

T.C
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı

**TURKISH ENGLISH TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT
GRAMMAR TEACHING AND THEIR GRAMMAR
TEACHING PRACTICES**

TÜRKİYE' DEKİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DİLBİLGİSİ VE
ÖĞRETİMİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ VE UYGULAMALARI

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İlker ALTUNBAŞAK

İstanbul, 2010

T.C
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı

**TURKISH ENGLISH TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT
GRAMMAR TEACHING AND THEIR GRAMMAR
TEACHING PRACTICES**

TÜRKİYE' DEKİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DİLBİLGİSİ VE
ÖĞRETİMİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ VE UYGULAMALARI

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

İlker ALTUNBAŞAK

Danışman: Dr. Özlem Kaşlıoğlu

İstanbul, 2010

T.C
Marmara Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı
İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bilim Dalı

İlker ALTUNBAŞAK tarafından hazırlanan **TURKISH ENGLISH TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT GRAMMAR TEACHING AND THEIR GRAMMAR TEACHING PRACTICES** (TÜRKİYE'DEKİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DİLBİLGİSİ VE ÖĞRETİMİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ VE UYGULAMALARI) başlıklı bu çalışma, 28.05.2010 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda başarılı bulunarak jürimiz tarafından Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

İmzalar

Danışman: Dr. Özlem Kaşlıoğlu

Üye: Doç. Dr. Derin Atay

Üye: Yard. Doç. Dr. Dilek İnal



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research study would not have been possible without the help and support of a few very precious people.

I deeply thank my advisor, Dr. Özlem Kaşlıoğlu for her encouraging guidance, intellectual and emotional support, infinite patience and understanding. Without her motivation and encouragement, I would not have considered a MA study. She helped me to realize a twenty-four- year-old dream.

I would like to thank my committee members, Assoc. Prof. Derin Atay and Assist. Prof. Dilek İnal, for their expert guidance and advice.

I am grateful to all the teachers who participated in this study for their invaluable support and willingness.

I gratefully remember my late teacher, Prof. Özcan Başkan, from whom, I took MA courses many years ago. He taught me how to learn and teach English.

ABSTRACT

TURKISH ENGLISH TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT GRAMMAR TEACHING AND THEIR GRAMMAR TEACHING PRACTICES

The present study aimed to investigate the beliefs of Turkish teachers of English on the role of grammar and grammar instruction, and, whether and how these beliefs are reflected in their classroom teaching and use of main course books while teaching grammar.

The study was conducted at private primary schools and private high schools in Istanbul in 2008-2009 academic year spring term and 2009-2010 academic year fall term. It included 98 participants teaching English at primary schools (6th, 7th and 8th grades) and high schools (prep class and 9th grades).

The study combined both qualitative and quantitative approaches during the data collection and data analysis phases. In order to obtain quantitative data, the belief inventory questionnaire developed by Mohamed (2006) was used. Results of the questionnaire were extended by using semi-structured interviews, and observations of classes, which constituted the qualitative part of the present study. Lesson observations provided direct access to what teachers did in classrooms and interviews provided teachers' rationales for their actual classroom practices.

The quantitative data yielded by the questionnaire were analyzed with the computer software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 15.0 for Windows. For the quantitative analysis descriptive statistics were used. The qualitative data was analyzed through content analysis.

The results have revealed that the majority of the Turkish teachers of English believe formal grammar teaching has a value in language learning and assists language development. Concerning language practice, the great majority of the teachers in this study have indicated that regular practice of the target language facilitates grammar learning.

The congruence between participating teachers' stated beliefs and their actual teaching was observed in teachers' approach to grammar teaching. However, there were mismatches between teachers' stated preferences for activity types and the activities they actually used in grammar teaching, and, their beliefs and actual teaching practices concerning the use of grammatical terminology and corrective feedback.

Key Words: Teachers' beliefs, grammar teaching, classroom practice, main course books

ÖZET

TÜRKİYE’DEKİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DİLBİLGİSİ VE ÖĞRETİMİ İLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ VE UYGULAMALARI

Bu çalışma Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin dilbilgisi ve dilbilgisi öğretimi hakkındaki inanışlarını ve bu inanışların onların sınıf içi uygulamalarına ve dilbilgisi öğretiminde ana ders kitabının kullanımına yansıyor yansımadığını ve nasıl yansıdığını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır.

Çalışma 2008-2009 öğretim yılı bahar dönemi ve 2009-2010 öğretim yılı güz döneminde İstanbul’daki özel ilköğretim okulları ve liselerde yapılmıştır. Çalışmaya liselerin hazırlık ve 9. sınıfları ile ilköğretim okullarının 6. , 7. ve 8. sınıflarında İngilizce derslerine giren 98 öğretmen katılmıştır.

Araştırmanın veri toplama ve analiz aşamalarında nicel ve nitel yöntemler kullanılmıştır. Nicel veri elde etme aşamasında 2006 yılında Mohamed tarafından geliştirilen öğretmen inanışları dökümü anketi kullanıldı. Anket sonuçları, çalışmanın nitel kısmını oluşturan ders gözlemleri ve yarı yapılandırılmış öğretmen görüşmelerinin kullanımıyla geliştirilmiştir. Ders gözlemleri öğretmenlerin sınıfta neler yaptığıyla ilgili doğrudan bilgi verirken, öğretmen görüşmeleri onların sınıf içi uygulamaları için öne sürdükleri gerekçeleri sağlamıştır.

Anket çalışması sonucunda elde edilen nicel veri bilgisayarda SPSS yazılımı vasıtasıyla analiz edilmiştir. Nitel analiz için, tanımlayıcı istatistikler kullanılmıştır. Nitel veri içerik analizi yoluyla incelenmiştir.

Sonuçlar çalışmaya katılan Türk İngilizce öğretmenlerinin büyük bir bölümünün dilbilgisi öğretiminin dil öğreniminde etkili olduğuna ve dil gelişimine katkıda bulunduğuna inandıklarını göstermiştir. Öğretmenlerin, öğrenilen dilde düzenli olarak yapılan alıştırmaların dilbilgisi öğrenimini geliştirdiğine inandıklarıyla ilgili sonuçlar elde edilmiştir.

Çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin belirttikleri inanışlar ile onların sınıf içi uygulamaları arasında dilbilgisi öğretiminde benimsenen yaklaşımlardan bir uyum gözlemlenmiştir. Bununla birlikte, benimsediklerini ileri sürdükleri alıştırmalar türleri ile dilbilgisi öğretiminde kullandıkları arasında ve dilbilgisi öğretiminde terminoloji kullanımı ve öğrencilerin dilbilgisi hatalarının düzeltilmesi hakkındaki inanışları ve öğretim esnasındaki uygulamaları arasında uyumsuzluklar gözlemlenmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Öğretmen inançları, dilbilgisi öğretimi, sınıf içi uygulamalar, İngilizce ders kitapları

List of Tables

Table 1 Teachers participating in the interviews and class observations.....	30
Table 2 Teachers' beliefs about the place of grammar in language teaching	38
Table 3 Teachers' beliefs related to learning and/or acquisition of grammar.....	42
Table 4 Teachers' beliefs about explicit and/or implicit teaching of grammar	46
Table 5 Teachers' beliefs about the effects of grammar instruction.....	48
Table 6: Teachers' beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction	50
Table 7: Teachers' beliefs about the use of terminology	52
Table 8: Teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms...	55
Table 9: Factors that are likely to affect teachers' instructional decisions	58
Table 10: Teachers' stated beliefs about their approach to grammar teaching	61
Table 11: Participant teachers' stated beliefs about the use of terminology	68
Table 12: Teachers' stated beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction	72
Table 13: Teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms	78
Table 14: The frequency of grammar activities used by the participant teachers while teaching	79
Table 15: Factors that are likely to affect teachers' instructional decisions.....	81

ABBREVIATIONS

A: Agree

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

D: Disagree

ELT: English Language Teaching

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

E: Essential

FI: Fairly important

F: Frequently

I: Important

KAL: Knowledge about Language

N: number of responses

Ne: Never

NI: Not important

NS: Not Sure

No: the number in Part One/Two/Three of the questionnaire

O: Occasionally

R: Rarely

SA: Strongly Agree

SD: Strongly Disagree

VI: Very important

TABLE OF CONTENT

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABBREVIATIONS	vii
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Purpose of the Study	3
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 Significance of the Study	4
1.5 Limitations of the Study	4
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Views of Grammar in Language Teaching	5
2.1.1 Traditional Grammar	5
2.1.1.1 Traditional Grammar and Language Teaching	5
2.1.2 Structural Grammar	6
2.1.2.1 Structural Grammar and Language Teaching	7
2.1.3 Transformational-Generative Grammar	8
2.1.3.1 Transformational-Generative Grammar and Language Teaching	8
2.1.4 Functional Grammar	9
2.1.4.1 Functional Grammar and Language Teaching	10
2.2 Explicit Versus Implicit Knowledge of Grammar	12
2.2.1 Arguments against the Teaching of Grammar	13
2.2.2 Arguments for the Teaching of Grammar.....	15
2.3 Teaching Grammar for Implicit Knowledge	18
2.4 Teachers' Beliefs and Grammar Teaching	21
2.5 Teacher Cognition.....	21

2.6. Teachers' Beliefs	22
2.6.1. Research on Teachers' Beliefs about Grammar Teaching	23
3. METHODOLOGY	28
3.1. Setting.....	28
3.2. Participants	29
3.3. Data Collection Procedure.....	30
3.3.1 Quantitative Data	31
3.3.2. The Belief Inventory Questionnaire	31
3.3.3. Qualitative Data	33
3.3.4. Classroom Observations	33
3.3.5. Teacher Interviews	34
3.4. Data Analysis	35
3.4.1 Quantitative Data Analysis	35
3.4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis	35
4. RESULTS	37
4.1 Research Question 1: What Do Turkish Teachers of English Think About the Role of Grammar in Learning and Teaching a Foreign Language?	37
4.1.1 Summary of the Findings: Research Question 1.....	59
4.2 Research Question 2: Do Participating Teachers' Practices Reflect Their Stated Beliefs About Grammar Teaching and Learning?	60
4.2.1 Summary of the Findings: Research Question 2	80
4.3 Research Question 3: Do Teachers' Beliefs Affect their Use of Main Course Books While Teaching Grammar?	81
4.3.1 Summary of the Findings : Research Question 3	85
5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION.....	86
5.1 DISCUSSION	86
5.1.1 Teachers' Beliefs about the Role of Grammar in Learning and Teaching a Foreign Language	86
5.1.2. Teachers' Stated Beliefs about Grammar Teaching and Their Classroom Practices	88

5.1.3. Teachers' Beliefs about their Use of Main Course Books While Teaching Grammar	91
5.2. IMPLICATIONS	92
5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	95
REFERENCES	96
APPENDIXES	110
Appendix 1 The Belief Inventory Questionnaire.....	111
Appendix 2 The Original Questionnaire	119
Appendix 3 The pre-observation Interview.....	127
Appendix 4 The post-observation Interview.....	128
Appendix 5 Sample pre-observation interview notes.....	129
Appendix 6 Sample observation notes.....	132
Appendix 7 Sample post-observation interview notes	134
Appendix 8 Data Reference Conventions	136

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I.I. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Teachers' beliefs are defined as personal constructs that can provide an understanding of a teacher's practice (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). There are a number of studies in foreign language teaching on the importance of teachers' beliefs (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Kagan, 1992; Woods, 1996; Richards and Lockhart, 1996). Pajares refers to beliefs as a "messy construct" which "travels under the alias of attitudes, values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understanding, and social strategy" (Pajares, 1992, p.309). Kagan (1992) argues that beliefs are a form of personal knowledge and they are often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms, materials or approaches. Woods (1996) suggests that teachers' beliefs develop through their experiences. Richard and Lockhart, in their study (1996), claim that teachers' own experience as learners and teachers, their personality and principles derived from research and an approach or method are the sources which form teachers' beliefs.

As the teaching of English has become a professional activity that is practiced by, now, more nonnative speaking English teachers than before, the field of ELT, when compared to other academic subjects, has become quite diverse in terms of what teachers bring with them into the teaching situation. Therefore, the focus on teachers' beliefs forms part of the process of understanding how they perceive their work.

One aspect of ELT teachers' background that has a great impact on instructional decisions is the role teachers' beliefs play when teaching grammar. Exploring teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and the rationales behind their choices and decision-making offers insights into their classroom practices. Studies of teachers' beliefs in relation to grammar teaching compose of three strands (Borg, 2003).

One strand has focused on teachers' knowledge of grammar (Andrews, 1994, 1999). In these studies, the researcher found that teachers' own knowledge of grammar had an impact on teachers' instructional decisions. Second strand of work has been concerned with teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar (Burgess & Etherington, 2002; Eisenstein-Ebsworth & Schweers, 1997; Schulz, 1996, 2001). In these studies, researchers found that teachers had beliefs which shaped their approaches to grammar teaching and provided rationales for their instructional decisions. The third strand investigated the reasons for teachers' instructional decisions and explored teachers' beliefs with direct reference to their actual classroom practice. In studies such as by Borg (1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2001), Phipps & Borg (2009), Schulz (1996,2001), Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis (2004), Andrews (2003), Johnston & Goettsch (2000), and Burgess & Etherington (2002), researchers found that teacher cognition was a key source of data in attempts to make sense of formal instruction.

According to the above cited research, what teachers think, believe and know about teaching is mainly shaped by and interrelated with their experiences as learners, teacher trainees and practicing teachers. Although there has been an increased interest in the area of teachers' beliefs and their impacts on the teachers' practices, the area seems to be relatively unexplored in terms of teaching of grammar by non-native teachers of English to large groups of students in non-western secondary school context (Borg, 2003).

The present study attempts to reveal the beliefs of Turkish teachers of English with regards to the role of grammar and grammar instruction and provide insights into their actual classroom practices. This thesis has five main parts. Chapter One introduces the topic, provides a brief background of research on teachers' beliefs about grammar, clears the purpose, importance and limitations of the study, and outlines the research questions. Chapter Two looks at the history of the most influential approaches to grammar teaching as they emerged chronologically and discusses their influence on grammar instruction. It deals with literature related to the role of grammar in formal instruction highlighting the current debate over whether and how grammar should be taught, and investigates the area of teachers' belief

systems in grammar teaching outlining the scope of research in teachers' beliefs in grammar teaching. Chapter Three describes the methodology of the study. Chapter Four presents the findings concerning the research questions. Chapter Five, the concluding chapter, discusses the findings of the study both at a practical and theoretical level. Suggestions and implications for further research are made. Finally the references and appendices are provided.

1.2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Research on exploring teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching in non-Western countries is relatively low in number. Therefore, this study has two major aims: to understand how Turkish English teachers view the role of grammar in language teaching, and to examine the relationships between teachers' belief systems and their instructional practices. In accordance with the second aim, teachers' attitudes to using main course books while teaching grammar are also investigated. The purpose is to find out what decisions teachers make if the course book suggests an alternative strategy or classroom technique that does not match their beliefs and/or preferences.

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. What do Turkish teachers of English think about the role of grammar in teaching and learning a foreign language?
2. Do participating teachers' practices reflect their stated beliefs about grammar teaching and learning?
3. Do teachers' beliefs affect their use of main course books while teaching grammar?

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Within the Communicative Language Teaching framework, how much grammar and what kind of grammar teaching should take place in language classrooms and the answers to these most debated questions are still far from clear (Fotos and Nassaji, 2004). Thus, the study of how practicing teachers make sense of and cope with the many uncertainties that surround grammar teaching can enrich our understanding of formal language teaching. Furthermore, most of the studies on teachers' beliefs have been conducted with native speaking teachers in Western contexts, and there is need for research in non-Western countries with teachers of non-native speakers of English, who teach a prescribed curriculum to students in secondary school settings in large classes of mixed ability learners (Borg, 2003). In this respect, the present study makes a contribution to the existing research by presenting non-native speaker teachers' beliefs in Turkey. Furthermore, this study differs from other studies on teachers' beliefs as it investigates whether teachers' beliefs affect their use of the main course books followed in the classes, which is an area that has not been explored before.

1.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The quantitative data which has been provided here is limited to Turkish EFL teachers teaching in private schools. The observation and interview data came from only 6 Turkish English teachers teaching primary school classes (6th , 7th , and 8th grades) and high school classes (prep and 9th grades). As a result, the qualitative data discussed represents a small number of instructional choices and their rationales, hence, cannot be generalized to all in-service Turkish teachers of English.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. VIEWS OF GRAMMAR IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

According to their general aims and objectives, views of English grammar have been categorized as Traditional grammar, Structural grammar, Transformational-generative grammar, and Functional grammar. These views of grammar have not existed in isolation; moreover, they have been intertwined over the centuries. A discussion of these views and their impact on grammar teaching follows.

2.1.1. Traditional Grammar

Traditional grammar, which was developed for the analysis of Greek and Latin, is often considered as a mental discipline and valued as a tradition. It divides the target language into eight parts of speech: nouns, verbs, participles, articles, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions. In order to learn a language, learners should study these eight categories and develop rules for their use in translation (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002). With the rise of vernacular languages, there arose an interest in developing a grammatical description of English. Ben Jonson's "Grammar of English", "Short Introduction to English Grammar" by Lowth, "English Grammar" by Murray, and "A Modern English Grammar" by Jespersen opened the way for the modern grammatical views, despite being considered to be traditional. These grammars aimed at making language rules systematic and explicit (Howatt, 1984).

2.1.1.1. Traditional Grammar and Language Teaching

The teaching approach generally associated with the traditional grammar is The Grammar-Translation Method. This traditional method has been greatly influential in language instruction (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002). The study of the literature through reading and translation is the major goal of the method. The Grammar-Translation Method has no theory of language learning behind it; and language is considered as

an object to be studied rather than a tool to be used (Celce-Murcia, 1991). In this method, language classes are conducted in the native language. While teaching the text book, the teacher translates every word and phrase from English into the mother tongue of learners. A typical chapter in a textbook of this method begins with a long bilingual vocabulary list. Grammar points come directly from the texts and are presented contextually in the textbook by the teacher. Furthermore, students are required to translate sentences from their mother tongue into English. These exercises in translation are based on various items covering the grammar of the target language. Grammar thus provides the rules for combining words into sentences. The method focuses on the study of grammar through deduction that is through the study of the rules of grammar, overemphasizing form over function and meaning. Translations and grammar drills are used to exercise and strengthen the knowledge without much attention to the content. Very little attention is placed on pronunciation or any communicative aspects of the language, ignoring the contemporary uses and all the varieties of the language (Richards & Rogers, 1986).

2.1.2. Structural Grammar

Broadly speaking, any grammar in which there is an attempt to describe the structure of grammatical sentences is structural grammar. Structural grammar is characterized by the procedure known as substitution, by which word class membership is established and by which smaller structures are expanded to larger ones (Richards & Rogers, 1986). Structural grammar aims at overcoming the drawbacks of traditional grammar. While traditional grammar tries to provide an idealized set of rules derived from Latin, structuralists stress the importance of language as a system. Francis (1993), outlining the fundamental principles of structuralism, suggests that

A language constitutes a set of behavior patterns common to the members of a given community. It is part of what anthropologists call the culture of the community. Its phenomena can be observed, recorded, classified and compared. The grammar of each language must be made up on the basis of a study of that particular language – a study that is free of preconceived notions of what a language should contain and how it should operate. The analysis and description of a given language must conform to the requirements laid down for any satisfactory scientific theory: simplicity, consistency, completeness, usefulness (1993, p.430).

When traditional and structural views of grammar are compared, the main focus of traditional grammar is the written language, while structural grammar investigates the place that linguistic units such as sounds, words, sentences have within the system of language. Traditional grammar defines the parts of speech in terms of meaning, but the structural grammar regards it as subjective and unscientific. Therefore, in structural linguistics the parts of speech are defined, based on their location in the structure of a sentence.

2.1.2.1. Structural Grammar and Language Teaching

In the mid-twentieth century, increased communication among European countries, gave rise to a demand for oral proficiency. Language educators recognized speech as the basis of language and considered structure as the key to developing learners' speaking ability. In the 1950's and 1960's, the techniques of language teaching were based on a behaviorist view of language. Behaviorist theory, which dwells on spoken language, founded by Watson (1913), advanced in part as a reaction to traditional grammar, making a particular emphasis on the importance of verbal behavior, and received a considerable support from the educational world of 1950s (e.g., Skinner, 1957). The major principle of the behaviorist theory rests on the analyses of human behavior in observable stimulus-response interaction and the association between them. Thorndike was the first behaviorist to explore the area that learning is the establishment of associations on particular process of behavior and consequences of that behavior. In the operant conditioning model of Skinner, "language learning and its development is a matter of conditioning by means of imitation, practice, reinforcement, and habituation, which constitute the paces of language acquisition" (Rivers, 1968). In language teaching area, behaviorism establishes the basic background of exercises, either oral or written in viewing language as stimulus and response (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

The structural view of language combined with the principles of behaviorist psychology led to emergence of the Audio-lingual Method. According to audio-lingual method, language learning is the accumulation of a set of habits in the use of

language structures and patterns. Based on structuralism, it is claimed that language could be drilled without recourse to rules and translation. Substitution tables and pattern drills are used to practice a particular structure. The exercises start with the easy structures and move gradually to more complex ones to avoid errors and the use of L1 is also discouraged (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The Audio-lingual Method was influential until the 1970s; yet, pattern drills and substitution tables are still used to reinforce a particular structure.

2.1.3. Transformational-Generative Grammar

Transformational-generative grammar offers a more accurate and complete conception of the system of language, building on both traditional and structural models. As a linguistic theory, Transformational-Generative Grammar is associated with Chomsky, particularly with his book *Syntactic Structures* (1957). Transformational generative grammar tries to show how sentences are generated in a language rather than show how to analyze sentences. To explain rules that can generate the limitless number of grammatical sentences possible in a language, transformational-generative grammar attempts to define a deep structure, which underlies a language and is believed to be genetically programmed in the human brain. Deep structures, which are believed to be universal to all languages, are transformed into the surface structures that characterize particular languages. Chomsky believes the existence of a universal grammar as a key characteristic of all languages.

2.1.3.1. Transformational-Generative Grammar and Language Teaching

Theory of language acquisition offered by Chomsky challenged the Audio-Lingual Method that was based on structuralism and behaviorism. Chomsky (1957) argued that language was learnt by experiencing it in context, which allows the language acquisition device to be activated and the learners get access to the innate rules of the language. With the help of the evidence provided in the context of using the language, the learners then make hypothesis about how the language works.

In transformational-generative grammar, the learner is viewed as an active processor of language. One of the insights offered by transformational-generative grammar, which has had a great impact on language teaching, is that if the deep structure rules represent a speaker's competence, there is no point in teaching the rule explicitly. What should be done is to create a context where the rules can be activated through exposing the learner to comprehensible input that is graded and useful for the learner (Krashen, 1987). This insight underpins much communicative and learner-centered methodology. However, transformational-generative grammar had little direct classroom application, that is, it has not provided an alternative method to language teaching (Chomsky, 1980).

