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Abstract
This research compares the grammar in English schoolbooks with the grammar teaching practised in a Swedish secondary school classroom. It explores the grammar content of two English schoolbooks from two different levels, and whether the teacher uses other materials when teaching grammar: language websites with grammar and vocabulary exercises, and listening, reading and writing activities, that are different or similar to the ones in the schoolbooks. The study also looks at different grammar teaching methods, Grammar-translation method, Direct method and Audiolingual method, used in the schoolbooks. Throughout the years, different methods have been used for teaching grammar, which is why it is interesting to see which ones are used here. The grammar content of two English schoolbooks and the classroom observations of year eight and year nine English lessons were analysed and compared in order to find out whether the grammar teaching affects the pupils proficiency level and accuracy in their essays. This investigation is relevant since language teaching has become more and more focused on communication, which means that accuracy has a tendency of being forgotten, even though fluency and accuracy are both equally important in order to achieve a communicative competence.
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1 Introduction

Grammar is “[...] a system for how words are put together to make sense and what 'roles' they play in relation to each other” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 26). Estling Vannestål (2007) mentions that one can distinguish between two grammars: universal grammar, i.e. the grammar people were born with, and language-specific grammar, i.e. what one acquires when being exposed to a certain language in childhood (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 27). Grammar also refers to the theory of how it works; for instance there is a distinction between the formal theory of grammar, which concerns the form of grammatical structures, and the functional theory of grammar, i.e. how grammar is used for different communicative objectives in various situations (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 27). Grammar is an important component of learning a language, whether it concerns the mother tongue or a foreign language, because, according to Estling Vannestål (2007), “[...] communicative competence in English does not only involve making yourself understood. It means that you can express yourself coherently and correctly in a number of different situations in both speech and writing. In order to do this you need to have a good command of all aspects of English, including its grammatical system” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 17). The Swedish governing school documents and the syllabus for English and modern languages mention that teaching a language involves all pupils' development of overall communication skills (Skolverket, 2011: 32 & 73). This means that pupils should acquire grammatical skills, including syntax and morphology. They should also develop sociocultural skills, that is how the language is used in different situations, and discourse skills, i.e. the capacity of putting together all the different pieces of a language and creating something coherent. Finally the pupils should expand their strategic skills, meaning being able to use communicative strategies such as reformulations, questions and body language (Lundahl, 2012: 140). Thus, grammar is not just about learning grammatical rules and knowing how to use them; grammar is mainly about having an accurate, fluent and coherent language.

Studying grammar can be useful if one wants to learn more about how one's first language is constructed, but also when learning a new language (Hewings & Hewings, 2005: 14). Although “[...] most teachers and students would accept that an understanding of second-language grammar is a necessary part of successful learning at some stage” (Hewings & Hewings, 2005: 14), teachers all have different ways of introducing grammar into the classroom. While some teachers choose to proceed with “traditional” grammatical sequences, that is teaching only grammar during a whole lesson or more and then giving the pupils grammar exercises to do and then a grammar test, others may choose to use different methods when working with grammar, such as including grammar teaching into a text the pupils have read or while going through the pupils' essays in class. Harmer (2007: 210) suggests that grammar can be taught through the means of other work that the
pupils are doing, for example studying different aspects of the language, such as grammar or vocabulary, in a text they have read, listened to or even written themselves, or if a grammatical issue is brought up in class and needs to be dealt with straight away. Harmer (2007: 210) also mentions that some teachers use the textbooks when teaching grammar; while some have already planned activities, such as games, exercises, and might bring in other material, such as language websites or other grammar exercises from other schoolbooks, when studying a specific part in grammar.

This topic is relevant because not all textbooks contain a great deal of grammar, whether it is theory or exercises; this investigation is also important since it sheds light on whether the teacher uses other materials when teaching grammar, or various grammatical activities, which might motivate the pupils as well as vary the activities in class. For instance, if the teacher chooses to use different language websites that have grammar and vocabulary exercises, or listening, writing and reading activities, which are different from the ones the pupils do in their workbooks, have some advantages; for one, pupils today like to spend time on their computers, and secondly, they need variation in their schoolwork or else they might get restless and bored. All teachers should think about using other material than just the schoolbooks, and this is something trainee teachers also should think about already at an early stage and look for various material they could use with their future pupils. Thus this is also a relevant topic to study since it might give teachers and trainee teachers a few pointers on what they could do with their pupils and future pupils.

1.1 Aim, research questions and scope
The aim of this study is to compare the grammar sections in the English textbooks *Good Stuff C* (2003) and *Good Stuff D* (2004), for year eight and year nine, with the grammar teaching practised in a secondary school in southern Sweden. Additionally, written texts from year nine were used to support how the teachers bring up the pupils' grammar mistakes in class. To fulfil this aim, the following research questions are addressed:

• How does the grammar content of the schoolbooks, if any, match what is taught in the classroom?
• What grammar teaching methods are used in the observed classroom and in the schoolbooks?
• Which grammatical features, if any, are highlighted during the lessons?
• How does grammar teaching, if any, affect the pupils' proficiency level and accuracy of their essays?

This investigation is first and foremost about studying how the grammar in English textbooks
compares to the grammar teaching practised in a Swedish secondary school classroom. This includes the observations done during English lessons of years eight and nine pupils using an observation guide (see Section 2.1.2) and the analysis of the grammar content in the schoolbooks used in these secondary school classes. However there are some limitations to this study; firstly the gender of the pupils and any mother tongue other than Swedish, although mentioned, will not be taken into account in the investigation, because the gender of the pupils is not relevant to this study and the pupils who have other first languages than Swedish were born in Sweden and speak Swedish as well as any other Swedish pupil. Secondly the content of the pupils' essays is of no interest, nor are the spelling mistakes, unless they have grammatical implications, for example: there house is yellow, instead of their house is yellow. This spelling mistake is grammatical since “[t]here is used with extraposed subjects that are noun phrases, to express some kind of existence” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 294), while their is a possessive pronoun (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 300). Another limitation is that the results of this investigation cannot be generalised outside these two classes, the year nine pupils' essays and the two schoolbooks, unless one expands this study. Nonetheless, the results of this investigation can show interesting and important teaching methods, i.e. that grammar should be incorporated into the lessons through various activities, that it is also good to use the schoolbooks when working with a specific grammar point, but that other material should also be used, which might be useful for teachers when teaching English as a second language.

2 Theoretical background

Over the years, language teaching, and especially grammar teaching, has made big changes in different stages. As a result, three methods of grammar teaching have emerged: the Grammar-translation method (Harmer, 2007: 63), the Direct method (Tornberg, 2009: 37), and the Audiolingual method (Tornberg, 2009: 44). Although there are many other teaching methods today, for the purpose of this essay I have chosen to mention only these three.

The Grammar-translation method appeared during the nineteenth century, when it was decided that foreign-language teaching would become part of the curriculum (Harmer, 2007: 63). The basic idea of this method was that the pupils would be taught certain grammar points, which they then practiced by translating given sentences from the foreign language (L2) to their first language (L1) and vice versa (Harmer, 2007: 63). Harmer (2007) also mentions a number of features which are worth discussing; firstly, language was taught using mostly sentences, which meant that longer texts were seldomly studied, secondly, spoken language was hardly considered at all, and thirdly, accuracy was the most important part (Harmer, 2007: 63). Thus, the pupils were not
really taught how to speak the foreign language.

The Direct method was introduced at the end of the nineteenth century with the intention of a completely new direction of language learning, away from the grammar-based teaching. This meant that spoken language would have a far bigger place in the classroom (Tornberg, 2009: 37). Since international contacts were still rather restricted, phonetics and phonetic transcriptions became a way of approaching spoken language (Tornberg, 2009: 37). With this method, the foreign language was to be learnt without the mediation of the mother tongue; this led to a similar development between the foreign language and the mother tongue, and to the fact that the learning process would lie in the pupils' capacity of associating words and expressions in the foreign language, and also objects and events in their immediate surroundings (Tornberg, 2009: 37 & 39-40).

The Audiolingual method started to bloom in the US during World War II when soldiers were sent to Europe and needed a quick way to learn a foreign language. This new method of language learning was also developed by the linguists who decided to solve the problem of how to teach modern languages. After the war, language learning became more accessible to everyone, and the need of knowledge of foreign languages had become global (Tornberg, 2009: 44). This method uses the stimulus-response-reinforcement model which attempts “through a continuous process of such positive reinforcement, to engender good habits in language learners” (Harmer, 2007: 64). These habits were formed using drills, which are a teaching method based on repetition in order to control the teaching of a new language (Harmer, 2007: 207). For example, if it is done using pictures, the teacher holds a picture of a man running, and the pupils have to describe the picture: He is running. The teacher holds up another picture, this time a man swimming, and the pupils answer: He is swimming. It can also be verbal, where the teacher asks a question and the pupils answer it. This is called cue and response.

2. 1 Previous studies

The previous section introduced grammar teaching and the different methods that have been used over the years. This section consists of various studies from different researchers on the topic of grammar teaching. They all have different views on how grammar should be taught and these studies present their perspectives and various teaching strategies.

According to Al Ghazali (2006: 2), a teacher has to make decisions all the time, some being more important than others since they have to do with the methods to be applied in class. Choosing only one method is not always the best choice since it involves putting together a large number of various and often conflicting priorities, and one method is never constantly supported. However, having no clear method can lead to using random teaching techniques (Al Ghazali, 2006:
Therefore, grammar is one of the topics that is the most argued when it comes to language learning (Al Ghazali, 2006: 2).

The purpose of Al Ghazali's (2006) paper is to compare two approaches: the Consciousness-Raising (CR), or Grammar-Consciousness-Raising (GCR), or the inductive approach, and the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP), or the deductive approach. The inductive and the deductive approaches are two ways teachers can use in order to achieve the understanding of a rule, which can also lead the pupils to practising the rule until its use becomes automatic (Al Ghazali, 2006: 4).

Inductive learning is “the covert and implicit presentation of grammar” (Al Ghazali, 2006: 5), which means that the pupils are not given the rule directly; they have to discover it and understand it by themselves through examples which will provoke discussions, thinking and brainstorming (Al Ghazali, 2006: 5). Deductive learning is the opposite of inductive learning, which means that it is “the overt and explicit presentation of grammar” (Al Ghazali, 2006: 4). That is, the pupils are given the rule right from the beginning, with examples and exercises where this rule is applied: they have already learnt the syntactic usage and the semantic meaning of the rule before applying it, rather than exploring it themselves (Al Ghazali, 2006: 4).

