



The Relationship between TESOL Teachers' Attitudes towards Grammar Teaching and their Grammatical Knowledge

Khadija Al Balushi*

The Specialized Centre for the Professional Training of Teachers, Sultanate of Oman Corresponding Author: Khadija Al Balushi, E-mail: khadija.b@moe.om

| ARTICLE INFO | ABSTRACT |
|--------------|----------|
| | |

Article history Received: January 22, 2019 Accepted: April 29, 2019 Published: June 30, 2019 Volume: 10 Issue: 3 Advance access: May 2019

Conflicts of interest: None Funding: None

Key words: TESOL, Grammar, Attitude, Knowledge, Test, Model

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, grammar teaching has regained its rightful place in language curricula. Language teaching professionals are now of the belief that grammar cannot be ignored, and that without a good grammatical knowledge, learners' language development can be severely constrained (Baleghizadeh & Farshchi, 2009). Grammar teaching and learning has attracted significant research attention. For example, many studies examined teachers' explicit or declarative knowledge about grammar (e.g. Shuib, 2009; Andrews, 1994; Bloor, 1986). These studies showed that learners and teachers had encountered inadequate levels of grammatical knowledge. Other studies focussed on L2 and FL teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar (Baleghizadeh & Farshchi, 2009; Borg& Burns, 2008). Borg and Burn's (2008) study indicated that teachers expressed very strong beliefs in the need to avoid teaching grammar in isolation and reported high levels of integrating grammar in their practices. Baleghizadeh and Farshchi's (2009) study revealed that teachers' beliefs could be traced back to their long experience of teaching textbooks that heavily draw on deductive approaches to teaching grammar. Yet, we have to fully understand whether teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching have an influence on their grammatical knowledge. This is important because teachers' attitudes/beliefs play a major role in influencing what they do in the classroom (Borg, 2006; Borg, 2003). Moreover, Shulman (1987) stressed that in order to teach grammar appropriately teachers need both grammatical knowledge and the skills "pedagogical content knowledge". Thus, the current study focused on in-service TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching, and their grammatical knowledge to see if there is a correlation between the two and whether other background differences affect their knowledge of and attitudes towards grammar. This might help teacher educators to see the relationship as well as the impact of these two variables, resulting in more effective ways of teaching

Grammar teaching continues to be a controversy matter in the field of teaching and teacher Education. It is generally agreed that attention to grammatical form is necessary and useful, but many issues related to teaching grammar still needs further research (Barnard & Scampton, 2008:59). This study investigated the relationship between Omani TESOL (teaching English to speakers' of other languages) teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching and their grammatical knowledge. A questionnaire was used to collect data from 40 respondents teaching English in Omani schools. The findings showed that there was a positive correlation between teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching and no effect of gender on teachers' grammatical knowledge and no effect of teaching experiences on attitude towards grammar teaching. The findings indicated that the final model of standard multiple regression showed that teachers attitudes towards grammar, gender, experience, age and the educational phase they teach in did not make a statistically significant unique contribution to the prediction of their grammatical knowledge. Such findings suggest directions for further studies in investigating the influence of language teachers' attitudes/knowledge on their classroom practices.

grammar in TESOL classes in the future. Accordingly, the key goals of the present study are to investigate TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching and their grammatical knowledge. In particular, it aims to focus on:

- The relationship between teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar and their grammatical knowledge.
- 2- The impact of teachers' gender on their grammatical knowledge.
- 3- The impact of teachers' years of teaching experiences on their attitudes towards grammar teaching.
- 4- The possibility of predicting teachers' grammatical knowledge from the combination of information on their attitudes towards grammar, gender, teaching experience and age.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study follows survey research where a questionnaire was developed as an instrument to collect data from the study sample. The questionnaire consisted of three main parts:

A. Attitudes towards teaching grammar: Attitude refers to teachers' general perceptions towards teaching grammar. It is TESOL teachers' self-reported responses to statements regarding teaching grammar. For each statement participants reported their level of agreement on a five-point Likert attitude scale (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=unsure, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree). The questionnaire consisted first, of 20 items assessing the extent to which respondents agreed with statements related to their attitudes towards grammar teaching. Answers from this scale could be easily quantified and analysed.

Published by Australian International Academic Centre PTY.LTD.

Copyright (c) the author(s). This is an open access article under CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.10n.3p.42

- B. Knowledge of grammar: Subsequent 16 survey questions asked about TESOL teachers' ability to answer multiple choice questions about their grammar knowledge and awareness. Respondents were asked to provide a single response to each question by choosing the most suitable answer from the 4 choices they have. A high score indicates high levels of grammar knowledge and a low score shows low levels of knowledge.
- C. Background Data: The remaining questions 37-40 asked about respondents' background data:
 - i. Gender: Respondents ticked a male or female box.
 - Age: Respondents selected from the categories: (24-28 years, 29-33 years, 34-38 years, 39-43 years, and 44 years or over).
 - Teaching experience: Respondents selected from the categories: (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 21 years or over).
 - Educational phase: Respondents selected from the categories: (Primary, Preparatory, and Secondary). The data from the questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS software package (version 20).

Sample Design

Sampling was not random because of the problems of availability of participants, time framing and facilities. As a result, convenience sampling was practiced depending on participants' willingness to participate (Baleghizadeh & Farshchi, 2009; Battaglia, 2008). The sample consisted of 40 participants (TESOL teachers from Oman) with different background variables: gender, age, teaching experiences, and different educational phases teachers teach in. It was a convenience sample recruited through various contacts with colleagues in Oman from different schools. This process of sampling may place some constraints upon generalising the findings drawn as a result of the study (Robson, 2002). However, this small-scale study was not seeking to obtain generalisations about the wider population; all TESOL teachers. Thus, it was considered a suitable approach to utilise in order to provide indications from which to base future research.

Measuring Instruments

In order to meet the study objectives, two main constructs were measured (attitudes and knowledge). Firstly, the attitude instrument aimed to reveal teachers' perceptions about grammar teaching. It contained 20 statements about grammar teaching. Respondents were asked to express their degree of agreement on a five-point Likert attitude scale of strongly agree to strongly disagree. The statements referred specifically to teachers' personal experiences of grammar teaching because it is believed that participants are more likely to be familiar with these issues and, therefore, better able to indicate their personal views. These 20 items are represented in Table 1. The second construct to be measured was knowledge of grammar. This scale aimed to reveal teachers' knowledge on meta-language. It contained 16 multiple choice questions about basic grammatical terminology such as "subject, object, adjective, auxiliary" and so on (Below are examples of some questions from the knowledge scale). The questions of both instruments were designed to help achieve the goals of this research (Robson, 2002).

The administrative procedures for distributing the questionnaire was done through contacting some colleagues who work as Senior English teachers at different schools in Oman, a good number of teachers' email addresses were collected. An email was sent to all those teachers explaining

Table 1. Questionnaire items assessing respondents' attitudes towards grammar teaching

| No | Statement | 1(SA) | 2(A) | 3(U) | 4(D) | 5(SD) |
|----|--|-------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1 | I present grammar rules to my learners first, then I expect them to use these rules. | | | | | |
| 2 | I think teaching the rules of English grammar directly is more appropriate for older learners. | | | | | |
| 3 | I start my lesson with communicative tasks then I move to focus on grammar structures. | | | | | |
| 4 | I think grammar should be taught separately, it shouldn't be combined with other skills like writing and reading. | | | | | |
| 5 | In my view, the teachers' main responsibility in grammar lessons is to explain the rules for students. | | | | | |
| 6 | I think indirect grammar teaching is more appropriate with younger than with older learners. | | | | | |
| 7 | I don't think that teaching grammar formally will help my students to become fluent in English. | | | | | |
| 8 | I think teachers should always correct students' spoken grammatical errors in English. | | | | | |
| 9 | It is difficult for me to correct my students' grammatical errors in a written communicative context. | | | | | |
| 10 | It is difficult for me to correct my students' grammatical errors in a spoken communicative context. | | | | | |
| 11 | Students do not use the grammatical structures they've learnt when they speak or write in English. | | | | | |
| 12 | When students frequently practice the structures, their grammatical accuracy can improve. | | | | | |
| 13 | Reading grammar books can help students to improve their language. | | | | | |
| 14 | Students need to be aware of a structure's form and its function before they can use it proficiently. | | | | | |
| 15 | Students can only develop their grammatical knowledge if they participate in real life tasks in language classrooms. | | | | | |
| 16 | Presenting grammar in a complete context will help students to learn it successfully. | | | | | |
| 17 | Comparison and contrast of individual structures is helpful for students learning of grammar. | | | | | |
| 18 | Form-focused correction helps students to improve their grammatical performance. | | | | | |
| 19 | Students can be encouraged to learn grammar by using problem-solving techniques. | | | | | |
| 20 | Discussing Grammatical rules explicitly is very helpful in improving students' grammatical knowledge. | | | | | |

An example of a question from the knowledge scale:

- 21 An auxiliary verb is used:
- \square a) to describe adjectives.
- \square b) as a helping verb that can help in forming a tense, negative or question.
- \square c) for referring to persons, things or substances.
- \Box d) for identifying things of particular types.

the aims of this research and the instrument was attached to that email. All respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire independently. An explanation of the questionnaire and instructions were included with the questions to enable it to be self-completed.

The questionnaire was also checked for its reliability and validity. Reliability refers to the purity and consistency of the measures, to the repeatability and the probability of obtaining the same results again if the measure were to be duplicated (Oppenheim, 2000:144). In this study, the internal consistency reliability of both attitude and knowledge scales were checked through the application of Cronbach's alpha tests of inter-reliability correlations. The analysis offered an indication of the degree of correlation between all the items of both scales. The value in both scales was above 0.7 which indicates that both scales met satisfactory the internal consistency reliability.

Validity tells us whether the scale measures what it is supposed to measure (Pallant, 2007; Oppenheim, 2000). In this small-scale study, tests of content validity were undertaken. Content validity 'refers to the adequacy with which a measure or scale has sampled from the intended universe or domain of content' (Pallant, 2007:7). Several steps were undertaken to assess the content validity of the items. First, books and articles addressing the issue were consulted to locate previous research and identify major themes. In addition, in order to better determine whether the items measured what is sought to measure, the items were checked and critiqued by two colleagues who work as TESOL teachers and have long experience of grammar teaching. The questionnaire was developed based on their comments and feedback.

Ethical considerations were taken into account in the current research as the study respondents were fully aware of the purpose of the questionnaire through some explicit statements which were provided to them in a written form attached with the questionnaire as well as in the instructions inside the questionnaire. Moreover, assurances of anonymity and confidentiality were followed as no identity of the participants was required in the data collection procedure.

Furthermore, the questionnaires were sent to participants via email and this method could violate the privacy of individuals (Umbach, 2004). However, to protect participants' privacy, a public folder was made online for them so that they could upload their questionnaire without worrying that their names will appear. The returned questionnaires were downloaded from the folder and labelled with numerical codes so that the researcher does not know respondents' identity. Additionally, the data was kept securely and only the researcher has access to them. The disclosure of the information was ensured for confidentiality and anonymity. It was also considered appropriate to provide participants the opportunity of requesting a copy of the correct answers for the knowledge measuring items and to inform them about the study findings if they wish that. This is important because in terms of good practice, researchers need to debrief respondents about the research outcomes at the conclusion of the research (BERA, 2011).

Participants' Background

The sampling group in this study consisted of 40 respondents; of equally 20 female teachers 50% and 20 male teachers 50%. They were teaching at different educational phases (12 teachers) or 30% teaching in primary schools, and equally (14 teachers) or 35% teaching in Preparatory/lower secondary schools and the same number/percentage teaching in upper secondary schools. Most of the sampling group (20 cases) or 50% were between 34-38 years of age, followed by44 years or over group (11 cases) with 27.5%. Most of the respondents (12 cases) or 30% have 6-10 years of teaching experience. The majority (14 cases) or 35% of teachers have only 1- 5 years of teaching experience.

Assessing Normality

Before examining the statistical analysis of the tests, the normality tests were conducted for both knowledge and attitude scales in order to assess the normality of the scores distribution. Thus, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk tests were applied for both parts of the questionnaire which included the degree of freedom and the significant value of the tests (Pallant, 2007). This is because the sample was less than 50, so it was better to double check the normality of the scores by referring to the Shapiro-Wilk test. For the attitude scale, the tests of normality implied that the data could

Table 2. Tests of normality (Attitude-score)

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov a | | | Shap | iro-W | 'ilk |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----|--------|-----------|-------|-------|
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Total Attitude Score | 0.103 | 40 | 0.200* | 0.953 | 40 | 0.097 |

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Table 3. Tests of normality (Knowledge-score)

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov a | | | Shapi | ro-W | ïlk |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----|-------|-----------|------|-------|
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | Df | Sig. |
| Total Knowledge Score | 0.285 | 40 | 0.000 | 0.672 | 40 | 0.000 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

 Table 4. Correlations (Spearman's rho)

| | | | Total knowledge score | Total attitude score |
|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | Correlation Coefficient | 1.000 | 0.166 |
| | Total Kn owledge Score | Sig. (2-tailed) | | 0.305 |
| | | Ν | 40 | 40 |
| Spearman's rho | Total Attitude Score | Correlation Coefficient | 0.166 | 1.000 |
| | | Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.305 | |
| | | Ν | 40 | 40 |

be treated as normally distributed because both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk statistic Sig. value was larger than.05, indicating a non-significant result and normality (Table 2). Therefore, it was decided to do parametric tests for attitude measuring tests (Pallant, 2007).

However, the knowledge score of both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk was .000 indicating a significant difference as the significant value was less than 0.05, hence, the data was not normally distributed (Table 3). Therefore, it was decided to use non-parametric tests for knowledge measuring and knowledge correlation tests (Pallant, 2007).

RESULTS

Knowledge measurement consisted of 16 items totally, each item scored 1 point. The maximum obtained score was 16 while the minimum was 5. In the attitude scale the maximum obtained score was 70 and the minimum was 40. It also worth's mentioning that there were no missing values in the collected data. Regarding the first aim of the study which investigated the relationship between TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge and their attitudes towards grammar teaching, it was measured using Non-parametric correlations analysis: Spearman's rho (Table 4).

The spearman's rho value = (.166), according to Cohen (1988), if the r =.10-.29 then the correlation is small (cited in Pallant, 2007). In this study, there was a small or a weak positive correlation between the two variables (Knowledge and attitudes of grammar), r =.166, N= 40, P=.305 with high scores in the grammatical knowledge associated with positive attitudes towards grammar teaching. So, TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge in this sample correlated significantly with their attitudes towards grammar teaching.

As regards the second aim of the study investigating the impact of teachers' gender on TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge. The participants (N=40) were divided into 2 groups, males (N=20) and females (N=20). The non-parametric Mann-Whitney Test was conducted to compare the grammatical knowledge of male and female teachers. A Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference in the grammatical knowledge of males (Md=15.00, n=20) and females (Md=15.50, n=20), U=173.000, z = -.765-,

 Table 5. Total knowledge score

| Gender | Ν | Median |
|--------|----|--------|
| Male | 20 | 15.00 |
| Female | 20 | 15.50 |
| Total | 40 | 15.00 |

Table 6. Test statistics a (Mann-Whitney)

| | Total knowledge score |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mann-Whitney U | 173.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 383.000 |
| Ζ | -0.765- |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.444 |
| Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)] | 0.478b |
| | |

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

Table 7. Test of homogeneity of variances

| Total Attitude Score | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----|-------|--|--|
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. | | |
| 1.954 | 4 | 35 | 0.123 | | |

| | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------|----|--------|-------|-------|
| | squares | | square | | |
| Between Groups | 214.200 | 4 | 53.550 | 0.838 | 0.510 |
| Within Groups | 2236.200 | 35 | 63.891 | | |
| Total | 2450.400 | 39 | | | |

p=48(see Tables 5 and 6). The z value was -.765- with a significant (2-tailed) level of 444. The probability value (p) is not less than or equal to 05, so the result is not significant. The tables showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the grammatical knowledge of male and female TESOL teachers.

The impact of teachers' years of teaching experiences on their attitudes towards grammar teaching was assessed using a parametric test one-way between groups ANOVA analysis of variance to explore the impact of experience on TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar. Participants were divided into 5 groups according to their teaching experiences (Group1: 1-5 years of experience, Group2: 6-10 years, Group3: 11-15 years, Group4: 16-20 years and Group5: 21 years or over). The sig value=510 at the p >.05 indicating that there was no statistically significant difference in attitude scores for the five groups: F (4, 35) =.83, p =.51 >.05 (Table 8). The homogeneity of variance was also tested by checking the significance value for Leven's statistics test (Table 7). The sig. value was greater than.05=.123, indicating that we have not violated the homogeneity of variance assumption (Pallant, 2007). In line with the main analysis which did not detect a statistically significant univariate (f) effect, the post-hoc test calculated did not yield any statistically significant differences in results between the groups. Specially, the post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test showed the mean score between the groups, Group1 (M=49.00, SD=5.2), Group2 (M=49.50, SD=10.2), Group3 (M=53.3, SD=7.5), Group4 (M=52.3, SD=9.6) and Group5 (M=55.60, SD= 6.4), with an overall sig. value.624 > .05 indicating that the groups did not differ significantly (Table 9 and Figure 1).

Therefore, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between experienced and novice TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching.

Regarding the last aim of the study, a multiple regression was done to assess a combination of variables (attitudes towards grammar, gender, teaching experience and age) in terms of its prediction of the knowledge of grammar. The model summary (Table 10) showed that the R Square value is.222 and when expressed as a percentage it means that only 22.2% of the dependent variable (knowledge of grammar) can be explained based upon

| Table 9. Total attitude score t | tukev | HSD | a, | b |
|--|-------|-----|----|---|
|--|-------|-----|----|---|

| Experience | Ν | Subset for alpha=0.05 |
|------------------|----|-----------------------|
| | | 1 |
| 1-5 years | 14 | 49.00 |
| 6-10 years | 12 | 49.50 |
| 16-20 years | 6 | 52.33 |
| 11-15 years | 3 | 53.33 |
| 21 years or over | 5 | 55.60 |
| Sig. | | .624 |

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed. a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size=5.850.

Table 10. Model summary b

| Model | R | R square | Adjusted R square | Std. error of the estimate |
|-------|--------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 0.471a | 0.222 | 0.133 | 1.954 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Experience, Gender, Total Attitude Score , Age b. Dependent Variable: Total knowledge score

Table 11. ANOVA a

| Model | | Sum of df | | Mean | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------|----|--------|-------|--------|
| | | squares | | square | | |
| 1 | Regression | 38.208 | 4 | 9.552 | 2.501 | 0.060b |
| | Residual | 133.692 | 35 | 3.820 | | |
| | Total | 171.900 | 39 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Total knowledge score

b. Predictors: (Constant), Experience, Gender, Total attitude score, Age



Figure 1. Means plots

a combination of the independent variables (attitudes towards grammar, gender, teaching experience, and age). The ANOVA Table (11) indicated that there was no statistical significance, as sig =.060 which really means P >.0005 (Pallant, 2007), so the model in this example did not reach statistical significance.

Regarding the contribution of each independent variable on the prediction of the dependent variable, Beta values were considered (Table 12). The largest Beta Coefficient was.802, which is for teachers' age, and means that this variable makes the strongest contribution to explaining and predicting the dependent variable. In addition to this, the Beta value for teachers' experience was the lowest -.491-, indicating that it made the less of a contribution.

In an attempt to see if other background information could contribute to the prediction of the dependent variable, another variable (the educational phase teachers' teach in) was added to the model (see Appendix A, Tables 13,14 & 15). This resulted in changing the R Square=.231, p=.098 >.05, indicating an additional 1% of the variance in knowledge which shows only a slight increase in the percentage from 22% to 23% and no predictors were statistically significant at the.05 level. Therefore, all five variables in the final model (attitudes towards grammar, gender, experience, age, and educational phase) did not make a significant unique contribution to the prediction of TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge. This model as a whole was a poor fit to the overall data.

| | | 0101105 W | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|---------|---------|----------------------------|-------|
| Model | | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized coefficients | t Sig | Sig. 95. Confi interva | | 0% idence al for B | Correlations | | | Collinearity statistics | |
| | | В | Std. Error | Beta | _ | | Lower bound | Upper bound | Zero-order | Partial | Part | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | (Constant) | 8.561 | 2.649 | | 3.232 | 0.003 | 3.184 | 13.939 | | | | | |
| | Total attitude score | 0.035 | 0.042 | 0.132 | 0.836 | 0.409 | -0.050- | 0.120 | 0.158 | 0.140 | 0.125 | 0.888 | 1.126 |
| | Gender | 0.467 | 0.710 | 0.113 | 0.658 | 0.515 | -0.974- | 1.908 | -0.096- | 0.111 | 0.098 | 0.758 | 1.319 |
| | Age | 1.519 | 0.549 | 0.802 | 2.767 | 0.009 | 0.405 | 2.633 | 0.376 | 0.424 | 0.413 | 0.265 | 3.778 |
| | Experience | -0.722- | 0.404 | -0.491- | -1.787- | 0.083 | -1.542- | 0.098 | 0.181 | -0.289- | -0.266- | 0.294 | 3.401 |

Table 12. Coefficients a

a. Dependent variable: Total knowledge score

DISCUSSION

This study revealed a number of findings. First of all, it shows that there is a weak positive correlation between attitudes towards grammar teaching and the grammatical knowledge of teachers, r =.166, N= 40, P=.305 with high scores in the grammatical knowledge associated with positive attitudes towards grammar teaching. So, TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge in this sample correlated significantly with their attitudes towards grammar teaching. This result matches with the findings of DİKİCİ's (2012) study that investigated pre-service English teachers' beliefs towards teaching grammar at two Turkish universities. His study showed that pre-service teachers' grammatical knowledge affect their beliefs about grammar teaching and how they deliver grammar lessons in the classroom. However, it cannot be said that there is always a positive correlation between the two variables (attitudes and knowledge of grammar) for the whole population (all TESOL teachers in Oman). This is because in my current study a small sample was used which cannot be representative as previously noted. DİKİ-CI's (2012) study also investigated pre-service teachers' not in-service ones, so the findings may differ accordingly

Regarding the effect of gender on TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge, the findings from the current study shows that gender did not make any difference on high or low knowledge of grammar. The Mann-Whitney Test was conducted to compare the grammatical knowledge of male and female teachers and it revealed no significant difference in the grammatical knowledge of males (Md=15.00, n=20) and females (Md=15.50, n=20), U=173.000, z = -.765-, p=48. This result seems to be in line with the findings of a study by Aljohani (2012) which indicated that gender plays no role regarding in-service teachers' beliefs about grammar. However, Aljohani's (2012) study looked at the effect of gender on teachers' beliefs/attitudes about grammar and my study looked at the effect of gender on teachers' grammatical knowledge. Thus, it could not be said that gender plays a role in orienting teachers' grammatical knowledge. While this hypothesis is plausible, empirical evidence supporting it is not available and this does suggest itself as a useful focus for continuing research.

As far as the effect of teachers' experiences on their attitudes towards teaching was concerned, one-way between groups ANOVA analysis of variance was used to test that and the study results indicated that there was no effect of teaching experiences on positive or negative attitudes towards grammar. The findings emphasized that there was no significant difference between experienced and novice TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching. While this result that is emerging from this questionnaire has concurrent validity with the results reported by some studies (e.g. Borg & Bums, 2008; Barnard & Scampton, 2008; Andrews, 2003), it contradicts the findings reported by other studies (DİKİCİ, 2012; Phipps &Borg, 2009). In fact, there has been a great amount of research regarding L2 teacher cognition/attitudes and teaching experiences. Based on most of these studies, teachers' beliefs about grammar did not relate in any significant way to their teaching experiences (Borg & Bums, 2008). This is because, the professional experience of teachers might be unreliable (Barnard & Scampton, 2008), as it has no influence on the beliefs/attitudes teachers hold about grammar teaching. Andrews' (2003) study examining the beliefs about grammar teaching of 170 teachers of English in Hong Kong also confirmed these findings. Despite that, DİKİCİ's (2012) study revealed that teachers' beliefs come from several stages of their educational career: their personal experiences, experiences with schooling and experiences with formal knowledge. Moreover, Phipps and Borg (2009) found that teachers' beliefs which exerted most influence on their work were the beliefs firmly grounded in experience. It could be argued that such differences in findings might be related to the diverse contextual settings where such studies were undertaken. In other words, teachers have different experiences related to the context they are working in and accordingly hold different attitudes towards teaching grammar.

According to all the above mentioned results, therefore, it is unable to predict TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge through a combination of attitudes towards grammar, gender, teaching experience, age and the educational phase teachers teach in because there is no significant difference. One reason why the standard multiple regression model did not reach statistical significance and was a poor fit to the data could be that the data was collected in one month, and thus simply reflecting opinions being expressed at that specific moment of time. Furthermore, the respondents in this study were all classroom teachers with very busy schedules and may not have been able to give as much thought as they would have liked to the survey questions (Barnard & Scampton, 2008). These facts should not necessarily invalidate results of this study, but they do point to the tentative and partial nature of any implications drawn from them. This further indicates that in the future we might think of other variables which could influence the prediction. Such findings also suggest directions for further studies in investigating language teachers' attitudes/knowledge and their influence on teachers' classroom practices.

CONCLUSION

This small-scale study aimed to examine the relationship between TESOL teachers' attitudes towards grammar teaching and their grammatical knowledge. It further investigated the impact of teachers' gender on their grammatical knowledge and the impact of teachers' years of teaching experiences on their attitudes towards grammar teaching. The study also examined the possibility of predicting teachers' grammatical knowledge from the combination of information on their attitudes towards grammar, gender, teaching experience and age. It might be concluded that there is a weak positive correlation, with higher knowledge of grammar associated with positive attitudes towards grammar teaching. However, gender and teaching experience did not feature as important variables in affecting respondents' attitudes towards and knowledge of grammar. In addition, TESOL teachers' grammatical knowledge could not be predictable based upon their attitudes towards grammar, gender, experience, age and the educational phase they teach in. To sum up, while the data from the present survey provided some valuable information regarding TESOL teachers' attitudes and knowledge of grammar, it is obvious that expressed beliefs should be triangulated with observed activities -as Borg and Bums (2008), and Borg (2006) emphasized. Hence, more fruitful studies should seek at exploring the extent of the convergence and divergence between grammatical knowledge and attitudes towards teaching grammar expressed by TESOL teachers, and their real classroom practices. This can constitute an ambitious research agenda of which the current research has merely been the first tentative step, but

one which is felt interesting and useful, and may be vital if we are looking at understanding classroom learning realities.

REFERENCES

- Aljohani, M. A. S. (2012). Grammar Beliefs of in-Service Teachers, British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences, 11(1), 96-108.
- Andrews, S. (1994). The grammatical knowledge/awareness of native speaker EFL teacher: what the trainers say. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn and E. Williams (eds), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. (pp. 69-89), London: Prentice Hall International.
- Andrews, S. (2003). Just like instant noodles: L2 teachers and their beliefs about grammar pedagogy. *Teachers and Teaching*, 9(4), 351-76.
- Baleghizadeh, S. and Farshchi, S. (2009). An Exploration of Teachers' Beliefs about the Role of Grammar in Iranian High Schools and Private Language Institutes. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 52, 212, 17-38.
- Battaglia, M. (2008). Convenience Sampling, In Paul J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods*. (pp. 149-150). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi. org/10.4135/9781412963947.n105
- British Educational Research Association (BERA), (2011) Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research, retrieved online from http://www.bera.ac.uk/ publications/Ethical%20Guidelines, Last accessed 25 December, 2013.
- Bloor, T. (1986). What do language students know about grammar? *British journal of Language Teaching*, 24, 157-160.

- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Lan-guage Teaching*, 36, 81-109.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*, London: Continuum.
- Borg, S. and Burns, A. (2008). Integrating grammar in adult TESOL classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), 456-482.
- Barnard, R and Scampton, D. (2008). Teaching Grammar: A Survey of Eap Teachers in New Zealand. New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics, 14(2), 59-82.
- DİKİCİ, I. Z. (2012). Pre-Service English Teachers' Beliefs Towards Grammar And Its Teaching At Two Turkish Universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1(2), 206-218.
- Oppenheim, A.N. (2000). *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*. London: Continuum.
- Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS Survival Manual. Maidenhead: Open University.
- Phipps, S and Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37, 380–390.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research*. (2nd Edition). Oxford: Blackwell. Shuib, M. (2009). Grammatical Awareness Among Primary School English

- Language Teachers. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 9(1), 35-46.
- Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*. 57(1), 1-22.
- Umbach, P.D. (2004). Web Surveys: Best Practices. New Directions For Institutional Research, 121, Spring, 23-38.

APPENDIX

Table 13. Model summary b

| Model | R | R square | Adjusted R square | Std. error of the estimate |
|-------|--------|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 0.480a | 0.231 | 0.118 | 1.972 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Educational phase, Total attitude score, Experience, Gender, Age

b. Dependent variable: Total knowledge score

Table 14. ANOVA a

| Model | | Sum of | Df | Mean | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|---------|----|--------|-------|--------|
| | | squares | | square | | |
| 1 | Regression | 39.649 | 5 | 7.930 | 2.039 | 0.098b |
| | Residual | 132.251 | 34 | 3.890 | | |
| | Total | 171.900 | 39 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Total Knowledge Score

b. Predictors: (Constant), Educational phase, Total Attitude Score,

Experience, Gender, Age

Table 15. Coefficients

| Model | | Unstandardized coefficients | | Standardized t coefficients | t Sig. | 95.0% confidence interval for B | | Correlations | | | Collinearity statistics | | |
|-------|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------|----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | | В | Std. error | Beta | _ | | Lower bound | Upper bound | Zero-order | Partial | Part | Tolerance | VIF |
| 1 | (Constant) | 8.561 | 2.649 | | 3.232 | 0.003 | 3.184 | 13.939 | | | | | |
| | Total AttitudeScore | 0.035 | 0.042 | 0.132 | 0.836 | 0.409 | -0.050- | 0.120 | 0.158 | 0.140 | 0.125 | 0.888 | 1.126 |
| | Gender | 0.467 | 0.710 | 0.113 | 0.658 | 0.515 | -0.974- | 1.908 | -0.096- | 0.111 | 0.098 | 0.758 | 1.319 |
| | Age | 1.519 | 0.549 | 0.802 | 2.767 | 0.009 | 0.405 | 2.633 | 0.376 | 0.424 | 0.413 | 0.265 | 3.778 |
| | Experience | -0.722- | 0.404 | -0.491- | -1.787- | 0.083 | -1.542- | 0.098 | 0.181 | -0.289- | -0.266- | 0.294 | 3.401 |

a. Dependent variable: Total knowledge score