2.1.4. Functional Grammar

In the 1970s, a reaction to traditional language teaching approaches began and soon spread around the world as older methods such as Audiolingualism and Situational Language Teaching fell out of fashion. Meaning in social contexts became the centre of investigation and grammar started to have a more functional orientation. Functional approaches to grammar can be differentiated from formal or generative approaches to grammar by their focus on the communicative as opposed to cognitive aspects of language. The most influential functional grammars are Dik's (1978) Functional Grammar and Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (1994).

Functional Grammar is a general theory concerning the grammatical organization of natural languages (Dik, 1989). It takes a functional view on the nature of language, attaches primary importance to functional relations at different levels in the organization of grammar and wishes to be practically applicable to the analysis of different aspects of language and language use. Dick's (1978) model of grammar has undergone several revisions and the latest version, Functional Discourse Grammar, the successor to Dick's (1978) Functional Grammar, was developed by Hengeveld and Lachlan Mackenzie (2005).

Functional discourse grammar expands the scope of Functional Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie, 2005). It takes the discourse act as its basic unit of analysis. It is thus a discourse rather than a sentence grammar and is capable of handling discourse acts both larger and smaller than a sentence. This type of grammar is quite distinct from systemic functional grammar.

Systemic functional grammar is a model of grammar developed by Michael Halliday in 1960s. The term "functional" indicates that the approach is concerned with the contextualized, practical uses to which language is put, as opposed to formal grammar, which focuses on compositional semantics, syntax and word classes such as nouns and verbs. The term 'systemic' refers to the view of language as 'a network of systems, or interrelated sets of options for making meaning'. The term "functional" indicates that the approach is concerned with the contextualized, practical uses to which language is put, as opposed to formal grammar, which focuses on compositional semantics, syntax and word classes such as nouns and verbs. Halliday (1994) describes grammar as a resource for making meaning.

2.1.4.1. Functional Grammar and Language Teaching

Transformational-generative grammar focused on the speaker's competence. The concept of competence goes back to Chomsky, who explained it as the knowledge of "an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community" (1965, p.3). In 1980s, this notion of competence was extended to what Hymes (1972) called 'communicative competence'. His model focused on language as meaningful communication, including the appropriate use of language in particular social contexts. Thus, according to Hymes, communicative competence includes components such as possibility of use of the language in social interaction, appropriacy in relation to a context and probability of use. Two of these components, appropriacy and probability have had great effect on communicative foreign language teaching, implying that what is taught by teachers is determined by the use or the context. As communication is the goal of instruction, a communicative syllabus which is not organized around grammatical structures but around content-

based topics relevant to learners' lives and expectations became the center of focus in language teaching (Richards & Rogers, 1986).

In 1970s, language learning was seen as a subconscious process of hypotheses formation and rule acquisition. Researchers, like Krashen and Terrel (1983) believed that if learners are exposed to language use and have the chance to practice language structures in meaningful and natural contexts, they are expected to analyse the language at a subconscious level and induce grammar rules simply from exposure to the input. Therefore, creating the similar conditions in first language acquisition is necessary and sufficient for second language acquisition. So, there is no need to teach grammar explicitly. Language learning theories such as those of Krashen and studies by American and British functional linguists like Hymes led to the emergence of Communicative Approach (Hedge, 2000).

Communicative Approach emphasizes that the goal of language learning is communicative competence (Richards & Rogers, 1986). Although grammatical competence is the knowledge we have of a language that accounts for our ability to produce sentences in a language, communicative competence is the ability to know when and where to use these sentences and to whom. While grammatical competence is necessary for language learning, it does not mean learning a language because one can attain the proficiency to form grammatically correct sentences in a language and still not be very successful at being able to use the language for meaningful communication. Therefore, in order to develop learners' communicative competence, teaching materials used with a communicative approach are designed to teach the language needed to express and understand different kinds of functions and are based on communicatively organized syllabus. In addition to this, it emphasizes the processes of communication, such as using language appropriately in different types of situations or to perform different kinds of tasks (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Communicative Approach has been developed as a reaction to grammar-based approaches (Richard and Rogers, 1986). So, with the rise of it in 1970s, there was a tendency to eliminate grammar instruction from language classes. While the strong version of the communicative movement pays no attention to grammar learning in

the classroom, the weak version attempts to integrate a communicative component into a traditional setting (Allright, 1977). CLT does not mean a rejection of grammar, but the adaptation of a different approach to the teaching of grammar. The integration of grammar teaching into the communicative syllabus needs to be addressed as part of communicative competence; however, it should not lead back to traditional grammar teaching methods.

In this part, an attempt has been made to give a picture of different views of grammar and their influence on English language teaching. As the communicative language teaching has replaced structurally-oriented approaches in language classes, the focus of grammar teaching has been expected to be more meaning oriented rather than rule focused one. Related to this, there has been a continuing debate as to whether grammar teaching should be explicit or implicit and how grammar is taught best to facilitate implicit knowledge.

2.2. EXPLICIT VERSUS IMPLICIT KNOWLEDGE OF GRAMMAR

Grammar instruction continues to be an important issue in language pedagogy (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2002). Over the years, language teachers have alternated between two approaches: structurally-oriented, in other words, rules-focused one and communicatively-based, that is, more meaning oriented one (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). This alternation has been motivated by the most controversial issue concerning how the learners achieve both accuracy and fluency in language learning. The disagreement has long centered around whether fluency in communication can be attained by natural exposure to language input or whether such learning occurs through formal lessons on the words and grammatical structures of the target language (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999). The key issue has always been the argument about whether the explicit and implicit knowledge are completely distinct (Krashen, 1981, as cited in Fotos & Ellis, 1991) or whether it is likely for one type to turn into the other (Sharwood Smith, 1981 as cited in Fotos & Ellis, 1991).

The most prominent issue for the continuing debate has remained over whether grammar instruction in second language learning facilitates the acquisition of the target language. While some studies suggest that not only is instruction unhelpful but also it is detrimental, others have produced evidence in favor of the formal teaching (e.g., Long, 1983). Ellis (2006b) suggests that, in order to understand the controversial role of teaching explicit knowledge of grammar, it should be necessary to ask three separate questions: “1. Is explicit knowledge of any value in and of itself? 2. Is explicit knowledge of value in facilitating the development of implicit knowledge? 3. Is explicit knowledge best taught deductively or inductively?” (p. 96). The answers to each question provide insights into the long-standing debate over the role of grammar in language teaching. As the debate over the value of explicit knowledge of grammar continues, the arguments and the study results provided have yielded mixed results. Therefore, arguments for and against formal grammar instruction for explicit knowledge are presented in the next sub-section.

2.2.1. Arguments against the Teaching of Grammar

With regards to the first question proposed by Ellis (2006b), whether explicit knowledge of grammar is of any value in and of itself, some researchers have questioned both the possibility of learning explicit knowledge of grammar and learners' ability to put their explicit knowledge of grammar into use in actual performance, claiming that both conditions are limited (Ellis, 2006b). For instance, Krashen's black-and-white distinction between explicit and implicit knowledge argues that the explicit language learning has no significant role in language acquisition (Doughty & Williams, 1998). There is also some evidence that teaching explicit knowledge by itself is not effective. Pica's (1983) study suggested that grammar teaching has no effect on L2 grammatical development. Also, the study by Wong (2004) indicates that students who received explicit information alone performed no differently on production tests than a control group did.

According to Krashen (1981) learning and acquisition are entirely distinct. Learning is a conscious process whereas acquisition is totally unconscious. The 'acquired system' or 'acquisition' is a process similar to the way children undergo when they acquire their first language. In contrast, learning is the product of formal instruction and it comprises a conscious process which is more related to knowing certain rules about a language such as grammar and so on. Conscious learning, whose role is somewhat limited in second language performance, cannot be converted into acquisition. The only role that consciously learned grammar rules or formal instruction have is to edit on the utterances. Output is checked and repaired, after it has been produced, by the explicit knowledge the learner has gained through grammar study. Consciously gained knowledge acts as an editor in situations where the learner has enough time to edit and is focused on form. As the situations in which all these conditions are satisfied are rare, it is difficult to apply conscious learning to performance successfully. That's why Krashen (1981) argued that grammar instruction played no role in the development of implicit knowledge. In Krashen's view, if the input contains forms and structures just beyond the learner's current level of competence in the language, then both comprehension and acquisition will occur.

The second question proposed by Ellis (2006b), "Is explicit knowledge of value in facilitating the development of implicit knowledge?" relates to what is known as the *interface hypothesis* proposed by Ellis (2006b), which addresses the role explicit knowledge plays in developing implicit knowledge, regardless of whether it has a value in language acquisition. Three *interface positions* can be identified (Ellis 2006b).

According to the *noninterface position*, explicit learning has no effect on language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). This position is supported by Krashen's (1981) distinction between conscious learning and unconscious acquisition of language. Krashen, for example, argues that the effects of grammar instruction are "peripheral and fragile" (p. 725) and explicit knowledge of grammar never changes into implicit knowledge which is required for communicative ability (Krashen, 1993, as cited in Fotos & Nassaji, 2004).

Also, the study by Paradis (1994) supports this position, suggesting that explicit and implicit knowledge exist as different systems in the brain.

However, other positions, the strong interface and the weak positions argue that explicit knowledge grammar has a value in language teaching and learning. This value relates to the extent to which learners can use their explicit knowledge in actual performance. That is, explicit knowledge may assist language development by facilitating the development of implicit knowledge. This issue, which supports teaching of grammar, is presented in the following sub-section.

2.2.2. Arguments for the Teaching of Grammar

The strong interface position proposed by Ellis (2006b) assumes that explicit knowledge becomes implicit knowledge if learners have sufficient opportunity for plentiful communicative practice. In other words, with practice, what learners have learned turns into acquisition. This implies that there is a strong connection or interface between two types of knowledge (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). There are various research findings that favor conscious grammar teaching and learning. Scott (1989) conducted a study on two different groups of students. The first group was presented a grammar structure explicitly. The second group was presented the same grammar structure implicitly. The finding was that the students who were taught the new grammar point explicitly did better in the tests than those who were taught implicitly. In another study, Lightbown and Spada (1990) examined classes for episodes of explicit grammar instruction and error correction. They found that students in classes where there was focus on form and error correction showed improved accuracy.

According to the weak version proposed by Ellis (2006b), it is possible for explicit knowledge to change into implicit knowledge if learners are ready to acquire the grammatical structures. Opportunities for formally practicing the new knowledge or for communicating naturally in contexts that call for its use will be needed before

implicit/procedural knowledge develops. A key aspect of this model is the role that explicit knowledge is hypothesized to play in ‘noticing’ (Ellis, 1993).

‘Noticing’ has led to an increasing interest in the role that learners’ conscious attention to form plays in second language acquisition (Truscott, 1998). Schmidt, for example, has argued that learners’ awareness of what they are learning is essential for learning to take place (Schmidt, 1994 as cited in Ellis, 2005). Noticing the new grammar structures and the meaning in the input facilitates acquisition of the target language (Schmidt, 1990, 1994, as cited in Ellis, 2001). Continuing noticing lets learners test their utterances and improve learners’ cognitive ability to restructure language in the mind and as a result, language acquisition starts to take place (Schmidt, 1990 as cited in Fotos, 1998). Sharwood-Smith suggests that input should be “‘meaningful, interesting, and largely comprehensible’”, and argues for a “‘rich communicative environment’”, but also recognizes that input can “‘be selectively manipulated to facilitate acquisition’” (1986: 242-253). Researchers such as Ellis (1997), Skehan (1998) and Robinson (1995) all agree with the role noticing plays in the acquisition process and add that noticing is an important component of sufficient language learning.

Besides “noticing”, the second support for formal teaching of grammar stems from the studies showing the effect of instruction on the rate and level of ultimate language acquisition (Fotos and Nassaji, 2004). According to Teachability Hypothesis, the teachability of language is constrained by what the learner is ready to acquire. That is, learners exposed to instruction in accordance with the developmental order produce the target language with a higher grammatical accuracy (Pieneman, 1984 as cited in Fotos, 1998).

The third argument for grammar instruction in language classrooms comes from the studies indicating inadequate accuracy gained in language classrooms where the emphasis is on communicative function over form (Fotos & Nassaji, 2004). In the case of immersion students in Canada, who received plenty of comprehensible input in French, the students’ performance was lower than expected (Larsen-Freeman,

2003). At schools where these programs were conducted, the medium of instruction was French. After the numerous evaluations, three significant results were obtained. First, it was seen that French proficiency of English-speaking children whose classes were taught in French beginning with the start of school was higher than that of students taking French 20 to 30 minutes a day. The second is that, on French listening and reading comprehension tests, French immersion students' scores were similar to those obtained by students whose classes were not taught in French. The third result, which was rather surprising, demonstrated that the speaking and writing abilities of French immersion students were different from those of their peers taking French only 20 to 30 minutes a day. Because of these latter findings, there raised doubts about the validity of the input hypothesis (Swain, 2005).

The third question proposed by Ellis (2006b), "Is explicit knowledge best taught deductively or inductively?" implies that explicit teaching of grammar has a value in language learning and addresses how it is best taught in the communicative teaching framework. There are two ways suggested: deductive and inductive. In deductive teaching, the teacher first presents the new structure and then practices in one way or another. In inductive teaching, learners try to discover the rule of the target structure by being exposed to it. A number of studies have examined which approach is more effective in teaching explicit knowledge of grammar. For example, Herron and Tomosello (1992) found that inductive teaching had advantages over deductive teaching of grammar, however, Robinson (1996) and Erlam (2003) found the opposite. Rosa and O'Neill (1999) found no clear advantage of one approach over the other. The studies, which have tried to demonstrate which approach is more effective, have failed to yield a certain result (Ellis, 2006b).

While the controversy surrounding the teaching of grammar continues, grammar is keeping its central role in language teaching (Ellis, 2006b). The recently conducted studies suggest that teaching of grammar results in high levels of accuracy and fluency in the target language (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Fotos, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Nunan, 1994). Considering the developments in applied linguistics and language teaching field, EFL course books have adapted more communicative

contexts to present the form so that learners' conscious attention to form is achieved, which enables the learners to realize meaning-form relationships thus allowing the form to be incorporated into learners' interlanguage system.

Acknowledging the role of grammar in language teaching and learning, the focus of attention has shifted from whether or not to teach grammar to the question of what kind of grammar is to be taught and how best it can be taught.

2.3. TEACHING GRAMMAR FOR IMPLICIT KNOWLEDGE

Batstone and Ellis (2009) suggest that the acquisition of grammar requires that learners learn to make communicatively and grammatically correct sentences, that is, learners' grammar knowledge should embrace both form and meaning. They suggest three 'interrelated principles' to learn 'form/function mappings'. The first is 'the Given-to-New Principle', which facilitates relating 'given' meaning to 'new form-meaning mappings'. The second is 'the Awareness Principle', which leads to noticing the relationships between form and meaning. The third is 'the real-operating conditions principle' which states that unless learners can use the target structure communicatively, they will not be able to incorporate the relationships between form and meaning. Grammar instruction is required to facilitate the sufficient linguistic environment for each of these three principles. These three principles have been derived from a single general principle which is "effective grammar teaching must complement the processes of L2 acquisition" (Batstone & Ellis,2009, p.203).

How these three principles are best implemented to complement the processes of L2 acquisition is a continuing debate. Long, (1991) proposed a new concept of grammar instruction; *focus on form*, which came out of this debate on whether and how to include grammar in second language instruction. Long describes two kinds of form-focused instruction and the distinction is based on where the primary concern of the instruction is.

The first kind of instruction, a structuralist approach to language, is a focus on formS. It provides activities whose primary purpose is to teach pre-selected language

forms in isolation. Its focus is rather on linguistic forms than on the meanings they convey. In a focus on formS instruction learners engage in production activities ranging from mechanical to more communicative drills. Focus on formS classes consist mainly of work on the linguistic items with little communicative language use. A number of studies on language acquisition have provided significant findings that the focus on formS speeds up the rate of learning and it affects acquisition processes in ways possibly beneficial to long-term accuracy (Ellis, 1994, 1995; Long, 1991; Long and Robinson, 1998; Lightbown, 1998).

The second kind of instruction, *focus on form*, in contrast, encourages meaning-focused use of form. It allows the learners to notice and comprehend the target grammar structure and arises from meaningful activities that constitute the core of classroom practice (Long, 1991 as cited in Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen, 2002; Hinkel and Fotos, 2002).

Ellis (2001) claims that form-focused instruction needs to be envisaged in terms of whether the primary focus of the instruction is on form or meaning and how the attention is allocated, intensively or extensively. On the one hand, there are those who limit attention to grammar by means of corrective feedback with minimal or no interruption in communication (Doughty and Valera, 1998), on the other hand there are those who advocate separate attention to grammar and subsequent integration of the knowledge provided in increasingly communicative activities (e.g., DeKeyser, 1998). DeKeyser (1998) uses different terms for the same notions. He suggests that form focused instruction covers *focus on formS*, *planned focus on form* and *incidental focus on form*. Focus on formS has its exclusive focus on pre-selected structural elements. In contrast, in planned focus on form instruction, the main concern is on meaning, but like focus on formS, again, there is too much focus on pre-selected target structures. Incidental focus-on-form arises from the interactive communicative activities and the teacher attempts to draw learners' attention to linguistic forms as they arise in activities whose primary focus is on meaning. Such a focus involves no pre-planning in terms of linguistic forms to be covered.

The rationale for focus-on-formS instruction is that a number of studies have revealed that a focus on formS successfully promotes second language development far beyond that achieved by unfocused approaches. For example, research on learning outcomes in French immersion programs in Canada (e.g.,Lapkin, Hart, and Swain, 1991; Swain, 1985; Swain and Lapkin, 1989) showed that students failed to acquire such features as verb tense markings even after many years of study. This has led second language acquisition researchers such as Swain (1995) to propose that learners need to do more than to simply engage in communicative language use; they also need to attend to form. In addition to this, many researchers argue that exposure to language without focusing on formS is not enough (DeKeyser, 1998; Doughty, 1991; Lightbown, 1998; Swain, 1985). They are in favor of a more formS-focused approach to language teaching, claiming that activities which focus only on meaning are not adequate for learners to attain an accurate knowledge of the language; therefore, formS-focused activities should be integrated into communicative classrooms. A number of studies concerning the role of formS-focused teaching have disclosed that a focus on formS successfully facilitates language learning far more than unfocused approaches (Doughty, 1991; Doughty and Williams, 1998).

The debate over whether and how to include grammar in second language instruction and which is the most effective form of grammar teaching in the communicative classroom continues. A language teacher, being conscious or unconscious of this long standing controversy, makes certain choices while planning and instant decisions while teaching. Since what teachers do in the classroom is a reflection of what they know and believe in and teaching is a personal activity, individual teachers have very different beliefs about what constitutes effective teaching. Studying these beliefs contributes to a better understanding of grammar teaching processes and might give useful insights into how to further develop grammar-teaching practices.

2.4. TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND GRAMMAR TEACHING

The last 15 years have witnessed the birth of the study of teachers' beliefs as an important area of research in the field of language teaching (Phipps and Borg, 2009). There seem to be three different strands of these studies. One strand has focused on teachers' knowledge of grammar (Andrews, 1994, 1999). Second strand of work has been concerned with teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar (Burgess and Etherington, 2002; Schulz, 1996, 2001). The third strand of work, however, involved the analysis of teachers' beliefs with direct reference to their actual classroom practice. This is believed to provide more clarifying insights into teachers' beliefs. Research on teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching based in classroom practices consisted of a variety of conceptions of teacher thinking, which would not be possible to understand without insights into teachers' rationales for their actual practices. Studies by Borg (1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2001), Phipps and Borg (2009), Schulz (1996, 2001), Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis (2004), Andrews (2003), Johnston and Goettsch (2000), Burgess and Etherington (2002) and Johnston and Goettsch (2000) are examples of this third strand. In these studies researchers investigated classroom episodes, discussed these with the teachers, trying to clarify teachers' perspectives on the teaching of grammar.

Research about how best to understand grammar teaching has attracted the study of what teachers know, believe and do – teacher's cognition (Borg, 2003) with respect to grammar and grammar teaching. As a result, studying teacher cognition has gained attention since the 1980s due to the emergence of an alternative conception of teaching as a process of active decision making informed by teachers' beliefs and attitudes.

2.5. TEACHER COGNITION

Teacher cognition includes “the store of beliefs, knowledge, assumptions, theories, and attitudes about all aspects of their work which teachers hold and which have a powerful impact on teachers' classroom practices” (Borg, 1998, p.19).

As an area of research, teacher cognition explores the actual thought processes teachers are engaged in as they plan and teach their lessons (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). The great majority of the research conducted in the field of teacher cognition claims that what teachers know about teaching largely comes from their experiences as teachers and learners. The primary assumption of these studies is that when teachers make instructional choices, they are guided by mental acts that have been shaped by beliefs about teaching and learning that they have accumulated through the years. Based on a number of studies of teacher cognition in general, educational researchers working in the field of language teaching (Breen, 1991; Freeman & Richards, 1996; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Woods, 1996) have also started to examine teachers' beliefs, which form an important aspect of teacher cognition.

2.6 TEACHERS' BELIEFS

Teachers' beliefs are defined as personal constructs that can provide an understanding of a teacher's practice (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). Abelson made a list of the defining features of beliefs in six different points suggesting that they provide an overall sense of a belief system:

1. belief systems are non-consensual: not everybody agrees on the belief, and there is an acceptance of alternative beliefs around the same issue;
2. belief systems often include a notion of 'existence', that something exists;
3. belief systems are highly evaluative: states are considered as being good or bad;
4. belief systems contain a high degree of episodic (anecdotal) material;
5. belief systems have differing degrees of strength (i.e. strong beliefs);
6. belief systems have unclear boundaries and a high degree of overlap with beliefs of other areas (1979, p.356).

The emphasis on teachers' beliefs constitutes part of the process of understanding how they perceive their work. There are a number of studies in foreign language teaching on the importance of teacher beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Kagan, 1992; Woods, 1996; Richards and Lockhart, 1996). Pajares in his review of the research refers to beliefs as a "messy construct" which "travels under the alias of attitudes, values, judgments, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual

systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertoires of understanding, and social strategy” (Pajares, 1992:309). Teachers’ beliefs which act as the background to majority of the teachers’ decision making and action are believed to be derived from several sources. Richards and Lockhart (1996) suggest that teachers’ own experience as learners and teachers, their personality and principles derived from research and an approach or method are the sources which form teachers’ beliefs.

Despite considerable research interest in education in recent years, there is lack of consensus about what the term ‘teachers’ beliefs’ exactly means (Woods, 1996; Borg, 2001). However, drawing on a number of definitions, for the purposes of the present study, one of the latest definitions is accepted. According to this, the term teacher beliefs is defined as “statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, should be the case, and is preferable” (Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004, p.244).

