Pre-Service English as a Foreign Language Teachers' Belief Development about Grammar Instruction

Seyit Ahmet Çapan
Çukurova University, sacapan@cu.edu.tr

Pre-Service English as a Foreign Language Teachers' Belief Development about Grammar Instruction

Seyit Ahmet Çapan
Çukurova University, Turkey

Abstract: *This study aims to investigate pre-service English as Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction in a foreign language (FL) context through their initial teaching practices. Analyses of semi-structured interviews and classroom observations apart from pre- and post-test results of participants' responses to a belief questionnaire imply intriguing findings regarding participants' beliefs about grammar instruction. The study reveals that practicum course has made no changes in pre-service teachers' beliefs except for the role of conscious knowledge. The results also indicate some other factors affecting the pre-service teachers' preferences for grammar instruction.*

Keywords: pre-service; EFL; belief; grammar; instruction.

Introduction

Second/ foreign language (L2) education is a complex process that is characterized by interactive and constant relationships among learners, teachers and contextual factors. Though the other two factors have been studied in depth and breadth, it is only recently that research has taken into consideration 'teacher' as a variable affecting overall achievement in L2 education. More specifically, research on the language teacher's cognitive world, in particular his/her beliefs about language teaching/learning, lags far behind the growing literature on L2 education (Borg, 1998; Borg, 1999). Teachers' beliefs are defined as "tacit, often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms and the academic material to be taught" (Kagan, 1992, p. 65). According to Johnson (1994), educational research on teachers' beliefs converges on three key assumptions. These are a) teachers' beliefs affect their perception and judgment, b) those beliefs play a major role in shaping teachers' classroom practices and c) specifying those beliefs is crucial for improving teaching practices and teacher education programs. In this regard, several calls (Borg, 2003a; Pajares, 1992) have been made to prompt further research on language teachers' beliefs as beliefs constitute a major part of teacher cognition. Similarly, Pajares (1992) refers to the need for belief studies while he cautions that these attempts should be discipline-specific. That is he makes it explicit that narrowing down studies on teachers' beliefs to a certain area and context can better facilitate an understanding of teachers' cognitive life than does conducting more general belief studies.

In line with the need for discipline-specific studies, research on teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction has gained prominent importance because grammar teaching itself is a controversial issue. Indeed, the role of grammatical instruction has gone through a cyclical process (Barnard & Scampton, 2008; Schulz, 1996). In its earlier forms, grammar instruction emphasized form over meaning through mechanical drill activities. Following the

introduction of communicative and natural approaches, attention to more communicative activities focusing on delivery of the meaning replaced the traditional form (Farrell, 1999). However, Azar (2007) points out that the role of grammar in L2 education has been revitalized, since communicative and naturalistic approaches fall short of ensuring successful language learning/teaching. As a result of the complexity within the concept of grammar instruction itself, studies addressing teachers', particularly pre-service teachers', beliefs about the role of grammar instruction have failed to establish a consensus.

With respect to concerns of this study, belief refers to any sort of views and ideas pre-service EFL teachers hold regarding the nature of language learning and teaching. Likewise, grammar instruction involves "any planned or incidental instructional activity that is intended to induce language learners to pay attention to linguistic form" (Ellis, 2001, pp. 1-2). Accordingly, the present study intends to arrive at an understanding of what pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction are and how these beliefs are reflected (if at all) in their teaching experience in the practicum course. One point to be firmly clarified is that this study does in no way evaluate their performance in the practicum course. Nor does it impose any form of grammar instruction as a model on pre-service teachers. Instead, it merely attempts to delineate their beliefs about different aspects of grammar instruction before and after initial teaching practices they have in the practicum course. Finally, it examines the extent to which pre-service EFL teachers' reported beliefs match their classroom practices.

Research Questions

1- What are pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction?
2- Do pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction display any difference following the practicum course? If yes, which aspects of their beliefs about grammar instruction change?
3- Do pre-service EFL teachers' reported beliefs about grammar instruction correspond to their actual practices?

Literature Review

Investigating teachers', in particular pre-service teachers' beliefs is crucial in that every teacher candidate brings with him/her certain beliefs. These beliefs should be specified as early as possible because they shape pre-service teachers' understanding of language teaching and learning as well as their practices (Johnson, 1992). Pajares (1992) highlights that many pre-service teachers are identified with the misconception that their beliefs are the best, and they hardly feel the need to refine and change some beliefs. Bearing in mind that previous beliefs may affect pre-service teachers' responsiveness to teacher education (Peacock, 2001), it becomes of paramount importance to examine their beliefs before they graduate from teacher education programs with possible misbeliefs. Investigation of pre-service teachers' beliefs also contributes to L2 teacher education programs as it may reveal possible content for L2 teacher education curriculum (Wright, 2010). Furthermore, quite a few researchers (Liao, 2007; Borg, 1999) purport that promoting awareness about their beliefs may improve reflective skills in teachers as well as the quality of their teaching.

A close analysis of previous research reveals basically three factors affecting teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching. Based on Borg's (1999) classification of teachers' cognitions

about grammar instruction, these factors can broadly be categorized as "schooling", "teacher education" and "classroom experience" (p. 26). To begin with schooling, several studies (Busch, 2010; Farrell & Lim, 2005; Fleming, Bangou & Fellus, 2011) report that teachers' beliefs are influenced by their background as language learners. Farrell (1999) indicated that beliefs of all pre-service teachers participating in his study were shaped by their prior experiences as learners. Similarly, Mattheoudakis (2007) investigated pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs and noticed that some of the participants' beliefs about language teaching and learning such as studying vocabulary and grammar as well as the role of correct pronunciation were rooted in their past experiences as learners. In addition, the type of teacher education pre-service teachers receive arguably affects their beliefs. Evidently, the impact of teacher education program on teacher beliefs is another area susceptible to conflicting results. Though some studies (Busch, 2010; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Özmen, 2012) reveal that teacher education programs make a difference in their beliefs, several others (Altan, 2006; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 2001) report no or little change in teachers' beliefs after being exposed to teacher education programs. Still others (Phipps & Borg, 2009) conclude that teacher education programs are useful in changing peripheral beliefs, but fail to change pre-service teachers' core beliefs. At the other end of the continuum, Almarza (1996) puts forth that the change in practices does not ensure change in beliefs. However, the results regarding belief change or stability should be interpreted tentatively in that many researchers (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Mattheoudakis, 2007) caution that belief change is a cumulative and gradual process. Moreover, Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000) maintain that regardless of the volume of the impact, teacher education programs deserve to be considered as a major factor affecting pre-service teachers' beliefs. Classroom experiences constitute another major factor impacting teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction. Though Borg (1999) uses classroom experiences to stand for factors deriving specifically from the nature of classroom, it may be extended to encompass a number of external factors such as learners' expectations, curriculum, society, parents, school administration and the school itself (Eisentein-Ebsworth & Schweers, 1997 ; Tsui, 1996). For instance, Burgess and Etherington (2002) highlighted that teachers' support for grammar instruction were more concerned with appeasing learners' preferences than their own beliefs.

