

Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers' accounts

Elin Lomgren

Department of English

Bachelor Degree Project
English Linguistics

Autumn 2022

Supervisor: Hyeseung Jeong



Stockholms
universitet

Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers' accounts

Elin Lomgren

Abstract

Language teachers' accounts regarding grammatical assessment have changed over the years. Researchers have presented conflicting approaches, methods and different materials language teachers can use when assessing pupils' L2 grammar. In addition, different researchers, within the applied linguistic field, have presented and discussed what possibly can affect teachers' accounts of underlying reasonings for certain practices. This study aims to investigate English teachers' accounts concerning grammatical assessment and reveal what methods English teachers use, further, what underlying reasonings the teachers have for their choices. To accomplish this investigation, three semi-structured interviews with English teachers from lower secondary schools in Sweden were conducted. The interviews were audio-recorded, transcribed and analysed through thematic analysis and table-coding. The results showed that the English teachers relied on four different methods when assessing their pupils L2 grammar. Grammatical assessment methods that emphasized both a traditional- and alternative assessment approach. Furthermore, all of the English teachers had several underlying reasonings for their grammatical assessment methods. The teachers considered learners' need, personal experiences, school system guidelines and time constraints. This study provides further insight to the grammatical assessment discussion within teaching English as a second language, and contributes with a perspective of how Swedish lower secondary English teachers work with grammatical assessment.

Keywords

English teachers in Sweden, English L2 grammatical assessment, grammatical assessment patterns, teachers' reasonings about assessing grammar, lower secondary school, semi-structured interviews.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Aim and research questions.....	1
2. Literature review.....	2
2.1 Approaches to language assessment.....	2
2.1.1 Traditional assessment approach.....	2
2.1.2 Alternative assessment approach.....	2
2.1.3 Previous research studies on approaches to assessing grammar.....	3
2.2 Teachers' underlying reasonings regarding language assessment.....	5
2.2.1 Borg's language teacher cognition framework.....	5
2.2.2 Teacher's self-efficacy concept.....	5
2.2.3 Syntactocentric- and communication-and-cognitive perspectives.....	6
2.2.4 Previous research studies on teachers' reasonings for assessing grammar...6	
3. Method.....	7
3.1 Motivation for qualitative methodology and semi-structured interviews...7	
3.2 Participants.....	7
3.3 Data collection.....	8
3.4 Data analysis.....	8
4. Result and discussion.....	9
4.1 Methods and approaches for assessing grammar.....	9
4.1.1 Observing pupils' oral and written productions.....	9
4.1.2 Assessing grammatical progression in a formative way.....	10
4.1.3 Doing summative assessment.....	11
4.1.4 Utilizing peer-feedback for assessing.....	12
4.2 Underlying reasonings for choosing grammatical assessment methods..13	
4.2.1 Wanting to respond to learners' needs.....	13
4.2.2 Trusting their own personal experiences.....	13
4.2.3 Affected by national- and European guidelines.....	15
4.2.4 Constrained by insufficient time resource.....	15
4.2.5 Additional analysis.....	16
5. Conclusion.....	17
6. Reference list.....	18
Appendix A - Translated email sent to participants.....	20
Appendix B - Consent form.....	21
Appendix C - Interview questions.....	23
Appendix D - Data analysis; Table coding.....	25

1.Introduction

“Language teachers have always acknowledged the inextricable link between teaching and testing, and accordingly have always assessed their students’ knowledge of grammar [...]” (Purpura, 2004, p.3). As the quote state, grammatical assessment has, for a long period of time, emphasized language teachers’ accounts of practices and cognition. However, over time, language teachers’ accounts for the methods, approaches and purposes of assessing grammar have evolved (Ebibi, Akubo, Afekereta & Bako, 2015). Purpura (2004) mentions how language teachers have changed their views on what to include and assess under “the title” of grammar. Historically, teachers often assessed their pupils’ grammar focusing on their ability to explain grammatical rules, how pupils provided skilful translations or choose correct grammatical answers in multiple-choice questions. Meanwhile more language teachers assess their pupils’ grammar by their appropriate use of grammar in a communication-based context of their second language (henceforth L2) nowadays, for example, when writing or speaking (Purpura, 2004). Therefore, as Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) note, it is important to consider how pupils’ grammar can be assessed; it would be interesting to further investigate what grammatical assessment methods Swedish lower secondary English teachers use when they assess their pupils’ L2 grammar.

A number of findings and theories about grammar within applied linguistics and linguistics have helped and shaped L2 teachers’ understanding and definition of grammatical knowledge since the 1950s (Purpura, 2004). These research findings and theories have reflected language teachers’ underlying reasonings for choosing certain assessment methods when they assess their pupils’ L2 grammar. However, new perspectives of explaining and understanding grammar have emerged (Purpura, 2004). This indicates that language teachers might have changed in their way of viewing grammar and in their underlying reasonings for choosing certain grammatical assessment methods when assessing pupils’ L2 grammar. Ebibi et al. (2015) indicate that this is an important part to discuss and emphasize regarding assessment of pupils. Hence, this study aims to investigate what underlying reasonings lower secondary English teachers in Sweden have when choosing grammatical assessment methods.

1.1 Aim and research questions

Most of the recognized research concerning grammatical assessment have been conducted elsewhere outside Sweden. Therefore, to gain further insight and contribute to the grammatical assessment research, this study is conducted nationally in Sweden and has two purposes. First, the study aims to investigate what grammatical assessment methods Swedish lower secondary English teachers use when they assess their pupils’ L2 grammar. Second, it also intends to investigate what underlying reasonings Swedish English teachers have when choosing grammatical assessment methods. To accomplish this, the study conducted semi-structured interviews with three Swedish lower secondary English teachers who actively assess grammar. The research questions are:

1. What grammatical assessment methods do English teachers in Swedish lower secondary school use to assess L2 learners' grammar?
2. What are the Swedish English teachers' underlying reasonings for their grammatical assessment methods?

2. Literature review

This literature review section introduces theoretical considerations and previous research findings about language assessment (2.1) and teachers' underlying reasonings for their different conducted decisions and actions (2.2). The literature reviewed in this section will be reflected and drawn on when I discuss the findings of my study.

2.1 Approaches to language assessment

Today there are many theoretical concepts recognizing language assessment with conflicting perspectives, different focus and performance patterns. Depending on what theoretical concept the language teacher ground in, different assessment methods will be conducted (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). What follows is a review of two common theoretical language assessment concepts, which language teachers could apply when they assess their pupils' L2 grammar.

2.1.1 Traditional assessment approach

Traditional assessment can be defined by four typical features: (1) relies on standardized tests with removed contextualized parts, (2) focuses on distinct and disconnected answers, (3) states summative test results and (4) occurs through non-interactive performances (Phongsirikul, 2018). Following this, traditional assessment corresponds to an approach called 'assessing *of* learning' which indicates that teachers use assessment methods that clearly confirms what learners know and highlights a purpose of determining the potential success the learners have attained (Ebibi et al., 2015). Also, Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) present grammatical assessment materials language teachers can use when assessing learners' L2 grammar. Some of the material clearly connects to traditional assessment such as multiple-choice and gap-filling tasks. Due to its straightforwardness and effectiveness in giving the results of assessment immediately, traditional assessment has been widely adapted by language teachers (Purpura, 2004).

