

SUPPORTING ADULT L2 LEARNERS' CONTEXTUALIZED GRAMMAR KNOWLEDGE AND PRESENTATION SKILLS WHEN WORKING WITH TASKS RELATED TO WORK PLACEMENTS

ROBERT WALLDÉN¹, ELI ANNE EIESLAND² & SIGNE LAAKE²

1. *Linnaeus University*

2. *OsloMet*

Abstract

This study investigates how a teacher's feedback on oral presentations was integrated with grammar teaching in Swedish for immigrants (SFI) directed to adult learners of Swedish. It focuses on a course where students participated in both workplace placements and classroom activities. The data consists of transcribed audio recordings of six lessons. The findings show that the teacher's feedback on the students' presentations focused on the interplay between written keywords and oral elaborations, as well as the use of visual resources. Moreover, the teacher used the students' presentations as a starting point for discussing grammatical features in context. We discuss the findings in relation to research on focus on form (FonF) and contextualized grammar teaching, demonstrating how these traditions can complement each other. We argue that the findings have implications for second language teaching more broadly, highlighting the value of integrating multimodal elements into language instruction and using students' multilingualism as a resource.

Keywords: Second language teaching, Swedish for immigrants, focus on form, contextualized grammar teaching, translanguaging

1

Walldén, R., Eiesland, E.A., & Laake, S. (2025). *Supporting adult L2 learners' contextualized grammar knowledge and presentation skills when working with tasks related to work placements. L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 25, 1-29.*
<https://doi.org/10.21248/l1esll.2025.25.1.830>

Corresponding author: Robert Walldén, Department of Swedish, Linnaeus University, 351 95, Växjö, Sweden, email: robert.wallden@lnu.se

© 2025 *International Association for Research in L1-Education.*

1. INTRODUCTION

A constant challenge for language education is linking classroom instruction with the communicative practices and needs outside the classroom (e.g., Lehtonen, 2017; Reinders & Benson, 2017). For adult language learners, the workplace is one of the most important domains of language use. This has resulted in various efforts to integrate work placements and other workplace experiences with language education. Research on L2 learners' opportunities to develop work-related linguistic resources has primarily focused on specific professional training programs that already require a high level of target language proficiency (e.g. Duff *et al.* 2002, Riddiford & Holmes, 2015. Li, 2000; Lehtonen, 2017 Lum *et al.*, 2018, Moanakwena, 2021; Myles, 2009). For example, studies have shown that placement experiences can help learners develop pragmatic skills such as expressing refusals (Riddiford & Holmes, 2015), making requests (Li, 2000) and engaging in small talk (Myles, 2009). However, similar to the predominant research focus on L2 learners in academic contexts (Godfroid & Andringa, 2023), much of this research also focus on learners with completed education on secondary or tertiary level. The conditions in adult education on basic levels, with a more diverse set of learners in terms of educational background, have not been as extensively studied. This includes studying how language teaching is connected to workplace experiences.

This study is conducted within the government-funded Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) program, designed for adults who need basic Swedish language skills to participate in daily life, society, work, and further education (Skolverket, 2022). Completion of the free SFI program also provides access to intermediate and advanced Swedish as a Second Language courses.

While SFI education has always been connected to the labor market, there has been an increasing focus on employability (e.g., Lindberg & Sandwall, 2017; Rosén & Bagga-Gupta, 2013). This has resulted in efforts to integrate SFI teaching with work placements, aiming for a mutual enrichment (Thornéus, 2018). While previous studies have highlighted the role of placements (Sandwall, 2013; Walldén, 2024a), there is still limited research on how classroom activities create links between classroom teaching and work placements.

The present study contributes to the field by reporting findings from a municipal development project in southern Sweden. In the project, SFI students were offered a course that integrated placement experiences with communicative assignments that were introduced and followed up in the classroom. The teacher offered feedback and instruction in the classroom to promote the students' capabilities to perform communicative tasks and learn about features of the target language. We investigate how knowledge about grammatical features of the target language was contextualized in form-focused instruction (see Long, 1991; Ellis & Shintani, 2014) drawing on communicative tasks related to the placements. Our study connects to previous studies on parts of the same data material, which showed that a vocabulary-oriented placement task provided opportunities for discussing the meaning a

situational use of words and word combinations that the students encountered on the placements (Walldén, 2024b). In the present study, we shift the focus to discussions about grammatical features.

The study aims to contribute knowledge about how a teacher support adult L2 learners' performance of tasks connected to workplace placements in basic language education. We ask the following questions:

- 1) What characterizes the SFI teacher's feedback on students' oral presentations connected to their workplace placement?
- 2) How is grammatical metalanguage used in the classroom discussions connected to performance of placement tasks?

As shown in later sections, we combine a thematic analysis of the teaching with notions derived from contextual grammar teaching (Myhill et al., 2012) to answer these questions.

1.1 Swedish for immigrants

Previous classroom research into the teaching of Swedish for Immigrants is limited. However, some recent studies have taken a holistic view of the students' engagement in literacy practices, emphasizing the development of multilingual, multimodal, and critical literacies (Bergsten Provaznik & Wedin, 2023; Wedin et al., 2018; Wedin, 2023). Furthermore, Wedin and Norlund Shaswar (2019; 2023) have examined students' opportunities for substantial engagement in classroom interaction. They concluded that the students were rarely challenged with more demanding communicative tasks. The importance of challenging students according to their capabilities as adult learners is evident also in Franker's (2011) study of the use of visual material in basic literacy instruction.

Wedin and Norlund Shaswar (2019) focused on discussions following students' oral self-presentations, showing that the students had limited opportunities for interaction. Another study (Norlund Shaswar & Wedin, 2019) examined the language learning strategies used when a teacher helped a student prepare for a presentation of recreational activities. The findings showed that students were supported in pronunciation, spelling, and the use of keywords, but the strategies employed by the teacher and by the students often did not align. Unlike the current study, these studies did not focus on teacher feedback after presentations and use of grammatical metalanguage in connection to the presentation task. Additionally, the studies mentioned focused on tasks relating to everyday contexts rather than work-related ones.

Also conducted in the context of SFI, Jakobson (2020) studied feedback on students' writing, finding that students particularly valued feedback on correct use of grammar. The feedback was primarily concerned with grammatical accuracy rather than the functional use of language resources. Similar results were reported in an earlier study of a beginner Swedish course for university students, where students appreciated accuracy-related feedback on writing and pronunciation tasks

(Jacobson, 2015). However, functional grammatical aspects of SFI-teachers' feedback related to students' performance of presentation tasks remain underexplored.

While placements can provide opportunities for language learning in real-world contexts, Sandwall's (2013) study of SFI placements revealed a disconnect between these practical experiences and classroom language instruction. She therefore advocated for a pedagogic model based on the idea of transfer between the placements and the classroom. The lessons observed in the present study drew inspiration from this model by creating placement tasks that were followed up in the classroom. A previous publication focused on students' experiences during these placements (Walldén, 2024a). Several students reported positive interactions with L1 speakers of Swedish and valuable workplace experiences. However, experiences differed according to the students' chosen branch, with students placed in warehouse or kitchen work being less satisfied than students placed in service houses and youth centers. Yet another study (Walldén & Winlund, 2024), partly based on the same material as the present contribution, showed that the teacher brought attention to structural and linguistic features of job application letters, such as adjectives, to scaffold the students writing. Moreover, she sometimes used the students' knowledge of other languages to make comparisons with the Swedish language. However, this study did not focus on the use of metalanguage or feedback related to the students' presentations of placement tasks.

The present contribution shifts the focus to the tasks students performed in the classroom, many of which involved presenting information about their placements to their peers. Since the teacher provided both instructions and feedback relating to these tasks and presentations, the material was analyzed to address the research gap concerning SFI teachers' feedback and teaching related to students' presentation tasks. The study provides further insight into a specific effort to bridge language teaching in classrooms and students' experiences at different workplaces, by looking at how different aspects of language, in particular grammar, are discussed in relation to language use in context.

1.2 Perspectives on grammar teaching

L2 research has predominantly approached grammar teaching in two distinct ways. While *focus on forms* (FonFs) involves explicitly teaching specific grammatical areas in isolated activities, *focus on form* (FonF) draws attention to linguistic features in meaning-focused and communicative activities (Long, 1991; Ellis & Shintani, 2014). Originally, FonF entailed providing corrective feedback or otherwise clarifying a linguistic feature before returning to the pedagogical task at hand (Long, 1991), thus incidentally drawing students' attention to problematic linguistic items (Basturkmen et al., 2002). However, Ellis (2016) has argued that FonF should be understood as a broader set of techniques aimed at directing learners' attention to form while they are engaged in communicative L2 use. These techniques may be incidental, as Long (1991) proposed, but can also be pre-planned and pre-emptive. Additionally, Ellis

(2016) emphasized that the focus should not only be on form but on form-meaning mapping, such as effectively using the past tense in communication by utilizing the *-ed* morpheme.

Research on FonF has typically examined its effectiveness in improving the rate of language development, often comparing it to FonFs approaches or to teaching without form-focused elements (e.g., Long, 1991, Ellis, 2016; Khezrlou, 2021; Shintani, 2015). More recent research has also compared the effectiveness of different types of FonF, such as variations in timing (Nassaji, 2020; Xu & Li, 2021) and explored the effects of FonF on the learning of different linguistics forms (Pouresmaeil & Vali, 2023). Additionally, research increasingly acknowledges the value of leveraging L2 students' multilingual competencies to develop meta-linguistic awareness and discourse skills (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013, 2022; Fuster, 2022; Hagemann & Sjøfteland, 2023). However, FonF approaches and multilingual perspectives have been largely absent in the limited studies on grammar teaching in Swedish as a second language, as they have focused on FonFs approaches in textbooks and teaching practices to traditionally challenging areas, for example word order (Bandh et al., 2023) and definiteness in relation to article use (Flyman Matsson & Nyqvist, 2023).

As has often been the case in L2 acquisition research (Bigelow & Tarone, 2004), studies on form-focused instruction involving adult learners have mostly been conducted in university contexts (e.g., Moncada-Comas & Block, 2021; Lytovchenko et al., 2020), with participants who have advanced or intermediate skills in the target language (Pouresmaeil & Vali, 2023). This contrasts with the present study, which involves a diverse group of students still developing basic skills in the target language. Moreover, previous research has mainly focused on measuring the effects of different approaches to form-focused instruction, such as FonF and FonFs, rather than providing qualitative and contextualized insight into on-going teaching practices.

The FonF approach is most relevant to the current investigation since it shares similarities with Contextualized grammar (also sometimes called “Grammar for writing”), as described by Myhill and colleagues (Myhill, Jones, Lines & Watson, 2012; Myhill, Jones, Watson & Lines, 2013). Although their research primarily focuses on L1 education, our point of departure is that the principles of Contextualized grammar can be readily adapted to an L2 context and may provide insights relevant to L2 teaching. Myhill et al. (2012) conducted interventions where grammar was taught by making students aware of the connection between grammatical form and meaning in texts. The intervention positively impacted students' scores on a standardized writing test administered post-intervention. In addition, students in the intervention group developed a more sophisticated grammatical metalanguage, as evidenced by the fact that they made “more comments defined as evidence of metalinguistic understanding” than the students in the control group (Myhill et al., 2012).

Myhill (2021) outlines four fundamental pedagogical principles for contextualized grammar, abbreviated LEAD: *linking* grammar with text, using *examples*, using *authentic* texts, and encouraging exploratory classroom *discussion*. The

contextualized approach to grammar is *inductive*, as students examine and discuss various grammatical constructions and their linguistic or rhetorical effects within the contexts they appear. While the teacher provides the relevant grammatical metalanguage for the discussions, the primary concern is the way linguistic constructions convey meaning. Myhill (2018) describes her approach a “Hallidayian theoretical framework for grammar, which emphasizes grammar as a semiotic resource for meaning-making”. In other words, the approach views grammatical form not as an end in itself but as a tool for interaction and communication, studied from this perspective. This is similar to the FonF method discussed above, which shares the overall principle that grammatical forms should be connected to usage.

Myhill’s approach, originally designed for improving writing skills, has been adapted to meet the needs of specific student groups, including students with dyslexia (McCormack-Colbert et al., 2018). Kabel (2023) and Strandberg and Lundström (2023) present examples of how contextualized grammar principles can be integrated with both writing and literature instruction, reinforcing the idea that grammar must be taught within meaningful contexts. Watson and Newman (2017) similarly explored how contextualized grammar instruction enhances students’ metalinguistic awareness during preparation for English Language exams. Arseneau, Focambert and Lefrançois (2018) examined the impact of contextualized grammar teaching, specifically on the relative clause, on students’ writing. For a comprehensive overview of recent studies on contextualized grammar, see Strandberg (2022). Although significant work has been done in L1, L2, and L3 contexts in Scandinavia (Hagemann & Sjøfteland, 2023; Kabel et al., 2022; Schurz & Coumel, 2023), research on contextualized grammar teaching in adult second-language instruction remains scarce, both nationally and internationally.

The resource-based approach to language in contextual grammar shares similarities with genre-based instruction (Rose & Martin, 2012), both grounded in Halliday’s work and emphasizing writing skills. Genre-based instruction places more emphasis on the teacher’s active and interactional modelling of linguistic resources in writing (see also Gibbons, 2006). Unlike Myhill’s approach, genre-based instruction is more commonly applied in adult second-language instruction to enhance students’ mastery of, for example, linking words (Palm, 2024; Sandgaard Ekdahl & Walldén, 2022; Walldén & Winlund, 2024), relative clauses (Caplan & Farling, 2017), evaluative resources (Sandgaard Ekdahl, 2024) and clausal information structure (Albino, 2017). However, both approaches have a bias towards written language—a tendency reflected both in L1 and L2 contexts (e.g., Aa, 2021; Hornberger, 1989; Wedin, 2023). This bias can restrict the exploration of grammatical features across different contexts and diminishes the potential for L2 development.

In an L2 context, grammatical metalanguage may be considered less central than in an L1 context, as the primary goal is mastering usage of the language and not the description of grammatical structures. The value of explicit grammar knowledge has been difficult to resolve in L2 research (Ellis, 2016). However, many L2 researchers (e.g., Ellis & Shintani, 2016; Loewen, 2014; Nation, 2013) concur with Myhill et al.

(2012) that metalinguistic awareness and grammatical metalanguage empower students to exert more conscious and direct control over their language use (2012, p. 6), enhancing their agency (Myhill, 2019). This shared assumption is also our theoretical point of departure in this article. Primarily, we utilize the Hallidayian perspectives of contextual grammar (Myhill et al., 2012) and the notion of metalinguistic support (Gibbons, 2006; Rose & Martin, 2012) to contribute knowledge about how a second-language teacher's feedback and scaffolding when connecting students' experiences at placements to basic language teaching in a classroom setting. Moreover, we wish to contribute theoretically by linking these perspectives to FonF approaches.

The theoretical perspective we adopt also frames our view of feedback, since we focus on the meaning-making resources the teacher prioritizes. This contrasts with the predominant focus on corrective feedback on L2 students' speaking (e.g., Nassaraji, 2020) and writing (e.g., Brown et al, 2023) in prior research.

The relationship between FonF and contextualized grammar will be revisited in the discussion, with an emphasis on broadening the concept of FonF by incorporating the perspective of contextual grammar teaching. This involves shifting the focus from the correct application of L2 forms to a more resource-based approach regarding the use of L2 forms in specific contexts. As stated in the aim of the study, our focus is on how a teacher support adult L2 students in the performance of placement tasks, which involved feedback and an explicit focus on resources of language.

2. METHOD AND MATERIAL

This investigation focuses on the organization of Swedish for Immigrants (SFI) instruction within a municipal setting in a southern Swedish town (see Walldén, 2024a). In this municipality, SFI students were offered the choice of three vocational pathways: (1) education, healthcare, and nursing; (2) foods, restaurant, and service; or (3) industry, warehouse, and logistics. The study specifically examines a locally implemented elective orientation course designed to provide participants with practical experience in their chosen vocational field. Over 13 weeks, students participated in weekly placements within their selected pathway, attending two half-day sessions each week. Additionally, language instruction sessions focused on preparing for and reflecting on these placement experiences.

2.1 *Field Access*

Before the study began, the first author was approached by the teacher and a project leader, both of whom later participated in the research. Their decision to involve the author was based on familiarity with previous research endeavors and a shared interest in ongoing evaluation (Swedish: *följeforskning*) of the municipality's initiative to integrate work placements with language learning objectives in SFI instruction. The project drew upon the pedagogical framework proposed by Sandwall (2013),

which emphasizes the transfer of knowledge between classroom and workplace settings. The first author also actively participated in planning and conducting some of the teaching activities (see Walldén, 2024a, 2024b). The study employed ethnographic methods (see Anderson-Levitt, 2006), combined with principles of action research (see Willis & Edwards, 2014). However, during the lessons discussed in this article, the first author was a participant observer of the teacher's instruction (see Anderson-Levitt, 2006). Given the researcher's selective focus on certain activities, the role is more accurately described as observer as participant or focused witness (Tracy, 2020).

The participating teacher held a qualification of 60 ECTS credits in Swedish as a Second Language, exceeding the base certification requirement for SFI instruction. Additionally, she was a certified teacher of languages at the upper secondary level and had 15 years of professional experience in adult education. The teacher had no training in using contextualized grammar or LEAD principles. However, like many second-language teachers in Sweden (see, for example, Palm, 2024), she regularly employed genre-based instruction which shares the Hallidayian perspective of grammar as a resource for meaning-making (see prior section). Thus, she can be presumed to have some theoretical and pedagogical knowledge of relevance to contextualized grammar teaching.

The study involved 20 students across two iterations of the course. While no detailed personal information was collected (see below), the students were generally diverse in terms of language background, previous education and years of residence in Sweden. The largest migrant languages in SFI program, as reported by the school, were Arabic, Dari/Persian, French, and Somali, which is reflected in some of the empirical examples in the findings section. The students were at different stages in their SFI education; some were enrolled in the final course (Course D), while others followed the penultimate course (Course C). However, all the students had progressed beyond the beginner level of Swedish.

2.2 Data collection

While a total of 22 lessons were documented throughout the placement period, the data analyzed in this article predominantly stems from transcribed audio recordings of six lessons. Furthermore, the researcher collected presentation slides used in the teaching, including both instructions from the teacher and presentations constructed by the students. These are not presented in the findings but were cross-referenced with the audio recordings in the process of analysis. In the documented lessons, the teacher provided support and feedback on the students' performance of placement tasks. These lessons were unevenly distributed across the two iterations of the course (four in the first iteration and two in the other). Each lesson lasted 90 minutes. The placement tasks typically involved gathering information at their placement sites and presenting it orally during the lessons using multimodal slide presentations. The examples in the findings were translated from Swedish to English

by the first author. Whenever feasible, translations retain features of learner language, thus reflecting the students' natural language usage. In the transcripts, italics indicate emphasis, "x" marks inaudible words, and parentheses denote uncertain transcriptions.

In some of the classroom conversations, languages other than Swedish were used. A combination of online dictionaries and generative AI chatbots, such as Gemini, ChatGPT and Copilot, was utilized to interpret and represent key phrases in such languages. For example, the researcher used AI prompts such as "What is [x] called in [language]" and cross-checked the responses generated by the AI tools with recordings, dictionaries and alternative AI services. The resulting transcriptions are considered uncertain and marked by parentheses.

2.3 Ethical considerations

This study adhered to the ethical guidelines outlined by the Swedish Research Council (2024). Before the study began, explicit informed consent was obtained from all participants. Students were informed, both orally and in writing, about the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw at any time. The written information was developed in collaboration with the teacher and tailored to suit with the students' expected language proficiency levels. Although the students had previously completed multiple consent forms as part of their participation in the municipal project, it was emphasized that this consent specifically pertained to research. When necessary, additional explanations were provided in other languages, facilitated by teachers or tutors proficient in the students' primary or dominant languages.

The data collection process adhered to the data minimization principles outlined in the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), collecting only information essential to the research questions (Regulation 2016/679). Measures were taken to avoid collecting data that could potentially reveal participants' ethnicity or other sensitive information, in compliance with both GDPR and Swedish legislation (SFS 2003:460). Consequently, no detailed information regarding individual students' countries of origin or first languages was collected. The gathered data is securely stored using an encrypted data storage service provided by the university.

2.4 Analytical approach

The analysis was conducted in two main phases. In the first phase, Walldén developed overarching themes the SFI teacher's feedback on students' oral presentations connected to their workplace placement, following a process inspired by thematic content analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2020). During the familiarization with the data, including both transcribed audio recordings and visual material used by the participants during the lessons, the researcher identified activities and interactions centered on the teacher's feedback and instructions regarding the presentations of

placement tasks. The material was coded according to different areas of emphasis from the teacher, such as “use of keywords”, “use of colors”, “font formatting”, “oral elaborations” and “use of grammatical metalanguage”. These codes were then used to thematically categorize the data. Table 1 shows examples of raw data connected to codes and the finalized themes (1–3).

Table 1. Data examples connected to codes and finalized themes

Data	Codes	Finalized theme
“Here is thick text. [points] Bold text. And then thin.”	<i>font formatting</i>	1. Visual resources are necessary to present key information
“It becomes clear. [points] You take all the questions in red, one could say. And then the keywords in black.”	<i>use of color</i>	
“So I don't want sentences here. No sentences. But when you present, what do you do then?”	<i>use of keywords</i>	2. Written keywords and oral language elaborations should be used as complementary modes
“When you present. Then you shouldn't just read the keywords”	<i>oral elaborations</i>	
“For example. An uncomfortable ^c situation. [writes on the board] Just like you inflect an adjective. An uncomfortable ^c situation.”	<i>grammatical metalanguage</i>	3. Performance of placement-related tasks require the use of grammatical features in context
“That you gave several examples. You said ‘if the bus is late you have to call the boss’. So good.”	<i>less explicit reference to features of language</i>	

Together, the themes illuminate different facets of the teacher’s feedback and support, and thus provide the answer to RQ1. This part of the analysis was primarily inductive as it was grounded in the data rather than in theoretical frameworks (see Braun & Clarke, 2020). However, as pointed out by Braun & Clarke (2020), thematic analyses are inescapably informed by theoretical concepts. Perspectives relevant to the developed themes were interactional scaffolding in L2 classrooms (see Gibbons, 2006), where the teacher articulate expectations and draws attention to language and other modes of expression that are necessary for language and knowledge development. This also aligns with the importance of metalinguistic discussions to support students’ agency in using resources of language (Myhill, 2019).

The third theme, “Performance of placement-related tasks require the use of grammatical features in context”, is presented first in the Findings since it turned out to contain a particularly rich array of examples. In the second phase of analysis, Eiesland and Laake employed an iterative qualitative approach (Tracy 2020), alternating between readings of the data and theoretical perspectives relating to this

theme. Thus, the analysis can best be described as abductive (Timmerman & Tavory, 2012) rather than inductive or deductive (cf. Braun & Clarke, 2020). Guided by research question 2, “How is grammatical metalanguage used in the classroom discussions connected to performance of placement tasks?”, we identified thematically coherent sequences relating to grammatical categories. An example of one such sequence is provided in (1). In all excerpts, the original wording in Swedish is shown on the left, with English translations on the right.

(1) Lesson 4

<p>Teacher: Eh ett verb är ju nånting man gör. Vi kan skriva här. [skriver på tavlan] Verb. Det är lika med något man gör. Eh. Och vi har. Ni sa äta, springa. Ja. När vi lär oss verb så lär vi oss ofta grundformen. Att äta. Att springa. Vad har vi mer? /.../ Fler verb? [Student's name] ett verb?</p>	<p>Teacher: Well, a verb is something you do. We can write here. [writes on the board] Verb. It equals something you do. Eh. And we have. You said eat, run. Yes. When we learn verbs, we often learn the basic form. To eat. To run. What else do we have? / ... / More verbs? [Student's name] a verb?</p>
---	---

The researchers identified three common categories, or sub-themes, in the grammatical metalanguage in the sequences: *syntax*, *morphology* and *comparing languages*. In the example in (1), the grammatical features discussed was categorized as *morphology*. This categorization gave us an impression of the grammatical topics being discussed. We also wished to look at how the teacher talked to the students about the grammatical topics. The pedagogical approach taken by Myhill (2021) emphasizes that grammar teaching should be connected to a linguistic context, and that linguistic choices are important for communication. This perspective is useful for the type of task the students in our data material were performing (talking about their placements). Thus, we aimed to investigate whether we could identify any of the principles from Myhill in our data. The LEAD principles are “link (between language use and grammar)”, “examples”, “authentic texts” and “discussion”. As they are principles of teaching they are not always confined to single sequences. Example (1) above shows use of both *examples* and *authenticity* since the teacher uses examples (*eat, run*) and these examples are verbs used by the students in their presentations, an authentic text.

3. FINDINGS

In this chapter, we present the key findings regarding the teacher's priorities in her feedback and instructions on student presentations according to three major themes. The first and most extensive theme addresses both RQ1 and RQ2 while the two additional themes primarily address RQ1 while also giving context to further understand the teacher's use of grammatical metalanguage.

3.1 Performance of placement-related tasks require the use of grammatical features in context

Throughout the observed lessons, the teacher consistently highlighted the students' use of grammatical features in the context of placement-related tasks and used relevant grammatical metalanguage. Thus, grammatical metalanguage formed part of her feedback and instructions to the students. Our analysis of the data identified three main sub-themes in the grammatical discussions: *syntax*, *morphology* and *comparing languages*. Each of these are discussed in the following sections. We point out how the LEAD principles from Myhill (2021) can be seen in the data.

3.1.1 Syntax

Grammatical metalanguage related to sentence structure appears in several sequences. The choice of the sentence as the topic of grammatical discussions comes from the nature of the tasks the students were given. For instance, in (2), the class discussed the difference between the keywords on a presentation slide and the full sentences they were expected to use when speaking (see also (13) and (14)). In the sequence in (2), the teacher employed multiple metalinguistic terms related to sentences, such as *verb*, *present tense*, and *subordinate clause*.

(2) Lesson 2

Teacher: Du ska berätta med meningar. Stödord och meningar. [Student 1] har vi pratat om verb i presens. Eller hur? Jag kommer att lyssna på dina verb. Och vi har [Student 2]. Vi pratade lite om bisatser. Att använda. Utvecklade meningar. Samma gäller [Student 3]. [Student 4] Vi pratade om att skriva egna stödord. Inte bara mina.

Teacher: You should tell it with sentences. Keywords and sentences. We have talked about verbs in the present tense with [Student 1]. Right? I will listen to your verbs. And we have [Student 2]. We talked a bit about subordinate clauses. To use. Extended sentences. The same applies to [Student 3]. [Student 4] We talked about writing your own keywords. Not just mine.

The teacher engaged students in discussing the difference between the written and oral parts of their presentation several times in our data material. In Myhill's LEAD principles, the "linking" principle states that there should be a clear link between the grammatical phenomenon and the effect on texts. As shown in a later section, the teacher also brought up this link in (13), where she engaged students in a discussion of keywords and full sentences, and that they have different purposes. In our data, the teacher always used the students' own presentation as examples when discussing grammar. Using authentic texts is also a principle in Myhill's approach (the A in LEAD).

In the lesson in sequence (3), the students were presenting the most important rules in their work placements. The teacher asked the students to provide reasons for some of the rules. She used this opportunity to discuss subordinate clauses, once

again linking the students' authentic language use to grammatical patterns. Explanations (you may not wear shoes inside *because* the floors will get wet) and conditionals (*when* you are with children you may not use your phone) are central functions of subordinate clauses. The teacher used the grammatical metalanguage to describe one of the students' explanations. The students got to see that the grammatical metalanguage can be used to describe their own communication, not just examples in textbooks. In addition, they were shown that grammar is also present in spoken language, not just in written language.

(3) Lesson 1

Teacher: Sen använder du många bisatsinledare. [skrattar] Jag lyssnade. 'Eftersom', 'om', 'vad', 'både och'. Hörde ni det? Student 1 hörde det. Student 2. Ni som har mig. Vi jobbar med orden 'eftersom', 'vad', 'om', 'både ... och' på sfi. Så vi använder. Använder dom orden. Jag kan skriva dom på tavlan. Eh. 'Eftersom'. 'Om'. 'Vad'. 'För att' också va?

Teacher: Then you use many subordinate conjunctions. [laughs] I listened. 'Because', 'if', 'what', 'both and'. Did you hear that? Student 1 didn't hear it. Student 2 did. Those of you who have me. We work with the words 'because', 'what', 'if', 'both ... and' at SFI. So we use. Use those words. I can write them on the board. Uh. 'Because'. 'If'. 'What'. 'In order to' as well?

In (4), the discussion was about different ways to express rules connected to a placement task. Although the teacher did not use explicit grammatical metalanguage in this sequence, she provided several examples of how to formulate rules and prohibitions. She directed the students' attention to various words and expressions that can be used to state rules and how these can be expanded on by adding subordinate clauses, which she had already named in sequence 3.

(4) Lesson 6

Teacher: Du behöver ta av dig skorna. Du behöver ta av dig skorna när du kommer in på förskolan. Till exempel. Man kan inte gå in med skor [klampar och skrattar] på förskolan. Man får inte göra det eftersom det kan bli smutsigt på golvet. Här är förklara varför till exempel. Här har ni ord och uttryck som ni kan använda. [pekar] När ni vill skriva ett tips. Du behöver. Till exempel du behöver ta av dig skorna. Det är viktigt att. Det är viktigt att du tar av dig skorna. Man kan använda olika ord. Eh. Det är bra om du tar av dig skorna. Okej?

Teacher: You need to take off your shoes. You need to take off your shoes when you come into the preschool. For example. You can't go in with shoes [stomps and laughs] in the preschool. You're not allowed to do that because it can make the floor dirty. Here's why, for example. Here are some words and phrases you can use. [points] When you want to write a tip. You need to. For example, you need to take off your shoes. It's important to. It's important that you take off your shoes. You can use different words. Uh. It's good if you take off your shoes. Okay?

In (5), one of the students said that he at first was uncertain of the meaning of something another student had explained, but then "he explained it". The teacher again

mentioned how clauses can be expanded, and that doing so helps the listener understand.

(5) Lesson 2

<p>Student: Det var bra med sätt för att jag förstod allt han säger. /.../ Mer än där på pausen för att jag var osäker på pausen men han förklarade det.</p> <p>Teacher: Du förklarade ju. Jag tänkte också. Jag tänkte säga samma. Att du förklarade bra och gav exempel. Här. [pekar] Till exempel. Så att vi förstår. Tänkte ni på det? Jag tänkte på det. Att du gav flera exempel. Du sa 'om bussen är försenad måste man ringa till chefen'. Så bra.</p>	<p>Student: It was good with the way because I understood everything he said. /.../ More than there on the break because I was unsure about the break but he explained it.</p> <p>Teacher: You explained it. I also thought. I was going to say the same thing. That you explained well and gave examples. Here. [points] For example. So that we understand. Did you think about that? I thought about that. That you gave several examples. You said, 'if the bus is late you have to call the boss'. So good.</p>
--	--

Even though there was no explicit grammatical metalanguage in this sequence, the teacher had used the terms earlier in the sequence, and calls attention to the same phenomenon in different ways throughout. Sometimes this was done by explicitly using grammatical terms, sometimes by using everyday terms, and sometimes, like in (5), by talking about the effect of the grammatical feature ("so that we understand").

3.1.2 Morphology

The morphological topics that the teacher brought up included derivational affixes and inflection of adjectives. In (6), the teacher and the students discussed the adjective *obekväm* ('uncomfortable', often used to describe non-standard working hours), using grammatical terms. This word appeared in a presentation where students shared vocabulary they encountered during their placement (see also Walldén, 2024b). This discussion was prompted by the students' own linguistic observations from the placement task. The student brought attention to different forms of the adjective, corresponding to the two genders in Swedish: common and neuter, marked by superscripted "c" and "n" in the English translation. In this case, the link between the grammatical phenomenon and the text was made salient by the student, and the language being discussed is authentic as it came from one of the students' presentations.

(6) Lesson 6

<p>Student: Jag vet inte Jessika. Jag hittade googlade lite. /.../ Dom två är detsamma. 'En obekväm' och 'ett obekvämt.'</p> <p>Teacher: Eh. Ja det är ju. Då måste det komma ett substantiv efter. Eh. Till exempel. En</p>	<p>Student: I don't know, Jessika. I googled a little. /.../ The two are the same. 'An uncomfortable^c' and 'an uncomfortableⁿ.'</p> <p>Teacher: Uh. Yes, it is. Then a noun must come after. Uh. For example. An uncomfortable^c</p>
--	--

obekväm situation. [skriver på tavlan] Precis som man böjer ett adjektiv. En obekväm situation. Där man inte känner sig trygg. Till exempel om det är konflikt och man ska prata med varandra. En obekväm situation. Obekvämt. Eh. Ja vad ska vi kunna hitta på här med ett. Det är ju lite svårare. Ett obekvämt eh /.../ Samtal. Det är ett samtal. [skriver] /.../ Och så har vi flera eller många. Många obekväma situationer eller samtal. [skriver] Och då använder vi pluralformen.

situation. [writes on the board] Just like you inflect an adjective. An uncomfortable^c situation. Where you don't feel safe. For example, if there is a conflict and you have to talk to each other. An uncomfortable^c situation. Uncomfortable. Uh. Yes, what can we come up with here with one. It's a little more difficult. An uncomfortable^a uh /.../ Conversation. It's a conversation. [writes] /.../ And then we have several or many. Many uncomfortable situations or conversations. [writes] And then we use the plural form.

The teacher demonstrated how the adjective *obekväm* modifies nouns with different grammatical genders by providing examples (*en obekväm situation, ett obekvämt samtal*) to illustrate agreement between the noun and the adjective. The teacher then connected these examples to the grammatical term *plural* with phrases like *många obekväma situationer eller samtal*.

Later in the same sequence, the teacher broke down the word into morphemes (*o/bekväm*) to show how the meaning of the derived word contrasts with the root *bekväm*. The teacher noted that this word is commonly found in the collocation *obekväm arbetstid*, meaning "unsociable working hours," as shown in (7).

(7) Lesson 6

Teacher: Motsatsen är ju bekväm. [delar upp morfem, o/bekväm]. Bekväm är ju något som är bra. Till exempel en bekväm stol. [vickar på stol]. Är skönt att sitta på. En obekväm stol är hård och man vill inte sitta och. Så därför har vi "o" för att visa att det är motsatsen. Obekväma.

Student 1: Till exempel han sover bekväm.

Teacher: Ja, han sover obekvämt. Det är hur han sover. Då är det adverb. Det talar om hur man sover. Beskriver verbet. Obekväm. Det är ju när man jobbar nätter, kvällar, helger.

Student 2: Det är negativ.

Teacher: Ja, man använder det inte om vanlig. [skrattar] Normal. Man säger inte att jag jobbar bekväm arbetstid. Utan man använder bara ordet med en arbetstid som inte är den normala. Typ sju till fem.

Student 3: Hemma också. Vi har pratat nu om obekväm situation. Till exempel det finns konflikt mellan två personer. Vi kan också använda den på vardagsliv.

Teacher: The opposite is comfortable. [divides the morpheme, un/comfortable]. Comfortable is something that is good. For example, a comfortable chair. [wiggles the chair]. It's nice to sit on. An uncomfortable chair is hard and you don't want to sit and. So that's why we have "un" to show that it's the opposite. Uncomfortable.

Student 1: For example, he sleeps comfortably.

Teacher: Yes, he sleeps uncomfortably. It's how he sleeps. Then it's an adverb. It tells how you sleep. Describes the verb. Uncomfortable. It's when you work nights, evenings, weekends.

Student 2: It's negative.

Teacher: Yes, you don't use it for regular. [laughs] Normal. You don't say that I work comfortable hours. But you only use the word with a working time that is not normal. Like seven to five.

Student 3: At home too. We have talked now about an uncomfortable situation. For example, there is a conflict between two people. We can also use it in everyday life.

When a student provided the example "he sleeps uncomfortably," the teacher introduced the term *adverb*, explaining that it "describes the verb." The teacher also contextualized the example by referencing unsociable working hours ("It's when you work nights, evening, weekends"). The discussion clearly engaged the students. One single affix thus led to grammatical discussions not only about this affix, but about adjectives, adverbs and plurals in addition.

Verbs are a recurring topic in the material, with metalanguage related to verbs frequently used, including terms like *present tense*, *adverb*, and *imperative*. The imperative form, in particular, is the focus of an extensive discussion related to the task about documenting and explaining workplace rules, in (8).

(8) Lesson 3

<p>Teacher: Men vi har en speciell form på verbet. Imperativ. Vi har jobbat med det i [kurs] D med insändare [mentions names of two students]. Det är uppmaningar vad någon ska göra. Det är imperativ. Så vi ska jobba lite med den verbformen. När jag säger öppna fönstret [student's name]. Det är vad någon ska göra. Tvätta händerna. Eh. Skaka inte hand. Rök inte. Det är imperativ.</p>	<p>Teacher: But we have a special form of the verb. Imperative. We have worked with it in [course] D with letters to the editor [mentions names of two students]. They are requests for someone to do something. It's imperative. So, we're going to work a little with that verb form. When I say open the window [student's name]. It's what someone should do. Wash your hands. Uh. Don't shake hands. Don't smoke. It's imperative.</p>
---	--

The term *imperative* was (re)introduced to the students in the discussion about rules as a contextually relevant grammatical feature. The teacher drew on examples from the students' presentation tasks, connecting them to grammatical terms and explaining their function using everyday language. In this instance, the link was not directly to the students' presentations but to a grammatical feature they were likely to encounter while completing the task.

3.1.3 Comparing languages

Following the sequence discussed above, the teacher further encouraged the students to compare the Swedish imperative with imperative forms in their own languages. This resulted in a long discussion with substantial student engagement. There are several grammatical terms in the sequence in (9), including *imperative*, *word order*, *subject*, *infinitive*, *verb* and *noun*.

The teacher referenced previous work on the imperative from her regular D-level SFI class, where it was discussed in the context of writing arguments. She explained its function in everyday language ("when you want someone to do something") and asked if it is used in the students' first languages ("mother tongues"). This prompted several examples from the students related to rules in both speech and writing, comparing their languages to Swedish. Through using their multilingual repertoires, the students can potentially learn grammatical metalanguage. In this particular

sequence, the teacher used terms like imperative, verb and noun. By using the comparative approach, the amount of relevant grammatical terms expands. Imperative sentences often have an omitted subject, which can be used as a starting point for discussing the subject as a grammatical category, for example.

(9) Lesson 4

Teacher: Har ni en speciell form för imperativ?	Teacher: Do you have a special form for imperative?
Student 1: Som den. Arabiska. Också som. Men heter namnet (sighat al'amr). [skrattar] Arabiska.	Student 1: Like that. Arabic. Also, like that. But the name is different (sighat al'amr). [laughs] Arabic.
Student 2: Order. Order. /.../ Samma order. /.../	Student 2: Order. Order. /.../ Same order. /.../
Teacher: Hur säger rök inte på dari och på persiska? Har ni ett verb? Rök. Rök inte. Är det ett verb?	Teacher: How do you say "don't smoke" in Dari and Persian? Do you have a verb? Smoke. Don't smoke. Is it a verb?
Student 3: Ja men vi först använder subjekt. /.../	Student 3: Yes, but we first use a subject. /.../
Student 4: Jag skriver persisk. [skriver på tavlan]	Student 4: I'll write it in Persian. [writes on the board] Teacher: But if I say this. Don't open. Then you only have one verb /.../
Teacher: Men om jag säger så här. Öppna inte. Då har du bara ett verb /.../	Teacher: But if I say this. Don't open. Then you only have one verb /.../
Student 3: Ibland vi använder verb och ibland vi använder först substantiv.	Student 3: Sometimes we use a verb and sometimes we use a noun first.
Teacher: Jaha. Verb och sen substantiv. Okej så det är lite annorlunda. Vi har ju alltid verb när det är imperativ.	Teacher: I see. Verb and then noun. Okay, so it's a little different. We always have a verb when it's imperative.
Student 4: [pekar] Samma. (nakosh sigār, sigār nakosh).	Student 4: [points] Same. (nakosh sigār, sigār nakosh).
Teacher: Man kan välja. /.../ Hur säger man tvätta händerna på franska?	Teacher: You can choose. /.../ How do you say "wash your hands" in French?
Student 5: Lavez les mains	Student 5: Lavez les mains.
Teacher: Ja ni säger alltid verbet först. På franska.	Teacher: Yes, you always say the verb first. In French.
Student 5: Ja. Lavez les mains.	Student 5: Yes. Lavez les mains.
Teacher: Det är ju samma.	Teacher: It's the same.
Student 5: Samma samma.	Student 5: The same, the same.

Overall, the teacher used a variety of grammatical terminology, particularly related to syntax and morphology. The terminology employed was always directly linked to the students' language use, both written and oral. In the next section, we discuss these findings in relation to the study's objectives.

3.2 Visual resources are necessary to present key information

We now turn to the second major theme of the findings, which concerns the use of visual resources to present key information. At the start of the course, lesson time was dedicated to explaining and providing feedback on the effective creation of

multimodal presentations in Google Drive. These slide presentations served as a foundation for the students' oral reports on their placement experiences. In her feedback, the teacher specifically praised the students' use of font color to enhance their presentations. Two examples are shown in (10).

(10) Lesson 1 and 2

Teacher: Det var jättefint med dom gröna färgerna Amila. Det blir fint för ögonen att titta. /.../ När man använder så att det blir tydligt. (Lesson 1)	Teacher: It was really nice with the green colors Amila. It's nice for the eyes to look at. /.../ When you use it so it becomes clear. (Lesson 1)
Teacher: Det blir tydligt. [pekar] Du tar alla kan man säga frågorna i rött. Och sen stödorden i svart. Ett litet tips till alla.	Teacher: It becomes clear. [points] You take all the questions in red, one could say. And then the keywords in black. A little suggestion for everyone.

In (10), the teacher highlighted the pleasantness of the color choice in the student's presentation, drawing attention to how font colors were used to differentiate between task-related concepts and the main points of information ("keywords") the students had gathered. The teacher also noted how one student had used bold font to achieve a similar effect, as shown in (11).

(11) Lesson 1

Teacher: Och tydligt här också. Här är tjock text. [pekar] Fet text. Och sen smal. Här har du gjort tjock och sen smal text. Tjock, smal. Jada du jobbade ju mer med färger. Så ni kan göra olika.	Teacher: And clear here too. Here is thick text. [points] Bold text. And then thin. Here you have made thick and then thin text. Thick, thin. Jada, you worked more with colors. So, you can do different things.
---	--

The teacher pointed to the student's slide to illustrate the difference in font, while also referencing another student's use of color for the same purpose. Additionally, the teacher emphasized the use of colons when modeling how students could design presentations on working hours, highlighting how colons visually link key concepts to workplace-specific information (12).

(12) Lesson 1

Teacher: Vi pratade om kolon [student's name]. Kommer du ihåg dom här? Vi tränade. Är det kolon kallas det och sen stödorden. Sen har vi. Sen har jag använt ett nytt ord. Privata ärenden. Det är ett svårt ord. Ärenden. Är det nån som vet var ärenden betyder? /.../ Ja man tar tid på vårdcentralen, man går till tandläkaren. Man måste med barnen eh på nåt möte på skolan. Eller banken. Det	Teacher: We talked about the colon [student's name]. Do you remember these? We practiced. It's called a colon and then the keywords. Then we have. Then I used a new word. Private errands. That's a difficult word. Errands. Does anyone know what errands means? /.../ Yes, you make an appointment at the health center, you go to the dentist. You have to go to a meeting at school with the children. Or the bank. Those are private errands.
---	--

är privata ärenden. Som man gör på arbetstid när man arbetar. Och sen kommer stödorden. Vi pratade om flex. Kommer ni ihåg flex? Och sen svaret här med stödord.	That you do during working hours when you work. And then come the keywords. We talked about flex. Do you remember flex? And then the answer here with keywords.
--	---

She explained how the colon connects key concepts (such as “flex” and “personal matters”) with “keywords” or “the answer”, referring to the main points of information the students had gathered at their placements.

In summary, a key priority for the teacher was guiding students in using visual resources (color, font, punctuation) to enhance their presentations on workplace-related concepts, as seen in the first two lessons. This early focus on visual resources may reflect the teacher’s awareness of the need to support students who were not familiar with presentation software. The students’ visualization of the information on the presentation slides became the point of departure for supporting the students’ use of oral language, including grammatical features such as the ones focused on in, for example, (2).

3.3 *Written keywords and oral language elaborations should be used as complementary modes*

As previously shown (10–12), the teacher emphasized the use of visual resources to highlight keywords. This occurred primarily in the first two lessons of the initial iteration, when students were still familiarizing themselves with the presentation requirements. In the teaching, the teacher elaborated on the function of the keywords, as visualized on the students’ slides, in relation to the students’ use of oral language. The example in (13) is from preparatory instructions.

