade 1, Aspen School, February 2012)**

When the students are expected to be on task and participating in the whole group activity, Teacher A will continue to speak English even if they do use Swedish.

340. [Teacher A calls on two Ss to work out problem on board in English.]
341. [S1 goes to board.]
342. **S1:** *Den är ju gjord.* <You know it’s done already.>
343. [Teacher A answers in English.]
344. [Teacher A goes through the problems in English.]
345. [S2 goes to board to solve a problem in English.]

**Extract 25: Physics (Grade 1, Aspen School, February 2012)**

If the students are asking for help related to a on-topic task, however, they may be just as likely to use English, as seen in this extract from a Physics lesson.

346. [Teacher A gives directions about a hand-out in English.]
347. **S:** We need help.
348. **T:** What? What?
349. **Ss:** We need HELP!

**Extract 26: Physics (Grade 1, Aspen School, October 2011)**

Still, the students tend to use Swedish with Teacher A about non-task topics, as illustrated in the extracts below from a Maths lesson.

350. **S1:** *Jag är klar!* <I am finished>
In addition to the language alternation for processing classroom management, both students and teachers make switches in other instances, as seen below in the next section.

8.3.2.2 Social language
Social language alternation includes exchanges or utterances that are not on topic of the content, including hedges, fillers, chunks, and slang, as well as stories and anecdotes. It may serve a phatic function, offering no instruction or content information. For the students on these EMI programs, the language use can be fluid, alternating both ways, perhaps presenting a view of their classroom as a bilingual space. One example of this is noted during Swedish-medium group work in a Maths lesson at Aspen School when a student exclaims “I get it!” in English when she understands the problem (February 2012). Sometimes the switch merely confirms what the other speaker has said in the other language, again verifying they are in a bilingual space.

Extract 28: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, January 2012)

There is no information exchange and no content learning taking place in Extract 28—only a social exchange between the students as S2 both responds to S1 and knows that S1 will understand her. Small chunks and swearing are frequently heard in English during group work and in between lessons: e.g. “if you know what I mean” and “fuck”. Examples of this are in Extracts 29 and 30.

Extract 29: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, February 2012)

357. [Students are discussing an assignment to be written for both English and Religion. They are unsure which language to use.]
358. S: Teacher I utgick från att alla skulle skriva på engelska men I don’t know. <Teacher I assumed that everyone would write in English but…>

Extract 30: English (Grade 3, Birch School, April 2012)

Teachers can also use chunks, such as when Teacher G is working on an experiment in Physics and says, “Don’t try this at home!” (Grade 3, Aspen School, December 2011). This is also seen in the extract below when Teacher A does not get the expected solution to a Maths problem.

359. **Teacher A**: No solution. Shit happens.

Extract 31: Maths (Grade 1, Aspen School, October 2011)

Language alternation may include anecdotal information. For example, switching language to tell an off-topic story is frequent in the two schools. One instance is the following exchange, from a Grade 3 Religion class at Aspen School taught entirely in Swedish, with only Swedish textbooks and materials. A movie in Swedish was also shown in this particular lesson. A student is completing a task on how different religions view the image of God, working together with another student. When he mentions the British Monty Python film *Life of Brian* (a comedy based on a person living at the same time as Christ), the student switches to English to deliver a quote. The quote is actually on topic with the task discussion, but is still anecdotal information. The film title alone may have triggered his switch.

360. **S1**: Jag tror att man inte får avteckna gud och så får man inte säga Jehovah. Har du aldrig sett Life of Brian?><I don’t think you can produce images of God and you can’t say Jehovah. Have you never seen Life of Brian?><

361. **S2**: Nej. <No.>

362. **S1**: De bara, så säger, så säger, John, ”Well he said, well what did he say? He said Jehovah! What? He said Jehovah!” <They just, then John says, says …>

Extract 32: Religion (Grade 3, Aspen School, February 2012)

During the same lesson, the student is speaking Swedish with his classmate, and says something off-topic in Swedish and then exclaims in a voice of fake shock, “Gasp! Will that be on tape?” in English. This exclamation is directed at the researcher, drawing her into personal interaction in the middle of the lesson. The use of English can also confirm his role as an English-speaking student on the EMI program who is aware that he is using Swedish in the lesson—but that he can just as easily switch to English.

Playing with languages is also frequently observed. During an interview, two students in Grade 1 at Aspen School describe how it is common for
students to use English together for “playing.” The extract below, involving the same two students, illustrates this.

363. [S1 + S2 + S3 are using Swedish when they start a task.]
364. S1: I’ll CHECK that!
365. S2+S3: Yes, let’s CHECK that!
366. All 3 Ss: Yes, yes, yes.
367. S1: Maybe we should CHECK that.
368. S2: What’s the story?
369. S3: I have no idea!
370. [They switch from playful voices to regular voices to talk about the task in English, working out how to do it.]
371. S1: Oh, we have a problem.
372. [They ask Teacher A for help, speaking Swedish. They then work on the task in Swedish and seem to understand what they are doing.]
373. All 3 Ss: oKAY, oKAY, oKAY…
374. [When they get going on the task again, then they start using English again.]
375. S1: What do we need? Is this useful?
376. S2: I don’t know. I have no idea.
377. All 3Ss: O-KAY! O-KAY! O-KAY! O-KAY!
378. [The students then switch back to Swedish when they start writing down their answers. S3 leaves the group. S1 starts to translate the questions into English as they talk about them. S2 looks confused and asks for help from S1 in Swedish. S1 starts to answer in English. S2 continues the thread in Swedish and they work out the problem in Swedish.]
379. S1: O-KAY! All right!
380. [They all switch back to English, now using exaggerated British accents.]
381. S2: OH! That was not SO much!
382. [S2 translates the Swedish questions literally to English.]
383. S2: Can you *uppskatta* how big work is needed to move yourself one *våningsplan* in school? <estimate> <floor in a building>
384. S1: Yes, we can!
385. [The third girl re-joins the group. S1 asks what she has been doing in English. S3 starts to answer in Swedish, then switches to English. Looks slightly confused. All three discuss the word *uppskatta* <estimate>.]

*Extract 33: Physics lab (Grade 1, Aspen School, November 2011)*

This extract illustrates many features of fluid language use observed in the schools. In lines 364-370, they are using “play voices,” meaning that they are using sing-sing voices with varying intonation. When they encounter a problem with the task, they seem to forget about that and use regular voices, still speaking English. In line 372, they need help and as per usual in the Physics labs, ask for help from Teacher A in Swedish. They then indicate their own switch back to English with sing-song voices, emphasising “O-kay!” In line 378, the students need to record their answers in Swedish and there is some confusion between S1 and S2 as to which language they
should use. They finally stick to Swedish to complete the task, which must be written in Swedish. They use both repetition (e.g. repeating forms of “Okay” and “I have no idea”) and sing-song voices, as well as exaggerated British accents in line 381, perhaps to make it clear to one another that they are playing with language as they work on the task. In line 384, the student uses a catchy phrase that may be a reference to the Obama presidential campaign slogan. In general, they switch to Swedish when they need to focus on the task, using mostly Swedish for the task talk and English for regulatory talk, making it clear that the English is for play through their exaggerated accents. In line 383, the student translates all of the everyday words into English, but does not know the academic word for estimate in English. She does, however, know the Swedish equivalent, as evidenced from her correct completion of the task.

Teachers also use Swedish occasionally for social purposes in English-medium lessons. In one instance, Teacher G interrupts an English-medium lesson when the students are giggling about something from a previous lesson.

386. **Teacher G:** Hello! Hello! Aldrig har jag haft en sådan rolig lektion där så många har skratat. <I have never had such a fun lesson with so many laughing.>

*Extract 34: Physics (Grade 3, Aspen School, December 2011)*

Teacher G first tries to get their attention in English (“Hello!”), the language she usually uses for classroom management, but then switches to social language off the topic of the lesson in Swedish. Together with the students, she spends a few minutes discussing the funny event before returning to English and the day’s topic. In another example, during a Grade 3 English lesson at Aspen School, Teacher J tells an anecdotal story in Swedish about some graffiti, related to a student’s speech. She finishes the story and returns to speaking English for the lesson.

387. **Teacher J:** Very interesting discussion, but we will have to move on, I think.
388. [Students applaud for student who gave a speech.]  
389. **T:** Jag måste bara säga en sak på svenska. <I just have to say something in Swedish.>
390. [Teacher tells anecdotal story about graffiti in Swedish.]  
391. **T:** Okay!  
392. **S:** Continuing on the same topic…  
393. [A student starts his presentation in English.]

*Extract 35: English (Grade 3, Aspen School, February 2012)*

As seen in Extract 35 above as well as frequently in in Teacher B’s lessons, Teacher J uses the word *okay* (pronounced in English, and not the similar
Swedish variety *okef*) to indicate a change in language. Although this is not noted in Teacher J’s other lessons (as she very rarely uses Swedish with the students in her teaching), the students seem to pick up on the switch, knowing that the Swedish aside is finished and they can continue with their presentations in English. In a similar lesson at Birch School, the students alternate to offer their classmate support before her presentation. In this English class, the students are going to present short speeches on their topic of choice. One student uses Swedish to indicate her nervousness, and is encouraged by her classmates in Swedish as well, even though the lesson is entirely in English otherwise. The use of Swedish is somehow “off the record” in the lesson.

394. **Teacher 1:** Okay, your turn!
395. **S1:** Jag är jättenervös! <I am really nervous!>
396. **Ss:** Det kommer att gå bra! <It will be fine!>
397. [FS1 starts her speech in English.]

*Extract 36: English (Grade 3, Birch School, February 2012)*

Once her speech starts, she completes it in clear English with no language alternation. The ensuing discussion after her speech is in English as well.

Finally, there are many instances in which a student alternates for no apparent reason but the switch does not hinder the flow of conversation.

398. [Students are working on task in English.]
399. **S:** Oh, yeah, I wonder hur. <how>

*Extract 37: Social Studies (Grade 2, Birch School, March 2012)*

This suggests that the participants together know that as members of the EMI group, they will understand both Swedish and English and that there is no need to stop and react to language alternation as marked language use.

### 8.3.3 Summary: Patterns of language alternation

This section has presented the language use in the EMI classrooms, with a focus on language alternation during and outside the content instruction. The instances indicate that both Swedish and English are actively used in both schools, albeit with differences in patterns and in teacher or student direction. These differences are further explored as translanguaging in the discussion. To summarise, some translanguaging does not provide a pedagogic function as far as providing access to the content material, but that does not mean that there are no potential benefits or function in the classroom. Social interaction is not only necessary for fluent output for the emergent bilingual, but also is key to the learner’s actual cognitive processes involved in the learner’s language development (Lindberg 2003). Interaction helps the
learner to engage in focussing on form so that it is possible to convert “…knowledge about language […] to knowledge about how to use language” (ibid. 358). Individual learners can access the competencies of the other learners in order to develop themselves, making the social interaction “collective and mutual scaffolding” (ibid).

8.4 Practices: Conclusion

Chapter 8 has presented the EMI practice of two schools, through an investigation on language choice and use, with an emphasis on language alternation. The aim has been to explore the patterns as well as to consider the functions the language choices fulfil. Language choices in any classroom are affected by the context in which the education takes place. The language choices in the EMI classroom affect and are affected by affordances that directly or indirectly influence the teaching. If students are expected to become proficient, comfortable users of English and yet also develop competence in the subject matter in Swedish, first this goal needs to be made explicit and, second, the roles of scaffolding and affordances in the classroom to help the participants reach the goal need to be focused. Is a single lexical item enough to be considered support for content understanding? How much is enough for the instruction to be considered integrated? Students want and need strategies for learning content with and in both languages; and teachers should not be afraid to let the L1 into the EMI classroom to accomplish this. The next chapter delves into the connections between the stakeholders’ discourse and the classroom practices, which were presented in the last two chapters.
9 Discussion

This chapter presents a discussion of the investigation of perspectives and practices, with an aim of understanding language use in the two schools in relation to the implicit and explicit goals and strategies revealed in their discourse. The chapter moves from a consideration of the two schools to a reflection on these micro contexts in relation to the macro context of Swedish language policy and ideology.

9.1 Two schools: two contexts

The teachers in the schools conduct their EMI lessons in different micro contexts, yet the macro context for both schools is the Swedish educational system and society. Both schools are Swedish municipal schools following the national curriculum. The classroom culture is similar to other Swedish upper secondary schools; for example, teachers are addressed by their first names instead of Mrs or Mr. All of the teachers have Swedish teaching qualifications in their subjects. They also have proficiency in Swedish, as either a mother tongue or an advanced second language. The vast majority of students at both schools have Swedish as their mother tongue. At both schools, the students have made a decided choice to study through English, as each offers the same program in Swedish. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the stakeholders in both school contexts see the value of Swedish and English in their personal and professional/academic life.

In these two school contexts, however, there is a variation in the patterns of language use, both between schools and within schools (teachers, lessons, subjects) (similar to findings noted previously by Falk 2000, 2002, and Lim Falk 2008). There is no macro policy in Sweden governing the practice of EMI, so the schools—and individual teachers—need to create their own micro policies on language use and language alternation, as well as how the content may be integrated with the language in each lesson. With the ecological perspective in mind, the classrooms in this study can be seen as their own ecosystems, with a web of relationships within the context.

The differences between the schools may depend on the differences in the support in place. The teachers at Aspen School mention the encouragement

69 This practice, not common in Sweden, was observed in one pilot study school.
they received from their principal both in the beginning, as Teacher E says the principal was “very positive” to starting EMI, and currently, with the current principal describing the teachers as “wicked good.” Besides moral support, the teachers received reduced teaching hours as well as English language lessons in the beginning. As a bottom-up initiative, they were also able—and keen—to develop their own strategies over time. The teachers and principal at Birch School, however, do not mention the same level of support. Instead, they note that the top-down decision has not been easy to comply with when the school has not been given the resources they need. Like Aspen School, the teachers were supported with English language lessons and study visits in the beginning, but as Principal Y says, “We have not managed to economically nor in any other way meet the needs for in-service training.” This lack of support is apparent in Teacher B’s comments that he feels the administrators have not met the needs of the teachers, which in turn has affected how they can run the program. Also, Birch School has struggled with teacher recruitment and staff stability, as well as student recruitment—which Aspen has not. At the time of the study, the EMI content-teaching staff at Birch was a small team of three compared to the Aspen School staff of six.

In short, this study has presented two schools with both similarities and differences, as indicated in their discourse and in their classroom practices. Likewise, the schools each have explicit and implicit policies as made evident by local language practices. The next sections will consider these similarities and differences in light of the main theoretical concepts in relation to language use, followed by a synthesis of the discourse and practice of each school.

9.1.1 Language use

A school may have an implicit or explicit local language policy, indicating which language to use in the classroom, but the interaction both during and outside of the lesson will still be the individual participant’s choice (Cromdal 2000:112-113). As seen in the present study, both teachers and students play a role in the decisions to use English or Swedish in the EMI classroom, whether in consistent patterns or in random fashion; and each is making a decision about how to participate in the interaction every time he or she adds to the discourse. In this section, language use as described by the stakeholders and as observed in the schools is discussed in relation to language alternation, language hierarchy and academic language, looking at both practices and possibilities in the classrooms.