2.6.1. Research on Teachers’ Beliefs about Grammar Teaching

Teachers’ beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions and attitudes play an important role in influencing teachers’ instructional decisions in grammar teaching and exploring both pre-service and in-service teachers’ pedagogical systems, grammar teaching and the rationale behind their choices and decision-making offer insights into their classroom practices. Language teaching researchers (Borg, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c and 2001; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Schulz, 1996, 2001; Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004; Andrews, 2003; Johnston & Goettsch, 2000; Burgess & Etherington, 2002) have investigated the impact of language teachers’ beliefs on their teaching of grammar at any stage of their careers.

Some of the major insights into teachers’ actual classroom teaching came from the work by Borg (1999a, 1999b, 1999c and 2001). Borg’s studies give a better perception of teachers’ practices and beliefs about grammar teaching, by describing

teachers' beliefs, their sources and the way such sources influence teachers' practices. Discrepancies were highlighted between teachers' beliefs and practices. For example, teachers who stated that they were not in favor of formal grammar teaching were observed providing explicit grammar instruction (Borg, 1999b). Borg (1999c) investigated the role of teachers' knowledge of grammatical terminology in shaping their instructional decisions. Teachers who were confident of their knowledge of terminology had tendency to do unplanned grammar lessons. However, a teacher who was less confident ignored conducting grammar work. Borg (2001) suggested that teachers' self-perceptions of their knowledge about language (KAL) had an influence on their pedagogical decisions.

Also concerned with teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching, Phipps and Borg (2009) examined tensions in the grammar teaching beliefs and practices of three practicing teachers of English working in Turkey. The teachers were observed and interviewed over a period of 18 months; the observations provided insights into how they taught grammar, while the interviews explored the beliefs underpinning the teachers' classroom practices. There were several cases where teachers' stated beliefs about language learning were in strong contrast with practices observed in their lessons. In each case, the teachers justified their instructional choices with reference to deeper beliefs about learning generally. Factors which led teachers to teach in ways contrary to their stated beliefs were primarily student expectations and preferences, and classroom management concerns.

Another perspective on the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practice in formal grammar instruction is provided by Andrews (2003). Andrews investigated the beliefs of 170 non-native English teachers teaching at secondary-level in Hong-Kong concerning grammar instruction. Their beliefs are all concerned with grammar and grammar pedagogy. The findings revealed how influential beliefs are on teachers' practices in the classrooms. For example, the majority of the teachers were in favor of deductive approach and explicit form-focused presentation and practice of grammar. To justify their instructional options, they articulated some rationales such as students' need to be adequately prepared for their written examinations and students need to feel that they have learnt something specific in a lesson.

Teachers' beliefs about the role of formal instruction in language learning were investigated by two large scale studies by Schulz (1996, 2001). The first of these studies (Schulz, 1996) was conducted at the University of Arizona. The study compared foreign language student and teacher beliefs concerning the advantages of a focus on form type of language teaching and corrective feedback. A total of 824 students and 92 teachers participated in the study. The first finding was that students in general were in favor of a focus on form in language learning regardless of language. A second finding pointed to a disagreement about the role of explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback among the teachers. For example, 94% of the students disagreed with the idea that teachers should not correct students' mistakes in class but 48% of teachers agreed with the statement implying students should not be corrected.

In the same vein, Schulz' paper (2001) reports a highly informative study of student and teacher perceptions on the role formal grammar instruction and corrective feedback play in learning a new language. Both Colombian language students and American language students and their teachers answered a questionnaire on the role of explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback in language learning. The results showed a great agreement on the majority of questions. Data, however, provided some differences between student and teacher beliefs regarding the role of formal grammar instruction in language learning. For example, Schultz's study indicated that 80% of the students considered grammar as necessary for eventual mastery of the language, but relatively small number of teachers (% 64) agreed with this view. In the study with Colombian participants, while 30% of the teachers agreed with the statement implying grammar was essential for the mastery of the language, 76% of the students said grammar was necessary for the mastery of the language.

Extending this work, Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis (2004) explored the relationship between three teachers' stated beliefs about and practices of focus on form in communicative lessons at intermediate level English language. Based on the same

communicative tasks, the teachers' statements of beliefs about focus on form were compared to their way of practicing focus on form during lessons. Results indicated some discrepancies in the teachers' stated beliefs regarding when to focus on issues of form, and apply error correction techniques.

The work of Johnston and Goettsch (2000) examined the knowledge base of experienced English teachers with a focus on grammar teaching. The authors had observations and interviews with four experienced ESL grammar teachers about their classroom explanations. The study focuses on three categories of teacher knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of learners. The results indicate that these three categories of knowledge are intertwined in complex ways as they are played out in the classroom and in teacher thinking. They concluded that teachers have been primarily influenced by two sources: their educational background, ranging from elementary and high school grammar classes to university courses in linguistic focusing on the structure of English and their teaching experiences.

Another analysis of teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching came from Burgess and Etherington (2002). Researchers in this study explored the beliefs of 48 English teachers in UK universities about grammar and grammar teaching with the help of a questionnaire. The majority of these teachers appreciated the values of formal instruction and felt that explicit knowledge of grammar played an important role for students to attain high levels of proficiency. The study concludes that teachers are more in favor of a focus on form approach and their views about appropriate approaches to grammar are influenced by their awareness of student variables.

Research on teachers' beliefs explores the processes formed depending on how teachers perceive their work. A large number of this research asserts that what teachers think, believe and know about teaching is mainly shaped by and interrelated with their experiences as learners, teacher trainees and practicing teachers. The underlying assumption of these studies is that when teaching, the teachers are under the influence of a great variety of mental acts shaped by the knowledge and beliefs

about teaching and learning that they have accumulated through the years. Also, the great many issues concerning grammar teaching discussed in this chapter have shown that grammar is inevitably in a central position in language acquisition studies and language teaching methodology. Thus, the aim of this chapter has been to specifically review teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching in English as a foreign language.

Although there has been an increased interest in the area of teacher beliefs and their impacts on the teachers' practices, the area seems to be relatively unexplored in terms of grammar teaching in the secondary school context. In Turkey, the number of the studies investigating the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional decisions is limited and Turkish secondary school context remains unexplored. In addition to this, the impact of teachers' beliefs on their use of main course books in language classes is still unstudied. Therefore, the research in this study sets out to investigate a group of Turkish secondary school English teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and the use of main course books in Istanbul, Turkey.

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. What do Turkish teachers of English think about the role of grammar in teaching and learning a foreign language?
2. Do participating teachers' practices reflect their stated beliefs about grammar teaching and learning?
3. Do teachers' beliefs affect their use of main course books while teaching grammar?

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. SETTING

The present study is descriptive as it aims to accurately and systematically describe beliefs of Turkish English teachers about grammar and its role in teaching English, and their grammar teaching practices. It was conducted at private primary schools and private high schools in Istanbul in 2008-2009 academic year spring term and 2009-2010 academic year fall term. The rationale for selecting private schools is that those schools, when compared to their counterparts in public schools, are more competitive in their teaching objectives and materials used for conducting the program. Furthermore, the private schools, when compared to their counterparts in public schools, offer six to eight more English lessons a week. In addition to this, the main course books from widely recognized ELT publishers, which reflect the most up-dated language teaching approaches, are used in private schools. Thus, it was expected that data gained would give a deeper insight into the research interest.

To conduct the quantitative research, 15 private schools which have both primary education (6th, 7th and 8th grades) and high school education were determined in Istanbul. Those schools were visited and the principal and the head of English of each school were explained the purposes of the survey study and invited to take part in the research. Information about the research was also given to the teachers and their consent was obtained. Anonymity was guaranteed. A total of 98 teachers teaching in private primary schools and high schools in Istanbul were involved in the questionnaire study. For the qualitative the study, the participants were selected among English teachers teaching at private primary schools (6th, 7th and 8th grades) and high schools where the survey study was conducted. These 98 teachers at 15 schools were asked to participate in the qualitative study and six teachers in two different private schools volunteered.

The course books used at schools where the qualitative part of the study was conducted are *Success* (by Pearson Longman ELT) taught at English prep classes at the first school, *Look* (by Pearson Longman ELT) taught at primary school 6th, 7th,

and 8th grades at the first participant school, and *Messages* (by Cambridge ELT) taught at primary school 6th, 7th, and 8th grades at the second participant school. The books in common use an inductive or ‘discovery’ approach to learning grammar, in which students can work out rules of form and usage themselves. Students are first given a dialogue or a reading text which contains clear examples of the target structure. Following the reading of the given text, students do various activities to improve their awareness about the target grammar.

This chapter presents the methodology that was adopted in this study, giving detailed explanations about participants, data collection instruments and procedures, and data analysis.

3.2. PARTICIPANTS

To identify teachers’ beliefs with regard to the role of grammar in language teaching and learning and to obtain information about teachers’ use of main course books while teaching grammar. All the teachers who participated in the study were Turkish nationals. The majority of English teachers (84.78%) were female. The age of most teachers (85.87%) ranged from 22 to 43 years. Only 11 teachers were between the ages of 44 and 54. The great majority of the teachers (72.83%) had a Bachelors degree. There were also teachers (23.91%) who had a Masters degree and one teacher had a PhD. Fifty-four of the participants were high school teachers and forty-four were primary school teachers. Altogether six English language teachers in two different private schools agreed to participate in the qualitative part of this study on a voluntary basis. The qualitative study aims to obtain data about teachers’ beliefs with direct reference to their actual classroom practices.

The table below presents information regarding the six participating teachers’ age, gender, teaching experience, schools types, grades and the subjects they are teaching.

Table 1: Teachers participating in the interviews and class observations

Observed Teachers	Age	Gender	Teaching Experience	School Types	Grades and Subjects they are teaching
T1	49	F	28	High school	Prep class, main course
T2	26	F	4	Primary school	7 th and 8 th grades, main course
T3	34	M	12	Primary school	7 th and 8 th grades, main course
T4	25	F	3	Primary school	6 th and 7 th grades, main course
T5	25	F	4	Primary school	7 th and 8 th grades, main course
T6	38	F	15	High school	9 th and 10 th grades, main course

Five of the teachers were female and one of them was male. Their ages ranged from 25 to 49 years. Teachers' teaching experience varied from 3 to 28 years and half of them had more than 10 years of teaching experience. Four of the teachers taught at primary school, 6th, 7th and 8th grades and two taught at high school, prep class, 9th, and 10th grades. They were all teaching main course books.

3.3. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

In the present study both quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures were employed. In order to obtain belief-related information from a large number of teachers, a questionnaire-based survey was administered. Moreover, as a means of understanding how beliefs shape teachers' classroom practices, case studies involving classroom observations and pre- and post- teaching interviews with individual teachers were conducted. For the quantitative and qualitative aspect of the study, purposeful sampling strategy was followed.

3.3.1. Quantitative Data

Quantitative data used for the present study was collected in the spring term of 2008-2009 academic years. A total number of 165 questionnaires were distributed and by the end of June 2009, 98 questionnaires were returned, representing a 61 % response rate.

3.3.2. The Belief Inventory Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix 1) used for this study was developed by Mohamed (2006) to identify the beliefs which teachers had regarding grammar and its role in language learning and teaching. It also aims to obtain information about teachers' reported classroom practices regarding the teaching of grammar. The questionnaire consists of four parts that contain 59 items in total. It contains close-ended sections that require participants to respond to statements on a five point Likert scale, as well as open-ended questions that teachers answer commenting on an issue in detail.

The questionnaire starts with a personal information part which provides information about participants' background, for example, nationality, age, gender, type of degree and the type of school they taught at. Part One of the belief inventory questionnaire consists of 35 items designed to elicit teachers' beliefs about grammar and its role in language learning and teaching. The participant teachers are required to rate each statement on a given five-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Part One of the questionnaire has different thematic categories such as teachers' beliefs about the place of grammar in language teaching, teachers' beliefs related to learning and/or acquisition of grammar and teachers' beliefs about explicit and/or implicit teaching of grammar.

Part Two aims to determine what grammar activities participating teachers consider to be most effective and how often they use these activities in their grammar teaching classes. This part lists seven grammar teaching activities which include both traditional activities such as written grammar exercises, oral pattern practice drills and explanation of grammar rules, and more learner-centered and communicative

tasks. The listed activity types are typical of those offered in ELT course books and grammar practice books. The participant teachers are required to rate each statement on a four point scale, ranging from never to frequently.

Part Three aims to explore the factors which have an impact on teachers' instructional decisions concerning grammar teaching. This part includes 11 factors such as interests of students, current research in the field, and the level of students; and, the participant teachers are asked to rank each statement on a given five-point Likert scale, ranging from not important to essential.

Part Four of the questionnaire consists of one closed-ended and five open-ended questions. This part is designed to elicit responses that reveal participant teachers' opinions about main course books that they are using. The participant teachers are asked to comment on the grammar teaching techniques and methodology that their course books offer and whether this methodology is in concordance with their grammar teaching beliefs.

For the present study, the original questionnaire was translated into Turkish by the researcher under supervision of the thesis advisor. The reason for translating the questionnaire was that participant teachers could freely respond to the questions, particularly the open-ended ones. To ensure item validity, the translated questionnaire was pilot-tested with four experienced EFL teachers, who were aware of its objectives. Teachers were asked to mark and comment on any problematic statements they noticed; and based on their suggestions several items were reworded in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire used for the present study aims to obtain English teachers' opinions regarding the approaches main course books employ and what they do to facilitate learning if these approaches do not match their own teaching techniques. Therefore, the questionnaire developed by Mohamed (2006) was modified by adding a further part (Part Four). In addition to this, the questions in Part B of the original

questionnaire were decided to be eliminated as they were scheduled to be asked in the pre-observation interview.

In order to check reliability, the questionnaire was piloted with a group of 35 EFL teachers working in four different private schools during March-April 2009. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .72.

3.3.3. Qualitative Data

Two private schools agreed to take part in the study. The teachers participating in qualitative study were informed about the objectives of the research and told the aim of the observations. Six participants' classes were observed, a minimum of three hours of lesson observations were made and recorded for each teacher, with a total of 18 hours of observational data collected for the study. In order to be able to reveal the rationale behind the teachers' behavior observation notes were taken (Appendix 6).

In two schools, six teachers participated in the pre- observation interviews which took 20-30 minutes each. The interview was audio-recorded (Appendix 5 Sample interview notes). After lesson observations, the teachers were interviewed individually for approximately 10-15 minutes each. (Appendix 7 Sample post-observation interview notes) They were asked to reflect on the specific explanations observed in their classes as well as on their general approach to explanations of grammatical and other linguistic issues.

3.3.4. Classroom Observations

The purpose of classroom observations in the context of the present study was to identify key instructional decisions in the teachers' approach to grammar teaching on the basis of the thematic categories used in Part One of the survey questionnaire. The categories: teachers' beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction, teachers' beliefs about the use of terminology, teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms, and teachers' approach to grammar teaching

were determined as the key episodes in a lesson and were used in order to compare teachers' stated beliefs about grammar and its role in language learning to their actual practices in the classrooms. Determining the rationale behind these key episodes was expected to lead to better understandings into the teachers' beliefs.

For this purpose, three hours of lesson observations were made and audio-recorded for each of the 6 participating teachers, with a total of 18 hours of observational data collected for the study. The observations were conducted in 7th and 8th grades of a primary school, and prep class, 9th and 10th grades of a high school.

3.3.5. Teacher Interviews

For the present study a total number of 6 pre-teaching interviews and 18 post-teaching interviews with 6 teachers were conducted and all interviews were audio-recorded. A pre-observation interview consisting of 5 open-ended questions (Appendix 3) was conducted with each participant teacher to obtain information on teachers' beliefs about grammar, effective grammar teaching, and the use of main course books when teaching grammar. Each interview lasted approximately 25 minutes.

After each classroom observation, post-observation interviews were conducted with participant teachers to gain understanding into the factors which had an influence on teachers' instructional decisions in teaching of grammar and the use of main course books. Teachers were asked to explain the reasons for their instructional decisions which were noted by the researcher during the observations. A typical question (Appendix 4) asked in the interview was "can you explain to me why you chose to use that/those particular activity, grammar terminology or a particular type of error correction?" The purpose of the post-observation interviews was to understand more clearly the rationales behind teachers' specific instructional decisions in relation to their approaches to teaching grammar, use of terminology, error-correction and use of main course books.

3.4. DATA ANALYSIS

3.4.1 Quantitative Data

The quantitative data for this study included teacher responses to the close-ended questions on the belief inventory questionnaire. Raw data yielded by the questionnaires were entered into a data base in the computer software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 15.0 for Windows. Using SPSS, descriptive analysis involving frequency counts and calculation of percentages was conducted.

3.4.2 Qualitative Data

The qualitative data collected for this study consisted of answers to open-ended questions in the part 4 of the belief inventory questionnaire, the pre and post observation interviews and observation notes. Content analysis was used in the analysis of qualitative data (Appendix 8). Content analysis is a widely used qualitative research technique used to interpret meaning from the content of text data. The analysis starts with relevant research findings as guidance for initial codes. Coding categories are derived directly from the text data (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

As for the present study, all qualitative data was analyzed for frequencies and coded into categories for building up inferences. Then, Data was coded to facilitate its thematic analysis. The following is an example to explain the process of data analysis:

The examples below show Teacher1 (T1) and Teacher 2's (T2) answers to the question number 4 in the Part 4 of the questionnaire (Q4-4). First, the responses were read, and then they were broken into the numbered codes/identified patterns.

The question was: Does the main course book you are teaching sufficiently support the teaching of new grammar points?

(T1.Q4.4)

1. presentation is not clear enough for my students
2. does not provide sufficient examples
3. activities are limited

(T2.Q4.4)

1. can't create a lively teaching atmosphere
2. I always need extra activities
3. Contexts (readings/dialogues/listening parts) are not rich for the new grammar

The next step in coding is to reduce the numbered responses to higher level categories.

Categories for (T1.Q4.4)

	<u>Categories</u>
1. presentation is not clear enough for my students	<i>teaching techniques</i>
2. does not provide sufficient examples	<i>context</i>
3. activities are limited	<i>practice</i>

Categories for (T2.Q4.4)

1. can't create a lively teaching atmosphere	<i>teaching techniques</i>
2. I always need extra oral activities	<i>practice</i>
3. Contexts are not rich for the new grammar	<i>context</i>

Categorizing was done horizontally by analyzing the codes of all the participants for a particular question.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter provides results of both quantitative and qualitative data about research questions.

4.1. RESEARCH QUESTION 1: WHAT DO TURKISH TEACHERS OF ENGLISH THINK ABOUT THE ROLE OF GRAMMAR IN TEACHING AND LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE?

Regarding teachers' beliefs about the place of grammar in language teaching, items 11, 18, 10, 20, 32, 34, and 35 from Part One of the questionnaire were analyzed. The data provided in Table 2 presents the frequency counts for each item.

Table 2: Teachers' beliefs about the place of grammar in language teaching

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
11	Grammar should be the main component of any teaching syllabus.	92	7 (7.61%)	29 (31.52%)	15 (16.30%)	37 (40.22%)	4 (4.35%)
18	It is important to focus on grammar in all English lessons.	92	10 (10.87%)	43 (46.74%)	10 (10.87%)	25 (27.17%)	4 (4.35%)
10	Grammar should be taught to all learners (i.e. beginner, intermediate and advanced).	91	4 (4.35%)	29 (31.52%)	17 (18.48%)	31 (33.70%)	10 (10.87%)
20	It is more important to teach grammar to beginners than to intermediate/advanced learners.	91	4 (4.35%)	33 (35.87%)	9 (9.78%)	36 (39.13%)	9 (9.78%)
32	The major part of a language course should focus on teaching and practicing grammar.	91	10 (10.87%)	57 (61.96%)	5 (5.43%)	18 (19.57%)	1 (1.09%)
34	The teaching of grammar enables students to produce more complex sentences.	91	3 (3.26%)	29 (31.52%)	20 (21.74%)	38 (41.30%)	2 (2.17%)
35	You do not need to speak grammatically in order to communicate well.	91	1 (1.09%)	18 (19.57%)	12 (13.04%)	38 (41.30%)	23 (25.00%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

In their responses to item 11, 40.22% of the teachers agree and 4.35% of the teachers strongly agree with the statement implying grammar should be given the priority in a teaching syllabus. In this item, 31.52% of the teachers disagree and 7.61% of the

teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. Also, 16.30% of the teachers are undecided. Observing the frequency counts for item 11, it can be seen that the number of teachers who agree or strongly agree and the teachers who disagree or strongly disagree with the statement is close to each other.

However, in item 18, 46.74% of teachers disagree and 10.87% of teachers strongly disagree with the idea of teaching grammar in every English lesson. In this item, 27.17% of teachers agree and 4.35% of teachers strongly agree with the same statement. Also, 10.87% of the teachers are undecided. Responses to item 18 show that more than half of the teachers in this study (57.61%) do not favor teaching grammar in all English lessons.

In item 10, the number of teachers (33.70%) who agree and teachers (10.87%) who strongly agree with the statement shows that nearly half of the teachers (44.57%) are in favor of teaching grammar to the students of all levels. In this item, 31.52% of teachers disagree and 4.35% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (18.48%) is noticeable.

But, in item 20, the number of teachers (39.13%) who agree and teachers (9.78%) who strongly agree with the statement shows that 48.91% of teachers believe it is more important to teach grammar to beginners than to intermediate/advanced learners. In this item, 35.87% of teachers disagree and 4.35% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. 9.78% of the teachers are undecided.

In item 32, the number of teachers (61.96%) who disagree and teachers (10.87%) who strongly disagree with the statement shows that the great majority of the teachers (72.83%) believe practicing grammar should not cover the main part of a language syllabus. In this item, 19.57% of teachers agree and only 1.09% of teachers strongly agree with the same statement.

Nevertheless, teachers are divided in their responses to the statement in item 34 implying that grammar helps students to make complex sentences. In this item, while 41.30% of teachers agree and 2.17% of teachers strongly agree with the statement, 31.52% of the teachers disagree and 3.26% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. Also, the number of the undecided teachers (21.74%) is noticeable. Teachers' responses to item 35 support the results obtained from the item 32.

The number of teachers (41.30%) who agree and teachers (25.00%) who strongly agree with the statement in item 35 indicates that the majority of the teachers (66.30%) believe there is no need to speak grammatically in order to communicate well. In item 35, 19.57% of teachers disagree and only 1.09% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement.

In order to obtain in-depth data about teachers' beliefs, the 6 teachers who volunteered to take part in the qualitative part of the study were asked to comment on how they perceived the role of grammar in language teaching. The majority of the teachers underlay the necessity to focus on grammar in teaching in order that students can attain proficiency in language. This is illustrated in the reply given below.

Teacher 1

Teaching of grammar is, I think, necessary. Without proper teaching of grammar, it is really difficult for students to achieve accuracy. When it comes to producing something orally or written, especially at writing, you can understand students' need for grammar. In order to convey different ideas, they sometimes want to make relatively complex sentences and they face difficulties making them.

Teacher 2

Grammar is the language itself. Without teaching of grammar, I don't believe that language proficiency can be attained. This is also true for Turkish or any other language. I believe student's awareness is very important; so while teaching, rules, especially the complex ones, should be highlighted. This helps learners be professional in the language.