In modern language teaching, one can summarise the debate over the teaching of grammar as being based on two choices: the grammar-based approach, which is to teach grammar directly as a group of grammatical rules i.e. the deductive approach, and the communication-based approach, meaning teaching grammar indirectly through different contexts of language use, i.e. the inductive approach. Even though much has changed during the years when it comes to practical research-based recommendations, many language teachers still prefer the more traditional ways of teaching languages, that is using mostly the workbook and doing translation based exercises (Hasselqvist, 2003: 1).

The aim of Hasselqvist's (2003) study was to compare, just as Al Ghazali (2006), two different approaches, the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model, or deductive learning (Al Ghazali, 2006: 4), and the Grammar-Consciousness-Raising (GCR) model, or inductive learning (Al Ghazali, 2006: 5), and get a deeper understanding of these two approaches for teaching English grammar in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classroom in Swedish upper secondary school. The purpose of the study was to offer the EFL teachers a better understanding of two different methods for teaching English grammar and an increased understanding of the possible usefulness of these methods, and to examine which one of them functions the best (Hasselqvist, 2003: 2).

Hasselqvist's (2003) material for his study was mainly the answers given by the pupils on a test. This test was given to four groups of pupils at a Swedish upper secondary school after
they had been taught the English genitive construction, during a 75 minute lesson. Two of the
groups were taught using one method, and the other two groups were taught using the other method.
For the purpose of this study, the four group were called G1-G4. Nearly all of the pupils in these
groups had Swedish as their mother tongue, except for five pupils, although this did not affect the
results of the investigation since their Swedish was as good as any other Swedish pupil
(Hasselqvist, 2003: 11-12).

In the G1 and G2 groups, the pupils were studying English 5. G1 and G2 both had 16
pupils. In the G3 and G4 groups, the pupils were studying English 6. G3 and G4 both also had 16
pupils. Thus, groups G1 and G3 were taught using the GCR model, while groups G2 and G4 were
taught using the PPP model (Hasselqvist, 2003: 12-13).

Overall, in the groups that were taught according to the PPP model, the girls had the
highest correctness score with 74%, while the boys obtained 55% of correctness (Hasselqvist, 2003:
16-18). Furthermore, even though the boys, who were taught according to the GCR model, scored
higher than the girls, who were taught according to the GCR model, on the singular form -s's,
overall, the girls had the highest score with 70%, while the boys scored 57% (Hasselqvist, 2003:
19-20).

The results of Hasselqvist's (2003) study showed that the GCR model was a better
teaching method than the PPP model. The pupils who were taught using the GCR model obtained a
higher score on all genitive forms than the pupils taught using the PPP model. The one significant
instance during which the PPP model was better in this investigation was in the overall score of the
girls taught using the PPP model. These girls scored 74% while the girls taught using the GCR
model scored 70% (Hasselqvist, 2003: 20-21).

Hasselqvist's (2003) study of the GCR and PPP is relevant because depending on what
method the teacher is using, (s)he will either let the pupils discover and understand the grammar
rule for themselves, or give them the rule and let them apply it to exercises, respectively inductive
and deductive learning. The teacher in the investigation of this paper applied both methods: when
the year nine pupils were handed back their essays, some pupils wanted the teacher to give them a
direct explanation of their mistakes, which in this case were subject-verb concords. This could be
seen as the deductive approach. The other pupils preferred discovering and understanding their
mistakes by themselves. This could be the inductive approach.

Richards (2002) discusses task-based approaches to teaching. These approaches were
based on involving pupils in significant interactions and discussions where the focus lay on
completing the task. This meant that instead of at predeclared grammar syllabus, the pupils'
performances determined their level of grammar (Richards, 2002: 153). Richards' investigation
focused on actual opinions about task-based grammar teaching and indicated that during the task
grammar learning can be influenced at different stages: before, during and after the task. The
purpose of this investigation was also to study the problem of the level of language pupils usually
used when practising fluency, and examine strategies for solving this problem using
communication-based methods (Richards, 2002: 153-154).

Richards (2002) proceeded by comparing two approaches: the grammar-based
approach, or PPP approach (Hasselqvist, 2003: 1-2), and the task-based approach, or GCR approach
(Hasselqvist, 2003: 1-2). According to Richards (2002: 154), the most important part of a task-
based approach is a teaching based on fluency, that is communication. Communication consists of
engaging pupils in various task that involve developing their language while focusing on meaning
rather than form and structure. The intention of communicative tasks is to immerse the pupils in
activities that demand them to focus on negotiating meaning and engaging on natural and
significant interactions and discussions (Richards, 2002: 154). “In advocating the use of task work
in language teaching, the assumption is that learners will develop not only communicative skills but
also an accessible standard of performance through task work” (Richards, 2002: 155), which means
that the task-based approach will help the pupil reach a good standard of fluency and skills that will
enable him/her to communicate.

However, there are issues with this task-based approach. One problem was that the
pupils would go through a process of changing their linguistic output by negotiating meaning, but
studies showed that pupils are not predisposed to using this method when encountering lacks of
linguistic knowledge (Richards, 2002: 155). Another issue was the low level of accuracy while
practising fluency, which is commonly a lack of grammatical knowledge. Richards illustrated this
second problem with a dialogue where two pupils role-played as a doctor and a patient (Richards,
2002: 156). The example clearly showed that “in task work communicative competence is often
used as a term for communication in spite of language, rather than communication through
language” (Richards, 2002: 157). In other words, acquiring communicative competence does not
mean that one acquires linguistic accuracy. In order to acquire both, one needs to understand the
process of second language learning, which is based on five stages: input, intake, acquisition, access
and output (Richards, 2002: 157). As a result, being able to communicate consist of both fluency
and accuracy in order to obtain communicative competence. Richard meant that focusing on
grammar can be reached during the tasks (Richards, 2002: 164).

Richards (2002) study is relevant to this investigation since it provides further insight
of the GCR approach, or the inductive approach (Al Ghazali, 2006: 5), that there are both
advantages and disadvantages when using a task-based approach. However, the teacher in the
present study does not teach grammar during this observed week; the pupils practice grammar on
their computers and from time to time she hands out photocopies of exercises from the workbooks
to them. However, from previous observations it has been noticed that her lessons have a clear
focus on communication using various texts, listening activities, discussions, group activities, etc.

Ellis (2002) discusses two questions about methodological options in grammar teaching
materials: what method for grammar teaching was being used in grammar practice books, and on
what basis was this method chosen. Ellis answered the first question by analysing the
methodological features of a variety of grammar practice books, and the second question by
indicating the guiding principles from the kind of exercises used in these books (Ellis, 2002: 155).
The purpose of Ellis' (2002: 156) investigation was to create a framework in order to be able to
depict and construct materials for grammar teaching. Ellis (2002: 155) proceeded by examining the
instructional options that are usually chosen by authors of grammar books, which gave an image of
how grammar teaching is conceived nowadays; then he reviewed theoretical and empirical research
which referred to a number of omitted alternatives in grammar teaching, and finally he considered
materials for grammar teaching that have these alternatives.

Ellis (2002: 158) identified three alternatives: explicit description, data and operations.Explicit description concerns the explanation (supplied) or the discovery (discover) of grammar
rules, data refers to texts with examples of the studied grammar structure, and operations concern
exercises, which can be of the the productive kind (production), either controlled or free, the
receptive kind (reception), controlled or automatic, or the judgemental kind (judgement) (Ellis,
2002: 158-159). These aspects are usually not all in the same grammar book; in some materials one
may find the options explicit description and operations, while others may only have the option
data Although practice books will always have the option of operations since it is involves
exercises (Ellis, 2002: 158).

By analysing one particular grammar point in six grammar books, Ellis (2002: 160) was
able to find out if a certain alternative was clear in a grammar point. Two aspects were
predominant: explicit description supplied and controlled production, which means that the
grammar books of today are probably not that different from those of previous years (Ellis, 2002:
160). Nevertheless, only two books gave the pupils the possibility to discover a grammar rule, and
even these books had very few exercises that could provide them with this opportunity. The data
options were also very few, although most of the books did have examples of usage as part of the
explanations and the activities (Ellis, 2002: 160).

From this perspective, the grammar teaching seems very traditional, meaning that the
pupils are given an explanation of the rule which they then have to practice in exercises, which are
for the most part controlled (Ellis, 2002: 159). For example, the pupil has to write questions to the answer using do/did. However, pupils should be given the possibility to also discover the grammar point for themselves, which means that they also need data in order to be put them into situation where they can notice how the grammar rule is applied (Ellis, 2002: 161).

Ellis' (2002) study is relevant because it provides insight into how grammar books are designed, which is of use for the analysis of the workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004). It is also relevant because, although the grammar books of today still have some changes to make in order to reach a level of variety where the pupils can both discover grammar rules and learn to understand by themselves, and also get some explanations of certain grammar structures, the lessons are not necessarily as traditional as the books; that is, some teachers choose to incorporate grammar through the means of other activities such as writing, listening, reading and discussing, and using various sources, i.e. authentic texts, different workbooks, and language websites.

This section contained various studies concerning grammar. Al Ghazali (2006) and Hasseqvist (2003) compared two teaching methods: the CR/GCR or the inductive approach and the PPP or the deductive approach. Richards' (2002) investigation was about addressing the problems of a task-based or inductive approach using a communicative methods. Finally, Ellis (2002) studies the design of grammar practice books by analysing the various options. The next section presents the results and analysis of the investigation of this paper and contains the analysis of the workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) (Section 4.1), of the observations of the English classes of years eight and nine (Section 4.2), and eight of the year nine pupils' argumentative essays (Section 4.3).

