



GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET  
INST FÖR SPRÅK OCH LITTERATURER

ENGELSKA

# English teaching with grammar?

A study on how English teachers at upper secondary school in  
Sweden use grammar in their teaching

**Rebecka Ronnå**

Kandidatuppsats  
HT 2012

Handledare:  
Monika Mondor  
Examinator:  
Jennifer Herriman

## **Abstract**

**Title:** *English teaching with grammar? A study on how English teachers at upper secondary school in Sweden use grammar in their teaching.*

**Author:** Rebecka Ronnå

**Supervisor:** Monika Mondor

**Abstract:** The aim of this essay is to investigate how English teachers at upper secondary school in Sweden use grammar in their teaching, and how their attitudes toward grammar affect how they use it in their teaching. To examine this, qualitative interviews were conducted with three English teachers. The results from these interviews showed that the teachers' attitudes toward grammar have a great impact on their teaching. The two teachers who had positive views used deductive grammar teaching with the students and also worked with focus on form, while the teacher who did not like grammar had no formal grammar teaching and only let her students work with grammar using games and quizzes on the Internet. The consequence of these different styles of grammar teaching means students will have different kinds of knowledge when they graduate and those without any grammar teaching might encounter difficulties if they continue studying English at a higher level. It is important for teachers to keep up with recent research that has proven that students perform and learn better from formal teaching, and not least to meet students at their individual level. Another unexpected finding was that teachers did not use technical terminology when they talked about different strategies and methods they use with grammar.

**Keywords:** English didactics, grammar teaching, second language teaching, foreign language teaching, attitudes, language learning, Sweden

## Innehållsförteckning

1. Introduction.....	4
1.1. Background.....	4
1.2. Aim.....	5
1.3. Overview of the study.....	5
2. Theoretical background.....	6
2.1. The role of English in Sweden.....	6
2.2. Key concepts in Language Learning.....	7
2.3. First Language versus Second Language Learning.....	8
2.4. History and Perspectives on Grammar Teaching.....	9
2.4.1. The Grammar Translation Method.....	9
2.4.2. The Direct Method.....	10
2.4.3. The Audio-Lingual Method.....	10
2.4.4. The Communicative Era.....	11
2.4.5. Focus on Form/Forms.....	12
2.4.6. Consciousness Raising and Language awareness.....	12
2.5. Why grammar?.....	13
3. Method and Material.....	14
3.1. Method.....	14
3.2. Material.....	14
3.2.1. <i>Sample</i> .....	14
3.2.2 The Interviews.....	15
3.3 Problems and limitations.....	15
4. Results.....	17
4.1. Question 1.....	17
4.2. Question 2.....	17
4.3. Question 3.....	18
4.4. Question 4.....	19
4.5. Question 5.....	19
4.6. Question 6.....	20
4.7. Question 7.....	21
4.8. Question 8.....	21
4.9. Question 9.....	23
5. Discussion.....	25
5.1. How do English teachers use grammar in their teaching?.....	25
5.2. What methods and theoretical perspectives affect their teaching?.....	26
5.3. What are the teacher's attitudes towards grammar?.....	28
5.4. Methodological considerations.....	28
5.5. Pedagogical implications.....	29
References.....	31
Appendix.....	33
I. Interviewees.....	33
II. Question sheet.....	33

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Background

During the first term of studying English at University, a fellow teacher trainee student said to me: “I don't need to learn English grammar, because I will not use it in my teaching”. This statement surprised me, since I have always valued grammar as an important part of language learning. This student later failed the grammar exam three times before passing the exam. This event led me to wonder, what teachers of English in Sweden think about grammar and how do they use it in their teaching?

Today English is the world's most important language when it comes to printed and electronic publications in education, business, information technology, science, tourism and TV (Lundahl 2012: 81). It has become a global medium of communication and connects an unprecedented number of people (ibid). Nowadays, one in five people in the world have some knowledge in English and over one billion people study the language in formal education (ibid). Here in Sweden, the English language plays an essential part in our everyday lives and we encounter it in many different forms both in and outside of school. Because of its significant role in society, it is not difficult to find reasons why students should learn English.

However, grammar is one feature of the English language classroom that few love and many hate (Crystal 2004: 6). Just mentioning the word *grammar* brings up bad memories for some, from their own grammar teaching experience (Estling Vannestål 2007: 17).

Today, we no longer treat English just as *product*, as in the traditional grammar and translation method (Tornberg 2009: 140). Grammar has been said to be on the rise again but in a new way, in that grammar can play an important role in the communicative approach to language teaching. There are a number of ways to teach grammar, but how is it used in today's schools? Has this new research trickled down to affect the classroom? This essay will focus on investigating how upper secondary school English teachers use grammar in their teaching, and how their attitudes toward grammar affect how they use it.

The term *grammar* is absent in the recent syllabus for English in Swedish schools; however, it is embedded in other words used to describe the goals of learning English. To be able to communicate intelligibility, for example, does include being grammatically correct. Tornberg (2009: 137) claims that when students say that it is more important to learn to speak than to learn grammar, this can be

a sign that they have split their language development into different parts that do not seem to co-exist. In most syllabuses in European countries, a communicative and functional approach to language prevails, where the language usage is emphasised, inspired not least by the Common European Framework of Reference for Language: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) (council of Europe, www). This naturally has consequences on grammar teaching (Tornberg 2009: 138). Could it be that the new Swedish syllabus has chosen to omit the explicit term for learning a language's structure because of its typically played down role in the communicative approach?

## **1.2. Aim**

The aim of this essay is to investigate how English grammar is being taught at upper secondary school level in Sweden and why? What are the teachers' attitudes towards English grammar and how does it affect their teaching?

The aim gives rise to the following research questions:

- How do English teachers use grammar in their teaching?
- What methods and theoretical perspectives affect their teaching?
- What are the teachers' attitudes towards grammar?

## **1.3. Overview of the study**

In the following chapter called (2) *theoretical background*, I will explain terms and key concepts of the essay, accompanied with an historical background of how grammar has been taught in schools the past century. In the next chapter, (3) *method and material*, I will account for how the study was carried out and after that I will present the (4) *results* followed by my analysis in the chapter called (5) *discussion*.

## **2. Theoretical background**

In this chapter, I will begin by defining (1) *the role of English in Sweden*, to make it easier to understand why English is important to know in Swedish society. Secondly, I will present (2) *key concepts in language learning* which are important to this essay, so that the reader will be able to comprehend their meaning more easily. Thirdly, I will account for the debate of differences and similarities between (3) *first language versus second language learning*, to elucidate the different views on language learning. Thereafter, I will give a review of the (4) *history and perspectives on grammar teaching* to give the reader an understanding of the vast changes that have occurred in language teaching during the past century and which resulted in today's communicative method. Finally, this chapter ends with a section called (5) *why grammar?* I will specify what recent research says about why it can be important to have a knowledge of grammar.

