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Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate the similarities/differences in the views on and practices of grammar teaching of a Swedish teacher of English (FL – Foreign Language) and a UK teacher of English (L1 – First Language). Furthermore, the study tries to explain how the differences found in the comparison can be connected to each country’s different steering documents and to the different teaching conditions involved in teaching English to L1 learners compared to FL learners. The two participating teachers were both interviewed and observed. The results of this study show that the teachers’ grammar practices are very similar since they include explicit formal instruction both inductively and deductively, but with a focus on the latter. These are typical ‘Focus on Form’ related practices even though both teachers want to achieve a ‘Focus on Form’ directed practice. Furthermore, both teachers use metalanguage in their teaching. The main difference between the teachers’ grammar approaches are the aims that they have with their teaching. The UK teacher aims at plain accuracy in her pupils’ written production whereas the Swedish teacher aims at developing all-round communicative abilities among her pupils. This is explained with the different accuracy-focus which each country’s steering documents hold.
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1. Introduction

As teachers we need to be clear about the extent and ways in which we consider grammar should be an integral part of language learning. This study examines these standpoints by investigating two teachers’ approaches to grammar teaching. What this study tries to pinpoint in more detail is how the teaching conditions of a teacher of native speakers versus the teaching conditions of a teacher of non-native speakers might lead to differences in their views on and practices of grammar. Therefore, this study compares a Swedish teaching context to a similar British context seen in relation to each country’s steering documents. In Sweden these documents are directed towards non-native speakers of English while the UK equivalents that are examined are directed towards native speakers. Henceforth, native speakers will be referred to as L1 (first language) learners and non-native speakers will be referred to as FL (foreign language) learners, even though the boundaries between what should be defined as an FL and an L2 (second language) are everything but sharp as we shall see below.

It is difficult to define whether Swedish learners of English in Sweden should be defined as FL learners or L2 learners. Saville-Troike defines an L1 as a “language that is acquired naturally in early childhood” (2006:188) and an L2 as generally referring to “any language that is acquired after the first language has been established” (2006:193). However, in addition, Saville-Troike narrows down the term L2 so that it includes only “additional language[s] which [are] learned within a context where [they are] societally dominant and needed for education, employment, and other basic purposes” (ibid). Therefore, the term FL (foreign language) will be used throughout this study to refer to non-native speakers of English, as it is defined as a “second language that is not widely used in the learners’ immediate social context, but rather one that might be […] studied as a curricular requirement or elective in school with no immediate or necessary practical application” (ibid:188). However, as can be seen from the definitions above, there are no sharp boundaries and there might be Swedish learners of English that should be defined as L2 learners as they will need English for ‘education’ and ‘employment’ as stated above.

The starting point of this study lies within a previous study with a similar focus, (Granlund, unpublished), carried out in 2009. However, that particular study focused on a Swedish teaching context. The strong connection between the syllabus and the teacher’s approach to grammar became very obvious when the first study was carried out and this made
me interested in examining the same connection in a UK context. Hence, the fact that each country puts different emphasis on grammar in their steering documents for the subject English and the consequences this has on teachers’ different approaches to grammar is an interesting and important aspect in this study.

1.2 Aim, research questions and scope

The aim of the present study is to investigate the ways in which two teachers’ grammar teaching approaches are affected by the different teaching conditions that an L1 class compared to an FL class of English language learners implicates. In the present study, it is also relevant to connect each teacher’s approach to grammar to the country-specific steering documents for the English language. This means that each teacher’s view on grammar will be put in relation to their country’s specific steering documents: the syllabus for English language in the Swedish compulsory education system and the equivalents for the English language in the UK elementary school system. The questions to be answered are therefore the following:

- What similarities and differences are there in the views on and practices of grammar teaching of a Swedish teacher of English (FL) and a UK teacher of English (L1)?
- How can the differences, if any, found in the comparison between the two, be connected to each country’s different steering documents and extensionally to the different teaching conditions involved in teaching English to L1 learners compared to FL learners?

The two interviewed teachers’ approaches to grammar can of course not be claimed to be representative of all teachers following the Swedish or the English syllabus for the English language and this essay has no intention whatsoever to be applicable to teachers as a group.

2. Background

2.1 Definitions of grammar and motivations for teaching grammar

Ericsson defines grammar as “an attempt to describe the language – without consideration of the functions of the language. Traditionally grammar has been divided into accidence (ie. formlära) and syntax” (1989:40, my translation). Ericsson describes syntax as “the study of clause-structure” and defines it as “the way we combine words to make sentences” (1989:40,
my translations). Accidence is also called morphology and Ericsson includes the knowledge about word-classes, word-formation and word inflection in the term. According to Nilsson (in Brodow et al, 2000:11) a grammar definition, which includes the naming of components such as the ones Ericsson mentions, should be considered a ‘traditional grammar’. Nilsson (in Brodow et al, 2000:21) distinguishes two main arguments for including grammar in language teaching: the argument of foreign languages and the meta-language argument. The first one can be described as follows: we learn a foreign language better and more easily if we are familiar with grammar. As for the second one, the meta-language argument, we need a language to describe our language so that we are able to talk about it. Furthermore, Teleman (in Brodow et al, 2000:19) argues that knowledge about grammar is of great value and an asset when writing a text.

2.2 Language acquisition/learning, the monitor function and language immersion

Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989:118-119) distinguishes language acquisition and language learning from each other. The first of the two has to do with the subconscious acquisition of a language in its natural surroundings while the second one has to do with the conscious type of learning that takes place for example in a school context in a country where the target language does not surround the learner on a daily basis. The fact that Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989) sets up so clear boundaries between the process of acquisition and the process of learning has been criticized by McLaughlin (in Ericsson, 1989:122) who does not consider the terms to have such sharp boundaries. For instance, acquisition might take place in a language classroom by means of language immersion. Scrivener (2005:15) defines language immersion as the process in which learners “pick up’ language” by being surrounded by it to the largest extent possible. In an FL classroom this can be obtained by using CDs and cassettes with recorded target language speech, for example.

Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989:119) connects the two terms ‘acquisition’ and ‘learning’ by introducing the hypothesis of a ‘monitor’. What has been taught through acquisition can be overviewed and monitored by what has been taught through learning. This means that explicit grammar rules can be used to correct the language that will be or has been acquired and produced. The monitor cannot be used at the same time as the person is speaking and only “consciously learnt rules” are “available for the monitor” (1989:119, my translation). Knowledge of grammatical rules is therefore crucial for the monitor to work. Yet, to what extent acquired language is monitored is highly individual.
As stated above, Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989:119) connects the two terms ‘acquisition’ and ‘learning’ with his hypothesis of the ‘monitor’. In addition to this, Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989:120) suggests an intense immersion of the target language to stimulate the more unaware acquisition process. In connection to this, Ericsson (1989:273) adds that in order for language immersion to work, the input needs to be made visible to the pupils by the teacher in a structured way, so that the pupils know what they learn.

2.3 Deductive/inductive explicit formal instruction versus implicit grammar teaching

Cadierno defines formal instruction as “any attempt by teachers to intervene directly in the process of inter-language construction by providing samples of specific features for learning” (1995:179). A study carried out by Winitz (1996:32) suggests that the pupils’ ability to “judge the grammaticality of sentences” is strongly connected to what type of language instruction they meet in the classroom and he argues in favor of a more implicit grammar teaching approach (1996:40-42). Winitz states that implicit grammar teaching methods are methods in which the learner herself reaches an understanding of grammatical structures through exposure to the target language (1996:32). On the contrary, explicit grammar teaching methods are methods in which the grammatical rule is uttered explicitly (ibid.) Moreover, explicit grammar teaching methods can be divided into inductive and deductive methods. The inductive method refers to grammar teaching that takes its starting-point in written or spoken texts only, moving towards a rule being derived (see Ericsson, 1989:271-273; Harmer, 2007:207), while the deductive method refers to grammar teaching that takes its starting-point in the rule, drudging the rule until the learner is “ready” to write a text (Ericsson, ibid; Harmer, 2007:203.). Brodow states that the teaching of grammar should be inductive “so that the pupils themselves can make observations of the language and systematize these observations on their own, with the teacher helping them only to a small extent” (Brodow et al, 2000:130, my translation).

The deductive method is the one that has been used in traditional grammar studies throughout history (Nilsson in Brodow et al, 2000:11ff). One method that can be seen as strictly deductive and traditional is Ur’s (1991:19-20) concept of skill learning as consisting of three important stages: verbalisation, automatisation and autonomy. At the first stage, the skill to be learnt is demonstrated and explained by the teacher. The pupils perceive the message and try to understand it. At the next stage, the learners are given the chance to
automatize the skill that has been verbalized, by doing exercises that are relevant for the skill that is being focused on. In the last stage, the learners use the skill in their own production.

Just like Winitz (see above) Krashen (in Ericsson, 1989:118-119) regards implicit grammar teaching methods to be more central than explicit ones in language learning, but he sees that grammatical rules that are made explicit may have a monitoring effect on the language input that the pupils are exposed to. However, other researchers such as Burgess and Etherington (2002) are of the opposite view. They conclude that most researchers today would agree on the fact that grammar explicitness is necessary in FL/L2 learning, but they are aware that the degree of explicitness is still a matter of discussion and further research (2002:433). Burgess and Etherington (2002:435ff) have studied teacher attitudes to grammar in FL learning and found that the participating teachers regarded grammar teaching as valuable in their teaching and that the majority of them followed a ‘Focus on Form’ approach to grammar. The latter is a grammar teaching approach, presented by Long in 1991, in which meaning triggers form discussions (Burgess & Etherington, 2002:434). In other words, when focusing on meaning in the language lesson, form-related issues are dealt with only when these types of questions emerge. Two other terms, related to the same theory by Long are ‘Focus on FormS’ and ‘Focus on Meaning’. The former one describes a teaching context in which language form is focused on instead of meaning, while the latter one focuses on meaning instead of form (Burgess & Etherington, 2002:434).

2.4 Grammatical mistakes

Based on a framework devised by Julian Edge regarding the categorization of grammatical mistakes, Harmer (2007:137f) divides grammatical mistakes into three subcategories. Two of them will be presented here: ‘slips’ and ‘errors’. When pupils make a ‘slip’ they usually understand that they made a mistake and are therefore able to correct themselves. ‘Errors’ on the other hand need correction and explanation since pupils do not have the language knowledge needed to correct these types of mistakes yet. Furthermore, ‘errors’ can be caused by two factors: L1 interference and as part of language development. In errors caused by L1 interference, the pupils’ knowledge of the framework in which their own language is used, causes problems in their L2 or FL production when unfamiliar structures appear in the sense that the pupils use the familiar structure from their L1. On the contrary, developmental errors are produced by all language acquirers and learners in a natural language proficiency process (ibid). However, since this study does not include any data on pupils’ language production,
their grammatical mistakes will not be analyzed henceforth in detail to distinguish the subcategories above, but instead be referred to as grammatical mistakes throughout the text.

Ur (1991:86) argues that grammatical mistakes can be divided into two categories: the ones that do not disturb the communication and the ones that do. For instance, when a pupil uses the present tense instead of the past tense when describing what was done yesterday, the pupil has made a mistake that disturbs the communication by leading to misunderstandings. However, when a pupil forgets to put the ‘s’ on a verb in the present tense when the subject is in the third person singular (a concord mistake), the message comes across anyway and the communication is not disturbed in the same way as in the previous example.

Brodow thinks that a grammar education that has the purpose of developing pupils’ language proficiency needs to take its starting-point in the pupils’ own text-production (2000:40-44). He states that the traditional school-grammar that is based on grammar chapters in workbooks is simply not enough when grammatical mistakes made by the pupils are being analyzed (2000:44). The constructed sentences that the traditional school-grammar delivers are not functional and language education needs to be functional (2000:44).

2.5 Communicative competence and the importance of a social context

Ericsson states that “the development of correct speech that is well adapted to its purpose is a social process. That is why the social context is important to language development” (1989:61, my translation). This is in line with Brown’s (2007:219) definition of communicative competence as the “aspect of our competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts”. Brodow (Brodow et al, 2000:45-46) claims that activities that aim towards developing pupils’ language skills, both in writing and in speech, need to be interactive in the sense that pupils produce texts in meaningful contexts where they are communicating with someone in an authentic way. The content that is focused on in communication, written and verbal, should be produced by the pupils themselves (Ericsson 1989:61, Brodow in Brodow et al, 2000:40).

2.6 Teachers’ approaches to grammar in language teaching

Borg (1999) argues that more research is needed on “teacher cognition – the store of beliefs, knowledge, assumptions, theories, and attitudes about all aspects of their work which teachers hold and which have a powerful impact on teachers’ classroom practices” (1999:19). His own
study offers an insight into these ‘teacher cognitions’ and he states that in relation to grammar teaching, the following aspects are processed by the teacher in order to form their methods:

- whether to conduct formal instruction at all,
- what language points to focus on,
- how to structure grammar lessons,
- how to present and/or analyse grammar,
- how metalinguistically explicit to be,
- what kind of grammar practice activities to utilize,
- how to deal with students’ grammatical errors

(Borg, 1999:25)

The same study (Borg, 1999:27) shows that teachers can have a view on which method, inductive or deductive, that is most appropriate to use in their teaching, but that the actual teaching conditions in the classroom can be what decide which method they are using.

This tension between teachers’ peripheral and core beliefs is explained by Phipps and Borg (2009:380-390). They state that “there is ample evidence that teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning […] are […] not always reflected in what teachers do in the classroom” (2009:381). They explain peripheral beliefs of how to best teach and learn language as the theoretical approaches that teachers’ want to align to, while the core beliefs of how to teach and learn languages include “a more generic set of beliefs about learning” (2009:380) as for example: students’ expectation and motivation, classroom management and test requirements etc. (2009:381-387). One area in which these tensions appeared, and which is described in Phipps’ and Borg’s own study, was when the teachers believed in “inductive and contextualised presentation of grammar […] and oral group-work” (2009:383) but found themselves teaching deductively and de-contextualised as well as using whole-class dialogues as oral practice. This happened because they thought that the learners did not understand that they were learning grammar otherwise, and because they needed activities that had a monitoring function as well as a class-management function (2009:385-386).

Moreover, teachers’ own security or insecurity about grammar plays a role in whether they decide to include it explicitly in their teaching or not (Borg, 1999:27). Another factor that contributes to which form the grammar teaching takes is the teachers’ own schooling, both in their own language studies and in their teacher education (Borg, 1999:27; Phipps & Borg, 2009:381). Consequently, Borg states (1999:27), if teachers have found a more traditional grammar teaching proficient for their own language learning, they are more likely to use such methods themselves and vice versa. Whatever approach has been emphasized in their teacher
education, most teachers modify their grammar teaching after some years in the profession so that it suits the conditions and context they work in (Borg, 1999:25-27).

