FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN

MAGÍSTER EN LA ENSEÑANZA DEL INGLÉS COMO LENGUA

EXTRANJERA

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of

Arts in TESOL

CLIL TEACHERS' BELIEF SYSTEMS REGARDING GRAMMAR TEACHING

AND THEIR TEACHING PRACTICES IN AN ENGLISH FULL IMMERSION

PRIVATE SCHOOL IN CHILE: A QUALITATIVE STUDY.

CATHERINNE GUILOFF SCHNEIDER

Supervisor: Dr. Mauricio Veliz-Campos

Santiago, Chile

2021

Acknowledgments

Abstract

Given the geopolitical status that English enjoys globally, many schools have given this language a major role in the curriculum. Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) appears as a solution for many schools in Chile in the teaching of English as a foreign language. The main aim of this multiple case study was to explore CLIL teachers' beliefs systems regarding grammar teaching, together with any possible reported inconsistencies emerging from the analysis of their beliefs and their teaching practices, and the possible elements responsible for any discrepancies. In this qualitative study, the data were gathered using individual face-to face interviews, and a focus group interview. The findings of this study suggest that most CLIL teachers believe in the communicative approach when teaching grammar, yet some reported that they teach it in a more explicit way. Also, it became apparent that most were not aware of the role of their prior experience as language learners in their current teaching practices, and that time constraint when planning posed a difficulty for greater consistency between their beliefs and practices. It was found that the results from CLIL teachers mirror those yielded in studies where licensed English language teachers' cognitions have been explored.

Resumen

Dado el estatus geopolítico mundial que tiene el idioma Inglés, muchos colegios en Chile le han asignado un rol importante en el currículum. La metodología CLIL ha surgido en respuesta a la necesidad de enseñar Inglés como lengua extranjera. El objetivo principal de este estudio de casos múltiple es explorar el sistema de creencias que sostienen los profesores de Educación General Básica que enseñan metodología CLIL respecto a la gramática, junto con posibles reportes sobre inconsistencias entre sus creencias y sus prácticas, así como las causas potenciales de estas posibles inconsistencias. En este estudio cualitativo los datos fueron reunidos a través de entrevistas individuales cara a cara y un focus group. Los hallazgos encontrados sugieren que los profesores CLIL creen que la gramática en Inglés debe enseñarse desde una perspectiva comunicativa, sin embargo, reportan enseñarla desde una perspectiva descontextualizada. Por otro lado, se encontró que la mayoría manifestó no haber tenido conciencia respecto del rol de su experiencia previa como aprendices del idioma Inglés en su práctica docente, así como la falta de tiempo para planificar representaría una dificultad para que su práctica docente sea consistente con sus creencias. Se encontró que los resultados de los profesores CLIL se reflejan en los hallazgos de estudios exploratorios respecto del sistema de creencias de profesores licenciados de Inglés.

Palabras clave: CLIL, Creencias de la enseñanza, Gramática.

Table of contents

1.Introduction

Every human being holds beliefs. Those beliefs influence every aspect of life, namely religion, politics, gender, and any ideas and experiences a person has had could shape behavior. According to Egan (1986) a belief "is introduced as the cognitive act or state in which a proposition is taken to be true" (p. 315). This feeling of certainty cannot be explained; however, attitudes and behaviors are triggered by conscious or subconscious beliefs people hold. The construction of self-concept is based on these assumed truths; hence, understanding them provides an opportunity to understand human behavior. In this regard, Chamorro, Alzás and Villares (2019) suggest that beliefs are in all realms of decision-making. They are resistant to change and are based on previous experiences, perceptions, personal and social interpretations of reality. Therefore, behavior should be understood as being underpinned by the individual's belief system.

Teachers hold beliefs too. These beliefs are part of teacher cognition studies that have been conducted more systematically over the last 20 or 30 years. Indeed, Kagan (1990) defines teacher cognition as "pre- or in-service teachers' self-reflections; beliefs and knowledge about teaching, students, and content; and awareness of problem-solving strategies endemic to classroom teaching" (p.421). Additionally, Borg (2003) posits that teacher cognition is "the unobservable cognitive dimension of teaching-what teachers know, believe and think" (p.81). Thus, according to Borg (2003), teachers' practice is underpinned by a good deal of thinking, prior experiences and knowledge, images, metaphors, attitudes, assumptions, conceptions, and perspectives. Furthermore, Raths (2001) suggests that the time teachers spend in classrooms as learners shapes their teaching beliefs as a result. He also posits that studying teacher cognitions

might allow the understanding of their practice and professional decisions in the future. All of these elements are non-observable and influence teaching. Consequently, the old idea of understanding teaching practice only as a product of tertiary education does not suffice when attempting to account for teachers' practices. Language teachers' subconscious beliefs occasionally differ from high standard practices (Chamorro, Alzás, & Villares 2019). The influence of teachers' beliefs on teachers' practices is not only observed at the beginning of teacher education, but also later on in their professional life. As an example, language teachers may report that they strongly advocate the use of a Communicative Learning Teaching (CLT) approach, while their practice might be more Grammar-Translation Method oriented. Those teachers reflect an inconsistency between their language teaching beliefs system and their actual practice, and consequently, their teaching could affect students' learnings due to a decontextualized instructional decision that is strongly influenced by their beliefs. This inconsistency between the teaching practice and the teaching beliefs system is particularly relevant in the case of the teaching of grammar, wherein language teachers are likely to reproduce the ways their own teachers taught them. Furthermore, if they have a repertoire of grammar experiences, they might not be able to understand that certain approaches are not effective in some contexts (Katz & Watzinger- Tharp, 2008). As grammar is considered a relevant part in teaching and studying English, then relating it to L2 teaching practices is necessary. Pradeep (2013) concludes in his research that there is a positive correlation between speaking English correctly and grammar proficiency.

Through the last century, grammar teaching has been extensively researched. Since the 1950's, grammar has been a controversial topic of discussion among SLA scholars, where some

were focused on structure, while others in use. Meanwhile the focus on structure is sentence

analysis into their constituent parts; the focus on language in use is based on real linguistic

situations (spoken or written), and the discussion of several linguistic features (Crystal, 1998).

Nowadays, the Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT) is claimed as the main

methodology of many EFL teachers (Richards, 2006). Richards (2006) suggests that CLT aims to

teach communicative competence hand in hand with grammatical competence, through "the

ability to produce sentences in a language" (p.3). He affirms that grammatical knowledge is an

important dimension in the learning of the L2, but it should include the knowing of how to use

the language and its different purposes and functions; language variations according to setting

and participants; the production and understanding of different types of texts; and the

maintenance of communication despite any individual's language limitations. Thus, CLT differs

from a traditional grammar approach which focuses only on the analysis of isolated sentences.

However, many teachers who claim to identify with CLT, as was previously suggested by

Richards (2006), have a more traditional grammar approach to teaching practice. According to

Martinez (2015) "most current research studies sustain that there seems to exist some overall

consensus on the effectiveness of grammar instruction, which is viewed as beneficial, and even

necessary for L2 learners in communicative L2 classrooms" (p.411). In conclusion, many SLA

scholars point to recognize grammar as an important part of the L2 acquisition, but not all agree

on how it should be taught. Identifying how EFL teachers teach grammar, becomes relevant to

understand how learners learn the L2. Ellis (2002) posits that research based on what teachers

believe and do regarding teaching grammar, is reported to be inadequate especially at the primary

education level in an EFL context.

Most research relates to English in-service teachers, who are not the only professionals that currently teach English as EFL. In Chile, according to Herrada, Rojas and Zapata (2012), almost the half of 3079 surveyed teachers by MINEDUC (2012) (which represents 80% of the total number of EFL teachers in the public system) work as EFL teachers in between grades 5 and 8, but do not hold any English specializations. In the private system, there are, for instance, teachers of other content areas who volunteer to teach their subject matter in English or are made to teach in English as well. Thus, teachers who engage in English language teaching may be certificated English teachers or CLIL teachers (Content Language Integrated Learning teachers), wherein the latter mostly work in full ever-growing immersion and bilingual school programs, where there is a focus on integrating contents in a meaningful way into a language learning classroom environment (Strakova, 2020). CLIL programs in primary education comprise teachers from diverse content areas which range from English, to Math or Social Studies. The English teachers' programs do not include other subject areas from the Chilean curiculum than English, which means that their expertise is in the English field. On the other hand, Primary teachers' programs include core subjects such as Maths, Science, Social Studies and in some universities they include other subjects such as Music and Arts. Primary teachers have an expertise area in these fields, but not in English. It was imposible to find the number of primary teachers that that do not hold any English specialization, that are currently working as English teachers in the private system. However, if 40% (as Mineduc suggested in 2012) of the teachers that are currently working in the public system are primary teachers without English specializations, then, there is a need of research to uncover that number. In that sense, if the number of public and private Primary teachers teaching English appear to be similar, then must be concluded that it is

difficult to find English teachers who perform competently in the teaching of the language and the subject matter or primary CLIL teachers that teach English as a foreign language competently if they do not hold any English formal studies. Pladeval-Ballester (2015) suggests that CLIL has been understudied and calls for further research due to the increasing number of primary and secondary schools that are adopting this language teaching approach.

As can be observed, teachers' beliefs play a role in English language teaching as they influence teachers' practice, not only in the early stages of the professional practice, but later on too (Borg, 2001). Today we bear witness to an ever-increasing use of CLIL methodologies, where one of the most pressing challenges is maintaining a balance between language learning and content learning; within language, the teaching and learning of grammar stands out as a most controversial topic. As a result, in this study my intentions were to explore CLIL teachers' grammar beliefs, their reported practice and the potential reasons for the likely inconsistencies between their grammar beliefs and reported teaching practices.

1.1 Background to the Problem

According to MINEDUC (2013) English has become a relevant topic in Chile. It has impacted the number of English teachers needed to work in public, subsidized, and private educational systems. Due to the increase number of English teachers needed to work in the Chilean educational system, 44 institutions offer English language teacher education programs. 20% of English teachers in the Chilean educational system are not licensed English teachers (MINEDUC 2013). Currently, the way Chile evaluates the acquisition of the L2 in schools is through a standardized test called SIMCE. This test has consistently reported poor results since 2012. Those results correspond to secondary education. There is no information regarding

elementary students before 8th grade. Primary schools in Chile are developing MINEDUC and their own EFL programs to teach English on those levels, thus having research based on our context about what students know, how they learn, how teachers teach and what beliefs they hold, could impact positively students' learning. One of the issues this research points to uncover, is elementary CLIL teachers beliefs toward grammar. However, there is a lack of studies that focus on this educational level.Uysal and Bardakci (2014) reinforce this issue by pointing out that there is a "scarcity of research on teacher beliefs and practices of grammar teaching, particularly at elementary-level" (p.5) let alone in establishments where a CLIL methodology has been adopted where grammar is embedded in the teaching of content. On the other hand, grammar is seen as an important component in the acquisition of any language. Borg and Burns (2008) suggest that grammar is particularly relevant when learning another language, because it aims to produce L2 learners that can communicate and understand others better. Thus, like in L1, L2 communication would be unlikely to happen. As mentioned before, over the last decade, considerable progress has been made in the research field of teaching beliefs. More specifically, regarding grammar teaching beliefs, according to Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) "teaching grammar exclusively at the sentence level with decontextualized and unrelated sentences, which has been the traditional way to teach grammar, is not likely to produce any real learning" (Cited in Siskin, 2007, p. 61). Many teachers continue to demonstrate such teaching practices. Recent studies have revealed inconsistencies between teacher's grammar beliefs and their practices. Moini (2008) posits that teachers may affect their grammar practice, due to cognitive and contextual factors. These personal and institutional factors can influence their beliefs and prevent them from doing what they think is best for the class. Furthermore, "most of a teacher's attitudes

and expectations about their teaching come from their own experience as a student" (Peña & Porto, 2008). Thus, despite an extensive undergraduate or post- graduate grammar methodologies education, teachers might have a similar practice to the one they were exposed to when they were learning EFL.

Even though there is extensive research on grammar beliefs, most of these studies are focused on English teachers and not on CLIL teachers that account for an increasingly larger portion of those currently teaching in Chilean schools at the elementary level. Finally, taking into account these three emergent issues: The large percentage of CLIL elementary teachers working in the educational system; the fact that a large number of them do not hold an English certification; and lastly, considering grammar as a relevant skill when communicating and understanding the L2; there is need to research what grammar beliefs CLIL teachers hold in order to understand their teaching practices and their future impact on L2 learnings. As a consequence, "It is of great importance to identify those beliefs, as they are at the very basis of the individual teaching methodology" (Pena & Porto, 2008, p.152) and determine the possible gaps between such beliefs and teachers' reported practices.

1.2 Statement of the problem

The present study aims to explore CLIL teachers' grammar beliefs, due to the large percentage working in the Chilean primary education system, and the lack of teaching English certifications. This information could be relevant in order to promote self-reflection upon CLIL teachers' practice, their understanding of the beliefs they hold, and what they think about their own practice. Furthermore, CLIL teachers might observe aspects related to the potential discrepancies between their grammar beliefs and reported teaching practices that affect their

teaching. Consequently, exploring these relevant issues could help them realize what changes are needed to improve their grammar teaching. Moreover, the information from this study could also have implications for further research which is shorter in this study field.

1.3 Aim, Scope and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to explore CLIL Teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning grammar, as well as explore possible inconsistencies between those beliefs and their reported teaching practices. It also aims at uncovering the aspects that relate to the possible discrepancies between CLIL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and their reported teaching practices. In order to research these issues, three questions arise for this study,

1.What beliefs do CLIL teachers hold about teaching and learning grammar at primary school level from a private school in Santiago?

2.What are the potential inconsistencies between CLIL teacher's beliefs about teaching and learning grammar, and their reported teaching practices emerging from the analysis of CLIL teachers belief systems and their reported teaching practice? And

3.What are the aspects that relate to the possible discrepancies between CLIL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and their reported teaching practices?

It is beyond the scope of this study to propose grammar methodologies or draw comparisons between certified English teachers and elementary CLIL teachers' practice. However, it does intend to explore in one-on-one interview sessions, and inform how this significant percentage of teachers perceive grammar and report their possible inconsistencies. Thus, these teachers, heads of department, school managers, and future researchers might

understand deeper how their grammar beliefs and reported inconsistencies could impact L2 learning.

1.4 Organization of the study.

The thesis is organized into five chapters. At the beginning, are included acknowledgements, table of contents, and the abstract either in English or Spanish. Then, chapter 1 presents an introduction which includes information regarding beliefs in general, teaching beliefs, grammar, Chilean context regarding the number of teachers teaching English, and Content Learning Integrated Language (CLIL). After that, the background to the problem will provide a more specific topic's situation in the broad area of research but set side by side to the local context. Another significant part of this chapter is the statement of the problem, who aims to identify the key point of concern of this thesis and its future implications. Finally, the aim, scope and research questions are proposed. Chapter 2 presents the literature review regarding beliefs, grammar teaching beliefs and CLIL teachers' grammar beliefs. Chapter 3 includes the methodology, which is qualitative in order to explore in depth CLIL grammar teaching beliefs and their reported grammar teaching methodologies in a private school in Santiago. Then, chapter 4 informs research results and discussion regarding one-on-one interviews with 6 participants subjects. Finally, conclusions will be drawn in chapter 5 in addition to further implications in future research.

1.5 Summary.

There is a shortage of English teachers (Mineduc, 2012); consequently, primary teachers are teaching English even if they do not hold English specializations. Since many SLA scholars suggest that grammar has an important role in the teaching of English as a foreign language, then,

what beliefs elementary CLIL teachers hold toward grammar, knowing if those beliefs and their

reported teaching practice is coherent, and uncovering the aspects that might be related to these

possible inconsistencies become relevant to understand how CLIL elementary teachers are

teaching and the methodologies they report to use in their classrooms.

1.6 Key terms

In order to better understanding, a list that includes key terms and their definitions is

provided in this section to use for the readers convenience.

- Beliefs: A group of ideas which are shaped in persons by their experiences and the

  overlapping of notions during the learning processes. Beliefs are different as we as

  individuals are different. (Khader, 2012)

- Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Is an approach that has coomunicative

  competence as the goal of language teaching that develops procedures of the four skills

  (listening, speaking, writing and reading) that acknowledge the interdependence of

  language and communication. (Richards, 2006)

- Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL): Is a language teaching approach that

  integrates content and language as a generic term of programs that use a second language

  as a medium for instruction. (Custodio-Espinar, 2020).

- Core beliefs: Are more important for an individual. They are connected to most other

  beliefs. Core beliefs are generally difficult to modify because of their strong convictions'

  system. (Brownlee, Boulton-Lewis & Purdie, 2002)

- Direct-Method: The L2 is taught exclusively in the target language, focusing on everyday vocabulary and sentences, where grammar is taught inductively through demonstration using objects, and pictures, whereas abstract vocabulary through association of ideas. The emphasis of this method is on grammar and pronunciation. Brown (2001).

- Focus on form: Meaning-focused interaction in which there is brief, and sometimes spontaneous, attention to linguistic forms. Loewen (2018).

- Focus on forms: Involves a primary emphasis on linguistic structures, often presented as discrete grammar rules or other metalinguistic information. Loewen (2018).

- Grammar-Translation method: Is a way of explaining meaning of words and phrases, and the medium of instruction is generally students' mother tongue. Thus, natives' language is commonly used to explain and discuss the use of grammatical structures of the L2. Grammar rules are learned deductively by rote learning. Then, students practice through drilling and translating sentences to and from the target language. Pronunciation and any communicative aspect of the language are left aside from the lesson. Brown (2001).

- Peripheral beliefs: Peripheral beliefs are more easily reflected upon and changed. (Brownlee, Boulton-Lewis & Purdie, 2002)

- Structural-Approach: According to Genc (2018), this approach "emphasizes the importance of mastering the structures of the target language" (p.1). He suggests that language teaching needs a systematic selection of sentence patterns; language is treated as a system which contains structured elements related to each other to code meaning. Phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types are taught, while vocabulary takes a secondary role.

- Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT): Emerges as the way of providing learners with the necessary input to trigger the communicative need, which implies interaction using the L2, a reaction to a communication problem, an implicit and sometimes explicit focus on grammar rules in response to a problem that arises in a communicative or linguistic exchange; and the induction of "noticing" by drawing learners' attention to target linguistic forms (Ellis, 2016)

2. Literature review

The most relevant constructs and related research are presented in this section of the study, which underpin the research topic and the research questions.

The relevance of the topic at hand arises partly from the geopolitical status that English enjoys globally. Indeed, Crystal (2012), estimated that in 2003 there were about 600 and 700 hundred million English as foreign language speakers. Since then, the number has surely and steadily rocketed. Llurda (2004) claims that "language researchers and educators are increasingly embracing the fact that English is spoken by more people as an L2 than as a mother tongue" (p.314) This author remarks the fact that English is becoming a lingua franca. Examples in several fields can be observed, as is the case of the film industry, scholarly magazines and journals, conferences in different fields, which are all written or produced in English. Similarly, several countries have incorporated English into their education programs as early as since primary school or early childhood education. Therefore, considering teaching strategies and methodologies that support L2 learning, in addition to profiling the individuals who currently teach English in a certain context, becomes a most relevant issue given the potential effect on L2 learners and L2 learning.

2.1 Grammar and grammar teaching

A considerable body of research on the topic of grammar and grammar teaching has been accumulated and its role in producing effective language users. In this section, a thumbnail historical overview of grammar teaching is provided. As mentioned in the first section of this study, grammar has been identified as pivotal in learning an L2. Maqsood et al. (2020) suggest

that "the role of grammar in any language is evident. Every person communicating using a

language, becomes aware of the grammar of the language" (p.4).

Chomsky (1985) posed that grammar is understood as a set of sentences, each finite in

length and constructed out of a finite set of elements. His understanding of grammar is limited to

a set of sentences that could be constructed in a particular language. His focus is on sentence

formation, but he highlighted meaning as an important component of grammar too. Dumas

(2002) argues that Chomsky's views are anti-empirical and non-experimental. As a result,

connectionism theories related to cognitivism appeared. Ur (1988) suggests that when teaching

grammatical structures, students must be learning a "large number of different though related bits

of knowledge and skills which are recognition, identification, and production of the target

structure" (p.6). In contrast with Chomsky's definition, Ur recognized some skills that are needed

when using the L2 and the relations between these bits of knowledge and the language skills he

posed. Connectionism suggests that learning is produced by neural networks. The more learning

an individual develops, the more extensive his neural networks are. Consequently, connectionists

see grammar as a construction within neurons and their networks and suggests that humans view

grammar as images (Dumas, 2002). In the early 90s, authors started to differentiate more

traditional classrooms from more constructivist practices. Weaver (1996) suggests that a more

traditional approach tends to ask learners to drill and exercise grammar, using a chalkboard,

textbooks, and exercise sheets, wherein grammatical structures are not seen holistically, and

learners are prompted to think in fragments. In contrast, constructivism promotes reflection using

real experiences. Teachers become facilitators instead of trainers who want their students to

repeat their behavior (Dumas, 2002). This view incorporates scaffolding into grammar learning

and emphasizes the relationship between learning and real-life experiences making learning

meaningful for students. Also, during the 1990s, errors come up again as a relevant issue when

teaching. Weaver (1996) points out that behaviorists consider students' errors as not interesting

for teachers, but for linguists they are a matter of study. Constructivists consider errors as part of

the learning process, which help students grow and build new concepts and neural relations. All

these debates have led scholars in the last 20 years to discuss the relevance of grammar in EFL

teaching. Ellis (2002) asserted that grammar learning occurs implicitly and explicitly. Thus,

teachers can manipulate input and use it as a way to produce new learnings, making students

aware of what they are learning. Implicit learning is supported by some linguists' and researchers

such as Schwartz (1993), who posits that similar processes underlie L1 and L2 acquisition. He

claims that if L1 learners do not require formal instruction to learn languages, neither should L2

learners. This position expresses that neither teaching grammar nor correcting errors is needed for

the L2 acquisition. In contrast, Schmidt (2001) suggests that grammar must be taught explicitly,

since he claims that learners need to notice different elements of the language to understand the

development of interlanguages over time, its variations, negotiation for meaning, among other

elements. In addition to Schmidt's position, Richards (2006) posited that grammar is a way to

develop communicative competence through knowing how to use language for different purposes

and functions. Consequently, he suggests that grammar is needed to use the language according

to the setting and participants, and to know how to produce and understand different types of

texts. He emphasizes the fact that grammar is needed to maintain communication despite having

limitations regarding the language. This view of grammar places greater emphasis on

communicative skills, not on rules for sentence formation. By the same token, De Keyser (1998)

is one of the proponents of grammar to be seen as an ability. For him, grammar can be taught

explicitly, and it is possible to learn it through the exposure of appropriate input, correction of

errors, and feedback that will help students to enhance their communication skills in the L2.

Lightbown and Spada (2017) suggest that readiness is a matter of relevance when teaching

grammar explicitly. For them, teachability hypothesis predicts that instruction that targets

learner's next developmental stage will be more effective than instruction which targets a stage

that is further beyond students' current developmental level.

   All in all, grammar teaching can be summarized in two camps, namely (i) Focus on form and

focus on forms. Loewen (2018) defines focus on form as "meaning-focused interaction in which

there is brief, and sometimes spontaneous, attention to linguistic forms. In contrast, focus on

forms involves a primary emphasis on linguistic structures, often presented as discrete grammar

rules or other metalinguistic information" (p.1). Nevertheless, Larsen-Freeman (2014) proposes a

three-dimensional grammar framework which not only includes focus on form and forms, but

also pragmatics. For her, social context, linguistic discourse context, and presuppositions about

context are as important as semantics and structure. These three dimensions are interconnected,

and they are not hierarchically arranged. Thus, pragmatics is, for Larsen-Freeman, also part of

grammar knowledge and use.

2.1.1 Grammar teaching methods

      In this section of the literature, various grammar teaching methods are surveyed as they

are predicated on different sets of beliefs. On the one hand, there are those methodologies that

embrace more forms-focus, like the Direct-Method, Grammar-Translation method, and

Structural-Approach, which advocate the teaching of grammar explicitly. Brown (2001) suggests

that according to the Direct-Method the L2 is taught exclusively in the target language, focusing on everyday vocabulary and sentences, where grammar is taught inductively through demonstration using objects, and pictures, whereas abstract vocabulary through association of ideas. The emphasis of this method is on grammar and pronunciation. The Grammar-Translation method is a way of explaining meaning of words and phrases, and the medium of instruction is generally students' mother tongue. Thus, natives' language is commonly used to explain and discuss the use of grammatical structures of the L2. Grammar rules are learned deductively by rote learning. Then, students practice through drilling and translating sentences to and from the target language. Most of the attention in a lessons is paid to the form of the translated sentences rather than to their content. This method ran into controversy on account of the disadvantages (and advantages) in its application. The association between this method and dead languages have discouraged teachers from using it since they consider it out-of-date. The use of the native language during lessons have been pointed out as another controversial issue since some lack of listening and speaking practice. Pronunciation and any communicative aspect of the language are left aside from the lesson. Furthermore, Kaharuddin (2018) suggests that Grammar- Translation method "is only good at teaching language rules and will never be good at teaching language skills such as speaking and listening" (p.235). However, it is important to mention that this method is also seen as useful when learning a language since millions of people have learned successfully foreign languages using it. That is the case of some countries, such as the former Soviet Union (Bowen 2013). It is also claimed by Kaharuddin (2018) that teachers tend to think that is easier and faster to teach grammar using this method and it does not require too specialized skills from them.

The other method to teach grammar focused on forms is the Structural-Approach. According to Genc (2018), this approach "emphasizes the importance of mastering the structures of the target language" (p.1). He suggests that language teaching needs a systematic selection of sentence patterns; language is treated as a system which contains structured elements related to each other to code meaning. Phonemes, morphemes, words, structures, and sentence types are taught, while vocabulary takes a secondary role. It was common during the 50s in the United States and was used to teach different foreign languages to Americans. Nevertheless, this approach had a great impact on teaching English to speakers of other languages in the USA (Genc, 2018). The major source of information for linguistic descriptions to determine the structures for instruction, are English native speakers. Ellis (1993) points out that this structural syllabus "is probably still the most common in language teaching" (p. 91). Thus, learners who are not developmentally ready to learn some structural properties could benefit from the structural syllabus, since it facilitates students' awareness of specific features of the L2 (Genc, 2018). Other SLA scholars like Mareva and Nyota (2012), are against the Structural-Approach and posit that students with high aptitude and intelligence do not need sequenced materials regarding the linguistic difficulty of grammatical forms. They found that L2 learners tend to learn more effectively through a situational approach and communicative language teaching methodologies.

Methodologies related to form-focus appeared to teach grammar with a meaning–focused orientation. Ellis (2001), suggests that while learning grammar through form focus methodologies, students view themselves as language users and language is viewed as a tool for communication. This communication focus is what scholars use to differentiate focus on form from focus on forms. Thus, Laufer (2006) posits that "Focus on form attends to lexical items

(single words and multi-word units) within a communicative task environment, since these

lexical items are necessary for the completion of a communicative or an authentic language task".

(p.150). Since the nature of focus on form is a communicative context, tasks are needed to

develop learners' attention to meaning and form. Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

emerges as the way of providing learners with the necessary input to trigger the communicative

need, which implies interaction using the L2, a reaction to a communication problem, an implicit

and sometimes explicit focus on grammar rules in response to a problem that arises in a

communicative or linguistic exchange; and the induction of "noticing" by drawing learners'

attention to target linguistic forms (Ellis, 2016). The current view about focus on form is that of

"a set of techniques deployed in a communicative context by the teacher and/or the learners to

draw attention implicitly or explicitly and often briefly to linguistic forms that are problematic for

the learners". In this regard, Borg (2012) posits that English teachers often desire to transform the

way grammar is conceptualized and handled by them through educational reforms. The need to

introduce communicative practices or task-based practices centrally implied in all of those

reforms is a change in the way grammar is viewed.

2.2 Teaching cognitions

Teacher cognitions have been researched in the last 20 years. Li (2013) surveys in his

study how well documented research is regarding teachers' beliefs and effective language

teaching practice. He emphasizes in his findings that the relationship between teachers' beliefs

and practice is complex, highlighting the influence of both macro- and micro-contexts in their

teaching practice decisions. To understand teachers' cognitions, first, beliefs must be

operationalized. Beliefs are understood as "mental representations of the ways our brains expect

things in our environment to behave, and how things should be related to each other—the patterns our brain expects the world to conform to". (Lewis, 2018). They also can be defined as a group of ideas which are shaped in persons by their experiences and the overlapping of notions during the learning processes (Khader, 2012). In other words, teaching beliefs are experiences, notions, and mental representations about teaching. They are different as we as individuals are different. The previous definitions express the complexity of beliefs, since they involve not only cognitive processes, but life experiences that vary from individual to individual. To sum up, as Toprak (2019) suggests "Teacher cognitions can be defined as an intricate web of knowledge, beliefs, and values which may exert a drastic impact on teachers' thinking and behaviors" (p.205). Teachers make pedagogical decisions when planning, while teaching, and after teaching. Borg (2003) states that "teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs" (p. 81). Thus, teaching cognitions are relevant because depending on how deeply they are rooted, teachers are going to be influenced by them or not when making pedagogical decisions. Beliefs affect educators when adopting teaching strategies coping with teaching challenges, shaping the learning environment, students' motivation, and their language ability (Pourhosein & Banou, 2017). Consequently, teaching beliefs become a significant matter to discuss due to their positive or negative impact on students' learning and the L2 learning environment. As stated previously, beliefs are relevant, and identifying how they are could enhance chances of understanding teachers' practices. Kumaravadivelu (2011) distinguishes between core and peripheral beliefs. Core beliefs are more important for an individual; they are connected to most other beliefs, whereas peripheral beliefs about learning

and teaching, are derived from these core beliefs. Peripheral beliefs are more easily reflected

upon and changed, whereas core beliefs are generally difficult to modify because of their strong

convictions' system (Brownlee, Boulton-Lewis & Purdie, 2002). These authors also postulate

that beliefs could be epistemological and categorized into different positions: dualism,

multiplism, relativism, and commitment. According to Brownlee (2004), dualism is a binary view

about the nature of knowledge. Individuals who hold dualistic views believe in absolute truths

that are related to right or wrong positions. These absolute truths could be transmitted from

authorities or experts. In the case of multiplism, individuals conceive knowledge in multiple

ways. For them, there are some things that cannot be known with absolute certainty, and

knowledge comprised both, personal opinions and ultimate truths. They rely less on authorities

for absolute truths, and personal opinions, but truths are still considered to be right or wrong. On

the other hand, relativism, constitutes a major shift in epistemological thinking since individuals

strongly believe that knowledge is a personal and active construction. For them, absolute truths

can no longer exist since truth is relative to each individual's personal interpretation. The last

position, commitment, places more value on particular beliefs, becoming more flexible. Beliefs

can range from naïve, to dualistic in the existence of absolute truths to sophisticated, or

relativistic beliefs where knowledge is tentative, personal, and relative to various contexts. Thus,

an individual can hold different beliefs and in different ranges according to the position they

hold, and they could be contradictory. Consequently, beliefs can be understood according to their

degree of conviction, and whether they are non-consensual (Borg, 2008). Moreover, Borg posits

that beliefs are connected to other beliefs, and sometimes they contradict one another. This

contradiction indicates the complexity of beliefs' nature. In other words, while a teacher can

strongly believe in one type of grammar methodology, his teaching practice can be contradictory in consideration of other elements such as his experience as a learner. Abdi and Asadi (2015) posit that teachers' beliefs are affected by their own experiences as learners and are established when they go to university. However, being aware of English teachers' previous experiences is not sufficient in order to hope to understand the complexity between their beliefs and practice. "Teachers have a set of complex belief systems that are sometimes not reflected in their classroom practices for various complicated reasons, some directly related to the context of teaching" (Farrell & Lim, 2005). How school managers, other colleagues and parents interact with each other might affect not only teachers' beliefs, but their teaching practice too. Therefore, experience, context, types of beliefs, and contradictory beliefs in interaction with teaching beliefs, could shape any teacher practice.

2.2.1 Grammar teaching cognitions

In the grammar section, grammar was highlighted as fundamental when teaching English. It is proven that students increase their communication skills as they increasingly master more grammatical features. In this section, studies are examined in connection to what EFL teachers believe about grammar and how it relates to their grammar teaching practices. Research on language teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction has demonstrated that teachers' practices are practical, and experiential rather than being based on SLA theories (Borg, 2003). This may explain why teachers' practice may differ from their beliefs. If experience or practice is so deeply rooted in teachers' cognition, identifying these beliefs becomes relevant as they can help improve their grammar teaching, hence students' learnings. Much of grammar beliefs research focuses on secondary and tertiary education.

Most studies conclude that teachers claim to believe in communicative approaches when teaching grammar, but their teaching practices tend to be traditional and focus on forms. Hos and Kekec (2014) found that most EFL teachers that were surveyed in their study, believe that CLT is the best method to teach grammar. However, they found that those teachers did not make use of CLT in their classrooms. Furthermore, they used, instead, a Grammar-translation method. In a similar case, Sato and Oyanedel (2019) conducted a study in Chile, which includes English teachers from grades 5- 12. They concluded that most of those teachers have a favorable view of communicative methods. They also found that what these teachers "believed in terms of the way grammatical knowledge should be developed and taught, did not necessarily reflect how they thought they could teach grammar leading to cognitive dissonance" (p.119). Other studies show how teachers claim to believe in focus on form approaches, while they tend to think that teaching grammar explicitly is best for students. That is the case of Rahman and Rashid (2017), who concluded in their study regarding tertiary education teachers in Malaysia, that English educators thought that implicit grammar teaching is important, yet most of them prefer to teach grammar using explicit instruction because of institutional requirements and students' needs. One of the few studies that was found are based on what primary education teachers believe about grammar was conducted in Spain. Roothooft (2017) concluded that "all the teachers believe in following a communicative approach which focuses mainly on speaking and listening and in which the explicit teaching of grammar plays a minor role" (p.211). The author asserts that "Popular classroom activities with the teachers in the present study are in line with their beliefs in an active, communicative methodology" (p.219). In this case no inconsistencies were found between grammar teaching beliefs and grammar teaching methodologies. It is interesting how this study

is the only one that mentioned a non-conflicted position between teacher's beliefs toward grammar and their current teaching practice.

Lastly, Alghanmi and Shukri (2016) conducted a study in Saudi tertiary education. They concluded that "Most teachers believe in the effectiveness of teaching grammar implicitly rather than explicitly, yet all the participants adopt explicit grammar teaching in their classrooms" (p.84). What is interesting from this study, is that the authors found some elements that have influence on teachers' beliefs. They suggest that findings also revealed that "students' proficiency level, attitudes, needs, learning styles, classroom environment, and the teacher development process are six factors that influence the transformation of teachers' beliefs regarding grammar and grammar instruction into practice". Thus, weighing up these factors could allow us to identify which are influencing teachers' beliefs and their methodologies.

As shown earlier, there is a lack of research in Chile into this topic, and especially in the primary education level around the world. All the studies found, to the researcher's knowledge, included English teachers as the only source of research. Studies of CLIL teachers represent an under-researched reality regarding elementary grammar teaching beliefs (Martinez & Gutierrez, 2015). As the aim of the study is to explore what CLIL elementary teachers believe about grammar and their reported practices, one more subsection will be included in this Literature review regarding this issue.

2.3 The CLIL method

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an English language teaching approach that emerged in Europe in the 1990s as an innovative approach to integrate content and language (Custodio-Espinar, 2020). Martinez and Gutierrez (2015) refer to Content Learning

Integrated Language (CLIL) as and "umbrella term adopted by various European researchers and agencies as a generic term of programs that use a second language as a medium for instruction" (p.51). In other words, English is used as a medium of teaching and learning other school subjects like Math, Social Studies, and Science. It has grown over the last 20 years as an English teaching approach across European schools. According to Mehisto et. al (2008) "CLIL encompasses different forms of learning: language showers, CLIL camps, student exchanges, local and international projects, family stays, partial and/or total immersion programs, among others" (as cited in Martinez & Gutierrez, 2015, p.52). Most CLIL teachers are non- natives of the target language (TL), and often they are content experts or Elementary teachers rather than English language teachers. According to Martinez and Gutierrez (2015) "CLIL lessons are timetabled as content lessons while the TL is still taught as a subject in its own right. Typically, in CLIL less than 50% of the curriculum is taught in the TL" (p. 52). In Europe CLIL programs start in secondary education (Dalton-Puffer, 2011), whereas in Latin America it is the other way around. CLIL programs tend to start in pre-school and finish in 6th grade before entering the secondary education. Whether in Europe or Latin America, besides the content areas, English subject has specific hours of teaching in schools' curriculum. Research has been conducted regarding CLIL effectiveness. In that regard, Jiménez Catalán et al. (2006) analysed the acquisition of English by primary school children in CLIL and EFL programs and reported that the CLIL groups outperformed the EFL groups on two tasks designed to measure general competence. Furthermore, Ruiz de Zarobe (2010) compared the oral and written competence of CLIL and EFL students from secondary education and tertiary education. Results showed statistically significant differences in favor of CLIL. These results, present how CLIL could

benefit students by having a positive impact on their language acquisition, no matter the

educational level they are in. The few studies that have investigated the impact of CLIL on

specific linguistic features have revealed that in the areas of morphosyntax and

phonetics/phonology the benefits of CLIL are not so clear (Ruiz de Zarobe, 2010). However,

Lasagabaster (2008) showed that a CLIL group in the fourth year of secondary education

significantly outstripped a matching Non-CLIL group in grammar, listening, speaking, and

writing. Consequently, not all language areas are favorably affected by CLIL and more studies

are needed to reach more definite conclusions on specific language features, such as grammar.

In Latin America, the implementation of CLIL programs, specifically in the elite private

schools has increased significantly. According to Matear (2008), "the knowledge of English in

Latin America has reflected existing political and economic power structures. It has remained the

preserve of the elite with access to private schooling, and as such it demarcates and divides social

groups by reinforcing an unequal distribution of wealth, resources and knowledge" (p.131).

Pueblas and Perez (2012) suggest that a tradition in teaching English in Chile could be seen in the

number of schools created since the 1930s for British immigrants who wanted to pursue the same

type of education they had in their country of origin. The Association of British Schools in Chile'

(ABSCH) was founded in 1977, and since then, several schools throughout Chile are part of it.

Currently 21 schools are members of the association and a third of them are outside the

Metropolitan region, Santiago. It is important to keep in mind that those are not the only schools

that are currently having a CLIL approach in their curriculum. Other private schools are offering

CLIL programs from elementary school until 6th grade but are not part of these or other known

bilingual associations. Formal information regarding schools that are implementing CLIL

programs and that are not part of the ABSCH is difficult to come by. Likewise, there is scant information about grammar teaching and teachers' beliefs about grammar in Chile. Having that information will shed light on how to improve CLIL teachers' practices and hence, English learners' language learning.

2.4 Summary

In this chapter concepts such as beliefs, grammar teaching beliefs, and CLIL methodology were presented in order to explain better the research line. This theoretical underpinnings examined the necessary background to understand participants' beliefs toward grammar and their current way of working.

In the following chapter, methodology wil be explained, including the type of study, context, participants, data collection methods and procedure, and data analysis and interpretation.

3. Methodology

In this chapter the research methodology will be presented, together with the rationale behind it. Also, it features the data-gathering methods used to explore CLIL teachers' beliefs of grammar, their reported practices, and the potential aspects for their reported discrepancies between their beliefs and teaching practices. This section also provides information regarding the participants, data collection procedures, data analysis methods, and ethical considerations.

3.1 Methodology

The purpose of this study is to explore a handful of participants' (CLIL teachers) views, opinions, experiences and ideas regarding grammar teaching. A qualitative inquiry was chosen in order to understand deeply the subjects' belief systems. Dörnyei (2007) and Creswell (2012) posit that qualitative studies are useful to explore and understand a problem from the target phenomenon. A particular situation, in a particular context, with particular subjects are the core matter of study. In this respect, qualitative research typically involves data collection procedures that result in open-ended, non-numerical data analyzed primarily by non-statistical methods. Indeed, Creswell (2014) suggests that the researcher "is the primary instrument in data collection rather than some inanimate mechanism" (p. 330) and, as a result, qualitative studies intend to describe particular issues in specific contexts. Thus, they result in the development of descriptions and themes from the data "to convey multiple perspectives from participants and detailed descriptions of the setting or individuals" (p.328). This type of research attends to the individuals' nature and their diversity. The focus of the study is on beliefs, opinions, experiences and teachers' perceptions, and this nature reports a non-generalizable condition which leads some scholars to question the validity of qualitative studies. A qualitative paradigm is in essence

interpretative and constructivist, while a quantitative paradigm is positivist (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

3.1.1 Multiple Case study

Within qualitative methodologies, several specific methodologies can be observed. In particular, this research is a multiple case study since it studies multiple cases (more than one single case) to understand the similarities and differences among them (Creswell, 2013). Six participants were individually interviewed in-depth exploring their cognitions regarding grammar teaching and their own reported teaching practices. According to Baxter and Jack (2008) the evidence that is generated from a multiple case study is strong and reliable. Some of the disadvantages that multiple case studies offer are that they are expensive and time-consuming. However, Gustafsson (2017) suggests that while conducting multiple case studies, researchers can understand and describe "the context of the scene in question in such a way so the reader can understand the context and to produce theory" (p.11). Furthermore, the data can be analyzed within each situation and across different situations. Lastly, making comparisons between the cases and providing the relevant literature for further studies is one of the premises of multiple case studies. Dörnyei (2007) suggests that the understanding of "a not-yet-understood feature, which might explain not only to the researcher but to the research audience, the relevance of the case to our understanding of a wider domain" can be reached through this particular qualitative methodology. (p.153).

3.2 Context and participants

3.2.1 Context

  This study took place in a private school in Santiago, Chile. The school was created in 1937 as a bilingual school who offered a British type education. One of the school's goals is to teach English as a foreign language to allow students to speak it fluently and familiarize themselves with some cultures of English-speaking countries. Its curriculum combines the different requirements of a school that has a British background with local requirements as well. It has a set of principles that vary from universal values to the awareness and appreciation of other cultures. This school also states publicly a students' profile document which relates to 21st century skills, such as innovation, creativity, responsibility as a citizen, and critical thinking among others. It claims to stick to inquiry-based learning from pre-school to 4th grade, and project-based learning from 5th to 11th grade. The last year of school is devoted to preparing international and national examinations. The school offers education from playgroup level to year 12. It is important to highlight that from 1st to 6th grade all the school subjects are taught in English. Most of teachers that work in the primary school are CLIL teachers who teach all the subjects in English and spend most of the school day with the students. Content area teachers work with children in Physical Education, Music, and Arts.

3.2.2 Participants and sample

In this research there were six participants that work as CLIL teachers in a private school in Chile. The number of participants is consistent with Creswell (2013) suggestion for multiple case studies, which is in between four and six cases to have a good sample size. The sample was non-probabilistic and purposefully selected to help better understand the data to be used to answer the research questions. All six participants are female teachers that teach in the same private school in Santiago. All hold Elementary teaching degrees and have an intermediate, advanced or proficiency level of English. One has less than 1 year of teaching experience, while two have between 1- 3 years; two have between 4-10 years and one has more than 10 years working as a CLIL teacher. Table 1.2 presents the main biographical data about the sample.

Table 1.2
Biographical data of the sample

Years of teaching experience	Gender	Age	Number of participants
0	female	24	1
1-3	female	25-27	2
4-10	female	30	2
More than 10 years	female	45	1

For research purposes, participants' names were changed, to provide them with the confidenciality they needed to express their experiences, thoughts and beliefs freely. The pseudonims are: Mia, Clementina, Magdalena, Carolina, Sandra and Odalisca. Magdalena has five years of teaching experience, and the same time working at this school. Clementina has four years of teaching experience and she is working for the last three years in this school. Carolina has one year of experience and the same time in the school. Sandra has 3 years of experience and it is her first year working in this school, while Odalisca has no teaching experience and it is also,

her first year working in this institution. Finally, Mia has 20 years of experience in bilingual schools across Chile, but also teaching in a Pre-school in the United States. This is her first year in this school. All are part of Year 4, and work as CLIL teachers. They teach English, Science, Social Studies, Math and as Headteachers they teach a school orientation program too.

3.3 Data collection methods and procedure

To uncover and explore the issues that emerged the teachers' responses dealing with their cognitions about grammar, the instruments that were used to collect data in this research were individual face-to-face interviews and a focus group interview, which sought to further explore emergent topics from the interviews. Dörnyei (2007) suggests that the use of interview research with the transcribed recordings are helpful to explore issues such as the one at hand, which are later analyzed by qualitative content analysis (Creswell, 2014). After drawing conclusions from interviewees' responses, a second moment to explore deeply participants' responses was conducted: a focus group was set up to explore even more deeply some issues of interest that came up after the first analysis was conducted.

The first instrument used was an interview based on the adaptation made by Cota and Ruiz-Esparza (2013) of the "Language Learning Inventory" (BALLI) originally developed by Horwitz (1988). This instrument used to create the interview can be found in the appendix 1.1. The instrument includes an interview protocol with participants' names, age, educational level, language specializations and certifications, working experience, and levels taught. In regards to grammar beliefs, there were questions that aimed to explore the participants' beliefs regarding how grammar is learned; how it should be taught; how the participants learned grammar features; their perceptions of the importance of grammatical rules in language learning; their perceptions

of the use of the L1 in grammar explanations; the role of grammar in L2 learning; their beliefs about cooperative learning associated to grammar; and the participants' primary focus ranging from accuracy to intelligibility. The orientating questions can be found in Appendix 1.2

Before interviews were carried out, a letter of intent explaining the research objectives, and asking permission to conduct the study with 6 of the staff teachers was sent to the elementary school principal (see Appendix1.3). After, receiving a positive answer, participants signed a letter of consent in which they were informed about the objectives of the study and their rights as volunteers (see Appendix 1.4). The school was asked and informed in advance about the research and permission was granted too. The school will receive a copy of the thesis, after the correction process.

Interviews were carried out face-to-face and individually since a better atmosphere of trust between the interviewer and the interviewee can be created. Furthermore, individual interviews assure the reliability of the answers, because interviewees can respond focusing only on what they believe, while not being influenced by other participants' responses. It is worth noting that the nature of the interview is semi-structured since more questions were added when the researcher needed to go deeper into the answers or needed further clarification. As a consequence, the interviewer has the "control over the line of questioning" (Cohen et. al, 2007). To understand interviewees' responses better, some strategies while interviewing were conducted such as backchannel feedback, reinforcement feedback, and encouraging elaboration by mirroring (Creswell, 2013). Thus, the use of these strategies increased chances of understanding exactly what interviewees tried to say. Another way to assure participants' understanding of the instrument was the previous testing of questions. This testing was done by an expert in the field

of linguistics who revised the coherence between the interview questions and the research

questions. He also revised if there were some changes to make concerning clarity of the way

questions could be understood by interviewees. All the changes suggested were later made, and

the instrument was modified before using it with the research subjects. Every interview was

recorded with a mobile phone recording app and later transcribed selectively. In addition to the

recordings, there were written notes of the answers to have the needed information in case the

recording equipment fails. A focus group was conducted after transcribing and analyzing the

interviews. Dörnyei (2007) suggests that "this within-group interaction can yield high quality

data as it can create a synergistic environment that results in a deep and insightful discussion"

(p.144). Furthermore, Cohen et al. (2013) posit that having a focus group could allow the

researcher to "triangulate with more traditional forms of interviewing, questionnaire, observation,

etc." (p.396). Collecting information using different methods helps to validate answers, probe

contradictions and explore deeply research issues and matters of concern that might come up

after using the first method.

The individual interviews were conducted over a period of three weeks during October

and November 2020 and conducted face to face in a room of participants' school with no

distractors. Each interview lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour. A focus group was conducted

in November 2020 to explore more deeply into participants beliefs towards and experience with

grammar. The questions that were asked in the focus gorup aimed to explain what participants

meant when they answered individually that "they teach grammar in context". Secondly,

participants were asked if the way they were taught grammar influenced the way they currenly

teach. Finally, were asked if they are influenced by some prior pedagogical patterns from their

experience when teaching grammar. This focus group lasted about one hour, and it was recorded using a mobile that has a secure password only known by this researcher. It was completely transcribed using the same pseudonyms that were used in the interviews to protect participants identities and provide them the confidence they need to answer honestly and without any pressure.

3.4 Data analysis and interpretation

As detailed earlier, interviews and focus group data were recorded and then transcribed. The analysis of the transcriptions was conducted by grouping data into "small number of themes" (Creswell, 2013). On the other hand, Cohen et. al (2007) posits that "one of the enduring problems of qualitative data analysis is the reduction of copious amounts of written data to manageable and comprehensible proportions". Consequently, thematic analysis deals with content analysis, which attempts to classify the texts of the interviews' transcriptions and focus group transcriptions into smaller categories. These "categories are usually derived from theoretical constructs or areas of interest devised in advance of the analysis (pre-ordinate categorization)" (Cohen et al., 2007). The themes that arise in order to answer the research questions were the views of grammar methodologies that participants hold, their prior experience in regard grammar, the use of mother tongue while teaching grammar, grammar importance when learning English, inclusion of cooperative learning strategies, and the influence of different aspects while teaching when teaching grammar. Data was hand coded and sorted for relevant information that suited the research topic in order to classify properly these relevant information, codes were assigned to the various emergent themes.

Table 1.3
Interview codes

Theme	Code
Participants' grammar methodology vision	Grammar rules
	Sentence structure
	Context
Grammar prior experience	Grammar rules
	Sentence structure
	Context
Use of mother tongue	Use/no use of mother tongue
Cooperative learning strategies	Group work
Influence of other aspects while teaching grammar	Prior experience
	Professional development

3.5 Summary

This research is a qualitative research, specifically a multiple case study. It is focused on exploring six elementary CLIL teachers grammar beliefs systems, and uncover possible discrepancies (and the aspects that relate to these possible discrepancies) from their reported beliefs, and teaching practices from participants point of view. The information emerged from these teachers, in individual interviews and later on, in a focus group. All the information was analized and hand coded to sort it accordingly to the research topic.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results and discussion based upon the data gathered, namely digital transcription of participants' interviews and a focus group interview. The data was stored in a computer with a special password to protect and ensure participants' confidentiality. Manual coding was used in an attempt to identify different themes that will serve to answer the research questions. These codes can be seen in Table 1.3.

To better understand the results, pseudonyms were provided to protect participants' identities. Six CLIL teachers were interviewed: Mia, Carolina, Clementina, Sandra, Magdalena, and Odalisca. All of them work in the same school and their ages ranged from 25-45. Their teaching experience is varied too; it ranges from 1-20 years (see Table 1.2). None have specializations in the teaching of English as foreign language, and most hold English international certifications ranging from intermediate to proficiency levels. They were interviewed individually, and face-to face in a first phase of the study. Then, in a second phase they participated in a focus group. These two phases aimed to answer the research questions:

1.What beliefs do CLIL teachers hold about teaching and learning grammar at primary school level from a private school in Santiago?

2.What are the potential inconsistencies between CLIL teacher's beliefs about teaching and learning grammar, and their reported teaching practices emerging from the analysis of CLIL teachers belief systems and their reported teaching practice? And

3.What are the aspects that relate to the possible discrepancies between CLIL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and their reported teaching practices?

4.2 Results

Results are presented in this section according to each research question. As a consequence, participants' answers respond to evidence what they believe about teaching and learning grammar, what major inconsistencies between their grammar beliefs and their teaching practices they report, and what causal factors for discrepancies they acknowledge in their teaching practice.

4.2.1 What beliefs do CLIL teachers hold about teaching and learning grammar at primary school level from a private school in Santiago?

In regard to participants' responses about how grammar is best learned, Mia and Sandra expressed that grammar should be taught considering the four major language skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking. Carolina, Clementina, and Magdalena considered context, real situations and practice, relevant to the teaching of grammar. Odalisca expressed that sentence, paragraph, and text structure are fundamental while teaching grammar.

Table 1.4
Examples of excerpts answering "How grammar is best learned"

Mia	*"The more the students read and write the more aware they become of grammar".*
Magdalena	*"When (grammar) is part of a context and students are able to apply it and put it into practice in something that is important for them and engaging".*
Odalisca	*"By understanding the composition of structures like sentences, paragraphs, texts, etc. Analyzing how these compositions of words act and affect in the sense of them"*

When they were asked about how grammar should be taught, Magdalena, Odalisca, Clementina, and Mia answered that grammar should be taught through games, performance tasks, and songs. Carolina and Sandra responded that students must learn grammar through learning rules by heart and then practice.

Table 1.5
Examples of excerpts answering "How grammar should be taught"

Magdalena	*"I believe (grammar) should be taught in context and not as a class itself, like through performance tasks. It is something that starts to be acquired as soon as a student is able to communicate in English or feels comfortable with the language.*
Mia	*"It should be taught from Pre-K through games, centers, songs, etc.".*
Carolina	*"Teach the rules and then practice with strategies, because if you don't know the grammar rules, it is difficult to use the words properly".*

Regarding the participants' ways of learning grammar, Mia, Odalisca, Carolina, Sandra and Clementina claimed that they learnt grammar through repetition, memorization, and sentence structure analysis. Magdalena answered that she learnt grammar while living and communicating with others in an English-speaking country.

Table 1.6
Examples of excerpts answering "How participants learnt grammar"

Odalisca	*"Practicing it, learning it by hard, memorizing, solving worksheets".*
Clementina	*"I was taught sporadically. I usually had a class every two weeks and they consisted of learning rules. I appreciate that I had the possibility to create afterwards to apply what we learned during the lessons".*
Magdalena	*"I think I learned it when living in the US for a couple of years, where I had the need to communicate in English because no one spoke Spanish. I had some ESOL classes which helped to work on grammar intentionally. We had to read a lot and by that, we put into practice grammatic structures".*

With respect to teaching grammatical rules to help students become fluent in the English learning process, Clementina, Odalisca, Carolina and Sandra agreed with this statement, while Mia and Magdalena disagreed. In table 1.7 some excerpts show attest to these findings.

Table 1.7
Examples of excerpts answering "Fluency in the use of English through the teaching of grammatical features"

Odalisca	*"It´s part of understanding a language, especially if it is a second language. Fluency comes together with acknowledging the uses that the language may have."*
Carolina	*"I think that teaching grammar rules is very important, because they are fundamental for a person to understand ideas and create sentences to express themselves in the language".*
Magdalena	*"I think that (grammar) should be modelled when students feel comfortable using the language, I do not believe it helps them to become fluent. Instead, it could be a barrier when learning a new language and might make them feel overwhelmed".*

Participants were asked about their opinion about using the students' mother tongue while teaching grammar. Magdalena, Mia, and Carolina expressed their preference for not using the student's mother tongue under any circumstances. Sandra, Odalisca, and Clementina answered that it is important to use the students' mother tongue while teaching grammar in order to help students make the necessary connections, especially at the beginning of the process of learning another language, and in case a student needs it to learn the L2 better.

Table 1.8
Examples of excerpts answering regarding to the "Use of mother tongue while teaching grammar"

Sandra	*"I think it is good for those students that require understanding to learn better".*
Odalisca	*"I would say it is ideal at first, to create the connections between what they already know and the new information"*
Magdalena	*"I do not like translating when teaching because not all concepts are the same in different languages. It is important to be able to explain concepts and describe them, so students extend their vocabulary".*
Mia	*"I think a second language should be taught in the second language to help the student, mixing languages makes the learning more difficult. The mother tongue has other rules, and it can become confusing for the students".*

When participants discussed the role of grammar when learning English, Mia, Carolina, and Clementina remarked that grammar is really important and should be included in every activity that involves the four language skills (speaking, reading, listening and writing). Magdalena, Sandra, and Odalisca place less importance on grammar when learning English; instead, they seem to favor other aspects like vocabulary or exposure to the L2.

Table 1.9
Examples of excerpts answering if "grammar is considered the most important aspect when learning English"

Mia	*"I think it is really important and it should be part of listening, speaking, writing and reading"*
Magdalena	*"No. Of course it is important, but I do not consider it as the most. I think that the most important aspect when learning EFL is the level of exposure to the language"*
Sandra	*"No, it is not the most important aspect, vocabulary and its versatility are very important and help to understand grammar in a better way".*
Carolina	*"I think that teaching grammar rules is very important, because they are fundamental for a person to understand ideas and create sentences to express themselves in the language.*

In regard to the use of cooperative strategies while teaching grammar, Odalisca, Clementina, and Sandra responded they were not aware of what cooperative strategies are, or that they were not sure of which cooperative strategies existed to teach grammar. Magdalena, Mia and Carolina mentioned that grammar could well be taught while using cooperative strategies, because of the benefits students can have while learning with others.

Table 2.0
Examples of excerpts answering about "the use of cooperative strategies when learning grammar"

Sandra	*"I think that I don't know cooperative learning strategies".*
Odalisca	*I´m not sure what this refers to.*
Magdalena	*"I think they are helpful because it's proven that students have meaningful learning when working with others. If you organize students by mixing levels, they are able to help each other"*

The participants were also asked whether they focused on what students say or on how they say it when speaking English. Clementina, Carolina, Sandra, Odalisca and Magdalena answered that they focused on what students say. Mia claimed that it is important to focus on how students say things but keeping in mind the aim of the learning activity.

Table 2.1
Examples of excerpts answering if participants focus on "what students say or on how they say it when speaking English".

Clementina	*"I think it is better to focus on what students are trying to say during the first years of learning a second language"*
Carolina	*"I think first it is important to focus on what they are trying to say, because they are wanting to say something and express themselves. But after this process, we have to pay attention to how they say things, how they connect the ideas, and we can teach grammar".*

Mia	*"It depends on what we are trying to accomplish. I believe the focus should be on how they say whatever they are trying to say".*

During the focus group, three questions were asked to inquire deeper into some aspects that appeared during the interviews' analysis. One of the aspects that was important to reflect upon and discuss was what participants understood by teaching grammar in context. Most of them use this word when they were asked about how grammar should be taught or mentioned activities that could be related to context when teaching grammar. Mia, Clementina, Carolina, Magdalena and Odalisca agreed on relating context with teaching through different activities that allow students either to discover or practice different grammatical features. Sandra places less importance on context; she claimed that connecting languages structures help students more to acquire the L2.

Table 2.2
Examples of excerpts answering about what they understand by context when teaching grammar

Mia	*"I think that grammar should be taught through fun activities. Otherwise, students will be bored and don't get the language because of their lack of motivation".*
Magdalena	*"As I mentioned in the interview, I think grammar should be taught whenever students are ready. When they will, performance tasks must be provided. These tasks must be related to what we want to teach them"*
Clementina	*"Context provide students a way of understanding complex topics for them. For instance, if we want to teach them the use of past tense, then a letter that is written*

	only using present tense could make them think about it. We as teachers need to look for the proper context for each grammar content.
Sandra	*"I don't think context is that important, as my colleagues say here. I think that comparing languages structures allow students to understand, use and finally acquire any language they are trying to learn. I did it while I was learning German and then English, so they can do that as well.*

Results evidenced that Carolina, Clementina, Odalisca, Magdalena, and Mia believe in a communicative approach when teaching grammar, while Sandra believes in an explicit approach to teach grammar to young learners.

4.2.2 What are the potential inconsistencies between CLIL teacher's beliefs about teaching and learning grammar, and their reported teaching practices emerging from the analysis of CLIL teachers belief systems and their reported teaching practice?

Participants were asked in their focus group if they thought there were discrepancies between their beliefs about grammar teaching and what they actually do in the classroom. Odalisca, Clementina, Carolina and Sandra answered that after thinking about their prior experience regarding learning grammar they realized they were repeating some of the strategies they had experienced when they were students at school and university. They agreed that to a greater or lesser extent, there were discrepancies between what they know about teaching grammar and how they currently teach it, admitting that their prior experiences as learners and the lack of time when working in the school influence their planning and teaching practice towards the teaching of grammar, prioritizing and planning activities they have done in the past

when they were students. On the other hand, Mia and Magdalena claimed that they have thought

about how they learnt grammar in the past and how they teach it currently. They claimed that on

some occasions they repeated activities that are alike to the way they learnt grammar in the past,

while some other times they planned completely different activities considering their students

interests, context and learning needs.

Table 2.3
Examples of excerpts answering about participants discrepancies between their grammar teaching beliefs and their grammar teaching practice

Carolina	*"As I answered before, I know that grammar must be taught through context. Even though I know this, on many occasions I teach grammar without any context".*
Sandra	*"I do not think that context is that important. I learned English through comparing it to German and Spanish and I think students can do that too.*
Clementina	*"Of course, I have been doing some activities that are part of a context. But many times, I did not use context, even knowing that students do not learn English properly. It is because I learned in a different way, but also because of the lack of time in school to plan properly. I feel bad about that.".*
Magdalena	*"I learnt English immersed in an English-speaking context, when I was living in the USA. I know that for me was easier, but I understand that we don't live in an English-speaking country, and that bilingual schools promote the use of English, but many times students need other ways of learning. There are students that learn better by understanding rules first. There are others that need to discover and then*

	practice. So, I believe that we as teachers need to choose how to teach everything according to our students needs and context.

It is relevant to take into consideration all participants' direct and indirect answers, to determine if there are discrepancies between their grammar beliefs and teaching practice. All were very clear to explain and acknowledge if their practice is consistent with their reported beliefs. For example, Carolina claimed that she thinks grammar should be taught in context, but mentioned that in many occasions she teaches grammar without any context.

To have a better understanding, the following table will show a comparison between their beliefs, practices and possible discrepancies.

Table 2.4
Comparative table to evidence participants' grammar beliefs, teaching practice and possible discrepancies

Participants	Grammar beliefs	Teaching practice	Possible discrepancy
Mia	Grammar should be taught communicatively	Teaches grammar implicitly, through games and activities	No teaching discrepancy
Magdalena	Grammar should be taught communicatively	Teaches grammar implicitly through task performance activities	No teaching discrepancy

Clementina	Grammar should be taught communicatively	Teaches grammar implicitly and explicitly	Teaching discrepancy: A considerable degree of explicitness in grammar teaching/ a considerable degree of implicitness
Odalisca	Grammar should be taught communicatively	Teaches grammar implicitly and explicitly	Teaching discrepancy: A considerable degree of explicitness /moderate degree of implicitness.
Sandra	Grammar should be taught explicitly	Teaches grammar explicitly	No teaching discrepancy
Carolina	Grammar should be taught communicatively	Teaches grammar explicitly	Teaching discrepancy: High degree of explicitness in her grammar teaching/low degree of implicitness.

As the comparative table shows, Clementina, Odalisca and Carolina present degrees of discrepancies between their teaching beliefs (that are related to CLT), and reported teaching practice, that varied from low to high degree of explicitness, and from low to considerable degree of implicitness. While Mia, Magdalena, and Sandra do not evidence teaching discrepancy.

4.2.3 What are the aspects that relate to the possible discrepancies between CLIL teachers'

beliefs about grammar teaching and their reported teaching practices?

As per the aspects that are capable of influencing participants' reported grammar teaching practice, Mia and Magdalena, claimed that grammar should be taught communicatively and reported consistent teaching practices; however, Carolina, Odalisca and Clementina reported teaching discrepancies between their grammar beliefs and their teaching practice. Despite the fact that Clementina believes in a communicative approach she claims that a lack of formal grammar training could influence her teaching practices. Carolina tends to plan grammar activities with a high degree of explicitness reporting that she does not have too much time at school to plan, which happens to be a repeat of her own learning experiences as a language learner. Odalisca was the only one that considered that nothing, from her perspective, influences her teaching strategies, although – as is well established in the relevant literature – all of our practices result from the complex interplay of cognitions, knowledge and such like. However, in the focus group she realized that her prior experience might influence her current teaching practice. She also claimed that she lacks formal grammar training and that might influence her practice too, because she tends to repeat the methodologies that she used to learn grammar instead of using the ones that are intended for her students' needs and specific context. Sandra considered that the way she learnt other languages by comparing English grammar to other languages such as Spanish and German, was the aspect that had the greater impact on her teaching strategies. She reported she teaches the same way she claims to believe how grammar should be taught, explicitly. Thus, Sandra is the only participant that considers grammar should be taught explicitly and is consistent with her teaching practices.

Table 2.5
Examples of excerpts answering if participants identify "some aspects that influences their grammar teaching"

Clementina	*"I am still learning about this topic and I would love to study about it formally. At the moment I am trying to do sessions that allow students to communicate, although it is complex. I think I can involve the inquiry method in teaching grammar since it allows students to discover and use the language previously. But exposing students to the language can help them to acquire the correct patterns and rules they need to communicate appropriately"*
Odalisca	*"Not particularly"*
Sandra	*"When I teach and I write the lesson plans, I use to choose one structure and teach that one in all the possible ways and compare it to Spanish grammar. This way they can get the structure and understand it. So, I make sure they get it and then we just practice it more and more until they automate them"*
Carolina	*"Now that you asked me, I feel I repeat a lot of activities I have done in the past in the university and in the school when I was a girl. Every time I have to plan, and I don't have enough time to think I do that. I know that I have to include context, but it's difficult for me.*

It is relevant to mention that during the focus group Mia, Clementina, Carolina, Sandra, and Odalisca realized that they were taught through more traditional ways, meaning analyzing sentence structure and memorizing lists of words that are related to different grammatical

features. On the other hand, Magdalena emphasizes that she learnt grammar through context

while she was living in an English speaking-country. Consequently, she prefers to teach it in such

a way, but she remarked that she understands that students have different needs and interests.

Another relevant point to mention, is that all participants agreed that the ways they learnt

grammar influenced their teaching nowadays.

Table 2.6
*Examples of excerpts answering about how participants think they were influenced from
their prior experience as learners and teachers in the teaching of grammar*

Carolina	*"I learned grammar, either at school or university (During my "Mención de Inglés") in a traditional way. Though at university my teachers told me the importance of teaching grammar through context. Now that I am thinking about this matter, I can tell that many times when I am planning, I tend to repeat the activities I did when I was learning".*
Odalisca	*"I have never thought about this before. I can tell that I learned grammar through memorizing lists. Also, I analyzed lots of sentences. It is also difficult for me planning grammar because I don't feel I know too much, so many times I teach my students the same ways I learned it. This is of course wrong because I know that context is important".*
Clementina	*"Grammar is one of the things I want to know more, I mean teaching grammar. I try to include context as much as I can, and I do, but now that you asked me*

	about the ways I learned grammar I can realized that I include many activities that are not contextualized and that were done by me as a learner before".

Results evidenced here, that one of the aspects that appeared to be related to the reported inconsistencies is the participants previous experience. Carolina, Clementina, Magdalena, Odalisca, and Mia claimed to a greater or lesser extent that they repeated their previous experiences as grammar learners. Another aspect appeared is in relation to time constraint. Clementina was one of the participants that indicated that time constraint influenced her pedagogical decisions when planning grammar activities. This lack of time at school, plays a relevant role in terms of repeating with her students the activities she used to do when she was a language learner, instead of planning activities more related to her students' needs and specific context.

Finally, a third element found in the results that appeared to be related to the reported inconsistencies, is the lack of English training among participants. Clementina, Carolina and Odalisca claimed that they want to know more about grammar and how to teach, and if they would have more experience and grammar knowledge, their pedagogical decisions will include a more communicative approachness.

4.3 Discussion

This study aimed to answer three research questions:

1.What beliefs do CLIL teachers hold about teaching and learning grammar at primary school level from a private school in Santiago?

2.What are the potential inconsistencies between CLIL teacher's beliefs about teaching and learning grammar, and their reported teaching practices emerging from the analysis of CLIL teachers belief systems and their reported teaching practice? And

3.What are the aspects that relate to the possible discrepancies between CLIL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and their reported teaching practices?

As evidenced in the results' section, most of CLIL teachers in this research believe grammar must be taught focusing on form. This result is consistent with a study that was conducted by Alghanmi and Shukri (2016) in which they concluded that "Most (English) teachers believe in the effectiveness of teaching grammar implicitly rather than explicitly, yet all the participants adopt explicit grammar teaching in their classrooms" (p.84). It is interesting to note that even though in this study the research subjects focused on CLIL teachers, Alghanmi and Shukri, described similar results with English teachers. As a consequence, one of the findings is that licensed English language teachers hold very similar beliefs to those upheld by CLIL teachers in this study. On the other hand, all the participants reported not having English specializations. Hence, if they do not have any training in teaching grammar, then their pedagogical decisions are mostly made on the basis of their prior experience and consequently affect students' learnings. In this respect, Banegas (2012) suggests in his study that training CLIL teachers should be a priority, since they lack formal training on bilingual education methodologies. Clementina, Carolina and Odalisca reported that if they had more training in teaching grammar, their decisions would be based on bigger repertoire of ideas, instead of just repeating, in many pedagogical situations, what they lived as learners. In that sense, Banegas' findings are similar to this study's findings in terms of the fact that CLIL teachers tend to repeat

their grammar learning experiences, because of their lack of grammar training. A third finding is in regard to what Abdi and Asadi (2015) posit in their study deals with how teachers' beliefs are affected by their own experiences as learners and how those beliefs are established when they go to university. It is noteworthy to mention that Carolina and Odalisca have between 1 and 2 years of teaching experience. Thus, having few years of practice can affect non-experienced CLIL teachers' pedagogical decisions by reason of not having a large repertoire of teaching experience. Although Abdi and Asadi studied licensed English teachers, their findings could certainly apply to this research CLIL teachers too.

Regarding the second research question, results evidenced that some CLIL teachers who participated in this study reported inconsistencies between their grammar teaching practice and their grammar beliefs. They mostly reported that they believe in teaching grammar focusing on form; however, they tend to teach and plan focusing on forms. Borg (2003) suggests that research on language teachers' beliefs about grammar instruction has demonstrated that teachers' practices are practical, and experiential rather than being based on SLA theories. Furthermore, Hos and Kekec (2014), complement Borg's (2003) research by suggesting that most EFL teachers that were surveyed in their study, believe that CLT is the best method to teach grammar. However, they found that by and large those teachers did not make use of CLT in their classrooms. These findings mirror those made in this study, wherein almost all the participants claimed to believe in a communicative approach for teaching grammar; however, a subgroup of them claimed that when they plan and teach, they use a range of strategies that go from considerable to high explicitness. As mentioned earlier, Kekec (2014) and Borg (2003) found similar results with

regard to EFL teachers, who evidenced discrepancies between their teaching beliefs and their practice.

Another finding is that the most experienced CLIL teachers of this study had been haunted by their own experience of learning grammar and claimed to fight such memories and adopt strategies that would place grammar in a more contextualized context. On the other hand, the less experienced CLIL teachers showed a lesser degree of awareness about their prior experiences and hence less reflection of their own practices claiming this was the first time they had thought about the relationship between their beliefs and their current teaching practice.

Since this study did not intend to uncover the role of teamwork between experienced and inexperienced CLIL teachers and its relationship with grammar teaching practices, it became evident that if there is no exchange of experience, it will follow that pedagogical decisions will most likely draw on their own beliefs and prior experiences. This could be counteracted if more collaboration was present amongst CLIL teachers. As Banegas (2012) suggests, "team teaching is one of the major drawbacks in CLIL" (p.47) promoting teachers' professional development, as well as EFL and CLIL teachers' collaboration due to reflection and planning sessions. Such collaboration could potentially bridge the gap between the existing discrepancies between belief systems and teaching practices

Finally, in regard to the third question, participants claimed that the potential aspects that might influence their reported inconsistencies between their beliefs, and grammar teaching practice are the lack of time to plan properly; the lack of reflection about their prior experience as learners and about how it influences their current grammar teaching; and the lack of grammar teaching training. Most responded that their prior experience as language learners influenced their

teaching practices and that this was the first time, they had thought about it. In this sense, Chamorro, Alzás, and Villares (2019) posit that language teachers' subconscious beliefs occasionally differ from high standard practices. Thus, being aware of how previous experiences can affect teaching practices can allow CLIL teachers to realize why they are making a pedagogical decision for a specific context and better understand the internal workings of their current practices.

Regarding the finding of time constraint as a contextual factor influencing CLIL teachers' pedagogical decisions, Farrel and Lim (2005) suggest that classroom practice is not always a reflection of teachers' beliefs, since they have a set of complex belief systems, but sometimes other reasons that are directly related to the context of teaching are the elements that influence their teaching practice the most. In this study, time constraint or planning seem to play a major role in teaching practices that go counter to the belief systems upheld by the very same CLIL teachers. This contextual factor gets intertwined with the teachers' past experience reducing the room for pursuit of congruent teaching practices. As was previously mentioned in the literature section of this thesis, there is scant work regarding CLIL teachers at elementary school level; however, the existing literature focusing largely on secondary and tertiary level language teachers appeared to be useful as benchmarks to the research questions evidencing similarities between EFL teachers and other school levels findings.

4.4 Summary

As can be observed, CLIL teachers from this study lacked formal education in grammar methodologies and most had never thought about the ways in which they learned grammar and how much that affected their teaching practices. Whilst most of the participants seem to favor

teaching grammar by focusing on form, most of their teaching practice is focused on forms, inconsistencies which acknowledged and seem to result from the significant role of their prior experiences as language learners with time constraint All of these elements have been described in the literature review for English teachers; however, they could be extended to CLIL teachers as well.

5. Conclusions

5.1 Conclusions

In the previous chapter the results and discussion were presented. In this chapter, the major conclusions are presented, together with suggestions for further research and the limitations this study has been faced with.

The study has allowed the researcher to come to several conclusions: whilst most CLIL teachers in this study claimed to advocate the principles underpinning the communicative approach to teach grammar in the elementary school, they reported teaching it explicitly devoid of the necessary context, i.e. a major discrepancy between their belief systems and their teaching practices, a phenomenon that seems more pervasive in less experienced teachers; more experienced teachers seemed to be more cognizant of their previous experiences as language learners and their role in their current teaching practices. Thus, it can be speculated that providing opportunities to pre-service and newly qualified in-service teachers to reflect upon their own learning experiences could allow them to connect SLA rationales into their own practices, and as a consequence make better grammar pedagogical decisions that are in relation to students' needs and their context.

Second, it can be concluded that teachers' beliefs are at times incongruent with teachers' practices on account of contextual factors such as lack of time when planning English sessions. This time constraint influences their decisions for teaching and participants wind up teaching similarly to the ways they learned. Thus, having enough time to plan properly could potentially enhance creativity and reflection, which could then facilitate optimal congruence between beliefs and practices.

Third, most of elementary CLIL teachers that participated in this study, claimed to lack formal English language teaching education, which may play a major role in enhancing CLIL teachers' grammar teaching practices and pedagogical decisions, basing them on SLA rationale and not in their deeply-rooted prior experiences. Banegas (2012) suggests in his study that training CLIL teachers should be a priority, since they lack formal training on bilingual education methodologies and tend to repeat their grammar learning experiences, because of their lack of grammar training.

Fourth, much of the clil-related research has been conducted with certified English teachers and not primary teachers with or without a concentration in English. However, the results of the studies that were found, were consistent with this research results. This implies that most teachers present inconsistencies between their grammar beliefs and their teaching practice, because they claim to believe in a communicative approach, but tend to teach focus on forms. Another aspect that corresponds to the reviewed literature is the fact that most teachers claimed to teach in the way they learnt. This preference for methodologies related to teachers' previous experiences rather than methodologies that are what students need and in relation to their context seems to be useful for CLIL teachers, school managers and English coordinators to know and be aware in advance of the issues presented in this study. Having this information could promote reflection upon their practices and may prevent them from evidencing teaching discrepancies between their grammar beliefs and their practice.

Lastly, the fact that this study was conducted in a private school is relevant when discussing extending these conclusions to subsidized and public schools. If some English teachers' issues can be extended to elementary CLIL teachers issues, such as the CLIL teachers

reported inconsistencies between their grammar teaching beliefs and their teaching practices, then the private setting findings might be extended to subsidized and public schools. More research will be needed to uncover this matters.

5.2 Further research

This study did not take into consideration teamwork between English teachers and CLIL teachers. The literature provided in this study evidenced that having that exchange of knowledge and experiences improves the teaching practices and promotes better informed decisions. On the other hand, providing more experienced teachers time and space to work with lesser experienced teachers will also enhance and evidence better teaching practices for specific contexts. Further studies that include the exchange of knowledge and experience between CLIL and licenced English teachers, and between experienced L2 primary teachers and lesser experienced teachers in the Chilean context can shed light on this matter to help understanding and explore deeper why inexperienced CLIL teachers tend to evidence more inconsistencies than experienced CLIL teachers. On the other hand, since time constraint is one of the elements that was reported by CLIL teachers as a factor that affect their pedagogical decisions, further studies are required that demonstrate its actual impact on their teaching practice.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

This is a qualitative study which aims to explore teachers' cognitions. In that sense, results cannot possibly be generalized. However, further research could be based on this study to fill this gap and reach get to a wider audience. Also, it falls outside the scope of this work, but the pandemic crisis we have undergone over the past year may have had an impact on how teachers think of their own beliefs and practices. This refers to reconsidering if L2 prior experiences as

learners and our current teaching practice are useful and effective not only in online teaching, but in in-person classes too.

5.4 Concluding reflections

This study gave me the opportunity to reseach about topics that are been undercovered in Chile, and mostly in the elementary school. Grammar teaching beliefs, and self-reflection upon grammar teaching practice are relevant topics not only for English teachers, but for CLIL teachers too, since the impact that could have on students' learning. Including participants that have not been considered widely in the research field, like the elementary CLIL teachers, give them a voice to express their beliefs and needs.

References

Abdi, H., & Asadi, B. (2015). A synopsis of research on teachers' and students' beliefs about language learning. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 3*(4), 104-114.

Alghanmi, B., & Shukri, N. (2016). The relationship between teachers' beliefs of grammar instruction and classroom practices in the Saudi context. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(7), 70. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p70

Anwar, C., & Fitriani, D. (2016). Total physical response and direct method in students vocabulary mastery learning. *SHAHIH: Journal of Islamicate Multidisciplinary*, *1*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.22515/shahih.v1i1.54

Bahar, K. (2013). *The communicative grammar translation method: An integrated method of CLT and GT for teaching english communicatively and accurately*. Trustmedia.

Banegas, D. L. (2012). CLIL teacher development: Challenges and experiences. *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, *5*(1), 46–56. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2012.5.1.4

Birello, M. (2012). Interview: Teacher cognition and language teacher education: Beliefs and practice. A conversation with Simon Borg. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *5*(2), 88. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jtl3.464.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching, 36*(2), 81-109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Borg, S. (2008). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice* (Illustrated ed.). Continuum.

Bowen, T. (2013). *Teaching approaches: The grammar-translation method*. One stop English. http://www.onestopenglish.com.

Brown, H. D. (2001). Teaching by principles: *An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Brownlee, J. (2004). Teacher education students' epistemological beliefs. *Research in Education*, *72*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.7227/rie.72.1

Crystal, O. L. D. (2012). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (2020). *Syntactic structures (Janua Linguarum, Ser. Minor Nr. 4)* (Reprint, 1985 ed.). Mouton Publishers.

Custodio-Espinar, M. (2020). Influencing factors on in-service teachers' competence in planning CLIL. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, *12*(2), 207–241. https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2019.12.2.2

De Keyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics. Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.

Egan O. (1986). The Concept of Belief in Cognitive Theory. In O. Egan (Ed.), *Annals of Theoretical Psychology* (pp. 315-350). Springer.

Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 91–113. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586953

Ellis, R. (2002). Does form-focused instruction affect the acquisition of implicit knowledge?. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(2), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263102002073

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(3), 405–428. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627

Genc, S. (2018). Structural Approach. *The TESOL Encyclopaedia of English Language Teaching,* 1–6. http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0164

Hos, R. & Kekec, M. (2014). The mismatch between non-native english as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' grammar beliefs and classroom practices. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(1), 80–87. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.1.80-87

Jiménez Catalán, R. M., Ruiz de Zarobe, Y., & Cenoz, J. (2006). Vocabulary profiles of English foreign language learners in English as a subject and as a vehicular language. *Vienna English Working Papers (VIEWS), 15*(3), 23–27.

Kagan, D. (1992) Implication of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2701_6

Katz, S. (2008). TAs and grammar teaching: beliefs, knowledge and education. J. Watzinger-Tharp (Ed.), *From thought to action: Exploring beliefs and outcomes in the foreign language program.* (pp. 188-208). Thompson Heinle.

Khader, F. (2012). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and actual classroom practices in social studies instruction. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, *2*(1), 73-92.

Kaharuddin, A. (2018). The communicative grammar translation method: A practical method to

teach communication skills of English. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and*

Research Journal), *4*(2), 232. https://doi.org/10.24252/eternal.v42.2018.a8

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2011). *Language teacher education for a global society (ESL & applied*

linguistics professional series). Routledge.

Laufer, B. (2006). Comparing focus on form and focus on forms in second-language vocabulary

learning. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(1), 149–166.

https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.1.149

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Teaching grammar. In C. Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a*

second or foreign language (pp. 256-270). National Geographic Learning.

Lasagabaster, D. (2008). Foreign language competence in content and language integrated

courses. *The Open Applied Linguistics Journal*, *1*(1), 30–41.

https://doi.org/10.2174/1874913500801010030

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an international language.

International Journal of Applied Linguistics, *14*(3), 314-323.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2004.00068.x

Loewen, S. (2018). Focus on form versus focus on forms. *The TESOL Encyclopaedia of English*

Language Teaching, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0062

Mareva, R., & Nyota S. (2012). Structural or communicative approach: A case study of English

language teaching in Masvingo urban and peri-urban secondary schools. *International*

Journal of English and Literature, *3*(5), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.5897/ijel11.015

Maqsood, S., Shahid, A., Nazar, F., Asif, M., Ahmad, M., & Mazzara, M. (2020). C-POS: A

    context-aware adaptive part-of-speech language learning framework. *IEEE Access*, *8*,

    30720–30733. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2972591

Marín, R., Alzás, T., & Hurtado, S. (2020). Creencias de los alumnos del grado de educación

    sobre el proceso de aprendizaje de la lengua inglesa. *Campo Abierto. Revista de

    Educación*, *39*(1), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.17398/0213-9529.39.1.71

Martínez Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J. (2015). Is CLIL instruction beneficial in terms

    of general proficiency and specific areas of grammar?. *Journal of Immersion and

    Content-Based Language Education*, *3*(1), 51–76. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.3.1.03adr

Matear, A. (2008). English language learning and education policy in Chile: Can English really

    open doors for all?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *28*(2), 131-147.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790802036679

Mehisto, P., Marsh, D., & Frigols, M. J. (2008). *Macmillan Books for Teachers: Uncovering

    CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in bilingual and multilingual

    education*. Hueber Verlag GmbH.

Miranda, L. P., & Pérez, M. L. (2012). *Bilingualism & CLIL: The Case of Chile*.

    https://www.academia.edu/9229233/Bilingualism_and_CLIL_The_case_of_Chile

Pradeep, K. (2013). The importance of grammar in English language teaching – A reassessment.

    Language in India, 482-486.

Pourhosein, G., & Banou, N. (2017). A detailed analysis over Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs

    towards using pronunciation software in teaching English pronunciation. *International

Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, *6*(7), 227.

https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.7p.227

Rahman, A., & Rashid, R. (2017). Explicit and implicit grammar instructions in higher learning institutions. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(10), 92. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n10p92

Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.

Roothooft, H. (2017). Primary teachers' beliefs about teaching English to young learners. *Pulso. Revista de Educación, 40*, 211-225

Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. (2010). Which language competencies benefit from CLIL? An insight into applied linguistics research. In Y. Ruiz de Zarobe, J. Sierra, & F. Gallardo del Puerto (Eds.), *Content and foreign language integrated learning: Contributions to multilingualism in European contexts* (pp. 129–153). Peter Lang.

Sale, J., Lohfeld, L., & Brazil, K. (2002). Revisiting the quantitative-qualitative debate: Implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and Quantity*, *36*, 43-53. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014301607592

Sato, M., & Oyanedel, J. (2019). "I think that is a better way to teach but …": EFL teachers' conflicting beliefs about grammar teaching. *System*, *84*, 110–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.06.005

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge University Press.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (2017) Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(1), 1-22. http://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00002

Siskin, J., & Blyth, C. (2007). *From thought to action: Exploring beliefs and outcomes in the foreign language program.* Thomson- Heinle.

Toprak, T. (2019). "Teaching grammar is not my main responsibility": Exploring EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 6*(1), 205-221.

Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weaver, C. (1996). *Teaching grammar in context*. Cook Publishers.

Appendix

1.1 Adaptation made by Cota and Ruiz-Esparza (2013) of the "Language Learning Inventory"

(BALLI) originally developed by Horwitz (1988)

Cota Grijalva & Ruiz-Esparza Barajas

Appendix A: Language Learning and Teaching Questionnaire

Name _____   Semester _____   Date _____

Are you currently working as a teacher? _____   If yes, which level(s) _____
Have you had any prior teaching experience? _____   For how long? _____
Levels taught _____

Read the following statements about language learning. For each statement indicate if you agree or dis-
agree with the statement.
1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=neutral; 4=disagree; 5=strongly disagree

Statements about language learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. It is easier for children than adults to learn a foreign language.					
2. EFL students generally need to understand the grammatical rules of English in order to become fluent in the language.					
3. Language can be thought of as a set of grammatical structures which are learned consciously and controlled by the learner.					
4. Students only learn what teachers teach them in class.					
5. It is important to speak English with excellent pronunciation.					
6. It is necessary to know the foreign language culture in order to speak the foreign language.					
7. You shouldn't say anything in English until you can say it correctly.					
8. It is easier for someone who already speaks a foreign language to learn another one.					
9. Language is learned subconsciously in non-academic situations.					
10. It is best to learn English in an English-speaking country.					
11. English should be taught only through the use of English.					
12. EFL students learn better if teachers implement cooperative learning.					
13. If EFL students understand some of the basic grammatical rules of the language, they can usually create lots of new sentences on their own.					
14. Methodologies play an important role in second language learning.					
15. The most important part of learning a foreign language is learning the grammar.					
16. Usually it is more important for EFL students to focus on what they are trying to say and not how to say it.					
17. English is better learned when teachers implement different activities for different learning styles.					
18. When EFL students make oral errors, it is best to ignore them as long as you can understand what they are trying to say.					
19. It is better to learn English through content rather than language courses.					
20. Everyone can learn to speak a foreign language.					

Pre-Service Teachers' Beliefs about Language Teaching and Learning...

Appendix B: Interview Questions

1. How is English learned?
2. How should English be taught?
3. How did you learn English?
4. How were you taught?
5. Has your perspective about how English is learned changed? How? Why?
6. Has your perspective about how English is taught changed? How? Why?

1.2 Research Interview

Name/Pseudonym _____ Age_____ Date _____.

What is your university degree? _____.

Do you hold a specialization in English? If so, which specialization do you hold?

_____.

Is your English certified? If so, which English level do you have if I may?

_____.

Are you currently working as a teacher? _____ If so, which level(s) do you teach

_____.

Have you had any prior teaching experience? _____ For how long? _____.

Levels taught _____.

Concerning teaching grammar when Learning English as a Foreign Language

How do you think grammar is best learned (by students of your classes)?

How do you think grammar should be taught? Why?

How did you learn grammar?

How were you taught grammar?

What do you think about teaching grammatical rules of English to help students become fluent in

the language?

What do you think about teaching grammar and using the mother tongue of the learner?

Do you think grammar is the most important aspect when learning EFL? Explain why.

What do you think about using cooperative learning strategies when teaching grammar?

What do you think is better, focus on what students are trying to say, or on how they say it?

Are there any aspect(s) that influence your grammar teaching methodologies? If so, please

mention them and explain their relevance.

1.3 Letter of Intent

October 18th, 2020

Moira Allen
Dunalastair School, Colina Santiago, Chile

Dear Mrs. Allen,

Letter of Intent

As you know I am currently doing a TESOL master at Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello. The purpose of this letter is to request your authorization to conduct educational research on the perceptions that CLIL teachers have towards their own performance in teaching grammar.

I plan to begin by reaching out to my prospective participants who can choose to participate on a voluntary basis. After these participants are informed and all ethical concerns are taken into consideration, I will begin by gathering data over the course of two months starting on October 20th. For this purpose, I will be employing different research tools which include online interviews. The themes that will emerge from the analysis of these data will provide insights into my research's topic which is exploring CLIL teachers' perceptions towards their own practice regarding grammar teaching.

Themes that emerge from this study will be presented in publications and in various contexts for educational/social purposes. It is important that you know that the confidentiality of the participants and the school will be kept anonymous at all times.

If you have any further queries about our research or wish to address a concern, please feel free to contact me at c.guiloff@gmail.com or at 56 9 86626564. As a researcher, I am committed to maintaining an open-door policy before, during and after my research. Also, upon completion of the study, I undertake to provide the school with a bound copy of the full research report.

Lastly, we would like to thank you for taking the time to consider my request to conduct research. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Catherine Guiloff
MA in TESOL (2019-2020) Andres Bello University

1.4 Consent to Participate in Research

Project Name: Master Thesis

Investigator: Catherinne Guiloff

Introduction
You are invited to consider participating in this research study. This form will describe the purpose and nature of the study and your rights as a participant in the study. The decision to participate or not is yours. If you decide to participate, please sign and date the last line of this form.

Explanation of the study
This study seeks to research the perceptions that CLIL teachers have towards grammar, their teaching practice, and some possible factors that could influence those grammar teaching practices.

Confidentiality
All of the information collected will be confidential and will only be used for research purposes. It means that your identity will be anonymous, so nobody besides the researcher will know your personal information. Whenever data from this study are published, your personal information will not be used. The information collected will be stored in a computer, and the access to it is limited to the researcher only.

Your participation
Participating in this study is strictly voluntary. It means your participation is not compulsory. You will participate in the same activities, but nothing you say or do will be recollected and considered in the research. If at any point you change your mind and no longer want to participate, you can tell the investigator. If you have any questions about the research, you can contact Catherinne Guiloff Schneider. by email at **c.guiloff@gmail.com**

Date: October 2020

Teacher's consent
I have read the information provided in this Informed Consent Form. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have voluntarily agreed to participate in this study.

Your signature: Date: