



An Analysis of Passive Voice Presentation in High School Common English I-II Textbooks from a Form–Meaning–Use Perspective

Hyunjun Cho (Kyungwoon University)

Received: 14 December 2025
Revised: 27 December 2025
Accepted: 8 January 2026

Hyunjun Cho. (2026). An analysis of passive voice presentation in high school common English I-II textbooks from a form–meaning–use perspective. *Modern English Education*, 27, 1-12.

Keywords

canonical passive constructions, form–meaning–use, FMU, grammar instruction in textbooks
정통형 수동태, 형태-의미-사용(FMU) 관점, 교과서 문법 지도

Hyunjun Cho

Assistant Professor
School of Glocal Studies
Kyungwoon University
hjcho@ikw.ac.kr

Abstract

This study examined how canonical passive constructions are presented in terms of form, meaning, and use in 18 high school Common English I-II textbooks developed under the 2022 Revised English Curriculum, using a Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) framework. A total of 2,466 passive constructions were extracted through a regular-expression-based procedure and verified by researchers. The results showed a strong bias toward simple passive forms, while functional meanings and use-based instruction were limited. Passive constructions were most often introduced implicitly through reading texts, whereas deductive and inductive explanations in grammar sections were rare. Although meaning-focused activities appeared relatively frequently, many were restricted to text-level comprehension, and few activities promoted discourse-based or functional use of passive voice. Analyses of instructional locations and activity types further showed that implicit presentation in reading texts predominated, with explicit grammar instruction and inductive activities occurring infrequently. From an FMU perspective, the findings indicate an imbalance in which form-focused instruction is emphasized at the expense of meaning and use, creating a gap between textbook practices and the curriculum's communicative goals. The study highlights the need for instructional designs that better integrate form, meaning, and use, including explicit functional explanations, inductive learning activities, and genre-based production tasks to support more effective grammar learning, with implications for strengthening function- and use-oriented grammar instruction beyond secondary textbooks.

INTRODUCTION

In high school English education, it has long been argued that grammar instruction does not sufficiently contribute to the development of learners' actual communicative competence, despite the recognition of grammatical competence as an

essential component of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). In EFL classroom settings, research has repeatedly shown that grammar instruction dominated by rule explanation and form-based exercises tends to yield gains in controlled accuracy but does not readily transfer to spontaneous communicative performance in speaking and writing. This gap has been attributed to the limited opportunities such instruction provides for learners to connect grammatical form with discourse-level meaning and context-sensitive use during interaction. Accordingly, researchers have argued for instructional approaches such as focus on form, which integrates attention to linguistic forms within meaning-oriented communication, as a way to better support communicative development while maintaining grammatical accuracy (Ellis, 2006; Long, 1991; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Spada & Lightbown, 2008). Traditional grammar-focused instruction has demonstrated some effectiveness in improving learners' grammatical accuracy through rule explanation and form-based practice; however, it has repeatedly been noted that such approaches are limited in enabling learners to use grammar functionally in authentic discourse contexts (Lee, 2015; Park, 2008). As a result, learners often experience difficulty applying grammatical rules appropriately in real-world productive situations, such as speaking and writing, despite repeated exposure to grammar instruction throughout their high school English studies.

This problem persists at a tertiary level. Even college students who have studied English for an extended period exhibit various difficulties in language use, including errors in choosing between active and passive constructions and the inappropriate selection of form-focused sentence patterns that do not align with discourse contexts (Biber et al., 1998; Hinkel, 2004). A representative example of this issue is that, although students are familiar with the basic forms of the passive voice, they repeatedly make errors because they are unable to judge its functional meanings or conditions of use in college English classes. Such errors extend beyond individual learning problems and are highly likely to be closely related to the nature of grammatical input provided in secondary education. Therefore, to clarify the relationship between learners' actual language use and textbook presentation, it is necessary to closely examine how the passive voice is presented in high school English textbooks.

The passive voice is particularly well suited to diagnosing these issues. Beyond simple structural transformation, the passive voice performs various discourse functions, such as adjusting information structure and shifting sentence focus, and its formal structure (Form), functional meaning (Meaning), and conditions of actual use (Use) are closely interconnected. However, learners often produce contextually inappropriate passive sentences or select active constructions in situations where passive forms are required, without sufficiently recognizing the functional meanings of these constructions. This indicates that instruction on the passive voice remains largely form-focused and lacks explicit guidance on functional meaning and contextual use.

Given these characteristics, the passive voice should be analyzed not as separate elements of form, meaning, and use, but as an integrated whole. The Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) perspective conceptualizes grammar as a linguistic resource in which structural form, functional meaning, and discourse-level use interact (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999), and it provides an appropriate analytical framework for examining the structural, semantic, and usage-related functions of the passive voice simultaneously.