2.7 The Swedish context

The Swedish syllabus states that the subject English “aims at developing an all-round communicative ability” (Syllabuses for the compulsory school, 2009:11) Grammar is only mentioned explicitly once in the syllabus:

The different competencies involved in all-round communicative skills have their counterparts in the structure of the subject. Amongst these is the ability to master a language’s form, i.e. its vocabulary, phraseology, pronunciation, spelling and grammar. Competence is also developed in forming linguistically coherent utterances, which in terms of contents and form are increasingly adapted to the situation and audience. (Syllabuses for the compulsory school, 2009:12, my italicizing)

However, grammar is mentioned more implicitly on several occasions in the syllabus. For instance, one of the goals to aim for is that the pupils “develop their ability to analyse, work with and improve their language in the direction of greater variation and accuracy (ie. säkerhet, my comment)” (2009:12). In the part of the syllabus that deals with the assessment of the pupil’s ability to write in English, grammar can also be deduced, as it states that the assessment is partly focused on “clarity and articulate plainness as well as the pupil’s ability to connect clauses and sentences” (Skolverket, 2000, my translation). However, the only grading-level where language correctness is mentioned as a grading criterion is the highest grade, ‘MVG’ (Pass with particular distinction). The fact that grammar should not be dealt with separately may be interpreted from the following statement: ”English should no more than other languages be divided up into separate parts to be learnt in a pre-determined sequence.” (Skolverket, 2000).

The curriculum for the compulsory School System, the Pre-School Class and the Leisure-time Centre (2000) does not mention grammar at all. Instead, it has the same focus as the syllabus, emphasizing the importance of the pupils’ ability to communicate. To “learn to communicate in foreign languages” (2000:9) is mentioned as one of the goals to strive for and the ability to “communicate in speech and writing in English” (2000:10) is held in the curriculum as one of the goals to be attained.

Ur (1996:21-22) emphasizes the importance of validity, in the sense that everything that goes on in the classroom needs to be valid in relation to the syllabus. For example, a learning-
sequence in which the teacher is doing all the talking is not valid in relation to a syllabus that has as its main focus to develop the learners’ ‘all-round communicative skill[s]’.

2.8 The UK context

The National Curriculum in the UK is divided into four different Key Stages (Qualification and Curriculum Development Agency, 2010). The last two Key Stages (3 & 4) are followed in Secondary Education and are relevant for the classes that the British teacher in the study was teaching when she was observed (ibid). In all Key Stages there are four key concepts that are essential to “promote students’ progress in speaking and listening, reading and writing” (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007:84). One of these concepts are ‘competence’, which includes “Expressing complex ideas and information clearly, precisely and accurately in spoken and written communication” as well as “Demonstrating a secure understanding of the conventions of written language, including grammar, spelling and punctuation” (ibid, my italicizing). The pupils are also required to learn what is counted as three different Key Processes (1. Speaking and Listening, 2. Reading and 3. Writing) (ibid:86ff). When it comes to Speaking, pupils need to be “confident and fluent [in their] use of standard English” (ibid). The following can be read about standard English:

> When teaching standard English, it is helpful to bear in mind the most common non-standard usages in the UK for subject-verb agreement (*they was*), formations of past tense (*have fell, I done*), formation of negatives (*I ain’t*), formation of adverbs (*come quick*), use of demonstrative pronouns (*them books*), use of pronouns (*me and him went*), use of prepositions (*out the door*).

> (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007:86)

As for reading, interpreting meaning construction within sentences includes “recognising the effect of different connectives” as well as “identifying how phrases and clauses build relevant detail and information” (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007:88). It is also stated that the pupils should be able to analyze literature with focus on form (ibid:89).

In the last Key Process, Writing, one section is spent on ‘Technical accuracy’. Here, it is stated that students “should be able to use the grammatical features of written standard English accurately to structure a wide range of sentence types for particular purposes and effect” (ibid:90). Finally, the teachers are told to structure their teaching so that it ranges over “the differences between spoken and written language in terms of vocabulary, structure and grammar” as well as “the importance of sentence grammar and whole-text cohesion and their impact in writing” (ibid:96). The GCSE exams (General Certificate of Secondary Education,
GCSE Criteria for English, 2001 & GCSE Criteria for English Literature, 2001) correspond to the fourth Key Stage and are held when the pupils are 15 years old. Hence, the assessment objectives in the GCSEs are in line with what has been stated above about speaking, listening, reading and writing.

3. Material and method

3.1 Material - The target schools and the interviewees

In this study two teachers have been interviewed and observed. The data that is analyzed in this study is therefore the interview answers and the notes taken during the observations in each teacher’s classes. One of the teachers teaches English to FL learners in Sweden at a secondary school while the other one teaches English mainly to L1 learners at a UK secondary school, as well as to some FL learners. However, given that the FL learners in Laurens’s classes were in minority (approximately 2 per class) the observed lessons in these classes were not specifically adapted to these learners but to the L1 learners instead. To be able to guarantee the interviewees anonymity they were given other names in this study. Thus, the Swedish teacher of English is referred to as Maria and the English teacher of English is called Lauren. Maria has worked as a teacher of English and Swedish for more than thirty years while Lauren has been a teacher of English for eighteen years. In the English subject in the UK both English literature and English language are included. This clear distinction is not made in Sweden.

The classes that have been observed when Lauren has been teaching consist of pupils in the age-range of 13-17, while Maria’s pupils are in the ages 13-16 (since some pupils turn 16 before they leave secondary school in Sweden). Maria teaches two classes with pupils in grade seven, two with pupils in grade eight and two with pupils in grade nine, in parallel, which has to be mentioned here so that the observation notes will not appear confusing to the reader (cf. Appendix 3).

Maria’s school is a lower-secondary school in Sweden. There are about 590 pupils at this public-school and they are in the age range of 13 to 15. The average number of pupils in a class at Maria’s working place is about 26. Lauren’s school is a private school in England to which pupils come when they are 11 years old. Occasionally, pupils can start here at the age of 16 as long as they can show good results on their GCSEs together with a satisfactory Headmaster’s reference. This school is a secondary school covering both lower and upper
levels, which means that the pupils can continue their studies here until the age of 18. The average number of pupils in Lauren’s classrooms is about 14-18.

3.2 Method

The methods that have been used in this study are qualitative, considering the fact that:

Qualitative research can be defined as a particular orientation within the human and social sciences that ‘fundamentally depends on watching people in their own territory and interacting with them in their own language, on their own terms (Kirk and Miller 1986:9). As such, it is committed to research ‘in the field’, i.e. observing in a school classroom or interviewing a colleague, and its methods of collecting data and analysing data reflect this.

(Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995:186)

The interviews and the observations in this study are thus qualitative in nature. Furthermore, the interviews aim “at obtaining nuanced descriptions from the different qualitative aspects of the interviewee’s life world [working] with words and not with numbers” (Kvale, 1996:32). The qualitative interview “is a conversation that has a structure and a purpose” (ibid:6) and in which the two participants, the interviewer and the interviewee, “interchange […] views […] about a theme of mutual interest” (ibid:2).

3.2.1 The interviews

Both the interview with Maria (the teacher working in Sweden) and the interview with Lauren (the teacher working in England) took place on two different occasions. With Lauren it was a matter of difficulties in finding a longer gap in her busy schedule. As for Maria’s interview, it was necessary to arrange a complimentary meeting where some additional questions could be asked. Lauren’s two interview-occasions took place in the spring of 2010, while the first interview with Maria was held in the autumn of 2009 and the last one in the spring of 2010. Lauren’s interview took about three hours in total, whereas the interview with Maria (the first one and the additional one) took about four hours.

The questions in the interviews were mostly open-ended. At some points in the interviews, questions with a more closed form (for example: “Should the teacher call the grammatical structures by their proper grammatical name?”) were used. This was done to avoid questions to which an answer is already presupposed or implied (for example: Why should the teacher call the grammatical structures by their proper grammatical name?). After the “Yes” or “No” answer that the more closed (but less presupposing) question triggered, follow-up questions
(for instance, “Why/Why not?”) were asked to examine the teacher’s approach in more depth. All interview questions in this study can be found in Appendix 1 and 2.

The interview technique used in this study is similar to what Hitchcock and Hughes refer to as an unstructured interview (1995:162ff). The interviews were based on questions that I had prepared before the interviews took place, but in both interviews we deviated from them on several occasions so the interviews took the shape of conversations to a large extent. This is important to point out, since my input in the conversations might have affected the teachers’ answers to some extent. However, as much as possible, I tried to avoid giving my view on the subject before the interviewed teachers had answered the questions. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:163) points out that an unstructured interview often takes the shape of a conversation and that it is impossible to totally avoid “that the presence of the researcher will have some kind of influence on the finds or data” (1995:164). They add that “The major problem here surrounds the extent to which the interviewer ‘leads on’ or influences the respondents’ responses” (1995:164) and as mentioned before, I tried to avoid to influence my interviewees as much as I possibly could in the interviews.

During each interview notes were taken. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:171) see that note-taking can have the disadvantage of making the interview context less relaxed and more formal, but that it at the same time is an acknowledged way of recording the interview (1995:170). Both note-taking and what Hitchcock and Hughes refer to as a ‘write up’ of the interview (1995:170) were used as recording methods of the interviews in this study. The ‘write ups’ were carried out on the computer the same day as the interviews had taken place to guarantee that the content was retold as accurately as possible. Likewise, the interviews were sent to the interviewees to be scrutinized in order to make sure that the lessons were retold as truthfully as possible. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:182) regards this method as a way to reach validity in the research interview by offering “the subject the opportunity of adding further information and the researcher the opportunity of checking on what data have been collected.”

In this study the interviews form the basis of reasoning, reflection and discussion in relation to literature written on this subject.

3.2.2 The classroom observations

In addition to the interviews, observations were made in both teachers’ classrooms. This gives the study a relevant and important aspect of grammar in practice and adds an opportunity to
analyze how the teachers’ different grammar approaches are actually being practiced in their classrooms. As with the interviews, notes were taken during the observations and the ‘write ups’ were carried out on the computer as soon as possible the same day. The notes from the observations can be found in Appendices 3 and 4.

The observations were also scrutinized by the interviewees to make sure that they were accurately retold. However, one must take into account that what the observer sees is not always identical with what the informant recognizes, reacts on and remembers in a classroom situation (or in any situation) and it must also “be remembered that the notes and records of observations have been lifted from a particular context and are only a partial record” (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995:132). The interviews are of great importance in adding important data to the ‘partial records’ that the observations constitute. Hitchcock and Hughes also conclude that “More often than not these field notes will be supplemented by other data collected by the teacher [here: researcher]” (1995:132).

3.3 Problems and limitations

Some questions asked in the interviews will not be presented in this study. One reason for why some of the questions will not be presented here is that some of them (Question 5 and 6) are more pupil-centred than teacher-centred, which makes them less relevant in this teacher-focused case study. Question 16 will not be taken into consideration here either, since it has a slightly irrelevant focus for this study as well, dealing with the implications that the diversity of pupils’ knowledge levels in one and the same class has on the teaching. Finally, questions 4 and 17 will not be dealt with explicitly, since the answers to these questions are covered to a large extent in the other interview questions.

The interviews were held in different languages, in Swedish with Maria and in English with Lauren. These languages were both their native tongues. With Lauren there were no options but to hold the interview in English since she is from Great Britain and English was the only language shared by the interviewer and the interviewee. With Maria, however, Swedish as the interview language was an alternative to English since both she and the interviewer (I) have Swedish as our mother tongue. To avoid misunderstandings and to make the interviewee (Maria) more comfortable in the interview situation, Swedish was chosen as the interview language. This is important to mention since the fact that one of the interviews was held in the interviewer’s native tongue might mean that that specific interview led to an easier understanding between the interviewee and the interviewer.
The fact that this study only presents two teachers’ view on grammar can be seen as a limitation. Therefore, it needs to be mentioned here that due to a short time limit and the fact that many teachers have a very busy schedule, it was difficult to get more teachers to participate in this study. It cannot be emphasized enough that this study is to be seen as a case study and that the results presented below cannot be applied to English teachers in general. The view on grammar that Maria has is therefore not representative for all teachers teaching FL learners of English, and in the same way Lauren’s grammar view should not be seen as an example of how teachers of L1 learners of English look at grammar in general.

One problem with the type of qualitative data that is gathered from interviews and observations is that it implies an interpretation, which can cause a lack of accuracy and objectivity. As mentioned previously, to avoid this, both the interview notes and the write-ups from the observations were scrutinized by the interviewees.

4. Interview results

This section presents the content of both interviews. It is important to remember that these results are not applicable on teachers as a group, but only pertain to this particular case-study. The interviewees’ answers have been ordered thematically to make their views on grammar easier to compare. This means that here, the interview questions (see Appendix 1 and 2) do not necessarily appear in the order in which they were asked during the interview.

4.1 Definition of the term grammar (Question 2 in Appendices 1 & 2)

Maria defines grammar as the skeleton of language. She makes this comparison to expose how language would be nothing without its grammar. However, the skeleton cannot move alone. It must be an integrated part of the body to move, and the same reasoning can be applied to the relation between the words ‘grammar’ and ‘language’. Grammar is an integral part of language, but fulfills no function on its own, outside a context. Other parts are needed in a language as well. In order to make the body (read ‘language’) move, you need muscles and Maria compares the muscles to the vocabulary needed to be able to communicate.

Lauren defines grammar as “the nuts and bolts of how language works”. She regards grammar as dealing with the parts of a language and with what those parts are called, even though she emphasizes that the grammatical names of the parts are not as relevant as describing how the parts are actually used. Word classes and verb tenses are some of the parts
which she mentions. Lauren also considers grammar to include how we form sentences and why sentences can be formed in some ways but not in other ways. She thinks that dealing with the why question is part of grammar but she emphasizes the how question more. Lauren includes punctuation in the term grammar. She explains that in order to learn where to punctuate correctly you need to know some grammatical terminology, namely subject, verb and object. That is, if you do not have a special feeling automatically about when to do so. She draws the line for what she includes in grammar at punctuation level. For instance, she does not include paragraphing in her grammar view.

4.2 The purpose and function of teaching grammar (Question 3 in Appendices 1 & 2)

Maria does not think that a meta-language is necessary to develop a good communicative skill, but she can see that the actual teaching of grammar is facilitated by knowing the names of different structures and parts of the language. The most important thing, though, is to understand how to use the structures. To know why you use the structures that way is less important and to be able to talk about the structure is not necessary at all, according to Maria. The meta-language is not a goal in itself but can be a way to reach the goal: the understanding of how the structure is used. Maria has noticed that many pupils who are exposed to the more traditional grammar education are good at dealing with simplified grammatical rules taken out of a context but incapable of translating this grammatical knowledge into something useful when writing a text on their own. To get around this problem, Maria thinks that language learning steered towards acquisition is necessary. By this, she claims that the pupils need to be substantially immersed in the foreign language.

Lauren’s main aim with teaching grammar is for her pupils to leave school being able to write accurately. Her second aim is that her pupils are able to write in an interesting way. She also sees that grammar teaching can help pupils understand that there is a difference between spoken and written discourse. During her teacher training, Lauren experienced that the predominant view on grammar and its role in language, and especially in writing, at that time was that if the pupils got the chance to write imaginatively, accuracy would come automatically, by its own force. Lauren does not agree with this view. She considers it to be the teacher’s responsibility to give the pupils the rules they need in order to improve their writing. She considers her lessons on full-stops and punctuation in general to be “absolutely essential” (cf. Observation 4 & 10, Appendix 4). She holds them every year because she cannot let her pupils go on in the educational system without mastering that crucial part of
writing, she says. When her pupils ask her why they have to know certain grammatical rules and stick to them in their writing, Lauren makes a comparison with football. She says that just like in football there are rules in writing and that if you practice one of these things without knowing the rules, you can look dumb. However, she adds that “It [grammar] is not there in its own right; it serves the purpose of helping the pupils become more accurate”. If grammar does not fill that function it only becomes ‘labeling’.