However, one of the teachers stated arguments against a dominant role of grammar in language learning, claiming that grammar was necessary but it should not be the main focus of language teaching as the following extract indicates:

Teacher 3

Grammar is the ABC of language learning. But a language can't be taught with grammar; a language can be learned with speaking. Learners should be given enough chance to use the language; the more a learner uses the language, the more accuracy they gain in the language.

With regard to teachers' beliefs related to learning and/or acquisition of grammar items 1, 7, 8, 25, 22, 24, 23, 27, and 2 from Part One of the questionnaire were analyzed. The data provided in Table 3 presents the frequency counts for each item, which explores teachers' beliefs related to learning and/or acquisition of grammar.

Table 3: Teachers' beliefs related to learning and/or acquisition of grammar

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1	A learner can acquire a second or foreign language without grammar instruction (i.e. similar to how children learn their mother tongue).	92	6 (6.52%)	16 (17.39%)	5 (5.43%)	43 (46.74%)	22 (23.91%)
7	Grammar is best acquired unconsciously through meaningful communication.	92	-	5 (5.43%)	10 (10.87%)	46 (50.00%)	31 (33.70%)
8	Grammar is best learned naturally through trying to communicate.	91	2 (2.17%)	5 (5.43%)	7 (7.61%)	57 (61.96%)	20 (21.74%)
25	Students should be given the opportunity to work out grammar rules from examples.	92	-	2 (2.17%)	5 (5.43%)	53 (57.61%)	32 (34.78%)
22	Students generally do not learn the grammatical structures they are taught.	91	2 (2.17%)	42 (45.65%)	24 (26.09%)	20 (21.74%)	3 (3.26%)
24	Students rarely become error-free because English grammar is very complex.	92	9 (9.78%)	32 (34.78%)	14 (15.22%)	30 (32.61%)	7 (7.61%)
23	Students learn grammar at different rates.	92	-	6 (6.52%)	10 (10.87%)	63 (68.48%)	12 (13.04%)
27	Students will learn a grammar point only if they are developmentally ready for it.	91	-	14 (15.22%)	13 (14.13%)	52 (56.52%)	12 (13.04%)
2	All students will learn the different structures of English in the same order.	92	19 (20.65%)	44 (47.83%)	10 (10.87%)	15 (16.30%)	2 (2.17%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

In item 1, the number of teachers (46.74%) who agree and teachers (23.91%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that the majority of teachers (70.65%) believe L2 learning is just like L1 learning. In this item, 17.39% of teachers disagree and 6.52% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. Teachers' responses to the items 7 and 8 support the results obtained from the item 1.

In item 7, the number of teachers (50.00%) who agree and teachers (33.70%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that the teachers believe grammar should be taught through meaningful interactions at natural situations, trying to communicate in the language. In this item, 5.43% of teachers disagree with the same statement. These results are similar to the ones obtained from the item 8. In item 8, 61.96% of teachers agree and 21.74% of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying that grammar should be taught at natural situations. In this item, 5.43% of teachers disagree and 2.17% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement.

Supporting the finding above, in item 25, the number of teachers (57.61%) who agree and teachers (34.78%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that the great the majority of teachers (92.39%) are in favor of inductive way of teaching grammar, in which learners are first introduced the target language and asked to discover rules on their own. In this item, only 2.17% of teachers disagree with the same statement.

In item 22, the number of teachers (45.65%) who disagree and teachers (2.17%) who strongly disagree with the statement indicates almost half of the teachers (47.82%) believe that students learn the grammatical structures they are taught. In this item, 21.74% of teachers agree and 3.26% of teachers strongly agree with the statement saying that students do not learn the grammatical structures they are taught. The number of the undecided teachers (26.09%) is noticeable.

In item 24, teachers seem to be divided in their responses to the statement saying that students rarely become error-free because English grammar is very complex. In this item, 32.61% of teachers agree and 7.61% of teachers strongly agree with the

statement. A 34.78% of teachers disagree and 9.78% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. A 15.22% of the teachers are undecided.

In item 23, the number of teachers (68.48%) who agree and teachers (13.04%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that the great majority of the teachers (81.52%) in this study believe students learn a grammatical structure at different rates. In this item, only 6.52% of teachers disagree with the statement. Also, in item 2, the number of teachers (47.83%) who disagree and teachers (20.65%) who strongly disagree with the statement indicates that the majority of the teachers (68.48%) don't believe that students learn the different grammatical structures in the same order. In this item, 16.30% of teachers agree and 2.17% of teachers strongly agree with the statement. 10.87% of the teachers are undecided.

In item 27, the number of teachers (56.52%) who agree and teachers (13.04%) who strongly agree with the statement shows that teachers in this study believe students learn the target language if they are developmentally ready for it. In this item, 15.22% of teachers disagree with the statement. 14.13% of the teachers are undecided.

For the purpose of understanding the observed teachers' approach to teaching grammar, in the pre-observation interview participants were asked to describe their approach to teaching of grammar. The qualitative data obtained from the pre-observation interviews are consistent with the findings for 1, 7, 8, and 25.

Six participating teachers were asked how they taught grammar in order to facilitate effective learning. According to teachers' accounts of how they teach a new grammar structure, it can be seen that inductive teaching of grammar is the dominant methodology in presenting grammar. The inductive elements which the teachers said to employ are illustrated in the remark below.

Teacher 2

I always use a suitable context in which my students can see and practice the new structure without knowing what it is; I just make them get involved in the context, use the target structure and develop the rule just by using it. In my classes, the students never hear formulas. I never say “OK this is the subject. After the subject, comes verb to be am is are”

As part of teachers’ beliefs on grammar, on the questionnaire, there were items about explicit and/or implicit teaching of grammar. The data provided in Table 4 presents the frequency counts for items 3, 4, 12, 21, 29, 33, and 25 from Part One of the questionnaire, which investigates teachers’ beliefs about explicit and/or implicit teaching of grammar.

Table 4: Teachers' beliefs about explicit and/or implicit teaching of grammar

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
3	Attention to grammar ensures that students become aware of how the language works.	90	2 (2.17%)	21 (22.83%)	18 (19.57%)	45 (48.91%)	4 (4.35%)
4	Explicit knowledge of grammatical rules is essential for the mastery of language.	92	5 (5.43%)	27 (29.35%)	7 (7.61%)	44 (47.83%)	9 (9.78%)
12	If learners receive grammar instruction, they are more likely to be able to correct their errors.	91	-	18 (19.57%)	17 (18.48%)	52 (56.52%)	5 (5.43%)
21	Regular practice exercises ensure that grammar is quickly and successfully acquired.	92	1 (1.09%)	13 (14.13%)	14 (15.22%)	52 (56.52%)	12 (13.04%)
29	Teachers should begin a grammar lesson by explaining how a particular structure works.	92	9 (9.78%)	47 (51.09%)	10 (10.87%)	21 (22.83%)	5 (5.43%)
33	The primary role of the teacher in a grammar lesson is to explain the grammar point.	92	12 (13.04%)	36 (39.13%)	10 (10.87%)	29 (31.52%)	5 (5.43%)
25	Students should be given the opportunity to work out grammar rules from examples.	92	-	2 (2.17%)	5 (5.43%)	53 (57.61%)	32 (34.78%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

In item 3, 48.91% of teachers agree and 4.35% of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying the positive effect of formal instruction on grammar learning. In this item, 22.83% of teachers disagree and 2.17% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (19.57%) is noticeable.

Supporting the results obtained from item 3 and item 4, the number of teachers (47.83%) who agree and teachers (9.78%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that 57.61% of the teachers in this study are in favor of grammar teaching. In this item, 29.35 % of teachers disagree and 5.43 % of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. Results obtained from item 12 are consistent with the results obtained from items 3 and 4. In item 12, 56.52 % of teachers agree and 5.43 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying grammar instruction is essential for the mastery of language. In this item, 19.57 % of teachers disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (18.48%) is noticeable.

Also, frequency counts for item 21 show that the majority of teachers (69.56%) in this study favor regular grammar practice. In item 21, 56.52 % of teachers agree and 13.04 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying that regular practice exercises ensure that grammar is quickly and successfully acquired. In this item, 14.13 % of teachers disagree and 1.09 % of teachers strongly disagree with the statement. 15.22% of the teachers are undecided.

In Item 29, the proportions of teachers who disagree (51.09%) and teachers (9.78%) who strongly disagree with the statement indicate that a considerable number of teachers (60.87%) favor inductive grammar teaching. In this item, 22.83 % of teachers agree and 5.43 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying deductive teaching elements. 10.87% of the teachers are undecided.

In item 33, 39.13 % of teachers disagree and 13.04 % of teachers strongly disagree with the statement implying that the primary role of the teacher in a grammar lesson is to explain the grammar point. In this item, 31.52% of teachers agree and 5.43% of teachers strongly agree with the same statement. 10.87% of teachers are undecided.

In item 25, the number of teachers (57.61%) who agree and teachers (34.78%) who strongly agree with the statement indicates that the great majority of teachers (92.39%) favor discovery learning. In this item, only 2.17% of teachers disagree with the same statement. Frequency counts for items 33 and 25 show that even if in

grammar focused activities, 52.75% of the teachers indicate that they are against explicit explanations and 92.39% of them favor discovery learning.

Concerning teachers' beliefs about the effects of grammar instruction, items 6, 30, and 34 from Part One of the questionnaire were analyzed. The data provided in Table 5 presents the frequency counts.

Table 5: Teachers' beliefs about the effects of grammar instruction

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
6	Grammar instruction may not offer immediate results.	88	1 (1.09%)	6 (6.52%)	12 (13.04%)	55 (59.78%)	14 (15.22%)
30	The effects of grammar instruction are not long lasting.	89	2 (2.17%)	43 (46.74%)	17 (18.48%)	25 (27.17%)	2 (2.17%)
34	The teaching of grammar enables students to produce more complex sentences.	91	3 (3.26%)	29 (31.52%)	20 (21.74%)	38 (41.30%)	2 (2.17%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

In item 6, 59.78 % of teachers agree and 15.22 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying that grammar instruction may not offer immediate results. In this item, 6.52 % of teachers disagree and 1.09 % of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. 13.04 % of teachers are undecided. Findings for items 6 indicate that the majority of teachers (75%) believe grammar instruction may not offer immediate results. While 75% of teachers in this study believe grammar instruction may not offer immediate results, almost half of the teachers (48.91%) have stated that the effects of grammar instruction are long lasting. In item 30, 46.74 % of teachers disagree and 2.17 % of teachers strongly disagree with the statement implying the effects of grammar instruction are not long lasting. In this item, 27.17 % of teachers agree and 2.17 % of teachers strongly agree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (18.48%) is noticeable.

Also, in their responses to item 34, nearly half of the teachers (43.47%) in this study believe grammar enables students construct complex sentences. In item 34, 41.30 % of teachers agree and 2.17 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying the teaching of grammar enables students to produce more complex sentences. In this item, 31.52% of teachers disagree and 3.27 % of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (21.74%) is noticeable.

This finding was reflected in the teachers' interviews. This is illustrated in the remark below.

Teacher 6

Logic of a language lies in grammar once learners grasp the idea of how a language works; it becomes easy for them to make accurate sentences which provide ample ground for proper communication.

Regarding teachers' beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction, items 17, 19, 26, 16, 12, and 14 from Part One of the questionnaire were analyzed. The data provided in Table 6 presents the frequency counts for these items.

Table 6: Teachers' beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
17	It is important to correct all grammatical errors in students' oral work.	92	14 (15.22%)	52 (56.52%)	12 (13.04%)	11 (11.96%)	3 (3.26%)
19	It is important to identify all grammatical errors in students' written work.	91	3 (3.26%)	24 (26.09%)	14 (15.22%)	42 (45.65%)	8 (8.70%)
26	Students will be able to learn from their errors if teachers just say the correct sentence after a student has made an error (i.e. without explaining the error).	92	6 (6.52%)	25 (27.17%)	20 (21.74%)	28 (20.43%)	13 (14.13%)
16	It is important for students to be given the right answers after a written exercise or test.	91	1 (1.09%)	1 (1.09%)	5 (5.43%)	38 (41.30%)	46 (50.00%)
12	If learners receive grammar instruction, they are more likely to be able to correct their errors.	91	-	18 (19.57%)	17 (18.48%)	52 (56.52%)	5 (5.43%)
14	It is better for students to figure out for themselves why their previous answer was wrong.	92	1 (1.09%)	6 (6.52%)	6 (6.52%)	55 (59.78%)	24 (26.09%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

In item 17, the number of teachers (56.52%) who disagree and teachers (15.22%) who strongly disagree with the statement indicates that the majority of the teachers (71.74%) in this study are against correcting all grammatical errors in students' oral work. In this item, however, 11.96% of teachers agree and 3.26 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying that it is important to correct all grammatical errors in students' oral work. 13.04% of the teachers are undecided.

While the majority of teachers (71.74%) in this study do not favor giving corrective feedback in oral work, as frequency counts for item 19 show, more than half of the teachers (54.35%) believe that all the mistakes should be identified in written work. In their responses to item 19, 45.65% of the teachers agree and 8.70% teachers strongly agree with the statement saying it is important to identify all grammatical errors in students' written work. In this item, however, 26.09% of the teachers disagree and 3.26% of teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. 15.22% of teachers are undecided.

As far as written work is concerned, as frequency counts for item 16 show, the great majority of teachers (91.30%) are in favor of giving the right answers after a written exercise or test. In item 16, 41.30% of teachers agree and 50.00% of teachers strongly agree with the statement saying that it is important for students to be given the right answers after a written exercise or test. The number of the teachers who disagree or strongly disagree with the same statement is one (1, 09%). 5.43% of teachers are undecided.

In item 26, teachers' beliefs about a type of error correction technique, "recast", which implies implicit teaching, was investigated. In this item, 20.43% of teachers agree and 14.13% of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying recast type of error correction technique. 27.17% of teachers disagree and 6.52% teachers strongly disagree with the same statement. Also, the number of undecided teachers (21.74%) is noticeable. This indicates that teachers seem to be equally divided in their responses to the statement in item 26.

In item 12, 56.52 % of teachers agree and 5.43 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying grammar instruction is essential for the mastery of language. In this item, 19.57 % of teachers disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (18.48%) is noticeable.

As far as error correction is concerned, the majority of the teachers (85.87%) are still in favor of implicit teaching. In item 14, 59, 78 % of teachers agree and 26.09 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying implicit teaching. In this item, 6.25% of teachers disagree and only 1.09 % of teachers strongly disagree with the statement. 6.52% of teachers are undecided.

The finding indicated in item 26 (Teachers' different options for corrective feedback) was reflected in class observations. Error correction was one of the key instructional episodes. Participating teachers were observed to differ in their error correction strategies. Explicit feedback in the form of direct correction and implicit feedback in the form of recast and peers' correction were key options. Seven direct corrections from two teachers were observed. The number of implicit feedback was higher. In total, 12 recasts and two peers' corrections were observed. Only one teacher employed peers' correction strategy.

Regarding teachers' beliefs about the use of grammar related terminology, items 5, 15, and 28 from Part One of the questionnaire were analyzed. The data provided in Table 7 presents the frequency counts for these items.

Table 7: Teachers' beliefs about the use of terminology

N	STATEMENT	R	SD	D	NS	A	SA
5	Grammar can be successfully taught without extensive use of grammatical terminology.	91	-	12 (13.04%)	18 (19.57%)	46 (50.00%)	15 (16.30%)
15	It is essential that students are familiar with the correct grammatical terminology.	92	9 (9.78%)	21 (22.83%)	15 (16.30%)	38 (41.30%)	9 (9.78%)
28	Students will learn grammar better if they understand grammatical terminology.	92	9 (9.78%)	36 (39.13%)	16 (17.39%)	29 (31.52%)	2 (2.17%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

As the findings for item 5 indicate, the majority of the teachers (66.30%) believe grammatical terminology is not necessary to teach grammar. In this item, 50.00 % of teachers agree and 16.30 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement implying grammar can be successfully taught without extensive use of grammatical terminology. In the same item, 13.04% of teachers disagree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (19.57%) is noticeable.

This is supported by the results obtained from item 28. Teachers' responses to item 28 show that teachers do not believe using grammar terminology facilitates grammar learning. In item 28, 39.13 % of teachers disagree and 9.78 % of teachers strongly disagree with the statement implying that students will learn grammar better if they understand grammatical terminology. In this item, 31.52 % of teachers agree and 2.17 % of teachers strongly agree with the same statement. The number of the undecided teachers (17.39%) is noticeable.

However, frequency counts for item 15 show that half of the teachers (51.08%) believe it is still helpful for students to be familiar with grammar terminology. In this item, 41.30% of teachers agree and 9.78 % of teachers strongly agree with the statement saying that it is essential that students are familiar with the correct grammatical terminology. The number of the undecided teachers (16.30%) is noticeable.

The finding indicated in item 15 (It is still helpful for students to be familiar with grammar terminology.) was reflected in class observations. Basic grammar terminology, such as verb, noun, and adjective, past form or second form was used by the participant teachers. Grammar terms were used both presentation and practice stages. The consistency with which using grammatical terminology occurred suggested that the teachers valued the role of terminology in explaining grammar. When teachers were asked to articulate their rationales in post-observation interviews, they stated that they teach basic grammar terminology due to some contextual reasons. This is illustrated in the replies below:

Teacher 1

It is necessary to give some basic terminology such as verb, adjective, adverb, and noun because they are sometimes used in the instruction parts of the exams; or students see them in the dictionaries.

Teacher 2

One can learn a language without knowing terminology of its grammar, but as we live in Turkey or as we teach in Turkey, I think students need to know basic terminology; that's why I refer to terminology.

Some teachers believe that basic grammar terminology helps students to better understand grammar, especially if they learn the Turkish equivalents.

Teacher 6

If students know the function of a certain grammar structure in Turkish, they easily understand its function in English; Students believe that if they compare the target language with its Turkish equivalent, they can learn better; so they ask me to tell them the grammar terms.

Some teachers have stated that students want to learn grammar terminology.

Teacher 4

My students want to learn the grammar terms and Turkish equivalents; especially older ones.

Teacher 2

Using terminology makes students think of Turkish equivalents, which help them form a better picture of the target language;

Regarding teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms, teachers participating in the questionnaire study were given grammar teaching activities and were asked to indicate how often they used these activities in their grammar teaching classes. Table 8 shows the grammar activities used by the teachers and how often they are used.

Table 8: Teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms

No	STATEMENT	N	Ne	R	O	F
1	Written grammar exercises E.g. a fill in the blanks exercise	89	-	10 (10.87%)	25 (27.17%)	54 (58.70%)
2	Explanation of a grammar point I.e. teacher explains the structure to the whole class.	89	4 (4.35%)	16 (17.39%)	26 (28.26%)	43 (46.74%)
3	Communicative grammar tasks I.e. tasks which require the use of the target form in purposeful communication	89	-	9 (9.78%)	12 (13.04%)	68 (71.91%)
4	Discussion of errors with class I.e. Discussing common errors that students make; suggesting ways to avoid them	88	2 (2.17%)	6 (6.52%)	31 (33.70%)	49 (53.26%)
5	Comparison with mother tongue grammar E.g. comparing how the passive is used in English and Turkish grammars	89	12 (13.04%)	28 (30.43%)	28 (30.43%)	21 (22.83%)
6	Oral pattern-practice drills E.g. Teacher: He stole the picture. Class: The picture was stolen. Teacher: He left the door open. Class: The door was left open.	89	3 (3.26%)	18 (19.57%)	28 (30.43%)	40 (43.48%)
7	Comprehension-based grammar tasks I.e. tasks that require learners to comprehend a grammar structure but not produce it	89	11 (11.96%)	22 (23.91%)	27 (29.35%)	29 (31.52%)

Note. No: refers to the number in Part Two of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. Ne: Never, R: Rarely; O: Occasionally, F: Frequently

Table 8 above shows how often teachers use the seven types of grammar activities in their teaching. Written grammar exercises were reported to be used rarely by 10.87% of the teachers, occasionally by 27.17% of the teachers and frequently by 58.70% of the teachers. Explanation of a grammar point was reported to be used never by 4.35% of teachers, rarely by 17.39% of the teachers, occasionally by 28.26% of the teachers and frequently by 46.74% of the teachers. Communicative grammar tasks were reported to be used rarely by 9.78% of the teachers, occasionally by 13.04% of

the teachers and frequently by 71.91% of the teachers. Discussion of errors with class was reported to be used never by 2.17% of teachers, rarely by 6.52% of the teachers, occasionally by 33.70% of the teachers and frequently by 53.26% of the teachers. Comparison with mother tongue grammar was reported to be used never by 13.04% of teachers, rarely by 30.43% of the teachers, occasionally by 30.43% of the teachers and frequently by 22.83% of the teachers. Oral pattern-practice drills were reported to be used never by 3.26% of teachers, rarely by 19.57% of the teachers, occasionally by 30.43% of the teachers and frequently by 43.48% of the teachers. Comprehension- based grammar tasks were reported to be used never by 11.96% of teachers, rarely by 23.91% of the teachers, occasionally by 29.35% of the teachers and frequently by 31.52% of the teachers.

The results indicate a strong preference of communicative grammar tasks (item 3). It appears to be the most frequently used activity (71.91 %), followed by written grammar exercises (58.70) and discussion of errors with class (53.26%). The most seldom used activities are comparison with mother tongue grammar (22.83%) followed by comprehension-based grammar tasks (31.52%).

In the pre-observation interviews, the 6 participating teachers were asked what sort of activities they use to practice the target language. They commonly indicated that, among all sort of activities, they mostly prefer the communicative type of activities which involve much speaking. It is followed by written grammar exercises. One teacher noted “comprehension based activity”.

This is illustrated in the replies below:

Teacher 3

Oral activities which engage students in meaningful speaking activities in which they freely use the target language they have learned are helpful. I favor productive written activities for example; a weekend worksheet focusing on the target language.

Regarding teachers' instructional decisions, in the third part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked about the factors which are likely to affect their instructional decisions in deciding how to teach and what type of activities to use when teaching grammar. Teachers were given a list of 11 factors such as the interests of my students and current research in the field and asked to rate each of these factors according to how important they are. Table 9 shows frequency counts for each factor which is likely to affect teachers' instructional decisions.

