Grammar Tasks in a Communicative Perspective:
A Study of Three EFL Textbooks

Master's Thesis

Tommy Espeland

Department of Foreign Languages

University of Bergen

November 2017

Acknowledgements

This project has been a challenging and exciting process for me, and I would like to thank those who have supported me through the course of this past year and a half of writing.

To my family, for their support and belief in me, for welcoming me home on weekends with my favorite meals, and for telling me to "get on with it" when I was struggling.

To my friends – Stephanie, Travis and Carly – for their encouraging words of support, but also for helping me take my mind off the work and recharge when I needed it, whether by watching Buffy, listening to Harry Styles' debut solo album or just catching up over Skype.

And most of all, to my supervisor Sigrid Ørevik, for her invaluable help and guidance, for constructive morning conversations in her office about the project, and for never putting any pressure on me, but letting me work my way through the writing in my own time.

Tommy Espeland

November 2017

Abstract in Norwegian

Kommunikativ språklæring fikk fotfeste som nytt paradigme på 1970-tallet, og brakte med seg et større fokus på kommunikasjon og meningsbasert læring. Denne tilnærmingen til språklæring er stadig aktuell. I engelskfaget i den norske skolen i dag gjenspeiles dette for eksempel i gjeldende læreplaner, hvor det er et mål at elevene skal lære seg å bruke språket i kommunikasjon, samt kunne tilpasse språket sitt til ulike kommunikasjonssituasjoner. En sentral del av det å lære seg et nytt språk er å utvikle grammatiske ferdigheter, men grammatikk oppleves for mange elever som en lite givende del av faget, med for stor grad av fokus på grammatiske former og regler, og lite rom for kommunikasjon og interaksjon.

Lærebøker står fremdeles sentralt i den norske skolen, og grammatikkoppgavene som finnes i disse er et viktig verktøy i mange klasserom. Formålet med denne oppgaven er å utføre en teoretisk lærebokanalyse av tre lærebøker for fellesfaget engelsk på Vg1-trinnet, for å undersøke hvilken plass grammatikkoppgaver har i norske lærebøker for engelskfaget, og i hvilken grad oppgavene kan sies å fremme kommunikasjon og meningsbasert læring. De tre lærebøkene som er inkludert i denne analysen er *Access to English*, *Stunt* og *Targets*. Hvilken plass grammatikkoppgaver har i de tre lærebøkene er undersøkt gjennom en kvantitativ analyse av hvor mange grammatikkoppgaver som er tilgjengelige i hver av lærebøkene, sammenlignet med antall oppgaver totalt. For å undersøke i hvilken grad grammatikkoppgavene er kommunikative er det valgt tre sentrale teoretiske konsepter innen kommunikativ språklæring som kriterier for analysen. De tre konseptene er: *autentisk språk*, *kontekstualisering* og *samarbeid*, og de omtales i oppgaven som kommunikative komponenter. Analysen undersøker i hvilken grad de kommunikative komponentene er en del av grammatikkoppgavene i de tre lærebøkene. Funnene fra undersøkelsene viser tydelig at de kommunikative komponentene i liten grad er inkludert i oppgavene, som generelt er utformet på et vis som har mye til felles med mer tradisjonelle tilnærminger til grammatikk.

Table of Contents

List of Tables and Figures

2. Theory and Central Terminology

3. Research Materials and Methods

4. Results and Discussion

List of Abbreviations

CEFR   Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching and Assessment

CLT   Communicative Language Teaching

EFL   English as a foreign language

L1   First language

NDLA   Norwegian Digital Learning Arena

Vg1   First year of upper secondary school in Norway

1. Introduction

Grammar is an integral part of learning a new language; it is the linguistic system that enables us to understand and to be understood when we use the language to communicate. English is a global language, used around the world in a myriad of different contexts, and it remains the principal foreign language taught in Norwegian schools today. This thesis will examine the place grammar work has in English as a foreign language (EFL) education in Norway through the study of grammar tasks in three textbooks used in Norwegian schools.

I remember from my own time in school, and I have seen during my practice as a teacher, that many students do not care for grammar work, finding it monotonous and rule-centric. Traditionally, grammar was taught in a way that favored a focus on structure, but since the rise of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as a new paradigm in the 1970s, more focus has been put on learning a language in context through meaningful interaction. In my experience, however, grammar teaching continues to be influenced by traditional methods. This thesis will examine grammar tasks in textbooks in a communicative perspective, to get a better understanding of how grammar is approached in EFL education in Norway today. The study of grammar tasks in textbooks is important because the tasks play a role in the development of students' grammatical competence, which is an aspect of communicative competence (see section 2.2.1). If the tasks are constructed in a way that stimulates to communication, it could contribute to making students more communicatively competent.

This chapter will provide a detailed rationale for why I decided on this topic, present my research question and give a brief overview of how the chapters of the thesis are structured.

1.1 Rationale for the topic of the thesis

1.1.1 English grammar in a communicative perspective

When choosing the topic for this thesis, it was clear to me that I wanted to write about grammar in some way. It has always been an intriguing part of language learning to me, because mastering the grammar of a language is key to mastering the language overall, and the more you learn, the greater your understanding of how the language works becomes. Grammar teaching is of special interest to me, as I think it is can be difficult for teachers to know how to approach it. Too often, in my experience, grammar is not properly integrated into the English subject overall. A common theme is that if the focus is grammar, the lesson starts with the teacher saying "in this lesson we are going to learn some grammar", rather than having it be a natural part of for instance working with various texts. If grammar is taught out of context, it can be hard for students to see how a structure is used in practice. It is worth looking at how grammar could be taught in a more dynamic and appealing way, where grammar is contextualized and well-integrated with the other parts of the subject. Studying textbook tasks is a good way to examine the approach to grammar, as textbooks remain a principal resource for teachers in Norwegian EFL classrooms (see section 1.1.2).

The way grammar is taught in EFL classrooms today is informed in part by central paradigms within language teaching, the English subject curricula as designed by the Ministry of Education, and the individual teachers' personal commitment to grammar. Larsen-Freeman (2001) writes that the Communicative Approach, used interchangeably with CLT in this thesis, continues to prevail as a language teaching paradigm. The focus on communication also continues to hold a central place in Norwegian subject curricula for English. Owing to this, it seems a worthwhile endeavor to examine how the grammar tasks in English textbooks used in Norwegian schools approach this emphasis on communication, which is why this thesis will examine the grammar tasks in a communicative perspective.

In CLT, a focus on meaning is prioritized over a focus on structure, and grammar is meant to be taught in context, as opposed to students working with decontextualized examples. The goal is for students to use the language in communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). If the grammar tasks in the textbooks include components that facilitate communication, it could help teachers who struggle with how to teach grammar in a meaningful way, and for students who find grammar a bit tedious, it could make grammar work more interesting. Communicative components will be discussed in more detail in section 1.2 of this chapter.

1.1.2 Analysis of three EFL textbooks used at Vg1 level

The decision to conduct a textbook analysis is based on how textbooks continue to be the most important classroom resource in a number of Norwegian schools (Juuhl, Hontvedt & Skjelbred, 2010). While the use of various digital learning resources like NDLA[1] is becoming more common, the textbooks available from Norwegian publishers are still widely used in many EFL classrooms.[2] What is more, while this is a textbook study, the approach to the grammar tasks and the criteria employed to examine them are transferable to grammar tasks appearing on other platforms. I have chosen three Vg1 textbooks from some of the most prominent Norwegian publishing houses, specifically *Access to English* from Cappelen Damm, *Stunt* from Fagbokforlaget, and *Targets* from Aschehoug. In addition to being released by reputable publishers, the three textbooks were familiar to me from my teaching practice as well as from various conversations with other students.

The reason for choosing to study grammar tasks in textbooks for Vg1 in general studies, the first year of upper secondary school, is twofold. For one, it serves as the final year of mandatory English education in general studies, as English as a subject then becomes an elective for the final two years. A focus on communication and being able to use the language in a meaningful way is important as many will encounter English in an academic setting at university or community college, or in an increasingly international job market at

---

[1] Norwegian Digital Learning Arena, an open educational resource online, used in some schools.
[2] Based on correspondence with a number of schools, and information obtained from leading bookstore chains Ark and Norli. Recent reprints of several EFL textbooks also supports that they remain important.

a later point. Being able to use English grammar correctly and appropriately in various contexts is a valuable skill that would give students an advantage as they move towards adulthood in a globalized world where English plays a significant part in a range of fields.

The other reason for deciding to do a textbook study for Vg1 level is that there is more of a research gap for this particular level of schooling. Master theses with a similar focus have for instance been written for middle school level, such as Askeland (2013) who analyzed grammar tasks for tenth grade in a more generally comparative view, but this has not been done at Vg1 level with this kind of explicitly communicative focus. While there have been theses written for Vg1 level, they have focused on other types of textbook tasks, such as Norenberg (2017) who conducted a study of pragmatic competences in oral textbook tasks.

1.2 Research question and communicative components

The objective of this thesis is to examine the grammar tasks in three EFL textbooks for Vg1 level in general studies through a communicative lens. The research question that I have formulated consists of two parts, the first pertaining to the distribution of grammar tasks in each of the textbooks and the second part of the question framing the grammar tasks in a specifically communicative perspective. The research question I will address in this thesis is: How many grammar tasks are available in the three Vg1 textbooks compared to the overall number of tasks, and to what extent are the grammar tasks communicative?

The first part of the research question is important because the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks speaks to the extent to which grammar work has a specific focus in the textbooks and by extension in EFL classrooms using these textbooks as a key resource. The tasks will be counted in a quantitative analysis and they serve as the research material relevant to answering the second part of my research question. In examining to what extent the tasks are fitted to the current focus on communication, seen for instance in prevailing paradigms like CLT and the Vg1 subject curriculum for English (see section 2.2.3), three

communicative concepts from CLT theory have been selected as the criteria for the study. The concepts are *authentic language*, *contextualization* and *collaboration*. The theoretical background for these concepts are detailed in the theory chapter, in sections 2.4.4-2.4.6. Each concept is considered a communicative component which if included in a grammar task would contribute to making the task more communicatively oriented. The study will examine to what extent these three communicative components are included in the tasks.

1.3 Overview of thesis structure

This thesis consists of five chapters in total, including this introductory chapter and the conclusion at the very end. After this introduction, the second chapter will present the theoretical background for my research as well as central terminology. Included in this are definitions of grammar and grammar teaching as well as a historical overview of central language teaching paradigms, in order to provide appropriate context for my discussion. The third chapter starts with a presentation of the research material, followed by the methods used in the study and a description of the approach to the data collection. The fourth chapter is dedicated to the findings and the discussion of these, while the fifth chapter concludes the thesis and considers some suggestions for possible further research.

Chapters two through four include introductory sections, outlining each chapter in detail.

2. Theory and Central Terminology

2.1 Introduction

As mentioned in the brief overview above, this chapter will present the theoretical background for my research and discussion on grammar tasks in a selection of textbooks for Vg1 English in general studies. I will begin the chapter with a general section where I define grammar and grammar teaching and examine how grammar is treated in the English subject curriculum set by the Ministry of Education.[3] Since I wish to examine to what extent the grammar tasks are fitted to the emphasis on communication seen for instance in the Vg1 subject curriculum and through CLT as a prevailing paradigm, I will also provide a historical overview of central language teaching paradigms. This will provide context to my discussion as it will enable me to examine the grammar tasks through the lens of language teaching history. Finally, I will discuss conceptions of tasks and define how I interpret the term "task", which is relevant to my research material where grammar tasks are the focus.

2.2 Grammar and grammar teaching

2.2.1 Defining grammar

Grammar can be defined as "the mental system that allows human beings to form and interpret the sounds, words, and sentences of their language" (O'Grady, Archibald, Aronoff & Rees-Miller, 2010, p. 6). In other words, proficiency in the grammar of a language is important both in terms of being able to form understandable utterances as well as being able to correctly interpret the utterances made by other speakers. When learning a foreign language, grammar is in a sense what the skeleton is to the body: an essential framework

---

[3]The subject curriculum is found on the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training website, the executive agency of the Ministry of Education. References in the text use the Norwegian abbreviation Udir.

and structure that has to be in place for everything else to make sense and work as intended. Larsen-Freeman (2001, p. 34) details how grammar as a term can have a broad scope which refers to the "abstract system underlying all languages", or a smaller scope, like in this thesis, where the focus is on the grammar of English, specifically, and not a universal grammar. English grammar, as other grammars, consists of several different grammatical components (see table below) that all have a part to play. Together, these grammatical components are meant to facilitate "the production and comprehension of a potentially unlimited number of utterances" (O'Grady, Dobrovolsky & Katamba, 1997. p. 9).

Table 2.1   The components of a grammar

Component	*Domain*
Phonetics	the articulation and perception of speech sounds
Phonology	the patterning of speech sounds
Morphology	word formation
Syntax	sentence formation
Semantics	the interpretation of words and sentences

(O'Grady et al, 2010)

According to Larsen-Freeman (2001), the interpretation of grammar is often limited to morphology and syntax, which provide the structural organization of a language. But as evidenced by the table above, some would also include phonology, phonetics and semantics in a comprehensive study of grammar. Familiarity with these core components of grammar is called grammatical competence, which is an aspect of communicative competence associated with "mastering the linguistic code of a language" (Brown, 2000, p. 247). Mastering the linguistic code of English thus requires relevant knowledge of its lexical items, morphology, syntax, semantics, and phonetics and phonology. In this thesis, all grammar tasks from the textbooks that incorporate one or more of these core components and fit the definition of a task (see section 2.5) will be included in the study. This is

primarily owing to how the textbooks themselves use such a broad approach; they even tend to avoid the term "grammar" altogether, opting for wider terms like "language work."

2.2.2 Teaching grammar

The teaching of grammar has been a much debated topic among EFL teachers and scholars in the field, but it continues to hold a central position in language teaching (Ellis, 2006). Traditionally, grammar teaching has been understood as the presentation and practice of various grammatical structures, but Ellis argues that this definition is much too narrow. He defines grammar teaching in a broader, more elaborate way (Ellis, 2006, p.84):

> *Grammar teaching* involves any instructional technique that draws learners' attention to some specific grammatical form in such a way that it helps them either to understand it metalinguistically and/or process it in comprehension and/or production so they can internalize it.

The definition above is perhaps particularly useful in how it expands upon the purpose of drawing students' attention to grammatical structures. The aim is for the students to understand the structure and its use, as well as learning how to produce it successfully. Ellis (1996) explains that such a focus on grammar learning and acquisition can help improve proficiency and accuracy among students and facilitate grammatical competence, and in this way support the development of proficiency in the target language. In a communicative perspective, McCarthy and Carter (2002) argue that a grammar component must be included when teaching a language. They refer to the widespread use of English and how the language has become a lingua franca[4] in international relations, suggesting that it is important that students try to attain a kind of fluency and accuracy that could help them in a range of situations (ibid.). With the emphasis on communication seen in recent decades, finding a place for grammar within that context has been a challenge, especially considering the enduring influence of traditional approaches to grammar (see section 2.3).

---

[4] English is referred to as a *lingua franca* because of how it often functions as a 'common language' where speakers of different first languages use it to communicate with each other (Simensen, 2007, p. 75).

It is important to stress that teaching grammar involves more than merely giving students a structural understanding of the grammar's components. Newby (2006) emphasizes that grammar can be seen as a cognitive phenomenon – where the main concern is with how grammatical rules are stored, processed and made use of – but also as a social phenomenon related to interaction and communication. The social aspect of language learning is central in EFL classrooms, and it is especially emphasized in CLT. In this paradigm, grammatical competence is acquired not through drilling and memorization of grammar structures, though it may feature in some capacity, but through the process of using the language communicatively (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This can be oral communication, for instance through pair or group work, but also written communication, such as completing a communicatively oriented task that is focused not just on form, but on meaning (ibid.).

We often distinguish between deductive and inductive approaches to grammar teaching. Thornbury (1999) describes deductive grammar teaching as rule-focused, where students start with a rule and then move on to more specific examples, while inductive grammar teaching is more about rule-discovery, where a grammatical rule is often inferred through examples rather than being explicitly taught in the abstract. The latter is more linked to the Communicative Approach than the former, since CLT generally does not have a strong focus on explicit rule drilling to make the students internalize grammatical structures.

2.2.3 Grammar in the Vg1 subject curriculum

The most recently revised version of the English subject curriculum was implemented in 2013. In this version of the subject curriculum for Vg1 general studies, the 'Purpose' section underlines the importance of developing grammar skills, including phonology and principles for sentence and text construction, as well as acquiring the ability to adapt the language to different topics and communication situations (Udir, 2013). This is a general section that is part of the subject curriculum for all years of English education in Norway. It includes a noticeable focus on communication and the students' ability to adapt their language to different social situations and degrees of formality. In order to achieve such

objectives, a communicative approach to grammar, supported by the selection of grammar tasks available in the textbooks used in class, could prove valuable for students.

