

**Investigating High School Teachers' Belief Regarding  
Teaching Grammar**

Majid Farahian

majid\_fa53@yahoo.com

**Abstract**

Although there is an ever increasing interest in the issue of teacher belief systems in mainstream education studies, the beliefs of EFL teachers, especially Iranian teachers', about grammar and the influence of such beliefs on their instruction remain relatively unexplored. The present study seeks to examine high school teachers' belief regarding teaching grammar. To do so a grammar belief questionnaire and an interview were administered. The result showed that although teachers were compelled by the curriculum and students needs to teach grammar explicitly through present, practice, produce (P.P.P) approach they were well aware of some tenets of focus on form instruction of grammar and valued learning grammar in communicative meaningful activities.

**Keywords:** Teachers' belief, Grammar, PPP approach,

**1. Introduction**

Studies of teacher cognition are interested in the thought processes of teachers, and the trend in this studies is based on the assumption that teachers as rational beings constantly making judgments and making decision in the complex environment of classrooms. There are so many variables interacting that the investigation of the whole issue of teachers' taught processes becomes demanding. To make such an attempt more manageable, Clark and Peterson (1986) categorize teachers' thought processes into three major branches: teacher planning, teachers' interactive thoughts and decisions, and teachers' theories and beliefs. This paper deals with the third category which is teachers' theories and beliefs.

For the past fifteen years the concept of teachers' belief has come into favor in English Language Teaching (ELT). Investigation of teachers' mental lives, based on Borg, has a central role in ELT. But what the term 'belief' implies? As the general trend in psychology to define the obscure concepts and operationalize them, the term belief has been defined by ELT scholars. Among others, Borg (2001) presents a concise and brief definition of the term. He defines belief as

... [A] proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual, and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment; further, it serves as a guide to thought and behavior ( p.186).

Borg moves from the definition of the term belief in general to 'teachers' belief' in particular and explains that "the term is used to refer to teachers' pedagogic belief, or those beliefs of relevance to an individual's teaching" (p.187). Therefore, it is evident, based on Phipps and Borg (2009), that language teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning

- have a powerful effect on teachers' pedagogical decisions.
- strongly influence what and how teachers learn during language teacher education
- can be deep-rooted and resistant to change (p.381).

One of the areas affected by teachers' perception is grammar. It has been greatly influenced by the teachers' perception of what it is, how much importance is attached to it and whether it should be taught in ELT courses. Of course, such a conception has not been away with the current perspectives about grammar.

For centuries the role of grammar in language teaching has been a topic for heated debate and controversy. In the hey days of the Grammar Translation Method and the Audio Lingual Method, grammar had a central role in language education and was one of the subject matter which was studied. In that era grammar teaching was viewed as the presentation and practice of discrete grammatical structures. Success in learning foreign language in the period of the grammar-translation method was to a great degree equal to having the to understand and apply grammatical structures (Meirin & Norman, 2001).

After the communicative approach started to gain popularity, such a high status suffered a decline. The strong version of the approach claimed that grammar had no place at all in language learning, while the weak version considered grammar facilitated learning language. All in all, both rejected the central role of grammar in ELT. However, as Yin (2006) holds, in recent years, there has been a growing interest in grammar and that revival is because of two reasons: “(a) reassessment of the communicative approach and (b) evaluation of French immersion classes”(p.63).

Findings of immersion and naturalistic SLA studies have revealed that when classroom second language learning is entirely experiential and meaning-focused, proficiency in some linguistic features does not ultimately develop to targetlike levels. (Doughty & Williams, 1998). There are some theoretical perspectives which suggest that a kind of intervention, here called focus on form instruction, coupled with communicative activities may help overcome classroom limitations ( Nassaji 2000). The strong form of such a suggestion claims that focus on form is necessary “to push learners beyond communicatively effective language toward target like second language ability.” This new trend in teaching grammar was very different from that of GTM and Audiolingual Method in which the grammar was the focus of study (Ellis, 2006).

These shifting paradigms regarding the importance of teaching grammar seems to have largely affected teachers’ perceptions; however, despite the fact that the importance of research into the psychological context of L2 teaching has been pointed out over the years (Borg, 1999; Barnard & Scampton, 2008) only in the past two decades the influence second language teachers' cognitive processes on their classroom instruction has been taken into consideration (Barnard & Scampton, 2008). Some research on ELT Teachers’ belief shows that belief system of teachers of English grammar in terms of its influence on teaching practice is resistant to change (Farrell ,1999). In the same line, Richards et.al. (2001) examined the beliefs of a group of in-service course teachers about grammar. The findings revealed that many teachers followed a communicative approach to teaching, in its strong form, while others showed a strong commitment to the direct grammar teaching in language learning. If such attitudes turn to dogmas and are not enlightened by teachers’ reflection and insight into both their own practice and the viable theories, may result in nothing but failure on the side of the learners.

Iranian teachers who teach in Language school, based on the authors seven years experience teaching in such institutes, are to a great extend inclined toward Communicative Approach, materials have been developed for such a purpose, and the management of such schools pose a great pressure on language teachers to have more attention on meaning in instruction and concentrate less on grammar in instruction. It can be easily seen that grammar is to a largely disfavored, while conversation and communicative activities have been highly appreciated. Scarcely, workbooks do contain activities for dealing with grammar and even value of such exercise is not appreciated by teachers. Some researchers state that such an eagerness as described by these authors has no place in Iranian schools (Razmjoo& Riazi ,2006) and explicit teaching of grammatical rules has a firm place in high schools (Moini, 2009). According to Jahangard (2007), students' aural and oral skills are not emphasized in Iranian EFL courses and textbooks. Communicative skills are not assessed at schools and in the final exams during the three years of senior high school and one year of pre-university education there is no speaking listening exam. According to Ghorbani (2009) the grammar exercises in the high school textbooks is devoid of the context and teachers who are mainly under pressure from the curriculum to follow the synthetic syllabus imposed by the curriculum, has no choice but follow the rules. The question which seems to be unexplored is whether Iranian high school teachers have the same conception of grammar teaching as the view held in the field? Do high school teachers of English regard teaching implicit grammar teaching pointless.

### **1.1 Statement of the Problem**

The issue of grammar in EFL teaching is an on-going debate. Such an inconclusive debate about how to teach grammar in the best way has had a great influence on the development of language pedagogy (Ellis 2006). Therefore, different views, and approaches to grammar teaching have informed EFL teachers' decisions. As teachers gain more experience and get more familiar with different views of teaching grammar, their personal theories are shaped and reshaped. Later these personal views become the basis for their personal knowledge about teaching and therefore, have a strong impact on teachers' planning, instructional decisions and classroom practices.

Since teachers are decision makers in classrooms and they are mainly responsible for students' learning, exploring certain issues regarding their beliefs about teaching grammar seems to be necessary. High school teachers in Iran have been exposed to different value systems regarding teaching grammar. Some studies have evaluated the high school textbooks and the curriculum (e.g. Jahangard, 2007) and have reported that the whole inclination in the curriculum is toward explicit teaching of grammar and there is too much concentration on language usage. These studies do not reflect beliefs of teachers some of whom hold M.A and PhD degrees. By examining belief of teachers in high school setting, this study is investigating whether teachers whole heartedly obey the current view of teaching grammar imposed by the top-down curriculum or value other approaches.

## **1.2 Research Question**

1. What is the teachers' belief about the role of grammar in language teaching and learning in high schools?

## **2. Method**

The design of the study was a survey through which the beliefs of a sample of teachers were investigated. The research was both quantitative and qualitative in design since both questionnaire and interview was used in the study to explore beliefs across groups of teachers. The questionnaire was in the form of a five point, Likert-type attitude scale which was completed by 32 male and female high school teachers. 12 of the participants took part in the interview.

### **2.1 Participants**

32 (21 female and 11 male) English language teachers volunteered to help the researchers from a number of state high schools in Kermanshah, a province of Iran. Their age varied from 28 to 45. Random sampling was not adopted since the number of volunteers for the study was scarce; therefore, convenient sampling was practiced.

## 2.2 Instruments

One of the instruments in the study was questionnaire. There is consensus about the use of questionnaires in the studies of teachers' belief (Burgess & Etherington, 2002).

As a five-point, Likert-type attitude scale, the questionnaire was completed by 32 male and female teachers. The questionnaire relevant to this construct was adopted from a study made by Burgess and Etherington (2002). There were some necessary changes in the questionnaire; some items were deleted and substituted with those which were in line with the purpose of the study and some ambiguous ones were paraphrased.

This closed-item questionnaire was used in the form of a Likert scale with 5 categories including strongly agree (5), agree (4), no idea (3), disagree (2) and strongly disagree (1) (see Appendix A). Since closed-item questions involved greater uniformity of measurement they have greater reliability (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Furthermore, answers could be easily quantified and analyzed. The first section of the questionnaire dealt with approaches to grammar teaching and the second section was about students and teachers' difficulties with grammar. Some areas regarding teachers' attitudes in this questionnaire include the role of grammar in language teaching, explicit grammar teaching including the importance of instruction, the role of declarative knowledge, consciousness in the learning of grammar, comparison and contrast of structures, the use of grammatical terminology, problem-solving activities, correction, presentation of grammar through authentic texts, and the role of practice (see Appendix B).

To make sure that the questionnaire was reliable it was given to 15 of the English language teachers 8 days before the study and the answers were checked meticulously in order to see if there were major changes in the responses. Fortunately, nearly all the answers corresponded with the answers which were later given to the questionnaire. It means that the attitude of each teacher before in the same questionnaire applied twice was the same.

To understand whether the questionnaire was valid, it was given to two experts in the field and three PhD holders to check the content of the questions. After discussion with the author, it was decided that the questionnaire really checked the construct it intended to assess.

Another data collection instrument in the study was interview. Following Mackey (2006) questionnaires need to be supplemented by additional measures such as interviews. As she notes “questions can be designed to find out more about teachers’ and learners’ opinions and attitudes about various aspects of language learning.” (p.51). Therefore, in the study; all the respondents were invited to participate in a series of follow-up interviews. Twelve of the survey respondents volunteered to take part in the interviews, all of whom had more than five years of language teaching experience. 2 participants who took part in the interview were PhD student, 5 were either M.A students or hold M.A degrees, and 5 hold an major in language teaching. The entire interviews were recorded.

Due to the communicative stress of the interview and in order to let the respondents express their ideas freely (Mackey, 2006) the participants were free to talk either English or Farsi. Therefore, PhD students talked in English, while others preferred to use Farsi.

### **2.3 Procedures**

The questionnaires for all high school teachers except PhD students were distributed out of schools, and those of PhD students received the questionnaire via e-mail. All participants were required to mark their response to the option that best explains their beliefs. PhD and M.A students helped the researcher with the process of handing in the questionnaires to other teachers and collecting them.

## **3. Results**

The result of the questionnaire is summarized for similar items in sections below.

### **3.1 The role of grammar in language teaching**

Among all questions four were related to teachers’ beliefs about *the role of grammar in language teaching*. These statements view grammar as a framework for the rest of the language system, as the building blocks of language. 72% of the state high school teachers agreed with the view of grammar as a framework for the rest of the language system, and 11 % disagreed and 17% had no idea. This may support the idea

that Iranian language teachers still, have a very positive view regarding the role of grammar. (Moini, 2009).

### **3.2 Explicit grammar teaching**

Questions 1.20, 2.3, 2.13 asked the participants their view about *explicit grammar teaching*. As to the question 1.20, 68.7% of state high school teachers agreed with this idea, while 11.5% disagreed. In answer to question 2.3, 77.8 % disagreed, while only 3.26% agreed with the idea. For question 2.13, 58.66% agreed, while 13% disagreed with the statement.

The responses to the statements 1.20, 2.3, 2.13 shows high school teachers' attitude toward explicit grammar teaching. Such a result may not be surprising since grammar has been given credit for in English Examinations in high school and Konkoor (entrance examination of universities) and to the researchers' knowledge, end of the term as well as mid-term tests are geared toward assessing students' discrete knowledge of English; therefore, teachers are required to provide the students with the quickest, easiest strategies to be prepared for the exams.

### **3.3 Instruction vs. Exposure**

Questions 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.10, 1.19, 2.10 were designed to investigate teachers' beliefs on formal instruction. As to the question 1.2, *It is exposure to language in natural use which helps learners learn grammar*. 81% agreed, 7.2 % disagreed with the statement and 11.8% did not respond to the statement. Such responses to the statement are in line with tenets of CLT. (Widdowson, 1990).

55% agreed with question 1.3, and 20.2% did not think that formal instruction helps learners to produce correct sentences. The answers to question 1.10 were as follows; 55.1% agreed while 39% disagreed. The result of the statement 2.10 was 79% agreed and 11% disagreed. In answer to question 1.19, 14% agreed and 66% disagreed with the individual focus on grammar in syllabus.

The results of the statements 1.3, 1.8, 1.10, 1.19 and 2.10 show teachers' positive view for explicit grammar teaching and focus-on-forms. Such responses may be support



to Dahmardeh's (2009) claim which states that in Iranian schools, the curriculum and students expect teachers to teach grammar explicitly.

### **3.4 The role of declarative and procedural knowledge**

91.4% of high school teachers agreed with the statement 2.1 that it is difficult for the students to transfer their grammatical knowledge into communicative language use. Only 8.6 % did not agree with the statement. Such a high rate of agreement is not surprising, because Iranian high school students expect teachers to transfer knowledge and facts; the value of one of CLT principles that is the importance of language use is not taken care of. (Razmjoo, 2007). The high rate of teachers' agreement with the statement may result from the fact that little communicative activities have been provided in high school syllabus and textbooks.

### **3.5 The importance of conscious knowledge**

Statements 1.4, 1.6, and 1.9 which were related to the importance of conscious knowledge received teachers' answers as follows:

As to question 1.4, 66.6% disagreed with the idea, and 33.3%, agreed with it. Teachers answer to the question "students need a conscious knowledge of grammar in order to improve their language" which was in line with the previous statement received 66% agreement and at the same time 18% disagreement. 77% of high school teachers agreed with statement 1.9, and 17% opposed it. Such a result may reveal the fact that high school teachers are aware of the fact that formal instruction is not the only way to learn grammar.

### **3.6 Comparison and contrast of structures**

Statement 1.17 stated that "comparison and contrast of individual structures is helpful for students learning grammar". 18.3% had no idea, whereas, 16.6% disagreed and 65.1% agreed with it. The high rate of agreement may reflect the fact that high school teachers believe in comparing and contrasting grammar of two languages.

### **3.7 The use of grammatical terminology**

As to the question 2.14, regarding the usefulness of grammatical terminology for students, 78.9% agreed, and 11.1 disagreed with the statement.

45% of teachers disagreed with the idea that their students had problem with grammatical terminology, and 19.4 % agreed with statement 2.19.

The finding is in line with Dahmardeh's (2009) argument that explicit knowledge of grammar is emphasized by teachers at schools.

### **3.8 Problem solving**

Statements 2.2, 2.5, and 2.20 were concerned with problem solving in high school English courses.

22% disagreed that their students are motivated by problem solving techniques for teaching grammar. 71.5% believed that problem solving activities motivates their students and 6.5% did not answer the question.

63.8% of teachers disagreed with statement 2.20 and 8.8% agreed with it, while 27.4% of the rest had no idea. As it can be seen, there is agreement between the responses 2.2 and 2.5 this may be due to the fact that teachers have practiced problem solving techniques. Even if the teachers may have not practiced problem solving tasks, they probably hold positive view toward problem solving activities and did not believe that they may frustrate students.

### **3.9 Correction of errors**

Items 1.16, 1.18, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17., and 2.18 were related to error correction.

Answers to statements were:

1.16: 37.9% disagreed, 50.4 agreed. Such a response may be indicative of teachers' assumption about error correction; so those who disagreed may believe that apart from correcting errors which hinder communication, there are other errors which should be taken care of.

1.18: 22.2 % disagreed, 48% disagreed and 29.8% of teachers did no answer. The researcher is not sure whether teachers, especially those with B.A degrees, had a good understanding of form focused instruction. This is probably shown in responses to 2.15

which stated that “students learn grammar more successfully if it is presented within a complete text”.

11.8% agreed with the statement, 13.3% did not provide the answer, and 74.9% did not agree with it.

2.18: 44% agreed, 33.8% did not answer the statement and 22.2% disagreed. The reason for high rate of the teachers who did not answer the statement may be due to the fact that speaking in Iran high school does not have any place and learners after years of studying English at schools are not able to speak in English (Razmjoo& Riazi, 2006).

### **3.10 Presentation of grammar in authentic texts**

Statements 1.15., 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 asked the high school teachers' opinions regarding authentic context.

As to the item 1.15, the answers were; 88.2% agreed, no one disagreed, and 11.8 did not answer the statement. 91% of teachers disagreed with item 2.4, and 9% disagreed. The answers to 2.6 % were 66.6 % disagreed, 17% no idea and 16.4% agreed. The answer is not surprising since the textbooks in Iranian high schools do not provide students with authentic texts (Razmjoo, 2007).

The answers to 2.7 were 58.1 % disagreements and 18% disagreement, while 23.9 % did not provide the answer.

2.8 received 81.2 % disagreements and 12% disagreement, while 6.8 % did not provide the answer.

Answers to statements 1.15., 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 and 2.9 may be indicative of the fact that high school teachers view authentic texts to be very helpful in teaching grammar.

### **3.11 The role of practice**

The role of practice was related to statements 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, 1.12, and 1.14. In response to the statement “students can improve their grammatical accuracy through frequent practice of structures” 11.2% agreed, and 79.6% of high school teachers disagreed with such a claim.

Statement 1.7 received responses approximately the same as the previous question; 76% agreement, 6.66% no agreement and 17.34% no answer.

Item 1.11 faced with 33% disagreement and 67% disagreement.

Statement 1.12 received 83.9% agreement, no disagreement and 16.1% no answer.

As to the item 1.14, it received 88 % negative response, and 12% negative.

In general teachers' attitude toward grammar learning in the communicative context was positive, although they believed in the role of grammar.

#### **4. Discussion**

This study revealed teachers' views regarding approaches to grammar teaching, students and teachers' difficulties with grammar teaching and teachers' beliefs about some of the related categories. Contrary to what was expected, majority of school teachers believed that formal instruction of language through PPP approach does not yield fruitful results. A few of the teachers agreed with the delivering grammar out of context. In this study many teachers agreed with the possibility of learning grammar through natural exposure to language; therefore, formal instruction still holds weight among them. Inductive, implicit, problem solving activities, and presentation through authentic texts, was regarded valuable among teachers. This may be indicative of the fact that formal instruction, the use of grammatical terminology, and explicit grammar teaching is still valued among EFL teachers.

Apart from questionnaire, interview was another instrument to have further support for the findings.

Two of the high school teachers who were PhD students had a relatively high proficiency with the language, had studied the related literature on teaching grammar and the role of instruction. Their opinion was that explicit grammar instruction is necessary for high school when they were asked the reason one reasoned that for high school curriculum explicit grammar teaching is a must especially for those who are going to take part in the entrance examination of universities. When they were asked whether by explicit instruction they were referring to form focused instruction or PPP they took side with the former. Of five M.A. teachers who took part in the interview, four agreed with the use of explicit instruction of grammar while one did not find it suitable. When M.A holding teachers were asked whether he they were satisfied with the state of affairs, they

responded that they wished to be free to choose his own textbooks or at least were allowed to do necessary adaptations. Five other teachers who did not have a satisfactory command of English were asked about the meaning of focus on form. They did not have a slightest idea what the term meant. However, when the researcher asked them if they believed in presenting grammar in meaningful context or through PPP, they were quick in condemning PPP ; however, one of them identified the approach as the best solution to for the current state of affairs. They highly appreciated authentic texts and valued use of such material in the classrooms.

## **5. Conclusion**

There is a general consensus in general education that teachers' cognition has a great effect on the teaching and the outcome of learning (Tillema, 2000). As Borg (2003) notes, "teachers are active decision makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex practically-oriented, personalized and context sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts and beliefs"(p.81). One of the important issues highly affected by teachers' beliefs in ELT courses is grammar (Borg, 2001). This study examined teachers' beliefs regarding teaching grammar in Iranian high schools and it was found that contrary to the view that high school teachers are more inclined toward PPP approach to teaching grammar they are familiar with the problems inherent in such an approach. Moreover, teachers were aware of the CLT tenet and the findings are in line with Razmjoo & Riazi's (2006) study which reported that contrary to the long held belief, Iranian high school teachers' attitude toward CLT is positive. Although the curriculum imposes great limitations on the high school teachers to teach grammar in the context, a lot of them believe that contextualization of grammar in authentic texts is of great importance (Dahmardeh, 2009). Furthermore, the use of authentic texts was highly valued.

## References

- 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. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27, 19-31.
- Borg, S. (2001). Key concepts in ELT: Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal*, 55(2), 186-188.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher Cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness*, 12(2), 96-108.
- Burgess, J. & Etherington, S. (2002). Focus on grammatical form: explicit or implicit? *System*, 30, 433-458.
- Clark, C.M., & Peterson (1986). Teachers' taught processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. pp. 255- 295). New York: Macmillan.
- Dahmardeh, M. (2009). *English language teaching in Iran and communicative language teaching*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Warwick University.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom Second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), 83-107.
- Farrell, T.S.C. (1999). The Reflective assignment: Unlocking pre-service English teachers' beliefs on grammar teaching. *RELC Journal*, 30(2), 1-17.
- Ghorbani, M. R. (2009). ELT in Iranian high schools in Iran, Malaysia and Japan: Reflections on how tests influence use of prescribed textbooks *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 8 (2), 131-139.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluation of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 130-150.
- McKay, S. L. (2006). *Researching second language classrooms*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Meirin, L., & Norman, N. (2001). Grammar in MFL teaching revisited. *Language Learning Journal*, 23, 58-66.

- Moini, M.R. (2009). The impact of EFL teachers' cognition on teaching foreign language grammar. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji*, 49, 141-164.
- Nassaji, H. (2000). Toward integrating form focused instruction and communicative interaction in the second language classroom: Some pedagogical possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(ii), 241-250.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37, 380-390.
- Razmjoo, S. A. (2007). High Schools or Private Institutes Textbooks? Which Fulfill Communicative Language Teaching Principles in the Iranian Context? *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4). Retrieved June, 2010 from [http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September\\_05\\_dn.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September_05_dn.php)
- Razmjoo, S. A., & Riazi, A.M. (2006). Do high schools or private institutes practice communicative language teaching? A case study of Shiraz teachers in high schools and institutes. *The Reading Matrix*, 6, (3), 340-363.
- Richards, J.C., Gallo, P. B., & Renandya, W. A. (2001). Exploring Teachers' Beliefs and the Processes of Change. *PAC Journal*, 1,1, 41-58.
- Tillema, H. H. (2000). Belief change towards self-directed learning in student teachers: immersion in practice or reflection on action. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 575-591.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Yin, W.K. (2006). *Teachers' belief and grammar practice*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Hong Kong.

**Majid Farahian** is studying for his Ph.D (Applied Linguistics) in Islamic Azad University- Science and Research Branch-Tehran-Iran. He has been teaching all courses related to ELT in Associate Diploma and BA levels at Islamic Azad University-Kermanshah Branch. He has had different articles on Linguistics, teaching and literature in different journals.

**APPENDIX A****Section 1: Teachers' attitude to the teaching of grammar**

1. Grammar has a basic role in language learning      1   2   3   4   5
  
2. It is exposure to language in natural use which      1   2   3   4   5  
helps learners learn grammar
  
3. Formal instruction plays a key role in producing      1   2   3   4   5  
grammatical sentences
  
4. Conscious knowledge of the grammatical system      1   2   3   4   5  
has no role in students' use of language.
  
5. Students can improve their grammatical accuracy      1   2   3   4   5  
through frequent practice of structure.
  
6. Students need a conscious knowledge of grammar      1   2   3   4   5  
in order to improve their language.
  
7. Practice of structure must be within a full              1   2   3   4   5  
communicative context.



- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8. Dealing with grammar separately does not<br>Lead to a natural use of language.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. A language learner should first learn the<br>structural form before using it in natural<br>communication.                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. The syllabus should contain a separate part<br>which focuses on grammar.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Decontextualised practice of structures has<br>a place in language learning.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Productive practice of structures is a<br>necessary part of the learning process.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Grammar is best taught through work<br>which focuses on message.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Participating in real-life tasks with language<br>is the best way for students to develop their<br>grammatical knowledge. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Students learn grammar more successfully<br>if it is presented in a meaningful context.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

16. Teachers should only correct student errors of form which interfere with communication. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Comparison and contrast of individual structures is helpful for students learning grammar. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Form-focused correction helps students to improve their grammatical performance. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Grammar is best taught through a focus on individual structures. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Explicit discussion of grammar rules is helpful for students. 1 2 3 4 5

**Section 2: Students and teachers difficulty with grammar.**

1. For my students it is not easy to make use of their grammatical knowledge in natural communications. 1 2 3 4 5
2. My students are motivated by problem solving techniques. 1 2 3 4 5
3. My students expect to receive only explicit instruction. 1 2 3 4 5

4. My students expect to learn grammar in brief short sentences. 1 2 3 4 5
  
5. My students prefer to make form meaning associations between a grammatical form and its meaning. 1 2 3 4 5
  
6. My students find it difficult to handle grammar presented in a an authentic context. 1 2 3 4 5
  
7. My students find grammatical points presented in authentic text difficult to deal with due to variety of structures presented. 1 2 3 4 5
  
8. My students find authentic texts difficult since they are culture bound. 1 2 3 4 5
  
9. My students find authentic text difficult because of its genre. 1 2 3 4 5
  
10. Only explicit instruction can help my students to find form-function relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
  
11. For teachers authentic texts are time consuming. 1 2 3 4 5

12. Teachers have little experience using authentic texts. 1 2 3 4 5
13. A lack of explicit grammar teaching leaves my students insecure. 1 2 3 4 5
14. My students find grammatical terminology useful. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Teachers find it difficult to correct students errors of grammar within a written communicative context. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Teachers find it difficult to correct students errors of grammar within a spoken communicative context. 1 2 3 4 5
17. My students find it difficult to improve the accuracy of the grammatical language within a totally communicative writing activity. 1 2 3 4 5
18. My students find it difficult to improve the accuracy of their grammatical language within a totally communicative speaking activity. 1 2 3 4 5
19. Grammatical terminologies are clues for my students to learn grammar. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Problem-solving techniques are not very useful for my students to learn grammar. 1 2 3 4 5

## **APPENDIX B**

### **The main 11 subscales**

**The role of grammar in language:** 1.1

**Explicit grammar teaching:** 1.20, 2.3, 2.13

**The importance of instruction:** 1.2, 1.3, 1.8, 1.10, 1.13, 1.19, 2.10

**The role of declarative knowledge:** 2.1

**Consciousness in the learning of grammar:** 1.4, 1.6, 1.9

**Comparison and contrast of structures:** 1.17

**The use of grammatical terminology:** 2.14, 2.19

**Problem-solving activities:** 2.2, 2.5, 2.20

**Correction of errors:** 1.16, 1.18, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18

**Presentation of grammar through authentic texts:** 1.15, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9,  
2.11, 2.12

**The role of practice:** 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, 1.12, 1.14