3 Material and method

3.1 Material

The primary material used for this investigation consists of the observations of three 40 minute-English lessons of year eight and two 60 minute-English lessons of year nine in a secondary school in southern Sweden, their respective English workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004), and eight argumentative pupil essays, of one to three pages, but no shorter than one page, produced by year nine pupils in English. I chose to use essays only from year nine since I had straight access to them by being the teacher of these pupils during my five week traineeship at the school; the year eight pupils had no writing activities at the time. These eight essays from year nine were chosen because they each had different grammatical mistakes. Since I had corrected these essays I knew what mistakes the pupils had made.
Each class consisted of 21 pupils in year eight, eight girls and 13 boys, and 32 pupils in year nine, 16 girls and 16 boys. The class of year eight had five pupils with other mother tongues than Swedish; however, their Swedish was as good as any pupil with Swedish as a L1. Therefore this did not affect my observations. The class of year nine had one pupil with a different mother tongue; however, he seldomly participated in the lessons since he had Swedish lessons instead. Thus this did not affect the results. Also, only the essays of Swedish pupils were chosen. The observations performed during the lessons, between Tuesday the 13\textsuperscript{th} of January 2015 and Friday the 16\textsuperscript{th} of January 2015, were based on an observation guide which I created specifically for this study (see Section 2.1.2).

3.1.1 Schoolbooks

These pupils in year eight and year nine use, respectively, the schoolbooks \textit{Good Stuff C} (2003) and \textit{Good Stuff D} (2004). For each of these levels there are two books: a textbook which contains various texts on different themes, and a workbook that contains exercises for the texts and a grammar section. For the purpose of this study, only the workbooks were analysed since the textbooks only consisted of texts. The workbook \textit{Good Stuff C} (2003), which is 144 pages long, contains two parts: the first part is exercises for the texts in the textbook, and the second part is grammar. The first part consists of sections that match the ones in the textbook and the exercises revolve around answering questions about the texts, translations, crosswords, writing, listening and discussion activities. The grammar part has also sections, each of them being a different grammar point for which there are explanations and grammar exercises. The workbook \textit{Good Stuff D} (2004), which is 160 pages long, is basically built the same way only it has different themes in the first part, and other grammar points in the second part. However, the school does not provide the pupils with new books, because the teachers are supposed to use more and more IT in the classroom. Nevertheless, this teacher still uses the workbooks on several occasions instead of the Internet by photocopying pages from the grammar part. This way, the pupils receive some form of variation.

3.1.2 Observations

As mentioned earlier, the observations for this study were based on an observation guide, which I created for the purpose of this investigation. This guide included:

- grammatical features brought up in class;
- whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence of the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar;
- grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity;
- whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other schoolbooks.
Five observations were made during a period of one week. Since I had been in both of the classes on several occasions before, my presence there did not disturb or change the pupils' or the teacher's behaviour in the classroom, which is exactly what the Observer's Paradox is about. This term was introduced by Labov (1972), who stated that “the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed; yet we can only obtain this data by systematic observation” (Labov, 1972: 209).

3.1.3 Essays

Eight essays out of 32 were selected for this investigation, and the average number of words per essay for these eight texts was 453. These essays were selected because, they all contained various amounts of grammatical mistakes which were of interest to this study, that is the most common grammar mistakes pupils, with Swedish as their first language, make when practising English as their second language. The topic was to argue whether parents should limit the use of social media by teenagers or not. Since the pupils had been working on the subject of argumentation during the past three weeks, they were expected to use a clear structure with an introduction where they had to present the topic and give some general information about it, two arguments for and one against with supporting explanations, and finally a conclusion where they had to briefly summarise their arguments and give their own opinion on the subject. The pupils were also expected to use other linking words than but, because, and, or, because during the first week they were taught how and when to use different linking words. The pupils were given a list of linking words for support. These texts were written by hand, so the pupils had to think for themselves how words were spelt and how sentences were formulated, without using any correction tools, such as the grammar spelling tool in Word. This way it was easier to note whether they had really understood how some grammatical rules worked, such as subject-verb agreement, since, as I noted when I corrected their essays, apart from spelling, this seemed to be the most difficult for the pupils when it came to writing, because the same mistake appeared many times in their texts. Thus, it would be interesting to see if their teacher uses exercises which might help them understand their mistakes in order to not make them again.

3.2 Method

The research carried out for this study consists of comparing how two different levels of English from a secondary school in southern Sweden, year eight and year nine classes, practised grammar in the classroom, with the grammar found in their workbooks, respectively Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004). For the purpose of this study, the method of triangulation was used, that is more than one method was used in order to gather data (Bryman, 2003: 1142). The triangulation method was appropriate for this study because it enhanced security and confidence in the results. In
this case it involved using a between-method triangulation by contrasting research methods (Bryman, 2003: 1142): classroom observations, analysis of grammatical mistakes in pupils' essays and of their schoolbooks. This comparison was performed by first observing three 40 minutes years eight English lessons and two 60 minutes year nine English lessons throughout a week, respectively 21 pupils and 28 pupils in each of the classes, using an observation guide (see Section 2. 1. 2), which I created, in order to make it easier to know what should be taken into account. Five observations were performed during that week, and they were complemented by eight argumentative essays produced by year nine pupils in English, in order to see whether the teacher chooses exercises which might help the pupils understand their mistakes so that they do not repeat them again. Although the teacher did not correct these essays she still had access to them and could see what the pupils needed to work on.

Secondly, the workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) were analysed to see how much grammar they contained, which grammatical features were mentioned, how many exercises could be found, their content and purpose. The results of this examination, presented in a table in order to get a clearer picture, were then compared with the results of the observation by looking at the differences, such as how much grammar did the workbooks have compared to what the pupils did in class with their teacher, the different grammatical features, how the exercises from the schoolbooks differed from the ones the teacher gave them in class, especially if they were taken from a different source, and the similarities, such as the resemblances between the grammar taught in the classroom and what is written in the schoolbooks, and if the teacher used similar exercises in class to those in the schoolbooks. Additionally to the observations, eight essays were analysed in order to uncover whether grammar teaching affects the pupils' proficiency level in their essays.

Since I corrected these essays, I already knew what mistakes the pupils had made. However there were not only grammar mistakes, there were also a number of spelling mistakes, but these were not taken into account unless they had grammatical implications. Estling Vannestål (2007) organises grammar into blocks: word classes, grammatical phrases and clause elements (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 45-46). In order to make it easier to categories the mistakes, Estling Vannestål's (2007) word classes were used. What seemed to cause the pupils most problems in their essays were: verbs, pronouns and prepositions. These features were placed into a table in order to clearly see the number of mistakes per feature in each essay. The different features were then compared to the features in the workbooks, especially Good Stuff D because it is the year nine pupils' schoolbook, by looking at which exercises would correspond to the pupils' needs.

Since this research involves human participants, it is important to consider ethical issues (Vetenskapsrådet, 2004). This means that the pupils and the teacher were informed of the nature
and purpose of my observations, and year nine pupils were asked whether their essays could be used for my study and were told what the study was about. The participants were also informed that they would remain anonymous throughout the investigation since neither their school, nor their names would appear in the study, this includes both the argumentative essays and the observations.

This section contained a detailed description of the material and method used for this study. The next section presents a short account of various studies made by different researchers on the subject of grammar teaching.

4 Results and analysis

4.1 Schoolbooks

At the secondary school where this study was conducted, the schoolbook used was the *Good Stuff* series. For each year at secondary school there is a different level, A to D, with two books: a textbook that contains only texts and list of new words for each text, and a workbook that contains various exercises which correspond to the texts and themes of the textbook, such as vocabulary exercises, listening activities, reading and comprehension, and the grammatical part with grammar exercises at the end of the book. However, the school does not provide the pupils with any new schoolbooks anymore since it has been decided that the teachers should use computers more. Each pupil and teacher are supplied with a computer, which they are meant to use more and more during the lessons.

For this research, *Good Stuff C* (2003) and *Good Stuff D* (2004) were analysed according to how much grammar they contained, that is the number of pages and number of exercises in relation to the total number of pages, 50, and the total number of exercises, 73, the content of each part and which grammatical features were mentioned. The findings of each of the books are presented in Tables 1 and 2 below and then analysed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar sections</th>
<th>Quantity of grammar (number of pages)</th>
<th>Quantity of exercises (number of exercises)</th>
<th>Content of exercises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plural form of nouns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng, crossword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Genitives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adjectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Circle the words, write the correct form, write your own sentences where you compare two entities, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adverbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Create adverb from adjectives, and write them into the correct column, translations Swe-Eng, write the correct plural form, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reflexive pronouns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translations Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Some and any</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There is/There are – It is</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Verbs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Write the correct verb form, underline the verb form and correct it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Present of regular and irregular verb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Imperfect of regular and irregular verb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks, give an examples of pronunciation rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perfect and pluperfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Meaning of the words, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reformulating with DO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, rewrite the sentences into questions starting with do or does, finish the questions so they correspond with the answers, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Reformulating with DID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finish the questions so they correspond with the answers, protest against the following statements, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Verbs – Practice of tenses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Passive form</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Write the sentence in all the tenses, answer the questions, translation Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Prepositions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Preposition + - ing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Circle the prepositions, fill-in-the-blanks, write your own sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Word order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng, rewrite the sentences with the temporal expressions, write your own sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tag questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, paring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see in Table 1, the workbook *Good Stuff C (2003)* for year eight contains 20 grammar sections out of 23; the grammar section is 55 pages. Three sections, five pages of *Principal*
part of irregular verbs, Numerals, and Phonetics, were left out since they did not contain any exercises, although one could discuss whether Phonetics should be part of the grammar part since it has to do with pronunciation. However, the book being 144 pages long, the grammar part only takes up 55 pages, which is not even half of it. One would expect there to be more since it is a workbook. Of course, understanding text and learning new words is also important; nonetheless, as mentioned in the introduction, grammar in important for the communicative competence since, apart from being understood, it also involves being able to express oneself coherently and correctly in various contexts (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 17).

Looking closer at the exercises, there are 73 grammar exercises and the number of exercises per section varies between two and six, which might suggest the difficulty of learning and understanding each feature; for instance, the more exercises a section has, the more difficult it is. For example, while the sections Genitives, Verbs, and Future only have two exercises each, the sections Adverbs, There is/There are – It is, and Imperfect of regular and irregular verbs have six exercises each.

The content of exercises does not differ much. Most of them revolve around filling-in-the-blanks of various kinds and translations from Swedish to English (Swe-Eng), but never from English to Swedish. Translation in the context of grammar teaching is known as the Grammar-translation method, or methods (Harmer, 2007: 63), which is translating from the mother tongue to the foreign language. This is basically what the pupils have to do in the grammar part of Good Stuff C (2003). They were given a few grammar points which they then had to apply in translations. For example, in the section Genitives, the pupils are first given an explanation of the genitive and the apostrophe + s and examples of how to use it, and then an exercise where they had to translate from Swedish to English, as shown in (1).

(1)

1 lärarens böcker ..............................................
2 lärarnas böcker ..............................................
3 barnens far ....................................................
4 barnets far ....................................................
5 gårdagens tidning ..........................................  
6 kvinnornas bilar ..............................................
7 Sveriges huvudstad ....................................... (Coombs et al, 2003: 94-95).

Of course there were also other exercises such as paring up sentences, crosswords, circling the correct word, underlining the mistake and correcting it, but these did not appear very often, perhaps
because these types of exercises were seen as not as efficient as the translation and fill-in-the-blanks exercises. The Fill-in-the-blanks exercises were also very common in this case. In order to get an idea of what these exercises intend to teach the pupils, they are linked to each of the three grammar teaching methods presented in Section 3. Obviously, and as stated earlier on, all the translation exercises from Swedish to English correspond to the Grammar-translation method. Exercises such as crosswords, writing your own sentences, correcting verb forms, finishing questions, answering questions, correspond to the Direct method because in some way they all engage the pupils into using their own capacity of associating words and expressions in the foreign language. Finally, exercises such as fill-in-the-blanks, circling words, verbs or prepositions, giving examples of pronunciation rules and writing the correct verb form and plural form correspond to the Audiolingual method since they are a part of the stimulus-response-reinforcement method, where the pupils are taught through drills and repetition.

The following table presents the findings of the workbook Good Stuff D (2004). It shows the selection of grammar sections in the book, the number of pages for each section, the number of exercises in each section and the content of the exercises.
### Table 2. Grammar in Workbook Good Stuff D (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar sections</th>
<th>Quantity of grammar (number of pages)</th>
<th>Quantity of exercises (number of exercises)</th>
<th>Content of exercises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nouns</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Circle the right alternative, translations Swe-Eng, fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adjectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swe-Eng, work in pares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adverbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translations Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pronouns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Swedish “man”</td>
<td>½</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Swedish “det”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swed-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Much, many – Every, each</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Verbs – Repetition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. - ing after certain verbs and expressions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, and circle the verb or expression prior to the – ing, translations Swe-Eng, work in pares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Modal auxiliary verbs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, translations Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Usually – used to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Had better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What to do/I want you to …</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Translations Swe-Eng, translation Swe-Eng/Eng-Swe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do/Make</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Prepositions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fill-in-the-blanks, write your own sentences, work in pares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Preposition + - ing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Finish the sentences, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Word order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Word formation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fill in the tables, write your own sentences, create your own words, translation Swe-Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Some other “Englishes”</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Find the BrE equivalent of the AmE words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to Table 1, Table 2 shows that the workbook for year nine contains 19 different grammar sections out of 23. The four last sections, which included the features Principal parts of irregular verbs, Numerals, Punctuation and spelling rules, and Phonetics, were excluded since they did not contain any exercises, although, here as well one could discuss whether Phonetics should be a grammar section since it is more about pronunciation. Some other Englishes could also be discussed whether it should be a grammar section since in this workbook it was more about vocabulary.

Some features are repeated from the previous workbook, such as Adjectives, Adverbs, Verbs, Prepositions, Preposition + -ing, Word order, Principal parts of irregular verbs, and
Numerals. The others, such as Nouns, Pronouns, The Swedish “man”, The Swedish “det”, Much, many – Every, each, -ing after certain verbs and expressions, Modal auxiliary verbs, Usually – used to, Had better, What to do/I want you to, Do/Make, Word formation, Some other “Englishes”, are new. Nevertheless, the grammar part is only 58.5 pages long, which is not even half of the 160 pages long workbook. Just as in Good Stuff C (2003), which might still not be enough. The grammar section should contain more pages and more exercises, because, as Estling Vannestål (2007) argues, grammar enables one to understand how words are put together to form a sentence; in order to be able to make oneself understood and communicate, one needs to know all the aspects of English, including grammar (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 17 & 26).

In this workbook, the number of exercises per section seems to vary even more, i.e. between one and 16. For example, Word formation has 16 exercises, while Much, many – Every, each only has one exercise. Thus, if one assumes that the number of exercises per section suggests the difficulty of it, Word formation would be more difficult than Much, many – Every, each.

Here again the grammar exercises mostly revolve around translations from Swedish to English (Swe-Eng), with one exception in What to do/I want you to … where there are sentences in both Swedish and English, which means the pupils have to translate the Swedish sentences into English and vice versa.

(2)
1 I never told you to do it ........................................................................
2 I told you never to do it ...........................................................................
3 We wanted them never to leave ............................................................
4 We never wanted them to leave ............................................................
5 De sa aldrig åt oss att komma tillbaka ..................................................
6 De sa åt oss att aldrig komma tillbaka ................................................. (Coombs et al, 2004: 137).

This again shows that the Grammar-translation method (Harmer, 2007: 63) is still very common in language lessons today, even though it is seen as a more traditional approach for learning foreign languages. Many of the exercises are also about filling-in-the-blanks just as in Good Stuff C (2003). Just as with the previous workbook the exercises can be linked to the three grammar teaching methods in Section 3. Translation exercises correspond to the Grammar-translation method. Exercises where the pupils have to work in pairs, write their own sentences, create their own words and find British English equivalences of the American English words are part of the Direct method since the pupils have to use their own capacity of the foreign language without the mediation of
their mother tongue. Lastly, the fill-in-the-blanks exercises and circling verbs and expressions prior the -ing form correspond to the third method, the *Audiolingual* method because they are based on drills and repetition. Nonetheless, these two exercise-books, along with their corresponding textbooks, are from 2003 and 2004, which means that these schoolbooks were published 11 years ago. In other words, the teaching method used in these books has probably changed somewhat.

This section provided a detailed description of the content of the exercise part of the workbooks *Good Stuff C* (2003) and *Good Stuff D* (2004) with an analysis of each of the part based the studies in the Section 3. 1. The next section presents the classroom observations conducted during a period of one week and an analysis based on previous studies.

### 4.2 Classroom observations

The observations conducted at the Swedish secondary school, between Tuesday the 13th of January 2015 and Friday the 16th of January 2015, were of the English lessons of year eight and year nine. It is important to know that the school provides each pupil and teacher with a computer which is meant to be used in class for various activities, such as practising grammar, doing reading and listening exercises, as well as writing. IT (Information Technology) has become more and more integrated into the classrooms and the teachers are supposed to use it during their lessons. Consequently, the school does not provide the pupils of year eight and year nine with new schoolbooks for their English lessons. Although the textbooks, that contain only texts, are still often used by there teacher, the pupils' do not use the workbooks; most grammar-based exercises are done on the Internet. However, the observed teacher sometimes photocopies pages of exercises from the grammar section in the *Good Stuff* workbooks. According to the teacher, this gives the pupils some variation in their activities.

The observations were conducted using a observation protocol, see Section 2. 1. 2. The first lesson, 40 minutes, was with the year eight pupils on Tuesday before lunch. This class is usually very loud and has a hard time concentrating on one activity for a longer period of time. This lesson was no different. During this lesson the pupils were going to learn how to use *Digilärf*, which is an Internet programme the school has paid for. This programme is a teaching material which replaces the traditional schoolbooks or complements them. *Digilärf* can be used in most secondary and upper secondary school subjects, such as languages, mathematics, geography, history, and more will come since it is still in the process of development. This programme covers the main content of the English curriculum with different activities for reading, writing and listening. It also has a grammar section where the pupils can do grammar exercises concerning articles (a, an, the), plural nouns, genitives, adjectives, adverbs, the present and past tenses of *be*, the present and past tenses of regular verbs, the present tense of *do* in both negative and none negative sentences, the future
tense, irregular verbs, equivalents of the Swedish *det*, numerals, interrogatives, pronouns, prepositions, and the past progressive form. The teacher has the possibility to keep an eye on the pupils' progress and comment on their work. The teacher's instructions were that the pupils had to do some listening, reading and translation activities.

Thus, it was observed that, although there were no particular grammatical features brought up in class, some pupils chose to practice their grammar, such as the present and past tenses of *be*, the present tense of *do* in both negative and none negative sentences, the present and past tenses of regular verbs, irregular verbs and prepositions, either as a complement to the other activities or instead of those activities. According to the teacher, these are the grammar points which are the most difficult for the pupils. Therefore, although the teachers instructions were to do some listening, reading and translation, it was actually good that some pupils chose to practice what they felt was hard to grasp.

The second lesson was after lunch on the same day, also 40 minutes with the year eight pupils. After lunch the pupils had even more difficulties focusing on the task, which was to explore the use of yet another programme, *Read Theory*. This programme is meant for reading and learning to understand various texts. It contains thousands of texts with different levels of difficulty. The pupils go through levels where they are given a text to read for which there are questions they have to answer. There are 12 levels in all, where level one is the easiest one and level 12 the most difficult one. If the pupils score less than 70% they go back a level, unless they are on level one, if they score between 70% and 90% they stay on the same level with a different text, and if they score more than 90% they move on to the next level. On average the pupils reached level three or four, which is, according to the teacher, grades C-B. This programme also enables the teacher to see the pupils' progress, that is, the pupils are listed under their English class, which the teacher added when she subscribed to *Read Theory*. For each pupil she can see how many texts he/she has read, how many questions he/she has answered and what level he/she has reached. The teacher can also see how the pupil has progressed on a digram. For example, a pupil might have gotten through level one and two easily, but had to do level three two times before reaching level four. Then maybe going back to level three because (s)he did not score enough on level four in order to reach level five or stay at the same level. At the end of lesson the teacher checked the pupils' progression.

According to the observation protocol, it was observed that no grammar was brought up during this lesson since the pupils worked with reading and understanding a text, and the only questions they had were about vocabulary. On the other hand, one could argue that, in order to understand a text, not only does one need a certain vocabulary, but also a certain knowledge of grammar.
The third lesson, one hour, was with the year nine pupils on Wednesday morning. This class is very different from the year eight class. Although it is a very mixed class when it comes to their level of English, they are, for the most part, very hard working, and usually focused on their task. During this lesson the pupils had to work with the programme Read Theory. The average level of this class was five or six, that is, according to the teacher, grades C-B. Thus, it was observed that, no grammar was discussed during this lesson since the task was to read and answer the questions about the text, and the pupils did not have any questions about grammar.

The fourth lesson was also one hour with the year nine pupils, on Thursday morning. The pupils were given back their argumentative essays, which they were to look at and ask questions if they had any. For the most part the pupils understood the corrections, although some did ask question about subject-verb agreements, which seemed to be what caused the most problems. Therefore, the teacher explained to these few pupils what they had done wrong, and told them to practice this on Digilär. Since the pupils knew what their difficulties were in writing, they could either choose to work with Digilär, where they could practice grammar such as subject-verb agreement and prepositions, writing, and translation, which might help them for their future essays, or Read Theory, where they could, apart from reading text and answering questions, also work with vocabulary when reading the texts.

According to the observation protocol, this teaching sequence had much more grammar in it than the previous one since the pupils were handed back their essays, where for the most part their mistakes were grammatical. Grammar was discussed in class, because some pupils needed explanations about concords. Those pupils who need explanations and help understanding their grammatical mistakes turned to the teacher who would explain what they had done wrong. The pupils would then turn to Digilär in order to practice grammar, such as subject-verb agreement, when to use there and when to use their, when to use there and when to use it, and prepositions.

The fifth and last lesson, 40 minutes, was with the year eight pupils on Friday afternoon. This time again the pupils were very unfocused on the activity at hand, which was to continue exploring Digilär or Read Theory. However, apart from a few serious pupils, most of the others seemed to think it was much more appropriate to check their Facebook page or watch videos on Youtube, which the teacher minded and tried to prevent by giving the pupils specific task to do in both of the programmes, however they had no interest in doing any hard work at all. Since not many pupils did anything productive during class, their homework was to at least reach level four on Read Theory. As a result, it was difficult to see who did what during this lesson, since most of the pupils did not seem to care about working. One could assume that this had to do with the fact that it was Friday afternoon, and the only thing the pupils could think about was what they were
going to do during the weekend.

These observations show that, during a period of one week, although the pupils worked with some grammar and the teacher explained some of it, grammar was not very noticeable during the lessons. The year nine pupils brought up grammar once when needing an explanation about concord, and the teacher explained it to them. Yet, no other grammar was discussed. Since the pupils of both year eight and year nine could choose between using Digilär or Read Theory, some chose Digilär where many of the pupils chose to do some grammar exercises concerning for example verbs and prepositions. However, the others chose Read Theory where they could practice reading and understanding various texts. Although understanding text is not a grammatical activity directly, indirectly it is, because in order to understand a text in a language, one also needs some grammar knowledge (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 17).

Even though there was not much grammar teaching to be observed, one of the questions of the observation protocol was whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, and the answer to this question is yes. Digilär, which was one of the programmes that the pupils used during that week, is a language teaching website which can either be used instead of the schoolbooks, or it can complement them. Although the school wants to use this website instead of the schoolbooks, the teacher chooses to use it more as a complement since she also uses the grammar exercises from the pupils' workbook for both year eight and year nine. The teacher also uses another language website called Språklänksportalen, though it was not used during this week. This one is a free website that gives access to various other free language websites for different activities, such as grammar, writing, reading, listening.

Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that this was only one week of observations, which means that although this precise week was not very grammatical, it does not mean that the teacher does not teach grammar during the rest of year. From previous observations it is known that she does teach grammar, although never as a complete lesson, only when a grammatical problem comes up and needs to be discussed or in relation to the activity at hand, for example reading a text, listening to a dialogue or writing. Sometimes she might give them photocopies of the grammar part in the pupils' workbook Good Stuff C or Good Stuff D, or ask them to practice certain grammar point on the language websites. Thus, the observations made for this study are limited.

This section provided a description and analysis of the observations of two English classes, year eight and year nine, conducted between Tuesday the 13th of January 2015 and Friday the 16th of January 2015. This next section presents eight argumentative essays of year nine pupils on the topic: Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers? These eight essays were
analysed according to the grammatical mistakes and the grammar structures were then compared to
the ones in workbook *Good Stuff D* (2004).

4. 3 Year nine essays

The argumentative essays of year nine pupils were written during the practice period in December.
The pupils had been working with argumentation and debate during three weeks, and the fourth
week they were asked to write an argumentative essays on the topic: *Should parents limit the use of
social media by their teenagers?* The pupils' instructions were to write at least one page, keep a
clear structure, that is an introduction where they present the topic and give general information
about it, two arguments for and one against with supporting explanations, and a conclusion where
they summarise their arguments and give their own opinion on the subject. They also had to use
linking words other than *but, because, and.*

For this study, eight essays were selected in order to analyse the pupils' grammatical
mistakes using Estling Vannestål (2007) word classes. The grammar structures were compared to
the ones in the workbook *Good Stuff D* (2004) by looking at which exercises would correspond to
the pupils' needs. The findings in the essays are presented in Table 3 and then analysed.

**Table 3. Grammar mistakes in eight year nine pupils essays**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essays</th>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>Prepositions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay 8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of verb mistakes, 74, in Table 3 shows that they are the most common mistakes in these
essays. When looking at each of the essays it was easy to notice that subject-verb agreement, or
concord mistakes were the ones that appeared the most throughout the essays.

(3) “*My arguments for limit use of social media is* that [...]” (Essay 1)
(4) “*Almost every child in our age have* a phone [...]” (Essay 2)

According to Estling Vannestål (2007), concord mistakes are “one of the most typical grammar
mistake made by learners of English” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 80). She also explains that one reason for this problem is that learners of English have to really understood the basis of concord; thus, learners seem to think that an -s should be added to a verb in plural, just as an -s is added to a plural noun (Estling Vannestål, 2007, 81). One also needs to take into account the fact that Swedish verbs are uninflected, which means that pupils might transfer this system into English.

A typical pronoun mistake in these essays was that some pupils wrote there instead of their.

(5) “Compared to might parents that got there phones when they were like twenty years old [...]” (Essay 7)
(6) “[...] teenagers know what there friends are doing [...]” (Essay 1)

These are a spelling mistakes, however, since they both mean two different things and belong to different word classes, these spelling mistakes become grammatical. “There is used with extraposed subjects that are noun phrases, to express some kind of existence” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 294), while their is a dependent possessive pronoun, which concerns some kind of ownership, and in this case it presents itself as a determiner in a noun phrase (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 299-300). Another common pronoun mistake in these essays was the use of it instead of there.

(7) “It's bad because of it's so much bullying on the social media” (Essay 6)
(8) “It's many things that you can do instead of updating on facebook” (Essay 8)

As mentioned earlier, “there is used with extraposed subjects that are noun phrases” (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 294); on the other hand, it is used with extraposed subjects that are clauses (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 296). According to Estling Vannestål (2007) it is very common for Swedish learners of English to use it instead of there, because the Swedish equivalence det is used in both cases (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 294-295).

Preposition mistakes were the least common in these essays; however when they did appear it was mostly an added or a forgotten preposition.

(9) “On the internet and social medias we see a lot __ photos [...]” (Essay 4)
(10) “[...] just check instagram in the whole time when [...]” (Essay 8)

In example 9 the pupil forgot the preposition of and in example 10 the pupils added the preposition
in. Estling Vannestål (2007: 369) explains that this occurs because some Swedish expressions contain a preposition, while the English equivalence does not, and vice versa.

Now, comparing these grammar structures with the ones in the workbook *Good Stuff D* (2004), and looking at the mistakes the pupils made in their essays, the sections from the book they should work with are sections eight, **Verb – Repetition**, and nine, **-ing after certain verbs and expressions**, especially the pupils who wrote the essays 5, 6, 7 and 8 since they made many verb mistakes. Although there were no mistakes concerning this last part, the pupils should still practice this particular grammar structure. Section eight contains a fill-in-the-blanks exercise where the pupils have to write the correct tense of the given verb, and a translation exercise where they have to translate from Swedish to English. Here the pupils can practice subject-verb concord and choosing the right tense. Section nine consists of a fill-in-the-blanks exercise where the pupils have to write the **ing-form** of the verb, and three translation exercises; in the first one they have to translate Swedish verb into English; in the second exercise they have to translate from Swedish to English using the **ing-form**, and in the third one they have to work in pairs and translate orally the Swedish dialogue into English.

Next the pupils need to work on pronouns, except those who wrote essays 2 and 5. In this case, sections four, **Pronouns**, and six, **The Swedish “det”**, correspond to their needs. Section four contains two exercises; a fill in the blanks exercise where the pupils have to choose between *that, what, which, who* or *whose*, and a translation exercise where they have to translate from Swedish into English. Here the pupils can practice choosing the correct relative pronoun. Section six also consists of two exercises: one fill-in-the-blanks exercise where the pupils have to choose the correct word for *det* and also add *is* or *are*, and one translation exercise where they have to translate from Swedish into English. In this case the pupils practice choosing the correct preparatory subject depending on whether the extraposed subject is a noun phrase or a clause.

Finally, the pupils also need to practice prepositions, except those who wrote essays 1 and 2. Sections 15, **Prepositions**, and 16, **Preposition + -ing**, should help the pupils understand their mistakes. Section 15 contains five exercises: four fill-in-the-blanks exercises where the pupils have to choose the correct preposition, and one exercise where they have to write their own sentences using as many space and time prepositions, and other prepositions, as possible. Section 16 consists of one exercise where the pupils have to finish the sentences using a preposition and a verb ending with **-ing**, and one translation exercise where they have to translate from Swedish into English. With both of these sections, the pupils hopefully gain an understanding of how to use prepositions.
4.4 Comparison between the schoolbooks and the observation

The teacher did not use the schoolbooks during the week when her English classes were observed. The pupils of both year eight and year nine were getting to know two new language websites: *Digilär*, the one the school is paying for which either replaces or complements the traditional schoolbook, and *Read Theory*, which is an English reading website where the pupils can practice their reading and understand of the text, and at the same time know their level of reading and their progress.

No grammar was really taught during that week, the pupils mostly practised the grammar they had already learnt, but which they had difficulties with, namely subject-verb agreement, pronouns and prepositions. While some pupils of year eight chose to read text on *Read Theory*, others did grammar exercises on *Digilär*. These exercises concerned grammar structures such as the present and past tenses of *be*, the present tense of *do* in both negative and none negative sentences, the present and past tenses of regular and irregular verbs, and prepositions. The pupils will not only practice the different tenses, but also subject-verb agreement, and when and how to use prepositions. These are both aspects of grammar that cause problems for Swedish learners of English (Estling Vannestål, 2007: 80 & 369). If one compares this to the grammar in the workbook *Good Stuff C* (2003), the grammar points in question match. In other words, in the workbook, the pupils can also practice the different tenses of regular and irregular verbs, when to use *do/does* and *did*, and also how and when to use prepositions.

The year nine pupils were more interesting to observe since eight of their argumentative essays were used for this investigation. According to the teacher, the grammar difficulties they face are subject-verb agreement and prepositions, which was clearly noticed when analysing the essays. Another grammar point that caused problems in their essays was pronouns. These three grammar features could have been practiced using the workbook *Good Stuff D* (2004) since it consisted of certain sections that could help the pupils practice what they needed. However, the amount of exercises per section is limited and the choice of exercises is rather restricted. Therefore, after the pupils had looked at their essays and seen what they needed to work on, some of them chose to use *Digilär* in order to practice their grammar difficulties, such as subject-verb concord, preposition, etc., while the others chose to practice some reading and comprehension on *Read Theory*. Some pupils needed further explanations about the verb mistakes, mostly concord mistakes, from the teacher before working on them themselves. The workbook can offer exercises and some explanations, but not in this case. Thus it would have been useless for those pupils to go straight to doing exercises if they did not understand how concord works, and why the verbs take certain forms. Nevertheless, the grammar exercises in the workbook match the ones on *Digilär*; the pupils
can practice the different tenses of regular and irregular verbs, prepositions and pronouns, etc., which suggests that they could just use the workbook in order to practice grammar. However, today the internet provides a much larger scale of various exercises, and since the pupils all have different difficulties and needs they can all find exercises that suit them, which is why the workbooks in both year eight and year nine are hardly used anymore.

Nonetheless, the workbooks should not be put aside completely since they can complement Digilär, or vice versa, which is what this teacher seems to do. Pupils need variation in their class activities, and using exercises for the workbooks can provide that. The books can also be used as backup. One cannot completely rely on electronics, for instance a computer might stop working, or the internet is down, etc. When these sorts of things happen it is good to have something to fall back on, that is the workbooks.

5 Discussion

This study was about comparing the grammar taught in schoolbooks and the grammar taught in class; however in this case, the teaching could only be observed in the exercises the pupils did on Digilär. Hasselqvist’s (2003) and Al Ghazali’s (2006) studies were about comparing two different teaching methods: the CR (GCR) or the inductive approach and the PPP or the deductive approach. The workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) use for the most part only deductive or the PPP approach (Hasselqvist, 2003 & Al Ghazali, 2006). The pupils are given an explanation of a grammar point with examples, which they then have to apply in the exercises. Some grammar points do not have any explanations, but these points are repetition, which suggests that the pupils have learnt the rule before. Nevertheless, the observations showed also an inductive or the CR (GCR) approach (Hasselqvist, 2003 & Al Ghazali, 2006). When the year nine pupils were handed back their essays, they looked at their mistakes, which some pupils then chose to practice on Digilär. The exercises in this programme do not have any explanations of the grammar point beforehand; thus the pupils have to think for themselves, meaning letting the pupils discover or recall the grammar rules for themselves which means that they will learn to notice the rules more easily in the future and hopefully remember them. According to Ellis (2002:161) letting the pupils discover and understand a grammar rule by themselves, the CR method, is to be preferred over giving them the rule and letting them simply apply it, the PPP method, because it will induce curiosity, they will more easily learn how to notice the rule in the future, and then remember it better.

Ellis’ (2002) study was also interesting because it enabled one to understand how grammar books are designed, and since he analysed several different books from different years,
one could see how they have changed and evolved during the centuries. For instance, Ellis' (2002: 160) results showed that two methodologies were predominant: explicit description supplied, which means that the pupils are given an explanation of the rule, and controlled production, which means that the pupils have exercises where they are required to produce the targeted grammar point. The workbooks Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) have a similar design where explicit description supplied and controlled production are the most dominant with exercises such as translation and filling-in-the blanks. Ellis' (2002) two methodologies correspond to the grammar teaching method called Grammar-translation method (Harmer, 2007: 63). The exercises that correspond to this method are the most predominant, which proves Ellis' (2002: 160) assumption that the grammar books or exercise books of today are not that different from those of previous years. However the workbook Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) are from 2003 and 2004, which means that today's exercise books could have improved over ten years.

Although the Grammar-translation method is the most predominant method, the workbooks also contain two other grammar teaching methods, namely the Direct method and the Audiolingual method (Tornberg, 2009: 37 & 44). The first named method engages the pupils to learn a foreign language without the mediation of the mother tongue which leads them to relying on their own capacity of associating words and expressions in order to make sense, and also objects and events in their current situation (Tornberg, 2009: 37 & 39-40). The last method uses an approach of stimulus-response-reinforcement in order to engender good habits in pupils' language learning (Harmer, 2007: 64). This method is characterised by repetitions and drills (Harmer, 2007: 207). Consequently, compared to Ellis' (2002) study, Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004) have already improved for the better and engage the pupils in various grammar teaching methods.

Richards (2002) investigates the issues with using a task-based or communicative-based approach, a part of the GCR or inductive approach, when learning a language. He means that the biggest problem is that accuracy, meaning grammar, is often forgotten, and that fluency becomes the main focus (Richards, 2002: 156). However, fluency and accuracy go hand in hand, because one cannot make him/herself understood if (s)he cannot structure a sentence properly or if (s)he uses the wrong verb form. This problem could be perceived in year nine pupils' essays. Although the essays were for the most part easy to understand, the fact that some pupils could not write one whole sentence without making a single grammar mistake is serious, especially since they seem to have been practising grammar on their computers. Perhaps this is not enough and the teacher should incorporate more grammar to the other activities the pupils do, such as reading and listening activities, or exchanging writing tasks with each other in order to correct them before handing them back to their owner.
However, looking at the essays one could see that the pupils were at different levels. As mentioned in the results, the pupils mistakes concerned mostly subject-verb agreement, preposition and pronouns; but since they had been practising these on *Digilär* before writing the essay, the pupils should have learnt the rules of subject-verb agreement, how to use *there* and *their* or *it* and *there*, etc. Nevertheless, some pupils made no mistakes at all. Therefore, grammar teaching and practising has improved some pupils proficiency level and accuracy of their essays, but not for all of them.

### 6 Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper presented a comparative study between the grammar sections in the English schoolbooks *Good Stuff C* (2003) and *Good Stuff D* (2004), for year eight and year nine, with the grammar teaching practised in a secondary school in southern Sweden. The research aimed to answer these questions:

- How does the grammar content in the schoolbooks, if any, match what is taught in the classroom?
- What grammar teaching methods are used in the classroom and the schoolbooks?
- Which grammatical features, if any, are highlighted during the lessons?
- How does grammar teaching, if any, affect the pupils' proficiency level and accuracy of their essays?

In order to answer these questions, the grammar section of the English schoolbooks *Good Stuff C* (2003) and *Good Stuff D* (2004) were analysed. Secondly, observations were made of the English classes of year eight and year nine in a secondary school in southern Sweden during a week, between Tuesday the 13th of January 2015 and Friday the 16th of January 2015; and thirdly, eight argumentative essays, on the topic of whether parents should limit the use of social media by teenagers, were analysed and then compared to the workbook *Good Stuff D* (2004). The observations were then compared to the schoolbooks.

The results showed that the workbooks consisted of various sections which each contained exercises in order to practice a grammar structure. Each section had a certain amount of exercises, which suggested that the difficulty of the grammar structure depended on the number of exercises per section. For instance, *Word formation* had five pages of 16 exercises, while *Much, many – Every, each* only had two pages with one exercise. Thus *Word formation* could be seen as more difficult to understand than *Much, many – Every, each*. It was also noted that the quantity of grammar for each workbook seemed very little compared to the entire book. Another interesting
point was that most of the exercises were about translating from Swedish to English and filling-in-the-blanks. However, it was noticed that the grammar exercises from each of the workbooks corresponded to three grammar teaching methods: the Grammar-translation method, the Direct method and the Audiolingual method. Thus, not only one method was used, but three different methods.

The results also showed that, during that one week of observations, there was really no grammar teaching, although the pupils from year eight and year nine did work with grammar using Digilär. The only time grammar was brought up and discussed in class was when the pupils of year nine were handed their argumentative essays, and a few pupils had questions concerning subject-verb agreement, which the teacher answered and explained. When the pupils practised grammar, they did exercises concerning verbs and prepositions, which according to the teacher is where their difficulties lie.

The results of the year nine pupils' essays showed that the grammar mistakes they had made corresponded directly to what they tend to practice the most in class. Those mistakes concerned verbs, pronouns and prepositions, and the pupils usually did exercises concerning verbs, mostly subject-verb agreement, and prepositions. When comparing these results with the schoolbooks, it was easy to see that the pupils could practice their grammar difficulties using the workbooks, because they contained exercises which could help the pupils understand what had gone wrong so they do not make the same mistakes again. Looking at the essays it was easily noticeable that the pupils were at very different levels. While some had hardly any mistakes at all, grammatical or lexical, some had great difficulties with grammar, and others with vocabulary. As mentioned earlier, the difficulties concerned mostly subject-verb agreement, prepositions and pronouns, however, since they have been practising these on Digilär prior to the essay, one would have hoped that the pupils would have learnt how to use there and their or it and there, and learnt the rules of subject-verb agreement. Therefore, grammar teaching and practising has improved some pupils proficiency level and accuracy of their essays, but not for all of them.

Finally, the observations and the schoolbooks were compared with each other. Although there was not much actual teaching to be observed, one could still compare the schoolbooks with the pupils' work in class. Thus, the grammar points which the pupils worked on in class could also be found in the workbooks. The difference was that Digilär gave a broader choice of grammar exercises than Good Stuff C (2003) and Good Stuff D (2004). However, the workbooks should not be excluded, since they can either complement Digilär, because the pupils need variation when it comes to class activities, or be used as backup if the computers do not work properly or if the internet is down.
This investigation is limited to these two classes and schoolbooks, and one cannot assume that these results are valid in other classes or schools. However, one thing that could broadened this study and given more material to work with was the number of observations. Nevertheless, the methods used for analysing the material were clear and made the results easy to understand.

Further research on this topic could consider using various schoolbooks from different years, comparing them with each other in order to see how they have changed over the years, and then performing observations in various schools and classes to get a more general and broader view of the topic. Another interesting topic to study could be whether pragmatic competence is developed in the classroom and in the schoolbooks, that is, for example, whether the pupils are taught politeness through grammar teaching.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Observation guide

- Year 8 – 40 minutes (11:10-11:50), Tuesday 13th of January 2015

Grammatical features brought up in class:
None.

Whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence during the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar:
Listening, reading and translation activity.

Grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity:
None.

Whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other textbooks:
Digilär: Teaching material which replaces the traditional coursebooks, the teacher has the possibility to comment and check the pupils' work. It can also complement the schoolbooks.

Remarks:
This class is usually very loud, and has a hard time concentrating and focusing on one activity for a longer period of time. All pupils have a computer given by the school, so schoolbooks are not used very much anymore. However this means that some pupils take advantage of this and do not do what they are supposed to.
The school has bought a programme called Digilär, for languages, chemistry, physics, Swedish, history and other subjects. The programme is still in the process of development and will include more and more school subjects at secondary and upper secondary school levels.
This year 8 class has only 40 minutes lessons each time, which sometimes makes it difficult to start bigger project, especially when it takes them 10 minutes each time to calm down.
Me being here does not seem to disturb neither teacher nor the pupils, they behave just as usual. It is difficult to here if the pupils are asking about grammar, vocabulary or the programme since they are working individually, and it is not completely quiet in class, but it seems as though it is mostly vocabulary and the programme.

- Year 8 – 40 minutes (12:30-13:10) Tuesday 13th of January 2015
Grammatical features brought up in class:
None.

Whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence during the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar:
None.

Grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity:
None.

Whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other textbooks:
*Read Theory.*

Remarks:
*Read Theory*, another website, only this one has only texts. The pupils start at level one, read the text and then answer the questions about the text. Once they are finished with one text, they move on to the next one and the next level. For each text they have read and answered the correct answers, the pupils move on to the next level. There are 12 level in total and about 1000 texts. If the pupils get a score inferior to 70% they go back a level, or if they are at the first level they have to do it over. If they score between 70% and 90% they stay at the same level with a different text. If the pupils get more than 90% they move on to the next level.

After lunch the pupils are even less concentrated and focused, and even louder.

Again the questions the pupils ask are about vocabulary or the programme.

On average, the pupils reached level three or four.

• **Year 9 – 1 hour (08:20-09:20) Wednesday 14th of January 2015**

Grammatical features brought up in class:

None.

Whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence during the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar:
None.

Grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity:
None.
Whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other textbooks:

*Read Theory.*

Remarks:

*Read Theory.*

This class is a rather hard working class. Very mixed since there are both very good pupils and some less good.

- **Year 9 – 1 hour (10:00-11:00) Thursday 15th of January 2015**

Grammatical features brought up in class:

S-V agreements, there/their, punctuation.

Whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence during the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar:

The pupils can chose to work either on *Digilär* or *Read Theory.*

Grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity:

None.

Whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other textbooks:

*Digilär.*

Remarks:

The pupils' essays were handed back. They are to work on *Digilär* or *Read Theory.* If there were some things the pupils had difficulties with in their essays, they practice these on *Digilär.*

The pupils are rather loud and unfocused today, some pupils are not doing what they are supposed to (Facebook).

- **Year 8 – 40 minutes (12:20-13:00) Friday 16th of January 2015**

Grammatical features brought up in class:

None.
Whether it is a whole grammar lesson or a sequence during the lesson where the teacher decides to bring up something specific in grammar, or where the pupils work with grammar:
The pupils can choose to work either with Digilär or Read Theory.

Grammar exercises some pupils do while their peers finish a previous activity:
None.

Whether the teacher uses other material for teaching grammar, such as the Internet or other exercises from other textbooks:
Digilär.

Remarks:
Those who do not have a computer or a phone on which they can work on, the pupils have to choose a text which they have to practice reading and then read it to the teacher.
Not many pupils are doing what they are supposed to be doing, this class is really unfocused apart from a certain pupil.

Year 8
I have noticed from previous observations of this class that the teacher often uses other material when teaching grammar, such as spraklankportalen.se, which is a language website with links to other website with exercises, for example grammar, vocabulary, listening, reading. They actually have 2 schoolbooks: one with only texts and the other with exercises. However, the school does not buy any more of these books since the teachers are supposed to start using Digilär, Read Theory and other Internet material rather than schoolbooks. Nevertheless, this teacher sometimes copies exercise pages from the workbook that the pupils can do. The pupils have had difficulties with S-V agreements, prepositions, mixing up regular and irregular verbs.

Year 9
I know from talking to their teacher that she usually uses other material when teaching grammar, such as spraklankportalen.se. Just as with year eight, this class also has two schoolbooks: one with only texts and the other one with exercises. Here also, the school does not provide these books anymore because the teachers should use the Internet instead. However, this teacher makes photocopies from the exercise book that the pupils can do.
From their essays, I have noticed that these pupils have problems with S-V agreements and punctuation.
Appendix 2: Pupils essays

Essay 1

Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers?

Introduction

My topic is: "Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers?" I'm going to discuss what I think is good about social media and what's bad about it.

Arguments

My arguments for limiting the use of social media are that teenagers spend too much time looking at their phones. An example is when you have to study and you have been in school all day. You can't concentrate because you see someone is texting you on facebook. As a result of this, you didn't study and you didn't pass your test in school.

(And) secondly social media is a place where people all over the world have access to. And that makes social media dangerous. Because the teenagers don't know how to use this. So the other side of this is who, phone, computer. They could be a fake person.
And now my argument against this is that teenagers need to have contact with one another. That is why social media is so fantastic. You can communicate with people even if they are in another country. And because of this teenagers know what their friends are doing and they are more updated on what's happening. Especially when it's like longer breaks from school like the summer break.

Conclusion
I have been talking about that social media is a distracting element for teenagers. And how you can't trust all the people on social media. However, it could be good for knowing what other people in your age are doing. I don't think that parents should limit the use of social media because teenagers need to have their own thing. And I think social media is just.

The mistakes you have made you seem to have mixed up your arguments for and against. Your first arguments seem to be more against while in the next paragraph, they seem to be more for. If you start talking about the teenagers as "they," don't switch to "you." Keep to one or the other from the start. Make sure to make the difference between "there" and "their."
Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers?

There have been a lot of discussions about this topic, especially now when teenagers are using their phones more than ever. The phones are getting more advanced, and many adults are having a hard time catching up and learn how to use these new highly advanced phones. Almost every child in our age has a phone, and many people spend too much time sitting with their phones. Social media, such as twitter, Facebook, Instagram, Vine, have millions of users. Some parents don’t know what their kids are doing on their phones.

Of course, there are both good and bad things about phones and social media. First, I think that social media is a very fun thing for teenagers, and it’s something to do when you’re bored. It’s easy to keep contact with your friends who live far away. You just write to them on Facebook, for example. And if you’ve taken a picture that you’re very proud of, you can just post it on Instagram so all your friends can see it. Second, you get a good view of the world. You can watch pictures of places from the other side of the planet, you can read news from all over the world. So, social media can be a place where you can learn things and have
Fun, if you use it right. Still, there are a lot of bad things about social media too. The biggest problem is that teenagers spend too much time on social media. Some teenagers even get addicted to their phones and they almost forget to hang out with their friends and family in their real life. And that's a very big problem. Teenagers that forget to live their real life and spend all their free time with their phones, is clearly very frightening. My opinion is that despite the fact that social media also creates harm, it's a fun thing and I think that we should keep using it. However, I also think that some parents should get better at checking that their kids aren't spending too much time on social media. So my conclusion is that I think some teenagers spend too much time on social media, but on the other hand, I think that social media can be very fun and useful. If you use it right, so I don't think that we should stop using it. Finally, I think that it's a good idea for parents to limit the use of social media by teenagers. I think that'll be good for everyone.
Essay 3

Still, parents limit the use of social media on teenage who using social media too much, some of them are using social media many hours a day. Other lets say that I think parents should set a time. But then the question is for how long on everyday for example. So if we-Hung don't set a limit teenagers can be stuck with their phone in their face all the time. Now we are going to go over some arguments for and against.

Parents must set a limit on their teenagers use of social media because being on social media all the time will make you hom meet people who want to "catfish" you or maybe want you to buy or sell things to persons you don't know and then they take all of your teenagers' money. Another argument is that the teenagers you or other persons can internet bully you and that can lead to depression for both of the persons. Some of these cases have lead to suicide. So we must set a limit.
Arguments against it is that you might think that teenagers should take responsibility for their own spare time. But if the teenagers use social media in school, you should probably take their phones.

Conclusion: My conclusion is that you should probably not set a limit on teenagers’ use of social media, but for example, if a teenager uses their phone so much that they get bad grades in school, or things like that, you should probably set a limit.

When you write an essay, you should try to keep to one pronoun. Either, you use “you,” all the way (as long as I know who you are talking about), or you use “they.” You cannot mix both, and switch. Watch out for those subject-verb agreements. Next time, try using more linking words, and not only the usual ones, but, and, because.
Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers?

Is it wrong or right for parents to limit their children's use of social media? Is it really their thing to decide? Should they stay out of their children's business? That's the question we are asking ourselves. Today, many teenagers, our friends and family members, spend way too much time on social media, like Facebook and Twitter. It has become a drug to them, as addictive as any other drug. I have friends that could not live without their cellphones. Sometimes, they feel bad if they have not checked their Facebook or Twitter feed. That's sad and it is a sign, and a sign that shows us that we have to do something about it. If parents could show some courage and limit their children's use of social media, we would get a better society. Teenagers would be able to socialize and interact with other people in real life, and not bent over a computer screen or an iPhone. Sitting bent over a screen all day often results in neck and back pain. There are also many boys and girls that get really stressed out by always having to
be reachable. Especially during the night. Due to that, many teenagers are having sleeping problems. As a result, they perform worse in school. If it goes even further, they could go in to depression and who knows what that could lead to. This addiction obviously needs an end, and that’s fast.

On the internet and social media, we see a lot of photos of good looking models, etc. That can in fact have a negative effect on kids and teenagers. They will get the wrong image of what’s normal and healthy.

On the other hand, there are many children who do not have the courage to talk and socialize with other people. I think they should have the same opportunity as everybody else. In that case, websites like Facebook and Twitter actually can help a lot of teenagers.

Our increased use of internet has pushed the revolution forward very much. If parents would limit the use of internet and social media among teenagers, they would limit the future.
That's it, the internet is our future. That is where our jobs will be.

My conclusion about parents limiting their children's use of social media.

Internet has become a big part of our lives. It has brought both good and bad things. Kids are getting more and more addicted to their phones and computers. In some cases, they lose their ability to interact with other people.

However, limiting the use of internet can lead to fights between parents and their children. I do not see that as a big problem. The real problem is that by limiting internet we also limit the knowledge about the future.

My honest opinion is that parents should limit their children's use of social media a bit. Teenagers should not be addicted to Facebook, they should be addicted to football and basketball.

A good essay! Great use of linking words. A few mistakes, but mostly forgotten commas and apostrophes, and watch out for these subject-verb agreements.
SHOULD PARENTS LIMIT THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA?

I wonder if social media are important? If it’s not already, it will soon be. Social media are a very big part of our lives today, especially for younger people—teenagers. It is not very usual to meet a teenager without a phone today. So, what are you doing on your phone? I am pretty sure every teenager knows about Facebook, Twitter, Vine, such as Instagram. Every time you have a minute left over, you grab your phone and check the social medias to see if someone has made an update. At least I do. I think social medias are a bit of a “bad habit.” It is almost like you get paralysed. For some people, it could be just like a drug you can’t control.

I think that parents today are a bit “blind.” Many children just sit in a dark room, checking all those social medias, and sometimes they never leave the bed. This paralysis can could actually lead to serious problems. For example, health. I think that if you want to sit inside with a computer all day—fine, but you need to be outside at least one hour. Compare children today with children from, let’s say, 1970. Do you think children diabetes for example, where the same as today? I don’t.
Another argument that speaks for limit is: the effects that social media have on you. For example: Facebook. If you scroll down on Facebook, you can see a lot of publicity. I think that even if you think that it won’t affect you— it is still a part of what you see, almost every day.

But there are some good parts of social media. For example: if there is a big, very important happening on a fire, you can really quickly send a warning message that can tell many people to avoid this area. It could actually lead to the fact that you save someone’s life.

Obviously, social media can be good as well as bad. It depends on whether you see it. Since I was about the age of 5, internet has existed. After a while social media was created and it went really popular. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and so on. It has become a very important part of your life. And I don’t know if I think it’s making it better. The phone in your pocket or hand is always calling for your attention, and I think that this world needs to put energy, money and power on more important things like health problems or world peace.

Look out for subject-verb agreement, and a few mistakes here and there. Great use of linking words, and a good essay.
Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers? (Facebook, Twitter...)

Introduction:
My topic is about social media and teenagers. Should teenagers use the social media or not, that's the question. Is it good or bad for them? Should they use Twitter, Facebook and Instagram? That's what I'm going to write about.

Argument against:
I think the parents of teenagers should let them use the social media because they can meet new people and talk with them on the internet. The teenagers can get new friends and that's good. They can also meet people who like the same things like themselves. They can keep in contact with their friends on the social media. If their friends moved away, they can write and keep in contact so they are still being friends. The teenagers can talk with people from another country and learn how it is there. So it's really good, because on the social media the teenagers can do a lot and learn a lot.
Arguments for

- It's bad because it's so much bullying on the social media. And sometimes teenagers and kids have take their own lives because if they are feeling really bad when anonymous people from the social media are bullying them. So if teenagers stop with the social media, they can't be bullying on the internet. Teenagers and also kids can be really mean when they are anonymous, but in real life they can't say anything. In real life can we also help teenagers and kids when someone is bullying them because we can see it and on the social media we can't see what people do.

- Some teenagers are desperate for confirmation, and they can find it on the social media. It can be bad people who want to meet the teenagers and trick them. I think that some parents are scared that their teenagers are talking with strangers on the social media. And it's very hard to find the people who are tricking with kids and teenagers. So it's bad because that parents don't know what their teenagers are doing on the social media.
Conclusion:
My conclusion of the topic "Should parents limit the use of social media by teenagers" is that, I think that teenagers should use the social media. Maybe some teenagers do not use it, but many do. And if they are doing bad things, they should stop using social media, and the parents may be know if they are doing mean things. Teenagers can learn things, on the social media, and it's really good. So my final conclusion is that teenagers should use the social media if they want to and if they can handle it.

You used some linking words, however, you did not use them correctly.
You made a few subject-verb agreement mistakes, so take a look at those, and you forgot the auxiliary "be" a few times (are, is).
Otherwise, you had good arguments, and overall a good structure!
SHOULD PARENTS LIMIT THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA BY TEENAGERS?

The social media, like Instagram and Twitter, has had an influence on many teenagers all around the world. Compared with my parents, that got their phones when they were, like, twenty years old, almost all of my friends today have their own phone or computer. The social media has grown very fast just for the last couple of years. Especially the apps, Instagram and Twitter. I use both apps, and all my friends do, too. My younger sister and her friends also have the apps, so it’s not only the teenagers that use it, it’s the younger kids too.

I’m not the girl that always has to check Instagram or Twitter, but I do it when I have time over and more often when I’m home, not that much in school. But some of my friends are. Around the school, I think that’s a problem when people can’t leave their phones for maybe just one hour or two. They get an addiction to checking their phones all the time.

I think that the people that always use their phone and the social media should have a little limit of when they use it.
it's okay to use the app and when it's not. I think that it can be okay to check it during the day, maybe when you have a break or lunch, but not just before they are going to go to bed or when they lay in their beds before they are going to sleep, because it's dangerous for their brains. They can also get less sleep. A consequence of that is that they get very tired. Another reason to why parents should limit the use of social media by teenagers is that a lot of people that get hurt by other people on the social media. They, for example, write something bad about a person on a page, as well as they take a picture of a person that doesn't want to be out on the internet, or maybe they create a fake account of a person. Fleabagging on the internet and the social media is very bad, and we have to do everything we can to stop it, so maybe limit the use of social media can help a little bit.

On the other hand, I don't think that parents should limit the use of social media by teenagers because I think that it is funny to look at the social media. This is the new world.
and we teenagers are communicating in other and new ways like the social media. I think that the parents want to limit the use of social media because they don't have the apps and they can't control us like they used to.

So to summarise my text is that I don't think that all the teenagers should limit the use of social media, because everybody doesn't use it that much. That other does what I mean with that is that the people that use it and people that just use it sometimes maybe the people that use it too much should limit the use and the other not. But I also think that it doesn't have to be a rule to limit the use, it can be an own personal choice that the parents can make if they think that their teenagers or children use the social media too much.

Like I said before, the social media is a new way to communicate, and the parents and adults just need to accept that we don't write letters or emails to each other anymore. Therefore since we have the new apps and the new internet.
SHOULD PARENTS LIMIT THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA BY TEENAGERS?

So today there are many teenagers that are using many social medias, like facebook, twitter and instagram. Some maybe thinks that it’s enjoying like their parents. Of course that’s not so funny at the dinner and your 15 years old daughter is sitting with her phone and just checking in the whole time when you’re eating. So what should really be the best? That the parents limit the use of social media or should they let their teenagers use their social media how much they want to? I don’t know what I think yet. But that is what I’m going to figure out...

So first I think that if the parents should limit the use of social media, then the teenager should have so much more time to spend on other things. The social media is not so important, but because they could have so much more fun if they spend the time with their friends in real life. I think that is more important instead.
of sitting with the phone and just checking Facebook, Twitter or something else. They can have more fun with your friends in real life, but many teenagers snapshot with each other and talk with each other on the phone instead. Maybe that's a great way to talk to each other and it goes fast too. But maybe they use it just too much? Anyway, there's not just more time with friends, teenagers can also help your parents with something in the house or you can learn something. As many things that you can do instead of updating on Facebook.

Just like I wrote before, it can be teenagers that are sitting and checking social media at the dinner, maybe that's okay once or twice but not all the time. And if the parents don't say something about home, maybe the teenagers are used to do that when they are with other people. As a result, other people think they are very unsocial and not so nice. So, as a second argument for limiting the social media, I think that...
many teenagers see many beauty ideals. And then they want to look like them, have the same clothes like them, and so on. That can't be good for the teenagers, because every girl can't be thin and look like a barbie doll, every boy can't look like a calvin klein model. Every teenager should look like they are. I know on my own that it's so many beauty ideals on Instagram and other social medias. If the parents should limit the use of social media or doesn't have to be the perfect beauty ideal, and the teenagers don't have to worry about that they should look like that girl or that boy or that model. Because it is in the social medias that teenagers see this beauty ideal most of the time. But if the teenagers could use their social medias how often they wanted to, then they could have a contact with their friends who maybe live far away. It should be more easier, you can see what your friend's
friends are doing and they can see what you are doing. You can also chat with each other on facebook and you don't have to pay anything because it's going on the internet. The teenagers maybe should get more friends and keep their friends in a more easier way.

So in my conclusion, I think that the teenagers should use their social medias as often as they want to, but in a good way. Maybe not when the family is or a dinner at the neighbours or just eating a dinner at home. It can look unpleasant. I also think that the social media should think about what they post so the teenagers don't think about their bodies that much. But the social medias don't have just bad things. It's great with social medias, just because you can chat with your friend on the other side of the earth, and it goes so fast, so it's good and bad with social medias, like everyone else. Use more linking words other than 'but' and 'because'.