### **2.1. The role of English in Sweden**

Even though the English language in many ways has become second nature to Swedes, the National Agency of Education classifies it as studying a foreign language (Skolverket 2001: 73). For a language to be considered as *second language*, the target language has to be dominant in the learning environment or has an institutionalized role in government and in the educational system. Learners are able to access authentic input from target language speakers and have many opportunities to practice the language in real situations (ibid). Some examples of this would be people in Sweden who do not speak Swedish as their mother tongue or English speakers in Canada who learn French. In these situations, learning a second language will make considerable differences to their lives. This factor can strengthen the learners' motivation (ibid). *Foreign language learning* does not meet these classifications to the same extent, despite the fact that nowadays great possibilities to access the target languages exist outside of school. However, most of the communication and interactions in English happens in the language classroom (ibid).

In the new English syllabus from 2011 in Swedish schools, it is pointed out that having a knowledge of the English language opens up possibilities for individuals to be part of social and cultural contexts and to partake in a globalised study and work life. It also mentions that English is used in areas like culture, politics, education and economy (Skolverket 2012, www). According to the same publication, English does have a more dominant role in Swedish society than a decade ago and it is quite essential to know it for studying at an academic level and required for many jobs. David Graddol has a similar discussion in his book *The Future of English?* (2000: 11) and says that one thing that separates English as a second to foreign language is that English is used in the speakers' community and is part of the speaker's identity repertoire. Graddol also mentions that in

many countries, including Sweden, there is now a shift of the status of English and that "the use of English for intranational communication is greatly increasing"(ibid). He states that this shift can be seen as a process where English is moving toward second language status (ibid). The importance of learning English for different purposes is thus growing.

## **2.2. Key concepts in Language Learning**

To explain what it means *to learn* something, there are several concepts that need to be taken into consideration. To make things more complicated many of these are entangled. First, the term *learning* is usually divided into *formal learning* and *informal learning* (Lundahl 2012: 40). Children, for example, acquire language without any conscious effort by simply being exposed to it. Being exposed to a language and learning it in its true environment through social and emotional contact, is what characterises *informal learning* (ibid). Here, the connection between language and context is complete, where everything from movements, facial expressions and objects are in immediate contact with the language. Because this learning happens unconsciously it often is not even perceived as learning (ibid).

Although informal learning may seem as the perfect way to learn, without realising it, it would be complicated to achieve this in school where most education is focused on *formal learning* (Lundahl 2012: 40). In contrast to the free learning process of informal learning, formal learning in schools are compulsory, within a time limit, organised and have institutionalized goals. In this institution, learning is mostly explicit, which means that learning is made visible through goals, homework, assignments and evaluation forms (ibid). In language learning research, formal and informal learning can be thought of as linked to the concepts *declarative knowledge* and *procedural knowledge* (ibid: 42). If students have declarative knowledge of a grammatical structure, it means that they are able to explain how it functions. To have procedural knowledge of a structure, students need to be able to use this knowledge in speaking and writing. However, having an analytical knowledge about rules and structures of a language does not mean that one will be able to use them nor that someone with great procedural knowledge will be able to explain the rules that are applied (ibid).

Two other important concepts are *implicit* and *explicit language knowledge*. They are very similar to declarative and procedural knowledge, but these terms make it possible to discuss both learning and education and therefore separate the means from the goal (Lundahl 2012, 42). According to the English syllabus in Swedish schools, the main focus for students is to develop versatile communicative skills (Skolverket 2012, www) and this means that their knowledge should be

implicit (Lundahl 2012: 42). However, to develop this knowledge they may need explicit learning and explicit teaching (ibid). Like procedural knowledge, implicit language knowledge refers to the ability to use language in communication (Tornberg 2009: 144). We are not aware of this knowledge so we cannot express it in words like we can with declarative knowledge, but we can use it automatically without conscious thought (Lundahl 2012: 42). Explicit knowledge on the other hand is conscious, declarative, irregular and inconsistent. We might know how a grammatical structure works, but not how to use it in different situations (ibid: 42-43).

There are also discussions whether explicit knowledge should be taught through *deductive* or *inductive teaching*. Deductive grammatical teaching means that students are first presented with a grammatical structure that they will then analyse and practice. In inductive grammar teaching, the students first meet examples of a grammatical structures and then get the assignment to draw conclusions from them and formulate the rules themselves (Matin Bolivar, 2011). The results of a number of studies that Rod Ellis has summarised were that simple rules can be best taught deductively and more complex rules inductively. However students with skills in grammatical analysis are more likely to benefit from inductive grammatical teaching than students who find grammar difficult (ibid).

There are two terms that express how people acquire languages in different ways, and they are *language acquisition* and *language learning*. *Acquisition* is an unconscious process (implicit knowledge) in which the language develops through communication in an authentic language environment and where focus is on the content rather than linguistic form, like how children learn their mother tongue. *Learning* on the other hand is a conscious process (explicit knowledge) in which language rules are learnt through formal teaching where focus is on linguistic form (Abrahamsson 2009: 117-118). Stephen Krashen, a famous linguist and education researcher, considered acquisition to be "true" second language competence because it could be used in speaking. Krashen thought that the explicit knowledge one gets from learning was not as interesting, because it could only be used to examine what we are saying but not be used directly in communication (ibid: 117-118).

### ***2.3. First Language versus Second Language Learning***

There is a debate whether there are any differences between how we learn grammar in our first language (L1) and second language (L2). It is widely recognized that the grammar of our first language is acquired automatically and unconsciously (Ohlander 1999: 106). This has its grounds in the famous linguist Noam Chomsky's theory of *universal grammar*, which claims that all people



have an innate ability to learn grammar (Passer 2009: 393). When it comes to L2 grammar there are different opinions. Some say that there is no difference and that the principles for both are the same, universal grammar, and the fact that a person already knows another language does not affect it.

Other scientists point to the obvious differences in success in learning between L1 and L2 grammar. They also stress that L1 grammar can affect how we learn L2 grammar (Ohlander 1999: 106). Which theory we put our faith in affects how we consider languages should be learnt. If we believe that L2 is acquired the same way as L1, then language learning should try to create the same conditions as L1. The idea that the language is both the tool and goal omits systematic grammar teaching. If we, on the other hand, think L1 and L2 are learnt in completely different ways, the result will be a more artificial and planned language learning situations where the focus is on language forms and structures, with systematic grammar teaching. The first view promotes an L2 learning method in which grammar is learnt solely unconsciously and implicit to be used automatically in oral communication, while the other believes that teaching grammar is a "necessary evil" (Ohlander 1999: 106-107). However, a question for the second position is whether it is possible for conscious knowledge about grammatical rules to evolve into the unconscious, which enables us to use it automatically in communication (ibid).

## ***2.4. History and Perspectives on Grammar Teaching***

In the past one-hundred years, there has been a spirited debate about what would be the best way to teach a language. Different methods and approaches has gone in and out of popularity, most of them taking a position at a distance from the previous ones, but they also keep points considered positive (Brown 2001: 16-18). The main methods of this turbulent time in language teaching will be presented in the following sections. I will start with the grammar-translation method, followed by the direct method, the audio-lingual method and then the beginning of the communicative approach and finish with the different perspectives called focus on form/forms and the notion of consciousness raising and language awareness.

### **2.4.1. The Grammar Translation Method**

During the past centuries, "foreign" language learning (in the Western world) was equivalent to the way people learnt Latin and Greek. Latin was the language of educated men and was taught through the Classical Method, which in the nineteenth century became known as "The Grammar Translation Method". This method focused on learning grammatical rules, memorising vocabulary and inflections, translating texts and doing written exercises. When other languages entered schools in the eighteenth and nineteenth century this method was applied also to them. There was little focus on spoken language and the goal with learning another language was to enable students to move

onto further studies (Brown 2001: 18).

This method had no theoretical background in language learning, and at the time people thought it could be learnt like any other skill. The Grammar Translation Method prevailed through the twentieth century reforms in language teaching and even today it is practiced in many educational contexts according to Brown (2001: 18). Some of the characteristics of this method were, that classes were taught exclusively in the mother tongue and vocabulary was learnt through lists of isolated words. It focused on grammatical forms and rules that were taught deductively. There was little attention to the content in texts and these were only used for practicing grammar analysis. The main activity was to translate isolated sentences between the first and second language. There was also no practice of communicative competence and no practice of pronunciation (ibid: 18-19).

### **2.4.2. The Direct Method**

The Direct Method was at its peak at the beginning of the twentieth century and its main goal was to make second language learning imitate the “natural” language acquisition that children have when they learn their first language. In contrast with the previous method, this method focused entirely on oral communication in the target language. To achieve this, classes were exclusively taught in the target language, often by native-speakers. Classes were small and intensive so the students would have plenty of opportunities to interact and use the target language spontaneously. However, the luxury of smaller classes, focus on individual attention and native language teachers came at a high price which no municipal school could afford, and that is why it was only successful at private language schools where motivation was already quite high among the students. The method was criticized for having a weak theoretical ground and its success was ascribed to having skilful teachers (Brown 2001: 21-22).

It broke off entirely from the classical method of teaching grammar and instead excluded all translations between languages and deductive teaching of grammatical rules. The teaching had a hands-on approach, where grammar was taught inductively and students, for example, learnt concrete vocabulary (actual everyday vocabulary) through demonstrations, where teachers showed objects or pictures. This method has also been called “the Berlitz Method” and there are still several well-established Berlitz language schools in all countries of the world (Brown 2001: 21-22).

### **2.4.3. The Audio-Lingual Method**

Unlike in Europe, the direct method did not work well in the United States. It was not easy to get hold of native-speakers and opportunities to use the target language in real settings were far away (Brown 2001: 22). Americans were convinced that the way to learn a foreign language was through

reading and in the 1930s and 1940s they went back to the Grammar Translation Method. However, when the Second World War started and Americans were transported out into the world, reading skills were not enough. They now needed to be able to communicate orally with both allies and opponents. To meet the new demand the US military created the Army Method (ibid), an intensive language course that focused only on oral communication, completely without grammar teaching and translation. Here they borrowed several parts from the criticized direct method and applied them to this method. This new success and sparked interest in foreign languages was the beginning of The Audio-Lingual Method (ibid: 22-23).

The method had a firm base in linguistics and psychological theory. Structural linguistics from the 1940s and 1950s went hand in hand with behaviouristic psychology, which incorporated mimicry and pattern drills into the audio-lingual method. Some of the characteristics of this method were that new material was taught through dialogs, with great emphasis on pronunciation. The teaching was co-dependent on mimicry, memorising and over learning and teachers often used visual aids and tapes. Only the target language was used in the classroom and grammar was taught by inductive analogy, rarely with any grammatical explanations. There was a great focus on getting the students to utter correct sentences, which were immediately reinforced (Brown 2001: 23).

#### **2.4.4. The Communicative Era**

The rise of the communicative approach began in the late 1970s and early 1980s as people became better at understanding the functions that needed to be incorporated in the learning environment (Brown 2001: 42). In the 1980s and 1990s, the development of this approach elucidated fundamental communicative properties of language, which contributed to the classroom becoming more genuine and using meaningful exercises. Besides the grammatical and conversational parts in communication, other important elements had been incorporated into the classroom, like for example the nature of social, pragmatic and cultural characteristics of the language. Teachers tried to help their students develop linguistic fluency and did not focus on accuracy like earlier methods. They strived to give their students the tools to be able to use the language in the "real" world and learn not for school but for life. Students should also work together as partners in their learning. These are some of the core features of what can be called *communicative language teaching*. It is difficult to define this method, because it is unified but with a wide body. It has its foundation in theories of the nature of language, language learning and teaching (ibid: 42-43).

However, the communicative approach has also created an ignorance of how to use grammar in this method. Cajkler and Addelman bring this up in their book *The Practice of Foreign Language*

*Teaching* (2000: 109) and describe the situation as follows:

One misconception associated with communicative approaches led to a loss of belief in grammar teaching in the classroom. Teachers sometimes found it necessary to teach grammar almost secretly, while others strenuously avoided references to grammar. Consequently, some teachers may still not be sure how and where it fits with communicative approaches, even though the teaching of grammar has been rehabilitated in the new National Curriculum for modern foreign languages. (Cajkler & Addelman 2000: 109)

There have been many changes in language teaching in the past hundred years and Nick Ellis comes to the conclusion that: "These pendulum swings in education practice suggest that there is no simple answer to which of the methods is 'best'" (Ellis 1994: 3).

#### **2.4.5. Focus on Form/Forms**

To address the constraints of using only the communicative method, a new approach called *focus on form*, chose to use a combination of formal instruction and communicative language use. It is based on the difference between explicit instructions on grammatical forms (with -s) and meaning-focused use of form (no -s) so the students have to notice the grammatical structure and then process it in solely communicative input (Hinkel & Fotos 2002: 5). In school, *focus on forms* are conscious discussions about grammar without reference to meaning and *focus on form* are accidental discussions about grammar which appear out of meaningful language use in the classroom. However, there is an idea that teaching grammar without meaning should not be called grammar at all, and Cook (2001: 40) argues against this and points out that: " the distinction between FormS [with -s] and FonF [without -s] does divert attention away from grammar explanation for its sake towards thinking how grammar may contribute within the whole context of language teaching methodology".

#### **2.4.6. Consciousness Raising and Language awareness**

This term in grammar teaching denotes exercises where the learners' attention is focused on the formal organisation or structure of a language. The purpose of this is that the learner creates a conscious, explicit knowledge about the target language's rule system (Tornberg 2009: 220). Hinkel & Fotos (2002: 6) explain that many teachers consider grammatical instructions to be "consciousness raising", because of how they create awareness towards a particular structure, even if the learner will not be able to use it immediately. It does not only build consciousness through instructions on specific forms but it also results in input enforcement. This means that actions performed on meaning-focused input in a way make the structure "pop out" for the learner (ibid).

Language awareness is a wider term which stems from a movement that was founded in England during 1980s, which emphasised the meaning of consciousness in language learning. Awareness concerns not only linguistic rules in the target language, but also cultural differences between the ones own country and the country of the target language (Tornberg 2009: 226).