2.1.2 Alternative assessment approach

Alternative assessment can be identified as a rejection to traditional assessment. To clarify, alternative assessment emphasizes a "learning-oriented approach" of assessing. This indicates a focus on the pupils' opportunities to create, perform, produce or do purposeful tasks that encourages a higher level of thinking and introduces implications of the real world (Purpura, 2004). Moreover, the alternative assessment approach focuses on long-term types of assessment where assessment is recognized as a continuous process containing a lot of various

communicative tasks. Pupils should be encouraged to state “open” and creative answers when they are assessed and therefore should the assessment involve several performances that forces learners to actively participate (Phongsirikul, 2018). Further, alternative assessment correlates to an approach called ‘*assessing for learning*’ which implies that the assessment and the methods are continuous, done over a longer period of time, cater for pupils’ needs and focuses on providing feedback to learners (Ebibi et al., 2015). As mentioned above, Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) present different grammatical assessment materials language teachers can use when they are about to assess grammar. Some of the material corresponds to alternative assessment such as information gap-test or simulation tests which all rely on some type of interaction.

To further clarify the traditional- and alternative language assessment approaches and to show the differences of performance patterns, Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) present the table below.

Table 1. Performance patterns of traditional- and alternative assessment approaches.

Traditional Assessment	Alternative assessment
One-shot, standardized exams	Continuous, long-term assessment
Timed, multiple-choice format	Untimed, free-response format
Decontextualized test items	Contextualized communicative tasks
Scores sufficient for feedback	Individualized feedback and washback
Norm-referenced scores	Criterion-referenced answers
Focus on discrete answers	Open-ended, creative answers
Summative	Formative
Oriented to product	Oriented to process
Noninteractive performances	Interactive performances
Fosters extrinsic motivation	Fosters intrinsic motivation

(Source: Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019, p.17).

2.1.3 Previous research studies on approaches to assessing grammar

Previous research report mixed findings about the traditional- and alternative approaches of assessing grammatical aspects in the classroom. The following three studies emphasizes the approaches and, therefore, have close relevance to this study.

Phongsirikul (2018) investigated 5 teachers’ and 103 students’ perceptions of traditional- and alternative types of grammatical assessment through questionnaires, to gather information regarding the assessment methods and their effectiveness. The investigation showed that both students and teachers valued traditional assessment higher in relation to reliability and validity. Teachers experienced difficulties using alternative assessment methods, reasoning that their assessment would then strongly rely on their own subjective judgements. The teacher participants felt that the alternative assessment methods did not provide the precise decisions they needed to fully assess their students’ English grammar and to distinguish

different students' abilities. Moreover, the student participants experienced that the alternative assessment methods were effective for their learning process and for preparations for a test, although they did not experience alternative assessment methods as valid tools for teachers to assess their grammar. Phongsirikul (2018) concluded that alternative assessment did not occur as an effective assessment method for either the teachers or the students. Despite this, alternative assessment is worth attempting for teachers so they create optional ways to assess grammar, develop trust to their own judgement and decision-making concerning assessment, and finally that alternative assessment methods should be conjoined with traditional assessment methods (Phongsirikul, 2018).

Larens, Díaz, Orellana and Villaón (2021) mention that language assessment has over the years been performed by English teachers mainly through two approaches: 'assessment *of* learning' or 'assessment *for* learning'. Therefore, Larens et al. (2021) conducted an exploratory case study of 205 English assessment instruments which were investigated through different principles to see what approach and method English teachers more or less relied on when assessing. The result showed that out of the 205 instruments, 148 instruments covered some grammatical assessment and that the three most used assessment instruments were: tests + rubrics, quizzes and rating scales. Meanwhile, the assessment instruments like checklists for peer- or self-assessment had a much lower frequency. Thus, Larens et al. (2021) concluded that English teachers still tend to emphasize and work with traditional assessment as well as the approach 'assessing *of* learning' when assessing, and that tests and quizzes are still the most common instrument used by English teachers when conducting assessment. Further, Larens et al. (2021) express concern about this result and suggest that teachers may need to go beyond their focus on specific knowledge and pay more attention to the use of grammar in communication when assessing.

Finally, Baleghizadeh and Zarghami (2012) report conflicted findings to the studies reviewed above. They investigated the effect of conferencing assessment (an alternative assessment instrument) on 42 EFL students' English grammar. Conferencing assessment relies on purposeful conversations or discussions between pupils and teachers where focus is on pupils' needs through the experiencing learning (Baleghizadeh & Zarghami, 2012). The students were assigned to either a control group or an experimental group, where the latter worked with conferencing assessment (alternative assessment). The result showed that the method of conferencing assessment (alternative assessment) significantly improved the students' grammar. Moreover, the result showed that the students' attitudes had increasingly changed when integrating with conferencing assessment (alternative assessment) and that they were more positive towards grammar assessment. Baleghizadeh and Zarghami (2012) concluded that the impact of conferencing assessment (alternative assessment), were positive and that teachers should integrate teaching, learning and assessment to emphasize positive effects on EFL student's achievements concerning grammar.

2.2 Teachers' underlying reasonings regarding language assessment

Hence, what follows reviews three theoretical concepts concerning teachers underlying reasonings that could influence their assessment practices, including their grammar assessment practice.

2.2.1 Borg's language teacher cognition framework

Through extensive research, Borg (2006) noticed that language teachers could be influenced as well as affected by various factors and implied that these factors differently were involved in the language teachers' teaching practices and performances. To bring further understanding, Borg (2006) created a framework to specify areas of the teachers' cognition and show how different elements and processes might reflect, for example, teachers reasonings for choosing grammatical assessment. Through his framework, Borg (2006) indicates what specific aspects, for instance, that can influence teachers' assessment methods. To provide a concise overview of this complexity of the teachers' cognition, Borg presents in *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*, a visual representation of the framework involving three main elements and processes that can influence language teachers' cognition (2006, p.283). The first element is 'schooling' and includes personal history as well as specific classroom experiences that determine preconceptions of education. The second element is 'professional coursework' which might affect the existing cognitions of the language teacher. Lastly, the third element and process are 'contextual factors' affecting classroom practice, including performances both inside- and outside the classrooms. Overall, Borg (2006) proposes his framework as a tool to explore language teachers' cognition and why they perform or have the accounts for what they do.

2.2.2 Teacher's self-efficacy concept

Self-efficacy theory is widely used throughout various research areas where Fathi, Greenier and Derakhshan (2021) extended the concept within their research by implementing it into understanding teacher's self-efficacy. Fathi et al. explain that teacher's self-efficacy can be described as: "instructors' beliefs regarding their capacity to make a difference in their students' academic performance" (2021, p.15). Teacher's self-efficacy comprehends three categories: classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies. Classroom management refers to teachers' viewpoint of their ability to operate various classroom matters. Student engagement concerns teachers' belief in their ability to engage the students in their events. Instructional strategies refer to teachers' belief in their ability to use new or different strategies for raising the instructional effectiveness (Fathi et al., 2021). Fathi et al. (2021) mention the effect of self-efficacy on teacher's practice with a teacher of high self-efficacy as an example. According to them, a highly self-efficacious teacher can be extra enthusiastic, be committed to their profession and be more responsive to new ideas and truly care about their learner' needs.

2.2.3 Syntactocentric- and communication-and-cognitive perspectives

Linguistic theories also help understanding language teachers' views on grammar and their ways of assessing grammar. Two distinct linguistic theoretical perspectives that are commonly taken by language teachers when assessing grammar is the syntactocentric- and communication-and-cognition perspective (Purpura, 2004). The syntactocentric perspective primarily focuses on syntax, where syntax is the grammatical "building-block" and the central aspect. In other words, language is viewed as an abstract object where structures should be independently recognized (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997). Based on this perspective, when grammatical assessment is conducted, the teacher would focus mostly on word placement in clauses or sentences without considering meaning and content. By contrast, the communication-and-cognition perspective focuses on language as an abstract system which identifies within human cognition and communication (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997). Therefore, when assessing based on the communication-and-cognition perspective, the teacher would treat grammar as a source of accomplishment for the language and that the grammar assessment would attend both structure and meaning of the assessed sentences.

2.2.4 Previous research studies on teachers' reasonings for assessing grammar

The findings of the two studies reviewed in the following resonate closely with two of the three theoretical considerations about the language teachers' cognition and beliefs presented above.

Narathakoon, Sapsirin and Subphadoongchone (2020) conducted a two-phase study on English teachers' beliefs and classroom assessment practices. By using a questionnaire in the first phase and observation as well as semi-structured interviews in the second phase, the study revealed various factors that shaped and affected the English teachers' reasonings of assessment and their classroom assessment practices. Some factors that were found were the teachers' earlier schooling, their teacher training, their informal collaboration (communication with other teachers within the school district) and contextual factors (educational policy, time constraints or excessive workload). Based on their results, Narathakoon et al. (2020) concluded that different factors rather than just one specific factor seemed to influence and shape English teachers' reasonings for different classroom assessment practices, for example, grammatical assessment.

Similarly, Yin (2010) investigated teachers' thinking concerning classroom language assessment. Yin (2010) found that the teachers had numerous of related cognitions that they were influenced by when conducting assessment of their pupils. The result was categorized under two titles: strategic- and interactive cognitions. For instance, two of the strategic cognitions were class parameters, which highlights number of students along with timing of class sessions, as well as course syllabus and summative assessments. Further, two of the interactive cognitions were assessment principles, which emphasizes personal sets of assessment principles, and projection which indicates that teachers to some extent imagine the students' knowledge (for more information, see Yin, 2010, p.182-190). Based on these findings, Yin (2010) concluded that the strategic- and the interactive cognitions could be seen

as basic patterns of language teachers thinking, even though, the cognitions appeared to be uniquely created in connection to the teacher participants' backgrounds and experiences.

3. Method

This section presents the method that was used to answer this study's research questions. The methodological approach is presented first, followed by the descriptions of participants, the data collection and the data analysis. Throughout the descriptions of participants, ethical considerations were discussed. The participants were given fictitious names to secure their privacy and integrity.

3.1 Motivation for qualitative methodology and semi-structured interviews

The study had a qualitative approach and a method of semi-structured interviews with guided prepared questions, which, in applied linguistics, is one of the most common forms of data collection procedures (Dörnyei, 2007). With a layout of open-ended questions, I could let the participants elaborate with the questions in an explanatory manner, as Dörnyei (2007) suggested. Further, since semi-structured interviews provide a rich understanding of how a certain "service" is performed by active providers within that service (Adeoye & Olenik, 2021), the method was considered suitable for obtaining English teachers' accounts of grammatical assessment.

Also, according to Adeoye and Olenik (2021), semi-structured interviews allow the questions to be asked in a flexible way where follow-up probe questions can be added. Therefore, since the study's research questions do not have straight-forward answers and are aimed to provide an improved exploratory in-depth understanding of English teachers' assessing accounts, the method was considered to best suit the purpose of the study.

3.2 Participants

Following the advice by Dörnyei (2007), data were collected from a smaller number of three participants to gather the valuable data needed to answer the research questions and to understand the precise meanings of the phenomenon in focus: teachers' grammatical assessment methods as well as teachers' underlying reasonings concerning grammar assessment.

The participants were selected through criterion sampling which included predetermined criteria the teachers needed to fulfil (Dörnyei, 2007). The criteria were: (1) be an active, lower secondary school, English teacher in Sweden; (2) teach English for classes 7-9; (3) have an English teacher license or currently study to receive one; and (4) actively assess their learners' English grammar. This was done in order to streamline the study's work, save time and to ensure the study's purpose since this study was conducted throughout a limited time frame.

The participants worked at different schools and had different years of experience, between 2-25 years as English teachers. Two participants were women and one was a man. However, gender and teaching experience variables were not considered in this study as extracting trends, since these types of variables cannot be further investigated with the qualitative design of this study. Following paragraphs present the profiles of the participants briefly.

Kristoffer taught English and two more subjects at a lower secondary school in Stockholm. Kristoffer had been teaching for twenty years and taught English for classes 7-9. He had an English teaching license conducted through university studies.

Helen taught English at a lower secondary school in Stockholm. Helen had been teaching English for two years and for classes 6, 7 and 8. She was studying to get her teaching license specifically for English.

Annika taught English and one more subject at a lower secondary school in Stockholm. Annika had been teaching for twenty-five years and she taught English to all of the lower secondary school classes 7-9 at the school. She had an English teaching license, conducted by university studies.

3.3 Data collection

The participants were contacted via e-mail (see appendix A) either directly or through the school's assistant principal. The participants were informed about the study's purpose and participation in the e-mail. Before the interview, the consent form (see appendix B) was read together by the interviewees and me, and then signed by both parties. The consent form included information about the study and interview, about the management of the interview material and information about their rights for confidentiality, privacy, integrity and to whenever withdraw their participation. The interviews were audio-recorded, for which all participants had given their consent by signing the consent form.

The interviews lasted for 35-45 minutes and were conducted in Swedish, the participants' first language. Even though the teachers have the proficiency to conduct the interview in English, the decision to interview in Swedish was made to help the participants feel more comfortable and be able to spontaneously answer and elaborate their answers without having any concerns about their speech formulations or fluency. The interviews started with background questions followed by topic-based questions prepared in relation to the research questions (see appendix C).

3.4 Data analysis

The recordings were verbatim transcribed with help of the digital transcription tool in Microsoft Word, which were then edited for further clarity and precision. In total, the transcriptions obtained 18 092 words stating 33 pages of collected material. The data analysis was done through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2022), where the table coding method was used in relation to the research questions (see appendix D) to assure the

study's purpose. The transcriptions were independently read, several times, and teachers central accounts were established. Some accounts needed a further enhanced investigation before they were to be totally established. Then, the central accounts of each teacher were placed within the table under a mutual theme, which were connected to the research questions and the reviewed literature. Key extracts from the interviews were fixed, cited and translated. The original Swedish extracts were considered as the most reliable, in relation to the translated data, and were used as the primary material for the analysis and discussion.

4. Result and discussion

This section presents this study's findings and discussion of them, in which the literature reviewed in section 2 is connected. Subsection 4.1 addresses research question 1 about teacher participants' grammatical assessment methods for assessing their pupils' L2 grammar. Subsection 4.2 responds to research question 2 and concerns the underlying reasonings the teachers had for using certain grammatical assessment methods. Each interview-extract is presented originally in Swedish and with an English translation. The teacher of the extract is referred by fictitious name.

4.1 Methods and approaches for assessing grammar

4.1.1 Observing pupils' oral and written productions

All three teachers report that some type of oral- or written productions are used for assessing learners' English grammar. For example, Kristoffer assesses his pupils' L2 grammar when they are in an "active mode" producing something with their grammar:

<i>... har vi jobbat med komparation av adjektiv, så ska man kunna använda det i ett aktivt läge både muntligt och skriftligt på den nivå som eleven befinner sig.</i> (Kristoffer)	<i>... if we have worked with comparison of adjectives, pupils should be able to use it in an active mode both orally and in writing at their level.</i>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Annika likewise reports that her grammatical assessment strongly relies on pupils' writing- and oral productions where grammatical structures of phrases are analysed and assessed:

<i>...framför allt handlar det om att i deras produktioner så går vi in och tittar på. Ja fraser då strukturer och så. Så dels texter men också deras muntliga produktioner behöver man ju titta över ibland</i> (Annika)	<i>...above all, it is a matter of going in and recognizing phrases and structures and so on. So, both texts but also their oral productions need to be checked sometimes</i>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Helen also mentions that the easiest way assessing learners' L2 grammar is by observing pupils' written assignments. What the teachers' accounts for using oral- and writing productions as a grammatical assessment method shows is that they appear to adapt alternative assessment (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Ebibi et al., 2015; Phongsirikul, 2018; Purpura, 2004). Using pupils' productions, the teachers showcase a grammatical assessment method of creative and free-response format, interactive performance and contextualized communicative tasks that are parts of what Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) describe as alternative assessment (see Table 1 in the literature review section). In addition, the teachers use of alternative assessment is aligned with Baleghizadeh and Zarghami's (2012) results of conferencing assessment as a form of alternative assessment, which indicated that teachers should integrate learning, teaching and grammar assessment to receive an improved grammar among the pupils.

4.1.2. Assessing grammatical progression in a formative way

The teachers also indicate that when assessing their pupils' grammar, the assessment needs to be viewed as a work of continuous progression over time in a formative way, rather than only looking at students' performances at the end of a term or year, or as examining static specific instances, as seen in Annika's and Kristoffer's statements:

<i>Jag tänker att det [bedöma grammatik] är 3 års projekt.</i> (Annika)	I think that it [assessing grammar] is a three-year project.
<i>I allt som man introducerar ska det ju finnas en progression och det är snarare progressionen som bedöms från sjuan till nian inom alla grammatiska moment [...]</i> (Kristoffer)	Everything introduced must be a progression and it is rather the progression that is assessed from seventh to ninth within all grammatical elements [...]

Helen's account in the following complements the other two teachers' point on long-term formative assessment:

<i>De [eleverna] blir ju aldrig betygsätta på enskilda uppgifter, så gör man ju inte.</i> (Helen)	They [pupils] will in fact never be graded on individual tasks. That is not how you do it.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

This use of long-term and formative assessment as a grammatical assessment method, once again, indicates that the teachers are willing to try alternative assessment methods rather than limiting their assessment only to traditional ways (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Ebibi et al., 2015; Phongsirikul, 2018). By focusing on assessing the pupils' L2 grammar over a longer period of time and focusing on their continuous progression, the teachers resonate with the 'assessing *for* learning' approach which is also strongly connected to the alternative assessment approach (Ebibi et al., 2015). Moreover, the teachers use of long-term formative

grammatical assessment, clearly, identify with two aspects of alternative assessment described in the table by Brown and Abeywickrama (2019): working with long-term and continuous assessment as well as being formative.

4.1.3 Doing summative assessment

As reported above, while assessing their pupils' grammar in a formative way and focus on the learners' progressive development, the teachers also report a use of summative assessment when assessing pupils' L2 grammar. In other words, teachers aim to summarize, check or evaluate what the pupils have grasped and learned so far (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). Interestingly, since the two methods mentioned above highlight forms of formative assessment, this suggests that the teachers are utilizing both types and are not specifically relying more on one. To continue, Kristoffer explains that he sometimes uses forms of summative assessment such as digital gap-filling tasks or classical interrogations when assessing his learners' grammar:

<i>Jag har konstruerat någonting på "Digiexam" till exempel, där man [eleverna] ska sätta in rätt saker [grammatiska ordklasser] i luckor till exempel, det [bedöma grammatik] kan det absolut vara...det kan vara mer traditionellt ett, ett förhör där de faktiskt också ska sätta ord på att de kan koppla ihop...verb. (Kristoffer)</i>	I have constructed something on "Digiexam", for example, where you [pupils] have to put the right things [grammatical word classes] in gaps, for instance, it [assessing grammar] can absolutely be that...it can be a more traditional, an interrogation where they actually must put into words that they can connect...verbs.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Likewise, Annika also applies somewhat decontextualized written grammar tasks for summative assessment:

<i>Om jag tänker klassiskt uppdelade skriftliga grammatiska övningar, kanske det har vi inte så hemskt mycket av. Däremot så lägger vi till sådana övningar ibland vid behov. (Annika)</i>	If I think traditionally divided written grammar tasks, maybe we do not do it an awful lot. Nevertheless, sometimes we add such tasks if needed.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Helen also reports summative assessment where standardized tests such as individual quizzes or "glossary interrogations" are used and scores are counted:

<i>...glosförhör där de [eleverna] ska fylla i rätt form och verbet på svenska. Och då drar jag av poäng om de[eleverna] inte stavar rätt. (Helen)</i>	...glossary interrogation where they [pupils] have to fill in the correct form and verb in Swedish. And then I deduct points if they [pupils] do not spell correctly.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The teachers' accounts for using different tests and tasks as a summative grammatical assessment method indicates that they also seem to adapt traditional assessment (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Ebibi et al., 2015; Phongsirikul, 2018). By using decontextualized test and task items, standardized exams, noninteractive performances and score settings, the teachers demonstrate many aspects of the traditional assessment approach Brown and Abeywickrama (2019) characterize. Further, this resembles with Larens et al.'s (2021) results showing that English teachers still assess grammar through traditional assessment methods, and this finding also corresponds to Phongsirikul (2018) results of English teachers using as well as valuing traditional assessment methods highly. In relation to the presented findings above, it seems like, as mentioned earlier, that the teachers tend to be both practical and pragmatic by using formative- and summative assessment. So, depending on needs of both teachers and students, the methods are to be, principally, overlapping and dynamically used throughout each other.

4.1.4 Utilizing peer-feedback for assessing

Among the three teachers, Kristoffer talks about his practice of utilizing pupils' own knowledge as a resource to assess their grammar, in the form of peer-feedback with checklists:

<p><i>Jag jobbar ganska mycket med kamratrespons...det [bedöma grammatik] kan ske på väldigt många olika sätt...som en individuell uppgift då. Enligt det här mönstret som jag [läraren] anger, ge feedback på den här texten...Eller så kan det vara att de [eleverna] sitter i grupper och diskuterar och läser upp sina texter och kanske upptäcker att en text...var svår att läsa. Varför var den svår att läsa? Vad är det som gör den svår att läsa? Är det meningsbyggnad? Är det grammatik?</i> (Kristoffer)</p>	<p>I work quite a lot with peer-feedback [...] it [assessing grammar] can happen in many different ways [...] as an individual task then. According to this pattern that I [teacher] specify, give feedback on this text [...] Or it could be that they [pupils] sit in groups and discuss and read their texts and maybe find that a text [...] was difficult to read. Why was this text difficult to read? What makes it hard to read? Is it sentence construction? Is it grammar?</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What Kristoffer shows regarding utilizing peer-feedback with checklists as a grammatical assessment method is interesting since the method tends to, both in relation to the other participants and to previous research, not be a commonly used grammatical assessment method. As can be noted, neither Annika nor Helen indicate that they use this method for assessing learners' grammar. In addition, Larens et al. (2021) indicate, drawn on their investigation of 205 assessment instruments, that methods such as checklists for peer- or self-assessment have a lower usage comparing to quizzes and test. On that note, Kristoffer's explanation of often using utilized peer-feedback with checklists is found interesting since it tends to be a rare grammatical assessment method among this study's English teachers but also among national English teachers. Parallel to this, Kristoffer's

account also interestingly highlights another described aspect of alternative assessment, that is not mentioned earlier, by Ebibi et al. (2015) that teachers use various methods and focuses on providing feedback to their learners when assessing through alternative assessment which is the case of Kristoffer's accounts.

4.2 Underlying reasonings for choosing grammatical assessment methods

4.2.1 Wanting to respond to learners' needs

The teachers all believe that learners and their needs are strongly connected to their choices of grammatical assessment methods, where learners' needs are more emphasized as the main underlying reason, as shown in Kristoffer's and Helen's accounts:

<i>Jag skulle så gärna vilja säga att det var någon sån här pedagogisk metod som man har läst eller någonting sånt där, men det är inte det. Utan allt det här är för mig intimt kopplat till mina elever.</i> (Kristoffer)	I would like to say that it was some kind of pedagogical method that you have read or something like that, but it is not. Yet, all of this is, for me, intimately connected to my pupils.
<i>...att se ett behov och sen försöka uppfylla det behovet på något sätt och sen så har man [lärare], om man har tur några metoder i sin arsenal som man kan dra fram... (Helen)</i>	...to notice a need and then try to fulfill that need in some way, and then if you [teacher] are lucky you have some methods in your arsenal that you can draw on...

Annika likewise highlights learners' needs as an underlying reason for choosing certain methods to assess grammar since the ultimate goal of teacher performances including grammatical assessment is learners' needs to develop an accurate and functional language:

<i>Nej, men det är ju för att eleven ska få ett så korrekt och fungerande språk som möjligt, så det är för elevens skull.</i> (Annika)	No, but it is for the pupils so they will get a correct and functional language as possible, so it is for the learners.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Interestingly, this result does not correspond to any of the three elements or processes, Borg (2006) indicates can affect language teachers' cognition when conducting different teaching practices. However, it strongly aligns with Fathi et al.'s (2021) description of a teacher with high self-efficacy, who often truly care for their learners' needs. The finding, to some extent, also resembles Yin's (2010) results of the interactive cognition named projection, where teachers seek to figure out their learners' needs through their imagination of the learners.

4.2.2 Trusting their own personal experiences

Besides wanting to respond to learners' needs, the teachers draw on their own personal experiences as a learner and teacher to find reason for choosing certain grammar assessment

methods. Helen explains her personal experiences through the lens of social constructivism, which signifies her belief in the importance of emphasizing social interaction for learning and assessing:

<i>Jag som ett barn av min tid har blivit marinerad i social konstruktivismen. Att inte tänka att lärandet sker i kontakt med andra och i och med mötet med den andra så blir det till omöjligt. Det går inte att tänka utanför det...Så det går inte att inte ha en spegel när det gäller språk.</i> (Helen)	Me, as a child of my time, have been marinated in social constructivism. It is impossible not to count that learning takes place in contact with others and through the meeting with the other. It is not possible to think outside of that...So, it is impossible not to have a mirror when it comes to language.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Meanwhile, Annika indicates how her personal experiences of participating in research projects and having discussions with colleagues have helped and shaped her reasonings:

<i>...tack vare att jag har fått mycket input från mina kollegor och att vi har blivit, utsatt oss för lite forskningsprojekt och vi har suttit och grottat lite kring, kring bedömning och kring hur man gör upplägg...</i> (Annika)	...thanks to the fact that I have received a lot of input from my colleagues and that we have exposed ourselves to some research projects and that we have sat down and dug into assessment and how to make plans...
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Considering personal experiences as something that shape reasons behind grammar assessment, it was also found in the interview with Kristoffer, who explains such consideration in relation to testing different grammatical assessment methods:

<i>Och anledningen till att jag tycker att mina fungerar bra, men det är ju också för att dom fungerar för mig. Men jag har ju provat alltså att göra på [bedöma grammatik], på väldigt många olika sätt.</i> (Kristoffer)	And the reason why I think mine works well, but that is also because they work for me. But I have tried to do it [assessing grammar], in many different ways.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

It is noted that the teachers have personal experiences that differently have affected their underlying reasonings when choosing grammatical assessment methods. Clearly, this relates to Borg's (2006) framework highlighting the two elements 'schooling' and 'contextual factors' for classroom practices. Helen's personal experience showcases the schooling element which implies that teachers can be affected by earlier teaching techniques or teachers. Annika's and Kristoffer's personal experiences highlight Borg's contextual factors element which suggest that teachers can be affected by inside- and outside classrooms actions. Furthermore, to some extent, this replicates Narathakoon et al.'s (2020) results that English teachers can be affected by personal experiences of earlier schooling and informal collaborations with other colleagues when conducting different performances.

4.2.3 Affected by national- and European guidelines

Following national- and European guidelines as an underlying reason when choosing grammatical assessment methods emerges from Annika's and Helen's statements:

<i>Tittar man på hur de [Europeiska riktlinjer], är skrivna, de är ju väldigt konkreta...det är kommunikativa handlingar. Och det, det påverkar, har påverkat mig mycket.</i> (Annika)	If you look at how they [European guidelines], are written, they are very concrete...it is communicative actions. And that, that affects, have affected me a lot.
<i>Läroplanen [nationella riktlinjer], absolut, men där dyker det ju mer upp så här...det blir ju bara färdmedlet för bedömningen.</i> (Helen)	The curriculum [national guidelines], absolutely, however it appears more like this...it becomes the vehicle for the assessment

Considering previous research studies, this finding correlates with Narathakoon et al.'s (2020) results of English teachers being affected by contextual factors such as educational policy in their reasonings of grammatical assessment. Moreover, since both Annika and Helen talk about being, to some extent, affected by European- and national guidelines they also unravel being affected by educational policy. Due to the fact that it is the educational policy who have formed and created these documents of guidelines. In addition, this finding also lines up with Yin's (2010) finding of the affecting strategic cognition named 'the course syllabus and summative assessments'. However, only the course syllabus part. As Yin describes the syllabus, as a national guideline, indicates a "comprised part of what teachers look for" (2010, p.184) and can therefore affect the teachers' assessment practices, which for this study is the case for Helen.

4.2.4 Constrained by insufficient time resource

Annika explains that assessment, generally, is time demanding due to different motifs. Through her statement it can be recognized that insufficient time resources seem to affect her assessment choices, which therefore also affects her in choosing methods for assessing grammar:

<i>Man [läraren], har ju 80 elever i varje årskurs. Så det [bedömning], tar ju mycket, mycket tid och då ska det ju vara värt det.</i> (Annika)	You [teacher], have 80 pupils in each grade. So, it [assessing], takes a lot, a lot of time and then it has to be worth it.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Even though this reasoning is not mentioned by Helen and Kristoffer, Annika's statement is still interesting since it strongly aligns with the presented results of the previous research studies. This reasoning is related to Narathakoon et al.'s (2020) data that shows the same result of time constraints as an underlying reason among English teachers' grammatical

assessment choices. Further, this corresponds to Yin's (2010) other strategic cognition 'the class parameter', which highlights teachers' consideration for the number of pupils there are in a class when choosing their practises, which in fact Annika highlights.

4.2.5 Additional analysis

Adding to the presented findings above in 4.2, it should be noted that none of the teachers did explicitly report that they considered linguistic theories as an underlying reason when choosing their grammatical assessment methods. However, after further analyzation it was noticed that the teachers to some extent unconsciously emphasized linguistic theories throughout their underlying reasonings. For example, Kristoffer explains that when assessing grammar through the pupils' written productions, the overall productions need to be understandable:

<i>Jag ska fortfarande kunna förstå texten och innehållet, förklaringarna och beskrivningarna och vem det är som tänker vad och så vidare.</i> (Kristoffer)	I should still be able to understand the text and the content, the explanations and descriptions as well as who is thinking what and so on.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

This means that he wants to see if and how pupils are using grammar for expressing what they want to say in a clear and correct way. In this case, for Kristoffer, grammar should be functional and should not be separated from meaning. On that note, it could be said that the underlying linguistic theoretical assumption that Kristoffer displayed seems to represent the theoretical linguistic communication-and-cognition perspective that Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) describe. On the other hand, as reported earlier, through using summative assessment by specific grammatical tests, Helen reasoned that a focus should be on how learners are "pinpointing" their grammatical knowledge:

<i>De [eleverna] lär sig, studerar in och sen så får de plocka fram den kunskapen vid ett väldigt tydligt "det här bedöms bara dina verb" [bedömningstillfälle] [...] en komponent i att bedöma språkriktigheten [...]</i>	They [pupils] learn, study and then they "pinpoint" that knowledge at a very clear "this is only where your verbs are assessed" [assessment occasion] [...] a component in assessing language correctness [...]
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Helen, through her method, wants to see if the pupils have fully understood the grammar that has been presented to them. In comparison to Kristoffer's accounts above, Helen emphasizes through this method that grammar should be separated from meaning and an aspect that is individually assessed. Therefore, her accounts for this type of grammar assessment seem to closely rely with the theoretical syntactocentric perspective (Valin & LaPolla, 1997).

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate English teachers' accounts regarding L2 grammatical assessment in a Swedish lower secondary school context. It was found that the English teachers appeared to apply various grammatical assessment methods where individual differences emerged. The teachers used all of oral- and written productions, long-term formative and summative assessment. Additionally, one teacher utilized peer-feedback with checklists. This variation among the teacher participants shows that they did not just stick to one or two specific assessment methods to assess their pupils' L2 grammar, rather, they dynamically shifted between methods. In addition, three of the four grammatical assessment methods they practiced can be regarded as alternatives to traditional assessment (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019; Ebibi et al., 2015; Phongsirikul, 2018; Purpura, 2004). This indicates that the English teachers of this study were willing to find alternative ways to assess grammar based on their reasonings, preferences and theories about L2 grammar assessment. Moreover, it was found that the English teachers had different underlying reasonings for choosing grammatical assessment methods, which were learners' needs, personal experiences, European- and national guidelines as well as time constraints. Noticeably, the participants' reasonings behind their grammar assessment practice appeared to have emerged mostly from external- and internal personal viewpoints about language and grammar.

Thus, for the English teachers in this study, the opportunity of being able to independently choose what grammatical assessment methods to use, seem to be appreciated in their teaching situation. In a larger educational context, this finding supports the Swedish National Agency for Education's choice of not specifically determining how grammatical assessment should be conducted. Furthermore, the findings of the English teachers' individual differences and dynamic shifting between assessment methods indicate that they did not solely depend on traditional assessment, while the majority of the previous research studies (see section 2.1.3) have stated that English teachers mostly rely on methods emerging from traditional assessment approaches. On that note, I mean that this could be an important recognition for university teachers at English teacher programs to acknowledge and present with their English teacher students when discussing how grammar and assessment should be approached.

In addition, for one English teacher in this study, the personal underlying external reasoning of being constrained by insufficient time resources seemed to be quite a considered underlying reasoning. In relation to the previous presented theoretical concepts (see section 2.2.1, 2.2.2 & 2.2.3), this finding can be viewed as a further suggestion of what can affect teachers' accounts for different conducted practices. However, this is not a unique or new finding, it has been noticed by previous international research (see section 2.2.4). Instead, my study contributes to confirming that teachers in Sweden have to struggle with insufficient time for doing their work properly. Further, the finding of the English teachers' unique preferences regarding underlying reasonings indicates that the teachers seemed to value external personal reasonings higher than internal personal reasonings. Moreover, this finding suggests that the English teachers relied much more on their external reasonings when choosing grammatical

assessment methods, while previous research (see section 2.2.4) showed that teachers commonly depended on internal personal reasonings. Therefore, in relation to a larger educational context, I mean once again that this could be a helpful recognition for English university teachers to emphasize for their English teacher students in their development toward grasping assessment as a concept. For the reason to make the English teacher students become sufficiently informed about the possibilities of finding reasonings for their assessment practices.

Due to the fact that this was a small study entirely based on three English teachers' subjective accounts within a limited timeframe, the findings should not be generalized as understanding English teachers' grammatical assessment in Sweden. To create a generalized understanding, further investigation is needed by means of different methods or observations. For that reason, in future studies, one could conduct a larger quantitative follow-up study of this current study by expanding the number of participants as well as their locations. Secondly, one could extend this research by a second-phase observation, and go in into the classrooms when the teachers are about to assess their learners' L2 grammar and observe if the teachers work with the methods they present in this study's interviews. Thirdly, one could conduct a quasi-experimental study where two or more of the found grammatical assessment methods are practically tested in a classroom where the learners' results are gathered to specifically determine what methods are the most effective.

6. Reference list

- Adeoye, O.O.A., & Olenik, N.L. (2021). Research and scholarly methods: Semi structured interviews. *Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy*, 4(10), p.1358-1367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1441> Retrieved October 10, 2022.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Zarghami, Z. (2012). The impact of conferencing assessment on EFL students' grammar learning (Impacto de la evaluación mediante conferencias en el aprendizaje de la gramática en estudiantes de inglés como lengua extranjera). *PROFILE: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), p.131-144. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1051567.pdf> Retrieved October 14, 2022.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: research and practice*. London: Continuum.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: a practical guide*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Brown, H.D. & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ebibi, J.O., Akubo, E. A., Afekereta, B.A & Bako, V. N. (2015). Teachers' assessment patterns and their effect on senior secondary students' achievement and retention in English grammar. *AFRREV LALIGENS: An International Journal of*

- Language, Literature and Gender Studies*, 4(1), p.151-162.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/laligens.v4i1.12> Retrieved September 26, 2022.
- Fathi, J., Greenier, V., & Derakhshan, A. (2021). Self-efficacy, reflection, and burnout among Iranian EFL teachers: The mediating role of emotion regulation. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 9(2), p.13-37. doi: 10.30466/IJLTR.2021.121043 Retrieved November 6, 2022.
- Larenas, C.D., Díaz, A.J., Orellana, Y.R., & Villalón, M.J.S., (2021) Exploring the principles of English assessment instruments. *Ensaio*, 29(111), p.461-483.
<https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-403620210002902851> Retrieved October 13, 2022.
- Narathakoon, A., Sapsirin, S., & Subphadoongchone, P. (2020). Beliefs and classroom assessment practise of English teachers in primary schools in Thailand. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), p.137-156.
<https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13310a> Retrieved October 12, 2022.
- Phongsirikul, M. (2018). Traditional and alternative Assessments in ELt: Students' and teachers' perceptions. *REFlections*, 25(1), p.61-84. Retrieved from Institute of education Sciences ERIC.
- Purpura, J.E. (2004). *Assessing Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733086> Retrieved September 5, 2022.
- Van Valin, R.D & LaPolla, R.J. (1997). *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, M. (2010). Understanding classroom language assessment through teacher thinking research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 7(2), p.175-194.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15434300903447736> Retrieved November 7, 2022.

Appendix A – Translated email sent to participants

Hello <name of participant or school>!

My name is Elin Lomgren and I am a student at Stockholm University (SU) studying my second subject English within the teacher program. This e-mail is an inquiry as to you would like to help me with my degree project.

Currently, I am writing my BA degree project for the course English III. For this project, based on my own interest and future profession as an English teacher, I have decided to investigate how active English teachers in lower secondary school (classes 7-9) assess L2 learners' grammar. The participation involves an audio recorded interview for approximately 45 minutes where questions regarding assessment of L2 learners' grammar will be asked.

My hopes are that the interview will lead to an educational and interesting conversation. I hope you have the time to participate and help me with this investigation for my BA degree project! If you want and can be my participant, please reply to this e-mail. I will then send more details about the project including a consent letter, and we will schedule a time for the interview at your convenience.

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Kind regards
Elin Lomgren

Appendix B – Consent form

Elin Lomgren
elin.lomgren@gmail.com 073–0655368

Consent letter for participating in my study, “Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers’ accounts”

I am Elin Lomgren, a student at Stockholm University (SU) studying English as my second subject in the teacher education program. Currently, I am writing my BA degree project for the course English III. For this project I investigate secondary school (year 7-9) English teachers’ accounts about assessing L2 learners’ grammar, focusing on how the teachers assess grammar, their reasons behind using particular methods, and how they understand and perceive their pupils’ responses to grammar assessment.

The participation involves an interview for approximately 45 minutes where questions regarding assessment of L2 learners’ grammar will be asked. Also, with consent from participant, supplementary material will be collected such as assessed material or rubrics. The participation is confidential, voluntary and participants can, at any time, withdraw from participating without explaining reasons. With your consent, I will audio record the interview and have it transcribed afterwards. You as a participant can ask to stop the audio recording at any time, in the doubtful event that delicate issues should come up throughout the interview or for any other reason.

The material of the interview will be handled with care in a safe space and only be used for this degree project’s investigation. The data will be deleted after the conclusion of the project, in line with GDPR. Any information that could reveal identities will be removed. No personal- or school names will be mentioned, instead, pseudonyms names will be used. The audio recorded interviews will be transcribed and read by the researcher Elin Lomgren. Furthermore, the transcriptions might be shared to the researcher’s supervisor Hyeseung Jeong, for further supervision during the writing process. The researcher Elin Lomgren and the supervisor Hyeseung Jeong, will be the two people that ever read the whole transcriptions.

If further questions would occur, please do not hesitate to contact me or my supervisor.

Me: Elin Lomgren elin.lomgren@gmail.com

Supervisor: Hyeseung Jeong hyeseung.jeong@english.su.se

Consent to participating in the research project

Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers' accounts

I have read and understood the information about the study in the document "Consent letter for research project Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers' accounts". I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and I have had them answered. I may keep the written information.

☐ I consent to participating in the study described in the document "Consent letter for research project Assessing L2 grammar: English teachers' accounts".

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Place, Date: _____

Appendix C – Interview questions

Background information

Would you please introduce yourself as an English teacher?

- Age:
- Multilingual:
- Years as an English teacher:
- Classes of teaching:
- English teacher degree and teaching license:
- Pedagogical and linguistic practice:

Topic-based interview questions:

Tell me how you assess your pupils' grammar, all the different ways you use for assessing grammar.

What types of material/assignments do you use when you are assessing your pupils' grammar?

To follow up, what are the prior grammatical features you focus on when you assess grammar?

Do you implement technology (for example, computer-based scoring) when you assess L2 learners' grammar?

How do you plan and organize your assessment? Do you have standardized- or long-term periods focusing on assessment?

What is your significant role when you assess your pupils' grammar? For example, are you an observer, a mediator or a participant?

Do you assess pupils' L2 grammar in an individual-or a group setting?

- Why do use this type of setting?
- What are the advantages?

You have told me you use _____. Would you be able to tell me if you have any particular reasons to use them? I will ask some specific questions, but before that it would be great to hear your thoughts first.

Why do you think it is specifically important to assess L2 learners' grammar?

Why do you think your choice of material/assignments are the most effective to assess your pupils' grammar?

- As a teacher, what are the advantages of your methods?

To follow up, do you believe that there are assessment methods that should not be used to assess L2 students' grammar?

What would you say have influenced/inspired you to use your assessment methods when assessing your pupils' grammar?

The knowledge requirements for English, in lower secondary school, does not explicitly say how grammar should be assessed. Does that effect your reasons on how to assess your pupils' grammar?
- If yes, in what ways?

Some researchers state that English teachers consider researched based linguistic theories when they assess pupils' grammar. What is your view on this?
- Do you believe that you origin from a linguistic theory? If, yes what type?

When you assess grammar, who are you assessing for? For instance, your performance as a teacher, your students learning or for the curriculum?

If your pupils were asked to give feedback to your grammar assessment methods today, what do you think they would say?

During your years of teaching, have pupils commented your grammar assessment methods?
- If yes, what have they expressed?

To follow up, why do you think they said what they said?

What do you believe are your pupils' attitudes towards your grammatical assessment methods?

Appendix D – Data analysis; Table coding

RQ 1: What assessment methods do English teachers in Swedish lower secondary school use to assess L2 learners' grammar?

Themes	Data extracts	Comments & relevant references
Observing pupils' oral- and written productions	<p>...har vi jobbat med komparation av adjektiv, så ska man kunna använda det i ett aktivt läge både muntligt och skriftligt på den nivå som eleven befinner sig. (Kristoffer, p.2)</p> <p>...framför allt handlar det om att i deras produktioner så går vi in och tittar på. Ja fraser då strukturer och så. Så dels texter men också deras muntliga produktioner behöver man ju titta över ibland. (Annika, p.3)</p>	<p>All teachers Speaking and writing productions</p> <p>Grammar is assessed as part of something more</p> <p><u>Alternative assessment</u> Brown & Abeywickrama (2019) Baleghizadeh & Zarghami (2012)</p>
Assessing grammatical progression in a formative way	<p>Jag tankar att det [bedöma grammatik] är 3 års projekt. (Annika, p.4)</p> <p>I allt som man introducerar ska det ju finnas en progression och det är snarare progressionen som bedöms från sjukan till nian inom alla grammatiska moment... (Kristoffer, p.3)</p> <p>De [eleverna] blir ju aldrig betygsätta på enskilda uppgifter, så gör man ju inte. (Helen, p.3)</p>	<p>All teachers. Long-term assessment Progression Continuity Formative</p> <p>Various material and situations created for assessing grammar</p> <p><u>Alternative assessment</u> Brown & Abeywickrama (2019) <u>Ebibi et al. (2015)</u></p>
Doing summative assessment	<p>Jag har konstruerat någonting på "Digixam" till exempel, där man [eleverna] ska sätta in rätt saker i luckor till exempel, det [bedöma grammatik] kan det absolut vara. (Kristoffer, p.3)</p>	<p>All teachers Gap-filling tasks Decontextualized tasks Standardized tests: quiz & glossary interrogations Counting scores</p> <p><u>Traditional assessment</u></p>

	<p>Om jag tänker klassiskt uppdelade skriftliga grammatiska övningar, kanske det har vi inte så hemskt mycket av. Däremot så lägger vi till sådana övningar ibland vid behov. (Annika, p.3)</p> <p>...glosförhör där de [eleverna] ska fylla i rätt form och verbet på svenska. Och då drar jag av poäng om de [eleverna] inte stavar rätt. (Helen, p.2)</p>	<p>Brown & Abeywickrama (2019) Larens et al. (2021) Phongsirikul (2018)</p>
Utilizing peer-feedback for assessing	<p>Jag jobbar ganska mycket med kamratrespons...det [bedöma grammatik] kan ske på väldigt många olika sätt...som en individuell uppgift då. Enligt det här mönstret som jag [lärare] anger, ge feedback på den här texten...Eller så kan det vara att de [eleverna] sitter i grupper och diskuterar och läser upp sina texter och Kanske upptäcker att en text...var svår att läsa. Varför var den här texten svår att läsa? Vad är det som göra den svår att läsa? Är det meningsbyggnad? Är det grammatik? (Kristoffer, p.8)</p>	<p>One teacher Peer-feedback with checklists</p> <p><u>Alternative assessment</u></p> <p>Larens et al. (2021) Ebibi et al. (2015)</p>

RQ 2: What are the English teachers' underlying beliefs and reasons for their use of their assessment methods to assess L2 learners' grammar?

Themes	Data extracts	Comments & relevant references
Wanting to respond to learners' needs	<p>Jag skulle så gärna vilja säga att det var någon sån här pedagogisk metod som man har läst eller någonting sånt där, men det är det inte. Utan allt det här är för mig intimt kopplat till mina elever. (Kristoffer, p.6)</p>	<p>All teachers. Learners' needs are in the first room</p> <p>The biggest and most important underlying belief or reason for all teachers.</p> <p><u>Teacher self-efficacy</u> Yin (2010) Borg (2006) Fathi et al. (2021)</p>

	<p>...att se ett behov och sen försöka uppfylla det behovet på något sätt och sen så har man [lärare], om man har tur några metoder i sin arsenal som man kan dra fram...</p> <p>(Helen, p.7)</p> <p>Nej, men det är ju för eleven ska få ett så korrekt och fungerande språk som möjligt, så det är för elevens skull.</p> <p>(Annika, p.9)</p>	
Trusting their own personal experiences	<p>Jag som ett barn av min tid har blivit marinerad i social konstruktivismen. Att inte tänka att lärandet sker i kontakt med andra och i och med mötet med den andra så blir det till omöjligt. Det går inte att tänka utanför det...Så det går inte att inte ha en spegel när det gäller språk.</p> <p>(Helen, p.8)</p> <p>...tack vare att jag har fått mycket input från mina kollegor och att vi har blivit, utsatt oss för lite forskningsprojekt och vi har suttit och gottat lite kring, kring bedömning och kring hur man gör upplägg...</p> <p>(Annika, p.8)</p> <p>Och anledningen till att jag tycker att mina fungerar bra, men det är ju också för att dom fungerar för mig. Men jag har ju provat alltså att göra på [bedöma grammatik], på väldigt många olika sätt.</p> <p>(Kristoffer, p.6)</p>	<p>All teachers Social constructivism. Research projects and college discussion Classroom experiences as an English teacher</p> <p><u>Borg's framework: schooling & contextual factors</u> Borg (2006) Narathakoon et al. (2020)</p>
Affected by national- and European guidelines	<p>Tittar man på hur de [Europeiska riktlinjer], är skrivna, de är ju väldigt konkreta...de är kommunikativa handlingar. Och det, det</p>	<p>Two teachers the curriculum & EU documents</p> <p>To some extent, they are affected by considering their grammatical assessment</p>

	<p>påverkar, har påverkat mig mycket. (Annika, p.9)</p> <p>Läroplanen [nationella riktlinjer], absolut, men där dyker det ju mer upp så här [...] det blir ju bara färdmedlet för bedömningen (Helen, p.8)</p>	<p><u>Previous research studies</u> Narathakoon et al. (2020) Yin (2010)</p>
Constrained by insufficient time resource	<p>Man [läraren] har ju 80 elever i varje årskurs. Så det [bedömning], tar ju mycket, mycket tid och då ska det ju vara värt det. (Annika, p.11).</p>	<p>One teacher Time demanding Many pupils and classes</p> <p><u>Previous research studies</u> Narathakoon et al. (2020) Yin (2010)</p>
Additional analysis	<p>Jag ska fortfarande kunna förstå texten och innehållet, förklaringarna och beskrivningarna och vem det är som tänker vad och så vidare. (Kristoffer, p.2)</p> <p>De [eleverna] lär sig, studerar in och sen så får de plocka fram den kunskapen vid ett väldigt tydligt ”det här bedöms bara dina verb” [bedömningstillfälle] [...] en komponent i att bedöma språkriktigheten [...] (Helen, p.2)</p>	<p>Two teachers Further analyzation Unconsciously</p> <p><u>Linguistic theories</u> Van Valin & LaPolla (1997).</p>

Stockholms universitet
106 91 Stockholm
Telefon: 08-16 20 00
www.su.se



Stockholms
universitet