Kristianstad University Sweden

Lund University

“Writing is Processing What You Have Read”

Using Written Input-to-Output Tasks in the Swedish Upper Secondary School

Authors: Josephine Hedenskog &
Emma Bovin
Supervisor: Dr. Ellen Turner
Term: Spring 2018
Course: ÄENM92 (30 hp)
Master’s Thesis (*Examensarbete*)
English for Subject Teachers
(Upper Secondary)
Campus Helsingborg

Abstract

The Swedish national syllabi for the subject of English challenges upper secondary students to not only produce text, but to interact with and through it; students should actively engage with the learning process through reading, writing, and speaking. Previous research within this field has investigated the relationship between reading and writing, as well as how to use writing to complement the reading process in the ESL classroom. Such tasks have been defined as input-to-output tasks. This thesis aims to research *how* and *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school might use input-to-output tasks in their classrooms. Therefore, multiple interviews with currently working upper secondary ESL teachers were conducted, and through the theory of constructivism we have investigated how and why input-to-output tasks are used. The results of this thesis suggest that when Swedish ESL teachers use input-to-output tasks, they usually construct them as either a pre-task or an end-task to their reading projects. Unearthing the reasons for *why* teachers might use these tasks has proven difficult, seeing as the teachers usually discuss their arguments for working with fiction in the ESL classroom, rather than explaining their use of writing tasks. Our material shows that there is a difficulty in separating reading and writing, and that teachers might not always be aware of what literacy skills they are promoting. Finally, this thesis has outlined suggestions for further research that might aid the understanding of how to incorporate input-to-output tasks in the most beneficial way.

Keywords: ESL Learning, Input-to-Output Tasks, Constructivism, Reading-Writing Relationship

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 4

2. Background 6

  2.1 Reading Fiction and Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom 6

  2.2 Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom 7

    2.2.1 When is writing performed in relation to the reading process? 8

    2.2.2 Types of written input-to-output tasks 9

3. Theory 12

  3.1 What is Constructivism? 12

  3.2 The Interconnectedness Between Constructivism and Input-to-Output Tasks 14

4. Methods 14

  4.1 Framing the Case Study 15

  4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews 15

    4.2.1 The participants 16

    4.2.2 The interview-structure 17

    4.2.3 Transcription and coding 18

5. Analysis 19

  5.1 How Teachers Work with Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom 20

  5.2 Why Teachers Work with Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom 27

    5.2.1 Ability 27

    5.2.2 The syllabi for English 30

    5.2.3 Teacher influence 35

6. Conclusion 43

  6.1 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research 46

References 48

Appendix 1. Missives 54

Appendix 2. Interview guide 56

1. Introduction

Throughout the years, fiction has played different roles in the English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom (Hirvela, 2001; Frantzen, 2002; Shook, 1996). Research and schooling up until late 1960 saw fiction as a suitable path towards language acquisition; it was seen as the ideal way of exemplifying natural language to the foreign language learner. The 1970's brought with it drastic changes in attitudes; fiction was criticised for being too difficult to use in ESL settings (Hirvela, 2001). However, recent developments in the field of ESL research show that working with fiction has become more popular, especially when accompanied by classroom activities where reading, writing, and speaking overlap (Grabe, 2003; Graham & Hebert, 2011).

Activities such as reading, writing, and speaking have been incorporated into the syllabi for English in the Swedish upper secondary school: "students should be given the opportunity to *interact* in speech and writing, and to *produce* spoken language and texts of different kinds, both on their own and together with others, using different aids and media" (Skolverket, 2011a). Although this particular part of the steering document is general for all kinds of written texts, the core content presented for all levels of English state that fictional and literary texts should be employed in the ESL classroom (Skolverket, 2011a). Viewing this, reading and *interacting* with literature is relevant for the Swedish ESL classroom.

There has been much investigation into the reading-writing relationship (Grabe & Zhang, 2016; Wickramaarachchi, 2014; Graham & Hebert, 2011), as well as research into different kinds of writing tasks that can be used to complement the reading process (Hirvela, 2016; Weber-Fève, 2009; Kern, 2000). Examination of different writing tasks has shown that they can be useful in developing reading- and writing skills, such as reflective practices, reading comprehension, and creativity (Kim, 2005; Marzec-Stawiarska, 2016; Sauro & Sundmark, 2016;

Hirvela, 2016). Despite there being a multitude of studies relating to these themes, there appears to be a dearth of research into how and why Swedish ESL teachers might approach and work with reading and writing in their classrooms. Furthermore, there are no guidelines provided by the steering documents as to how Swedish ESL teachers should proceed with these types of writing tasks in relation to reading fiction. Under these circumstances, we as pre-service ESL teachers are interested in examining in what way ESL teachers in Sweden engage with reading and writing in their classrooms.

By conducting multiple interviews with currently working ESL teachers, this case-study aims to investigate *how* and *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school might use writing tasks while working with fiction in their classrooms. The interviews are transcribed, producing material that is decoded through a conventional content analysis. The established codes regarding the writing tasks, defined as written input-to-output tasks by previous research, are used to answer the following research questions:

1. How do teachers report engaging with writing tasks in relation to teaching fiction in the ESL classroom?
2. How do teachers report engaging with writing tasks in relation to teaching fiction in the ESL classroom?

In order to analyse the different tasks, and the teachers' motivations for using them, we use the theory of constructivism. Constructivism is applied on the material to investigate how the tasks activate the students' learning process, and if this activation correlates with the goals given by

the participating teacher. This thesis contributes to the research of *how* and *why* input-to-output tasks are used in the Swedish ESL classroom.

2. Background

An abundance of research has been carried out on fiction in the ESL classroom during the last century and a half, as well as the relation between reading fiction and written tasks. Such tasks have been defined as input-to-output tasks and will now be explored further.

2.1 Reading Fiction and Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom

The value of using fiction as a means for language instruction was rediscovered in the late 1970's and early 1980's, after being somewhat neglected since the turn of the century. This was due to the popular opinion that fiction seemed too difficult to use in the ESL classroom (Hirvela, 2001). During this period, researchers also began to emphasize the importance of a meaningful task to accompany the reading of fiction (Frantzen, 2002; Shook, 1996) and subsequently, elicit interest into the relationship between reading and writing as cognitive- and social processes (Hirvela, 2001; Langer & Flihan, 2000). It is therefore mainly during the past forty years that the relationship between reading and writing has garnered attention from education- and language researchers.

Recently, a plethora of studies on the connection between reading- and writing skills have been presented (Paesani, 2016; Graham & Hebert, 2011; Wickramaarachchi, 2014; Grabe, 2003, Grabe & Zhang, 2016). It has been theorized that the area accumulated interest from educators and linguistic researchers because language acquisition, learning content knowledge, and literacy expansion are potentially all stimulated by simultaneous use of reading- and writing skills (Grabe, 2003). In a meta-analysis of experiments concerning reading and writing, Graham and

Hebert (2011) found that “writing about material read improves students’ comprehension of it; that teaching students how to write improves their reading comprehension, reading fluency, and word reading; and that increasing how much students write enhances their reading comprehension” (p. 710). This way of working does not only promote reading comprehension, but also vocabulary knowledge (Zimmerman, (1997).

Weber-Fève (2009) identified these writing tasks as *input-to-output tasks*, where the purpose is to let the language learner perform “what good readers of literature do” (p. 457). What this expression entails is not explicitly defined, however it is pointed out that input-to-output tasks should give the learner the tools to analyse and communicate with the fictional work. These ideas are closely associated with the *literacy-based model of teaching* described by Kern (2000). He states that “a basic principle of teaching reading in a literacy-based language program is that students need controlled tasks, not controlled texts” (p. 129). Focus should instead be on giving the learner the tools to become the good reader discussed previously by Weber-Fève (2009).

2.2 Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom

How this can be done was explored by Hirvela (2016), who discussed the connections between reading and writing in multiple ways. Written input-to-output tasks, as defined by Weber-Fève (2009), fall under the category *source-based writing* in Hirvela’s (2016) research, where the writing task is based upon a text of some sort. Examples of such tasks were text-summaries, reading-journals, and longer papers (Hirvela, 2016; Weber-Fève, 2009; Kern, 2000). This provides a glimpse into what writing tasks can be done when reading fiction and will be further explored using previous research.

Our investigation into this field in combination with our material, has formed two category-systems: one concerning *when* the task is performed in relation to the reading process,

and the second concerning *what type* of writing is being performed by the ESL learner. These will now be explored in further detail.

2.2.1 When is writing performed in relation to the reading process? According to our interview material, the input-to-output tasks were either performed before reading the fictional work, while reading the fictional work, or after finishing the fictional work. In regard to this, we have decided to define the input-to-output tasks presented in the interviews as either pre-, continuous-, or end-tasks.

In relation to Kern's (2000) literacy-based teaching, reading and writing should overlap in an attempt to "bridge the gap that too often separates the teaching of language from the teaching of literature'' (p.132). When structuring a pre-task, this overlap can manifest itself as the learner is asked to write predictions about the target text before reading it. This theory is echoed by Costello's (1990, as presented by Hirvela, 2001) pedagogy, where students were given the chance to speculate about a text before having read it; the input-to-output pre-task provided a meaningful introduction to literary texts.