4.3 Presenting a new grammatical rule (Question 8a, 8b & 8c in Appendices 1 & 2)

If Maria presents a totally new grammatical rule she deals with the cardinal rule at an early stage and the exceptions at a later stage. If not so, her experience is that the learners will become confused and that their language development will not continue as effectively as it could have done. The presentation of a grammatical rule is done in many ways by Maria. However, she can see that she has a tendency to let the pupils read a text in their textbooks first, and then, make them aware of one grammatical structure seen in the text by talking about that particular structure explicitly. Maria also lets her pupils translate the text so that a comparison to Swedish can be made and after this she lets the pupils work in their workbooks with exercises that are related to the text. Finally, Maria tries to get the pupils to produce texts of their own including the grammatical rule that has just been dealt with. She considers text-production to be a good way of understanding that the rule being made explicit in class, is of importance and can be useful when writing (or communicating by other means). She does not always control and regulate the text-writing, so that it takes a form that practices the grammatical rule that was presented, but instead lets the pupils write a text that is free in its content and form. She thinks that the type of learning, which is not directed totally by a teacher or a text-/workbook is more motivating and fun for the pupils.

Maria thinks that a combination of ‘text-to-rule ‘and ‘rule-to-text’ is what should be applied in the classroom. Whatever method is chosen, she thinks that grammar education needs to be repetitive, so that the structure to be learnt finally sticks. Even though Maria prefers to work with grammar in a more implicit way, achieving it through immersion, she is aware of the fact that all pupils learn differently and that some of them need to have grammatical rules explained in a more explicit way. She thinks that education that only provides one way of learning is bad education and for the sake of the pupils she varies her methods so that she sometimes uses a more traditional and deductive grammar education.
Lauren explains that most of her grammar lessons dealing with the usage of full-stops, commas and semi-colons are structured as follows:

1. **Introduction/Motivation part**, in which Lauren tries to motivate the pupils to learn the content. She finds the GCSEs very motivating for the pupils, since the fact that the exams lead to a personal certificate tends to make the pupils aim for the higher grades.

2. **Visual presentation**: One way for Lauren to visualize grammatical content is to use the smartboard. For example, she shows different constituent parts of a sentence on the smartboard and makes the pupils move them around in order to give the pupils a sense that language consists of different parts that can be moved about (cf Observation 10 & 4, Appendix 4). Lauren says that the fact that she starts her grammar presentations orally and visually is an advantage for the dyslectic pupils, since she thinks listening is more their style. Another advantage of starting the explanation orally is that she can see whether her pupils have understood the content or not.

3. **Writing rules down**, but using an everyday language instead of a metalanguage (cf. Observation 4, Appendix 4). She says that she wants the focus to lie on the practice part of the exercise instead of a lot of new difficult and unfamiliar grammatical terms. Lauren claims that the only metalanguage words that she considers that she needs in class as her tools are ‘subject’, ‘verb’ and ‘object’. She has a couple of small figures to visually illustrate the function of a subject, a verb and an object in a sentence (cf. Observation 10, Appendix 4).

4. **Practice part**: Lauren makes her pupils practice the grammatical structure for instance by writing sentences that include the structure.

5. **Using the grammatical rule in a wider context**: If, for instance, the correct way of using commas has been in focus, larger paragraphs of text including the rule in practice are written by the pupils.

Lauren thinks that there is a big difference between teaching L1 and FL learners when it comes to what role a metalanguage can play in grammar teaching and in the presentation of new rules. She has experienced that FL learners are much more familiar with grammatical terms than L1 learners. According to Lauren, the explanation to this is that FL learners need their grammar to be able to learn their second language, in a way that L1 learners would never need to know grammar.

Lauren would like to use more eliciting methods (in which she would try to have the pupils come up with the correct usage of a grammatical structure) in her grammar teaching.
However, she thinks that eliciting suits different teaching situations and that it might not always be ideal in grammar teaching. She is willing to try it out a little bit more though, because she knows that, as she puts it, “the theory that is popular at the moment” says that pupils remember the taught content better with such a method. However, her pupils tend to regard her attempts to elicit knowledge from them as a guessing game and Lauren says that she ends up with a range of different answers covering things that are not relevant to the question at all. This is the reason to why she is not using grammar eliciting that much. It is a waste of time having the pupils guessing when she knows that it could be much quicker if she gave them the answer directly.

4.4 The most efficient way to teach grammar according to the teachers (Questions 14 & 9 in Appendices 1 & 2)

Maria is convinced that the best way to learn grammar is to integrate it in communication (speaking, writing texts etc.) She sees this as the best way to develop ‘all-round communicative skill[s]’ and she emphasizes that grammar is everywhere in language learning; it is present in every utterance her pupils make when they speak to each other in smaller groups, and therefore, they are practicing grammar when they practice to speak English in order to develop their all-round communicative skills. One method that Maria thinks could be used more in her teaching than what is done today, is the one where a textual analysis is made together in the whole class but led by the teacher. Here, grammatical structures can be commented on so that pupils become aware of how these structures function in a text. The reason why she does not use this method as much is because she thinks that it contradicts the focus of the syllabus: to learn to communicate by communicating.

Lauren thinks that the most efficient way to teach grammar is to find a situation in which the pupils will actually have to use the language point to be taught. For instance, when Lauren wants to teach her pupils to include the modal verbs could and would in their essays for the GCSEs, she creates exercises and lessons that make the pupils reflect on and use sentences starting with If, she says (cf. Observation 8, Appendix 4). Moreover, Lauren thinks that her way of presenting grammatical structures (see 4.3 Presenting a new grammatical rule, p. 15ff) is the most efficient way to teach grammar.
4.5 Calling grammatical structures by their proper grammatical names (Question 8d in Appendices 1 & 2)

Maria is against lessons in which grammatical metalanguage is dealt with for its own sake and purpose and thinks that the most important thing is for the pupils to understand how the structures are meant to be used. She wants to incorporate the learning of metalanguage into the ordinary communicative activities in her classroom. However, once in a while, a theoretical explanation that is more thorough is needed, but these explanations still have to be linked to the regular teaching sequences. She mentions one example of a grammatical structure in which she considers it useful for the pupils to know some metalanguage: putting an ‘s’ on verbs appearing after third person singular (known as concord, my comment). In order to understand this structure, she explains, the pupils need to know what a verb and a noun (or a subject, my comment) are. In a situation like the above, Maria thinks that metalanguage fills an important function. However, even though these grammatical terms (verb and subject) are dealt with to make the pupils understand the above mentioned grammatical structure, she is aware of the fact that some pupils do not learn the construction anyway. Oftentimes, she adds, metalanguage is taught in the pupils’ native tongue (here Swedish) and this knowledge can then be used in their second language (here English).

Lauren does not like to call grammatical structures by their name because she thinks that this is too perplex information for the pupils. Maybe, she says, really academic pupils would appreciate getting this type of information. She also sees that grammar as a metalanguage can fill a function for someone who is learning a second language or a foreign language, since it makes the communication about the rules to rely on, quicker and more efficient. She also believes that metalanguage can help FL learners to put “things in boxes” so that they are able to order and master their new language. For your own language, though, Lauren would not say that a metalanguage is needed. She says that she does not know all the terms herself, but that she knows how to use them and that the how is what she wants to pass on to her pupils.

4.6 Comparisons with other languages (Question 8e in Appendices 1 & 2)

Comparisons between English and Swedish are rewarding to the pupils’ language development, according to Maria. By highlighting the grammatical structures in the target language that Swedish learners of English generally find difficult and comparing them to similar structures in Swedish, the learner may understand why the mistake is easily made and
become more aware of the typical “language-trap” that is to be avoided (cf. Observation 1 & 6, Appendix 3). To make it easier for her pupils to understand a grammatical rule, Maria presents it in both English and Swedish.

Lauren does not make comparisons with other languages when she teaches a grammatical rule, because she thinks that this would only make the content confusing to the learners. Moreover, she adds that she does not feel sure enough about other languages to include them in her teaching in such a way.

4.7 Correcting pupils’ production (Questions 7 and 15 in Appendices 1 & 2)

Maria sees that grammatical mistakes can be divided into two categories: the ones that do not disturb the communication and the ones that do. For instance, when a pupil uses the present tense instead of the past tense when what was done yesterday should be described, you have a mistake that disturbs the communication by leading to misunderstandings. However, when a pupil forgets to put the ’s’ on a verb in the present tense when the subject is in the third person singular (a concord mistake), the message comes across anyway and the communication is not disturbed in the same way as in the previous example. A mistake like that is of course important to correct for the sake of the pupil’s language development anyway, says Maria, but when considering whether it disturbs the communication or not, it does not play a big role.

When Maria corrects the pupils’ texts she sometimes focuses on correcting mistakes related to the grammatical rule that the class has been working with at the moment, and sometimes looks at all the grammar mistakes made in the text, not focusing on a particular grammatical rule. This varies. If she sees that the pupil has made a lot of mistakes in relation to a certain grammatical rule, she sometimes writes the rule down in the pupil’s text and explains it again. In cases when the pupil obviously has not understood a basic and fundamental grammatical rule, Maria prefers to talk about it in person with the pupil (cf. Observation 9, Appendix 3). Sometimes a small talk like that can help Maria to see whether the mistake is made “in a hurry” even though the pupil has understood the grammatical rule or if it has to do with the fact that the grammatical rule has not yet been understood.

When it comes to speaking, Maria usually walks around in the classroom and listens to what the pupils say when they are communicating in smaller groups and many times she stops to participate in a conversation (cf. Observation 1, Appendix 3). If a pupil says something that is grammatically incorrect, she repeats the utterance but in the correct way (cf. Observation 4, Appendix 3). She sees this as a way of correcting the pupils in a more implicit way.
When Lauren corrects her pupils’ essays she looks for patterns and tries not to make the pupils feel that “everything is wrong”. She says that she has “a sort of hierarchy about what to prioritize”. She lists the most severe grammatical mistakes, in her opinion, by starting with the worst: 1. Punctuation, 2. Verb tenses, 3. Articles and 4. ‘s’ on third person (known as concord; my remark). When asked why these grammatical mistakes are considered by her as severe, she answers that she corrects them for the purpose of plain accuracy.

Lauren says that a good way to find out whether you need to deal with a grammatical rule in more detail or not, is to look at the pupils’ essays. If the pupils do not know how to use a particular grammatical structure it shows in their written work. Lauren emphasizes that a grammatical rule only has to be dealt with if the pupils “can’t do it”. To find out what her pupils need to work on, Lauren makes them write a lot. Sometimes Lauren also picks up ungrammatical sentences in the pupils’ oral production and decides to explain why one structure is more grammatically correct than another one.

4.8 Grammatical structures that pose difficulties to pupils (Question 10 in Appendices 1 & 2)

When asked which grammatical structures her learners of English find most problematic, Maria mentions three structures: concord, do-constructions and the difference between *it is* and *there is*. She says that there are more than these yet these are the ones that she comes to think about immediately. However, she adds, getting the concord structures right is not necessarily important from a communicative point of view since mistakes made on this structure do not lead to problems in getting the message across in a conversation or likewise.

Lauren has experienced that most grammatical mistakes made by her learners are on sentence level. Her learners have problems understanding when to use a full-stop, a comma and a semi-colon when they are writing. They do not know when a sentence is complete and finished. Furthermore, she has noticed that they mix tenses in their writing and that they overuse the present continuous (also called progressive) and the simple present when they want to describe something. Lauren also says that she can see an overuse of present continuous with native speakers of English when they want to describe something in writing. Her own explanation to why this happens is that since the present continuous is used when describing something that happens at the same moment as the speech or written text is produced, and since many texts that describe something actually describe a here-and-now context, this form becomes strongly associated with description in the learners’ minds.
Lauren says that she has noticed that a common grammatical mistake is the omitting of articles made by Russian L1 speakers. Lauren says that she sees this with some of her Russian pupils in class and that it is due to the fact that there are no articles in Russian. To forget to put an ‘s’ on the verb following a subject in the third person singular is more common with her Chinese pupils, she says.

4.9 The role of the coursebook in grammar teaching (Question 11 in Appendices 1 & 2):

Maria says that she uses the exercises included in the coursebook (Good Stuff, Coombs et al., 2002, 2003 & 2004) since there are a lot of them. She says: “we have a book at the school, so why not use it?!” Maria likes the idea of being able to individualize her teaching by showing each pupil different grammar exercises that they can work on in the coursebook, depending on what grammatical structures they find most difficult. When the grammar exercises in the book are unsatisfactory, Maria makes her own exercises.

Maria says that she can see a development in her teaching towards using the coursebook more and more. Previously, she was more focused on learners’ autonomy in the sense that she made and provided different exercises and tasks for the pupils to choose from. However, she realized in time that by working in that way you ‘wear yourself out’ as a teacher. In addition to this, directing one’s teaching towards the learners’ autonomy does not suit all pupils. For some pupils, this teaching style involves too much independence and choices for them to be able to learn anything. Others, she adds, like the freedom in this way of working and learn a lot. The latter ones are often the independent and ambitious pupils.

However, working with the coursebook as a framework for what is to be taught in the classroom is a bit problematic as well, she adds. She says that using this method of teaching makes it difficult for the pupils to challenge themselves at the level they are at in their personal language development, since everyone is doing the same thing at the same time. Therefore, in a class where the pupils are at totally different proficiency levels in their English, the coursebook is problematic. Thus, Maria sees pros and cons with both mentioned methods and she does not think that there is any method that can satisfactorily suit every pupil’s own learning style.

Lauren does not use a coursebook. She says: “I have always made my own material”. She is not very fond of coursebooks since she has too many bad memories of them from her own years in school. According to her, working in coursebooks was all they did in class. She remembers that she wondered what the point in doing so was and that she did not feel that she
benefited from using her coursebook since she was a quick learner. Furthermore, she cannot see that pupils who are weaker benefit from using coursebooks all the time either.

However, some copies of pages from a coursebook could be useful and sometimes Lauren uses such copies in her teaching. She thinks that the older coursebooks have better language practice and exercises than the modern ones, which instead emphasize comprehension and which are “filled with newspaper articles”. She says that she can find a newspaper article “that is more updated” and relevant herself. Yet, the advantages with coursebooks are, according to Lauren, that they offer exercises that can reinforce the grammatical content that has been dealt with. She also finds it rather difficult to come up with her own examples of grammatical structures.

4.10 The teachers’ views on their syllabi in relation to grammar teaching (Question 12 & 13 in Appendices 1 & 2):

Maria does not think that grammar needs to be emphasized more in the syllabus (Syllabuses for the compulsory school, 2009). She says that she cannot quote by heart the part in the syllabus where grammar is mentioned, but she is sure that it is hardly mentioned. Instead, the syllabus is focused on communication and she prefers it that way. According to the syllabus, Maria says, we are only allowed to take language correctness into account for the highest grade, MVG (Pass with particular distinction) and there is nothing prescribed in the syllabus about the way grammar is supposed to be taught. The fact that the teacher is free to plan and adapt the teaching in whatever way is appropriate for a certain class is good, according to Maria. The focus on ‘the communicative thought’ must be the most important part of language teaching and learning, even though a certain level of accuracy must be included. You cannot exclude grammar and accuracy when correcting for instance a pupil’s text. It is a tool that you need in order to reach a good communicative ability.

Lauren would like to see that the steering documents (see Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007; GCSE Criteria for English, 2001 etc.) put more emphasis on how to teach grammar from a teacher’s perspective. Lauren motivates this by saying that she thinks “there is this great belief that if we can learn how to speak by ourselves, we can learn how to write as well”. However, she thinks that writing takes more work than that and she would like the curriculum to emphasize this by pointing at how to teach written accuracy. She thinks that the importance of knowing where to put a full-stop, for instance, is not stressed enough and she knows that the pupils need to work more on sentence structure to become more accurate.
5. Discussion

5.1 Comments on some interview answers about learners’ grammar knowledge

At one point in the interview Lauren states that she thinks there is a big difference between how much metalanguage her FL learners know in comparison to her L1 learners. In her experience, FL learners know more metalanguage than L1 learners. However, this cannot be seen as valid for FL learners in general as it depends on how much and what type of grammar instruction they have received in their L1.

Lauren also notes that her Russian learners have difficulties with the use of articles since they do not have any articles in their native tongue. Yet, this is applicable on many other FL learners of English as well. For instance, Swedish learners of English tend to have difficulties with the same grammatical structure in that they overuse the definite article. Estling Vannestål (2007:128) states that “the use of articles in English […] does not always correspond to the use of markers of definiteness in Swedish [with the consequences that] learners of English tend to have problems here”. Moreover, the grammatical structures that Lauren found her L1 learners to have most problems with (eg. correct use of punctuation) are problems that even university students in Sweden can struggle with (Ask, 2007:82f) and consequently cannot be seen as typical for Lauren’s L1 learners.

5.2 Similarities and differences in the teachers’ views on and practices of grammar

Krashen’s distinction between language acquisition and language learning (in Ericsson, 1989:118-119) can be applied to Lauren’s and Maria’s different teaching conditions. Obviously, Lauren’s teaching context is connected to a process of language ‘acquisition’ for her pupils, whereas Maria’s pupils are ‘learning’ a language.

Just like most teachers modify their teaching after some years of working (Borg, 1999:25-27), Lauren has started to regard grammar as more and more important throughout her years as a teacher. Like Maria, she uses formal instruction (Cadierno, 1995:179) that is explicit (Winitz, 1996:32) and includes both inductive and deductive methods (Ericsson, 1989:271-273). This can be seen in both the interview with Lauren and in the observations of her classes. However, Lauren would like to use more eliciting (cf. inductive) grammar teaching methods than what she does today. The reason for her failure to follow through with this idea is that she considers her lessons to be more efficient when she provides the answers herself. This tension (Phipps & Borg, 2009:380-381) can be explained by Lauren having the
peripheral belief (ibid) in eliciting grammar teaching methods, but the core belief (ibid) that
her teaching would not be as efficient if she used the technique as it is without it.

As for Maria, her explicit formal instruction is mostly deductive, as she says that she
explains grammatical structures as well as uses a coursebook which includes explicit
grammatical rules (Good Stuff, Coombs et al., 2002, 2003 & 2004). From the observations of
her teaching, an almost purely deductive grammar teaching method emerges (cf. Observations
2 and 6, Appendix 3). However, her teaching partly moves towards inductive grammar
teaching methods as she lets her pupils write texts (often dialogues) which might trigger
conversations about grammatical rules (cf. Observation 1, Appendix 3). Her lessons are also
inductive in the sense that she often poses a question to her pupils in order to obtain an
example of the grammatical structure that she already intends to bring up during the lesson
(Observation 10, Appendix 3). Ur’s (1991:19-20) concept of verbalization, automatisation and
autonomy can be applied to both teachers’ grammar teaching as this process is closely related
to deductive grammar teaching methods.

Both teachers can be said to use grammar approaches that ‘Focus on Form’ (Burgess &
Etherington, 2002:434) as they let meaning trigger grammar. This is, if their separate views on
grammar are considered here. When it comes to the teachers’ actual teaching of grammar,
however, it takes the shape of a ‘Focus on FormS’ (ibid) in which the grammar itself is in
focus and where the examples of grammatical structures are partly de-contextualised (cf.
Observation 10, Appendix 3 & Observation 8, Appendix 4). Whether or not this tension
(Phipps & Borg, 2009: 380-381) can be seen as a result of the teaching conditions that the
teachers experience in their classrooms or not (Borg, 1999:27) is difficult to say judging by
the interview answers. However, Maria states that she believes in more context-based
grammar teaching, but that some of her pupils need to work in their coursebooks to feel that
they learn grammar. This core belief (Phipps & Borg, 2009: 380-381) that some pupils learn
grammar better by working in their coursebooks might be the reason why her teaching
appears to take an approach more similar to the ‘Focus on FormS’ approach than she would
really wish for it to do.

Another reason for Maria’s use of a coursebook is that it is not as time-consuming as for
instance, preparing different worksheets that are all differently challenging in order to suit
different learners. A teaching that only focuses on coursebooks is not enough if you want to
be able to observe and revise the pupils’ own language production, according to Brodow
(2000:40-44). He wants grammar teaching to take its starting-point in the pupils’ own
language production. However, Maria achieves this by letting her pupils write a lot after which she corrects the texts and hands them back to her pupils. Lauren does not want to use coursebooks due to her own experience from school. This is a typical example of how a teacher’s own schooling can affect her teaching (Borg, 1999:27; Phipps & Borg, 2009:381).

Maria’s view on grammar indicates that she would like her teaching to be more learner-focused than teacher-centred as well as less bound to the coursebook so that the teaching becomes ‘more motivating and fun for the pupils’. However, as observed in her classroom (cf. Appendix 3), her teaching tends to be teacher-centred during long lesson episodes as well as greatly based on the coursebook. This tension can be seen in relation to how the informants in Phipps’ & Borg’s study (2009:383) wanted their teaching to be ‘inductive’ and ‘contextualised’ as well as including a lot of ‘oral group-work’, but found themselves achieving the opposite “using whole-class dialogues as oral practice” (ibid). When it came to the teachers’ in Phipps’ and Borg’s study (ibid), this tension could be explained by the teachers’ perception of learners’ expectations as well as their need to monitor the classes. The previous explanation can be deduced from Maria’s interview answers.

Through language immersion (Scrivener 2005:15) pupils get more implicit grammar teaching (Winitz, 1996:32). Maria likes the idea of language immersion and she combines the input of written and spoken text with more traditional, structured and deductive formal instruction. This type of combination, in which an unstructured language input (like the one in language immersion), is structured by the teacher is beneficial for the pupils’ language learning according to Ericsson (1989:273). What Maria is trying to produce with language immersion, Lauren does not need to think about since her pupils are constantly immersed with the target language in their natural surroundings.

Neither Maria nor Lauren think that a metalanguage (Nilsson, in Brodow et al, 2000:21) plays a role in language teaching (and grammar teaching specifically) if it is not used as a tool to reach higher accuracy levels in the pupils’ productive language abilities (Speaking and Writing). Maria mentions one area in which she finds metalanguage useful (concord), whereas Lauren only considers the grammatical terms subject, verb and object to be really necessary in order to improve her pupils accuracy levels (especially in writing). Yet, she seems to use some more metalanguage than that (eg. ‘Adjectives’, ‘Personal pronouns’, ‘Tense’ in Observation 1, Appendix 4).

A big difference can be seen in how the two teachers correct learners’ mistakes. Lauren corrects her pupils written work for ‘plain accuracy’ whereas Maria’s biggest concern is
whether the mistake can be seen as disturbing communication of not (cf. Ur, 1991:86). Yet, Maria thinks that it is relevant to correct pupils for the sake of accuracy as well so that they develop their language correctness continuously, but she does not emphasize it and she does not think that this approach can be fully justified according to the Swedish syllabus for English as a foreign language (Skolverket, 2000). In line with Teleman (quoted in Brodow et al, 2000:19) Lauren thinks that knowledge of grammar is beneficial when writing a text. To improve her pupils’ written production she focuses her grammar lessons on sentence construction so that her pupils learn how to use punctuation properly. In addition, Lauren is convinced that grammar helps her pupils understand the difference between spoken and written discourse. However, still, the major difference between Maria’s and Lauren’s grammar teaching is Maria’s focus on helping her pupils reach an ‘all-round communicative skill’ (Syllabuses for the compulsory school, 2009:12) compared to Lauren’s focus on ‘plain accuracy’ in the teaching of writing skills.

5.3 Differences due to the different steering documents and teaching conditions involved in teaching English to L1 and FL learners

There is a clear difference in the steering documents for the Swedish school and the English school. Whereas the Swedish syllabus barely mentions grammar and accuracy (Syllabuses for the compulsory school, 2009:12), there is a much greater emphasis on these terms and their functions in language learning in the British curriculum (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority, 2007) as well as in the assessment criteria for the GCSEs in English and English Literature (2001). Instead, the Swedish syllabus for English as a foreign language (ibid) focuses mainly on reaching ‘an all-round communicative skill’ among the pupils. The GCSEs play an extensive role in the English education system and also in Lauren’s teaching. She even motivates her pupils to work hard on their coursework essays by mentioning what the GCSEs will require from them.

The different emphasis mentioned above is reflected in the two teachers’ different teaching of grammar in that Lauren views grammar as a tool to use in her teaching for her pupils to achieve ‘plain accuracy’ in their writing, whereas Maria has her pupils’ communicative skill in focus in her view on grammar. However, Maria’s actual teaching practice is not as focused on a communicative approach as her thoughts of grammar in practice are. This can be seen in relation to what Ur (1991:21-22) states about validity (see also section 2.7, p.7f).
The fact that Maria’s learners have another L1 than English leads to many comparisons between English and Swedish in her classroom. From looking at the interview with and the observations of Maria it becomes obvious that many structures (such as concord and do-constructions) have to be taught explicitly in class, due to the fact that the Swedish L1 does not have any grammatical structures that are equivalent to some of the target language’s grammatical structures. In the teaching of these foreign grammatical structures, Maria thinks that a comparison with the pupils’ native tongue (Swedish) is rewarding.

The fact that the two countries’ different steering documents focus on grammar and accuracy to such different extents and the reasons why Lauren’s grammar approach focuses on ‘plain accuracy’ for its own sake and Maria’s on reaching a communicative ability among her pupils, must be seen in relation to each teachers’ specific working-context and their pupils’ needs. L1 learners of English might have the primary purpose of mastering the ability to speak and write accurately in their mother tongue for many different purposes. In their further studies or in their future work they are often required to be able to write and speak accurately and this triggers both steering documents that focus form and teachers trying to reach a high accuracy level among their pupils. For Maria’s FL learners, on the other hand, the strong focus in the syllabus on achieving an all-round communicative ability can be interpreted as an aim towards a great oral fluency whereas accuracy is barely mentioned and therefore easily forgotten as a great part of a communicative ability. However, it can be questioned if the purpose for FL learners to study English has not slightly shifted during the last decade towards a need to use it in further studies and working life in a similar way as L1 learners need to be able to do. Especially if we consider the fact that English is the true lingua franca in today’s globalized world. In order for FL learners in Sweden to succeed in these areas, there might be a need for some more emphasis on accuracy in the Swedish syllabus for English as a foreign language (2000).

6. Conclusion

One of the research questions that this study raises is what similarities and differences there are in the views on and practices of grammar teaching of a Swedish teacher of English (FL) and a UK teacher of English (L1). In conclusion it can be stated that the teachers’ practices of grammar teaching are very similar in the sense that they both include explicit formal instruction that are both inductive and deductive, but which, in both cases, steer towards the
latter (cf. verbalization-automatisation-autonomy). Both teachers also ‘Focus on Forms’ whereas they express a will to have a grammar practice that is more directed towards a ‘Focus on Form’. They share the same ambivalent attitude towards the role of a metalanguage in grammar teaching in that they both see areas were a metalanguage is beneficial but they do not want to integrate it in their teaching if it only becomes ‘labeling’, as Lauren expresses it. In general, the teachers’ views and practices of grammar teaching were much more similar than expected. However, one difference between the teachers’ grammar teaching practices is the extent to which a coursebook is used. Lauren does not use one since she does not believe in them whereas Maria uses one for two reasons: convenience and her learners’ expectations. Yet, the biggest difference can be found in the teachers’ different aims with their grammar teaching. Whereas Lauren teaches grammar integrated in the teaching of writing skills with a focus on plain accuracy, Maria’s aim with her grammar teaching is for her pupils to reach an all-round communicative ability.

Furthermore, this study raises the question how the differences can be connected to each country’s different steering documents and extensionally to the different teaching conditions involved in teaching English to L1 learners compared to FL learners. To conclude, the different aims that the teachers in this study have with their grammar teaching can be explained in relation to each country’s steering documents. The British steering documents emphasize accuracy to a much larger extent than the Swedish ones, which instead focus on the communicative aspect. Moreover, there is a great difference in the teachers’ teaching conditions due to the fact that Lauren teaches L1 learners who acquire a language whereas Maria teaches FL learners who learn another language than their native tongue. Therefore, Maria tries to implement an element in her teaching that is already there in an L1 environment: language immersion. In further studies it would be interesting to investigate pupils’ different views on the types of grammar teaching approaches held by the two teachers in this study, as the pupils did not get to be heard in this particular study and since their experiences of learning outcomes should be regarded as important and guiding for a teacher when deciding what grammar teaching approach to choose.
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Appendix 1. Intervjufrågor.

1) Information:
   Vilket år tog du din lärarexamen?
   Hur många år har du varit yrkesverksam?
   Vilka ämnen undervisar du i?
   På vilka stadier har du undervisat under dina yrkesverksamma år? Hur gamla är eleverna på det stadiet?

2) Hur definierar du ordet ”grammatik”?

3) Vad är syftet med att ha grammatikundervisning? Vad fyller grammatikundervisningen för funktion anser du?

4) Resonera kring följande: Vikten av att göra rätt (grammatiskt)/Vikten av att veta varför något är rätt (grammatiskt). Vilka fördelar kan det ha att veta varför något är rätt?

5) Vilken inställning uppfattar du att dina elever har till grammatik?

6) Kan du se någon skillnad i elevers inställning till grammatik under de år du har varit yrkesverksam? Om så är fallet, vad beror det på tror du?

7) Att rätta elevtexter:
   Hur stor tyngdpunkt bör läggas vid grammatiska fel?
   Finns det grammatiska misstag som stör mindre än andra? Vilka?
   Ska man som lärare rätta alla grammatiska fel i en elevtext eller fokusera på vissa?
   Vilka i sådana fall?

8) Introducera/Presentera en ny grammatisk regel:
   a) Kan du beskriva ditt vanligaste tillvägagångssätt när du ska presentera en ny grammatisk regel, steg för steg?
   b) Presentera regeln i skrift eller muntligt? Både och? Hur? Av eleverna eller av läraren?
   c) Ges exempel på den grammatiska regeln? Hur?
   d) Ska läraren kalla strukturer för deras grammatiska namn? Varför/Varför inte?
   e) Görs jämförelser med andra språk? Varför/Varför inte?

9) Ska man förenkla en grammatisk regel när man förklarar den? Varför/Varför inte? Om så är fallet, hur mycket ska man förenkla en grammatisk regel när man förklarar den. Varför?
10) Vilken grammatisk struktur tycker du dig ha sett vara den svåraste för svensktalande elever att lära sig inom det engelska språket? Varför tror du att det är så?

11) Vilken roll har kursboken i grammatikundervisningen? Vad tillför den? Vilka för och nackdelar kan du se med att använda grammatiska förklaringar och övningar i en kursbok i din egen undervisning?

12) Hur ser du på grammatik i relation till kursplanen för ämnet? Hur kan kursplanens mål uppnås och förverkligas?

13) Vad anser du om det utrymme grammatiken ges i kursplanen? Behövs mer/mindre betoning av grammatik eller är nuvarande kursplan i linje med vad du anser rimligt? Varför/Varför inte?

14) Finns det ett sätt/en metod att lära ut grammatik som du anser vara mer effektiv än andra? Vilken? Varför/Varför inte?

15) Hur vet man vilka grammatiska regler som lämpar sig att arbeta med i en klass/med en viss åldersgrupp just där och då i deras språkliga utveckling?

16) När det gäller grammatikundervisning, hur kan vi komma runt dilemmat att vi har elever som ligger på olika språkliga nivåer i en och samma klass?

17) Om du får sammanfatta denna intervju/ vårt samtal genom att sätta de didaktiska frågorna i relation till grammatikundervisning, vad svarar du i sådana fall på följande:
   a) Vad ska undervisas (när det gäller grammatik)?
   b) Hur ska grammatik undervisas?
   c) När bör grammatik undervisas?
   d) Varför ska grammatik undervisas?
Appendix 2. Interview questions

1) Information:
   What year did you get your teacher diploma?
   For how many years have you been working as a teacher?
   What subjects do you teach?
   On what levels have you taught? How old are the pupils at that level?

2) How do you define the word grammar?

3) What is the purpose of teaching grammar? What function does grammar teaching fill?

4) Reflect upon the following: The importance of writing and speaking accurately/The importance of knowing *why* something is accurate. What advantages may there be with knowing *why* something is more accurate?

5) What view on grammar do you experience that your pupils have?

6) Is there a difference between pupils’ view on grammar today compared to when you first started teaching? If so, what difference and why has this change taken place according to you?

7) Correcting pupils’ texts:
   a) To what extent should grammatical mistakes be corrected?
   b) Are there grammatical mistakes that interfere with a text more than others? What mistakes?
   c) What grammatical mistakes should the teacher correct? All of them? Only some? Which mistakes in that case?

8) Introducing/Presenting a new grammatical rule:
   a) Can you describe how you normally present a grammatical rule, step by step?
   b) Is the rule presented orally or in writing? Or in both ways? How? By the students or by the teacher?
   c) Are examples of the grammatical structure given? How?
   d) Should the teacher call the grammatical structures by their proper grammatical name? Why/Why not?
   e) Do you make comparisons with other languages? Why, why not?

9) When explaining a grammatical rule, should it be simplified or not? Why/Why not? If so, how much should it be simplified? Why?
10) What grammatical structure do you consider learners of English in the UK to find most problematic and to make most mistakes on? Why do you think it is that way?

11) What role would you say that the coursebook has in your grammar teaching? What does it provide? What pros and cons can you see with using the grammatical exercises included in a coursebook in your own teaching?

12) What is your view on grammar in relation to the syllabus and curriculum related to the subject English? How can the aims of the syllabus and curriculum be reached?

13) What do you think about the space and relevance that grammar is given in the syllabus and curriculum? Should grammar be given more or less emphasis or is the current syllabus and curriculum emphasis satisfactory according to you? Why/Why not?

14) Is there a way of teaching grammar that you consider to be more efficient than other ways? Which way? Why/Why not?

15) How can you tell which grammatical rules that are appropriate to deal with in a class, at a certain age, right then and there in their language development?

16) When it comes to grammar teaching, how would you say we can get around the dilemma of having pupils at totally different language proficiency levels in the same class?

17) If you would summarize this interview/our conversation by putting the didactic questions in relation to grammar, what would you answer to the following questions:
   a) What should be taught (when it comes to grammar)?
   b) How should grammar be taught?
   c) When should grammar be taught?
   d) Why should grammar be taught?
Tuesday 6 April

Observation 1

Grade nine; class one; (15 years old); 50 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

The previous lesson, the pupils started working with a new theme, namely “War”. Maria reminds the pupils about what they did last time they met. She says that they will spend today’s lesson on repeating the text that they started to work with last time in class. She asks three pupils to take on the roles as the three different characters in the dialogue-text, “The Negotiator” (see Appendix 5, p. A.29-A.30), which the pupils have in their textbooks. The pupils read the text out loud in class and the others follow the text in their textbooks. When the pupils have finished reading the text, they are divided into the same groups of three-four as they worked in the last lesson. Maria writes down the instructions about what to do next on the board. The pupils are told to write a new dialogue, rehearse it as a play and later on to act it out in front of the rest of the class. Maria gives the instructions at first in English, and after that in Swedish. After these instructions, some pupils still have questions about what they are expected to do so Maria walks around in the classroom and talks to each group and makes sure that they get started. She also tells them to look up difficult words in the dictionaries that are available in the classroom, and to help each other out when they find something difficult.

When the pupils write their dialogues in groups, most of them speak to each other in Swedish. Only when they form sentences to fit in the dialogue and when they read these sentences out do they use English. All pupils have been told to write the dialogues down, so everyone is active writing during the lesson. One group works faster than the others and is soon ready. Maria stops by the group for a while and asks them to read their dialogue out loud to her. When one pupil produces an incorrect grammatical structure: “I can’t stop you from to take it from her”, Maria gives the correct structure: “I can’t stop you from taking it from her”. Maria explains that every time a preposition (here: from) is followed by a verb, the verb needs to be in “the ing-form” (here: taking). She continues explaining by comparing Swedish and English in this particular aspect. She says that in Swedish we use the infinitive (here: ta) preceded by the infinitive-marker (att) after a preposition (here: från), but that in English the “ing-form” is needed after a preposition. She reminds the pupils that they have talked about this during
earlier lessons, but she adds that these types of things need to be repeated once in a while so that they stick.

At one moment in the dialogue one of the pupils uses an incorrect grammatical verb tense in a sentence and Maria corrects this error by giving the pupil the correct form to use. The pupil says: “She’s like size 4. I’m like size 7; why the hell would I stole her shoes?” Maria says that the correct verb form to use here would be “steal” and that the same tense is used in Swedish in a sentence construction like that: “varför skulle jag stjäla hennes skor?” The pupil repeats the sentence with the correct verb tense before the group reads the remaining parts of their dialogue to Maria. Another grammatical mistake in the dialogue triggers a similar situation. The same pupil as before says: “I didn’t stole them” and Maria corrects this by correcting and emphasizing the verb in the sentence:” I didn’t steal them”. Then Maria writes down the principal parts of the verb steal on a piece of paper for the pupils to look at (ie. steal-stole-stolen). She explains that when the help verb (auxiliary verb) did is used in any of its forms (did-didn’t, do-don’t, does-doesn’t) the verb that follows has to be in its infinitive. That is, she explains, why we say “I didn’t steal them” instead of “I didn’t stole them”.

Later on in the lesson, the same grammatical structure (do/does/did + infinitive) is dealt with together in class. Maria writes the different forms of do on the board (Do-Don’t, Does-Doesn’t, Did-Didn’t) and adds that this verb need to be followed by the infinitive by writing + verb in infinitive right next to the different do-constructions. She repeats to the whole class that always when a do-construction appears, the infinitive form is needed. She illustrates this by giving an oral example in which she stresses the infinitive verb: “I didn’t steal them; not: I didn’t stole them”.

After the short grammar explanation in class, Maria lets the group who has finished their dialogue, read their text out loud in front of the class. Even though the group has been corrected by Maria in their smaller group, they still produce sentences like: “Why should I stole your shoes?” This is corrected subtly by Maria when the dialogue is finished as she repeats what they said in the dialogue but uses the correct grammatical structure: “Yes, why should you steal her shoes?; That’s the question”.

Observation 2

Grade nine; class two; (15 years old); 70 minutes; approximately 15 pupils:

Maria has two parallel classes with pupils in year nine. When the lesson is over with one of these classes the other class with 15-year-olds comes into the classroom. Maria deals with the same things in both classes throughout the year, to the extent that this is possible. Left on the board from the previous lesson is the following grammatical rule: Do-Don’t, Does-Doesn’t, Did-Didn’t + verb in infinitive.

Maria starts this lesson by saying that many pupils think that grammar is something that is dealt with only when traditional workbook grammar-exercises are focused in the classroom,
but that grammar is so much more since it is present in language all the time in every utterance and written sentence. She adds that grammar is also dealt with when the pupils are listening to something and she compares grammar’s role in language to the skeleton’s role in the body. The words we need in order to be able to talk can be compared to the muscles we need to move. She says that many things are needed in order to make the language work but that a language’s grammar is its very base.

After this comparison, Maria introduces the new chapter to be dealt with in class during a couple of weeks. She says: “We are going to start with a new chapter about war today.” and she asks her pupils to open their textbooks and their workbooks (see Appendix X). When they have done so she continues her presentation of the new theme by saying that “All over the world we have war” and by mentioning some war-torn areas and asking the pupils what they know about these. Then, she mentions that where there is war negotiators are needed. The text that they are about to read together in class is called “The Negotiator”. Maria adds that not only in war can it come in handy to have a negotiator but in everyday conflicts between friends as well. She asks if there is anyone in the class who sees him- or herself as a negotiator, but no one does. Three pupils are chosen (by Maria) to read the text out loud in class and the others follow in their textbooks meanwhile.

When the pupils have finished reading, Maria explains, at first in English and later on in Swedish, what they are expected to do next. This class follows the same work order as the previous one: write a new dialogue, rehearse it as a play and later on act it out in front of the rest of the class. Before they start working with this in their groups, however, Maria wants their attention at the board for a couple of minutes. She says that in the text that they just read in class there were some sentences of denial and she mentions the simple sentence “I didn’t.” as an example. On the board she writes “I didn’t steal the bike” and “You stole it”. She asks the class if they know why steal is used in one of the sentences and stole in the other one even though they are both dealing with the past, the imperfect (or the past simple as it is called in many grammar books today; my comment). No pupil answers and Maria explains that when a do-construction as in “I didn’t steal the bike” is used, the infinitive of the verb is needed. She repeats the same thing in Swedish.

The class then does the same group activities as the previous class did. Maria circulates in the classroom and talks to each group during a couple of minutes each. However, in this class, no grammar explanations can be seen or heard in any of the groups when she does this. The class ends with three performances of three different group dialogues.

Wednesday 7 April

Observation 3
Grade seven; class one; (13 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

The lesson starts with the teacher handing out evaluation forms on which the pupils are asked to evaluate their own ability to: read in English, speak in English, write in English and listen to and understand English. These evaluations, Maria explains, will be used as a framework for discussion in the meetings between the school, the pupil and their home that is held once every semester. The pupils are also asked to evaluate how their own ability to learn can be described. Maria reads everything on the paper out loud to the class and they tick the given alternative that they think suits their own ability the best.

When the pupils are done with the evaluations, Maria gives them a smaller test to see if they have done their homework for today. In the test the pupils are asked to translate a couple of sentences from English to Swedish and some other sentences from Swedish to English. When the pupils have done their test, they continue working with tasks that Maria has scheduled on the board. The board says the following:

Tell your friend sitting beside you:

- What you are scared of – for example: “I am scared of snakes because…”
- About a situation when you were really scared!

Before the pupils get started, Maria tells a story about when she was really scared. When it is the pupils turn, Maria circulates in the classroom and asks follow-up questions to some pairs.

Observation 4

Grade seven; class two; (13 years old); 55 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

This class gets to fill in the same evaluation form as the previous seventh-graders did last lesson (cf. observation 3 above). Afterwards, the pupils get to talk about what they are scared of, following the same instructions from the board as the previous class did (cf. observation 3). However, this time, Maria explains that in situations when we want to explain what we are scared of, in English, we need to use the ‘–ing form’ of the verb so that we get constructions like the following: “I am scared of diving”.

When the pupils have talked to each other in pairs about their fears, Maria asks each pupil to report what they have found out to the others in the class. One pupil says that his friend is “scared of homeworks” [sic]. Maria then corrects the pupil’s grammatical mistake (putting the uncountable noun ‘homework’ in a plural construction with an ‘-s’) by repeating what was said in a correct way: “He is scared of homework”. A similar situation occurs a few minutes later when a pupil says that: “He is scared for mad women”. Maria corrects the mistake on the plural construction of women by repeating what was said in a correct way but with an interrogative tone in her voice this time: “mad women?” The pupil nods. However, Maria does not correct the mistake in use of preposition (here: for, but should be: of). When the class has gone through their fears together on class, the lesson finishes.
Thursday 8 April

Observation 5

Grade nine; class one; (15 years old); 65 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

The first part of the lesson is spent on acting out the conversations that the pupils wrote the last lesson. Meanwhile, no correction of grammatical mistakes is made by Maria. When this activity is finished, the teacher introduces a new text from the coursebook to the pupils. The text is called “War and Peace” and Maria introduces the content of the text by putting it in a historical and geographical context: the war in former Jugoslavia. Maria asks the pupils if any of them have been in any of the countries that belonged to the former Jugoslavia and four of them says that they have. While she speaks about the war she asks the pupils rhetorical questions: “How familiar are you with the Jugoslavian war?” and “When did the war break out?”. She does not wait for replies but keeps explaining what the war was about, when it took place and what the consequences of it were.

After the smaller introduction, Maria reads the text out loud to the class and goes through the word-list that belongs to it. The pupils are asked to repeat the words that Maria reads from the word-list. One of the phrases that appears in the word-list is ‘make up one’s mind’. Maria asks the pupils in Swedish how we say “Jag har bestämt mig” (ie. I have made up my mind). One pupils answers: “I made up my mind” and Maria says that if we want to use the exact same form as in the Swedish example that she gave earlier, we need to say “I have made up my mind”.

By the end of the lesson, the pupils are given the task to write a summary of the text in groups of three.

Observation 6

Grade seven; class two; (13 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

When Maria checks who is present and not in today’s English class, the pupils tell her that one of the pupils is ill. This leads to Maria writing three English sentences on the board and the Swedish translations right next to them:

I am cold.  
Jag fryser.

I have a cold.  
Jag är förkyld.

I am right.  
Jag har rätt.
Maria points out that as can be seen from these examples it is not possible to directly translate sentences from Swedish to English. If we did that, she adds, we would say “Jag är rätt” instead of “Jag har rätt” when we want translate the sentence “I am right” from English to Swedish. She adds that she just mentioned this to the pupils as a reminder and that she knows that they know this already.

Maria now tells the pupils to discuss in pairs what they did last night. She writes on the board “What did you do last night?” When this is done, Maria asks the pupils one by one what they did last night and asks follow-up questions on what she finds out. These follow-up questions are written down on the board:

- What kind of music did you listen to?
- What did you watch on TV?
- What did you read?
- What did you play?

Maria underlines the verbs in each sentence. She then tells the pupils that the last verbs in the sentences, for example play, is in its infinitive and she asks them if they know what that means. She does not get any reaction from the pupils and she asks them if they are perhaps more familiar with the term ‘grundform’ (directly translated base-form). She translated the last sentence on the board to Swedish by writing underneath it: “Vad gjorde du spela?” [sic]. She says that this is how the sentence “Vad spelade du?” is constructed in English if we want to be very precise. She adds that this might seem strange, but that we have learned from the previous examples in class that it is not possible to directly translate sentences from Swedish to English and vice versa. Even though the direct translation of “What did you play?” is “Vad gjorde du spela?”, it still means “Vad spelade du?”

Maria explains, in Swedish, that when we give the principle parts of a verb, we do it in three forms: the infinitive, the past tense and the perfect participle. She writes on the board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEMA</th>
<th>(Principle parts of verbs, my addition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infinitiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the infinitive, my addition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Played</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See</td>
<td>Saw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Maria has introduced and written down the first example on the board (play, played, played), she asks the class if they know how we give the principle parts of the verb ‘see’. The pupils answer and Maria writes down what they said on the board. Then, Maria asks the pupils if they know the principles parts of ‘go’. The class concludes that it is “go, went, gone”. Maria reminds the pupils about the fact that they have almost all the irregular verbs.
listed at the back of their coursebooks and she encourages them to learn those verbs by heart by saying that “if you know the irregular verbs, it will take you far!”

Maria now refers back to the sentences they wrote previously on the board by saying that the infinitive form, the first form, is the one that they used as the last verb in those sentences, eg. “What did you play?” She draws an arrow from the verb *play* in the sentence to the verb *play* in the table on the board. She then asks the class which form on the board should be used if she wants to say “Vad såg du?” (ie. What did you see?). The pupils produce the correct sentence construction by looking at the board and picking the first form of the verb there. Maria asks one pupil that mentioned earlier that he had watched TV the night before, what he watched. He answers: “I saw Family Guy on TV”. Maria explains to the class, writing on the board meanwhile, that ‘såg’ can take two constructions in English, both ‘did see’ and ‘saw’.

Maria now writes the following on the board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Form</th>
<th>Second Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you play football?</td>
<td>You play football.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does he play football?</td>
<td>He plays football.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She explains that since there is already an ‘-s’ on the verb ‘do’, so that it becomes ‘does’ in the second question, no ‘-s’ is needed on the last verb ‘play’ there, even though it is a ‘he’ (third person singular) that does something. Maria asks the pupils what they have learnt during this lesson so far. She answers herself: “We have learnt that when we have *do/does/did* in a sentence, the next verb is supposed to be in the first form, the infinitive and that we do not put an ‘-s’ on it even though we have a *he* or *she* or an *it* that does something.” She asks the pupils to open their coursebooks for more practice on these forms. The page that the pupils look at contains a dialogue which includes a number of ‘do-constructions’ asks two pupils to read the dialogue out loud to the class (see Appendix 6, Exercise A, p.A.31). Based on exampled from the texts, Maria mentions that if we construct a negation, as: ‘don’t’, we still use the first form of the verb for the following verb.

The pupils are now asked to do the exercises in their coursebook (see Appendix 6, Exercise B, p.A.31). When they are done, the class goes through the pupils’ answers together. Maria reads the Swedish sentence out loud and one the pupils give their suggestions for a translation. Maria writes down what they say on the board:

```
1. What did you think?
2. Did you like it?
3. Didn’t you think it was funny?
4. He didn’t have a horse.
5. I didn’t know he had a brother.
6. What movie/film did you see?
```

Again, the infinitives are underlined. The following task that the pupils have to do is to write the question that can produce the answers that has been written down in their coursebooks already (see Appendix 6, Exercise C, p.A32). The following sentences are written on the board when the class finally goes through all answers together:

```
1. What did you think?
2. Did you like it?
3. Didn’t you think it was funny?
4. He didn’t have a horse.
5. I didn’t know he had a brother.
6. What movie/film did you see?
```
Did you wash my car?
Did he play tennis with Paul?
Did I lock the door?
Did you eat the whole ice cream?
Did Sue fall in love with Joe?

This time, the verbs in the infinitive are not underlined. When a pupil is about to produce the last question (Did Sue fall in love with Joe?) she says “Did Sue *fell* in love with Joe?” [sic]. Maria corrects her by saying that the principle parts of *fall* is *fall, fell, fallen* and that we need the first form out of these ones in the question about Sue and Joe, since it starts with *did*. The pupil gets frustrated and says that she does not understand the difference. Maria does not notice the pupils comment but moves on to the next exercise.

The same procedure as during the last exercises is carried out. The pupils give their answers to Maria, who writes them down on the board (see Appendix 6, Exercise D, p.32):

2. Eve didn’t wash her hair.
3. The dogs didn’t bark a lot.
4. I didn’t *fall* off the horse.
5. We didn’t eat everything.

When one of the pupils gives his answer the sentence numbered 4 above, he says: “I didn’t *fell* off the horse” [sic]. Maria has to correct the same grammatical mistakes as she corrected just some minutes ago in the previous exercise and this time she does this by writing the correct form of the verb, *fall*, in the sentence on the board and by underlining it twice for extra emphasis. She asks the class if they have understood what has been dealt with during class today. She adds that it is not easy to get these things right if you do not know the principle parts of the irregular verbs.

The final section of the lesson is spent on reading a text about two men who were the first persons to fly over the Atlantic Sea without making a stopover. Maria reads the text to the class and the pupils follow the text in their coursebooks.

**Observation 7**

**Grade eight; class one; (14 years old); 50 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:**

Maria presents a new subject that the class will be working with the up-coming lessons: “Love and Friendship”. She asks the pupils if they normally tell their friends about what happened on the dates they have been to. She asks some pupils to take on the parts as three different characters in a dialogue about dating. The pupils are asked to read the dialogue out loud in class while the other ones follow what is being said in their coursebooks. Afterwards, the pupils work with the expressions and words in the text. They are told to write a text with advice to a person that is about to go on a date. When this is done, the pupils work with exercises in their coursebooks.
Observation 8

Grade eight; class two; (14 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

The pupils are restless when they come into the classroom. They say that the sun is shining outside and that they have been inside the whole day. Soon it is decided that the class will spend the lesson outside, going for a walk. Meanwhile, they are asked to look for items that begin with each letter in the alphabet and to write these things down so that they can report them to Maria by the end of the lesson.

Friday 9 April

Observation 9

Grade eight; class one; (14 years old); 55 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

The following (my selection) is written on the board when the pupils enter the classroom:

Listen to exercise F p.77

Grammar p.108-111 (see Appendix 7, p.A.33-A.34 for some exercises)

Finish exercises A,B,C,D,E + Pick and choose

The lesson starts with a listening comprehension exercise. When the pupils listen to the text, they follow it in their coursebooks. After this exercise, Maria writes the following on the board: ‘Det är’/’Det finns’ (ie. ‘It is’/’There is/are’, my comment). Then, she asks the pupils: “How many people are there in this classroom?” When the pupils have counted everyone in the classroom, she says: “There are 22 people in the classroom”. She explains that if we want to express that something with the meaning “it exists”, we need to use ‘there is’ or ‘there are’, not ‘it is’. She then asks the pupils if they know the difference between when we use ‘there is’ and ‘there are’. One pupil explains that is has to do with how many people are involved in the action (/the existence, my comment). Maria writes the following on the board:

There is one

There are many

Maria emphasizes the difference between singular and plural by underlining two words. Referring back to the previous distinction between ‘It is’ and ‘There is/are’ she explains that we use ‘It is’ when we speak about the weather. After this short introduction, the pupils work with mentioned grammar exercises in their coursebooks (see Appendix 7, p.A.33-A.34 for
some exercises). Meanwhile, Maria walks around in the classroom and gives a test, which she has corrected, back to the pupils. Every now and then, she comments on and explains grammatical mistakes individually to the pupils. One of these comments is the following: “You are missing out on an ‘-s’ here. Why do you need to put it there?” The pupil does not answer. Maria explains that an ‘-s’ is needed on the verb right there in the sentence, since the sentence deals with a subject in the singular. However, she puts it this way: “Det är för att det är en här”. When everyone has got their test back, the lesson finishes.

Observation 10

Grade seven; class one; (13 years old); 55 minutes; approximately 20 pupils:

Maria asks some pupils “What did you do last night?” She gets answers like “I watched TV” and “I played on my computer”. Maria writes the question on the board:

What did you do last night?

In addition to this, she asks the pupils if they know what we do when we give the principle parts of a verb. No one knows. Maria explains that giving the principle parts of a verb is something that they have been doing ever since they first started learning English. She mentions the irregular verbs and starts writing the following on the board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:a</th>
<th>2:a</th>
<th>3:e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(the infinitive, my addition)</td>
<td>(the past tense, my addition)</td>
<td>(the perfect participle, my addition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

play | played | have/has/had played
spela | spelade | har/hade spelat

When this is done, Maria asks if the pupils know what the equivalent inflection of the verb ‘do’ would be. The pupils get as far as ‘do, did...’ in their guesses, but they cannot seem to come up with the last principle part of the verb. Maria says that she believes they can figure it out since it is one of those irregular verbs that they are trying to learn at the moment. When Maria does not get any suggestions, she asks: “How do you say ‘Jag har gjort det’ in English?” The pupils gives the correct answer: “I have done it”. Together they complete the principle parts of ‘do’ on the board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1:a</th>
<th>2:a</th>
<th>3:e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(the infinitive, my addition)</td>
<td>(the past tense, my addition)</td>
<td>(the perfect participle, my addition)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.15
Now, Maria wants to know what the principle parts of ‘have’ is. After some answering the pupils and Maria conclude that ‘have, had, had’ is what they want to add to the board. Maria asks the pupils how we say the following in English: “Jag hade haft en cykel om ingen hade stulit den.” One pupil answers: “I have had a…” Maria writes the Swedish equivalents for ‘have, had, had’ on the board:

### TEMA
(Principle parts of verbs, my addition)

1:a 2:a 3:e
(the infinitive, my addition) (the past tense, my addition) (the perfect participle, my addition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Past Tense</th>
<th>Perfect Participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>play</td>
<td>played</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spela</td>
<td>spelade</td>
<td>har/hade spelat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have</td>
<td>had</td>
<td>had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>hade</td>
<td>haft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, one pupil produces the correct grammatical structure: “I had had a bike if…” The pupils are now given the task to write down what their friend did yesterday and the last summer. When this is done, Maria goes through some pupil texts in class.

After a while, Maria writes down a negation on the board: ‘He didn’t buy shoes.’ She explains that if we want to write a sentence that includes ‘didn’t’/’did not’ we have to use the first form of the verb for the verb that follows, which is ‘buy’ in this case; she adds. If he, on the other hand, really bought a pair of shoes, Maria continues, we would write it as follows: ‘He bought shoes’. Maria points out that in both cases, when using ‘didn’t buy’ as well as when using ‘bought’, the Swedish equivalent is ‘köpte’.

The next task that the pupils are given is for some of them to read a dialogue out loud in class, while the others are listening and following the text in their coursebooks. In addition to the text are some grammatical rules and Maria reads them out loud in class before it is time for the pupils to do some gap-filling exercises together in class (see Appendix 6, p.A.31-A.32). Maria writes the pupils’ answers on the board:

1. What **did** you **think**?
2. Did you enjoy/like it?
3. Didn’t you think it was funny?
4. He didn’t have a horse.
5. I didn’t know that he had a brother.
6. What movie/film did you see?

Maria is not consistent in her underlining here. Some of the relevant verbs are underlined, some are not. At sentence four, she stops for additional information. She tells the pupils to be aware so that they put the apostrophe in the right place in the word didn’t. She asks the pupils if they know why the apostrophe is supposed to be put between the n and the t. She answers the question directly when she has asked it: “It is because I have taken away one or more letters right there.”

The pupils and Maria now moves on to another exercise in which they write questions together. This exercise is the same one as is described in Observation 6 above, starting with: Did you wash my car?

The last exercise that the pupils do together with Maria, is about denial. Maria writes the answers on the board and comments on them now and then:

2. Eve didn’t wash her hair.
3. The dogs didn’t bark a lot.
4. I didn’t fall off the horse.
5. We didn’t eat everything.

When the first example (about Eve who didn’t wash her hair) is written, Maria tells the pupils to have an extra look in their workbooks to make sure that they have used the correct form of wash. The following examples are gone through quickly. The lesson then ends with the pupils listening to Maria reading a text about two men who crossed the Atlantic Sea in an airplane without making a stopover.
Appendix 4.

Classroom observations of Lauren.

Great Britain.

Number of pupils in each observation is approximately 14-18, except for two individual teaching sequences.
Pupils in the classes observed are in the age range of 13 to 17.

Monday 22 February

Observation 1

Form 5; (16 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 14 pupils; GCSEs coming up;
(Stylistic values – grammar):

Lauren lets the pupils practice for their GCSE exams by focusing the lesson on essay writing. The essay writing is about analyzing a charity advertisement, and Lauren starts the lesson by handing out one copy of the advertisement to each pupil. The advertisement is about homeless people and it tries to encourage people to sponsor a room for a homeless person to help that person get out of the street (for whole advertisement, see Appendix 8, p.A.35). Lauren presents the two questions to be answered in the essay on the board, one by one, and after each question she and her pupils try to come up with key-words that summarize the answer to the question. Lauren asks the following questions:

How does the author use language? Why?

How are presentational devices used? Why?

The key-words that the class comes up with together are written down on the white-board by the teacher. Lauren then asks the pupils to individually think about how they want to divide these key-words into paragraphs in the text.

The first question that Lauren asks the pupils, *How does the author use language? Why?*, is extra interesting for this study. When the class and the teacher are trying to come up with key-words that answer this question, some grammar discussions appear. Words such as *rough, tired, hungry, dirty and cold* are suggested as key-words to answer the first question and the teacher helps the class categorize them as “simple, dramatic words”. Lauren then asks the class what these words are called with a gathering name and one pupil answers “Adjectives”. Furthermore, after Lauren has asked what these words do and have in common a pupil answers that “They describe something”.

A.18
The class continues looking at how language is used in the advertisement. The teacher asks from who’s perspective we read the text. Pupils conclude that it is one young woman’s (Sophie’s) experience of living on the street that the reader gets to know about. Lauren then throws out the question: What person is the text written in? She starts writing the list of Personal pronouns on the white-board and one pupil answers that the text is written in the third person singular. Lauren then states to the pupils that when the GCSE exams ask them about language, it is crucial that they know what person the text they analyze is written in. In addition to this she tells the pupils to ask themselves the question why the author has chosen to write in that person. The answer to this question, she states, can include analyses of “distance” and “the feeling that someone is talking directly to you”. She encourages her pupils to always give reasons to why they think the author uses language the way it is used.

Furthermore, Lauren tests whether the pupils have understood the Personal pronouns by introducing a game in class. She tells all pupils to stand up and then she asks them questions like the following: “What’s the third person singular?” and orders them to: “Tell me what’s the first person singular!” Lauren asks one pupil at the time and everyone who answers correctly can be seated. She continues the game until everyone is seated.

After looking at adjectives and Personal pronouns from a stylistic point of view, Lauren writes another grammatical term on the board, namely tense. She asks the pupils when things are happening in the text in the advertisement and they all agree on the fact that it is happening now. Lauren then wants her pupils to tell her why the tense is used this way and together they come to the conclusion that the fact that homeless people need help right now, in the present, makes their need for help more urgent and the advertisement more striking. Lauren says: “Sophie needs help. It is happening now!”

The pupils are told to finish their essays at home, based on what they have taken notes of in class and the lesson ends.

**Observation 2**

**One pupil stays after class; Form 5; (16 years old); approximately 15 minutes; 1 pupil; GCSE coming up (Pronunciation – Phonology):** After class one pupil stays, on his own initiative, to talk to Lauren. The pupil origins from China and has English as a second language. He finds himself having problems with some pronunciation and Lauren lets him stay so that they can go through some of these pronunciation problems. Together they look at the pronunciation of schwa in different words; for example “nonsense”. Lauren explains to the pupil that his pronunciation problems of that particular sound are due to the fact that it does not occur in Chinese. They continue looking at some other examples and the pupil tries to pronounce these ones with guidance and corrective feedback from Lauren. After some minutes the pupil has to go to another class and leaves the room.
Observation 3

Form 3; (14 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 18 pupils; Key Stage 3 (literature and essay writing):

In the beginning of the lesson the pupils get back texts that they have written, which have been corrected by Lauren. The pupils are asked to write an essay on scene seven in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*. They are told to answer the following question: “What do you learn about the characters of Macbeth and Lady Macbeth from their conversation in this scene?” The task is introduced as training for the GCSE exams, in which pupils are required to write an essay on a play by Shakespeare. The teacher and the pupils study the relevant scene by reading it together in class. A couple of the pupils are given the task to read the dialogue out loud and Lauren stops at some places in the scene for comments on content. This activity takes up the whole lesson.

Monday 1st of March

Observation 4

Form 4; (15 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 14 pupils; (essay writing):

The pupils are told to take up their red working sheets which they always bring to class. The working sheet is called *Yes! I got the grads [sic!] I wanted for GCSE English! Essential English Revision Book* and is made by Lauren. It includes some good advice about “How to get good marks in English Exams”, which also is the title of the page that the pupils are told to look at during this lesson (see Appendix 9, p.A.36). Lauren explains that the subject of today’s lesson will be the creation of more advanced sentences. Together, Lauren and the pupils will experiment on how to use commas, colons and semi-colons. Lauren tells the pupils that these three different ways of punctuating are worth different amounts of money. She gives the commas a worth of 5 pence and the semi-colons a worth of 5 pounds. She then explains that as with anything else you want “to buy” you have to be aware of how much money you are spending and of how many items you can afford to buy. She keeps explaining her metaphor by reminding the pupils that they cannot afford to buy as many semi-colons as they can afford to buy commas, which means that they cannot use the semi-colons as often as they can use the commas.

Lauren then asks the class when it is appropriate to use commas. One pupil picks up a diary with some grammar notes printed in the back he has brought to class and quotes it directly. Lauren then asks the pupil if he knows what the quote that he just read actually means and the pupil cannot explain what he just read. Instead, Lauren explains the use of commas by using other words, which are less grammatical than the words included in the quotation. Lauren
uses the board to show that commas are used when we want to enumerate things, as for example in a shopping list. She writes the following on the board: *apples bananas oranges grapes*. She points with her hand on the board and after each word that she passes with her hand she asks whether it is appropriate to use a comma after the word or not. The class gives an answer to her question simultaneously after each word. Some pupils do not say anything at all. After *apples* the pupils want a comma and after *bananas* they want a comma as well. When Lauren put her finger just after *oranges* though, the pupils says that they want to put the word *and* there. After this introduction Lauren opens the smartboard that is installed in this classroom.

In smartboard Lauren opens a document with movable clauses and movable conjunctions/coordinators. Lauren then makes a sentence on the board by moving two clauses and connecting them with a semi-colon. She explains that these two clauses have a content that connects them somehow and which makes them tell a little bit more of the same thing when added to each other. She shows that they are independent by putting her fists together in front of her body and pulling them apart in separate directions. The sentence used is the following: *she [sic!] was not wearing her hair tied up; Mrs Clark stopped her*. To the particular pupils on this school, the contents of these clauses are well known. The pupils are all wearing school-uniforms and the girls are required to wear their hair tied up. If they do not follow the clothing-rules they may get reprimands by the woman in charge of the school-uniforms at the school: Mrs Clark.

One pupil after another are then asked up in front of the smartboard and told to move around the clauses on the board however he or she prefers to put them. After each new construction that appears on the board, the class discusses how the meaning of the sentence has changed.

Lauren then changes slides on the smartboard to a slide with the same layout as the previous one, but dealing more specifically with commas. She makes a sentence with a relative clause put after a noun phrase and explains that not only are commas used when enumerating things, but also when including extra-information in the sentence. The sentence used is the following: *The traffic wardens, who are the mean ones, are writing parking tickets*. Lauren tells the pupils that a structure like this one, using commas, is a much better solution than using brackets to include extra-information. Lauren asks the class what are the only parts she needs in order to make a full sentence. One pupil answers: “A verb”. Lauren asks for something else that she has to include in her sentence. Another pupil answers: “A subject!” Lauren then explains that a subject is “someone who is doing something”. She repeats that these two parts are everything that she needs in order to make a full-worthy sentence. Then she adds that what she has done in the sentence about the traffic wardens is that she has just added some extra-information. Lauren asks a pupil to come up in front of the board and make a similar sentence, in which the most essential sentence parts are included, but in which some extra-information has been added.

After some more examples on the board, Lauren asks the class if they have heard about the rule which says that it is forbidden to start a sentence with *because*. She announces that she is
going to show them that this is fully grammatically correct and accepted to do so as long as you include one thing, a comma. She shows a sentence construction like this on the smartboard: *Because she was not wearing her hair tied up, Mrs Clark stopped her.* Lauren tells her pupils that this rule applies to a lot of other connectors/coordinators/conjunctions as well and she mentions *as* as an example.

With the sentence structure still on the board Lauren tells an anecdote about a similar lesson she had with some pupils a couple of years earlier. Lauren says that when she broke the prohibition to use the word *because* in the beginning of a sentence, by introducing the comma structure, two girls in the class she was teaching burst out that: “that’s a smiley-face comma!” No one in class understood what they meant but when the girls had had the time to explain their utterance things became clearer to them all. The girls found it deliberating to finally be allowed to start their sentences with a connector/coordinator/conjunction and felt this needed to be celebrated by giving the comma a new epithet. A comma which fills mentioned functions is now what Lauren refers to as a smiley-face comma.

A pupil is asked up in front of the board to create a sentence with a similar structure using another connector/coordinator/conjunction than *because.* The pupil creates the sentence: *As he walked to the seafront, he wanted to buy an ice-cream.* Lauren then asks the rest of the class if this sentence makes sense, which they think it does. New pupils are asked to come up to the board and make their own examples of the structure. Each time Lauren asks the others if the new construction makes sense and the class answers that it does. Lauren then summarizes the exercise by saying that “A sentence needs to make sense! That’s the sense part of the word”.

Moving on, Lauren quickly goes through the stylistic value that repetition has in texts and no grammar is included in the explanation. After this explanation she tells her pupils to take up a piece of paper and a pencil saying: “We are doing a page about commas”. The following is written on the board:

```
Revision
Commas
1. Commas instead of brackets
2. Smiley-face commas
3. In a list
```

Moreover, a similar list about semi-colons is done:

```
Semi-colons
They join two sentences which mean almost the same thing.
```

With some minutes left until the lesson is finished, one pupil expresses that he is still unsure about how to use semi-colons. Lauren explains the structure one more time on the smartboard, using the same example as before: *she [sic!] was not wearing her hair tied up; Mrs Clark stopped her.* After this last explanation the lesson ends.
Observation 5

Form 5; (16 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 14 pupils; GCSE coming up; (essay writing):

The class gets an assignment to write at home. They are asked to write a comparative analysis between two poems, which they look at together in class. The class is practicing for their GCSE’s in which they will write a similar essay.

Observation 6

Form 3; (14 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 18 pupils; Key stage 3; (spelling triggers grammar):

The class is told to take up their yellow working sheets which they always carry with them to class. The working sheet is called Spelling it out and is made by Lauren. Pupils are given a piece of homework from the sheet. They are told to learn how to spell six words: ceiling, deceive, deceit, receive, receipt and perceive. These words will be homework for the next day.

A rule about how to spell these words is written by Lauren on the board: “i before e, except after c”. She explains that this means that normally a word including an i and an e following each other, is spelled ‘ie’ as in for example chief. Furthermore, she explains that the exceptions to this usual pattern though, are the cases in which the ‘ie’-part is following a c, as in for instance ceiling.

The case that some of the words given as homework are very similar triggers some grammar discussions in the lesson. This happens when Lauren asks the pupils if they know the meaning of each of the six words. The meaning is not written out on the study sheet. Lauren asks what is the difference between some of the words that are very similar and it takes a lot of guessing before the pupils work out the difference between, for instance, deceive and deceit. They all come to the conclusion that the first of the two words is a “doing word”, while the last one is the actual “thing”. Lauren asks the pupils if they remember the name for words that are “doing words” and after a while someone gives the correct answer, being verbs. Lauren then explains the function of nouns shortly by repeating that they are “words of things”. She then asks the pupils whether or not it is possible to see a deceit. One pupil answers that it is not possible since it is an abstract word. The same comparison is then made between the words receive and receipt.

The rest of the lesson is then used to continue reading Macbeth in the same manner as was done the last lesson.

Individual teaching: teacher-pupil: Lauren was supposed to hold an individual grammar lesson dealing mainly with punctuation, for a pupil in the sixth form (17 years old), but the pupil did not show up. Lauren explains what she had planned to teach and the methods that she had planned to use, anyway. She explains that she has a special way of dealing with some pupil’s
difficulties in knowing where to begin and finish a sentence. To explain the function that a subject and a verb fill in a sentence and to make the pupil aware of the fact that a sentence is not complete until it contains a subject and a verb, Lauren uses small figures to illustrate different actions and different agents. For example, she can let one of the figures kick the other to show the relation between subject (kicker), verb (the act of kicking) and object (the figure which is being kicked). Lauren repeats different actions and keeps reminding the pupil that a full stop is needed after each of the actions carried out.

Monday 15th March

Observation 7

Form 4; (15 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 14 pupils; (essay-writing and literature):

An essay has been written on Great Expectations by Charles Dickens. Parts of the novel have been read out in class by the teacher. This lesson, the class watches a screen adaption of Great Expectations, made in 1946.

Observation 8

Form 5; (16 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 14 pupils; (essay writing):

The teacher has corrected essays written by the pupils. The essay task was to compare poems. Lauren tells the class that she has noticed, when correcting their essays, that they have understood the content and forms of the poems very well but that they tend to forget to compare and contrast the poems enough. She reminds them that their essays need more comparing to pass the GCSEs. Furthermore, she reminds them about two essay-patterns that they can use for comparative essays. These two patterns have been taught before in class but Lauren goes through them shortly again.

Lauren says to the class that the board that produces the GCSE-exams wants to see that the pupils can use “something that’s called a modal verb”. She then adds that the pupils do not need to know that term, but that this lesson will be spent on looking at some sentence structures that include modal verbs. Lauren asks if there is anyone in the class who knows what a modal verb is and no one has the answer. She lets them know that “it doesn’t matter” and says that she will write the modal verbs down on the board for them. She writes: could, would, should and might down on the board. Lauren says that since the exam-board has decided that it is important for the pupils to be able to include these verbs in sentences, she tried to think of different situations and sentence structures in which you use modals. She then
says that *If*-sentences have a structure that requires modals and that this is why this lesson will be about *If*-sentences.

Moving on, Lauren asks if there is any pupil in class who can give her a sentence that starts with *If*. One pupil answers: “If English could be easy, I could be good at it.” Lauren corrects the pupil by saying that: “The correct way of saying it is actually: If English was easy, I could be good at it”. Lauren reflects about this structure openly in class, saying that it is not strange that second language learners have troubles learning these forms when even native speakers find it difficult sometimes.

Lauren then asks the pupils to imagine themselves some years ahead answering the question: “If you were in the 6th form, how would you feel?” One pupil answers: “Older”. Lauren and the class reason about the structure of the *If*-sentences. They conclude that they are about someone imagining something and one pupil uses the word “hypothetical”, which they all agree is a very useful word for *If*-sentences.

At the next stage in the lesson, Lauren shows the class a slide on the smart-board. The three following statements are included in the slide:

1) Jess hasn’t brought cakes. If she had cakes, she would give them to you.

2) You don’t know if Mrs. Dawson has brought cakes. If she has cakes, she will give them to you.

3) If Mrs. Dawson has cakes, she gives them to you.

During the whole time that Lauren reads the sentences out loud in class, she points at her bag and moves it around in class, implying that there might be some cookies in it.

After each statement there is a picture of a cake. When pupils have heard Lauren reading the sentences out loud in class, one of them is asked to come up to the board and move the first cake. Under it, the word *hypothetical* is hidden. Lauren then tells the pupils to have a guess about what word might be hidden under the second cake. Some pupils give it a go but no one gives the right answer so Lauren asks the pupil by the board to remove the second cake. The word *possibility* appears. The same procedure is carried out for the third statement and the cake that belongs to it. When the pupil by the board reveals what is under it, the word *usual* can be seen.

The next slide on the board has three *If*-structures on it. They look as follows:

1) If I want ____________ I buy ________________ (usual)

2) If I want ____________ I will buy ________________ (real possibility)

3) If I wanted ____________ I would buy ________________ (hypothetical)

Below the incomplete sentences, on the smartboard, there is a set of different nouns written. For each sentence a pupil is called up to the board and asked to choose one noun to fill the
gaps with. Lauren also asks the class what types of punctuation the example-sentences need. At first the pupils do not understand the question but later on they suggest a comma and a full-stop to make the sentence complete. Lauren asks each pupil, who gets to choose a noun for the sentences, to put a comma and a full-stop in the same sentence where they think it is appropriate to do so. Each pupil put their commas after the noun phrase in the If-clause (the subordinate clause).

The next slide that Lauren shows the class on the smartboard is a grammar slide that shows three different If-clauses’ structures; or the zero conditional, the first conditional and the second conditional as they are called with more grammatical terms. The slide looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Present</th>
<th>Simple Present</th>
<th>Usually true</th>
<th>“Yes!”</th>
<th>zero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I want a car, I buy one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>A real possibility</th>
<th>“I expect so”</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I want to buy a car, I will buy one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Past</th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Hypothetical</th>
<th>“Maybe”</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I wanted to buy a car, I would buy one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lauren reads the list out loud in class. She comments on the numerals zero, 1 and 2 by saying that they indicate the conditional and that this information only is relevant for the FL learners in the classroom, because they are familiar with these types of grammatical terms since before. Lauren says that the numerals are there to help pupils who are familiar with the terms already and that pupils who have not come across the terms before can ignore them.

Moving on, Lauren hands out an exercise to each pupil. In the exercise the pupils are supposed to make up an ending to six sentences starting with the If-construction. Lauren tells the pupils to look at the smartboard slide, that is still projected on the screen and which shows the different If-structures. Meanwhile, Lauren circulates in the classroom and looks at the pupils suggestions. As a sum-up to the exercise, Lauren asks some pupils to read their examples out loud in class and then the class discuss together whether the sentences makes sense or not. Two of the pupil examples are the following: “If my brother wants to annoy me, he has to deal with the consequences” and “If I have an argument with my brother, he usually wins”.

When the class has gone through the exercise together, Lauren reads a paragraph from a pupil’s essay to everyone. She has chosen to read that paragraph, she says, because it contains a lot of If-sentences, which are good to include in the essay writing for the GCSEs. The class finishes with Lauren collecting the exercise handouts that the pupils have written their examples on. She says that she wants to make sure that they have really understood how to use the If-constructions.
Observation 9

Form 3; (14 years old); 60 minutes; approximately 18 pupils (commas):

The comma lesson is carried out again, following almost exactly the same pattern as last time.

Observation 10

Individual teaching: Form 6; (17 years old); approximately 40 minutes; 1 pupil:

In an individual meeting teacher to pupil, Lauren helps a pupil to understand when to put a full-stop by explaining which the constituent parts of a sentence are. Lauren starts the individual meeting by pointing out that she has notices when marking the pupil’s essays that the pupil is not really sure about how to use full-stops. She asks the pupil: “What do you think a sentence is? How do you decide where it starts and stops?” The pupil answers that sentences are separated where “there are different points” and that “you can’t put too much information in a sentence, you need to divide it”. The pupil also adds that when the word *the* occurs, you can put a full-stop. Lauren says that she can tell by the way the pupil answers and that the pupil is not really sure about what a sentence is, but she adds that they will have a look at this together. Lauren explains that there are actually some rules that apply to a sentence. She says that a sentence has to make sense and that it has to have two separate parts. Lauren asks the pupil if she knows which these parts are, but the pupil do not. Then Lauren asks the pupil if she knows what sentence is the shortest one in the Bible. The pupil does not know and Lauren says that the shortest sentence in the Bible would be “Jesus wept”. Lauren explains that in that sentence there is “someone doing something” and she says that this is really all you need to include in a sentence to make it complete. As a follow-up question Lauren asks the pupil if she knows what a verb is, but the pupil cannot answer. Lauren explains that the verbs usually is referred to as “the doing words” and that we call “the person who is doing something” a subject.

At this stage, Lauren takes up some small figures from a bag. She introduces the pupil to the small figures, which she calls “Mr. Candleman” and “Mr. Plasterman”. Then she explains that Mr. Candleman is a bullier and that he kicks Mr. Plasterman. Lauren moves the figures around over the table and makes Mr. Candleman do all sorts of bad things to Mr. Plasterman. She then establishes that “each of these things he did was a sentence”. On a piece of paper, Lauren writes down that *M.C kicks M.P*. She then asks the pupils to find the verb for her in that sentence. The pupil answers that *kicks* is the verb and Lauren asks her if she can find the subject as well. The pupil hesitates and asks: “Is it both of them?” Lauren explains that it is only the one doing something in a sentence that can be called the subject. She adds that “the other poor chap is something else: the object” and that it is easy to remember because “he’s treated as an object” as well. Lauren continues the session by giving the pupil different examples of sentences following the same pattern as *M.C kicks M.P* (namely: Subject-Verb-Object) and asks the pupil to find the verb, the subject and the object for her.
After a while Lauren and the pupil come up with sentences that include two objects (both a direct object and an indirect one). When this happens, Lauren says that they “don’t have to worry too much about that today!” Instead, she repeats the pattern that they have been working with so far: “Someone is doing it to someone else”. She adds that “we say a word is a doing-word, but it can also be a being-word” and she gives some examples of sentences that include the words was, been and are. She asks the pupil if she remembers dealing with the verb être in her French lessons. The pupil says that she does and Lauren adds that those être-words were all being-words, and that there are a lot of them in French.

At the next stage in the lesson Lauren explains when to use a full stop. She says that what they have seen so far is that a sentence consists of a subject, a verb and an object. After these sentence constituents, she explains, a full-stop is needed. The full-stop “tells the sentences apart” and makes sure that we have one subject, one verb and one object on one side of the full-stop and another set of subject, verb and object on the other part. When Lauren has explained this, she asks the pupil to look at some example sentences that Lauren has taken from pupil essays and to put a full-stop in them wherever it is needed. For every sentence that the pupil works with, Lauren asks her why she put the full-stop where she put it. The pupil and Lauren then goes through sentence after sentence and try to find the subject, the verb and the object to find out where they need to finish the sentences. After only a minute or two, the pupil has a fluency in her punctuation and she is encouraged the whole time by Lauren. Lauren explains further that what the pupil is starting to understand now is that punctuation does not only have to do with meaning, but with grammar as well.

The following sentences that the pupil is asked to work with are all dealing with conjunctions. She is asked to link sentences together with for example the word because. The pupil understands Lauren’s explanations quickly, can use them in the exercises and also explain why she makes the choices that she does when adding conjunctions to sentences.

Lauren and the pupil move on to dealing with commas after a few minutes. Lauren explains that when you want to add extra information in a sentence you can do this with commas. She explains that the commas are put between the subject and the verb and that they are there to tell the reader not to panic when he or she cannot find the verb immediately after the subject. The verb will come when the information between the commas is presented. Lauren makes a comparison between commas and brackets and tells the pupil that the commas have a similar function as the brackets, but that they make the text look more professional and that they give the text a better flow.

After dealing with commas, Lauren asks the pupil if she thinks that she is allowed to start a sentence with because. The pupil answers: “No, you can’t really, can you?” Lauren explains that in primary school the teachers tell you that you cannot start a sentence with because, but that now, when the pupil has grown up, she is allowed to. Lauren shows the pupil that if because is put in the beginning of the sentence and a comma is included at the right place later on in the sentence, it is perfectly possible to start the sentence with a conjunction like because.
Lauren asks the pupil to look at some mistakes made by her third-form pupils and to try to see how she can improve the punctuation in each sentence or small paragraph of sentences. The pupil works with this exercise for a while and with the help from Lauren whenever help is needed, she manages to correct all sentences.

The last structure that Lauren teaches the pupil includes semi-colons. Lauren explains that semi-colons can be used to link two sentences, which mean almost the same thing, together. She asks the pupil if she can figure out why it can be good to say almost the same thing twice in a row and the pupil answers that it is a way of emphasizing what is being said. Lauren agrees but she adds that even though semi-colons are useful to emphasize a message, they cannot be used too often. A normal full-stop costs only one pence, she says, but a semi-colon costs as much as 5 pounds. This is worth to keep on mind when writing a text, she adds. Lauren explains that the reason to why you cannot use a semi-colon too often is that the ideas in your text would not progress very quickly that way, since you would be saying the same thing over and over again but in slightly different ways each time. After this explanation it is time for Lauren and the pupil to finish their meeting and the pupil says that she will go home and look at an old essay of hers, which she will practice her new knowledge about punctuation on.
Appendix 5. Good Stuff D. Textbook.

Gary: You are both my friends. This war has got to stop. Shake hands. Make up.
Liam: Never!
Neil: Not in a million years!
Gary: Just make friends. Why can’t you stop being so angry at each other?
Liam: He knows why.
Neil: Yeah, I know why. It’s because you’re a prat, that’s why.
Liam: I’m a prat? Well, if I’m a prat, you’re a total prat.
Gary: Look, stop the name-calling. That’s not going to help.
Neil: He stole my jacket and gave it to his brother.
Liam: I did NOT. Stop calling me a thief or I’ll …
Gary: Look, just calm down. I’m sick of all this fighting.
Neil: That jacket cost me 120 pounds. You stole it. I see your brother wearing it all the time!

Liam: You idiot! I can’t help it if my brother bought the same kind of jacket. But it was you who took my mobile phone! I know it was you...

Gary: Mobile phone? Is that true?

Neil: Noooooo! Why would I want his stupid old phone? I’ve got a brand-new one.

Gary: Okay, so this is what the fighting is all about. A jacket and a mobile phone. Well, let’s get this straight once and for all. Did you steal his jacket?

Liam: No,

Gary: Did you steal his mobile?

Neil: No I didn’t.

Gary: Okay. Misunderstanding right? Problem solved. Because that IS all, isn’t it?

Liam: Yeah, well, no ... not really. It’s about Martha as well.

Neil: You knew I fancied her so why did you ask her out?

Liam: It’s a free world. Let her choose between me and you.

Gary: Look, if you’re fighting about Martha I can make peace between you and I can do it now. Guess who she’s going out with now!

WORDS

**negotiator** – förhandlare
**make up** – bli sams
**not in a million years** – aldrig i livet
**prat** – tont, idiot
**stop the name-calling** – stuta skälla på varandra
**sick of** – trött på
**fighting** – bråk

I can’t help it – det är inte mitt fel
brand-new – splitter ny
get straight – reda ut
once and for all – en gång för alla
misunderstanding – missförstånd
solve – lös
not really – faktiskt inte
as well – också
fancy – gilla
make peace – stifta fred

GOOD STUFF 69
A Läs

Florry: Hi Jason. Did you just come out of the movie as well?
Jason: Yes, I was sitting at the back.
Florry: I was at the front. So, what did you think?
Jason: Of the movie? I thought it was great. Did you enjoy it?
Florry: No, I slept for most of the time.
Jason: What? Didn’t you think it was funny?
Florry: Funny? No, I thought it was stupid. Which part was funny?
Jason: When the doctor fell off his horse.
Florry: He didn’t fall off his horse. He didn’t have a horse.
Jason: Yes he did. He got the horse when his brother was put in jail.
Florry: I must have been asleep by then. I didn’t know he had a brother.
Jason: But he gave his brother the gun at the beginning of the movie.
Florry: Wait a minute, what movie did you see?
Jason: I saw ‘The Fires of the Moon’.
Florry: Ah, well that explains it. I saw ‘The Dawn of Love’. Trust me. Don’t go, it’s rubbish.

B Skriv

Hitta följande i text A.

1 Vad tyckte du?
2 Gillade du den (filmen)?
3 Tyckte du inte att den var rolig?
4 Han hade inte någon blixt.
5 Jag visste inte att han hade en bror.
6 Vilken film såg du?

I frågor och i meningar med not måste du ta hjälp av did i imperfect (dåd).
Did används om alla personer.
Efter did och didn’t använder man infinitiv (grundformen) av huvudverben.
Ex: Did she eat anything?
No, she didn’t eat anything at all.
C Skriv frågor
Skriv frågor. Använd did. Läs svaren först så att du vet vad du ska fråga om.

1 Did you answer Meg's question? Yes, she answered it right away.
2 _____________________________
   you ___________ my car? Yes, I washed your car last night.
3 _____________________________
   he ___________ tennis with Paul? Yes, they played all evening.
4 _____________________________
   I ___________ the door? Yes, you locked it properly.
5 _____________________________
   you ___________ the whole ice cream? Yes, I ate it all.
6 _____________________________
   Sue ___________ in love with Joe? Yes, it was love at first sight.

D Skriv nekande meningar
Gör meningarna nekande. Använd didn’t.

1 Tony played golf in July. _____________________________
   Tony didn’t play golf in July.
2 Eve washed her hair. _____________________________
3 The dogs barked a lot. _____________________________
4 I fell off the horse. _____________________________
5 We ate everything. _____________________________
Appendix 7. Good Stuff C. Workbook.

7 There is / There are – It is

There is a cat on the table. Det sitter en katt på bordet.
There are two dogs under the table. Det ligger två hundar under bordet.
There is no juice in the jug. Det finns ingen juice i tillbringaren.
There are no biscuits left. Det finns inga kex kvar.
There is / There are Det finns / Det står / Det sitter / Det ligger o.s.v.

A Skriv There is eller There are i följande meningar.
1. ___________________ only one woman in the shop.
2. ___________________ five book shops in town.
3. ___________________ many people on the beach.
4. ___________________ a fly in the soup.
5. ___________________ no milk in the fridge.
6. ___________________ no tomatoes left.

There was a tiger in the cage. Det satt en tigr i korgen.
There were two rabbits under the bed. Det låg två kaniner under släggen.
There was no tea left. Det fanns inget te kvar.
There were no bananas in the basket. Det fanns inga bananer i korgen.
There was / There were Det fanns / Det stod / Det satt / Det låg o.s.v.

B Skriv There was eller There were i följande meningar.
1. ___________________ a big hole in the ground.
2. ___________________ thirty students in the class.
3. ___________________ somebody sitting on the chair.
4. ___________________ no water in the swimming pool.
5. ___________________ no letters for you today.
6. ___________________ some milk in the bottle.

There were no postcards for you today.
Frågor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there a cat on the table?</th>
<th>Sitter det en katt på bordet?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there two dogs under the table?</td>
<td>Ligger det två hundar under bordet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there a tiger in the cage?</td>
<td>Satt det en tiger i buren?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there two rabbits under the bed?</td>
<td>Låg det två kaniner under sängen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there?/Are there?</th>
<th>Finns/Sitter/Ligger det? o.s.v.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was there?/Were there?</td>
<td>Fanns/Stod/Satt/Låg det? o.s.v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C Skriv det som fattas i varje fråga.

1. Are there ________ twelve players in a football team?
2. ________ a good film on tonight?
3. ________ a lot of people at the match last week?
4. ________ many mistakes in her essay?
5. ________ a car in the garage when you arrived?
6. ________ anything I can do to help you?
7. ________ a lot of snow in the mountains now?
8. ________ any questions you want to ask?
9. ________ any pirates on the island when you were there?
10. What! ________ more than 1000 birds in the tree yesterday?

D Översätt till engelska. Skriv i din skrivbok.

1. Det sitter en fågel i trädet.
2. Det är femton pojkar i min klass.
3. Det var mycket folk i parken igår.
4. Är det någon hemma?
5. Hur många dagar är det i september?
6. Stod det en cykel i trädgården när du kom hem?
7. Det låg en orm bakom stenen.
8. Det finns många bra böcker jag vill läsa.
9. Är det någon glass kvar?
10. Det ligger en alligator under min säng!
11. Det var många bra band på festivalen.
12. Hur mycket pengar är det i lådan?
13. Var det några snygga killar på dansen?
Appendix 8. Advertisement

You can’t end homelessness.
But you can end hers.

Sophie needs help. She’s been sleeping rough on London’s streets for three years and she can’t stand it any longer.
She constantly feels cold, hungry, dirty, tired and scared. Many of her friends have been attacked and Sophie thinks it’s only a matter of time before something similar happens to her.

By sponsoring a room at Centrepoint, you can get one homeless young person off the streets right now. They’ll then receive all the support they need to rebuild their life and get off the streets for good.

Text homeless to 80010* or visit our website and help get one homeless young person off the streets right now.

Please tear off and keep

Sponsor a room at Centrepoint

Text homeless to 80010* or visit www.centrepoint.org.uk/homeless

centrepoint

*Texts are charged at your standard network rate.
Charity No 29/1411
Appendix 9. How to get good marks in English Exams

ALWAYS MAKE A PLAN FIRST

Use rhetorical questions eg. How would you like to be torn apart by a pack of dogs?

Use semi-colons eg. Everybody had died; no one had a chance.

Use ‘signal’ words at the beginning of paragraphs eg. firstly, secondly, finally

Use interesting vocabulary, especially adjectives (describing words) eg. red, angry, delicate

Use a mixture of long & short sentences

Remember to use question marks. Why. Because it’s annoying if you don’t.

Use repetition eg. The boys were shouting, the girls were shouting, even the old ladies in bobble hats were shouting.

Find different words for ‘said’ eg. shouted, cried, whispered

Use a little bit of conversation. This shows you can punctuate and use variety of sentence length.

Indent all spoken sentences. For example:

The police inspector held out the photograph for them all to look at.

“I’ve never seen him before in my life!” yelled the man in the yellow suit. Everyone stared at him.

Use the most interesting words you can think of. You will get credit for using them, even if they aren’t spelt perfectly.

Start a paragraph with ‘If…’ so that you can include ‘would’, ‘should’ etc

CHECK! (This is probably the single most important thing you can do)