## **2.5. Why grammar?**

Why is it so important to learn grammar? Well, the main reason for learning grammar is because it helps one's language abilities (Crystal 2004: 7). There are four core linguistic domains in language learning: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In all of these, grammar serves a very important role (ibid: 7). Grammar is the way to study the meaning of the language (ibid: 9).

Grammar is all about how we handle any kind of meaning, on any occasion, in any subject. Whatever the nuance we want to express, we need grammar in order to express it. Whatever the nuance someone else expresses, we need grammar in order to understand it. (ibid)

Learning grammar can improve learners' proficiency, correctness and ease internalization of its syntactic system, and contribute to developing fluency (Hinkel & Fotos 2002: 10). Though, there are a few conditions that need to be fulfilled to be able to understand and use a new structure. First, the person has to be mature enough in his or her language development to embrace the rule. Secondly, one must consciously understand how it works and thirdly, one must have a need of the rule in order to enforce it into one's language repertoire (Tornberg 2009: 144-145). According to this, it is not enough for a teacher to explain a grammatical rule for the students to be able to understand it and be able to use it (Lundahl 2012: 45). Ohlander also brings up a very important finding from Ellis research: "Learners who receive formal instruction outperform those who do not; that is, they learn more rapidly and reach higher levels of ultimate achievement"(Ohlander 1999, 115).

### **3. Method and Material**

The method used in this essay was qualitative interviews. In this section, I will account for how the interviews were carried out. To answer my research questions, interviews were conducted with three English teachers at upper secondary school. I decided to carry out semi-structured interviews, which means that I had questions prepared in advance, but was able to ask follow-up questions during the interview (Troost 2005:160). Most of the questions were sent out before the interviews so the teachers could prepare material and have more time to think about their grammar teaching. During the interview two additional questions were added, prepared in advance but not shared with the teachers beforehand, which were supposed to make them look at their teaching from a different perspective.

#### **3.1. Method**

Qualitative interviews are known for giving deep, rich and complex answers by asking simple and straight questions (Troost 2010: 25). This method is, according to Troost, very good for trying to understand people's way of reasoning or reacting (ibid: 32). Within this kind of method, it is better to conduct a limited number of interviews in order to make the material easier to process (ibid: 143). Considering that this essay will focus on investigating how English teachers reason and think about grammar, I found this method appropriate.

#### **3.2. Material**

I interviewed three English teachers working at upper secondary schools in a large city in southern Sweden.

##### **3.2.1. Sample**

To find suitable interviewees for this essay, I went onto the websites of three large upper secondary schools in a large city in southern Sweden and emailed all the teachers there who taught English and asked if they would have the possibility to answer questions about how they use grammar in their teaching. I chose these schools out of convenience, but I had no control over which teachers chose to participate (Troost 2005: 120). Two female and one male English teacher were interviewed at the school they work at. To keep them anonymous to the reader I will refer to them as Teacher A, B and C. I also assembled information that could be of interest to the analyses of their answers. I asked them to write down the following information to be handed in to me: their sex, age, which subject/subjects they teach, how long they have worked as teachers and which year they finished their teaching degrees (if they had one). This information can be seen in Appendix I. Teacher A is a native English speaker from Britain and taught students at a special program called International

Baccalaureate program, where all lessons are in English (mostly taught by native speakers) and she teaches them English language and literature. Teacher B and C are Swedish and taught English 5, 6 and 7 courses (previously known as English A, B and C). Which programs they taught were not mentioned.

### **3.2.2 The Interviews**

Three teachers from one of the schools volunteered to be interviewed. Before beginning to construct the interviews, I studied the areas of interest for my essay which were *English didactics*, *grammar teaching* and *second and foreign language teaching*. The purpose was to gain knowledge of the subject and decide which questions to ask (Trost 2010: 71). I prepared and formed the interviews from guidelines in Trost's *Kvalitativa intervjuer* [qualitative interviews] (two editions, 2005 & 2010) where he presents how qualitative studies can be carried out and what the interviewer should have in mind. Before meeting the interview persons, I sent out a sheet with most of the questions that would be asked, so the teachers could prepare material and reflect on how they teach English. The interview sheet can be seen in Appendix II. Before starting the interviews I informed the interviewees that they would be anonymous to the reader (Trost 2005: 157), and I asked them if they would agree for me to audio record the interviews. They all accepted.

I chose to record the interviews because this would enable me to listen to them again afterwards. Trost (2010) mentions that it is good to record interviews so the interviewer can listen to the tone of voice and choice of words over and over again. This way I did not need to take notes and could focus my full attention on the questions and answers (ibid: 74-75). I let the interviewee choose the location for the interview so they would feel comfortable and safe (ibid: 65); two of the interviews were in private rooms, but one took place in a staff coffee room, where two other persons sat in the other side of the room. This location could have disturbed the interview but, fortunately, this did not seem to affect the interviewee who seemed to completely focus on the interview. During the interview I put my full attention, as mentioned before, on the person being interviewed. Trying to be observant of the speaker's manners and not being afraid of silence so they had the time to think about their answers and not interrupt them in their thoughts (Trost 2010: 97).

### **3.3 Problems and limitations**

There were some difficulties during the work with the essay. I found it difficult to get people to interview. In the beginning I had planned to interview six people, but was not able to find anyone else than the three people who volunteered straight away. Another thing that did not go according to plan was that I could not get a hold of some of the materials I was hoping to collect. In the interview

sheet I sent out to the teachers I asked for samples of student essays the teachers had corrected, so I could see for myself how they handle grammar in students written assignments. However, none of the teachers had the possibility to provide this, because of the simple reason that they were not working with written texts at that time. Because of the limited number of interviews it will be difficult to make any generalisation of my result. However by choosing to do qualitative interviews my objection is not to make as many interviews as possible to form a generalisation, but to see how people differ from one another. In spite of this, I do believe the result can give a good perspective of how some teacher work with grammar in their teaching and that this could form the basis of a more extensive study.



## 4. Results

Here the results of the interviews will be presented. There will be a summary of the three answers to each question. Since many of the questions intertwine, some of the teachers' answers will concern more than one of the questions.

### 4.1. Question 1

*If you would summarise your view of grammar in one word, which would it be and why?*

Teacher A summarised her view of grammar with the word *troublesome* and said that it is boring and that nobody likes it. "It is not natural if you consider how languages are learnt, and the best way is when you don't even know you're learning it, by using sounds and music for example." (Teacher A). Teacher B and C say that they have great respect for grammar and Teacher B says he would spontaneously summarise his view with the word *fun*. If he were to give a more serious answer then maybe the word *beneficial* and Teacher C used the word *important*. Both of them mentioned that having a knowledge of grammar is a great tool for students' language development and that it offers a firm, secure foundation to build on. Teacher C also said that it "opens doors".