(13) *Lesson 1*

<p>Teacher: Vi skrev stödord tillsammans förra gången. Stödord. Inga meningar. Inte stor bokstav och punkt. På den här skriver vi stödord. /.../ Varför skriver vi stödord och inte meningar? Varför? /.../</p> <p>Student 1: Kanske bättre att mycket pratar.</p> <p>Teacher: Ja det här är ju för att hjälpa.</p> <p>Student 2: Och komma ihåg?</p> <p>Teacher: Ja. För att komma ihåg. För att inte bara berätta allt själv utan ord. Det här hjälper ju er när ni ska berätta om arbetstider. /.../ Och det hjälper också dom som lyssnar eller hur?</p>	<p>Teacher: We wrote keywords together last time. Keywords. No sentences. No capital letters or periods. We write keywords on this one. /.../ Why do we write keywords and not sentences? Why? /.../</p> <p>Student 1: Maybe it’s better to talk a lot.</p> <p>Teacher: Yes, this is to help.</p> <p>Student 2: And to remember?</p> <p>Teacher: Yes. To remember. In order to not just tell everything yourself without words. This helps you when you are going to talk about working hours. /.../ And it also helps those who are listening, right?</p>
---	---

The teacher clarified the meaning of "keywords" by contrasting them with writing conventions, emphasizing "no sentences, no capital letters." A student suggested that keywords facilitate speaking, or that one is supposed to say more than the keywords. The teacher confirmed that keywords aid both the speaker and the listener. Continuing the explanation, the teacher emphasized how students should use oral language to elaborate on the key points of information (14).

(14) Lesson 1

Teacher: Så jag vill inte ha meningar här. Inga meningar. Men när ni presenterar. Vad gör ni då?

Student Pratar mening.

Teacher: Ja när ni presenterar. Då ska ni inte läsa bara stödorden [skrattar]. Då måste ni. Det är då ni ska berätta om era arbetstider. Ni ska förklara. Ge exempel. Det är då ni ska använda språket. /.../ Med meningar.

Teacher: So, I don't want sentences here. No sentences. But when you present, what do you do then?

Student: Talk in sentences.

Teacher: Yes, when you present. Then you shouldn't just read the keywords [laughs]. Then you must. That's when you're supposed to talk about your working hours. You should explain. Give examples. That's when you should use the language. /.../ With sentences.

After restating that she did not want to see sentences in the students' visual presentations, the teacher asked a question to emphasize that students should speak in full sentences during their presentations. She clarified that they should not simply read the keywords but instead "tell", "explain" and "give examples" using complete sentences. This instruction implies that the students should use function words preferably omitted in their slides (cf. (15) below) As shown (2–3), these exchanges incorporated grammatical metalanguage to help students fulfill the task.

In the second lesson, the teacher addressed instances where students deviated from expectations. For example, when a student simply read his keywords while presenting about working hours ("flex: no"), the teacher asked how a full sentence could be formed (15).

(15) Lesson 2

Teacher: Det står "flex nej". Hur säger man en mening? När Student 1 ska förklara.

Student 2: Det finns inte.

Teacher: Ja. Det finns inte flex. Ja. Om du ska använda en mening. Det finns inte flex på min arbetsplats. Det finns övertid på min arbetsplats. Bra.

Teacher: It says, "flex no". How do you say it in a sentence? When Student 1 is going to explain.

Student 2: There is none.

Teacher: Yes. There is no flex. Yes. If you are going to use a sentence. There is no flex at my workplace. There is overtime at my workplace. Good.

The teacher commented similarly when a student had written full sentences in her presentations (16):

(16) Lesson 2

<p>Teacher: Samma här. [pekar på formulering: "Det blir problem och man blir stressad och det blir sent för matlagning"] Vad kan man ta bort. Om man kommer försent. /.../ Tänker vi kan ha kvar. [stryker så det står: "problem, stressad, sent för matlagning"] Så försök ta bort ord som du inte behöver. Som du kan säga till oss. Så här kan du berätta. Om du kommer försent så kan det bli problem och man blir stressad. Och det kan bli sent för matlagning. Barnen får inte maten, lunch, i tid. Så förklara med. Du behöver bara dom tre.</p>	<p>Teacher: Same here. [points to the phrase: "It becomes a problem, and you get stressed and it gets late for cooking"] What can you remove? If you arrive late. /.../ I think we can keep it. [crosses out so it says: "problem, stressed, late for cooking"] So try to remove words that you don't need. That you can tell us. This is how you can tell it. If you arrive late, it can become a problem, and you get stressed. And it can get late for cooking. The children don't get their food, lunch, on time. So explain with. You only need those three.</p>
---	--

The teacher showed how, for example, function words and pronouns can be omitted ("words you don't need") and instead communicated orally, thus addressing the complementary roles of the modes. Furthermore, the complementary modes actualized the need to use grammatical features to expand on the oral language presentations along the lines shown in (2–3).

4. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore how students' experiences at placements are connected to basic language teaching in the classroom, specifically through tasks related to work placements. The oral presentation task, where students described and explained aspects of their placements, presented a challenging communicative task—an element previously noted as lacking in SFI research (Wedin & Norlund Shaswar, 2019, 2023). As the findings show, teacher feedback played a crucial role in supporting students' success. In response to RQ1, "What characterizes the SFI teacher's feedback on students' oral presentations?" the primary finding was that the teacher's feedback focused on the multimodal aspects and linguistic resources used to expand their presentations. These findings contrast with the dominant focus on verbal language development and accuracy in L2 classroom research (e.g., Long, 1991; Nassaji, 2020; Xu & Li, 2021; Pouresmaeil & Vali, 2023).

The emphasis on visual resources likely stemmed from the need to support students with limited or no experience in creating multimodal presentations. The curriculum for Swedish for immigrants (Skolverket, 2022) specifically requires teaching to provide opportunities for developing the ability to "use digital technology and relevant tools for learning and communication." This underscores the importance of supporting not only oral language skills but also multimodal competencies, enabling communication in various contexts among a diverse group of learners. Such skills are likely already acquired by L2 learners with secondary or tertiary education, a group primarily focused on in previous research (Duff et al., 2002; Li, 2000; Riddiford &

Holmes, 2015). While previous research on SFI has highlighted the multimodal aspects of writing practices (Wedin et al., 2018), the present study shows an emphasis on the use of visual resources and the integration of writing, speech, and visual elements in the teacher's feedback and support. This is evident throughout the three themes presented as the answer to RQ1, since the teacher supported the students to visualize relevant information on their slides, pointed out the role of the visualized keywords in relation to their use of oral language, and affirmed the students' beneficial use of grammatical structures to complete the tasks.

The feedback also placed significant emphasis on features of verbal language, from forming complete sentences to using linking words to create the explanations and descriptions needed for the task. This resource-based approach contrasts with the common focus on corrective feedback and accurate production of language structures found in previous L2 research (e.g., Long, 1991; Nassaji, 2020; Xu & Li, 2021; Poursmaeil & Vali, 2023). The teacher's approach aligns with Ellis's (2016) broader conceptualization of Focus on Form (FonF), as it appeared to be a pre-planned strategy aimed at supporting the use and awareness of specific structures, rather than an incidental focus.

In this study, we also drew inspiration from the principles of contextual grammar teaching outlined by Myhill (2013). Building upon this exploration, we will discuss how elements from both contextual grammar and FonF were evident in the observed lessons and how the two approaches can complement each other in the classroom.

In the FonF approach, the teacher typically highlights linguistic features within activities that are primarily meaning-focused and communicative (Long, 1991; Ellis & Shintani, 2014). This principle is also present in Myhill's contextualized grammar, where the focus is on the meaning of grammatical structures, and students are encouraged to discuss and explore the effects of different grammatical choices. The teacher typically selects relevant metalanguage based on the grammatical characteristics of the text being discussed, but the metalanguage itself is not the primary goal. Instead, the focus is on developing metalinguistic awareness and conscious control over linguistic and stylistic choices. This same principle is evident in the observed SFI lessons, where the teacher used students' presentations and discussions to address grammatical features of Swedish. Each time grammatical language was introduced, the teacher provided examples and explained the function of grammatical categories, such as the imperative, in non-technical terms like "telling others what to do."

In the observed sequences, the authentic texts were the students' presentations, both written and oral. While Myhill's approach typically involves literary texts as the authentic materials (see also Strandberg & Lundström, 2023), the student presentations in our data served a similar purpose. These texts, though different in nature, were still authentic and highly relevant to the students.

Because contextualized grammar teaching has been developed in an L1 setting and primarily focuses on written language (e.g., Arseneau et al., 2023; Kabel, 2023; Strandberg & Lundström, 2023), oral language receives less attention (see Aa, 2021).

This emphasis on writing may reinforce graphocentric views, suggesting that writing is the primary mode of language, rather than recognizing the importance of spoken language. Understanding that grammar is also present in speech could enhance the perceived relevance of grammar and expand the utility of grammatical metalanguage. In this respect, contextualized grammar efforts could benefit from the approach observed in our data, where the focus in SFI lessons was largely on oral language, alongside the use of keywords in student presentations.

Another similarity between the principles of contextualized grammar and the instruction observed in this study is the connection between form and function. For example, in our data, the teacher highlighted the distinction between sentences and non-sentences by emphasizing their functional roles—sentences are used in speech, while keywords are employed in presentations, allowing these two modes to complement each other. The teacher frequently used classroom discussions to encourage students to reflect on why certain grammatical constructions are used in specific contexts, which aligns with Myhill's contextualized grammar approach. As previously discussed, the presentations provided a context for exploring both the interplay between visual resources, writing and oral language and the functional use of subordinate clauses and subordinate conjunctions during the presentations.

It is noteworthy that the presentation topics were quite challenging, as the students had to describe their experiences at their placements rather than focusing on personal or private matters (see Wedin & Norlund Shaswar, 2019; Norlund Shaswar & Wedin, 2019). This challenge likely guided the teacher's approach in affirming and advocating the use of specific grammatical features to enhance the presentations. Such a prescriptive approach is common in L2 teaching but contrasts with the descriptive and exploratory approach advocated by Myhill et al. (2012). However, the teacher emphasized the communicative use of these features rather than mere correctness (see Jakobson, 2020). This may be influenced by genre-based instruction (see Rose & Martin, 2012), which often adopts a prescriptive approach to strengthen students' control over linguistic resources. However, in the present study, this approach was applied to support oral presentations rather than writing (c.f. Albino, 2017; Caplan & Farling, 2017; Palm, 2024; Sandgaard Ekdahl, 2024; Sandgaard Ekdahl & Walldén, 2022).

An important element in the approach of Myhill et al. (2012) is the emphasis on *grammatical choice*, where the rhetorical or communicative impact of different grammatical constructions is explored, such as the effect of moving an adverbial to the beginning of a sentence or using multiple verbs in a sentence. This focus on grammatical choice was absent in the present study, possibly due to the L2 context. While functional aspects of constructions were consistently emphasized, there was no discussion of multiple grammatical ways to express the same idea. For example, in the discussion of the imperative in one of the analyzed sequences, the teacher explained its function as "telling others what to do" but did not explore alternative grammatical structures, such as using questions (direct or indirect) or statements to achieve the same effect. Integrating grammatical choice into the discussion could have helped

develop the students' pragmatic ability to use the target language, which is crucial given the challenges L2 learners face in adjusting their level of directness in different oral communication situations (see Li, 2000; Riddiford & Holmes, 2015).

Incorporating the students' multilingual knowledge, the category of imperative was also explored in other languages known to the students. Comparing grammatical features across languages helps develop metalinguistic awareness, making students more cognizant of key grammatical differences between their L1 and L2. While Myhill's contextualized grammar does not include this cross-linguistic perspective, it does utilize the contrastive principle within one language by having students compare different grammatical constructions. Although the data in the present study is limited, the findings support the idea of using students' multilingual competence as a resource to enhance pragmatic skills and metalinguistic awareness (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). This use of translanguaging in the studied classroom contrasts with previous studies in Swedish for immigrants, which primarily emphasize how teachers encourage students to use different languages among themselves (Bergsten Provaznik & Wedin, 2023; Wedin et al., 2018; Wedin, 2023).

A limitation of the approach studied, compared to previous studies on L2 in connection to worklife, is that it did not extensively address oral language competencies relevant to the workplace, such as using speech acts and engaging in small talk (Li, 2000; Myles, 2009; Riddiford & Holmes, 2015). While oral and multimodal presentations like those performed by the students do occur in workplace contexts, they are more common in educational settings. Additionally, the placements provided the content for the presentations rather than shaping the discourse. The focus on the imperative mood also stemmed from a task centered on documenting written rules at the workplace rather than from engaging in oral interaction. Nonetheless, the contextualized and functional approach demonstrated in this study could be effectively applied to authentic examples of workplace discourse related to students' language learning during placements.

4.1 Implications and final conclusions

In this study, we observed the teacher integrating multimodal elements (visuals, writing, speech) into language instruction, a practice particularly beneficial for learners with limited prior experience in creating presentations. As seen in the data, this approach can also lead to grammatical discussions about concepts such as sentences. This study demonstrates that principles from contextualized grammar, such as discussion and the use of authentic (oral) texts, are also fruitful in the L2 setting, facilitating the transfer of these principles from L1 to L2 classrooms.

In particular, the findings illustrate how student-generated content (presentations) can be used to explore grammatical structures and their functions in meaningful contexts. Moreover, teachers can leverage students' diverse linguistic backgrounds to enhance metalinguistic awareness and understanding of grammatical differences between languages. As Cenoz and Gorter (2013, 2022) suggest, this can be

achieved through cross-linguistic comparisons and discussions, as evidenced in our data.

Additionally, teachers could emphasize how grammatical structures are used to achieve communicative goals, such as describing, explaining, and interacting. This pragmatic focus can complement and enrich traditional corrective feedback methods, empowering learners to make more appropriate linguistic choices. Furthermore, as also shown in Walldén (2024b), teachers can be encouraged to build on observations the students themselves make, as exemplified in this study in an exchange about a morphological feature puzzling the student (6).

The present research is limited as it builds on a small-scale qualitative study involving just one teacher who was not familiar with the LEAD principles employed in the analysis. However, we believe that further research could build on these findings to investigate the possibility to incorporate authentic examples of work-related oral language that are discussed with adult learners, encouraging both observations of grammatical choice and cross-linguistic comparisons.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research was supported by the Crafoord Foundation (20240533).

6. REFERENCES

- Albino, G. (2017). Improving readability in an explicit genre-based approach: The case of an EFL workplace context. *RELC Journal*, 48(3), 311–326. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216684279>
- Anderson-Levitt, K. M. (2006). Ethnography. In J. L. Green, G. Camili, & P. B. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 279–295). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Arseneau, R., Foucambert, D., & Lefrançois, P. (2018). Improving the mastery of relative clause in French L1 secondary classes: The effects of an intervention based on verbal interactions on written syntactic structures. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.01.08>
- Aa, L. I. (2021). Grammatikdidaktikk på grammatikkfeltets grunn [Grammar didactics on the foundation of the grammar field]. *Norsk læreren* 4, 65–81
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2002). Metalanguage in focus on form in the communicative classroom. *Language awareness*, 11(1), 1.
- Bergsten Provaznik, T., & Wedin, Å. (2023). Att se med egna ögon – kritisk litteracitet på svenska för invandrare, sfi [To see with one's own eyes – critical literacy in Swedish for immigrants, sfi]. *Forskning om undervisning & lärande*, 11(2). https://forskul.se/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/ForskUL_vol_11_nr_2_s30-52.pdf
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bandh, E., Collberg, P., & Lundin, K. (2023). L1-orienterad grammatikundervisning i L2-kontext: En kvalitativ studie [L1-oriented grammar instruction in an L2 context: A qualitative study]. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 17(4), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.9733>
- Bigelow, M., & Tarone, E. (2004). The role of literacy level in second language acquisition: Doesn't who we study determine what we know? *Tesol Quarterly*, 38(4), 689–700. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588285>

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2020). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Brown, D., Liu, Q., & Reza, N. (2023). Effectiveness of written corrective feedback in developing L2 accuracy: A Bayesian meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221147374>
- Caplan, N. A., & Farling, M. (2017). A dozen heads are better than one: Collaborative writing in genre-based pedagogy. *TESOL Journal*, 8, 564–581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.287>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes. *RELC Journal*, 53(2), 342–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0036882221082751>
- Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *Tesol Quarterly*, 47(3), 591–599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.121>
- Duff, P. A., Wong, P., & Early, M. (2002). Learning language for work and life: The linguistic socialization of immigrant Canadians seeking careers in healthcare. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 397–422.
- Ellis, R. (2016). Anniversary article. Focus on form: A critical review. *Language teaching research*, 20(3), 405–208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627>
- Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
- Flyman Mattsson, A., & Nyqvist, E.-L. (2023). Definitheit, bestämdhet och artikelbruk – en missad svårighet i L2-svenska [Definiteness and article use – An overlooked difficulty in L2 Swedish]? *Acta Didactica Norden*, 17(4), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.9800>
- Franker, Q. (2011). *Litteracitet och visuella texter: studier om lärare och kortutbildade deltagare i sfi*. Literacy and visual texts: Studies on teachers and participants with limited prior education in Swedish for Immigrants (Doctoral dissertation, Stockholm University)
- Fuster, C. (2022). *Lexical transfer in pedagogical translanguaging: Exploring intentionality in multilingual learners of Spanish*. Stockholms universitet.
- Gibbons, P. (2006). *Bridging discourses in the ESL classroom: students, teachers and researchers*. Continuum.
- Godfroid, A., & Andringa, S. (2023). Uncovering sampling biases, advancing inclusivity, and rethinking theoretical accounts in second language acquisition: Introduction to the special issue SLAF or all? *Language Learning*, 73(4), 981–1002. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12620>
- Hagemann, K., & Sjøfteland, Å. (2023). Et tverrspråklig perspektiv som utgangspunkt for konseptuell grammatikkundervisning i språkfag [A cross-linguistic perspective as a starting point for conceptual grammar instruction in language courses]. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 17(4), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.9844>
- Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of Bilinguality. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271–296. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543059003271>
- Jakobson, L. (2020). Vuxna nybörjarstuderandes uppfattningar om skriftlig lärarrespons på skrivande i svenska som andraspråk [Adult beginner students' perceptions of written teacher feedback on writing in Swedish as a second language]. *Educare*, 4, 1–32.
- Jakobson, L. (2015). Holistic perspective on feedback for adult beginners in an online course of Swedish. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 9(2), 51–71. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201512174094>
- Kabel, K., Vedsgaard Christensen M., Storgaard Brok, L. (2022) A focused ethnographic study on grammar teaching practices across language subjects in schools. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. 35 (1), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2021.1918144>
- Kabel, K. (2023) Kontekstualiseret grammatikundervisning i dansk: Tre eksempler [Contextualized grammar instruction in Danish: Three examples] In K. Kabel, M. Vedsgaard Christensen, K. Bjerre, L. Storgaard Brok (Eds). *Grammatikdidaktik*. (pp. 79-95). Akademisk Forlag
- Khezrlou, S. (2021). Explicit instruction through task repetition: effects on explicit and implicit knowledge development. *Language awareness*, 30(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1866590>

- Lehtonen, T. (2017). "You will certainly learn English much faster at work than from a textbook": Law students learning English beyond the language classroom. *System*, 68, 50–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.06.013>
- Li, D. (2000). The pragmatics of making requests in the L2 workplace: A case study of language socialization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(1), 58–87.
- Lindberg, I., & Sandwall, K. (2017). Conflicting agendas in Swedish adult second language education. In C. Kerfoot & K. Hyltenstam (Eds.), *Entangled discourses: South-North orders of visibility* (pp. 119–136). Routledge.
- Loewen, S. (2014). *Introduction to instructed second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In C. N. Candlin & N. Mercer (Eds.), *English language teaching in its social context* (pp. 180–190). Routledge.
- Lum, L., Alqazli, M., & Englander, K. (2018). Academic literacy requirements of health professions programs: Challenges for ESL students. *Tesol Canada Journal*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v35i1.1282>
- Lytovchenko, I., Lavrysh, Y., Lukianenko, V., & Ogienko, O. (2020). How to teach grammar to adult ESP learners at technical university more communicatively: Task-based approach. *Multidisciplinary Journal for Education, Social and Technological Sciences*, 7(1), 54–71.
- McCormack-Colbert, A., Ware, J., & Wyn Jones, S. (2018). Developing writing skills of learners with persistent literacy difficulties through explicit grammar teaching. *Support for Learning*, 33(2), 165–189. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12200>
- Moanakwena, P. G. (2021). *Language and literacy practices of hairdressers in the Botswana multilingual context: Implications for occupational literacy development in vocational training*. The University of British Columbia. <https://open.library.ubc.ca/media/download/pdf/24/1.0401364/3>
- Moncada-Comas, B., & Block, D. (2021). CLIL-ised EMI in practice: Issues arising. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(6), 686–698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1660704>
- Myhill, D. (2018). Grammar as a meaning-making resource for language development. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 18(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.04.04>
- Myhill, D. (2019). Linguistic choice as empowerment: Teaching rhetorical decision-making in writing. *Utbildning & Demokrati* 2019, vol 28, no 2, 55–75.
- Myhill, D. (2021). Grammar re-imagined: foregrounding understanding of language choice in writing. *English in Education*, 55(3), 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04250494.2021.1885975>
- Myhill D, Jones S, Watson A, Lines H (2013). Playful explicitness with grammar: a pedagogy for writing. *Literacy*, 47(2), 103-111
- Myhill D, Jones S, Lines H, Watson A (2012). Re-thinking grammar: the impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding. *Research Papers in Education*, 27(2), 139-166
- Myles, J. (2009). Oral competency of ESL technical students in workplace internships. *TESL-EJ*, 13(1), 1–24.
- Nassaji, H. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of interactional feedback for L2 acquisition: Issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000375>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Norlund Shaswar, A., & Wedin, Å. (2019). Language learning strategies and teaching practices in adult L2 education: The case of Swedish for immigrants. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063590>
- Palm, C. (2024). *Skrivundervisning i svenska som andraspråk inom vuxenutbildning [Writing instruction in Swedish as a second language in adult education]*. (Doctoral dissertation, Gothenburg University) <https://hdl.handle.net/2077/81693>
- Pouresmaeil, A., & Vali, M. (2023). The effects of incidental focus on form on learning vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231185419>
- Reinders, H., & Benson, P. (2017). Research agenda: Language learning beyond the classroom. *Language Teaching*, 50(4), 561–578. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000192>
- Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such

- data and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) [2016]. OJ L 119/1 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016R0679>
- Riddiford, N., & Holmes, J. (2015). Assisting the development of sociopragmatic skills: Negotiating refusals at work. *System*, 48, 129–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.010>
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Equinox.
- Rosén, J. K., & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2013). Shifting identity positions in the development of language education for immigrants: An analysis of discourses associated with ‘Swedish for immigrants’ *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2013.765889>
- Sandgaard-Ekdahl, H. (2024) Dekonstruerande samtal om insändare med vuxna andraspråksinlärare [Deconstructing opinion pieces: discussions with adult second language learners]. *HumaNetten*, (53), 26–60. <https://doi.org/10.15626/hn.20245302>
- Sandgaard-Ekdahl, H., & Walldén, R. (2022). ”Det fattas jättemycket” – genreoretiska perspektiv på vuxna andraspråkslevers texter och responsamtal [”Lots of things are missing”: Genre-theoretical perspectives on adult second-language students working with feedback and argumentative texts]. *Forskning om undervisning och lärande*, 10(2), 55–87. <https://doi.org/10.61998/forskul.v10i2.19003>
- Sandwall, K. (2013). *Att hantera praktiken: Om sfi-studerandes möjligheter till interaktion och lärande på praktikplatser* [Managing the internship: About sfi students' opportunities for interaction and learning at internship sites] [Doctoral dissertation, University of Gothenburg]. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1184056.pdf>
- Schurz, A., & Coumel, M. (2023). Grammar teaching in ELT: A cross-national comparison of teacher-reported practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(5), 1167–1192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820964137>
- SFS 2003:460. Lag om etikprövning av forskning som avser människor [Act on Ethical Review of Research Involving Humans]. https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svensk-forfattnings-samling/lag-2003460-om-etikprovnig-av-forskning-som_sfs-2003-460
- Shintani, N. (2015). The incidental grammar acquisition in focus on form and focus on forms instruction for young beginner learners. *Tesol Quarterly*, 49(1), 115–140. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.166open_in_newISSN0039-8322
- Skolverket. (2022). *Kursplan för kommunal vuxenutbildning i svenska för invandrare [Curriculum for municipal adult education in Swedish for immigrants]*. <https://www.skolverket.se/undervisning/vuxenutbildningen/komvux-svenska-for-invandrare-sfi/laroplan-for-vux-och-kursplan-for-svenska-for-invandrare-sfi/kursplan-for-svenska-for-invandrare-sfi>
- Strandberg, A. (2022). Representations of grammar teaching in L1 education – a literature review. In S. Ericsson, I-L. Grahn & S. Karlsson (Eds.) *Språklig mångfald: Rapport från ASLA-symposiet i Göteborg, 23–24 april 2020*, 196–216
- Strandberg, A. & Lundström, S. (2023) Design för kontextualiserad grammatikundervisning [Design for contextualized grammar instruction]. *Forskning om undervisning och lärande*, 11(2), 53–77
- Swedish Research Council (2024). Good practice in research.
- Thornéus, L. (2018). *Sfi och språkpraktik: Med arbetslivet som lärandeum* [Swedish for immigrants and language placements: With the workplace as a learning space]. Gothia Fortbildning.
- Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory construction in qualitative research: From grounded theory to abductive analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), 167–186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275112457914>
- Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods : Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Walldén, R. (2024a). Adult migrants’ voices about learning and using Swedish at work placements in basic language education. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 56(1), 43–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2023.2246763>
- Walldén, R. (2024b). Contextual elaborations and shifts when adult L2 learners present and discuss workplace-related vocabulary. *Linguistics and Education*, 80, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2024.101272>

- Walldén, R., & Winlund, A. (2024). Dimensioner av flerspråkighetsutveckling i praktikrelaterad undervisning på sfi [Dimensions of multilingual development in placement-related teaching in Swedish for Immigrants]. *HumaNetten* (53), 133–164. <https://doi.org/10.15626/hn.20245306>
- Watson, A. M., & Newman, R. M. C. (2017). Talking grammatically: L1 adolescent metalinguistic reflection on writing. *Language Awareness*, 26(4), 381–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2017.1410554>
- Wedin, Å. (2023). Becoming an independent Swedish citizen: Critical literacy as a tool for multilingual literacies in Swedish for Immigrants. *Studies in the Education of Adults*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2023.2171097>
- Wedin, Å., Rosén, J., & Hennius, S. (2018). Transspråkande och multimodalitet i grundläggande skriftspråksundervisning inom sfi [Translanguaging and multimodality in basic written language instruction within SFI]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 23(1-2), 15–38.
- Wedin, Å., & Norlund Shaswar, A. (2019a). Whole class interaction in the adult L2-classroom: the case of Swedish for immigrants. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(2), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201903251959>
- Wedin, Å., & Norlund Shaswar, A. (2023). Interaction and meaning making in basic adult education for immigrants the case of Swedish for immigrants in Sweden (SFI). *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2022.2065786>
- Willis, J. W., & Edwards, C. (2014). *Action research: Models, methods and examples*. Information age publishing.
- Xu, J., & Li, C. (2021). The effects of the timing of form-focused instruction on EFL learners' learning of difficult and easy grammatical features: A comparative study. *System*, 101, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102612>