

TEACHERS' AND LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECTIVENESS  
OF GRAMMAR COURSES IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT OF  
ANADOLU UNIVERSITY

A THESIS PRESENTED BY

GAYE ÇALIŞ

TO THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

JULY 2001

## ABSTRACT

Title: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions About the Effectiveness of Grammar Courses in the Foreign Languages Department of Anadolu University.

Author: Gaye Çalış

Thesis Chairperson: Dr. William E. Snyder  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Dr. James Stalker  
Dr. Hossein Nassaji  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Grammar has always been one of the major concerns of researchers. Teacher and learner perceptions about grammar, on the contrary, have received less interest in the field.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the teachers' and the students' perceptions about the effectiveness of the grammar courses in the Foreign Languages Department of Anadolu University.

Twenty-two teachers who were teaching grammar at the time of the study and 141 students from beginner/elementary, lower intermediate/intermediate, and upper intermediate/ advanced levels participated in the study.

Data was collected through two questionnaires which were parallel to each other. One of the questionnaires was for the teachers and the other was for the students. In data analysis, quantitative techniques were used.

The results of the study revealed that both the teachers and the students wanted to have separate grammar courses. They were undecided about the effectiveness of the grammar courses. While the students believed that they were required to memorise the grammar rules, teachers disagreed with this statement. There were no differences among the levels in terms of their perceptions about the

need and effectiveness of the grammar courses. However, some differences were observed in their perceptions about the way these courses were taught. For instance, upper intermediate and advanced level students were the ones who thought that their teachers encouraged them to discover grammar rules rather than explaining them. On the other hand, Lower Intermediate and Intermediate level students thought that their teachers did not encourage them to discover grammar rules, instead they explained them to the students.

The findings of this study suggest that grammar courses should be maintained as part of the foreign language curriculum. However, since there are too many rules to cover in a short period of time, the study suggest that the load of the syllabus should be lightened so that students can find enough time to practice the grammar rules they are expected to learn.

BILKENT UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES  
MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

July 31, 2001

The examining committee appointed by the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences  
for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Gaye Çalış

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions about the Effectiveness of  
Grammar Courses in the Foreign Languages Department of  
Anadolu University

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Hossein Nassaji  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Dr. James C. Stalker  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Dr. William Snyder  
Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

---

Dr. William E. Snyder  
(Chair)

---

Dr. Hossein Nassaji  
(Committee Member)

---

Dr. James C. Stalker  
(Committee Member)

Approved for the  
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

---

Kürşat Aydoğan  
Director  
Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank to my thesis advisor, Dr. Hossein Nassaji, for his support through out the year and his invaluable guidance in writing my thesis. I also wish to thank to my instructors Dr. William E. Snyder and Dr. James Stalker for their assistance.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Gül Durmuşođlu, who gave me permission to attend the MA TEFL Program and to conduct my study at Anadolu University Foreign Languages Department (AU-FLD).

I would like to thank to my administrators who encouraged me while writing my thesis, and my colleagues who participated in this study.

I wish to thank my friends in MA TEFL, especially Nurcihan Abaylı, Meltem Coşkuner, Zeliş Çoban, Shahla Garayeva and Seçil Somer. Without them, MA TEFL would be unbearable and I will never forget them in the rest of my life.

I am grateful to my parents and my husband for their continuous encouragement and love throughout the year.

*To my Husband*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem .....	4
Significance of the Problem .....	5
Research Questions .....	5
Method.....	6
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	7
Explicit vs. Implicit Grammar Teaching.....	8
Traditional Grammar Teaching.....	9
Communicative Language Teaching.....	11
Focus on Form.....	14
Teacher and Learner Perceptions .....	18
Perceptions of Teachers and Learners About Language Teaching.....	18
Perceptions of Teachers and Learners About how Grammar Should be Taught .....	21
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	24
Participants .....	24
Instruments .....	27
Questionnaires.....	27
Procedure.....	28
CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS.....	30
Overview of the Study.....	30
Data Analysis Procedure .....	31
Results .....	31
What are the Most Preferred Courses for the Students and the Teachers in General and in AU-FLD? .....	31
Do the Teachers and the Students Need Separate Grammar Courses?.....	36
Are the Grammar Courses in AU-FLD Effective? .....	38
How is Grammar Taught in AU-FLD? .....	41
Level Effect.....	47
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	52
Implications .....	56
Limitations.....	56
Further Research.....	57
APPENDICES.....	62



APPENDIX A:	
Student Questionnaire .....	62
APPENDIX B:	
Teacher Questionnaire.....	66

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1 The Number of the Student Participants in Each Faculty.....	25
2 Teachers' Teaching Before and Now.....	27
3 Type of Questions in the Student and Teacher Questionnaire.....	30
4 Student/ Teacher Preference of the Courses in General.....	32
5 Student/ Teacher Preference of the Courses in AU-FLD.....	35
6 Perceptions About Separate Grammar Courses.....	37
7 Effectiveness of the Grammar Courses.....	38
8 Reasons for the Ineffectiveness of the Grammar Courses.....	40
9 Memorisation of the Grammar Rules.....	42
10 Opportunities for Practising the Grammar Inside the Classroom.....	41
11 Opportunities for Practising the Grammar Outside the Classroom.....	44
12 Explanation of Grammar Rules, and No Encouragement of the learners.....	45
to Discover Rules Themselves	
13 Presentation of Grammar Rules in Context.....	46
14 Usage of Supplementary materials in Grammar Courses.....	47
15 Level effect on Practice of Grammar outside the Classroom.....	45
16 Level Effect on Explanation of Grammar Rules, and No Encouragement.....	49
of the Learners to Discover Rules Themselves	
17 Level Effect on Usage of the Supplementary Materials.....	50

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Grammar teaching has been “a dilemma” (Koshi, 1996) for a long period of time. Different ideas, approaches and techniques have been proposed to find out the most effective way for it. Research has not provided a specific prescription of the best way to teach grammar yet, and this issue will probably be in question for years. Current ways to teach grammar are formed by the approaches, theories and the perceptions of practitioners, which are teachers and students.

One of the well-known debates is over whether implicit or explicit grammar teaching is more effective. While some (Krashen, 1981) claim that implicit grammar teaching is effective, the others (White, 1987) claim just the opposite. Implicit learning refers to having students get the rules without presenting explicit rules. In implicit teaching it is assumed that learners can get the rules by themselves from the implied context. On the other hand, “explicit learning occurs with concurrent awareness of what is being learned” (DeKeyser, 1995, p.380). Both implicit and explicit grammar teaching have their underpinnings in different approaches and methodologies of teaching.

Traditional grammar teaching highly focuses on explicit grammar teaching and “neglect[s] the non-grammatical features of communication” (Brumfit, 1980, p.116). The major aim in this type of teaching is to teach learners discrete grammatical points, which are listed one after the other. Nevertheless, learners’ inner learning systems may not let them acquire rules one after the other in the way they are listed (Ellis, 1990; Nunan, 1988; Rutherford, 1987).

As Ellis (1993) states:

Studies designed to investigate whether learners succeed in learning the structures they are taught suggest that often they are unable to internalise new structural knowledge in a manner that enables them to use it productively in communication unless they are ready to do so (p. 92).

The structural syllabus is one of the main problems of the traditional grammar teaching. The items in this syllabus may not match with the readiness of the learners (Ellis, 1993; Fotos & Ellis, 1991).

The communicative approach came to the fore in the 1970's with a purpose of developing learners' communicative competence unlike traditional language teaching did (Richards & Rogers, 1986). According to this approach, "communication is the goal of second or foreign language instruction and ... the syllabus of a language should not be organised around grammar but around subject matter, tasks/projects, or semantic notions and/or pragmatic functions" (Celce-Murcia, 1991, p.461-462).

Krashen (1981) advocated a purely communicative way of teaching since he believed that formal instruction had no effect on the learners' competence in the positive way. His claim was that L2 could be acquired if learners were provided with sufficient comprehensible input. However, a communicative approach like that failed to produce learners who were grammatically accurate since it focused on just the communicative competence and downplayed the linguistic competence in performance (Ellis, 1997; Salomone, 1998).

The shortcomings of both traditional and communicative language teaching led to another approach in teaching, which is Focus on Form. This approach aims to bridge formal instruction with communicative skills. The Focus on Form approach aims to

make students aware of the grammatical items when they occur while students are dealing with a communicative activity. Consciousness-raising can be named as one technique of this approach (Doughty & Williams, 1998). In this technique, learners' consciousnesses are raised through communicative grammar tasks (Ellis, 1994; Long, 1991).

Although grammar has been one of the major issues of second language teaching for a long time, how one should teach it is still a mystery. Different approaches, methods, and techniques prescribe different roles for the teachers and the students for teaching/learning grammar; however, these prescriptions are not enough to reflect the actual teaching process. In order to gain a deeper understanding about grammar teaching, we should take into consideration the practitioners and their perceptions about grammar.

Teachers' and learners' perceptions are involved in teaching/learning process. These perceptions, i.e. assumptions, beliefs and attitudes of the teachers are the things through which they understand and assess classroom performances.

Teachers 'interpret' a teaching situation in the light of their beliefs about the learning and teaching of what they consider a second language to consist of; the result of this interpretation is what the teacher plans for and attempts to create in the classroom (Woods, 1996, p.69).

Learners and teachers have perceptions about grammar, too. As Borg (1999) stated, "Research on grammar teaching in L2 learning has focused predominantly on learning outcomes rather than on the actual processes of formal instruction" (p. 95). At the core of these processes, there are teachers and students, and their perceptions. Since these perceptions may provide valuable information about grammar teaching which may

bring a different dimension to it, more attention should be given to the way teachers and learners perceive grammar in order to reach sound conclusions about grammar teaching.