In line with this orientation, the 2015 and 2022 Revised English Curricula conceptualize grammar as a linguistic resource for meaning making and emphasize instruction in which grammar is presented in an integrated manner across texts, activities, and tasks so that learners can select appropriate grammatical forms in real-world contexts. In other words, grammar education is required to move beyond form-focused presentation and enable learners to understand functional meanings and conditions of use within discourse contexts. However, the extent to which these curricular intentions are realized in the actual construction of high school English textbooks has not yet been sufficiently examined. Recent studies have also pointed out that teacher-centered and form-focused instructional approaches are limited in their ability to improve learners' grammatical understanding and application (Park & Lee, 2023) and have called for data-driven, learner-centered approaches to address these limitations.

Moreover, although previous studies have repeatedly noted that grammar presentation in high school English textbooks is heavily biased toward form-focused instruction, empirical research analyzing how the passive voice is presented in an integrated manner from the perspectives of form, meaning, and use remains extremely limited. Few studies have conducted a multi-layered examination of the passive voice from an FMU perspective, necessitating further investigation into how the curriculum's emphasis on meaning- and use-based grammar education is implemented in textbooks.

Accordingly, this study aims to empirically analyze the presentation of the passive voice in 18 high school *Common English I-II* textbooks developed under the 2022 Revised English Curriculum, focusing on its formal characteristics, instructional locations and modes of explanation, types of learning activities, and the degree of integration of form, meaning, and use from an FMU perspective. By examining patterns of passive voice presentation from multiple perspectives, this study seeks to evaluate the extent to which textbooks align with curricular intentions and to provide foundational data explaining why grammatical learning at the high school level does not sufficiently transfer to communicative competence

at the college level. Furthermore, by highlighting meaning- and use-based elements that have not been adequately addressed in structure-centered textbook analyses, this study aims to contribute to qualitative improvements in grammar education. The research questions guiding this study are as follows:

- Research Question 1. What frequencies and formal characteristics do passive constructions exhibit in high school *Common English I-II* textbooks?
- Research Question 2. How are passive constructions presented across textbook components, such as reading texts, grammar sections, exercises, and activities?
- Research Question 3. What proportions do passive-related learning activities represent among form-focused, meaning-focused, and use-focused activities?
- Research Question 4. To what extent are the three elements of form, meaning, and use integrated in the presentation of the passive voice?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Background

The passive voice is a grammatical construction that simultaneously exhibits formal and functional complexity within the English grammatical system, and it has been consistently argued that learners find it difficult to fully understand its semantic and discourse-related functions through traditional structure-based instructional approaches alone (Larsen-Freeman, 2015; Quirk et al., 1985). The passive voice is not merely a structural transformation of the active voice; rather, it also serves important functions, such as adjusting information structure and shifting sentence focus (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014; Quirk et al., 1985). However, in actual instructional settings, these functional aspects are insufficiently emphasized, and the passive voice is typically presented primarily in terms of its structural features.

In addition, ongoing discussions in grammar education have emphasized the need to shift instructional approaches from a form-focused orientation toward meaning- and use-oriented perspectives. While form-focused grammar instruction is effective in promoting rule awareness and grammatical accuracy, it has been criticized for its limited transfer to actual language use and discourse competence (Ellis, 2006). To address these limitations, Long (1991) proposed that acquisition is facilitated when learners' attention is drawn to grammatical forms within communicative activities, and Schmidt (1990) likewise argued that learners' noticing plays a central role in grammar acquisition.

The Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) perspective (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999) conceptualizes grammar not as structural knowledge but as the outcome of usage-based choices, and it proposes pedagogical principles that encourage learners to understand grammar through the interaction of form, meaning, and use. The passive voice is particularly suitable for analysis from this perspective, and the need for FMU-based analysis is especially salient given that excessive emphasis on formal presentation can hinder learners' acquisition of its semantic and discourse-related functions.

Previous Studies

Previous analyses of English textbooks in Korea have repeatedly reported that grammar presentation in high school English textbooks remains heavily biased toward form-focused instruction and that meaningful guidance or use-based tasks are not sufficiently provided (Gu & Park, 2013; Jung, 2013). For example, Hong and Lee (2019) pointed out that, although textbooks developed under the 2015 Revised Curriculum tend to integrate grammar into reading texts, instructional mechanisms that enable learners to systematically understand functional meanings remain insufficient.

In addition, previous studies on the passive voice have raised concerns that, despite its diverse functional meanings, textbooks present it in a structure-centered manner, making it difficult for learners to understand the discourse conditions governing active–passive choice. Studies analyzing Korean learners' passive-voice production errors have repeatedly reported mechanical use and contextual inappropriateness; however, they have failed to consider the functional meanings of passive constructions.

Meanwhile, alternative approaches have recently been proposed to address the limitations of traditional grammar instruction. Research has shown that data-driven, learner-centered grammar learning improves learners' grammatical understanding and their ability to apply grammatical knowledge (Park & Lee, 2023), providing empirical evidence that complements the shortcomings of form-focused grammar instruction.