Table 9: Factors that are likely to affect teachers' instructional decisions

No	STATEMENT	N	NI	FI	I	VI	E
1	The interests of my students	91	1 (1.09%)	1 (1.09%)	19 (20.65%)	49 (53.26%)	21 (22.83%)
2	What I learned from teacher training	91	-	12 (13.04%)	32 (34.78%)	28 (30.43%)	19 (20.65%)
3	Current research in the field	91	-	6 (6.52%)	26 (28.26%)	36 (39.13%)	23 (25.00%)
4	The availability of materials	89	-	5 (5.43%)	28 (30.43%)	39 (42.39%)	17 (18.48%)
5	Whether I think it will work	90	-	3 (3.26%)	22 (23.91%)	46 (50.00%)	19 (20.65%)
6	What feels right at the moment	90	-	11 (11.96%)	25 (27.17%)	46 (50.00%)	8 (8.70%)
7	My school's goals and policies	91	3 (3.26%)	6 (6.52%)	30 (32.61%)	32 (34.78%)	20 (21.74%)
8	My personal goals and beliefs	91	2 (2.17%)	8 (8.70%)	24 (26.09%)	43 (46.74%)	14 (15.22%)
9	It should be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book	91	8 (8.70%)	26 (28.26%)	27 (29.35%)	23 (25.00%)	7 (7.61%)
10	It is not necessary to be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book	89	20 (21.74%)	27 (29.35%)	26 (28.26%)	14 (15.22%)	2 (2.17%)
11	The level of my students	91	-	2 (2.17%)	23 (25.00%)	53 (57.61%)	13 (14.13%)

Note. No: refers to the item number in Part Three of the questionnaire. N: number of responses NI: Not important; FI: Fairly important; I: Important; VI: Very important; E: Essential

As the results indicate, when making their instructional decisions, teachers report to be strongly influenced by two factors, which are the level of the students (57.61%) and the interests of their students (53.26%). These two factors are closely followed by what feels right at the moment (50%), whether they think it will work (50.00%)

and the availability of materials (42.39%), which also seem to be considerably influential. According to the participant teachers the least important factor was if it is necessary to be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book (21.74%).

The findings concerning factors that might affect teachers' instructional decisions were also reflected in the pre-observation interviews. Teachers were asked to comment on the factors which are influential in making their instructional decisions when teaching grammar. Among the factors teachers mentioned such as students' needs, the level of students and the program, and the approach of the main course book, two factors which are the level of students (5 teachers) and the interests of students (5 teachers) seemed to most commonly influence teachers' instructional decisions when teaching grammar. This is illustrated in the reply below:

Teacher 4

While preparing my lesson plan or deciding how to teach something, I attach importance to the level and interests of my students. In my opinion, as long as an activity is interesting for students, we can keep their motivation high.

4.1.1 Summary of the Findings: Research Question 1

Quantitative and qualitative data gained provided insights into what Turkish teachers think about the role of grammar in learning and teaching a foreign language. The teachers believe the teaching of grammar is necessary and has an important role in language learning but should not be the main component of the teaching syllabus (Table 2).

According to the teachers, grammar is best learned while using the language unconsciously to communicate in meaningful and natural situations (Table 3). Teachers believe that the effect of formal grammar teaching is not immediate but long lasting (Table 5). Most of the teachers believe grammar should be taught to all learners, however, almost half of the teachers who participated in the study believe that beginners need more grammar than the students of other levels (Table 2).

Teachers are generally in favor of inductive way of grammar teaching (Table 4). In terms of grammar focused classroom activities, teachers report to have a strong preference for communicative grammar tasks and written grammar exercises. The most seldom used activity is comparison with mother tongue grammar followed by oral pattern-practice drills and comprehension-based grammar tasks (Table 8).

Teachers, when making their instructional decisions, report to be strongly influenced by two factors, which are the proficiency level and the interests of their students (Table 8). Teachers do not find the knowledge of terminology essential to learn a language but they still believe some familiarity with grammar terminology is needed (Table 7). Concerning corrective feedback, teachers disagree with the idea of correcting errors on the spot in speaking activities. Teachers find recast type of error correction useful; however, teachers still seem to be divided in their practices. They are in favor of giving feedback in written work (Table 6).

4.2. RESEARCH QUESTION 2: DO PARTICIPATING TEACHERS' PRACTICES REFLECT THEIR STATED BELIEFS ABOUT GRAMMAR TEACHING AND LEARNING?

Data regarding six participant teachers' actual classroom practices were obtained from the interviews and class observations, and then compared to the quantitative data which came from the same teachers' responses to the belief inventory questionnaire. The comparison of participant teachers' stated beliefs to their teaching practices involves teachers' approach to grammar teaching, teachers' use of grammar terminology, teachers' options for corrective feedback, and teachers' use of grammar activities.

Teachers' stated beliefs about their approach to grammar teaching were compared to their actual instructional decisions. Table 10 shows the general distribution of frequency counts for items 29, 33, and 25 from Part One of the questionnaire which investigates teachers' stated beliefs about their approach to grammar teaching.

Table 10: Teachers' stated beliefs about their approach to grammar teaching

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
29	Teachers should begin a grammar lesson by explaining how a particular structure works.	6	2	4	-	-	-
33	The primary role of the teacher in a grammar lesson is to explain the grammar point.	6	1	4	-	1	-
25	Students should be given the opportunity to work out grammar rules from examples.	6	-	-	-	3	3

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

Frequency counts for items 29 and 33 show that all or the great majority the participant teachers (n=5) are against teaching approaches containing deductive teaching elements. Teachers' responses to item 25 indicate that all the participant teachers are in favor of employing inductive teaching approaches. In observed lessons, participant teachers presenting a new grammar point mostly employed inductive teaching, which reflected their stated beliefs about teaching grammar.

Below, participant teachers' responses to the questionnaire items 29, 33, and 25, their accounts of how they teach the target form and their observed actual classroom teaching will be presented in detail.

When questionnaire responses are examined closely for each teacher, it can be seen that T1 strongly disagrees with the statement in item 29, disagrees with the statement in item 33 and strongly agrees with the statement in item 25. Thus, T1's responses to the statements show that she favors inductive teaching approaches.

In the pre-observation interview with T1, she stated that she favored inductive teaching. Her views about grammar teaching are illustrated in the remark given in the pre-observation interview.

Teacher 1:

I am against giving rules or formulas first and then practicing the language; We don't teach mathematics; That was the way I started to learn English, but it is not helpful; I use readings, short conversations, pictures, visual aids, sometimes a short story or a song (I wish my teachers had used a song to teach grammar) to help my students to discover what the new structure is.

During class observations, T1's beliefs about teaching grammar were observed to be reflected in her instructional decisions. In her observed three lessons, besides other grammar activities used to reinforce the already presented form, two inductive grammar presentations were observed. Based on observations, it can be said that there is congruence between T1's beliefs about grammar teaching approaches and her actual teaching. This is illustrated in the following example of her teaching.

T1, while teaching quantifiers such as much, many, a few and a little, first presented the reading passage in the course book (Success, Pre-intermediate, Student's book, p: 50, Longman). She asked questions and had students to make sentences including the target form, quantifiers. This was followed by the activity given in Episode 1.

Episode 1

(T1 put the quantifiers 'a little' and 'a few' on the board and asked students to say different nouns)

S1: book

T1: a few books (the teacher wrote "books" in 'a few' column)

S2: money

T: a little money (the teacher wrote "money" in 'a little' column)

S3: water

T1: a little water (the teacher wrote "water" in 'a little' column)

S4: student

T1: a few students (the teacher wrote "students" in 'a few' column)

(This activity continued with more nouns both countable and uncountable as

it was described above and the teacher asked):

T1: Who can tell me why some nouns go with ‘a few’ and others with ‘a little’

Ss: countable nouns with a few and uncountable nouns with a little

T1: Good.

T2’s responses to the statements indicate that she employs inductive teaching techniques in her classes, as T2 strongly disagrees with the statement in item 29, strongly disagrees with the statement in item 33, and strongly agrees with the statement in item 25. In the pre-observation interview, T2 responded to the question “How do you teach grammar?” as follows:

Teacher 2:

I always use a suitable context in which my students can see and practice the new structure without knowing what it is; I just make them get involved in the context, use the target structure and develop the rule just by using it. In my classes, the students never hear formulas. I never say “OK this is the subject. After the subject, comes verb to be am is are”

T2, in her three observed lessons, did a large body of grammar related activities to practice the target form already taught. In one of the observed lessons, the way T2 taught the target grammar form, ‘need to’ demonstrated inductive teaching elements. In her presentation stage, T2 put a list of 10 sentences containing ‘need to’ on the overhead projector, in which students can work out rules of form and usage themselves. In this stage the target grammar items were extracted from the sentences and presented. Following that, T2 asked questions containing ‘need to’ and asked students to answer the questions using ‘need to’. As we can understand from the observed grammar presentation episode, T2’s beliefs about grammar teaching approaches match her actual teaching.

T3 disagrees with the statement in item 29, disagrees with the statement in item 33 and strongly agrees with the statement in item 25. T3’s responses to the statements indicate that he prefers inductive teaching techniques in his actual classroom practices, which was also reflected in the pre-observation interview conducted with this teacher.

Teacher 3:

I always make use of multimedia presentations. They can see sentences containing the new grammar point or hear people using it. I speak a lot; I make them speak a lot, using the target language.

Although T3 is in favor of inductive way of teaching, in the interview he added that this approach does not work in crowded classes.

Teacher 3:

But this method doesn't work in crowded classes particularly if there is a management problem. In such classes, I employ more traditional methods.

Based on the field notes, he was observed to employ inductive elements in his presentations and explanations of the grammar points. One example from one of his observed lessons shows that the way T3 explained the difference between the use of 'since' and 'for' in present perfect tense provided a clear picture of inductive teaching. Upon a student's question 'when to use 'since' and when to use 'for'', T3 first told the students to read the sentences in the worksheet containing 'since' and 'for' and, in pairs, ask each other questions about the sentences. He also asked questions which focused on students' own life, using the context of the sentences students went through in pair work. He put the answers on the board and underlined the time expressions. This activity continued until most of the students gave correct answers. From the example it can be understood that, there is congruence between T3's beliefs about grammar teaching approaches and his actual teaching.

Another participant teacher is T4, who disagrees with items 29 and 33, and agrees with the item 25 of the questionnaire. T4's responses to the statements indicate that she also favors inductive grammar teaching. The following quote obtained from the pre-observation interview illustrates T4's views.

Teacher 4:

I find classical "warm up" stage in the beginning of the lessons very useful. For example, if the new structure is simple present tense, at the warm up stage, I talk about my daily life and put it on the board. Then, I ask the students what they do first in the morning then in the afternoon.... I put all the correct sentences they utter on the board so

that they can copy them, imitate them. I highlight the differences such as I wake up but she wakes up; I don't explain I just underline it so that they can notice it.

Based on the field notes made during lesson observations, it was observed T4 made efforts to include inductive teaching elements into her classes while she was presenting, explaining or practicing a grammar point. The example below illustrates her way of presenting a target form. T4 used a task based teaching activity while presenting the new grammar structure, the past continuous tense. First, T4 showed different pictures and sentences describing them in the past continuous such as:

- *When he went out, she was studying.*
- *When the match started, it was raining.*

She asked questions about the pictures such as 'what was she doing when he went out?' Then, T4 asked students to write a short note to one of their friends, explaining 'what they were doing when their mother /father/teacher came in'. In the light of this example, it can be said that there is congruence between T4's beliefs about grammar teaching approaches and her actual teaching.

The questionnaire responses of T5 show that she disagrees with the statements in items 29 and 33, while she agrees with the statement in item 25; indicating a preference for inductive teaching techniques. In the pre-observation interview, T5 responded to the question 'How do you teach grammar?' as follows:

Teacher 5:

The readings or the dialogues in the beginning of each lesson are useful. I frequently use them to present the target grammar. I want my students to read the passage and elicit what the sentences containing the target form mean. Then I supply some vocabulary and ask my students to make sentences similar to those in the reading.

In the example given below, T5 used inductive teaching techniques while presenting and practicing the target form, 'had to', which also indicated congruence between her stated beliefs about grammar teaching approaches and her actual teaching practices.

Episode 2

(T5 put some cues indicating different things she had to do yesterday such wake up early, come to school, catch the bus, and be on time for school)

T5: (pointing to the cues on the board) these are the things I did yesterday. Now tell me, what did I have to do yesterday?

S1: You had to come to school

T5: Good, (T5 put the sentence on the board and underlined the word 'had to')

S2: You had to catch the bus

T5: Good, (T5 put the sentence on the board and underlined the word 'had to')

(T5 also asked students what they had to do yesterday and wrote each response on the board, underlining the word 'had to')

T5: Which one do we use with the past sentences, have to or had to?

Ss: had to

T5: Correct; the past form of 'have to'

T6, on the other hand, disagrees with the statement in item 29, agrees with the statement in item 33, and agrees with the statement in item 25. Similar to the other five teachers, T6's responses show that she favors inductive teaching techniques. The following comment obtained in the pre-observation interview reflects this teacher's view.

Teacher 6:

We have a brainstorming session on the target structure. I ask my students to try to make sentences which contain the new grammar point and I put the correct ones on the board. We make as many sentences as possible from which the students derive the meaning and usage. Once they understand the usage, I explain the rule.

Although T6 said that she was in favor of inductive teaching techniques as an answer to the questions in the pre-observation interview, in the example provided below, she was observed using both inductive and deductive

teaching techniques at the same activity while presenting and practicing ‘have to/has to’.

During the grammar activity, T6 put some pictures about a student named Ali, and asked questions to elicit some information about him. Then, the teacher put a sentence on the board saying Ali has an important exam tomorrow. The activity continued as follows:

Episode 3

(T6 put some vocabulary on the board: study, hard, read, memorize, words, go to bed early, wake up early, listen to teacher, workbook)

T6: Ali has an important exam tomorrow; tell me ‘What does he have to do?’

(T6 underlined the words ‘have to’) you can use the words on the board

S1: Ali have study English

T6: No, you have to say Ali has; Ali has to study English. (T5 underlined the word “has

to”) Onur, do you have to study English?

S1: Yes, I.... (S1 hesitates) is it have or has, teacher?

T6: OK, subject pronouns I, you, we, they: have to- he she it, all singular nouns - has to

S1 (Onur): Yes, I have to study English.

The activity continued until the most of the students made grammatically correct sentences in terms of the use of ‘have to and has to’. In the post-observation interview, T6 was asked to articulate her rationales for giving explicit rules while answering S1’s question. Her rationales are illustrated in the remark below:

Teacher 6

Sometimes, I find it useful and time awarding to give rules explicitly. For example, as I did in the lesson, a short and simple formula helps students to form a mental picture, which, I believe, may be helpful for students to learn the rules.

Regarding the issue of inductive/deductive grammar teaching, the analyses of questionnaires, lesson observations and pre- and post interviews reveal that participant teachers' actual teaching correspond to their beliefs except one teacher (T6) who was observed to use both inductive and deductive techniques.

Another comparison point between actual practices and reported beliefs was the use of grammar terminology. Table 11 shows frequency counts for items 5, 15, and 28 from Part One of the questionnaire which summarizes the 6 participant teachers' stated beliefs on this issue.

Table 11: Participant teachers' stated beliefs about the use of terminology

N	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
5	Grammar can be successfully taught without extensive use of grammatical terminology.	6	1	1		2	2
15	It is essential that students are familiar with the correct grammatical terminology.	6		2		3	1
28	Students will learn grammar better if they understand grammatical terminology.	6	2	2		1	1

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

Frequency counts for items 5 and 28 indicate that 4 out of 6 of the participant teachers believe that there is no need to use terminology to teach grammar successfully. In other words, they don't believe grammatical terminology does not help students learn grammar better. However, 2 out of 6 of the participant teachers believe that it is necessary for students to be familiar with the correct grammatical terminology.

During the class observations, the majority of the teachers were observed to frequently use grammar terminology. In the post-observation interview, they articulated various rationales for their instructional decisions concerning using grammar terminology in their teaching practices.

T1's responses to the statements presented in Table 15 indicate that she believes grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better; as she disagrees with the statement in item 5, and agrees with items 15 and 28. Corresponding with her belief, T1 was observed to use grammar terminology in her lessons. The following extract highlights characteristic features of the way terminology was used by T1.

Episode 4

(T delivers a handout containing an exercise in which students will provide the correct form of the regular verbs in brackets).

T1: (to the class) Use the correct "Verb 2" to fill in the blanks. For regular verbs, what is "the simple past" form?

Ss: We add "-ed" at the end of the verb.

In the post-observation interview, T1 was asked to articulate her rationales for using grammar terminology. Her rationales are illustrated in the remark below:

Teacher 1

Students believe that if they compare the target language with its Turkish equivalent, they can learn better; so they ask me to tell them the grammar terms.

T2 agrees with the statement in item 5, disagrees with the statement in item 15, and strongly disagrees with the statement in item 28.

T2's responses to the statements indicate that she does not believe grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better. However, it was observed that T2 used basic grammatical terminology in her teaching which shows a mismatch between her stated beliefs about using grammar terminology and her actual teaching practices. This is illustrated in Episode 5.

Episode 5

T: OK, the answer is "interested in" what preposition does "interested" take?

Ss. In

T. what is the verb form of "interested"?

Ss. (no answer)

T: The verb form is "interest"

Also, T2 used the grammar term ‘infinitive’ while teaching ‘need to’ in her explanations such as ‘need to takes infinitive form of the verb’ and ‘after need infinitive comes’ T2 provided her rationales for using grammar terminology in the post-observation interview as follows:

Teacher 2

It is necessary to give some basic terminology such as verb, adjective, adverb, and noun because they are sometimes used in the instruction parts of the exams.

Examination of T3’s questionnaire responses show that he strongly agrees with the statement in item 5, disagrees with the statement in item 15 and strongly disagrees with the statement in item 28. T3’s responses to the statements indicate that he does not believe grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better. But, T3’s observed lessons demonstrated that, while teaching ‘have to’, he used basic grammar terms such as modal, singular, plural, subject, and pronoun which again indicates a mismatch between his stated beliefs about using grammar terminology and his actual teaching practices.

In the post-observation interview, T3 articulated his rationales for his instructional decision concerning using basic grammar terms. This is illustrated in the remark below:

Teacher 3

I give some basic terminology because students see them in the dictionaries.

A similar discrepancy was found when T4’s questionnaire results and observation data were compared. T4 strongly agrees with the statement in item 5, agrees with the statement in item 15 and disagrees with the statement in item 28. T4’s responses to the statements indicate that she does not believe grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better. However, in her observed lessons, while presenting and practicing ‘past continuous tense, T4 was also observed to use grammatical terminology such as simple past tense, past continuous tense, verb + ing, and past

form of verb to be. When T4 was asked to articulate her rationales for using grammar terms she made the following comment:

Teacher 4

One can learn a language without knowing terminology of its grammar, but as we live in Turkey or as we teach in Turkey, I think students need to know basic terminology; that's why I refer to terminology.

T5 agrees with the statement in item 5, agrees with the statement in item 15 and disagrees with the statement in item 28. T5's responses to the statements indicate that she does not believe grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better. Similar to other participant teachers T5 was observed to use grammar terminology while teaching grammar as the following extract illustrates:

Episode 6

T5: Which one do we use with the past sentences, have to or had to?

Ss: had to

T5: Correct; the past form of 'have to'

Besides the terms 'past sentences' and 'past form' mentioned above, T5 also used grammar terms such as modal and obligation. In the post-observation interview, T5 articulated her rationales for her instructional decision concerning using basic grammar terms. This is illustrated in the remark below:

Teacher 5

I mention the grammar terms because they are used in the exams.

Lastly, T6 strongly disagrees with the statement in item 5, strongly agrees with the statements in items 15 and 28. T6's responses to the statements indicate that she believes grammatical terminology helps students learn grammar better. Accordingly, she was observed to use grammar terminology in her lessons as Episode 7 shows.

Episode 7

(T6 while teaching 'have to')

S1: Yes, I.... (S1 hesitates) is it have or has, teacher?

T6: OK, subject pronouns I, you, we, they: have to- he she it, all singular nouns - has to

S1: Yes, I have to study English.

In the post-observation interview, T6 provided her rationales for using grammar terminology. Her remarks are as follows:

Teacher 6

Using terminology makes students think of Turkish equivalents, which helps them form a better picture of the target language. My students want to learn the grammar terms and Turkish equivalents; especially older ones.

The comparison of questionnaire data and observations suggest a congruence between T6's stated beliefs about using grammar terminology and her actual teaching practices.

Other features that formed the basis of comparison between practices and stated beliefs were teachers' grammar related feedback and error correction. Table 12 shows frequency counts for items 26 and 14 from Part One of the questionnaire which explores these two features.

Table 12: Teachers' stated beliefs about grammar related feedback and error correction

No	STATEMENT	N	SD	D	NS	A	SA
26	Students will be able to learn from their errors if teachers just say the correct sentence after a student has made an error (i.e. without explaining the error).	6	-	-	-	4	2
14	It is better for students to figure out for themselves why their previous answer was wrong.	6	-	-	-	4	2

Note. No: refers to the number in Part One of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree; NS = Not Sure, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.

The statements in the questionnaire reflect an implicit approach to feedback and error correction. Examination of teachers' answers to items 26 and 14 indicates that all the participant teachers are in favor of implicit corrective feedback (i.e. recast). In addition, all the participant teachers disagree with the idea that students should be corrected while speaking. The comparison of their beliefs and classroom practices regarding implicit corrective feedback indicate accordance for a majority of the teachers (4 out of 6).

T1 strongly agrees with the statement in item 26, and agrees with the statement in item 14. While T1's responses indicate that she favors implicit corrective feedback she was observed to always employ an explicit feedback strategy. In her lessons, she was observed to use 16 direct corrections. An example explicit corrective feedback instance involving comparative adjectives is provided below.

Episode 8

(Having worked on an exercise on comparative adjectives, students are answering questions)

S1: Jack is more taller...

T1: Oh, "Jack is more taller..?" No. Jack is taller. OK? Jack is taller

S2: The school cafeteria is expensive than ...

T1: No. The school cafeteria is (The teacher stops for a while to get the correct answer from the students)

S3: The school cafeteria is more expensive

T1: That's right. The school cafeteria is more expensive

In the post-observation interview, T1 articulated her rationales for explicit feedback as follows:

T1

If you don't correct students' mistakes, they continue making them, even the worse ones. In addition to this, mistakes are likely to become permanent.

T2 also favors implicit corrective feedback, as she strongly agrees with the statement in item 26, and agrees with the statement in item 14. T2 was observed to give 14 corrective feedbacks, 11 of which were implicit and 3 of which were explicit, indicating congruence between T2's stated beliefs and her actual teaching with regard to corrective feedback. Her approach to corrective feedback is illustrated in the example below, in which she presented and practiced the target form, 'need to'.

Episode 9

S1: I need buy a new book.

T2: Oh, you need to buy a book. Why do you need to buy a book?

S1: I need to buy a book for my homework

S2: She need to memorize the words.

T2: She needs to memorize the words.

In the post-observation interview, T2 articulated her rationales for implicit feedback. It is also interesting to note that T2 ignores mistakes made by students in spoken English.

Teacher 2

Especially, in speaking activities, correcting students' mistakes all the time is discouraging. It is better for students to hear the correct utterance from me in a natural way. Furthermore, I mostly ignore grammar mistakes students do while speaking.

Similar to the other teachers, T3 agrees with the statements in items 26 and 14, which suggests that he favors implicit corrective feedback. T3 was observed to give 12 corrective feedbacks, all of which were implicit. T3 was also observed to sometimes ignore the grammar mistakes. Different from the other teachers, T3 was observed to use peer correction as an alternative implicit corrective feedback strategy. This is

illustrated in Episode 10, which also demonstrates congruence between T3's reported beliefs about corrective feedback and his actual practice.