However, it is clear that perceptions about grammar have not received as much interest in research as grammar itself has (Borg, 1998; Schulz, 1996). This study aims to examine grammar courses in Foreign Languages Department at Anadolu University by considering teacher and learner perceptions about it.

#### Statement of the Problem

The program in the Foreign Languages Department at Anadolu University (AU-FLD) provides intensive English language courses to preparatory classes. The program offers courses in five areas: listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and a core-course class in which all the skills are taught in an integrated way. These courses are conducted at six levels: beginner, elementary, lower intermediate, intermediate, upper intermediate, and advanced. A skills-based curriculum is implemented in AU-FLD, and a grammar course takes place in the curriculum although it is not a skill. In those grammar courses, a structural syllabus which is designed to develop learners' explicit knowledge of grammatical patterns is followed. As it is known that teaching grammatical items one by one through a structural syllabus does not match the learners' learning of the rules (Ellis, 1990; Nunan, 1988; Rutherford, 1987). So it is important to find out how students and teachers feel about the need and effectiveness of these classes. As the grammatical items to be covered are too much and time is limited, an ordinary class consists of explicit explanation of the grammar items and very limited controlled practice. Therefore, many teachers and the students may feel uncomfortable about these courses. This research aims to find out these perceptions about grammar courses

### Significance of the Problem

As mentioned above, teachers' perceptions about teaching highly affect their classroom performance, and as it is the teachers who experience the grammar classes everyday, it is necessary to examine their perceptions about this type of grammar teaching. Through the discovery of these perceptions, teachers can monitor themselves to see the mismatches among "what [they] think they do and what they actually do and what they'd like to do" (Underhill, 1999, p. 138). This realisation of the mismatches between their beliefs and their applications may lead them to improve their teaching, and thus the learning of their students.

Furthermore, like the teachers, students have some perceptions related to their learning situations, which are important factors in their success. Since students' perceptions related to the process of learning are very important for the teaching/learning process, they should be taken into account. In order to do this, we should first discover what these perceptions are. This study is an attempt to achieve this goal.

In order to make the necessary changes and create a successful learning and teaching environment for the grammar courses that are held in AU-FLD, it is important to discover both teachers' and students' perceptions about them.

### Research Questions

This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What are the students' perceptions about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses in AU-FLD?

2. What are the teachers' perceptions about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses in AU-FLD?
3. Are there any differences between the students' and the teachers' perceptions about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses?
4. What are the perceptions of teachers about the way they teach grammar in AU-FLD?
5. What are the perceptions of students about the way their teachers teach grammar in AU-FLD?
6. Are there any differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about the way grammar is taught in AU-FLD?
7. Does the proficiency level of the students play a role in their perceptions?

#### Method

141 students, who were at six language proficiency levels and from ten different faculties, and 22 teachers who were teaching grammar at the time of the study in AU-FLD participate in the study. Their perceptions about the grammar courses and the way these courses was taught were investigated through two questionnaires which had parallel questions.



## CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study aims at exploring the perceptions of teachers and students about the need and the effectiveness of the grammar courses and the way these courses are taught at Foreign Languages Department of Anadolu University.

There has been an ongoing controversy on the issue of how grammar should be taught in second language teaching (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Fotos & Ellis, 1991). While one approach defends teaching grammar implicitly, the other prefers teaching it explicitly. Traditional methods of language teaching consider grammar as the major focus of teaching and present grammar rules one by one, in an additive way. On the other hand, while communicative approaches accept grammar as one component of communicative competence in the theory, they are against the idea of teaching grammar explicitly in the classroom. Approaches like consciousness-raising and focus on form aim to combine communicative activities with a linguistic focus. However, no matter what different methods propose, it is the teachers and the students in the classroom who choose what to use or not to use; and this choice depends mostly on their beliefs about how language teaching and learning take place.

In this section, I first review approaches and methods which view grammar teaching from different perspectives. The first section discusses the distinction between explicit and implicit grammar teaching. The second section includes information about traditional grammar teaching. The third section points to the features and weaknesses of communicative language teaching. This section is followed by a review of the Focus on Form approach. The last two sections examine the perceptions of teachers and learners about language learning and teaching and how grammar should be taught, respectively.

### Explicit vs. Implicit Grammar Teaching

One of the distinctions in the field occurs between explicit and implicit grammar teaching. In implicit teaching, “the meanings of words or structures are not to be given through explanation in either the native tongue or the target language but is to be induced from the way the form is used in a situation” (Richards & Rogers, 1986, p.36). In other words, in implicit teaching, students are not provided with the grammar rules although they are learning the language (Harmer, 1987). On the other hand, in explicit grammar teaching students are given the grammar rules and explanations overtly (Harmer, 1987). This type of grammar teaching draws the students' attention directly to the linguistic patterns.

Both implicit and explicit grammar teaching have received some criticism in second language pedagogy. For instance, Krashen (1981) opposes to the notion of explicit grammar teaching, and claims that it hinders acquisition. Furthermore, in his distinction between learning and acquisition, he argues that explicitly learned patterns can not be acquired later on. On the contrary, White (1987) claims that some grammatical points should be taught through formal instruction, as they may not be acquired implicitly.

Many studies (DeKeyser, 1995; Green & Hecht, 1992; Master, 1994; Robinson, 1996) have been conducted to clarify whether implicit or explicit grammar teaching is more effective. DeKeyser (1995), for instance, conducted a study to test two hypotheses: implicit-inductive learning is better than explicit-deductive learning for complex rules; and explicit-deductive learning is better than implicit-inductive learning for simple rules. Sixty-one students were the subjects of the study. Fifty-one of them were undergraduates

and 10 of them were graduate students. For implicit-inductive teaching, picture-sentence pairs were used, and for explicit-deductive teaching traditional grammar teaching technique was used. The results tended to support the hypotheses, but only the second hypothesis was supported. A similar study was done by Robinson (1996). He tested the same two hypotheses that were investigated in the study of DeKeyser (1995). One hundred four adult ESL learners were exposed to “implicit, incidental, rule-search and instructed trainings conditions”(Robinson, 1996, p.27). The results of the study revealed that implicit learners were not better than the others when the concern was complex rules, but instructed learners were better than the others in learning simple rules. These studies showed that explicit grammar instruction facilitates simple rule learning, but it has not much effect on the acquisition of complex rules.

#### Traditional Grammar Teaching

In traditional grammar teaching, e.g. the grammar translation method, explicit grammar teaching is advocated since grammar plays the central role in this approach. Grammatical forms are taught in isolation as discrete items through a structural syllabus that includes a list of grammatical items to be taught. Nunan (1991) gives the following description of a traditional classroom:

Traditionally, the language classroom was a place where learners received systematic instruction in the grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation of the language, and were provided with opportunities for practicing the new features of the language as these were introduced. Methodology training focused on the most effective ways for teachers to present and provide practice in the target grammar (pp. 143- 144).

In the Grammar Translation Method (GTM), for instance as one of the major approaches to teach grammar, the major aim is to provide learners with reading and

writing skills. This target is believed to be reached through a close analysis and practice of grammar. Richard & Rogers (1986) describe how grammar is taught and practiced according to this method:

Grammar is taught deductively- that is, by presentation and study of grammar rules, which are then practiced through translation exercises. In most Grammar-Translation texts, a syllabus was followed for the sequencing of grammar points throughout a text, and there was an attempt to teach grammar in an organised and systematic way (p.4).

However, this kind of teaching is quite problematic. The first problem that occurs is the learnability issue. Yip (1994) defines learnability as a “mechanism of progression from one state of knowledge to the next” (p. 125). This progression does not occur in an order that depends on the linguistic complexity. In other words, the “inherent learnability of specific [linguistic] features” (Ellis, 1990, p. 27) may be different than a syllabus that is designed according to rule complexity. Fotos & Ellis (1991) talk about the developmental sequence of learning and say, “there are psycholinguistic constraints which govern whether attempts to teach learners specific grammatical rules result in implicit knowledge” (p.607). Furthermore, Ellis (1993) argues that if learners are not ready to learn certain linguistic items, they can not capture and use them effectively. So, to what extent the given input turns into intake may depend on the learner’s psycholinguistic readiness to acquire that specific rule, a system that runs apart from teaching.

The other problem with traditional grammar teaching is the assumed linearity of the learning. In traditional language teaching, grammar has always been considered as bits and pieces of rules, and this consideration is rooted in these two beliefs:

1. a belief that language is built up out of sets of discrete entities and that language learning consists of the steady accumulation of such entities by the learner,
2. a belief that the essential characteristics of the entities (e.g. the 'rules' for their formation) can be directly imparted to the learner through teaching

(Rutherford, 1987, p.17).

So, it is assumed that rules can be learned one by one in an additive way.

However, learners do not learn in a linear way. Rules appear and develop in the learners' mind simultaneously (Nunan, 1988). They do not add up one on top of the other.

Rutherford (1987) calls this "accumulated entities" (p. 4), and states that language learners do not learn linguistic items in a "steady accumulation of more and more complex entities" (p. 5).

As we can see, learning is something different than structuring knowledge layers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the way the rules are taught in traditional grammar teaching does not match the way the learners acquire them.

### Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), as pointed out by Richards and Rodgers (1986), came into existence as a reaction to Situational Language Teaching, in which "language was taught by practicing basic structures in meaningful situation-based activities" (p.64).

When it was observed that the language teaching approaches of the time could not deal with the functional and communicative dimension of the language appropriately by focusing on grammar only, a need for a new approach, which could focus on communicative competence emerged (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). With this new

approach, the emphasis of language teaching shifted from learning about the language to learning about how to use the language.

CLT aimed mainly at developing students' communicative competence. In order to achieve this goal, students were provided with a variety of functions, meanings, and linguistic forms. Students were expected to learn how to communicate through communicative activities such as problem-solving tasks, role-plays, etc. (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Although knowledge of forms is considered to be important, there is the superiority of function over form (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). Thus, grammar has lost its centrality in CLT. It is viewed as just one of the four components of communicative competence, which are 'sociolinguistic competence,' 'discourse competence,' 'linguistic competence' and 'strategic competence' (Celce- Murcia, 1991). Moreover, as Celce- Murcia (1991) pointed out:

As a result of the communicative revolution in language teaching, it has become increasingly clear that grammar is a tool or resource to be used in the comprehension and creation of oral and written discourse rather than something to be learned as an end itself (pp. 127-128).

So, in communicative approach grammar is viewed as a means to reach the communicative goals. The aim is learning the language, not learning about the language. Therefore, meaning is emphasised all the time, and error correction rarely takes place in the classroom.

Although meaningful interaction rather than memorising grammar rules sounds attractive, the syllabuses which are purely communicative are also considered problematic as they totally ignore grammar instruction. As Salomone (1998) states, teaching without grammar leads to fossilisation in the learner's language. Learners do

not always realise their errors via ‘comprehensible input.’ In other words, the thought that comprehensible input is enough for the learner to acquire the needed grammatical forms may not be true all the time. Although comprehensible input is important for the learners, it is not sufficient.

Studies done on the learners in immersion programs revealed that they were far from being accurate since some of the rules could not be recognised (Ellis, 1997). For instance, it was found that immersion programs failed to provide accurate grammar use for their learners although they provided good communication skills. This finding shows that high levels of grammatical acquisition might not be achieved via only classroom communication (Ellis, 1997). On the other hand, the research which compared the instructed and uninstructed teaching revealed that instructed teaching provided some benefits in terms of the learner’s learning span and achievement level (Long, as cited in Long, 1991). Master (1994), for example, did a study on the effect of systematic instruction on learning English article system. A test consisting of 58 articles was given to 47 university students in four ESL classes, from high-intermediate and low-advanced levels as a pre-test. Fourteen of the subjects (one class) were used as the experimental group, and 33 of them (the three other classes) were used as the control group. While the experimental group was taking a systematic article instruction in their composition course for nine weeks, the control group was focusing on writing tasks in a parallel composition course. After the treatment, all of the subjects were given the same test as a post-test. The results of the study showed that while a significant difference occurred between the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental group, there was no significant difference in the results of the control group. So, according to the researcher,

the subjects receiving systematic instruction showed greater improvement than the ones who did not. These studies have revealed that learners do not gain linguistic knowledge naturally while they are dealing with communicative activities. The shortcoming of this approach has led to search for new approaches.

#### Focus on Form

As the research reviewed earlier suggests, since both traditional and purely communicative ways of teaching have been found to be problematic (Ellis, 1990; Ellis, 1997; Fotos & Ellis, 1991; Master, 1994; Rutherford, 1987; Salomone, 1998), a third type of teaching method, which combines the communicative skills and grammar instruction, has emerged. In this type of teaching students are given some tasks through which they acquire the grammar explicitly or implicitly and communicate at the same time (Long, 1991). Focus on form is something different than focus on forms. Long (1991) defines this difference as follows:

Whereas the content of lessons with a focus on *forms* is the *forms* themselves, a syllabus with a focus on *form* teaches something else—biology, mathematics, workshop practice, automobile repair, the geography of a country where the foreign language is spoken, the cultures of its speakers, and so on—and overtly draw students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication (pp.45-46).

So, while focus on forms directly focuses forms and teaches them in an order, the purpose of focus on form is to take learners' attention to grammatical points which they are experiencing problems with while dealing with a "pedagogic task" (Long, 1991). Many researchers agreed on this kind of a syllabus. Celce-Murcia (1991), for instance, by mentioning the use of some focus on form, supports such a syllabus and states, "We



should integrate grammar instruction into a communicative curriculum and reformulate the role of grammar in language teaching” (p. 123). She defends the use of integrating focus on form with content- based and/or task based language teaching, and says that grammar should not be learned as an isolated system, but it should involve “meaning, social function, and discourse” (p.123). Ellis (1994) states that this kind of approach leads learners to focus on form in communication context and facilitates acquisition.

Consciousness-raising is another technique providing a focus on form. It aims to make the learners aware of the new rules in L2 through communicative tasks, which are specifically prepared for this purpose. Although it has been claimed that “some consciousness-raising tasks may be considered focus on forms” (Doughty & Williams, 1998, p. 240), consciousness-raising tasks are one way of directing learners’ attention to linguistic forms. The idea of consciousness-raising was first introduced by Rutherford (1987). Then, it has been subject to many studies and many articles have been written about this approach by researchers like Ellis (1993), Fotos (1994), and Yip (1994). According to Ellis (1993), practice does not help the learner to develop rules in their mind; thus grammar teaching should be done through consciousness- raising by using a structural syllabus. He defines consciousness-raising as “a deliberate attempt on the part of the teacher to make the learners’ aware of specific features of the L2; it entails an attempt to instil an understanding of the formal and functional properties of these features by helping the learners develop a cognitive representation of them.” (Ellis, 1993, pp. 108- 109). Ellis (1993) defines practice, on the other hand, as the ‘opportunities’ that are provided to the students to master the forms that are presented by the teacher.

Although consciousness-raising activities are useful for the learners, they are not enough. Ellis (1993) states that consciousness-raising syllabuses should be accompanied by other types of syllabuses (e.g. task based or content based syllabuses) as they do not serve as a 'complete course'. Through grammatical consciousness-raising, teachers provide learners a tool to use in the way of being competent in the language; on the contrary, in traditional grammar teaching teachers try to pour this competence into the learners' minds (Rutherford, 1987).

Öncü (1998) did a study on comparison of grammar consciousness-raising tasks and traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction on teaching of modals: *can, may, must, have to*, and their negative forms. Sixty, second-year university students were divided into two groups and given a pre-test. In the first group, modals were taught through grammar consciousness-raising tasks, and the students in the second group learned the same modals through traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction. After a treatment for five weeks (20 hours), a post-test was given to the learners. The results showed that the first group was more successful than the second group in the post-test.

Fotos (1994) investigated the use of three grammar consciousness-raising tasks related to word order. 160 university EFL learners in three classes were the subjects of the study. Students in the first class were exposed to traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction, and the second class did three grammar tasks on the same structures. The last class dealt with three communicative tasks on the same grammatical forms, but did not directly include grammar content. The results revealed that grammar consciousness-raising tasks were effective in enhancing interaction and grammatical knowledge.

Yip (1994) conducted a pilot study on ergative verbs, which are quite difficult to learn for foreign language learners, and investigated whether consciousness-raising facilitates learning these verbs. For this purpose a contextualized grammatical judgement test was developed and given to two groups of advanced university students as a pre-test. There were five learners from different L1 backgrounds in each group. It was seen that most of the students judged the sentences that included ergative verbs such as *break*, *melt*, *cook* as ungrammatical and tried to turn them into passive sentences when they were asked to correct these statements. By claiming that positive evidence was not enough for learners to discover the rule, Yip suggested that the use of consciousness-raising could provide negative evidence, and could help the learners to draw the distinction between the ergative and the passive statements. After the pre-test, students were exposed to the consciousness-raising sessions for two weeks. Then they were given the same test as a post-test. The results revealed that consciousness-raising can be effective in this case.

Despite the popularity of grammar in SLA, studies done on grammar instruction are far from being conclusive. Ellis (1994) mentions, “It is probably premature to reach any firm conclusions regarding what type of formal instruction works best” (p. 646). If we can approach this issue with a different perspective, i.e. from that of teachers and learners’ perspective, we may see a different picture and gather conclusions that might help how to teach grammar (Borg, 1999; Borg, 1998). Thus, the following section takes the teaching of grammar from the perspective of teacher beliefs and attitudes. It presents a general view of the perceptions of teachers and learners about language teaching/learning, and then it examines the topic with reference to grammar.

## Teacher and Learner Perceptions

Despite the fact that there are different proposals as to how grammar should be taught in the second language classroom, teachers and learners and their beliefs and attitudes are other important factors which influence how grammar should be taught. This section focuses on these beliefs and attitudes of the teachers and learners.

### Perceptions of Teachers and Learners About Language Teaching

Teachers' and students' beliefs and attitudes mostly shape their language behaviours, and they directly affect the classroom practices. As Wright (1987) points out, "The teacher's style is inevitably going to be influenced by his beliefs and attitudes." (p. 62). Thus, even though there has been some developments day by day in teaching methods, and there are different ways to teach the language, it is still the teachers who determine how to teach, when to teach, and how much to teach in class, depending mostly on their beliefs. These perceptions of the teachers may be based on their own experience as learners, their experience on teaching or their training (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Learners also choose their approach for their learning depending on their own beliefs and attitudes toward language and language learning. Language learners have various beliefs about language learning. They generally come to the class with different beliefs and attitudes that are shaped by their previous experience with language learning. Some of these beliefs are based on students' cultural backgrounds (Horwitz, 1987) and social context of learning (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Horwitz (1988) points out "...student beliefs about language learning would seem to have obvious relevance to the understanding of student expectations of, commitment to,

success in, and satisfaction with their language classes” (p. 283). So, it can be seen that students’ perception about language serves as a determinant factor for their learning.

Since beliefs and attitudes of teachers and learners have such importance in their teaching/ learning process, this issue has attracted the attention of many researchers who deal with second language learning. One of the studies conducted to seek how much beliefs of teachers affect their teaching practices was done by Johnson (as cited in Richards, 1994). She categorised the teachers’ teaching approaches into three categories according to the beliefs they stated (skills-based approach, rule-based approach, and function-based approach). Then she observed these teachers’ classroom practices and concluded that there is consistency between their methodological beliefs and classroom applications.

Woods (1996) conducted a case study with eight ESL teachers from different universities in Canada. He aimed to determine planning and interpretive processes of these teachers by observing their classroom practices and through weekly interviews. Based on the 60 interviews and lessons, it was found that teachers’ interpretations of classroom events were strongly influenced by their beliefs, assumptions and knowledge about L2 teaching and learning.

Horwitz (1988) worked on learners’ beliefs about language learning. In her study, 241 beginning foreign language learners’ beliefs about language learning were explored through a questionnaire. The results revealed that most of the learners believed that they were expected to speak the language in a very accurate and fluent way, language learning could be achieved mainly by translating from English, some people were more skilful in learning languages, and a language can be learnt in a two years

time. This study showed that learners held systematic beliefs although some of them were far from being realistic. Discovering these beliefs is quite important in order to be able to change unrealistic beliefs of learners and expectations of learners related to language learning.

Another study related to beliefs was conducted by Wen and Johnson (1997). They explored the relationship between learner variables and success in English. The subjects of the study were 242 tertiary-level Chinese speakers who were learning English as a foreign language. They were administered a questionnaire that detected 16 variables. Based on a “hypothetical causal model” (p. 27), relationships within the variables and the relationships between learner variables and success were analysed. The results of the study showed that there were six variables that directly affected the success: sex, risk taking, vocabulary learning strategies, mother tongue avoidance, L1 and L2 proficiency. In the same study, it was found that belief variables have “strong and consistent” (Wen & Johnson, 1997, p. 29) effects on strategy variables. Based on this finding the researchers commented,

Whichever approach is adopted, success in identifying students’ beliefs about language learning and their related strategy preferences, and sensitivity in dealing with these preconceptions, are likely to have a major bearing upon students’ attitudes to the programme and upon its effectiveness (p.40).

Therefore, it can be concluded that beliefs and attitudes of the learners, as well as the teachers, have great impact on their performance and satisfaction with a course or a program.

### Perceptions of Teachers and Learners About how Grammar Should be Taught

When compared to other areas, it can be observed that teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward grammar have received less attention in research than has grammar itself (Borg, 1998; Schulz, 1996). Both students and teachers bring many different beliefs and attitudes related to grammar to the classroom, and these perceptions have direct effects on their grammar teaching/ learning. However, there are few studies on this important issue. Schulz (1996) conducted one of those few studies about beliefs regarding grammar. He examined and compared students' and teachers' beliefs about "the role of explicit grammar study in FL learning" (p. 344). Eight hundred and twenty-four L2 learners of German, Arabic, Chinese, French, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish and 92 FL teachers were the subjects of the study. The results displayed that all of the students supported the notion of explicit grammar study, no matter which language they were learning. On the other hand, the same consistency could not be observed in the teachers' responses. There were discrepancies in the teachers' beliefs toward the role of grammar in language learning. Their responses revealed some contradictions in issues like role of explicit grammar instruction. Schulz, then recommended that in order to increase students' success and participation, teachers should close the gap between their own and their students expectations.

Borg (1998) worked with an experienced EFL teacher in order to find out the relationship between the teacher's actual teaching, and beliefs and attitudes underlying his practice. First, he interviewed the teacher in order to get information about his educational background, why he became a teacher, and his opinions about second

language teaching. Then, he observed the teacher's practice for 15 hours in a two weeks time, and he identified some "conceptual categories" (p. 13) from the recordings of these observations. Based on these conceptual categories, Borg conducted two post-observation interviews with the teacher. Then, he showed the relationship between the teacher's actual teaching and beliefs and attitudes underlying his practice by analysing the data gathered in the interviews. The teacher seemed to have some conflicting beliefs about both second language teaching and teaching/learning in general. For instance, although he did not believe in the use of formal instruction, he used it in the classroom because of many reasons like working on grammar contributes to learning. Moreover it was found that the initial training of this teacher, in which he focused on communicative methodology, had a strong effect on his belief system. It was suggested by the researcher that more studies like the one he did would provide us with information about "what L2 grammar teaching actually involves" (Borg, 1998, p. 32).

Since human beings are emotional creatures, their belief systems play an important role on their behaviours. This fact is also true for grammar context. Both teachers and learners take their belief systems as a base for their actions, their negative or positive attitudes toward it. So, it is essential and logical to examine their beliefs. In this research, grammar instruction and grammar courses are examined from the student and teacher perspective. In other words, beliefs of the teachers and the students in preparatory school of Anadolu University (AU-FLD) are explored via questionnaires that specifically seek information about how they feel about the grammar courses that are taught in AU-FLD and how they perceive the way grammar is taught in these courses in order to shed light on their perception of the grammar classes that are taught



in this department. The findings of this study can guide both the administrators and the teachers in AU-FLD in understanding how grammar actually is taught in this school and in developing more effective grammar courses.

### CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to identify the beliefs of the teachers and the students about grammar courses that are held in preparatory classes of AU-FLD.

More specifically the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses in AU-FLD?
2. What are the perceptions of students about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses in AU-FLD?
3. Are there any differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses?
4. What are the perceptions of teachers about the way they teach grammar in AU-FLD?
5. What are the perceptions of students about the way their teachers teach grammar in AU-FLD?
6. Are there any differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about the way grammar is taught in AU-FLD?
7. Does the proficiency level of the students play a role in their perceptions?

#### Participants

The preparatory school of AU-FLD had 1157 students at 10 different faculties (faculties of fine arts, economics and administrative sciences, civil aviation, science, literature, education, tourism and hotel management, industrial arts, engineering, and communications). Sixty-eight English teachers staffed the program, 28 of whom were teaching the grammar courses at the time of the study. Courses of the program were conducted at six levels, which are determined by a placement test given at the very

beginning and in the middle of the term. At the time of the study, there were 3 beginner, 11 elementary, 9 lower intermediate, 7 intermediate, 6 upper intermediate and 1 advanced class. There were approximately 25 students in each class.

Twenty-two Grammar teachers and 141 students of AU-FLD participated in the study. Seventy-seven of the students were male, and 63 of them were female. One of the participants did not fill in the age part in the questionnaire. Six of them reported to be between the ages of 15-20, a hundred and five of them to be between the ages of 18-20, 28 of them to be between the ages of 21-25, and 2 of them did not report their ages. Students in the study were from 10 different faculties: faculties of fine arts, economics and administrative sciences, civil aviation, science, literature, education, tourism and hotel management, industrial arts, engineering, and communications. The number of the students from each department in the study is presented in the Table 1 (Seven students did not report their faculties).

Table 1

The Number of the Student Participants in Each Faculty

	Engineering	Communication	Fine Arts	Science	Civil Aviation	Literature	Economics and Administrative	Education	Tourism and Hotel	Industrial Arts
n	24	22	23	20	16	3	5	11	8	2
%	17.8	16.3	17	14.8	11.9	2.2	3.7	8.1	5.9	1.5

Note. n: number of students

The students in the study were from three levels, 49 from beginner/ elementary levels, 49 from low intermediate/intermediate levels, and 43 from upper intermediate/advanced levels. In this study one class from each level was selected randomly.

Grammar teachers who participated in the study were all ELT graduates. Only five of them had MA degree, and three had a certificate in ELT. Six of the teachers were male, 15 of them were female, and one of the teachers did not fill in the gender option. There were eight teachers between the ages of 20-25, five teachers between the ages of 26-30, four teachers between the ages of 31-35, three teachers between the ages of 36-40, and 2 of the teachers did not report their ages. Approximately, 41% of the teachers had experience in teaching English for less than three years. 32% of them had English teaching experience ranging from 3 to 6 years, and 18% had experience in teaching English varying from 10 to 14 years. The teachers' experiences in grammar teaching vary from 6 months to 5 years. Except for one teacher, all the grammar teachers were teaching other courses besides the grammar, and they had experiences in teaching different courses. The frequencies and percentages of teachers' previous and current teaching positions are presented in the Table 2.

Table 2

Teachers' Teaching Before and Now

	Core Course		Speaking		Reading		Grammar		Writing		Listening	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Before	22	100	9	40.9	17	77.3	21	95.5	10	45.5	14	63.3
Now	6	27.3	4	18.2	5	22.7	22	100	7	31.8	1	4.5

Note. f = frequency

## Instruments

This study employed two parallel questionnaires to collect information. One of the questionnaires was for the students in AU-FLD and the other questionnaire was for the teachers.

Questionnaires

Students and teachers in AU-FLD were surveyed using two questionnaires (see Appendix A for student questionnaire and Appendix B for teacher questionnaire). I developed the questionnaires based on the literature I reviewed for this study and my experience in teaching grammar courses for four terms in AU-FLD. The questionnaires were designed to gather information about the perceptions of both teachers and students about the grammar courses.

The student questionnaire consists of 24 questions covering three separate areas. The first section of the student questionnaire included five questions to gather data about students' gender, age, department, level at AU-FLD, and years of studying English. The information related to these questions is reported in the participants section. The

questions in the second section were related to the most preferred course of learners in general and in AU-FLD, and their attitudes toward a need for separate grammar courses, and the effectiveness of the grammar courses, and the third section had questions related to the way grammar courses were held in AU-FLD. There were three types of questions: rank order, Likert-scale, and questions allowing the participants choose more than one option.

The teacher questionnaire consisted of 27 questions covering three topic areas. The first section of the teacher questionnaire included nine questions to gather data about teachers' gender, age, years of experience in teaching English, years of experience in teaching grammar in AU-FLD, the highest degree they completed, whether they had any certificates for teaching ELT or not, the courses they had taught before, the courses they were teaching at the time this study was conducted and the levels they were teaching. The information related to these questions is reported in the participants section. The questions in the second section were related to the most preferred course of teachers in general and in AU-FLD, their attitudes toward a need for separate grammar courses, and the effectiveness of the grammar courses. The third section had questions related to the way grammar courses were held in AU-FLD. There were four types of questions: rank order, Likert-scale, questions allowing teachers choose more than one option, and yes-no questions.