Taken together, these studies consistently indicate that grammar presentation in high school English textbooks remains form-focused and that even grammatical items requiring functional choice, such as the passive voice, are not adequately

supported by meaning-based guidance or use-based activities. Despite these observations, empirical research systematically analyzing how the passive voice is presented in an integrated manner from the perspectives of form, meaning, and use remains extremely limited. To date, no studies have conducted a multi-layered examination of the passive voice from a Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) perspective, necessitating an investigation into how the curriculum’s emphasis on meaning- and use-based grammar education is realized in textbooks. Nevertheless, more recently, research has extended the analysis of passive constructions to technology-mediated contexts. For example, Kim (2023) examined how English-to-Korean machine translation systems render English passive sentences and reported that current MTs can produce semantically accurate translations of passive constructions at high rates, indicating the continued relevance of passive voice analysis beyond traditional textbook-based instruction. Accordingly, the present study aims to address this research gap by systematically analyzing patterns of passive voice presentation in 18 high school *Common English I-II* textbooks developed under the 2022 Revised Curriculum, thereby complementing previous research and suggesting directions for improving grammar instruction at the college level, while also providing important pedagogical implications for enhancing passive voice instruction in high school English education.

METHOD

Research Materials

This study analyzed 18 high school *Common English I-II* textbooks developed in accordance with the 2022 Revised English Curriculum. These textbooks are officially authorized instructional materials approved by the Ministry of Education and represent the grammatical input to which high school students are exposed in actual learning environments. The scope of the analysis included all textual components of the textbooks, such as reading passages, dialogues, listening materials, grammar explanations, exercises, and speaking and writing activities. A detailed list of the textbooks analyzed in this study is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

18 high school Common English I-II textbooks

No.	Textbook Title	Author(s)	Publisher	Year of Publication
1	Common English I	Eun-hyung Kim et al. (6)	YBM	2025
2	Common English I	Jun-eon Park et al. (8)	YBM	2025
3	Common English I	Byeong-cheon Min et al. (6)	Neungyule Education	2025
4	Common English I	Seon-young Oh et al. (7)	Neungyule Education	2025
5	Common English I	Min-pyo Hong et al. (5)	Visang Education	2025
6	Common English I	Byeong-min Lee et al. (4)	Dong-A Publishing	2025
7	Common English I	Sang-geun Shin et al. (8)	Jihaksa	2025
8	Common English I	Sang-gu Kang et al. (9)	Chunjae Education	2025
9	Common English I	Su-kyung Jo et al. (9)	Chunjae Education	2025
10	Common English II	Eun-hyung Kim et al. (6)	YBM	2025
11	Common English II	Jun-eon Park et al. (8)	YBM	2025
12	Common English II	Byeong-cheon Min et al. (6)	Neungyule Education	2025
13	Common English II	Seon-young Oh et al. (7)	Neungyule Education	2025
14	Common English II	Min-pyo Hong et al. (5)	Visang Education	2025
15	Common English II	Byeong-min Lee et al. (4)	Dong-A Publishing	2025
16	Common English II	Sang-geun Shin et al. (8)	Jihaksa	2025
17	Common English II	Sang-gu Kang et al. (9)	Chunjae Education	2025
18	Common English II	Su-kyung Jo et al. (9)	Chunjae Education	2025

The analysis of passive constructions in this study was limited to canonical passives, which are consistently presented as grammatical items in the curriculum. Canonical passive constructions were operationally defined as structures realized in the forms *be* + past participle, *have/has been* + past participle, and *be* + past participle + preposition. These structures allow for clear syntactic and semantic interpretation and can therefore be analyzed at the sentence level. In contrast, adjectival past participle uses (e.g., *interested, tired*), stative descriptions based on intransitive verbs (e.g., *The door is closed*), participial constructions whose interpretation is ambiguous depending on context, and idiomatic or lexicalized expressions were excluded from the analysis, as they do not realize grammatical passivity. These exclusion criteria were applied to clearly distinguish the functional properties of passive constructions and to ensure analytical rigor in the data analysis.

Using a Python-based regular expression (RegEx) procedure, candidate passive sentences were first automatically extracted by targeting formal patterns associated with canonical passive constructions, specifically structures involving forms of *be* or *have been* followed by past participles. Because surface-level patterns may also capture non-passive or ambiguous constructions, all extracted sentences were subsequently subjected to a manual review conducted by the researcher. During this review process, non-passive cases were excluded, including adjectival uses of past participles (e.g., *interested, tired*), stative descriptions (e.g., *The door is closed*), context-dependent participial constructions, and idiomatic or lexicalized expressions.

Research Procedures

After segmenting the entire textbook content into sentence-level units, candidate passive constructions were identified through a regular-expression-based batch search. This automated extraction process yielded approximately 3,200 candidate sentences. The automatically extracted sentences were then manually reviewed by the researcher, and only those that met the criteria for canonical passive constructions were retained; all non-passive and ambiguous cases were excluded.