Episode 10

T3: What time did you go to bed yesterday night?

S1 (Okan): I go to bed....

T3: Aslı, What time did you go to bed yesterday night?

S2: (Aslı) I went to bed.

T3: OK. You went to bed.

(T3 asks the same question to S1 again)

T3: Okan, What time did you go to bed yesterday night?

S1: I went to bed at 10 o'clock.

T3: OK. Okan went to bed at 10 o'clock (The teacher put the correct answer on the board.)

In the post-observation interview, T3 provided rationales for using peer correction as follows:

Teacher 3

When a student makes a mistake, I let another student answer the question or continue the activity. I want my students to hear the correct form from their peers not from me as long as child's pedagogy is concerned.

T4 agrees with the statements in items 26 and 14, favoring implicit corrective feedback. During the class observations, T4 was observed to give 16 feedbacks. The majority of the given feedbacks (12 out of 16) had an implicit value, which also indicated congruence between T4's stated beliefs concerning error correction and her instructional decisions. An example of how T4 used implicit corrective feedback while practicing 'past continuous tense' is as follows:

Episode 11

(Students are working on a semi-controlled exercise on past continuous tense, making sentences starting with “while”)

S1: While he was watch TV, his father came home.

T: While he was watching TV, his father came home.

S2: While they are going out, the telephone rang.

T: While they were going out, the telephone rang.

In the post-observation interview, T4 was asked to articulate her rationales for employing implicit feedback. Her remarks are as follows:

Teacher 4

If a student is often corrected, next time he/she may get afraid of speaking. Without interrupting the student, I want my students to hear the correct form from me.

T5, as he agrees with the statement in item 26, and strongly agrees with the statement in item 14, is also favor of implicit corrective feedback. In her observed lessons, she gave 14 feedbacks, nine of which were implicit. While she was presenting and practicing ‘had to’, she employed implicit corrective feedback, which indicated congruence between her stated beliefs and actual error correction strategies. This is illustrated in Episode 12.

Episode 12

(T5 put some cues indicating different things she had to do yesterday such wake up early, come to school, catch the bus, and be on time for school)

T5: (pointing to the cues on the board) these are the things I did yesterday. Now tell me, what did I have to do yesterday?

S: You have to come to school

T5: Yes, I had to come to school; you are right (T5 put the sentence on the board and underlined the word ‘had to’)

In the post-observation interview, she articulated her rationales for a recast as follows:

Teacher 5

The more I interfere in their speaking, the more they get afraid and become unwilling to talk or participate in the activity. Not to interrupt the students while speaking, I just say the correct sentence. I think this technique proved to be successful in my career.

Like all the other participant teachers, T6 also favors implicit corrective feedback, as she strongly agrees with the statement in item 26, and agrees with the statement in item 14. However, she was observed to employ 19 explicit direct corrections in her lessons, in which whenever a student made a mistake, T6 corrected the mistake on the spot, first pointing to the mistake then providing the correct sentence. One of her direct corrections is illustrated in the example given in Episode 13, which also demonstrates a mismatch between T6's stated beliefs and her error correction options.

Episode 13

(T6 put some vocabulary on the board: study, hard, read, memorize, words, go to bed early, wake up early, listen to teacher, workbook)

T6: Ali has an important exam tomorrow; tell me 'What does he have to do?'

(T6 underlined the words 'have to') you can use the words on the board

S1: Ali have study English

T6: No, you have to say Ali has; Ali has to study English. (T5 underlined the word "has to")

In the post-observation interview, T6 provided her rationales for explicit corrective feedback. Her remarks are as follows:

Teacher 6

Some teachers take notes of common mistakes; let's say 10 common ones and they give feedback to the whole class. In my opinion, this is just like teaching the same things again; Students never say "Oh, this is my mistake". So, it is better for students to be corrected on the spot.

In the comparison between teachers' beliefs and practices, the last area to investigate is participant teachers' use of grammar activities. Table 13 shows participant teachers' reported use of different grammar activities.

Table 13: Teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms

No	STATEMENT	N	Ne	R	O	F
1	Written grammar exercises E.g. a fill in the blanks exercise	6		1	1	4
2	Explanation of a grammar point I.e. teacher explains the structure to the whole class.	6		1	3	2
3	Communicative grammar tasks I.e. tasks which require the use of the target form in purposeful communication	6				6
4	Discussion of errors with class I.e. Discussing common errors that students make; suggesting ways to avoid them	6		3	2	1
5	Comparison with mother tongue grammar E.g. comparing how the passive is used in English and Turkish grammars	6		4	1	1
6	Oral pattern-practice drills E.g. Teacher: He stole the picture. Class: The picture was stolen. Teacher: He left the door open. Class: The door was left open.	6				6
7	Comprehension-based grammar tasks I.e. tasks that require learners to comprehend a grammar structure but not produce it	6		1	3	2

Note. No: refers to the number in Part Two of the questionnaire. N: Number of responses. Ne: Never, R: Rarely; O: Occasionally, F: Frequently

Frequency counts for the participant teachers' reported use of various grammar activities and frequency of use show that the most frequently used activities are communicative grammar tasks (6 Ts) and oral pattern-practice drills (6 Ts) , followed by written grammar exercises (4 Ts).

The table 14 below, on the other hand, illustrates the types and frequencies of grammar activities used by participant teachers in actual teaching.

Table 14: The frequency of grammar activities used by the participant teachers while teaching

No	STATEMENT	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6
	Written grammar exercises E.g. a fill in the blanks exercise	2	1	1	2	4	3
2	Explanation of a grammar point I.e. teacher explains the structure to the whole class.						
3	Communicative grammar tasks I.e. tasks which require the use of the target form in purposeful communication		1	1			
4	Discussion of errors with class I.e. Discussing common errors that students make; suggesting ways to avoid them	1					
5	Comparison with mother tongue grammar E.g. comparing how the passive is used in English and Turkish grammars						
6	Oral pattern-practice drills E.g. Teacher: He stole the picture. Class: The picture was stolen. Teacher: He left the door open. Class: The door was left open.	3	2	1	2	2	2
7	Comprehension-based grammar tasks I.e. tasks that require learners to comprehend a grammar structure but not produce it	1					

As presented by the table, the most frequently used activities in the lessons were oral pattern-practice drills and written grammar exercises opted by all the participant teachers. Only two teachers (T2, T3) were observed doing communicative grammar activities, followed by one teacher (T1) doing comprehension-based grammar tasks, and one teacher (T1) discussing errors with class. Teachers have stated that they mostly prefer doing communicative activities but lesson observations have not reflected this. Thus, the results indicate a mismatch between participant teachers' reported use of various grammar activities in their classrooms and the frequency of each grammar activity used by the participant teachers in observed lessons.

4.2.1 Summary of Findings: Research Question 2

Teachers stated that they prefer inductive teaching in their questionnaire responses and lesson observation confirmed this. So, there is congruence between teachers' stated beliefs and their instructional decisions

However, it was observed that there were mismatches between teachers' stated beliefs and their actual classroom practices concerning corrective feedback, the use of terminology in language classes, and the grammar activities used in actual teaching. Teachers' options for corrective feedback are one of the grammar teaching aspects which teachers' beliefs have an impact on. Although all the participant teachers have stated that they favor implicit feedback, they were observed to employ explicit corrective feedback. Also, despite the participant teachers' negative attitudes towards the use of grammar terminology in language classes, teachers were observed to freely and frequently use grammar terminology. Lastly, teachers have stated that they mostly do communicative activities but lesson observations have not confirmed their reported practices.

4.3. RESEARCH QUESTION 3: DO TEACHERS' BELIEFS AFFECT THEIR USE OF MAIN COURSE BOOKS WHILE TEACHING GRAMMAR?

Items 9 and 10 in Part Three were asked to all the participant teachers. In addition to this, in-depth were obtained from six observed teachers through class observations and interviews.

In Part Three, the responses to items 9 and 10 provided data to investigate if teachers believe their grammar teaching approach should be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book. Table 15 gives the frequency counts for items 9 and 10.

Table 15: Factors that are likely to affect teachers' instructional decisions

N	STATEMENT	R	NI	FI	I	VI	E
9	It should be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book	91	8 (8.70%)	26 (28.26%)	27 (29.35%)	23 (25.00%)	7 (7.61%)
10	It is not necessary to be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book	89	20 (21.74%)	27 (29.35%)	26 (28.26%)	14 (15.22%)	2 (2.17%)

Note. No: refers to the item number in Part Three of the questionnaire. N: number of responses NI: Not important; FI: Fairly important; I: Important; VI: Very important; E: Essential

In item 9, 36.96% of the teachers have indicated that what the statement says (It should be parallel to the approach suggested in the main course book) is not important or fairly important and 54.35% of the teachers have indicated what the same statement says is important or very important. 7.61% of teachers say what the statement says is essential. In item 10, 51.09% of the teachers have indicated that what the statement says (It is not necessary to be parallel to the approach suggested

in the main course book) is not important or fairly important and 43.48% of the teachers have indicated what the same statement says is important or very important. 2.17% of teachers say what the statement says is essential. The results indicate that the grammar teaching approach offered in the main course books don't have considerable impact on teachers' instructional decisions.

In Part Four, out of 62 responses, 36 teachers (58.00%) stated that the book they were teaching matched with their grammar teaching methods. In this part, teachers were also asked to articulate rationales for in what ways the book they were teaching matched with their grammar teaching methods. Out of 98 participants only a few chose to comment on this question. Teachers who chose to answer this question in Part Four provided the following rationales reflecting their beliefs. The most frequently mentioned one (5 teachers) is that the book has sufficient number of examples containing new grammar, followed by the book has implicit and inductive teaching elements (4 teachers) and rules explained in natural situations (3 teachers). As the findings indicate that the participant teachers value inductive teaching elements in a course book.

In the same part, 26 teachers (42.00%) stated that the main course book did not match with their own teaching methods. Teachers were also asked to provide rationales for their answers. A few teachers, out of 98 participants, who chose to answer this question, articulated the following rationales: Six teachers have stated that the main course books don't have adequate amount of productive practice and grammar teaching is insufficient. Three teachers have stated that the books don't have enough texts containing the target grammar. As the findings indicate that the participant teachers value the way the book teaches grammar, adequate amount of practice and inductive teaching in a course book.

Similarly, in Part Four of the questionnaire, teachers were given the statement "Even if it contradicts with the approach the main course book employs, I use my own trialed methods which, I know, are useful" and were asked to provide a yes/no answer based on their beliefs. Sixty-nine respondents out of 92 (63.48 %) ticked

‘yes’, indicating that they used their own methods even if those methods did not match with those of the main course book.

In Part Four, teachers were also asked to articulate rationales for using their own methods rather than the course book’s. Teachers who chose to answer this question in Part Four provided the following rationales reflecting their beliefs. The most articulated rationale (6 Ts) is that ‘my own techniques save time’ and followed by ‘teachers’ techniques are more effective’ (5 Ts), and ‘teachers’ techniques bring variety to the class’ (5 Ts). Four teachers have articulated that ‘teachers can adopt books to students’ needs and level’. The least articulated rationale is that books are just tools (3 Ts). Fifteen teachers out of 92 (13.8%) stated that they followed the methodology the book employed. In articulating their rationale, these teachers mainly gave the reason that course books always offer up-to-date techniques which they consider more effective.

Teachers were also asked whether their course book sufficiently supported teaching of grammar (Part 4, question 4). Out of 68 responses, 29 teachers (42.64%) said ‘yes’ and 39 teachers (57.35%) said ‘no’. Teachers who said ‘No’ provided the following rationales: Teachers believed the book did not sufficiently support teaching of grammar; it didn’t have discovery type exercises; activities were not communicative. Teachers indicated that they used extra grammar books, activities taken from the various text books, worksheet, and handouts to support the book. Some teachers argued that they had enough experience to adopt books to students’ needs.

In order to obtain more insights into if teachers’ beliefs affect their use of main course books, during the pre-observation interviews the 6 observed teachers were asked to describe their opinions about the role of the main course books in teaching and practicing a new grammar point. About the place of the course book in a lesson plan when presenting a new grammatical structure, the remarks teachers made indicate that the great majority of the teachers (5 teachers) use their own materials and techniques when teaching the target language grammar. There are teachers (2

teachers) who also make use of the material the book provides, however, these teachers, too, say they present the target language with their own techniques.

This is illustrated in the replies given below:

Teacher1

I use my own teaching methods to present the target language; my students finish the projects, do all the extra activities; when I feel that they have done everything and learned the target language, I do reading, listening parts or activities to practice what I have taught. I usually assign books as homework.

Teacher4

At the presentation stage, I use the material the book provides. For example, I use the reading part to present the new grammar, but I don't prefer to employ the techniques the book suggests, I use my own techniques;

Based on the interview data it can be said that there are two common tendencies: one is that teachers mostly ignore the methodology the book employs, and the second one is that all the teachers use the book at the practice stage. This is illustrated in the remark below

Teacher 5

I mostly use the main course book at the practice stage to reinforce the new grammar.

Teachers' preferences for using the book depend on the variety of the material. Teachers accept that the books are necessary even if they sometimes skip some parts. It is interesting to note that teachers use the books and assign them as homework because of parents' pressure on them. This is illustrated in the replies given below:

Teacher 4

It depends on the material which the book offers; if it is interesting enough for my students, I normally do it; another thing is the time constraint, if I have limited time and many things to cover, I ignore the book.

Teacher 3

In a private school, once the students have bought books, we should use them; I skip some pages and I assign them as homework; anyway we can't say that books are unnecessary.

Teacher 6

I rarely ignore the book; you should, somehow, use the book; there are perhaps helpful activities; moreover, parents want to see the books being used;

Teachers' remarks about their attitudes towards the methodology of the book coincide with the previous finding that the majority of the teachers insist on using their own trialed techniques, which they believe are useful regardless of the methodology of the book. The following teacher quote represents this point well:

Teacher1

I prefer my own techniques; after years of experience, now, I know the key points, effective and precise ways; I don't think I need the instructions given in the teacher's book; I know how my students learn the best.

Findings obtained from the questionnaire indicated that main course books are insufficient in teaching grammar and supplementary materials are used. Observed teachers' beliefs about the main course books confirm these findings. Teachers' remarks about if the books alone are sufficient enough to facilitate learning of the target language clearly indicate that all six teachers believe the books alone are insufficient to present and teach the target language. The following extract explains this point well:

Teacher 3

Sometimes, the books are insufficient to help students to understand the target language clearly; there is very many times that I say 'I wish the book would have this and that or teach that way'

4.3.1 Summary of Findings: Research Question 3

Results of both quantitative and qualitative data with regard to if teachers' beliefs affect the use of main course books while teaching grammar indicate that the main course books don't have much impact on teachers' instructional decisions and teachers strongly favor their own way of teaching even if it contradicts with the approach the main course books employs.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the results obtained through the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data instruments will be discussed in relation to relevant studies in the field. This will be followed by the presentation of implications for education.

5.1.1. Teachers' Beliefs about the Role of Grammar in Learning and Teaching a Foreign Language

The research has highlighted typical patterns of Turkish English teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and learning. The results of the present study have revealed that the majority of the teachers who participated in the questionnaire survey believe formal grammar teaching has a value in language learning and assists language development. This is compatible with studies by Ellis (1994, 1995), Long (1991), Long and Robinson (1998), and Lightbown (1998), where researchers provided significant findings that the focus on form speeds up the rate of learning and affects acquisition processes in ways possibly beneficial to long-term accuracy. However, the great majority of the teachers in this study also believe that formal instruction is of limited value because communicative competence depends on acquisition. This is compatible with the studies by Long (1988) and Batstone and Ellis (2009). In their studies, two researchers suggest that grammar has to be taught in a way with which learners can embrace both form and meaning. Then, the question arises as how instruction can facilitate this. Both to include grammar in language instruction and complement the processes of L2 acquisition, the teachers in this study stated that they prefer inductive teaching of grammar. This finding is consistent with the results obtained from the pre-observation interviews and class observations. According to the participant teachers' accounts of how they teach a new grammar structure, inductive teaching of grammar seemed to be the dominant methodology in language classes. In the present study, observed lessons also indicated teachers' tendency towards inductive teaching of grammar.

The participant teachers' preference for inductive teaching of grammar can be explained in terms of their beliefs about implicit learning. The great majority of the teachers in this study believe grammar should be taught through meaningful interactions at natural situations, trying to communicate in the language and that L2 learning is just like L1 learning, which occurs through unconscious processes when learners are exposed to language input. This is compatible with studies by Long (1991 as cited in Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2002), and Hinkel & Fotos (2002). In these studies, researchers suggest that focus on form, which encourages meaning-focused use of form, allowing the learners to notice and comprehend the target grammar structure, arises from meaningful activities that constitute the core of classroom practice.

Most of the teachers in this study believe that the effect of formal grammar teaching is long lasting and they are in favor of teaching grammar to the students of all levels. This finding is supported by the results of the data obtained from the qualitative part of the study. Teachers, in their responses to the questions on the pre-observation interview, have indicated that grammar is essential for the mastery of language, which support what Eisenstein-Ebsworth and Schweers (1997) and Burgess and Etherington (2002) found in their studies. In both studies, researchers found that teachers had positive attitudes towards formal instruction and believed that it facilitated their students' proficiency.

In relation to language practice, the great majority of the teachers in this study have indicated that regular practice of the target language facilitates grammar learning and they spare considerable amount of time for language practice in their classes, which implies teachers' emphasis on formal grammar teaching. This is supported by the findings from the class observations. The lessons seemed to follow the presentation-practice-production pattern and the practice stage was clearly the main part of the lessons. Types of the activities were characterized by accuracy work and based on a movement from controlled to semi- controlled and finally to less-controlled work. Generally, formS focused activities, whose primary purpose is to teach pre-selected

language forms, were used in the observed lessons. This is compatible with the studies by DeKeyser (1998), Doughty (1991), Lightbown (1998), and Swain (1985). In these studies, researchers claim that activities which focus only on meaning are not adequate for learners to attain an accurate knowledge of the language; therefore, formS-focused activities should be integrated into communicative classrooms.

Lastly, participant teachers in their responses to the questionnaire study have indicated that when making their instructional decisions, they are influenced by two factors: the level of students, and the interests of students. Six teachers participating in the qualitative part of the present study articulated these two factors as the most influential of all.

5.1.2. Teachers' Stated Beliefs about Grammar Teaching and Their Classroom Practices

The congruence between participant teachers' stated beliefs and their actual teaching was observed in teachers' approach to grammar teaching. The results gained by participant teachers' responses to the related questionnaire items indicated that all the teachers promoted inductive teaching of grammar, which was also reported by the teachers participating in the pre-observation interviews. In addition to this, teachers were observed to employ inductive elements of teaching in their actual teaching.

Teachers' preference for inductive teaching was influenced by their beliefs formed by their language learning experiences (T1), theories of language acquisition and contextual factors. For example, as we can clearly understand from the remark made in the pre-teaching interview (p.90), deductive teaching elements had been part of T1's learning experience. This finding is consistent with Farrel's (1999) study which revealed that pre-service teachers in the study refused deductive teaching because it had not worked for them as learners.

The second finding related to participant teachers' approach to grammar teaching is that teachers might well change their teaching strategies depending on their

perceptions of how positively they worked. This can be considered in terms of contextual factors. T3, in his responses to the pre-observation interview questions stated that inductive teaching did not work in crowded classes particularly if there was a management problem and in such classes, he employed more traditional methods. This finding confirms what Tsui (1996) found in the study in which he investigated the impact of contextual factors on the instructional decisions.

The third finding concerning observed teachers' approach to grammar teaching is that both inductive and deductive teaching elements may well take place at the same time while teaching or practicing the target form as it was observed in T6's teaching. T6, in her post-observation interview, argued that a short and simple formula helps students to form a mental picture, which, may be helpful for students to learn the rules. This is compatible with what Ellis (2006b) argues that simple rules may best be taught deductively.

There are congruence and mismatches between the participant teachers' stated beliefs and their actual classroom teaching concerning the use of terminology in language classes. Two participant teachers' (T1 and T6) responses to the related questionnaire items indicate that they are in favor of using basic grammar terminology in language classes. This was reflected in their observed lessons and supported by the rationales articulated by them in the post-teaching interviews. These participant teachers (T1 and T6) provided certain experiential, cognitive and contextual factors such as terminology used in the instruction parts of the exams and using terminology makes students think of Turkish equivalents, which help them form a better picture of the target language as their rationales for using basic grammar terminology while teaching. The other participant teachers (T2, T3, T4, and T5), although their stated beliefs indicate an opposition to the use of grammar terminology in teaching, were observed to use some basic grammar terms freely in their lessons. During class observations, it was observed that these participant teachers made use of grammatical terminology while presenting a new grammar point, making explanations, practicing the target language and answering students' grammar related questions. In the post-observation interviews, these teachers also

mentioned contextual factors as their reason for using grammatical terminology such as students want and students see terminology in the dictionaries. As we can understand from the common aspects of two groups of contextual factors, students' needs are main concern. These findings in relation to congruence and mismatches between the teachers' stated beliefs and their actual teaching practices are compatible with the study by Borg (1999c), in which the researcher found that the use of terminology in language classes was influenced by a variety of "experiential, cognitive and contextual factors" (p.118) such as students enjoy talking about language, some students like and feel comfortable with labels and it equips students to be able to use grammar books autonomously. Also, the participant teachers are in favor of inductive teaching, which has an implicit value. On the other hand, the grammar terminology, which participant teachers use frequently, is a necessary part of an explicit approach to grammar teaching (Stern, 1992).

So, there is a mismatch between teachers' options for grammar terminology and their preferences for inductive teaching of grammar.

Findings of the study with regard to teachers' corrective feedback revealed the strong influence of teachers' beliefs on their instructional decisions. Teachers were observed to employ different error correction strategies. There were observed congruence in four participant teachers' and mismatches in two teachers' options for corrective feedback. Although all the participant teachers, in their responses to the questionnaire, seemed to consistently agree with the statement implying implicit corrective feedback, two of the teachers (T1 and T6) were observed giving explicit feedback in the form of direct correction. In the post-observation interview, these teachers articulated concerns about fossilization of errors in learners' interlanguage and claimed that this way of giving feedback proved effective in her teaching career, which is in accord with studies by Carroll and Swain (1993) and Lyster (2004) who have found that explicit feedback was more effective in both eliciting the learner's immediate correct use of the structure and in eliciting subsequent correct use.

The other teachers (T2, T3, T4, and T5) were observed to use two different forms of implicit feedback such as recast and peer correction, which also indicated

congruence between participant teachers' reported beliefs and their instructional decisions. Teachers (T2, T4, and T5), in support of 'recast', believe that it has implicit value and facilitates learning of grammar. This is compatible with what Muranoi (2000) notes in the study where the researcher suggests that implicit feedback is more effective when it is targeted intensively at a single structure. In addition to recast, another option of implicit corrective feedback observed was peer correction. The teacher (T3) claimed that this was more humanistic to employ in terms of students' encouragement. This finding is consistent with Eisenstein-Ebsworth and Schweers' (1997) study which found the minimal role theories of language acquisition played in rationales for teachers' instructional decisions in grammar work.

Related to the teachers' use of grammar activities, a mismatch was identified between participant teachers' stated preferences for grammar activity types, and the actual activities they used in teaching. Although all the participant teachers stated that they frequently did communicative grammar activities, only two teachers were observed doing communicative tasks such as writing a notice for the school notice board and writing a message after a telephone conversation. In observed lessons, all the participant teachers frequently used written grammar activities and oral pattern-practice drills. Teachers' preference for intensive written and oral grammar practice may be due to the assumption that, with sufficient opportunities for practice, learners will eventually succeed in automatising the structures they are taught.

5.1.3. Teachers' Beliefs about the Use of Main Course Books While Teaching Grammar

Findings highlighted influence of teachers' beliefs on the use of main course books in grammar teaching. The results of the data obtained from questionnaire item, Part Four, Q1 and interviews and class observations indicated that the great majority of the teachers strongly favored their own way of teaching even if it contradicted with the approach the main course books employed. The main course book did not have much impact on teachers' instructional options. All six teachers participating in the

qualitative part of this study seemed to have developed stances generated by experiential factors. Two examples of experiential factors mentioned by teachers are ‘my trialed methods are much more effective’ and ‘the books alone are not sufficient’. This finding is compatible with those of Borg’s (1999, 2003) studies which both revealed that experiential factors shape teachers’ instructional decisions. Also, the results of the qualitative data revealed that all the participating teachers would support the methodology of the main course book if it included implicit and inductive teaching elements.

Another central issue concerning the impact of the six participant teachers’ beliefs on the use of main course books is the role of context. Teachers, stating their beliefs about the use of the main course books in teaching grammar, articulated contextual factors such as if the book has a good part or an activity, I do it, it depends on the material which the book offers, and I use the books and assign them as homework because of parents’ pressure, which affected their use of the main course book in both positive and negative ways. This finding confirms findings of Borg (1999, 2003) and Tsui (1996) that contextual factors shape teachers’ instructional decisions.

Based on the results of data obtained from six participant teachers’ responses to the pre-observation interviews, two common tendencies emerged: one is that teachers mostly ignore the methodology the book employs, and the second one is that all the teachers use the book at the practice stage.

5.2. IMPLICATIONS

Implications emerging from the study are as follows.

Turkish English teachers in this study differ in their options for corrective feedback. Although the participant teachers favor implicit knowledge for eventual mastery of the language, some teachers were observed to employ explicit corrective feedback options. Thus, in-service teachers should be provided with training and support to be able to explore their own beliefs and to develop principled eclecticism, which

enables them to implement approaches compatible with their beliefs into their classroom practice. Also, in pre-service education programs, teacher trainees should be encouraged to make self-observations in their schools to raise awareness for their own beliefs and opportunities for discussions on these beliefs should be provided.

The great majority of the teachers believe that formal instruction contributes to learning of grammar, and, to complement the processes of L2 acquisition, they prefer teaching approaches which have an implicit value such as inductive teaching. But, teachers' preferences for grammar activities mainly consist of written and oral pattern practice, which focus on forms. However, recent course books contain communicative task based activities. This discrepancy between teachers' preferences for grammar activity types and activities provided in books may hinder the efficiency of the courses. A number of researchers have argued (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; R. Ellis 1994; Robinson, 2001) that if the goal of second language learning is the development of communicative competence, enabling learners to use language for communicative purposes, then grammar and communication must be integrated. Thus, novice and in-service teachers should be provided with training on how tasks can be facilitated effectively in the communicative approach framework while focusing on meaning; situation sensitive training should be provided and a system providing feedback for teachers should be developed. Similarly, pre-service teachers should be trained using case studies, observations and micro-macro teaching opportunities in pre-service teacher education programs.

This study has provided valuable insights into teachers' beliefs with regard to the use of main course books, which has remained unstudied from teachers' perspectives. In the Turkish context, main course books are important as well as indispensable tools for both teachers and students to both teach and learn English. Due to the great interest in learning English from kindergarten to universities, in all private and state schools in Turkey, ELT managers and teachers try hard to find the 'best book' which fits the students' needs, which facilitates learning in the best way, and finally which keeps up with the most up-to-date multimedia technologies. But, teachers' active and

preferred role in implementing the main course books into lessons has long been ignored. Issues concerning at what stage of teaching teachers use the main course books or whether they employ the methodology suggested in the book have not been matched by studies of teachers' beliefs. This study suggests that teachers do have well-established beliefs about the use of books, which merit comprehensive consideration. The present study has demonstrated that most of the teachers in this study are likely to employ their own trialed methods to present the target form. In other words, they usually ignore the methodology suggested in the book. In the light of an acceptance that the course books are written on the basis of recent approaches, teachers' preferences for their methods may prevent students from reaching ultimate goals set by the writers and publishers of ELT books. Thus, to make sure that teachers are using a selected course book to the maximum effect, novice and in-service teachers should be provided with effective training and support on how to use and exploit main course books while presenting and practicing target grammar. Also, course book writers, materials designers and ELT publishers should productively cooperate with teachers to obtain teachers' perspectives, expectations, ideas, and critical suggestions before and while designing the main course books and pedagogical materials. In relation to the use of main course books, the issues concerning main course book inspection and effective implementation should be an important part of courses for pre-service teachers.

The findings and implications of this study should be viewed in the light of its limitations. First the number of teachers who participated in this study was 98, and all worked at private primary and high schools located in Istanbul. Thus it is difficult to draw strong generalizations due to the limited number of participants. The findings would be more informative if a greater number of teachers from both state and private schools and from different regions of Turkey were studied.

Six teachers volunteered to take part in the qualitative part of this study. The classroom practices of more teachers working at different educational settings and with different student levels may provide us with more insights about their beliefs

and practices. In addition, the qualitative findings of the study could have been more reliable if teachers kept diaries and the observed lessons were video-recorded and then followed by a think-aloud procedure.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Teachers' beliefs have long been considered as a key source of data to understand rationales behind teachers' teaching preferences during formal instruction and research has provided perspectives into the field (Borg, 2003). However, the present study only focused on teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. Further research focusing on teachers' beliefs and teaching reading, writing, listening, speaking and vocabulary might be conducted.

Current study was conducted to investigate the impact of teachers' beliefs on the use of main course books in teaching grammar. A study exploring the relationships between teachers' beliefs and language skills parts (listening, speaking, writing and reading) of the main course books merits attention.

REFERENCES

- Abelson, R. (1979). Differences between belief systems and knowledge systems. *Cognitive Science*, 3, pp. 355-366.
- Andrews, S. (1994). The Grammatical Knowledge/ Awareness of Native-Speaker EFL Teachers: What the Trainers Say. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher* (pp. 69–89). London: Prentice Hall International.
- Andrews, S. (1999). 'All these like little name things': a comparative study of language teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. *Language Awareness*, 8, 143–59.
- Andrews, S. (2003). 'Just like instant noodles': L2 teachers and their beliefs about grammar pedagogy'. *Teachers and Teaching*, 9:4, 351 — 375.
- Allright, R. (1977). Language learning through communication practice. *ELT Documents*, 76/3, pp. 2-14.
- Asher, J. (1982) *Learning Another Language Through Actions*. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Bailey, N., Madden, C., & Krashen, S. (1974) Is there a natural sequence in adult second language learning? *Language Learning*, 24, pp. 235-243.
- Bailey, K. M. (1996). The best laid plans: teachers' inclass decisions to depart from their lesson plans. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (eds.), *Voices From the Language Classroom* (pp. 15–40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 243-272.
- Batstone, R., & Ellis, R. (2009). Principled grammar teaching. *System*, Volume 37, issue 2 p. 194-204.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Borg, S. (1998).
- Borg, S. (1998). [Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study](#). *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 9-38.
- Borg, S. (1999a). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27, 19-31.
- Borg, S. (1999b). Teachers' theories in grammar teaching. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 157-67.
- Borg, S. (1999c). The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (1), 95–126.
- Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Journal*, 55(1), 21-29.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81-109.

- Breen, M. P. (1991). Understanding the language teacher. In Phillipson, R., Kellerman, E., Selinker, L., Sharwood Smith, M. and Swain M. (eds.) *Foreign/second Language Pedagogy Research*. pp. 213-233. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Brumfit, C. J., Mitchell, R., & Hooper, J. (1996). Grammar, language and classroom practice. In Hughes, M. (ed.) *Teaching and Learning in Changing Times*. pp. 70-87. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Burgess, J., & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: explicit or implicit? *System*. 30/4, pp. 433-458.
- Cabaroglu, N., & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE program. *System*, Vol. 28, 387-402.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25/3, pp. 459-480.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton. Random House.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Dik, S. C. (1978). *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam, North Holland: Foris Publications.
- Dik S C (1989). The theory of functional grammar. Part 1: the structure of the clause. Dordrecht: Foris.
- DeKeyser, R.M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspective on learning and practical second language grammar. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. pp. 42-63. Cambridge: CUP.
- Doughty, C. (1991). Second Language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from empirical study of second language relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 13, pp. 431-496.
- Doughty, C., & Valera, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J (eds.) *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. pp. 114-138. Cambridge: CUP.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge: University Press.
- Eisenstein Ebsworth, M., & Schweers, C. W. (1997). What researchers say and practitioners do: perspectives on conscious grammar instruction in the ESL classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, 8(2), 237-260.
- Ellis, N. C. (2005). At the interface: How explicit knowledge affects implicit language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 305–352.

- Ellis, R. (1993). The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 91-113
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, – 106.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language*, 51 *Supplement*, 1–46.
- Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A review of the research. *Studies in Second Language acquisition*, 24, 223–236.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281–318.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2002). Doing focus on form. *System*, 30, 419–432.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System*, 33, pp.209-224.
- Ellis, R. (2006a). Researching the Effects of Form-Focussed Instruction on L2 Acquisition. *AILA Review*, Vol. 19, No. 1. pp. 18-41.
- Ellis, R. (2006b). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly* 40, 83–107.

- Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 242–260.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: unlocking pre-service teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELCJournal*, 30 (2), 1–17.
- Fotos, S., & R. Ellis (1991). Communicating about grammar: a task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4): 605~28.
- Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 323–351.
- Fotos, S. (1998). Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 52 (4): 301-307.
- Fotos, S., & Hossein Nassaji (2004). Current Developments in Research on The Teaching of Grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 126-145.
- Francis, W. N. (1993). Revolution in Grammar. In Miller L. C. and M. D. Linn (eds.) *Linguistics for Teachers*. pp. 426-441. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freeman, D. (1992). Language teacher education, emerging discourse and change in classroom practice. In J. Flowerdew & M. Brock & S. Hsia (Eds.), *Perspectives on second language teacher education*. Hong Kong.
- Freeman, D., & Richards, J. C. (1996). *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. New York: CUP.

- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*. 32/3, pp. 397-418.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*, Oxford University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees., & J. Lachlan Mackenzie, (2005). *Functional Discourse Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herron, C., & Tomosello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided . *French Review*, 65, 708–718.
- Hinkel, E. & Fotos, S. (2002). (Eds.), *New Perspectives on Grammar Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (pp. 1-10). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Associates, Inc.
- Hollinsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. *American educational research Journal* 26(2), 160-189.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A History of English Language Teaching*. Oxford:OUP
- Hymes, D. (1972) On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B. and Holmes, J. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. pp. 269-293. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439-452.

- Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, 437- 468.
- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*. 27, pp. 65-90.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983) *The Natural Method: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen S. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, S. (1993). The effect of formal grammar teaching: Still peripheral. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 722–725.
- Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Swain, M. (1991). Early and Middle French immersion programs: French language outcomes. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, 11–40.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*, Second Edition. Oxford

- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 251-266). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 12,429-448.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In Doughty, C. and Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. pp.177-196 Cambridge: CUP.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (3), 359-382.
- Long, M. H. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 115–141)., MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. DeBot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-63). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lozanov, G. 1978. *Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399–432.
- Miles M.B., & Huberman A.M. (1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*, 50, 617–673.
- Nassaji, H. (2002). Schema theory and knowledge-based processes in second language reading comprehension: A need for alternative perspectives. *Language Learning*, 52, 439–481.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 19/4, pp. 317-328.
- Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417–528.
- Numrich, C. (1996). On becoming a language teacher: Insights from diary studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (1), 131–53.
- Nunan, D. (1994). Linguistic theory and pedagogic practice. In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. pp. 253-270 New York: CUP.

- Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*. 62/3, pp. 307-332.
- Paradis, M. (1994). Neurolinguistic aspects of implicit and explicit memory: Implications for bilingualism and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed). *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 393–419). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-Service ESL Teachers' Beliefs about Second Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study. *System*, 29 (2), pp.177-195.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, Volume 37, Issue 3 p 380-390.
- Pica, T. (1983). 'Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different of exposure'. *Language Learning*. 33, pp. 465-497.
- Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 186–214.
- Pienemann, M. (1988). Determining the influence of instruction on L2 speech processing. *AILA Review*, 5, 40–72.
- Pienemann, M. (1999). Language, processing and second language development: *Processability theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language* . Cambridge: CUP.

- Richards, J. C. (1998). Teacher beliefs and decision making. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 65–85). Cambridge: CUP.
- Richards, J. C., B. Li & A. Tang (1998). Exploring pedagogical reasoning skills. In J. C. Richards (ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 86–102). Cambridge: CUP.
- Rivers, M. Wilga (1968). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Rivers, W. M. (1983). *Speaking in Many Tongues: Essays in Foreign Language Teaching*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: CUP.
- Robinson, P. (1995). Attention, memory, and the noticing hypothesis. *Language Learning*, 45(2), 283–331.
- Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex rules under implicit, incidental - search conditions, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18, 27–67.
- Rosa, R., & O'Neill, M. (1999). Explicitness, intake and the issue of awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 511–556.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1993). Awareness and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 206–226.
- Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Scultz, R. (1996). Focus on Form in the Foreign Language Classroom: Students' and Teachers' Views on Error Correction and the Role of Grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, No.3
- Scultz, R. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA: . *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 85, No. 2 pp. 244-258
- Scott, V. M. (1989). An empirical study of explicit and implicit teaching strategies in French. *Modern Language Journal*, 73(1): 14-21
- Sharwood-Smith, M. (1986). 'Comprehension versus Acquisition: Two Ways of Processing Input.' *Applied Linguistics*. 7/3, pp. 239-256.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, D. B. (1996). Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 197–216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (eds.) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. pp. 235-253. Rowley, MA: House.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1989). Canadian immersion and adult second language teaching— what's the connection. *Modern Language Journal*, 73, 150–159.

- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. in E. Hinkel. (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Truscott, J. (1998). Noticing in second language acquisition: a critical review, *Second Language Research*, 14 (2), 103-135
- Tsui, A. B. M. (1996). Learning how to teach ESL writing. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 97–119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- White, L., Spada, N., Lightbown, P., & Ranta, L. (1991). Input enhancement and question formation. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 416–432.
- Wong, W. (2004). Processing instruction in French: The roles of explicit information and structured input. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition* (pp. 187–205). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Woods, D. (1996) *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1

The Belief Inventory Questionnaire

Değerli Meslektaşım,

Bu anketin amacı sizin iki konu hakkındaki düşüncelerinizi öğrenmektir. Bunlardan birincisi dilbilgisinin yabancı dil öğretimindeki yeridir. Sizin de bildiğiniz gibi dilbilgisinin yabancı dil öğretimindeki rolü, etkisi, ne kadar ve nasıl öğretilceği hakkında farklı görüşler bulunmaktadır. Dilbilgisi öğretimi ve öğrenimi üzerine yapılmış araştırmaların sonucunda en uygun ve etkili sonuç veren yöntem(ler) konusunda farklı görüşler öne sürülmekle beraber, hepimiz öğretmenler olarak derslerimizde dilbilgisi öğretimine yer ayırıyoruz. Dilbilgisi öğretimini bazen yeni fikirler, metotlar, bazen kendi deneyimlerimiz ve inançlarımız ışığında gerçekleştirebiliyoruz. Bu çalışmanın birinci amacı yabancı dil öğretiminde dilbilgisinin rolü ve ne şekilde öğretilbileceği konularında sizlerin değerli görüşlerine ulaşmaktır.

Bu çalışmanın ikinci önemli amacı ise takip edilen ana ders kitabının dilbilgisi öğretiminizle olan bağlantısını anlamaya çalışmaktır. Bazılarını çok sevdiğimiz, bazılarını pek de kullanmak istemediğimiz, kuvvetli ve zayıf yanlarını tartıştığımız ders kitaplarının sınıf içi yöntemlerimiz ve uygulamalarımızda yer tuttuğu bir gerçek. Ana ders kitaplarının ve bu kitaplarda önerilen dilbilgisi öğretim yöntemleri ve aktivitelerinin öğretmenlerin dilbilgisi öğretim biçimi ve kişisel görüşleriyle ne şekilde bağdaşıp bağdaşmadığı daha önce araştırılmamış çok önemli bir konudur.

İşte sizlerin desteğinizle bu iki konuyu araştırmak istiyorum. Bu araştırmanın, dilbilgisi konusunda dünyada yapılmış olan çalışmalara Türk öğretmenlerimizin de değerli görüşlerini ve tecrübelerini katmalarını sağlamak için bir araç olmasını umuyorum. Çalışma kapsamında size sorulacak soruların veya görüş belirtmeniz istenen konularda düşüncelerinizi bütün açıklığıyla belirtmenizi rica ediyorum. Vurgulamak isterim ki; bu çalışma hazırlanırken tek bir geçerli yaklaşım, yöntem veya ‘doğru’ olduğu varsayımıyla yola çıkılmamıştır.

Zaman ayırdığınız için ve bu çalışmaya olan katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla

Aşağıdaki bölüm katılımcıların kişisel bilgileriyle ilgilidir.

1. Uyruk:

T.C. ☐

Yabancı ☐

Çift Uyruklu ☐

2. Cinsiyet:

Erkek ☐

Kadın ☐

3. Yaş:

22-32 ☐

33-43 ☐

44-54 ☐

55-üzeri ☐

4. Lise öğreniminizi tamamladıktan sonra en son hangi dereceyi aldınız?

Üniversite ☐

Yüksek lisans ☐

Doktora ☐

5. Halen görev yaptığınız okul:

Özel İlköğretim ☐ Devlet İlköğretim ☐ Özel Lise ☐

☐ Devlet lise (Türü:.....)

☐ Diğer

6. İngilizce öğrenmeye nerede başladınız?

Lise ☐

Anadolu Lisesi /Süper Lise ☐

Kolej ☐

Üniversite ☐

Dil Kursu ☐

Yurt dışı ☐

I. Aşağıda dilbilgisinin yabancı dil öğretimindeki yeriyle ilgili görüşler var. Bunlarla ilgili düşüncelerinizi her bir cümlenin yanındaki kutucuklardan size uygun olanına ☒ işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

		KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM	KATILMIYORUM	EMİN DEĞİLİM	KATILIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILIYORUM
1	Öğrenciler bir yabancı dili, dilbilgisi öğretimi olmadan edinebilir.(Bir çocuğun ana dilini öğrenmesi gibi)					
2	Her öğrenci İngilizcenin farklı yapılarını aynı sırayla öğrenir.					
3	Dilbilgisine yapılan vurgu öğrencilerin dilin nasıl işlediğiyle ilgili bilgi sahibi olmalarını garanti eder.					
4	Dile hakim olabilmek için öğrencilerin dilbilgisi kurallarını bilmeleri ve bunları açık bir şekilde ifade edebilmeleri gerekir.(Explicit knowledge of grammar)					
5	Dilbilgisi, kapsamlı bir terminoloji kullanımı olmaksızın başarı ile öğretilir.					
6	Dilbilgisi öğretimi kısa vadede sonuç vermeyebilir.					
7	Dilbilgisi edinimi en iyi, dilin anlamlı kullanımıyla, farkında olmadan gerçekleşir.					
8	Dilbilgisi en iyi, o dille iletişim kurmaya çalışırken doğal olarak öğrenilir.					
9	Dilbilgisi en iyi dersin doğal akışında öğrenilir.(Önceden bir dilbilgisi dersi planlamaya gerek yoktur.)					
10	Dilbilgisi her seviyeden öğrenciye öğretilmelidir. (başlangıç, orta, ileri)					
11	Dilbilgisi her yabancı dil müfredatının ana parçası olmalıdır.					
12	Öğrencilere dilbilgisi açık bir şekilde öğretilirse kendi hatalarını kendilerinin düzeltebilmesi konusunda becerileri gelişir.					
13	Dilbilgisini yoğun bir şekilde öğretmek (örneğin; bir dilbilgisi konusunu öğretmeyi bir dönemin birkaç haftasına yoğunlaştırmak) aynı dilbilgisi konusunu zamana yayılmış bir şekilde (bütün bir okul yılı) öğretmekten daha iyidir.					
14	Öğrencilerin verdikleri yanıtın neden yanlış olduğunu kendilerinin bulması daha iyidir.					

		KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM	KATILMIYORUM	EMİN DEĞİLİM	KATILYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILYORUM
15	Öğrencilerin doğru dilbilgisi terminolojisine (terimlerine) aşina olmaları çok önemlidir.					
16	Yazılı bir alıştırma veya sınavdan sonra öğrencilere doğru cevapların verilmesi önemlidir.					
17	Öğrencilerin sözlü üretimlerindeki hataların hepsini düzeltmek önemlidir.					
18	Bütün İngilizce derslerinde dilbilgisi konularına zaman ayırmak önemlidir.					
19	Öğrencilerin yazılı üretimlerindeki her dilbilgisi hatasını tespit etmek önemlidir.					
20	Dilbilgisini başlangıç seviyesindeki öğrencilere öğretmek, orta ve ileri seviyedeki öğrencilere öğretmekten çok daha önemlidir.					
21	Düzenli yapılan alıştırmalar dilbilgisi ediniminin hızlı ve başarılı olmasını garanti eder.					
22	Öğrenciler genellikle kendilerine öğretilen dilbilgisi yapılarını edinmezler.					
23	Öğrenciler dilbilgisi konularını farklı oranlarda öğrenir.					
24	Hiç hata yapmayan öğrenci nadirdir; çünkü İngilizcenin dilbilgisi çok karmaşıktır.					
25	Öğrencilere, dilbilgisi kurallarını örneklerden kendilerinin anlayıp çıkaracakları fırsatlar verilmelidir.					
26	Bir öğrenci hata yaptıktan sonra öğretmen hatayı açıklamadan sadece doğru cümleyi söylerse öğrenciler hatalarından öğrenirler.					
27	Öğrenciler bir dilbilgisi konusunu ancak gelişimsel olarak ona hazırlarsa öğrenirler.					
28	Öğrenciler eğer dilbilgisi terminolojisini (terimlerini) anlarsa dilbilgisini daha iyi öğrenirler.					
29	Öğretmenler dilbilgisi derslerine o dersin konusu olan yapıyı açıklayarak başlamalıdır.					