#### Procedure

The questionnaire that was designed for the teachers was piloted with five English teachers at AU-FLD. They did not participate in the main study. The questionnaire for the students was piloted with 27 beginner level and 28 elementary

level students at AU-FLD; they did not participate in the main study. The pilot study showed that some of the vocabulary items were difficult for the students, thus the necessary changes in terms of vocabulary were made based on the results of the piloting.

The teacher questionnaire was administered to 22 of 28 grammar teachers since the others did not want to participate in the study. The student questionnaire was administered to 21 students from beginner, 28 from elementary, 22 from lower intermediate, 27 from intermediate, 21 from upper intermediate, and 22 from advanced levels. In total, 141 students answered the student questionnaire.

## CHAPTER 4: DATA ANALYSIS

### Overview of the Study

This study investigated the perceptions of the students and the teachers about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses in AU-FLD, and the way these courses were taught. Twenty-two grammar teachers and 141 students participated in the study.

In order to collect data for this study, both the teachers and the students were given questionnaires, which were parallel to each other. In the questionnaires, Likert-scale, rank order, yes-no, and questions allowing the participants to choose more than one option were used. The student questionnaire consisted of 23 questions under 3 topics. In the teacher questionnaire, there were 27 questions under 3 topic areas. Table 3 presents these topics and the number of the questions related to each topic.

Table 3

#### Types of Questions in the Student & Teacher Questionnaires

	Demographic Information	Perceptions about grammar courses	Perceptions about the way grammar courses are taught
SQ	5	9	9
TQ	9	9	9

Note. SQ = Student questionnaire, TQ = Teacher questionnaire

The results of the first section, that is questions asking for demographic information, were presented in the methodology chapter. The second section had 9 questions about the most preferred course of learners and teachers in general and in AU-FLD, and their attitudes toward a need for separate grammar courses, the effectiveness



of the grammar courses, and the third section had questions related to the way grammar courses were taught in AU-FLD.

#### Data Analysis Procedure

For analysing the data, statistical calculations were done using SPSS. Different questions required different statistical techniques. For rank order questions the Kruskal-Wallis test was calculated. For yes-no questions frequencies and percentages were calculated. To see across group differences Pearson Chi-square was calculated.

#### Results

The first area of this section is the second section in the questionnaire since the demographic information was displayed in methodology chapter. In this section, the results of the parallel questions in teacher and student questionnaire are presented.

#### What are the Most Preferred Courses for the Students and the Teachers in General and in AU-FLD?

Question 6 in the student questionnaire and Question 7 in the teacher questionnaire aimed to discover the most and least favoured courses for the students and the teachers in general. For this purpose, the students and the teachers ranked their preferences of the courses in a 6-point scale, by giving 1 to the most preferred and 6 to the least preferred course. Table 4 presents the results of these questions.

Table 4

Student/ Teacher preference of the Courses in General

		N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	df	p																																														
Core Course	Student	139	80.9	.002	1	.960																																														
	Teacher	22	81.5				Grammar	Student	140	83.4	1.754	1	.185	Teacher	22	69.4	Speaking	Student	140	77.5	7.656	1	.006	Teacher	22	106.6	Reading	Student	140	86.5	12.072	1	.001	Teacher	22	49.9	Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212	Teacher	21	92.6	Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1
Grammar	Student	140	83.4	1.754	1	.185																																														
	Teacher	22	69.4				Speaking	Student	140	77.5	7.656	1	.006	Teacher	22	106.6	Reading	Student	140	86.5	12.072	1	.001	Teacher	22	49.9	Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212	Teacher	21	92.6	Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839	Teacher	21	82.3						
Speaking	Student	140	77.5	7.656	1	.006																																														
	Teacher	22	106.6				Reading	Student	140	86.5	12.072	1	.001	Teacher	22	49.9	Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212	Teacher	21	92.6	Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839	Teacher	21	82.3																
Reading	Student	140	86.5	12.072	1	.001																																														
	Teacher	22	49.9				Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212	Teacher	21	92.6	Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839	Teacher	21	82.3																										
Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212																																														
	Teacher	21	92.6				Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839	Teacher	21	82.3																																				
Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839																																														
	Teacher	21	82.3																																																	

The Kruskal-Wallis test was calculated for this question in order to find out the most and least preferred courses of the learners and the teachers in general. Here, it is important to note that in the table the higher the mean rank is, the less preferred the course is since the rank orders were done by giving 1 to the most preferred course and 6 to the least preferred one. The table revealed that the least preferred courses of the students were Reading (mean rank = 86.47) and the Grammar (mean rank = 83.4), which were in the sixth and the fifth place, respectively. Core Course (mean rank = 80.93) was placed as the fourth preferred course. Listening (mean rank = 80.22) followed it. Writing (mean rank = 79.26) seemed to be the second most preferred course of the students, and

the most preferred course for the students in general was Speaking (mean rank = 77.55), the reason for it may be because this course is seen as fun for most of the learners.

Unlike the students, the most preferred course of the teachers in general was Reading (49.86). Grammar (69.43) appeared to be the second most preferred course. Core Course (81.45) followed the Grammar course. Listening (82.33) was in the fourth place in the rank order. Writing (92.62) was one of the least preferred courses according to the teachers; however, it was quite obvious that it was not as unfavourable as Speaking (106.64).

The Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to see if there were any significant differences between the teachers and the students in terms of ranking. The results showed that two courses; Speaking and Reading revealed statistically significant differences. Whereas Reading was the most preferred course of the teachers, it was the least preferred course of the students, and while Speaking was the least preferred course of the teachers, it was the most preferred course of the students. Based on the results of this analysis, it can be concluded that students preferred the productive skills (speaking, and also writing though for writing the difference was not big enough in general) to the receptive skills (listening, reading) in general. On the other hand, those productive skills were the ones that were least preferred by the teachers. Although it is not statistically significant, there is a big difference between the teachers and the students in terms of grammar course. Grammar course which is one of the least preferred of the students is among the favourite courses of the teachers. Usually, a grammar course consists of explicit rule explanation followed by mechanical drills related to that rule. The steps of this course are usually very predictable. In other words, students usually know what is

coming next in a grammar course. This monotonousness may be the reason for the students' dislike of the grammar course; and the teachers' preference for grammar courses may be because these courses are considered as a comparatively easy course to teach.

Assuming that there may be some differences between the teachers' and students' course preferences in general and in AU-FLD, question 7 in the student questionnaire and the question 8 in the teacher questionnaire were placed in the questionnaires. These questions searched for the courses the students would prefer to take and the teachers would prefer to teach in AU-FLD. For this purpose, the students and the teachers ranked their preferences of the courses in a 6-point scale, by giving 1 to the most preferred and 6 to the least preferred course. Table 5 presents the results of these analyses.

Table 5

Student/Teacher Preference of the Courses in AU-FLD

		N	Mean Rank	Chi-square	df	p
Core Course	Student	139	80.9	.002	1	.960
	Teacher	22	81.5			
Grammar	Student	140	83.4	.1754	1	.185
	Teacher	22	69.4			
Speaking	Student	140	77.5	7.656	1	.006
	Teacher	22	106.6			
Reading	Student	140	86.5	12.072	1	.001
	Teacher	22	49.9			
Writing	Student	140	79.3	1.557	1	.212
	Teacher	21	92.6			
Listening	Student	139	80.2	.041	1	.839
	Teacher	21	82.3			

As it was in the ranking of the courses in general, students' most preferred course appeared to be Speaking (mean rank = 77.55) in AU-FLD. Students chose Writing (mean rank = 79.26) as the second most preferred course. Listening (mean rank = 80.22) followed the Writing course in the rank order. Core Course (mean rank = 80.93) was the fourth preferred course of the students. Grammar (mean rank = 83.4) was appeared to be one of the last preferred courses by taking the fifth order. Reading (mean rank = 86.47) was again the least preferred course of the students in AU-FLD.

Teachers' most preferred course in AU-FLD, however, was Reading (mean rank = 49.86) as it was in rank order for the general ranking. Grammar (mean rank = 69.43) was the second most preferred course of the teachers which was exactly the same of the

general rank order. Core Course (mean rank = 81.45) was the third favourite course of the teachers. Listening (mean rank = 82.33) was the course that followed the Core Course. Writing (mean rank = 92.62) and Speaking (mean rank = 106.64) were the least preferred courses, respectively.

The Kruskal-Wallis test showed that the Speaking and the Reading courses were the ones that created a significant difference between the teachers and the students in terms of ranking. Whereas Reading was the most preferred course of the teachers, it was the least preferred course of the students, and while Speaking was the least preferred course of the teachers, it was the most preferred course of the students.

When the general rank order and the rank order in AU-FLD is compared, it can be observed that what teachers and students preferred in general was similar to what they preferred in AU-FLD. This means that both the teachers and the students have had similar experiences before and in AU-FLD in terms of these courses. Although it was popular among the teachers, grammar seemed to be quite unpopular among the students. The unpopularity of this course may be the indication of a problem in the grammar courses.

#### Do the Teachers and the Students Need Separate Grammar Courses?

This section presents the results of the questions about teachers' and students' perceptions about the separate grammar courses. The questions covered in this section are Questions 8, 9, 10 in the student questionnaire and questions 12, 13, 14 in the teacher questionnaire, which have the same statement for different levels. Since there was no significant difference among the levels in terms of these questions, first Q 8, 9, 10 in the

student questionnaire were grouped into one question, and the same procedure is followed for Q 12, 13, 14 in the teacher questionnaire. In Table 6, the results of these analyses are displayed.

Table 6

Perceptions About Separate Grammar Courses

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	104 74.8%	33 23.7%	2 1.4%	139 100%
Teachers	14 63.3%	4 18.2%	4 18.2%	22 100%
Total	118 73.3%	37 23%	6 3.7%	161 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 14.867,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .001$

Overall, most of the teachers and the students (73.3%) agreed that “students in all levels need separate grammar courses to learn grammar rather than integrating it with other language skills”. However, there were significant differences between the students and the teachers. Whereas more teachers (18.2%) disagreed with the statement, fewer students (1.4%) disagreed with it, and the percentage of the students who agreed with the statement (74.8%) was higher than the percentage of the teachers who agreed with it (63.3%). The results of this analysis revealed that although the grammar courses were not popular among the students, they believed that it was necessary. The teachers also believed that the grammar courses were necessary in order to teach grammar. This result revealed the importance given for grammar in language learning/teaching in AU-FLD.

### Are the Grammar Courses in AU-FLD Effective?

This section presents the results of the questions concerning teachers and students perceptions about the effectiveness of the separate grammar courses. The questions covered in this section are 11, 12, 13, and 14 in the student questionnaire and questions 15, 16, 17, and 18 in the teacher questionnaire.

Questions 11, 12, 13 in the student questionnaire and questions 15, 16, 17 in the teacher questionnaire, which have the same statement for different levels, are searching for the effectiveness of the separate grammar courses. Since there were no significant differences among the levels in terms of these questions, first, Questions 11, 12, 13 in the student questionnaire were grouped into one question, and the same procedure is followed for questions 15, 16, 17 in the teacher questionnaire. Table 7 presents the results of these questions.

Table 7

#### Effectiveness of Grammar Courses

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	49 34.8%	64 45.4%	28 19.9%	141 100%
Teachers	4 19%	9 42.9%	8 38.1%	21 100%
Total	53 32.7%	73 45.1%	36 22.2%	162 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 4.139,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .126$

As the table shows, in total the participants were undecided (45.1%) about the effectiveness of the separate grammar courses. However, the participants who agreed with the statement (32.7%) are more than the ones who disagreed (22.2%) with it.



Although the results of the chi-square analysis are not significant for this question, the difference between the students and the teachers who agreed with the statement cannot be neglected. Namely, more students agreed (34.8%) that grammar courses were effective than the teachers (19%) did. The reason for that may be because students are accustomed to be taught the grammar in a similar way in their educational background and they may feel as if they were learning much since they are provided with a lot of grammar rules. On the other hand, the reason of teachers' lower agreement rate may be because they know that providing learners only with the rules is not enough for a course to be effective.

Altogether, 19.9% of the students and 38.1% of the teachers disagreed that the grammar courses in AU-FLD are effective. Question 14 in the student questionnaire and question 18 in the teacher questionnaire were the ones that explain why they felt so. Answers to those questions were then analysed. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

Reasons for the Ineffectiveness of the Grammar Courses

	rank	S	rank	T
Students have to learn too much grammar in a short period of time.	1	73%	1	81%
I feel that students do not have enough time for practising the newly learnt rules.	2	70%	2	69%
Students are just required to learn the rules not the application of the rules.	3	35%	1	81%
The materials are not appropriate for the students.	4	29%	4	56%
The course book is not appropriate for the students.	5	21%	6	19%
Others	6	2%	5	38%
* The syllabus I have to follow for the grammar courses does not allow me to teach grammar effectively.	-	-	3	63%

Note. The sum of percentages is more than a hundred since the participants were allowed to choose more than one option.

\* Student questionnaire did not have this option.

As it can be seen in the table, the highest ranked reasons stated by the learners were “Students have to learn too much grammar in a short period of time at that/those levels” (73%), and “I feel that students do not have enough time for practicing the newly learnt rules in that/those class(es)” (70%). The teachers’ most popular reasons were “I have to teach too much grammar in a short period of time at that/those levels” (81%), and “We are just required to teach the rules not the application of the rules” (81%). Therefore, it can be concluded that the main reason of the ineffectiveness of the

grammar courses shared by both the students and the teachers is teaching too much grammar in a short period of time.

Other reasons of ineffectiveness of the grammar course stated by one student in the choice (f) and by 6 teachers in the choice (g). The only student who responded to this choice stated, “Teachers teach them [beginner/elementary] basic topics and sometimes they teach wrongly”. Two of the teachers thought that grammar courses were inefficient since students were not able to use the grammar rules that were “taught” in the class effectively and in the appropriate situations. The other two teachers complained about the difficulty of the syllabi followed in the lower levels. One teacher complained about teaching too many details in grammar, which was not useful for them. The last teacher who responded to this question stated that she preferred integrated-skill teaching.

The results of this section revealed that the both the teachers and the students were undecided about the effectiveness of the grammar courses. The ones who thought that these courses were ineffective stated the requirement for learning too many rules in a very short period of time and the requirement for learning the rules not their applications.

#### How is Grammar Taught in AU-FLD?

This section analyses the data pertaining to the perceptions of the students and the teachers about how grammar is taught in AU-FLD. To address this question, the answers given to questions 15, 17, 18, 22 in the student questionnaire and the questions 19, 21, 22, 26 were analysed.

Whether memorisation of the rules was demanded from the students is the first question of this section. The questions covered in the table are Question 15 in the student questionnaire and questions 19 in the teacher questionnaire. In Table 9, the results are presented.

Table 9

Memorisation of Grammar Rules

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	83 60.1%	15 10.9%	40 29%	138 100%
Teachers	5 22.7%	2 9.1%	15 68.2%	22 100%
Total	88 55%	17 10.6%	55 34.4%	160 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 13.367,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .001$

Although it seems that the teachers and the students tended to agree that memorisation is what is emphasised in teaching grammar, the majority of the participants who agreed with the statement is constituted mostly by the students. In fact, there is a great difference between the students' and the teachers' responses; whereas most of the students agreed that the teachers make the learners memorise the grammar rules, most of the teachers disagreed with the same statement. The results of the chi-square analysis were significant for this question. The results of the analysis of this question revealed that teachers and the learners perceive the rule teaching/learning in different ways. This mismatch between the students and the teachers may be resulted from teachers' insufficient description of the course requirements, or the testing system

which tests the knowledge of the grammatical items that are taught in class in detail may lead students to memorise each rule that appears in the classroom.

Results of the questions about teachers' and students' perceptions about whether learners are provided with enough chances to use and practice grammar inside the classroom (SQ 17, TQ 21) and outside the classroom (SQ 18, TQ 22) are presented respectively in Table 10 and Table 11.

Table 10

Opportunities for Practising the Grammar Inside the Classroom

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	82 58.2%	24 17%	35 24.8%	141 100%
Teachers	11 50%	3 13.6%	8 36.4%	22 100%
Total	93 57.1%	27 16.6%	43 26.4%	163 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 1.314,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .518$

The table reveals that more than half of the students and the teachers (57.1%) agreed that learners were provided with enough chances to use and practice grammar inside the classroom. Nevertheless, more teachers (36.4%) than students (24.8%) disagreed with the statement. The results of the chi-square analysis are not significant for this question. This means that the teachers and the students did not have different opinions about the inside class opportunities for practising grammar.

Although it seems that there is a conflict between the participants' responses since they thought that too many rules were to be taught in a very short period of time, and they also believed that they had adequate practice time, it is important here to note

that the participants who thought in this way were only the ones who considered the grammar courses as ineffective in AU-FLD. Moreover, this outcome may be resulted from their definition of adequate practice time. They may be considering those limited drill minutes as enough time for rule practising.

Table 11

Opportunities for Practising Grammar Outside the Classroom

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	36 25.7%	27 19.3%	77 55%	140 100%
Teachers	2 9.1%	4 18.2%	16 72.7%	22 100%
Total	38 23.5%	31 9.1%	93 57.4%	162 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 3.293,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .193$

However, Table 11 shows that neither the students nor the teachers thought students are provided with opportunities to practise the grammar rules outside the classroom (57.4%). The chi-square analysis results are not significant for this question, which means that both the students and the teachers agreed that there are not enough outside-class grammar practices. So, it can be concluded that grammar teaching/learning is limited only with classroom practice according to the students' and the teachers' perceptions.

The responses given to the statement "Teacher always explain grammar rules, and never encourages learners to discover rules themselves" are presented in Table 12. The questions covered in the table are Question 19 in the student questionnaire and Questions 23 in the teacher questionnaire.

Table 12

Explanation of the Grammar Rules, and no Encouragement of the Learners to Discover Rules Themselves

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	52 37.7%	18 13%	68 49.3%	138 100%
Teachers	4 18.2%	2 9.1%	16 72.7%	22 100%
Total	56 35%	20 12.5%	84 52.5%	160 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 4.286,  $df=2$ ,  $p=.117$

The table shows that the teachers and the students tended to disagree (52.5%) that in the grammar courses, rules were explained and learners were not encouraged for the discovery of the rules. Nevertheless, this disagreement does not mean that there is a communicative way of grammar teaching since the course requires the memorisation of the rules at the same time according to the students' perceptions. The differences between the students' and the teachers' responses were not statistically significant. However, the students who agreed (37.7%) that teachers explained the grammar rules and they did not encourage the students to discover the rules themselves are more than the teachers (18.2%).

The results of the questions related to presentation of grammar rules in context, which are question 22 in the student questionnaire, and question 26 in the teacher questionnaire are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Presentation of Grammar Rules in Context

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	62 44.4%	27 19.1%	52 36.9%	141 100%
Teachers	10 45.5%	3 13.6%	9 40.9%	22 100%
Total	72 44.2%	30 18.4%	61 37.4%	163 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = .406,  $df=2$ ,  $p= .816$

Overall, the teachers and the students tended to (44.2%) agree that grammar rules were presented in context. However, the number of teachers and students who disagreed with the statement cannot be neglected (37.4%). The differences between the students and the teachers were not statistically significant for this question, which means that they have similar perceptions about the presentation of the rules in class.

Results of the questions concerning teachers' usage of supplementary materials in grammar courses are presented In Table 14. The questions covered in the table are Questions 23 in the student questionnaire and questions 27 in the teacher questionnaire.



Table 14

Usage of Supplementary Materials in the Grammar Courses

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Students	41 29.3%	12 8.6%	87 62.1%	140 100%
Teachers	8 36.4%	4 18.2%	10 45.5%	22 100%
Total	49 30.2%	16 9.9%	97 59.9%	162 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 2.977,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .226$

Both the teachers and the students tended to disagree with the statement (59.9%) and thought that supplementary materials are not used in the grammar courses. The difference between the teachers and the students is not significant for this question.

The results of the analyses of this section reveal that according to the perceptions of the teachers and the students, grammar rules are taught in context and through the discovery of the rules with opportunities to practice them inside the classroom. The major distinction between the teachers and the students occurred in memorisation of the rules. While the students felt that memorisation of the rules was emphasised in the grammar courses at AU-FLD, the teachers disagreed with this opinion.

Level Effect

The questions above were reanalysed by considering the level variable. It was thought that this variable might affect the results of this study. Based on the results of the Chi-square analysis, differences among the levels were found to be statistically significant only for the questions 18,19, 21 and 22, which were about the practice of

grammar outside the classroom, explanation of grammar rules and discouragement of the learners in discovering rules for themselves, and the usage of supplementary materials. The responses given to these questions are presented in the Tables 15, 16, and 17, respectively.

Table 15

Level Effect on Practice of Grammar Outside the Classroom

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Beginner/Elementary	2 4.2%	4 8.3%	42 87.5%	48 100%
Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate	22 44.9%	12 24.5%	15 30.6%	49 100%
Upper Intermediate/ Advanced	12 27.9%	11 25.6%	20 46.5%	43 100%
Total	36 25.7%	27 19.3%	77 55%	140 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 35.398,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$

Table 15 reveals a significant difference among levels. While beginner/ elementary levels agreed that they are provided with enough opportunities to practice the grammar rules with a 4.2%, the agreement percentage increases to 44.9% in lower intermediate/ intermediate levels. It can be observed in the table that agreement percentage decreases in upper intermediate/advanced in comparison to lower intermediate/ intermediate levels. The results reveal the students' perceptions were that the lower intermediate/ intermediate levels are the levels, which have the most opportunities for practising the grammar rules, whereas the beginner/ elementary levels have the least opportunities for it.

Table 16

Level Effect on Explanation of Grammar Rules, and no Encouragement of the Learners to Discover the Rules for Themselves

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Beginner/Elementary	19 40.4%	6 12.8%	22 46.8%	47 100%
Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate	27 56.3%	12 10.4%	16 33.3%	48 100%
Upper Intermediate/ Advanced	6 14%	7 16.3%	30 69.8%	43 100%
Total	52 37.7%	18 13%	68 49.3%	138 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 17.711,  $df = 4$ ,  $p < .001$

The highest disagreement percentage was in the Upper intermediate/ Advanced levels with a 69.8%. Thus, they thought that their teachers encouraged them to discover grammar rules rather than explaining them. On the other hand, 56.3% of Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate level students thought that their teachers did not encourage them to discover grammar rules, instead they explained them. In the Beginner/Elementary levels the percentage rate is almost equally distributed between agree and disagree options. The distribution in the Beginner/Elementary levels may be resulted from their language unawareness. The Upper intermediate/ Advanced levels are the ones which have the highest level of language proficiency and the language awareness. They may use these cognitive strengths in rule discovery successfully in a very short time period. Thus, the teachers at those levels may feel more confident to let their students discover the rules by themselves. On the other hand, in the Lower

Intermediate/ Intermediate levels, students are exposed to a lot of new rules in a very limited time. Hence, it is possible that teachers do not provide their learners with opportunities to discover the rules themselves. Instead, they may prefer explaining the rules directly, which is a less time consuming process.

Table 17

Level Effect on the Usage of the Supplementary Materials

	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Total
Beginner/Elementary	37 4.2%	5 10.2%	7 14.3%	49 100%
Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate	11 22.4%	11 22.4%	27 55.1%	49 100%
Upper Intermediate/ Advanced	14 32.6%	11 25.6%	18 41.9%	43 100%
Total	62 44%	27 19.1%	52 36.9%	141 100%

Note. Chi-Square Value = 32.259,  $df = 4$ ,  $p = .001$

Table 17 shows that according to the perceptions of the students, Beginner/Elementary levels were the ones in which the supplementary materials were used most in the grammar classes. Since these levels are the ones that need more support to develop effective language learning strategies, they are provided with wider range of supplementary materials.

In conclusion, according to the perceptions of the students there were difference among the levels in terms of practicing grammar outside the classroom, explanation of grammar rules and no encouragement of the learners to discover the rules for themselves

and the usage of the supplementary materials. These differences may be due to the different features and needs of the different levels.

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study investigated the perceptions of the students and the teachers about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses at AU-FLD.

The results indicated that although the students did not prefer the grammar courses, they still thought that separate grammar courses were needed in order to learn grammar. Unlike the students, the teachers chose the grammar courses as one of the most favourite courses, and they also believed that they needed separate grammar courses in order to teach grammar. Although both the teachers and the students believed in the need of separate grammar courses, still there were some differences between them. Almost none of the students rejected the need of separate grammar courses, but there were a few teachers who believed these grammar courses are not necessary. The students' approval of having separate grammar courses to learn grammar may be due to the importance given to the learning of grammar in language learning in general. Grammar courses are demanded by the students since they seem to present the "learnable formulae" of the language which is complex in its nature (Green & Hecht, 1992). The teachers also seemed willing to teach grammar in separate courses. This willingness may be resulting from a similar belief about the teaching and learning grammar. As Green and Hecht (1992) state, when teachers teach formal grammar, their main assumption is "it will help the learners to 'get the language right'" (p.172). However, although both the teachers and the students defend the idea of separate grammar classes in general, some of them still notice some deficiencies in these courses. In general, both the students and the teachers were undecided about the effectiveness of the grammar courses. This result indicated that they had some doubts about these

courses. However, it seemed that more teachers than students felt in this way. This result is not unexpected, though. The teachers are probably more aware of the requirements of an effective course. Unlikely, students' satisfaction with a course depends highly on their beliefs and thus their expectations related to it (Shulz, 1996; Horwitz, 1988; Richard & Lockhart, 1996). Since these courses provide students with a variety of rules, they probably meet the students' expectations, and thus they find it somewhat effective. The main reasons of the ineffectiveness of the courses perceived by the teachers and the students are: teaching/ learning too much grammar in a short period of time, lack of time to practice the newly learnt rules, requirement for teaching the rules not the application, the syllabi followed in the grammar courses.

When all the reasons are considered, it can be interpreted that the main problem of the grammar courses in AU-FLD is the load of the syllabus according to the perceptions of the teachers and the students. Since there are too many rules to cover in a short period of time, the quality of the content of the courses decrease. The findings of this study revealed that students thought that they were required to memorise the grammar rules in these courses, but they also thought that they are encouraged to discover the rules in the class. According to their perceptions, supplementary materials were not used in the grammar courses. Although they thought that they were provided with opportunities for practising the rules inside the classroom, they do not have the same perceptions related to the practice outside of the classroom. Students seemed to have different perceptions about the practice of newly learnt grammar rules. While the ones who perceived the grammar courses as ineffective stated "lack of time to practice the newly learnt rules" as one of the reasons of this ineffectiveness, the others agreed

they that they were provided with opportunities for practising the rules inside the classroom.

The teachers had similar perceptions to the students about the way grammar courses are taught except for one topic. That is, while students believed that they were to memorise the grammar rules, teachers believed vice versa. This difference may have resulted from a misunderstanding between the teachers and the students about course requirements. The course objectives may not be presented to the students in advance. The perceptions of the students related to this issue may also resulted from the testing system. These perceptions may be motivated by the kind of examinations in which the students aim at scoring as many points as possible. It is found out in the study that both the teachers and the students believed that in general, learners were encouraged to discover the rules themselves; they also believe that teachers generally did not use any supplementary materials for the grammar courses. In those grammar courses, the teachers are not allowed to prepare their individual supplementary materials for their own classes. Thus, the preparation of the extra materials requires extra staff meetings, which is time consuming. Like the students, the teachers believed that the learners were provided with opportunities for practising the grammar rules inside the classroom, but they did not think that they provided the same opportunity outside the classroom. The lack of opportunities for practices outside the classroom may be resulted from the teachers' workload for this course. They may not find enough time to prepare and follow out-class performances of their learners.

The last research question was about whether students at different levels had different opinions about the need and effectiveness of the grammar courses and the way



these courses were taught. The data analysis revealed that the level of the students did not play any role in the perceptions of the learners about the need and the effectiveness of the grammar courses, which means that learners shared similar opinions about the need and the effectiveness of the grammar courses no matter what their level was. On the other hand, it was observed that students' perceptions about the way the grammar courses were taught differed according to the level. Namely, there was a difference between students from the upper intermediate/ advanced levels and the other levels. The students felt that there was more rule explanation and less encouragement of learners to discover the rules for themselves at the lower levels than there is at the upper intermediate/ advanced levels. This may be due to the language awareness and the proficiency level of the learners; the teachers may be feeling that it is easier and faster with upper intermediate/ advanced levels to do the discovery activities than doing it with the lower levels. They may be thinking that teaching the rules through letting the learners discover these rules is time consuming.

Another difference among the levels occurred in the practicing the grammar rules outside the classroom. Lower intermediate/ Intermediate levels believed that they had more opportunities to practise the grammar rules outside the classroom than the other levels. Lastly, it occurred that students believed that beginner/elementary levels were the ones in which supplementary materials are used most, accordingly. Since these levels are the ones which have the lowest proficiency level, they may need more support to develop effective learning strategies and their proficiency level. Through the use of the supplementary materials, the teachers may try to fasten this process.

### Implications

Based on the responses given to the questionnaires, some implications for AU-FLD and the field of ESL will be offered here.

Given the fact that both the teachers and the students want to have separate grammar courses, the question as to how these courses can be made more effective should be asked. The students' and the teachers' perceptions about the reasons of ineffectiveness of these courses can provide good source for the administrators of AU-FLD in searching for the ways to improve the effectiveness of the grammar courses.

The results of this study showed that one of the biggest reasons of the ineffectiveness of the grammar courses resulted from the syllabus that is followed in these courses according to their perceptions of the participants. Since there are too many rules to cover in a short period of time, they can not find enough time to practice the rules.

In the light of these findings, the reassessment of the syllabus that is followed in these grammar courses can be suggested to the administrators of the program. The load of the syllabus can be reduced, or some of the items may be shared among other courses.

### Limitations

Due to the time restriction, the perceptions of the teachers and the learners were investigated through only questionnaires; more reliable conclusions could be obtained if interviews and classroom observations were included in the study.

It is important to note that the students and the teachers who were the subjects of this study were in a particular kind of institutional setting, and thus the results can only be generalised with caution to ESL and other settings. In summary, this study could be

seen as having some relevance for grammar teaching in general with an expansion of the topic by viewing it with teacher/learner perspective.

#### Further Research

Further research may provide a better understanding of the students' and the teachers' perceptions about the grammar courses if it tries to replicate this study, but if it uses classroom observations and follow-up interviews. Moreover, further research should look at the reasons for the differences of perceptions both between the teachers and the students and among the proficiency levels of the students. Then, it may look for the ways to change these perceptions.

## REFERENCE

- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 9-38.
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27, 19-31.
- Brumfit, C. J. (1980). *Problems and Principles in English teaching*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 459- 480.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: an experiment with a miniature linguistics system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 379- 410.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. (pp. 197-263). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 91- 113.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotos, S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness- raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 323-353.

- Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 605-628.
- Green, P. S., & Hecht, K. (1992). Implicit grammar: An empirical study. *Applied Linguistics*, 13, 168-184.
- Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and learning grammar*. NY: Longman Publishing.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.) *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 119-129). NY: Prentice Hall.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283-294.
- Koshi, A. K. (1996). Holistic grammar through Socratic questioning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 403-413.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. NY: Pergomon Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Master, P. (1994). The effect of systematic instruction on learning the English article system. In T. Odlin (Ed.). *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Öncü, H. (1998). A study on comparison of grammar consciousness-raising tasks and traditional teacher-fronted grammar instruction on teaching modals in English. *Unpublished master's thesis*.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1994). Teacher thinking and foreign language teaching. [On-line]. Available: <http://langue.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/94/aug/richards.html>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex second language rules under implicit, incidental, rule- search, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 27- 67.
- Rutherford, W. E. (1987). *Second language grammar: learning and teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Salomone, A. M. (1998). Communicative grammar teaching: A problem for and a message from international teaching assistants. *Foreign Language Annals, 31*, 552-565.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*, 342-353.
- Underhill, A. (1999). Facilitation in language teaching. (pp. 125-154). In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Wen, Q., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: a study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 27-46.
- White, L. (1987). Against comprehensible input: The input hypothesis and the development of second language competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 95-110.
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, T. (1987). *Roles of teachers & learners*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yip, V. (1994). Grammatical consciousness-raising and learnability. *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: CUP.

## APPENDIX A

Dear Student,

I am a student in the MA TEFL 2001 program at Bilkent University. This questionnaire has been prepared to learn about your attitudes toward the grammar courses that are held in Foreign Languages Department of Anadolu University. I regard your answers as a valuable contribution to my study. They will provide important information about the effectiveness and the problems of the grammar classes, and how grammar classes can be improved. All the information in this questionnaire will be kept confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Gaye Çalış Şenbağ

**SECTION 1**

Please answer the following questions.

1. Gender: ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. Age: ( ) 15-17 ( ) 18-20 ( ) 21-25 ( ) 26-30 ( ) 31-35 ( ) 36+

3. Department: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Level: \_\_\_\_\_

5. How long have you been learning English? \_\_\_\_\_

6. Which of the following courses do you like in general? Rank them by giving 1 to the most preferred, and 6 to the least preferred.

( ) Core-course ( ) Grammar ( ) Speaking

( ) Reading ( ) Writing ( ) Listening

7. Which of the following courses do you like in our school? Rank them by giving 1 to the most preferred, and 6 to the least preferred.

( ) Core-course ( ) Grammar ( ) Speaking

( ) Reading ( ) Writing ( ) Listening



**SECTION 2**

Please put a tick (✓) near the appropriate item. Please tick only one item.

8. Beginner/Elementary levels need separate grammar course to learn grammar rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

9. Lower intermediate/Intermediate levels need separate grammar course to learn grammar rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

10. Upper Intermediate/Advanced levels need separate grammar course to learn grammar rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

11. The Beginner/Elementary level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

12. The Lower Intermediate/Intermediate level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

13. The Upper Intermediate/Advanced level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

14. If your answer to any of the Questions 11, 12, 13 is Disagree or Strongly Disagree, please indicate your reasons by putting a tick (✓) near the statements that are true for you. (You can tick more than one statement).

- a.) Students have to learn too much grammar in a short period of time at that/those levels.
- b.) I feel that students do not have enough time for practicing the newly learnt rules in that/those class(es).
- c.) The materials of that/those level(s) are not appropriate for the students.
- d.) (Answer this question if you use any) The course book of that/those levels is/are not appropriate for the students.
- e.) We are just required to learn the rules not the application of the rules.
- f.) Others (Please specify)
- \_\_\_\_\_.

### **SECTION 3**

Please indicate below how you learn grammar in our school. Put a tick (✓) near the choice appropriate for you.

**15.** Our teacher always wants us to memorise grammar rules.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**16.** Our teacher does not use grammatical expressions while teaching grammar.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**17.** Our teacher provides us with enough chances to use and practice grammar inside the classroom.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

18. Our teacher provides us with enough chances to use and practice grammar outside the classroom.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

19. Our teacher always explains grammar rules, and s/he never encourages us to discover the rules ourselves.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

20. Our teacher never explains grammar rules and s/he always wants us to discover the rules ourselves.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

21. When our teacher teaches a grammar rule, s/he first presents many examples and then s/he wants us to discover the relevant rules.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

22. Our teacher always presents new grammar rules in context. (e.g. conversations, dialogues, stories)

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

23. Our teacher uses various supplementary materials in our grammar courses such as pictures, real objects, etc.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree



8. Which of the following courses are you currently teaching? Please tick the one(s) you are teaching.

Core-course     Speaking     Reading

Grammar     Writing     Listening

9. At what levels are you currently teaching grammar courses in our school? Please tick the one(s) you are teaching.

Beginner     Elementary     Low-Intermediate

Intermediate     Upper Intermediate     Advanced

10. Which of the following courses do you like to teach in general? Rank them by giving 1 to the most preferred, and 6 to the least preferred.

Core-course     Grammar     Speaking

Reading     Writing     Listening

11. Which of the following courses do you like to teach in our school? Rank them by giving 1 to the most preferred, and 6 to the least preferred.

Core-course     Grammar     Speaking

Reading     Writing     Listening

## **SECTION 2**

Please put a tick (✓) near the appropriate item.

12. We need a separate grammar course to teach grammar for Beginner/ Elementary levels rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree     Agree     Undecided     Disagree     Strongly Disagree

13. We need a separate grammar course to teach grammar for Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate levels rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

14. We need a separate grammar course to teach grammar for Upper Intermediate/ Advanced levels rather than integrating it with other language skills (Reading, writing, listening, speaking).

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

15. The Beginner/ Elementary level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping the students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

16. The Lower Intermediate/ Intermediate level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping the students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

17. The Upper Intermediate/ Advanced level grammar courses in our school are very effective in helping the students to learn grammar.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

18. If your answer to any of the Questions 15, 16, 17 is Disagree or Strongly Disagree, please indicate your reasons by putting a tick (✓) near the statements that are true for you.

\_\_\_ a.) I have to teach too much grammar in a short period of time in that/ those level(s).

\_\_\_ b.) I feel that learners do not have enough time for practicing the newly learnt rules in that/those class(es).

\_\_\_ c.) The syllabus I have to follow for the grammar courses at that/those level(s) does not allow me to teach grammar effectively.

\_\_\_ d.) The course book(s) (if you use any) of that/those level(s) is/are not appropriate for my students.

\_\_\_ e.) The materials of that/those level(s) is/are not appropriate for my students.

\_\_\_ f.) We are just required to teach the rules not the application of the rules.

\_\_\_ g.) Others (Please specify)

\_\_\_\_\_.

### **SECTION 3**

Please indicate below how you teach grammar in our school. Put a tick (✓) near the choice appropriate for you.

**19.** I always want my students to memorise grammar rules.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**20.** I do not use grammatical expressions while teaching grammar.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**21.** I provide my students with enough chances to use and practice grammar inside the classroom.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**22.** I provide my students with enough chances to use and practice grammar outside the classroom.

( ) Strongly agree ( ) Agree ( ) Undecided ( ) Disagree ( ) Strongly Disagree

**23.** I always explain grammar rules, and I never encourage my students to discover the rules for themselves.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

**24.** I never explain grammar rules and I always want my students to discover the rules for themselves.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

**25.** When I teach a grammar rule, I first present many examples and then I want my students to discover the relevant rules.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

**26.** I always present new grammar rules in context. (e.g. conversations, dialogues, stories, etc.)

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree

**27.** I use various additional materials in my grammar courses such as pictures, real objects, etc.

Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly Disagree