9.1.1.1 Language alternation

As indicated in Chapter 4, the notion of translanguaging as a pedagogical process is applied to the investigation of language alternation in this study.
The use of the term translanguaging is exploratory, as there is no consensus on how, when and why to use it. Aims of translanguaging may be different in different contexts—e.g. to either strengthen or maintain a bilingual student’s two languages (e.g. a Swedish EMI student) or to assist in the acquisition of a second language (e.g. English as a second language learners in the US context). This thesis aims to apply the concept to the analysis of the Swedish EMI context. Translanguaging in this study has been identified as 1) pedagogic, either part of a planned strategy or a specific serendipitous instance, or 2) non-pedagogic, part of the classroom interaction but without a specific learning function (cf. Lewis et al. 2012b:667).

The patterns of language alternation (switching to and from English and Swedish) and their functions as identified in the analyses are examined here from an ecological perspective. Following the descriptions proposed by Lewis et al. (2012a), both planned and serendipitous translanguaging were considered for how these language choices may provide affordances and scaffolding in the EMI classroom. This is aligned to pedagogic translanguaging. Non-pedagogic translanguaging was also considered for what the process may offer in the EMI classroom. The exploration of the translanguaging categories in the classroom is based on the results presented in Chapters 7 and 8, and is thus data-driven. Table 30 below illustrates the translanguaging strategies identified in the EMI classrooms in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 30: Translanguaging categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedagogic translanguaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-pedagogic translanguaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exploration of how the three categories of translanguaging relate to the specific contexts of this study and to the processes suggested in the classroom material follows.

9.1.1.1 Pedagogic translanguaging

**Translanguaging as affordance**

The first category is translanguaging as affordance. In the EMI classroom, students and teachers engage in an environment where different kinds of action take place that may promote content and language learning (cf. van Lier 1997:785). Students may be afforded more prospects of participation if
they perceive that they are allowed to use both languages in the classroom. As an affordance, translanguaging can be seen as an action potential, as a “relation of possibility” between the participants in the EMI lesson and language (cf. van Lier 2004:95), leading to action or, alternatively, no action.

In the EMI classroom, an affordance may be the possibilities that the environment offers to either promote language use or to discourage language use, as well as perhaps to promote content learning or to discourage content learning, because, as Williams (1996:64) makes clear, in order for students to use information “successfully,” they must first understand it, and thus they need access to language to do so. The affordances offered through translanguaging practices in the EMI classroom mean that the participants can make use of all their language resources. Lewis et al. (2012a:643) maintain that integrating content with language affords great possibilities for both language learning and content learning if “both languages are utilised in a lesson.” Some potential advantages of translanguaging practices for students in a dual language classroom include greater access to the specific content matter, increased competency in the weaker language, and facilitation of collaborative work between students (Baker 2011; also explored in Lewis et al. 2012a). Another possible advantage specifically in this EMI context is that the students will not lose competency in Swedish, as they can work on and discuss their schoolwork in Swedish as well.

In the context of this study, it would not be helpful to the EMI students to only know how to talk and write about biology in a linguistically diverse form, as real life will demand that they at some point use one language to work with the subject, either in an academic or a professional capacity. Thus, from a pragmatic point of view, even if theoretically the practice of translanguaging facilitates a move away from a monolingual view of languages, there is value in giving the students the opportunity to really delve into and learn the material in each language at separate times. Students need the opportunity to spend time in the subject specific language, working on the content and “digesting” it, as Baker says (2011:289). If they hear “English only!” all the time, then perhaps they will hesitate to participate if they cannot use Swedish for their idea or question. It is not enough to only receive support at the single word level (e.g. the reformulation seen in Section 8.3.1.1). Instead, translanguaging as a pedagogic strategy allows for more concentrated time spent in each language and also affords them the opportunity to learn the material more thoroughly and to use it in either language in the future.

Translanguaging may also offer an affordance for pushed output, as the students will have the opportunity to actively use subject-specific language in each language if different lesson activities are conducted in each. The affordance may actually become a constraint if the students are not encouraged to use each language and to develop knowledge and academic language
in each language. Thus, translanguaging needs to offer opportunities for both receptive and productive language use.

Teacher-directed translanguaging for instruction may encourage content learning (cf. Lewis et al. 2012a:651), as the practice offers a resource for the balanced and purposeful use of both languages instead of a constraint of a one-language-only goal. Affordances are offered through the routine use of Swedish in Teacher A’s classroom, for example. In her lessons, the students usually work with the material in the whole group in English and then work with the same material individually or in groups in Swedish (see Table 25). The action potential afforded in Teacher A’s lessons is that Swedish can be used to understand the subject. It does not have to be used, but the action potential is present. Affordances are “that which is offered by the linguistic environment and perceived by the learner” as available (van Lier 1996:12); and if the student in Teacher A’s lessons perceives that Swedish is available to her, she can make better use of the two languages, as seen through the consistent use of English and Swedish in relation to Teacher A’s consistent use of the two languages. If students know that Swedish is available when they need it for understanding, then they might be more willing to participate in English. They do not have to worry that this particular learning moment is the only one and thus they need to use Swedish right now in order to understand, but they can work with it in English and feel sure that anything they miss will be covered in Swedish later. In contrast, in Teacher B’s classroom, this affordance of the Swedish language is not evident, and thus the students are more likely to use Swedish throughout the English-medium parts of his lessons, as they cannot be sure when they will get the Swedish assistance they want and need to follow the subject material (see Table 27 and more on Birch below).

The EMI students in this study are proficient in English but, at the same time, English-language material may not always be appropriate for them. All of the teachers discussed the quandary of material being both at the right language level as well as at the right subject level. Offering Swedish textbooks is an affordance for comprehension of the subject matter, especially when the English material may not be exactly suitable. Translanguaging aims to reinforce the material the students know in one language in the other (Lewis et al. 2012b:644, citing Williams 2002). Many students at Aspen School comment on how useful it is to have textbooks in both English and Swedish for most subjects, explaining that it is necessary to be able to know the subject-specific terms in both languages. Teacher G, for example, uses a Swedish textbook for Maths lessons, although she conducts the lesson in English. Teacher A uses two Swedish textbooks and one English textbook for Physics. Another aspect of translanguaging in Teacher A’s lessons involves the two textbooks used: one in English and one in Swedish. Teacher A also uses “s.” for sida <page>on the whiteboard when the students should
look in the Swedish textbook and “p.” for page when the students should use the English book.

While the students in Aspen School specifically express the usefulness of learning subject-specific terminology in both languages, in part through their work with materials in both languages, some students in Birch School do not concur. One group of students in the Grade 2 Chemistry course (Autumn 2011) complain that it is hard to have to re-learn all the terms in Chemistry that they knew in secondary school. As one student explains, “We have to learn everything from scratch.” The group also maintains that being given a study guide in Swedish is not helpful, but to the contrary, the guide makes their studying in English difficult. The teachers do not see the use of materials in both languages as an affordance either. Teacher I, for example, does not always find appropriate material in English. He thinks having the students read a Swedish text in order to discuss the topic in English in the lesson is not ideal, but is resigned to do this in order to meet the curricular demands. This might be considered “accidental” translanguaging. The use of Swedish materials is not perceived as positive in the Birch context. Thus, they may miss the potential of Swedish as a possible affordance.

Classroom activities that facilitate student participation are more likely to create affordances that encourage learning (Järvinen 2009:169). In the EMI classroom, this activity may be the practice of language alternation. The affordance of translanguaging may allow for more daring and confident language use in English. The opportunity to speak Swedish actually translates into an opportunity to speak more English: the use of Swedish affords the use of English. While Lim Falk maintains that students feel the mantra of “language must not be a hindrance” means that students do not feel the pressure to use English (2008:271), translanguaging strategies may have the opposite effect. Instead of feeling pressure to produce English for the entire lesson, with translanguaging the participants know that the other language is available. The affordance of Swedish simply makes it possible to learn the content well and to avoid the risks of lack of comprehension and may remove the obstacles discussed in previous research, such as Lim Falk (2008).

This practice not only potentially affords language and content learning, but also offers scaffolding, as seen in the next section.

**Translanguaging as scaffolding**

Language alternation in the classroom discourse may also provide scaffolding through translanguaging, and this is identified as the second category (see Table 30). Scaffolding is key in the EMI classroom, as students, either individually or as a group, need subject-specific language for learning the content. This may take the form of translanguaging to the L1. If the strategic use of two languages in the EMI classroom is seen as a possible pedagogic tool, much like the use of different registers by monolingual teachers in a monolingual classroom (Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:33), then teachers may
realise that switching languages intentionally can facilitate both content and language acquisition and thus, ultimately facilitate learning, as seen in the practices of reformulation, explanation, and language awareness presented in Table 29. Translanguaging through scaffolding may also increase students’ chances of managing the lesson (Creese & Blackledge 2011:18) through the support given at the time of need, as seen in the practices of lesson participation and group work, also in Table 29.

Allowing both Swedish and English into the EMI classroom can counter the supposed domain loss feared by many in the Swedish context today. Domain loss can be task-specific, according to García, who notes, “It is only when bilinguals are forced to choose only one language in carrying out a precise task that we may be able to speak of their language dominance for that exact event” (2009:57). The students can have greater access—access they may not manage on their own—to the intended subject content, either through oral or written language, when the teachers offer scaffolding through pedagogic translanguaging. (i.e. providing subject terminology in Swedish during an English-medium lesson). Students need the subject-specific language if they are to fully comprehend the content (Dalton-Puffer 2007:90), and providing them the terms in both Swedish and English provides the opportunity to access this vocabulary in a way that may be difficult if they only ever hear them in English.

Translanguaging as a classroom strategy, however, should not be equated with constant, concurrent translation (Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:34). Hence, a subject-specific term in Biology, for example, may be needed as a scaffold and provided for the EMI students as a single word on the whiteboard in order to assist their performance in the lesson. Once the students have incorporated that item into their own lexicon, the teacher no longer needs to provide the scaffolding through pedagogical translanguaging and thus can dismantle that specific scaffolding. As seen in Section 8.3.1.1, reformulation, both oral and written, is a common strategy in the EMI lessons in the classroom. For example, in Extract 4, Teacher B offers the single Swedish words to ensure comprehension, but continues the lesson in English. Scaffolding through translanguaging thus refers to specific instances.

Scaffolding can also confirm what they know in their own language and stretch them to be English speakers as well—competent in both. This is seen, for example, in student-directed translanguaging when the students request confirmation of terminology or utilise both languages during group work. Language alternation can include two functions in the “moment-to-moment development of talk itself” (Rampton & Charalambous 2012:484): 1) Language indicating the speaker’s proficiency or preference, and 2) Language indicating a shift in the discourse (e.g. topic or participants) (citing Auer 1988). In the EMI lessons in this study, some students clearly prefer to speak Swedish whilst participating in the lesson. This may indicate their uncertainty in their own proficiency or the topic. The language alternation in
the lessons is often observed to indicate a shift in the participants, as certain students consistently choose English in the EMI lessons while others consistently choose Swedish. These may be the students who need more scaffolding or those who have not noticed the language affordances. Interestingly, the students who use Swedish in response to their teachers’ English tend to be those at Birch School, where the use of Swedish is not explicitly considered to be an affordance (see e.g. lines 407 and 408 in Section 9.1.2). The Aspen School students are both more positive to the potential benefits that Swedish affords and also less critical of Swedish scaffolding.

Scaffolding through translanguage is identified as differing from the affordances offered through translanguage in that scaffolding is temporary assistance given right at the point of need, when that need is expressed by the students or perceived by the teachers. Affordances instead are seen as the planned fluid strategy of offering access to both languages over the course of a lesson in order to allow students to process the content in both languages. Thus, affordances can be seen as the overall strategy and scaffolding as a specific single instance. Both scaffolding and affordances involve pedagogic translanguage, unlike the other category identified in the classroom: non-pedagogic.

9.1.1.2 Non-pedagogic translanguage

According to Lewis et al. (2012b:657), the earliest applications of translanguage designated planned and intentional use of two languages in a lesson, but the reality of the dual language classroom is that unplanned language alternation occurs no matter what the explicit or implicit local language policy is. This may also include “spontaneous translanguage,” here categorised as non-pedagogic translanguage (see Table 30). Non-pedagogic translanguage does not offer pedagogic support. In this study, the focus is on how non-pedagogic translanguage transpires in both social language use and classroom management, as the students and teachers make use of their linguistic resources in a bilingual environment. Students and teachers alike shuttle between languages even in the activities outside of the actual content instruction (see Canagarajah’s 2011b discussion on “shuffling”). Such language alternation may serve a phatic function, offering no instruction or content information, but plays a functional role nonetheless.

Fennema-Bloom (2009/2010:32) categorises language alternation without pedagogic purposes as habitual and restricts this kind of switch to the language of the individual teacher (i.e. her habits), explaining three identifying features she observed in dual language classrooms:

---

70 The students who are most consistent in speaking Swedish during the EMI lessons were asked about their preference for Swedish. This is explored in Section 8.2 in the investigation of who makes the language choice.
1) First, the switch was a conversational product and not a topic/content-generated product and/or idiosyncratic to the individual teacher.
2) Second, no evidence [...] that would indicate that the translated equivalent was used.
3) Third, the switch is a discourse marker or international participle that is idiosyncratic to the individual teacher such as the word “okay” or “ya know.” (ibid.)

Similar patterns of social and regulatory language use are observed in the lessons of this study. Students use English (especially chunks, e.g. Extracts 29 and 30 above) in their Swedish social conversations but also use Swedish in their interaction with teachers outside of the content instruction (e.g. Extracts 25 and 27). Likewise, they may also use English in off-topic talk, for example, for play as seen in Extract 22 or for task management as seen in Extract 24. The third category was also observed in the present study, especially in the lessons of Teacher B at Birch School, as seen in Table 19.

Social language alternation occurs frequently at both schools, as has also been seen in previous research (e.g. Lin & Li 2012; Nikula 2007). At an individual level, language alternation can indicate competency in the two languages as well as understanding of the discourse structure (Gardner-Chloros 2009:41) (e.g. Extract 28). Language alternation thus may not be seen or experienced as marked by the students in the EMI classroom, but rather they continue the interaction as before (cf. Rampton & Charalambous 2012:484) (e.g. Extract 29). However, not all language alternation has a specific purpose—sometimes it just illustrates that the participants see the space as bilingual (Nikula 2007:206; see also Bailey 2012). The students and teachers in the EMI classrooms in this study know that the others will understand them whether they use English or Swedish and can thus choose the language for the moment, whether to tell a story or to share an identity as bilingual speakers. In the EMI classroom, the participants know the others—both teachers and other students—understand Swedish and English, so translanguaging can come easily. They only rarely invite a third language into that bilingual space, though, even though several students at both schools have a mother tongue other than Swedish. Only one instance of an L3 (not the mother tongue of any of the students) being used socially was observed, when two students at Aspen School played with French phrases (Maths, Grade 1, May 2012).

As seen in their discourse presented in Chapter 7, the students are very aware of the roles of each language in their daily life and school life. A difficulty in examining EMI in the Swedish context is that the students involved are somewhat in their own category: traditional CLIL research and bilingualism research do not “correspond” to these students who have been exposed to and have learned English both in and outside of the classroom from an early age. The definition of who they are as bilingual speakers is
fuzzy\footnote{Compare this to official definitions of bilingualism offered by the National Agency for Education (Håkansson 2003:21-22), which exclude both categories of students with Swedish as one mother tongue together with another, as well as categories of students with Swedish as one mother tongue who are studying through the medium of English.}, as is their exact exposure to learning English as a language. English is both a school language and a media language, but not their own personal language, as seen in the interviews. Their translanguaging includes alternation intended for personal interaction, relationship-building, or identity formation or confirmation. Students use English for communicative effect, often as part of a discourse to establish their identity in the group (Falk 2000). Hyltenstam (1993) likens changing language to changing identity, or as in the case of the EMI classroom, building or confirming identity or group membership, as the speakers know that the others are part of the same bilingual community.

Their discourse and practice depict their identity in several ways: they see themselves as bilingual, they allow themselves to try out aspects of language, and they align themselves to the role of an EMI student. First, they display their competence when they use English and exhibit flexible access to both English and Swedish. This fluid language use may be a marker of a fluid identity, for many students aligned with their view of themselves as international or interested in discovering the world. Second, they try language out, as it were to say, through play with words and accents, for example. This is seen in the exaggerated British accents that students used at Aspen (Extract 33) and the sing-song voices they used at Birch (Extract 22). This play took place during group work and lab work, when they would not be expected to use English at either school. Thus, they have a little more freedom to taste the language outside the context where they may feel they must perform in correct English. Third, and finally, choosing to use English may be one way for students to confirm their assumed identity as EMI students. They belong to this community and show their membership by using English (cf. Wenger 1998:152) in their roles as “EMI students.”

Still, while they “own” English as one of their languages, they do not see English as a language that is naturally theirs to use with friends and family. Although they readily align themselves to an identity as EMI students—and thus English speakers—they do not want to use English in the Swedish-language environments at schools, such as the lunch room, lest they are seen as different (line 246). So they are not using English to exclude others (cf. Cromdal 2000; Håkansson 2003). It is a useful language and it only needs to be mastered at a “good-enough” level. Nevertheless, English is such a large part of the Swedish student’s identity, that they have strong beliefs about their own proficiency and their own language development—without actually knowing either as fact (Hyltenstam 2004:98).
This use of English may be the same for all Swedish youth, however. Sharp (2001) found that young Swedes tend to tack on English phrases in their speech, noting that the English phrases have mainly a phatic function and not a content function (see also Josephson 2004:11). Thus, this kind of language use may not be limited to EMI students, but rather be prevalent amongst all Swedish youth (cf. Section 3.3.). Swedish EMI students, as well as perhaps all Swedish youth, must be seen as emergent bilinguals (cf. Garcia 2009) in light of the Swedish context. The term has been used in other contexts for newly arrived students in school who have a different mother tongue than the majority language of that school. These Swedish students are exposed to English from birth in the Swedish context—music, advertising, movies, and television, including educational public television programs aimed at children. In a sense they are emergent bilinguals from a very young age in their own homeland, whether they have another mother tongue other than Swedish at home or not. They do not “have” but rather they “do” English language both in and out of school (cf. Garcia 2014a:149). While on the one hand, as a group they are not bilingual from birth in their own family (although, of course, there are many bilingual families in Sweden), on the other hand they are most definitely functioning well in two languages on a daily basis, reflecting Grosjean’s definition of bilinguals as those who “use two or more languages in their everyday lives” (2010:22), whether they choose EMI or not. Their acquisition of English is not completed in increments like a foreign language learned solely in the classroom, nor have they fully adopted it as a second language.

9.1.1.1.3 Summary of language alternation
To summarise, the analyses of language use in the lessons for this study offer a view of language alternation as a potentially positive strategy in the EMI classroom. The three categories of translanguaging in the EMI classroom identified in the present research reveal that the practice of language alternation may both facilitate affordance of greater subject understanding through patterns of language use that allow the participants to use all of their linguistic resources and offer scaffolding as needed during the lessons. Scaffolding and affordances, while not the same, are not mutually exclusive either, but should be understood as intertwined, as the practices and functions of language alternation in the classroom can be overlapping. Non-pedagogic translanguaging offers other functions that are not pedagogical in nature, but key to the interaction in the classroom and to identity nevertheless.

9.1.1.2 Academic language
EMI students have a great deal of academic language in place as they have attended Swedish-medium schools for nine years prior to upper secondary school. Learning the academic language of subjects can be challenging for any student in a monolingual program, but here the students have a redou-
bled task, so to say, experiencing the demands in two languages simultaneously. Students will not get the academic English and Swedish unless specific strategies guarantee this—they cannot just acquire this kind of language because it is not part of their everyday language. Academic English is not only the subject-disciplinary language—it is also the language involved in academic studies generally. For example textbooks may have references or language that are given for the intended target student (i.e. a native English speaker), but which make it difficult of EMI students to understand (cf. Teacher I on the need for specific books for EMI students, line 193).

The ability to move between academic and everyday language is key to learning in the classroom, but then the academic subject-specific language must be featured (Nygård Larsson 2013:593). Although the informants, especially at Aspen School, focus on the need to learn content terminology in both languages, there is neither clear focus on academic language nor any mention of subject-specific genre in the observed lessons at either school (e.g. how English is used in the academic language of Physics). Teacher L argues that the students learn more standardized subject language, which is not available through extramural English, describing the English the students are exposed to on the EMI program: “It isn’t exactly fiction.” Teacher C adds that while Swedish students in general do know a lot of English, they still get a little more English on an EMI program, including access to a different kind of vocabulary and the opportunity to speak more. Likewise, Teacher G notes that the Swedish youth of today do not have the same threshold to cross to access English as perhaps her generation had, but that their great exposure to extramural English is still not the same as learning academic English in an EMI classroom. However, as much as the students use English, they are not regularly using Maths and Physics concepts outside the classroom. Teacher E elaborates on this difference in relation to the students’ needs:

400. You know, people in Sweden think they are so good in English as a whole. They aren’t that good in English. They are good at talking everyday English and can babble a little about this and that. You need to raise the level. That is what you do when you teach through English. You raise the standard of academic English all the time. I think this is obviously really, really good.

It is not enough to only offer specific terminology: students need to understand the material as well (Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman 2013:20). The teacher who ruminates the most over the difficulty of providing the students with the appropriate academic language in both Swedish and English is Teacher F, also the newest teacher on the EMI team at Aspen School (see Section 7.4.2.2). She expresses concerns both about the students’ use of subject terminology as well as her own use. Nevertheless, although the other content
teachers are not explicit about the demands of learning academic language in two languages, one can argue that they do focus on academic language in their endeavours to make sure the students get the subject specific terminology in both languages. This is especially true at Aspen School, where the teachers have a clear strategy to provide the students with terminology in each language as a means of ensuring subject comprehension. At Birch School, however, even though the students are provided with the terminology in each language in Biology lessons, the provision is in response to the students’ language alternation, rather than a planned strategy (see, e.g., Extract 16) (cf. Gibbons & Hammond 2005 on online and designed-in scaffolding).

Because everyday language and academic language differ, students may benefit from scaffolding providing contextualisation (Walqui 2007:212). If students have no linguistic support in the details of the environment (cf. van Lier 2004:98), language choice and use may become even more important, especially for learning academic language. In this study, both Aspen School and Birch School have very bare classroom environments (although Birch does have a few English-language posters in the common corridor) with very little linguistic support outside of the lesson interaction and the lesson material. Linguistic support may be provided with multimodal aids (not observed beyond the use of the whiteboard), physical artefacts (e.g. Teacher B uses a model of a skeleton in Biology, March 2012), or verbal contextualisation, such as providing analogies for the students in order to bridge the gap between the complex academic language and the students’ world (e.g. Extract 7) (Walqui 2007:212).

Lindberg stresses that all teachers in any school should be concerned with language: “An essential part of becoming a History, Physics or Geography teacher, especially in multicultural settings, is to become aware of the linguistic demands of different school subjects” (2011:157). This becomes perhaps even more apparent if the subject teaching is through an additional language, one that is not a mother tongue of most students and teachers in the classroom. Teachers need explicit instruction themselves in how to teach academic language, training that is lacking in most teacher education programs. Perhaps because of this lack, teachers do not see themselves as language teachers and may only focus on single vocabulary words (cf. Schleppegrell & O’Halleron 2011:14), as seen here in the practice of reformulation in Section 8.3.1.1 and in the teachers’ interviews (e.g. line 177), rather than teaching disciplinary discourse in English (cf. Airey 2012).

The role of language alternation in relation to academic language in the EMI classroom has not been explored much. Cook (2001) outlines four reasons why L1 has as a valid role in the L2 classroom: efficiency, learning, naturalness, and external relevance. Each is related to a functional view on the role of L1 in an L2 classroom. Although these factors were not identified specifically for an EMI context, they are nonetheless applicable to the un-
derstanding of how and why language alternation is taking place in these two schools in relation to an alternation between everyday language and academic language in Swedish and English. Each is explored here.

By *efficiency*, Cook means whether or not something can be done more successfully through the L1 than through the L2. The teachers may resort to everyday language in either Swedish or English as a quick and efficient tactic to ensure subject comprehension. This is seen, for example in Extract 16 when Teacher B includes the informal term *number one* in his explanation of the digestive system, leading the student to respond in Swedish everyday language as well (*bajs*). The teacher does not introduce the subject-specific terminology, *excrement*, until the student does so in Swedish (*avföring*). Rather than assist the students in learning the academic language from the start, the teacher attempts an efficient shortcut, which only delays the introduction of the formal term. According to Nygård Larsson (2008:74), teachers need to highlight the subject-specific language to differentiate it from the everyday language that the students know. The explanation or discussion may utilise informal language as part of the scaffolding interaction, but if the language alternation is never addressed with the appropriate terminology, then the student may miss out on the academic language they need (Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman 2013:196). Thus, scaffolding academic language is also a kind of bridging between the everyday language offered in Swedish and the academic language of English (cf. Walqui 2007:210; also see Gibbons, 2003, on *shuttles*).

An efficient use of the L1 might be to quickly check the students' grasp of the material, a strategy mentioned by Teacher D, for example, when she says she pauses in the English presentation to do a comprehension check in Swedish.

The second factor is *learning*, in the case of this study, whether or not learning can be enhanced through the use of Swedish in the nominally EMI lesson. In the EMI classroom, this encompasses both language learning and content learning. There are very few instances of English language scaffolding through the medium of Swedish in the observed lessons, with a few exceptions of metalinguistic asides, such as when the Teacher A explains the differences and similarities between *sin*, *sine* and the Swedish *synd* (Section 8.3.1.3). She draws the students' attention to the similarities between the Physics terms used in Swedish and English, and here she is actually switching from the Swedish used for lab to make a metalinguistic comment. However, it can be argued that through the provision of subject terminology in both languages—the usual planned strategy for Aspen School and the usual serendipitous activity at Birch School—the teachers are actually facilitating academic language learning as well, albeit not always explicitly. This provision also involves content learning, the second aspect of the factor. Swedish is used frequently during EMI lessons at both schools, specifically to ensure subject comprehension, especially regarding the terms and concepts included in the academic language of each subject.
The third factor in Cook’s description is naturalness. At both schools, many students choose to use Swedish for regulatory functions and when using everyday language, such as asking when the lesson ends or if the teacher has a pair of scissors to use. In Social Studies and History at Birch School, students also want clarification on assignments to be given in Swedish. Students and teachers alike prefer to use Swedish for social interaction in the classroom, as seen in the section on social language alternation. As indicated in Section 8.2.3, some students think it is very unnatural or even amusing to speak English with their classmates at school outside of an EMI lesson. Thus the factor of naturalness plays a role in their language use, but not in their acquisition of academic language.

The fourth factor, external relevance, is also the most pertinent to the context of the EMI: the use of both languages clearly helps the students to master specific English skills that they may need after their upper secondary school studies. Knowing and working with terminology in both languages addresses the common concern that English-medium instruction may prove to be an obstacle during the students’ upper secondary education or an obstacle to choosing further Swedish-medium studies in higher education (see e.g. Lim Falk 2008). If the students continue to a Swedish university, they will in all likelihood encounter parallel academic language use22 (see e.g. Mežek 2013; Airey & Linder 2008). For example, they may be required to read material in English and then discuss it in Swedish, or vice versa. The affordance of working with the subject material in both languages in the EMI content lessons in upper secondary schools allows access to the material as well as familiarity with both languages in an academic context, an affordance prominent in the discourse of the stakeholders (e.g. lines 17 and Section 7.3.1.4).

In summary, while strategic translanguaging can aid the facilitation of content-learning in Swedish and English, students also need support in the alternation from everyday language to academic language, particularly subject-specific disciplinary discourse. This is especially true for their language development in English, as it is clear that they enter the EMI program with generally strong confidence and often with great interest in leisure-time English, but without experience in the demands of English as an academic language.

22 While translanguaging in the classroom refers to the use of more than one language as a means of enhancing student learning, parallel language refers to the policy of maintaining the status of the national language alongside English at the tertiary level. In the language report Speech (2002:4), language use in higher education was specifically addressed: “Measures shall be taken to promote parallel employment of English and Swedish in research and scholarship.” This is the case for all Nordic countries. See, e.g., Airey 2004.
9.1.1.3 Language hierarchy

Three levels of Swedish language status can be described: as the principle, dominant language in Sweden; as an official language of the European Union, albeit with a lower status than French, for example; and as a language at risk of the dominance of English, both within and outside of Sweden’s borders and domains (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:124; see Chapter 4). In this study, the value of Swedish in relation to the value of English, as perceived by the stakeholders and as revealed in their discourse, can be narrowed to two areas concerning the roles of the two languages: first, in relation to the status of each and second, in relation to the roles they hold in the classroom.

The perspectives of the stakeholders reveal a discourse of English associated with status. They regard an English-medium program as one with prestige in language, students, and school. This is evident especially in the discourse of the teachers and principals, but even in that of the parents and students. The teachers and principals use words like *elite* (line 2) and *top education* (line 8) to describe their EMI program and *academically motivated* (line 14) to describe the students. One principal states, “I am super proud of this program!” They are also clear about what does not belong to this view of EMI: teachers who are lazy (line 6) or students who do not have high grades in English from secondary school (line 10). EMI is not recommended for large-scale implementation (line 3). For the students, the focus is on the prestige of attending a program with a reputation of being difficult, harder than most. Although the students usually dismiss the reputation, many also readily agree that the program is harder. Still, they do not dispute the status of English, as seen for example in Leo and Malte’s discussion (Extract 34). They see the status of Social Sciences as raised when taught in English.