The confirmed passive constructions were subsequently classified according to four analytical categories based on a coding scheme developed by the researcher: instructional location (e.g., reading texts, grammar explanations, exercises, and activities), mode of explanation (deductive, inductive, or implicit), type of learning activity (form-focused, meaning-focused, or use-focused), and the extent to which Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) elements were reflected. A subsequent review process was conducted to verify the consistency of the coding.

Analytical Framework: Form-Meaning-Use (FMU)

To analyze the structural, functional, and usage-related characteristics of passive voice presentation in textbooks in an integrated manner, this study adopted the Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) analytical framework proposed by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999). The FMU framework conceptualizes grammar as a linguistic resource in which the three dimensions of form, meaning, and use interact.

Within this framework, ‘*form*’ refers to the formal and syntactic properties of grammatical structures; ‘*meaning*’ refers to the functional and interpretive meanings that those structures convey; and ‘*use*’ refers to the conditions under which the structures are selected in actual discourse contexts. Because the passive voice is a grammatical construction in which structural variation, functional meaning, and discourse-based selection operate in a complex and interrelated manner, it is particularly suitable for analysis from an FMU perspective. Accordingly, this study employed the FMU framework to evaluate the extent to which textbook presentations of the passive voice reflect these three elements.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In the quantitative analysis, frequencies of passive constructions by structural type were calculated, along with their distributions across textbooks and levels, proportions by instructional location and mode of explanation, and the distribution of learning activity types. In the qualitative analysis, the discourse functions performed by passive constructions in reading texts, the level of semantic guidance provided in grammar explanations, and the extent to which activities could be extended to use-focused learning were examined. Qualitative analysis was conducted through close reading and interpretive examination of representative textbook examples. Rather than relying on frequency counts, this analysis focused on identifying instructional tendencies in how passive constructions were contextualized, explained, and practiced, particularly with respect to meaning and use. This interpretive approach allowed for a deeper understanding of pedagogical patterns that could not be fully captured through quantitative analysis alone.

In addition, chi-square (χ^2) tests were conducted to determine whether differences in the distribution of passive construction types and activity types between *Common English I* and *Common English II* textbooks were statistically significant. Furthermore, by analyzing the extent to which each sentence reflected the three FMU dimensions—form, meaning, and use—this study comprehensively evaluated the degree to which textbook grammar presentation aligned with the curriculum’s objectives, namely, meaning-based and use-based grammar instruction.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the analysis of the formal, semantic, and usage-related characteristics of canonical passive constructions in high school *Common English I·II* textbooks, focusing on Research Questions 1–4 introduced earlier, and discusses the pedagogical implications of the textbooks’ approaches to grammar presentation. The analysis is based on 2,466 instances of canonical passive constructions, and the interpretations are organized in accordance with each research question.

Distribution of Passive Construction Types

This subsection presents the quantitative distribution of canonical passive constructions by structural type in high school *Common English I·II* textbooks. The analysis is based on 2,466 instances of passive constructions identified in Chapter 3: 1,158 instances in *Common English I* textbooks and 1,308 instances in *Common English II* textbooks. The frequencies of canonical passive constructions by structural type are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 2

Frequencies of Passive Construction Types in Common English I Textbooks (9 Titles)

Textbook Series and Lead Author	Passive Construction Types and Frequencies			Total
	be+p.p	have/has been+p.p	be + p.p. + preposition	
YBM (Eun-hyung Kim)	87	3	42	132
YBM (Jun-eon Park)	91	2	47	140
Neungyule Education (Byeong-cheon Min)	102	4	44	150
Neungyule Education (Seon-young Oh)	94	6	50	150
Visang Education (Min-pyo Hong)	110	4	48	162
Dong-A Publishing (Byeong-min Lee)	81	8	43	132
Jihaksa (Sang-geun Shin)	55	1	21	77
Chunjae Education (Sang-gu Kang)	60	5	29	94
Chunjae Education (Su-kyung Jo)	78	7	36	121
Total (Common English I: 9 textbooks)	758	49	360	1,158

TABLE 3

Frequencies of Passive Construction Types in Common English II Textbooks (9 Titles)

Textbook Series and Lead Author	Passive Construction Types and Frequencies			Total
	be+p.p	have been+p.p	be + p.p. + preposition	
YBM (Eun-hyung Kim)	102	6	66	174
YBM (Jun-eon Park)	98	4	51	153
Neungyule Education (Byeong-cheon Min)	104	4	45	153
Neungyule Education (Seon-young Oh)	100	7	57	164
Visang Education (Min-pyo Hong)	104	6	51	161
Dong-A Publishing (Byeong-min Lee)	91	10	52	153

Textbook Series and Lead Author	Passive Construction Types and Frequencies			Total
	be+p.p	have been+p.p	be + p.p. + preposition	
Jihaksa (Sang-geun Shin)	48	2	30	80
Chunjae Education (Sang-gu Kang)	72	11	37	120
Chunjae Education (Su-kyung Jo)	99	6	45	150
Total (Common English I: 9 textbooks)	818	56	434	1,308

The analysis revealed that among the passive constructions presented in *Common English I-II* textbooks, simple passives (*be* + past participle) accounted for the largest proportion. A total of 758 instances were identified in *Common English I* textbooks and 818 instances in *Common English II* textbooks, together constituting approximately 64% of all passive constructions. This finding indicates that, despite the wide range of passive constructions involving diverse tense forms and discourse functions, textbook presentation is dominated by the most basic, form-focused passive structure. The overwhelming emphasis on the simplest passive form reflects a structural and instructional environment in which learners may find it difficult to naturally extend their understanding to the functional meanings and conditions of use associated with the passive voice.

In contrast, perfect passives were extremely limited, occurring in 63 instances in *Common English I* textbooks and 62 instances in *Common English II* textbooks, accounting for approximately 5% of the total. Given that the core function of the perfect passive is to link past events to present states, the low frequency with which it appears in textbooks suggests that learners have limited opportunities to experience and fully understand this functional characteristic.

Prepositional passives occurred in 329 instances in *Common English I* textbooks and 444 instances in *Common English II* textbooks, indicating a relatively balanced distribution across the two textbook levels. Nevertheless, their overall proportion remained comparatively low at approximately 31%. Although prepositional passives play important discourse roles in actual language use—such as agent suppression, focus shifting, and procedural description—textbook presentation tended to remain at the level of providing examples rather than emphasizing their semantic and functional properties.

Although the overall frequency of passive constructions was higher in *Common English II* (1,308 instances) than in *Common English I* (1,158 instances), this difference appears to reflect a quantitative increase resulting from a greater number of units and a larger volume of text rather than a qualitative expansion in terms of structural diversity or meaning- and use-oriented application. To examine whether differences in the distribution of passive construction types between *Common English I* and *II* were due to chance, a chi-square (χ^2) test was conducted. The results indicated that the distributional differences between the two groups were not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 2.73$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$). This finding suggests that the dominance of simple passive constructions is not attributable to differences among publishers or textbook levels, but rather represents a structural characteristic embedded across high school English textbooks. In response to Research Question 1 concerning the distribution of passive construction types, these results confirm that high school English textbooks remain primarily focused on basic-form-centered presentation.

The qualitative analysis further revealed that although passive constructions frequently appeared in textbook texts, their functional roles were rarely made explicit to learners. In many cases, passive forms served discourse functions such as backgrounding agents or emphasizing results; however, these functions were not systematically addressed in grammar explanations or accompanying activities. As a result, learners were primarily exposed to passive constructions as formal structures rather than as meaning-bearing or discourse-sensitive choices. These qualitative observations help explain why the predominance of simple passive forms does not necessarily lead to learners' understanding of the functional motivations underlying passive voice use.

Instructional Location and Mode of Presentation

The results of the analysis examining where passive constructions are presented and how they are explained in *Common English I-II* textbooks are shown in Table 4. Instructional locations were categorized into reading texts, grammar explanation sections, exercises, task-based activities, and other sections. Modes of explanation were classified as deductive, inductive, or implicit. Deductive explanation refers to an approach in which grammatical rules are explicitly presented first and then followed by examples. In contrast, inductive explanation guides learners to discover grammatical rules from examples. Implicit presentation was defined as cases in which passive constructions are naturally introduced within texts or activities without explicit rule explanation.

TABLE 4*Frequencies of Passive Constructions by Instructional Location in Common English I-II Textbooks*

Textbook Type	Instructional Location and Frequency				
	Reading Texts	Exercises	Task-Based Activities	Grammar Explanations	Others
Common English I	578	270	99	32	179
Common English II	683	271	140	21	193
Total	1,261	541	239	53	372

Note. Others include untitled general descriptive paragraphs, embedded texts, and example sections.

Passive constructions were most frequently presented in reading texts, accounting for more than half of all instances (1,261 sentences). Reading texts, which typically exhibit explanatory or narrative characteristics, naturally incorporate passive constructions; however, they also present a limitation, as learners may find it challenging to explicitly recognize the grammatical functions of the passive voice. In contrast, passive constructions appearing in grammar explanation sections accounted for only 53 sentences, representing approximately 2% of the total dataset. This finding indicates that the passive voice is not systematically addressed as an independent grammatical item but is instead primarily introduced through implicit exposure within texts.

Deductive explanation was observed only to a minimal extent. Passive constructions presented in grammar explanation sections accounted for 53 sentences, approximately 2% of the total dataset, and only a small number of these provided a systematic presentation of grammatical rules. Inductive explanation was likewise extremely rare, with most cases remaining at the level of text comparison or comprehension rather than engaging learners in rule-discovery activities.

By contrast, implicit presentation constituted the most prevalent mode across all textbooks. The high frequency of passive constructions in reading texts (1,261 sentences) demonstrates that implicit presentation is the dominant approach. While this mode of presentation may be beneficial for input exposure (Schmidt, 1990), it limits learners' ability to clearly understand the functional meanings of the passive voice or the discourse conditions governing active–passive choice. This pattern mirrors the lack of explicit grammatical guidance reported in previous studies (Hong & Lee, 2019) and represents a key characteristic of passive voice presentation addressed in Research Question 2.

Analysis of Activity Types Based on the Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) Framework

The results of classifying activities that include passive constructions into form-focused, meaning-focused, and use-focused categories are presented in Table 5. The classification of activity types was based not on the location in which a sentence appeared, but on the type of activity prompt to which it belonged. Specifically, passive constructions included in exercise prompts (e.g., *Fill in, Choose, Rewrite*) were classified as form-focused activities; those included in activity prompts (e.g., *Discuss, Compare, Think & Share*) were classified as meaning-focused activities; and those included in speaking and writing task prompts (e.g., *Write about, Present, Describe, Create*) were classified as use-focused activities. This criterion was adopted to more directly capture the type of learning experience with which passive constructions are associated during actual task performance.

TABLE 5*Distribution of Activity Types (Form–Meaning–Use) in Common English I-II Textbooks*

Textbook Type	Activity Types and Frequencies			Total
	Form-Focused	Meaning-Focused	Use-Focused	
Common English I	175	254	134	563
Common English II	251	311	145	707
Total (18 textbooks)	426	565	279	1,270

The analysis showed that, of the total 2,466 passive constructions identified, only those directly linked to learning activities accounted for 563 instances in *Common English I* and 707 instances in *Common English II*. This indicates that not all passive constructions presented in textbooks are used in activities; rather, a substantial number appear in reading texts or explanatory sections and are presented outside activity contexts.

In *Common English I*, meaning-focused activities accounted for the largest share of the 563 activity-related passive constructions, comprising 254 instances (45.1%). This finding suggests that passive constructions in activity prompts are primarily associated with tasks that require learners to interpret discourse meaning or to compare and comprehend content. Form-focused activities followed with 175 instances (31.1%), reflecting the use of passive constructions in accuracy-oriented exercises such as transformation or selection tasks. Use-focused activities accounted for 134 instances (23.8%), indicating that opportunities for learners to produce passive constructions as actual output in speaking and writing task prompts were relatively limited. A similar pattern was observed in *Common English II*. Of the 707 activity-related passive constructions, meaning-focused activities again constituted the largest proportion, with 311 instances (44.0%), followed by form-focused activities (251 instances, 35.5%) and use-focused activities (145 instances, 20.5%). Compared with *Common English I*, the proportion of use-focused activities increased by approximately 8.2%; however, it remained at around 20% of all activities in *Common English II*.

These findings indicate that activity design in *Common English* textbooks places a relatively strong emphasis on meaning-focused activities. However, such activities primarily involve interpreting passive constructions in reading texts or explanatory prompts rather than tasks that require learners to explore the functional meanings of the passive voice—such as agent suppression, focus shifting, or meaning contrast—or to analyze the reasons for choosing particular grammatical structures. In other words, a higher quantitative proportion of meaning-focused activities does not necessarily imply effective implementation of meaning-based grammar learning.

Meanwhile, the relatively substantial proportions of form-focused activities in both *Common English I* (31.1%) and *Common English II* (35.5%) suggest that passive constructions continue to be frequently used in exercises focused on accuracy checking and rule application. This finding demonstrates that the form-focused bias repeatedly noted in previous textbook analyses persists in the most recent textbooks.

Although use-focused activities accounted for 23.8% in *Common English I* and 20.5% in *Common English II*, tasks that explicitly required learners to produce passive constructions for discourse-oriented purposes were extremely limited. To assess whether differences in the distribution of activity types between the two textbook levels were statistically significant, a chi-square (χ^2) test was conducted. The results indicated that these differences were not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 44$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$). This suggests that the imbalance among meaning-, form-, and use-focused activities is not confined to specific textbooks or levels but instead represents a structural pattern embedded across high school English textbooks. Indeed, although passive constructions were often embedded in speaking and writing task prompts, the functional and communicative purposes requiring their use were not clearly specified. This pattern stands in contrast to the use-oriented grammar instruction emphasized by Larsen-Freeman (2015). Overall, these findings address Research Question 3 by demonstrating that, despite an increase in the quantity of meaning-focused activities, the connection to functional meaning learning remains insufficient.

Presentation Patterns from a Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) Perspective

A comprehensive synthesis of patterns of passive voice presentation in textbooks from a Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) perspective revealed a clear imbalance among the three components: form, meaning, and use. First, with respect to *form*, repeated exposure to the basic structure of the passive voice was sufficiently provided; however, the presentation of structural variation and more complex passive constructions was limited. Second, in terms of *meaning*, the functional meanings of the passive voice—such as agent suppression, focus shifting, and information structure management—were not explicitly presented, and activities guiding learners to discover meaning-based rules were scarce. Finally, regarding *use*, activities designed to help learners understand the conditions under which passive constructions are selected in actual communicative contexts were insufficient, and tasks requiring learners to use the passive voice for discourse-oriented purposes in speaking and writing activities were minimal. Overall, passive voice presentation in high school English textbooks exhibits a structural progression characterized by form-focused presentation, followed by insufficient meaning-based guidance and ultimately restricted opportunities for use-based learning. This pattern indicates a discrepancy between textbook practices and the curriculum’s emphasis on meaning- and use-based grammar instruction under the 2022 Revised English Curriculum. In response to Research Question 4 concerning the level of integrated presentation of form, meaning, and use, these findings demonstrate that passive voice presentation in high school English textbooks does not sufficiently align with the curriculum’s intended goals of meaning- and use-oriented grammar education.

Furthermore, the lack of statistically significant differences in the distribution of passive construction types and activity types between the two textbook levels suggests that form-focused bias and the scarcity of use-based activities are not characteristics of individual textbooks, but rather structural features embedded across high school English textbooks. These

results empirically support Schmidt's (1990) claim that implicit presentation alone is insufficient to adequately trigger learners' noticing, as well as Long's (1991) argument that form-focused grammar presentation inhibits the transfer of grammatical knowledge to communicative language use. Given that the imbalance among FMU components appears to be structurally entrenched, systematic improvements in the presentation of meaning- and use-oriented grammar are required.

First, it is necessary to present the functional meanings of the passive voice more explicitly. Because the passive voice serves discourse functions such as agent suppression, focus shifting, and information structure management, learners can more clearly understand the rationale for choosing between active and passive constructions when these functional properties are addressed alongside formal explanations rather than through form-based description alone (Ellis, 2006). As confirmed in this study, the near absence of functional meaning in textbooks limits the development of such understanding.

Second, employing inductive approaches that encourage rule discovery from examples can provide learners with opportunities to actively connect form and meaning. The near absence of inductive explanation observed in this study suggests that learners have limited opportunities to independently construct conceptual understanding of the passive voice. Accordingly, classroom instruction should incorporate simple rule-discovery activities, such as comparing example sentences and exploring differences in meaning.

Third, the expansion of genre-based activities in which passive voice use is naturally required should be considered. Certain text types, such as procedural descriptions and scientific or technical reports, provide contexts in which passive constructions are functionally appropriate; however, the present analysis showed that such use-based activities were only minimally represented. Enhancing task design to enable learners to experience the functions of the passive voice through actual text production is, therefore, necessary (Hyland, 2004).

Finally, it is essential to establish instructional environments in which form, meaning, and use are experienced in an integrated manner during passive voice learning. This study demonstrated that textbook presentation of the passive voice remains largely form-focused, with limited attention to meaning- and use-based activities, revealing a gap between textbook practice and the curriculum's orientation toward function-centered grammar education. Future instructional design should therefore aim to incorporate integrated FMU-oriented approaches, even in partial form, to support learners' understanding of the roles played by the passive voice in real communicative processes (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

CONCLUSION

This study empirically analyzed patterns of canonical passive voice presentation in 18 high school *Common English I-II* textbooks developed under the 2022 Revised English Curriculum from a Form–Meaning–Use (FMU) perspective. The findings revealed that passive voice presentation in these textbooks was heavily biased toward form-focused instruction. At the same time, opportunities for learning experiences grounded in functional meaning and actual use were limited. This gap highlights a misalignment between the curriculum's emphasis on function-oriented grammar instruction and the actual structure of the textbooks.

With respect to Research Question 1, the analysis showed that simple passive constructions (*be* + past participle) accounted for the overwhelming majority of instances, whereas perfect passives and prepositional passives were presented only to a minimal extent. Such structural imbalance restricts learners' opportunities to encounter variations of passive constructions across diverse discourse contexts and may hinder the functional extension of passive voice use. As confirmed by the findings related to Research Question 2, passive constructions were primarily presented implicitly in reading texts, while explicit guidance in grammar explanation sections was minimal. The near absence of deductive and inductive explanations constrains learners' systematic understanding of both the structural and functional properties of the passive voice.

The activity-type analysis addressing Research Question 3 revealed that meaning-focused activities accounted for a relatively high proportion; however, many of these activities remained at the level of textual meaning processing, and activities that required learners to explore the functional meanings of the passive voice or to explain the rationale behind structural choices were insufficient. Although some use-focused activities were identified, tasks requiring learners to produce passive constructions in authentic communicative contexts were rare, thereby limiting opportunities for the development of learners' grammatical decision-making abilities. In the FMU-integrated analysis addressing Research Question 4, form-focused presentation was found to be adequately addressed, whereas guidance on meaning and use was notably lacking. Core discourse functions of the passive voice—such as agent suppression, focus shifting, and information structure management—were rarely addressed, and tasks grounded in authentic use contexts were minimally presented. This pattern suggests that, while learners may acquire the passive voice as a structural form, they are likely to experience difficulty

using it as a communicative resource.

These findings offer several important implications for improving instruction on the passive voice in high school English grammar education. First, instructional design should explicitly present the functional meanings of the passive voice and explain its discourse roles. When functional perspectives are made explicit, learners can better understand the rationale for choosing between active and passive constructions and for evaluating the appropriateness of grammatical forms in specific contexts. Second, incorporating inductive approaches—such as example-based rule-discovery activities—can provide learners with opportunities to actively connect form and meaning. Third, the use of genre-based tasks in which passive constructions are functionally required, such as procedural descriptions, experimental reports, and technical explanations, may facilitate the transfer of grammatical knowledge to actual language use. Finally, establishing instructional environments in which form, meaning, and use are experienced in an integrated manner can help to realize the curriculum’s goals of function-centered grammar instruction more effectively.

Beyond the high school context, the findings of this study also hold important implications for college English education. Insufficient guidance on the functional meanings and conditions of passive voice use at the secondary level may lead to persistent errors among university students, including difficulties in active–passive selection, misuse of prepositional passives, and limited use of passive constructions for discourse purposes (Jung, 2006). Accordingly, college English instruction should explicitly address the functional meanings of the passive voice and strengthen genre-based activities—such as procedural writing, report writing, and academic writing—in which passive constructions are naturally required. Furthermore, instructional designs that incorporate error-analysis feedback based on actual learner output and FMU-integrated activities are needed to support learners in using the passive voice not merely as structural knowledge but as a communicative resource.

Nevertheless, this study has several limitations. First, because the analysis was limited to textbook texts, it did not capture how teachers mediate passive voice instruction in actual classrooms or how learners produce and use passive constructions in practice. Second, by restricting the scope of the analysis to canonical passive constructions, the study did not address learning issues related to adjectival past participles or ambiguous passive constructions. Third, supplementary materials such as workbooks, assessment materials, and online support resources were excluded from the analysis. These limitations suggest the need for future research to more comprehensively investigate passive voice learning through classroom discourse analysis, learner production data, and analyses of diverse instructional materials. Experimental and longitudinal studies examining the effects of different modes of passive voice presentation on learners’ actual language use are also warranted.

From an academic perspective, this study provides empirical evidence that extends FMU-based grammar education research by analyzing the passive voice as a discourse-based grammatical construction in which form, meaning, and use interact. By highlighting the importance of meaning- and use-based presentation that has been relatively underexplored in structure-centered textbook analyses, the study contributes to the theoretical advancement of grammar education research. From a pedagogical standpoint, the findings provide concrete evidence for improving grammar instruction and textbook development by presenting a multidimensional analysis of the passive voice in high school English textbooks.

At the policy level, this study underscores the need to incorporate FMU-based grammar presentation into textbook development processes systematically. Development guidelines should be strengthened to ensure that grammatical items are not confined to structural explanation but are explicitly linked to meaning- and use-based activities. Teacher professional development should also be enhanced to build instructional capacity for explicitly teaching the functional meanings and discourse conditions associated with the passive voice. Furthermore, to strengthen alignment between high school and college English education, it is necessary to establish collaborative frameworks that ensure consistent instructional goals for core grammatical items across educational levels.

References

- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher’s course* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tesolquarterly/40.1.83>
- Gu, H. J., & Park, E. S. (2013). An analysis of grammar presentation in high school English textbooks and its relationship to grammar items in the College Scholastic Ability Test. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction Studies*, 17(1), 91-107. <https://doi.org/10.24231/rici.2013.17.1.91>

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Hong, S. H., & Lee, K. N. (2019). An analysis of language forms in high school English textbooks based on the 2015 revised national curriculum. *English Language and Linguistics*, 25(1), 69-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17960/ell.2019.25.1.004>
- Jung, W. H. (2006). Error analysis: What problems do learners face in the production of the English passive voice? *ETAK (English Teaching and Linguistics)*, 12(2), 19-40.
- Jung, W. H. (2013). Grammatical accuracy and authenticity in EFL textbook dialogues. *The Korea English Education Society*, 12(2), 149-175.
- Kim, C. E. (2023). Analysis of passives in English-to-Korean machine translation systems' output. *Modern English Education*, 24(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.18095/meeso.2023.24.1.1>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Research into practice: Grammar learning and teaching. *Language Teaching*, 48(2), 263-280. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408>
- Lee, K. N. (2015). Changes in grammatical concepts and instruction in English education. *Language Research*, 31(2), 357-376. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000408>
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). John Benjamins.
- Ministry of Education. (2015). *2015 revised English curriculum*. Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (2022). *2022 revised English curriculum*. Ministry of Education.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. Routledge.
- Park, H. K., & Lee, M. S. (2023). Effects of data-driven, self-directed grammar instruction on middle school learners' grammatical understanding and application. *Journal of Holistic Convergence Education*, 27(2), 43-63.
- Park, S. O. (2008). A study on the effects of English grammar instruction: Focusing on middle school students. *English Education Research*, 20(3), 199-223. <https://doi.org/10.17936/pkelt.2008.20.3.009>
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2), 181-207. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00256.x>