As to the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices, Johnson (1992) speculates that specifying this relationship is inherently difficult because of the ill-defined distinction between instructional techniques used in L2 teaching. Nevertheless, myriad studies (Phipps & Borg, 2009; Ezzi, 2012; Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2001) demonstrate inconsistency between what teachers believe and do. Johnson (1992) hypothesizes that one of the main reasons underlying the incongruence may simply be a lack of clearly defined beliefs on the part of the teacher. Another reason may be the subordination of teachers' beliefs to learners' expectations. That is teachers are observed to practice in a way that prioritizes learners' needs and wants over their own beliefs (Burgess & Etherington, 2002). Other reasons might be such external factors as time restrictions, curriculum and school-driven requirements (Barnard & Scampton, 2008; Eisentein-Ebsworth & Schweers, 1997).

Regarding pre-service teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction, there is clashing evidence on the need for providing learners with grammar instruction. Yet, recent studies (Burgess & Etherington, 2002; Busch, 2010) reveal that pre-service teachers certainly attribute some role for grammar teaching. While Azar (2007) defines this role as "the weaving that creates the fabric" (p. 2), pre-service teachers in Busch (2010) view it as "the building block for phrases and sentences" (p. 329). Teik (2011) purports that teachers' knowledge of grammar, the way they are trained to teach grammar and the way they are taught grammar are the most prominent factors impinging their beliefs about grammar

instruction. Nonetheless, one should notice that despite the debate over desirability of grammar instruction, several studies (Borg & Burns, 2008; Dikici, 2012; Fleming, Bangou & Fellus, 2011; Teik, 2011) unanimously point out that a certain amount of grammar instruction is useful. In line with the current emphasis over the joint importance of fluency and accuracy, much research indicates that there is a significant preference for approaches which integrate grammar to other skills, and present it in context rather than in isolation.

Overall, the area of teachers' beliefs is a relatively complicated one, which makes the existing findings highly fragile. Borg (2003a) maintains that the relationships between different components of teacher cognition, their practices in the classroom and learning are yet to be discovered. Another point that encourages and indeed necessitates more longitudinal research is the lack of consistency over findings about teachers' beliefs. Moreover, there is a dearth of research on teachers' beliefs in state schools with non-native teachers of English (Borg, 2003b). Therefore, the present study is geared to compensating for these deficiencies as it specifically focuses on pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction in a state school context with non-native teachers of English.

Methodology

Context

The study was carried out with pre-service EFL teachers enrolled in the practicum course at a public university. The program in which the participants were enrolled lasted four years requiring the completion of 240 credits in total. The program consisted of courses mainly focusing on teaching methodology, material development, language acquisition and linguistics. One of these courses, the practicum was a one-year course in which pre-service teachers were assigned to a public school under the supervision of a cooperating teacher from the school and a supervisor from the university. In the first semester, pre-service teachers were required to make observation on learners, teachers and overall school system. The second semester was the phase where they were actively involved in teaching practice for a 10-week period by teaching at least one session (40-45 minutes in duration) each week. The decision for focusing on belief development particularly within the practicum course is justified by several studies (Busch, 2010; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Özmen, 2012), which make explicit that the practicum provides a basic means for pre-service teachers to identify their beliefs and thus, it is viewed as the most important component of language teacher education. However, one should notice that pre-service teachers assigned to practicum schools do not teach in the first semester. Hence, the present study investigates the role of real teaching experiences in the development of pre-service teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction merely throughout the second semester.

Participants

There were 47 pre-service teachers participating in this study. They were all senior students majoring in English language teaching (ELT) at a public university. Of these, 34 were females and 13 were males, which was typical of the population of ELT departments in the country. Forty three of them were ranging between 20-25 years of age while only four were between 26-30 years old. The participants were selected through maximal variation sampling (Cresswell, 2002). A majority (63.8 %) of the participants were graduates of state

high schools where they attended to a preparatory class with intensive English courses for one year whereas the remaining 36.2 % attended to the prep-class at a private high school. Still 25.5 % of the participants took a full-preparatory class offered at their university while 19.1 of them took the preparatory class for one semester only. Moreover, 27 participants had taught English at some private course. Although all were taking French as a compulsory subject in the teacher education program, 26 participants reported to have taken courses in an additional language including German and Russian.

Data Collection and Analysis

Studying beliefs is a demanding attempt, since beliefs are by nature relatively intricate. Given that teachers' reported beliefs are not necessarily reflected in their teaching practices, research on beliefs is required to incorporate different variables in order to arrive at "a collective understanding" (Pajares, 1992, p. 316) of teachers beliefs. As Borg (2003b) suggests, the complexity of beliefs can be accounted by employing various tools including interviews, questionnaires, repertory grids and observations. Evidently then, a proper depiction of the relationships between teachers' beliefs and practices can be achieved through a joint analysis of what teachers say and do. For this reason, the present study adopted a mixed-type approach by utilizing a questionnaire, semi-structured interviews and observation field notes. Therefore, the data collection process took over three months.

The questionnaire used in this study is adapted from Burgess & Etherington (2002). It is a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The questionnaire consists of 40 items divided into two sections. The first section probes into pre-service EFL teachers' approaches to grammar instruction while the second section examines their beliefs about difficulties learners and teachers may have with grammar. The questionnaire was administered twice so that the participants' development of beliefs about grammar instruction could be tracked. The first time the participants took the questionnaire was at the beginning of the second semester before they started out teaching practices in the cooperating school. After they completed the mandated number of teaching practice (i.e., 10 sessions in 10 weeks), the participants took the questionnaire for a second time. However, the participants were given three days to respond and hand in the questionnaire in each application so as to minimize the inconvenience that might stem from responding a lengthy questionnaire with 40 items.

With the purpose of hinting on the consistency between the participants' reported beliefs and their classroom practices, the researcher conducted non-participant observations, where he took field notes on instructional practices, materials and techniques as well as error correction strategies used by the participants. The researcher adopted a criterion-based sampling strategy (Patton, 2002) for observations as he observed those participants who reported to have no prior teaching experiences. Hence, a total of 20 participants were observed and tape-recorded in the classroom, which took about 2 months. However, it should be noted that throughout 10-weeks, each participant was observed only once, and this may limit the findings emerging from classroom observations.

As for the interviews, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with the same 20 participants in their mother tongue. The purpose of conducting interviews lasting for about 10 minutes each was to achieve a deeper understanding of their perceptions about grammar instruction. Bearing this in mind, the researcher devised six open-ended questions to be used in the interviews. The initial version of the interview questions was piloted with 10 MA students studying in ELT department at the same institute. Based on insights gathered from

the students' reflections, one of the questions was dropped as it was considered rudimentary. The remaining five questions (See Appendix A) were asked to the pre-service teachers the day after they were observed in the classroom.

Data analysis procedure comprised two steps. On the one hand, the quantitative data gauged through the questionnaire were analyzed to yield percentages and frequencies for each subsection. Moreover, the comparison of pre- and post-practice applications of the questionnaire was conducted through Paired Samples T-test. On the other hand, the qualitative data emerging from the interviews and field notes the researcher took during classroom observations were content analyzed. Finally, the thematic codes deriving from the interviews transcribed by the researcher and the field notes rooted in the classroom observations were peer-checked by an experienced EFL instructor who was doing her PhD in ELT department at the same institute by the time the data were collected. Though there was an overall consensus on labels to categorize the data, two cases of divergence between the coders were handled by mutual agreement achieved through discussion. The following section then highlights findings emerging from the above-mentioned procedures.

Findings

This section sheds light on the pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about 12 dimensions of grammar instruction. Of these, 11 dimensions are the subcategories determined by Burgess and Etherington (2002) and the remaining one is emergent from the interviews with the participants. The present study adopts those subcategories and enriches their framework based on the participants' responses to the interviews and their practices during initial teaching experiences. Comparisons of the participants' beliefs reported in the pre-practice and post-practice tests have revealed intriguing findings. The results have reported no statistically significant difference between the pre-practice and post-practice tests except for the dimension entitled as the importance of conscious knowledge. The twelfth dimension has emerged specifically from the multi-faceted nature of the present study. The researcher has labeled it as the "use of mother tongue", since it fundamentally illustrates the participants' views about the use of learners' mother tongue for grammar instruction.

Role of Grammar in Language

The original version of the questionnaire applied by Burgess and Etherington (2002) comprised four statements suggesting possible metaphors for the role of grammar in language teaching and learning. This study, however, subsumed them under the roof term 'basic role' as this was considered sufficient for the overall objective of this study. Participants' responses to this item revealed that they were mostly positive about the importance of grammar in L2 education. That is almost half of the participants (See Appendix B for frequencies and valid percentage of all items) supported the view that grammar held prominent importance and thus, should be taught in L2 classrooms. More importantly, their beliefs about the role of grammar showed no significant difference after the teaching practices they had in the cooperating school (Tab. 1, p< .05). Though there were slight changes in the frequencies, the comparison of pre- and post-practice responses indicated that the pre-service teachers still attributed a major role for grammar in L2 education.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	3,57	1,11	1,071	.29
Post-practice	47	3,31	1,12		

Table 1. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding the role of grammar

The participants' responses in the interviews yielded conflicting results. On the one hand, a few participants abided by their initial views, and defined the role of grammar in L2 education as "central to teaching and learning" (Participant 1), "skeleton of the body" (Participant 2) and "vital because it monitors learners' sentences and helps to produce correct sentences" (Participant 3). One of the participants seemed to equate learning grammar to the use of language as she claimed that "If a learner doesn't know grammar of a language, she cannot use the language" (Participant 5). On the other hand, the rest challenged the view that grammar should be the focus of L2 education. Instead, they argued that grammar should be "a tool, rather than the goal to help learners express himself/ herself" (Participant 6).

Explicit Grammar Teaching

The way grammar instruction is delivered in the language classroom forms a major concern. Although more recent approaches to L2 education emphasize meaning over form (Farrell, 1999), the explicit versus implicit dichotomy still features as an important question facing novice teachers. In this study, items 1.20, 2.3, and 2.13 investigated the participants' beliefs regarding how to deliver grammar instruction. The participants' responses in pre- and post-practice tests displayed no significant difference (Tab. 2, $p < .05$). In both cases, a great majority of the participants agreed that explicitly discussing grammar would be useful for language learners. Furthermore, quite a few participants supported that a lack of explicit grammar instruction would promote feelings of insecurity among learners.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	10,55	2	,578	,566
Post-practice	47	10,31	2,28		

Table 2. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding explicit grammar teaching

Interviews with the participants, however, yielded utterances contradicting their responses to the questionnaire. Indeed, most of the pre-service teachers were found to be strong advocates of implicit instruction in contrast to what they reported in the questionnaire. They emphasized that grammar instruction should be delivered implicitly through use of several examples for each structure. They referred to the importance of contextualized grammar instruction as they stated that grammatical rules should be given in a text rather than in isolation. One of the participants warned that "explicit grammar teaching of grammar rules makes learners scared of the language and increases their prejudice about learning a new language" (Participant 8). Nonetheless, the participants were also found to make distinction based on learners' age and proficiency level. One of the participants explained her favor for explicit grammar instruction in younger and low proficiency groups by saying that "rules and structures should be made clear at the beginning so that younger or beginner learners can learn the correct form" (Participant 1).

Instruction versus Exposure

Pre-service EFL teachers' belief with regard to whether formal instruction is required for successful language learning or mere provision of input will be sufficient forms an important component of their view of L2 education. Seven items (i.e., items 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.10, 1.13, 1.19 and 2.10) particularly sought for an answer to this question. Yet, the results pointed out a lack of consensus among the participants. That is their responses to those items unraveled that the participants could not come up with a uniform idea about whether instruction or extensive exposure to L2 input would be more beneficial for learners. Furthermore, the lack of a conclusive tendency to the former or the latter form of grammar instruction was observed to continue after the teaching practices, since the post-practice analysis of their responses did not reveal a statistically significant difference (Tab. 3, p< .05).

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	23,08	3,50	,62	,539
Post-practice	47	23,38	2,98		

Table 3. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding instruction versus exposure dichotomy

Contrary to the perplexing finding arising from the participants' inconclusive views about the role of explicit instruction and exposure, the interviews yielded a clear inclination toward natural exposure. 15 out of 20 participants made remarks criticizing the way they were taught grammar. They complained that they were taught grammar in traditional grammar-based teaching settings where they were given the rules, and the teacher made most of the talk. One of the participants suggested some criteria to make grammar teaching more efficient as she maintained that: "As learners do not like grammar, they can easily be bored. Teacher should make their decision by taking into account students' level, interest and learning styles. I mean teachers should take learners' differences (preferences) above any other things" (Participant 3). Hence, an unequivocal inference from all the participants' responses highlighted that they considered an integrated grammar instruction the best possible model.

Declarative and Procedural Knowledge

Distinction between declarative and procedural knowledge refers to the difference between theory and practice. Whereas declarative knowledge is the knowledge of what (i.e., a grammatical structure/ rule in this case), procedural knowledge requires the ability to apply this rule in real communication (i.e., knowledge of how). Item 2.1 examines the pre-service teachers' beliefs about learners' ability to benefit from their grammatical knowledge in actual communicative contexts. Indeed, a great majority of the participants agreed/ strongly agreed that learners failed to transfer their grammatical knowledge into communicative language use. Interestingly, a comparison of their beliefs before and after the teaching practices in the cooperating school showed no significant difference (Tab. 4, p< .05).

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	4	,95	1,82	,075
Post-practice	47	3,7	1,01		

Table 4. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding declarative and procedural knowledge

The participants' responses to the interview questions pointed out that they attached paramount importance to learners' procedural knowledge. Evidently, almost all of the participants believed that grammar instruction should encourage learners to functionalize their knowledge by interacting with others. In the same vein, two of the participants (participants 9 and 12) stated a general criticism about grammar instruction as they maintained that too much focus on grammar might at times be an obstacle for speaking and using language fluently. Instead, they suggested that more attention should be paid to communicative skills so that it would be easier for learners to benefit from their knowledge of grammar in real language use.

Importance of Conscious Knowledge

This study probed into the participants' beliefs regarding learners' consciousness about language use, accuracy and form-function correspondence through three items (i.e., 1.4, 1.6, and 1.9). Obviously, this was the only area where pre-service teachers' beliefs in pre- and post-practice tests displayed a statistically significant difference (Tab. 5, p< .05). Whereas the participants' views about the role of consciousness about language use were inconclusive before the teaching practices, more than half of the participants disagreed/ strongly disagreed that learners used language subconsciously of its grammatical system and the way it worked. Also, the sound support for the need for learners' conscious knowledge of grammar to improve their language in the pre-practice test was replaced by a more moderate agreement in the post-practice test. Indeed, the post-practice test revealed a similar decline in the participants' positive beliefs about the need for conscious knowledge of grammatical structures and their function. That is fewer participants compared to pre-practice test held the view that attaining to conscious knowledge of grammar could ensure proficient use.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	10,1	1,96	2,18	,034
Post-practice	47	9.44	1,93		

Table 5. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding conscious knowledge

The participants' remarks in the interviews painted a clearer picture of the change in their beliefs about the role of conscious knowledge about grammatical forms. In addition, 17 out of 20 participants rigorously claimed that consciousness was but one component of language learning. They referred to some drawbacks that might derive from over-consciousness about grammar such as boredom, superficiality and lack of confidence. One of the participants maintained that "we sentence learners to be perfect and talk perfectly" (Participant, 6) by prompting conscious use of grammatical forms all the time. Still, some of them asserted that promoting conscious knowledge would be helpful but alternative methods should be adopted. For instance, Participant 7 pointed out that: "Drawing attention to certain rules makes it easier for learners to catch the form. But we can emphasize a rule simply by our intonation or give them in a text by bold-fonts, underlining or highlighting. Then, it will be easier to learn". In addition, all the participants converged on the role of using games, role-plays, flash-cards and puzzles as facilitators for establishing a classroom environment conducive for subconscious learning of grammar.

Comparison and Contrast of Structures

Item 1.17 investigated the participants' beliefs about the use of introducing a certain structure/ rule by comparing and contrasting it with some others. Their responses both in the pre- and post-practice tests indicated a high rate of support for employing this technique in the language classroom (Tab. 6, p< .05). Apparently, their convergence on the use of comparing grammatical structures to ensure learners' understanding was perplexing. Although their responses to the previous items regarding explicit focus on grammatical forms were inconsistent with the interviews, there was a clear uniformity in their beliefs regarding the adoption of a comparative technique.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	3,44	,90	,107	,915
Post-practice	47	3,46	1,01		

Table 6. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding comparison and contrast of structures

The participants' remarks throughout the interviews indicated a close match with their responses to item 1.17. Despite their overt favor for employing a comparative technique to introduce grammatical structures, one should notice that the participants explicitly defined the stage to include this technique. They illustrated that a comparative technique should be used with learners whose proficiency level was low. A large majority of the participants reiterated that once learners learned the basic structures, then there would be little or no use of employing this technique.

The Use of Grammatical Terminology

Using terminology refers to addressing learners' metalinguistic knowledge about grammatical forms and structures. It can be ascribed to an explicit focus on form approach (Ellis, 2001). Two items (i.e., items 2.14 and 2.19) intended to delineate the participants' beliefs about using terminology for grammar instruction. A majority of the participants agreed that grammatical terminology would be useful for learners while at the same time, a similar rate of the participants deemed that learners would find it difficult to use grammatical terminology. More surprisingly, their beliefs following the teaching practices remained virtually the same (Tab. 7, p< .05). Likewise, the interviews corroborated their view that language learners considered the use of grammatical terminology beneficial, but difficult for learners. Participant 4 reasoned that: "I use grammatical terms when I am introducing a rule. It helps learners to be familiar with these terms so that they can more easily understand where and when they can use this rule".

	N	Mean	S	t	P
Pre-practice	47	3,44	,90	,107	,915
Post-practice	47	3,46	1,01		

Table 7. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding the use of terminology

Problem-solving

Problem-solving activities involve learners in tasks in which they are required to find a form-function relationship. Hence, this sort of activities implicitly target at their consciousness about grammar. An analysis of the participants' responses to items 2.2., 2.5 and 2.20 revealed that their beliefs about learners' perceptions of problem-solving activities did not display any significant difference (Tab. 8, p< .05). A great number of the participants both in pre-practice and post-practice tests reported that learners considered problem-solving activities motivating (item 2.2), and liked to be engaged in them (item 2.5). Moreover, the high rate of disagreement in the post-practice test on the idea that problem-solving activities were frustrating for learners verified the participants' position for using problem-solving activities in the language classroom.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	9,82	1,40	1,25	,217
Post-practice	47	10,19	1,74		

Table 8. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding problem-solving

Apart from the statistical results, the interviews with the participants highlighted that the participants regarded learners' involvement in problem-solving activities as crucial in order to figure out the relationships between grammatical forms and their functions. One of the participants explained her support for problem-solving activities as she stated that "they (problem-solving activities) help learners discover facts about grammar" (Participant 2).

Correction of Errors

Correction of errors arising from learners attempts to produce in the target language is a debatable issue in that there are still some concerns over its use as well as methods of using it. In this study, 6 out of 40 items (i.e., items 1.16, 1.18, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17 and 2.18) specifically delved into the pre-service teachers' beliefs about different aspects of error correction including the type of errors to be corrected and the impact of error correction on grammatical performance. The participants' responses to these items unveiled that there was remarkable uncertainty in their beliefs about whether teachers should merely correct errors that would interfere with communication (item 1.16), whether correction of errors would contribute to learners' grammatical performance (item 1.18) and whether it was more difficult to correct errors within a spoken (item 2.15) or written (item 2.16) communicative setting. Additionally, they lacked consensus on their beliefs regarding learners' perceptions about the difficulty of improving accuracy within a totally written (item 2.17) or totally spoken (item 2.18) communicative task. It was also confounding that the teaching practices seemed to make no statistically significant difference in their beliefs about correction of errors (Tab. 9, p< .05).

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	18,10	3,79	,322	,749
Post-practice	47	18,31	3,31		

Table 9. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding correction of errors

With respect to the participants' uncertainty about correcting learners' errors, interviews provided precious insights. The participants' responses during the interviews implied a sound belief in favor of handling errors as soon as they appeared. The participants emphasized that teachers should employ different methods to correct learners' errors such as using a questioning tone to convey that an error was committed, having learners correct their own error, or asking other learners to correct the error.

Presentation in Authentic Texts

Authentic texts involve those materials that are originally not intended to be used for language teaching and learning purposes. Following the widespread adoption of communicative approaches to L2 education, using materials that prompt an impression of real communicative contexts has gained prominence. Accordingly, this study examined the participants' beliefs about delivering grammar instruction through authentic and complete texts with 8 items (i.e., items 1.15, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11 and 2.12). The participants' responses revealed that although they were well-convinced of learners' achievement in learning grammar through the use of complete texts (item 1.15), they had serious concerns about employing authentic texts for teaching grammar in their classrooms. In the pre-practice test almost half of the participants agreed/ strongly agreed that using authentic texts would impose some challenges due to the difficulty of grammar used in them (item 2.6), the cultural connotations embedded in them (item 2.8) and their time-consuming nature (item 2.11). More than half of the participants indicated that using authentic texts would be difficult because of learners' preferences (item 2.4), the wide variety of structures in them (item 2.7), the vocabulary used (item 2.9) and high level of proficiency required to comprehend them (item 2.12). Besides, the participants' beliefs about the use of authentic texts revealed no significant difference after the teaching practices (Tab. 10, $p < .05$). However, the study noticed a dramatic inconsistency between the participants' reported beliefs and their responses in the interviews. Although the statistical analyses pinpointed serious concerns, the participants featured to be strong proponents of using authentic texts in their classrooms. They purported that teachers should provide a contextualized grammar teaching through using such materials as newspapers, songs, stories, videos and movies.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	26,31	5,07	,562	,577
Post-practice	47	25,76	5,11		

Table 10. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding use of authentic texts

Role of Practice

When the participants were asked to reflect on the role of practice in learning grammar, their responses to the five items addressing their beliefs about practice indicated that they were strong proponents of the use of practice in grammar instruction. Evidently, in all cases (except for item 1.11) a large number of the participants agreed/strongly agreed that if given in full communicative contexts (item 1.7) with real-life tasks (item 1.14), practice would improve learners' grammatical accuracy (item 1.15) and productive use of language (item 1.12). In item 1.11, however, 14 out of 47 participants believed that a de-contextualized practice of grammar had a role in language learning. Although there was no significant difference in statistical analyses of the pre- and post-practice tests (Tab. 11, $p < .05$), the study

revealed a close correspondence between their reported beliefs and responses to the interview questions. All the participants maintained that teachers should provide learners with ample opportunities to practice what they learned. They reiterated that engaging learners with a lot of examples for each structure could foster their participation as well as endorsing their learning. In contrast to the inconsistency in item 1.11, the interviews highlighted that all of the participants argued for contextualized practice rather than practicing grammatical structures in isolation.

	N	Mean	S	t	p
Pre-practice	47	18,91	2,33	1,775	,083
Post-practice	47	19,74	1,96		

Table 11. Pre- and post-practice beliefs regarding practice

Use of Mother Tongue

Use of a mother tongue in L2 classes is a research area yielding clashing results (Cook, 2001; Schweers, 1999). Though this study originally had not intended to probe into pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about using it, interviews and classroom observations encouraged the researcher to include it in this section of the study. Throughout the interviews, it was realized that the participants were concerned about the use of learners' mother tongue (Turkish in this case) to facilitate their understanding of grammatical forms. For instance, Participant 17 defined her teaching experience as: "I was in a dilemma about what language to use when they (learners) asked me a question about a grammatical point". Two other participants (i.e., Participants 16 and 19) criticized that teachers generally used mother tongue in teaching grammar and thus, they felt obliged to give instructions in Turkish. Participant 20 asserted that "explaining a grammatical rule in English seemed to be insufficient. That's why I preferred to use Turkish while I was teaching grammar". However, a few participants claimed that an English-only approach in the classroom promoted learners' motivation because "they (learners) see that English is really serving some functions". Henceforth, the pre-service teachers' general belief about employing the mother tongue in grammar instruction was found to be relatively positive for explaining the form but rather negative for conducting practices.

Classroom Observations

The observations conducted throughout the teaching practices of the 20 participants provided invaluable insights into the match between their reported beliefs and actual practices. Besides, the field notes taken during the observations made a major contribution to clarifying the areas in which the participants' beliefs appeared to be controversial. Firstly, the overall picture of the participants' practices painted in the observations corroborated their belief that grammar had a basic role in language learning. However, the observations indicated that they mostly followed a traditional approach to grammar instruction. Almost all the participants were observed to teach grammar deductively as they mostly started out with the rule and then, proceeded to practice on it. Though this finding was in tune with the results of statistical analyses, the participants' practices did not resonate with what they stated in the interviews. An important contribution of the observations appeared on the participants' uncertainty about the distinction between instruction and natural exposure, since their

practices in the cooperating school surfaced to be instruction-based. Thus, the researcher hypothesized that the participants' had a stronger belief in the importance of presenting grammar through explicit instruction than through exposing learners to natural input. Another crucial observation was that despite the reported support for more procedural and less conscious knowledge of grammar, the participants' practices mainly addressed learners' declarative knowledge as they presented grammar in a way to improve learners' consciousness about grammatical rules and structures. However, the findings emerging from classroom observations highlighted that the participants' teaching practices were highly congruent with their beliefs about the use of adopting a comparison technique in grammar instruction and familiarizing learners with grammatical terminology.

Although the participants' practices were to some extent observed to be convergent with their reported beliefs about the importance of engaging learners in problem-solving activities, they treated learners' grammatical errors with a traditional approach. That is the participants mostly corrected errors by themselves though they referred to some alternative methods in the interviews. As for the ambiguity emerging from the statistical analyses and interview reports regarding the use of authentic texts, the participants' teaching practices added credentials to the results of the statistical analyses in that only two participants were observed to utilize authentic texts (songs in both cases). Obviously, previously reported concerns about using authentic texts such as the wide variety of grammatical structures and difficulty of vocabulary used in authentic texts hindered the pre-service teachers from employing them. Furthermore, the participants' practices partially confirmed their reported beliefs about the use of practice in learning grammar. Although they spared some time to provide learners with the opportunity to practice the target form, this was oftentimes observed to be interrupted by teacher interference. Finally, the participants' practices appeared to be highly representative of their beliefs about the use of mother tongue in grammar instruction because the participants were observed to use their mother tongue while introducing a new grammatical item and giving instructions for exercises whereas they employed English for the rest of the time.

Discussion

This study examined the development of pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction over a period of 10 weeks during which they had initial teaching experiences in the cooperating school. The results explicitly demonstrated that except for one dimension, there was no change in the participants' beliefs about grammar instruction. Of 12 dimensions of the participants' beliefs investigated in this study, it was only the area regarding the importance of conscious knowledge that displayed a statistically significant difference. Even though the participants had no clearly defined position about the importance of conscious knowledge of language use, accuracy and form-function correspondence at the beginning, they were subsequently identified to be convinced that learners should develop conscious knowledge of the grammatical system in L2. This significant change in the participants' beliefs about the role of conscious knowledge of grammar could be attributed to their teaching practices. Though they had studied the role of conscious knowledge in the teacher education program they were enrolled in, the researcher hypothesized that it was the actual teaching experiences that gave the participants a clearer understanding of the importance of promoting conscious knowledge in learners. This was congruent with Busch's (2010) assumption that the teaching experience in the practicum served an instrumental goal as it helped the pre-service teachers connect what they learned in the teacher education

program with actual language teaching and learning process. Nonetheless, the general lack of change in the participants' beliefs despite the teaching practices resonated with previous studies (Altan, 2006; Peacock, 2001) as even more longitudinal studies like Mattheoudakis (2007) reported little or no change. In addition, the fact that the development of participants' beliefs was tracked for a relatively limited time span might account for the lack of change. Given the highly complex nature of beliefs, this study contributed to the conclusion that belief change is "essentially cumulative and gradual" (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000, p. 392).

As for the discrepancy between the pre-service teachers' reported beliefs and actual practices, the study highlighted that the participants theoretically supported communicative approaches but they practically adopted a traditional approach to grammar teaching. An explanation for the observed inconsistency surfaced from the participants' own statements in the interviews as a participant proposed that: "The teaching style of teachers should not depend on teachers' experiences. It must be shaped according to the learners' expectations" (Participant, 16). This finding verified Phipps and Borg's (2009) study with three in-service teachers of English working in Turkey. They (2009) deemed that the teachers' strong preference for explicit grammar instruction was driven by learners' expectation to be taught grammar directly. Another participant in the present study accounted for her traditional teaching practice by time and curriculum requirements, since she emphasized that: "I had to obey the school's curriculum and time was limited to do more interactive activities" (Participant 1). This replicated Fleming, Bangou and Fellus' (2011) proposition that pre-service teachers were restricted in integrating the content of teacher education into the practicum. Moreover, Barnard and Scampton's (2008) presumption that time could be an obstacle for teachers to employ more contextualized, communicative approaches might help to account for the inconsistency observed between the participants' reported beliefs and actual practices in the cooperating school.

As for the use of terminology, the pre-service teachers' reported beliefs and teaching practices evinced a close match. The participants used grammatical terminology in their practices based on their reported belief that this would contribute to learners' metalinguistic knowledge and in turn, facilitate grammar learning. On the one hand, the correspondence between the participants' beliefs about the use of grammatical terminology and teaching practices was in tune with Burgess and Etherington's (2002) suggestion that pre-service teachers considered the use of grammatical terminology beneficial but difficult to use. On the other hand, it provided an answer to Burgess and Etherington's (2002) call for an investigation of pre-service teachers' practices in real classroom settings. Therefore, the present study concluded that the pre-service teachers held positive beliefs about familiarizing learners with grammatical terminology. Yet, the study also cautioned that it would be relatively demanding to expect learners to use it.

The inconclusive finding regarding the correction of errors augmented the existing controversy in L2 education research. Though the statistical analyses indicated that the participants were uncertain about whether to correct errors and whether correction would improve learners' grammatical proficiency, the interviews and observations pointed out that they definitely ascribed some role to error correction. However, the classroom observations revealed that what the pre-service teachers believed about error correction methods diverged from what they did in the classroom. More specifically, despite various methods they suggested to correct learners' errors, the pre-service teachers were observed to adopt a single approach, in which learners' errors were corrected by the teacher immediately after they appeared. Still, the participants' rigorous support for correcting errors might be interpreted as corroboration of Barnard and Scampton's (2008) suggestion that form-focused correction was believed to foster learners' grammatical proficiency.

Eventually, the final aspect of the participants' beliefs about grammar instruction was self-emergent in the process of the present study. The participants were found to be sensitive about using mother tongue while teaching grammar in the classroom. A closer analysis of their reflection in the interviews coupled with their teaching practices made it explicit that the participants strongly supported mother tongue use in the L2 classroom. Nevertheless, they differentiated between two stages of grammar instruction regarding the use of mother tongue. The pre-service teachers purported that using learners' mother tongue while introducing a grammatical structure/ rule and giving instructions for grammar activities could facilitate learning grammar whereas conducting follow-up exercises in the medium of the target language could help learners' attend to various uses and functions of the structure more easily.

Conclusion

This study provided an in-depth analysis of the development of pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction and how those beliefs surfaced in their teaching practices within the practicum course. The results indicated that there was relatively little impact of those practices on the participants' beliefs regarding grammar instruction. One possible reason underlying the lack of change in the participants' beliefs about grammar instruction might be that as they were at the final year of the program they were enrolled in, the participants had already well-established their belief systems. This would lead to the suggestion that teacher educators should involve pre-service teachers in activities that could help to unravel their beliefs at an earlier stage of the program and thus, refine possible misbeliefs. Another explanation for this lack of change might be that the participants had not yet clearly defined their beliefs about the role of grammar instruction in L2 education (Johnson, 1992), since they had relatively few actual teaching experiences in the practicum school. This would imply that practicum courses in teacher education programs should give pre-service teachers more opportunities to be involved in actual teaching practices. Still another tentative speculation about this lack of change might be established on the relationship between the pre-service teachers and their mentor. Assuming that they were paired with a mentor holding similar beliefs, the pre-service teachers might not have needed to revise and change their initial beliefs. However, as this study did not focus on the role of mentor in pre-service teachers' belief development, it could be beneficial for future studies to search for possible impacts of the role of mentor in the development of pre-service teachers' belief system. The only category in which the pre-service teachers' beliefs displayed a significant change at the end of the practicum was that of the importance of conscious knowledge of grammar. Yet it was still noticeable that the pre-service teachers were identified to hold strongly positive beliefs about the role of grammar instruction in the language classroom. Another remarkable result was that the participants rigorously argued for employing learners' mother tongue in order to introduce grammatical structures and give instructions for an activity as they proposed that the use of mother tongue would improve learners' understanding of L2 grammar.

Nevertheless, all interpretations deriving from this study should be considered under the light of four basic limitations. First and foremost, the data in this study were collected in approximately 3 months. Given the relatively "inflexible" (Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000, p. 392) nature of beliefs, such a short period of time might impose a serious restriction on the results. Furthermore, the classroom observations might be limited in themselves, since each participant was observed only once in a single session lasting for 40 minutes. Hence, one can

argue that repeated observations over a longer time period could yield more reliable insights into pre-service teachers' classroom behaviors. The number of participants might also limit the results as a large scale study with more participants could prove more informative. Ultimately, the specific school context where the pre-service teachers practiced and the characteristics of the learner group to which they taught might be a factor interfering with the pre-service teachers' belief development and teaching practices. Therefore, conducting a similar study in various school contexts with different learner groups may yield more fruitful information about pre-service teachers' belief development.

Reference

Almarza, G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' growth. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 50-78). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Altan, M. X. (2006). Beliefs about language learning of foreign language-major university students. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,* 31(2), 44-52. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2006v31n2.5

Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-based teaching: A practitioner's perspective. *TESL-EJ,* 11(2), 1-12.

Barnard, R. & Scampton, D. (2008). Teaching grammar: A survey of EAP teachers in New Zealand. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics,* 14(2), 59-82.

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32(1), 9-38. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587900

Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System,* 27, 19-31. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(98)00047-5

Borg, S. (2003a). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness,* 12(2), 96-108. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658410308667069

Borg, S. (2003b). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching,* 36, 81-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Borg, S. & Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics,* 29(3), 456-482. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn020

Burgess, J. & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System,* 30, 433-458. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00048-9

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research,* 14(3), 318-337. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365239

Cabaroglu, N. & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme. *System,* 28, 387-402. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(00)00019-1

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review,* 57(3), 402-423. http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.57.3.402

Cresswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Dikici, I. Z. (2012). Pre-service English teachers' beliefs towards grammar and its teaching at two Turkish universities. *IJALEL,* 1(2), 206-218. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.2p.206

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, 237-260.

Ellis, R. (2001). Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning,* 51, 1-46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.2001.tb00013.x

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly,* 40(1), 83-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40264512

Ezzi, N. A. A. (2012). Yemeni teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching and classroom practices. *English Language Teaching,* 5(8), 170-184.

Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). The reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service English teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal,* 30(2), 1-17. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368829903000201

Farrell, T. S. C. & Lim, P. C. P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom pratices. *TESL-EJ,* 9(2), 1-13.

Fleming, D., Bangou, F. & Fellus, O. (2011). ESL teacher-candidates' beliefs about language. *TESL Canada Journal,* 29(1), 39-56.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior,* 24(1), 83-108. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(94)90024-8

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.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist,* 27, 65-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6

Liao, P. Teachers' beliefs about teaching English to Elementary school children. *English Teaching & Learning,* 31(1), 43-76.

Mattheoudakis, M. (2007). Tracking changes in pre-service EFL teacher beliefs in Greece: A longitudinal study. *Teaching & Teacher Education,* 23, 1272-1288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.06.001

Özmen, K. S. (2012). Exploring student teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching: A longitudinal study. *Current Issues in Education,* 15(1), 1-15.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research,* 62(3), 307-332. http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543062003307

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: A longitudinal study. *System,* 29, 177-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00010-0

Phipps, S. & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System,* 37, 380-390. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.002

Richards, J. C., Gallo, P. B. & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal,* 1(1), 41-58.

Schweers, C. W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum,* 27(1),6-13, retrieved from http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/E-USIA/forum/acrobat/P6.pdf on May, 28,2013.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focusing on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals,* 29(3), 343-364. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01247.x

Teik, O. C. (2011). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about the teaching and learning of grammar. *The English Teacher,* 40, 27-47.

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, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review of recent research on practice. *Language Teaching,* 43(3). 259-296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000030

Appendix

Interview Questions
Q-1- What is the place of grammar in language teaching compared to other skills?
Q-2- Do you think grammar should be taught? If yes, what are the characteristics of a good teaching strategy for grammar instruction?
Q-3- How do you feel about teaching grammar with respect to its advantages and disadvantages?
Q-4- What factors should teachers take into account while preparing the grammar part of their lesson plan?
Q-5- Do you think practice in a real classroom affected your views about teaching grammar?

Frequency and Percentages of Questionnaire Items

	The Role of Grammar in Language									
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.1	3 6,4%	6 12,8%	7 14,9%	23 48,9%	8 17%	3 6,4	10 21,3%	8 17%	21 44,7%	5 10,6%
	Explicit Grammar Teaching									
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.20	3 6,4%	12 25,5%	11 23,4%	19 40,4%	2 4,3%	2 4,3%	16 34%	8 17%	16 34%	5 10,6%
Item 2.3	4 8,5%	3 6,4%	2 4,3%	19 40,4%	19 40,4%	0 0%	6 12,8%	6 12,8	25 53,2%	10 21,3
Item 2.13	1 2,1%	8 17%	9 19,1%	26 55,3%	3 6,4%	1 2,1%	13 27,7%	9 19,1%	16 34%	8 17%
	Instruction versus Exposure									
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.2	2 4,3%	4 8,5%	2 4,3%	21 44,7%	18 38,3%	2 4,3%	0 0%	2 4,3%	25 53,2%	18 38,3%
Item 1.3	3 6,4%	4 8,5%	11 23,4%	23 48,9%	6 12,8%	1 2,1%	6 12,8%	15 31,9%	18 38,3%	7 14,9%
Item 1.8	2 4,3%	9 19,1%	16 34%	15 31,9%	5 10,6%	3 6,4%	1 2,1%	11 23,4%	23 48,9	9 19,1%
Item 1.10	5 10,6%	14 29,8%	15 31,9%	10 21,3%	3 6,4%	6 12,8%	14 29,8%	13 27,7%	14 29,8%	0 0%
Item 1.13	3 6,4%	8 17%	8 17%	21 44,7%	7 14,9%	4 8,5%	5 10,6%	12 25,5%	18 38,3%	8 17%
Item 1.19	4 8,5%	14 29,8%	16 34%	10 21,3%	3 6,4%	5 10,6%	21 44,7%	7 14,9%	12 25,5%	2 4,3%
Item 2.10	2 4,3%	8 17%	15 31,9%	17 36,2%	5 10,6%	0 0%	10 21,3%	8 17%	24 51,1%	5 10,6%

Declarative and Procedural Knowledge										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 2.1	2	2	3	27	13	0	9	6	22	10
	4,3%	4,3%	6,4%	57,4%	27,7%	0%	19,1%	12,8%	46,8%	21,3%

The Importance of Conscious Knowledge										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.4	4	14	10	16	3	3	22	10	11	1
	8,5%	29,8%	21,3%	34%	6,4%	6,4%	46,8%	21,3%	23,4%	2,1%
Item 1.6	2	3	10	24	8	2	12	8	17	8
	4,3%	6,4%	21,3%	51,1%	17%	4,3%	25,5%	17%	36,2%	17%
Item 1.9	2	9	10	20	6	1	10	7	27	2
	4,3%	19,1%	21,3%	42,6	12,8%	2,1%	21,3	14,9	57,4	4,3%

Comparison and Contrast of Structures										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.17	2	4	15	23	3	2	7	10	23	5
	4,3%	8,5%	31,9%	48,9%	6,4%	4,3%	14,9%	21,3%	48,9%	10,6%

The Use of Grammatical Terminology										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 2.14	3	9	14	17	4	4	5	10	25	3
	6,4%	19,1%	29,8%	36,2%	8,5%	8,5%	10,6%	21,3%	53,2%	6,4%
Item 2.19	1	12	13	16	5	0	15	14	14	4
	2,1%	25,5%	27,7%	34%	10,6%	0%	31,9	29,8%	29,8%	8,5%

Problem-solving										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 2.2	1	10	15	16	5	1	4	7	31	4
	2,1%	21,3%	31,9%	34%	10,6%	2,1%	8,5%	14,9%	66%	8,5%
Item 2.5	4	6	12	22	3	2	6	4	27	8
	8,5%	12,8%	25,5%	468%	6,4%	4,3%	12,8%	8,5%	57,4%	17%
Item 2.20	0	9	21	14	3	4	19	9	13	2
	0%	19,1%	44,7%	29,8%	6,4%	8,5%	40,4%	19,1%	27,7%	4,3%

Correction of Errors										
Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item	7	21	9	7	3	5	15	7	13	7

1.16	14,9%	44,7%	19,1%	14,9%	6,4%	10,6%	31,9%	14,9	27,7%	14,9%
Item	3	11	12	20	1	2	11	13	20	1
1.18	6,4%	23,4%	25,5%	42,6%	2,1%	4,3%	23,4%	27,7%	42,6%	2,1%
Item	3	16	11	13	4	6	21	8	8	4
2.15	6,4%	34%	23,4%	27,7%	8,5%	12,8%	44,7%	17%	17%	8,5%
Item	6	15	10	13	3	6	23	6	9	3
2.16	12,8%	31,9%	21,3%	27,7%	6,4%	12,8%	48,9%	12,8%	19,1%	6,4%
Item	0	15	13	13	6	0	14	7	21	5
2.17	0%	31,9%	27,7%	27,7%	12,8%	0%	29,8%	14,9	44,7	10,6%
Item	1	10	12	15	9	0	12	3	26	6
2.18	2,1%	21,3%	25,5%	31,9%	19,1%	0%	25,5%	6,4%	55,3	12,8%

Presentation in Authentic, Complete Texts

Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.15	3	5	5	23	11	1	6	5	18	17
	6,4%	10,6%	10,6%	48,9%	23,4%	2,1%	12,8%	10,6%	38,3%	36,2%
Item 2.4	6	13	5	16	7	1	13	5	21	7
	12,8%	27,7%	10,6%	34%	14,9%	2,1%	27,7%	10,6%	44,7%	14,9%
Item 2.6	3	12	10	18	4	4	19	3	17	4
	6,4%	25,5%	21,3%	38,3%	8,5%	8,5%	40,4%	6,4%	36,2%	8,5%
Item 2.7	4	6	10	21	6	4	17	5	18	3
	8,5%	12,8%	21,3%	44,7%	12,8%	8,5%	36,2%	10,6%	38,3%	6,4%
Item 2.8	5	7	17	14	4	4	17	10	14	2
	10,6%	14,9%	36,2%	29,8%	8,5%	8,5%	36,2%	21,3%	29,8%	4,3%
Item 2.9	4	6	12	20	5	4	15	8	14	6
	8,5%	12,8%	25,5%	42,6%	10,6%	8,5%	31,9%	17%	29,8%	12,8%
Item 2.11	7	8	9	16	7	5	10	5	21	6
	14,9%	17%	19,1%	34%	14,9%	10,6%	21,3%	10,6%	44,7%	12,8%
Item 2.12	2	10	11	20	4	5	9	6	22	5
	4,3%	21,3%	23,4%	42,6%	8,5%	10,6%	19,1%	12,8%	46,8%	10,6%

The Role of Practice

Item Number	Pre-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)					Post-Test Frequency of Responses Valid Percentages (Strongly Disagree:1 Strongly Agree:5)				
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Item 1.5	2	5	3	22	15	0	5	4	28	10
	4,3%	10,6%	6,4%	46,8	31,9%	0%	10,6%	8,5%	59,6%	21,3
Item 1.7	1	6	3	19	18	0	2	5	21	19
	2,1%	12,8%	6,4%	40,4%	38,3%	0%	4,3%	10,6%	44,7%	40,4%
Item 1.11	3	10	16	14	4	3	11	17	13	3
	6,4%	21,3%	34%	29,8%	8,5%	6,4%	23,4%	36,2%	27,7%	6,4%
Item 1.12	2	3	5	27	10	1	2	5	27	12
	4,3%	6,4%	10,6%	57,4%	21,3%	2,1%	4,3%	10,6%	57,4%	25,5%
Item 1.14	1	6	2	20	18	0	1	1	15	30
	2,1%	12,8%	4,3%	42,6%	38,3%	0%	2,1%	2,1%	31,9%	63,8%