### 4.2. Question 2

*What significance does grammar have in your teaching?*

Teacher A says that she puts grammar aside. Her teaching is context driven and instead of working with modules, the teaching forms a unit, where they work, for example, with topics such as bias, authentic material and politics. If a problem arises she deals with it immediately, but does not make an entire lesson out of it. "Grammar should only contribute, it's only building blocks and it is the house we are interested in and should work with, not prepositions two Thursdays in a row. It's almost like going to see a really weird movie, it will not be fun, but can be interesting." (Teacher A).

The other two teachers, Teacher B and C, said that grammar is very significant in their teaching. Teacher C describes that it is important because it is the foundation of the language and that she takes up grammar when she feels it is needed, which is continuously through her teaching. Teacher B said that he thinks it is meaningful because it is an important tool he wants to provide the students with so they can work with the language. He says that he is critical to the changes in language teaching that have taken place during the past few decades. He does not oppose the development toward a more communicative approach, but he feels that we are throwing out grammar in a rush: "[...] it's good that it is being connected [to meaningful contexts], but along the line a phobia of grammar has been created, as you can see in Swedish. It is important for me as an English teacher

to be able to build on students' knowledge from their mother tongue." (Teacher B). He makes a comparison with his own time before graduating from upper secondary school in 1992 and says that there was more focus on grammar at the time. He mentions that it is great with meaningful contexts, but that we definitely can do isolated work with grammar as well. Teacher B also says that he thinks grammar is very important and that he takes it very seriously. He has created his own working material with grammar. However, he has not put it into use yet, because he is unsure of its reception by the students.

### **4.3. Question 3**

*How do you let the students work with grammar? Individually, in groups or in full-class?*

Teacher A says that she does not let them work with grammar at all. Every month when she corrects oral exercises (recorded), she takes notes on what kind of errors the students make, then summarises the general errors and later lets them work with it orally or in writing by using games and quizzes. She never just lets them correct sentences on paper.

Teacher B explains that it is a mixture depending on the exercise. He likes to individualise or group the class according to level so that the students can work with grammar on their own level, within the course's framework. Sometimes he needs to let them work in full-class, even though some already know that particular grammar. He usually does this when he thinks that everyone in the classroom could benefit from it. And some things are better to work with individually, above all with students who risk failing the course, and often do to trivial diction like irregular verbs and prepositions. These students are supplied with good exercises and keys to practice with. He usually writes down the students' usual mistakes, and consistently it is subject-verb agreement, even with stronger students. "Congruence seems to be incredibly hard to grasp, which I find baffling because it is one of the first things you learn in English and it's not that difficult to keep track of. At the same time I can understand that it is difficult in oral production when you need to talk at the heat of the moment and it's not that easy to have the meta cognition in mind and think about what you are going to say" (Teacher B).

Teacher C says that it depends. However, when it comes to written assignments she always does the correction in a specific way. She underlines linguistic errors, but she does not correct them. Instead she writes in the margin what kind of problem it is and then in a matrix writes comments about the assignment and the grade for documentation. When they get their assignments back she starts by going through the usual mistakes or errors (common errors) on the blackboard, and it can be about

anything, for example, that *I* is always spelled with a capital letter, or more complicated thing like allusion. After that, the students have time to correct their essays while Teacher C can go around and help them. "If I pick up a grammatical part that many have trouble with, then I might have two grammar lessons. First a review, then drills from the exercise book. But it's not like I have seven weeks of grammar in the autumn and then it never comes back again, no, we have it continuously throughout the course. Most of the time they work individually." (Teacher C).

#### **4.4. Question 4**

*What language do you use when you explain grammar and why?*

Teacher A said that she only uses English in her teaching. "Like the way that a child learns a language, it doesn't have an explanation and it wouldn't be natural to transfer it into Swedish. It's easier for them to understand that this is the way in English. They have no trouble understanding when they play World of Warcraft or Nintendo." She teaches English to students at the International Baccalaureate program, where almost all students want to take English to the next level.

Teacher B and C said that they use English when they explain grammar, but that they can use Swedish as support for grammatical terms that are difficult to understand. Teacher B said that they follow the National Agency of Education's new line that all teaching should be in English. However, you should not take it to the extreme. You have to meet the students at their level, at least in English 5. Even if you do not use Swedish to explain, you can explain that the Swedish term for noun is substantiv. Teacher B has also assembled his own material to help students to get acquainted with their grammar book, and since it is in Swedish so is the material connected to it. Since this is a primary step into getting to know the grammar book he thinks it is okay to use Swedish, so that students as quickly as possible get a grip of the different terms.

#### **4.5. Question 5**

*What kind of grammar exercises do you use in your teaching? Any examples?*

Teacher A explains that she only uses games and quizzes on the Internet, in pairs or groups with competitions in teams. The students think it is fun and learn quickly from it. It also helps "the boys to stay awake" (Teacher A).

Teacher B presented some of his own material that he uses with his English five students. They first get to know their grammar book and how to use it. Many of the troubles that students have, with, for example, prepositions, are where the words differ in Swedish and English. When they do these

exercises they always work in groups or pairs. The students should also reflect on how they learn/pick up grammar. Two exercises from this material are: *100 irregular verbs*, a typical gap-exercise and *24 incorrect sentences* with some of the most usual grammatical mistakes that the students should solve together. This way they always discuss the exercises, so they do not feel that speaking and working with grammar are separate items. "I think it is very important that they have knowledge about elementary concepts otherwise I won't be able to use the meta-language to discuss their own production" (Teacher B). When half the school year has passed, he has enough material to see what the usual errors in the class as a unit are. These are usually the same, year after year. However they mostly work with grammar when a problem arises in the classroom. If they worked only with the textbooks grammar exercises, Teacher B says it would be tedious and not so profitable. He also says that how they work with grammar depends on the level and need.

Teacher C lets her students correct their own work and sees learning grammar as a stage process. They first learn about the rules, how to spot mistakes and correct them in their own work and finally being able to prevent themselves from making those mistakes in the future. She wants to raise their consciousness about the process. Her students are also obliged to keep the comments from her so they can have a look at them again before their next assignment, so they will be able to see their improvement. She also mentions that it is written in the new criteria for the English syllabus that the students should be able to see a result and have a process with their writing.

#### **4.6. Question 6**

*How does a usual grammar lesson look like?*

I do not have grammar lessons and seldom take up grammar in class. But it can happen at any time, but I do not take up solitary mistakes. But it's not about if someone says something wrong, it's whether how much one is disturbed by it, if I understand what they mean with this sentence, then I should not pick out grammar just for the sake of grammar. There is a difference between a mistake that disturbs [it is still understandable] and on that destroys [the mistakes make the sentence incomprehensible]. (Teacher A)

Teacher B and C say that they do not have that many grammar lessons, when they have one it is usually when they have found something that all the students need to have a closer look at. Teacher B mentions that he has never worked with grammar the same way twice in a single course and he always thinks about the best way to do it with this particular class. In each group there is something special that they need to improve. Both teachers do a lot of work with process writing in different forms, with students either getting feedback from each other or the teachers. And both teachers also

mentioned that it says in the new syllabus that students should give each other response. Teacher C also takes anonymous extracts from students writing and has a look at them together in full-class. She lets them have a look at it and see what is wrong with it and then have a review session.

#### **4.7. Question 7**

*How do you supervise the students' work with grammar?*

Teacher A usually takes notes about typical errors, but not for students to work with. They have a lot of process writing. The students start with writing notes, then short sentences, after that a story and finally write a fine copy of it. They start working in groups, then in pairs and by themselves and finally hand it in to her. She always controls how the students sit in the classroom and they switch places all the time. This way they always talk to new people and learn from each other. She also likes to play with the different senses. They might sit in a ring on the floor or on the tables with the lights off and perhaps with a smell of oranges. She says that using all the five senses has helped students to remember classes very well.

Teacher B supervises when the students work with exercises, walking around. If an individual student has a problem he tries to guide him or her on the right way. If there are, on the other hand, several students who make the same mistakes, he goes to the front of the class and takes it up with all of them if he has seen many make this error. But he also plays it down by saying: " And this is a very common mistake...". This way the students have a very close connection to what they are doing at the moment.

Teacher C says when it come to speaking it depends on what level the student is at if she intervenes and corrects them. If they are strong students then she can do it, while with weaker students she does not, she prioritises that they dare to speak English at all, because that is often the challenge to make them comfortable with the language. It is better to let them work on fluency, and when they feel comfortable you might go in and point out things, and never in front of the group. Instead the students get feedback on an individual basis.

#### **4.8. Question 8**

*What role do you think grammar plays in the English classroom? (Part 1)*

Teacher A states that she thinks grammar is an obstacle for making the class interesting. "To learn a language is like being an architect. One does not need to know what kind of concrete to use. You need to look at the much bigger picture when you build a house. You look at the form, even though you might have to know something about the concrete." (Teacher A).

Teacher B says that it has a huge role. That knowing about grammatical rules can help us use the language correctly and to comprehend it. An utterance that is faulty, but comprehensible can be a little tricky for the receiver to take in. It also affects the impression of you, especially when you are abroad. He does not think any teacher at this school would consider that grammar has no place in the English classroom. He says it is good to try and model the authentic way that people learn their first language, but even when it comes to a level in our mother tongue we need to learn grammar. Awareness does not come naturally.

It irritates me that in the new syllabus they have gone so far to avoid using the word grammar. They speak of intelligibility, which does imply grammatical correctness. Structure could to some degree be about grammatical structure in perhaps texts. They use a lot of other terms, but if you look through them you can see that they talk about grammar. But we are not allowed to talk about it, however, if we have a look at the commentary material for the syllabus then it does say that grammar should be studied in meaningful contexts and not in isolation. [...] I think it's a notable idea from the National Agency of Education to express the desire to avoid grammar as something disconnected. (Teacher B)

Teacher C explains that to her it is the key to freedom. If you know the grammar of a language, you can reach so much higher. It gives you many opportunities to express yourself in different ways and opens up possibilities to read more advanced texts like novels. If you do not have the basic knowledge of a language, then it will also be difficult to perceive its input.

*(Part 2: How do you think grammar's role in English is similar to/different from grammar's role in other languages taught in school?)*

Teacher A thinks there is a huge difference. There is English everywhere and it can be considered as a second language to Swedes. However people do not use it much, besides on the computer. There needs to be more output orally to really learn the language.

If I would teach German I would not use pronouns or der, das, die, nothing. I would strip the sentence of all grammar and then start with body language, gestures, facial expressions, irony and emotion-icons for a year and see how they interpret it without context. Then you already have so much communication going on and grammar just pops in. German is *güte*, not *das* or *die*. You must see how the whole mirrors a culture, and not look at grammar. (Teacher A)

Teacher B on the other hand who does not oppose using grammar in teaching has something

different to say about the matter. He thinks the attitudes toward using grammar in modern languages are more lenient than they are to English grammar:

Even if the syllabuses for English and modern languages are synchronised and should be the same, I think grammar is being treated more step-motherly than in modern languages. Often in upper secondary school the students there are at level one to level three and there are still a lot of basic things to learn which require grammar teaching. While English is at step five, six and seven and that it is expected that they already should have all this knowledge from secondary school, but what about when you immediately see that many of them don't? The teaching would be pointless if you start three levels above their knowledge. I think that there is more tradition present in the modern languages. (Teacher B)

Since Teacher C also teaches Swedish, she connected the question with the Swedish subject:

With language as a whole, grammar has a very important role for the language's structure and as a Swedish teacher you can see that you are at a totally different level with your mother tongue in comparison with English and other modern languages. It's a much simpler form of grammar in English, and with this difference in level, how can you develop fluency? There are also mix-ups like who, how and which and witch that causes problems in comprehension. (Teacher C)

#### **4.9. Question 9**

*Do you think second language learning/foreign language learning happens the same way as first language learning? (This question was unknown to the teachers in beforehand)*

Teacher A takes up the perspective that we do not learn English just for the sake of it, we learn it so we can use it as a mean to learn other things. She says that it is not the same, "because we aim higher than just concentrating on the language. You need to use the language to learn something else. To learn a language is like learning how to think, culturally and from the language way of describing the world". Teacher B says that people desperately want to see language learning modelled after the way we learn our mother tongue:

It might seem like the natural way to learn a language, well, to some extent the best way to learn a language is to plunge into it. But it is not possible for us even in a society where English is constantly present. Then you have to use tools to ensure yourself that the students indeed have picked up the most important things, otherwise you expect that they have, but they haven't. I would say that it is a good model to work from, *however*, it cannot become a kind of dogma. One has to realise that this is about a second language, and to some extent a foreign language, and that it is a school subject. Teachers can only hope and encourage their students to plunge into the language on their spare time and be observant when they watch TV and TV-series. However, what

we can do here, in the classroom, is probably something that they do not do with English on their own time. What things can we bring up now, with a competent tutor in a little analytic and unnatural way? (Teacher B)

Teacher C says "No, Swedish is a mother tongue and completely different. You have it with you from your very first months and you learn intonation and a linguistic instinct. Second languages cannot be learnt on the same premises, even if you move abroad and live there for many years and might develop a linguistic instinct. However, it can never be the same as the mother tongue. A second language will always just be a second language, even to me who works with English and speaks it every day. We can never reach the same level as our first language. The language learning process is different, just look at bilingual students. They have two languages in a completely different way".



## **5. Discussion**

The aim of this essay was to investigate how English teachers at upper secondary school in Sweden use grammar in their teaching. What are their attitudes toward grammar and how does it affect their teaching? What method and theoretical perspectives affect their teaching? To examine this, qualitative interviews were conducted with three English teachers at a large upper secondary school in southern Sweden.

In this chapter the discussion of the results will be presented. I will start with presenting the results for (1) how English teachers use grammar in their teaching then (2) what methods and theoretical perspective affect their teaching followed by (3) what the teachers' attitudes toward grammar is. Then I will discuss (4) methodological considerations and the (5) pedagogical implications from these results.

### ***5.1. How do English teachers use grammar in their teaching?***

The results showed that Teacher B and C focus on explicit grammar teaching and let students work with grammar deductively. The teachers also have similar goals with their grammar teaching. Teacher B wants the students to have a basic (explicit) knowledge of grammar so they can use meta-language to discuss their own production and Teacher C uses it to raise their consciousness about grammar in their writing. She wants them to understand the process from learning about the rules to achieving the ultimate goal of never making the same mistakes again. Between each written assignment her students have to take a look at their previous work and become conscious about what kind of mistakes they usually make and try to learn from them. Teacher B always changes his methods of teaching to match the particular group of students' levels and needs. Neither of these teachers have "regular" grammar lessons weekly. They do have grammar lessons continually through the school year, when they feel that it is needed.

Teacher C lets her students correct their own texts, after she has written in the margin what kind of mistakes there are. She also takes out anonymous extracts with common mistakes from their papers which they later work with together in class. Many of the usual mistakes among students in English are, in her experience, when the English rules differ from Swedish. When many of the students have similar problems the teachers then has a run-through of the rules and let the students practice them. Teacher B also thinks it is important at the beginning of upper secondary school to get the students acquainted with their grammar book so they know how to use them on their own. He also has exercises where he tries to make the students reflect on how they learn grammar and pick up things

like a new use of a preposition; this way he makes them aware of their own learning progress. Teacher B makes them work in pairs or groups as often as possible so they can practice oral output. They also learn from each other when they discuss and help each other out. One reason why he chooses to let the students work with his own material is because he thinks the textbooks grammar exercises are dull and not beneficial. Both teachers also work with process writing.

Teacher A, on the other hand, has a completely different way of letting her students "work" with grammar. She only lets them work with grammar on the Internet, with games and quizzes, where she uses competitions and fun challenges to mask the fact that they are learning grammar. She has usually done this as a break from what they are doing in class and it has become so popular that the students would rather do another quiz than to have a break. Teacher A here uses informal teaching and implicit learning to make the students acquire grammar without even realising it. They do exercises to win a competition or to beat their best time at Battleship (a guessing game) while unconsciously learning irregular verbs. However, following recent research, without any explicit teaching it is hard for the students to develop any conscious or explicit knowledge about how the grammatical rules work.

## ***5.2. What methods and theoretical perspectives affect their teaching?***

It is clear that these teachers have different opinions of how English should be taught. Teacher A, who is also a native speaker of English, has a firm view that L2 should be learnt the same way as L1, that grammar is unnatural and has no place in the classroom, for the reason that children do not need grammar when they learn to speak their mother tongue. Her attitude to learning grammar and English, which go hand in hand with the direct method, has a clear impact on her way of teaching, and she has chosen to omit explicit grammar teaching. She even explains that if she would teach German to beginners she would do so without using any grammar at all. Her statements about her teaching agree with Krashen's theory that acquisition is superior to learning. Because she is a native speaker one could assume that she has a different bond with the English language than those with Swedish as their first language and that it might feel natural to her to teach English with the same method that she learnt it. She described the way she learnt Japanese when she did her masters in Japan and said that they still used old fashioned methods that focus on pronunciation and phonetics, like the audio-lingual method. Could it be that she disliked this interesting but "boring" (her words) formal way of learning languages that she decided to teach in a more informal "natural" way, as a counter reaction?

Teacher B thinks that it is admirable to try and make L2 learning resemble L1 learning, but in

reality it does not really work. However, Teacher B and C say that English is a second language and in some cases even a foreign language to Swedes and that we cannot pretend that students have the same possibilities in Sweden to plunge into the English language (which is a necessity for L2 acquisition) as if they had been in an English speaking country. Teacher B also brings up that we, sooner or later, also need grammar teaching in our own mother tongue. Teacher C says that there are different learning processes involved between learning L1 and L2 and that we can never reach the same level in L2 as we can in L1. This agrees with what scientists have said concerning the differences in success rate between L1 and L2 learning, and the fact that L1 grammar affects how we learn L2 grammar. Common mistakes that students make come from negative transfer from the mother tongue. In other words, the learner is transferring structures and rules from their L1 to L2 (Abrahamsson 2009: 236). Teacher C also works with consciousness raising in her students' written work.

Focus on form is something that both Teacher B and C find useful in their grammar teaching. They try to work with grammar in meaningful contexts when a problem arises in the classroom. However, Teacher B does not oppose also working with a focus on forms. He is critical to the fact that the National Agency of Education has stated in their commentary material for the English syllabus that grammar should not be taught in isolation. He argues that it can be useful in some contexts, so why should the syllabus explicitly say that teachers should not use it? He mentions that the syllabus usually does not say exactly how the teachers should carry out their teaching. He also does not like the fact that the word grammar has been omitted from the syllabus. Teacher B also says that it seems like we are trying to get rid of grammar prematurely. Even though he is positive to focusing on grammar in meaningful contexts, some might interpret the omission as acceptable to leave grammar out of their teaching. It is possible that Teacher B can be right, that people who are unsure of how to work with grammar can choose not to teach it at all. The new syllabus could, with this omission, reinforce the idea that the current communicative approach in teaching does not have room for "traditional" grammar teaching that many people already disliked.

There are elements from the communicative approach present in all the teachers' teaching, which is not surprising because the contemporary language syllabuses are created around this method. All teachers focus more on students developing fluency than uttering correct sentences, unlike the methods previous to the communicative approach. They all want their students to learn English so they will be able to use it in the "real" world and both Teacher A and B want students to see each other as partners in their learning and to understand that they can learn from each other. Teacher A also points out the importance of looking at the language culturally.

Teacher A describes her view of language learning quite differently from the others. She portrays the students as architects that should focus on the form of the building and not on what concrete to use. I have interpreted this statement to mean that the students should focus on using the language and not pay attention to the language's structure, its grammar. However, can we "build a house" without knowing that we have a firm structure to build on?

### ***5.3. What are the teacher's attitudes towards grammar?***

Here the views are split into two directions. Teacher B and C perceive learning grammar as a natural and important part of learning English and other languages. They portray it as the foundation to build further knowledge on. They talk about grammar with fond voices and summarise their views with the words like "fun", "beneficial" and "important". They also say that they have great respect for grammar and take it seriously. In their teaching grammar is always present in some way. Their affection has no doubt trickled down to affect how grammar is used in their teaching. Their conviction that grammar has a place in the language classroom can also come from their own educational tradition. Teacher B described his own time in school as having more focus on grammar, which he did not have a problem with because he liked it.

Teacher A, on the other hand, described her view of grammar as troublesome and boring, that it is unnatural and nobody likes it. She does not think that grammar has a place in language learning and does not put any focus on it in her teaching. However, for someone who thinks grammar is boring she has a very entertaining way of working with it.

### ***5.4. Methodological considerations***

Because of the limited number of interviewees it is not possible to make any generalisation from these results, however, I believe that this essay can give a fair idea of how English teachers in Sweden work with grammar. I did the interviews with three teachers from the same school, so the results might reflect how grammar is being taught at this particular upper secondary school in southern Sweden. But on the other hand, the methods of teaching grammar at this school were very different between Teacher A and Teacher B and C. The results might have come out differently if I had interviewed teachers at more different programs, in other school or in other cities in Sweden. However, these results are still of interest, because they represent how three different teachers work with grammar in their own way. The results showed that there were two main approaches and attitudes toward grammar amongst the teachers. The first one consisting of Teacher B and C and the other of Teacher A.