As the learner begins to read the text, the input-to-output tasks performed become continuous. An example of this is process writing, where students complete multiple drafts of the same text before handing in their final product (Frantzen, 2002). Here, the tasks and the reading-process merge, as the students engage with the text in numerous ways (this will be further explored in 2.2.2). Shook (1997) indicated that these tasks are usually designed to improve reading comprehension, as it allows the reader to interact with the overall structure of the text. Frantzen (2002) further suggested that L2 learners' writing skills could benefit from working more comprehensively with writing; e.g., by performing process writing. She argued that if

teachers incorporated process writing in their classrooms to a larger extent, overall writing skills would improve.

Such improvement is usually revealed in the assessed end-tasks, as investigated by Hirvela (2016). In his research, written input-to-output end-tasks are used as diagnostic tools and final examinations. Using end-tasks to assess the learner's ability to grasp the fictional work has also been explored by Shook (1997). He claimed that end-tasks "provide opportunities for the reader to confirm prior predictions regarding the text and comprehension, to integrate/incorporate the new textual information into the reader's knowledge, and to serve as a springboard into other language-learning activities" (p. 239).

Using input-to-output tasks in such a way (before, during, or after reading), allows the learner to connect with the text and develop both their reading- and writing skills (Hirvela, 2016,). This bridges the gap between the reading- and writing process, by deepening the learner's appreciation of the text as a whole (Weber-Fève, 2009). How this can be done through different types of writing tasks will be presented below.

2.2.2 Types of written input-to-output tasks. The first type of writing task defined through our material is *reflective writing*. When associating reflective writing with reading, it delves into critical thinking, analytical ability, and individual reflection (Sharif & Zainuddin, 2017; Jasper, 2005). Being fundamentally subjective, reflective writing usually relates to the learner's personal experiences, emotions, and thoughts (Jasper, 2005). This can be done in different ways, such as writing essays, journals, portfolios, or stories (Sharif & Zainuddin, 2017).

Reflective journal writing is popular within research on literacy education and ESL teaching. Journal writing is said to promote "authentic learning, reflective practice, and interactive engagement among learners and teachers" (Peyton & Reed, 1990; English & Gillen,

2000, as cited in Kim, 2005). By keeping a reading journal, Redmann (2005) proposed that the learner's writing- and reading skills are improved, while also enhancing their reading comprehension. Nevertheless, she claimed that to fully utilize reading journals, they need to be thoroughly incorporated into everyday classroom work. The topic is further explored in a thesis by Adams-Boateng (2001), where reading comprehension was tested by comparing reflective journal writing with other language-related activities. She eventually concluded that writing a reflective journal is in many ways more beneficial to reading comprehension than activities involving grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. This might be because reflective journal writing allows the learner to *communicate* with the source material in a way that other tasks do not (Adams-Boateng, 2001).

The reflective category within this thesis will not be limited to only reflective journals. Instead it will include all tasks that promote personal reflection from the learner, for example open ended questions and personal reviews.

Another type of writing task in our thesis, is *summary writing*. It can be described as a shortened version of either certain chapters or a whole novel, where the writer presents the main ideas of the text in their own words (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Winograd, 1984). Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) further argued that someone writing a summary should remain neutral to the source material: there should be no assessment, interpretation, or personal thoughts involved.

Summative writing tasks are often researched in relation to its effects on reading comprehension (Yang, 2017; Mbirimi-Hungwe, 2016). For instance, in a study by Marzec-Stawiarska (2016), the participants were divided into two groups (one experimental- and one control group) before reading the same text. The experimental group was asked to systematically write summaries of the texts, while the control group performed other tasks such as multiple-

choice questions and true/false statements. Testing their reading skills both before and after, Marzec-Stawiarska (2016) concluded that the experimental group in general performed better on the reading comprehension test. She suggested that this is due to the experimental group needing to filter out the most important aspects when writing their summaries.

In this thesis, summary work will only relate to tasks that deal with recollection of the fictional work and no personal thought from the learner herself. This distinction has been made to differentiate the categories presented so far in this section.

The third, and final, type of writing task found in our material is *creative writing*. According to Bayat (2016), creative writing in relation to reading occurs when a writer invents a new kind of text by “reconstructing current knowledge, concepts, sounds, images and dreams” (p. 618) from original source material. Research articles on such creative writing tasks are abundant, and they also display a larger variety than the other categories in this thesis.

One example of a creative writing task is presented by Gaskins’ (2015), where students participating in his course were asked to read different types of fiction, and then compose essays that emulate the style of the corresponding genres. Due to this, it can be argued that this type of writing task stimulates creative writing without creating an actual narrative. Nevertheless, working with a narrative closely tied to the fictional work is a common thread in other creative writing tasks. This is seen in Beliavsky’s (2007) study, where she argued for the positive aspects of working with creative writing and short stories in the ESL classroom. In her classes, Beliavsky (2007) created opportunities for her students to write their own endings to short stories. This means that they have to mirror the author’s language and style in their own writing, in a similar manner to Gaskins (2015). Sauro and Sundmark (2016) examined a third option,

writing blog posts about missing story moments in Tolkien's *The Hobbit* from the perspective of one of the characters.

Due to this thesis focusing on writing tasks in relation to reading fiction, the term *creative writing* has been limited to only concern source-based writing. For instance, this purports that free/original writing will not be analysed or included in this category.

To summarise, three types of writing tasks have emerged within our analysis, containing reflective-, summative- and creative writing. It is important to note that these categories originate from our interview material, suggesting that one might find different assignments in other ESL classrooms. The categories may also overlap.

3. Theory

The input-to-output tasks presented previously address various learning processes. Some aim to test the learner's knowledge of the plot, and others the learner's ability to analyse or use the target language. However, they all ask the student to become an active part of the learning process and, in some ways, the reading process of the fictional work. This is the base of the constructivist theory that will guide us through our analysis.

3.1 What is Constructivism?

Constructivism is a theory of knowledge and learning where information is discovered by the learner herself, rather than being handed over from an instructor, such as a teacher or a guardian. In a school context, this can manifest itself by asking questions to promote communication with other learners, critical thinking, and/or inquiry of the information at hand (Foncha et al, 2017).

Based on Jean Piaget's and Lev Vygotsky's learning theories, there are two branches within the theory of constructivism: the cognitive and the social. The cognitive, using Piaget's learning scheme, maintains that knowledge is obtained within the mind of the learner; new knowledge is assimilated into the learner's cognitive structures and through this, changes. Social constructivism is based upon Vygotsky's "dialogic nature of learning" (Schcolnik et al, 2006, p. 13), and regards knowledge as something that is created through collaboration with one's surroundings. Both perspectives acknowledge the other as an important part of the learning process, although not the *most* important, therefore creating two branches within the constructivist theory (Schcolnik et al, 2006; von Glasersfeld, 1989).

These two branches, conceived by Piaget and Vygotsky, comprise one dimension within the theory of constructivism as explored by Phillips (1995). According to him, there are three different dimensions within the constructivist theory of knowledge and learning. The first dimension, influenced by Piaget and Vygotsky, considers the question of "how the individual learner goes about the construction of knowledge" (Phillips, 1995, p. 7); how is new knowledge contrived? The second dimension provides another layer to the question, focusing on whether new knowledge is made or discovered. Finally, the third and last dimension explores the active process within the learner when she obtains new knowledge (Phillips, 1995). All three dimensions converge and build upon each other, while simultaneously trying to explain the learning process within the student.

Building upon this, the three dimensions established by Phillips (1995) have been interpreted into three different learner roles, presented by David Perkins (1999). These roles are identified as the active-, social-, and creative learner. The active learner refers to the basic concept of the constructivist theory; knowledge is obtained through activity and discovery. The

social- and creative learner roles, on the other hand, evolve from the active learner role by identifying *in what way* the knowledge is discovered. The social learner discovers new knowledge in collaboration with others and/or her surrounding, while the creative learner unearths new knowledge through self-creation. This can be done by applying theories and different perspectives upon already discovered information (Perkins, 1999).

3.2 The Interconnectedness Between Constructivism and Input-to-Output Tasks

Using writing as a complement to reading, in this thesis referred to as input-to-output tasks, promotes the active learning suggested by the constructivist theory. In the ESL classroom, input-to-output tasks have become significant to gain in depth knowledge about fictional literature, as discussed previously in our background. Linking this to constructivism, input-to-output tasks promote active learners since the learner is given "the opportunity to write about what they find interesting/significant/moving/puzzling [and] may help them realize that their understanding of complex texts evolves as they (re)read and that written reflection makes this understanding possible" (Zamel, 1992, p. 474). The learner becomes an active part of the reading process, thus following the core concept of the constructivist theory.

To summarise, this case study will use the theory of constructivism to identify what kind of learner role/s the different writing tasks promote/s, and to help us investigate why ESL teachers use input-to-output tasks in their classroom.

4. Methods

The aim of this thesis is to research *how* and *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school use written input-to-output tasks. To explore this, we created a case study utilizing semi-structured interviews to generate transcribed material and employed a

conventional content analysis to decode said material. These methods are described in further detail below.

4.1 Framing the Case Study

Adopting the case study as a methodological structure became more common during the 1970's and is today closely associated with Robert K. Yin (1981; 2018). According to Yin (2018), a case study "investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the "case") in depth and within its real-word context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident" (p. 15). This can be done in multiple ways, using methods such as observations and interviews to acquire material from the participant/s. When performing a case study, the conclusions drawn from the material are closely linked with the participant/s, portraying his/her/their views and experiences of the phenomenon. Sometimes, case studies are seen as a sampling unit to represent a certain group of people. When doing so, any findings from the case study become non-reliable since they are usually based upon the personal viewpoints of the participant/s. A case study is not supposed to generate generalisable conclusions according to Yin (2018). Instead it gives transferable insights about the phenomenon. Thus, the findings from a case study can be reapplied onto other settings to investigate if the outcome is the same (Yin, 2018; Jensen & Sandström, 2016). Through this, one can argue that our findings can be transferred to other ESL-classrooms (our context) to investigate how and why input-to-output tasks (our phenomenon/case) are used.

4.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

Using interviews to gather our material, a semi-structured protocol was constructed, adopting six broad pre-determined questions that "may yield spontaneous, rich descriptions where the subjects themselves provide what they experience as the main aspects of the

phenomenon investigated" (Kvale, 2007, p. 12). By using this interview structure, the participants had the opportunity to steer the interview towards aspects that they themselves found important, thus promoting transparency when attempting to answer *how* and *why* they use input-to-output tasks (Kvale, 2007; Nunan, 2012).

4.2.1 The participants. A missive (see Appendix 1) containing general information about the thesis was sent out to a group of 126 people, consisting of both administrative staff and ESL teachers working in Swedish upper secondary schools in Skåne county. We initially intended to use both classroom observations and interviews to gain in-depth knowledge about *how* and *why* teachers use writing tasks while reading fiction. However, after difficulties with participant recruitment, the observation portion was discarded in favour of using only semi-structured interviews.

A convenience sampling method was used to send out our missive to both school faculties and ESL teachers. Convenience sampling is sometimes seen as problematic due to its issues with generalisability (Christoffersen & Johannessen, 2015). However, since our missive was sent to all schools within three districts, in addition to currently working ESL teachers in our immediate proximity, this issue may have been mitigated. The teachers responding to our missive were informed that they could cancel the interview at any time. They were also promised anonymity in accordance to Vetenskapsrådet's (2017) respectable research customs (God forskningssed).

To ensure that the participating teachers are kept anonymous, they were given the following pseudonyms inspired by the TV-series *Dr Who*: Rose, Amy, Bill, Donna, and Rory. It is important to note that the genders assumed throughout this thesis do not reflect those of the

participating teachers; they reflect the genders of the corresponding characters. The following information has been collected about our participants:

Table 1: Participants

	Educational Degree	School	Other Information
Rose	2007, Dalarna University (distance).	Top-ranked public school.	Has only taught at this single school. Her other subject is Danish.
Amy	2017, Kristianstad University/Lund University (Campus Helsingborg).	Public school with trainee programs.	This is her first employment as a teacher. Her other subject is Swedish.
Bill	2014, Malmö University.	Private school with a digital profile.	Her other subject is Math.
Donna	1986, Lund University/Malmö University.	Public school with a sports profile.	First teacher in one of her subjects (not clarified in our material). Her other subject is Swedish
Rory	2015, Lund University/Malmö University.	Private school with a music profile.	Has majored in Philosophy and Religion but is currently teaching English.

4.2.2 The interview-structure. The purpose of these interviews was to answer the two research questions of this thesis: how do teachers engage with writing tasks while reading fiction in the ESL classroom, and according to the ESL teachers, what are the motivations for working with writing activities while reading fiction? Working with a pre-constructed interview guide (see Appendix 2), we wanted to ensure that all interviews followed the same basic structure, while still allowing spontaneity and the opportunity to establish relaxed conversation with the participant (Patton, 2002). The interview guide was further inspired by previous research, and the theory of constructivism. Spontaneous follow-up questions were asked by us both, in order to clarify or to develop the participant's train of thought.

The interviews, which lasted between 13 and 30 minutes, were conducted during the spring of 2018. The participants were given the choice of conducting the interview in either English or Swedish, to ensure optimal comfort for the interviewee. Four out of five teachers chose to complete the interview in Swedish, with one wishing to do it in English. For that reason, the majority of the quotations from the material have been translated to the best of our ability, striving to not deviate from the original meaning of the quote. All interviews were recorded, using two smartphones to ensure that no data was lost, before they were transcribed and decoded.

4.2.3 Transcription and coding. In order to conduct the analysis, the material from the interviews had to be transcribed. A simple transcription was used since the prime focus of our research is to investigate the teachers' ideas, attitudes, and reasoning. Aspects such as body language, pauses, and pitch were therefore disregarded, on account of not being relevant for our thesis.

The transcribed material was then analysed using a conventional content analysis. According to Downe-Wamboldt (1992), content analysis strives to "provide knowledge and understanding of the phenomenon under study" (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005, as cited on p. 1278). Of the three different types of content analysis identified by Hsieh and Shannon (2005), we have selected the conventional. This type of content analysis is done by first reading the material repeatedly to create a sense of the whole. Next, the material is read word for word to discover key-aspects of what is being said. These highlights, words that can represent the core content, form the base of the analysis. They are also utilized in the third stage of the analysis, where the researcher creates notes by presenting her initial thoughts and impressions of the material. It is in this stage that the actual codes start to materialize; they are labelled, categorised and linked into

meaningful clusters which are compared with previous research, and the theory of one's choice (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005).

Due to the nature of conventional content analysis, no codes have been predetermined. However, since we have been working from a fixed aim, to research input-to-output tasks, the codes that have emerged from our material are closely linked to our research questions. This can also be seen in the clusters of intel that have been deemed relevant, and the ensuing formation of categories. The themes that developed through our coding process were the following:

- Ability
- The Syllabi for English
- Assignment
- Teacher influence

These four categories provide the framework for the next section.

5. Analysis

The codes found in our interview material will be presented in two parts. In section 5.1, focus will be upon *how* teachers work with input-to-output tasks in their classrooms. Their activities will be described in detail and interpreted through a constructivist perspective to determine what learner role/s are being promoted. The following section, 5.2, will explore the motive (the *why*) behind the written tasks presented by the teachers. Here, the attitudes towards using written input-to-output tasks will be examined and linked to our previous research.

5.1 How Teachers Work with Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom

Throughout the interviews, various input-to-output tasks have been described by the participating teachers. These tasks will be presented in as much detail as possible, before being analysed using the constructivist theory to determine which learner role/s the tasks promote/s.

Based on the novel *Something Noble*, Amy, a first-year teacher at an upper secondary school with a trainee program, designed a pre-task that required her students to read the first page and write about their initial impressions of the story. No continuous tasks were done while reading the text. As an end-task, the students had to produce one page of written text choosing one, or a combination, of the following assignments:

- Rewrite the end.
- Book-review.
- Character analysis.

During the interview, Amy chose to go into further detail about the character analysis. This task required the students to consider a certain character's actions and explain the motivation behind them.

Rose, who has taught English and Danish at the same upper secondary school since completing her educational degree in 2007, also chose to describe a character analysis organized as an end-task. In a similar manner to Amy's task, the students were supposed to explore character development, and discuss whether they could connect secondary characters and/or any events to this transformation. Rose stated that hopefully this would allow her students to understand the chain of events within the plot, and also why the character transformed and/or acted in the way he or she did. Additionally, this could help facilitate student empathy; it supports the realization that a person may act in a certain way due to an event in their life, and

not because “they are stupid in the head, as they [the students] would say” (Rose). This is echoed by Hirvela (2001), who asserts that “literature encourages us to empathize with or react against the characters who attract our attention ... [and] vicariously experience what they do as we identify with them” (p. 117). This kind of reasoning, striving to develop empathy, further correlates with the fundamental values on which the Swedish school system is built upon:

> Education should impart and establish respect for human rights and the fundamental democratic values on which Swedish society is based. Each and every one working in the school should also encourage respect for the intrinsic value of each person and the environment we all share. (Skolverket, 2011b, p. 4)

Rose’s ambition to ensure that her students develop empathy while performing this reflective task, might guide them towards the path of becoming the democratic citizens the Swedish school system wants to foster. Whether Rose succeeds with this goal or not is difficult to assert, since it is not explicitly conveyed in our material.

Examining the different character analyses through the constructivist scope, it can be argued that the tasks activate both the active- and creative learner role (Perkins, 1999). Due to the student actively searching for the reason behind an action in the original text, she becomes a part of her learning process; she is the one discovering new information within the novel. Furthermore, she uses the information to explain the cause of the character’s actions and/or development. This is the fundamental component of the active role within constructivism; knowledge is obtained through activity and discovery (Phillips, 1995; Perkins, 1999). Moreover, the creative learner role can also be seen in the task - the student has to examine the character

through another perspective and, consequently, rediscovers the plot and any potential character development. The ability to understand another person's actions, and exercising empathy in everyday life, cannot be connected to the learner roles presented by Perkins (1999). Therefore, viewing such abilities through the constructivist scope cannot be done.

Turning to Bill, an English and Math teacher at a private school, she chose to describe a module where the students worked with a short story named "Man in the Black Suit". In addition to the students reading the text themselves, Bill offered to read the text out loud *and* provided a recorded version of the short story. Whole-class discussions were conducted in relation to the students reading/hearing the original text. During these meetings, the students reviewed the plot by discussing specific events, and why the characters acted in certain ways. Throughout this process, Bill asked her students to support their claims by providing examples from the text. If these discussions were conducted during or after reading the whole short story was not expressed in the interview. However, deriving from the whole-class discussions, a writing task was conducted after the short story was read. This end-task was divided into two parts: firstly, a brief summary of the short story and secondly, three questions that could be answered on various levels.

The writing task described by Bill is problematic to examine through the theory of constructivism. This is somewhat due to the first part being a summary; it does not necessarily require any active engagement, since the student is only supposed to objectively reproduce her recollections of the text (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). The second part is also problematic to analyse, as it has not been described in enough detail. Bill remarks throughout the interview that the students are supposed "to back up their answer with examples from the text", a process that promotes the active learner role because the student is seeking new knowledge. Furthermore, the

three questions, which are not explicitly stated in the interview, might represent reflective writing, due to the fact that they require examples from the text. The questions are also described to generate answers on various levels, depending on whether the student strives for a high or a low grade. Working with questions that can be answered in depth, aids the assumption that they are related to reflective writing. However, on account of not being able to determine the scope of the questions, we can only hypothesize about this.

Reflective writing has been said to promote reading comprehension (one of Bill's goals further discussed in section 5.2.2), because it allows students to work *communicatively* with the work of fiction (Adams-Boateng, 2001; Redmann, 2005; Kim, 2005). However, since most research on reflective writing has been done in regard to journal writing, i.e., the reflective writing and reading as a simultaneous process, it is difficult to deduce whether the input-to-output task described by Bill accomplishes the goal of increasing reading comprehension. Plot comprehension, on the other hand, is easily spotted when receiving information about Bill's whole class discussion. This task, done in relation with or prior to the end-task, promotes the social learner role as the whole class evaluate the plot together, and therefore find knowledge in collaboration with each other (Perkins, 1999).

Collaborative learning can also be seen in Donna's input-to-output task, where she uses a non-specified novel as the original text. Donna, the only Lead Teacher participating in our thesis, calls this assignment *Bookclub*. The novel is divided into four or five parts, and the students are divided into groups with a maximum of five students in each group. Every week while reading the novel, the students within the groups are given certain assignments which rotate throughout the module. The assignments are prepared by the students beforehand, presumably in written

form even though this is never explicitly stated in the interview, and then discussed orally within the Bookclub-groups. The different assignments are as follows:

- Group-leader: summarising what has happened in the chapters, guiding the group towards two scenes and asking questions about them.
- Character-analyst: by choosing two characters, this person describes the characters using references from the novel to back up the claim/s.
- Detail-analyst: examining the cultural references in the chapters.
- Vocabulary-searcher: depending on the novel, a certain number of words have to be found in order for this student to design a word-assignment for the other group members.
- Genre-interpreter: finding themes, motifs, and symbols in the text.

Every group-meeting takes 40 minutes, after which an individual written evaluation of the discussion is handed in by all students. In this evaluation, they are also asked to speculate about what will happen next in the novel, promoting both reflective- and creative writing. This continuous work while reading the novel prepares the student for the end-task, which is an adaptation of the rotating assignments.

The social learner role is conspicuous in Donna's reading project. New knowledge is discovered collaboratively within the groups, encouraging the individuals to understand the plot through each other (Perkins, 1999). The rotation of assignments may be seen as a promotion of the creative learner role, since the students have to analyse the plot through different perspectives. However, the new perspective is not applied upon the same part of the original text, since the assignments alternate while the students continue reading the novel. This does not adhere to the definition of the creative learner set by Perkins (1999). According to him, the creative learner obtains new knowledge through self-creation, and by applying new perspectives

to information already known to the individual. Due to the text changing every week, the new perspectives are not applied to the same chapters of the literary work, and therefore no self-creation is performed in Donna's Bookclub-project.

Discovering knowledge and re-evaluating information can also be seen in the project of our last participant: Rory. In our interview, he described a reading-project using poems as the original text. It began with a pre-task, where the students were supposed to evaluate the title and then speculate upon what the poem might be about. It is not expressed during the interview whether this is done in written form or not. After analysing the title, the students are allowed to read the original piece and then write their own poem about the same topic. This poem is understood to be the end-task of this module. After completing the previous tasks, the students are asked to listen to a recording of the original poem. That poem is later discussed in groups, after which the students are supposed to prepare a performance of their own poem. Rory also described a phase where students write down their own opinions about the original poems. This strand of information about the task is given out of context, and it is therefore difficult to create a proper overview of the progression of this project.

Nevertheless, what becomes apparent throughout the project is that the students are asked to recreate their opinions about the poem both individually and collaboratively. The creative learner role can be seen in the pre-task, when the student reflects over what the poem is about while only knowing the title. She then re-evaluates this first impression, as the poem is read in full. Thus, the poem is seen through a new perspective, following Perkin's (1999) definition of the creative learner role. However, if adopting the reasoning of needing to use the same part of an original text (as discussed previously in this section), the creative learner role can only be applied upon the title of the poem, since that is the part of the original text that has been re-

evaluated. On the other hand, the student has created an opinion about the poem through the title; an opinion that may be re-evaluated after reading the actual poem. For that reason, one could speculate that the creative learner is promoted by the whole poem, even though it has only been read once.

When writing their own poems, the students are no longer creative learners re-discovering the text, but active learners performing creative writing. Using the poem as source material, the students create their own poem about the same topic, following a similar task-structure to the one presented by Gaskins (2015). The difference between the two tasks is not only the choice in source material, poem versus fiction, but also that Gaskins (2015) asked his participants to mimic the narrative style of the author of the original work (see 2.2.2). It is not explicitly stated that Rory's students are supposed follow the same narrative pattern as the author of the original poem, only that they should take inspiration from the source material and write about the same topic.

This correlates with Kern's (2000) discussion about controlled tasks; the text read by the student is not important, but the structure of the task is. When examining Gaskins' (2015) and Rory's choice of texts, this becomes apparent since their tasks follow a similar structure. They both perform a controlled task, where the students are supposed to take inspiration from the source material and write their own text. The same concept can be applied to all the input-to-output tasks described by our participating teachers. If the task is well-structured it can be applied on any text, by promoting the tools that make the learner into the greatest reader they can be (Weber-Fève, 2009).

5.2 Why Teachers Work with Input-to-Output Tasks in the ESL Classroom

The codes emerging from the transcribed interviews have been used to investigate *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school work with written input-to-output tasks. These codes formed the following four categories: *Ability*, *The Syllabi for English*, *Teacher Influence*, and *Assignment*. The categories will be presented and discussed in relation to our previous research, as well as the Swedish national syllabi for the subject of English. Since we have used an inductive content analysis, certain themes that emerged from the material are not relevant to the aim of this thesis. They will only be briefly discussed in this analysis.

5.2.1 Ability. The category *Ability* includes codes that relate to the students' capability to perform input-to-output tasks: i.e. student-motivation, literary-habit, and learning-difficulties. Certain attention will be given to what may affect the students' ability to perform the tasks described by the participating teachers, and why this has influenced the teachers' choice when designing the input-to-output task.

Creating tasks that match the students' ability in the ESL classroom is something all the participating teachers reflect upon. Amy suggests that many of her students lack the motivation to perform well in the subject of English. They do not find English necessary, and therefore do not recognize the relevance of reading fiction or working formatively with the accompanying written assignments. Rose expresses a similar thought about her students' ability to grasp the purpose of reading fiction, as well as their capacity to use different tools to become good readers. According to her, this ability has grown exponentially over the years due to the admission points at her school having risen. Overall, this has resulted in a more study-motivated student body. She herself points out during the interview that it would be interesting to experiment with her assignments at another school, where the students might not be as motivated.

The student's relationship to the subject of English, as well as understanding the purpose of the assignment, seems to be a vital part in how the input-to-output task is received. Rory mentions that his students have low self-esteem in relation to the subject of English. He is backed up Amy, whose students rejoiced when they learned that they would not be taught English after their first year of upper secondary school. This mindset affects their ability to both read and write in the ESL classroom. Without a literary habit, a practice implemented at an early age according to Amy, reading any text is transformed into a chore in her classroom. This theory is in accordance with Zimmerman (1997), who suggests that some L2 learners might not be proficient enough to find reading gratifying, and therefore "so- called pleasure reading does not bring pleasure to everyone" (p. 135). Rory demonstrates a similar belief about his students; they do not see the benefits of reading in English because they are used to fast-paced stimuli from social media. Therefore, fiction is not a vital component in their lives. Consequently, ensuring that the students grasp the purpose of a task is essential for motivating them to perform and succeed in the ESL classroom.

The importance of including a direct purpose with a task can be seen in many of our categories. In the category *Assignment*, finding the task relevant for life after upper secondary school can motivate the student since the skills are relevant in real life. On another note, demonstrating a curricular purpose with the task (as seen in *The Syllabi for English*) can justify it in the eyes of the state and the students. Being able to present these aspects in such a way that the students understand and accept them, can also be seen in the category *Teacher Influence*. This, in relations to Kern's (2000) controlled tasks, suggests that an input-to-output task should have a clear purpose; it should be relevant for the students, while also providing them with tools that can be reapplied on multiple texts, and situations in real life.

Another intriguing strand that emerged from our codes was student maturity and how this might affect the students' ability to perform the task at hand. Being able to discuss, analyse, and relate to literature is seen as a part of the higher grades by both Amy, Bill, Donna, and Rose. Amy mentions that "they [the students] get stuck in shallow things and that's when you want them to [ask themselves] what is the source of this, this way of acting[?]", implying that some of her students do not yet possess the ability to understand cause-and-effect. This correlates with Rose's goal to develop empathy in her ESL classroom while reading fiction. She wants her students to "think a bit more about why we do as we do … a bit more empathy and such has never hurt anybody". According to Hirvela (2001), reading and writing about literature can allow students to "speculate on those aspects of their [the characters] lives that the authors have not described for us" (p. 117) - i.e., to read between the lines. However, both Amy and Rose indicate that this is a skill that many of the students do not yet possess. If so, reflective writing may be seen as too difficult for the students. This opinion is again voiced by Amy, who ponders whether she could have an existential discussion with her 15-year old students.

The individuality and personal ability of the students do not only affect the result of a task, but also influence the way it is designed. According to Bill, "for some [students], it is easier to express themselves when speaking, while others have it easier when writing … so I try to vary, so that they get them both". All teachers try to diversify their tasks, by providing the students with the opportunity to express themselves in writing and speech. Rory implies that his students show a greater understanding of the purpose of spoken English, rather than producing academic texts. The same can be said about Amy's students. She believes they do not see the point of academic writing, since this is not how one writes in real life. Here, the students' wish for relatable writing (i.e., writing that is useful in everyday life), and the English syllabi do not

correlate. According to the central content, students should be given the opportunity to develop "the ability to adapt language to different purposes, recipients and situations" (Skolverket, 2011a, p. 2) - something the students do not see the point in doing. However, even though all participating teachers maintain the importance of adapting their teaching to the students, resorting to the syllabi was deemed more important.

The discussion about ability, student motivation, and curricular issues, suggests that teachers have to deal with a multitude of perspectives when trying to design input-to-output tasks. Interestingly enough, this is one of the core issues addressed by Hirvela (2001): "increasingly, the issue many L2 writing (and reading) teachers confront is not whether to link reading and writing but how to do so meaningfully" (p. 110). Throughout the interviews it became apparent that this is something teachers struggle with, perhaps because there is not enough research on effective L2 reading-writing instructions.

5.2.2 The syllabi for English. This category includes codes which pertain to how teachers might relate, or not relate, to the syllabi for English when they plan and validate input-to-output tasks in their classrooms. By extension, this will also encompass the subject of language development.

The syllabi for English are present, explicitly or implicitly, in every participating teachers' line of reasoning. It is interesting to note that the participating teachers seem to use two different ways of engaging with the steering documents - they either use them as justification for doing something, or justification for not doing something. Donna, for example, refers to the syllabi while discussing her continuous writing tasks. By using writing tasks both before, during, and after the reading is finished, Donna argues that the students' strategy-use (as suggested by Skolverket, 2011a) improves because "writing is processing what you have read". In accordance

with the constructivist theory, Donna's students are allowed to become active learners; the students purposefully participate in the reading process by writing and reflecting about certain topics (Zamel, 1992). In a similar fashion, Bill touches upon reading comprehension as a central theme in the steering documents and argues that working with, and reflecting on, fiction is a way for students to develop the analytical mechanisms necessary for interpreting texts. Bill's theory is supported by Graham and Hebert (2011), who assert that writing about something one has read enhances reading comprehension in both strong and weak students.

Diverging from using the syllabi as an argument for working in a certain way, some teachers also excuse not pursuing certain teaching opportunities by stating that "it's not in the syllabi" (Rory). The essence of Rory's teaching philosophy is that the subject of English should always be relevant to the students, including working with fiction. Whatever task they perform, the students should feel an interest towards the subject. Rory exemplifies this by mentioning that Shakespearean literature is not at all in the students' sphere of interest, and since the syllabi do not state that Shakespeare has to be included, it can be disregarded and substituted for something else. Similarly, Rose points out that the steering documents do not explicitly state that you have to read a complete novel. In light of these comments, it can be suggested that being able to justify certain ways of working, or not working, by referring to the syllabi is an important factor in why these teachers work with literature in their ESL classroom. However, there is no explicit mention of why they use input-to-output tasks in relation to literature - the aspect investigated in this thesis.

Even though Rose argues against using full novels in the ESL classroom, she chooses to do so to prepare her students for further studies. Furthermore, she mentions that she struggles to find writing tasks where the results equal the amount of time the students put into it. This is due

to her feeling that the students do not develop proper writing and analytical skills to justify six weeks of work: the amount of time it usually takes her students to read a work of fiction, and then write about it. It is interesting to note that Rose does not use input-to-output tasks continuously during the reading process. Instead the students produce a written text of some sort at the end of the module. In accordance with Zamel's (1992) reasoning, this means that the students are not given the chance to constantly interpret and re-discover the fictional work: something that could possibly explain why Rose does not see the results she is hoping for.

Within the spectrum of the steering documents, it is also relevant to discuss the theme of language development since the teaching of English in Sweden should promote a range of various language skills (Skolverket, 2011a). The term language development has been determined, through the interviews, as all aspects connected to linguistic abilities, and the analytical abilities that emanate from knowledge of the target language. By reading literature, Bill hopes that her students will "take in language": interpreted here as language acquisition. Her end-task is used as a way to test if the students can transfer their language knowledge into analytical knowledge. Carson (1993) argues that "ESL writing courses are sometimes founded on the premise that writing competence results somehow from exposure to reading, and that good readers make good writers" (as cited in Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 39). This suggests that perhaps ESL teachers should seek a more dual approach to reading and writing. The many common traits between reading and writing also work against the assumption that reading only creates proficient writers: it might be the other way around.

The notion that writing competence derives from reading is interesting to compare with Bill's thoughts on reading- and language development. Supposedly, the students should perform good writing if they are exposed to literature. However, this is not seen in our thesis. After being

exposed to the short story, Bill acknowledges that some students did not perform well on the final written task. This is attributed to them not reading the short story thoroughly enough; they did not improve when simply reading fiction, and then writing about it. Consequently, Bill's situation can be juxtaposed with the foundation of Graham and Hebert's (2011) findings, that writing about something one has read increases reading comprehension. However, their analysis also indicates the importance of teaching specifically designed to improve writing skills, as well as the advantage of giving students more time to work with written texts. Through this, in relation to the constructivist theory of learning (Perkins, 1999), one can deduce that the students' reading process was not activated enough by only performing a written end-task. Instead they might have benefited from continuously working with the short story and being activated throughout the whole reading project. Using such a task-structure might help them gain deeper knowledge of the fictional work, pursuing the following reasoning:

> Just as students "need to become better readers" in order "to become better writers," as Spack (1988, p. 42) argues, they can become better readers by becoming better writers. This realization is critical, given the segregated ways reading and writing are addressed in ESL research and pedagogy... (Zamel, 1992, p. 480)

By using continuous input-to-output tasks in written form, one could argue that the gap between reading and writing ceases to exist. They become dependent on, and influence, each other, promoting better readers *and* writers.

Another aspect brought up by Rose is the importance of an expanding vocabulary within the subject of English. It is apparent from Rose's interview that her main focus is not the content of the novel, but writing-strategies such as how to structure a written report with an introduction, body, and conclusion. Because of this, she emphasises the importance of "using some very good words, a lot of synonyms, synonyms, synonyms" (Rose). She wants her students to develop their vocabulary by finding and using words they may not be familiar with; the students should try to find formal words to create an academic voice. To use vocabulary to adapt to one's purpose, for example when writing an academic text, is supported by the syllabi. As already mentioned in 5.2.1, the steering documents ask the Swedish upper secondary teacher to give the student "the ability, desire and confidence to use English in different situations and for different purposes" (Skolverket, 2011, p. 1). Changing one's vocabulary is one way to adapt to the environment the text will be received in, using more *academic* synonyms to words used in everyday language.

This is the overall aim of the task constructed by Rose; to promote formal- or academic language to prepare her students for future studies. This is not only supported by the national syllabi, since Frantzen (2002) also suggests that "incorporating discussions of authors' use of particular structures, vocabulary, or sociolinguistic features ... [as well as] overt analysis of linguistic features used by authors" (p. 120) can enrich the ESL classroom. To some extent it seems that Rose works with literature in this way; she wants her students to learn new vocabulary from working with the texts. Yet, the students did not always live up to Rose's expectations regarding improved vocabulary. In relation to this, there is research which suggests that working with reading can increase vocabulary knowledge (Zimmerman, 1997). Zimmerman (1997) maintains however, that though there is a common belief among teachers that students will acquire vocabulary incidentally, this might not be the best strategy for L2 learning. Working

with “reading and interactive vocabulary instruction will show an increase in vocabulary knowledge” (Zimmerman, 1997, p. 132), which might explain why Rose’s students did not perform the written task as well as she had hoped. By focusing on structured vocabulary work together with the students, the finished products might have better corresponded with Rose’s expectations.

5.2.3 Teacher influence. Here, codes concerning the participating teachers’ own influence upon their students and the assignments described, will be explored. Throughout the interviews, their personal preference towards reading fiction, opinions about written- and spoken tasks, as well as aspects regarding teaching experience have been expressed.

The students’ relationship to reading and the subject of English, has been discussed previously in the category *Ability*. That section also dealt with how the aforementioned relationship may have affected teaching choices while working with fiction. In this thesis, the codes reveal that the teacher’s own relationship with fiction is equally important. The participating teachers are divided on this subject: Rose and Rory both express a disinterest towards using full novels in the classroom, whereas Bill mentions “a great interest in fiction, which rubs off on my teaching”. Similarly, Amy enjoys reading in her spare-time, while the subject is not broached during Donna’s interview.

According to Rose, reading a fictional work “is something you should do, but it is the most mundane part of the course according to myself”. Her opinion is based on her students’ negative view towards reading, a recurring theme throughout the interview. She also finds it difficult and time-consuming to work with fiction in the ESL classroom, prompting her to use written end-tasks which are constructed to make sure that the students have read the novel. However, even though Rose believes that working with literature is the most tedious part of the

English courses, she still exposes her students to works of fiction. The same attitude is seen in Rory's classroom, where he subjects his students to fiction although he himself does not read. Both Rose and Rory use fiction in their classrooms even though they do not find it interesting.

Therefore, our material suggests that works of fiction possess an undeniable position in the ESL classroom, as opposed to the outdated idea that working with fiction is too difficult and thus, ill-suited for L2 teaching (Hirvela, 2001). What makes this even more interesting is that the English syllabi do not explicitly state that one should read novels - one should simply introduce the students to different kinds of literary texts (Skolverket, 2011a). However, as stated previously, reading a work of fiction is something you *should do*; a statement that is verified by all our participants in their work with literature and input-to-output tasks.

With regard to structure, similar input-to-output tasks are presented by all participating teachers; they are tasks that mainly promote reflection, but to some extent also creative- and summative writing. This suggests that the teachers' opinion towards working with fiction in the ESL classroom is not an influential factor when constructing input-to-output tasks. Nevertheless, the discourse surrounding reading projects and how to work with fiction differs depending on the teacher's personal view on reading fiction. Amy expresses the wish to introduce continuous work in her classroom in the future through the use of reading logs. During her interview she describes an end-task that gives the student a choice between reflective-, creative- and summative writing. The same goes for Bill, giving her students a choice when constructing the written end-task. Both Rose and Rory present one single option for their written end-task, which may be due to them working with a module that does not interest them.

Apart from the teacher's personal interest in input-to-output tasks, their teaching philosophy, as well as their experience within the field, can be seen as influential factors in our

thesis. Regarding Donna's Bookclub-project, the students did not have any objections towards becoming active learners and perform continuous writing. That same writing-tool was met with negativity in Amy's classroom, because her students did not understand why one has to modify and adapt a task that is already completed. This might be due to Donna's teaching philosophy, and the belief that continuous writing should play a role in her ESL-classroom. Her students have become accustomed to working in this way, and therefore do not question it. In contrast, this was Amy's first reading project as a graduated teacher, which perhaps made her less confident about her not fully developed teaching philosophy. She personally states that her introduction of the project may not have been the best, due to her being inexperienced, and lacking in time and equipment when it began. Here, the teacher's ability to structure a task in order to convey the purpose with the assignment becomes apparent. This theme will be further explored in the final category, namely *Assignment*.

5.2.4 Assignment. The category *Assignment* will explore the reasons behind the input-to-output tasks described in 5.1 through two perspectives: why the task has been *structured* in such a way, and what was the *purpose* of the task? These reasons have emerged from codes such as structure, purpose, and collective learning, tying the category close to the other clusters created in our analysis. Therefore, some information will be repeated, although from different perspectives.

Focusing on the tasks' *structure*, a majority of our participating teachers use input-to-output pre-tasks. Using pre-tasks when reading a text supposedly "add[s] depth, richness, and particularity to their writing, and ... point[s] to the problematic nature of setting up dichotomies between personal and academic discourse" (Elbow, 1991, as cited in Zamel, 1992, p. 478), by mingling the learner's own voice with the author's. Interpreting this, a pre-task before reading a

text allows the learner to form an opinion of the text to hold against the author's. This does not only promote the active learner (taking charge of one's own learning process), but also the creative learner - seeing the text from different perspectives: the learner's and the author's (Perkins, 1999). Such a pre-task is demonstrated by Amy, where her students read the first page of the assigned novel and then, presumably in written form, express their initial impression of the plot. Why Amy uses this pre-task is not conveyed during the interview. In contrast, Donna states that she uses pre-tasks to prepare the students for the upcoming reading project. Why students need to prepare, or if the outcome is different when not using pre-tasks, is not discussed in our material. One suggestion, however, is that preparing a pre-task allows the learner to feel more connected to, and invested in, the reading material. To illustrate, Zamel (1992) declares that endorsing student preparation "demonstrates that what they bring to the reading not only is a valid perspective but enables them to better understand, analyze, [and] take issue with the perspective that they read about" (p. 478).

Working with written end-tasks when reading fiction is another aspect all our participating teachers have in common. As previously described in 5.1, Amy and Rose use a character-analysis, Bill asks her students to answer three questions in written form, Rory allows his students to take inspiration from the source material to create their own poem, and Donna modifies one of her rotation-assignments into an end-task. All of these written tasks derive from some type of reading material, either by analysing it or taking inspiration from it, thus making the writing source-based (Hirvela, 2016). Amy believes that her students need written end-tasks to create a sense of purpose with the reading project, after receiving the comment "why are we doing this if it is not supposed to be handed in?". Similar reasons are provided by Bill and Rose, who use the end-tasks to test if their students have read the assigned texts, as well as for grading-

material. Rory, who does not use grades, does not give a reason as to why his students have to perform an input-to-output task when writing their poems.

All writing tasks are also done individually, and during the interviews there is no reflection on individual versus collective work. According to Zamel (1992), activities that are done collectively, such as peer-review, can help the learner to explore one's own text through the eyes of another. Viewing this through a constructivist point of view, the learning process becomes both active, social, *and* creative when working collaboratively with a written input-to-output task (Perkins, 1999). Such tendencies can be seen in Donna's Bookclub-project, when the group-members share their findings with each other. However, this collaborative learning is done orally, and not through the editing of written input-to-output tasks. Donna's written end-task is done individually, while following the same structure as one of the rotation-tasks performed throughout the reading project. This does not only promote all three learner roles, it is also in line with formative learning and assessment.

Donna's Bookclub-project is the only continuous input-to-output task in written form. One could speculate that Bill uses continuous input-to-output tasks, introducing whole-class discussions about the short story. However, these discussions are done orally, and it is not explicitly stated if they are done while reading the fictional work. Viewing Donna's rotating assignments, written- and oral processes are weaved together: the students prepare for the meeting in writing, perform the meeting orally, and then evaluate it in written form. The reasoning behind this mixture of written- and oral input-to-output tasks is not given in our material.

Nonetheless, Donna does give a reason for using continuous tasks while reading a novel. According to her interview, she uses the rotation-assignments for two reasons: to enable peer

learning, and to provide the students with a chance to practice before the end-task. Asking students to perform process writing, as opposed to product writing (where only one draft is required), has been said to notably improve writing skills (Frantzen, 2002). Asking the students to perform process writing and discuss the novel in group-meetings, not only gives them the opportunity to share their views, but also allows them to help and inspire each other. They may also be exposed to new perspectives and ideas about the fictional work, thus deepening their understanding of the plot.

When analysing Donna's reading project, one can clearly see that all three learner roles are encouraged through the written- and oral input-to-output tasks. However, if attention is given only to the written tasks, the active and, to some extent, the social learner are promoted. This is due to Donna's use of process writing, which is also one of her reasons for using the rotating assignments. Allowing students to practice before the written end-task is an assignment structure that Donna claims to use frequently. Without being graded, the students are able to perform the different rotation-assignments with the help of each other, before receiving feedback from Donna. Only after this are they given the written end-task that is individually graded. That the students are in charge of her own learning process is apparent throughout the project; they themselves have the responsibility for utilising other students' input and the feedback given by Donna. It is this feedback, when viewed through Perkins' (1999) concept of constructive learner roles, that gives the written input-to-output tasks a social aspect; new knowledge is obtained in correlation with Donna and her comments on the texts handed in by the end of the Bookclub-meetings.

As far as the *purpose* of writing tasks is concerned, the participating teachers display various ideas of what type of learning these tasks should promote (as previously discussed in

5.2.2). During our interview with Donna, it became obvious that she is aware of what kind of knowledge she wants to promote in the classroom. Her goals are to:

> Practice the linguistic abilities, in order for the students to feel that they widen their vocabulary when they meet it in text and so on. Eh, it is also about reading strategies, that is how do I work with a text that initially feels difficult, heavy, without simply throwing it away. (Donna)

Furthermore, Donna is hopeful that once the students become more proficient, these basic language skills will translate into more advanced strategies for linguistic- and thematic analysis of texts. Thus, she wants to see progression in the way her students approach and work with different texts. According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), "reading and writing are both acts of meaning construction; they develop students' linguistic, cognitive, and sociocultural understandings; and they engage students in problem solving and critical thinking" (as cited in Paesani, 2016, p. 268). These ideas can be seen in the way Donna reflects on topics connected to reading and writing. Therefore, the main purpose for using writing tasks in Donna's classroom can be seen as encompassing different language qualities and learning strategies. These can be applied on other school subjects as well, something that Donna briefly mentions in her interview.

In the case of Rory, he repeatedly mentions the importance of preparing his students for life after school. The purpose of his teaching is to give students the chance to develop skills significant for the outside world. He also mentions that he bases his teaching choices on student preference, in order to make English relevant to them. These objectives can be seen to some extent in his written input-to-output task. As explained in section 5.1, Rory describes a poetry

task where the poems were no older than six years. According to Rory, this would make the pieces more accessible to his students, and yet, a reason for why his students would not be able to relate to older poems is not given. The topics of the poems are probably relatable to many students (body shaming, child abuse, and freedom), which means that Rory manages to fulfill that particular component of his teaching philosophy. Nevertheless, the structure of the input-to-output task (students writing their own poem based on the original text), does not necessarily correlate with Rory's teaching-goal. Even though the topics of the poems are relatable to the students, writing an actual poem might not feel like relevant, real life knowledge. Not knowing the students' opinions on this, we can only speculate about this presumed dissonance.

Turning to Amy, the purpose of her project is to develop a "thirst for knowledge", and to generate students' interest in a literary canon. Throughout the interview, Amy expresses resignation over her students' aversion to working formatively and continuously with written tasks. This results in Amy resorting to written end-tasks that the students perform simply to get a grade. This makes it difficult for her to achieve her purpose when reading fiction. Amy shows an understanding of the divergence between her purpose, and the reading project. She declares that she would like to use reading logs to let her students work continuously, in order to intertwine reading and writing. However, since her student are reluctant to work formatively (as mentioned in 5.2.3), she has to adapt her tasks to fit the needs of her students.

Overall, it is fascinating to observe that most of the participating teachers did not give a clear-cut reason for why they chose to work with written input-to-output tasks. They discussed the purpose of reading fiction, and what kind of learning they would like their students to engage in. Nonetheless, they rarely philosophized if their writing tasks promoted their objectives. This suggests that our participants might sometimes regard writing as a means to an end (e.g.,

improving reading- and/or language skills), and the written text is simply a finished product awaiting assessment. Hirvela (2016) argues that this is common procedure in the L2 classroom, since many students find it challenging to read in their second language. On the opposite spectrum, source-based writing and the use of input-to-output tasks (see 2.2), derive from the idea that "reading, at least in academic or school settings, is a prelude to writing and eventually helps shape the writing that follows from it" (Hirvela, 2016, p. 47). It can be argued that our participating teachers do this to some extent; they use literature as the basis for the texts they want their students to write. Yet, the writing segment in the input-to-output tasks is overshadowed by the reading process. Therefore, we sense a discrepancy between what teachers want to achieve, and what they actually do in the Swedish ESL classroom. Moreover, there is a need for further discussion regarding the reading-writing relationship, in order to help teachers detangle and understand the different processes and what they entail. The conclusion of this thesis will explore aspects of this, as well as major findings, and suggestions for future research in this area.

6. Conclusion

Revisiting our aim, the goal of this thesis has been to investigate *how* and *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school use written input-to-out tasks in their classrooms. From our interview material, we can conclude that though written input-to-output tasks occur in the ESL classroom, they are seldom used by themselves; more often than not the written tasks are accompanied by oral input-to-output tasks. None of the participating teachers work only with written input-to-output tasks when reading fiction, seemingly on account of the teachers feeling that their students are more comfortable with spoken English.

When exploring *written* input-to-output tasks, the majority of the components have been structured as pre-tasks and end-tasks to a reading project. Amy indicated that she would like to include more continuous work in her classroom, however, her students are reluctant to perform continuous writing. Some participants also referred to their own disinterest in working with fiction in the ESL classroom, something that could have impacted their use of a single, graded end-task. If the teacher herself is not interested in the topic, there might not be much incentive to work continuously over an extended period of time. This could have consequences for the students' formative- and active learning process since they do not get the chance to revise their work and learn from previous mistakes. Only Donna used continuous input-to-output tasks, using writing-assignments while reading the fictional work. She was also the only participant to discuss the positive effects of continual work - her students becoming more confident in their own abilities. Her students knew what was expected of them since they had practiced and prepared before they wrote the final end-task.

The majority of the tasks have been of the reflective kind: analysing a character or detail in the fictional work, answering a question while referring to the original text, and/or identifying chains of events that unfold within the plot. Some tasks have also asked the students to summarise and/or perform creative writing, such as Rory's poetry end-task. It became apparent that the participating teachers rarely reflected on the nature of the constructed tasks. For example, no one referred to their task as reflective, summative, or creative. One reason for this is of course that we as researchers have created these boundaries in order to contain our thesis, but it could also be due to teachers not analysing what their tasks entail. Perhaps a more distinct relation to scientific basis (vetenskaplig grund) would make it easier for teachers to match their

learning goals with suitable tasks. Relating to academic research on different writing tasks and what kind of learning they might enhance could give more weight to this area of ESL teaching.

The tasks described in this thesis have all promoted the active learner role, since the students are responsible for their own learning process (Perkins, 1999). Some participants, mainly Donna but also Bill and Rory, have promoted the social- and creative learner role by asking students to work together, and rediscover knowledge about the text they have read.

Trying to identify the participating teachers' motivations for using input-to-output tasks, and by extension trying to answer our second research question, has proved precarious at times. The majority of our teachers have not given a reason as to why they conduct certain input-to-output tasks in their ESL classroom. Instead, the teachers discuss why they do, or do not, use fiction in their classroom, citing the national syllabi to support their opinions. Both Rose and Rory state that the steering documents for the subject of English do not mention what kind of texts one has to expose the students to. Nevertheless, both Rose and Rory use complete novels as classroom material: according to Rose it is "something one should do".

In relation to reading fiction, Amy and Bill aim to ignite the feeling of enjoyment within the students. By allowing them to read, Bill hopes that the students will develop their language skills through acquisition. The same could be said about Rose; she hopes to expand her students' vocabulary through reading. However, these are reasons for using works of fiction in the ESL classroom, not for specifically using input-to-output tasks.

Donna explicitly states a purpose with her written pre- and continuous tasks: to prepare the students for the reading project, and to allow them to practice for the final end-task. By doing so, she incorporates the mechanisms laid out by the constructivist theory of learning interpreted by Phillips (1995) and Perkins (1999), and our previous research.

To conclude, it has been difficult to find a clear answer as to *why* teachers work with input-to-output tasks. However, reading between the lines, it can be argued that when the participating teachers justify their motives for working with fiction, they might implicitly demonstrate their intentions for their written input-to-output tasks. Themes such as linguistic abilities, reflective practices, life-relevance, and a general interest in knowledge, have been acknowledged in the interviews when discussing fiction. It could be argued that these themes are interchangeable with the goals our participating teachers have for written input-to-output tasks, suggesting a difficulty in disconnecting the two. Hirvela (2001) emphasizes that the issue might not be that teachers combine reading and writing, and therefore find it challenging to separate one from the other, but that they struggle with creating meaningful tasks (see 5.2.1). Undoubtedly, this is an area in need of further exploration, on account of there being no consensus about *how* and *why* ESL teachers in Sweden teachers should approach written input-to-output tasks in relation to fiction.

6.1 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Through this thesis, we have contributed to the investigation of *how* writing tasks are used in relation to reading fiction, by concluding that the majority of the input-to-output tasks used by our participating teachers were reflective pre-tasks and end-tasks. The question of *why* our teachers used these tasks in their ESL classrooms, has been more difficult to answer. In exploring this territory, the reasoning behind the input-to-output tasks, our thesis would have benefited from secondary interviews in which our findings could have been investigated in more depth. Through this, the assumptions and speculations drawn by us would have been confirmed or abandoned, and by extension given further richness to the claims in the second part of our analysis.

Also, our research has only scraped the surface into *how* and *why* ESL teachers in Swedish upper secondary schools use input-to-output tasks. Our thesis gives insight into multiple teachers' approach to input-to-output tasks and, following the traits of a case study discussed in 4.1, may be transferable to other ESL classrooms all over the globe. That is to say, the present study raises issues and questions upon which teachers in other settings might reflect when considering their own practices around the teaching of writing, and it also prompts themes that researchers might take up in future studies that examine teacher perspectives on writing instruction.

An example of this, developed from our findings regarding the nature of the written input-to-output tasks, could be to explore ESL teachers' reasoning behind using reflective-, summative-, or creative tasks. Our research suggests that the participating teachers do not reflect upon the nature of the tasks performed in their ESL classroom, neither by contemplating what kind of task it is nor what learner role/s they promote. It would be interesting to expand this theme and investigate how teachers would identify their own tasks, i.e., by first informing the participating teachers of our division (reflective/summative/creative tasks), and then compare this to a secondary opinion and/or previous research. This might contribute to the topic of *how* and *why* ESL teachers in the Swedish upper secondary school use written input-to-output tasks, digging a little deeper into if this could provide a foundation for best practice in the ESL classroom.

References

Adams-Boateng, A. (2001). *Second graders' use of journal writing and its effect on reading comprehension*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED450409.

Bayat, S. (2016). The effectiveness of the creative writing instruction program based on speaking activities (CWIPSA). *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *8*(4), 617-628. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1109868

Beliavsky, N. (2007). Discover the unknown Chekhov in your ESL classroom. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 41*(4), 101-109. doi:10.1353/jae.2007.0032

Christoffersen, L., & Johannessen, A. (2015). *Forskningsmetoder för lärarstudenter.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition. Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Foncha, J. W., Mafumo, T., & Abongdia, J. A. (2017). Reading and response as facilitation to the teaching and learning of second/foreign language. *Gender & Behaviour, 15*(2), 8762-8772. Retrieved from https://journals.co.za/content/journal/10520/EJC-af4791a4a

Frantzen, D. (2002). Rethinking foreign language literature: Towards an integration of literature and language at all levels. In V. M. Scott & H. Tucker (Eds.), *SLA and the literature classroom: Fostering dialogues* (pp. 109-130). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gaskins, J. (2015). The literary essay and the ESL student: A case study. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 49*(2), 99-106. http://doi:10.5406/jaesteduc.49.2.0099

von Glasersfeld, E. (1989). Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching. *Synthese, 80*(1), 121-140. doi:10.1007/BF00869951

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and

practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Zhang, C. (2016). Reading-writing relationships in first and second language academic literacy development. *Language Teaching*, *49*(3), 339-355. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000082

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2011). Writing to read: A meta-analysis of the impact of writing and writing instruction on reading. *Harvard Educational Review*, *81*(4), 710-744. doi:10.17763/haer.81.4.t2k0m13756113566

Hirvela, A. (2001). Connecting reading and writing through literature. In Belcher, D.D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.) *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 109-134). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hirvela, A. (2016). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction* (2nd ed.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Jasper, M. A. (2005). Using reflective writing within research. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *10*(3), 247-260. https://doi.org/10.1177/174498710501000303

Jensen, T., & Sandström, J. (2016). *Fallstudier*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kern, R., & Schultz, J. M. (2005). Beyond orality: Investigating literacy and the literary in second and foreign language instruction. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(3), 381-392. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00312.x

Kim, J. (2005). A community within the classroom: Dialogue journal writing of adult ESL

learners. *Adult Basic Education: An Interdisciplinary Journal for Adult Literacy Educational Planning*, *15*(1), 21-32. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=42&sid=250c5d64-f9eb-4 4d5-ab64-8eed68607fe4%40sessionmgr4010

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Langer, J. A., & Flihan, S. (2000). Writing and reading relationships: Constructive task. In R. Indrisano & J. R. Squire (Eds.), *Perspectives on writing: Research, theory, and practice* (pp. 112-139). Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Marzec-Stawiarska, M. (2016). The influence of summary writing on the development of reading skills in a foreign language. *System*, *59*, 90-99. doi:10.1016/j.system.2016.04.006

Mbirimi-Hungwe, V. (2016). Translanguaging as a strategy for group work: Summary writing as a measure for reading comprehension among university students. *Southern African Linguistics & Applied Language Studies*, *34*(3), 241-249. doi:10.2989/16073614.2016.1250352

Nunan, D. (2012). *Research methods in language learning*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Paesani, K. (2016). Investigating connections among reading, writing, and language development: A multiliteracies perspective. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *28*(2), 266-289. Retrieved from http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/October2016/articles/paesani.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE.

Perkins, D. (1999). The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Leadership*, 57(3), 6-11. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=139&sid=250c5d64-f9eb-44d5-

ab64-8eed68607fe4%40sessionmgr4010

Phillips, D. C., (1995). The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Researcher*, *24*(7), 5-12. doi:10.3102/0013189X024007005

Redmann, J. (2005). An interactive reading journal for all levels of the foreign language curriculum. *Foreign Language Annals*, *38*(4), 484-492. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2005.tb02515.x

Sauro, S., & Sundmark, B. (2016). Report from Middle-Earth: Fan fiction tasks in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, *70*(4), 414-423. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv075

Schcolnik, M., Kol, S., & Abarbanel, J. (2016). Constructivism in theory and in practice. *English Teaching Forum, 44*(4), 12-20. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1107896

Sharif, A. M., & Zainuddin, S. Z. (2017). Students' perceptions of their reflective essay writing experience and teacher feedback comments. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(2), 204-212. doi:10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4845

Shook, D. J. (1996). Foreign language literature and the beginning learner-reader. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(2), 201-16. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb02327.x

Shook, D. J. (1997). Identifying and overcoming possible mismatches in the beginning reader-literary text interaction. *Hispania: A Journal Devoted to the Teaching of Spanish and Portuguese, 80*(2), 234-43. doi:10.2307/345882

Skolverket. (2011a). *Syllabi for the subject of English*. Retrieved from https://www.skolverket.se/polopoly_fs/1.174542!/English%20120912.pdf

Skolverket. (2011b). *Curriculum for the upper secondary school*. Retrieved from https://www.skolverket.se/om-skolverket/publikationer/visa-enskild-publikation?_xurl_=http%3A%2F%2Fwww5.skolverket.se%2Fwtpub%2Fws%2Fskolbok%2Fwpubext%2Ftr

ycksak%2FBlob%2Fpdf2975.pdf%3Fk%3D2975

Vetenskapsrådet. (2017). *God forskningssed*. Retrieved from https://publikationer.vr.se/produkt/god-forskningssed/

Weber-Fève, S. (2009). Integrating language and literature: Teaching textual analysis with input and output activities and an input-to-output approach. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(3), 453-467. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01035.x

Wickramaarachchi, T. I. (2014). Writing-reading relationships: Effectiveness of writing activities as pre-reading tasks to enhance L2 inferential reading comprehension. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *5*(5), 213-221. http://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.5n.5p.213

Winograd, P. M. (1984) Strategic difficulties in summarizing texts. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *19*(4), 404-425. doi:10.2307/747913

Yang, G. (2017). The effect of summary writing on reading comprehension: The role of mediation in EFL classroom. *Reading Improvement, 54*(2), 82-86. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=90&sid=250c5d64-f9eb-44d5-ab64-8eed68607fe4%40sessionmgr4010

Yin, R. K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(1), 58-65. doi:10.2307/2392599

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, *26*(3), 463-485. doi:10.2307/3587174

Zimmerman, C. B. (1997). Do reading and interactive vocabulary instruction make a

difference? An empirical study. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 121-40. doi:10.2307/3587978

Appendix 1. Missives

1. Missive sent to school administration:

Hej!

Vi är två lärarstudenter som skriver examensarbete, med inriktning mot engelska på gymnasienivå, på Lunds Universitet Campus Helsingborg. Uppsatsen syftar till att undersöka engelsklärares tankar om och kring skrivande i samband med litteraturläsning i klassrummet.

Vi söker engelsklärare att intervjua gällande hur och varför de arbetar med skrivuppgifter i kombination med läsning av skönlitteratur. Exempel på sådana uppgifter kan vara omskrivningar av slut, läsloggar, översättningar och litteraturanalyser; all sorts skrivande som kopplar tillbaka till skönlitteratur i klassrummet.

Vi vänder oss därför till Er för att komma i kontakt med engelsklärare och kunna genomföra en intervju på cirka 30 minuter. Om Ni finner detta intressant, hör av er för mer information eller skicka en mailadress för potentiella engelsklärare, så tar vi upp kontakt själva.

Ni är välkommen att kontakta oss om du har några frågor.
Att Ni deltar är värdefullt för oss, tack på förhand!

Med vänliga hälsningar,
Emma och Josephine

2. Missive sent to ESL teachers:

Hej!

Vi är två lärarstudenter som skriver examensarbete, med inriktning mot ämneslärare i engelska på gymnasiet, på Lunds Universitet Campus Helsingborg. Uppsatsen syftar till att undersöka engelsklärares tankar om och kring skrivande i samband med litteraturläsning i klassrummet.

Vi söker Dig som vill ställa upp på en intervju och berätta om hur du kombinerar skrivuppgifter och läsande av skönlitteratur i ditt klassrum. Exempel på sådana uppgifter kan vara omskrivningar av slut, läsloggar, översättningar och litteraturanalyser; all sorts skrivande som kopplar tillbaka till skönlitteratur i klassrummet.

Vi undrar därför om Du vill ställa upp på en intervju, som kommer att ta cirka 30 minuter om skrivuppgifter i relation till skönlitteratur?

Kontakta oss vid intresse, eller om du har några frågor.

Att Du deltar är värdefullt för oss, tack på förhand!

Med vänlig hälsning,

Emma och Josephine

Appendix 2. Interview guide

1. What are your goals when you work with fiction? *Vilka är dina mål när du arbetar med skönlitteratur?*
2. How do you use writing while reading fiction to promote/achieve those goals? *På vilket sätt tycker du att skrivandet förstärker/hjälper dig uppnå dina mål i arbetet med skönlitteratur?*
3. Could you describe a writing task you have done with your class? *Skulle du kunna beskriva en uppgift som du genomfört med dina elever?*
4. What were your expectations with this writing task? *Vad vad dina förhoppningar/mål med denna skrivuppgift?*
    a. Did the class live up to the expectations? *Uppfyllde klassen dina förväntningar?*
5. Do you sometimes work with fiction without using writing-tasks? *Brukar du vid vissa tillfällen arbeta med skönlitteratur utan att använda dig av kompletterande skrivuppgifter?*
    a. If so, do you experience any differences in your students' learning process? *Om så är fallet, upplever du någon skillnad i elevernas lärprocesser?*
6. Do you have any additional comments? *Är det något ytterligare du skulle vilja tillägga?*