The more concrete 'Competence aims' section specific to the Vg1 subject curriculum covers similar ground to that of the 'Purpose' section, but makes no explicit references to grammar or language structure skills. This is a departure from previous editions of this subject curriculum. In the first version of the curriculum, used from 2006 to 2010, one of the competence aims was "enable students to use relevant and precise terminology to describe the forms and structures of the language" (Udir, 2006). This has since been removed. There are, however, implicit references to grammar in the competence aims of the current curriculum, such as "[using] various types of sentences in communication" referring to syntax, as well as "enable students to express oneself fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation" (Udir, 2013). Overall, it seems clear that in the current version of the English subject curriculum for Vg1 in general studies, the focus on communication and being able to adapt one's language to different purposes and situations is given more weight than explicit emphasis on learning grammar.

Both the English subject curriculum and the Vg1 textbooks that I use as my research material in this study are influenced by central paradigms within language teaching, as research within the field offers important guidance in terms of how to form the subject. The focus among scholars on grammar in the past decades has led to a range of different approaches being developed (Crystal, 2007). While the Communicative Approach, or CLT, has been a prevalent paradigm of late, it was preceded by other paradigms that have also made their impact on how grammar was taught and how it is still taught many places. Crystal points to the generational change seen on the subject of grammar teaching, and suggests that the way grammar was generally taught in schools before the 1960s, for instance, was quite different from how many students are learning grammar today (ibid.). In the next sections of this chapter I will give a brief historical overview of the main methods and approaches that have been—or continue to be—central in language teaching.

2.3 Traditional approaches to grammar

Traditional grammar as a term is typically used about a structural approach to grammar, centered around the form or structure of the language (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). This type of grammar is often described in terms of an abstract ideal with emphasis on accuracy rather than as a key aspect of human behavior and interaction (Fotos & Hinkel, 2002). In central paradigms of the early twentieth century, the approaches to grammar were varied, but often dominated by a deductive way of teaching, focusing on grammar rules and drilling in order to have the students internalize the rules (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Somewhat of an exception here, The Direct Method (see section 2.3.2) relies on a more inductive way of teaching. In the next sections, I will outline three central methods within language teaching before CLT rose to prominence in the 1970s and onwards (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). Such an overview will help establish my discussion of the textbook grammar tasks within a broader context. It should also be noted that traditional approaches to grammar have not simply been replaced by CLT, but are still in use around the world (Larsen-Freeman, 2015). In this overview, I make some comparisons with CLT (see section 1.1.1), while a more in-depth presentation of Communicative Language Teaching follows chronologically in section 2.4.

2.3.1 The Grammar-Translation Method

The approach to language teaching that would later develop into what is commonly known as the Grammar-Translation Method grew out of a period of friction between the traditional teaching of classical languages and the increased focus on modern languages. Owing to its connection to classical languages, it was first known as the Classical Method (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). From the seventeenth century and onwards, the status of Latin weakened and the study of Latin took on a different function (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). A lot of weight was now given to teaching Latin grammar explicitly, through means like studying grammatical rules closely, memorizing a range of conjugations, writing sample sentences using the grammatical structure in focus, and translating texts (ibid.). This approach to

language teaching became the standard way of studying foreign languages in school by the nineteenth century, where grammar rules were to be learned and memorized (ibid.).

The Grammar-Translation Method as it is known in relation to non-classical languages began in Germany, more specifically in Prussia, at the end of the eighteenth century, with many German scholars producing material on the subject (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). This approach was an attempt to adapt the aforementioned way of studying Latin to the new, "modern" languages, preserving the basic framework of grammar and translation since these were already well-known components to many teachers and students (ibid.). The Grammar-Translation Method became a dominating paradigm in language teaching from the 1840s into the 1900s and a revised form of it remains in use around the world.

Below is a brief overview of central principles in the Grammar-Translation Method, based on lists laid out in Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards & Rodgers (2001), respectively:

I.   Grammar is taught deductively, with the students studying and memorizing grammar rules that are presented by the teacher. The rules are generally presented without context, but later students will apply the rules in translation and sentences.

II. The sentence is generally the unit of teaching grammar points. Students are expected to be able to translate sentences and passages from one language into another. Example sentences are used to illustrate grammar rules and paradigms.

III. The students' native language is used in grammar instruction. The teacher explains and presents rules and students also ask and answer questions in their native tongue. Learning to communicate in the target language is not a priority in this method.

IV. Grammatical accuracy is paramount. Students are expected to develop solid skills in translation to avoid errors. Questions must be answered correctly. If a student is incorrect, another will be called on, or the teacher will provide the right answer.

V.   The objective of the language teaching is to be able to read literature written in the language and experience intellectual development. Literary language is valued over spoken language and reading and writing take priority over speaking and listening.

As demonstrated in part by the points above, some of the techniques applied in the Grammar-Translation Method are translation, use of example sentences, memorization and applying grammar rules the students have studied. More specific types of grammar tasks are fill-in-the-blanks, where students are given sentences with words missing and are expected to fill in the missing words with the correct structure (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

In contrast to CLT, contextualization is not a primary objective and communication and authentic language use[5] is not prioritized in the Grammar-Translation Method. This is in part because during the time this method gained traction, before globalization took hold and indeed even before the railroad was established several places, students rarely needed to speak the target language in everyday life (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). But as Europeans got more opportunities to communicate with speakers of other languages, a need for a greater focus on oral proficiency emerged, which influenced the work with reforms (ibid.).

Part of the growing criticism of the Grammar-Translation Method in the mid-twentieth century was rooted in the dependency on the students' native language, with very few opportunities to communicate in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Another complaint was aimed at the lack of authentic language use, where the example sentences to illustrate a grammar point or the translated sentences were often meaningless and absurd, with little relation to real language use or communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Below is an example of a sentence constructed to exemplify a grammatical structure:

---

[5] Scholars use different terms when referring to language use that reflects how the language is actually used when interacting and communicating with other people. "Real", "authentic" and "genuine" are often used in this context, and the former two appear in this thesis. Authentic language use is discussed in section 2.4.4.

The cat of my aunt is more treacherous than the dog of your uncle.

(Titone, 1968, cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 4)

Illustrating the use of a prepositional phrase rather than the possessive, the sentence above appears stilted and does not reflect typical use of English. In terms of meaning, cats and dogs are not known for being treacherous, though they may behave mischievously. In general, the method was criticized for being frustrating and tedious for students, with a too-strict focus on grammar rules, memorization and accuracy, and in the mid- and late nineteenth century, opposition to the method grew in Europe (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Through reforms and innovations, greater attention would soon be paid to communication and using the target language in a more authentic, realistic manner (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

2.3.2 The Direct Method

Similar to the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method was not a new invention. The general idea of a natural approach to language teaching with a focus on oral-based communication has roots back to at least the sixteenth century, with previous labels like the Natural Method or the Conversation Method (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). These ideas about language teaching rose to prominence again as a reaction to the perceived flaws of the Grammar-Translation Method. In the Direct Method, the focus was on making foreign language learning more like first language learning (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). Since the Grammar-Translation Method had not prioritized letting students use the target language in communication, the Direct Method, with its emphasis on developing "skills in listening and speaking", using only the target language, gained some popularity (Simensen, 2007, p. 28). The name of this method more specifically refers to the central notion that establishing direct associations between words and phrases in the target language and the actual objects or actions referred to would be beneficial and facilitate language learning (ibid.).

The Direct Method as it was used in the 1900s was in part based on the work of reformers such as Henry Sweet and Wilhelm Viëtor, who believed in an oral-based methodology, that

translation should be avoided, and that grammar rules should be taught inductively, rather than deductively as had been done previously (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Students would observe grammar points in texts or in question-answer sessions with the teacher. Later, they would be asked to induce the rules from their observations (Simensen, 2007). Parallel to the work of many reformers, there was also a growing interest in using naturalistic principles of language learning, seen in first language acquisition, in the teaching of foreign languages. These features became important parts of the Direct Method (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Below is a brief overview of central principles in the Direct Method, based on points outlined in Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards & Rodgers (2001), respectively:

I. Grammar is taught inductively, with the students inferring grammatical rules from given examples. The teacher should demonstrate, not explain in the abstract, and may choose to draw attention to grammar points when interacting with the students.

II. Teaching is strictly monolingual and is conducted in the target language. The native language is to be avoided by both the teacher and the students. Grammar points are best taught through demonstration and action, rather than relying on the L1.[6]

III. Oral interaction has a central place in the Direct Method. Communication and grammar skills are built up through graded progression organized around teacher-student interaction. The teacher should endeavor to make the students speak as much as possible in the target language. Good pronunciation is an important aim.

IV. Vocabulary is taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures. The focus is on everyday vocabulary and it is to be acquired with the help of full sentences, as opposed to memorizing word lists, for a more natural path to language acquisition. This approach is meant to help students with both word and sentence formation.

---

[6] "L1" is used interchangeably with "native language", both of which refer to the language native to the country in which English is taught as a foreign language – in the case of this thesis, Norwegian. Of course, there are also Norwegian students of English whose native language is not necessarily Norwegian.

Several techniques were employed by teachers to implement the above principles. Question and answer sessions would be used in order to let students practice words and structures through full sentences in the target language (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Other techniques included reading aloud, dictation, and fill-in-the-blank tasks (ibid.). The importance put on communication in this method, as well as the inductive approach to grammar, suggests some similarities to CLT. However, the repetition and drilling that was part of the question and answer sessions, as well as the mechanical aspects of reading aloud, dictation and fill-in-the-blanks tasks, did not lend itself to authentic language use (see section 2.4.4). The strict adherence to using only the target language is also different from CLT (ibid.).

The rather rigid monolingual aspect to the Direct Method was a central factor in the objections many critics voiced against the method. For one, it depended heavily on teachers with a "nativelike fluency in the foreign language" (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p.13). Furthermore, the lengths to which the teacher often had to go in order to avoid the native language seemed counterproductive, especially in situations where a short explanation in the native language would have been the most efficient solution (ibid.). In the Audio-Lingual Method, some of these criticisms would be addressed through a more systematic approach. By the 1920s, the use of the Direct Method was declining across Europe (ibid).

2.3.3 The Audio-Lingual Method

The Audio-Lingual Method is an oral-based method, and the audio-lingual skills, listening and speaking, take priority over the written skills, writing and reading (Simensen, 2007). The method was developed in the United States in the time after the Second World War, in part due to increased demand for skilled teachers of English as a foreign language. Many foreign students entered the country to attend college during this time, and several of them were in need of English training before starting their studies (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The method relies on system and control, with language being seen as a rule-governed system in which meaning is encoded (Simensen, 2007). This emphasis on language as

structural systems was influenced by structural linguistics, which served as an important part of the theoretical background for the Audio-Lingual Method (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Another important influence in the development of the Audio-Lingual Method was behavioral psychology. Larsen-Freeman (2000) writes that with behaviorism in mind, theoreticians thought that the best way to acquire the grammatical patterns of the target language was through conditioning, by helping students respond accurately to stimuli through reinforcement. Reinforcement is consequently seen as an essential part of the learning process in this approach, as it was meant to increase the likelihood of the desired behavior occurring again and eventually becoming a habit (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Through the influences of structural linguistics and behavioral psychology, a range of teaching practices developed as part of this method, which took an oral-based approach focused on structural drills with sentence pattern practice of different kinds (ibid.).

Below is a brief overview of central practices in the Audio-Lingual Method, based on principles listed in Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards & Rodgers (2001), respectively:

I. Grammar is taught inductively, in the sense that students practice sentence patterns and do drills to learn by analogy before any explanations of rules may be given. The rule-discovery is informed by strict pattern practice rather than using the language communicatively. The goal is to enable learners to form correct analogies. Learning structural grammar patterns takes priority over learning vocabulary.

II. Language and grammar learning is essentially mechanical habit formation. The more a pattern is repeated, the greater the learning. Students should 'overlearn', so their response will be automated. Memorizing dialogues and patterns reduces the chance of errors. Errors should be corrected immediately by the teacher to avoid forming bad habits, and positive reinforcement is used to help form good habits.

III.   The target language is used almost exclusively and should be presented in spoken form first. The teacher is the students' model of the target language. Digital or tape recordings for the students to listen to may be employed in this context as well.

As evidenced by the practices described in the points above, structural drills and pattern practice was at the center of grammar teaching under the Audio-Lingual Method. Several different types of drills were used, the most basic of which was the repetition drill. In this type of drill, students were asked to repeat the lines of dialogue supplied by the teacher. As an extension of this, the teacher could then initiate an expansion drill, in which a word or phrase would be added to a certain place in the sequence (Richards & Rodgers, 2001.) Examples of other types of drills were replacement drills, where a word would be replaced with another (a person's name replaced by a pronoun, for instance), and transformation drills, where a sentence would be altered, for instance by changing its tense, mood or voice (ibid.). Simensen (2007) also emphasizes the prevalent use of substitution tables as part of the pattern practice. She describes how "constituents in sentences could be replaced by other constituents (substitutions), provided they had an identical syntactic function in the sentences" (Simensen, 2007, p. 45). The idea was that the substitution tables would enable students to better understand the syntactical structure of the language and then internalize it.

It is clear that grammar teaching during the peak of this method in the early post-war decades was characterized by mechanical drills, repetition, and pattern practice. After reaching its apex in the United States in the 1960s, the Audio-Lingual Method was criticized on several points based on new research (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Part of the criticism was linked to the focus on structural drills. The method's theoretical background in structural linguistics and behavioral psychology was also thought to be discordant with language and learning theory, and critics rejected the notion that language learning was just like all other forms of learning (ibid). Furthermore, the results of the method when applied in the classroom were underwhelming, with students often struggling with how to transfer the skills acquired from drills and practice patterns to actually communicating in the

language. While practices seen in the Audio-Lingual Method might lead to language-like behavior, critics argued that they did not result in actual communicative competence (ibid.).

2.4 Approaches to grammar in Communicative Language Teaching

2.4.1 Communicative Language Teaching – an overview

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), also referred to as the Communicative Approach, rose to prominence in the 1970s and marked "a major paradigm shift within language teaching in the twentieth century" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 81). Many of the principles in CLT are still in use, and the emphasis on communication, specifically communicating in the target language, remains a central focus (ibid.). Being an approach, or a set of approaches, its principles can be applied in a variety of different ways, making it more flexible than some methods of the past. There is no single method or model in CLT that is "universally accepted as authoritative", and to some the approach is simply "an integration of grammatical and functional teaching" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 86). Part of the reason for the rise of CLT was as a reaction to previous methods, which critics felt had failed to teach students to communicate in a real way (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). New research, ideas, and educational philosophies, as well as technological advances, contributed to the ushering in of a new language teaching paradigm (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The increased focus on communication was also related to globalization, including greater cooperation in Europe through the European Common Market, which made clear the benefits of being able to communicate well in a lingua franca such as English (ibid.).

With its functional focus on language as a means of communication, CLT is meant to provide opportunities for real communication in the target language (Simensen, 2007). The objective is communicative competence, a phrase coined by Dell Hymes (1972), which highlights the distinction between knowledge about forms and structures, and knowledge that lets someone communicate in a functional and collaborative way (Brown, 2000).

Hymes viewed communicative competence as the aspect of our competence that "enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts" (Brown, 2000, p. 246). In this type of communicative view, language is generally seen as "a system for the expression of meaning", where its primary function is "to allow interaction and communication" (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 89). It follows from this that the speaking and listening skills are an important focus in this paradigm, not just the writing and reading skills, as communication is linked to active student interaction.

Linguistic and grammatical competences are also part of communicative competence, but when the Communicative Approach took hold, it did constitute a change from the stricter structural focus that had been present for instance in the Grammar-Translation Method (see section 2.3.1) and the Audio-Lingual Method (see section 2.3.3), with their often heavily controlled tasks including structural drills, pattern practice and substitution tables. Instead, freer types of tasks with communicative components were introduced to create more opportunities for student interaction and real communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Student cooperation in order to negotiate meaning is also an important aim, as well as making sure the activities or tasks are contextualized and not appearing in isolation (ibid.). Communicative tasks are often collaborative, and activities such as jig-saw and role plays are highlighted as beneficial in the way students have to work together in order to succeed. The use of various authentic materials (see section 2.4.4) is also seen as valuable (ibid.).

The theoretical base for CLT led to several changes in terms of grammar teaching, one of which was a greater focus on fluency, and not simply grammatical accuracy. Richards and Rodgers (2014, p. 96) define fluency as "natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction," aiming to maintain ongoing communication, despite any possible limitations to the students' communicative competence. In contrast to for instance the Grammar-Translation Method, grammatical accuracy is not a principal focus, with more weight being given to students' fluency and ability to communicate with others. Depending on how the principles of CLT are interpreted and incorporated, the amount of emphasis put on accuracy in tandem with fluency may differ. It is common to focus on both

of these skills within the Communicative Approach, but the clear structural focus seen in several of the earlier methods and approaches to language teaching gave way to a more functional, meaning-based approach to learning grammar in a more communicative context. The balance between fluency and accuracy is explored further in the next section, which elaborates on the distinction between "strong" and "weak" versions of CLT (section 2.4.2).

Owing to the importance of fluency in CLT, errors are tolerated and often seen as valuable, as they are part of the process of developing communication skills (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). If a student were to make an error, the teacher might make a note of it rather than correcting the student and then return to the specific grammar point at a more appropriate time (ibid.). This fits CLT's inductive approach to grammar, where a rule is usually inferred through examples, encouraging rule-discovery rather than explicit rule drilling (Thornbury, 1999). However, that is not to say that form-focused practices cannot have a place within a meaning-based, communicative approach; many researchers have suggested that an initial focus on structure could enhance students' ability to notice certain aspects of the English language (Larsen-Freeman, 2001). The teacher could for instance present a certain structure before introducing more communicative tasks or subtasks, or integrate communicative components in a structure-based task. Focus on form is discussed further in section 2.4.3.

In terms of grammar tasks found in EFL textbooks, there is a natural tendency to focus on a specific structure, as a way of centering the task around specific grammar points. It would be difficult to create a grammar task without any kind of selection being made with regard to the topic of the task. But it is certainly possible to give the tasks a more functional, communicative dimension, rather than a strictly structural focus. This can be achieved for instance by incorporating components that allow students to study the structure in an environment that facilitates communication and language use. Larsen-Freeman (2001) also emphasizes the importance of making sure that the practice is contextualized (see section 2.4.5) and meaningful, as opposed to dealing with a grammatical structure in isolation. Richards and Rodgers (2014) points to how grammar tasks often include subtasks, which makes it possible to start the task with a form-focused introduction of a certain structure

and expand on that in subtasks with components that are more communicative in nature. These components may in other words both be integrated or be introduced sequentially. Examining to what extent the grammar tasks in the textbooks currently used in Vg1 classrooms in Norway include these kinds of communicative components is the primary focus of this study, as outlined in the presentation of my research question in section 1.2.

2.4.2 Strong and weak versions of CLT

There are considered to be two main versions of CLT, as scholars often distinguish between a "strong" and a "weak" version of this approach to language teaching (Simensen, 2007). The labels "strong" and "weak" are not used in the sense of quality, but rather refers to how strongly the principles of learning English communicatively are implemented in teaching. The strong version is the least prevalent of the two, and it puts its principal focus on using English, the target language, in order to learn it (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). It suggests that the target language is acquired almost exclusively through communication, similarly to how informal language learning, such as L1 learning, would often occur (Simensen, 2007). With its strong focus on using English, fluency is prioritized over accuracy in this version.

The weak version of CLT became "more or less standard practice" in the 1970s and 1980s, and it refers to learning how to communicate in the target language (Howatt, 1984, p. 279). Simensen (2007, p. 117) elaborates on this by explaining that learning to communicate in the target language usually means that various communicative components are "integrated into both grammatically and functionally based teaching programs." Both fluency and accuracy are seen as key features to language learning in this version. Rather than a rigid focus on using English to learn it, the idea is to learn to use English by incorporating communicative components in a wider teaching program (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). This most widely used version of CLT is also the version that is relevant to this study, as I will examine the integration of communicative components in the grammar tasks. Owing to this, all the references made to the Communicative Approach in this thesis are more specifically referring to this broader, more flexible version of this language teaching paradigm.

2.4.3 Focus on form

The term "focus on form" refers to the idea of providing some type of focus on specific grammar points within the context of CLT (Fotos, 1998). Communicative activities alone have been found to promote fluency among students, but not high levels of accuracy (ibid.). Larsen-Freeman (2001) suggests that grammar instruction as part of CLT may help students notice aspects of English, which might otherwise be hard to pick up on in communication. Fotos (1998, p. 301) is clear that this does not mean a retreat to the "old ways of language teaching," but rather that it can serve to complement a communicative approach, especially in EFL classrooms with non-native speakers less intuitively familiar with English grammar. The balance between form-focus and communication can be delicate, as a too structural model could inhibit students' fluency, whereas not enough form-focus could come at the expense of the development of linguistic competence (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2002).

There are two different types of the focus on form approach, distinguished by whether the focus on form is incidental or planned (ibid.). Incidental focus on form refers to tasks where a specific form is not the main focus. This can for instance be communicative tasks where the goal is general communication, rather than practicing a certain grammatical structure. If there are incidents of student errors, the teacher can then direct the attention to the forms that students are finding difficult (ibid.). Planned focus on form, on the other hand, refers to tasks that are concentrated on a specific grammatical structure, within the context of CLT. It is a type of approach that bears more similarities to a structural view of grammar, but while there is a planned focus on form, the emphasis is still on meaning (ibid.). In terms of the grammar tasks in the Vg1 English textbooks, it is this planned focus on form that is the most relevant, as the tasks have a natural focus on form by design, as mentioned in section 2.4.1. This concept of a focus on form within a meaning-based, communicative approach, suggests that it should be possible to combine a planned form-focus with communicative components, also in the context of grammar tasks in textbooks (Larsen-Freeman, 2001).

2.4.4 Authentic language

The concept of authentic language is central in CLT. As touched upon in section 2.4.1, critics of previous paradigms had expressed concern that not enough attention had been paid to the facilitation of real communication and the use of authentic materials (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). In CLT, authentic language in EFL classrooms can refer to exposure to English as it is used in a real context, as well as spontaneous, unscripted language use by students (ibid.). Richards and Rodgers (2014, p. 90) suggest that students need to be provided with tasks that engage them in "meaningful and authentic language use," as opposed to "merely mechanical practice of language patterns." Thus tasks should ideally include some component that gives students a chance to use language in this way.

Larsen-Freeman (2000, p. 132) emphasizes the importance of exposing students to "natural language in a variety of situations", through the use of "materials authentic to native speakers of the target language." The use of certain complex authentic materials might be most fitting for students with an intermediate or high target language proficiency (ibid). Most Norwegian students at Vg1 level have studied English for about ten years, and would generally be able to make use of materials such as opinion pieces or articles in newspapers, radio shows, topical videos or TV broadcasts, even if they include some difficult words. Such exposure to authentic language can be incorporated in most tasks, including grammar tasks. An example of this could for instance be students completing a task in which they are meant to notice the use of a grammar structure when engaging with authentic materials.

In terms of students using the target language in a way that is authentic, it is important that tasks are constructed in a way that allows for a degree of spontaneity and freedom in how the target language is used. Past language teaching paradigms such as the Grammar-Translation Method and the Direct Method were more focused on control through for instance structural drills and rehearsed dialogues, and there was not as much room for authentic, unrehearsed language use as a way to negotiate meaning and develop communicative competence, which is so central in CLT (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Incorporating an authentic language component, whether it is exposure to authentic materials or accommodating students using the target language in a non-restricted way, would contribute to giving grammar tasks an element that facilitates communication.

2.4.5 Contextualization

Contextualization is another important concept within the Communicative Approach. Halliday (1999, p. 9) describes how in traditional foreign language teaching textbooks, "single sentences and even single words were often presented in isolation: out of context." If there were a context to speak of, it would usually just be the linguistic context, like in a structural drill, where sets of sentences would display a similar structure or function (ibid.). This very marginal grammatical contextualization is not what is sought after in CLT, where students are meant to work with more than just isolated sets of grammatical examples, to better "gain an insight into the contextualized nature of language" (Summer, 2011, p. 115). Pennington (2002) expands on this, arguing that grammar structures should be taught in context, because lexical and syntactic choices do not exist in a decontextualized vacuum. Grammar that is largely decontextualized has little meaning or value for learners (ibid.).

In CLT, the idea is that language should be meaningful and purposeful, and contextualized tasks can help students appreciate why a certain grammatical structure is worth learning, as well as making it easier to see how the structure may be used in practice (Summer, 2011). As with the Communicative Approach in general, there is a palpable focus on meaning, and contextualization is one way to add a meaningful component to grammar tasks (ibid.). Summer suggests that grammar tasks that are contextualized and embedded within a learning process where the goal is to create meaning can prove beneficial to EFL students. A truly contextualized task lends itself to communication in that you are given more than just the structure in a linguistic context, which provides communicative opportunities. There are several ways in which grammar tasks can be contextualized to create a more communicative learning environment. Summer (2011, p. 118) highlights a range of various examples, such as "everyday situations, dialogues, texts and stories" that can be used to

inject more life into grammar tasks and bring attention to how language works in context. This can be done in a number of ways, depending on the topic of the task. For instance, if the topic is related to different vocabulary in varieties of English, rather than simply listing words that are different, the task could make use of a dialogue or another type of text. If the topic is a specific grammatical feature, such as adjectives, the task might be contextualized by being linked to a text in which students are meant to notice this particular part of speech. The text could relate to an everyday situation where descriptive language is used, which in turn could serve as a starting point for students to engage in their own conversations. Adding this kind of contextualization component to a grammar task would serve the communicative goal of presenting language in meaningful and purposeful contexts.

2.4.6 Collaboration

Student interaction has a prominent place in CLT, where negotiating meaning through communication is often seen as a collaborative endeavor (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Larsen-Freeman (2000) points to how collaborative work encourages a more cooperative dynamic among students and that collaboration may occur in various configurations, whether the students are working together in pairs, small groups or larger groups. With a focus on communication in the classroom, the approach to learning tends to be "based on a cooperative rather than individualistic" philosophy (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 98). Working together allows students to make use of each other's knowledge and skills, and is for many EFL students the main arena in which they can use the target language regularly.

It is possible for grammar tasks to facilitate collaboration. Often it can be something as simple as including instructing language calling for students to "work in pairs" in order to complete the task. This is an approach many students are familiar with. But tasks can also be constructed in a way that embraces a more comprehensive collaborative approach. Larsen-Freeman (2000) names information gap and feedback as desirable features in tasks meant to promote communication. This could be incorporated in a collaborative grammar task by giving students different pieces of information to focus on, allowing students to

discuss the relevant structure and then giving each other feedback on their understanding of it. Overall, if the task includes instruction that encourages collaboration, it is easier to facilitate the kind of student interaction that is valued in the Communicative Approach.

2.5 Defining the task

In this thesis, "task" is the term used when referring to students doing certain grammar work, and it is the term I use when referring to the research material for my study (see section 3.2), namely the tasks in the Vg1 textbooks. Terms like "activity" or "exercise" are also sometimes used in this context, but task is the term I have encountered most often in Vg1 classrooms both as a student and as a teacher. A basic definition of the term is provided in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR):

> Tasks are a feature of everyday life in the personal, public, educational or occupational domains. Task accomplishment by an individual involves the strategic activation of specific competences in order to carry out a set of purposeful actions in a particular domain with a clearly defined goal and a specific outcome. Tasks can be extremely varied in nature, and may involve […] a greater or lesser number of steps or embedded sub-tasks" (CEFR, 2001, p.157).

The definition above is especially useful in how it expands upon the processes that are necessary to complete a task, including the strategic activation of specific competences and taking several purposeful actions to complete the task. In EFL textbooks used in Norwegian classrooms, tasks can be fashioned as questions, but they are often presented as a set of instructions. Completing a task refers to using the skills necessary to purposefully follow the task's instructions and/or answering its question(s). My definition of a task is adapted from Summer (2011, p. 210), but I have endeavored to make it less narrow, to better fit the textbooks and cast a wide net to incorporate the varied types of tasks represented in them. A task is defined as a purposeful activity "that engages the operation of production and/or reception, and written and/or oral skills" through direct questions or instructions (ibid.).

"The nature of the task may require a specific linguistic focus or specific phrases and/or language chunks may be provided within which the target structure is embedded. […] The participatory structure can vary ranging from individual to pair work or group work (ibid.). Grammar was defined in section 2.2.1, and a grammar task is thus defined as an activity that fit the above definition of a task and incorporate one or more of the core components of English grammar, whether morphology, syntax, semantics, phonetics or phonology. In the EFL textbooks which I will discuss in the next chapter (see section 3.2), these tasks are usually listed together under headings like "language work" or "improve your language."

3. Research Materials and Methods

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will give details on research materials and methods that will be employed to answer my research questions pertaining to how many grammar tasks are included in the textbooks, and to what extent the grammar tasks are communicative, which I will examine by use of a set of criteria. I will begin the chapter by presenting the research materials, which provide the foundation of the study. Next, I will explain my choice of research methods and the way in which I intend to carry out the analysis in terms of data collection. To conclude, I will discuss reliability, validity, and possible limitations of the study.

3.2 Research materials

3.2.1 Textbook overview

As mentioned in section 1.1.2, the three English textbooks for Vg1 in general studies that I have chosen as my research material are *Access to English,* published by Cappelen Damm; *Stunt,* published by Fagbokforlaget; and *Targets*, published by Aschehoug. The three textbooks' approaches to grammar are not uniform, but all three include a section dedicated to grammar learning. *Targets* and *Stunt* have their own grammar chapters at the end, while *Access to English* has opted for a brief glossary of grammar terms instead. All textbooks include grammar tasks throughout the various chapters, but to varying degree. Of the three textbooks, only *Access to English* makes explicit mention of grammar in the preface section of the textbook, while *Targets* and *Stunt* have chosen terms like 'language work' instead.

The grammar tasks are mainly found after each of the texts in the various chapters, though there are not grammar tasks following every text in the textbooks. There are also several

other task categories, ranging from reading comprehension tasks linked to the texts to tasks related to mathematics. The grammar tasks are explicitly marked, with headings like 'Language work', 'Improve your language', and 'Language workshop.' They cover topics such as adjectives, the definite and indefinite article, and relative pronouns. There are many different types of tasks, including translation, text composition, and pronunciation practice.

All three textbooks in my study are all-in-one books that include both texts and tasks, in contrast to for instance a two-book set where you have both a textbook and a workbook. In addition to this, *Access to English*, *Stunt*, and *Targets* also provide supplementary resources on their respective websites, where a range of material—including tasks—can be accessed. Due to limitations related both to time concerns and the fixed length and scope of this thesis, these additional resources will not be included in the study. Another reason for this decision is related to my own personal experience as a student and a teacher. In classrooms that still use a textbook, it remains a principal resource, and the most readily available one. Owing to this, it seems worthwhile to me to examine how they hold up on their own. The tasks used in my research will consequently be taken exclusively from the three textbooks.

3.2.2 *Access to English*

Access to English was first published by Cappelen Damm in 2013 and is written by Richard Burgess and Theresa Bowles Sørhus. It consists of 296 pages in total and is divided into five main chapters. Following the five chapters there is a short glossary of grammatical terms and a "toolbox" which includes a couple of topics related to grammar. The grammar tasks in this textbook are marked in blue and listed under "Activities." They are primarily located after each text, with a couple of exceptions where tasks are embedded in the texts. The main subheading used for the grammar tasks is "Improve your language," but some tasks occur under different subheadings as well, for instance "A closer look at language."

3.2.3 *Stunt*

Stunt was first published by Samlaget in 2009, since taken over by Fagbokforlaget, and is written by Kristin Maage Areklett, Øystein Hals, Kristin Lindaas, and Hilde Tørnby. It consists of 360 pages and is divided into four main chapters. A fifth chapter at the end of the book is devoted to language work. This chapter includes both grammar tasks as well as explanations of various grammatical topics. Some of the topics in this chapter are related to parts of speech, affixes, and syntax. A selection of grammar tasks can also be found in the main chapters; they appear in light green activities sections after the texts, mainly titled "Language workshop." There are also "rule of thumb" sections appearing in the chapters that are often grammar-related, with subjects such as comma usage and capitalization.

3.2.4 *Targets*

Targets was first published in 2009 by Aschehoug. Written by Lillian Balsvik, Øivind Bratberg, James Stephen Henry, Julia Kagge, and Rikke Pihlstrøm, it is the most-selling textbook designed for Vg1 in general studies.[7] A fourth edition of the textbook—which is the one I will be using for this study—was published in 2015. This edition is developed in accordance with the 2013 revisions of the subject curriculum (mentioned in section 2.2.3.) The textbook consists of 328 pages, divided into five main chapters, with a sixth chapter called "Words, Sentences and the Rules of English" dedicated to grammar and language. Grammar tasks primarily follow the texts in the main chapters, listed under the subheading "Language work." There are also light green two-page sections at the end of each of the five main chapters devoted to grammar tasks. The sixth chapter does not include tasks, and instead focuses on explaining a selection of topics on grammar and various terminology.

---

[7] I obtained this information through communication with bookstore chains Ark and Norli. The fact that the 2009 textbook is already published in a fourth edition (2015) with several recent printings also supports this.

3.3 Methods

3.3.1 Mixed methods

In research methodology, a distinction has traditionally been made between quantitative and qualitative research (Bryman, 2012). Dörnyei (2007, p. 24) describes this particular contrast as "one of the most general and best-known distinctions" within the field. It is, however, not without its detractors, and the distinction has been a basis for much debate. Many writers continue to find it useful to distinguish between the two, while others have moved away from seeing quantitative and qualitative research as strictly opposing methods. Dörnyei (2007) suggests that rather than being opposites, the methods form a continuum, while Bryman (2012) emphasizes the importance of not exaggerating the differences between the two, and points out that it is possible to combine them in a fruitful manner. This combining of the two methods is increasingly prevalent and is usually referred to as mixed methods research, where different combinations of qualitative and quantitative research occur "either at the data collection or at the analysis levels" (Dörnyei, p. 24).

In this study, I wish to draw from both quantitative and qualitative research methods in a mixed methods research approach, as I think it will prove beneficial to my analysis and discussion. Quantitative research focuses on quantification when collecting and analyzing data, and is more numerically focused than qualitative research (ibid.). In this type of research, common features present in the research material are studied through use of variables which are then quantified for instance by counting (Dörnyei, 2007). This is how I will approach my analysis of the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks, as well as my set of criteria (presented in section 3.4.2.) for examining to what extent the tasks are communicatively oriented. Taking into account the substantial overall number of tasks, a quantitative approach will enable me to present a clear overview of the distribution and features of the grammar tasks. I would also like to analyze some of the grammar tasks more closely, which requires a more qualitative approach to the research material. Qualitative research usually has more of an emphasis on words as opposed to a strict numerical focus,

and will let me conduct a more in-depth analysis of examples of different types of grammar tasks (Bryman, 2012). This approach lets me expand on my findings in the quantitative overview of the grammar tasks and their communicative components. The approach is similar to what Bryman (2012, p. 639) refers to as an "explanatory sequential design", which is a mixed methods design where quantitative research may be elaborated on by qualitative research. Using this mixed methods approach in my study will allow me to produce a more complete picture of the distribution and features of the grammar tasks.

Richards (2005, p. 36) notes in her book on handling qualitative data that quantitative and qualitative data are simply "different ways of recording observations of the same world." One of the objectives in this study is for the quantitative and qualitative parts of the mixed methods approach to complement each other in a valuable way. In summary, I will combine quantitative and qualitative research in this study, with a quantitative overview of grammar tasks and their communicative components, and a qualitative discussion of specific tasks.

3.3.2 Content analysis of textbooks

Bryman (2012, p. 285) defines content analysis as "an approach to the analysis of documents and texts that seeks to quantify content in terms of predetermined categories and in a systematic and replicable manner." This definition pertains to a quantitative content analysis and fits the description in the previous section of the quantitative part of my study. It is a flexible approach to text analysis, and my chosen research sample is the three Vg1 textbooks (see section 3.2). The coding scheme for my quantitative analysis will consist of tables for counting grammar tasks to examine their distribution in the textbooks, and for studying to what extent specific communicative components are featured in the tasks. These tables will be presented in the following section of this chapter. The qualitative part of this study shares similarities with a qualitative content analysis, in which there is an emphasis on the role of the researcher in constructing meaning in texts (Bryman, 2012).

More precisely, I am carrying out what Summer (2011) refers to as a theoretical textbook analysis. This kind of analysis examines only the textbooks themselves, through a specific framework, seen in this study in my counting of grammar tasks and the criteria for communicative components, as well as the qualitative analysis of specific tasks. This is different from for instance a more practical analysis aimed at how textbooks are actually used in the classroom in a particular setting and context. Summer (2011, p. 87) argues that "for the teaching and learning of grammar to be as effective as possible, it is vital for teachers and learners to have an excellent textbook." The textbook remains a principal tool for teachers and students in classrooms around the world, and so a theoretical analysis of them can be a useful way to examine the features of prominent textbooks and the way they are constructed (Summer, 2011). The textbooks provide a clear framework for language learning, and their approaches to grammar tasks thus play a part in how grammar is taught.

3.4 Approach to data collection

3.4.1 Counting of grammar tasks

To answer the first part of my research question (see section 3.1), I will give a quantitative overview of the distribution of grammar tasks in the three textbooks, with three main points of data: number of grammar tasks, number of tasks in total, and the percentage of tasks that are grammar tasks in each book. What qualifies as a grammar task is a textbook activity that fits the definition of a task (see section 2.5) and that includes one or several core components of grammar, whether morphology, syntax, semantics, phonetics or phonology. As an example, this means that "word bank" type of vocabulary lists will not be counted; they are not tasks because they lack any kind of instruction, and are essentially just lists of words students are encouraged to learn. The same goes for the sections of the textbooks that are dedicated to grammar, but focuses on explaining terminology and structures rather than giving students an opportunity through instruction or questions to complete a specific task.

It is also important to note that all the grammar tasks are not necessarily listed under a grammar-related heading, as some tasks may be more than one thing; a grammar task may thus be listed under a different heading, but could obviously still qualify as a grammar task. Tasks are assessed on the basis of their content and purpose, not the heading under which they appear. Furthermore, a grammar task may include several subtasks, but these will not be counted as separate tasks. The reason for this is that the subtasks are usually a way to structure the work that is to be done to complete a task, and they are generally focused on a common topic, which is the topic of the task. The subtasks thus tend to relate to each other.

While reaching the bare minimum of what constitutes a task, simple questions posed in the margins of texts in the textbooks that can be understood as "checkpoints" meant to help students reflect on the reading will not be counted in this study. This decision was made largely in order to avoid inflation in the number of non-grammar tasks, which would then influence the percentage of grammar tasks in the textbooks, possibly painting a somewhat misleading picture of the overall distribution of grammar tasks compared to overall tasks.

Although the table used to show the distribution of grammar tasks will compare the three respective textbooks, this comparison is not a goal in itself. It is not my intention to draw conclusions about which textbook is the "best" when it comes to grammar, but simply to survey the presence of grammar tasks in the selected Vg1 textbooks, and then examine to what extent the tasks are fitted to the current focus on communication (see section 3.4.2), seen in the subject curriculum (see section 2.2.3) and in current language teaching trends. The number of grammar tasks provided in the textbooks makes up the total potential for tasks that may include one or several communicative components, making that data point relevant for the second part of the analysis, to be described in detail in the next section. The table that will be used for the data from the counting of the tasks is presented below.

Table 3.1

Distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks			
*	*Access to English*	*Stunt*	*Targets*
Number of grammar tasks			
Number of total tasks			
Percentage of tasks that are grammar tasks			

The overall objective of this part of the analysis is to produce a comprehensive overview of the place grammar tasks have in the textbooks. This will provide valuable information on the extent to which grammar work has a specific focus in the three textbooks. As mentioned above, the quantitative data collected in this part of the analysis also serves as the key material for the next part of my study, where the grammar tasks are examined more closely. Relatedly, the overall number of grammar tasks available in the textbooks make up the total potential of grammar tasks that could include communicative components. If there are few grammar tasks available in the books, that would obviously mean that the volume of grammar tasks with a communicative focus would be inherently limited to begin with. Alternatively, if there is a wide selection of grammar tasks available in the textbooks, that would increase the pool of possible tasks that could feature a focus on communication.

3.4.2 Criteria for communicative grammar tasks

To answer the second part of my research question (see section 3.1), I have selected a set of criteria based on principles that have a firm place within the Communicative Approach. Each of the components that make up the criteria would if included contribute to making a task more communicatively oriented, which would be valuable in EFL classrooms with a

focus on communication, where learning to use English in real contexts is given emphasis. The three components I will examine to determine to what extent the grammar tasks in the textbooks are communicative are *authentic language*, *contextualization* and *collaboration*. The theoretical background for these concepts is detailed in sections 2.4.4 through 2.4.6. As with the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks, this quantitative overview of the tasks examined by use of the criteria will be laid out in a table, which is presented below.

Table 3.2

Communicative components in grammar tasks				
		Number of tasks:		
		Access to English	*Stunt*	*Targets*
	Tasks in total:			
1. Authentic language (AL)	1.1 AL use by students			
	1.2 Exposure to AL			
	1.3 None			
2. Contextualization	2.1 Contextualized			
	2.2 Not contextualized			
3. Collaboration	3.1 Pair work			
	3.2 Group work			
	3.3 Class discussion			
	3.4 Not specified			

The table above shows how my findings concerning communicative components in the grammar tasks will be presented in the next chapter. The top section of the table includes the total number of grammar tasks in each textbook, a data point lifted from table 3.1. Following below are the three criteria: (1) authentic language, (2) contextualization and (3) collaboration; together they make up the selected communicative components. Each criterion has a number of possible outcomes for each task, and the table will show how many grammar tasks qualify for each outcome, in relation to the total number of tasks. In the next sections, the numbers in parentheses refer to the relevant part of the table above. Authentic language (1) as a concept in CLT theory is discussed in detail in section 2.4.4. A grammar task can incorporate a focus on authentic language either through letting students use English in a non-restricted way, with emphasis on spontaneity, or through exposure to authentic materials, like audio recordings of conversations in the target language, or articles found in newspapers. With this perspective on authentic language, the meaning of "authentic" differs somewhat depending on whether it refers to students using authentic language, or students being exposed to it. Authentic language use is students being allowed to use English freely, in a way that is authentic to them. This is a way to negotiate meaning and develop skills in the target language. Exposure to authentic language, on the other hand, refers to the use of materials which showcase English as it is used in a real context, perhaps through a dialogue between native speakers of the language.

Authentic language use by students (1.1) and exposure to authentic language (1.2) make up the two outcomes where authentic language as a component is present in a grammar task. For this to be the case, the task has to include instruction that promotes authentic language use with students, or provide authentic materials that expose students to authentic language. Should neither option be present in the task, "None" (1.3), will be the registered outcome.

Contextualization (2) as a concept within CLT is discussed in detail in section 2.4.5. Some examples for how grammar tasks can be contextualized are also included there. In essence, contextualization as a criterion examines if the topic of the task appears in a context that can be seen as meaningful and purposeful, or if the grammar structure appears in isolation.

Contextualizing a grammar task can make it easier for students to see why the structure can be important to learn, and enable them to more easily see how it is used in practice. A task that simply asks students to fill in the correct verb or inflections in a selection of standalone example sentences is not contextualized, whereas a task that for instance links the task topic to a text in the textbook would be a contextualized one. However, for a task to actually be contextualized, something more is needed than a vague implicit connection to the text preceding the task in the textbook. For instance, if a text is about a job interview and the following grammar task presents a list of adjectives with positive and negative connotations for you to sort, that in itself does not make the task contextualized, even if describing yourself could be considered as a natural part of a job interview. When present in a task, this component highlights a focus on meaning, which is central within CLT theory.

As a criterion, contextualization (2) is of the either/or type, which means that the two possible outcomes in this part of the analysis are that a task is either contextualized (2.1) or not contextualized (2.2). There is consequently no third "None" option, like with authentic language, as outcome 2.2 covers the absence of contextualization in the task. Naturally, there may be different degrees of contextualization in a task, but based on an initial survey of the research material, I concluded it would not benefit the study to deconstruct further for the quantitative overview. Degrees of contextualization is touched upon in section 4.3.3.

Collaboration (3) in the context of CLT theory is discussed in section 2.4.6, including examples of ways in which grammar tasks can facilitate a "cooperative rather than individualistic philosophy" that promotes collaboration (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 98). In terms of the criteria in this quantitative analysis, I have chosen to look specifically at whether there is any explicit instruction letting students know that they should complete the task in collaboration with other students, rather than doing so quietly by themselves. If a task does not include language instructing students to work together, it falls to the teacher to adapt the tasks to pair or group work, and often it can be easier to just let students complete the tasks on their own. But if the task is constructed to promote collaboration, there is arguably more incentive to follow through on it, as the task itself encourages it.

The possible outcomes included in the collaboration (3) criterion are pair work (3.1), group work (3.2), class discussion (3.3) and lastly a "Not specified" (3.4) outcome for tasks that do not include any instruction related to whether or not the students should work together. I have chosen to omit "working alone" as an outcome as it would overlap with 3.4 in that the instructions for completing the task would not directly specify that you should work on your own, but instead simply not include any instruction on this, which is covered by 3.4. As an example, a task would fit the pair work (3.1) outcome if it instructs the students to work together in pairs, for instance by working with the person sitting next to them in class.

I have chosen these three criteria for several reasons, the first of which being that they are all anchored in the rich and eclectic theoretical base of CLT (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). They are also broad enough concepts that they could realistically be incorporated in the type of grammar tasks often found in EFL textbooks. In other words, even with a focus on form, where the task is centered around a structure, these components could be integrated.

It is important to add that it is certainly possible for teachers to add components that are not present in the grammar tasks in order to encourage communication, but as mentioned in section 3.3.2, this is a theoretical textbook analysis, and so only the task itself is considered.

3.4.3 Qualitative analysis of a selection of grammar tasks

The objective of this final part of the study is to elaborate upon the data gathered for the quantitative overview of communicative components in the grammar tasks (section 3.4.2). While the full quantitative analysis will provide an overview of the distribution of grammar tasks and to what extent the tasks are communicative based on the selected criteria, the qualitative discussion of specific tasks will let me examine a selection of tasks in detail and thus give a more complete picture of the grammar tasks, as touched upon in section 3.3.1. This analysis of specific grammar tasks will be conducted in the sections focusing on each

of the communicative components that make up my criteria (see sections 4.3.2-4.3.4) and then a selection of tasks will be examined in a more complete perspective in section 4.4.

For section 4.4, tasks will be selected based on how well they exemplify aspects explored in the quantitative analysis and they will be discussed in the context of language teaching history. Both tasks that are communicatively oriented and tasks that are more traditional in nature will be examined, in order to demonstrate the variation of grammar tasks available in the textbooks. Inherent in the second part of my research question, namely to what extent the grammar tasks in the textbooks are communicative, is the prospect that a large part of the tasks simply will not be angled toward communication. Consequently, it makes sense to give attention to both tasks that include a communicative dimension and ones that do not. This approach will allow me to compare different tasks, highlight contrasts, and hopefully draw some conclusions in terms of the overall composition of the grammar tasks available.

3.5 Reliability, validity and possible limitations

Dörnyei (2007, p. 48) stresses the importance of a disciplined approach to research, referring to a consensus among researchers that some quality criteria are needed to give legitimacy to the findings. Reliability as a criterion points to the extent to which our procedures produce consistent results in different circumstances (ibid.). In a theoretical textbook study, the tasks are a consistent variable in the sense that the selection of tasks is the same to everyone who uses the textbook. As mentioned in section 3.3.1, the aim of the quantitative part of my study is to make clear the number of grammar tasks compared to the overall number of tasks in the textbooks, as well as to what extent grammar tasks incorporate communicative components. This part of the study should be replicable if the same definitions and criteria are employed, and the counting of the tasks thus has a certain objectivity to it that adds to the study's reliability. However, even in this kind of analysis, with variables quantified by counting, there will always be some degree of subjectivity, especially in terms of the criteria examining a selection of communicative components.

Some of the tasks will inevitably include features that can be seen as marginal, where some might choose to count them while others would not. More generally, people may interpret the features of various tasks differently, as is the case with all text. Nevertheless, the criteria used for the quantitative strand of this study are explained in detail and used consistently in my selection procedure, which ensures a high degree of reliability for this part of the study.

The qualitative part of my study will as explained in section 3.3.1 serve as an elaboration on the findings in the quantitative part of the analysis. While the quantitative part of the study will provide a systematic overview of the frequency of these components, the qualitative analysis of specific tasks will give me room to discuss my findings in greater detail, by delving into how a selection of communicative and non-communicative tasks are put together. This part of the study is not as easily replicable as the quantitative part of it, as the close analysis of specific tasks is more open-ended and to a greater extent based on my own subjective interpretations of the tasks' features. Bryman (2012, p. 398) touches upon this problem, saying that "the investigator is the main instrument of data collection, so that what is observed and heard and also what is the focus of the data collection are very much products of his or her preferences." But Bryman (2012) also points to the rich data that can be attained through qualitative research, as it is not limited to numerical considerations.

Validity is another central quality criteria for research, and research validity is an important aspect in the quantitative part of the study (Dörnyei, 2007). A key factor for a study's validity is that the variables included in the study actually measure what is intended (ibid.). In this study, that means that the chosen criteria of authentic language, contextualization and collaboration must say something about to what extent the tasks are communicative. Considering that these concepts are taken from the rich theoretical base of CLT, discussed in sections 2.4.4 through 2.4.6, I think it is fair to say that this is the case. However, there are certainly other concepts within CLT that could also speak to the communicative aspects of grammar tasks in EFL textbooks. As such this study is not exhaustive in its approach, but rather it utilizes a selection of three central communicative concepts to examine the tasks. In the qualitative part of the study, examining specific grammar tasks, descriptive validity

is a term that refers to the "accuracy of the researcher's account" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 58). Related to this is of course the overall quality of the researcher. In the quantitative part of the study, the researcher's role is to an extent limited by the numeric approach to the data, but in the qualitative part the researcher is "the main instrument"(Bryman, 2012, p. 398). Dörnyei (2007) suggests that one approach to solve this is to use multiple researchers to collect the data, but that has not been possible for this study. Consequently, my approach to the qualitative research is simply to be as transparent and systematic as possible, making use of the language teaching theory presented in Chapter 2 to support my conclusions.

In terms of possible limitations to this study, carrying out a theoretical textbook analysis means, as explained in section 3.3.2, that the study is limited to the textbooks themselves. As a consequence, what happens in the classroom is not a part of the analysis, whether it is the teacher's instructions to the students of how to complete the tasks, or the way students interpret the tasks. The teacher might for instance further contextualize the tasks or introduce additional materials for the students to make use of in their work with the tasks. I also have no records of the general level of grammatical competence in English among students on Vg1, which is relevant when it comes to their ability to complete the tasks. All of this is an inherent limitation to the theoretical textbook analysis in its design, where the idea is to see how the textbooks hold up on their own and how the tasks are constructed. Moreover, I have no information about the textbook authors' intentions and priorities when making the tasks, beyond the general influence of the English subject curriculum for Vg1.

As touched upon in the section above on validity, my role as the sole researcher for this study is a limitation in the sense that the findings depend to an extent on my interpretations. Another researcher might have chosen to focus on other aspects of the tasks, for instance.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will attempt to answer my research question by presenting and discussing the findings from my research. First I will address the part of the question pertaining to the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks through a quantitative analysis of the number of tasks. Next, I will present the findings from the analysis of communicative components in the grammar tasks, to determine the extent to which the grammar tasks are fitted to the current communicative focus in EFL teaching highlighted in the subject curriculum and prevailing language teaching paradigms. I will make use of specific tasks as examples to illustrate various aspects of my findings. Finally, I will examine a selection of tasks more in depth to complement my quantitative analyses of the grammar tasks in the textbooks.

4.2 Distribution of grammar tasks

As discussed in section 3.4.1, the main objective of this part of the study has been to produce an overall overview of the place grammar tasks have in the Vg1 textbooks. A certain focus on grammar in the textbooks is needed to form a foundation for communicatively oriented grammar work, including a range of available grammar tasks. Exploring the distribution of grammar tasks also has worth in and of itself as it provides valuable information about what kind of focus there is on language work in the textbooks.

The table below includes the data on the distribution of grammar tasks in *Access to English*, *Stunt* and *Targets*, respectively, compared to the overall number of tasks (see next page.)

Table 4.1

Distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks			
	Access to English	*Stunt*	*Targets*
Number of grammar tasks	40	38	126
Number of total tasks	218	432	419
Percentage of tasks that are grammar tasks	18.3%	8.8%	30.1%

As evidenced by the findings in the table above, grammar tasks still have a solid place in EFL textbooks in Norway. This is not unexpected when we consider the integral role that grammar plays in learning a new language (see section 2.2). It is also something that is made clear in the preface section of each of the three textbooks. *Access to English* mentions the acquiring of language skills, pointing to how the textbook includes "grammar practice and other language activities" (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 6). *Stunt* lists "language and language development" as the first of several areas of learning in which the textbook intends to pique the students' interest (Areklett, Hals, Lindaas & Tørnby, 2009, p. 11). *Targets* lets students know that it includes "useful approaches to improving your language" together with language tasks (Balsvik, Bratberg, Henry, Kagge & Pihlstrøm, 2015, p. 11).

The number of grammar tasks differs in the three textbooks, but all of them include a substantial selection of tasks, generally distributed evenly across the chapters of the book. *Stunt* is somewhat of an exception in this regard, as the bulk of its grammar tasks are found in the final chapter of the book ('Words, Words, Words'), which is devoted to grammar. *Access to English* and *Stunt* include about the same number of grammar tasks with 40 and 38, respectively, but because the former contains significantly fewer tasks in total, its share of total tasks that are grammar tasks is much higher, at 18.3% compared to 8.8% for *Stunt*.

Stunt's percentage is low partly due to how it takes a slightly different overall approach to language learning, with greater emphasis on artistic expression. A significant number of the tasks are what the authors have called "creative stunts"—tasks with a more practical focus. The tasks in *Stunt* also proved somewhat challenging to count, as they are not marked in the usual way with numbered main tasks and subtasks distinguished by letters. Subtasks would frequently be marked with new numbers, but in such instances I counted them as one task. My general approach to interpreting and counting subtasks is explained in section 3.4.1.

Targets is the textbook that includes the most grammar tasks (126), with 30.1% of the overall tasks qualifying as such. Part of this is a result of how the final two pages of each chapter in the book are devoted to a selection of grammar tasks on various topics. These tasks are generally rather simple and decontextualized in nature, which is something I will expand upon when I examine tasks with no communicative components (see section 4.4.2). Overall, while the differing number of grammar tasks in the textbooks suggest somewhat different priorities on this subject, the tasks that are included cover a wide range of topics. The counting tables of grammar tasks, including task topics, can be found in Appendix 1.

The degree of attention paid to grammar in the textbooks demonstrates that the potential is there for communicatively oriented grammar tasks that focus on meaning and grammar in a real context. In other words, there is no issue of grammar tasks simply not being available. However, while the numbers in table 4.1 establish the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks, they hold no information on the features of the tasks or how well the tasks might lend themselves to communication. And so the point of interest becomes to what extent the tasks that are available can be said to invite communication, which is so valued in modern language teaching paradigms like CLT (see section 2.4). Alternatively, it could be the case that the grammar tasks have more in common with the type of grammar work that was mainly championed in more traditional approaches to grammar teaching (see section 2.3). Having established the distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks, I will turn my attention toward the aforementioned, specifically the study of communicative components.

4.3 Communicative components in grammar tasks

4.3.1 Overview of findings

As touched upon in section 4.1, the objective of this part of the study has been to answer the part of my research question regarding to what extent the grammar tasks in the three textbooks can be said to be communicative. In order to do that, three components with basis in CLT theory were chosen (see section 3.4.2) as the criteria through which to examine the tasks. Each of the components that form the criteria would if included contribute to making a task more communicative. The findings from this part of the study are presented below.

Table 4.2

Communicative components in grammar tasks				
		Number of tasks:		
		Access to English	*Stunt*	*Targets*
	Grammar tasks in total:	40	38	126
1. Authentic language (AL)	1.1 AL use by students	3	3	1
	1.2 Exposure to AL	6	4	9
	1.3 None	31	31	116
2. Contextualization	2.1 Contextualized	13	8	31
	2.2 Not contextualized	27	30	95
3. Collaboration	3.1 Pair work	5	5	3
	3.2 Group work	3	-	2
	3.3 Class discussion	2	1	3
	3.4 Not specified	30	32	118

What is clear right away from the findings in the overview table is that the specific communicative components are not a systematic, consistent part of the grammar tasks in the textbooks, with the majority of the tasks examined in this study failing to include them. In all of the textbooks, the most frequent outcome for each of the selected criteria is that the communicative component is not included, as shown by the numbers for 1.3, 2.2 and 3.4. There is, however, still a significant number of tasks with one or more of these features. Especially the second component, contextualization, is quite regularly a part of the tasks.

In the next subsections I will go through the findings for each of the components, providing examples of tasks that include or fail to include features that may facilitate communication. The emphasis will be on tasks that include one or more of the communicative components, while what is typical of non-communicative tasks will be examined fully in section 4.4.2.

4.3.2 Authentic language

As discussed in section 3.4.2, the authentic language component covers two main functions, specifically authentic language use by students and students being exposed to authentic language through the use of various authentic materials. The findings related to these two aspects of authentic language in the books are presented in sections 1.1-1.3 of table 4.2.

The most striking results are found in 1.3 of the overview table, confirming that the vast majority of the grammar tasks available in the three Vg1 textbooks do not feature an authentic language component. Neither the encouragement of authentic language use among students nor the exposure to authentic materials has a significant place in the parts of the textbooks that are dedicated to grammar work. Nevertheless, each textbook does have a small number of grammar tasks that include an authentic language component, albeit to varying degrees, like the grammar task featured on the following page, taken from *Stunt.*

> 🎧 Listening comprehension:
>
> As you listen to these two women talk about their first day at
> school as teachers, jot down the differences you hear.
> After you have heard the text twice, you will get the transcript.
> What other differences do you now see?
>
> - Differences in pronunciation
> - Differences in vocabulary
> - Differences in school atmosphere
> - Differences in spelling
> - Differences in punctuation

Adapted from *Stunt* (Areklett et al, 2009, p. 37)

In this task, the exposure to authentic materials serves as the starting point for the students to complete a task involving various grammar elements such as differences in vocabulary and pronunciation. As detailed in section 2.2.1, semantics and phonetics are included in my definition of grammar, as the textbooks include tasks of this kind under the headings for grammar tasks. The two women on the audio recording are speaking American English and British English, respectively, centering the task around different varieties of English. This approach is consistent with research from Larsen-Freeman (2000, p. 132) related to the importance of exposing students to authentic language in various situations, through the use of "materials authentic to native speakers of the target language" (see section 2.4.4). In addition to audio, through the transcript the students are also exposed to differences in spelling and punctuation, complementing the experience of listening to the conversation. The communicative component provides a palpable focus on meaning, with students listening, interpreting and making notes on what they discover from the audio recording. While the task includes a certain focus on form (see section 2.4.2), it is not too pervasive, but simply pointing students in the direction of noticing some key grammatical differences.

In general it is curious that there are so few grammar tasks in the textbooks that make use of audio recordings. Vg1 students in Norway have personal laptops, making access to all kinds of clips easy as long as Internet access is provided and functional in the classrooms. If audio clips were better integrated in the grammar tasks across the textbooks, it would have given students more possibilities to listen to English as it is spoken in a real context.

The task above is generally emblematic of the few grammar tasks in which exposure to authentic language has been incorporated in the three textbooks, as they tend to relate to noticing certain aspects of different varieties of English. A less elaborate example of this is provided in an *Access to English* task, where students are exposed to a specific variety of American English through the acclaimed Lorraine Hansberry play *A Raisin in the Sun*.

---

2. Improve your language

The characters in the play speak a variant of non-standard American English. That means that they use grammar that is seen as being "wrong" in writing. Put the following sentences into standard English:

    a. People like Will don't never get "tooken".
    b. Ain't she supposed to wear no pearls?
    c. Death done come into this here house.
    d. It's when he's at his lowest and can't believe in hisself 'cause the world done whipped him so.

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 212)

This grammar task uses sentences from a play excerpt, written in a non-standard variety of American English, to expose students to language that appears in an authentic context, specifically the daily life of an African American family in 1950's Chicago, as they move into a new home. The task instructs the students to transform the sentences from the play

into standard English. However, it provides no specific information about which variety of non-standard English is featured, namely African American Vernacular English (AAVE). What is more, by emphasizing that non-standard English is seen as "wrong" in writing, without elaborating, the task arguably gives students a reductive view of English grammar. Non-standard English encompasses a myriad of different varieties of English that all follow predictable patterns and are as rule-governed as standard English. It is important not to give the impression that non-standard varieties are somehow linguistically inferior, rather than the embodiment of a living language in constant development (Lippi-Green, 2012). This is a task that includes exposure to authentic language, but where the way the specific type of language is explained in the text of the task lacks clarity and precision. This issue relates to the strong focus on meaning seen in CLT (see section 2.4.1), making clear that even if a task is communicatively oriented, it is also essential that the task as it is written gives the students the appropriate information needed to fully understand the topic at hand.

The other aspect of authentic language is authentic language use by students, the findings for which appear in section 1.1 of the overview table. These findings support the notion that students being encouraged to use the language in a way that is authentic to them, usually in conversation with others, is a component that is almost non-existent in the grammar tasks. The majority of grammar tasks in the three textbooks do not facilitate this kind of language use as a part of exploring and learning grammatical structures, and in that respect lean more toward the somewhat mechanical approaches seen in traditional grammar (see section 2.3). The task below is taken from *Access to English* and it is one of the few examples of a grammar task that includes language that encourages students to actively use the language.

Points of departure:

How can you tell whether an English-speaker is from
Britain or the USA? Discuss in class.

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 80)

The task above precedes a text called "Divided by a Common Language" which highlights the differences between American English and British English, a recurring topic across the textbooks in several of the tasks that include an authentic language component. The task serves, as its heading suggests, as a point of departure for students to explore the text. While the task as written is simple, the open nature of the question allows for students to touch upon a variety of ways in which American English and British English sometimes differ, whether it be in pronunciation, spelling, vocabulary or cases of cultural differences. Furthermore, the task explicitly states that it is to be completed through class discussion. This shows a link between authentic language use and collaboration (see section 4.3.4), where explicit instruction to collaborate with other students can facilitate language use.

The task's combination of an open question and the clear instruction to collaborate with other students, makes it a brief, but very constructive task with a clear communicative dimension. The text is also available should students need ideas to begin the discussion. Overall, this is an example of how tasks that focus on grammatical aspects of English can include open questions that stimulate to discussion, rather than relying solely on direct instructions to carry out a specific action, like translating sentences from Norwegian or filling in missing words in example sentences meant to illustrate the use of a structure. Tasks instructing students to translate or fill in the blanks often include a high level of control, familiar for instance from the Audio-Lingual Method (see section 2.3.3), which might be beneficial in terms of showing students basic ways to employ a structure, but these tasks often fail to include components that make the task communicatively oriented.

The task on the next page is taken from *Targets*, and it is an example of a more traditional grammar task, but in which an authentic language component could easily have been included. The number of grammar tasks in the textbooks that include such a component is very limited, as evidenced by table 4.2, but by the same token there are also many tasks where only minor adjustments would be necessary to make the task more communicative.

6. Phrasal verbs (page 301)

Complete the sentences.
away, of, up, out, on/along, over, down, around

    a. They had to get rid … the dead body.
    b. Will you get … of my way!
    c. Are you still in bed? Get …, you lazy lump!
    d. My brother and I get … like a house on fire.
    e. I can't get … how easy the exam was.
    f. Let's get … to business.
    g. I finally got … to finishing my essay.
    h. Don't commit crime. You will never get … with it.

Adapted from *Targets* (Balsvik et al, 2015, p. 216)

This task from *Targets* is an example of a non-communicative task, indicating a grammar task that does not include any of the communicative components examined in this study. It is a typical fill-in-the-blanks task where students are provided with a set of example sentences in which they are meant to fill in one or more missing words to complete the sentences. This type of fill-in task with example sentences was commonly used as a learning tool in the Grammar-Translation Method (see section 2.3.1), and it is clear from the three textbooks that such tasks still have a strong presence in EFL teaching. To better fit the current focus on communication, an authentic language component could have been incorporated in this task with some small adjustments. One way of accomplishing that could have been to simply add another part to the task, with some questions for discussion about phrasal verbs, which would have encouraged students to study the structure more closely in collaboration with each other. Another option could have been to start off the task with students trying to explain to each other what phrasal verbs are, with examples. The page number for where phrasal verbs are explained is already given in the task's heading, which serves as a practical point of departure for a conversation on the structure.

This grammar task on phrasal verbs also serves as an example of a decontextualized task, where the grammatical structure appears in isolation. Contextualization is the second communicative component examined in this study and as with all of the three selected components, authentic language and contextualization are closely linked to one another.

Overall, there are extremely few grammar tasks with an authentic language component available in the textbooks. In each of the three books, the tasks including this component add up to less than a fourth of the total number of grammar tasks available (see table 4.2). As a consequence of this, students are rarely exposed to authentic language in their work with grammar, nor do the tasks provide much room for them to use English in a way that is authentic to them as part of that work. And so in terms of authentic language, the grammar tasks are not as fitted to the current focus on communication as they could have been.

4.3.3 Contextualization

As detailed in section 3.4.2, contextualization is approached as an either/or component, which is to say that either a grammar task is contextualized or it is not contextualized. Tasks that are contextualized may be so to varying degrees, which is something I will examine further in the example tasks presented in this section. The findings related to contextualized and not contextualized tasks are presented in sections 2.1-2.2 of table 4.2. The theoretical background for this concept within CLT is discussed in section 2.4.5.

It is clear from the findings in table 4.2 related to contextualization that the majority of grammar tasks available in the three textbooks are not contextualized, which is to say that the grammatical structure appears in isolation, with no link to a text, nor any context given. On the other hand, it is also established by the overview of findings that contextualization is still the component with the highest rate of inclusion in the textbooks. In *Access of English*, for instance, close to one third of the grammar tasks are contextualized to some degree. It is typical of the tasks that are contextualized that they are largely given context through a

connection to the preceding text in the textbook, as tasks usually follow each of the texts. An example of this type of contextualization is seen in the following task, taken from *Stunt*.

Checkpoints

4. Find the verbs in the poem. Which tense are they in?
How does this affect the reading of the poem?

Adapted from *Stunt* (Areklett et al, 2009, p. 278)

The poem that this task is referring to is one by Zindziswa Mandela, titled 'My Country'. She is Nelson Mandela's daughter, and the poem appears in a section dedicated to him. Contextualized through its textual link, the task instructs the students to return to the poem to examine the verbs and the tense in which they appear. This is an example of studying language in context, as opposed to decontextualized tasks that often use isolated example sentences to illustrate various uses of a specific structure. The former approach, as seen in this task, is less mechanical and more communicative in its emphasis on meaning, giving students a chance to study "the contextualized nature of language" (Summer, 2011, p. 115). The question at the end of the task allows students to reflect on how choice of verb tense can affect the reading of a text, which also speaks to the workings of language in context.

The way in which the above task is contextualized is characterized by its simplicity, but a straightforward textual link is nonetheless an effective and valuable way to include contextualization as a communicative component in grammar tasks. Textbooks are, as indicated by their name, centered around a wide selection of different texts, and it follows logically that the tasks should try to make good use of them. In some cases, however, the grammar tasks provide a textual link that is simply too weak or marginal to truly contribute to the task's communicative potential. In many of these instances, it would not have taken

much to rectify this in order to make the task more communicative. An example of this type of decontextualized grammar task is found in *Access to English*, and it is examined below.

---

3. Improve your language

Translate the following excerpts from the text into Norwegian:

    a. It offered a doorway to the wider world and I was hooked.
    b. None of these players has ever dazzled me in a match, probably because I was too busy chasing the ball to notice.
    c. I was able to build my confidence, because people expected a kid to make mistakes as he learned his trade.
    d. Rarely will anyone say the owners were mad to give him the wage in the first place. Instead, most of the anger goes to the player, for having the sheer nerve to accept it.

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 35)

The sentences provided in this task are excerpts from the preceding text in the textbook, titled "I Am the Secret Footballer." In this sense, the task does make use of a text, but this link does little to contextualize the task. On the contrary, the sentences are removed from their natural place within the text, and as such do not illustrate the contextualized nature of language. There is also no explanation given for why these specific sentences have been selected. Communicative tasks are characterized by a focus on meaning (see section 2.4.1), and this specific task feels decontextualized despite its textual link. It is an example of how making use of a text in itself may not be enough to make a task more communicative, stressing the importance of seeing textual links as a way to make tasks more meaningful.

The example task related to the play *A Raisin in the Sun* (see section 4.3.2) is similar to the task presented above in that it lifts a selection of sentences from their context within a text. However, in that example the sentences are given at least a degree of context through the

task's focus on standard vs. non-standard English, asking students to put the sentences into standard English, rather than simply to translate a selection of sentences into Norwegian. The lack of context seen in the above task could have been rectified with some adjustments. The task could for instance have selected a number of sentences from the text based on their use of football terminology, phrases and expressions and then instructed students to explore possible Norwegian equivalents through translation work. Such an approach would have given the task a specific focus, with the sentences for translation being contextualized through their explicit emphasis on specific language used when discussing football/sports. This would have followed the English subject curriculum's focus on students being aware of the importance of learning about situational aspects of language use (see section 2.2.3). The task could also have made use of the text in a way that allowed the students to explore it more fully, rather than only providing a seemingly arbitrary selection of brief excerpts.

While some of the grammar tasks include this type of ineffective link to a text, other tasks provide much of their context in the text of the task itself, like this example from *Targets:*

Before you read

- For each of the following countries, write down a few adjectives that may describe its inhabitants: Italy, France, Great Britain, Russia, Japan, Norway and the US. Share the adjectives in class, and comment on your associations.

- Stereotypes are oversimplified ideas about groups of people. Do you think there is any truth at all in national stereotypes? What can be the consequences of such stereotyping?

Adapted from *Targets* (Balsvik et al, 2015, p. 81)

This task is a point of departure task used as a way to introduce a text. The grammatical topic of the task is adjectives and the associations students make with the adjectives they

choose to describe the inhabitants of a selection of countries. The descriptive words are tied to national stereotypes, providing the basis for a discussion on what the task refers to as "oversimplified ideas about groups of people." In this way, adjectives are contextualized beyond just their place in the linguistic landscape, with the task exploring them in a cultural and multinational context, relevant to the subject's focus on English in a global perspective. More precisely, the task links adjectives to a context in which they are often used, namely to describe and categorize people from different backgrounds, which is then problematized. The task also works together with the text it introduces, titled "Understanding Britain", which is centered around the way we see Britain in terms of stereotypes and cultural traits.

This type of contextualization in the text of the task is possible for a grammatical topic as broad as "adjectives", but would be more difficult with a narrower topic, like for instance the use of periphrastic forms. When tasks feature more specific structures, it might be tempting to resort to fill-in tasks, because they let students show if they understand how to apply the form correctly. However, they do not let them see how the structure works in context, favoring an approach more reminiscent of structural drills than meaning-based learning. As touched upon in section 2.4.5, grammar tasks using isolated sets of examples fail to take into account the contextual aspect of language, which diminishes their value.

Even with a healthy selection of contextualized tasks across the three textbooks, the fact remains that there are far more grammar tasks that do not include contextualization as a communicative component. In all the Vg1 textbooks, the clear majority of the tasks are completely decontextualized, failing to illustrate how various structures are used in context, and instead depending on isolated examples to make grammar points. In some tasks, the examples are just lists of words to which the students are meant to add inflections, like a task in *Targets* that simply instructs students to "[w]rite the plurals of the following words", and then lists the five nouns "solo, cello, potato, duo, ghetto" (Balsvik et al, 2015, p. 166). This kind of grammar task is a far cry from what is considered valuable and meaningful in modern approaches to language teaching such as CLT. As stated in section 4.3.1, tasks that fail to include communicative components will be examined more closely in section 4.4.2.

4.3.4 Collaboration

Collaboration is the third and final communicative component examined in this study. As laid out in section 3.4.2, this component relates to whether or not a grammar task gives explicit instructions for the students to collaborate with each other on completing the task. Tasks that did not specify whether students should collaborate were registered with the outcome "not specified", while the remainder of the tasks were sorted into the categories "pair work", "group work" or "class discussion", depending on the text of the task. The findings for this component in the textbooks are detailed in sections 3.1-3.4 of table 4.2. The theory related to collaboration as a concept within CLT is discussed in section 2.4.6.

As with both authentic language and contextualization, collaboration as a communicative component does not have a strong presence in the grammar tasks available in the textbooks. In *Access to English*, ten out of 40 tasks include instructions for students to collaborate, while in *Stunt* the number is six out of 38 tasks, and in *Targets* only nine out of 126 tasks. These findings, presented in full in table 4.2, confirm that the authors of the textbooks have not considered instructive language encouraging students to work together to be essential. Part of this may be owing to the relative ease with which the teacher can make the decision of having students collaborate. But as discussed in section 3.4.2, it can often be tempting to just let students work with the tasks on their own, as this requires little to no organization. By contrast, when a task explicitly instructs students to work together, whether in pairs or in groups, this provides encouragement for the teacher and the students to follow through. What is more, it is now easier than ever for students to collaborate; as touched upon in section 4.3.2, that students now have personal laptops offers new possibilities. They are able to collaborate without having to move around in the classroom, as it can be done by using online services. As an example, at a school I visited as part of my teaching practice, the students in a Vg1 class were often using Google Drive, a service where any number of students can edit documents together. So if collaboration were considered a disruptive element in the past due to the organization required, this arguably holds less weight today.

Incorporating instructions intended to promote collaboration in a grammar task contributes to making the task more dynamic, as it requires that students pull together to negotiate meaning and complete the task. On a more general level, Larsen-Freeman (2000) points to how collaborative work could inspire a more cooperative way of thinking among students. An example of a collaborative grammar task follows below, taken from *Access to English*:

1. Understanding the text

Vocabulary changes over time, in English as in all languages. Some of the words in the song are no longer used in modern English ("thee" "thou" = "you", "thy" = "your"). Some are still used, but often with a different meaning. The word "gay" often means "homosexual" in modern English, but in the 16th century it simply meant "light-hearted". "Brave" could mean "splendid" as well as "courageous".

Sit in pairs and read the poem aloud.
After every verse, paraphrase the text in modern English.

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 26)

This task focuses on how languages develop and change over time, with specific examples of vocabulary meant to give students an idea of the way English has changed through the years. The poem the task refers to is an old English song called "Greensleeves", written during the Tudor period. Owing to this, the language is not identical with modern English, but it is still similar enough for students to make sense of it. At the end of the task, students are instructed to "sit in pairs", reading the poem aloud to each other and transforming each verse into modern English. This is a good example of a task where students have to work together to negotiate meaning, in an endeavor to make sense of the text they are examining. With the focus on communication in mind, it is clear that working with the task in this way

adds an element that elevates the task's communicative potential. In contrast, if students were to work on their own, they would likely not opt to vocalize the language by reading aloud, nor would they be able to pool resources with other students when putting the verses into modern English. Collaboration in general is seen as a key part of CLT, which favors a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to language learning (see section 2.4.6).

Working together in pairs is a collaborative dynamic with which most students are familiar. Often, desks in classrooms will be arranged two and two together, and so turning to face your neighbor tends to be an easy way to organize this kind of small-scale cooperation. But grammar tasks can also stimulate to collaboration through group work and discussions, though there are very few tasks in the textbooks instructing students to work in this way. Table 4.2 shows that only five grammar tasks across all three textbooks instruct students to work in groups, while there are six tasks in total that suggest students have a discussion. The task below is taken from *Stunt* and is one of the few tasks to incorporate this feature.

Creative stunt!

Being a teenager is not easy. Many young people feel pressurised *[sic]* by parents, fellow students, teachers etc. Have a discussion with your classmates where you include the following words: *mob psychology*, *easily impressionable*, *spine*, *independent*, *humble*, *obedient*, *strict*, *lenient and resourceful.*

Adapted from *Stunt* (Areklett et al, 2009, p. 32)

Focusing on a selection of specific words, this task follows a text centered around the movie *Dead Poets Society* with Robin Williams as an unorthodox, but inspiring teacher. Having seen the movie, students are asked to have a discussion about the pressure many young people often feel from those around them. While the focus here is on collaboration,

it should be noted that in terms of contextualization, this link to the movie is only implied, which is not an ideal approach. The young characters in the movie deal with this kind of pressure, and the link should have been made explicit to better frame the discussion the task sets up. The inclusion of a number of lexical items that are thematically linked to the topic for discussion gives the task a grammatical element. Not only are students supposed to learn what terms like "mob psychology" and phrases like "easily impressionable" mean, but they are also meant to use them in the context of the discussion. This is a much more communicative way to learn new vocabulary than for instance through studying word lists.

Including the kind of collaborative language seen in the task above provides a basis for oral interaction between students, in an open setting that is not obfuscated by rigid regulations. Beyond trying to incorporate a selection of relevant words, the students are free to discuss the topic in an unrestricted way that puts them and their experiences at the center. This is in line with the objectives of CLT in how it focuses on communication in a functional and collaborative way, where language serves as a way to express meaning (see section 2.4.1). In contrast to this, the Direct Method (see section 2.3.2), with its similar emphasis on oral interaction, made little room for students to discuss topics freely in the target language. Interaction often took place in highly controlled settings, for instance through question and answer sessions where students had to repeat sentences to the teacher, or through dictation. This type of interaction had a clear focus on form and structure, as opposed to the more communicative approach of letting students speak English freely (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Most authentic language use is collaborative: together, we negotiate meaning through the words we use, the way we use them and how we endeavor to understand and be understood. In a communicative view, both the contextualized and the collaborative nature of language would be best reflected in grammar tasks that aim to teach aspects of language in this way. Even otherwise structural tasks become more meaningful through collaboration, as it stimulates to both interaction and communication, primary functions of using a language. The overall lack of explicitly collaborative grammar tasks available in the textbooks puts the responsibility of having students collaborate on grammar tasks squarely on the teacher.

4.4 A comprehensive look at a selection of grammar tasks

While the previous sections focused on the extent to which the grammar tasks in the textbooks are communicative in the context of each communicative component, this section will present a broader perspective, considering the overall communicative potential of a selection of tasks, including a closer look at non-communicative tasks (section 4.4.2).

4.4.1 Communicative tasks

In this section, two tasks incorporating one or more of the communicative components included in this study will be examined; the first of which, adapted from *Targets*, appears below. It is an example of a task with several aspects that are seen as valuable in CLT.

5 American and British English

    a. Many Norwegian students speak English with an American accent and use American vocabulary, but use British spelling when writing. Do you think this is a problem? Can you spot the combination of British and American in these sentences?
        This is my favourite brand of fries.
        What is the colour of your new cellphone?
    b. Do you confuse American pronunciation and British spelling? Discuss in class whether this is a problem for some of you, and what could be done about it, if necessary.
    c. Sometimes British English and American English use the same word, but with different meanings, like the word *football* and *chips*. Can you explain the difference in meaning?
    d. Can you explain the difference in meaning between these pairs? Can you guess which one is American and which one is British? If necessary, translate them into Norwegian.

    [eight example pairs omitted]

Adapted from *Targets* (Balsvik et al, 2015, p. 42)

The task above is one of five consecutive tasks on American and British English in *Targets*. Each of the five tasks focuses on different aspects of these two major varieties of English. I have chosen to examine this specific task in part because it is one of the only tasks in the textbooks to include all three of the communicative components that make up my criteria. More than anything, it is a task meant to make students reflect upon how they approach American and British English, and whether they are conscious about differences in spelling and pronunciation, as well as words that are used differently in the two varieties. In all of the subtasks, students are asked a range of questions linked to the topic of the task, and the second subtask encourages them to have a discussion about some of the notable differences. As cited in section 2.4.1, Simensen (2007) points to how CLT applied in practice should provide opportunities for students to communicate in the target language, which is based in its view of language as a means for communication. The way this task is constructed, asking questions and relating the topic to learning English as an EFL student, stimulates to communication through how it allows students to draw from their own experiences.

While the task follows the text 'The Ant-Eater' by Roald Dahl, a funny take on differences between American English and British English pronunciation, it is contextualized mainly through the text of the task itself. The five grammar tasks on this topic across the two pages following the Dahl text work together to create an approach to the topic that is meaningful. Example sentences are featured, but rather than appearing in isolation, they work to complement the questions the students are to answer. In a), two example sentences are included to demonstrate how easily American and British spellings of words can be mixed up. In d), eight pairs of example sentences—omitted in the adaptation above for length— use the same English word in two sentences, where one sentence uses it in a British English context and the other in an American English context. One of the pairs uses the word "gas", which is used instead of "petrol" in American English when referring to fuel for your car. Example sentences in themselves are not detrimental to communication; it is only when they appear in isolation, contrived to exemplify the use of a specific structure, that there can be a lack of focus on meaning. The Grammar-Translation Method, for instance, often made use of strange isolated sentences, such as the example provided in section 2.3.1 about the

treacherous cats and dogs, intended as an illustration of how to use prepositional phrases. This task, however, uses examples constructively to aid students in answering its questions.

Through its explicit instruction for students to enter a discussion, the task also promotes collaboration. This could have been more inclusive in that rather than having it only as part of b), the questions posed in the other subtasks could also have been subject for discussion. The task could for instance have introduced the subtasks by saying "discuss the following questions together in class", rather than reserving the discussion for one specific question. In terms of authentic language, the kind of questions asked in the task, combined with the facilitation of a discussion, creates opportunities for authentic language use by students. Considering how the task focuses on differences in pronunciation, including authentic materials could also have been beneficial, especially audio clips to illustrate the differences. But even without such materials, this is a task with a number of communicative features.

A communicative grammar task which is focused on a more specific grammatical topic can be found in *Access to English*. It is an example of how in a task with a clear focus on form, it is also possible to have the grammar points be contextualized in a meaningful way.

Activity

- Look up *import*, *export* and *transport* in your dictionary. Can you see any difference between the way the noun and the verb are pronounced?
- Look up *fast* in your dictionary. List the various meanings and then write a meaningful sentence in which you use at least three of them.
- Look up the word *bow* in the dictionary. How many basic meanings do you find? Are they pronounced the same?

Find out what the following phrases mean:
- To take the wind out of someone's sails; - To wind someone up;
- To put the wind up someone; - To break wind
Was *wind* pronounced the same here?

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 37)

The topic of the grammar task above relates to how words that are spelled the same can have different meanings and pronunciations, depending on the context in which they are used. The word "bow", for instance, which is mentioned in the third part of the task, could refer to the verb "to bow", but also to the noun "a bow" as in "bow and arrow". The words look the same, but have different meanings as well as differently pronounced vowel sounds. The task also exemplifies how verbs and nouns that are spelled the same and share common meaning, are often distinguished by word stress, like "to import" and "an import", where in the verb the stress is put on the second syllable and in the noun it is put on the first syllable. Students are instructed in the task to explore this topic and find the information they need to complete the task through the use of dictionaries, an important tool in language learning.

The task is contextualized in part through the information given in the task itself, where the grammatical points are made in the context of the usefulness of dictionaries, in which students can study the examples that are brought forth in the task. What is more, the task appears in the middle of a text called "The Magical Dictionary Tour", which aims to teach the students about dictionaries, including how they are organized and how to use them well. Similarly to the task, the text includes examples and takes the time to contextualize these. It is easy to imagine a decontextualized version of this task, with a list of nouns and verbs appearing in isolation, and students then being asked to explain how to distinguish them. The use of dictionaries, as well as integrating the task in a text, contributes to creating a more dynamic and meaningful task – making it more communicatively oriented as a result.

Despite the inclusion of contextualization as a communicative component in the task, there is no instruction for students to collaborate. Working actively with dictionaries, looking up various words and trying to find answers to the questions in the task, naturally lends itself to collaboration, and so this could have been explicitly constructed as a collaborative task. Facilitating cooperative work between students would also have provided opportunities for authentic language use, with students navigating the dictionary together with their peers. The lack of attention paid to collaborative work and authentic language in this task is characteristic of the grammar tasks in the textbooks overall. While the example tasks so far

may have given the impression that there is a vast number of communicative tasks available in the textbooks, the overall findings (see table 4.2) confirm that these tasks are exceptions rather than the norm in terms of the way the grammar tasks are generally put together. Even contextualization, which is the most frequently included component (see section 4.3.3), is only present in a third of the tasks in *Access to English*, and even less in *Stunt* and *Targets*. Owing to this, it seems fitting to end this chapter by looking at non-communicative tasks.

4.4.2 Non-communicative tasks

The term 'non-communicative task' refers to grammar tasks that do not include any of the communicative components that are part of this study. The table below is based on the findings included in Appendix 1, designed to show the number of non-communicative grammar tasks present in the textbooks compared to the number of grammar tasks overall.

Table 4.3

Non-communicative grammar tasks in the textbooks			
	Access to English	*Stunt*	*Targets*
Number of non-communicative grammar tasks	22	25	92
Number of grammar tasks available in total	40	38	126
Percentage of grammar tasks that are non-communicative	55%	65.8%	73%

The table above shows how the majority of grammar tasks in the three textbooks do not incorporate any of the communicative components that have been examined in this study. More precisely, the tasks counted as non-communicative tasks are decontextualized and do not include instruction for students to collaborate, nor an authentic language component.

In other words, it is a relatively low bar to clear for a task to be seen as communicative, seeing as all that is required is a degree of context, or language such as "work in pairs." Even with generous parameters, it is evident that many tasks are not fitted to the focus on communication seen in the Vg1 subject curriculum and in prevailing paradigms like CLT.

The textbook with the most grammar tasks is *Targets*, and it is also the textbook in which non-communicative tasks make up the largest percentage of grammar tasks in total. As mentioned in section 4.2, this is in part owing to how the final two pages of each chapter feature a substantial number of fairly simple and decontextualized tasks on various topics. With five main chapters, these tasks alone account for about 60 non-communicative tasks. In a practical sense, it is useful to devote a couple of pages in each chapter entirely to grammar tasks, but in a communicative view, it is important that these tasks have a focus on meaning, rather than only focusing on form and having the structure appear in isolation. A task which is emblematic of the end-of-chapter grammar tasks in *Targets* appears below.

---

8 Subject-verb agreement (page 312)

What is the correct form of the verb?

    a. The news __ (be) on at nine.
    b. The flowers in my garden __ (smell) lovely.
    c. A bouquet of these flowers __ (lighten) up my day.
    d. Everyone in this family __ (like) a nice cup of tea.
    e. John's parents __ (live) next door.
    f. Homework __ (have) to be finished before you __ (be) allowed to watch TV.
    g. Reading and writing __ (be) my favourite pastime.
    h. The bread you made __ (make) my mouth water.

Adapted from *Targets* (Balsvik et al, 2015, p. 72)

The task above appears at the end of the second chapter of *Targets*. It is one of ten grammar tasks, all of which fail to include any communicative components. The topic of the task is subject-verb agreement, and it is a fill-in-the-blanks task where students are meant to fill in the right form of the verb in the example sentences provided. In terms of contextualization, the task is entirely decontextualized, only providing a reference to the page where subject-verb agreement rules are presented. As mentioned in section 2.4.5, this kind of linguistic context does not make a task more communicative, but instead promotes a deductive way of learning grammar contrary to the inductive approach favored in CLT (see section 2.2.2). Rather than inferring grammatical rules through the use of examples and studying language in context, students are asked to study the rules right away and then fill in the right forms.

The objective of this thesis is not to contend that this type of grammar task is completely without merit, but in the specifically communicative perspective that the tasks are analyzed, decontextualized, fill-in-the-blanks tasks do not fit the bill of what is seen as valuable. Similar tasks were much used in previous language teaching paradigms, where activities like structural drills and pattern practice were common (see section 2.3.3, for instance). Through societal changes like globalization, as discussed in section 2.4.1, more emphasis is now given to learning how to communicate effectively in the target language, and recent paradigms have distanced themselves from the more structural focus of the past. As such, non-communicative tasks have more in common with traditional approaches to grammar.

In addition to not being contextualized, the task on subject-verb agreement does not instruct students to collaborate, nor make use of authentic materials or stimulate to language use. It is a task that is direct and to the point in its approach, using each sentence to demonstrate a specific facet to subject-verb agreement, for instance how the uncountable noun "news" takes singular verb, which is also the case for an expression like "a bouquet of", seen in c). In this sense, the task gets the job done, but it is not necessarily the case that this type of structural grammar work will lead to students internalizing the rules and being able to apply them successfully when using the language in communication (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The fact that so many of the tasks in the textbooks take this non-communicative approach means that there are fewer opportunities for students to work with grammar in context.

Non-communicative tasks are also commonly found in *Stunt*, where nearly two thirds of the grammar tasks available have no communicative components. The fifth and final chapter in *Stunt* is devoted to grammar, with a substantial number of its grammar tasks appearing in this chapter. The chapter does not include any texts, but instead focuses on explaining various grammatical topics. The grammar tasks that are placed in this chapter are mostly non-communicative and the task below is an example taken from this part of the textbook.

Language workshop

Write sentences using the following nouns in the plural –
one sentence for each noun: Baby, bush, thief, tax, church,
life, mouse, hero, monkey, book.

Adapted from *Stunt* (Areklett et al, 2009, p. 334)

This task on nouns is similar to the one from *Targets* mentioned at the end of section 4.3.3. It is a decontextualized task that instructs students to put a list of singular nouns into plural and use each of the nouns in a single sentence. The task appears on a page in the book where grammatical rules related to nouns are presented, and is as such situated in the same kind of linguistic context as the previous task on subject-verb agreement. As explained above, this type of context is not enough to make a task more communicative. When the task also elects not to include collaborative language or authentic materials and does not encourage language use, it is clear that the task does not have features that provide a basis for communication. Moreover, it epitomizes the kind of grammar task that favors a focus on form over a focus on meaning. It is hard to make a case for this task being meaningful, giving students valuable insight into the many ways in which nouns can be used in English.

The operations the task asks students to perform are mechanical to a point where it might have been equally useful to simply list the nouns in singular and plural with some examples of usage. Writing a sentence like "The mice were dancing on the table" does not require much, and in a communicative view it is not a meaningful approach to language learning. In its preface, *Stunt* sets out to "challenge you to learn, evaluate, think, discuss", framing learning a language as something that should feel inspiring (Areklett et al, 2009, p. 11). This suggests a focus on meaning, but that is not reflected in the grammar task seen above.

The reliance in the textbooks on the kind of grammar tasks that require students to fill in missing words in example sentences or add inflections to words, supports the notion that traditional approaches to grammar continue to influence the way grammar is taught. There is a palpable mechanical feel to what is asked of the students, where tasks provide such a controlled learning environment that anything resembling real language use is lost. It is interesting that the types of tasks that were common during the height of paradigms like the Grammar-Translation Method (see section 2.3.1) and the Direct Method (see section 2.3.2), continue to be a significant part of grammar teaching today—when the criticism aimed at these methods was part of what paved the way for language teaching paradigms like CLT. Following the decline of the Audio-Lingual Method (see section 2.3.3), scholars like Noam Chomsky suggested that the type of structural focus seen in these methods could "lead to language-like behaviors", but not result in competence (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 72). Nevertheless, tasks reminiscent of the methods era are widespread in EFL textbooks today.

The final example task to be examined is taken from *Access to English*, where the majority of the grammar tasks are also traditional in nature, with 55% of the tasks including none of the communicative components included in this study, as demonstrated in table 4.3. Unlike *Stunt* and *Targets*, the grammar tasks are not mainly found in the final chapter of the book or on the last pages of each chapter, but are spread quite evenly across the textbook. The following task is an example of how meaning might get lost when the choice to forego context is made, which can sometimes cause confusion rather than stimulate learning.

4 Improve your language

Match the following words, which are taken from the text,
with a synonym (a word that means nearly the same thing):

1 - significant	a) look
2 - moisture	b) easily seen
3 - laborious	c) disgusting
4 - inhale	d) dampness
5 - downpour	e) difficult
6 - disapproving	f) shape
7 - alone	g) insight
8 - gaze	h) important
9 - snicker	i) breathe in
10 - conspicuous	j) heavy rain
11 - nauseating	k) get back
12 - intuition	l) person who advises
13 - contour	m) critical
14 - mentor	n) laugh mockingly
15 - retrieve	o) solitary

Adapted from *Access to English* (Burgess & Sørhus, 2013, p. 56)

The topic of the task above is word meanings, or more specifically synonyms. The words in the left column are taken from the preceding text, and students are asked to couple them with their synonyms, presented in the right column. Despite the words in the left column being taken from the preceding text, this is a decontextualized task organized as a word list. The task defines "synonym" in parentheses as "a word that means nearly the same thing." But several of the entries in the right column are phrases, not single words, and in some cases they are more of a definition of their counterpart in the left column. "Person who advises", for instance, is not a synonym for "mentor" as much as an explanation of the word. What is more, the synonyms that are listed can often not be used in the same way as the words in the left column, but since they do not appear in context, this is not made clear. It is for instance possible to say that a man "looks conspicuous", but saying that he "looks easily seen" is not an acceptable phrase. Similarly, you can spot a "solitary bird" on the

sidewalk, but not an "alone bird", and distinctions such as these are largely lost in this task. Even though synonyms refer to words with nearly the same meaning, and not necessarily the same function, it can be confusing to encounter new words out of context like this, as students are not made privy to the ways in which the various words can and cannot be used.

Overall, the lack of context in the majority of the grammar tasks in the textbooks speaks to the general lack of tasks that include communicative components (see tables 4.2 and 4.3). And so when reflecting on to what extent the grammar tasks are communicative, the answer is that in many cases, the tasks are not constructed in way that promotes communication. Even the tasks that do feature one of the three communicative components included in this study, often do so in a borderline way, where a task is only loosely linked to a text, or one of the subtasks incorporates a sentence instructing students to "discuss" a specific question. The grammar tasks in the textbooks cover a large number of topics and many of them are organized in a way that can certainly help students on their way to learning more about English grammar, but the tasks are not particularly tailored to a focus on communication.

5. Conclusion

The objective of this study has been to chart the distribution of grammar tasks in three EFL textbooks for Vg1 in general studies and then examine to what extent the grammar tasks are communicatively oriented, as laid out in my research question in section 1.2. I have carried out a theoretical textbook analysis where a quantitative analysis has been conducted in order to find the number of grammar tasks compared to the overall number of tasks in the textbooks. The extent to which the grammar tasks are communicative has been analyzed through the use of a set of criteria consisting of three communicative components, based on central theoretical concepts in Communicative Language Teaching. The purpose of conducting these analyses has been to gain a greater understanding of the place grammar has in textbooks used as part of EFL education in Norway today, and the extent to which grammar tasks are fitted to the current focus on communication, seen in the English subject curriculum (section 2.2.3) and in modern approaches to language teaching, such as CLT. This chapter will provide a summary of the findings of the study, offer some conclusions based on the findings overall and give some suggestions for possible further research.

5.1 Summary and conclusions

The distribution of grammar tasks in the textbooks (see section 4.2) shows that grammar work continues to play a part in textbooks used in EFL classrooms in Norway. This is also explicitly stated in the preface sections of *Access to English*, *Stunt* and *Targets*, the three textbooks analyzed in this study. The textbooks include 40, 38 and 126 grammar tasks, respectively, making up 18.3%, 8.8% and 30.1% of the tasks overall. The inclusion of a number of grammar tasks covering a range of different topics is natural considering how integral grammar is to learning a new language, as mentioned in the introduction to this thesis. The grammar tasks serve as one of many tools designed to help students become more proficient in English, but the overall potential of the tasks rests on the qualities they

hold. It has been interesting to study how the grammar tasks in the textbooks are put together, as their inclusion alone does not speak to the value they could have for students.

The main part of this study has been dedicated to examining the extent to which the grammar tasks included in the textbooks can be said to facilitate communication. Since CLT became a major paradigm in the 1970s and early 1980s, and through—in a historical perspective—recent changes in society related to globalization and the rise of the Internet, this focus on facilitating communication continues to have a central place in EFL teaching. The English subject curriculum explicitly touches upon this point, where the introductory 'Purpose' section states that students "need English for communication" and that to succeed in a world where English is so significant in areas such as trade and technology, "it is necessary to be able to use the English language and to have knowledge of how it is used in different contexts" and in different communication situations (Udir, 2013). In this kind of communicative perspective, grammar tasks should ideally integrate components that make the tasks fitted to communicative purposes, rather than lean exclusively on the primarily structural focus that was prevalent in the pre-globalization methods era (see section 2.3).

Contrary to the ideals of CLT and the objectives set out in the English subject curriculum, the study of communicative components in the grammar tasks shows that the grammar tasks in Norwegian EFL textbooks are generally not tailored to a focus on communication. The findings (presented in tables 4.2 and 4.3) make clear that the majority of the grammar tasks in the textbooks are decontextualized tasks where the grammatical structure appears in isolation. What is more, the majority of the tasks do not promote authentic language use, include authentic materials, or encourage students to collaborate on completing the tasks. Non-communicative tasks are tasks that do not include any of the selected communicative components, and in *Access to English* they account for 55% of the grammar tasks. In *Stunt*, the number is 65.8% of the grammar tasks and in *Targets* as much as 73% of the tasks. Some tasks do include one or more of the communicative components, but these tasks are in minority, and as touched upon at the end of section 4.4.2, the communicative aspect is often marginal, where a task is for instance loosely linked to a text, providing some context.

Overall, the tasks have more in common with traditional approaches to grammar in how grammar points are often presented out of context through the use of word lists, contrived examples or fill-in-the-blank sentences meant to demonstrate the use of a specific structure. There are few opportunities to learn grammar in a way where students can get familiar with how a structure is used in different communicative situations and use the language actively. These findings beg the question of why authors of the textbooks have not prioritized the incorporation of more communicative components in tasks that involve grammar work. It could be a conscious decision to keep the grammar tasks traditional, because students are expected to use the language in communication in other parts of the subject. However, I would argue that this could contribute to making grammar feel even more removed from the rest of the subject than it already does to many students, when ideally students should be considering grammar as a natural, integrated part of working with English in class.

The lack of communicative grammar tasks means that for tasks to facilitate communication, in most cases they depend on English teachers actively trying to make grammar work more communicatively oriented. As demonstrated by the findings, the EFL textbooks themselves largely do not provide this. Teachers may for instance choose to provide authentic materials as a supplement to the tasks, give context to tasks that have none and continually make a conscious effort to have students collaborate whenever possible – which as touched upon in section 4.3.4 is easier than before at Vg1 level due to the students having personal laptops. While it is certainly conceivable for teachers to build on textbook task in this way, it is hard to envision it as something that could be implemented consistently, and so it would be more practical if the tasks themselves were constructed to provide communicative opportunities.

The examples of communicative tasks in the previous chapter show that it is possible to construct grammar tasks that include features that promote communication. The use of explicit textual links, audio clips and other authentic materials, as well as including a collaborative focus, are all feasible components to incorporate in a grammar task, and in that way make the tasks more dynamic, meaningful and appealing for EFL students.

5.2 Further research

This study has contributed with explicit data on how EFL textbooks in Norway approach grammar work through the lens of communicative competence as an important objective. It complements other studies of EFL textbooks from for instance Askeland (2013) and Norenberg (2017), who also found that tasks are often simplistic and decontextualized. With its explicitly communicative focus, this study has shown that grammar tasks remain traditional in nature and that more could be done to adapt tasks to modern classrooms. Below are some suggestions for further research, which could help give a greater insight into how textbooks are put together, and how they are approached in Norwegian schools.

Firstly, it could have been interesting to conduct a similar study of the tasks in the textbooks that are not grammar tasks, to examine if non-grammar tasks are more communicatively oriented, and if so to what extent. Tasks related to reading comprehension are naturally more contextualized as they are explicitly linked to a text by design, but it is possible that some types of tasks are generally non-communicative in a similar way to grammar tasks. While this study has been limited to analyzing grammar tasks in a communicative view, a complementary analysis of other textbook tasks viewed through a similar lens would provide a more complete picture of how textbook tasks are constructed.

Secondly, due to the limitations inherent in a theoretical textbook analysis, which only examines the textbook itself, supplementing this kind of data with research from classrooms, with interviews with teachers and students in order to examine the way grammar is actually taught in EFL classrooms in Norway, could have proved beneficial. Interviews with teachers could have provided information on how they approach grammar tasks in the textbooks, and whether they try to angle the tasks toward communication. Student interviews could have provided insight into students' thoughts on grammar work.

Finally, studying the approach to grammar on digital learning platforms such as NDLA will likely become more relevant as digital resources continue to develop and become more

widely used in schools. It could be interesting to examine whether grammar tasks found on online platforms are traditional and form-focused in a similar way to textbook tasks, or if they do a better job of incorporating audio clips and other authentic materials, which could more easily be embedded into the tasks either through materials built into the tasks or links. The textbooks used in this study also have their own websites that include tasks, and so a comparison of the online tasks and the textbook tasks would be worthwhile in this context.

In conclusion, while several theses have been written on EFL textbooks at various levels of schooling in Norway, there is still a need for more research to better understand how textbooks are put together by their authors and how they are used in classrooms, by both teachers and students. The textbook remains a principal tool in many Norwegian schools (Juul, Hontvedt & Skjelbred, 2010), and owing to that it is important to make sure that the textbooks are designed in a way that is conducive to learning and fitted to today's world.

References

Areklett, K.M., Hals, Ø., Lindaas, K. & Tørnby, H. (2009) *Stunt.* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Askeland, E. (2013) *Grammar Teaching in the EFL Classroom: An Analysis of Grammar Tasks in Three Textbooks* (Master's thesis). Department of Foreign Languages, University of Bergen

Balsvik, L., Bratberg, Ø., Henry, J.S., Kagge, J. & Pihlstrøm, R. (2015) *Targets*. Fourth Edition. Skien: Aschehoug

Brown, H.D. (2000) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Fourth Edition. New York: Pearson Education

Bryman, A. (2012) *Social Research Methods.* Fifth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Burgess, R. & Sørhus, T.B. (2013) *Access to English.* Oslo: Cappelen Damm

Council of Europe (2001) Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Strasbourg: Language Policy Unit. Available at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Framework_EN.pdf [Accessed 11 April 2017]

Crystal, D. (2007) *How Language Works.* New York: Avery

Dörnyei, Z. (2007) *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ellis, R. (1996) *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. & Loewen, S. (2002) Doing focus-on-form. *System*, [online] 30(4), pp. 419-432. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00047-7 [Accessed 12 April 2017]

Ellis, R. (2006) Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc. (TESOL)*, [online] 40(1), pp. 83-107. Available at: http://www.jstor.org/stable/40264512 [Accessed 08 March 2017]

Fotos, S. (1998) Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal,* [online] 52(4), pp. 301-307. Available at https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/52.4.301 [Accessed 12 April 2017]

Fotos, S. & Hinkel E. (2002) From Theory to Practice: A Teacher's View. In: Fotos, S. & Hinkel E. ed. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 1-12

Halliday, M.A.K. (1999) The Notion of "Context" in Language Education. In: Ghadessy, M. ed. *Text and Context in Functional Linguistics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 1-24

Howatt, A.P.R. (1984) *A History of English Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Howatt, A.P.R. & Widdowson, H.G. (2004) *A History of English Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Hymes, D. (1972) On Communicative Competence. In: J.B. Pride & J. Holmes ed. *Sociolinguistics Selected Readings.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269-293

Juuhl, G. K., Hontvedt, M. & Skjelbred, D. (2010). Læremiddelforsking etter LK06: eit kunnskapsoversyn (Vol. 1/2010). Tønsberg: Høgskolen i Vestfold.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000) *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001) Chapter 5 - Grammar. *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*, [online] pp. 34-41. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667206.006 [Accessed 02 March 2017]

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015) Research into practice: Grammar learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, [online] 48(2), pp. 263-280. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408 [Accessed 19 May 2017]

Lippi-Green, R. (2012) *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States.* Second Edition. London: Routledge

McCarthy, M. & Carter, R. (2002) Ten Criteria for a Spoken Grammar. In: Fotos, S. & Hinkel E. eds. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 51-76

Newby, D. (2006). Teaching Grammar and the Question of Knowledge. In: Fenner, A.-B. & Newby D. eds., *Coherence of Principles, Cohesion of Competences: Exploring Theories and Designing Materials for Teacher Education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, pp. 95-112

Norenberg, M. (2017) *Pragmatic Competences in Oral Textbook Tasks* (Master's thesis). Department of Foreign Languages, University of Bergen

Pennington, M.C. (2002) Grammar and Communication: New Directions in Theory and Practice. In: Fotos, S. & Hinkel E. eds. *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* United States: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 77-98

O'Grady, W.; Dobrovolsky, M. & Katamba, F. (1997) *Contemporary Linguistics*. Harlow: Longman

O'Grady, W., Archibald, J., Aronoff, M. & Rees-Miller, J. (2010) *Contemporary Linguistics*. Sixth Edition. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2014) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Third Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Richards, L. (2005) *Handling Qualitative Data: A Practical Guide.* London: Sage

Simensen, A.M. (2007) *Teaching a Foreign Language*. Second Edition. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget

Summer, T. (2011) *An Evaluation of Methodological Options for Grammar Instruction in EFL textbooks.* Germany: Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

Udir – Utdanningsdirektoratet [executive agency of the Ministry of Education] (2006)
English subject curriculum (ENG1-01). Available at:
https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-01?lplang=http://data.udir.no/kl06/eng [Accessed
24 June 2017]

Udir – Utdanningsdirektoratet [executive agency of the Ministry of Education] (2013)
English subject curriculum (ENG1-03). Available at:
https://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03?lplang=http://data.udir.no/kl06/eng [Accessed
24 June 2017]

Appendix 1 – Counting tables for grammar tasks

		Grammar tasks in *Targets* (2014), published by Aschehoug			
Task #	Page #	Task topic	Authentic language	Contextualization	Collaboration
1	11	Indefinite article	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
2	24	Adjectives	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [too marginal link in c]	Not specified (3.4)
3	31	Standard vs. non-standard English	Exposure (1.2) [to non-std. poem]	Yes (2.1) [linked to poem]	Not specified (3.4)
4	35	Parts of speech	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to short story]	Not specified (3.4)
5	35	Word stress	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
6	35	Prefixes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
7	35	Suffixes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
8	35	Homophones, IPA symbols	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
9	36	Homonyms	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
10	36	Etymology	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
11	36	Various	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [focus on meaning in dictionaries]	Not specified (3.4)
12	36	Word sorting	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
13	37	Semantics	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
14	37	Sentence formation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
15	39	Pronunciation	None (1.3) [exposure not to AL per se]	Yes (2.1) [linked to poems plus context given]	Not specified (3.4)
16	40	American vs. British English	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
17	42	American vs. British English	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Group work (3.2) ["together"]
18	42	American vs. British English	AL use (1.1) [free discussion]	Yes (2.1)	Discussion (3.3)

19	43	American vs. British English	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
20	43	American vs. British English	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
21	43	Subject-verb agreement	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
22	52	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [audio]	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
23	52	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [Londonstani English excerpt]	Yes (2.1) [Influence from Asian immigration]	Not specified (3.4)
24	58	Words of cause and effect	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
25	65	Tense	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)
26	65	Collocations	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
27	69	Language style	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)
28	78	Indefinite article	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
29	78	Definite article	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
30	78	Definite article	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
31	78	Definite article	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
32	78	It/there	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
33	79	Who/which	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
34	79	Some/any	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
35	79	Subject-verb agreement	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
36	79	Tense	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
37	81	Adjectives, associations	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text plus context given]	Discussion (3.3) ["share in class, comment"]
38	79	Adverbs/ adjectives	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
39	95	Vocabulary	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
40	95	Vocabulary	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
41	99	Non-standard English	Exposure (1.2) [text & audio]	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
42	99	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [text & audio]	Yes (2.1)	Group work (3.2) [final bullet point]

43	107	Apostrophes, 'd – had/would	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
44	107	Apostrophes, sing./pl. nouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
45	109	Semantics	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
46	112	Verbs, active form	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
47	112	Verbs, passive form	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
48	114	Pronunciation, tongue twisters	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text/film]	Not specified (3.4)
49	115	Formality, language style	Exposure (1.2) [speech text]	Yes (2.1) [linked to text/film]	Not specified (3.4)
50	124	Tense, phrasal verbs, "let"	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)
51	132	Regular and irregular verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [link to text too marginal]	Not specified (3.4)
52	132	Word families	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [link to text too marginal]	Not specified (3.4)
53	138	Incomplete sentences	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
54	138	Punctuation, capitalization	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
55	138	Appositions	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
56	138	Sentence types	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
57	138	Adverbials	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
58	138	Conjunctions	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
59	139	Subject-verb agreement	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
60	139	Subordinating conjunctions	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
61	139	Subordinating conjunctions-2	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
62	139	Run-on sentences	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
63	139	Adverbials, word order	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
64	152	Idioms, set phrases	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
65	152	Punctuation, capitalization	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
66	161	Non-standard English	Exposure (1.2) [AAVE, marginal]	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)

67	161	Adjectives	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
68	161	The infinitive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
69	166	Plurals of nouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
70	175	Vocabulary	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link vague and implicit]	Not specified (3.4)
71	177	Language style	Exposure (1.2) [audio recording, language styles]	Yes (2.1) [linked to audio]	Not specified (3.4)
72	177	Non-standard English	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link weak, implicit]	Not specified (3.4)
73	183	Apostrophes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
74	184	Adjectives	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to poem, quote from Milne]	Pair work (3.1) [specified in b)]
75	190	Vocabulary	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
76	190	Object complements	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
77	204	Similes and metaphors	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) (text link + some context in task)	Not specified (3.4)
78	204	Similes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
79	216	Phrasal verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link weak and post-task]	Not specified (3.4)
80	216	The -ing form	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
81	216	The –ing form	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
82	219	Verbs, progressive	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link just for translation]	Not specified (3.4)
83	219	Past progressive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
84	224	Similar words	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
85	224	Nouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
86	224	Determiners	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
87	224	Few/little	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)

88	224	Many/much	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
89	224	Collocations	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
90	224	Negation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
91	225	Adverbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
92	225	Action or linking verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
93	225	Action or stative verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
94	225	Word order	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
95	225	The infinitive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
96	225	The infinitive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
97	233	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [West Indies English variety]	Yes (2.1) [linked to text + language types]	Not specified (3.4)
98	233	Infinitives of purpose	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Pair work (3.1)
99	246	Collocations	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
100	250	Time shifts, tenses	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)
101	250	Writing style	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Discussion (3.3) [specified in c)]
102	256	Gerund or infinitive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
103	256	Gerund or infinitive	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
104	262	Adjectives, prepositions	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
105	267	Verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
106	267	Slang and abbreviations	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [marginal]	Not specified (3.4)
107	276	Sentence types: the imperative	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to text]	Not specified (3.4)
108	280	Linking words	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to usage in preceding text]	Not specified (3.4)
109	287	Adverbs	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [marginal as text used as 'word bank' to find adverbs]	Not specified (3.4)

110	292	Finite and non-finite verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
111	292	Non-finite clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
112	292	Non-finite clauses	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [you see how they're used in text]	Not specified (3.4)
113	292	Relative clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
114	292	Relative clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
115	292	Reduction of relative clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
116	292	Relative pronouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
117	292	Relative clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
118	293	Reported speech	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
119	293	The first conditional	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
120	293	The first conditional	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
121	293	The second conditional	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1) [but marginal 'read out to classmate']
122	293	The second conditional	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
123	293	The third conditional	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
124	293	*That*-clauses	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
125	293	The *-ing* form	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
126	293	Modals, *should*	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)

TOTALS, *TARGETS:*									
126 grammar tasks in total									
419 tasks overall in the textbook		**Total occurrences of each potential outcome:**							
		Authentic language			**Contextualization**		**Collaboration**		
		1.1	**1.2**	**1.3**	**2.1**	**2.2**	**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.4**
		1	9	116	31	95	3	2	3	118
		Total: 126			Total: 126		Total: 126			

* tasks on Am. English vs. Br. English (p. 42-43) go together and all are thus seen as contextualized.

		Grammar tasks in *Stunt* (2009), published by Fagbokforlaget			
Task #	Page #	Task topic	Authentic language	Contextualization	Collaboration
1	18	Semantics, words	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [marginal, but words appear in context of text]	Not specified (3.4)
2	18	Semantics, phrases	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [marginal, but phrases appear in context of text]	Not specified (3.4)
3	32	Word meanings	AL use (1.1) [free discussion with classmates]	Yes (2.1) [context in task, plus related to DPS]	Discussion (3.3)
4	36	Language errors	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text just used for example sentences]	Not specified (3.4)
5	37	Pronunciation, spelling ++	Exposure (1.2) [listening to two women talking]	Yes (2.1) [linked to 'starting point' and text]	Not specified (3.4)
6	41	GA and RP pronunciation	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [implicit text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
7	41	Spelling in AE and BE	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [answer in text, but link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
8	41	American and British English	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
9	44	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [different types of spoken English]	Yes (2.1) [linked to text + intro context given]	Not specified (3.4)
10	50	Assessment of language skills	AL use (1.1) [discuss your own skills with partner]	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1)
11	67	Loanwords	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
12	67	Word meaning, synonyms	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link only implicit + too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
13	91	Uncountable nouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
14	117	Language terms, vocab	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
15	136	Grammatical errors	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [sentences about topic; no context]	Not specified (3.4)

16	137	Parts of speech	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
17	258	Varieties of English, creole	Exposure (1.2) [finding En sounds in English creole]	Yes (2.1) [implicit, but linked to sounds in poem]	Not specified (3.4)
18	258	English creole to Std. English	Exposure (1.2)	Yes (2.1) [linked to poem]	Not specified (3.4)
19	278	Verbs, tense	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [linked to poem]	Not specified (3.4)
20	332	Word definitions	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
21	332	Capitalization	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
22	333	Prefixes and suffixes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
23	334	Nouns in the plural	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
24	336	Verbs	AL use (1.1) [explaining in own words]	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1)
25	337	Adjectives and adverbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1)
26	337	Relative pronouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
27	337	Relative pronouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
28	338	Sentence analysis	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
29	341	Abbreviations	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1)
30	341	Abbreviations	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
31	343	Formal vs. informal En.	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1)
32	344	Verbs	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [linked paragraph just gr. context]	Not specified (3.4)
33	348	Verb forms	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
34	349	NO-EN translation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
35	349	NO-EN translation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
36	350	"Norwenglish"	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
37	350	Pronunciation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
38	353	Word classes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)

TOTALS, *STUNT*:									
38 grammar tasks in total									
432 tasks overall in the textbook		**Total occurrences of each potential outcome:**							
* issues w/ counting addressed in ch. 4		**Authentic language**			**Contextualization**		**Collaboration**		
		1.1	**1.2**	**1.3**	**2.1**	**2.2**	**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.4**
		3	4	31	8	30	5	0	1	32
		Total: 38			Total: 38		Total: 38			

		Grammar tasks in *Access to English* (2013), published by Cappelen Damm			
Task #	**Page #**	**Task topic**	**Authentic language**	**Contextualization**	**Collaboration**
1	14	Global English	Exposure (1.2) [audio of different accents]	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
2	24	Acronyms, Internet slang	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Pair work (3.1)
3	26	Modern English vs. Old English	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [text link + intro in task]	Pair work (3.1)
4	35	Translation	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
5	37	Nouns & verbs, pronunciation	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
6	38	'Treasure hunt', several topics	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Group work (3.2)
7	44	Adjectives, nouns & verbs	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1) [types of words as they appear]	Not specified (3.4)
		*activity on p.48 not included as it just refers to online tasks			
8	55	Phrases and expressions	AL use (1.1) [free discussion, integrating topic]	Yes (2.1) [how phrases are used in context]	Group work (3.2)
9	56	Word meanings, synonyms	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link too weak]	Not specified (3.4)
10	56	Word classes	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Pair work (3.1) [suggested through "to each other"]

11	60	Informal vs. formal English	None (1.3) [examples too marginal for 1.2]	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
12	60	Informal vs. formal English	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
13	60	Informal vs. formal English	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
14	68	Word meanings	None (1.3) [discussion too limited for 1.1]	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
15	68	English loan words in NO	AL use (1.1) [free discussion of wide topic]	Yes (2.1) [situational context provided in task]	Discussion (3.3) ["discuss"]
16	69	Grammar errors, EFL	None (1.3) [authentic errors, but not EN per se]	Yes (2.1) [related to text and global EN topic]	Pair work (3.1)
17	70	English loan words in NO	Exposure (1.2) [audio of Icelandic EFL speaker]	Yes (2.1) [linked to audio + context in task]	Group work (3.2)
18	78	Translation	None (1.3)	No (2.2) [text link implicit, too vague]	Not specified (3.4)
19	80	American vs. British English	AL use (1.1) [AE and BE words & pronunciation discussed freely]	No (2.2)	Discussion (3.3)
20	84	American vs. British English	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
21	84	American vs. British English	Exposure (1.2) [chat log between AE & BE speaker]	No (2.2) [no explicit context, topic link vague]	Pair work (3.1)
22	85	Standard vs. non-std. EN	Exposure (1.2) [song lyrics]	No (2.2) [topic link vague]	Not specified (3.4)
23	94	Gerunds, translation	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
24	97	Fill-in sentences	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
25	104	Idioms	None (1.3)	Yes (2.1)	Not specified (3.4)
26	119	Prepositions, question tags	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
27	125	Definite article before nouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
28	125	Proverbs, fill-in	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
29	135	Relative pronouns	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)
30	148	NO -> EN translation, word meanings	None (1.3)	No (2.2)	Not specified (3.4)

31	158	Various topics	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
32	167	Word meanings	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
33	179	Expressions, adjectives	None (1.3)		Yes (2.1) [linked to text, spec. film reviews]		Not specified (3.4)				
34	183	Varieties of English	Exposure (1.2) [audio, accents]		Yes (2.1) [linked to text + audio of speakers]		Not specified (3.4)				
35	203	The verb "mean"	None (1.3)		No (2.2) [only linguistic context given]		Not specified (3.4)				
36	203	Translation	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
37	212	Varieties of EN (AAVE)	Exposure (1.2) [AAVE in Hansberry's play]		Yes (2.1) [marginal, but linked to text]		Not specified (3.4)				
38	226	Abstract nouns, verbs	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
39	247	Subject-verb agreement	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
40	273	It/there, the verb "mean"	None (1.3)		No (2.2)		Not specified (3.4)				
TOTALS, *ACCESS TO ENGLISH*: *40 grammar tasks in total* *218 tasks overall in the textbook*											
			Total occurrences of each potential outcome:								
			Authentic language			**Contextualization**		**Collaboration**			
			1.1	**1.2**	**1.3**	**2.1**	**2.2**	**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.4**
			3	6	31	13	27	5	3	2	30