### ***5.5. Pedagogical implications***

English is gradually becoming more important in Sweden and the language's status is rapidly increasing, which puts even more stress on English as a school subject. The goal with the Swedish school system is to give all students an equal primary education. However, the students of the teachers I have interviewed will have different kinds of knowledge of English when they graduate from this upper secondary school. If Teacher A's students begin studying English at a higher level, which most of them probably will, they might have more trouble with English grammar than the other teachers' students who learned explicit knowledge of the rules.

It might be noteworthy for teachers to keep up with recent research, which has proven that students who receive formal teaching perform better, learn faster and can reach higher levels in English than those who do not. Knowing grammar can be useful, but it might be that students who have difficulties in English might find grammar even more confusing. Nevertheless, able students may benefit greatly from learning it. However, it is as Teacher B said, teachers have to meet students at their individual level, otherwise the teaching will be completely pointless if you start three steps above their knowledge.

The communicative approach does have room for grammar, and, as Teacher B says, the syllabus does imply that you need to have knowledge of grammar to achieve its goals. There are also a number of problems when it comes to teachers who believe that L1 learning equals L2 learning. Teacher B says that it is not possible in Sweden to acquire English in the same way we learn our mother tongue, and that teachers cannot count on all students picking up the essential knowledge on their own. This is in agreement with recent research.

Finally, I would like to pay attention to something that I did not expect to find. Both Teacher B and C made many connections between their teaching methods and the syllabus. However, it is interesting that all the teachers talked about and used different strategies to talk about grammar, but none of them used technical terminology for these concepts, like consciousness raising, focus on form/forms or the name from different historical methods when they referred to them. The language they used when they talked about grammar is an unexpected outcome, which could have been a research question for this essay.

Grammar's place in English teaching might not be clear from the English syllabus, and whether teachers use or do not use grammar in their teaching, I believe that most of them, unlike my fellow

teacher trainee student, know that they themselves have to know grammar, even if they do not want to teach it.

## References

### Books

- Abrahamsson, Niclas. 2009. *Andraspråksinläring*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles – An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Cajkler, Wasyl & Addelman, Ron. 2000. *The practice of foreign language teaching*. London: David Fulton Publishers
- Cook, Vivian. 2001. *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Holder Education
- Crystal, David. 2004. *Making Sense of Grammar*. Harlow: Personal Education
- Ellis, Nick (ed.). 1994. *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. London: Academic Press Limited
- Ellis, Rod. 2002. "The Place of Grammar Instruction in the Second and Foreign Language Curriculum" in *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Estling Vannestål, Maria. 2007. *A University Grammar of English- with a Swedish Perspective*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Hinkel, Eli & Fotos, Sandra. 2002. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Lundahl, Bo. 2012. *Engelsk språkdidaktik*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Ohlander, Sölve. 1999. "Grammatiken än en gång...-Språkpedagogikens "comeback kid" slår till igen" in *Målspråk och språkmål- Festskrift till Eie Ericsson*. Göteborg: Enheten för språk och litteratur, Göteborgs universitet
- Passer, Michael. 2009. *Psychology- The Science of Mind and Behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education
- Skolverket. 2001. *Språkboken*. Stockholm: Statens skolverk
- Tornberg, Ulrika. 2009. *Språkdidaktik*. Malmö: Gleerups Utbildning AB
- Trost, Jan. 2005. *Kvalitativa intervjuer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Trost, Jan. 2010. *Kvalitativa intervjuer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur

### Online source

- Graddol, David. 2000. *The Future o English?* The British Council  
([http://www.officiallanguages.gc.ca/docs/f/Future\\_of\\_English.pdf](http://www.officiallanguages.gc.ca/docs/f/Future_of_English.pdf)) 2012-12-04

Matin Bolivar, Siéwoué. 2011. (This is a summary of Rod Ellis (2006) “ Current Issues in the Teaching of grammar: An SLA Perspective”, in TESOL Quarterly, vol. 40, Num 1, online) (<http://www.scribd.com/doc/63877382/Current-Issues-in-the-Teaching-of-Grammar>) 2013-01-06

Skolverket. 2012. Ämnesplan Engelska ([http://www.skolverket.se/forskola-och-skola/gymnasieutbildning/amnes-och-laroplaner/eng?subjectCode=ENG&courseCode=ENGENG05#anchor\\_ENGENG05](http://www.skolverket.se/forskola-och-skola/gymnasieutbildning/amnes-och-laroplaner/eng?subjectCode=ENG&courseCode=ENGENG05#anchor_ENGENG05)) 2013-01-06

Council of Europe, Education and Languages, language policy: ([https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1\\_en.asp](https://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Cadre1_en.asp)) 2012-12-21



## **Appendix**

### ***I. Interviewees***

#### **Teacher A**

Sex: Female

Age: 52

Subjects: English (literature and language) and theatre

Years in occupation: 7

Year of teaching degree: Not finished yet, has two masters and working on her teachers degree

#### **Teacher B**

Sex: Male

Age: 39

Subjects: English (lector)

Years in occupation: 3,5 years

Year of teaching degree: Not finished yet, has a master's degree from 2001 and has a college pedagogical education from 2005.

#### **Teacher C**

Sex: Female

Age: 35

Subjects: English and Swedish

Years in occupation: 10

Year of teaching degree: 2003

### ***II. Question sheet***

#### **Intervjufrågor till C-uppsats**

Hejsan!

Till intervjun skulle jag vilja att du tar med några övningar/uppgifter som du brukar använda i din grammatikundervisning och kopior på två kommenterade elevuppsatser. Förutom att diskutera detta material kommer jag också ställa följande frågor:

1. *Om du skulle sammanfatta din syn på grammatik i ett ord, vilket skulle det vara?*

*Varför?*

2. *Vad har grammatik för betydelse för din undervisning?*

3. *Hur låter du eleverna jobba med grammatik? T.ex. enskilt, i grupp eller i helklass?*
4. *Vilket språk använder du när du förklarar grammatik? Varför?*
5. *Vad för grammatikövningar använder du dig av i undervisningen? Några exempel på övningar?*
6. *Hur kan ett vanligt grammatikmoment se ut?*
7. *Hur ser du över elevernas arbete med grammatik?*
8. *Vad anser du att grammatiken spelar för roll för engelskämnet?*  
*(Additional questions the teachers did not know of in beforehand:*
8. b) *Hur tror du grammatikens roll i engelskämnet liknar/skiljer sig från grammatikens roll i andra språkämnen i skolan?*
9. *Tänker du att andraspråksinlärning/främmandespråksinlärning sker på samma sätt som förstaspråksinlärning? )*

Även om du som intervjuperson kommer vara helt anonym skulle jag behöva lite information om dig som lärare:

Kön:

Ålder:

Ämneskombination:

År i yrket:

Året du tog lärarexamen: