UiT
THE ARCTIC
UNIVERSITY
OF NORWAY

Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education

Students' Perception of Grammar Instruction

A study of the relation between students' perception of grammar instruction and their multiple intelligences

—

Susanne Lillehaug Rasch

Master's Thesis in English Education
ENG-3980
May 2016

UNIVERSITY OF TROMSØ

Acknowledgements

CONTENTS

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and the basic question of research

There seems to be a common belief that grammar is nothing but heavy theory that in reality has very little to do with the real language of English. This is probably because of the traditional way English grammar used to be taught in the Norwegian school – we associate grammar with cramming of strange rules that does not have much to do with the way the language is actually spoken, or with theoretical words and concepts that one does not really need in order to use the language.[1] The questions to be asked are: Should we not teach grammar, then, given that most people clearly find it useless? Or, is it maybe the way it has been taught? Are we to blame the teachers for their dull and poorly adapted teaching methods? Or is it perhaps the traditional method itself that is to blame? Thus, for my Master's thesis (hereinafter referred to as "thesis"), I have decided to investigate students' perception of grammar instruction within the English subject in the Norwegian upper secondary school. I argue that although it seems to be a common belief that grammar instruction is boring and useless, nevertheless, it seems like students find it important and useful. My research question is; In order to achieve a more positive perception towards grammar instruction among students, is it necessary to approach the students with more adapted teaching methods according to their different intelligences?

2 Theoretical perspectives

2.1 Second language acquisition research

One of the most debated questions within the research of second language acquisition (SLA) seems to be whether explicit grammar instruction is important or not, and if it should be included in language education. Some SLA researchers, such as Stephen Krashen and Tracy D. Terrell, claim that: "Language is best taught when it is being used to transmit messages, not when it is explicitly taught for conscious learning."[2] Their theory is that if learners

---

[1] Anne Dahl, "Prinsipper for grammatikkundervisningen," (*"Principles of grammar teaching"*) in *Fremmedspråksdidaktikk* (*Foreign Language Education*), ed. Camilla Bjørke, Magne Dypedal and Gro-Anita Myklevold (Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS, 2014), 114.

[2] Stephen Krashen and Tracy D. Terrell, *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom* (Haywards: Alemany Press, 1983), 55.

concentrate on syntax, it limits the development of their vocabulary.[3] Grammar-based approaches to language teaching is therefore seen as counterproductive when it comes to learning a second language, and one should therefore rely on communication alone. Other SLA researcher, such as Rod Ellis and Patsy Lightbown,[4] argue that it is essential to teach learners grammar if we want linguistic development to occur, and that communicating in the language does not guarantee the development of full target language competence.[5] As an attempt to answer what seems to be a rather complicated question, this chapter will present and discuss theoretical perspectives that I find relevant for this thesis. I will start by presenting and comparing the opinions of two linguists who has had a great deal of influence in the field of second language acquisition, namely Stephen Krashen and Rod Ellis – distinguished and world known professors also in the field of English language teaching.

2.2   Stephen Krashen and the importance of communication

Stephen Krashen is an expert in the field of linguistics and belongs to the group of SLA researchers who claim that participating in natural communication is sufficient for acquiring proficiency in a second language, including grammatical competence. He claims that it is possible for classroom learners to acquire grammatical competence without any form-focused instruction and argues that form can best be learned when the learner's attention is focused on meaning. He therefore suggests that teachers should attempt to create an informal classroom environment where students are given the opportunity to participate in meaningful and natural interaction in the target language, instead of spending time on extensive introductions of conscious grammar rules.[6]

2.2.1   Language acquisition and language learning

According to Krashen, there are two independent systems for developing second language competence: language *acquisition* and language *learning*. Language acquisition is the result of a subconscious learning process very similar to the process children undergo when they acquire first and second languages. He writes: "It requires meaningful interaction in the target language – natural communication – in which speakers are concerned not with the form of

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Patsy M. Lightbown and Nina Spada, *How Languages are Learned 4th edition*. (Oxford University Press, 2013).

[5] Rod Ellis, *SLA Research and Language Teaching* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 50.

[6] Rod Ellis, *SLA Research and Language Teaching* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 47.

their utterances but with the message they are conveying and understanding."[7] It is not important for acquirers to have a conscious awareness of the grammatical rules the target language holds, hence error correction and explicit teaching of rules are, according to Krashen, "not relevant to language acquisition."[8] Instead, the acquirers should: "self-correct only on the basis of a 'feel' for grammaticality,"[9] seeing as this is generally what native speakers do in the case of speech errors. Language learning, on the other hand, is quite the opposite. This is the result of a conscious learning process where the focus is on formal introduction, including conscious knowledge of grammar rules.

2.2.2   The monitor theory

One of Krashen's many hypotheses about second language acquisition is called the "Monitor Theory" of adult SLA, a hypothesis that defines the relation between acquisition and learning. The theory explains how our *conscious learning* can have an influence on our *subconscious acquisition*, and suggests that the learned system, which involves our "formal" knowledge of the second language (i.e. grammatical knowledge), can be used in order to modify the output of the acquired system, which is our utterance initiator. The learned system, then, functions as a "monitor" which allows us to correct our utterances, sometimes before and sometimes after the output is produced, in order to improve accuracy. There are, however, certain conditions that must be met in order to successfully monitor. First of all, the second language learner must have an adequate amount of time at his or her disposal. The second condition is that the learner is required to be focused on form and correctness. Last, but not least, it is important that the learner has a good perception of the rule in order to apply it correctly. Krashen finds this rather problematic, given that a) learners do not usually have time to think about and apply conscious grammatical rules when they participate in normal conversation, b) an overconcern with form and correctness can get in the way of fluency, and c) not even the best language students master all the rules presented to them. Given that there are very few situations in which all three conditions are met, Krashen claims that it is very difficult to successfully apply conscious learning to performance, and concludes that conscious learning can only make a small contribution to the development of the second language learner's communicative ability. On account of this, Krashen finds subconscious acquisition more

---

[7] Stephen Krashen, *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning* (Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd., 1981), 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., 2.

important than conscious learning, and argues: "When conditions for "Monitor-free" performances are met, when performers are focused on communication and not form, adult errors in English as a second language (…) are quite similar to errors made by children acquiring English as a second language,"[10] He also says that it has been noted some similarities to first language acquisition as well. Furthermore, he argues that: "When the second language speakers 'monitor', when they focus on form, this 'natural order' is disturbed."[11] He claims that second language performers "utilize the conscious grammar extensively only when they have to do extreme 'discrete-point' grammar tests, tests that test the knowledge of rules and vocabulary in isolation."[12] When Krashen claims that form can best be learned when the learner's attention is focused on meaning, he does so because he believes that when classroom exercises emphasize correctness instead of communication, "it puts students on the defensive and encourages them to avoid using difficult constructions for fear of making mistakes."[13] He therefore argues that in order to use the language for what it was always meant for – communication – grammar should be something the performer knows intuitively, as focus on correctness may disrupt the focus on communication. He believes that when teachers create formal classroom environments where the focus is on form and correctness, the second language learners' risk becoming monitor "overusers" or monitor "underusers." He explains that monitor overusers are learners who have an overconcern with form and correctness, and feel they must know the rule for everything. This can be a problem because learners who do not entirely trust their feel for grammaticality may, according to Krashen, "suffer from 'lathophobic aphasia', an unwillingness to speak for fear of making a mistake."[14] Because these learners are overly concerned with correctness, it can make them unable to speak with any fluency at all. The monitor underusers, on the other hand, seem to be completely reliant on what they can "pick up" of the second language and usually judges grammaticality "by feel". The underusers may actually acquire a great deal of the target language and is often able to use quite complex constructions, even though they usually do not perform well on "grammar" tests. Nevertheless, both overusers and underusers are considered to be bad language users, the overusers because they will be limited by their conscious knowledge and may suffer from a lack of spontaneity, the underusers because they

---

[10] Ibid., 6-7.
[11] Ibid., 7.
[12] Ibid., 7.
[13] Ellis, *SLA Research*, 47.
[14] Ibid., 4.

will only progress as far as their attitudes will take them.[15]

2.2.3   Formal vs. informal learning environments

Krashen is convinced that the optimal linguistic environment for the second language learner is a natural, informal environment, and he presents a number of studies to support this claim. In several of these studies the formal classroom environment and the informal classroom environment are contrasted. He argues that these studies prove that features of formal instruction (e.g. deductive presentation of rules) are not necessary for learning to take place, and that "several studies (…) suggest that adults can not only increase their second language proficiency in informal environments, but may also do as well as, or better, than learners who have spent a comparable amount of time in formal situations"[16] He also claims that after one of these studies, "statistical analysis reveal no significant effects on language learning attributable to amount of language instruction."[17] He argues that if second language students are motivated to learn, they will provide themselves with the formal instruction they find necessary without going to class. He also suggests that "rule isolation can be done by resource to a text or by asking informants about grammar, while feedback is available when helpful friends correct the learner."[18] Thus, Krashen concludes that when students have access to informal, natural environments that offers rich intake, this is enough to acquire full second language competence, and extra classes in second languages (classes that provide formal instruction) are not necessary.[19]

2.3   Rod Ellis and the importance of grammar instruction

Rod Ellis, another expert in language studies and linguistics, belongs to the group of SLA researchers who claim that teaching learners grammar does contribute to their linguistic development, and that "there is also growing empirical evidence that communicating in a second language does not ensure the development of full target language competence."[20] He explains that in recent years, the "zero grammar" approach proposed by Krashen and other SLA researchers has been challenged. According to Ellis, "a number of researchers have

---

[15] Krashen, *Second Language Acquisition*, 38.

[16] Ibid., 40.

[17] Ibid., 41.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., 49.

[20] Ellis, *SLA Research*, 50.

argued that the kind of explicit knowledge which typically results from formal grammar instruction can convert, through practice, into the kind of implicit knowledge that is required for use in communication."[21] However, it is important to note that he also explains how some SLA researchers suggest that: "grammar instruction may not cause acquisition to take place, but may facilitate it by providing the learner with a conscious understanding of grammatical constructions that can be exploited later when the learner is ready to acquire these features."[22] According to Ellis, several empirical studies demonstrate that "learners who receive instruction outperform those who do not, both with regard to the rate of acquisition and ultimate level of achievement."[23] This stands in a clear contrast to Krashen's theory and the studies he relies on to support his claim, which suggest the exact opposite. Ellis writes: "If it is assumed that the instruction these learners received entailed grammar teaching, which would seem reasonable, then, these studies would suggest that teaching learners grammar contributes to their linguistic development."[24] Ellis therefore disagrees with the "zero grammar" position, and argues that there are also theoretical reasons for doubting the efficiency of communication as a basis for grammar acquisition. For instance, he says that even though some studies suggest that input can be relevant to the learner when it comes to interpreting meaning, this is not necessarily the same kind of input that you need in order to build grammatical knowledge.[25] Furthermore, Ellis argues that "there is also evidence to suggest that it is particular kinds of grammatical features that learners fail to acquire,"[26] and that some SLA researchers suggest that there are certain grammatical features that are easier learned than others – some might even be acquired naturally. Form-focused instruction can therefore, in some cases, be necessary in order to help the second language learner acquire these features.[27]

2.3.1   The problem with informal classroom environments

In contrast to Krashen, Ellis does not believe that proficiency in a second language can be acquired by simply participating in natural communication. First of all, he claims that it would be very difficult to actually create a communicative classroom environment that provides

---

[21] Ibid., 48.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid., 50.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid., 50-51.

learners with natural input rich enough to ensure grammar learning, and that there is plenty of evidence to support this claim: "Many factors conspire against it – the number of participants involved, the need for the teacher to maintain discourse control, and the learners' attitudes regarding what kinds of activities are appropriate for learning a second language in a classroom."[28] According to him, the input provided in a classroom learning situation includes relatively few past tense verb forms, and there is not much need for the teachers to vary their choice of linguistic form when giving lectures. He also claims that there are even greater problems with learner output, and that some studies show that less than 15 percent of total students turns are more than a clause in length, meaning that there is hardly any opportunity for the second language students to continue production.[29] Then there is also the fact that students have a tendency to turn to their first language in peer-peer interaction instead of making use of the target language. Krashen suggested that it would be enough for the learners to receive helpful feedback from other learners who could correct their utterances in order to make it grammatically correct. Ellis, on the other hand, sees it as a problem that much of the talk that learners hear comes from other learners, due to the fact that the term "second language *learner*" means that one is in fact still learning and has not yet reached proficiency in the target language. If students were to teach each other, then, they could risk preventing further development of the language they are trying to acquire, as there is nothing motivating them to advance to higher levels of proficiency once they see them selves as functional.[30] According to Ellis, it would therefore be incorrect to call a classroom environment a "natural sociolinguistic language acquisition setting" if the students spend a large amount of their time interacting with other interlanguage speakers.[31] Hence, even though there are several things that can be done in order to create a communicative classroom, Ellis argues that "the resulting environment may not be conductive to successful grammar acquisition, because the input learners receive is impoverished, because they resort to their [first language], and because the opportunities for certain kinds of output are limited."[32] He does, however, claim that a communicative classroom "can make it possible to succeed in developing learners who [are] able to confidently communicate in a second language, as well as developing the discourse and strategic competence necessary for effective use of a second language."[33] Nevertheless,

---

[28] Ibid., 51.
[29] Ibid., 50.
[30] Ibid., 52.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid., 51.
[33] Ibid., 52.

he concludes that there is growing evidence that a communicative classroom environment does not seem to result in development of full grammatical competence.

2.3.2 Focus on form

As we have seen, Krashen makes an attempt at proving the effectiveness of meaning-based methods regarding the development of grammatical competence, while Ellis tries to prove the effectiveness of a form-focused approach. In his work, Ellis mentions Krashen several times and has attempted to demonstrate how his theories are doubtable. He argues that via classroom communication, second language learners are only able to acquire basic grammatical competence, and only because some grammatical features are easier learnt than others and can be acquired naturally. Other than that, learners will struggle to acquire full grammatical competence through communication in the informal classroom environment like Krashen suggests, because the input these classrooms provide, as well as the learner output, are simply not rich enough. Ellis also argues that there are studies that have produced evidence to suggest that: "some grammatical features are performed more accurately if learners have access to form-focused introduction."[34] However, it is important to note that Ellis also says that "whether form-focused instruction is successful or not depends on the complexity of the target structure."[35] In other words: If we want form-focused instruction to succeed in teaching a learner a new developmental structure, it has to work in accordance with the natural sequence of acquisition, because in order for a learner to acquire a new structure he or she has to be ready to do so.[36] Additionally, Ellis explains that: "some studies have produced evidence to suggest that form-focused instruction has an effect on accuracy in planned but not in unplanned production."[37] Meaning that if acquisition is measured in relation to spontaneous speech, form-focused instruction may not work.

2.3.3 Summary

Based on what we have seen so far, it could seem like the reason why Krashen and Ellis have such different opinions regarding how grammar competence is best acquired in second and foreign languages, is somewhat caused by their differences in expected outcome. Even though both of them regard full target language proficiency (including grammatical competence) as

---

[34] Ibid., 57.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid., 61-3.
[37] Ibid., 57.

the most important achievement, Krashen's opinion indicates that he finds communication in the form of natural and spontaneous speech a lot more important than what Ellis does. Despite Ellis' strong accusations against Krashen, it still seems like Krashen's theory has been very influential in language teaching pedagogy. According to Krashen, the teacher's job is to provide opportunities for communicative language use in the classroom, and many teachers of second and foreign languages in today's Norwegian schools have therefore started to question whether or not they should teach grammar, and if doing so has any value at all. Ellis disagrees with this and argues that there is research to suggest that "the communicative classroom does not result in very high levels of grammatical or sociolinguistic competence [and that] although it is no yet clear that form-focused instruction will be able to remedy this situation, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that it might."[38] As I see it, Krashen's method does not necessarily have to end in failure. The method's outcome simply depends on the conditions at hand: His theory requires "natural" communication also outside of class, which is not always possible in all cases. The fact that Ellis provides sufficient evidence to show that form-focused instruction can and does work, and given that this thesis is concerned with the English education in Norwegian upper secondary schools, I choose to agree with Ellis: "Yes, teachers should teach grammar."[39]

2.4   The importance of grammar in English as a second language

Anne Dahl and Eva Thue Vold, both associate professors at respectable universities in Norway, have also researched different aspects of second and foreign language acquisition. Their articles concerning grammar instruction in second and foreign language education (published in the book *Fremmedspråksdidaktikk* [*Foreign Language Education*]) are therefore highly relevant to include in this master thesis. It is also worth mentioning that many of their theories are based on Ellis' work.[40]

The fact that grammar is something that native speakers of a language master intuitively, tells us that grammar can be taught without explicit explanations. Dahl argues that children have

---

[38] Ibid., 71.

[39] Ibid., 71.

[40] Entered references are, inter alia, Rod Ellis, *Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective* (Tesol Quarterly, 2006. 83-107) and Rod Ellis, "Methodological Options in Grammar Teaching Materials," in *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms,* ed. Eli Hinkel and Sandra Fotos, 155-179. (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006).

the ability to learn grammar simply by listening attentively when meeting the language in use. She explains that when language researchers began to understand more of how young children learn their first language, they came up with the idea that also elder children and adults would learn second and foreign languages best if they used it for real communication.[41] Like Krashen suggests, the language education should therefore aspire to look like the environment young children are in when they acquire their first language, given that this language-learning environment seems to be most successful.[42] According to Dahl, linguists today still agree that the most central element in language education is to make sure that students meet the language in use as much as possible. In other words: Make sure that they have sufficient input. This seems fair, yet I choose to agree with Ellis. The reason I do so is because the way students learn a second language in school differs from how children acquire their first language in two important ways: age and disposal of time.[43] Dahl writes: "Without knowing everything about why or how, most of the language researchers agree that there is something about young children that makes them particularly suited to learn languages, especially when it comes to learning it naturally and without explicit instruction."[44] This ability, however, seems to disappear with age. She then writes: "The other big difference between young children's development of their first language and second language learning in school, is the time spent on the target language."[45] It is, of course, not as easy for students in school to learn a second language as it is for young children to acquire their first language. After all, young children are surrounded by the language they are to learn all day. That said, it is important to take into account that even thought students in school have to settle for a few hours of language education a week, this master thesis is concerned with the English language education – English being a language that, in Norway, is no longer seen as a foreign language like e.g. German, Spanish and French are. First of all, children in Norway start their English education already in the first grade of primary school, and it is a compulsory subject both in primary school, lower secondary school and upper secondary school. Second of all, the amount of English input students receive from e.g. media, music, movies and TV series outside school is a lot more than the amount of input they get from other foreign languages. The English language is therefore different from other foreign languages in this respect. Despite this important difference, Norwegian students learning English in Norway can still

---

[41] Vold, *Methods for Teaching Grammar*, 114.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

not be regarded as the same as growing up in an English speaking country. I therefore choose to agree with Dahl when she argues that it is not likely that the short time spent on learning a second or foreign language in school can give good enough language education if it is exclusively based on input, and that explicit grammar instruction therefore can, to a certain extent, compensate for the limited time at hand.[46]

2.4.1 Language use and terminology in grammar introduction

If we now determine that explicit grammar introduction is necessary given that the short and fragmented time spent on second or foreign language education in school makes it impossible for the students to be exposed to enough language input for them to acquire grammar implicitly, the question is no longer why we should teach grammar, but how. In explicit grammar introduction one usually utilizes special technical terms that is not exactly part of most people's everyday speech, and it is, of course, not natural for teachers to bring all the linguistic terminology they know into the classroom. Nevertheless, Dahl argues that "students does actually need some terminology in order to fully understand grammatical phenomenon's, to describe them and to understand the explanation of them and, with that, for example understand why something is right or wrong in the target language."[47] That way, grammatical terminology can contribute to give the students a meta-perspective on their own language learning process.[48] It is, however, important that teachers carefully consider what kind of words and expressions they use and what kind of words and expressions they expect of the students. According to Dahl, "the terminology must not be the goal itself, and must be used in order to promote, not prevent, understanding of the language."[49] That said, one should, as far as one can, use the target language as much as possible when teaching. The more the students get to hear the target language, the more often they are given the opportunity to learn from this linguistic input.[50] This is an important principle in all language education and also applies to the way we teach grammar. Many teachers might feel the need to turn to their mother tongue when it comes to explaining grammar, especially if they have the same mother tongue as all of their students. This is quite natural, given that grammar truly can be a rather complicated matter that sometimes is hard enough to understand and explain in one's own

---

[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid., 116.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid., 117.
[50] Ibid., 121.

language. Even so, Dahl says that one can still question this practice. She argues that if explanations are given in one's mother tongue, this is done at the expense of optimal target language exposure – the most important source to language learning. If explanations are done in the target language, however, one is able to provide abundant input at the same time as one gives explicit introductions. Another reason for why teachers should stick to the target language when teaching grammar is to avoid the possibility of (unintentionally) suggesting that "here comes something very difficult," like they probably will if they keep changing between use of the target language and their mother tongue. For some students, this can be very demotivating.[51]

2.5 Methods for teaching grammar

Grammar teaching does not have to be synonymous with tedious lectures carried out on the blackboard; there are many ways to vary grammar teaching. Unfortunately, most people do not associate grammar instruction with variation and engagement.[52] According to Vold, "a lot of people still associate this part of the education with cramming and recitation of inflectional paradigms or preposition rules which are presented to them detached from context."[53] She believes that the reason for people to still have such a view on grammar, lingers from the traditional way of teaching it, a method that will be presented in the next chapter. In today's English subject curriculum for Norwegian upper secondary schools, the competence aims that concern grammar is placed under the main subject area named "Communication."[54] This makes it perfectly clear that grammar teaching must be connected to the language in use. Dahl writes: "Grammar is not meant to be a separate subject within the [English] subject. Grammar is a part of the language and contributes in the same way as vocabulary, utterance and knowledge about sociocultural norms, to students communicative competence."[55] She also states that the keyword for communicative competence is *meaning*, which involves knowing how to interpret and impart the meaning of a message.[56] Additionally, the goal of today's second language education is not just to educate students in a way that they will "manage" in

---

[51] Ibid., 121-2.
[52] Vold, *Methods for Teaching Grammar*, 126.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Udir.no
[55] Vold, *Methods for Teaching Grammar*, 126.
[56] Ibid.

the second language. "Tourist language is not the goal,"[57] according to Dahl. She argues that the schools' second language education must aim to make the students as competent users of the language as possible, as the goal is to prepare the them for many different situations, including formal situations in their future working life. The students must therefore be capable to use the language reasonably accurate and appropriate in both written and oral communication.[58] From a pedagogical and didactical point of view, grammar itself is therefore no longer seen as unimportant, and now that we have established this, the next chapters will describe three different methods that can be used when teaching grammar: The classic approach, the inductive approach and the input processing instruction.

2.5.1 The classic approach

"The classic approach to grammar teaching is usually described in short as PPP, which stands for presenting, practicing, producing,"[59] and refers to a method consisting of three parts. First, the teacher presents the rule by using grammatical terminology and usually illustrates with the help of standard examples that is typically constructed for this purpose alone (and rarely manages to reflect the real language). The students will then practice the rule, usually based on constructed single phrases or short texts that sometimes look more like compounded sentences than a coherent text. Typical examples are "fill-in" tasks (fill in the correct form of the verb), situation tasks (replace the noun phrase with a personal pronoun) or transformation tasks (change the text from present tense to past tense, or, make sentences in the singular form into plural form). According to Vold, what many of these tasks have in common is that they are not dependent on the students' understanding. The students can easily solve these tasks without having to understand the meaning of the subject matter in these sentences or texts. At last, the students produce their own texts where the topical structure is included. This part of the method is meant to secure that the students use the learned structures also in communication.[60] According to Vold, the production tasks are meant to "establish a connection between the grammar and the 'real' language"[61] Yet, the purpose of these tasks is not to impart meaning, but to practice the learned structures. Vold writes: "the classic way of teaching grammar consists of a deductive approach where the students first have the rule and

---

[57] Ibid., 127.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Ibid., 127-8.

[61] Ibid., 128.

the linguistic structures explained to them before they get to practice the same structures in more or less appropriate ways."[62] She argues that there is nothing wrong with the classic approach's ground structure itself, which consists of modeling followed by practice and then more and more independent use.[63] What is criticized is the lack of connection to the authentic language. Still, this approach is not necessarily a method one should steer clear of. Many students feel that they learn a lot by working this way, and the thought behind this traditional method of grammar teaching is that it can contribute to automation of fixed structures.[64] That way, the learners are able to attain a nice flow when communicating, because there are certain structures and elements they do not have to stop and think about before speaking. That said, there are other approaches to grammar teaching that could be used in order to vary the teaching lessons, and to give the students a different experience of grammar in their second language as well. The inductive approach presented below is an example of such a method.

2.5.2   The inductive approach

With an inductive approach, the teacher does not reveal the grammar rule or structure, but leaves it to the students to find out on their own. This approach therefore stands in a clear contrast to the traditional PPP method. Here, the teacher's job is to provide the students with sufficient and thoroughly selected linguistic input in order to help them determine the rule. Of course, the provided input has to be comprehensible and it has to contain ample examples of the topical structure if the students are to have a chance to recognize and identify it. To have the students formulate the rules on their own may sound intricate, but according to Vold, it does not have to be. She writes: "the method can be used on all levels as long as the choice of structure, amount and the difficulty of the input is adapted to the students' level."[65] English language learners can for instance be given a few simple sentences and be told to formulate a rule for how to use the past tense of the verb *to be*. If necessary, one can steer the students' attention towards the topical structure with the help of colors or cursive in order to help them to look for patterns for when to use *was* and when to use *were*. According to Vold, "the biggest advantage with an inductive approach is that the students usually remember best what they themselves have found out. The grammar lessons become more 'discovering' and is

---

[62] Ibid., 129.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid., 131.

often regarded less boring when carried out this way."[66] She also claims that such an approach will give the students practice in the main subject area "language learning" in the English subject curriculum, because "they are practicing to look for patterns in languages and to form hypothesis about the language, maybe based on previous experiences with language learning and what they know about other languages."[67]

2.5.3   Input processing instruction

The third and last approach to grammar teaching I would like to present is a method called "input processing instruction." The idea of this method is not to focus on output, put to have the students learn grammar by interpreting and editing linguistic input. First, the teacher will present the grammatical rule through a classic approach or let the students find out about the rule on their own through an inductive approach. Nevertheless, it is what follows that is of importance: The teacher will give information about and awareness of the problems and misunderstandings the topical structure often can cause for learners. The students will then work actively with tasks connected to examples of the topical structure. Vold describes: "Meaning is central here; the tasks are constructed in a way that in order to solve them, the students must show that they have understood the meaning that is imparted by the grammatical structures."[68] Typical examples would be "to connect a set of active and passive sentences to the correct pictures (who does what to whom?), place events on a timeline based on the sentences' verb tense (what happens first, what happens at the same time?), or to choose the right translation of sentences in the second language (the French *Tu me manques* – does it mean *I miss you* or *You miss me*?)."[69] The input usually also contains so-called distractors – examples that contains a similar form or structure, but where the meaning is different. The thought behind including distractors is to make the students even more aware of the correlation between form and meaning. According to Vold, it might become easier for the students to understand "the point" of grammar lessons if you make use of such an input based approach, because the students learn that form is connected and highly relevant to meaning.[70] Like the inductive approach, this teaching method also stands in contrast to the classic approach to grammar teaching where the students imitates and copies the learned structures.

---

[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid., 131-2.
[68] Ibid., 132.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.

By processing input, like the input-processing instruction aims to do, one focuses on a deeper cognitive adaption through activities related to reflection and understanding.[71] The students become more aware of the grammatical structures, notice them, understand what role they play in the text and accept the fact that grammar is not necessarily reflected in spontaneous language use.[72]

3   Thomas Armstrong – Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom

As I am not only concerned with the importance of grammar instruction in the English language education, but also the students' perception of grammar instruction, the theory of Multiple Intelligences seems relevant to include in this study as I wish to ascertain if there is any concurrence between students' preferred choice of study and their perception of grammar instruction.

3.1   The MI Theory

In 1983, the now world-famous psychologist Howard Garner revolutionized the fields of psychology and education when his book *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* was published. His Multiple Intelligence theory (MI theory) challenged the commonly held belief that "intelligence" could be objectively measured and reduced to a single number or "IQ" score. He argued that the way our culture had defined intelligence was far too limited, and suggested that "intelligence has more to do with the capacity for 1) solving problems and 2) fashioning problems in a context-rich naturalistic setting."[73] In his theory of multiple intelligences, Gardner sought to broaden the scope of human potential beyond the confines of the IQ score, and proposed at least seven basic intelligences (more recently, he has added an eight and discussed the possibility of a ninth). About 10 years later, Thomas Armstrong's book *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom. Association for supervision and curriculum development*[74] was published, and Armstrong became the leading figure in the world in translating Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences into practical applications when he described how educators could bring the MI theory into the classroom every day. Armstrong describes Gardner's eight comprehensive categories or "intelligences"

---

[71] Ibid., 133.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Thomas Armstrong, *Multiple intelligences in The Classroom*, 3rd ed. (Alexandria: ASCD, 2009), 6.

[74] Thomas Armstrong, *Multiple intelligences in The Classroom. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1994).

as follows:[75]

- *Linguistic:* The capacity to use words effectively, whether orally or in writing.
- *Logical-mathematical:* The capacity to use numbers effectively and to reason well.
- *Spatial:* The ability to perceive the visual-spatial world accurately and to perform transformations upon those perceptions.
- *Bodily-Kinesthetic:* Expertise in using one's whole body to express ideas and feelings and facility in using one's hands to produce or transform things.
- *Musical*: The capacity to perceive, discriminate, transform and express musical forms.
- *Interpersonal:* The ability to perceive and make distinctions in the moods, intensions, motivations, and feelings of other people.
- *Intrapersonal:* Self-knowledge and the ability to act adaptively on the basis of that knowledge.
- *Naturalist:* Expertise in the recognition and classification of the numerous species – the flora and fauna – of an individual's environment.

There are more to these eight intelligences than what I have just described, and it is also important to note that people may have a combination of several multiple intelligences where one is perhaps more dominant. Nevertheless, seeing as linguistic intelligence is said to be typical of those who favor social sciences, and given that logical-mathematical intelligence is said to be typical of those who favor natural science and mathematics, these are the intelligences that will be described further.

3.2   Linguistic intelligence

Those who have the capacity to use words effectively, whether orally (e.g., as a storyteller, orator, or politician) or in writing (e.g., as a poet, playwright, editor, or journalist) demonstrate linguistic intelligence. This intelligence includes the ability to manipulate the syntax or structure of language, the phonology or sounds of language, the semantics or meanings of language, or the pragmatic dimensions or practical usage of language. Some of these uses include rhetoric (using language to convince others to take a specific course of action), mnemonics (using language to remember information), explanation (using language

---

[75] Thomas Armstrong, *Multiple intelligences in The Classroom*, 3rd ed. (Alexandria: ASCD, 2009), 6.

to inform), and metalanguage (using language to talk about itself).[76] Students who excel in linguistic intelligence often seem to enjoy reading books, write better than average for age, has a good vocabulary for age, spell words accurately, communicates to others in a highly verbal way, appreciate nonsense rhymes, puns and tongue twisters, spins tall tales or tell jokes or stories, enjoy word games like Scrabble, Anagrams, or passwords, and usually has English, social studies, and history as their favorite subjects in school.[77]

3.3 Logical-Mathematical intelligence

Those who have the capacity to use numbers effectively (e.g., as a mathematician, tax accountant or statistician) and to reason well (e.g., as a scientist, computer programmer or logician) demonstrate a logical-mathematical intelligence. This intelligence includes sensitivity to logical patterns and relationships, statements and propositions (if-then, cause-effect), functions, and other related abstractions. The kinds of processes used in the service of logical-mathematical intelligence include categorization, classification, inference, generalization, calculation and hypothesis testing.[78] Students who excel in terms of logical-mathematical intelligence often seem to ask a lot of questions about how things work and believe that almost everything has a rational explanation. Their minds seem to search for patterns, regularities or logical sequences in things, and they seem to enjoy working or playing with numbers and solving brainteasers that require logical thinking. They might also enjoy playing chess, checkers, or other strategy games. They usually enjoy putting things in categories, hierarchies, or other logical patterns and feel more comfortable when something has been categorized, analyzed, measured or quantified in some ways. Usually, math and/or science are among their favorite subjects in school, and they might like to do experiments in science class or in free play.[79]

---

[76] In conformity with the last footnote, the description of what characterizes linguistic intelligence is borrowed from Thomas Armstrong, *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom*, 2009, 6. This also applies to the description of what characterized logical-mathematical intelligence.

[77] Armstrong (2009), *Multiple intelligenses*, 22 & 35.

[78] Ibid., 6.

[79] Ibid., 22-3 & 35.

3.4 How to know and how to teach

According to Armstrong, "there is no 'megatest' on the market that can provide a comprehensive survey of students' multiple intelligences."[80] Nevertheless, he suggest that teachers make an effort to ascertain what kind of intelligence each of their students seem to demonstrate, and says that there are several ways to do this. The easiest way, however, is to simply observe their behavior, both in class and in their free time in school. Armstrong therefore suggests: "Every teacher should consider keeping a notebook, diary or journal handy in a desk for recording observations."[81] They can also find use of a checklist (list of what characterizes the different intelligences) to help organize their observations. Viewing school records can also provide important information about students' multiple intelligences. For instance, if a student's grades over the years are higher in math and the hard sciences than they are in social sciences, this may indicate an inclination toward logical-mathematic rather than linguistic intelligence.[82] Another way to assess students' proclivities could be to simply ask them, as they are the ultimate experts of their multiple intelligences – they live with them every day. If teachers introduce the MI theory to their students, they can ask them afterwards what *they* consider to be their most highly developed intelligence. That way, teachers can discover how each of their students learns most effectively and adapt their teaching activities and instructional strategies accordingly. Armstrong argues that those who demonstrate linguistic intelligence would for instance learn most from lectures, discussions, word games, story telling, choral reading and journal writing.[83] Instructional strategies should therefore be: listen to it, talk about it, read about it, and write about it.[84] Those who demonstrate logical-mathematical intelligence would learn most from brainteasers, problem solving, science experiments, mental calculation, number games and critical thinking.[85] Hence, instructional strategies should be: quantify it, experiment with it, put it in a logical framework, and think critically about it.[86]

When it comes to grammar instruction in the English subject, is it perhaps possible, then, that those students who seem to demonstrate linguistic intelligence, those who usually prefer

---

[80] Ibid., 33.
[81] Ibid., 34.
[82] Ibid., 39.
[83] Ibid., 48.
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid.

social sciences over natural science and mathematics, would learn more if both the lessons and the tasks were more "discovering" and included more independent thinking, like they are set up to be with an inductive approach? This would seem reasonable, given that these students often seem to be proficient writers with a good vocabulary, concerned with spelling words accurately and able to handle the syntax or structure of language. And is it, perhaps, also likely that these students could benefit from the input processing instruction, an approach where students are made aware of the relation between form and meaning? Their ability to manage the semantics or meanings of language, or the pragmatic dimensions or practical usage of language, would certainly suggest so. Is it perhaps also reason to believe that those who demonstrate logical-mathematical intelligence, then, would learn more from the classic approach to grammar teaching, where the rule is first presented by the teacher and then practiced by the students? Given that students who incline towards logical-mathematical intelligence often would like to know how things work, and enjoy putting things in categories or other logical patterns, this would be reasonable to assume. The question is therefore if methods for teaching grammar should be adapted to the students respective intelligences.

4 Methodology

In order to investigate the students' perception of grammar instruction and to find out if it is it necessary to approach the students with adapted teaching method according to their different intelligences, I visited one class in two different upper secondary schools in the county of Finnmark. The students were in their second semester in the first out of three years at upper secondary school. In this study, several different methods were applied when collecting data. These methods were: observation, log, questionnaire and interview, all of which are qualitative methods. When I was to choose a research method for my study, I learned that the decision on whether to use quantitative methods or qualitative methods is dependent on whether you want to focus on breadth or depth. While quantitative methods makes it possible to examine a phenomenon more generally among a large amount of people, qualitative methods are used when you are "trying to approach a deeper understanding of what is studied, based on a small selection of people."[87] Thus, given that I wanted to survey methods for teaching English grammar in two upper secondary school classes, and where the examination would undertake about 40 students, I decided to use qualitative methods for my research. My

---

[87] Cato R. P. Bjørndal, *Det vurderende øyet* [The Apprising Eye], 2nd ed. (Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk, 2013), 29.

choice of method was also of strategic matter, meaning that I considered what kind of methods that would be most expedient for my study, especially when it came to resources. To strengthen the validity of this study, I examined two classes in order to collect relevant data that provided knowledge for my analysis. One challenge was that in the county of Finnmark there are quite long distances between most of the towns, and only one upper secondary school in each of them. In the matter of resources, then, I had to take into account that I would have limited time in each school if I were to avoid traveling around the county several times. Additionally, previous experiences had taught me that when it came to data collection in schools, there is never really a good time to do so as everyone's schedules are usually fully booked. I therefore chose to make use of qualitative methods that could consider the limited time available – methods that made it possible for me to carry out the data collection as quickly as possible. According to Cato Bjørndal, author of the book *Det vurderende øyet: Observasjon, vurdering og utvikling av undervisning og veiledning* [*The Apprising Eye: Observation, evaluation and the development of teaching and guidance*]), there are several advantages by using qualitative methods for the kind of research I am conducting. One of these advantages are that qualitative methods makes it possible to study selected issues of cases in depth and detail,[88] which were my exact intentions. Additionally, qualitative examinations are more flexible, and it is possible to change the arrangements as one obtains bigger insight and understanding during the surveys.[89] Furthermore, they provide you with an opportunity to form "relevant interpretations of data from each individual examination unit."[90] In my case, that would for instance mean a thorough analysis of each response to each of the questions within the questionnaire. The process of collecting data in such methods would therefore give me, as a researcher, more freedom to express my own understanding of what is examined, and approaching an in-depth interpretation certainly makes the data more credible.[91] There are, however, also a few disadvantages by using qualitative methods. When it comes to the flexibility of interpretations, Bjørndal claims that the results can become less unambiguous and difficult to compare, given that you might gather different information from the different examination units.[92] Also, the fact that qualitative methods are quite unstructured makes it difficult to draw a general conclusion about a phenomenon. With these facts taken

---

[88] Michael Q. Pratton, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, 2nd ed. (Newbury Park: SAGE Publications, Inc., 1990), 165.
[89] Bjørndal, *Det vurderende øyet*. p. 109
[90] Ibid., 110.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Ibid.

into consideration, I still chose to make use of qualitative methods as I concluded that such methods would be most suitable for my research. As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, I chose use four methods for acquisition of data: observation, log, questionnaire and interview.

4.1 Observation and log

Bjørndal describes observation, in a pedagogical context, as something one is very attentive of – you try to observe something that is of pedagogical importance in a very concentrated way.[93] He claims that for the pedagogue, observation is seen as a professional skill connected to the task of the person concerned. "One observes in order to create the best possible conditions for learning and progress."[94] I wanted to be present while English grammar was taught in the two upper secondary school classes, in order to observe what kind of methods for teaching grammar the teachers made use of. According to Bjørndal, there are two different types of observation: *observation of first order* and *observation of second order*. The first one mentioned occurs when "the pedagogue, the pupil, the student or an outsider has observation of the pedagogical situation as a primary task"[95] The other type, observation of second order, takes place when the teacher or the instructor continuously needs to observe the pedagogical situation that he or she is also a part of. In other words: "The observation happens at the same time as the pedagogical activity and is not primary, but a task that is complementary and juxtaposed with teaching or guiding".[96] In my case, observation of first order was practiced, as I was only in the classroom to observe and not interact in any way. One of the advantages by using observation as research method is that the method is very direct when it comes to gathering information about an issue, and because that, the data itself naturally becomes more accurate and reliable. When the method itself is accurate, this also improves the accuracy of the actual research results. Another advantage is that observation can help you understand the verbal responses of the ones you observe more efficiently, and at the same time increase the problem of depending on the respondents alone. There are, however, also a few disadvantages by using observation as research method. You are, for instance, not able to study opinions or attitudes. Because of that, you will not be able to obtain a complete answer to any question or issue by exercising observation alone, which is why I chose to make use of several other

---

[93] Ibid., 32.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.

methods in addition to observation. Not only did I observe the two classes while grammar was taught, I also wrote a personal log during the grammar lessons where I focused on writing down my observations of the teaching techniques and methods the teacher used, as well as studying the students' reaction, interest and participation. The log also contained my own thoughts about how the period had been carried out. Even though the focus is mostly on observation as a method in the work of evaluation, Bjørndal also mentions two other types of evaluation methods that can work as good supplements to observation: questionnaire and interview.[97] I therefore decided to make use of both of these methods in addition to observation and log, as a way of gathering more accurate data.

4.2 Questionnaire

The reason I chose to make use of a questionnaire as one of the methods for collecting data, is because it made it possible for me to gather information about several persons at the same time. Additionally, I believed that it would make it easier to present the results of the surveys in a lucid way, and gathering of information would not become too time-consuming when the questionnaire first had been drafted. The purpose of the questionnaire was to survey how the students experienced their learning outcomes and motivation in relation to the English lessons where grammar was taught, and the questions in the questionnaire was therefore related to these themes. In the questionnaire I included both fixed response alternatives that the students had to answer in the form of checkboxes, and open-ended response alternatives where the students had the opportunity to give more elaborating answers. The advantage of a questionnaire with fixed response alternatives is that the students' work becomes less demanding, which also makes it easier and less time-consuming for the researcher to adapt and edit the responses. A questionnaire with fixed response alternatives also makes it easy for the researcher to compare the responses, seeing as clearly formulated response alternatives already exist. However, the disadvantage with such a questionnaire is that it does not give the students the opportunity to respond with alternatives that the researcher might not have thought of, and they would not be able to add any prospective comments. I therefore chose to include a couple of open-ended response alternatives as well, in order to give the students an opportunity to elaborate and explain why they gave a particular answer, which also made it possible to reveal ignorance and misunderstandings. Another advantage by using open-ended response alternatives is that it looks more like a regular conversation, and compared to the

---

[97] Ibid., 95.

fixed response alternatives it does not force the respondent to give one specific answer. It can also be quite favorable with such a response alternative given that some of the questions might include complicated or foreign words that are difficult for the students to understand. In order to get as honest answers as possible, I chose to let the students be anonymous, which also made the responses more credible.[98]

4.3   Qualitative interviewing

To converse might be the best way to take part in another person's thoughts, and according to Patton, author of the book *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*, the purpose of interviewing people is "to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe."[99] The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person's mind – to understand the other person's perspective.[100] That is why interview as research method has so many advantages, maybe especially compared to one-sided exterior observation. Not only does it give an opportunity to spot details that otherwise could have been ignored, but an interview also makes it possible to give a trial of understandings, and even more importantly: unravel misunderstandings.[101] Patton explains that "qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of other is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit"[102] and that the interviewer's task is "to make it possible for the person being interviewed to bring the interviewer into his or her world." [103] That said, interview as research method also has its disadvantages. First of all, interviews can require a lot of time when it comes to preparation, the actual carry out, and of course the processing. This often enables you to interview a limited amount of people, which is why I chose to only interview three students from each class. Another disadvantage is that you can risk affecting the ones who are being interviewed, and your own opinions could color the information you gather.[104] As long as you are attentive, you can, however, confine such an effect.

---

[98] Ibid., 118.
[99] Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation*, 278.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Bjørndal, *Det vurderende øyet*, 95.
[102] Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation*, 278.
[103] Ibid., 279.
[104] Bjørndal, *Det vurderende øyet*, 96.

4.3.1 The interview guide approach

Interviewing has a variety of forms. They can be done online or face-to-face, individually or in groups, and they can be formal or informal. Patton identifies three basic types of qualitative interview, ranging from unstructured to more structured ones. On this scale we find *the informal conversational interview* as the most unstructured form. This type of interview is more like an is an informal conversation where the interviewer has, to a confined extent, not planned the course of the conversation, and where the person you are conversing with may not even be aware that he or she is being interviewed.[105] This one is followed by *the general interview guide approach*. This type is more or less a detailed survey of questions or issues that are to be brought up during the interview, and "simply serves as a basic checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered."[106] This type of onterview is also quite informal. The third type of interview is the *standardized open-ended interview,* an interview form that consists of a fixed order of questions to respond to and where "the flexibility in probing is limited."[107] Given that all of these interview forms have in common that the participant's responses are open-ended and not restricted to choices provided by the interviewer, they would all be appropriate and favorable to use when you are doing qualitative research. For my study, I chose to make use of the interview guide approach, because "the relatively loose form makes the interview form suitable in group interviews, where the aim often will be to reveal rich information about a case,"[108] which was my exact intension. An interview guide is, more or less, a detailed overview of questions or issues that are to be brought up and explored during an interview. The interview guide is therefore a little more structured than the informal conversational interview, but there is still a great deal of flexibility involved. The order of questions is not predetermined but can be changed by the interviewer during the interview, depending on how the interview evolves. Also, with this type of interview, a considerable amount of follow-up questions will usually be included. According to Bjørndal, the interview guide "balances the consideration between having to be open for different types of information and at the same time secure that you focus on questions or issues that it is important to gather information about."[109]

---

[105] Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation*, 280.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Bjørndal, *Det vurderende øyet*, 97.
[109] Ibid.

4.3.2   Advantages of disadvantages of qualitative interviewing

In my experience, using qualitative interviewing as research method had several advantages. First of all, the open-ended responses to the questions asked during the interview provided me with quotations, which then became the main source of the raw data. I also found that by using interview as research method after the results of the questionnaire had been analyzed, I was able to gain insight into interesting or unexpected findings. Additionally, the students seemed to be more genuine when responding, seeing as the interview allowed them to answer the questions by using their own words, rather then being restricted to predetermined categories like the questionnaire demanded. It also allowed me as interviewer to probe for more details and ensure that the students were interpreting questions the way they were intended. I would say that the questionnaire was appropriate for what my research was trying to accomplish. However, I was looking for perception, opinion and point of view, which could only be reflected and expressed in an interview. That said, there are also disadvantages of using qualitative interviewing. There was, for instance, the risk of making the students experience the interview as intrusive. To confine such an effect I did however make it clear that if they said more than they intended to say, and later regretted having done so, I would not include these statements in my research. There is also the fact that processing qualitative interviews is much more time-consuming than processing quantitative interviews, because there are expectations of more subjective analysis and interpretation. Even though it can be quite time-consuming, I would say that it is actually an advantage that the researcher gets to decide which quotations or specific examples to report, depending on what you want to bring to or include in your study. That way, you are also more in control of the outcome.

4.3.3   Registration of information

Bjørndal argues that it may not be sufficient to only depend on your confined memory in order for a longer interview to pan out well.[110] Hence, to get satisfying results, I chose to lean on both notes and sound recording for support during the interviews. Bjørndal also claims that even though extensive writing by the interviewer might interrupt the dialog, doing written notes can seem less threatening than sound recording on the one that's interviewed.[111] "The more unstructured and conversational an interview is, the bigger the chance that extensive

---

[110] Ibid., 101.
[111] Ibid.

writing will affect the conversation in a negative way."[112] Thus, given that the interviews were of the unstructured kind, I figured that if I was to use notes as the only technique for gathering information I would risk that the result would not become as accurate and complete as I wanted it to be. I therefore chose to make use of sound recording as well, because it gave me the opportunity transcribe the entire interview. Even though it takes a lot of time to transcribe an interview, it made sure that I got more accurate and complete information. Additionally, it gave me as interviewer a better opportunity to be present in the conversation, instead of getting lost in my notebook.[113] According to Bjørndal, an important point regarding interview is that "the quality of the information that you gather through an interview depends on the climate that you manage to create with your interlocutor. As a basic rule, the situation should be characterized by calmness and contact."[114] I therefore made sure that the interview was carried out in as shielded surroundings as possible to avoid disruptions. I also made sure that the students gave their consent to being recorded and clarified my obligation of professional secrecy before the interviews took place.

5   Survey results and discussion – Class X

I will start by describing my findings in class X, beginning with the observations I did when visiting the class while grammar was taught. I will then present the results of the questionnaire, and at last the interview done with three of the students from the class. The presentation of the results from class Y (chapter 6) will follow and will be done in the same way.

5.1   The result of my observations

When I met with the teacher before class, he told me that he did not teach grammar very often. He also said that he rarely had lessons where the focus was on grammar alone, partly because of the way the textbook was structured, with grammar tasks here and there, and partly because he tried to relate grammar to other topics in the English subject. Additionally, he told me that most of the students were proficient writers who master the English language quite well, hence he did not find it necessary to teach much grammar. When visiting class X I chose to find myself a seat in the back of the classroom where the students would not notice me. I did

---

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid., 102.

[114] Ibid., 98.

so in order to make the English lesson as normal as possible and to prevent their possible need of behaving differently than usual because they were being watched. The lesson lasted for about an hour and included reading of a text, different grammar tasks and discussions in plenary. The teacher had prepared about five tasks for the students and presented one at a time with the help of a couple of Power Point slides. The first task was to read an extract from Charles Dickens' novella "A Christmas carol," a story about an old miser called Ebenezer Scrooge. I learned that the students already knew the story as they had been working with it a few months earlier, before Christmas time. The students listened while the teacher read the text out loud, and afterwards he told them to identify the descriptive words in the text (there were plenty) and gave them a couple of minutes to quietly write them down on their computers. When the two minutes were up, the students took turns presenting their findings out loud, and while doing so, the teacher also asked them to explain them in their own words. The teacher then went on to talk about the meaning of these words, and said: "What do you make of this? What is Mr. Scrooge like?" He wanted the students to describe Mr. Scrooge with one single sentence based on what these descriptive words meant. They all agreed that Mr. Scrooge was "a bitter old man", and the teacher explained to them that even though the text did not say exactly that, this was the message the writer intended to impart. Task number three was to find the adjectives, verbs and adverbs in the text. I noticed that the students suddenly became very quiet and that they kept staring at the task written on the Power Point slide while at the same time exchanging looks with each other. The teacher noticed that too, and asked the students if they could describe what adjectives, verbs and adverbs were. Many faces turned into question marks and it was obvious that not all of them knew, thus, the teacher had to explain. When he had done so, the students began to work with the task at hand. Many of them raised a hand as a sign for help, and the teacher walked up to them and answered whatever questions they had. When the students were finished with the task, they took turns presenting their answers out loud again, and the teacher made them explain how they new that some words were adjectives while others were verbs and adverbs. The next two tasks were also focused on descriptive language, and the teacher explained how descriptive language was connected to meaning and understanding. Task number four was to find three more descriptions from the extract and mark the words that "carried" the description. Task number five was to make three descriptions of their own by using descriptive language. The students did not get to finish the last two tasks as the lesson was soon to be over and I was meant to use the last 10 minutes on the survey.

At first, the method used for teaching grammar looked a lot like the inductive approach. The teacher provided comprehensible input (a text) that contained plenty of examples of the topical structure (descriptive words), and the students were then given tasks they had to solve on their own (find the descriptive words in the text). The students easily solved these tasks as the term "descriptive words" kind of speaks for itself, hence no additional explanation was necessary. The teacher's plan was to have the students solve the next task in the same way, telling them to identify the verbs, adverbs and adjectives in the text on their own. However, this is an example of a task that usually requires instruction beforehand if the students are to have a chance to recognize and identify the topical structure presented to them, otherwise they will not know what to look for. When there was not given any instruction on what characterizes these linguistic categories, the students naturally felt confused. When the last task included production of their own text where the topical structure was to be included (make three descriptions on your own by using descriptive language), I realized that the method also looked a lot like the classic approach where the teacher 1) presents the rule 2) the students practice the rule (in this case look for it in a text) and 3) the students produce their own text where the topical structure is included. This could have been a classic example of the traditional way of teaching grammar had the teacher not failed to include the first part, the part where he presents the students with the information they need to solve the task. However, he shortly explained the rules when he saw that many of the students were confused. Yet, it should have been done more thoroughly. There are probably plenty of ways to combine different methods for teaching grammar, but in this case the combination between the inductive approach and the classic approach did not seem to work out too well. In the presentation of the interview done with three of the students from class X, we will learn more about what their opinion towards this grammar lesson was.

5.2 The result of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives (Class X)

As explained earlier, the questionnaire included both fixed and open-ended response alternatives. In total there were nine questions. Question one to six and question nine had fixed response alternatives, while question seven and eight provided an opportunity for open-ended responses. I will start by presenting the result of the questions with fixed response alternatives, but before I do so, I wish to inform you that the reason these questions had four response alternatives is because of the opportunity it gives to divide the responses into two categories, positive and negative, if needed. I wanted to do so in order to determine how many

of the students seemed to have a positive perception of grammar instruction, and how many seemed to have a negative point of view. The first two alternatives are seen as positive responses, while alternative three and four are seen as negative. In a class of totally 15 students, only 13 of them were present the day I visited the class. All 13 students participated in the survey.

A) Choice of study program (social sciences or natural sciences and mathematics)

In Norway, one normally has to choose between studying social sciences or natural science and mathematics after finishing the first year of general studies in upper secondary school. The result of the first question shows (see appendix 3) that five of the students in class X wanted to study social sciences, seven of them wanted to study natural science and mathematics, and one of them responded that he or she did not know yet what to choose. The reason I included this question is because when I started working with this thesis, I thought that it would be an idea to find out if there was any concurrence between the students' choice of study and their perception of grammar instruction, and I thought that by including a question such as this one, I would be able to determine if their interest in either social sciences or natural science and mathematics, affected their opinion towards grammar. My hypothesis was that those who favor social sciences would be more positive towards the English subject than those who favored natural science, given that language studies are often included in this program. If students choose to study social sciences, it would be logical to assume that they are interested in language studies as well as the structure and system of a language (grammar), and if they choose study natural science and mathematics, it would be logical to assume that they do not.

B) The relation between students preferred choice of study and their perception of grammar instruction

In class X, where the method used for teaching grammar was a combination of the inductive approach and the classic approach (yet, perhaps more classic than inductive), the result of the questionnaire's second question shows (see appendix 3) that none of the students responded that they thought about grammar lessons as fun when the teacher announced that this would be today's topic. However, none of them answered that they though of it as boring either. Six of them answered, "That is fine" and seven of them answered "Not exactly my favorite thing to do." If we were to divide the four response alternatives into two categories, positive and negative ("Fun!" and "That is fine" being the positive ones, while "Not my favorite thing to

do" and "Boring!" being the negative ones), the result of the first question shows that 46 percent of the students in class X had a positive perception of grammar instructions, while 54 percent of the students had a negative perception of grammar instructions. The positive responses were mostly from students who had chosen to study natural science and mathematics as of next year (hereinafter referred to as natural science students). Out of seven natural science students in this class, five of them gave a positive response to this question (see appendix 5). Almost all of the negative responses came from students who had chosen to study social sciences as of next year (hereinafter referred to as "social science students"). Out of six social science students in this class, five of them gave a negative response to this question (see appendix 4). As described in the introduction of this thesis, my hypothesis was that those who favor social sciences in school would be more positive towards the English subject (and grammar instruction) than those who favor natural sciences and mathematics, given that language studies often are included in this program. However, after I had conducted the survey in class X, I discovered that my hypothesis was misleading (as the result of this question shows), which is why I chose to include the chapter of MI theory and got some new perspective.

Given that so many of the natural science students in class X were positive to grammar instruction, the result of this question indicates that those who take interest in natural science and mathematics in school, students who according to Armstrong often incline towards logical-mathematic intelligence, prefer the classic approach to grammar teaching, seeing as students with logical-mathematic intelligence often would like to know how things work, and enjoy putting things in categories or other logical patterns, like the classic approach allows them to do. Given that so many of the social science students had a negative perception of grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach, these results could indicate that those students who take interest in social sciences in school, students who, according to Armstrong, often demonstrate high linguistic intelligence, would benefit more from the inductive approach, a method that is said to be more discovering as it involves independent thinking and solving of tasks, and where the students practice to look for patterns in the language and to form hypothesis about the language. This would seem reasonable to assume, given that students who incline towards linguistic intelligence often seem to be proficient writers with a good vocabulary, concerned with spelling words accurately and able to handle the syntax or structure of language. Perhaps these students would also benefit more from the input-processing instruction to grammar teaching, the approach where students are made aware of

the relation between form and meaning. Given that they have the ability to manage the semantics or meanings of language, or the pragmatic dimensions or practical usage of language, would certainly suggest so.

C) The students' perception of learning outcome

The result of the third question shows (see appendix 3) that three of the students thought that grammar instruction was "very informative", while 10 of them thought it was "quite informative." Hence, according to these responses, none of the students felt that they did not learn anything when the teacher had grammar instructions – no one saw it as uninformative. If we divide the four response alternatives into positive and negative categories, all students, regardless of their choice of study, seemed to have a positive learning experience with grammar instructions. I find this very interesting considering that more than half of all the students in the class, or more specifically all of the social science students, seemed to have a negative perception of grammar instruction and the classic approach. This could indicate that the students themselves find grammar as a matter of importance, and that informative grammar lessons trumps fun grammar lessons. However, when the result of the questions with open-ended response alternatives have been presented, there will be a deeper discussion of what these results may imply, as I find it problematic to state a certain opinion about this matter without referring to the elaborating comments from the students themselves.

D) The extent of motivation

The result of question four shows (see appendix 3) that none of the students in class X found grammar instruction "very motivating." However, 11 of them found it "quite motivating." Two of them answered that grammar instruction was "not that motivating", while none of them answered "not motivating at all." This means, that 85 percent of the students had a positive view towards grammar instruction regarding motivation. I therefore choose to argue that regardless of their choice of study (and intelligence), almost all of the students in class X claimed that grammar instruction was motivating to work with. The result of the responses from the second question showed that almost all of the natural science students had a positive perception of grammar instruction, hence it would be natural for them to give a positive answer to this question as well, as it would be logical to assume that when students find that something is fun to work with, they will also be motivated to learn. However, given that almost all of the social science students gave a positive response to this question as well, even though almost all of them responded that grammar instruction was "Not exactly [their]

favorite thing to do," this result could indicate that even though students, and especially those who incline towards linguistic intelligence, might find grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach a bit dull, the result of the third question showed that they still find it informative, which could be the reason for why they are motivated to work with grammar.

E) Engagement in learning grammar

The result of question five shows (see appendix 3) that none of the students claimed to be *very* engaged during a class where English grammar was taught. However, 12 of them responded that they were "quite engaged." Only one of the students responded that they were "not that engaged", and none of them claimed to not be engaged at all during grammar lessons. This shows that 92 percent of the students in class X had a positive view towards participation during grammar lessons. Like I argued in my discussion of the result of the question regarding motivation, the result of this question also indicates that even though students, and especially those who incline towards linguistic intelligence, might find grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach a bit dull, the result of the third question showed that they still find grammar instructions informative, which could be the reason for why they are engaged during grammar lessons.

F) The perception of the relation between grammar instruction and other topics in the English subject

The result of the questionnaire's sixth question shows that seven of the students felt that the grammar instructions were related to other subjects they learned about in English class. Five of them answered that "Some of it is", one answered that "Not much of it is", and none of them answered "No, not at all." This means that 92 percent of the students in class X were positive to grammar being a matter related to other subjects presented in English class, while 8 percent of the students seemed to have a negative view on the relation between grammar and other topics. The reason this question was included is because I was curious to find out if the students experienced that learning grammar was a "separate subject" within the English subject, given that Vold (chapter 2.5) believes that this is a common perception, especially when teachers turn to the classic approach when teaching grammar. As mentioned before, the teaching method in class X was a classic approach, thus I would have expected the students to respond that they did not feel that grammar instruction were in coherence with other things they learned about in English class. However, the result of this question makes sense, as it seems like the teacher in class X succeeded in making grammar relevant and related to topics

that the students already had been introduced to. As described in my observations of the class (chapter 5.1), both the grammar instruction and the grammar tasks were related to a text that the students had worked with before Christmas.

G) Perception of the English subject in general

The responses from the ninth question shows (see appendix 3) that nine of the students found the English subject in general "very interesting." Three of them responded "quite interesting" and one of them responded "not that interesting." None of the students claimed to not be interested in the English subject at all. This means that 92 percent of the students were positive to the English subject in general. As explained in the discussion of question one, the question regarding the students preferred choice of study, I thought that I would be able to prove that those who favor social sciences are more positive towards the English subject in general than those who favor natural science and mathematics. It turns out that I was wrong, as the result of this question shows that almost all of the students, regardless of their choice of study, seem to find the English subject interesting. However, I still find this question relevant to include, as it makes it possible to determine if there is any concurrence between the students' perception of grammar instruction and their perception of the English subject in general. In other words, it makes it possible to establish if it is just the grammar instructions they are dissatisfied with and not the subject itself, which seems to be the case.

5.3 The result of the questionnaire's open-ended response alternative (Class X)

As explained earlier, I chose to include a couple of open-ended response alternatives in the questionnaire in addition to the fixed ones in order to give the students the opportunity to elaborate and explain why they gave a particular answer. The presentation of the responses to these questions will be done mostly in the form of quotes, and I have chosen to present the answers from the social science students and the answers from the natural science students separately, as I wish to discuss how the students' perception of grammar instruction could have something to do with their preferred study. As the questionnaire was in Norwegian and the students therefore replied in Norwegian, I have translated the quotes into English. The questions, which became number seven and eight in the questionnaire, were:

Question 7. *Is there something that you are satisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why).*

Question 8. *Is there something that you are dissatisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why).*

5.3.1 Responses from social science students

Most of the social science students in class X had both positive and negative things to say about the teacher's grammar instructions. To question seven, one of them responded: "I am glad the teacher takes time to explain if there is something that we find difficult to understand" To question eight, the same student wrote: "I think we should have more grammar instructions so that we can learn about what it is we do wrong when we hand in papers." Another student's response to question seven was: "By learning grammar it gets easier to write papers and texts in all subjects. Grammar has an important role in the written language" However, to question eight, the same students wrote: "If we have a lot of grammar instruction, it can quickly get tiring and boring. It is therefore important to vary with other topics." Another student responded to question seven this way: "It is maybe not the most fun part of the English subject, but I am happy with the amount of grammar lessons" (which we have already established was not many). This student had not much to say when it came to question eight, and simply wrote: "No, I think it is fine." Others also responded shortly to question seven and wrote: "Well, sometimes it is informative." To question eight, the same student wrote: "Sometimes it can be really boring and difficult to fully pay attention, especially if it is an entire hour with grammar instruction alone."

This is simply a refined selection of quotes, yet I want to make it clear that many of the social science students in class X gave very similar answers to these questions, which is also why I decided on not to include too many of them. In the presentation of the questionnaire's second question, we saw that more than half of all the students in class X seemed to have a negative perception of grammar instruction and responded "Not exactly my favorite thing to do." It was also established that most of these responses came from social science students. We have now seen that many of these students also wrote things like "It is maybe not the most fun part of the English subject" and "Sometimes it can be really boring and difficult to pay attention" when responding to question eight. However, in the presentation of the questionnaire's third question, we saw that the social science students also responded that they found grammar

instructions either "quite informative" or "very informative." We have now seen that this also comes to show in their replies to question seven, where many of the students express again that they find grammar instructions informative. They also express that learning grammar is of big help when they have to write papers, and that they would like to have grammar instructions more often. The fact that many of the social science students claim to find grammar instructions tedious, yet still express that they would like to have it more often, could imply that the students themselves find grammar instruction as a matter of importance, and that informative grammar lessons trumps fun grammar lessons. The result certainly seem to indicate that even though students do not find grammar instructions much fun, they will still be motivated to work and engage themselves during grammar lessons, as long as they find it informative and as long as the they find it useful.

5.3.2   Responses from natural science students

Those who thought about studying natural science and mathematics as of next year seemed to be more positive towards the teacher's grammar instructions than the social science students were. To question seven, one of them wrote: I am happy with the way our teacher explains thoroughly and provides good examples." This student left question eight blank, ergo, he did not seem to have any negative things to say about it. To question seven, another student wrote: "Yes, the language becomes better when we use correct grammar. The grammar lessons within the English subject are easy to understand and learn from." There was no response to question eight from this student either. Another response to question seven was: "I think it is good and I am pleased with the way our teacher brings up topics that he says we struggle with in our texts." The same student's response to question eight was: "I wish we could get a plan where we are told what we will learn and when we will learn it. We rarely do grammar tasks and I wish we could repeat the grammar we have been taught on a regular basis." My last example from question seven is a quote that could easily have been misunderstood had it not been an open-ended response alternative: "I am not satisfied, I think we go through very little grammar." The same student then responded to question eight this was: "*If* we go through grammar, we use way too little time explaining it properly." As I see it, it is not that the student was negative to grammar instructions. I believe that he or she simply thought that it was not enough of them, and that the teacher should spend more time on thorough explanation.

In the presentation of the questionnaire's second question, we saw that most of the positive responses came from natural science students. The fact that most of these students also seemed to only have positive things to say about grammar instruction in their replies to the questions with an open-ended response alternative indicates that they are a found of the classic approach. They express that they find grammar instructions easy to understand and learn from, and that they think that the teacher provides good explanations and good examples when teaching grammar. This also indicates that my previous arguments about how natural sciences students, students who often incline towards logical-mathematical intelligence, learn best if the teaching method is in the form of the classic approach, seems to be accurate. While the social science students in this class expressed that they found it boring and difficult to pay attention during grammar instructions, the natural science students thought the grammar instructions were "easy to understand and learn from". Given that the teacher of this class said that grammar instruction was not something that they had too often, I am choosing to believe that in the latter comment, the student who wrote it referred to the grammar lesson they had just been through and where there teaching method was in the form of the classic approach.

5.4   The result of the interview

When the students were finished with filling out the questionnaire, I was lucky to get three volunteers for interviewing. At some point during the interview I was told that all three of them belonged to the group of students who had chosen to study natural science and mathematics as of next year, and I realized that I should have been more specific when I asked them if there were any volunteers for the interview. I would have preferred to talk to someone who had chosen social sciences as well, seeing as I was curious to find out if their different choices of study made them have different opinions about grammar instruction. As the interview was carried out in Norwegian, I have translated the quotes presented in this text. According to these students, grammar was not something that was taught very often. One of them actually claimed that the grammar lesson they had just been through must have been the first one this school year (they were now in the second semester). Still, they all claimed that they "new" grammar. When I asked them to elaborate, they explained that they for instance knew that for a sentence to be correct it had to be written in a certain way, but they could not explain why – they just new. Then they told me that they had learned grammar through

reading texts, and because of that they found it difficult when the teacher (on rare occasions, like today) had grammar lessons where he made use of all of these different terminologies.

"I feel like we don't go through much grammar in school, hardly ever.
We mostly read and do other tasks or write papers."

(Student, class X)

According to these students, the teacher never held lectures where only grammar was taught. If there was any grammar teaching at all it was in coherence with something else. Thus, they did feel like they learned grammar, it just was not very obvious *when.* They did, however, wish that they could have more specific grammar lessons as they found it difficult to understand and learn all the grammar by only reading or writing texts, and they made it very clear that they did not think that grammar was taught often enough. When I asked them what they thought about the teacher's way of teaching grammar, for instance like he had that day, one of them said that he thought it was a nice way to do it – first reading a text and then finding the different parts of speech. The other ones agreed, but they all said that they would prefer it if the teacher went through the different parts of speech in advance, because they did not know the meaning of all of them. They said that if he had just done it beforehand, they could have written it down and then they would not have needed so much help, and the teacher would not have had to go around explaining it to everybody before they could start working. When I asked them if the tasks they had been working with that day were tasks they usually got, they said that they had not had any tasks like these before in English class. They usually had to write papers and hand them in. When I told them about the classic approach to grammar teaching and asked them if the teacher had had them work in such a way before, they responded that they had not had anything like that this year, and that this was the kind of method they liked, because then they would be more aware of what they were actually studying. They said that it would have been nice to have a few classes where the focus was on grammar alone. That way, they would learn the specific rules of grammar, and if they got some "fill-in tasks" they would get to automate. One of them also suggested that instead of writing texts where the focus was on the content, they could write texts where they focused on using correct grammar. One of them said that he thought they should have "a mix of it", because it would be really boring if they only had to do grammar tasks, but it would also be boring to only write papers and not focus on grammar, because then they would not be made aware of how to use it correctly. I told them that I was surprised that they preferred the classic

approach, because I thought that this method would be the one the students found most tiring. They then told me that it was probably because they had been given so many tasks were they had to do everything on their own, and they said that at one point they would just get really tired of having to figure everything out by themselves. Sometimes it could also be difficult to do so, especially if the teacher did not give them any instructions to begin with. One of them said that sometimes it could be fun, figuring things out on their own, but that sometimes she just wanted to have the rules given to her straight.

> *"I don't think that we necessarily find grammar boring,*
> *it's more the way that it is taught that is boring. It's a little difficult."*
>
> (Student, class X)

All of the students said yes to the question on whether they liked the English subject generally. They said that they found it instructive, informative and fun. Moreover, they also said that they used the English language every day, an interesting remark I wish address in the discussion part of this paper. When I asked them what their conclusion would be, they all agreed that they would like more variation in the way grammar was taught, and grammar lessons more often where the teacher made clear what they were actually doing.

"We want more variation and we want to work on grammar more often." (Student, class X)

6   Survey results and discussion – Class Y

6.1   The result of my observations

When I met with the teacher before class, she told me that she did not teach grammar very often. According to her, the students in class Y were very proficient in English. Therefore, she did not find it necessary to teach much grammar. When we walked into the classroom, I quickly introduced myself to the students and found myself a seat in the back of the room for the same reason as I explained in my observation of class X – to make the grammar lesson as normal as possible. This day, the students were going to work on English verb forms and learn the difference between present tense and present participle, and past tense and past participle. The teacher began by explaining the different verb forms and then gave examples of how to use them by writing down sentences that included the these verb forms on the

blackboard. She then asked if the students could tell the difference between the sentences written in present tense (e.g. "I smoke") and the sentences written in present participle (e.g. "I am smoking"). Some of the students raised a hand and guessed, and the teacher explained that the difference was that the present tense often is used when describing a habit (smoking is a habit of yours, you do it everyday, you have done it for a long time and you will probably keep doing it), while present participle is often used when something is being done "right now" (I am smoking [right now]) and does not necessarily mean that you do it all the time, it is not have to reflect a habit of yours. She gave similar examples when explaining the difference between past tense and past participle. By illustrating with examples like these, the teacher made the students understand that even though the focus is on form, meaning is connected to form, and that it is very important to understand this relation if they want to describe or talk about something correctly and avoid misunderstandings. When the teacher was done explaining and illustrating, she gave the students a small booklet with different grammar tasks. Examples were "fill-in" tasks (fill-in the correct form of the verb), translation tasks (translate questions from Norwegian to English, the answers should include past participle), and tasks that asked them to explain the difference between similar sentences, like the ones she had illustrated on the blackboard. The teacher helped those who needed it, but the students also discussed the tasks with each other. The English class was going to last for nearly two and a half hours, but I got to hand out the questionnaire after about an hour of observation, and then I got to interview three of the students while the others continued their work with the booklet.

While observing class Y, I realized that the teacher in this class had a different approach to grammar teaching than the teacher in class X. As mentioned earlier, the teacher in class X seemed to make use of a combination between the inductive approach and the classic approach. The method used for teaching grammar in this class seemed to be leaning more towards the classic approach than the inductive approach. The teacher first presented the rules by using grammatical terminology, illustrated with the help of examples, and then gave the students tasks in the form of single phrases to practice the rules. I do not know if the students later had to produce their own texts where the topical structure was included, which is usually this method's last step. Another difference between the grammar lesson in class X and the grammar lesson in this class, was that the teacher in class X did not mention the word grammar at all while in class Y the teacher begun the lesson by telling the class that grammar was the topic of the day. One would think that the students would complain or protest, but they did not seem to mind. Another observation made was that the teacher in class Y had

grammar instructions in Norwegian, while in class X the teacher spoke English. Additionally, while the students in class X spoke Norwegian most of the time, the students in class Y spoke English.

6.2   The results of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives (Class Y)

In a class of totally 25 students, 24 of them were present the day I visited the class. All 24 students participated in the survey.

A) Choice of study program (social sciences or natural science and mathematics)

The result of this question shows (see appendix 6) that 14 of the students in class Y thought about studying social sciences, nine of them taught about choosing natural science and mathematics, and one of them had still not decided what to choose.

B) The relation between students' preferred choice of study and their perception of grammar instruction

To the questionnaire's second question (see appendix 6), none of the students in class Y responded that they thought about grammar lessons as fun. Nine of them answered "That is fine," 10 of them answered "Not exactly my favorite thing to do" and five of them answered "Boring!" If we were to divide the four response alternatives into categories of positive and negative, this shows that 37 percent of the students had a positive perception of grammar instruction, while 63 percent of the students had a negative perception of grammar instruction. The result of the responses to this question points in the same direction as the result of the responses to this question in class X: A lot of the negative responses came from social science students. Out of 14 social science students in this class, nine of them seemed to have a negative perception of grammar instruction (see appendix 7). However, note that one third of all the social science students responded "That's fine" to this question, which means that a lot of them also had a positive perception of grammar instruction, unlike the social science students in class X where almost all of them gave a negative response to this question. Another difference between the responses to this question in class X and the responses to this question in this class, is that almost half of all the natural science students in this class responded "That is fine" to this question, while the other half responded "Not my favorite thing to do" (see appendix 8). Hence, half of all the natural science students in class Y had a positive view on grammar instruction, while the other half had a negative view. As I

organized the responses from the students in class X first, and the natural science students in class X seemed to enjoy grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach, I must admit that I had expected that all of the natural science students in class Y would be positive towards this method as well. The fact that some of the natural science students find grammar instruction (and the classic approach) a bit dull could perhaps indicate that not all students who enjoy natural science and mathematics in school demonstrate a high logical-mathematical intelligence. It could be the case that these students incline towards other intelligences and would therefore find another grammar teaching approach more fun to work with.

C) The students' perception of learning outcome

The result of the third question shows (see appendix 6) that four of the students responded tat they found grammar instructions "very informative", 18 of them found it "quite informative" and two of them responded "not that informative." None of the students responded that they did not find grammar instructions informative at all. This means that 92 percent of the students in class Y had a positive learning experience of grammar instructions. The result of this question also point in the same direction as the result of this question in class X: It is fairly interesting how so many of the students responded that they found grammar instruction either "very informative" or "quite informative", even though two thirds of the class gave a negative response to the second question and replied that grammar instruction was either "Not [their] favorite thing to do" or "Boring!" As stated in the presentation of the result of this question in class X, this could indicate that the students themselves find grammar as a matter of importance, and that informative grammar lessons trumps fun grammar lessons.

D) The extent of motivation

The result of the fourth question shows (see appendix 6) that none of the students found grammar instructions "very motivating." However, nine of them found it "quite motivating." 10 of the students responded "not that motivating" and five of them "not motivating at all." This means that only 21 percent of the class had a positive view towards grammar instruction regarding motivation, while 79 percent of the class had a negative experience. The responses to this question are actually identical to the responses given to the second question, the question regarding their perception of grammar. The students who gave a positive response to the question regarding their perception of grammar, in this case both social science students and natural science students, were the same students who gave a positive response to the

question regarding motivation, and those students who gave a negative response to the question regarding their perception of grammar were the same students who gave a negative response to this question (see appendix 7 and 8). The logical reason for this result would be that when students find something fun to work with, it automatically gives them motivation to and learn. Yet, this does not correspond to the responses from the students in class X where those who found grammar instructions dull still responded that they found it motivating. The students in class X could simply have misunderstood this question, or, the reason for their responses could be that even though they find grammar lessons boring, they still find it motivating to work with because they find it informative.

E) Engagement in learning grammar

The result from question number five in the questionnaire shows (see appendix 6) that three of the students claimed to be very engaged during classes where grammar was taught, 12 of them answered that they were "quite engaged," six of them said they were "not that engaged" and three of them responded that they were "not engaged at all." This shows that 62 percent of the students had a positive view towards participation during grammar lessons, while 38 percent of the students seemed to have a negative view. The responses from the students in this class are quite different from the responses from the students in class X where almost all of the them gave a positive response to the question regarding engagement, even though half the class had a negative perception of grammar instruction and did not find it much fun. In class Y, however, more than half of all the social science students gave a positive response to the question regarding engagement, even though two thirds of these students had given a negative response to the question regarding their perception of grammar and to the question regarding motivation (see appendix 7). When it comes to the natural science students in this class, almost all of them gave a positive response to the question regarding engagement even though about half of these students had given a negative response to the question regarding their perception of grammar and to the question regarding motivation (see appendix 8). Not surprisingly, the negative responses to this question came from the same students who had given a negative response to the question regarding their perception of grammar and to the question regarding motivation. However, given that there are students in this class who responded that grammar was not exactly their favorite thing to do and not very motivating to work with, but still answered that they were "quite engaged" or "very engaged" during grammar lessons, this could indicate that even though students can find grammar instruction

tedious and not very motivation to work with, they still try to engage themselves during grammar lessons because they find it informative and useful.

F) The perception of the relation between grammar instruction and other topics in the English subject

The result of the sixth question shows (see appendix 6) that seven of the students felt that the grammar instruction their teacher gave were (absolutely) related to the other topics in the English subject. 13 of them felt that some of it was, four of them that not much of it was, while none of the puils responded "No, not at all." This shows that 83 percent of the students had a positive experience of grammar being a matter related to other subjects they learned about in English class, while 17 percent of them had a negative view on the relation between grammar and other topics. As already explained in the presentation of the responses to this question in class X, the reason this question was included in the questionnaire was because I wanted to ascertain if the students experienced that learning grammar was a "separate subject" within the English subject, given that Vold (chapter 2.4) believes that this is a common perception, especially when teachers turn to the classic approach when teaching grammar. Given that the teacher made use of the classic approach, I would have expected the students to respond that they did not feel that grammar instruction were in coherence with other things they learned about in English class. The fact that the tasks also were of the typical "fill-in" kind, tasks that, according to Vold, has the purpose of making the students practice the learned structures but rarely manages to reflect the real language, I certainly expected more negative responses to this question. However, the teacher talked about and gave examples of how form is connected to meaning, and since form is connected to meaning, and meaning certainly is connected to the language in use, the teacher managed to illustrated how important it is to understand the relation between the these matters, and the positive responses to this question could therefore have been caused by the teacher succeeding in making grammar relevant and related to other topics.

G) Perception of the English subject in general

The result of the questionnaire's ninth question shows (see appendix 6) that nine of the students liked the English subject in general, 12 of them found it "quite interesting", two of them "not that interesting" and one of them replied "No, I do not find it interesting at all." This shows that 88 percent of the class was positive to the English subject in general, while 12 percent of the class were not fond of the English subject in general. The reason this question

was included in the questionnaire was because I wanted to determine if there was any concurrence between the students' perception of grammar instruction and their perception of the English subject in general. In other words, I was curious to learn if it was only the grammar instructions they were dissatisfied with and not the subject itself, which seems to be the case.

6.3   Result of the questionnaire's open-ended response alternatives

The presentation of the result from the questionnaire's open-ended response alternatives will be done in the same way as with the responses from class X – mostly in the form of quotes. The questions were:

Question 7. Is there something that you are satisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why).

Question 8. Is there something that you are dissatisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why).

6.3.1   Responses from and social science students

Again, I will like to start by presenting responses from the students who had chosen to study social sciences as of next year. Many of these students had, like those in class X, positive things to say about grammar instruction. The response to question seven from one of these students was: "I am pleased with the fact that we do not only revise the grammar we learned in lower secondary school but also learn new things. I am also glad that we get to learn correct grammar in areas where Norwegian students do poorly." To question eight, the same student simply wrote "No." Another one of the students responded to question seven by writing: "I am satisfied with most of it. We do not learn a lot of unnecessary things." To question eight, the same student wrote: "We do not have enough [grammar instruction]." Another student that seemed to be happy with the grammar instruction responded to question seven by writing: "I think it is very informative and helpful when we write texts. It is something that everyone can do no matter how bad your English is." The same student responded to question eight by writing: "We have far too few grammar lessons." Even though many of these students only had positive things to say about grammar instruction, others were

not as satisfied. One of the students responded to question seven by writing: "Yes, I am satisfied because I know that you need it." However, the same student gave the following response to question eight: "Sometimes it can be very boring." Another one response to question seven was: "We don't have enough grammar lessons, we have only had it twice. But it is informative and you know you will need it later." In spite of wanting more grammar lessons, the same student also wrote: "Not that fun" in his or her response to question eight. The response to question seven from another student was: "Yes, you learn how to build sentences. It helps you with written tasks." Yet, when responding to question eight, this student wrote "Grammar is pretty boring." Another response to question was: "I think it is very difficult to keep my focus when grammar is taught because it does not interest me. That is why there is nothing I am particularly satisfied with." To question eight, the same student wrote: "No, the only thing is that we have very few grammar lessons, but I do not mind because I think it is boring."

It looks like a lot of the social science students in class Y seemed to find grammar instructions in the form of the classic approach boring. If we see these results in coherence with what these students responded to question two, the question regarding their perception of grammar instruction, the result of the survey so far indicates that those students who take interest in social sciences, those who often demonstrate high linguistic intelligence, would benefit more from the inductive approach or the input-processing instruction to grammar teaching, than from the classic approach. Yet, it is worth noticing that about one third of the social science students in class Y gave a positive response to the question regarding their perception of grammar instruction, and the comments from question seven and eights show that there are also students who seem to find grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach fine to work with. Why not all of them had a negative view will simply be speculations, yet one possible reason could be that despite the method used being the classic approach, the teacher also managed to make it "meaning-based," which could have made the instruction appealing to those students with high linguistic intelligence as well (students who often enjoy social sciences). If so, this raises the question as to whether all grammar teaching methods can be utilized in the classroom as long as they are adapted – an idea worth considering as this would indicate that it is possible for teachers to stimulate more than one intelligence at a time when teaching grammar. However, another reason for this result could simply be that not all students who prefer social sciences have developed a high linguistic intelligence. It could be the case that students with, for instance, logical-mathematic intelligence for some reason

choose to study social sciences instead of natural science and mathematics, and that this is why the classic approach appealed to them. Or, these students could incline towards another intelligence or have a combination of several intelligences that the classic approach happened to indulge. This will remain an open question.

6.3.2 Responses from natural science students

The students who had decided to study natural science and mathematics seemed to be a bit more positive than those who had chosen social sciences. One of the responses to question seven was: "I think it is good because I feel like it can help me become better in English." The same student's response to question eight was: "Not really, but I feel like I know most of it." Another satisfied student responded to question seven by writing: "I like that the teacher provides good examples and is engaged when teaching so that it becomes less boring for us." To question eight the same student wrote: "We don't usually have grammar." Another satisfied student responded to question seven by writing: "I am pretty satisfied with the grammar instruction because if we have to write a paper and hand it in, I feel like I am sure of how to write and how to use the language." The response to question eight from the same student was: "No, not really. I think that lessons carried out on the blackboard are all right, although it could have been made more fun by for instance playing games about grammar." This response is an example of a student that finds grammar instructions important, but still thinks it could have been made more fun. There are more of these responses and, of course, not everybody was completely satisfied. One of the students wrote that 'she' was happy with the fact that they got to work with tasks after they had learned something new, that it was very informative, and that she was satisfied with the way the teacher used examples to show them what was expected of them to learn. She also wrote: "It is really to bad that we have so few grammar lessons. We have only had it once since I started upper secondary school. Yet, to question eight, the same student responded: "I wish the teacher would make the grammar lessons more interesting, it can be very boring sometimes and it becomes difficult to pay attention, especially when the teacher comes with a lot of grammar at once instead of in small doses." Another student wrote: "When we have it, it is informative." Still, this student's response to question eight was: "It can be a little boring." One of the other students seemed to feel the same way, and wrote: "It is very informative", yet, the response to question eight was: "Grammar lessons are boring because you only sit there and take notes. But that is almost the only way to do it."

Discussion of responses

We have seen that in class Y, about 50 percent of the natural science students had a positive view towards grammar instruction and responded "That is fine" to the questionnaire's second question (the question regarding their perception of grammar instruction). However, the other 50 percent seemed to have a negative view and responded that having grammar instructions were "Not exactly [their] favorite thing to do." We have now seen that the responses to the questions with an open-ended response alternative also show that the opinions on this matter are divided. When I presented this result after looking at their responses to question two, I briefly concluded that it is not necessarily always the case that all students who enjoy natural science and mathematics in school incline towards logical-mathematical intelligence. It could be the case that these students incline towards other intelligences, and this could be the reason for why they did not find this grammar teaching method (the classic approach) much fun to work with. However, I realize that to suggest that that many natural science students do not incline towards a logical-mathematical intelligence seems a bit odd, as one would assume that their interest in natural science and mathematics, which should also reflect their intelligence, would be the exact reason for why they chose such a study program. Luckily, the students' responses to the questions with an open-ended response alternative makes it possible to probe for more detail and search for an explanation as to why so many of these students find grammar instructions and the classic approach dull. Now, one of them seems to simply find it boring and wish that the teacher could have made the grammar lessons more fun, and another find it boring because "you just sit there and takes notes." These students could be examples of students who have chosen to study natural science and mathematics but happen to incline towards another intelligence. However, most of these comments imply that the reason for why they find grammar instruction boring is because the teacher usually has an entire hour of grammar instruction alone. In this case, the English class actually lasted for over two hours and the students solely worked with grammar. One of the students wrote that when they seldom had grammar instruction, it was actually very informative, but it could be a bit boring because they had it very rarely so when they first did, it was a lot at once. Another student seemed to have the same perception and wrote that she would actually like to have more grammar instruction, as in: shorter grammar instructions more regularly instead of a lot of grammar instruction on rare occasions. Another students' explanation for why she did not enjoy grammar instruction was because she felt that she already new most of the things they went through. Hence, it was not that these students did not like to learn about grammar – the

reason they found grammar instructions boring was because it was usually a lot to take in at once, and because they did not learn anything new.

6.4 Result of the interview

Since the three students I interviewed in class X were students who had chosen to study natural science and mathematics as of next year, I requested students who had chosen to study social sciences for the interview in class Y. I figured that this way, I could tell if the students' different choices of study made them have different opinions about grammar instruction. This interview was also carried out in Norwegian, hence I have translated it into English. In the interview with three students from class Y (I find it necessary to call them student one, student two and student three), I learned that these students too felt that grammar was not something that was taught too often, especially compared to the amount of grammar lessons they had had in middle school. Like the students interviewed in class X, these students did not see grammar as a separate subject within the English subject either. They told me that most of the time, the grammar they learned was in relation to other topics they learned about in English class, and the teacher rarely held lectures where only grammar was taught. When I asked them if they found grammar instructions informative, if they felt like they learned something, student one and two said that they already knew English grammar pretty well. Student three, however, said that even though they had learned a lot of grammar already, referring to the years in lower secondary school, she had forgotten about much of it, and it could therefore be nice to have a few grammar lessons in order to repeat what she had already learned. Student three also said that by learning more grammar, it helped her a lot when they had to write texts.

> *"I like to learn about grammar because it helps me a lot when I am writing texts."*
>
> (Student, class Y)

As mentioned in the part where I describe my observation of the grammar lesson, the method the teacher used looked a lot like the classic approach, a method where the teacher explains the different grammar rules by using linguistic terminology. When I asked the students if they felt the need to know these concepts in order to learn the different structures or rules, they all responded that it could be quite confusing sometimes. Student one told me that when they were in primary school and lower secondary school, they had to cram up the first three or four

verb forms. I believe she referred to infinitive, present tense, past tense and past participle, which are usually the first English verb forms that students have to learn in school. However, she said that when they worked with grammar in school today, and the teacher started to talk about "past perfect progressive", she had absolutely no idea what that meant. Student two and three agreed, and explained that they could never remember, or know, what these concepts meant until they saw the verbal conjugation. When I asked them what they thought about the teacher's way of teaching grammar, like she had that day, student three said that she liked how the teacher went through the grammar rules with all of them before handing out tasks so they could practice on their own. She also liked that the teacher wrote everything down on the blackboard. When I asked them if they found the tasks difficult, the same student responded that she usually took notes during class, and that if she thought that some of the tasks were difficult she would just look at her notes. Student one and two, however, did not find the tasks very difficult and claimed that usually they could just hear if something was right or wrong. They knew for instance that in some cases they had to use the "ing-form", even though they could not explain "the rule" of when to use it. Hence, they did not know all the terminologies, but did not feel like that was necessary either in order to make use of the different verb forms. I asked them if these were tasks that they typically got when they worked with grammar, and if the class we just came from was a typical grammar lesson. They answered that in middle school, this was usually the way the teacher presented grammar, and today it was also normal for the teacher to go through everything first before she handed out tasks. But, it was not always that they got these "fill-in" tasks, the teacher could also give them oral tasks.

I feel like I can just hear if something is right or wrong."

(Student, class Y)

Usually, the students got individual tasks, but they were allowed to discuss with each other on how to solve them. Then I asked them if they knew about other ways to be taught grammar, ways that they thought could be more informative or more fun. Student one then mentioned that in her foreign language education class, they could get small notes with sentences they were to translate or sentences they were to change from, for instance, present tense to past tense, and that these were tasks she found more fun then the ones they were given in English class. When I told them about the inductive method for teaching grammar, the method where the teacher does not reveal the rule but leaves it to the students to find out on their own, student two and three said that this method sounded more fun, while student one said that

sometimes she found it really difficult to find out about the grammar rules on her own, and she could become really impatient when working with such tasks. She preferred that the teacher told her about the rule first. Student three said that she thought it could be good to get a common understanding of the rules, but at the same time she also thought that they would learn a lot more and remember things better if they had to figure it out on their own, and that this could also be the case when learning English grammar.

"If you figure things out on your own, you will remember it better."

(Student, class Y)

When I asked them if English lessons with grammar instructions motivated them to work, student one said: "No", student two said: "It is in the English subject curriculum, so then we kind of just have to do it", and student three said: "I think it is okay that we learn it because I feel like my written texts become a lot better." When I asked them if they liked the English subject in general, student one and two said that they did, while student three said that she was not that fond of it.

7   Discussion and conclusion

7.1   Students find grammar important and useful

As it has been discussed in this thesis (chapter 2.1.3), Krashen believes that communicating in the target language is enough to acquire full target language proficiency, including grammatical competence. It has also been discussed (in chapter 5.1 and 6.1) that the teachers of the students who participated in this survey argued that one of the reasons for why they did not teach much grammar was because they did not find it necessary as they already found the students proficient users of the English language. In contrast to both Krashen's opinion of grammar instruction and the teachers' perception of their students' needs, responses from the students themselves makes it clear that they find grammar instruction as a matter of importance as they express that they feel the need to learn more grammar. As I went through the students' responses to the questions that had an open-ended response alternative, I counted 11 completely unsolicited comments related to how few grammar lessons they had in the English subject and how badly the students wanted grammar lessons more often. Despite the fact that many of the students seem to find grammar instruction boring, the result of the surveys also show that almost all of the students, regardless of their choice of study, find

grammar instruction informative and useful. As discussed (in chapter 2.3) in this thesis, I have chosen to agree with Ellis on the subject of the importance of grammar teaching, and the fact that the students themselves express that they wish to have more grammar instruction is good enough reason to question the teachers' practice.[115] After all, the result of the survey indicates that the students show an increased need of more grammar instruction as they wish to develop and expand their own knowledge and expertise within the English subject. This study therefore makes a perfectly good example of illustrating how important it is for teachers to talk to their students in order to understand their perceptions and their needs.

7.2   A need for adapted grammar teaching methods

We have seen that the social science students and the natural science students who participated in the surveys have, with their different intelligences, different opinions and perceptions of grammar instruction. Most of the social science students in the survey seemed to have a negative perception of grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach. However, as Vold argues (in chapter 2.5.1), the classic approach to grammar teaching is not necessarily a method one should steer clear of, as many students feel that they learn a lot by working with grammar this way. Natural science students, for instance, seem to prefer such an approach and feel that it is not enough to simply read and write when they are trying to learn grammar. They seem to be concerned with rules and correctness, they like to work with typical "fill-in" tasks, and they do not find the need to "discover" things on their own and would rather just have the rules presented to them. These descriptions are all typical for students who demonstrate logical-mathematical intelligence; students who often would like to know how things work and who enjoy putting things in categories or other logical patterns. It would therefore be reason to conclude that natural science students, students who often (but not always) demonstrate high logical-mathematical intelligence, would learn best from the classic approach to grammar teaching as this method provides an opportunity for students to work with grammar in a way that appeals to their intelligence.

Given that almost all of the social science students seemed to find grammar instruction in the form of the classic approach both boring and a bit difficult, this could imply that the classic approach to grammar teaching does not appeal to their intelligence. In order to achieve a more

---

[115] By all means, I mean no disrespect toward the two teachers in this study. This applies to all foreign and second language teachers who avoid teaching grammar based on their assumption that it is unecessary.

positive perception of grammar instruction among these students, they should probably be approached a different teaching method. I have already discussed that it is likely that these students would learn more from either the inductive approach or the input-processing instruction, as these are students who often are able to handle the syntax or structure of language, the semantics or meanings of language, and the practical usage of language. However, as I did not get to observe or conduct a survey in a class where the inductive approach or the input-processing instruction was used as method for teaching English grammar, concluding that these approaches are more suitable for those who incline towards linguistic intelligence is simply not possible. Nevertheless, as the tasks within both the inductive approach and the input-processing instruction involve more independent thinking and problem solving, and where the students practice to look for patterns in the language and to form hypothesis about the language, it would be reasonable to suggest that social science students, students who often (but not always) demonstrate high linguistic intelligence, would learn better from either of these approaches as they provide an opportunity for these students to work with grammar in a way that appeals to their intelligence.

A comment from one of the student in class Y implied that the students in this class have not been given the opportunity to work with grammar in different ways, and it is a shame that the students feel as if the classic approach is the only way to learn grammar because that is simply not true. Teachers should, like Vold suggests (in chapter 2.5), try their best to vary their teaching methods. I have already discussed the possibility of combining different methods when teaching grammar and that way perhaps manage to appeal to several of the intelligences that exist inside the classroom. If there are teachers who find this difficult, they should at least aspire to vary their teaching methods from time to time. It could also be an idea to give shorter grammar instructions now and then, instead of, let's say, a two-hour session every other month, as it can lead to frustration among the students when they are forced to partake in a lot of grammar instructions at once.

7.3   Conclusion

I conclude that in order to further improve the students' perception towards grammar instruction in the English subject, it seems necessary to focus on the students different intelligences and adapt the teaching methods accordingly. The result of this study shows that the question of whether or not the students enjoy working with grammar seems to be closely

related and highly dependent on the method used for teaching grammar. Based on the results of this study I will therefore suggest further research on different methods for teaching grammar in relation to the many intelligences that exist in the classroom.

8 Bibliography

Armstrong, Thomas. *Multiple intelligences in The Classroom. Association for Supervision and Surriculum Development.* Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1994.

Armstrong, Thomas. *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. 3rd ed. Alexandria: ASCD, 2009.

Bjørndal, Cato R. P. *Det vurderende øyet* [The apprising eye]. 2nd ed. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk, 2013.

Dahl, Anne. "Prinsipper for grammatikkundervisningen." [Principles of grammar teaching] In *Fremmedspråksdidaktikk* (*Foreign Language Education*), edited by Camilla Bjørke, Magne Dypedal and Gro-Anita Myklevold, 111-124. Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS, 2014.

Ellis, Rod. *Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective.* Tesol Quarterly, 2006. 83-107.

Ellis, Rod. "Methodological Options in Grammar Teaching Materials." In *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*, edited by Eli Hinkel and Sandra Fotos, 155-179. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006.

Ellis, Rod. *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Gardner, Howard. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. NY: Basics, 1983.

Krashen, Stephen and Tracy D. Terrel. *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom.* Haywards: Alemany Press, 1983.

Krahen, Stephen. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pregamon Press Ltd, 1981.

Lightbown, Patsy M., and Nina Spada. *How Languages are Learned 4th edition*. Oxford
University Press, 2013.

Ministry of Education and Research. (2013). English subject curriculum: Eng1-03:
Competence aims - competence aims after Vg1 – programs for general studies and
Vg2 – vocational education programs. Accessed April 28, 2016, from http://udir.no Er

Patton, Michael Q. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park:
SAGE Publications, Inc., 1990.

Vold, Eva T. "Metoder i grammatikkundervisningen." [Methods for teaching grammar] In
Fremmedspråksdidaktikk (*Foreign Language Education*), edited by Camilla Bjørke,
Magne Dypedal and Gro-Anita Myklevold, 125-138. Oslo: Cappelen Damm AS, 2014.

Appendix 1

Questionnaire

1. Have you thought about what you would like to study as of next year?
☐ Social Sciences
☐ Natural Sciences
☐ Other
☐ I do not know

2. When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking...
☐ Fun!
☐ That is fine
☐ Not exactly my favorite thing to do
☐ Boring!

3. To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?
☐ Very informative
☐ Quite informative
☐ Not that informative
☐ Not informative at all

4. To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?
☐ Very motivating
☐ Quite motivating
☐ Not that motivating
☐ Not motivating at all

5. Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taugt?
☐ Yes, very engaged
☐ Quite engaged
☐ Not that engaged
☐ No, I am not engaged at all

6. Do you think that the grammar instruction are related to other topics you learn about in the English subject?

☐ Yes, absolutely

☐ Some of it is

☐ Not much of it is

☐ No, not at all

7. Is there something that you are satisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why?)

8. Is there something that you are dissatisfied with in terms of grammar instruction within the English subject? Feel free to elaborate on your answer (what and why?)

9. Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in genral interesting?

☐ Yes, very interesting

☐ Quite interesting

☐ Not that interesting

☐ No, I do not find it interesting at all

(The questionnaire was originally in Norwegian)

Appendix 2

Informal interview guide

- What do you think of grammar instruction?

- Do you feel that you learn anything from having grammar instructions?

- What do you think of the way the teacher presents grammar?

- Do you usually have an entire hour of grammar instruction?

- What do you think about the grammar tasks that you get? What kind of tasks do you usually get?

- Do you solve the tasks individually or do you sometimes work in pairs or in groups?

- Could you imagine another way of working with grammar? Do you have a suggestion for a different approach?

- What do you think of the English subject in general?

(The questions were originally written in Norwegian)

Appendix 3
Resuslts of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives (Class X)

Question 1. Have you thought about what you would like to study as of next year?			
Social sciences	Natural Sciences & math.	Other	I do not know yet
5	7	0	1

Question 2. When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
0	6	7	0

Question 3. To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
3	10	0	0

Question 4. To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	11	2	0

Question 5. Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
0	12	1	0

Question 6. Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other topics you learn about in English class?			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
7	5	1	0

Question 9. Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
10	3	1	0

Appendix 4
Result of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives – Class X (Social sciences)

Question 2. *When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…*			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
0	1	5	0

Question 3. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?*			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
1	5	0	0

Question 4. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?*			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	5	1	0

Question 5. *Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?*			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
0	5	1	0

Question 6. *Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other topics you learn about in English class?*			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
5	1	0	0

Question 9. *Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?*			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
4	1	1	0

Appendix 5
Result of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives – Class X
(Natural science and mathematics)

Question 2. When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
0	5	2	0

Question 3. To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
2	5	0	0

Question 4. To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	5	2	0

Question 5. Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
0	7	0	0

Question 6. Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other subjects you learn about in English class?			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
2	4	1	0

Question 9. Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
5	2	0	0

Appendix 6
Resuslts of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives (Class Y)

Question 1. Have you thought about what you would like to study as of next year?			
Social sciences	Natural Sciences & math.	Other	I do not know yet
14	9	0	1

Question 2. When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
0	9	10	5

Question 3. To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
4	18	2	0

Question 4. To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	9	10	5

Question 5. Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
3	12	6	3

Question 6. Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other topics you learn about in English class?			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
7	13	4	0

Question 9. Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
9	12	2	1

Appendix 7
Result of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives – Class Y
(Social Sciences)

Question 2. *When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…*			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
0	5	5	4

Question 3. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?*			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
2	10	2	0

Question 4. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?*			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	5	5	4

Question 5. *Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?*			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
1	7	4	2

Question 6. *Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other subjects you learn about in English class?*			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
5	7	2	0

Question 9. *Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?*			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
5	7	1	1

Appendix 8
Result of the questionnaire's fixed response alternatives – Class Y (Natural science and mathematics)

Question 2. *When your teacher tells you that you are going to work on grammar, you are thinking…*			
Fun!	That is fine	Not my favorite thing to do	Boring!
2	10	2	0

Question 3. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction informative?*			
Very informative	Quite informative	Not that informative	Not informative at all
2	10	2	0

Question 4. *To what extent do you find grammar instruction motivating?*			
Very motivating	Quite motivating	Not that motivating	Not motivating at all
0	5	5	4

Question 5. *Are you engaged during a class where English grammar is taught?*			
Yes, very engaged	Quite engaged	Not that engaged	Not engaged at all
1	7	4	2

Question 6. *Do you think that the grammar instructions are related to other subjects you learn about in English class?*			
Yes, absolutely	Some of it is	Not much of it	No, not at all
5	7	2	0

Question 9. *Apart from the grammar lessons, do you find the English subject in general interesting?*			
Yes, very interesting	Quite interesting	Not that interesting	No, I do not find it interesting at all
5	7	1	1