In their discourse on the EMI option, the stakeholders focus on this status of English and on the potential material advantages (e.g. benefits in university studies or future careers) more than the actual integration of language and content during lessons. Indeed, the names the stakeholders give their program focus on these perceived rewards: the *international* or the *English-language* program. The informants do not use the concept *CLIL* themselves, with the exception of Teacher E and Teacher I, both of whom have investigated the educational option in their own tertiary studies. This absence of focus on the integration possibilities (especially in relation to academic genres) reflects the survey study conducted for this thesis, as many of those respondents were unclear on the description of *CLIL* and instead focused on other language aspects of upper secondary education (e.g. modern languages or mother tongue tuition).

The choice of offering English as the medium of instruction as opposed to other languages also indicates the perceived value of English as a global language. According to Risager:

"The choice of offering English as the medium of instruction as opposed to other languages also indicates the perceived value of English as a global language. According to Risager:
Language hierarchization may also be described as simultaneous inclusion and exclusion. When one chooses a language in practice, one simultaneously excludes all other languages, specifically the language(s) that compete with it in the context in question. When one explicitly includes, or just mentions, a language or a category of languages in representation, one simultaneously excludes all other languages. One can also explicitly exclude languages by discouraging or prohibiting their use. (2012:115)

The stakeholders were specifically asked if they thought the educational option could or should be offered in another language. The general response was that although the idea was interesting, no other language offered the same advantages as English and no other language was as established in the Swedish educational system to the same degree. Thus, rather than work to include another language, the choice of English excludes other languages.

Despite the emphasis on English as a high status language, the stakeholders do not focus on the contact with the English-speaking countries as a means of gaining an English-language culture. Several students, especially at Birch, discuss the promise of a trip abroad as a motivation to choosing the EMI program, but none claim it was the only reason. Only one student specifically emphasises the goal of going to the USA as key to her EMI experience (Ella in line 96). So, in general, the students do not indicate a desire for English language culture as one might for French culture, for example, as a Francophile. Instead, they view English as “detrimentalised” (cf. Risager 2012), as a language they can adopt as their own (as seen in their social use in the previous section as well as their discourse on their own English proficiency as seen in Section 7.3). This adoption is not the adoption of an Anglo culture. Instead, three functions of English as their own surface in the student discourse:

1) An academic language, one of two which they have already mastered
2) A social language, either for fun or for social contact online, but not necessarily personal
3) A future language, specifically useful in the areas of university studies and future careers

At the classroom level, while translanguage practices may allow for both English and Swedish to be used to accomplish the EMI lesson, patterns of language use indicate that the two languages tend to have general roles. According to Risager (2012:114), “Language hierarchization in practice happens all the time as people choose languages for verbal interaction and writing in specific situations and contexts.” The language choices at the two schools in this study are more complicated than simply “English for this” and “Swedish for that,” although the division of language use according to roles suggests the academic status of each language in each lesson. The
teachers at Birch aim to use English for the content activities (e.g. instruction), while Swedish is used more for classroom management (e.g. roll call) and personal or individual language interaction. The teachers also aim to require all exams and written assignments in English. Thus, English has a high status as the language of learning at Birch. The teachers at Aspen tend to use English for instruction and classroom management, but two do use Swedish exclusively for exams (see Tables 19 and 20 for the overview). Swedish is given higher learning status in those subjects. Others, for example Teacher J, aim to use English for all activities (although she also uses Swedish for social interaction as seen in Extract 35).

At both schools, lab work is conducted in Swedish in some subjects (i.e. Biology with Teacher B and Physics with Teacher A). This suggests the status of Swedish as necessary for comprehension, as seen below.

401. Minna: When we have lab, we also have it in Swedish because it is really important that we understand.
402. R: Is that good?
403. Minna: Yes, because you can still develop in English. Some lessons are only in English so you know how it is (in English). I think it is good.

To summarise, English is a high status language both in and outside of the classroom at the two schools in this study. The value of only offering English as the medium of instruction instead of Swedish is confirmed in the discourse of the stakeholders in this study and in the results of the survey (section 6.2.2). The hierarchy of language as evident in their roles in the classroom, however, is not as clear-cut. Still, although English maintains a status as the preferred academic language for most teachers at both schools, Swedish maintains a role in its own right in several subjects.

9.1.2 Two local language policies: How much? or How?

The aim of this section is to recapitulate the differences and similarities of Aspen School and Birch School, although a thorough comparison is neither possible nor desirable, as so many variables affect the practice of EMI. Despite some similarities of context, each school has developed its own EMI culture, which is evident in the discourse of each school as revealed through the interviews and the practice of each school as revealed through the observations.

The stakeholders at the two schools in this study have different attitudes towards and different practices for language choice. How language is used is dependent upon the social context in which the language use takes place and one must understand the “social realities” of language users (Martin-Jones, Blackledge & Creese 2012:10). How language choices are made actually contributes to the realisation of that same social context (Schleppegrell
The language practices that take place in the “ecological microsystem” of the classroom can and should be linked to discourse and ideologies of language choice and policy (Creese & Martin 2003). In this study, the analysis suggests that Aspen School has a discourse of *How?* while the smaller sample at Birch has a discourse of *How much?* The teachers at Birch School emphasise the role of the students more than the teachers at Aspen, who instead emphasise the importance of the demands of the content. Birch School teacher lay much of the language strategy on the students, with all of the teachers talking about how much or little the students speak English and what they think can be done to address this, as it is considered problematic. The Aspen School teachers, on the other hand, do not focus on how much the students speak English, but rather on how the students can best manage the content requirements when much of the instruction is in English. Thus, Birch School focuses on language, while Aspen School focuses on subject (cf. Hyltenstam 2004). (Also seen in Diagram 8 on the students’ reasons for the choice of EMI. Aspen students focus more on the subject and Birch students focus more on the language.)

The discourse of the teachers at Aspen School is *How?* The *how* refers to how the two languages can and should be used for learning in the content classroom—not *if* each language should be used. In the words of Teacher G, the Swedish language is “present” in the lessons. She and the other teachers at Aspen are clear about their strategy to include Swedish as a specific means of ensuring subject comprehension and lesson participation. Aspen School has an implicit unified local language policy that the subject content must take precedence over the language. This is emphasised repeatedly in their interviews, for example with Teacher E stressing that Swedish is “needed” and other teachers (e.g. Teachers L and D) describing their planned practice of repeating terminology in Swedish to make sure the students understand. Their focus on subject first, language second is revealed in the presence of Swedish in almost every lesson, seen clearly in the observations, as presented above in the analysis of classroom language use.

The language alternation practices at Aspen are not a response to the students’ language alternation, but rather intentional, in line with designed-in scaffolding (see Gibbons & Hammond 2005). The teachers have in effect adopted an ideology that affords “multiple language practices” (cf. Garcia 2009:7) moving away from separateness, as well as moving away from a problem discourse of allowing Swedish into the classroom. The similar views and practices reported and observed from teacher to teacher at Aspen School reflect a unified vision, even though the teachers are clear that they have not specifically decided on the same strategies together beforehand. The subject focus of the Aspen School teachers is not the same as that of all other stakeholders involved in the EMI option: Hyltenstam (2004:95) suggests the opposite when he states that teaching through a foreign language usually means that the language is more in focus than the subject. A focus
on the content learning of the lesson allows for a “speaker-centered view” rather than a “language-centered view” (cf. Muhonen 2013:44), which is also in line with translinguaging processes. As Teacher A says:

404. It is better for them and better for me. I think we have found a good mix of Swedish and English, actually.

The teachers at Aspen say that this policy has developed over the years based on their experience with EMI, as they have understood how the students manage their studies and exams best using both languages. They say that the policy is not explicit, and this is seen in the fact that the new Teacher F was unaware that a strategy with dual language use was a possibility. The teachers acknowledge Swedish as a resource to be used and do not perceive the presence of Swedish in the EMI classroom as a constraining affordance. The teachers are also the ones directing the language choice for the most part in the Aspen School classroom. Teachers at Aspen do not ask the students if they want to speak English. They decide the strategies and the students follow their lead. Most studies of translinguaging in the classroom indicate that teachers are not actively and intentionally using translinguaging as a strategy (Canagarajah 2011b:8). However, this is actually the case at Aspen School.

At Birch School, the teachers and students have a discourse of How much? Both teachers and students focus on how much English is being used—or not. In general, the stakeholders do not see Swedish use as an affordance in the EMI subject classroom, and teachers at Birch School have conflicting feelings about using Swedish in the classroom. Teacher I, for example, is apologetic about the use of Swedish texts in his History class. Early in the study, another teacher says, “We really need to get better about speaking English,” after having his lesson observed by the researcher. Teacher N states that if the material is in Swedish, the students are less likely to speak English during the lessons, explaining, “to convince to them to talk in English when the literature is in Swedish, that is also hard.”

Perhaps in response to their ambivalent feelings about the place of Swedish in the classroom, there is no common strategy for language use at Birch, although Teacher N stresses the need for one (line 186). At the same time, the teachers at Birch say they wish they had a policy of more English language use and do not indicate any desire to further develop the use of Swedish in the EMI classroom. Instead of the teachers deciding upon a unified strategy, the language use is very much in response to the students’ language choices, especially in the lessons of Teachers N and B. For example, Teacher N says, “I find it is different from year to year when it comes to how interested they are to talk in English,” effectively placing the responsibility for language choice on the students and not on the teachers. Unlike Aspen School, Birch teachers often let the students decide the language strategies.
They have passed on the choice making to the students. Because the students may feel unsure, they tend to use both English and Swedish more randomly, perhaps in order to make sure they get what they need. The tendency for the students to use Swedish even when Teacher B is trying to be consistent with English (as observed in the lessons and as stated by Teacher B in the interview) results in exchanges in which he eventually acquiesces. Students may even use Swedish or English as a form of protest (cf. Slotte-Lüttge & Forsman 2013:193) if they think the teacher is not being clear enough about making the language choice or they do not like the choice made (e.g. lines 217-220).

In practice, this means that at Birch School, the patterns of translanguaging are less planned and more serendipitous. That is, more online tactics are used to ensure content comprehension rather than designed-in plans with intentional use of Swedish and English, like at Aspen. For example, reformulation is more common than distinct phases of lessons in Swedish and English. While this kind of translanguaging is useful, the students’ discourse indicates that they find the general lack of strategies a constraining affordance to their use of English. Without clear strategies in place at Birch, the students do not know when to use one language or the other. Instead of focusing on content, they are making a decision for language choice all the time. Blackledge and Creese (2010:223) found in their studies of complementary schools that there was “an intense interaction between identities imposed institutionally and students’ own subjective positioning.” This may be compared to the Birch School students, who need to re-negotiate English language use on a constant basis. Are they in the EMI program or not?

405. R: What would have motivated you to use more English in the classroom?

406. S1: More structure in the lessons that we have had in English but not used English, like X’s lessons. It is because they mix their language so much. If they mix then you just take the language that comes easiest.

407. S2: If they speak Swedish then it is, yeah, then it is not so serious about speaking English. If they speak Swedish, then I can do it, too, and the whole idea about English-medium instruction is out the window.

One Birch student complains that a random mixing of Swedish and English can feel choppy; and another adds that if she concentrates on learning the material in English, she can find a switch to Swedish disconcerting. Alva agrees, stating that it makes her feel like she has “porridge in her head” if the languages are mixed too much.

408. Alva: We were a little confused in Grade 1. The teacher went through the book in English, the book was written in Swedish, and then we wrote our papers in English.
Some dislike the presence of Swedish in the English-medium lesson if other students make the language choice. Molly says that when she is listening to one teacher’s lecture in English, she automatically starts thinking about the subject material in English. Then when another student asks a question in Swedish, she thinks, “Wait a minute. What are they talking about?”

Thus, compared to Aspen School, where an implicitly unified strategy is in place and the students are more positive about both English language use and language alternation, the Birch students are more critical of their teachers’ language use. They do complain more about their teachers than the students at Aspen do: about their teachers’ “flow,” their teachers’ dedication to using English, even their teachers’ proficiency. Birch students also emphasize the desire to have native speakers as teachers. This discourse of critique is largely missing from the students’ perspectives from Aspen. (Still, it should be noted that Birch students are fairly positive as a whole; and twelve of the thirteen interviewed would without hesitation choose their program again.)

Quite the opposite of the Birch students, the discourse of the Aspen students mirrors that of the teachers at Aspen School. Rather than seeing the use of L1 as a “failure brought about by instructional conditions,” as Cummins (2007a:225) has described L1 use in the L2 classroom, the Aspen students appreciate the place of Swedish in their EMI lessons. They do say that there is less English on the program than expected (especially the two students with a mother tongue other than Swedish), but they do not see this as problematic. Instead, several students mention that the language alternation strategies Teacher A employs are useful during the lessons, saying, for example, “It is good to choose if you want to ask a question in English or Swedish.” Another appreciates that if the teacher sees that many are struggling, she will switch to only Swedish. They do not feel this affects their possibilities to develop subject-specific knowledge in English. When asked about Teacher A’s language alternation strategies, two students respond:

409. **Meja:** I think it is good because otherwise if you only hear the English words, maybe you won’t understand the Swedish words and vice versa.
410. **Vera:** It is good to learn the Swedish words, too.
411. **Meja:** So you can talk with people! [laughing]
412. **Vera:** So you can tell people in Swedish and you don’t have to say the words in English.

None of the twelve students at Aspen feel negative about the use of Swedish in the EMI lessons. Those who express the most positive attitudes towards the presence of English and Swedish in the classroom still prefer to have the teacher make the language decisions and to be consistent in her strategies. The students at Aspen School who are least positive about language alternation are two with a mother tongue other than Swedish. Although they each
emphasise the importance of learning the material in both languages, especially for their future study plans, they feel they want to learn the material well in one language first.

413. **S1:** It’s most difficult that we have reference books mostly in Swedish. We have two books but we use the Swedish ones most and the English one doesn’t have such detailed information about the subject.

414. **S2:** The teacher has taken everything in English but we do it in Swedish. He kind of mixes up the languages and sometimes we get confused.

These two students had studied through the medium of Swedish for less than two years before commencing their EMI program. One of these students has previously had some schooling through the medium of English while the other has only had extramural exposure. Their previous formal schooling in any language (which they do have in their mother tongues) is positive for their possibilities for academic achievement on an EMI program, but the fact that neither has studied in either Swedish nor English for any great length of time would indicate that they might struggle with the program, as four years is considered a minimum in an L2 to reach grade level (Thomas & Collier 2002:7). Their EMI program will only last three years. At the time of the interview, they both feel that they are managing, although they concede that they need to use material in their own mother tongues as well as extra English materials to manage the Swedish work. Thus, two considerations became apparent. First, a concern for any EMI program in Sweden should be how the students without Swedish or English as a mother tongue fare. Second, and related to the first point, the language alternation strategies that assist the Swedish L1 students, who can use translanguaging to ensure subject comprehension, may not be as beneficial to students with Swedish as an L2. How translanguaging with more than two languages may benefit these students in practicality should be addressed, in terms of both acquiring the subject knowledge they need to manage their programs of study and in terms of acquiring academic language in both Swedish and English in addition to their mother tongue. At the same time, having a mother tongue other than Swedish may actually be an affordance to use more English, as the students lack a common language with their peers and teachers. These students may speak English better than they speak Swedish.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the stakeholders in this study do not emphasise the differences between the two programs of study as far as language demands are concerned. Some at Birch (such as Principal Y in line 8 and Leo and Malte in lines 29-33) do discuss adding prestige to the Social Sciences program with the added value of English, but there is no focus on
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what this means in terms of language use on the program. In the classroom observations, the students on the Social Sciences program at Birch had much more group work and independent work time, usually using computers. The students on the Natural Sciences program at Aspen had more lecturing interspersed with in-class task work as well as laboratory work. These differences may be natural due to the course requirements of the programs, but in addition to the lack of focus on disciplinary genres, the informants’ discourse also lacks focus on the possible necessity of different kinds of language use due to program choice.

In summary, the two schools in this study have observable differences in their practice and their discourse. While the perspectives in Chapter 7 presented what the stakeholders say about EMI and their own practices, the practices in Chapter 8 presented what they actually do. Together, the discourse and practice of these two schools provide a wider picture of EMI in Swedish schools today than interviews or observations alone could. This section has focused on the micro contexts of these two schools and now the discussion moves to the macro context of Sweden, with a consideration of what the present study can offer to the understanding of EMI in a wider sense.

9.2 The Swedish context

In the present study, the interviews and observations reveal the local language policies from the two schools. The ecological view of language is particularly useful in understanding language policy (Hult 2014:170), with its focus on context, and in the case of the present study, affordances. The discussion of the local contexts of two EMI schools must also be positioned in the context of Sweden in general, and more specifically, in the Swedish language policy. Thus, this section aims to offer a bottom-up view of language policy in practice and to conclude the discussion with a consideration of how the micro discourse revealed in the stakeholders’ perspectives and practices aligns with the macro discourse—or not.

Teachers are on the “front line of language policy” as macro policies become reality in the micro actions of the classroom (Hult 2014:159); and in order to understand language policies, one must study actual practices (Menken & García 2010:3). Real language practice as seen in the classroom reveals de facto policies that may or may not be an implementation of macro policies. The way the students use English is reflective both of their micro context and their macro context, as they both make individual choices at the time of need in the classroom discourse, and also are afforded a collective language use due to the macro context (cf. Blommaert’s discussion of scales, 2010:32, as well as van Lier 2004:13). Language policy is a kind of macro language alternation, while the classroom language use involves micro alter-
nation (cf. Garcia 2009, citing Duverger 2005, who also discusses macro and micro alternation but in a slightly different way). The macro level necessarily affects language choices made and language roles sustained at the micro level. Thus, teachers need to be aware of their own local policies as well as of the official policies (Hult 2014:174) and how the two may relate.

The language policy in Sweden is clear about the roles of Swedish, minority languages and English in the Swedish context, but this is not necessarily reflected in the experience of EMI. The official discourse of the Swedish language policy is multilingualism, but in reality it is just English in the educational context, as English as a language subject is prioritised in the national curriculum and English is the only additional language of instruction (see Chapter 6). The choice of an additional language as a medium of instruction means that the language has recognition and status in the context, usually related to both symbolic and material resources and benefits (Cummins 2009:164). What is it about English that makes it a legitimate choice for this educational option when other languages do not hold this same value? How does the promotion of English-only actually fit in with Swedish language policy?

English as a medium of instruction may be possible in the upper secondary school in the Swedish context in part due to the affordances in both the school micro context and in the larger macro context of media and technology. The macro context of Sweden affords the possibility of a micro context in the school with English as a language of instruction. This is suggested by the students in their perspectives on why they chose the EMI program (Section 7.1.3) as their discourse of confidence evidences a prior perception of and acting upon affordances for English language competency. The affordance of extramural English is one example of this (Section 3.3). Students (and all Swedes) benefit from the constant English-language scaffolding present in their daily lives (e.g. subtitles in Swedish instead of dubbing on television programs, providing all viewers a potential learning moment as they listen to English and read Swedish). Still, English may also be considered a constraining affordance as an acceptance of English as the only other language needed beyond Swedish allows for the exclusion of other languages. The ubiquitous presence of English can be perceived as signalling the redundancy of other languages.

Phillipson identifies two factors concerning global English that have direct relevance for Sweden: the investment in English as a school subject and the levels of multilingual competency in various contexts in society (2003:26). There is a strong investment in English as a foreign language in the Swedish school system — with much more focus on English than any other foreign language. By multilingual competency, Phillipson (citing Rosen et al. 2000) means that in “small” countries like Sweden, people tend to have very high proficiency in English, as compared to countries where the national language is regarded as sufficient, such as Spain.
As seen in Chapter 3 and in the interviews with the stakeholders involved in EMI in Swedish upper secondary schools (Chapter 7), English clearly has a value in the linguistic market of Sweden and is seen as a commodity. Addressing the unique position of English in Sweden, Hyltenstam asks if the aim is to make English a second language—and thus “via instruction give English the injection it needs”—or if the aim is to keep English a “foreign language” (2004:60). Hyltenstam argues that this question is not only one for educational policymakers, but really for language policymakers in the Swedish society today. Language policies, together with attitudes and beliefs, as well as institutions, form language ideologies. According to Cooke and Simpson, “Ideologies are made up of beliefs and assumptions that appear ‘common sense’ to members of a society and therefore often remain unquestioned” (2012:117). The somewhat conflicting discourse of language ideology in regards to English in the Swedish context was explored in Chapter 3: Swedes are confident, eager users of English and yet some assume an ever-increasing position of English in society. There is a discourse of potentially negative consequences of EMI (see e.g. Josephson’s opinion piece, 2008). However, Swedish is not a small weak language (Nyström Höög 2013; Josephson 2011; Oakes 2005) and EMI does not necessarily lead to its demise.

In this study, the local language ideology of the EMI schools reflects the positive views of English in the general language ideology of the macro context, and not a belief that there is a risk to educational domains if EMI is offered. The stakeholders actually involved in EMI have overwhelmingly positive views about the role of English and the place of English in the future of the students. While a few stakeholders acknowledge the potential risks to the Swedish language development of the students, the majority either do not seem to consider the dual language context as problematic or do not seem to have even considered the possibility of difficulties. In fact, many do not doubt the teachers’ and students’ abilities to manage without specific training or preparation; and instead, as the discourses of the stakeholders “work together to construct common sense knowledge,” as Cooke and Simpson would say (2012:117, citing Fairclough 1992), they have their own “common sense assumption” that interest and enjoyment are enough.

Do Swedish students “need” CLIL? In the Swedish context, CLIL means only English-medium instruction in practice today. Because of the role and status of English in Swedish society today, many stakeholders may see EMI as enough. Students “know” English already so they need to mainly learn the English academic language, as they already see themselves as proficient users. This faith in their own proficiency—one shared by their teachers and parents—may mean they do not feel the need for explicit content and language integrated learning. That is, they may feel they only need the subject teaching and no focus on the language teaching. The students feel they have already conquered the basic language.
At the same time, the students’ discourse of confidence in their own English competence and their self-professed motivation raises certain issues. First, as seen in Chapter 3, all students in Sweden enjoy great exposure to the English language, so this confidence may be true of any upper secondary school student. Second, as seen in interviews, students do not explicitly differentiate between everyday and academic English. Perhaps EMI with more focus on subject disciplinary and core academic English language is more desirable if they already have communicative competence. Finally, if there are no significant outcomes (greater vocabulary, higher proficiency), is there any point to choosing EMI? (cf. Lim Falk 2008; Sylvén 2004; Edlund 2011) Academically motivated students choose EMI, but in light of these reflections and the fact that English is something that already works well in Swedish schools (as seen in Chapter 3), then perhaps the focus should be on other educational options.

On a macro level beyond Sweden, Baker asserts that CLIL is intended to meet the needs of a more multilingual Europe, in line with the European Union goals of mother tongue plus two languages (2011:246):

With the growing communication and trade between European countries, there is an increased demand for multilingual employees (e.g. speaking English and other European national languages). CLIL is about helping to create Europeanisation, a multilingual and global economy, and transnational workers.

He maintains that the practice of CLIL is thus neither a linguistic nor an educational endeavour, but rather a politically ideological one. The medium of instruction in schools is a key issue in language politics today (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:33), affecting education at all levels. Henry (2012:12) indicates that already in secondary school, students are less motivated to study foreign languages other than English, which in turn means that the EU goal of 1 + 2 is less likely to be reached. At the other end of education, Swedish universities offering EMI may be considered more global than local (Söderlundh 2012:89), but one can hardly say the same about upper secondary schools. A kind of spectrum is developing in which younger students in Sweden are losing interest in languages other than English and older students are attending universities where English is the academic language of choice. In the upper secondary school in between, the English reality means that CLIL programs really are only EMI programs.

In their discourse, the stakeholders seem to have an ideology of multilingualism, but in actuality it is only English-Swedish. Multilingualism is not part of the consideration of the affordances of the option. They may feel that EMI is separate from the traditional views of multilingualism that may be part of a “problem discourse” in Sweden. According to Lindberg (2011:150):
The linguistic diversity that characterizes Sweden and many other Western European countries today has a great potential for strengthening human and social capital and meeting the demands of global communication and worldwide social relations of late modern times.

This diversity—which in Sweden means more than 90% of students speaking another first language in some big city schools (Lindberg 2007:57)—does not always translate to a perceived asset. In the same vein, Hult (2014:159) cites Ruíz 1984 in his delineation of language-as-problem vs language-as-resource. In the view of language as a problem, minority language students are considered a challenge to the school system; and policies will aim to integrate them quickly through transitional practices to get them studying in the majority language. In the view of language as a resource, however, the students’ linguistic resources are valued. However, within the framework of deficit ideologies, bilingualism can be seen as problematic (Lindberg 2011:164; Håkansson 2003:22; cf. also Bernstein 1971). This negative view of bilingualism does not include English nor is it reflected in the informants’ discourse in the present study. Thus while minority language students may be viewed as “lacking intellectual capacities and motivation to learn” (Lindberg 2011:165), students voluntarily choosing to learn through an additional language (English) are viewed as possessing exactly those aptitudes. Multilingualism is something relegated to the realm of immigrants and not to the realm of prestigious educational options—and not associated with English. The prevalent language hierarchies in place prevent proficiency in other languages being equated with prestige.

In her study, Wingstedt found that the vast majority (78%) of her informants felt that bilingualism was more advantageous than monolingualism (1998:269). Swedes are positive towards bilingualism—and especially positive about English (see Chapter 3). This applies to students as well, as their beliefs about their relationship with English were revealed in the interviews (e.g. lines 91 and 94). However, despite the vast potential resources that the multilingual Sweden offers, there is a general attitude in the Swedish context that “Swedish and English are enough” (cf. Henry 2012), notwithstanding the declared language policy to the contrary, both in the Swedish context with the official Language Act and the wider EU context with the goal of 1+2 plurilingualism. The level of English competence in Sweden (described by Phillipson above) can affect people’s attitudes towards other foreign languages and language use. It is, however, a misconception that English will be enough in this time of globalisation (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:51). Seeing English as enough to modern economic world is “naïve and outdated” as local contexts may require local languages. Indeed, multilingualism will be increasingly in demand (Baker 2011:425). As building the linguistic capital
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of youth (Bourdieu 1991) is “dependent mostly on the education they receive” (García 2009:12) and while students’ linguistic capital may increase with EMI, there may be other gains to be made in offering instruction through other minority languages in Sweden or other world languages (see also Sylvén 2013). Sweden already has great potential in its linguistic capital with the multilingual situation (Hyltenstam & Milani 2012:19). This can be seen both as a resource and as a problem as to how this potential can best be harnessed. Internationalisation demands skills in many languages (ibid.25): will English be enough?

In summary, both the research outside the schools and the research in the schools in this study suggest that the role and status of English on both the macro and micro levels are intertwined. The survey results indicate that content and language integration is neither well known as a concept nor widespread in any language other than English. Still, the fact that English is the only language that is included in the survey responses (see Chapter 6) confirms the status that is also evident in language policy, common sense assumptions and educational requirements. The results from the schools, both perspectives and practices, can be seen as a reflection of the de facto local policies. The relation of the micro to the macro policies and practices, however, is more complicated.
Final conclusions

This study offers a fairly broad picture of the context of English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school today with the analysis of perspectives and practices in macro and micro contexts. This is a study of dynamic process—not of proficiency or results—and cannot be claimed to present all aspects of the EMI option. Instead, it contributes to the current field of research on EMI and CLIL as well as to the general understanding of what it means to teach a content subject through a foreign language. The main study is limited to two schools, but the voices of a wide variety of stakeholders within those micro contexts contribute to the understanding of the option in the wider context.

10.1 Revisiting the results

The intention of the study was to answer questions about how and why EMI is offered, chosen, and practiced in the Swedish context today in two schools. Table 31 presents a general overview of the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering</th>
<th>Choosing</th>
<th>Practicing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>Choosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMI in select schools</td>
<td>Academically motivated students</td>
<td>Swedish and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often 100%</td>
<td>Confident students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessarily CLIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International profile</td>
<td>How much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigation into how and why the option is offered was presented in the survey study (Chapter 6) as well as the study of perspectives (Chapter 7). The main results found that 100% EMI is not widespread but that partial or occasional instruction through an additional language was more common. Also, what is offered is English-medium instruction—not CLIL or instruction through other additional languages. Finally, the reasons for offering EMI are prestige, an international profile, and marketing potential as well as personal interest from the stakeholders. The investigation into how and why
the option is chosen was presented in the study of perspectives (Chapter 7). The main results found that students choose EMI because they feel academically motivated and because they already feel competent in English and thus see it as an easy, fun option. Also, they choose it—usually with their parents’ support—for the prestige, the potential material rewards (e.g. benefits in university studies), and for their future (e.g. travel, studies and work abroad). The investigation into how and why the option is practiced as it is was presented in the study of practice (Chapter 8). The main results found that 100% EMI is not always the goal and is definitely not always the practice. Translanguaging is abundant in the lessons, but how language alternation is perceived as an affordance or not differs in the two schools. One school focuses on how the languages are used while the other school focuses on how much each language is used. These results from in and outside the schools are reflected in the implications below. First, some reflections on the study are offered.

10.2 Reflections on the study

Hindsight is 20-20 and, likewise, with this thesis, strengths and weaknesses have become apparent in the final analysis and writing process.

With an emphasis on perspectives and practices within a context (van Lier 2004:3), an ecological perspective is appropriate for a study such as the present one with its focus on the dynamic processes of the EMI classroom and in Swedish society. This approach has also been the main perspective for other studies of language use in diverse contexts. Hult, who says that the approach examines “holistically all factors that contribute to the position of languages in the social environment” (2003:50), uses an ecological perspective in his studies of the role and use of English in Sweden (e.g. 2003, 2010). García (2009) advocates an ecological approach as well in the understanding of translanguaging, especially in the view of the students as emergent bilinguals. Sandwall (2013) uses the perspective as a lens for her case studies of adult second language speakers using Swedish in workplace learning. The ecological perspective was deemed suitable for the present study firstly due to the focus on the students as emergent bilinguals, secondly due to the suitability of understanding the language use in the classroom as a practice involving both scaffolding and affordances, and finally due to the focus on both micro and macro contexts.

A non-ecological perspective may have not afforded the holistic view necessary to understand how these specific schools with their practices and their participants place in the wider context of Swedish language ideology and policy. If the focus had been on outcomes or proficiency, other approaches would have been more suitable. In this study, however, the focus was on understanding the option in the context.
The multi-perspectival methods approach in this thesis allow for what Martin-Jones, Blackledge and Creese call an “analysis of small phenomena as set against an analysis of big phenomena” (2012:12). The methodology chosen for this study, linguistic ethnography, has also been an approach employed in other studies of the dual language classroom, such as Söderlundh’s 2010 study of English-Swedish language use in the Swedish university context. The methodology was fitting for the aims of the research foci of this study as well, with the focus on the patterns of language use and the beliefs about language, a contextualised view of the stakeholders’ language experience, and a focus on the stakeholders’ perspectives (cf. Maybin & Tusting 2011:6), which had not been investigated thoroughly in previous studies. However, Blommaert and Jie (2010:64) liken the material collected in an ethnographically inspired study to a kaleidoscope. Fieldwork is “messy and chaotic”–as the resulting data may be. This thesis generated large amounts of rich data, albeit limited to local contexts for the most part. While the triangulation of a survey study together with the different foci comprising the main study offer an in-depth description of the present status and practice of English-medium instruction in the Swedish upper secondary school today, the risk is that the whole picture is somewhat diluted when so many angles are covered.

The role and the work of the researcher in classroom-based studies are uncertain in many respects. One is bound to the schedules and changes of everyday school life. Because of the naturalistic approach of the classroom studies, the researcher could not control the outcomes of every planned observation session during the data collection. Thus, there were occasions on which observations or informal interaction were planned, but the time spent in the schools did not produce any usable material. This could be due to teachers being on sick leave, changes in lesson planning (e.g. another lesson took place other than the one planned), and students engaged in group or individual work during a lesson, which made observations difficult. When time at the research site is limited and two sites are geographically far apart, each such change can affect the possibility to collect material. One needs to be open to unexpected events outside of the original focus, as “sometimes what you need to pay attention to is what is disruptive.” The disruptions may reveal the norm (cf. Lundgren 2009:87-88). More time at each school may have better allowed for the disruptions as well as more of the daily practice, perhaps revealing other results or views.

Related to the role of the researcher was the problem of achieving an emic perspective, one feature of linguistic ethnography. With the interviews, the informants’ accounts were given high priority. Outside judgements or assessments were not used, but instead the attempt was to highlight their voices. Still, it must be acknowledged that choices had to be made at every step. For example, transcription decisions were made constantly during both the transcription work and the selection of illustrative material. Even the act
of translating Swedish text (e.g. from Swedish-medium interviews or classroom interaction in Swedish) involves a myriad of choices. In brief, practical decisions had to be made and these decisions necessarily affect the possibilities for a true emic perspective.

The observations were participatory in that there was interaction with the students and teachers both in and out of the classroom and the aims of the study were transparent. During the course of fieldwork, both students and teachers asked questions about language or for language help, which caused some uncertainty. Should students be given help with a language problem when the teacher is out of the room? Such interaction was kept to a minimum. Early in the study, a teacher said, Du får säga om jag säger konstiga saker <You have to tell me if I say strange things.> Still, as the researcher’s role is neither a language consultant nor a judge of the classroom participants language proficiency, English assistance was never offered unless directly requested, and kept to a minimum. The researcher’s role in the lessons was also somewhat problematic due to the observer’s paradox. One teacher, after an observation of a lesson, explained, “We really will get better about speaking more English.” The classroom practices may have been affected by the study, but the fact that much time was spent at the schools over a period, as ethnography demands, may have alleviated this to a degree.

For the other main method of data collection, the interviews, the guides may have limited the responses from the informants. While interviews offer a “way of gaining understanding of the perspectives, attitudes, beliefs, or values of the people being studied” (Hammersley 2005: 9), at the same time, there is always a risk that participants choose what they tell us and omit what they wish to omit (O’Toole 2002:5). The informants were allowed to choose the language of interview, and this may also have affected the responses they gave. Several of the first graders chose English, perhaps as part of their new identity as EMI students. They may have offered other perspectives or more information in Swedish. Interestingly, the majority of the third graders chose Swedish. Finally, although the informants’ language proficiency could have added an interesting aspect to the presentation of the practice, the decision was made to silently correct language errors. There were language errors, both in the interviews and the classroom interaction, but as competence was not a focus and as the informants had been clearly informed that aim was not to judge their English, these mistakes are not noted in this thesis.

10.2.1 Study constraints

The current research project is limited to both a certain period of time, two certain schools, and a certain set of informants. The results can only provide a picture of these circumstances and thus a glimpse of the status if EMI at the time as well as of that stage in the historical development of the educa-
tional option in Sweden. Some of the more specific limitations are presented below.

In the research outside the schools, the results of the survey study on current statistics offers information on how the educational option was being practiced only at that particular point in time (2011-2012). However, while the statistics generated from that survey may no longer be valid today, they do still provide valuable insight into how the option has developed over time in the Swedish context.

There are aspects that were not addressed at all in this study. For example, the material from the informants was limited to their self-described beliefs, goals and experiences as well as to what was observable in the lessons. The study did not take into account background variables, such as gender, language or socio-economic background beyond what they said in the interviews. While this may be considered a methodological weakness, the decision was actively made to focus only on what the stakeholders said and what was actually happening in the classroom: perspectives and practices. This was part of the goal of an emic perspective.

A potential problem with classroom ethnography is generalisation as comparable studies with comparable groups are unlikely (LeCompte & Goetz 1982). The present data represent only the micro context of two EMI programs and the general macro context of Sweden. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1999:14) argue, however, that qualitative studies such as those in educational ethnography do not necessarily have a lesser degree of generalizability than quantitative studies. All studies offer only generalisations that are “tentative at best” and the in-depth understanding offered by a qualitative study may offer a depth of understanding that a large scale cross-sectional study cannot. Still, as it is “impossible to sort out the typical from the unique” (ibid.17), researchers cannot really generalise their findings. Furthermore, while Walford (2002:100) claims that there is a risk of “spurious generalizability” if a school is not identified as the findings that are then assumed to apply to any school at all, rather than specifically to that one school in the research, Hammersley counters that perhaps researchers should be more focused on the relevancy of the ethnographic study (1990:107). He identifies two aspects of relevance: “the importance of the topic [and] the contribution of the conclusions to existing knowledge.”

In this present study, the results from the two schools cannot be used to make claims about all schools offering English-medium instruction in Sweden. However, these results do indeed offer understanding of both the importance of the practice of EMI in the Swedish context as well as a contribution to the current body of knowledge about this form of education today, both in and out of Sweden. Thus, this thesis can still be found relevant to the wider body of growing knowledge in a fairly under-researched field.
10.3 Contributions of the study

Two main implications of this thesis have been ascertained: the need for a definition of content teaching through the medium of a foreign language in the Swedish context and the need for a practice that can be commonly agreed upon. The study has also contributed to the continuing development of translanguaging as a pedagogical theory.

10.3.1 Definitions

A common, generally accepted definition of what is meant by EMI in the Swedish school based on the Swedish context is lacking.

**Teacher I:** I was surprised when I started here /…/ they called it the bilingual program and had never heard of sprint (CLIL). I wonder if the National Agency knows what is going on and how similar and different these programs are.

Indeed, the Agency has indicated that it is difficult to draw any general conclusions about EMI when it can mean so many different things in practice (2010:64). Edlund (2011) also calls for a clearer model of what is meant with CLIL and EMI in the Swedish context as well as more research on the educational option. The various terms used in theory and practice today, e.g. EMI, CLIL, SPRINT and more, are all terms trying to succinctly clarify what in reality is a very complex form of instruction in any context. Also, there are always issues about what is meant by bilingual or multilingual as well as first language and second language or foreign language. According to the description of CLIL in the EU report, however, the option designates specific and careful integration:

Accordingly, its [CLIL] advocates stress how it seeks to develop proficiency in both the non-language subject and the language in which this is taught, *attaching the same importance to each*. Furthermore, achieving this twofold aim calls for the development of a special approach to teaching in that the non-language subject is not taught in a foreign language but with and through a foreign language. This implies a more integrated approach to both teaching and learning, requiring that teachers should devote special thought not just to how languages should be taught, but to the educational process in general. (Eurydice 2006:7, added emphasis)

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2010:370) maintain that the target language in CLIL contexts is not one used outside of the school environment. Coyle, Hood & Marsh further define CLIL as dual-focused, an educational approach clearly focused on the learning and teaching of both content and language (2011). Together with Dalton-Puffer’s definition of CLIL in the European context (2011:182) as an option in which students encounter a lan-
language not otherwise used in their life outside the classroom (cf. Hyltenstam 2004) and based on the fact that most instruction through a foreign language in Sweden is not actually integrated content and language learning, SPRINT or CLIL may not be the best terms for the Swedish practice today. Those terms suggest an equal focus on language and disciplinary content, with explicit language and content learning goals.

The vast majority of instruction today through a foreign language in Sweden is basically the same subject instruction but through the medium of English and thus should be called English-medium instruction when that is what is meant. This does not preclude the possibility for CLIL to develop in the Swedish context, especially in other languages, as called for by Sylvén (2013), and nor does it deny the fact that teachers are offering subject-specific terms in both Swedish and English. However, with the special role and status of the English language in the Swedish context and with the assumptions by teachers and students alike that English is already a manageable language of instruction, the Swedish practice must be seen as separate from other forms of integrating content with language. It is time for researchers and practitioners alike to deconstruct the European notion of CLIL in the Swedish context and embrace EMI in its own right as a viable option for Swedish schools. The discourse of Swedish students may indicate that they do not feel they “need” language integrated with content, because they see English as an academic language that they manage (whether they do or not, cf. Hyltenstam 2004:98). Still, as indicated by Teacher E (line 6), the schools need to be clear about what it is that they are actually offering—are they offering content integrated with language instruction or are they offering a content simply taught through another language? Understanding the differences between the two may be the first step towards a definition of what is—and perhaps what should be—practiced in Sweden today.

10.3.2 Practices

Closely related to the definition of EMI or CLIL in the Swedish context is the description of the practice of that option. Despite the recommendations made in the report Speech (2002:3; see Section 3.4) over a decade ago, a common, generally accepted practice and policy of EMI in the Swedish school based on empirical research is lacking. There is no macro policy deciding a micro policy. With no official policy and no national guidelines (Sylvén 2004), each local educational practice will be different, as seen in this study and previous research. Teaching content through a foreign language “depends on a range of situational and contextual variables,” making the need for common definitions necessary in all contexts (Coyle 2008:3). Levine argues, “…the time is ripe for the development of a principled, multilingual approach to language classroom communication” (2011:5, original italics), an argument that also applies to the Swedish context.
Strategies for the practice of EMI need to address the previous criticisms and failings of the option in the Swedish context (e.g. Lim Falk 2008) as well as benefit from the approaches that work. If, as Josephson (2004:8) argues, we must focus on preventing the loss of Swedish domains to the English language (i.e. losing Swedish as a language of content instruction in favour of English), the practice of pedagogic translanguaging in the EMI classroom may be the solution. A practice allowing for translanguaging in the classroom fits into the emergentist view of language learners, and moves away from “the monolingual habitus” of the traditional classroom (Gogolin 1994 in Smit & Dafouz 2012:1). Translanguaging affords the possibility of content and language integration, and not simply teaching a subject through the medium of another language. As seen in this study, one school focuses on content learning and the other focuses on language use, yet through more strategic translanguaging (Teacher A’s practice, for example), the marriage of content and language may more easily become a goal in itself.

Teacher A: I feel that it’s a richer experience if we can give them both (Swedish and English) actually. I feel that somehow we have come to the conclusion that it's almost like having your cake and eating it, too.

Students may use both languages (or even other languages) to access the content learning and their English language development. Research does not actually support keeping languages separate (Cummins 2007a:221). Two languages can exist side-by-side in a variety of domains in educational contexts, and parallel language use such as this may be “desirable for the relationship between Swedish and English” (Josephson 2004:12). Language alternation as a means to “optimize pedagogic outcomes” is an issue that researchers in the EMI and CLIL classroom must address (Fennema-Bloom 2009/2010:27).

The teachers in this study called for more in-service training in their interviews. Hoare (2001 cited in de Mejia 2012:208) researched the teaching strategies of teachers with and without in-service training in teaching their own subjects through a foreign language. Those who received training managed better at providing their students with opportunities for learning the subject material. Teachers are not generally given guidance in language alternation strategies and thus need more explicit and specific strategies for the dual language classroom, with approaches to assist using language as an academic tool (Cummins 2005, 2009).

Levine (2011:168) suggests that learners similarly need to be explicitly taught how to code-switch, with a goal of “dynamic code choice practices.” One student, for example, said that some kind of coaching in the beginning of the EMI program would have been helpful. Should the students be better prepared for what it means to study EMI? Yes. The lack of preparation for the option as well as the lack of understanding about academic English is
evident from the informants of this study. “English-medium instruction” is really an “English-and-Swedish” reality, not an “either-or,” as has been seen in the analysis of classroom practices in this thesis. The language choices in the classroom can offer both scaffolding and affordances for learning the content in both languages. Students need guidance in making use of learning opportunities in both languages to access disciplinary content and co-construct knowledge (cf. Martin-Beltran 2014). By being allowed and encouraged to use their L1 in the classroom, students can take also steps towards forming their identity as proficient users of academic English with the scaffolding provided in Swedish, as English language use is mediated by the presence of Swedish.

Gibbons states, “…while appropriate policies and appropriate teaching programs, and effective teaching and learning activities are all important, in the end it is in the talk between a student and a teacher that educational success ultimately rests” (2006:10). If the participants in the classroom are all on the same page, then the lessons may have a greater chance of using language for learning content effectively. Students are already used to translanguaging in their daily lives, but need to know to apply the process to their academic lives. Axellson (2013:551), for example, argues for the value of second language learners using their mother tongues in the classroom to support their learning in the Swedish-language classroom. The concrete suggestions she gives can be just as useful in the EMI classroom: e.g. encouraging students to write notes in their L1 or to conduct group work in their L1. In brief, in order to implement EMI practices utilising Swedish, both teachers and students need more explicit training.

Informants in all of the stakeholder groups emphasise the importance of dedicated, competent teachers, meaning that EMI programs risk quick demise if an enthusiastic teacher or two retires or is laid off. Programs are vulnerable to change. Teachers can come and go, sometimes outside of the control of the school heads. Without policies at the macro level, all of the participants in each micro context share a role in keeping the program going. If there were policies at the macro level, or specific guidelines or requirements set forth by the National Agency for Education, this risk would not be so clear.

When there is no macro policy dictating the micro policy, the question becomes how do we get from “what is” to “what should be” (Hornberger & Johnson 2011, referring to Canagarajah’s formulation, 2006:153). How can studies of individual schools and individual voices benefit the development of EMI in the Swedish context? Research on actual practices and on stakeholder perspectives on those practices may contribute to the construction of a more general model of the EMI option in the Swedish context. Of course, it may be obvious that students will learn more English if there is more English in the classroom, but at what cost to the subject learning? Both the facilitation of English use and the assurance of content learning are essential.
In this study, as with previous research (e.g. Lim Falk 2008:255), some teachers stress that the subject is the most important aspect of the lesson—not the language of instruction. However, as Lim Falk also notes, language is key if it becomes a hindrance in the teaching and learning of the subject material.

The dilemma lies in the importance of language in the presentation of the subject material—if the students are not proficient in the linguistic expressions, then they cannot themselves present or discuss the material they have learned, and the teachers can only assess the students on what they manage to convey. (ibid.)

This risk, however, is not present if the students are allowed to use all their linguistic resources, which in the EMI classroom in the Swedish context, means that they are allowed to use Swedish as well as English.

Policies on the national level—including the national curriculum and school financing—are key to the success and development of any CLIL program (Dalton-Puffer 2007:4). According to Swedish language policy, the aim should be to keep Swedish parallel with English and to prevent English from taking over in one domain. If domain loss means that a language cannot be used any longer neither for communication nor for access to new information or learning, translanguaging is the antidote. Parallel language use may solve the problem as it gives more weight to each language—so not only English. However, it may set up false expectations that the languages are equal. Parallel implies two tracks, while translanguaging implies crossing.

Instead of CLIL [or EMI], an English-medium education needs to be developed that does not risk contributing to a deterioration of subject knowledge and that cannot be suspected of affecting their language development in their own mother tongue. (Hyltenstam 2004:101)

Should this development at the upper secondary level be a free-for-all? Or monitored as the National Agency for Education has tried to do with compulsory schools? Although the Agency acknowledges that they still cannot really estimate what is actually happening in the EMI classroom at the compulsory level (2010:61), it is time for the development of macro policies based on empirical research on classroom language ecologies to guide the micro policies of EMI, which in turn must lead to classroom practices designed to ensure both content and language learning.

10.3.3 Theory

A final contribution of the study is the exploratory application of the concept of translanguaging, and how the results of this may add to the pedagogical
theory of translanguaging in relation to the Swedish context, especially the EMI classroom. The study of language alternation was key from the beginning of this research project; and through the observations, translanguaging became an interesting concept to consider in light of what the data revealed. On the micro level, the data was specifically analysed to explore the functions of translanguaging in and outside of content instruction, and subsequently to consider how the language alternation offered affordances and scaffolding. On the macro level, the interview and observation data was considered in light of language policy and ideology.

Previously the focus of translanguaging studies has been on bilingual students entering a majority language context (e.g. García 2009; García 2011) or students studying an official minority language in an immersion context (e.g. Lewis 2008). In this study it has been used in the analysis of very different data, as majority Swedish speakers are using English—neither an official minority language nor a second language but instead a high status global language—for instruction and learning.

Translanguaging is an appropriate aspect of an ecological perspective with its focus on contextualised and situated language use (Creese & Blackledge 2010). However, as a concept, the term does not yet comprise a single definition for all researchers (García & Li Wei 2014:20), but rather has been explored and applied in a variety of contexts. Translanguaging as part of a pedagogic theoretical framework affords a view of language that allows for a multilingual reality for participants in the micro context of the classroom. The practice fits into a more dialogic approach to language, with attention on the process of the participants in the interaction within and with specific contexts, both micro and macro.

Because translanguaging moves away from language separation, the practice has both ideological and political associations (Lewis et al. 2012b:659). The ecological perspective also offers a means to understand multilingualism in relation to language ideology (Blackledge & Creese 2010:202). Lewis et al. elaborate:

[T]he conceptualisation of translanguaging is ideological. The term reflects a movement from considering languages as separate to integration, from a diglossic to a heteroglossic view of the minority-language world, from ideology that accented the subtractive and negative nature of bilingualism to one that expresses the advantages of additive bilingualism where languages in the brain, classroom, and street act simultaneously and not sequentially, with efficient integration and not separation. Thus, translanguaging is simultaneously symbolic of a change in ideology about bilingualism and bilingual education, and in itself provides a conceptualisation that promotes that new ideology. (2012b:667-668)

In the Swedish EMI classroom, this can mean that the concerns about Swedish domain loss can be addressed. Restricting translanguaging practices
reflects a monolingual ideology (cf. Cromdal 2000:114) that does not align with general Swedish language policy of promotion of multilingualism and preservation of minority languages. Not accessing translanguaging processes also reflects a lack of understanding of the potential benefits of using all linguistic resources.

Furthermore, translanguaging resists language status and can be seen as a counter response to language hierarchy (García & Li Wei 2014:68), both in the micro context of the classroom and the macro context of Swedish society. Rather than limiting languages to one role or the other (e.g. English for instruction and Swedish for classroom management), both can maintain the status of a language for learning. Languages do not need to be oppositional, but can rather work together dynamically. Translanguaging may offer a way to move beyond the language hierarchy roles, affording more status to Swedish in the EMI classroom. According to García and Li Wei (ibid.),

Translanguaging transgresses and destabilizes language hierarchies, and at the same time expands and extends practices that are typically valued in school and in the everyday world of communities and homes.

In summary, the translanguaging lens of flexible language use in this study offers the view of language alternation as a possibility rather than a deficit. On the micro level, translanguaging affords students the use of all linguistic resources and addresses previous concerns about Swedish domain loss. On the macro level, translanguaging aligns with the official Language Act in upholding the position of Swedish as a principle language in EMI classes as well, while also supporting students’ language development in English. Though other languages are not present at this time in the educational option, translanguaging as a theory implies an open door to more languages in the classroom. The present research has thus contributed to developing translanguaging further as a pedagogic theory applicable to and appropriate for Swedish EMI, although with the reservation that each educational context may be different.

10.4 Future research and concluding remarks

This thesis focuses on the stakeholder perspectives and practices of EMI in the Swedish context: how and why the option is offered, chosen and practiced. When casting a net as wide as was done in this present thesis, it is difficult to conclude with one final statement about the object of study. However, as discussed above, the exploration of these expectations and experiences has made clear that two aspects of EMI require further development: 1) A common, generally accepted yet broad definition of EMI in the
Swedish school based on the Swedish context, and 2) A common, generally accepted practice of EMI in the Swedish school based on empirical research.

Based on these two identified needs above, the next step is more classroom research to investigate how different language strategies may affect the content learning and language proficiency of students who have chosen the option. In the words of García (2009:5, original emphasis), “Bilingual education is the only way to educate children in the twenty-first century;” but we need to move beyond checking and controlling how much English is spoken, and look instead at how English and Swedish are used together to offer affordances and scaffolding for both content and language learning in the EMI classroom. This also means moving beyond the monolingual norm that may stigmatise the use of Swedish in the EMI classroom, away from “the burden of guilt associated with translanguaging in educational contexts” (Creese & Blackledge 2010:112). Further studies of translanguaging may address previous results that students do not participate as actively in EMI lessons or may even miss out on content learning (e.g. Airey & Linder 2008; Lim Falk 2008).

There are many aspects of EMI that this thesis has not addressed, but that are both worthy of investigation and necessary to the fuller picture of what EMI is today in Sweden and where it is headed. Further areas of study in the understanding of the status of EMI include student recruitment, entrance requirements, teacher in-service training, teacher qualifications in both the content subject and the target language, and resources made available to the schools and teachers. While understanding the current research and the present practice of various types of content teaching through a foreign language is both useful and necessary, the contexts in which the research and practice are implemented are key. More research is thus needed in the specific Swedish context to understand how the option can—and perhaps should—develop in the near future. More examination of the “classroom language ecologies,” and “pedagogic bilingual practices” (cf. Creese & Blackledge 2010:112) is also needed, especially in consideration of the possibilities translanguaging as a process may afford in content learning for both EMI students and L2 students.

In conclusion, what is needed in the Swedish context is a considered effort to plan for EMI in the Swedish upper secondary school, and a move away from haphazard local policies that may or may not work. English-medium instruction is already a fact on the educational landscape of Sweden, or as Josephson implies, English is here to stay in Sweden. How are we going to handle it? (2004:8). It is time to develop the option according to the Swedish context and the Swedish needs. EMI is currently being practiced today in a variety of ways and with varying degrees of success, as seen in this study and previous Swedish research. Measures need to be taken for standard guidelines and for in-service training for teachers willing to and interested in teaching their subjects through English (cf. Hyltenstam
This present study has supported this and shows that there are specific means to do this. English as a medium of instruction does not necessarily lead to the loss of Swedish, but instead may be used as an additional language, as called for in Swedish language policy, already at the upper secondary level. Not English at the cost of Swedish—but both. In the words of one EMI student:

**Esther:** Well, maybe my friends ask me, well are you learning in English? But it is also in Swedish. But you are learning in English? No, I learn mostly in Swedish, sometimes in English. So I think it is better to know Swedish, Swedish first and then English.
11 Sammanfattning på svenska

1 Inledning och bakgrund

Denna avhandling utforskar ämnesundervisning på engelska i den svenska gymnasieskolan idag genom en analys av perspektiv och praktik på makro- såväl som på mikronivå. Kunskapen om vad ämnesundervisning på ett annat språk än på modersmålet (ofta kallad för språk- och innehållsintegrerad lärande och undervisning eller SPRINT) innebär och hur denna undervisningsform omsätts i praktiken i Sverige idag är bristfällig. Detta beror dels på otillräcklig löpande aktuell statistik över undervisningsformens utbredning och omfattning och dels på brist på klassrumsforskning och forskning om de olika deltagarnas perspektiv. Denna avhandling syftar till att bidra till en ökad förståelse för denna undervisningsform genom empirisk kunskap om undervisningsformen med betoning på de berörda deltagarnas förväntningar och mål och om undervisningspraktiken i gymnasieskolan. Målet är att belysa hur språk- och innehållsintegrerad lärande och undervisning definieras och praktiseras i det svenska sammanhanget idag och bidra till förståelsen för dess praxis mer allmänt. 

Den övergripande frågeställningen i avhandlingen är: Hur och varför erbjuds, väljs, och utövas ämnesundervisning på engelska (English-medium instruction, EMI) i den svenska gymnasieskolan idag? Denna vida forskningsfråga syftar till att ge såväl en beskrivning av som en förklaring till nuvarande praxis i ämnesundervisning på engelska i den svenska kontexten. Studiens syfte uppnås genom flera delstudier som tillsammans täcker tre infallsvinklar: 1) en undersökning av hur undervisningsformen har utvecklats i Sverige och varför ämnesundervisning på engelska erbjuds, 2) en undersökning av deltagarnas förväntningar om undervisningsformen och dess mål i två gymnasieskolor, och slutligen 3) en undersökning av hur EMI-undervisning bedrivs i två gymnasieskolor, och vilka deltagarnas erfarenheter av denna undervisning är. Fokus ligger således inte på elevernas utveckling av språk- och ämneskunskaper, utan på de olika deltagarnas perspektiv och på själva klassrumspraktiken.

1.1 Ämnesundervisning på ett annat språk än modersmålet

Det finns många undervisningsformer i vilka elever får sin undervisning på ett annat språk än sitt modersmål. Fokus för denna avhandling är den frivilliga utbildningsform där deltagare använder sig av ett annat språk (företrädesvis engelska) än elevernas modersmål i ämnesundervisningen. I Europa går denna undervisningsform under beteckning CLIL, eller Content and language integrated learning, ett koncept som liknar de immersionsprogram (så kallade språkbad) som utvecklats i Kanada. Trots viss enighet i europeisk forskning om användandet av termen CLIL, varierar den exakta definitionen liksom den praxis som avses från land till land och från skola till skola. Det förekommer således en mängd olika definitioner och metoder i samband med denna typ av språk- och innehållsintegrerad lärande och undervis-

1.2 Den svenska kontexten


Det står klart att svenska gymnasieelever kommer att behöva engelska i sina framtida yrkesliv, både inom och utanför Sverige (Hyltenstam 2004:38), vilket också motiverar engelska som ett ämne redan från tidig ålder i det svenska utbildningssystemet. Svenska ungdomar har länge klarat sig exceptionellt bra i internationella studier där engelska språkkunskaper i olika länder jämförts (ibid.54). Svenska elever får sig även mycket engelska utanför klassrummet, och till exempel sociala medier spelar en stor roll för spridningen av engelska i många kontexter (Gardner 2012:249). Sundqvist (2009:10) menar att just denna kombination av att lära sig engelska i klassrummet och utanför klassrummet komplicerat bilden av engelska som ett främmande språk.


2 Teoriram

2.1 Språkekologi

Denna avhandling undersöker det dynamiska förhållandet mellan språk (specifikt svenska och engelska), deltagare (det vill säga elever och lärare) och lärmiljö ( hur deltagare agerar både i miljön och med miljön) utifrån en ekologisk teoriram. I en

2.2 Språkbruk
Språkbruket i klassrummet undersöks med hjälp av följande begrepp: språkväxling, skolspråk och språkhierarki. I undersökningen av språkväxling används translanguaging (som saknar en vedertagen svensk beteckning), ett koncept som inkluderar all användning av språkresurser som en del i lärandeprocessen. I denna avhandling betraktas translanguaging ur ett sociolinguistiskt perspektiv i förhållande till språkbruket i EMI-klassrummet och i förhållande till de funktioner som svenska och engelska har i ämnesundervisning. Skolspråk, eller det akademiska språket, avser det allmänna och ämnesspecifika språk som används i undervisningen och för bedömning (Schleppegrell & O’Hallaron 2011:3). I denna avhandling undersöks betydelsen av språkval i undervisningen, med särskilt fokus på skolspråkets roll i språkbruket och deltagarnas förståelse för de krav det mer formella akademiska registret medför. Slutligen är det viktigt, för att förstå varför deltagarna väljer ett visst språk i klassrummet, att även fokusera på de roller de respektive språken spelar i klassrummet. Här spelar deltagarnas uppfattning om språkens betydelse i enlighet med verkliga eller förmodade hierarkier en viktig roll. Användandet av engelska eller svenska i EMI-klassrummet kan således återspeglas elevernas uppfattning om språkens respektive status.

3 Metod
Metodologiskt bygger studierna i avhandlingen på lingvistisk etnografi, med tillämpning av i första hand kvalitativa metoder kompletterade med beskrivande statistik, som syftar till att ge en bred bild av den kontext som studeras. Metoderna inom lingvistisk etnografi kan variera, men utmärks av 1) en etnografisk forskningspraxis, 2) ett deltagarperspektiv, 3) forskarens reflexivitet och 4) en beskrivning, inte bara av mikrokontexten, utan även av den makrosociala och kulturella kontex-

---

ten (Söderlundh 2010:18). Avhandlingen omfattar tre delstudier, en utanför skolan och två i skolan.

3.1 Forskning utanför skolan: Delstudie I (kartläggning)

3.2 Forskning i skolan: Delstudie II (intervjuer) och Delstudie III (observationer)
Intervju- och klassrumstudier utfördes på två skolor som har tilldelats namnen Aspskolan och Björkskolan i denna text. Metoderna inbegrep intervjuer med de berörda deltagarna (lärare, elever, föräldrar och skolledare) och observationer av lektioner. Intervjuerna analyserades med fokus på deltagarnas förväntningar och erfarenheter av EMI. Resultaten kategoriserades i allmänna teman. Tyngdpunkten låg här på vad deltagarna sade och inte på hur de sade det. Lektioner i Aspskolan och Björkskolan observerades och analyserades, med fokus på språkbruk. Två aspekter av språkbruk som observerades var språkval (det vill säga hur deltagarna valde engelska eller svenska) och språkväxlingens funktioner (det vill säga vilka funktioner engelska och svenska fick under lektionen). Språkval i utvalda EMI ämneslektioner analyserades på två sätt: 1) språkval under olika faser av lektionen och 2) språkval beroende på typ av aktivitet under lektionen. Språkväxling analyserades för att förstå mönster och funktion, med fokus på språkväxling som translanguage med och utan pedagogiska funktioner.

4 Resultat
4.1 Delstudie I: Kartläggning
Resultaten från denna undersökning som syftade till att beskriva den aktuella situationen för SPRINT i svenska gymnasieskolor visar bland annat att många lärare och rektorer som svarade på enkäten inte förstod vad som avsågs med "ämnesundervisning på ett annat språk" trots att detta definieras i frågan. Vidare identifierades vissa andra "problemområden" som att: respondenterna förväxlade SPRINT med undervisning i moderna språk, modernsålsundervisning, eller svenskt språkstöd, och att det saknades svar från skolor som är kända för att erbjuda SPRINT. Begreppet SPRINT - och vad det kan innebära att undervisa ett ämne på ett annat språk än svenska - är således inte väl bekant för skolpersonal. Detta kan bero på att det inte finns någon officiell definition. Sammantaget tyder analysen av denna undersökning på att antalet skolor som erbjuder SPRINT inte har ökat under senare år. De skolor
som väljer att erbjuda detta alternativ väljer dessutom i princip uteslutande att göra det på engelska.

4.2 Delstudie II: Deltagarnas perspektiv på EMI

4.2.1 Att erbjuda EMI

Resultaten från denna delstudie visar bland annat att skolledare och lärare i studien ger uttryck för en diskurs som prisar värdet av engelska som framtidens språk. Ingen av de berörda parterna nämner samma möjligheter eller potentiella fördelar med andra språk för SPRINT. Deltagarna fokuserar också på det faktum att engelska, till skillnad från andra språk i den svenska kontexten, redan har en given plats i elevernas dagliga liv. Det innebär att eleverna (och lärarna) anses funktionellt tvåspråkiga i engelska och svenska och att de inte i första hand ser EMI som en väg att utöka elevernas språkliga repertoar, utan bara som ett stöd för en redan befintlig kompetens. Slutligen reflekterar inte skolledare och lärare över att valet att erbjuda EMI, med fokus bara på engelska, kan strida emot den officiella språkpolicyn för flerspråkighet i Sverige.

4.2.2 Att välja EMI


4.2.3 Att utöva EMI

Elevernas perspektiv på praktiken

Elevernas beskrivningar av hur det var att börja på ett EMI-program ger motstridiga bilder. Deras oro för att använda engelska i början av studietiden står i kontrast till en övertygelse om att det räcker med att vara intresserad eller tycka att det är kul. De betraktar sig själva som kompetenta användare av engelska (ibland mer kompetenta än sina lärare). De anser att det är en myt att det skulle vara svårare att studera på engelska, men talar ändå om hur "orättvist" programmet är (till exempel anser vissa elever att det är svårare att få bra betyg om man läser på engelska). Eleverna
tycker dessutom inte att deras svenska försämras, även om en del medger vissa smärra problem. Frågan om lärarnas språkfärdigheter i engelska återkommer i elevernas diskurs. Vissa elever anser att lärarnas bristande språkkunskaper är problematiska. Många elever menar också att det är en stor omställning att tala engelska med svenska lärare.

**Lärarnas perspektiv på praktiken**

Resultaten från intervjuerna med lärarna visar att ämneslärarna, trots avsaknad av formell utbildning i engelska, i allmänhet känner att de kan hantera undervisning på engelska tack vare sina egna privata och yrkesmässiga intressen samt långa erfarenhet. Medan majoriteten av lärarna känner sig säkra på sin egen språkfärdighet, är de inte helt överens om huruvida programmet skulle gynnas av en lärare med engelska som modersmål. De flesta lärarna på Aspskolan uppger också att de inte upplever några språkliga begränsningar när de undervisar sina ämnen på engelska istället för svenska. På Björkskolan verkar åsikterna gå isär. En lärare märker att elevernas språkförmåga förbättras dramatiskt under deras tre år på Björkskolan, och att de överträffar lärarna i språklig kompetens. Ingen av lärarna på de två skolorna anger hur de bemöter eventuella upplevda begränsningar, utöver att läsa ämnesspecifika tidskrifter eller använda engelska på fritiden.

I korthet finns det en tydlig diskurs av högt självförtroende hos både elever och lärare i fråga om språkfärdigheter, och målen med EMI handlar inte om språkinlärning. I de intervjuade deltagarnas diskurs återkommer istället viken av det språkliga kapital som EMI ger (till exempel hög status, gott rykte, framgång i universitetsstudier, möjlighet till en internationell livsstil). Elever och lärare anser sig ha språkkunskaper som funktionellt tvåspråkiga, men det finns ingen diskurs om den dubbla språkutvecklingen hos individen. Detta innebär att deltagarna inte tar upp elevernas behov av stöttning för att utveckla sina färdigheter i så väl engelska som svenska. Istället tas de engelska språkkunskaperna för givna.

### 4.3 Delstudie III: Språkbruk i klassrummet

#### 4.3.1 Språkval

Resultaten visar att elever och lärare, trots grundregeln om användning av engelska i EMI-klassrummet, hela tiden gör val gällande vilket språk som ska användas och när. En del lärare och elever är konsekventa i sitt språkbruk, medan andra inte är det, vilket kan leda till frustration bland elever som önskar sig engelska språk på lektionerna. Svenska används nästan uteslutande av alla på både Aspskolan och Björkskolan för all social interaktion både i och utanför klassrummet. Detta innebär att eleverna före, efter och under lektionerna ofta väljer att tala svenska med sina klasskamrater. Både lärare och elever tycks föredra svenska utanför klassrummet och betraktar inte engelska som ett språk för personlig kommunikation.

#### 4.3.2 Funktioner med språkutbyte

Observationer i klassrummet tyder på att både svenska och engelska aktivt används i båda skolorna, om än med skillnader i mönster och strategier. Språkutbyte innebär...
lyserades med hjälp av begreppet translanguaging, som ser växlingen mellan språken som en potentiell del av lärandeprocessen. De flesta lärare på Aspskolan använder engelska för genomgångar och svenska när de hjälper elever i deras arbete med olika uppgifter. Ibland använder lärarna det språk som eleven använder, det vill säga eleven väljer språk. Även om lärarna på Björkskolan också använder både svenska och engelska under lektionerna har de mindre tydliga strategier för språkväxlingen. Translanguaging visade sig ha följande funktioner i de två skolorna: omformulering, förklaring, språkmedvetenhet, deltagande i lektion, och grupparbete. Viss translanguaging har ingen tydlig pedagogisk funktion, vilket inte betyder att den inte kan ha potentiella fördelar i klassrummet.

5 Diskussion
5.1 Språkbruk
I detta avsnitt diskuteras språkbruket, som det beskrivs av deltagarna och som det observerats i skolorna, i förhållande till språkväxling, språkhierarki och akademiskt språk (register), med fokus på såväl aktuell praktik som potentiella möjligheter i klassrummet.

5.1.1 Språkväxling
Sammanfattningsvis gav analysen av språkanvändningen på lektionerna en bild av språkväxling som en potentiellt positiv strategi i EMI-klassrummet. Translanguaging kan underlätta tillägnandet av ämneskunskaper genom språkbruk som tillåter deltagarna att använda alla sina språkliga resurser och den stödning som behövs under lektionerna. Icke-pedagogisk translanguaging erbjuder andra funktioner som är viktiga för samspelet i klassrummet.

5.1.2 Skolspråk


5.1.3 Språkhierarki

I denna studie kan svenskans värde i förhållande till engelskans, såsom det uppfattas av de berörda deltagarna och som avslöjas i deras diskurs, begränsas till två områden: i förhållande till den status som respektive språk har samt i förhållande till de roller språken har i klassrummet. Deltagarnas perspektiv avspeglar en diskurs kring engelska som förknippat med hög status. De betraktar ett EMI-program som ett program med prestige vad gäller språk, elever och skola. Engelska är också förknippat med lärande, vilket man kan visa mot bakgrund av den dominans engelska har i fråga om undervisningstid på Aspskolan liksom mot bakgrund av målet om mer undervisning på engelska på Björkskolan. Valet att erbjuda engelska som undervisningsspråk istället för andra språk visar också det upplevda värdet av engelska som ett globalt språk.

Det engelska språket förefaller ha blivit "determinantiserat" (jämför Risager 2012) för deltagarna i studien, det vill säga ett språk utan bestämda geografiska gränser som eleverna kan anta som sitt eget. Tre funktioner för engelska kan uttydas i elevernas diskurs: engelska är ett akademiskt språk, ett av de två som de redan behärskar, men också ett socialt språk som man använder för nöjes skull och/eller för social kontakt på nätet, men inte nödvändigtvis ett personligt språk. Dessutom är engelska ett framtida språk, speciellt användbart för högre studier och framtida karriär.
5.2 Två skolor, två kontexter

5.3 Den svenska kontexten

Användningen av engelska som undervisningspråk möjliggörs på gymnasiets i Sverige bland annat genom specifika undervisningsprogram (affordances) i form av bland annat media och internet (till exempel film och sociala medier) såväl i skolans mikrokontext som i makrokontexten. Detta framkommer också i elevernas uttalanden om varför de välte EMI-program. Till exempel anser eleverna att extramural engelska, det vill säga fritidsengelskan utanför klassrummet, räcker långt som förberedelse inför studier på engelska. Elevernas tilltro till den egna engelskakompetensen väcker emellertid vissa frågor. För det första exponeras alla elever i Sverige i mycket hög grad för engelska, vilket innebär att detta förtroende skulle kunna gälla alla gymnasiellever. För det andra gör eleverna, såsom framkommit i intervjuer, inte uttryckligen någon distinktion mellan vardagsengelska och akademisk engelska. Kanske finns det därför ett behov av EMI med ett tydligare fokus på skolspråk och grundläggande akademisk engelska när eleverna redan har uppnått en så pass hög kommunikativ kompetens som många svenska gymnasiellever uppvisar. Slutligen kan

Sammanfattningsvis tyder undersökningarna både utanför skolorna och i sko- lorna i denna studie på att de roller och den status som engelska har på makro- och mikronivå är sammanflätade. Resultaten visar att SPRINT varken är känt som begrepp eller utbrett på något annat språk än engelska. Det faktum att engelska är det enda språk som ingår i enkätsvaren, bekräftar språkets status som den tar sig uttryck i såväl i språkpolitiken som i det svenska skolväsendet. Även synen på engelska som framkommer i klassrumsstudien återspeglar den rol- lorna engelska har i det svenska samhället.

6 Slutsatser


Note: Swedish authors are listed according to the Swedish alphabet. Swedish titles have not been translated.
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13 Appendices

Note: all appendices are translated from the original Swedish documents.

Appendix 1: Form of consent

Information for participation in the research study
Here is some information about the study, which will take place at your school during Autumn term 2011- Autumn term 2012.

The research project
My research is part of my dissertation as a doctoral student at Stockholm University in the Department of Language Education. My main interest is upper secondary schools that offer instruction in English. I will, for a period (Autumn term 2011- Autumn term 2012), visit your school to attend the lessons. I am also interested in interviewing teachers and students about their experiences with English-medium instruction.
I will collect the material in three different ways: through field notes, audio recordings and interviews.

Voluntary participation
Participation in this project is voluntary. You have the right at any time to withdraw your consent and you will then be withdrawn from the study.

Privacy
Collected data will be treated with utmost care and stored safely. Everyone included in the study (students, teachers and schools) will remain anonymous in subsequent publications / presentations, all in accordance with the Swedish Research Council's ethical guidelines. Recorded material is anonymised and digitised in databases that form the basis for empirical analyses. The material will be used only for research purposes and may appear in articles and research conferences. For all other possible use, I will seek further consent from all involved.
Benefits of participation
Most of research will take place during your regular school activities. One advantage of participation in this study is that you will see how the implementation of a scientific study can proceed. Another advantage is that your participation helps to increase awareness of the issues I am investigating.

Drawbacks of participation
As far as I can judge, there are no downsides to participation in the study.

Reporting of results
I will report the results of my research in the form of articles and presentations at research conferences, and in the final version of my dissertation.

Information
If you have any questions, please contact me:
BethAnne Yoxsimer Paulsrud
e-mail address has been removed
telephone number has been removed

CONSENT
Please tick 'Yes' and sign if you want to participate in the study.
Please tick "No" and sign if you do not want to participate in the study.

☐ YES, I want to participate in this study
☐ NO, I do not want to participate in this study

____________________________________________________
Your signature

Your full name_________________________________________

Class________________________________________________

Place and date________________________________________
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Appendix 2: Questionnaire on Google docs

* Required

What is the name of your school? *
In which municipality is the school? *

Is there currently language and subject integrated teaching (i.e. content instruction in another language other than Swedish) at your school? *
☐ Yes: an entire program is taught mostly in another language
☐ Yes: some courses are taught mostly in another language
☐ Yes: we have individual lessons or days when certain subjects are taught in another language
☐ No: but we plan to offer content teaching in another language in the near future (within 2 years)
☐ No: we never have content teaching in another language

Any comments?

Your name
Your position
Your email address *

Appendix 3: First letter to schools

Hello!
My name is BethAnne Paulsrud and I am a PhD student at Stockholm University in the Department of Language Education. I am investigating content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in upper secondary schools in Sweden.

To get an idea of how many upper secondary schools offer content instruction in a language other than Swedish, I am conducting a survey.

I therefore ask you to answer this short survey (see link below). The survey takes about 2 minutes to answer.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your help!

Sincerely,
Beth Anne Paulsrud
e-mail address removed

I have invited you to complete the form “Survey on content and language integrated learning in upper secondary schools (Spring term 2011). To complete the survey, please go here: (link has been removed)
Dissertations in Language Education
Doktorsavhandlingar i språkdidaktik

No. 1 (2011)
Franker, Qarin
Litteräritet och visuella texter: studier om lärare och kortutbildade deltagare i sfi.

No. 2 (2013)
Skar, Gustaf
Skrivbedömning och validitet. Fallstudier av skrivbedömning i svenskaundervisning på gymnasiet.

No. 3 (2014)
Yoxsimer Paulsrud, BethAnne
English-Medium Instruction in Sweden: Perspectives and practices in two upper secondary schools.