		KESİNLİKLE KATILMIYORUM	KATILMIYORUM	EMİN DEĞİLİM	KATILIYORUM	KESİNLİKLE KATILIYOR UM
30	Dilbilgisi öğretiminin etkileri uzun süreli değildir.					
31	Bir dilbilgisi dersinin önemli bir bölümü öğretilen yapıyla ilgili değişik alıştırmalara ayrılmalıdır.					
32	Bir dil öğretim programının (müfredatının) önemli bir bölümü dilbilgisi öğretimi ve ilgili alıştırmalar üzerinde yoğunlaşmalıdır.					
33	Bir dilbilgisi dersinde öğretmenin öncelikli rolü dilbilgisi konularını açıklamaktır.					
34	Dilbilgisi öğretimi öğrencilerin daha karmaşık cümleler kurmasını sağlar.					
35	Yabancı dilde iyi iletişim kurmak için dilbilgisi kurallarına uygun konuşmak gerekmez.					

II. Aşağıda dilbilgisi öğretimi sırasında tercih edilebilecek alıştırmalar çeşitlerinden bazıları var. Bunların her birini “ne sıklıkla” yaptığınızı uygun kutucuğa ☒ işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

		ASLA	NADİREN	ARA SIRA	SIKLIKLA
1	Yazılı dilbilgisi alıştırmaları <i>Örnek; Boşluk doldurma çalışmaları</i>				
2	Bir dilbilgisi konusunun açıklanması <i>Örnek; Öğretmen belli bir yapıyı bütün sınıfa açıklar</i>				
3	İletişime dayalı dilbilgisi çalışmaları <i>Örnek; Öğretilen yapının anlamlı bir şekilde kullanılacağı çalışmalar</i>				
4	Yapılan hataları sınıfta öğrencilerle tartışmak				
5	Ana dilin dilbilgisi kurallarıyla karşılaştırma yapmak <i>Örnek; Etken/Edilgen yapının Türkçede nasıl kullanıldığı</i>				
6	Dilbilgisi yapılarına ait sözlü alıştırmalar <i>Örnek: Teacher: He stole the picture. Class: The picture was stolen. Teacher: He left the door open. Class: The door was left open.</i>				
7	Anlamaya yönelik dilbilgisi çalışmaları <i>Örnek; Öğrencilerin bir dilbilgisi konusunu anlamalarını bekleyen ama bu yapıyı kullanmalarını beklemeyen çalışmalar.</i>				

III. Dilbilgisi öğretme yönteminize karar verirken dikkate alabileceğiniz bazı noktaların sizin için önem derecesini değerlendiriniz. Her bir husus için değerlendirmenizi uygun kutucuğa ☒ işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

		ÖNEMSİZ	KISMEN ÖNEMLİ	ÖNEMLİ	ÇOK ÖNEMLİ	GEREKLİ
1	Öğrencilerimin ilgileri					
2	Öğretmenlik eğitimim sırasında öğrendiklerim					
3	Bu alandaki son bilimsel araştırmalar					
4	Kaynakların olup olmaması					
5	Seçeceğim yöntem ve alıştırma türlerinin işe yarayıp yaramayacağı konusundaki düşüncelerim					
6	O an için neyin doğru olduğuna inandığım					
7	Okulumun hedef ve politikaları					
8	Kişisel hedeflerim ve inançlarım					
9	Seçeceğim yöntem ve alıştırma türlerinin ders kitabımızın yaklaşım ve tekniklerine uygun olması					
10	Seçeceğim yöntem ve alıştırma türlerinin kitabın yaklaşımına uygun olmaması					
11	Öğrencilerimin seviyesi					

IV. Bu son bölümdeki soruları cevaplandırırken, cevabınızı evet/hayır ile sınırlamak yerine kısa da olsa sebebinizi anlayabileceğim şekilde açıklamanızı rica ederim. (Daha fazla yere ihtiyaç duyarsanız arka sayfadaki boş alanı da kullanabilirsiniz).

1. *Kitabın yaklaşımına ters düşse bile ben kendi denenmiş ve işe yaradığını bildiğim yöntemlerimi kullanırım.*

Bu görüş sizin dilbilgisi öğretirken ana ders kitabını kullanımınızla ilgili yaklaşımınızı yansıtıyor mu?

Evet ☐ Hayır ☐

Sebeplerinizi kısaca açıklar mısınız?

.....
.....

2. Hangi ders kitabını kullanıyorsunuz? Kullandığınız kitabın dilbilgisi öğretimi ile ilgili yaklaşımından kısaca bahsedebilir misiniz?

.....
.....

3. Yukarıda bahsettiğiniz kitabın yaklaşımı sizin dilbilgisi öğretimiyle ilgili düşünce ve görüşlerinize uyuyor mu? Kısaca açıklar mısınız?

.....
.....

4. Kullandığınız kitabın dilbilgisi öğretimi açısından yetersiz kaldığı hususlar var mı? Cevabınız “Evet” ise bu husus(lar) nedir/nelerdir?

.....
.....

5. Yukarıdaki soruya cevabınız “Evet” ise bu durumda ne yapıyorsunuz?

.....
.....

6. Eklemek istediğiniz başka hususlar var mı?

Appendix 2

The Original Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about your views of the role of grammar in the language classroom. It is NOT an evaluation of you as a teacher. It is NOT a test. There are no right or wrong answers. All your responses are confidential.

Part A

Please answer the following questions about yourself.

1) Name:.....

2) Nationality:.....

3) Gender: (please tick) Male Female

4) Academic qualifications (please tick and complete):

A teachers' certificate in

A diploma in

A bachelor's degree in

A master's degree in

A doctorate degree in

Other (please specify).....

5) Number of years of teaching experience

a. in Maldives:

b. elsewhere:

6) School that you currently teach

in:.....

7) Grades that you currently teach (please tick) 8 9 10 11 12

8) English is your (please tick) mother tongue second/subsequent language

9) Age that you began learning English

10) Other languages that you speak (if applicable):.....

11) Please describe your own language learning experiences (e.g. where and how did you learn; was it a positive or negative experience; did you have exposure to the target language community; etc.):

.....

Part B

1) Please describe what the word *grammar* means to you.

.....

2) What role do you think grammar plays in language learning and teaching?

.....

3) a. Do you think it is necessary to teach grammar? (Please tick) Yes No

b. Please explain why you think so.

.....

4) a. Have you ever experienced any difficulties in teaching grammar? (Please tick)

Yes No

b. If yes, please describe them briefly.

.....

5) a.. Over the years, has your approach to teaching grammar changed at all? (Please tick)

Yes No

b. If yes, explain how.

.....

.....

.....

6) If your teaching approach has changed in any way, which of the following sources have been **most** responsible for that change? Number the three most important 1, 2 and 3. (1 being the most important)

Feedback from supervisor Student feedback

Trial and error Collaboration with colleagues
 Self discovery In-service programmes
 Use of new textbooks Professional teaching journals
 Published research Experimenting with new ideas
 Other (please specify).....

Part C

The following table shows some activities that could be used to teach grammar.

1) Please indicate how often you use each of the given activities in your teaching, by circling

the appropriate number in the first column ("Frequency"). Please use the following scale

to answer this question:

1 Never 2 Rarely 3 Occasionally 4 Frequently

Activities Frequency Effectiveness

Written grammar exercises.

E.g. a fill in the blanks exercise

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Explanation of a grammar point.

I.e. teacher explains the structure to the whole class.

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Communicative grammar tasks.

I.e. tasks which require the use of the target form in purposeful communication.

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Discussion of errors with class.

I.e. Discussing common errors that students make; suggesting ways to avoid them.

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Comparison with mother tongue grammar.

E.g. comparing how the passive is used in English and Dhivehi grammars

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Oral pattern-practise drills.

E.g. Teacher: He stole the picture.

Class: The picture was stolen.

Teacher: He left the door open.

Class: The door was left open.

Teacher: The doctors discharged her from hospital today.

Class: She was discharged from hospital today...

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

Comprehension-based grammar tasks.

I.e. tasks that require learners to comprehend a grammar structure but not produce it.

1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4

2) Now look at column two (“Effectiveness”) in the above table. Imagine that you are going to teach the passive form in your next grammar lesson. Using the scale given below, please indicate how effective you think the above activities will be in teaching the passive form to your students. Circle the most appropriate number for each activity in column two (“Effectiveness”).

1 Not At All Effective 2 Fairly Effective 3 Effective 4 Very Effective

3) Please note down any other types of grammar activities (not mentioned here) that you use with your students, indicating how often you use them.

.....
.....
.....

4) In deciding how to teach and the type of activities you use, rate how important each of the following factors are for YOU personally, on the following scale, by circling the most appropriate number.

**1 = Not Important 2 = Fairly Important 3 = Important 4 = Very Important
5 = Essential**

a. The interests of my students 1 2 3 4 5

- b. What I learned from teacher training 1 2 3 4 5
- c. Current research in the field 1 2 3 4 5
- d. The availability of materials 1 2 3 4 5
- e. Whether I think it will work 1 2 3 4 5
- f. What feels right at the moment 1 2 3 4 5
- g. My school's goals and policies 1 2 3 4 5
- h. My personal goals and beliefs 1 2 3 4 5
- i. The way my peers operate 1 2 3 4 5
- j. The level of my students 1 2 3 4 5

Part D

Rate each of the following statements by circling the most appropriate answer on the given scale.

- 1) A learner can acquire a second or foreign language without grammar instruction (i.e. similar to how children learn their mother tongue).

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 2) All students will learn the different structures of English in the same order.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 3) Attention to grammar ensures that students become aware of how the language works.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 4) Explicit knowledge of grammatical rules is essential for the mastery of language.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 5) Grammar can be successfully taught without extensive use of grammatical terminology.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 6) Grammar instruction may not offer immediate results.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 7) Grammar is best acquired unconsciously through meaningful communication.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

- 8) Grammar is best learned naturally through trying to communicate.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

9) Grammar is best taught incidentally (i.e. there is no need to pre-plan grammar lessons).

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

10) Grammar should be taught to all learners (i.e. beginner, intermediate and advanced).

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

11) Grammar should be the main component of any teaching syllabus.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

12) If learners receive grammar instruction, they are more likely to be able to correct their errors.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

13) It is best to teach grammar intensively (i.e. concentrate teaching grammar into a few weeks of a term) rather than extensively (i.e. over the whole school year).

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

14) It is better for students to figure out for themselves why their previous answer was wrong.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

15) It is essential that students are familiar with the correct grammatical terminology.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

16) It is important for students to be given the right answers after a written exercise or test.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

17) It is important to correct all grammatical errors in students' oral work.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

18) It is important to focus on grammar in all English lessons.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

19) It is important to identify all grammatical errors in students' written work.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

20) It is more important to teach grammar to beginners than to intermediate/advanced

learners. STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE

STRONGLY AGREE

21) Regular practice exercises ensure that grammar is quickly and successfully acquired.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

22) Students generally do not learn the grammatical structures they are taught.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

23) Students learn grammar at different rates.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

24) Students rarely become error-free because English grammar is very complex.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

25) Students should be given the opportunity to work out grammar rules from examples.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

26) Students will be able to learn from their errors if teachers just say the correct sentence after a student has made an error (i.e. without explaining the error).

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

27) Students will learn a grammar point only if they are developmentally ready for it.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

28) Students will learn grammar better if they understand grammatical terminology.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

29) Teachers should begin a grammar lesson by explaining how a particular structure works.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

30) The effects of grammar instruction are not long lasting.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

31) The major part of a grammar lesson should involve students in practising the grammar point.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

32) The major part of a language course should focus on teaching and practising grammar.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

33) The primary role of the teacher in a grammar lesson is to explain the grammar point.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

34) The teaching of grammar enables students to produce more complex sentences.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

35) You do not need to speak grammatically in order to communicate well.

STRONGLY DISAGREE DISAGREE NEUTRAL AGREE STRONGLY AGREE

Part E

Any additional comments or suggestions about teaching/learning grammar:

Appendix 3

The pre-observation interview

Pre- observation interview questions

1. Please describe what the word *grammar* means to you.
2. Do you think it is necessary to teach grammar? (What role do you think grammar plays in language learning and teaching?)
3. What is your approach to teaching grammar? (How do you teach/present a new grammar point?)
4. What sort of grammar teaching activities do you use? What factors influence your choice of activities?
5. What is your approach to using the main course book in teaching grammar?

Appendix 4

The post-observation interview

Post- observation interview questions

Could you explain to me why you have chosen to use that/those particular method/activity?

(Additional questions relating specifically to the lesson(s) and/or the teacher's responses may also be asked)

Appendix 5

Sample interview notes

Teacher 4

Q: Could you tell me what the word “grammar” means to you?

A: Grammar is as important as doing different activities or making the class interesting. I think, regarding the teaching of a language, grammar is so important. Grammar should always be underlined in language teaching.

Q: How would you describe it with just a few words?

A: Grammar is the language itself

Q: What role do you think grammar plays in language learning and teaching?

A: Grammar is the language itself. Without teaching of grammar, I don't believe that language proficiency can be attained. This is also true for Turkish or any other language. I believe student's awareness is very important; so while teaching, rules, especially the complex ones, should be highlighted. This helps learners be professional in the language.

Q: Do you think teaching of grammar enables students to produce more complex sentences?

A: Certainly. Grammar rules make them perfect. Teachers should spare extra time for grammar. Students must be aware of the rules.

Q: Could you describe your approach to teaching of grammar?

A: I find classical “warm up” stage in the beginning of the lessons very useful. For example, if the new structure is simple present tense, at the warm up stage, I talk about my daily life and put it on the board. Then, I ask the students what they do first in the morning then in the afternoon....I put all the correct sentences they utter on the board so that they can copy them, imitate them. I highlight the differences such as I wake up but she wakes up; I don't explain I just underline it so that they can notice it.

Q: Students are trying to use the target language without knowing what it is

A: Exactly.

Q: In other words, you don't teach the rule first

A: Yes. Students use the language naturally in real communication.

Q: What sort of activities do you use to practice the target language?

A: I want to be sure that students can comprehend what they read. For example, while doing a reading passage, my comprehension questions always contain the target language.

Q: How about free production?

A: Next stage always focuses on producing the new grammar points in natural conditions.

Q: Do you mostly prefer oral activities?

A: Both written and spoken activities. But, I always put the sentences on the board regardless of written or spoken.

Q: What factors are more influential in deciding how to teach and the type of activities you use?

A: Sometimes, I use what ever the book provides. Actually, I am in favor of challenging activities with which students can produce more complex sentences, from which they learn new things for example, more words. I like rewrite activities. They give students a chance to see grammar from different point of views.

Q: What do you think about the role and place of the main course books in teaching and practicing the new grammar point?

A: Well, in teaching the new grammar point, I use the book at the presentation stage as well as at the practice stage.

Q: Do you sometimes ignore the book?

A: Particularly, if the way the book presents the language is insufficient, I use my own way of teaching. I occasionally ignore the book if I have something more interesting, more motivating for my students at the presentation stage.

Q: Which one do you prefer? Your methods or the approach of the book

A: I am in favor of a good combination of techniques; what the book suggests, my methods and my friends' trialed methods;

Q: How about using only the methods the book suggests?

A: My answer is “Generally, the books don’t help students to understand the target language clearly”

Appendix 6

Sample Observation Notes

Teacher 1

Observation 1

High School English Prep Class

Duration: One contact class hour

(The class has already studied comparative/superlative form of adjectives. Teacher's intention is to have a quick review of the target structure first and then to practice it with the help of a handout delivered beforehand)

T enters class.

T: Good morning. OK, what did you learn in the previous lesson? Who remembers?

Ss: Comparative adjectives

S: Adjectives with –er and more

S: Teacher, we learned, for example, to say “something is bigger, taller or cheaper than something” (S said this in Turkish)

T: Who can tell me when we use –er , when we use more-

Ss: with short adjectives, we use –er , with long adjectives more

(Ss generally tend to speak in chorus and some Turkish words for adjectives, long adjectives or short ones)

(T shows different pictures or figures with the help of an overhead projector, which contain objects differing in size, price etc.)

T: Which one is taller?

Ss: White building is taller than yellow building

T: Please one by one.

S: White building is ...

T: The white building... Isn't it?

S: The building is taller than yellow building

T: the yellow building, OK good, now which one is the tallest?

Ss: White building

T: What are there in the picture?

Ss: Watches

T: Which one is the most expensive?

Ss: Casio

(T shows a figure containing information about three different hotels and asks the students to make sentences with comparative/superlative form of adjectives. Ss have five minutes to finish the task. T walks round the class, answering questions. Ss mostly speak Turkish. T sometimes refuses to answer those who speak Turkish. A lot of related terminology is frequently heard. Both T and Ss feel free to use terminology. T takes a look at what Ss are doing and give corrective feedback. T explains the rules, using expressions such as short adjectives or long ones.)

T: Who wants to make the first sentence?

S: Star Hotel is bigger than Ocean Hotel

T: True, good. Another sentence?

S: Ocean Hotel is cheaper

T: Which is the cheapest of all?

Ss: Star Hotel

(Ss make various sentences. T attaches a lot importance to accuracy. Whenever they make a mistake, T corrects the students. T usually puts the correct one on the blackboard. T always tries to elicit the accurate answers. After Ss finish the task, T asks Ss to take out the handouts)

T: Question number 1, who wants to answer it?

S: Jack is more taller.

T: Oh, "Jack is more taller..?" No. Jack is taller.. OK? Jack is taller

S: Jack is taller than his brother

T: Well-done

(Handout includes more or less the same type of activities done in this lesson so far. Ss answer the questions on the handout one by one.)

Appendix 7

Sample Post-Observation Interview Notes

Teacher 1

Q: You corrected almost every mistake. Could explain your rationale for this?

A: If you don't correct students' mistakes, they continue making them, even the worse ones. I believe teachers must correct the mistakes on spot, if the mistakes are not corrected on the spot, I believe, students may forget it; the mistakes may become permanent and habits;

Q: Do you sometimes take notes of students' mistakes and explain them later?

A: Some teachers take notes of common mistakes; let's say 10 common ones and they give feedback to the whole class. In my opinion, this is just like a teaching the same things again; Students never say "Oh, this is my mistake". I do this in writing; In students' work, I correct each mistake and give feedback to each student individually; then, I put them, the most common and vital ones on the board and explain why they are wrong.

Q: Do you think this kind of corrective feedback eradicates students' mistakes?

A: This way of giving feedback has proved effective in my teaching career. I have witnessed many times that mistakes in spoken and written work become less.

Q: How about correcting mistakes in speaking?

A: I correct the mistakes mostly in accuracy focused activities; but, when fluency is my priority, I don't correct the mistakes, I just let them speak; at the end of the activity, perhaps I emphasize on a few important ones.

Q: I have observed that you used at least basic terminology so often. Do you think it is helpful for learners ?

A: I expect my students to understand what the word “adjective” mean and its function in the sentence. I usually cooperate with the Turkish teacher; we usually teach the same grammatical subject.

Q: Is it the school policy?

A: No, but I believe that If students know the function of a certain grammar structure in Turkish, they easily understand its function in English.

Q: Do you think it is necessary to learn a language?

A: One can learn a language without knowing terminology of its grammar, but as we live in Turkey or as we teach in Turkey, I think students need to know basic terminology; that’s why I refer to terminology. Furthermore, it is necessary to give some basic terminology such as verb, adjective, adv, and noun because they are sometimes used in the instruction parts of the exams;

Appendix 8

Data Reference Conventions

Category 1: Need for grammar

Identified patterns

Data Reference Conventions

Necessary for students to achieve accuracy	(T1.I.2)
Grammar is the ABC of language learning	(T3.I.2)
Grammar should not be the main focus of the curriculum	(T6.I.2)

Category 2: Tendency to teach inductively

Identified patterns

Data Reference Conventions

I am against giving rules or formulas	(T1.I.3)
I always use a suitable context	(T2.I.3)

Category 3: Effect of context on inductive teaching

Identified patterns

Data Reference Conventions

doesn't work in crowded classes	(T3.I.3)
---------------------------------	----------

Category 4: Teachers' options for grammar activity

Identified patterns

Data Reference Conventions

meaningful speaking activities	(T1.I.4)
productive written activities	(T6.I.4)
All production- based activities	(T5.I.4)

Category 5: Factors for teachers' selection of activities

Identified patterns

Data Reference Conventions

Students' needs	(T4.I.4)
The level of the students	(T2.I.4)
The book usually guides me	(T1.I.4)

Category 6: Place of the main course book in grammar teaching

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
at the practice stage	(T2.I.5)
At the presentation stage	(T3.I.5)

Category 7: The use of the main course book while teaching grammar

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
I occasionally ignore the book	(T1.I.5)
assign the book as homework	(T4.I.5)

Category 8: The effect of context on the use of main course books

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
parents want to see the books being used	(T2.I.5)
In a private school, we should use books	(T3.I.5)

Category 9: Teachers' attitudes towards the methodology suggested in the main course book.

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
I prefer my own techniques	(T4.I.5)
I have my own methods	(T6.I.5)

Category 10: Teachers' opinions about the methodology suggested in the main course book.

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
the books are insufficient to help students	(T6.I.5)
it depends on the book	(T3.I.5)

Category 11: Rationales for explicit corrective feedback

Identified patterns

students continue making mistakes
mistakes may become permanent

Data Reference Conventions

(T1.PI.CF)
(T6.PI.CF)

Category 12: Experiential factors with regard to explicit corrective feedback

Identified patterns

proved effective in my teaching career

Data Reference Conventions

(T1.PI.CF)

Category 13: Rationales for implicit corrective feedback

Identified patterns

correcting students' mistakes is discouraging

Data Reference Conventions

(T2.PI.CF)

Category 14: Rationales for peer correction

Identified patterns

It is better for child's pedagogy

Data Reference Conventions

(T3.PI.CF)

Category 15: Rationales for grammar terminology

Identified patterns

used in the instruction parts of the exams
help them form a better picture of the target language
students see them in the dictionaries

Data Reference Conventions

(T1.PI.GT)
(T4.PI.GT)
(T5.PI.GT)

Category 16: Rationales for doing grammar activities

Identified patterns

enhance students' attention to the target form
chance to expose our students to the target structure

Data Reference Conventions

(T5.PI.GA)
(T4.PI.GA)

Category 17: Rationales for teachers' using their own methods

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
Methods which have been experienced before is time-awarding	(Q.4.1)
Learning style of each student is different; teachers know the differences best	(Q.4.1)

Category 18: Rationales for teachers' using the methodology suggested in the main course book

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
I always find the methodology the books employ more effective	(Q.4.1)
Books always suggest updated techniques	(Q.4.1)

Category 19: Teachers' factors in favoring the methodology of the main course book

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
Rules are explained in natural situations	(Q.4.3)
There many examples containing new grammar	(Q.4.3)

Category 20: Teachers' factors in ignoring the methodology of the main course book

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
Deductive teaching is employed	(Q.4.3)
Reading passages containing the target grammar are needed	(Q.4.3)

Category 21: Shortcomings of the main course books participant teachers are using

<u>Identified patterns</u>	<u>Data Reference Conventions</u>
Inadequate number of contexts	(Q.4.4)
Lack of discovery type exercises	(Q.4.4)