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Tartalmi kivonat
Az elméleti nyelvtantól a pedagógiai nyelvtanig: a nyelvtan szerepének újraértelmezése az angol nyelv tanításában

Jelen disszertáció áttekinti és újraértékelő az angol nyelvtan tanításának és tanulásának folyamatait egy idegnyelv tanár szemszögéből. Felsorakoztatja azokat az elméleteket és grammatikai paradigmákat, melyek befolyásolhatják a nyelvtan tanítását és elsajátítását. A nyelvtantanításban alkalmazott megközelítések és módszerek újraértelmezését a kommunikatív nyelvoktatás széles körben való elterjedése motiválja. Ennek eredményeként mind az elmélet mind a gyakorlat terén változásokra van szükség.

A dolgozat egyik fontos célja, hogy a pedagógiai nyelvtan fogalmának újraértelmezése révén hozzáárukjon az angol nyelvtan tanításával és elsajátításával kapcsolatos ismeretnyag bővüléséhez és a mindennapi nyelvtanítási gyakorlat tökéletesítéséhez Magyarországon. Másrésztt kapcsolatot keres az angol nyelvtan tanításához kötődő tanári képzete és tévképzete, valamint gyakorlati módszertani eljárások között. A szerző hipotézise szerint a gyakorlott angol nyelvtanárak nyelvtantanításhoz kötődő képzetei messzemenően befolyásolják módszertani eljárásaikat az osztálytermi gyakorlatban, és ezek a változás folyamatának mozgatórugói. Mindenfajta szemléletbeli változás a képzete vagy tévképzete megváltoztatásával kezdődik, így ezek a folyamatok a szakmai fejlődés fontos állomásai. A tanári képzetei vizsgálata a nyelvoktatásban viszonylag új terület, ezért a kutatási rész egyik feladata az eredmények értelmezésén kívül az, hogy felhívja a figyelmet erre a területre a magyarországi angol nyelvoktatásban.

A szerző reméli, hogy jelen értekezéssel hozzááruk egyrészt az elméleti nyelvpedagógia tudásanyagának bővüléséhez másrészre gyakorlatiasabb nyelvtan oktatásának középpontba állításával az eredményesebb hazai nyelvoktatáshoz.
Abstract
From Theoretical to Pedagogical Grammar: Reinterpreting the Role of Grammar in English Language Teaching

The present dissertation attempts to reinterpret the process of teaching and learning grammar from the point of view of a language teacher. It provides an overview of the most influential grammatical paradigms and discusses their influence on grammar instruction. The necessity of redefining our approach to grammar is justified by the shift towards a more communicative approach to language teaching which should bring about changes both at a theoretical and practical level.

The aim of the dissertation is twofold. On the one hand, it aims to redefine the scope of pedagogical grammar and broaden the knowledge base connected to teaching and learning English grammar in a Hungarian context. On the other hand, it attempts to reveal the relationship between English language teachers’ belief systems and their instructional practice. The underlying assumption of the research is that English language teachers are guided by mental acts that have been shaped by the knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learning grammar that they have accumulated through their teaching careers. Changing teachers’ beliefs is essential for teacher development and represents an important step to improving current grammar teaching practices. Exploring teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching is a relatively new field of investigation, therefore, the research aims to stress the importance of this field in a Hungarian context.

The dissertation was conceived of and realized in the hope of contributing to the development of the theory of language pedagogy and to the enhancement of current grammar teaching practices in Hungary.
Zusammenfassung

Der Weg von der theoretischen zur pädagogischen Grammatik: Die Neuauslegung der Rolle der Grammatik im Unterricht der englischen Sprache


Die Autorin hofft durch die gegenwärtige Arbeit einen Beitrag zur Erweiterung des sprachpädagogischen Wissens zu leisten, und andererseits durch den verstärkten Fokus auf eine eher praxisorientierte Vorgehensweise zu mehr Erfolg im heimischen Sprachunterricht beitragen zu können.
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 The general framework of grammar acquisition 21
Figure 2 The interface position 31
Figure 3 The non-interface position 32
Figure 4 The revised model of second language acquisition 45
Figure 5 Types of grammar 84
Figure 6 Descriptive grammar as a source of other grammars 85
Figure 7 Conceptual levels underlying grammar teaching 87
Figure 8 Pedagogical grammar as a filter model 92
Figure 9 Levels of teaching 128
Figure 10 Teachers’ knowledge of grammar 128
Figure 11 Teachers’ knowledge of grammar books 129
Figure 12 Teachers’ knowledge of approaches to grammar 129
Figure 13 Teachers’ beliefs about focus on forms 130
Figure 14 Teachers’ beliefs about the use of terminology 131
Figure 15 Teachers’ beliefs about error correction 132
Figure 16 Teachers’ beliefs about the usefulness of discovery techniques 133
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>List of grammar definitions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Implicit and explicit language learning</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Options in grammar instruction</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>An overview of grammatical paradigms</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>A priori and emergent grammars contrasted</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Comparison of linguistic, descriptive and didactic grammars</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>The scope of teacher cognition research</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Background information about teachers</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics about the six areas of belief</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Correlation between belief areas</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF APPENDICES

- **APPENDIX A**  Questionnaire on Grammar Teaching  173
- **APPENDIX B**  Interview questions to teachers  179
- **APPENDIX C**  Observation sheet  180
- **APPENDIX D**  Cluster Analysis  181
- **APPENDIX E**  Chi-square test: items 14 and 45  182
- **APPENDIX F**  Chi-square test: items 30 and 41  183
- **APPENDIX G**  Chi-square test: items 3 and 48  184
- **APPENDIX H**  Chi-square test: items 6 and 36  185
- **APPENDIX I**  Chi-square test: items 19 and 37  186
- **APPENDIX J**  Chi-square test: items 15 and 47  187
- **APPENDIX K**  Chi-square test: items 16 and 46  188
- **APPENDIX L**  Chi-square test: items 11 and 44  189
- **APPENDIX M**  Teacher interviews  190
Chapter 1
Setting the context

1.1 Introduction

The whole impetus behind this work is to reassess the learning and teaching of grammar from a language teachers’ point of view and find relationships between teachers’ belief systems concerning grammar teaching and their instructional practices. Such an endeavour involves reviewing issues of theory and practice in the context of grammar instruction, in order to develop new ways of thinking about the teaching of grammar.

The choice of grammar as the focus of investigation in this dissertation is the controversies and paradoxes that surround it. On the one hand, grammar is an orderly, structured system, on the other hand, it can be characterised by many exceptions. A good command of the grammar of a language can be empowering, following grammatical rules slavishly, however, can be imprisoning. The language teacher has to be aware of these paradoxes and find individual ways of filtering his knowledge into the learners’ heads. This process is greatly influenced by approaches to grammar teaching and teachers’ belief systems including their feelings and understandings of the approaches. As a result, understanding how these beliefs influence teachers’ decisions in the classroom when they teach grammar, might give useful insights into how educational practice can be improved.

In this dissertation an attempt is made to give a comprehensive picture of grammar teaching approaches, influential grammatical paradigms in second and foreign English language teaching, and cognitive theories underlying the processes of grammar acquisition. As an outcome of the investigation the term pedagogical grammar will be redefined from a language teacher’s perspective. In addition to this, the influence of teachers’ belief systems on grammar teaching is explored as a relatively new field of investigation which has attracted a number of researchers during the last 15 years. Finally, a small-scale research is presented focusing on English teachers’ belief systems on grammar teaching. The information thus gained
provides the basis for drawing conclusions about grammar teaching in the English classrooms today and for outlining implications for the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL).

In sum, this dissertation sets out to examine the current situation in grammar teaching with the exploration of different approaches, psycholinguistic factors, and the effect of grammatical paradigms on the history of grammar teaching. Its aim is twofold. On the one hand, the term pedagogical grammar is redefined in the light of the latest developments, on the other hand, the research attempts to reveal how English teachers’ beliefs influence their instructional practice, and how these relate to the relative unsuccessfulness or successfulness of foreign language learning.

1.2 Brief outline of the content of the dissertation

This first chapter introduces the topic, clears the terminology used throughout the dissertation, defines grammar as understood in this work, and finally, outlines the research questions on teachers’ belief systems in grammar teaching.

The second chapter starts with a brief historical review of grammar teaching and with the discussion of the place of grammar in communicative language teaching. Grammar teaching in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was preoccupied with the notion of correctness, centred around sentence-level explicit grammatical analysis and instruction (Brumfit et.al., 1996). Language learning theories, such as those of Krashen (1988) and Pienemann (1998), and the communicative language-teaching movement (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979) have been encouraged to promote more meaning-oriented use of the foreign language and de-emphasize formal grammar instruction (Peck, 1988). Although the 1970s and 80s saw a decline of formal grammar teaching, nowadays there are a great deal of studies that prove the paramount importance of grammar instruction in the classroom. Thus, grammar is seen as a tool in language learning, not an aim in itself (Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith, 1988; Celce-Murcia, 1991).
Once the importance of grammar teaching in second language acquisition has been established, the second part of the chapter explores the psycholinguistic dimension of grammar learning and teaching by giving a comprehensive picture of grammar acquisition theories in second language acquisition. The role of input in language acquisition and the most influential hypotheses connected to the processing of input are discussed. Grammar learning is seen as a complex cognitive skill and a number of processes are explored which lead to a better understanding of how grammar learning takes place. Therefore, the next part discusses overlapping categories of ways of acquiring knowledge: declarative and procedural; forms of conscious knowledge: explicit and implicit; and the types of attention used in grammar instruction: noticing and consciousness-raising. Although there is some confusion in the terminology and disagreement on the effectiveness of different approaches, researchers agree, that some kind of focus on form is necessary for learning to take place. Finally, taxonomies for grammar instruction are explained based on the distinction originally made by Long (1991) including Focus on form, Focus on form and Focus on meaning.

The third chapter looks at the history of the most influential grammatical paradigms as they emerged chronologically and discusses their influence on grammar instruction. The traditional and the structural paradigms have focused teachers’ attention on the role of knowledge about the language, mainly grammar in foreign or second language teaching. As a result, the formal teaching of second languages has historically centred on the study of grammar. The emergence of the generative and the functional paradigms have led to the rise of experiential theories of language learning, the view that we learn primarily by using the language. Parallel to this the formal teaching of grammar was abandoned for a while.

The four most influential grammatical paradigms are presented in chronological order, however, this does not imply that each has in turn fallen from use. Moreover, they have influenced the different types of grammars used in linguistics and grammar teaching. Thus, the discussion of different types of grammar follows, since these provide particular tools for doing particular jobs. From the point of view of the topic of this dissertation the focus is on defining and redefining pedagogical grammar (PG) and finding its place among other grammars creating the link between theory
and pedagogical practice with respect to grammar instruction. *Pedagogical grammar* is therefore seen as an interface grammar existing either as a source of teaching materials or as a system of beliefs in teachers’ mind about effective grammar teaching. Teachers existing knowledge about grammar and about theories of grammar acquisition do not necessarily coincide with what they believe about how to teach grammar. The accepted view of PG as a source of teaching material is expanded with the exploration of teachers’ belief systems. The form of PG will be a reflection of one’s belief about the psychological processes of language learning. Therefore, teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching and learning have considerable impact on classroom practices. In the attempt to redefine the scope of *pedagogical grammar* the issues connected to grammar rules and the use of terminology are discussed. In these areas teachers have to make informed decisions every day, transforming knowledge they gained in their academic studies and their belief systems have a great influence on their decisions.

Chapter four investigates the area of teachers’ belief systems in grammar teaching outlining the scope of research in two areas: teachers’ beliefs in general and teachers’ beliefs in grammar teaching. The dissertation was conceived of and realised in the hope of contributing to a better understanding of how teachers’ beliefs in grammar teaching influence their way of teaching grammar and how the change of these beliefs might contribute to teacher development. Thus, teacher education programs might benefit from the insights of the research into English teachers’ beliefs in grammar teaching and contribute to improving current grammar teaching practices.

### 1.3 Terminology

In this section the terminology and key terms are described as used and interpreted in this work:

*Cognition:* The term is used in two different meanings in this work. In its first meaning it refers to “how the human mind processes all kinds of information, including the various mental processes used in thinking, remembering, perceiving, recognising, classifying, etc.” (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992:59). In this work *cognition* will be used as reflecting the processing, storing and recalling of the new
information in grammar learning and teaching. This meaning is used in the second chapter when discussing the different theories of language acquisition.

In the second meaning cognition means the store of beliefs, knowledge, assumptions, theories, and attitudes about all aspects of their work which teachers hold and which have a powerful impact on teachers’ classroom practices (Pajares, 1992; Borg, 1999a). This meaning of the term is used in the literature as well as in the fourth chapter as a synonym for teachers’ personal pedagogical system.

**Learning and acquisition:** Maintaining that the distinction between learning and acquisition might bear significance in certain contexts, the two terms will be used interchangeably in this dissertation. Although learning normally refers to conscious processes for internalising the language, and acquisition is reserved for subconscious ones, the distinction between the two is not unequivocal enough to use reliably. This is reflected in the ongoing debate about the conscious vs. subconscious dichotomy (Ellis, 1994:359-62).

**Foreign or second language:** Another problem is what terminology to use when referring to the language to be learned. If a distinction between second or foreign language needs to be made, second language refers to the language which is spoken as L1 by some members of the community where it is learned, that is, it has a social function. A foreign language is not considered to function as L1 in the local community, it is learned primarily for contact outside the community. In this respect, the Hungarian situation is almost exclusively a foreign language learning context. Similarly to the previous one (learning and acquisition), this distinction is not always water-tight, and because of the existence of second language acquisition (SLA) addressing issues of both learning and acquisition, second language seems to be the more widely used, generic term. Therefore, the current dissertation will use these two terms as synonyms.

**Teacher beliefs** is one aspect of teacher cognition which has attracted considerable research interest in the field of education in recent years, however, there is a lack of consensus about what the term exactly means (Woods, 1996; Borg, 2001). Drawing on a number of definitions, for the purposes of the present study one of the latest
definitions is accepted. According to this, the term teacher beliefs is defined as statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what should be done, should be the case, and is preferable (Basturkmen, Loewen and Ellis, 2004).

1.4 Defining grammar

To know what we are talking about it is essential to define the word grammar. The problems researchers encountered in the process of trying to grasp the essence of grammar and squeezing it into definitions are demonstrated in the following table which provides an overview of grammar interpretations in a chronological order. These definitions seem to represent a development in the interpretation of grammar from a narrow view to a broad one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leech, Deuchar and Hoogenraad, 1982:51</td>
<td>“We shall use grammar in reference to the mechanism according to which language works when it is used to communicate with other people. We cannot see this mechanism concretely because it is represented rather abstractly in the human mind. One way of describing this mechanism is a set of rules which allow us to put words together in certain ways, but which do not allow others.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal, 1987:88</td>
<td>“It is difficult to capture the central role played by grammar in the structure of language, other than by using a metaphor such as ‘framework’ or ‘skeleton’. ….. Two steps can usually be distinguished in the study of grammar. The first step is to identify units in the stream of speech (or writing or signing) units such as ‘word’ and ‘sentence’. The second step is to analyse the patterns into which these units fall, and the relationships of meaning that these patterns convey. Depending upon which units we recognize at the beginning of the study, so the definition of grammar alters. Most approaches begin by recognising the ‘sentence’, and grammar is thus most widely defined as ‘the study of sentence structure’. A grammar of a language, from this point of view, is an account of the language's possible sentence structures, organized according to certain general principles.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Richards, J.C., Platt J. and Platt H., 1992:161</td>
<td>“A description of the structure of a language and the way in which linguistic units such as words and phrases are combined to produce sentences in the language. It usually takes into account the meanings and functions these sentences have in the overall system of the language. It may or may not include the description of the sounds of a language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, L. 1993:111</td>
<td>“Grammar is the linguistic description of the rule system of a language and the explicit or implicit representation of this rule system in the learner’s mind.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batstone, 1994b:4</td>
<td>“At its heart, then, grammar consists of two fundamental ingredients – syntax and morphology – and together they help us to identify grammatical forms which serve to enhance and sharpen the expression of meaning.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, 1994b:347</td>
<td>“Grammar is a system of rules governing the conventional arrangement and relationship of words in a sentence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock, 1996:4</td>
<td>“Grammar includes two aspects: 1. the arrangements of words and 2. the internal structure of words.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur, 1996:87</td>
<td>“Grammar is a set of rules that define how words are combined or changed to form acceptable units of meaning within language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen-Freeman, 2003:142</td>
<td>“…grammar(ing) is one of the dynamic linguistic processes of pattern formulation in language, which can be used by humans for making meaning in context-appropriate ways.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1: List of grammar definitions |

Three observations can be made about the content of these definitions, taken from the linguistic and the pedagogical field. Firstly, in the definitions of Brown, Lock and Jung the structuralist point of view of grammar is prevailing covering only morphology and syntax. It is interesting to note that Lock (1996), whose book is about functional English grammar seems to exclude meaning from the narrow definition of grammar. Grammar is defined in these definitions in its narrow sense as
an external system isolated from the speakers and the context. In sum, in the narrow sense grammar means morphology and syntax (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983; Stern, 1992).

Secondly, the traditional, narrow view of grammar meaning morphology and syntax is expanded by scholars, psychologists and others who look at the English language from a different point of view than that of the grammarians. (Crystal, 1987; Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992; Batstone, 1994a and Ur, 1996). In their interpretation grammar is not simply structure, but structures in use in particular contexts. Larsen-Freeman (1991) reminds us that grammar is best seen as involving interrelationships among form, meaning and contextualisation including the dimensions of semantics and pragmatics into the scope of grammar. Celce-Murcia (1991) also takes the view that grammar interacts with meaning, social function, or discourse and does not stand alone as an autonomous system which should be learnt for its own sake. This is a broader view of grammar also shared by Helbig (1992) and takes us closer to pedagogical application.

Thirdly, three of the definitions take us into the cognitive dimension where grammar is seen not in terms of its forms but of its underlying knowledge systems (Leech, Deuchar and Hoogenraad, 1982; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). With this a reference is made to the internal grammar which is acquired through different mental processes. As a result, grammar is regarded as a system in a dynamic sense. The word “dynamic” used by Larsen-Freeman refers to our understanding of grammar as process and not only product.

Defining grammar is not a straightforward matter. For the purposes of this dissertation the following interpretation of grammar is used. For teaching purposes the broad conception of grammar is more appropriate, which is not only a description of the rules for well-formedness (morphology and syntax) but also rules specifying the relationships between grammatical forms or structures and the real use. This is termed communicative grammar by Leech:

“I understand communicative grammar to mean an approach to grammar in which the goal is to explore and to formulate the relations between the formal events of grammar (words, phrases, sentences, and their categories and structures) and the conditions of their meaning and
use. In linguistic terminology, this means relating syntax and morphology to semantics and pragmatics’… ‘Grammar is acquired progressively as a system …So grammatical knowledge evolves organically, rather than growing in discrete steps” (1994:19).

This view does not neglect the systematic nature of grammar, however, it is understood in an organic and dynamic rather than in a mechanistic sense (Rutherford, 1987; Leech, 1994, Larsen-Freeman, 2003). In accordance with this one of the most important tasks of a language teacher is to help learners to employ grammar effectively in everyday language use. In order to assist this process teachers need to consider the broader view of grammar including not only morphology and syntax but semantics and pragmatics as well.

1.5 Pedagogical grammar

In Chapter Two a number of theories are discussed on how grammar teaching should be more effective and what kind of cognitive processes are involved. However, the translation of these theories into the actual classroom experience of language learners remains the responsibility of the teachers. Pedagogical grammar plays an important mediating role in this process, since it is the link between theory and practice. We can only understand the role of grammar in language teaching if we consider what teachers know about grammar from their academic studies and what they know about the psycholinguistic processes taking place in grammar acquisition and what they are making of this knowledge in the classroom. The implementation of the theoretical principles happens with the help of pedagogical grammar, however, there are a number of other influencing factors involved: “traditions, personal preferences, personal experiences as learners, cultural and educational context and methodological orthodoxy” (Mitchell, 1994:91).

One of the aims of this dissertation is to define and redefine the scope of pedagogical grammar. Although the term is widely used, its meaning and context is not clearly defined. The discussion of the different interpretations of pedagogical grammar leads to a reinterpretation of the meaning of the term. In its expanded view it involves teachers’ beliefs about the teaching of grammar and about the processes
involved in grammar teaching. A teacher’s *pedagogical grammar* will be a reflection of his or her beliefs about the psychological processes of grammar learning and about the most appropriate approaches. Therefore, in this dissertation the concept of *pedagogical grammar* is expanded with the belief systems of teachers about the issues connected to grammar teaching and learning. By exploring teachers’ belief systems in connection with grammar teaching, we can outline the directions of changes that would be necessary both in teacher training practices and in the everyday classroom teaching context.

1.6 Research questions and hypotheses

The research investigates the hypothesis that it is possible to access the patterns of knowledge about grammar teaching and learning (teachers’ pedagogical knowledge) that experienced teachers utilize while they teach grammar. The underlying assumption of the research is that when teaching grammar teachers are guided by mental acts that have been shaped by the knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learning grammar that they have accumulated through the years. This pedagogical knowledge operates as part of the teachers’ pedagogical grammar.

The following questions have been set for the dissertation to address:

1. Is there any relationship between teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning grammar and their background context (age, sex, gender, teaching experience, school type and academic qualification)?
2. What kind of beliefs do practicing teachers actually possess and utilize when teaching grammar?
3. Are there any general patterns in teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge about grammar teaching?
4. Are there any patterns of association between teachers’ pedagogical knowledge about grammar teaching and their perceived pedagogical practice?
5. What does all this imply for foreign language grammar instruction and for teacher training?
In seeking to answer these questions the following hypotheses have been formulated:

- Teachers of English as a foreign language in the western part of Hungary are strongly influenced by traditions and their own experience as language learners when teaching grammar.
- *Teachers’ beliefs* about grammar teaching consciously or unconsciously influence their classroom practice.
- At the level of beliefs teachers are influenced by the principles of the communicative approach.
- English teachers are not consciously aware of the ways their learners learn or acquire grammar as a result of their teaching.
- The typical grammar teaching applied by the majority of teachers is still characterized by traditional form-focussed activities, grammar practice activities, oral drills and translation.

To answer the research questions and see how far the hypotheses are confirmed, a small scale research involving 63 teachers of English as a foreign language has been conducted. Their beliefs on grammar teaching were examined by the application of a belief inventory questionnaire. Parallel to this method, observations were carried out by the researcher in the English language classes of the teachers involved and interviews conducted with the same teachers in order to see how they view related matters. On the basis of the collected data, suggestions for including a *Pedagogical grammar* course in teacher training programs have been offered to improve current grammar teaching practices.
Chapter 2
The Theoretical Background to Grammar Teaching and Learning

2.1 A brief historical view of grammar teaching

The main part of this section looks at the history of grammar teaching and how this shapes our assumptions about how we teach it. The reason for looking back is that “history gives us perspective” (Titone, 1968:2) and past experiences give us the opportunity to better perceive tendencies in today’s language teaching methodology. In order to fully understand the present picture of grammar teaching, it is useful to consider in some detail some of the most important developments in its history.

“Traditionally, grammar has been the sine qua non of language teaching” (Stern, 1992:127). According to Rutherford (1987) for 2,500 years the teaching of grammar had often been synonymous with foreign language teaching. Current views on grammar teaching and learning can be traced back to nineteenth-century thinking. There is, for instance, the assumption that a good knowledge of grammar leads to clear thinking and aids intellectual discipline. Its central position has never been debated.

However, several second language researchers and teachers have questioned the role of grammar over the past 15 years (Brown, 1994a; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Fotos, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 1991; Nunan, 1994; Stern 1992; Terrell, 1991).

2.1.1 To teach or not to teach grammar, that is the question

The word “traditional” is often used in connection with grammar teaching when referring to the beginning of the nineteenth century. By “traditional” we mean a simple, straightforward and systematic approach to grammar. This idea is rooted in the way as Latin grammar is taught using a method called Grammar Translation. As Richards and Rogers describe it:

“grammar translation approaches the language first through detailed analysis of its grammar rules, followed by application of this
knowledge to the task of translating sentences and texts into and out of the target language. It hence views language learning as consisting of little more than memorizing rules and facts in order to understand and manipulate the morphology and syntax of the foreign language” (1986:3).

Although certain scholar-educators challenged the grammar translation approach in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in an effort to place emphasis on the acquisition of oral language skills (e.g. Gouin and the famous “Gouin series”, the Direct Method), Grammar Translation was a dominant language teaching paradigm well into the middle part of the twentieth century. Born of the United States army’s interest in developing oral language skills during World War II, audio-lingual methodology was supported by American structural linguistics and the theory of behaviourism. This meant that the grammatical system was to be uncovered by the learner through rote practice of sentence patterns, memorization of dialogues, and other oral practice. In audio-lingual methodology grammar learning was thought to take place through stimulus-response conditioning, which led to the overlearning of the grammatical patterns of a language. It was not necessary for learners to know what rules they were learning, but it was necessary for them to correctly repeat, transform, and perform other manipulations on sentences orally as a necessary first step towards achieving communicative ability.

In the work of such British language teaching specialists as Hornby (1954) and Palmer (1968), and such American specialists as Fries (1945) and Lado (1961), questions concerning the linguistic content of a language program were considered primary and a necessary basis for planning a language program. This reflects the fact that many applied linguists were trained as linguists, therefore, a linguistically constructed syllabus was considered as an optimal introduction to the target language resulting in a structural orientation.

With the rise of Generative Grammar and its view of language as a system of rules, grammar learning was seen to take place through a process of rule formation. This meant that learners formulated, tested and revised hypotheses about grammatical structures in the target language.
Generally, the twentieth century is characterized by the rise of experiential theories of language learning and development. The view that we learn primarily by using the language achieved wide acceptance and resulted in the abandonment of the formal teaching of grammar. Krashen’s theories of language learning (1988) and the communicative movement (Brumfit and Johnson, 1979) encouraged more meaning-oriented use of the foreign language and de-emphasized formal grammar instruction.

In language teaching there has been a shift of focus from teaching to learning during the last 50 years. Ellis (1984) assumes that there is a strong connection between what teachers teach and students learn. This belief has long been the focus of attention dating back to Antiquity (Stern, 1983). Others formulate their opinions more cautiously. Rivers describes teaching as “the teacher’s contribution to language learning” (1983:2). According to Ellis, it is “the external manipulation of the input” (1989:305). These statements show that the view of the traditional causative relationship between teaching and learning – I teach therefore you learn – has been modified. The learner’s cognitive involvement is more and more appreciated. As a result, cognitive theories of language acquisition have emerged. A detailed discussion of the cognitive dimension follows in section 2.3.

In the 1970s arguments were developed to support the undesirability of teaching grammar based on empirical research by L2 researchers. Bailey et al (1974) found that there was little difference in the development of accuracy in speakers of first languages learning English naturalistically or in the classroom, whether in childhood or adulthood. Pica’s (1983) study also suggests that grammar teaching has no effect on L2 grammatical development.

Another argument against the teaching of grammar emerged from Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1985). The theory maintains that language learning progresses as the result of learners being exposed to samples of the target language which are a bit beyond the learner’s current competence. That is, the input is comprehensible, but contains elements of the target language, that are new to the learner. In this way the new items become part of the learner’s subconscious grammar naturally and effortlessly.
If there is no empirical evidence that grammar teaching has a direct effect on the course of grammatical development, why teach grammar at all. From the 1970s on there have been a number of teaching methods that excluded grammar teaching, for example the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983), Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1978), Total Physical Response (Asher, 1982), and immersion programmes (Baker, 1993). However, the strong point of natural approaches is that they promote communicative competence, but they do not appear to encourage grammatical accuracy.

Grammar or no grammar has been a debate in language teaching since the early days of what came to be known as the communicative revolution in the late 1970s and early 1980s. An extremist position was no grammar at all, a view held by over-enthusiasts in the field. However, the need for grammar teaching is embedded in the slogan of the communicative revolution itself. The aim of language teaching is defined to help the development of communicative competence, which includes grammatical competence.

2.1.2 Communicative language teaching (CLT) and grammar

One of the cornerstones of CLT is the interpretation of *competence*. The origins of the concept of *competence* go back to Chomsky’s understanding of it as the knowledge of “an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community” (1965:3). Competence, the primary concern of linguistic theory, is said to underlie performance. Hymes (1972) wished to broaden the concept of *competence* beyond grammar as a reaction against Chomsky’s interpretation. Besides including knowledge of the formal linguistic system, Hymes wanted to account for the possibility of our use of the language in social interaction. Thus, Hymes’ *communicative competence* includes four components:

1. the formal possibility of an utterance;
2. its feasibility;
3. its appropriacy in relation to a context;
4. its probability of use;
Two of these four components – appropriacy and probability – have had tremendous influence on communicative foreign language teaching. What is taught by teachers is not formally driven, but determined by the use or the context. As a result, grammar became neglected. This was due to the reaction against an earlier over-emphasis on grammar. Soon, however, it was acknowledged that the tendency to overemphasize appropriateness and probability happens at the expense of the other sectors, including grammatical competence. It meant that Hymes’ communicative competence implied grammatical competence. Its effect was the realization that form-oriented activities need to precede message-oriented activities if effective communication is to take place (Hawkins, 1981; Littlewood, 1981).

The integration of grammar teaching into communicative language teaching seems to be a need to fill the gap left by the first attempts to apply communicative language teaching. While the strong version of the communicative movement pays no attention to grammar learning in the classroom, the weak version attempts to integrate a communicative component into a traditional setting (Allright, 1977).

CLT does not mean a rejection of grammar, but the adaptation of a different approach to the teaching of grammar.

“Reason, balance, and the experience of teachers in recent CLT tradition tell us that judicious attention to grammatical form in the adult classroom is not only helpful, if appropriate techniques are used, be essential to a speedy learning process” (Brown, 1994b:349).

In sum, communicative language teaching has its theoretical roots in sociolinguistics and in the models of language use. The integration of grammar teaching into the communicative syllabus needs to be addressed as part of communicative competence, however, the reinstatement of grammar should not lead back to an emphasis on formal considerations. In addition, psycholinguistics needs to be involved for evidence of how learners learn looking for ways of relating these insights to pedagogical practice.

Another influence on the communicative approach came from Searle’s Speech Act Theory. His distinction between “just uttering sounds or making marks and performing an illocutionary act” (Searle, 1969:42) cannot be realized in many
activities in language teaching, since these are still ultimately concerned with language as a code, rather than language as communication. Many activities under the umbrella term “communicative” still fall outside Searle’s definition of serious and genuine communication since they include a number of things which are not normally part of the way language is used in the world outside the language classroom.

2.1.3 Problems with CLT

According to Rogers there are no theoretical roots to explain how the language classroom can become an entirely authentic reproduction of language use outside the classroom:

“Communicative language teaching has its theoretical roots in sociolinguistics and the philosophy of language… the assumption that language use in a classroom context will lead to language learning cannot be justified on the basis of these theoretical origins, since neither says anything about the relationship between use and learning. The integration of grammar teaching into the communicative syllabus needs to be addressed … it seems sensible to abandon the illusion that the language teaching classroom can be an entirely authentic reproduction of language outside this context” (1996:37).

With the preference given to notional and social-functional aspects of language, communicative language teaching neglected linguistic competence and assumed that linguistic form emerges on its own as a result of learners’ engagement in communicative activities. However, this is against the principles of cognitive psychology. “For learning to take place efficiently the learner must pay attention to the learning objective and then practice it so that it changes to an automatic process” (Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurell, 1997:143).

The problem lies in the separation of language forms from meaning, since grammar does not exist apart from communication. Grammar and communication cannot be separated, rather they influence each other. The message and the code interact and ideas take shape in the moment. The wrong order, the wrong function word, or the wrong inflection may cause miscommunication in the message. Therefore, proficiency and accuracy should be allies not enemies.
In an assessment of both the merits and the drawbacks of communicative language teaching it is probably fair to draw the following conclusions. Firstly, and most importantly, to the participants of the communicative language teaching movement we owe the insight that functions and notions, rather than structures and forms are conveyed as elements of human communication. Secondly, new teaching practices have been steadily gaining ground that were firmly based on the belief that efficient foreign language learning could best be realized through intensive classroom interaction. The role of grammar instruction in this process has gone through different stages. Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei and Thurell claim that CLT has come to a turning point, where the task of the new approach is to “synthesize direct, knowledge-oriented and indirect, skill-oriented teaching approaches” (1997:148).

Having looked at the brief history of grammar teaching and having indicated the tendencies in favour or against the teaching of grammar, the next sections look at second language acquisition processes in relation to grammar.

### 2.2 Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and grammar teaching

Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is a relatively new field of study, it has existed for little more than 30 years (Ellis, 1993). During this time it has had considerable influence on the teaching of grammar.

The following sections attempt to give a summary of the findings of SLA research on grammar instruction. Although there are more questions than answers in the field, research findings may contribute to a better understanding of the concept of teaching grammar.

“There is now general acceptance in the SLA research community that the acquisition of an L2 grammar, like the acquisition of an L1 grammar, occurs in stages” (Ellis, 1994:21).

Besides Ellis, Krashen (1985) and Pienemann (1986, 1989) made comments on the effect of developmental sequences on grammar pedagogy. Although both of them
base their conclusions on the findings that learners of a second language proceed through predictable stages, their teaching proposals are different.

Krashen suggests that teachers should count on the availability of the linguistic features at the appropriate next developmental level (which he calls i+1) in any rich enough context of comprehensible input. His proposal is exclusively based on the provision of comprehensible input and is against the use of any specific linguistic form for focused attention. He emphasizes the value of language teaching methods, thus his focus is on how to teach. Pienemann’s pedagogical recommendations on the other hand are based on his teachability hypothesis. Unlike Krashen he concentrates on what to teach, on the linguistic features that are likely to be affected by instruction and when those features are best taught. Although they disagree on pedagogical recommendations, Krashen and Pienemann appear to agree on the assumption that learners themselves will process and use for acquisition only those items which are developmentally appropriate.

2.2.1 Second language acquisition theories

Second language acquisition research aims to describe and explain how L2 acquisition takes place. However, its field of interest is different from that of language pedagogy. While SLA investigates natural ways of acquiring a language, the goal of foreign language pedagogy is to arrange the learning experiences of L2 learners in such a way that they will learn with maximal efficiency. Therefore, SLA is not directly interested in institutionalised foreign language teaching. Still, there is some research evidence in SLA that can be applied in language teaching.

In foreign language teaching in general and in grammar instruction in particular the learners are faced with different options. The choice of the right option should ideally be based on psycholinguistic processes relevant for L2 acquisition. “A teaching approach which goes against the grain of natural disposition will create needless difficulties for the learner” (Widdowson, 1990:48). If the method of instruction is not useful for the learner, then grammar instruction is in vain.
Research in SLA has already provided us with theories of language acquisition which proved to be useful in second language pedagogy. However, there are still a lot of questions to be answered. The theories should serve as sources of information for teachers and learners alike and should help make informed decisions in the teaching-learning process. Therefore, some relevant theories of SLA research will be discussed as theoretical foundations behind grammar instruction.

2.3 The cognitive dimension in SLA and grammar

In the current teaching and learning trend the emphasis has shifted on learners as active information processors and on cognitive processes within learners, while teaching is just a way of facilitating learning. Therefore, teachers should know how learning grammar takes place in order to help learners control the central aspects of the process of learning. Cognitive psychology provides a general framework of information processing to explain the learning process. These findings are applied to second language learning in general and learning or acquiring grammatical structures in particular.

Human language use depends on a creative faculty that is being able to use the stored rules and patterns (Rubin, 1987). Therefore, knowing how grammar rules can be stored, used and checked is of crucial importance for learning a second language. Although there are different ways of explaining how second language acquisition takes place, SLA researchers base their theories on cognitive psychology. The following sections investigate the role of cognitive theories, their effect on second and foreign language acquisition, and grammar teaching in particular.

2.3.1 General theoretical framework for the acquisition of grammar

The following discussion of the general theoretical framework for investigating L2 acquisition including grammar is based on the work of Ellis (1994) and Skehan (1996). They distinguish five main stages of the learning process with the aim of providing a rationale for grammar instruction in language teaching: input, intake, acquisition, access and output:
Each stage in the framework has been further expanded and the processes included have been debated by applied linguists. The main question is what kind of language data are needed for learners’ internal mechanisms in order to operate efficiently and effectively. The concept of input is of central importance to this question.

In the 1950s and 1960s the debate between Skinner and Chomsky about the child’s acquisition of language started the enquiry into how input is related to acquisition. The behaviourist learning theory (e.g., Skinner, 1957) supposed that language learning occurred through a stimulus-response-feedback process. This model of learning claimed that imitation was a necessary precondition for language learning. Learners would receive language input through listening as stimulus, and learn through imitation of this input. Imitation - together with the effects of corrective feedback acting as reinforcement - would lead to the successful internalisation of new language items which would be added to the learner’s grammar. Listening had a key role in the behaviourist view of language learning, both as the channel for the input of the stimulus, and also for the reinforcement of learning. Early SLA theories assigned key roles to input, as stimulus, and to feedback.

This view of language learning was discredited largely through the work of Chomsky (1957, 1965). He believed that the learning of a first language (L1) was unlike the learning of any other complex skill and that humans innately possess a language acquisition device (LAD) that could be used to act on language input and create language capability. For Chomsky then, input served to trigger the innate language learning processes and mechanisms with which humans are born. He did not address the question of L2 learning, but these innatist ideas influenced the role ascribed to input by later SLA theorists, such as Krashen (1987).
2.3.2 The role of input, intake and output in language acquisition

A central concern in SLA is the question of the process of acquisition, more precisely how the type of linguistic environment facilitates learner comprehension and acquisition. In the following different theoretical claims are discussed in order to explore the link between the various sources of input and language development.

The role of input comprehension has been of primary importance in second language acquisition research and theory. This has been motivated by the belief that a learner’s exposure to the target language is not in itself a sufficient condition for second language acquisition. The learner must comprehend the input if it is to assist the acquisition process. Therefore, input that is understood by the learner constitutes primary data for SLA. Given the importance of input comprehension in language acquisition, current SLA research has tried to identify the role of input in the language learning process. Most of the studies on input comprehension have developed from Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1985).

2.3.2.1 Input and intake

The starting point of all language learning process is some kind of input. The term has been taken over from computer language referring to data entered into a system for processing. Input has been defined as “…the potentially processable language data which are made available by chance or by design, to the language learner” (Sharwood-Smith, 1993:167). In language teaching input refers to the language resources, textbooks, materials, and classroom discourse that are used to initiate the language learning process. The use of the term is problematic, since it implies a passive learner as a tabula rasa, who is absorbing rules and structures of a foreign language in isolation. Hundreds of years of language teaching experience prove the opposite. When learners receive input they already have some background knowledge and are influenced by internal and external factors. This makes the investigation of the effect of input on the acquisition process extremely difficult.
On the other hand, what is taught rarely equals with what is learnt. Therefore, input is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for language learning. If input is internalised by the learner, it becomes intake. Intake is that part of the input that has actually been processed and turned to knowledge of some kind. Input is data that the second language learner hears and intake is “that portion of the L2 which is assimilated and fed into the interlanguage system” (Ellis, 1985:159). Comprehensible input needs to become intake for learners to develop in their second language (Ellis, 1985; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991). Input has to be utilised by the learner to become intake:

“Intake is that part of the input that learners notice and therefore take into temporary memory. Intake may subsequently be accommodated in the learner’s interlanguage system” (Ellis, 1994:708)

There are several factors affecting how items pass from input to intake. These include the following:

1. complexity: items should be at an appropriate level of difficulty;
2. saliency: items must be noticed or attended to in some way;
3. frequency: items must be experienced with sufficient frequency;
4. need: the items must fulfil a communicative need (Richards, 2002:41).

2.3.2.2 The Input Hypothesis

Within the framework of the Monitor Model Krashen has developed his Input-Hypothesis, an attempt to explain how a learner acquires a second language (1985). The learner progresses along a natural order when receiving input that is one step beyond the learner’s current stage of linguistic competence (i+1). This is called comprehensible input. If the input is understood and there is enough of it, the learner will automatically acquire the necessary grammar. Krashen claims that comprehensible input is not only necessary but also sufficient for successful SLA to take place. However, he does not believe that focusing on any particular form will alter language acquisition.

There are some dangers with Krashen’s approach since mature learners may communicate by using strategies which ignore the underlying language-system, and consequently they may not restructure their interlanguage system and develop
fossilized language (Skehan, 1994). McLauglin also claims that *comprehensible input* alone cannot develop the learner’s grammatical system:

“Comprehensible input (made meaningful through extra-linguistic information) cannot, in and of itself, account for the development of the learners’ grammatical system. Understanding messages is not enough: How does the learner progress from understanding to acquisition? Here the theory is silent” (1987:38).

It cannot be assumed that learners automatically induce the grammatical concepts from the input without mentioning grammar in the classroom. According to White it is actually “*incomprehensible input* that stimulates the necessary grammar building” (1987:96). Incomprehensibility or comprehension difficulties, which can provide important negative feedback to the learner, are necessary for second language acquisition.

This position is also supported by Long (1983) who emphasizes the importance of instruction in the early stages of learning and in acquisition-poor environments. Ongoing research has not confirmed Krashen’s hypothesis since some linguistic forms appear rarely in classroom interactions (Lightbown, 2000).

Krashen’s hypothesis has had a considerable effect on foreign language teaching and despite the number of attacks it is still in the centre of debate. Unfortunately the hypothesis does not give an exact definition of what is meant by the term *comprehensible* and how i+1 is transmitted. Another problematic area of the hypothesis is the implied statement that acquisition happens through comprehension. In this view the learners’ contribution and non-linguistic factors are completely ignored. Finally, it has not been proved empirically yet that linguistic structures are rather acquired than learnt in an input-rich context.

### 2.3.2.3 The Output Hypothesis

“Output is language produced by the learner” (Ellis, 1994:697). There are two opposing views about output. Krashen (1985) and his followers claim that output is not essential to acquisition, while Swain (1993, 1998) has proposed that it is essential.
In her *Output Hypothesis* Swain argues that *comprehensible input* may be essential to the acquisition of a second language, but it is not enough to ensure that the outcome will be native-like performance. Her research shows that even immersion class students do not demonstrate native-speaker productive competence. This is not because their *comprehensible input* is limited but because their *comprehensible output* is limited. Swain proposes that grammatical acquisition results in part through conversational exchanges in which meaning is negotiated but these exchanges are not themselves the source of acquisition derived from comprehensible input. Language acquisition may occur through producing language, either written or spoken.

Swain (1993) further suggests that just speaking and writing are not enough, learners need to be pushed to make use of their resources. Moreover, they need to reflect on their output and consider ways of modifying it to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy. This has been called pushed output.

Edmondson (1999) mentions in connection with the *Output Hypothesis* the spectator hypothesis (die Zuschauer-Hypothese) which means that some learners get much more out of listening to other people being active in the classroom than they do out of being active themselves. “They learn more from being spectators rather than active players on the language stage” (1999:166). Although the two hypotheses seem to represent opposite views, their combined application in the classroom context could be beneficial in advancing second language learning.

While Krashen’s *input hypothesis* puts the emphasis on understanding the meaning through *comprehensible input*, Swain questions the accuracy level of immersion class students and states that appropriate feedback in addition to attention to the form of output is an essential element for the development of a second language. A third view is represented by the *interaction hypothesis* first proposed by Long (1982).
2.3.2.4 Modified input

The input that has been modified in some way before the learner sees or hears it is called modified input. On the one hand this definition might sound meaningless, since this happens in everyday conversations between native speakers in different interactions. Therefore, modified input should not be a particular feature of foreign language acquisition.

On the other hand, current second language research has tried to identify what it is that makes input comprehensible to the learner. Researchers (Long 1983; Chaudron, 1983; Pica et al., 1987) have attempted to answer this question through a study of input comprehensibility in two different kinds of linguistic environments. The first kind of linguistic environment is characterized by input that has been modified or simplified in some way before the learner sees or hears it. This can be done through repetitions, paraphrase of words or sentences, and reduction of sentence length and complexity, among others. Some typical examples of modifications that different speakers make are motherese, foreigner talk, and teacher talk. In regard to second language acquisition research, simplified input most often refers to L2 input that has been modified by a native speaker to facilitate non-native speaker comprehension, the so called foreigner talk.

The second kind of environment for L2 acquisition is characterized by opportunities for native speaker-non-native speaker interactions in which “both parties modify and restructure the interaction to arrive at mutual understanding” (Pica et al., 1987:739). Long (1982, 1983) made an important distinction between modified input and modified interaction by differentiating the modified talk directed to the learner, and the modified structure of the conversation itself. In investigating the social discourse of non-native and native speakers, Long (1983) identified the strategies employed by both parties to negotiate their way through the conversational discourse. These strategies included aspects of conversation such as comprehension checks, clarification requests, topic shifts, self and other repetitions, and expansions. Long claims that non-native speakers modify interactions using these devices so as to avoid conversation problems and repair discourse when non-understanding
sequences arise. He termed this *interactional modification*, which later became more widely referred to as *negotiation*. This term has been used to "characterize the modification and restructuring of interaction that occurs when learners and their interlocutors anticipate, perceive, or experience difficulties in message comprehensibility" (Pica, 1994:494).

Long (1996) later redefines negotiation for *negotiation for meaning* in his updated version of the *interaction hypothesis*.

This type of *negotiation for meaning* appears to have a more beneficial effect on learners’ comprehension than what is commonly offered in current commercially produced materials. However, it has to be noted that any type of *modified input* has the aim of facilitating comprehension but not necessarily acquisition. The issues of comprehension and acquisition need to be separated which is not always done in the literature. It is not yet understood how different levels of comprehension feed into acquisition, nor is it clear what precise factors make input comprehensible.

### 2.3.2.5 The Interaction Hypothesis

The *Interaction Hypothesis* is the expansion of the *Input Hypothesis* stating that *negotiation for meaning* has a facilitating effect on comprehension and acquisition. According to Long (1996), *negotiation for meaning* involves more than usual frequencies of semantically contingent speech of various kinds such as repetition, extension, rephrasing, and expansion. The negotiation work may function to focus the learner on form in similar way that input enhancement appears to do in the classroom. The input that has not been comprehended, the ‘+1’ part of the *comprehensible input* (i+1) may become comprehensible through the process of interaction or negotiation.

Long (1982, 1983) also emphasizes that modifications are likely to occur more in two-way tasks which oblige native speakers and non-native speakers to negotiate for meaning in order to make their speech more comprehensible to their interlocutors. Moreover, competent speakers must attend to the feedback they are receiving before
pressing ahead. This allows the learner to negotiate the conversation, which in turn forces the competent speaker to adjust his or her input until what he/she is saying is comprehensible to the learner. Therefore, a two-way exchange of information will provide more comprehensible input, and promote acquisition better than one-way information exchange. Many researchers hold a similar view on the significance of input modifications, which result from the negotiation process in interaction (Henrici, 1995; Gass, 1997; Edmondson, 1999; Ellis, 1999).

The assumption that input realised in interaction contributes to language development could be usefully applied in language teaching. Thus, those new structures are used in interaction to which the learners have to directly react unlike in coursebooks activities where learners have to use previously established patterns.

The relationships between input, input modification, negotiation for meaning, production and acquisition are not directly observable and have to be evaluated in a context. However, acquisition gains do not automatically follow from comprehension gains, but among other factors the task, the purpose, the situation, and affective factors play a crucial role in the process. Therefore, input for comprehension and input for acquisition may be alternatives.

The Interaction Hypothesis does not provide more information about the processes between comprehension and acquisition, and research in the field remains restricted in its scope. However, the important role of interaction and negotiation for meaning in the learning process cannot be denied. One of the implications of the interaction hypothesis for foreign language teaching is that learners should be exposed to more possibilities of interaction and cooperation in the classroom than before.

2.3.3 Pedagogical implications of input processing

Foreign language teaching should provide learners with comprehensible input, which challenges the learners, however, does not place extra demands on them (cf. Krashen, 1988). In addition, this input can only be learnt if the learner’s
interlanguage is close to the point when this structure is acquired (cf. Pienemann, 1984). It is essential that teachers modify the input, which can happen either through explicit instruction or through implicit awareness raising. Learners should be exposed to language use and have the chance to practice language structures in meaningful and natural contexts, and possibly test their hypothesis and modify if necessary (cf. Swain, 1985). If the input is realised by the learners in interaction, it will probably contribute to better understanding and internalisation. Therefore, teachers should create possibilities for learners to get access to input rich contexts where they can work out hypotheses for themselves. This involves, on the one hand, the transformation of declarative knowledge into procedural, on the other hand, the use of unanalysed language forms. Accepting the hypothesis that unplanned language use results in procedural knowledge while planned language use leads to declarative knowledge, both processes should be fostered in foreign language teaching.

2.4 Internal processes in acquiring grammar

Cognitive psychology research claims that learning a second language is a complex cognitive skill and grammar learning within it has an important role (Anderson and Finchman, 1994). The cognitive process of attention has captured the interest of researchers, particularly with respect to the learners’ need to notice relationships of L2 form and message meaning. This learning process has been incorporated into a variety of constructs and named differently causing some confusion in terminology. These terms are consciousness-raising (Rutherford and Sharwood Smith, 1985), noticing (Schmidt, 1990), input enhancement (Sharwood Smith, 1993), language awareness (James and Garrett, 1991; VanLier, 1995), and focus on form (Long, 1991; Doughty and Williams, 1998b). The following sections attempt to clarify these terms.
2.4.1 Declarative and procedural knowledge

In the discussion of the processes involved in the internal representation of language structures the terms declarative and procedural or explicit and implicit are unavoidable. Krashen’s *Monitor Hypothesis* (1985) brings these terms closer together. It makes a distinction between a natural and implicit acquisition process and a conscious and explicit learning process. In his view there is no interface between the two types of knowledge, learned knowledge cannot be acquired and vice versa. Acquisition requires meaning-focused instruction, whereas learning is helped by explicit rules and error correction. He claims that the learned system only comes into play when learners monitor the output from it. Monitoring happens when learners are focused on form rather than meaning and have sufficient time to access their learned knowledge.

Anderson defines the twin pair of procedural and declarative knowledge the following way:

“A distinction frequently made in psychology is that between declarative and procedural knowledge: Declarative knowledge is explicit knowledge that we can report and of which we are consciously aware. Procedural knowledge is knowledge of how to do things, and it is often implicit” (1995:308).

Since grammatical and communicative competence are considered to be procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1980), by analysing how new information becomes declarative knowledge and how this turns into procedural knowledge leads us to the realisation of how grammatical competence is achieved. With the description of the information process we can draw a parallel between declarative knowledge and explicit knowledge versus procedural and implicit knowledge. In Anderson’s model of the skill-learning process, attention to new information makes this information turn into declarative knowledge. This declarative knowledge drives performance and becomes accessible to introspection. As opposed to Krashen, Anderson believes that declarative knowledge can be turned into procedural knowledge.

Following this definition we assume that all learning begins with an explicit or declarative knowledge of facts of which we are consciously aware. This includes
vocabulary knowledge and verbalised grammatical rules. The mental control over this knowledge becomes automatic through practice and turns into procedural or implicit knowledge. This is called the interface position (Multhaup, 1997) or the strong interface position (Anderson, 1983).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative knowledge</th>
<th>turns into</th>
<th>Procedural knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(explicit knowledge of facts)</td>
<td>(practice)</td>
<td>(implicit knowledge and automated control over declarative knowledge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2 The interface position**

Using language is more an example of what one knows how to do – procedural knowledge – rather than what one knows – declarative knowledge. However, language has important declarative components such as the lexicon and grammatical rules. “Grammar knowledge is a declarative component that may become procedural with increased language proficiency” (O’Malley and Chamot, 1990:51). Consequently, knowing the rules would be the first step to get closer to grammatical competence. Even if learners know some rules of the second language, they may not be able to apply them in spontaneous use, since they have not acquired procedural knowledge yet. According to O’Malley and Chamot there is no procedural knowledge without declarative knowledge that raises problems in SLA, since

“there are L2 learners living in the target language country who have got a procedural grammatical knowledge without having gone through the declarative stage – the acquisition of conscious knowledge of the rules” (1990:28).

Anderson and Finchman offer an explanation for this by acknowledging that not all procedural knowledge is initially declarative:

“It is too strong to argue that procedural knowledge can never be acquired without declarative representation or that the declarative representation always has to be in the form of an example that is used in an analogy process. Nonetheless, the research does indicate that this is a major avenue for the acquisition of procedural knowledge” (1994:1323).

The above described process is referred to as the non-interface position, the opposite of the interface position outlined above. The non-interface hypothesis denies that knowledge of abstract grammatical rules can turn into a procedural knowledge of
language. Advocates of this hypothesis assume the existence of a *language acquisition device* (LAD) that directs language learning along a genetically pre-programmed path (Krashen, 1988; Ellis, 1997a). There are many instances when implicit or procedural knowledge precedes the ability to give an explicit or declarative account of what one knows. First language acquisition is one of the examples. Children learn to recognize and produce grammatical utterances without being explicitly aware of the underlying rules of the grammar. Therefore, we have to accept, that there is a reverse direction for the developmental relations between declarative and procedural knowledge. The non-interface position is highlighted in the following figure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural knowledge (implicit knowledge)</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Declarative knowledge (explicit, metalinguistic knowledge of facts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Figure 3 The non-interface position*

However, with learners who do not live in the target language country, their only contact with the target language is in the classroom, declarative knowledge is the first step towards the acquisition of procedural knowledge (Anderson and Finchman, 1994). Therefore, in a classroom setting a great deal of practice and feedback are needed in order to turn declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge.

Between the two poles of the non-interface position and the interface position is Ellis’ weak interface position which “allows some seepage from explicit metalinguistic to implicit knowledge” (Ellis, N. 1994:4), but does not support the idea that declarative knowledge should precede procedural knowledge (Anderson, 1983). These positions can be placed along a continuum, allowing some overlap between the two extreme positions. The existence of some kind of connection between explicit and implicit knowledge is extremely important. The choice of an interface or non-interface position determines the use of an inductive or deductive approach to the teaching of grammar.

Procedural knowledge comes about by the repeated use of declarative knowledge in productions. It can be argued whether “awareness-raising will bring about declarative
knowledge, whereas practice will lead to enhance procedural knowledge” (Van Patten and Cadierno, 1993:239).

Research seems to be hesitant about whether language learning starts from explicit knowledge which, becomes by practice implicit procedural knowledge, or if L2 learning must build on the learners’ implicit procedural knowledge and aim to raise their awareness of how languages work, and are learnt. This is the result of the different status of declarative and procedural knowledge in an information processing approach to language learning and in a cognitive approach.

**2.4.2 Reflections on declarative and procedural knowledge**

Assuming that declarative knowledge is explicit and can be turned into procedural knowledge through practical application seems to be obvious, but logically not defendable. It would mean that after the transition this explicit knowledge cannot be articulated any more. Besides the practical application of declarative knowledge it presupposes the existence of procedural knowledge. Therefore, their relationship must be more complex and cannot be described with the above outlined interface and non-interface hypotheses. In addition to this, acquiring procedural knowledge involves much more than the operationalisation of declarative knowledge.

According to Wolff (1995) the two knowledge systems are in mutual interrelationships with each other, however, their development is separated. The twin pair terms explicit-implicit and declarative-procedural cannot be directly related to each other as suggested by Krashen’s Monotor Hypothesis. Through analysis and integration target language phenomena can become both explicit and implicit and declarative knowledge might have both explicit and implicit basis. The following table attempts to give a summary of the explicit and implicit learning process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Implicit</th>
<th>Explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit language knowledge (mental representation)</td>
<td>• Innate (universal)</td>
<td>• Explicit (analysed; language specific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intuitive</td>
<td>• Rule-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Example-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to and/or use of implicit language knowledge</td>
<td>• Automatic (effortless)</td>
<td>• Deliberate (effortful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fluent, skilled</td>
<td>• Halting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>• Inductive</td>
<td>• Deductive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>• Incidental</td>
<td>• Intentional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis testing</td>
<td>• Inherent</td>
<td>• Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive comparison</td>
<td>• Unaware</td>
<td>• Noticed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing gaps or holes</td>
<td>• Imperceptible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>• Attracted</td>
<td>• Directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unconscious</td>
<td>• Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of control</td>
<td>• Experiential</td>
<td>• Practiced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Automatic</td>
<td>• Procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching intervention</td>
<td>• Unobtrusive or none</td>
<td>• Overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Obtrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Metalinguistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 Implicit and explicit language learning (adapted from Doughty and Williams, 1998b:230)*

The research on explicit and implicit processes in grammar instruction is far from conclusive. The following sections outline briefly the findings of research in the field.

### 2.5 The role of attention in grammar acquisition

Attention is generally regarded as a necessary precondition for successful learning. While Schmidt's *noticing hypothesis* (1990; 1993) conceptualises conscious attention as indispensable for turning *input* into *intake*, Tomlin and Villa (1994) break down the construct of attention. On the basis of psychological theories of perception they distinguish between *alertness, orientation, and detection*, and claim that detection in SLA may occur without awareness or even without alertness and orientation. However, the relationship between attention and awareness in both approaches is still a critical issue and Tomlin and Villa's model may not be generalisable to the context.
of SLA. In addition to previous research which has mainly dealt with characteristics of attention directed towards the input, there are recently an increasing number of studies investigating attention directed towards the output (Kormos 2000, Skehan 2001, Swain and Lapkin 2001). As we consider L2 production a central source of L2 competence, we do not subordinate output to input, but regard both as equivalent.

2.5.1 Attention to form: possibilities

In cognitive psychology and SLA attention implies allocating resources, perceptual or cognitive, to some things at the expense of not allocating them to something else, thus, it is the ability to maintain focus. Bialystok states that attention is the process that

“brings something into awareness and awareness is the result of the interaction between analysis and control” (1994:165). “Control of processing is the process of selective attention with which there is an analysis of knowledge, a representation, and explicitness” (Bialystok, 1994:160).

All researchers in the field of grammar instruction agree that input is at the root of language learning and that attention is necessary for the internalisation of language (Bialystok, 1982; McLaughlin, 1978; O’Malley and Chamot, 1990; Schmidt, 1990; Skehan, 1998; Stevick, 1982). However, not all of the writers agree about the meaning of attention.

Skehan claims that attention to form is necessary at the central processing stage so that the interlanguage system may change.

“Reflection and awareness are part of the attentional process and are the central principle in the information-processing approach to learning” (1998:131).

Incidental acquisition involves some degree of conscious attention to the features of the input, a fact that Krashen refused to admit.
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There seems to be a terminological confusion about the definitions of attention, therefore, different terms are used to refer to it in the literature. Schmidt sees consciousness as the awareness of specific forms in the input level of noticing (conscious attention) necessary for language learning to take place. Thus, awareness and consciousness are seen as synonyms by Schmidt (1990, 1993) and Van Lier (1995).

Schmidt defines awareness as understanding claiming that understanding refers to a higher level of awareness than noticing. Noticing is related to rehearsal within working memory and the transfer of information to long-term memory, to intake, and to item learning. Understanding is related to the organization of material in long term memory, to restructuring, and to system learning. Schmidt chooses the word noticing to define the allocation of attentional resources to some stimulus and identifies the level at which perceived events are subjectively experienced and are reportable by the person who experiences them. These steps involve conscious apprehension, awareness of input, and awareness with attention.

Tomlin and Villa (1994) suggest

“that it is best to leave the word consciousness as rich with multiple associated meanings but to limit the term awareness to the subjective experience of any cognitive content or external stimulus” (193-194).

They believe that awareness is not necessary, while awareness requires attention, attention does not require awareness. Attention involves three components: alertness, orientation, and detection, being only detection the principal organism of selective attention. Without detection there cannot be hypothesis formation, however, awareness is not essential for detection to occur, but detection is a central component of attention. Therefore, just detecting is enough.

Based on the investigation of specialized literature we can state that consciousness and awareness are used as synonyms. Schmidt and Van Lier distinguish several types of consciousness in the cognitive perspective of consciousness. The two types relevant for the context of grammar teaching and learning are the following:

“awareness or consciousness of something – perceptual activity of objects or events in the environment, including attention, focusing, and
vigilance; and *metaconsciousness* or *awareness* of the activity of the mind – language awareness, metalinguistic awareness of formal properties, communicable knowledge” (Van Lier, 1998:160).

It is recognized in cognitive psychology that *attention* is necessary for learning to take place. In SLA the role of *attention* has been widely discussed and applying the theories, we can conclude that learners must consciously pay attention or notice input in order to change input into intake. The growing emphasis on consciousness-raising requires a new look at language that stresses the role of language in sociocultural contexts and requires from teachers to sharpen their students abilities to notice things they were not aware before. The prevailing view today is that students must notice what it is they are to learn. Although this has traditionally been accomplished by the teacher’s presentation of an explicit rule, a far more implicit and interactive approach is favoured today. An example of the implicit means of focusing learners’ attention is consciousness-raising. The concept of focusing on different types of *attention* in grammar teaching concords with the principles of communicative language teaching in taking a meaning-oriented view of language. It is no longer the forms that should determine our thought but rather our interest in finding out how context affects the choice of linguistic forms and grammar.

Consciousness-raising is not a new phenomenon. It has always been a concern in language teaching. However, its role and interpretation has changed. Earlier consciousness-raising was used together with habit formation as a starting point in grammar teaching and meant the explicit explanation of the forms (Lado, 1964; Banó and Szoboszlay, 1972). Consciousness-raising in communicative language teaching, on the other hand, does not mean the conscious attention to grammatical forms, but the awareness of the natural use of the language in the sociocultural context. In order to achieve this, the process has to be reversed. The new grammar should first appear in a communicative context and its function and use should be made clear. Then learners are expected to discover the structural patterns similar to the natural language acquisition process. Although the term consciousness-raising has received much attention lately, its exact meaning has to be cleared.
2.5.1.1 Consciousness-raising

This section investigates *consciousness-raising* and explores the meanings of the term implied by different authors in different contexts. Special attention is devoted to the cognitive perspective with reference to language teaching and learning. This perspective rests on the assumption that *consciousness* is individual rather than social and that there is a sharp distinction between mind and body. In this view it is possible to identify different layers and levels of *consciousness* such as:

- **“Global consciousness”** (Wittgenstein, 1980:165) is just being alive and awake. This level is a prerequisite for any learning to occur at all.
- The second level is awareness of objects and events in the environment including attention and focusing (Van Lier, 1998).
- **Metaconsciousness** represents the third level. The term covers awareness of the activity of the mind. It includes language awareness, knowledge about mental processes, and metalinguistic awareness of formal linguistic properties (Van Lier, 1995, Bühler, 1965).
- The fourth level is voluntary action and mindfulness (Bühler, 1965; Piaget, 1970). It means deliberate and purposeful engagement in action.

These four levels of *consciousness* form a hierarchy, each one presupposes the one before it. Looking at the four levels of *consciousness* it can be shown that language plays an increasing role as we move up the hierarchy, and this brings about an increase in social activity. By taking this broader view it is assumed that consciousness and interaction are promoted to their fullest extent and *consciousness* is intimately connected with language.

The term *consciousness-raising* was first introduced in SLA literature by Sharwood-Smith (1981). It refers to deliberate attempts on the part of teachers to raise learners’ awareness of the formal features of the language with a view to promoting the development of their L2 knowledge. It implies that direct manipulation of the learners’ mental state is possible.

As a next step, Rutherford (1987) was also among the first SLA researchers to discuss the assumption that raising students’ *consciousness* about target language
rules facilitates second language acquisition. Rutherford offers a strikingly short and broad definition of the term: “the drawing of the learner’s attention to features of the target language” (1987:189). He refers to instruments and modes of operation which are other ways of referring to the tasks learners perform which would lead them to induce an appropriate generalisation. So in a consciousness-raising task the learner does “not only notice but also perform an operation of some kind” (1987:152-3).

Rutherford’s consciousness-raising is something of a compromise. It focuses on aspects of grammar without necessarily using explicit rules or technical jargon. Instead of trying to impart rules and principles directly as in the traditional grammar lesson, it seeks to help learners discover them for themselves by focusing on aspects of the target structures. Brown’s (1994a) inductive reasoning is quite similar to this view. Storing a number of specific instances and inducing a general law or conclusion. This could also be called consciousness-raising.

Ellis (1993a) draws the distinction between the teaching of grammar through practice and the teaching of it through consciousness-raising. The former has the aim of producing sentences exemplifying the grammatical feature that is the target of the activity, while the latter attempts to provide the learner with an understanding of a particular grammatical feature, but does not require him to produce example sentences. In Ellis’ view consciousness-raising might include the teaching of explicit grammar rules. Sharwood-Smith (1988), however, takes the view that requiring learners to absorb, and be able to articulate rules may hinder their understanding of the grammatical feature which is the focus of attention. For him the interaction between explicit and implicit knowledge leads to acquisition. So, the two researchers appear to have conflicting views about what constitutes consciousness-raising. For Ellis (1993a) it might include the presentation of explicit rules, for Sharwood-Smith (1981) this is unacceptable.

Consciousness-raising is claimed to hold a middle-ground position between two extreme approaches to teaching L2 grammar (Yip, 1994; Nunan, 1991). At one end of the scale is the non-interface position discussed in section 2.4.1 implying the insignificance of grammar instruction, at the other end of the scale is the strong interface perspective claiming the usefulness of slow and appropriate use of
conscious knowledge and rules. *Consciousness-raising* represents a compromise between the two extremes. The focus on meaning introduced by the communicative movement is not abandoned and “texts that have been produced for communication are preferred over concocted examples” (Willis and Willis, 1996:64). The same idea is advocated by Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith concerning *consciousness-raising* (1988). Their summary of the meaning of the term rests on two characteristics of language learning. Firstly, the provision of comprehensible input alone is not sufficient to ensure L2 grammatical accuracy. Secondly, at appropriate times some form of grammatical *consciousness-raising* is effective in improving accuracy.

*Consciousness-raising* refers to the teachers’ intentional attempt to raise learners’ awareness of the input features so that they can improve the development of their L2 knowledge. Accepting this means that the formal introduction of a grammatical feature is a core element of *consciousness-raising* and the direct manipulation of learners’ mental state is possible. To achieve this aim the use of communicative grammar discovery tasks and problem-solving activities should be used (Fotos and Ellis, 1991; Doughty, 1991). As a result, *consciousness-raising* can be a multifaceted pedagogical device with extremely broad applications. It is a learner-led inductive approach to grammatical instruction. It is rather process and not product oriented, providing learners with data and inviting them to draw conclusions based on the data. Consequently, grammar does not have to be necessarily taught in the form of explicit rules, the learner may be led to grammatical insights implicitly.

The prevailing view of *consciousness* in language teaching emphasizes the cognitive and individual aspects influenced by linguistic theories which locate competence in the brain and regard learning as the processing of inputs and outputs. This perspective totally disregards outside factors and the social context in which learning happens. However, consciousness is viewed as a social phenomenon born out of social activity by Vygotsky (1978) and Wittgenstein (1980). They attempted to explain *consciousness* as the end product of socialization which plays a fundamental role in the development of cognition.
2.5.1.2 Noticing

Noticing can be defined as the conscious registration of form in input that is being aware of a form that has just been encountered in the input. Therefore, noticing is a lower level form of consciousness, below the awareness of how a particular form functions. According to SLA researchers the role of noticing in SLA is an interface and it precedes consciousness-raising. It is also assumed that noticing – unlike consciousness-raising – has implications for language processing and the actual acquisition of linguistic features (Fotos, 1993; McLaughlin, 1990; Skehan, 1998).

Noticing is considered to be important because it is a mechanism that dictates access to awareness and paying attention, which includes “alertness, orientation, preconscious registration, selection, facilitation and inhibition” (Schmidt, 2001:3).

Sharwood-Smith suggests that input should be “meaningful, interesting, and largely comprehensible”, and argues for a “rich communicative environment”, but also recognises that input can “be selectively manipulated to facilitate acquisition” (1986: 242-253).

Therefore, noticing plays a key role in converting input into intake in second language learning. A number of researchers have attempted to design models of language acquisition (Ellis, 1997b; Skehan, 1998; Robinson, 1995). They all agree that noticing has a mediating role in the acquisition process and is an important component of successful language learning.

Robinson (1995) and Schmidt (1990) talk about the same process, stating that it is inside short-term memory that noticing must take place. Schmidt’s six influences on noticing are discussed in the following section.

2.5.1.2.1 Schmidt and noticing

Schmidt claims in his noticing hypothesis that what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning (1990). Schmidt claims that noticing is a necessary but
not sufficient condition for effective processing to take place. In contrast to Krashen, he believes that a degree of awareness is important before material can be incorporated into an interlanguage system. He discusses six influences on the process of noticing:

1. Frequency
The more frequent a form, the more likely it is to be noticed and to become integrated into the interlanguage system. A language feature may become frequent due to repeated instruction or by way of teacher talk. As Skehan (1998) suggests, learners’ attentional resources might be stretched and a form may, on occasion, go unnoticed.

2. Perceptual salience
The more a form stands out in the input stream, the more likely it is that it will be noticed. Consequently, unstressed items are less likely to be noticed.

3. Instruction
Instruction makes the less obvious aspects of the input salient, so that it is the learner who makes the focusing. The role of instruction is to channel attention and to bring into awareness what otherwise would have been missed. At this point Ellis disagrees by pointing out that instruction serves to draw attention to items that do not conform to expectations and may therefore not be noticed (1997b).

4. Individual differences in processing ability
This means that some people are more effective in input processing than others, consequently, they are more able to notice. This processing ability determines how ready learners are to notice new forms in the input. Skehan (1998) adds that some learners are better input processors, as they have a larger working memory capacity or they are quicker in analytical processing within working memory. Individual differences are also discussed in Van Patten’s study (1996:46-48).

5. Readiness to notice
Readiness to notice implies that a prediction can be made about what the learner can profitably notice in the sense that the product of this noticing is the chance of being incorporated into the interlanguage system.

6. Task demand

Task demand refers to the way in which an instructional task causes learners to notice particular features that are necessary in order to carry out the task. Tasks based on familiar information with clear structure will have low task demands while tasks requiring abstract thinking and imagination will probably have high task demands (Skehan, 1998).

Schmidt’s position echoes established points of view in cognitive psychology which suggests that awareness in terms of what is being learnt and the ability to report on that learning are generally the default case. This does not exclude incidental or implicit learning, learning something which is outside the scope of the learners’ attention. Schmidt’s noticing hypothesis is a view of learning which strongly supports the facilitative effects of consciousness on second language learning.

Similarly, Fotos sees noticing as “an interface between explicit and implicit knowledge” (1993:387). Many other authors refer to the importance of noticing as one way of enhancing second language acquisition (Gass, 1988; Batstone, 1994b). Rutherford (1987) and McLaughlin (1987) also claim that noticing is an important component of successful language learning. However, they consider that noticing a feature in the input may be a conscious or an unconscious process, as opposed to Schmidt claiming it to be a conscious process (1990).

Summarising the investigation about noticing it can be asserted that it is necessary for second language acquisition and the notion of noticing appears to be based on the assumption that is not supported by appropriate empirical research.
2.5.1.3 The place of consciousness-raising and noticing in the acquisition process

Having discussed the concepts consciousness-raising and noticing and their interpretations, an attempt is made to show their place in the process of language acquisition. The starting point for the model is Ellis’ (1993b) computational model of SLA. Unfortunately, the internal processes involved in language acquisition have not been revealed yet. There have been only speculations and a number of hypotheses about the internal organisation of the black box in our mind. Ellis’ computational model is based on the analogy of information processing in computers. One of the shortcomings of the model is that it fails to incorporate important external and internal factors like affective factors or the role of previous knowledge. Therefore, the following model of second language acquisition is proposed, indicating the place of consciousness-raising and noticing in the acquisition process together with other external and internal factors:
In this model the existing language system plays an important role, since the learners’ L1 influences the learning of a L2 to a great extent in the form of implicit knowledge of grammar rules. When a new grammar item is acquired learners are influenced by their existing language system. Secondly, what is called working memory, following Baddeley (1986) is a place where the information arrives and we can only hypothesize what exactly happens. The input is influenced by several factors to become intake. Noticing, consciousness-raising and input processing are
ways of focusing learners’ attention to grammatical items and help the internalisation process. However, there are other influential factors involved such as motivation, previous knowledge or metalinguistic knowledge.

If input arrives to the working memory without any focal attention, it might be lost. Another route to follow is when the grammar structure or any type of new information is negotiated with the existing language system and becomes intake and by retrieval becomes part of the interlanguage system. On the other hand, in certain situations output might be forced as a solution to a task or problem. This often happens in a classroom context. Whatever happens with the intake, whether it is lost, becomes part of the interlanguage system or output, the internal systems are the same.

This model shows that SLA involves an explicit learning process and is consistent with recent research claiming that explicit knowledge is a necessary condition for second language learning (cf. Ellis, 1994; Robinson, 1997; DeKeyser, 1998). It is believed, that the process of input becoming intake should involve both explicit and implicit learning, where consciousness-raising and noticing are necessary to form an appropriate connection between intake and existing knowledge.

### 2.7 Form-focused instruction

The concept of focus on form comes out of the debate on whether and how to include grammar in second language instruction and which is the most effective form of grammar teaching in the communicative classroom. Focus on form studies in the 1980s were primarily concerned with finding out whether focus on form instruction enabled learners to acquire the structures they had been taught (Ellis, 1984). Studies in the field in the 1990s distinguished different kinds of form-focussed instruction. Ellis (2002) claims that form-focused instruction needs to be envisaged in terms of whether or not the primary focus of the instruction is on form or meaning and how the attention is allocated, intensively or extensively. On the one hand, there are those who would limit attention to grammar by means of corrective feedback with minimal or no interruption in communication (Doughty and Valera, 1998), on the other hand
there are those who advocate separate attention to grammar and subsequent integration of the knowledge provided in increasingly communicative activities (DeKeyser, 1998). This section attempts to give an overview of the literature on form-focused instruction and its effect on grammar teaching.

2.7.1 Focus on form versus focus on forms: issues of terminology

Grammar seems to have been rehabilitated and recognised for what it has always been: an essential component of language learning. The past 40 years in language acquisition research have seen a change in focus and methodologies in the field of grammar teaching and learning. These changes have led to the reorganisation of taxonomies for grammar instruction. This new taxonomy is going to be explained in the following sections.

The discussions about the importance of form in grammar instruction are based on the distinction originally made by Long between focus on forms, focus on form and focus on meaning (1991). However, the current concern has been around only two options, focus on forms and focus on form.

Focus on forms is a structuralist, synthetic approach to language. It is not to be confused with consciousness-raising. Its focus is rather on linguistic forms than on the meanings they convey. Focus on form, however,

“consists of an occasional shift of attention to linguistic code features – by the teacher and/or one or more students – triggered by perceived problems with comprehension or production” (Long and Robinson, 1998:23).

The third option is focus on meaning where the form is not important at all, the main concern is to convey meaning.

Since the introduction of the notion of focus on form, there has been some confusion in the literature due to the imprecise use of terminology. The traditional notion of forms always involves isolation of linguistic features from the context. Unfortunately, there have been a variety of terms used in the literature to refer to focus on forms instruction ranging from grammar instruction, formal instruction, form-focused instruction to code-focused instruction (Doughty and Williams, 1998b).
However, *focus on form* and *focus on form* are not opposites in the sense that form and meaning have often been considered to. *Focus on form* involves a focus on linguistic elements, whereas *focus on form* has its exclusive focus on structural elements, *focus on meaning* on the other hand, excludes it. This confusion partly comes from the general use of the term *form-focused instruction* to denote the teaching of linguistic forms in isolation, as well as the integration of form, meaning and use. *Focus on form instruction* is an umbrella term widely used in the literature to refer to any pedagogical technique used to draw learners’ attention to language form.

Ellis (1994) uses different terms for the same notions. In his taxonomy *form-focused instruction* covers *focus on form*, *planned focus on form* and *incidental focus on form*. Similarly, Doughty and Williams (1998b) offer a detailed discussion of options within *form-focused instruction* with an analysis of classroom tasks representing the options. In their taxonomy *focus on form* is called the proactive approach, designed to preempt a problem, while *focus on meaning* is termed as the reactive approach that deals with one problem only that has arisen. In communicative language teaching there is a preference for reactive focus on form, delivered as implicitly as possible.

The following table summarises the three options in *form-focused instruction*, the terminology used in the literature connected to syllabus types and preferred methods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabus design</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long (1991)</td>
<td>Focus on Meaning</td>
<td>Focus on Form</td>
<td>Focus on FormS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis (1994)</td>
<td>Incidental focus on form</td>
<td>Planned focus on form</td>
<td>Focus on FormS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doughty and Williams (1998b)</td>
<td>Reactive approach</td>
<td>Proactive approach</td>
<td>Focus on FormS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods and approaches</td>
<td>Natural Approach Immersion programmes</td>
<td>Content-Based Language Teaching Communicative Language Teaching</td>
<td>Grammar- Translation method Audio-lingual Method, The Silent Way, TPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Options in grammar instruction

### 2.7.2 Focus on FormS

Long (1991) describes *focus on forms* as instruction which provides activities whose primary purpose is to teach language forms in isolation. Doughty and Williams (1998a) claim that in a *focus on formS instruction* learners engage in production activities ranging from mechanical to more communicative drills. These drills have the pitfall that too much attention to form results in deliberate rather than automatic language use. This option as described in Table 3, uses a synthetic approach to syllabus design and is accompanied by synthetic methods like the Grammar Translation Method, the Audio-lingual-Method, the Silent Way or Total Physical Response. It is associated with synthetic classroom devices including explicit grammar rules, repetition of model sentences, transformation exercises and direct error correction. *Focus on formS classes* consist mainly of work on the linguistic items with little if any communicative language use.

The *focus on forms* approach is based on the assumption that instructed foreign language learning derives from general cognitive processes, and entails the learning of a skill, therefore it is characterized as a skill-learning approach (DeKeyser, 1998). As such, it consists of the following stages:

1. “providing understanding of the grammar by a variety of means (including explanation in the L1, pointing out differences between the L1 and the L2..."
2. exercises entailing using the grammar in both non-communicative and communicative activities for both comprehension and production.
3. providing frequent opportunities for communicative use of the grammar to promote automatic, accurate use” (Sheen, 2002:304).

The *focus on form* option is attacked for several reasons. First, there is no needs analysis to identify learners’ communicative needs, therefore, there is too much of the language focus and too little of the skill focus. Second, it ignores language learning processes altogether and the fact that SLA is not a process of accumulating knowledge. Third, the idea that what you teach is what learners learn is simply not true, teachability is constrained by learnability (cf. Pienemann, 1984, 1986, 1989). Research also shows that acquisition sequences do not reflect instructional sequences (Ellis, 1989). It would appear more sensible to adopt an attitude towards teaching which tries to simulate the developmental sequences learners go through. In order to achieve this, a lot more information is needed about the nature of those sequences, which will only be available by carrying out more empirical investigations. However *focus on form* is still a widely used instruction device in second language teaching, which partly follows a traditionally accepted approach to language and language teaching. This means the treatment of language as an object, which can be learnt and taught in a building-block fashion, moving from one item to another in a linear order. However, it places emphasis on communicative language use as well.

### 2.7.3 Focus on form

“Focus on form overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (Long, 1991:4-46).

*Focus on form* arises from meaningful activity and the process is purely incidental to the interactive communicative activities that constitute the core of classroom practice. This means that teachers attempt to draw learners’ attention to linguistic forms as they arise in activities whose primary focus is on meaning. Such a focus, according to Long involves no pre-planning in terms of linguistic forms to be covered. Long and Robinson (1998) add to all this that the outcome of *focus on form* should be noticing. Schmidt (1993) stated that attention in the form of noticing is an essential feature of the acquisition process (section 2.5.1.2.1). Long and Robinson
further elaborate that noticing should be brought about by negotiations between the teacher and the learners. These restrictions assume normal synthetic syllabi.

For the same approach the term *form-focussed instruction* is used by Lightbown, (1998) and Spada, (1997). Lightbown believes that *focus on form* should not be done when students are focused on meaning since it can cause negative reactions in students. *Focus on form* should be treated as separate learning activities. In Spada’s interpretation *form-focused instruction* refers to “any pedagogical effort which is used to draw the learners’ attention to language form” (1997:73).

Being dissatisfied with the terminology and its coverage Sheen (2000) renamed the concept for *planned grammar instruction* (PGI). He claims that PGI has a wider scope than the other two terms, since it imposes no restrictions on permitted forms of instruction, whether direct or indirect, planned or spontaneous.

In terms of the theoretical underpinnings *focus on form* derives from an assumed degree of similarity between first and second language acquisition positing that the two processes are based on an exposure to comprehensible input arising from natural interaction. However, that exposure is insufficient to enable learners to acquire the grammar of the second language, consequently, this lack needs to be compensated for by focusing learners’ attention on grammatical features.

**2.7.3.1 Explicitness of focus on form**

The pedagogical question of whether learning and instruction are most effective when implicit or explicit is answered differently in SLA and cognitive psychology. In the field of applied linguistics there has been a tendency to claim that explicit learning is more effective, while cognitive psychologists attempt to discover evidence of the superiority of implicit learning (DeKeyser, 1995). However, it is unrealistic to expect that learning or acquiring a second language is entirely effortless and incidental. In relation to the explicit-implicit distinction two pedagogical approaches can be offered, emphasizing the differing degrees to which the teacher guides the learners’ language processing.
One is the implicit focus on form aiming at attracting learners’ attention and avoiding metalinguistic discussion. Helping learners pay attention to input features may happen in different ways, such as consciousness-raising, noticing and input processing (cf. sections 2.5.1.1, 2.5.1.2). The other approach is explicit teaching, when teachers direct learner attention and exploit pedagogical grammar in this regard. Long and Robinson (1998) discuss a number of the experimental studies that have compared the effectiveness of implicit and explicit teaching-learning conditions. The findings of the research generally suggest that explicit focus on form is better for simple rules than implicit learning is. For complex rules, however, the findings are less obvious. The combination of rules and carefully selected examples of the rules appear to be the most effective strategy for complex rules. Carroll and Swain (1993) also suggest that explicit instruction combined with explicit metalinguistic feedback may be helpful for rules that are not clear-cut.

It should be emphasized that the all-or-nothing choices between the implicit and the explicit focus on form are not acceptable and result in inflexible approaches to grammar teaching. We believe that the nature of the form will have an impact upon the decision as to whether to take an explicit or implicit approach to drawing learner attention to form. Consequently, it is entirely possible to combine explicit and implicit focus on form techniques depending upon the particular acquisition circumstances. It is the teachers’ pedagogical decision how to integrate attention to form and meaning.

2.7.3.2 Learner readiness and focus on form

The choice of the target linguistic form seems to play a crucial role in achieving success in the focus on form instruction. Learner readiness is another important factor that goes hand-in-hand with the linguistic form. According to Pienemann

“L2 structures can only be learned by introduction if the learner’s interlanguage is close to the point when this structure is acquired”(1984:198).
Following several researchers (Williams and Evans, 1998; Han, 2002; Izumi, 2002) have repeatedly emphasized that learners are more likely to notice forms that they are ready to learn and internalise, and that aiming at target structures which are too advanced for learners may not be effective. This is an important issue for it puts an emphasis on the internal state of the learner, rather than on the external factors such as the type of input the learner is exposed to. Corder (1967) and Long and Robinson (1998) emphasize that the learners' internal mental state is more important than the teacher’s external behaviour or an external syllabus.

The implications of all this for practice is that the effectiveness of the focus on form instruction essentially depends on successfully striking a match between the learners’ internal syllabus and the teacher’s external behaviour. The question is only how this match could be achieved, and whether it is feasible.

2.7.4 Focus on meaning

The third option is focus on meaning, an approach where the main concern is the communication of meaning without any attention given to the forms used to convey this. The Natural Approach of Krashen and Terrell (1983) and other so-called non-interventionist approaches are examples of this option. The idea is implicitly involved in Prahbu’s procedural syllabus and in French immersion programmes in Canada (Doughty and Williams, 1998a). The starting point of focus on meaning is not the language, but the learner and the learning processes. It is believed that second language acquisition is essentially similar to first language acquisition, therefore, creating similar conditions should be necessary and sufficient for second language acquisition. Focus on meaning classrooms are highly communicative, learners are presented with examples of communicative language use and they are expected to analyse the language at a subconscious level and induce grammar rules simply from exposure to the input. Grammar is considered to be learnt implicitly and incidentally.

However, there are some problems with a focus on meaning approach. Long (1990) suggests that adolescents and adults fail to achieve native-like levels in a second language because they have lost access to innate abilities they used in their early childhood. Consequently, it is insufficient to recreate the conditions of first language
acquisition in the classroom. Ellis (1994) also claims that comprehensible input is necessary, but not sufficient, so a pure focus on meaning is inefficient. Since research in grammar teaching suggests that some conscious attention to form is necessary for learning to take place, focus on meaning has not been a hot issue lately.

### 2.7.5 Input processing as focus on form

The input processing model or input-processing instruction (the two terms are used interchangeably in the literature) is an approach to language instruction as part of the focus on form paradigm. It draws on the processing model of second language acquisition and is designed to alter learners’ default processing strategies in order to direct them to attend to and make better form-meaning connections of the targeted form in the input they receive.

*Input-processing instruction* begins with an explanation of a form-function relationship, and hence may not be always concerned with rules in the usual sense of the word. The point of the explanation is to make the relationship clear. Models of structures or forms are given and illustrated but always in connection with meaning.

VanPatten defines *input-processing instruction* as “a type of grammar instruction whose purpose is to affect the ways in which learners attend to input data” (1996:2). The theory is claimed to be more effective than an output-based instructional approach in enabling learners interpret and produce the targeted form. It is assumed that certain aspects of language will not be learnt by learners, even in communicatively-based instruction, because learners are not attending to the cues in the input which signal particular form-function relations. The model is meaning-oriented in that it assumes that comprehension of meaning is what is driving learning, what Van Patten calls the “push to learn” (1996:2). Thus, it is hypothesised that learners, when they understand the meaning of an utterance, will be able to allocate attentional resources to novel forms in the string and therefore to work out the form-function relationship of these novels forms, given their meanings.

Ellis gives practical examples of *input-processing instruction*, one of them is connected to the morphological marking of verbs (2002:170). These markers are
frequent sources of errors of L2 learners. Therefore, the suggestion is that strategy training should be applied by means of pointing out to students the necessity of attending to tense/aspect markers in sentences that do not contain an adverbial. Such training is designed to overcome the natural processes of simplification found in L2 acquisition. Techniques used in Total Physical response are also listed among the examples for *input-processing instruction*, since they involve nonverbal responses from learners showing whether they have been successful in processing the target structure in the input. The responses required by such tasks involve more than just comprehension, they entail processing the specific linguistic forms they have noticed for meaning.

The effectiveness of *input-processing instruction* is generally criticized in terms of a comparison with traditional, production-based instruction. *Input-processing* establishes a direct contrast between itself and traditional grammatical instruction. Van Patten writes in this regard:

“Over the centuries, grammar instruction has taken a variety of forms depending on the overall goal of instruction. Under grammar-translation approaches, the goal of foreign language learning was to learn a language in order to read texts (i.e., the great works of literature) in that language” (1996:2)

Ellis (1999) proposed the following conclusions about *input-processing instruction*. The approach leads to benefits in learners’ ability to comprehend the target structures. In this respect, he adds, it works better, than production-based instruction, however, it is not superior to it. The biggest advantage is that improvement in learners’ ability to produce the target structures accurately tends to disappear in the case of production-based instruction but to persist in the case of *input-processing instruction*.

Generally we can say that *input processing* is a psychologically motivated focus on form that is an adjunct to communicative language teaching. The idea is consistent with the overall theory of form-focused instruction about the role of input in second language acquisition that is: we need some kind of focus on form. However, further research is needed to clarify whether *input-processing instruction* affects interlanguage development (implicit knowledge) or it just serves to raise awareness which involves noticing and understanding.
2.7.6 Remarks about form-focused instruction

Unfortunately, a variety of terms have been used to refer to grammar instruction including *focus on form*, *formal instruction*, *form-focused instruction*, *planned grammar instruction* and *processing instruction*. This has lead to confusion, because these terms have been juxtaposed to terms like focus on meaning or communication. However, Doughty and Williams (1998a) stress that *focus on forms* (isolation of linguistic forms from context) and *focus on form* (drawing learners’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally) are not polar opposites in the way that *form* and *meaning* have often been considered to be. *Focus on form* entails a focus on formal elements of language whereas *focus on forms* is limited to such focus, and *focus on meaning* excludes it.

Many second language acquisition researchers now argue that exposure to language is not enough (DeKeyser, 1998; Doughty, 1991; Lightbown, 1998; Swain, 1985). They advocate a more form-focused approach to language teaching, arguing that activities which focus solely on message are inadequate to develop an accurate knowledge of the language in question, therefore, some kind of form-focused activities need to be incorporated into communicative classrooms. A number of studies on the role of *form-focused instruction* have revealed that a *focus on form* successfully promotes second language development far beyond that achieved by unfocused approaches (Doughty, 1991; Doughty and Williams, 1998a).

After having examined the research in the field we have come to the conclusion that neither forms-based instruction nor meaning-based instruction alone can lead to complete second language acquisition. A number of studies in SLA, applied linguistics and cognitive psychology have provided sound evidence that the *focus on form* conditions outperform the conditions without any focus, it speeds up the rate of learning and it affects acquisition processes in ways possibly beneficial to long-term accuracy (Ellis, 1994, 1995; Long, 1991; Long and Robinson, 1998; Sharwood-Smith, 1981; Lightbown, 1998).
2.8 Concluding remarks

The aim of this chapter has been to briefly review the historical context of grammar teaching and interpret the development of grammar teaching and learning from the perspective of applied linguistics, second language acquisition theories, and cognitive processes. It would have been impossible to review all the literature connected to the acquisition of grammar, therefore, I have been highly selective, highlighting only some of the relevant themes in SLA research and in cognitive psychology. There is an ever-growing body of research that examines when and how the teacher can engage the cognitive processing abilities of L2 learners. Until recently the primary concern of many applied linguists has been language form. The interest in cognitive processes, like noticing and consciousness-raising, and input processing has opened the functional perspective, which sees forms as socially-functionally motivated grammatical elements.

Owing to contributions from SLA research, we can appreciate the fact, that the acquisition of grammar is not likely to be accounted for by one type of learning process. Regardless of which type of process is responsible for learning, it is clear, that some attention to form must be given to grammar by second language learners. However, it is also clear, that the attention to form should not come in the shape of decontextualized drills or isolated grammar exercises. For new forms to be incorporated into learners’ interlanguage system, it is assumed, that learners must first notice what it is they are to learn. Then, even when they are able to produce grammatical structures accurately, learners still need to learn what they mean and when they are used. In sum, what needs to be learnt about grammar can be characterized by the three interconnected dimensions: form, meaning, and use, however, they can be described discretely as well.
Chapter 3
Grammar and grammars

3.1 From theoretical to pedagogical grammar

The previous chapter attempted to describe learning and acquiring grammar from a cognitive perspective and outlined the cognitive processes involved. It highlighted the importance of learning processes that need to be actively supported in the classroom. This chapter creates the link between language input and pedagogical mediation - in plain language between grammar and teaching – by introducing and redefining the concept of pedagogical grammar, as a tool of assisting this process.

Effects of teaching grammar are influenced by the teachers' knowledge of language, by their own attitudes towards language, and the instructional methods they use. This chapter discusses first the grammatical paradigms that have had an influence on grammar teaching and provide the source for teachers’ knowledge. Second, grammar types will be identified and the term pedagogical grammar interpreted and redefined.

Acknowledging the role of grammar in language teaching and learning, the focus of attention has shifted from whether or not to teach grammar to the question of what kind of grammar is to be taught and how best it can be taught. For an informed decision we have to investigate the different types of grammar and their scope. Therefore, the following sections provide an overview of the most influential grammatical paradigms in language teaching and then a discussion of types of grammar follows influenced by the paradigms.

3.2 Grammatical paradigms

Halliday (1994) claims that in the Western heritage there have been two major approaches to grammar: the formal and the functional. They are not contradictory in nature, however, they are often made to appear so. Each has had its prominence at different periods. The interrelationship of these two approaches to grammar has led to the emergence of the four grammatical paradigms related to different types of grammatical descriptions based on different approaches to language.
Historically, English grammars, according to their general aims and objectives, can be divided into

- Traditional grammar;
- Structural grammar;
- Transformational-generative grammar;
- Functional grammar.

These grammatical paradigms have not existed in isolation, moreover, they have been intertwined over the centuries. A detailed discussion of these paradigms follows.

### 3.2.1 Traditional grammar

By traditional grammar we mean the Aristotelian orientation towards the nature of language as exemplified in the work of the ancient Greeks and Romans, the speculative works of the medieval age, and the prescriptive approach of the 18th century grammarians (Howatt, 1984).

The term itself is a vague expression to refer to a number of grammars that are primarily concerned with language as a set of rules. Traditional grammar is often valued as a mental discipline and respected as a tradition. The terminology and the system of classification were based on the work of Aristotle and Dionysius Thrax. Developed for the analysis of Greek and Latin, traditional grammar divided the target language into eight parts of speech: nouns, verbs, participles, articles, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs and conjunctions. Learning the language meant the study of the eight categories and the development of rules for their use in translation (Hinkel and Fotos, 2002).

In the Middle Ages vernacular languages started to be used instead of Latin and attention turned to developing a grammatical description of English. One of the earliest grammars of English was created by Ben Jonson (Howatt, 1984). The grammar of Latin was taken as the norm and even later grammars were concerned with codifying the principles of English and reducing it to rules. The most notable of these grammars were written by Lowth (Short Introduction to English Grammar,
1762), by Murray (English Grammar, 1794), and by Jespersen (A Modern English Grammar, 1909-49) (Crystal, 1998). Although they are considered to be traditional grammars or scholarly grammars, they paved the way for the modern grammars. They were already regarded as pedagogical versions of traditional grammars however, they still had a limited scope and strong Latin orientation.

The main objective of these grammars was to make language rules systematic and explicit what every native speaker knows implicitly. However, they were limited in scope and inflexible in the sense that they were unable to cope with the realities of English in use. As a result, traditional grammars do not deal explicitly with semantics, however, meaning is not totally excluded. Sweet expressed his didactic purpose when writing his grammar and summarised it the following way:

“We study the grammar of our own language for other objects than those for which we study the grammar of foreign languages. We do not study grammar in order to get a practical mastery of our own language, because in the nature of things we must have that mastery before we begin to study grammar at all” (Sweet, 1891:5).

### 3.2.1.1 Traditional grammar and language teaching

The Grammar-Translation Method as a teaching approach is generally associated with the traditional grammatical paradigm. This traditional approach has been extremely influential in instructional pedagogy and it is still being used as the primary approach of language instruction. The ultimate goal of the method is the study of the literature through reading and translation (Bárdos, 1997).

The Grammar-Translation Method has no explicit theory of language learning, language is regarded as an object to be studied rather than a tool to be used. Students are expected to learn the rules, memorize patterns, and translate sentences and passages from one language to another. The method is easy for a teacher with limited language knowledge and not much time or training who simply wants to follow a textbook and have the reassurance of clear-cut answers. Different versions of this
method are still widely used all over the world as the main language teaching approach.

3.2.1.2 Drawbacks of traditional grammar

Traditional grammar provides a poor model for the grammars of different languages. The Latin framework used by it does not reflect the realities of the language and implies that Latin is an organized language while other languages are not. Its scope is limited, overemphasising form over function and meaning, disregarding the dynamic nature of language. It does not adequately distinguish all the linguistic levels, it operates only at the sentence level and bellow. According to the traditional method, the sentence is analysed in terms of the parts of the sentence: Subjects, Predicate (principal parts), Object, Attribute, Adverbial Modifier (secondary parts). One and the same constituent is often given more than one analysis. In the sentence John wants to go there we cannot say whether the infinitive is part of the verbal predicate or the object. This example suggests that traditional sentence analysis is endowed with some problems. Besides that, it is normative and prescriptive, as a result, its main concern is correctness and preciseness. It lacks scientific accuracy, objectivity and ignores the contemporary uses of the language and all the varieties of languages.

These days traditional grammar incorporates the achievements of past and present, and, it is used as a reference source by teachers of English and as a point of departure by scholars.

3.2.2 Structural grammar

Structural grammar aims at overcoming the shortcomings of traditional grammar: the lack of objectivity, precision, and scientific respectability. The aim was achieved through objective, detailed and systematic observation which resulted in descriptions of patterns of language in use. While traditional grammar provides an idealized set of rules derived from Latin, structuralists are concerned with patterns of language in use. The eminent representatives of the movement were C.C. Fries, Z. S. Harris and
L. Bloomfield (Máté, 1998). The fundamental principles of structuralism are outlined by Francis the following way:

- “A language constitutes a set of behaviour patterns common to the members of a given community. It is part of what anthropologists call the culture of the community. Its phenomena can be observed, recorded, classified and compared.
- The grammar of each language must be made up on the basis of a study of that particular language – a study that is free of preconceived notions of what a language should contain and how it should operate.
- The analysis and description of a given language must conform to the requirements laid down for any satisfactory scientific theory: simplicity, consistency, completeness, usefulness” (1993:430).

While the focus of traditional grammar was the written language, structuralist grammar dealt mainly with speech and analysed the sound system. Bloomfield’s book entitled “Language” (1933) includes a precise description of phonemes – the distinctive individual sounds of language.

Whereas traditional grammar defined the parts of speech in terms of meaning, the structuralists regarded it as subjective and unscientific. Therefore, they defined the parts of speech based on where they are located in the structure of a sentence and based on their structural characteristics (e.g. “the” is a word which comes before a noun; or “searched” is a verb because it contains the suffix “ed”).

Sentence patterns are important in structuralist grammar. In analysing the sentence they used a process called immediate constituent analysis (IC). The sentence is divided into parts until the process cannot be continued any further and the fundamental building blocks of the sentence are reached. It is not difficult to see a similarity between IC analysis and the traditional procedure of parsing sentences into subject, predicate, attribute, object and adverbal. However, a big advantage of the IC analysis is that it does not use the traditional concepts, which are not defined clearly.

### 3.2.2.1 Structural grammar and language teaching

Structuralism provided what was required by the age, the mid-twentieth century. People started to travel, and the demand for language courses increased which
focused on the spoken language for purposes of communication with native speakers. This was the era of the emergence of the new learning theory, behaviourism.

The structural view of language was combined with the principles of behaviourist psychology. As a result, the Audio-lingual Method to second language teaching emerged. The linguistic description provided by structuralism outlined patterns that could be drilled without recourse to rules and translation. Substitution tables and pattern drills were used that involved the manipulation of a particular structure. The structures were designed so that they started with the easy structures and moved gradually to more complex ones. This way they tried to avoid errors and the use of learners’ first language was also discouraged. The Audio-lingual Method was influential until the 1970s, however, pattern drills and substitution tables are quite commonly used techniques to reinforce a particular structure even nowadays.

### 3.2.2.2 Drawbacks of structural grammar

Structuralism ignores meaning, native speaker’s intuition and their competence of being able to generate an infinite number of sentences from a finite set of items. It does not recognize that the analysis of a relatively small sample of instances of language cannot account for the entire language system. It emphasises structure at the expense of function and meaning. As a result, it does differentiate for example between sentences that have the same structure but different meaning. Similarly it does not deal well with the syntax of complex sentences. Despite the above mentioned drawbacks structuralist grammar brought a fresh perspective to the teaching and learning of languages.

### 3.2.3 Transformational-generative grammar

Transformational-generative grammar is a linguistic theory associated with Noam Chomsky, particularly with his book *Syntactic Structures* (1957). Transformational-generative grammar does not teach us how to analyse sentences; it teaches us how sentences are generated in a language. It attempts to define rules that can generate the
infinite number of grammatical sentences possible in a language. Neither tarditional nor structural grammar was interested in the generation of sentences. The starting point of Transformational-generative grammar is a rationalist assumption that a deep structure underlies a language, and that a similar deep structure underlies all languages. These abstract deep structures are transformed into the surface structures that characterise particular languages. Transformational-generative grammar seeks to identify rules called deep structure rules that govern relations between parts of a sentence, on the assumption that beneath such aspects as word order a fundamental structure exists.

Chomsky’s (1957) belief of the existence of a universal grammar as a key characteristic of all languages contradicts the ideas of structuralism. Instead of focusing on surface structures he looks at the relationships between the surface structures and the underlying deep structures. The deep structures are seen as universal to all languages and are said to be genetically programmed in the human brain. These abstract deep structures are transformed into the surface structures that characterize particular languages.

The recognition of surface and deep structures makes it possible to relate all the sentences of a language and even different languages. Transformational-generative grammar can account for any structural ambiguity by relating ambiguous constructions to two deep structures. The sentence Hunting tigers can be dangerous can be related to two different deep structures:

- DS: Tigers +pres. Hunt+ X+ Tigers pres. can be + dangerous
- DS: X pres. Hunt+ tigers + IT + pres. can be + dangerous

This way Transformational-generative grammar can account for any structural ambiguity by relating ambiguous constructions to two deep structures.

Although Chomsky (1980) insisted that his theory of grammar had little direct classroom application it has had tremendous influence on second language learning:

“is undoubtedly the most dynamic and influential,… Every other school of linguistics tends to define its position in relation to Chomsky’s view on particular issues”(Stern, 1983:140).
3.2.3.1 Transformational-generative grammar and language teaching

Chomsky’s theory of language acquisition challenged the dominant language teaching approach that was based on structuralism and behaviourism. He argued that language was learnt not through the repetition of structures until they became automatic, but rather by experiencing it in context. Then the language acquisition device was activated and the learner got access to the innate rules of the language. As a next step the learner made hypothesis about the working of the language based on the evidence supplied in the context of using the language. In this view the learner is an active processor of language.

Transformational-generative grammar provides a framework for relating mind and grammar, going beyond surface structures. It also offers a more accurate and complete conception of the system of language, building on both traditional and structural models. One of its biggest benefits is that it provides the basis for analysing the nature and degree of learner errors, which are viewed positively as indications of the learner’s current hypothesising about how the language works.

Since the deep structure rules represented the speaker’s competence, there was no point in teaching the rule explicitly. It was suggested that a context should be created where the rules could be activated through exposing the learner to comprehensible input that is graded and useful for the learner (Krashen, 1987). In the 1970’s there was great optimism regarding transformational generative grammar. Its emphasis on how surface structures can be generated from deep structures and how structures can be transformed into stylistic variants seemed to indicate that a study of transformational grammar would lead to improved language use. This expectation has not been realized, Transformational-generative grammar has not provided an alternative to language teaching. The theory is directed more towards linguists and psychologists than towards language teachers, therefore, it is assumed that generative grammar is pedagogically inadaptable to language teaching.
3.2.3.2 Drawbacks of Transformational-generative grammar

Transformational-generative grammar emphasizes the ideal speaker-listener’s competence at the expense of the ability to use the language appropriately in real communication. The emphasis is still on form and it does not take social and cultural differences into account. It operates at sentence level and below. However, the generative approach opened a new perspective which reflected “the creativity of language, the process of linguistic production and interpretation, which structural linguists disregarded” (Stern, 1983:142). Chomsky and his followers did not take any steps to encourage the use of transformational-generative grammar in language teaching. As a result, the theory is seen as an abstract system by teachers and tends to be ignored.

The theory of Transformational-generative grammar influenced the emergence of the cognitive view of language learning creating an opposition to the Audio-lingual approach, behaviourism and structuralism.

3.2.4 Functional grammars

Transformational-generative grammar focused on the speaker’s competence. This notion was extended in the 1980s to what Hymes called communicative competence (1972). His model focuses more on appropriate use of language, that is, on how language functions in discourse. Although not rejecting Chomsky’s model entirely, Hymes extended it and gave greater emphasis to sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors. His concept of communicative competence emphasizes language as meaningful communication, including the appropriate use of language in particular social contexts.

As a next step in the development of competence Canale and Swain (1980) offers an alternative model of communicative competence that has become extremely influential. This model consists of grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence. Sociolinguistic competence is broken down into sociocultural and discourse competence. In this model grammatical competence
is the knowledge of the language code, including lexical items, rules of morphology and syntax, sentence-grammar semantics and phonology.

Grammar started to have a more functional orientation and meaning in social contexts became the centre of investigation. Functional approaches to grammar can be differentiated from formal or generative approaches to grammar by their focus on the communicative, as opposed to cognitive, aspects of language. The most influential functional grammars are: Dik’s (1978) Functional Grammar and Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar (1994). Their major contribution to the movement was to explore the relationship between the forms of the language (the lexical and syntactic elements) and the function of language in particular contexts. The roots of functional grammar lie in sociology and anthropology rather than in psychology (Trask, 1993).

3.2.4.1 Functional discourse grammar

Functional discourse grammar (Hengeveld and Mackenzie, 2005) is the successor to Dick’s (1978) Functional Grammar expanding its scope by adopting as its starting point the communicator’s intention to influence his or her interlocutor through the use of linguistic discourse. It is characterized by the following properties:

- It takes the discourse act as its basic unit of analysis. It is thus a discourse rather than a sentence grammar and is capable of handling discourse acts both larger and smaller than a sentence;
- It distinguishes an interpersonal, a representational, a structural, and a phonological level of linguistic organization;
- It orders these levels in a top-down fashion. It starts with the representation of the linguistic manifestations of the speaker's intentions at the interpersonal level, and gradually works down to the phonological level;
- It structures each of the levels of linguistic organization hierarchically.

By organizing grammar in this way, Functional discourse grammar takes the functional approach to language to its logical extreme: within the top-down organization of the grammar, pragmatics governs semantics, pragmatics and
semantics govern morphosyntax, and pragmatics, semantics and morphosyntax govern phonology. Therefore, Functional discourse grammar is a discourse grammar rather than a sentence grammar. Since the model strictly separates the interpersonal, representational, morphosyntactic, and phonological characteristics of every discourse act in terms of different levels, the interaction between these levels of linguistic organization can be studied systematically.

### 3.2.4.2 Systemic functional grammar

Halliday’s systemic functional grammar was offering an alternative to Chomsky’s approach, in which language was seen not as something exclusively internal to the learner, but rather as a means of functioning in society. Language is seen as a representation of reality, transmitted for a specific purpose, and structured as a message. Halliday (1994) describes grammar as a resource for making meaning. He argues that speakers and writers draw on their language resources according to the social context to make three kinds of simultaneous meanings or metafunctions: ideational meaning, interpersonal meaning and textual meaning.

The ideational metafunction means using language to represent our experience of the world. Analysed this way, a clause consists of a process and some number of participants in it. The participants are given functional labels depending on their role in the clause. The interpersonal metafunction is the interaction between speakers it encodes. Distinctions of mood, tense and positive-negative fall under this metafunction. The textual metafunction is the way it encodes its role in a greater span of communication, in a text. This means language use to create a coherent and cohesive text both in speaking and writing.

### 3.2.4.3 The influence of functional grammars

Functionally inspired approaches to language teaching as coherent theories have emerged since the second half of the 19th century. Bühler’s organon model (1965) and Searle’s (1969) speech act theory are examples of the functional orientation. The
tendency has resulted in several functional grammars both in English and in German (Leech and Svartvik, 1975; Givón, 1993; Engel and Tertel, 1993; Zifonun, Hoffmann and Strecker, 1997). The functional orientation focuses on the relationship between form and function, system descriptions are related to usage descriptions, however, they are incomplete and lack terminological clarity.

The form-meaning relationships of linguistic expressions can be analysed and described from a semasiological or an onomasiological perspective. You can either investigate or describe the semantic properties of particular linguistic forms, or the various ways in which particular meanings are expressed. In spite of the works of Gabelenz (1891) and Jespersen (1924), the distinction between semasiological and onomasiological language description has not received much interest.

3.2.4.3.1 Semasiological and onomasiological approaches

Each linguistic expression can be viewed from two perspectives: the perspective of the hearer who analyses what he or she hears and the speaker who puts his or her thoughts into words. This idea led Gabelentz (1984) to the conclusion that a language consists of two interacting systems and these should be described separately. Therefore, the ideal description of a language should present two complementary grammatical systems. Gabelentz called the first one the analytical system, because it explains linguistic phenomena by breaking them down, the other one was called the synthetic system, because it shows how the grammatical means are made use of to construct speech.

Accordingly, an ideal grammar consists of two mutually complementary parts: the analytical or semasiological part takes the linguistic expression as given, analyses their forms and describes their meanings, whereas the synthetic or onomasiological part takes the meaning as the starting point and describes by what kind of linguistic forms they are expressed. According to Gabelentz, the semasiological part precedes the onomasiological one. Since the semasiological part takes the hearer’s perspective “the analysis has to start with the sentence, proceeding from the whole to the parts, i.e. from the sentence to the words and word forms reaching the terminal elements,
the single sounds” (1984:86). As for the organization of the onomasiological part, Gabelentz is less explicit. He only says that it should have sections for everything that is expressed by grammatical means.

Jespersen, who had probably been influenced by the work of Gabelentz’ distinguishes “three stages of grammatical treatment of the same phenomena, of three points of view from which grammatical facts can be considered, which may briefly be described as form, function, notion”(1924:56).

All formal elements are to be treated in a section he calls morphology, the functional categories are described in the syntax section which include number, case, tense, mood, voice, person and gender. He lists here futurity, which also serves as an example for a notional category. His distinction between functional and notional categories is not always clear. He only takes those categories as onomasiological language descriptions that have some grammatical correlate.

Gabelentz and Jespersen were convinced that languages should be described from both the semasiological and onomasiological perspective, but actually did not provide any arguments. Linguistic grammars usually choose the semasiological perspective. This is necessary because the readers need to know what kind of linguistic forms exist before they can understand their meaning. Ideally written a comprehensive grammar covers all grammatical phenomena and their meanings, but where is the onomasiological perspective? None of the linguistic grammars comprise the two parts of a semasiological and onomasiological description as envisaged by Gabelentz (1891), Jespersen (1924) and later Lehmann (1989). However, Leech and Svartvik’s Communicative Grammar of English and Kommunikative Grammatik by Engel and Tertel (1993) contain parts with onomasiological description. These descriptions relate to the semantic function of possession, orientation in space and time or negation. These semantic functions play an important role in communication, but they cannot be treated together in single chapters of the semasiological description because they are expressed by linguistic constructions which pertain to more than one morpho-syntactic category. In addition, the onomasiological approach can account for productive speech formula which partly fulfil grammatical functions. This idea led to the lexical approach discussed later in section 3.7.
Since systemic functional grammar is concerned with meaning in context, analysis involves looking at the whole text and the lexico-grammar features which are characteristic of the text. In Halliday’s grammar there is one set of terminology to talk about meaning and function and another set to refer to the grammatical classes that realize those meanings. This is important because there is no one-to-one correspondence between meaning and grammatical class. This model of language tries to incorporate meaning, function, context and grammatical categories, therefore bound to involve a great deal of complexity.

### 3.2.4.5 Functional grammars and language teaching

Although functional grammar is a theoretical construct, it has had a great influence on language teaching, more specifically on syllabus design. A more functionally oriented syllabus was prepared by Wilkins (1976) describing the communicative meanings that learners would need to be able to make. In this type of syllabus “notions and functions are generally seen as replacing linguistic structures as units of content, and a notional/functional orientation is seen to be incompatible with a concern for grammatical structure and meanings intrinsic in form” (Widdowson, 1990:41).

The notional-functional syllabus has been quite influential on second language teaching. A number of British applied linguists have become advocates of functional syllabuses and have emphasised language as a social phenomenon (Widdowson, 1990; Wilkins, 1976; Littlewood, 1981; Brumfit and Johnson, 1979). Grammar content is organized on the basis of forms required for particular communicative activities. Although it appears first to be the opposite of the structural approach, there is actually a structural basis to functional grammar instruction.

The typical characteristics of functional grammars as opposed to their structural alternatives are summarized in the following:

1. linguistic form subserves communicative function;
2. focuses on competence and performance;
3. acquisition arises from use;
4. There is discourse basis for form selection.

Functional grammar puts the emphasis not so much on correcting grammatical errors or on syntax, but extending the learners’ ability to use language effectively and appropriately in a variety of contexts. The key point is that taking text as a major unit of analysis means that grammar is treated beyond the level of sentence syntax. The words and structures that make up a text are known as the lexicogrammar, which realizes the three metafunctions, the ideational, interpersonal, and textual meanings of a text by patterning words into phrases, clauses, or clause complexes.

The impact of functional grammars on the teaching of grammar includes the exploration of the context and the situation first, then the specific genres are analysed and finally students are assisted to identify grammatical patterns characterizing a particular genre. The same idea is implied in the focus of form paradigm (Chapter 2, section 2.7.3). Undoubtedly, functional grammar brought a new perspective into language teaching, which requires a pedagogical shift on the part of teachers as well as learners.

3.2.4.4 Drawbacks of functional grammar

Although Functional grammar places the emphasis on using language to achieve real-life purposes, it has some weaknesses as well. Since most linguistic functions lack satisfying definitions or reliable means of identification, the sequencing and grading of functions and notions are more complicated than in a structural syllabus. Notions and functions do not provide a basis for the systematic coverage of the language to be taught (Brumfit, 1981). Moreover, the category of notion is not easy to interpret in other languages which makes the implementation of the functional approach difficult (Bárdos, 2005). Similarly to Transformational-generative grammar, the theory is too complicated for teachers to directly implement in the classroom. However, it would require investment on the part of the teacher and a willingness to re-think language and grammar.
The following chart attempts to give a short summary of the above discussed grammatical paradigms with their characteristic features. It is only an outline and does not give a full picture and details of each model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional grammar</th>
<th>Structural grammar</th>
<th>Transformational generative grammar</th>
<th>Functional grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of grammar</strong></td>
<td>Rules and forms are in the centre</td>
<td>Building blocks of the language are combined in structures</td>
<td>LAD is an innate device which includes the basic knowledge about the structure of language</td>
<td>Grammar is a means of expressing meaning in social contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View of language</strong></td>
<td>Language is a set of rules</td>
<td>Language is a set of habits</td>
<td>Language is a rule-governed activity</td>
<td>Language is a system of meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus of investigation</strong></td>
<td>Focus is on forms with traces of function</td>
<td>Focus is on structure</td>
<td>Focus is on syntactic form with interest in semantics</td>
<td>Focus is on forms and functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emphasised areas</strong></td>
<td>Grammar of the written language</td>
<td>Spoken language is emphasised</td>
<td>Not relevant</td>
<td>Difference is made between the spoken and the written context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overlap with other disciplines</strong></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Behaviourist psychology</td>
<td>Cognitive psychology</td>
<td>Sociology, Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative figures</strong></td>
<td>Dionysius Thrax Robert Lowth</td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>Chomsky</td>
<td>Halliday Dik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom application</strong></td>
<td>Deductive teaching of grammar rules as an ultimate aim</td>
<td>Selection of structures is guided by the teacher’s knowledge of the structural patterns</td>
<td>The acquisition sequence guides the selection of input for the learners</td>
<td>Grammar points are discussed in context to raise learners’ awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4 An overview of grammatical paradigms*

The second half of the 20th century was greatly influenced by formal and functional grammars. The most influential formal grammar has been the Transformational-generative theory of grammar by Chomsky (1957), with a primary focus on morphology and syntax. Functional models on the other hand, are also concerned
with the appropriate use of language in context. The influence of these theoretical models is evident in various areas in applied linguistics and language teaching.

The approach to grammar as abstract linguistic description is found in Quirk and Greenbaum (1972). It is a descriptive grammar that deals with abstract forms as syntactic combinations of words. On the other hand, a functional approach is evident in Leech and Svartvik (1975) or in Givón (1993) which are communicative grammars based on correspondencies between structure and function. In these grammars, each section is built around a major function of language, such as requesting, denial or affirmation.

Another area of the influence of different grammatical paradigms is syllabus design. Traditional grammars require structural syllabuses, in contrast, functional and/or notional syllabuses developed at a time when interest had been shifted to the functional properties of the language. Teaching approaches also draw on insights from the differing approaches to grammar. Formal theories like Transformational-generative grammar, which tend to view language learning as rule acquisition, influence approaches that focus on formalized rules of grammar. On the other hand, the functional orientation manifests itself in communicative language teaching, viewing language as communication and shifting the focus from sentence-level to discourse-level language functions.

Recently, there is a tendency to favour an approach that draws not on one or the other grammar models, but on all. Widdowson (1990) argues that it is a mistake to concentrate solely on functional considerations while ignoring form altogether. Approaches that rely heavily on an ability to use language appropriately can lead to a lack of necessary grammatical knowledge. Therefore, an eclectic approach is needed that provides the middle ground. Such an approach should be created by language teachers themselves. Therefore, for a language teacher the knowledge of the grammatical paradigms and their effects is essential in order to make the right choice about teaching grammar in their own contexts.
3.3 Dynamism in grammar description

Foreign language pedagogy has historically been based on prescriptive standard language grammars with a strong emphasis on correct written usage, on syntax and morphology. Although these grammars were basically developed for pedagogic purposes and not written for specialists, they still represent a heavy theoretical orientation (Corder, 1973). The familiarity with traditional sentence grammar for language teachers is still assumed. However, more emphasis is placed on process and functional approaches to grammar due to the communicative movement. In the definition of communicative competence the idea of being able to use grammatical knowledge is inherent (Hymes, 1972). Although grammatical competence must be an integral part of communicative competence, just learning grammar rules does not seem to help learners achieve either. This paradox rests partly on the failure to identify exactly what we mean by grammar in foreign language education and whether the concept we have of grammar is appropriate to pedagogical needs.

The tendency of moving towards more functional approaches is described and advocated in the literature by several authors (Batstone, 1994; Celce-Murcia et.al., 1997; Larsen-Freeman, 2003). The movement can be connected with Anderson’s (1980) model of the two types of knowledge: knowledge about the language system called declarative knowledge and knowledge of how to use the language called procedural knowledge. This was discussed in detail in chapter 2 section 2.4. Based on the assumptions of cognitive psychology about language learning, grammar is viewed as a skill rather than an area of knowledge (Larsen-Freeman, 2003) Therefore, learning grammar should be much more than storing knowledge about the rules, it should be a process of acquiring how to use the rules. Batstone (1994) named it the process approach to grammar, Larsen-Freeman (2003) calls the process grammaring, and Thornbury (2001) grammaticization.

According to Mitchell the following tendencies led to the changing views on grammar pedagogy on the theoretical level:

- “dissatisfaction with the usefulness of traditional grammars
- changing views among linguists concerning the valid representation of language
- concern that language description for learners should be both authentic and relevant” (2000:291).
Attention to the dynamic nature of grammar has started with the functional paradigm shift initiated by Halliday (1994). Another linguist, Hopper, criticising Chomsky’s idealised grammar as a static object proposes what he calls emergent grammar (1988, 1998). According to this view, grammar is seen as incomplete and in process or emergent. The following table, adapted from Hopper (1998) contrasts the Chomskyan rule-based grammar, which he calls an a priori grammar, and emergent grammar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A priori grammar</th>
<th>Emergent grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrete set of rules</td>
<td>Regularity comes out of use in discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logically and mentally detachable from discourse</td>
<td>Cannot be distinguished from discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite for generating discourse</td>
<td>Emerges in discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sentence is regarded as a unit</td>
<td>The clause is regarded as a unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data are supplied by intuition</td>
<td>Data come from actual discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A static entity, fully present at all times in the mind of the ideal speaker</td>
<td>Regularities are provisional and are continuously subject to negotiation and abandonment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atemporal</td>
<td>Real-time activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous</td>
<td>Heterogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses all examples equally in the system</td>
<td>Investigates strategies for constructing texts that produce the fixing or sedimentation of forms that are understood to constitute grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 A priori and emergent grammars contrasted

The grammar which Hopper labels a priori is the popular view of grammar in many foreign language classrooms and texts. If teaching is based on a priori grammar knowledge, then the role and process of understanding contexts is diminished and this leads to a lack of discourse in the language classrooms. The notion of emergent grammar suggests that structure and regularity come out of discourse and are shaped
by discourse in an on-going process. Therefore, grammar cannot be understood as a prerequisite for discourse since its forms are not fixed but negotiable in face-to-face interaction (Hopper, 1998).

Chomsky’s static grammar and Hopper’s emergent grammar represent two extreme viewpoints on grammar. A middle ground position between the two is offered by Givón (1999) and Goldberg (1999). Both of them see grammar as a rigid and flexible system at the same time “although minute changes in the system constantly occur, the system as a whole is fairly stable” (Goldberg:1999:200).

In sum, when linguists systematise language and within it grammar for studying purposes, it becomes a static, objective, atemporal system. For teaching purposes however, we have to think of language and grammar as a skill or dynamic process. Rutherford comments on it the following way:

“Yet there is another side of language that is not very machine-like at all, a side in which the edges become blurred or disappear altogether. Language is constantly in the act of change or growth … Growth of course is quite unmachine-like, or alien to that which we can conceive of in purely mechanical terms. The apt descriptive term for growth then is not mechanic but organic” (Rutherford, 1987: 36-37).

This dynamic view of grammar might well fit the learners’ internal processing of the input, concentrating on the association between meaning and form as realization of knowledge in performance.

### 3.4 Linguistic and didactic grammars

Chapter 2 investigated perspectives and possibilities of second language grammar acquisition influenced by cognitive psychology. Although there is no clear agreement among theorists on the details of the hypothesized processes, their effect on instructed grammar teaching has been quite influential. If we concentrate on this perspective in foreign language teaching and learning, it has to be realized that linguistic grammars need to be adopted to support the processes involved in effective grammar acquisition. Therefore, the following sections will investigate different
types of linguistic and didactic grammars and their possible implementation in the classroom.

For the purposes of foreign language grammar teaching a different type of grammar is needed than the one prepared on linguistic grounds for native speakers. This type of grammar should be more comprehensive and explicit (Helbig, 1993). There are some areas of grammar which do not appear to be difficult for native speakers, however, for non-native speakers are extremely difficult. Native speakers intuitively know what is correct and acceptable in their language, however, non-native speakers lack this intuitive power. Therefore, non-native speakers need to develop a competence which Harden termed “cognitio clara distincta adaequata” (1993:83). This is the faculty of being able to recognize internal relationships in the language and compensate for the lack of intuition. This process needs to be supported by grammar teaching.

The need to provide foreign language teaching with an appropriate type of grammar has always been a central issue. There have been a number of initiatives which are characterized with a constant debate about the relationship between theoretical or linguistic grammars and applied grammars or didactic grammars.

Grammar, on the one hand can serve scientific or theoretical purpose, on the other hand pedagogical purposes, depending on the users and the target audience. Therefore, we can make a distinction between linguistic and didactic grammars. Linguistic grammars include traditional grammars, structural grammars, transformational-generative grammars, and functional grammars, primarily used by linguists. Each has its purposes and its methods. Each is connected to a grammatical paradigm already discussed in section 3.2. in this chapter.

Didactic grammars, on the other hand, are often associated with school grammars, grammars for teachers and learners. In the literature descriptive grammars, prescriptive grammars and pedagogical grammars are labelled as applied grammars. The cover term didactic grammar is also used to refer to them. However, the term is an ambiguous one, it needs to be cleared and interpreted.
The distinction between linguistic and didactic grammar is a broad categorization. There has always been a tension between these two options; however, a didactic grammar should be based to some extent on linguistic grammars. Linguistic grammars offer a comprehensive, explicit and objective description of language rules, while didactic grammars adapt rules from linguistic grammars for teaching and learning purposes according to criteria such as the order of acquisition or the needs of learners. Didactic grammars are more eclectic, drawing on insights from formal and functional grammars, as well as corpus linguistics, discourse analysis and pragmatics (DeCarrico and Larsen-Freeman, 2003).

From both broad perspectives different types of grammar have emerged with considerable overlaps representing stages with different focus on a scale ranging from linguistic to didactic grammars.

### 3.5 The typology of grammars

The discussion of grammar types in the literature is not clear and obvious. Crystal distinguishes six types of grammar, descriptive, pedagogical, prescriptive, reference, theoretical and traditional (1998:118). However, his list is neither comprehensive nor adequate, since he does not provide the basis for his classification. In his interpretation linguistic grammars are mixed with didactic grammars.

Helbig (1992) defines twelve grammar types determined by the aims of different user groups including

- linguistic grammar and pedagogical grammar;
- grammar for foreign language learners and grammar for native speakers;
- descriptive and norm-prescriptive grammar;
- contrastive and non-contrastive grammar;
- production and receptive grammar.

Zimmermann (1979) offers the following distinction:

- grammar for teachers – either coursebook dependent or independent;
- reference grammar for learners;
• grammar for specific target audience.

His distinction is based on didactic principles, since these grammars are defined on the basis of the aims and the users.

The differing classification of grammar types and their interpretation raisis questions of application for different purposes. Therefore, the following criteria are offered for setting up a typology of grammars:

- the objective of the investigation (e.g. corpus grammars);
- didactic considerations (e.g. descriptive, prescriptive and pedagogical grammar);
- the user’s perspective (e.g. linguistic grammars or didactic grammars);
- theory of language (e.g. dependence grammar, case grammar, transformational-generative grammar etc.).

From these criteria the theoretical side has already been explored. We should turn now to didactic considerations and discuss grammar types which influence instructional practice. From this perspective didactic grammars are important including descriptive grammar, prescriptive grammar, theoretical grammar and pedagogical grammar.

3.5.1 Descriptive grammar

Descriptive grammars aim to describe language as it is actually used and represent speakers’ unconscious knowledge or mental grammar of the language. According to Crystal descriptive grammar is

“An approach that describes the grammatical constructions that are used in a language, without making any evaluative judgments about their standing in society. These grammars are commonplace in linguistics, where it is standard practice to investigate a 'corpus' of spoken or written material, and to describe in detail the patterns it contains. Descriptive grammars are data-oriented and define grammar inclusively rather than exclusively. They are essentially reference grammars as full in their coverage as possible” (1998:118).
A *descriptive grammar* of a language does not only consist of accounts of syntax and morphology, moreover, phonetics, phonology, semantics and/or lexis are included. The relevance of this type of grammar is different for native speakers and non-native learners. Therefore, sections of a *descriptive grammar* would seem self-evident for native speakers. For them it is not a problem to choose the right verb tense in an adverbial clause like *Before he finishes work, he will give us a call.* For language learners it has to be emphasised that the present tense is considered to be normal in *before he finishes work.*

*Descriptive grammars* aim at revealing the mental grammar which represents the knowledge a speaker of the language has. While certain forms may be preferred for social or political or economic reasons, no specific dialect is linguistically superior to any other (Howatt, 1984; Trask, 1993; Odlin, 1994). According to Odlin, *descriptive grammars* provide a detailed look at both contemporary usage and earlier patterns in the language. As examples *Curme’s Syntax* from 1931 and Jespersen’s seven-volume *Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles* from 1922-1942 are mentioned (Odlin, 1994). For language teachers the boundaries between *descriptive* and *prescriptive grammars* are often not clear.

### 3.5.2 Prescriptive grammar

Grammars with rules that make distinctions between correct and incorrect forms are defined as prescriptive grammars.

“A manual that focuses on constructions where usage is divided, and lays down rules governing the socially correct use of language. These grammars were a formative influence on language attitudes in Europe and America during the 18th and 19th centuries. Prescriptive grammar states rules for what is considered the best or most correct usage. They are often based not on description of actual usage but rather on the grammarian’s view of what is best. Most of the traditional grammars are of this kind” (Crystal, 1987:118)

In the above definition *prescriptive grammar* means usage books for native speakers, giving *Fowler’s Modern English Usage* (1926) as an example. One of the earliest and most influential *prescriptive grammars* is *Lowth’s Short Introduction to English Grammar,* published in 1761. He criticized English writers from Shakespeare to
Pope and made most of the prescriptive statements people still follow today for instance “never split an infinitive” or “never end a sentence with a preposition”. *Prescriptive grammars* can be thought of as the opposite of descriptive grammars in that they describe rules that govern the use of language. They describe a proper way in which to speak and write. This approach to grammar description codifies certain distinctions between standard and non-standard varieties, and often makes overt value judgements by referring to the standard and non-standard varieties as correct or good and the non-standard as incorrect, or bad. Prescription makes the standardization of languages possible, which makes communication easier between highly different dialect regions. The difference between *prescriptive* and descriptive grammars was already pointed out by Jacob Grimm (1890) attacking Adelung’s norm-oriented prescriptive approach.

It should be noted that there are tremendous differences between a *prescriptive grammar* for native speakers and for non-native speakers, moreover, according to Juhász (1985) this difference exists in *descriptive grammars* as well. However, it is believed that the difference between *prescriptive* and *descriptive grammars* should not be overemphasized, since most of the grammars today go beyond pure description and serve as the basis for instruction in form of rules.

### 3.5.3 Theoretical grammar

“An approach that goes beyond the study of individual languages, to determine what constructs are needed in order to do any kind of grammatical analysis, and how these can be applied consistently in the investigation of a human language. It is thus a central notion in any investigation of linguistic universals. Theoretical grammars aim to justify a particular theory or model of language, and the language data are part of this justification only in so far as they illustrate the superiority of formulation in this model to other possible formulations e.g. N. Chomsky (1983) Transformational Grammar” (Crystal, 1998: 118).

*Theoretical grammars* are generative grammars that linguists use to gain insights into human language. They are often called scholarly grammars trying to validate a particular theoretical language model (Corder, 1973).
The above definitions make a difference between grammars according to the purpose and the intended population of users. Their content identifies grammar simply with a book containing a designedly teachable description. However, there is some uncertainty in the literature about the allocation of grammar books to the types of grammar. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (1985) by Quirk et al. is labelled as reference grammar by Crystal, as descriptive grammar by the authors themselves or Jespersen’s grammar is identified as reference grammar or descriptive grammar.

The confusion about the identification of different grammar types and references made to different grammar books comes from the fact that the writers have completely different aims and target audience in mind. Linguists, applied linguists and teachers have different reasons, aims and target audience when describing the same object, grammar.

### 3.5.4 Didactic grammar and pedagogical grammar

The terms *didactic grammar* and *pedagogical grammar* are often used as synonyms in the literature, however, it is important to make a difference for the purpose of clarity. The term *pedagogical grammar* (PG) is used in this dissertation as a type of *didactic grammar*. According to Crystal *pedagogical grammar* is:

> “a book specifically designed for teaching a foreign language, or for developing an awareness of the mother tongue. Such ‘teaching grammars’ are widely used in schools, so much so that many people have only one meaning for the term ‘grammar’: a grammar book. E.g. M Swan (1995) Practical English Usage Oxford:OUP”

For applied linguists and language teachers, the focus is more on *didactic grammar*, the type of grammar designed for the needs of second-language students and teachers. Although teaching grammar in a second language might involve some of the prescriptive rules for the standard varieties, didactic grammars resemble a descriptive grammar more than a prescriptive one, especially in terms of the range of structures used (Odlin, 1994). Other authors break further down the concept of
*pedagogical grammar* and distinguish between three different types (Hüllen, 1971; Corder, 1973; Helbig, 1981):

- PG for course book writers;
- PG for learners;
- PG for teachers;

### 3.5.5 Relationship between grammar types

Leech identifies only three varieties of grammar: academic grammar, teachers’ grammar and grammar for learners (1994:17). He claims that teachers should ideally be well versed in both academic grammar and grammar for learners. They should have a sound academic knowledge of the language and they should also be skilled in the methodologies of mediating grammar to learners. However, in reality this is too much to hope for. The problem is still the indirect relationship between academic knowledge and the way it can be put to use in the classroom. The following table models views about the types of grammar and their relationships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic grammar for university students</th>
<th>Teacher’s grammar</th>
<th>Grammar for learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and descriptive</td>
<td>←-----------------</td>
<td>Practical, selective sequenced, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5 Types of grammar (adapted from Leech, 1994:17)*

Based on the different definitions of grammar types we can create a link between these grammars for teaching purposes. *Descriptive grammar* mediates between *theoretical* and *didactic grammars* as shown in Figure 6 below. This realistic view of grammars suggests that theory and pedagogical practice are relatively self-contained, each with its own aims and criteria, whereas description tends naturally to be oriented towards one or the other - perhaps both. In this view *descriptive grammar* provides an input to both *theoretical* and *didactic grammars* (Leech, 1988).
Therefore, the role of *pedagogical grammar* – as a type of didactic grammar – is that of an interpreter between a number of formal grammars, the audience and situation-specific language teaching materials.

Descriptive and theoretical linguistics have often been presented as fields with conflicting interests. However, modern descriptive grammars should benefit from the work carried out by theoretical linguists and vice versa since “both disciplines are concerned with grammatical structure and how to characterize it” (Aarts, 1993:200). The two areas differ regarding their objectives and methodology. The aim of a theoretical grammar is to construct a theory which allows us to interpret the data in order to see how that data fits in within the framework of the theory whether it is structuralist, functionalist or generativist. The focus is on partial analysis of some chosen areas of grammar.

Descriptive grammar, on the other hand, aims to focus on empirical data in order to provide a detailed account of the principles governing grammatical categories. Descriptivists often criticize theoretical analysis, since they are based on idealized and insufficient data (Aarts, 1993; Stern, 1983). That is, linguistic theory is concerned “with an ideal speaker-listener in a homogeneous speech community” (Chomsky, 1965:3-4). However, theoretical ideas are being incorporated into descriptive work, therefore, linguistic theory can be an important source of
information for descriptive grammars. New descriptive grammars like Quirk et.al. (1985) bridge the gap between theory and description by incorporating many of the insights of modern theoretical linguistics and thus making grammatical descriptions accessible to a wider audience.

Didactic grammars have been largely influenced by descriptive grammars focusing on the product of language use. The importance of language description in applied linguistics has been questioned by some theorists (Stern; 1980, 1983; Widdowson, 1990) because of the perception that the theoretical insights of descriptive linguistics are different from the practical needs of language pedagogy. Still, the descriptive view has led to new insights about language and new ways of talking about and defining units of language. Didactic grammar has taken on a more descriptive focus, with learners being required to deduce rules from linguistic data (Tomlin, 1994).

The following table attempts to give a summary of the comparison of the three types of grammatical descriptions which influence instructional practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Linguistic grammar</th>
<th>Descriptive grammar</th>
<th>Didactic grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>To construct a theory or model of language</td>
<td>To describe the grammatical constructions that are used in a language</td>
<td>To make grammatical rules understandable for learners To systematise grammar in a pedagogically appropriate way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis</strong></td>
<td>Small sample of sentences Idealised, insufficient data</td>
<td>Empirical data in order to provide a detailed account of the principles governing grammatical categories</td>
<td>Data provided by descriptive grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Organized according to universal structural categories</td>
<td>Organized according to structural and functional patterns supported with examples</td>
<td>Organized according to usefulness and ease of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target audience</strong></td>
<td>Linguist or student of linguistics</td>
<td>Anybody who is interested in the study of language</td>
<td>Teachers or learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6  Comparison of linguistic, descriptive and didactic grammars*
Since the above discussed grammars provide the source of grammatical information, it is necessary to be clear about the conceptual levels of grammatical statement. The following figure symbolizes these relationships (Stern, 1992:131):

**Figure 7 Conceptual levels underlying grammar teaching**

On the first level grammatical theory manifested in grammatical paradigms provides models with categories and procedures for descriptive research. These will provide the necessary tools to describe and analyse the language on the second level. The third level comprises a possibly full description of the language, offering the best possible analysis of the target language within a particular paradigm. The fourth level is didactic grammar, which relates theory to practice working as an interface in the sense that the information provided by the linguistic theory is filtered and made accessible for teachers and learners to be used. *Didactic grammar* is a cover term for any type of grammar resource for teachers and learners. Its practical manifestation is
pedagogical grammar, the implementation and adaptation of linguistic grammars to specific needs already filtered by didactic principles. These provide grammatical information to be used in classroom practice.

Regarding the above developments in the classification of grammar types, having distinguished between different types of grammar we have to turn to defining and interpreting pedagogical grammar as a type of didactic grammar. This clarification is needed to create the link between theory and practice, and help teachers to make more informed decisions in their classroom teaching.

Chapter 2 has shown how much influence the psychological processes have on second language grammar acquisition and have shifted the attention to the role of explicit knowledge in language teaching. The developments of grammatical paradigms brought about a change of perspectives in grammar teaching and learning with the functional orientation. As a result, linguistic grammars and didactic grammars need to be more integrated in order to avoid the sharp distinction between grammar and communication. Therefore, a new interpretation of pedagogical grammar is required as a type of didactic grammar.

3.6 Defining the scope of pedagogical grammar

The interest in pedagogical grammar (PG) “reflects a growing sensitivity to the role which grammars play at the point of interaction between the learner, the material to be learned, and the teacher” (Walmsley, 1997:11).

Based on the investigation in the literature about different types of grammar, it seems that the term pedagogical grammar is understood as a source and a basis for language teaching materials or pedagogical explanation. The use of the term is usually connected to a book or grammatical description, however, the term itself seems to be ambiguous and debated in the literature and is often used without a clear definition.
3.6.1 Pedagogical grammar as a source of teaching materials

A common sense definition for pedagogical grammar would probably be constructed as grammar for teaching purposes. This wider view of pedagogical grammar is related to a type of grammar manifested in a book. In this meaning pedagogical grammar has a strong relationship to linguistics, since the prevailing grammatical description provides the basis for it. However, a pedagogical grammar should be eclectic in its nature, relying on several linguistic descriptions appropriate to the aims and the needs of the learners (Budai, 1979).

A pedagogical grammar can be grammar for foreign language teachers or for language learners. A distinction is made between native speaker teachers and non-native speaker teachers. The aim of a pedagogical grammar for native speakers is to raise awareness of the mother tongue, to make explicit what they already know implicitly with a heavy reliance on their competence (Corder, 1973; Crystal, 1998; Helbig, 1992). Pedagogical grammar for non-native teachers on the other hand, helps to present the facts of the language in a form which will help teachers to present grammar to their own learners. As a result, a pedagogical grammar for non-native speakers should be more explicit and complete.

Grammar for learners is referred to as practical grammar and as early as 1899 Sweet already proposed the nowadays obvious distinction between a scholarly grammar and a pedagogic grammar for second language learners (Sweet, 1899).

Chalker's (1994) definition, built upon the work of Allen and Corder (1975), and Dirven defines pedagogical grammar as a systematic study of the language which:

- can be for reference or for course work;
- could be comprehensive but will probably be more modest in its aims;
- will draw attention to rules, thus probably combining prescription with description;
- will help foreigners to learn a language and/or help mother-tongue speakers to understand their own language;
- can be either for learners or for teachers (1990:34).
Dirven includes in his definition both teachers and learners stating that pedagogical grammar

“is a cover term for any learner- or teacher-oriented description or presentation of foreign language rule complexes with the aim of promoting and guiding learning processes in the acquisition of that language” (1990:1).

When talking about pedagogical grammar, Mohammed (1996) refers to the types of grammatical analysis and instruction designed for the needs of second language students and teachers. It is simplified and presented to the learners in such a way that it can easily be digested and used as a means of achieving linguistic competence.

In grammar teaching there is a prevailing tradition which connects grammar teaching with linguistic grammars disregarding the interdisciplinary nature of foreign language teaching. The emphasis is still on the product of language use. As a result, PG is interpreted as grammar written down in form of rules and there seems to be as strong reliance of a pedagogical grammar on linguistic grammars.

3.6.2 Pedagogical grammar as application of linguistic models

In the history of the development of the term pedagogical grammar we can distinguish at least two phases. In the first phase one linguistic theory, often the latest one was directly applied and called pedagogical grammar. In the second phase it was realized that no single grammatical description will meet all needs equally well in all contexts at all times. Therefore, the response was to draw on a number of linguistic models simultaneously. A pedagogical grammar reflects as closely as possible the basic principles and objectives of the linguistic grammars on which they draw. In this sense, pedagogical grammars use eclectic simplification and selection processes to adapt to the needs of foreign language learners and teachers. However, teaching grammar in a second language setting involves a lot of prescription, although the range of structures important to consider resembles a descriptive grammar much more.

The aims of a linguistic theory could be totally different from those of foreign language teaching. Transformational-generative grammar for instance has the aim of
describing abstract universal principles with variable parameters, while foreign language pedagogy aims to describe language specific phenomena to make the learning process easier. The literature seems to be quite divided about the possible relevance and adequate application of linguistic models to foreign language teaching and learning (Bausch, 1979; Klein, 1987; Cook, 1988). How could linguistic theories be most optimally applied so that the specific features of the theory are retained and understandable for the target population of non-linguists at the same time? This question has remained unresolved since linguistic grammars have a strong influence on language teaching and often disregard the learner’s perspective. The history of foreign language teaching, however, shows that changes in linguistic theory do leave their mark on language teaching, even if the time and manner are not always predictable.

3.6.3 Pedagogical grammar as a filter model

Pedagogical grammar relies on the one hand on material extracted from one or more linguistic grammars, on the other hand, uses foreign language teaching methodology as a basis. In addition, psychological processes are offered to accelerate the processes of grammar acquisition discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, PG functions as a filter between theoretical language descriptions provided by linguistics, foreign language pedagogy principles and practical applications at classroom level. The following table highlights the filtering function of pedagogical grammar.
The pedagogical filter has the aim of adapting the linguistic input to the needs and aims of the learners. Although the idea of filtering is logical it has not been used as a principle for producing a type of pedagogical grammar, because the exact filtering processes have not been defined precisely.

3.6.4 Pedagogical grammar redefined

Pedagogical grammar seems to define itself differently in different environments. Without a clear definition the term is available for unrestrained use for marketing purposes, therefore, a clear understanding of its role is a prerequisite for effective grammar teaching.

Pedagogical grammar is commonly understood as a reference source of one kind or another influenced by one or several linguistic theories. It usually manifests itself in different grammar books presenting information about the target language system
for teachers or learners. The term is often associated with a particular grammar book and helps the teacher systematize the target language for presentation to the learner. In this interpretation *pedagogical grammar* should have the following criteria:

- A *pedagogical grammar* is based on descriptive grammar and includes frequently used language structures and language chunks;
- Its focus is on structures and meanings difficult for learners;
- It should describe more grammatical areas than a grammar for native speakers, who can rely on their intuitive knowledge more. Therefore PG for learners is more explicit and complete;
- It should move beyond the level of syntax and include semantics and pragmatics to serve communicative purposes;
- It should include contrastive elements to account for interference problems, therefore, a pedagogical grammar could be bilingual;
- Its rule formulation should be inductive-empirical and not deductive theoretical. The starting point is the text level or discourse level as a result of the influence of the functional paradigm discussed in section 3.2.4.;
- Its terminology should be graded and adapted to the learner’s level.

In another sense, *pedagogical grammar* denotes pedagogical processes, which brings us to the psycholinguistic dimension. Teachers need to be aware of psychological constructs and processes that underlie interlanguage competence and performance. Therefore, a teacher’s pedagogical grammar will be a reflection of his or her beliefs about the psychological processes of grammar learning and about the most appropriate approaches. The teachers’ knowledge and understanding of grammar have a powerful influence on their view of language acquisition and their teaching practice. It is the teacher’s decision how much grammar is needed for learners, where this grammatical information should come from and how grammatical problems should be transmitted. Therefore, in this dissertation the concept of *pedagogical grammar* is expanded with the belief systems of teachers about the issues connected to grammar teaching and learning.
Drawing on work in several fields such as linguistics, psychology and second language acquisition theory, *pedagogical grammar* is of hybrid nature, which usually denotes grammatical analysis and instruction designed for the needs of second language students. In its expanded view it involves decision making processes on behalf of the teacher which requires careful and time-consuming interdisciplinary work. This process is influenced by the teachers’ cognition, beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes about the teaching of grammar. The area will be further elaborated and supported by a small-scale research in Chapter 4.

*Pedagogical grammar* in one meaning is based on sources and materials, in another it involves the psycholinguistic dimension in the teachers’ mind including their beliefs about the teaching of grammar. In this interpretation PG can be the mediator between product and process approaches to teaching grammar, reflecting its dynamic nature. Undoubtedly, sources and materials are important and foreign language teaching must be based on a sound description of the target language. This description needs to be presented in a format which is made accessible to the learner, and which will promote the learner's insight into the target language, and thus facilitate the learning process. Therefore, the definition of *pedagogical grammar* should be expanded with the belief systems of teachers, since these have a considerable impact on their decisions in the classroom when teaching grammar. *Pedagogical grammar* in its expanded meaning is part of the content (sources and materials) and part of the process (including the belief systems of teachers) of grammar teaching and learning.

### 3.7 Putting pedagogical grammar at work

If *pedagogical grammar* is simultaneously part of the content and part of the process of grammar teaching and learning, it also affects decisions about grammatical rules and terminology. Pedagogical grammar embraces all aspects of these areas that help systematize the grammar of the target language for presentation to the learner.
3.7.1 Grammar rules

Grammar and rules are synonymous in the minds of learners and teachers alike. Linguists describe the rules, applied linguists interpret them, teachers present them, and learners memorize them. Rules have authority and provide security to language teachers and learners in the learning process. However, it is misleading to identify grammar strictly with rules. Rules are static descriptions or prescriptions of the forms of language, while grammar is interpreted nowadays as a dynamic and flexible system. Therefore, it is extremely difficult for teachers to adapt a dynamic approach to teaching grammar rules.

Most of the traditional grammars are “rule-example” grammars where the rule is described and followed by examples. This procedure is common in widely used grammars for teaching and learning purposes as in Alexander’s (1988a) Longman English Grammar or Thomson and Martinet’s (1980) A Practical English Grammar. Grammars influenced by the functional paradigm follow a different route, first a context is given and then the rules are provided as characteristics of particular genres. An example for this type of reference grammar is Leech and Svartvik (1975) A Communicative Grammar of English. The second part in the book has a clear functionally based arrangement, under such headings as “Concepts”, “Information reality and belief”, “Mood, emotion and attitude” and “Meanings in connected discourse”. However, even in this book the authors felt the need to add a lengthy and alphabetically arranged part going through the traditional grammatical categories.

Besides the static linguistic rules provided by reference grammars learners should be helped by pedagogical rules which are based on linguistic grammar rules, but created by teachers. In addition, teacher’s belief systems greatly influence the adaptation and interpretation of linguistic rules. The design criteria for pedagogical grammar rules are sufficiently distinct from rules offered by linguistic grammars, or standard reference grammars. Therefore, we distinguish between pedagogic rules and linguistic grammar rules. Swan defined pedagogic rules as “rules which are designed to help foreign-language learners understand particular aspects of the languages they are studying” (1994:45). The criteria for designing pedagogical rules are rarely discussed in any detail. According to Hammerly they should be “concrete, simple,
non-technical, cumulative, close to popular/traditional notions and in rule-of-thumb form” (1982:402).

To look for clear-cut solutions concerning rules for pedagogical purposes is problematic. To be able to formulate appropriate pedagogical rules teachers should have knowledge about the different descriptions of the grammar of the language and decide which one is appropriate for their purposes. They should also know about relevant psycholinguistic criteria that determine how learners can be best helped in grammar acquisition. The purpose here is to attempt some clarification of criteria for pedagogical rules from the perspective of the language teacher. Three of the specific requirements of rules for pedagogical purposes will now be examined in some detail.

3.7.1.1 Simplicity

Simplicity refers to the way a rule is constructed. Simplifying a linguistic description involves trimming it to make it more manageable by reducing the number of categories or leaving out essential details. Simple and clear rules are psychologically valuable, because they make students feel that they can understand and control even difficult grammatical areas.

How much one can reduce complexity without distortion is the teacher’s individual decision, which is influenced by his knowledge of grammar and his understanding of the approaches to grammar. Practicing teachers often give students explanations that they would not dream of producing if an inspector was in the room. They might contain oversimplifications, half-truths or unscientific terminology which work better. Good grammar teaching might involve the teacher’s inventive approach when producing pedagogical rules. These rules are often called rules of thumb, which sometimes inevitably prove inadequate, if not actually false. In pedagogical grammar there is more need for rules of thumb, than for linguistic rules, which do not always reflect linguistic truth, a fact which may easily lead to conflicts. view all possible combinations of verb forms are possible with if. A similar simplification is offered in connection with teaching the present perfect in Alexander (1988b). The present perfect is used:
1. “to describe actions beginning in the past and continuing up to the present moment (and possibly into the future): *I have planted fourteen rose bushes so far this morning.*

2. to refer to actions occurring or not occurring at an unspecified time in the past with some kind of connection to the present: *Have you passed your driving test?*” (Alexander, 1988b:59).

As opposed to this simple definition, grammar books devote long pages to the explanation of the present perfect, making it rather complicated to learners. In Thomson and Martinet (1980) you can find 10 pages, in Leech and Svartvik (1994) 4 pages, in Alexander (1980a) 4 pages about the present perfect.

The diversity in simplifying or complicating rules is a matter for individual judgement, however, teachers are greatly influenced by linguistic grammars and often do not take the responsibility of simplifying rules which are still clear and true.

### 3.7.1.2 Relevance

A good pedagogical rule does not present a neutral analysis of a set of linguistic data, but tries to answer a potential question by the learner, generated by his or her interlanguage (Swan, 1994). This means that teachers should focus on learners specific problems and exclude information that is irrelevant. This will necessarily lead to giving fragmentary or even bad rules of the target language, still this approach can be justified by its usefulness. Conditional structures can be given as examples. Reference grammars like Leech and Svartvik (1975), Thomson and Martinet (1980) or Swan (1995) often divide sentences with *if* into “first, second and third conditionals”, however, from a strictly descriptive point of view all possible combinations of verb forms are possible with *if*. However, whatever its theoretical defects, this analysis gives learners what they need.

### 3.7.2 Terminology

Probably nothing has shaped our thinking about language more than the terminology we inherited from the Greeks and the Romans. For centuries these categories have
been taken for universals, however, recently some linguists have expressed their doubts concerning them (Sasse, 1993; Broschart, 1997). Although they are convinced that these categories do not exist in the language they describe, have difficulties doing without the traditional terms and express themselves in a contradictory way.

The problem of traditional terminology is that it does not always clearly distinguish between form and function. A frequently found example is the confusion of word class and syntactic function when the term adverb is indiscriminately used for both and it is said that an adjective or a prepositional phrase may function as an adverb. In most grammars there is no distinction made between the term and the meaning it refers to. In German we identify Gegenwart (the meaning) with Präsen (the term) or Möglichkeitform (the meaning) and Konjunktív (the term). Therefore, issues of terminology play an important role in grammar instruction and the use of terminology requires a careful decision of the teacher.

From a pedagogical grammar perspective the use of terminology is a debated issue. If it is introduced, it should be graded to the level of the learners and can be taken from sources representing different linguistic theories which are compatible with each other. However, too much terminology is not appropriate to use, since it is a means to achieve the aim of acquiring grammar and grammar instruction in a class should not be made into a linguistic seminar. We must try to get things across using the simplest possible grammatical notions, therefore, terminology is chosen for its familiarity rather than for its precision.

3.8 Recent developments: lexis and grammar

The different types of grammar are largely influenced by the grammatical paradigms and they are mainly concerned with what to describe and how to describe it. One of the limitations to descriptions of grammar is the isolation from all other parts of the language system. Grammar does not exist on its own, it is interdependent with lexis, and in many cases, grammatical regularity and acceptability are determined by
words. This approach is called the \textit{lexical approach} and has been influential in second language teaching and learning.

The \textit{lexical approach} puts lexis at the heart of language learning rather than grammar. Using lexis including chunks of language as a starting point rather than grammar “represents a radical change to the status quo and a major shift with profound theoretical and practical implications” (Lewis, 1993:95). Unlike vocabulary, which is seen as a collection of individual words, lexis may consist of multi-word units. These can be produced and processed more rapidly as they are perceived as single, unanalysed wholes. In our conversations we use fixed and pre-patterned phrases by which we routinely manage aspects of interaction. These language chunks are called routines by Edmondson (1999) and were first observed in first language acquisition and later applied in teaching German as a foreign language successfully. Many of the prefabricated units, often referred to as lexical phrases exist somewhere between the traditional poles of lexis and syntax, they occur more frequently and have more idiomatically determined meaning than language that is put together each time (Nattinger and DeCarrico, 1992). The Collins COBUILD English Course (Willis and Willis, 1989) has been the most ambitious attempt so far to develop a syllabus based on lexical rather than grammatical principles.

The \textit{lexical approach} suggests a different approach to grammar teaching which is in opposition to the traditional and the structuralist practices where language is divided into individual components which are then put together to form larger chunks. A \textit{lexical approach} would stress the introduction of meaningful, prefabricated chunks of language, which can be expanded on, played with or analysed. Lewis (1993) rejects the Chomskyan models of language as being mainly concerned with the production of well-formed sentences. He stresses real language use which is not simply a degenerate version of some idealized competence and makes the distinction between correct language (which is not necessarily natural) and successful language (which achieves the purpose at the time).

The work of Lewis (1993) and Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) represent a significant theoretical and pedagogical shift from the past. First, their claims have revived an interest in a central role for accurate language description. Second, they
challenge a traditional view of word boundaries, emphasizing the language learner's need to perceive and use patterns of lexis and collocation. Most significant is the underlying claim that language production is not a syntactic rule-governed process but is instead the retrieval of larger phrasal units from memory. The lexical phrases can be taught as a means of realizing speech acts in conversation. This idea is very much in line with the functional orientation in language teaching.

In the process of learning grammar whether explicitly or implicitly, words inevitably come before structures. The explicit knowledge of grammatical rules is useless unless we know some of the words whose behaviour the rules describe. The implicit knowledge of grammatical rules can develop only in association with a developing mental lexicon.

However, implementing a lexical approach in the classroom does not lead to radical methodological changes. Rather, it involves a change in the teacher's mindset and in their belief systems. Most important, the language activities consistent with a lexical approach – for instance the exploration of words in terms of the semantic links between them - must be directed toward naturally occurring language and toward raising learners' awareness of the lexical nature of language.
3.9 Concluding remarks

This chapter looked at how the views of grammar have changed over the years both from a theoretical and pedagogical point of view. Instead of seeing grammar as a static and unchanged system, there is the tendency to see its dynamic nature and flexibility as a result of the functional orientation. The different grammatical paradigms have been reviewed and their effect on the teaching of grammar has been discussed. A distinction has been made between theoretical and didactic grammars and their interpretations. By discussing different types of theoretical and didactic grammar we arrived at the notion of pedagogical grammar as a type of didactic grammar. Considering the existing interpretations of pedagogical grammar, which regard it mainly as a source and basis for language teaching materials, an attempt has been made to expand the scope of pedagogical grammar and reinterpret it to adjust to present day language teaching requirements.

Thus, pedagogical grammar has been redefined from the teacher’s perspective. It does not only entail grammar books used as sources but pedagogical decisions made by the teachers in the field of adapting grammar rules and terminology among other things. This decision making process is greatly influenced by the teachers’ belief systems. What teachers do in the classroom is the reflection of what they know and believe in. “That knowledge is the underlying framework that guides the teacher’s actions in the classroom” (Richards and Lockhart, 1996:29). Since teaching is a personal activity, individual teachers have very different beliefs about what constitutes effective teaching. Studying these beliefs contributes to a better understanding of grammar teaching processes and might give useful insights into how to further develop grammar-teaching practices. The next chapter will explore the details of teachers’ belief systems in relation to grammar teaching.
Chapter 4

Teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge and grammar teaching

Teacher cognition is a field of research which aims to explore the actual thought processes teachers are engaged in as they plan and teach their lessons (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). The term teacher cognition is used synonymously with teachers’ pedagogical knowledge in the literature. The area started to emerge in the 1980s in the field of general education with the aim of describing teachers’ thoughts, decisions and judgements as the cognitive processes that shaped their behaviour. On the basis of a number of studies of teacher cognition in general education researchers in the field of second language teaching have also begun to examine teachers’ pedagogical knowledge, including beliefs (Breen, 1991; Freeman and Richards, 1996; Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Woods, 1996).

Teacher cognition in second language teaching involves a wide range of psychological constructs and cognitive thought processes in a rich mental context including what language teachers think, know and believe. This chapter looks specifically at teachers’ beliefs in general than at their beliefs about grammar teaching in English as a foreign language in particular. The study of teachers’ belief systems is important for two reasons. On the one hand, teachers’ practices are largely influenced by their beliefs, on the other hand, beliefs play a significant role in the process of teacher development. Therefore, investigating the topic should help clarify why teachers do what they do in the classroom and how teachers change their approaches to teaching and learning over time. The insights gained might give suggestions for necessary modifications to foreign language instruction and teacher training content on pre- and in-service levels. Finally, research is going to be presented on English language teachers’ beliefs in connection with grammar teaching.
4.1 Teacher cognition

Teacher cognition includes “the store of beliefs, knowledge, assumptions, theories, and attitudes about all aspects of their work which teachers hold and which have a powerful impact on teachers’ classroom practices” (Borg, 1998:19).

Studying teacher cognition has gained attention since the 1980s as a result of the emergence of an alternative conception of teaching as a process of active decision-making informed by teachers’ beliefs and attitudes. The focus of studies on teacher cognition in general covers a wide range of areas and summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brickhouse, 1990</td>
<td>Science teachers’ beliefs about the nature of science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graden (1996)</td>
<td>How language teacher beliefs about reading instruction are mediated by their beliefs about students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laplante, B. (1997).</td>
<td>Teachers’ Beliefs and Instructional Strategies in Science: Pushing Analysis Further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uhlenberg et. al., 1993</td>
<td>Differing beliefs about classroom management:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 The scope of teacher cognition research

The number of papers shows the growing interest in research in how teachers’ beliefs shape and influence their classroom practice. The bulk of this research argues that what teachers know about teaching is largely constructed out of their experiences and classrooms they have come from. The underlying assumption of these studies is that when teachers work to promote learning in the classroom they are guided by mental acts that have been shaped by the knowledge and beliefs about teaching and learning that they have accumulated through the years.
4.2 Defining teacher beliefs

The notion of belief systems connected to language teachers is a central idea of this chapter. Therefore, it is essential that we attempt to construct a definition of it. Beliefs are defined as personal constructs that can provide an understanding of a teacher’s practice (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). Beliefs are part of our language, and are signalled by different aspects of our language. Belief systems refer to social structures and are negotiated and shared through interactions.

Abelson listed the defining features of beliefs in six points suggesting that they provide an overall sense of a belief system:

1. belief systems are non-consensual: not everybody agrees on the belief, and there is an acceptance of alternative beliefs around the same issue;
2. belief systems often include a notion of ‘existence’, that something exists;
3. belief systems are highly evaluative: states are considered as being good or bad;
4. belief systems contain a high degree of episodic (anecdotal) material;
5. belief systems have differing degrees of strength (i.e. strong beliefs);
6. belief systems have unclear boundaries and a high degree of overlap with beliefs of other areas (1979:356).

In this interpretation belief is a mental state which has as its content a proposition that is accepted as true by the person holding it. This element distinguishes belief from knowledge which must be true. A debated question about belief is the conscious-unconscious distinction. Some maintain that consciousness is inherent in the definition of belief (Fenstermacher, 1994), others think that a person may be conscious of some beliefs and unconscious of others (Pajares, 1992; Borg, 2001).

Despite the definitional problems and “the differing understanding of beliefs and belief structures” (Pajares, 1992:307) a working definition has to be created for the purposes of this paper. From the investigation in the literature about teachers’ beliefs the following definition has been established. Teachers’ beliefs are an extremely complex and interrelated system of personal and professional knowledge which can be either conscious or unconscious. They heavily rely on cognitive and affective components, and are often tacitly held.
“The more one reads studies of teacher belief, the more strongly one suspects that this piebald of personal knowledge lies at the very heart of teaching” (Pajares, 1992:329).

4.3 Teacher beliefs – a literature review

It has been stated that teacher cognition includes teachers’ beliefs that gratefully influence their classroom practices. The focus on teachers’ beliefs forms part of the process of understanding how they perceive their work. There are a number of studies in foreign language teaching on the importance of teacher beliefs (Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992; Kagan, 1992; Woods, 1996; Richards, 1996; Breen et al., 2001). Pajares in his review of the research refers to beliefs as a “messy construct” which “travels under the alias of attitudes, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, perspectives, repertories of understanding, and social strategy” (Pajares, 1992:309).

This is a proof of how difficult it is to define the concept belief. The confusion comes mainly from the distinction between knowledge and belief. Pajares states that beliefs themselves constitute a form of knowledge themselves. Nespor also makes a distinction between beliefs and knowledge systems saying that knowledge often changes, while beliefs are static. Knowledge can be evaluated, beliefs cannot, moreover, there is a lack of consensus about how they are to be evaluated. Therefore, Nespor considers beliefs as a form of knowledge which could be referred to as personal knowledge. Kagan (1992) argues that beliefs are a particularly provocative form of personal knowledge and they are often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms, materials or approaches.

Wood’s studies in the field show a close interrelationship between beliefs and knowledge. He introduces the hypothetical concept of the integrated system of beliefs, assumptions and knowledge which he terms BAK from the initials of the three words. He concludes that BAK develops through the teacher’s experiences and evolves as a result of conflicts and inconsistencies. His case studies demonstrate the
effect of teachers’ beliefs upon practice and their interrelationship with knowledge systems.

Richards develops the concept of teacher maxims. These are rational principles for teachers’ professional behaviour and

“are founded on the goals, values and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching and their understanding of the system in which they work and their roles within it” (Richards, 1996:284).

These beliefs and values serve as the background to much of the teachers’ decision-making and action, and hence constitute what has been termed the culture of teaching. Richard and Lockhart claim that there are a number of different sources teachers’ belief systems are derived from:

1. their own experience as language learners;
2. their experience of what works best;
3. established practice;
4. personality factors;
5. educational based or research-based principles, and
6. principles derived from an approach or method (1996:30-31).

Breen et al discusses L2 teachers’ guiding principles, and examines the link between those principles and pedagogical practice. The study suggests a pattern in the links between principles and practices based on a research conducted with 18 teachers (2001).

Pajares in his review provides a synthesis of the findings on beliefs summarised in 16 points:

1. Beliefs are formed early and tend to self-perpetuate, preserving even against contradiction caused by reason, time, schooling or experience;
2. Individuals develop a belief system that houses all the beliefs acquired through the process of cultural transmission;
3. The belief system has an adaptive function in helping individual define and understand the world and themselves;
4. Knowledge and beliefs are inextricably intertwined, but the potent affective, evaluative, and episodic nature of beliefs makes them a filter through which new phenomenon are interpreted;

5. Thought processes may well be precursors to and creators of beliefs, but the filtering effect of belief structures ultimately screens, redefines, distorts, or reshapes subsequent thinking and information processing;

6. Epistemological beliefs play a key role in knowledge interpretation and cognitive monitoring;

7. Beliefs are prioritised according to their connections or relationship to other beliefs or other cognitive and affective structures. Apparent inconsistencies may be explained by exploring the functional connections and centrality of the beliefs;

8. Belief substructures, such as educational beliefs, must be understood in terms of their connections not only to each other but also to other, perhaps more central, beliefs in the system. Psychologists usually refer to these substructures as attitudes and values;

9. By their very nature and origin, some beliefs are more incontrovertible than others;

10. The earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter. Newly acquired beliefs are most vulnerable to change;

11. Belief change during adulthood is a relatively rare phenomenon, the most common cause being a conversion from one authority to another or a gestalt shift. Individuals tend to hold on to beliefs based on incorrect or incomplete knowledge even after scientifically correct explanations are presented to them;

12. Beliefs are instrumental in defining tasks and selecting the cognitive tools with which to interpret, plan, and make decisions regarding such tasks hence, they play a critical role in defining behaviour and organising knowledge and information;

13. Beliefs strongly influence perception, but they can be an unreliable guide to the nature of reality;

14. Individuals' beliefs strongly affect their behaviour;

15. Beliefs must be inferred, and this inference must take into account the congruence among individuals' belief statements, the internationality to
behave in a predisposed manner, and the behaviour related to the belief in question;

16. Beliefs about teaching are well established by the time a student gets to college (Pajares, 1992: 324-326).

Based on the investigation in the literature we can identify specific statements about beliefs that can be applied in the following sections in connection with beliefs about grammar teaching. These statements are the following:

- beliefs are implicit and unconscious;
- beliefs are teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge;
- beliefs include cognitive and affective components;
- beliefs create links between practice, experience and decisions which have to be made.

4.3.1 Teacher beliefs and change

Changing beliefs is a complex and difficult psychological process, however, change is necessary if we are to move forward. According to Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) change in practice is frequently preceded by change in beliefs and understanding. Therefore, identifying teachers’ beliefs in specific areas and initiating attempts to change these beliefs are essential for professional development, and for implementing changes.

It is a generally held view that beliefs appear to block development and change because of their static nature (Nespor, 1987). They are resistant to change and are generally not affected by applying the findings of educational research (Brousseau et.al., 1988). Pajares describes how beliefs operate and contribute to teachers’ resistance to change:

“From both a personal and socio-cultural perspective, belief systems reduce dissonance and confusion, even when dissonance is logically justified by the inconsistent beliefs one holds. This is one reason why they acquire emotional dimensions and resist change. People grow comfortable with beliefs, and these beliefs become their self so that
individuals come to be identified and understood by the very nature of the beliefs, the habits they own” (1992:317).

The more central a belief is, the more it will resist change. Woods (1996) describes teachers’ beliefs as tightly interconnected with other beliefs, therefore, even more difficult to change. However, when the belief is less densely connected to other beliefs, change is a less complex operation. As a result, for changes to occur there has to be some deconstruction of beliefs before another set can be constructed and this leads to periods of disorientation, frustration, or even pain.

Another important remark made by Woods is the interconnectedness of elements of teachers’ BAK (Beliefs, Assumptions and Knowledge) network and their relationship to change. Change in one aspect will have an effect on other aspects. Therefore,

“a teacher cannot simply at will change one belief by itself, because each one is part of an interwoven network which includes many other beliefs”(Woods, 1996:293).

The conclusion is that teacher change can be encouraged but not mandated. A similar idea emerges in Lightbown’s (1985) discussion of second language acquisition, which is how to change elements of a language system. Linguistic knowledge is organised in a cognitive system in which the elements do not function independently. Therefore, for one element to change, other elements have to change too.

According to Prawat, teachers’ beliefs are a major obstacle to educational reform, because they insist on outmoded forms of instruction “that emphasize factual and procedural knowledge at the expense of deeper level of understanding” (1992:354). He also adds that teachers’ beliefs are inconsistent with constructivist approaches to teaching and learning. Constructivism is a learning theory in education which holds that knowledge is not transmitted unchanged from teacher to student, but instead that learning is an active process of learning. At the beginning of their teaching many teachers view the process of teaching as telling, and learning as remembering, a belief that presents difficulties in terms of pushing teachers towards a more constructivist approach (Calderhead, 1988).

Prawat further claims that constructivism is a new theory, its open to many interpretations and many of its implications have not been made clear. Therefore,
changing teachers’ fundamental beliefs to reflect constructivist philosophy may be an important step to bring about educational reform (1992).

Changing teachers’ beliefs is an extremely challenging process. As the literature on the subject tells us, teachers’ beliefs are so ingrained and so interrelated with their life’s experiences and with what they do and know that they are totally resistant to direct manipulation. Providing teachers with training, new information and knowledge, and encourage them to think differently present challenges for teacher trainers to be able to influence change and promote professional development.

In summary the literature about teacher beliefs in general shows the close interrelationship of beliefs and knowledge, and their influence on teachers’ pedagogical practice. The area needs further investigations as a result of the gap existing in different domains. (Breen, 1991; Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992, Freeman and Richards, 1996; Woods, 1996).

4.3.2 Beliefs and language learning

While in mainstream education there has been a great concern about doing research in the field of teachers’ beliefs, second and foreign language instruction lags behind in this field. Woods’ work represents a step towards bridging the gap. He attempts to clarify how teachers’ beliefs, attitudes and experiences influence classroom practices and argues that there is insufficient research “on what the second language teacher brings to the process of second language learning” (1996:2).

His system of beliefs, assumptions and knowledge (BAK) about what language is, how it is learned, and how it should be taught resulted in different classroom experiences for the learners. In his study he found that teachers interpret curriculum innovations in light of their BAK as opposed to interpreting it in a way that would be more consistent with the institutional system. He concludes that ‘each teacher has an individual system of interwoven beliefs, assumptions and knowledge, a system which has evolved in an individual and organic fashion when aspects of that teacher’s BAK have interacted with experience, especially experiences that resulted in a conflict with the BAK’s current state’ (1996:248).
Johnson’s qualitative study of pre-service teachers’ beliefs of four English teachers investigated teachers’ beliefs inferred from their narratives and instructional practices. The outcome of the research was that the teachers’ beliefs were largely based on images from their formal language learning experiences and that these beliefs may have been responsible for the teachers’ ineffectual teaching practices. The teachers were aware of their own teacher-directed instructional practices, still

“they described feeling powerless to alter their instructional practices because they had few, if any, alternative images of teachers and teaching to act as a model of action” (1994:449).

In summary, teachers’ beliefs often result in misconceptions about language learning which may have a negative effect on their understanding of learners’ language development. Therefore, these beliefs need to be identified and analysed and subsequently used for myths and misconceptions to be replaced by sound language learning theory.

4.4 Teacher beliefs in grammar teaching

The numerous issues surrounding grammar teaching discussed in Chapter 2 have shown that grammar has occupied a central position in L2 acquisition studies and in foreign language teaching methodology (Ellis, 1994; Batstone, 1994b; Bygate, Tonkyn and Williams, 1994; Doughty and Williams, 1998; Hinkel and Fotos, 2002). However, as stated by Borg (1998) the lack of attention to the cognitive bases of teachers’ work in grammar teaching represents a gap in the research agenda for L2 teaching. There have been some initial attempts to fill this perceived gap by research which concentrated on two areas: teachers’ knowledge of grammar and teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching.

4.4.1 Research on teachers’ knowledge of grammar

The three studies discussed here are concerned with the grammatical knowledge of prospective and practicing English native-speaker teachers in the UK. Andrews (1994) study examined 82 teacher trainers’ views of the adequacy of the grammatical
knowledge of native-speaker trainees on a teacher-training course. A questionnaire was used as a research instrument in which trainers had to rate the grammatical knowledge of the trainee teachers they had worked with. The finding was that more than 50% of the trainees had inadequate levels of grammatical knowledge and awareness. Awareness was defined as the ability to reflect on grammar and analyse it, and included the skills in handling grammar in the classroom. The fact that trainees continue in the profession with serious weaknesses in their ability to use grammatical points, to identify learner errors correctly calls for the rethinking of the content and approaches of the linguistic components in teacher education.

Another study by Andrews (1999) compared the explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology of four teacher groups: non-native speaker teachers of English, (NNS), non-native speakers prospective teachers of English, English native-speaker prospective teachers (NS), and English native-speaker prospective teachers of modern languages. The instrument was a 60-item test of measuring explicit knowledge about language including the knowledge of metalanguage and also the ability to state grammatical rules. The non-native teachers of English with at least two years of experience did significantly better on the test and outperformed the other three groups. The study concluded with the remark that non-native speaker teachers could be expected to possess a better level of explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. In addition, teaching experience seemed to be a determining factor in the development of teachers’ explicit knowledge of grammar and terminology.

Cajkler and Hislam (2002) investigated the level of grammatical knowledge of 503 teacher trainees in the UK. The research consisted of entry- and exit-level audits, which were basically tests on grammar and understanding of grammatical terminology administered at the beginning of the trainees’ studies and when they finished their training. In addition to this ten semi-structured interviews were conducted focusing on trainees’ reflections on grammar teaching they had done and on their associations and anxieties concerning grammar teaching.

Results confirmed that trainees’ knowledge of grammar improved significantly between the entry- and the exit-audit, however,
“some misconceptions about parts of speech occurred due to over-
dependence on simple definitions and a failure to appreciate functional
shifts”(2002:175).

In order to have a positive impact on grammar teaching in the long term, ways of
defining grammatical terms need to be researched by trainees. Unless this happens,
trainees may offer “muddled definitions and explanations about grammar during

The three studies suggest a need for rethinking those components of teacher
education programmes which develop trainee’s declarative knowledge about
language. However, this knowledge is only one element in a complex knowledge
system language teachers must call on in grammar teaching.

4.4.2 Research on teacher beliefs about the teaching of grammar

Another area of investigation within language teacher cognition is the teachers’
beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions and attitudes. They play an important role
in influencing teachers’ instructional decisions in grammar teaching therefore, the
bulk of research is mainly concerned with their beliefs about formal instruction.

The review is based on Berry (1997), Andrews (2003), Borg’s, (1998, 1999a,
1999b), Cajkler and Hislam’s (2002), and Williams’ (1994) work.

Berry’s study is concerned with the mismatch between students’ knowledge of
terminology and teachers’ assumptions about it. The research was conducted in Hong
Kong with 372 undergraduate students and 10 teachers using a 50-item questionnaire
to measure the knowledge of grammatical terminology of the participants. Teachers
generally overestimated their students’ knowledge of terminology.

Borg’s studies (1998, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c, 2001) give insights into second language
English teachers practices in teaching grammar and the cognitions - the store of
beliefs, knowledge, assumptions and attitudes - underlying their practices. Findings
of the research suggest that although teachers apply explicit formal instruction-
feeling that their learners expect it- they do not believe that such instruction promotes
language learning (1998, 1999a, 1999b). Another area of investigation was the use of grammatical terminology (1999c). Teachers’ decisions about terminology were not related directly to their beliefs they held about one particular issue, rather, this was influenced by the interaction of a range of beliefs about the best way to learn grammar. Finally, two teacher’s experiences were compared based on what they know about grammar and what they think about formal instruction (2001). It was suggested that teachers’ self-perceptions of their knowledge of grammar motivated their pedagogical decisions.

Schultz’s (2001) large-scale study involved 122 foreign language teachers and 607 of their students in Colombia and investigated teachers and learners beliefs about the role of explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback. The outcome of the research pointed out significant mismatches between teachers’ and students’ views about error correction. The majority of the students disagreed with the statement ‘teachers should not correct students when they make errors in class and insisted on being corrected while speaking in class. In the same question less than fifty percent of the teachers agreed.

Another area of investigation was the role of formal instruction in grammar teaching showing similar mismatches between students’ and teachers’ perceptions and reinforced the findings of Berry (1997). 76% of the students said they liked grammar, only 30% of the teachers felt students did. The study concludes that the discrepancies between student and teacher belief systems can have a detrimental effect on learning and may reduce the pedagogical face validity of instruction in the eyes of the learners, therefore, teachers should explore the conflict areas between student beliefs and instructional practice.

Burgess and Etherington (2002) examined the beliefs of 48 teachers of English in UK universities about grammar and grammar teaching with the help of a questionnaire. The majority of these teachers appreciated the values of formal instruction and felt that conscious knowledge of grammar played a significant role in the development of students’ proficiency. In contrast to Schulz findings 90% of the teachers felt that their students expect the explicit presentation of grammatical items. The study concludes that teachers are more in favour of a focus on form approach and their
views about appropriate approaches to grammar are influenced by their awareness of student variables.

Another perspective on the relationship between cognition and practice in formal grammar instruction is provided by Andrews (2003). He investigating the beliefs of 170 non-native English teachers teaching at secondary-level in Hong-Kong concerning grammar instruction. The finding revealed among other things how influential beliefs are on teachers’ practices in the classrooms. Some patterns of associations between cognitions about subject matter and pedagogical practices emerged and pointed towards a form-focused style of second language teaching.

The studies discussed in this section seem to be homogeneous in some respects and highlight issues connected to teacher cognition in grammar teaching. Here are some general patterns that emerged from the number of studies in the field:

- Teachers’ and their learners’ views on grammar, learning grammar, correction and the use of grammatical terminology may differ considerably. This can result in low effectiveness of formal instruction;
- Formal instruction seems to be still dominant in English as a foreign language classrooms and teachers are inclined to conduct explicit grammar instruction;
- Teachers’ practices are largely influenced by their beliefs which are drawn from their own experiences as learners.

Furthermore, the studies revealed several interacting sources influencing teachers’ decisions like the knowledge of learners, knowledge about teaching and personal learning experience.

4.5 Description of the research

4.5.1 Introduction

In order to understand how experienced teachers deal with the complexities of grammar teaching in the language classroom, it is necessary to examine the beliefs that underlie teachers' instructional practices. Despite the increased interest in the area of teacher beliefs and the influence of such beliefs on the teachers' classroom
practices, the area seems to be relatively unexplored in connection with grammar teaching in the school context. Research in the literature has focused on two areas: on teachers’ knowledge of grammar and on teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching.

The results of the research point to a need for teacher-trainers to recognise how experienced teachers’ beliefs could result in resistance towards teacher development. Moreover, teacher development programmes should take into account the types of constraints that influence classroom instructional practices. It is hoped that such enlightened programmes would help in the professional development of experienced teachers.

Practicing teachers have well-developed beliefs about teaching that are stable and resistant to change. These beliefs can form obstacles to instruction and professional development. Therefore, the research in this dissertation sets out to investigate a group of English teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching in Vas county, in the western part of Hungary. The assumption behind the investigation was that effective teachers of English would have a coherent set of beliefs about the nature of grammar and the teaching of grammar which played an important role in their selection of teaching approaches.

The research addresses the following questions:

1. Is there any relationship between teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning grammar and their background context (age, sex, gender, teaching experience, school type and academic qualification)?
2. What kind of beliefs do practicing teachers actually possess and utilize when teaching grammar?
3. Are there any general patterns in teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge about grammar teaching?
4. Are there any patterns of association between teachers’ pedagogical knowledge about grammar teaching and their perceived pedagogical practice?
5. What does all this imply for foreign language grammar instruction and for teacher training?
In seeking to answer these questions the following hypotheses have been formulated:

- Teachers of English as a foreign language in the western part of Hungary are strongly influenced by traditions and their own experience as language learners when teaching grammar.
- *Teachers’ beliefs* about grammar teaching consciously or unconsciously influence their classroom practice.
- At the level of *beliefs* teachers are influenced by the principles of the communicative approach.
- English teachers are not consciously aware of the ways their learners learn or acquire grammar as a result of their teaching.
- The typical grammar teaching applied by the majority of teachers is still characterized by traditional form-focussed activities, grammar practice activities, oral drills and translation.

4.5.2 *Phases of the research*

An outline of the various phases of the research follows. The phases are presented in the chronological order in which they took place.

1. Assessing *teachers’ beliefs* by the application of a belief inventory questionnaire (see Appendix A)
2. Observing English classes to see what teachers actually do in their classes when teaching grammar.
3. Interviewing participating English teachers to find out about their views on grammar teaching and learning and related matters.
4.5.3 Research design

In the design of the research elements of qualitative and quantitative approaches were combined. When selecting methods for data analysis, and seeking for explanations for the patterns of teacher beliefs revealed, a variety of techniques were applied. Statistical data analysis within the researcher’s control, further, observations and interviews were conducted, thus triangulation was realized in collecting as well as analysing data. Following Pajares’ (1992) argument that belief inventories need to be supplemented by additional measures such as interviews and observation of behaviour, the present study attempts to follow these guidelines.

There follows a detailed description of the research. First, the research method will be outlined with the participants, instruments, and procedures for data collection and analysis will be discussed. Then the presentation of the results follows. Finally, the findings will be discussed in the light of the questions presented in section 4.5.1.

4.5.4 Research method

4.5.4.1 Participants

A total of 63 teachers teaching in secondary and primary schools in the western part of Hungary were involved in the questionnaire study. The reason for aiming at both secondary and primary level is that the teacher training offered in the four-year programme and the three-year single major programme at the Department of English Language and Literature of Berzsenyi Dániel College, Szombathely focuses on these two levels and the researcher has been involved in these programmes. The questionnaire data provided the first set of data.

As regards selecting teachers for participation in the observation and in the interview study, the intention was to approach ones with whom the researcher had been on friendly terms, so that it would not be embarrassing to ask them to contribute to the research. Their classes have been observed a number of times by the researcher as part of the methodology component at the teacher training college. Altogether four experienced English language teachers agreed to participate in the observation part of
this study. Three of them are female, one of them is a male teacher. Two of them are in their late fourties with teaching experience ranging from 15-20 years. One of them is in her late thirties with 14 years of teaching experience and the male teacher is the youngest with five years of teaching experience. He is currently involved in a university upgrading programme. Three of the teachers have been working as mentors for the four-year double major and the three-year single major programmes for varying length and time, two of whom had completed mentor courses as well.

Since the researcher has observed these teachers’ classes many times during the last couple of years, only one class taught by each of the four teachers was videotaped. Passages involving grammatical explanations were selected from every lesson for analysis which formed the second set of data for the study.

Shortly following the observations, the teachers were provided with a list of interview questions (Appendix B). The teachers were then interviewed individually for approximately 10-15 minutes each. They were asked to reflect on the specific explanations observed in their classes as well as on their general approach to explanations of grammatical and other linguistic issues. The interviews formed the third set of data.

The research aims to profile a range of different teacher beliefs connected to grammar teaching, and in so doing, it has needed to include a large sample of teachers. The selection does not, however, indicate an aim to provide data which might be generalized to a wider population. Instead, the responsibility is on the readers of this study to generalize the beliefs to their situation. The choice of participants was motivated, not by a concern for representativeness, but by a conceptual question. In order to understand teachers’ beliefs, we should see different instances of these beliefs with different individuals.
4.5.4.2 Instruments

4.5.4.3 The belief inventory questionnaire

A wide array of strategies can be measured through questionnaires within a short time at low cost, and last but not least, they are supposed to be the least threatening tool, when applied under conditions of confidentiality.

The questionnaire for this study was designed to assist teachers in revealing implicitly their personal beliefs about the teaching of grammar. The questionnaire consists of four sections (see Appendix A). Section one provides information about participants background, for example, age, gender, teaching experience, type of degree, time spent in an English-speaking country, level at which they are teaching and the type of school they work for. Section two focuses on what participants think about their own knowledge of grammar and approaches to grammar. Section 3 is a 35-item belief inventory questionnaire designed to elicit responses to different statements on teaching grammar. Section 4 is a 15-item additional part asking for reflection on actual grammar teaching practices. In Section 3 teachers were asked to show their agreement or disagreement on a five-point Likert scale. In addition to indicating the degree of agreement or disagreement a don’t know and a don’t understand options were also given. Section 4 also used a Likert-type scale, however, respondents had to indicate how often they do certain activities when teaching grammar ranging from never to often. The Likert-type scale is the most widely used method of scale construction because it is a simple, versatile, and reliable method and in contrast to other scaling techniques, no judges are required (Karavas-Doukas, 1996; Dörnyei, 2003).

Altogether 110 questionnaires were distributed to primary and secondary school English teachers in Vas county. The number of questionnaires to be distributed was decided on the basis of the data gained from a report prepared by the Vas County Pedagogical Institute (Kovácsné Wagner, 2003). According to this report there are 63 English language teachers teaching in primary schools and 20 secondary schools with two or three English language teachers on average in the region. Therefore, the approximate number of English teachers is between hundred and hundred and ten.
Altogether 63 questionnaires were returned representing a 57.2% response rate. This sample size exceeds the number of 30 which Cohen and Manion (1994) describe as the minimum for useful statistical analysis. The distribution of the questionnaires according to the type of school is the following: 17 primary school teachers, 40 secondary school teachers and 6 teaching at both types returned the questionnaires. The unequal distribution between the two school types might be due to the volunteer bias. Secondary school teachers seemed to be more interested in the teaching of grammar to complete and return the questionnaire.

The design of the questionnaire took place in two stages. From the investigation of the literature about the cognitive processes involved in grammar teaching and learning discussed in the second chapter processes and key characteristics of grammar teaching and approaches were identified and were used as the basis for a set of statements in the second and third part of the questionnaire. The first version of the questionnaire was piloted with a group of teachers participating in a workshop at the college the researcher works for. Their answers and comments made it possible to discover problematic statements and terms which were altered in the final questionnaire. However, items 8 and 33 in the final version still included terms for which many participants gave the don't understand option.

In the second phase of the design of the questionnaire statements about grammar teaching approaches and related issues like the question of using terminology or correcting errors were added to the statements. The majority of the statements in Section 3 of the questionnaire can be grouped into six thematic categories which emerged as important issues in the second and third chapters investigating the theoretical background of teaching grammar. These are the following:

1. belief in a **deductive approach** to the teaching of grammar (6 items)
2. belief in a **inductive approach** to the teaching of grammar (6 items)
3. belief in a **focus on form** approach (9 items)
4. belief in a **focus on form** approach (4 items)
5. belief in using grammatical **terminology** (3 items)
6. belief in correcting grammatical errors (3 items)
The principle of using six areas of belief is valid for the construction of the fourth section of the questionnaire. Within these groups many statements overlap in content, but their wording is different. The items were placed in random order in the final questionnaire to avoid choices which might make a favourable impression. With the random order of the statements the aim was to see whether respondents gave consistent answers to the above 6 categories of belief.

4.5.4.4 Limitations of the questionnaire research

The questionnaire survey was not limited to one approach to grammar teaching. It aimed to cover at least 6 areas of belief, therefore, it was impossible to use the split-half method in order to check reliability as suggested by Karavas-Doukas (1996). However, having statements referring to the same content within the 6 thematic groups provided some possibility of checking the consistency of teachers’ responses.

4.5.5 The observations

The aim of the observation was to identify key instructional episodes in the teachers’ approach to grammar teaching based on the six categories used in the third section of the questionnaire study. The use of a particular grammar teaching activity or approach, the type of the explanation of a grammar rule used and the use of terminology or error correction were seen to be key episodes. Identifying the rationale behind these key episodes was expected to lead to insights into the teachers’ behaviour. The researcher’s role was a non-participant observer during the observation. Due to technical difficulties altogether 4 short lessons were videotaped for this study, however, the conclusions made are partly based on a number of other lessons observed by the researcher with the four teachers.

One of the problems related to observations could be summed up in what Allwright and Bailey described as “the observer’s paradox” (1991:70). This refers to the phenomenon that the presence of tapes, videos and observers might change the behaviour of those observed to undesirable extents, leading to the contamination of data.
In order to be able to reveal the rationale behind the teachers’ behaviour an observation instrument was used (Appendix C). This is an observation sheet divided into seven columns. They provide space for a description of the activity the teacher used and the type of approach she or he applied. There is also room for any comments the observer feels like recording, and for other data about the observed class in terms of time, school and teacher’s name.

The observations were meant to reveal:

- typical task types that teachers apply for grammar teaching in and out of class;
- the choice of different psychological processes involved in the task-types.

4.5.6 The interviews

Interviews fall into three categories: highly structured, semi-structured and unstructured. In highly structured interviews the researcher has a predetermined agenda in a list of questions that the respondent is expected to reply. The other extreme is using unstructured interviews, where the researcher has little or no control over the direction the interview takes. The whole process is being dictated by the responses as they evolve during the course of the conversation. Semi-structured interviews represent the middle path and seem to be favoured most by researchers due to their flexibility. There is normally a prompt to elicit information on matters of the researcher’s concern, but researchers and respondents alike may pursue topics of interest as they arise (Dörnyei, 2003).

Another possibility is to conduct small group interviews, however in this case the problem of ‘social desirability’ (Cohen, 1998:29) might occur relating to the number of respondents. This means that some subjects might be reluctant to talk in the presence of others, being fearful of producing a socially unacceptable answer. At the same time, it might happen that subjects give answers they believe are socially desirable, either for the other subjects present or the interviewer.
For the purposes of this study it was decided to use semi-structured interviews to support the questionnaire and the observation findings. As suggested by Nunan (1992: 153), in each interview the researcher made notes and, with the subject’s permission, audio recorded the conversation. The interviews were conducted in Hungarian to avoid a large degree of communicative stress, which might have influenced the respondents in expressing their ideas clearly. The interview questions can be found in Appendix B.

The questions include open-ended questions and they focus on the interviewee’s feelings, using you as the subject of the sentence to encourage the interviewees to give information from their point of view.

For their information, and for ethical reasons, the interviewees were given the purpose of the interview and it was also explained to them that their identity will not be revealed. Other people might see their words, but they will not know who said them.

The aim of the interviews was to gain insight into the factors which influenced teachers’ instructional decisions in teaching grammar, through a discussion of classroom practices.

It was decided to use interviews as well as a questionnaire and observation for the five reasons given by Creswell (1994:175). Firstly, because of triangulation, by which it is hoped that the information gained during the interviews confirms the data from the questionnaire and the observation. This helps improve the internal validity of the investigation results. Secondly, the interviews can complement the questionnaire results by exploring issues in more depth, for example by finding out why the subjects answered the questionnaire in the way they did. Thirdly, the interviews can investigate reasons for unexpected or unusual answers to the questionnaire items. For example, more information can be sought on why interviewees gave a don’t know response, or why their answer was unusual. It can also provide grounds for analysis when the reliability of some of the questionnaire data is in doubt. Fourthly, the interviewees may bring a fresh perspective to the topic under investigation, one which was not investigated by the questionnaire items.
Finally, in summary of the points above, a third research instrument adds scope and breadth to a study.

The data was analysed by comparing the statements of the 4 interviewees (section 4.5.9.3). It was decided not to try to quantify this qualitative data and correlate it statistically with the questionnaire results because of the difficulties in quantifying qualitative research and the distinct natures of qualitative and quantitative research.

4.5.7 Data collection

Data for this study came from three sources: questionnaire, observation of classes focusing on grammar explanations and follow-up interviews with the teachers. All the data were collected during the spring term of 2005. Anonymity was guaranteed. The four teachers participating in the observation and the interviews had been approached and informed about the objectives of the research, and then the observations started. The teachers had seen the observation instrument and the interview questions before.

4.5.8 Data analysis

4.5.8.1 Analysing data from the belief inventory questionnaires

In this section the belief inventory questionnaire data is reported, statistically analysed, and interpreted, so that the results can be assessed. Raw data yielded by the questionnaires have been entered into a data base in the computer software SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 11.0 for Windows.

Concerning the questionnaire a variety of mathematical mean values and frequencies have been computed: means for overall beliefs, means for each of the six broad groups, and means for the six groups across the sample. Second, the chi-square test was used to find statistically significant relationships between teachers’ background in the first section of the questionnaire and the belief variables in the third and fourth sections. This was followed by cluster analysis to identify groupings in belief areas across the sample. As a next step, Pearson correlation was used to see how strong or
weak the intercorrelations are among the six groups of belief. Finally, the chi-square test was used to reveal relationships between teachers’ beliefs about teaching grammar and what they actually do in the classroom by comparing statements from Section 3 and Section 4 of the questionnaire.

To determine significance throughout the study, the standard of \( p < 0.05 \) was used, which means that a result was considered statistically significant if it could have occurred by chance fewer than 5 times out of 100. In selecting statistical procedures and the standard “p” value, personal communication with an expert on statistics in the social sciences was conducted and the research literature on the topic (Brown, 1991, 1992; Falus and Ollé, 2000) was consulted for guidelines.

4.5.9.1 Questionnaire results

In this section the belief inventory questionnaire data is reported, statistically analysed, and interpreted.

4.5.9.1.1 Background information about teachers

The first part of the questionnaire focused on teachers’ personal background. The following table summarises some background data of the 63 respondents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master’s degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching in primary school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching in secondary school</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching both in primary and</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 17 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time spent in an English-speaking country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no time spent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than a month</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than a year</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching at pre-intermediate level</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching at intermediate level</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8  Background information about teachers

The majority in the sample are female teachers and most of them have a bachelor’s degree. Their teaching experience ranges from less than a year to a couple of decades and interestingly enough ten teachers have spent more than a year in an English-speaking country. The majority of them teach at pre-intermediate and intermediate level. The distribution of the teachers according to the level they are teaching is shown in the following figure:
Section two of the questionnaire focussed on teachers’ self-perceptions about their knowledge of grammar, their knowledge of grammar books and knowledge of approaches to grammar. The following three figures give a summary of their answers.
67% of the teachers think, they have a good knowledge of grammar, 51% a good knowledge of grammar books and only 28% believe that they have a good knowledge of approaches to grammar. They are quite confident about their knowledge of grammar, however, less confident about their knowledge of grammar books or approaches.
4.5.9.1.2 Analysing the belief inventory questionnaire data

This section of the questionnaire consists of a Lykert type scale, where respondents had to indicate their agreement or disagreement in connection with different statements about grammar. As a first step frequencies were computed to identify teachers’ preferences concerning focus on form approaches, the use of discovery techniques and terminology, and their approach to error correction. The results are shown in the following figures:

![Focus on formS](image)

*Figure 13 Teachers beliefs about focus on formS*

The figure above shows teachers’ beliefs in connection with a focus on formS approach. Three items from section three of the belief inventory questionnaire were analysed:

- **Item 6** (*Grammar should be taught in a explicit or direct way)*;
- **Item 14** (*It is best to give the grammatical explanation first and then practice the rule)*;
- **Item 27** (*Accuracy, correctness of form, is a primary aim in teaching*)

The figure shows that most of the teachers are either undecided or disagree with these statements implying that they do not favour a focus on formS approach.
However, it is interesting that there are a relatively great number of teachers being indecisive in relation to the three statements.

The second area to be investigated is the teachers’ approach to the use of terminology.

![The use of terminology](image_url)

**Figure 14 Teachers’ beliefs about the use of terminology**

The following three items from the questionnaire were included:

- **Item 15** (The knowledge of terminology of grammar and direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively)
- **Item 22** (Learners should understand all the common grammatical terms in L2)
- **Item 26** (Learners should be able to use the common grammatical terms in the L2 correctly when discussing grammar)
As clear from the figure, in all three questions the majority of the teachers disagreed with the idea of using terminology in grammar teaching. This means, they do not believe that learners should know or even understand terminology.

Figure 15 Teachers’ beliefs about error correction

Figure 13 above shows teachers’ responses to the following two questionnaire items:

- **Item 11 (In oral practice teachers should not correct learners’ grammatical errors)**
- **Item 13 (Learners’ mistakes should always be corrected as soon as possible to prevent the formation of bad habits)**

Since one of them is negative, when analysed, the scores were reversed. Similarly to the issue of terminology, teachers seem to clearly and consistently disagree with the idea of correcting learners’ errors immediately.
The analysis shown in the above figure is based on two questionnaire items:

- **Item 17** *(Teachers should begin teaching a new grammar point by giving examples)*
- **Item 32** *(Teachers should help learners to work out grammar rules for themselves)*

The results indicate a strong preference of discovery techniques at the level of teachers’ beliefs. It is also clear, that in this question they were not divided at all. The majority of them believes in the usefulness of an inductive approach.

In sum, this sample of 63 respondents showed a high preference for using discovery techniques, which shows a tendency to believe in an inductive approach. Similarly, a clear tendency against a focus on formS approach can be identified supporting the preference for a rather inductive approach. Subjects in the sample seem to object the idea of correcting learners immediately and the majority of them does not think that terminology is important in grammar teaching, however, in this issue there was some indecisiveness.
4.5.9.1.2 An analysis of teachers’ beliefs

As a next step the chi-square tests were used to see whether there were statistically significant relationships between respondents background (Section 1), their perceived knowledge of grammar, approaches and grammar books (Section 2), and their beliefs about the teaching of grammar (Section 3).

The chi-square tests revealed almost no statistically significant relationships between teachers’ background and their beliefs about grammar teaching. This means that factors, like age, sex, type of school or the type of degree have no influence on teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching. Therefore, the answer for the first research question is that there are no patterns of associations between particular teacher cognitions about grammar and specific factors of teachers’ background.

As a next step cluster analysis was applied to reveal any possible groupings among the statements in sections three and four based on the respondents’ answers. On the basis of the cluster analysis statements were categorised into groups of various preferences. Cluster analysis made it clear that two overall categories of beliefs lent themselves to establishing (Appendix D). One category is clearly the belief in a rather inductive approach focusing on both form and meaning in grammar teaching. The other category is the belief in a deductive approach to grammar teaching with a strong focus on forms and explicit knowledge. These two categories overlap with the two of those six areas created for the purposes of this research discussed in section 4.5.4.3.

The next stage of the analysis focused on the six areas of belief and tried to reveal relationships between these beliefs. Partly based on the results of the cluster analysis six thematically related groups were created (see section 4.5.4.3). In this way respondents could be given a rating for each of the six areas of belief:

1. belief in a deductive approach (6 items –max. 30);
2. belief in an inductive approach (6 items- max. 35);
3. belief in a focus on formS approach (9 items- max. 45);
4. belief in a focus on form approach (4 items-max. 20);
5. belief in the importance of grammatical terminology (3 items- max 15);
6. belief in correction techniques (3 items –max.15).

First descriptive statistics were calculated with means, standard deviation and range for each of the belief areas. The results are shown in the following Table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Deductive approach Max 30</th>
<th>Inductive approach Max 30</th>
<th>Focus on formS Max 45</th>
<th>Focus on form Max 20</th>
<th>Terminology Max 15</th>
<th>Correction Max 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2381</td>
<td>24.7143</td>
<td>25.4921</td>
<td>15.6032</td>
<td>7.9524</td>
<td>9.7619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.88427</td>
<td>2.92613</td>
<td>4.73788</td>
<td>2.28275</td>
<td>2.36526</td>
<td>1.76630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.08756</td>
<td>8.56221</td>
<td>22.44752</td>
<td>5.21096</td>
<td>5.59447</td>
<td>3.11982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9 Descriptive statistics about the six areas of belief**

The standard deviations are relatively small, however, the range of scores indicate a diversity of opinions about the six areas of belief. The terminology scores for example range from a minimum of 3 to the highest of 15 or the focus on formS scores range from a minimum of 16 to 41, where the highest score was 45. Based on the mean scores and the range we can assume that the respondents were equally divided in these issues at the level of their beliefs.

As a next step in the analysis Pearson correlation was calculated to identify positive or negative correlations between the thematic groupings. The majority of positive and negative intercorrelations are statistically significant. Certain correlations could be anticipated without looking at the data. The belief in the deductive approach to teaching grammar should positively correlate with the belief in the focus on formS approach and negatively with the belief in the deductive approach. Similarly, a negative correlation might be expected between the belief in the focus on form approach and the belief in the deductive approach. However, the results in Table 10 show a different picture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deductive</th>
<th>Inductive</th>
<th>Focus on Form</th>
<th>Focus on Form</th>
<th>Terminology</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deductive Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.167</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inductive Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-1.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Form Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>-.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Form Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Correlation between belief areas

The size of the negative intercorrelation between the belief in an inductive approach and the deductive approach is not high at all (-1.167), a much higher might have been expected. Similarly, the positive intercorrelation between the focus on form approach and the deductive approach is not especially high (-.440). The intercorrelation between the focus on form approach and the inductive approach is quite modest (-.376), while there seems to be a relationship between the belief in using terminology and the belief in the deductive approach. Interestingly enough, terminology shows a modest positive interrelationship with the focus on form and
the deductive approach (r=-.497, r=-.340). Correction on the other hand, does not show any significant positive or negative interrelationship with the other areas of belief.

The analysis suggests that the six areas of belief are not totally independent from each other. The belief in one approach does not exclude using elements of another approach. Teachers may favour different approaches to the teaching of grammar depending on the situation or other factors like learners’ needs or the nature of the grammar item. Although the dichotomies deductive versus inductive approaches or focus on forms versus focus on form to the teaching of grammar are theoretically exclusive, the data gained from the respondents show that in reality they are not totally incompatible, moreover, they overlap in teachers’ belief systems. An interesting result of the survey is that correction is not tied to any of the grammar teaching approaches, while the use of terminology seems to be connected to the deductive and the focus on forms approaches. The findings reveal that pedagogical dichotomies (inductive-deductive; focus on form-focus on forms etc.) implied by existing research on grammar teaching become blurred in practice. Teachers are aware of existing trends in grammar teaching, however, in practice they are influenced by their beliefs and thinking. Thus, grammar teaching is not a monolithic enterprise, rather it is defined by teachers interacting decisions about a range of issues connected to grammar teaching.

The final stage of the analysis investigated the relationship between teachers’ beliefs when teaching grammar (Section three) and what they actually do in practice (Section four) by comparing two similar statements from each section. The chi-square tests revealed significant relationships between teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching and what they perceive they actually do in the classroom. Comparing the statements concerning the explanation and isolation of grammar rules (items 14 and 45; 30 and 41) revealed that teachers believe in focusing on the form first, then practicing it and this is what they do in practice (Appendix E, F). Practicing teachers think that learners should work out rules for themselves and in reality they encourage their learners to discover rules for themselves (items 32 and 48, Appendix G). They believe in explicit grammar teaching and apply this approach a lot (items 6 and 36, Appendix H). Since they like focusing on grammatical forms
and teaching them explicitly the comparison of the statements about the usefulness of drilling is not surprising. Drilling is a favourable technique and used often by practicing teachers. (items 19 and 37, Appendix I). However, in the area of terminology and correction some inconsistency was found between teachers’ beliefs and their actual classroom practice. Although terminology is regarded as not important, the majority of the teachers use terminology in grammar explanation (items 15 and 47, Appendix J). They also think that using Hungarian is more effective in explanation and they do it so (items 16 and 46, Appendix K). In error correction at the level of beliefs most of them think that errors should not be corrected in oral practice activities, however, in practice they usually correct learners immediately (items 11 and 44, Appendix L).

The statistical analysis employed cannot reveal the causes of any relationships shown to be significant. However, it is interesting to note some tendencies. Based on this analysis of the data, there is a suggestion that there is a discrepancy between teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching and their perceived practice. Teachers favour the presentation-practice-production pattern and use a variety of techniques in their everyday practice. At the level of beliefs there is the recognition that learners need grammar primarily for communicative purposes, and that such grammar knowledge should embrace form, meaning and usage. However, in practice explicit, form-focused teaching is characteristic, often involving deductive presentation and mechanical practice of the taught grammar item. This tendency is supported by the observation as well.

4.5.9.2 Analysing observation data

Based on the observations of the four teachers’ lessons the following tendencies have emerged on these teachers’ grammar teaching practices. The aim of the observation was to identify key instructional episodes already described in section 4.5.5. It is clear that deductive elements outnumber the inductive ones in these teachers’ lessons and most of the time they control the whole class. Three of them make efforts to use the focus on form approach, while one of them is clearly focusing almost exclusively on forms. Their lessons seem to follow clearly the presentation-practice-production
pattern, a finding which supports the questionnaire results, however, there is a tendency to abandon the production stage which results in a more accuracy-oriented instructional practice.

In the structure of the teachers’ lessons there were clear differences. Three of the teachers’ lessons consisted of clearly demarcated accuracy and fluency zones and talk about grammar was limited to those stages of the lesson where grammar was being presented or practiced. In the other teacher’s lesson grammar work was actually the result of, rather than preparation for fluency work. The different manner in which teachers structured their lessons, had an influence on the use of terminology. The three teachers more or less following the presentation-practice pattern consciously used well-prepared and clear terminology, while the fourth teacher did not enforce the terminology. He focused rather on the meaning of the grammar structure and did not emphasize the grammar terms too much. A general observation was that grammatical terminology was used quite freely by both learners and teachers alike. The consistency with which it occurred suggested that the teachers valued the role of terminology in explaining grammar except for one teacher. In all four lessons errors were almost always corrected, except with one teacher, even where communicative goals were attained. Generally, with three teachers more form focussed activities were used in their classes and there was no consciousness-raising or discovery type of activity applied. The fourth teacher made several attempts to involve the learners with problem-solving or discovery activities. Apparently, she was rather implementing the focus on form approach.

4.5.9.3 Analysing teacher interviews

In this section the findings gathered from the interviews conducted with the four English teachers will be presented. The language of the interviews was Hungarian. (For interview questions in Hungarian and English see Appendix B).

In presenting the findings, the approach taken by Pearson (1988) will be followed. That is, a brief introduction of the teacher’s professional background and the
summary of what she said will be presented. The transcripts of the interviews in Hungarian can be found in Appendix M.

4.5.9.3.1 Interview One

Teacher One has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Hungarian, English and library studies. She has been teaching English for more than fifteen years. Since she graduated, she has attended hundreds of hours of further training at various courses, including mentoring. She has been working as a mentor in English for the four-year teacher training programme.

This teacher generally uses the inductive approach to grammar teaching. She frequently applies the discovery technique and thinks that learners enjoy doing this type of work because it enhances their sense of achievement. Her belief in the inductive approach is highly influenced by her own experiences as a language learner. She expressed her powerful belief about the unusefulness of immediate correction and explicit grammar work instilled by her own experience as a learner. She believes in the importance of communication and mutual understanding, therefore, grammar should not necessarily be the main focus in the classroom.

She does not spend too much time on grammar work and considers meaning as more important than form. She overestimates the importance of fluency over accuracy, therefore, if communicative goals are attained, she does not think errors of form should be corrected. She uses grammatical terminology in grammar teaching, however, does not expect the learners to use grammatical terms only to recognize them.

4.5.9.3.2 Interview Two

Teacher Two has a university degree in Hungarian, a Bachelor of Arts degree in Russian and English. She has got fifteen years’ of English teaching experience at
secondary level. She is also experienced as a teacher of Hungarian as a foreign language. She attended a mentor course and occasionally works as a mentor.

Her views on grammar teaching can be considered fairly traditional. She likes teaching grammar, since it is an essential element of the language and because grammar is logical. Admittedly she devotes much time to grammar teaching and rather focuses on forms. She deliberately isolates grammatical forms for analysis and believes in the usefulness of this approach. For her this is the way to enable learners to use the language later. She believes in the usefulness of isolating grammar items and focusing learners’ attention on the structure which should appear on the blackboard.

She firmly believes that explicit knowledge has a direct impact on the development of practical control of grammar. She applies consciousness-raising in the sense that learners have to be made aware of the form in an explicit and direct way. In her approach to grammar appears to be fairly traditional, where grammar plays a central role with a clear preference of knowing the rules and applying them in a number of controlled activities.

4.5.9.3.3 Interview Three

Teacher Three has over ten years’ teaching experience at secondary level. She has a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and Russian language and literature. She has recently upgraded her degree to a university degree. She works occasionally as a mentor and attended a mentor course.

She regards grammar teaching as a necessary part of language teaching and does not believe that it is more or less important than the skills. Her understanding of the role of grammar in language teaching is supported by the needs of learners and the language exam requirements. Therefore, she thinks that grammar has lost importance, communication is in the centre, as a result, accuracy is not so important any more.
In her language learning career she has been exposed to different approaches and techniques, from which she prefers using discovery techniques since they make the lesson more interesting and enjoyable. In teaching grammar she starts with the form, isolates it, and then highlights the function as well. She thinks that it is important for the learners to see the structure and the rule clearly if possible in a substitution table. Although she thinks that grammar is not so much important any more, she uses structural drills a lot for memorization. For highlighting the function she uses questions or Hungarian explanation.

As for terminology, she expects learners to recognize them and understand them. Her attitude to error correction is quite interesting. Although she does not think that accuracy is the most important thing nowadays, she admittedly finds it difficult not to intervene when learners make mistakes. She believes in the importance of developing fluency and prefers using discovery techniques, however, her stated beliefs about grammar teaching are not implemented in practice.

4.5.9.3.4 Interview Four

Teacher four is the youngest of the interviewees. He has a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and Hungarian language and literature, his teaching experience has been gathered at the secondary level. He has recently upgraded his degree to a university degree.

Similarly to his colleagues he feels that grammar occupies a similar position in his teaching as any other part of language teaching. He does not spend too much time on grammar teaching, however, he also added that it depends on the difficulty of the structure.

He recalls positive experience from his own language learning and he admits this has had more influence on his teaching approach than the formal training during his studies. He likes presenting grammar in context and follows the pattern of presentation–practice and production. He thinks he plays more emphasis on meaning
than on form. However, in reality he still keeps on explaining grammatical forms and their meaning.

He believes that the use grammatical terminology is a necessary part of grammar teaching and it does not present any difficulty for the learners. However, if there are problems he switches to Hungarian in his explanation. In his approach to error correction he chooses different techniques in different activities. He does not feel the need to correct everything, but tries to consciously avoid fossilized forms.
4.6 Summary of the research results

The research has highlighted typical patterns of teacher beliefs about grammar teaching and discrepancies between beliefs and actual practices. A relatively small sample of teachers in the western part of Hungary has been included in the research. Their beliefs about grammar teaching and learning and their effects on actual classroom practices have been investigated. Regarding these facts it can be stated that the research results allow cautious generalizations in this context.

Now we will examine what the findings presented in the analysis of the questionnaire results, the observation and the interviews suggest and how the five questions addressed by the research can be answered (section 4.5.1).

As has been noted in section 4.5.9.1, the analysis of the questionnaire data revealed no consistent associations between teacher beliefs and aspects of teacher background such as age, sex, type of school and type of degree. At the level of their beliefs, teachers seem to accept the principles of a communicative approach which was revealed in the analysis of section 4.5.9.1.2:

- they have a preference for a rather inductive approach;
- they do not believe that correcting errors immediately is useful;
- they do not find the knowledge of terminology important;
- they are clearly against a focus on formS approach.

However, the observation and the interviews showed a different picture. In actual practice there is a strong focus on formS with mechanical practice activities which outnumber the discovery type of activities. Although they think that errors should not be corrected immediately, in the interviews they expressed their natural inclination towards correcting all the errors and this is what could be observed in their lessons as well. In the use of terminology they are more divided, except one teacher there is a tendency to avoid complicated and unnecessary terminology. In sum, there is inconsistency between teachers’ beliefs and their actual practice. It is not so much their beliefs, but rather their previous learning experience which influences their teaching practice.
The findings in relation to questions 2 and 3 suggest that practicing teachers believe in certain communicative principles, like learners need grammar for communicative purposes and that such grammar knowledge should embrace both form and meaning. Therefore, grammar teaching should be more meaning oriented and making mistakes should not be taken seriously. Another commonly held belief is that learners need explicit grammatical knowledge, however it is not clear exactly what role teachers believe that this knowledge plays in language use. Teachers do not necessarily understand the need for conscious noticing as part of the learning process, since most of the replies to respective items in the questionnaire were either “do not know” or “do not understand”. Another pattern in their belief system is that the learning of grammar can take place simply through exposure to input in context. They do not consider any cognitive processes like consciousness-raising, noticing or input enhancement as important.

The findings in relation to question 4 show a considerable mismatch between teachers’ beliefs and their perceived pedagogical practice and actual practice. A general conclusion is that theoretical principles become blurred in practice. Although the teachers all share the understanding that language is above all a means of communication, as opposed to an object of linguistic study, their teaching is still characterized by accuracy- rather than fluency activities. The majority of them believe in the usefulness of an inductive approach, however their style of presentation is typically though not exclusively deductive, their practice activities are mechanical and form-focused rather than message-focused. The area of error correction is the best example of how principles become blurred in the course of practice. There is the commonly held belief that errors should not be corrected all the time, however in practice teachers more often interfere than not. In the interviews two of them admitted that it is extremely difficult not to correct all the time. The incongruence between belief and practice is an issue which should be addressed by teacher educators, so that teachers become better equipped to reconcile beliefs and practice in order to provide more effective grammar instruction.

The need for correction of forms is apparent from both the observations and the interviews and may indicate an awareness of the particular need for accuracy and clarity. It may also show a concern about fossilisation of errors in learners’
interlanguage as expressed by one of the teachers in the fourth interview. The last investigated area was the use of grammatical terminology. Its use could be understood as a necessary part of an explicit approach to grammar teaching (Stern, 1992). The research showed that the use of terminology is connected to the *deductive* and the *focus on form* approaches with the observed group of teachers. There is the *belief* that the use of terminology does not present any particular differences for learners, therefore, most teachers introduce grammatical terms and find them as a necessary part of grammar teaching.

The findings presented provide a substantial support for the hypotheses set for the research. Now we will examine to what extent the hypotheses have been confirmed or disconfirmed by the results. From the 5 hypotheses two (the second and the fourth hypothesis) have been confirmed, and three disconfirmed. The interviews and the observations revealed that practicing teachers are strongly influenced by traditional approaches and by their own experience as learners and so much by their beliefs. They apply techniques randomly which are not supported by theories of language learning. However, at the level of their beliefs they accept the principles of the communicative approach, but fail to apply them in everyday practice. This gap between their beliefs and perceived pedagogical practice was clear in questions of error correction and focus on form.

The data gained through the analysis of the questionnaire showed that teachers are not consciously aware of the different processes involved in grammar acquisition. This is further supported by the anecdotal evidence provided by them in the interviews. But it is impossible to deny that their beliefs about the right way of teaching are stronger than the need for the required changes. As a result, classroom reality is still characterized by traditional activities as formulated in hypothesis five. Undoubtedly, more and different research would be needed to confirm or reject for sure the extent to which teachers’ beliefs are responsible for learning outcomes in grammar acquisition. However, their influence cannot be questioned.

In sum the assumption has been made that teachers are not consciously aware of the ways their learners learn or acquire grammar as a result of their teaching. Their approach being fairly traditional in the classroom context implies that they cannot
address the question of how to change their approach to grammar teaching. This has at least two reasons. On the one hand, the curricular requirements compel them to focus on form and content rather than on methods of learning and teaching. The approach required by the needs of communicative language teaching (e.g. more awareness raising and focus on function) are time consuming and they believe that giving sound knowledge about grammar in a controlled environment brings about the same results in a short time. On the other hand, most teachers are not prepared methodologically for implementing the required changes in their classrooms. Therefore, introducing a course on *Pedagogical grammar* in foreign language teacher education would be necessary to bridge the existing gap between theory and practice.
4.7 Implications of the research

The answer for research question 5 is also linked directly to the findings of the research. The results suggest that teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge of grammar teaching is highly influenced by their belief systems and it is not always consistent with theoretically grounded knowledge. Therefore, teacher education programmes must attempt to link trainee teachers’ personal pedagogical knowledge with empirical knowledge generally presented in teacher education programmes. A course in Pedagogical grammar in teacher education programmes could provide trainee teachers with opportunities to make sense of the theory of grammar and grammar teaching by filtering it through experiential knowledge gained as teachers and learners. By connecting their personal pedagogical knowledge influenced by their beliefs and theoretical knowledge gained in their formal training would enable trainee teachers to develop alternative conceptions of grammar teaching and make it more effective. The course in pedagogical grammar should be based on the expanded meaning of the term elaborated in sections 3.6 in Chapter 3.

I argue that a course entitled Pedagogical Grammar, which is fully integrated with regular language development and teaching-related subjects like methodology or applied linguistics in teacher training programmes should become a regular part of foreign language teacher education. It would empower trainee teachers through an exploration of their perceptions about grammar and grammar teaching and bridge the gap between theoretical principles and pedagogical practice influenced by teachers’ belief systems. The Pedagogical Grammar course would aim to encourage trainee teachers to identify and interpret their attitudes and beliefs about grammar and grammar teaching in different contexts and help them gain new insights into ways of talking about grammar. It would serve teachers’ immediate as well as long-term interests, and the long-term interests of all the learners by improving grammar teaching and learning.
4.8 Conclusions

The teachers’ knowledge of grammar is one of the core components of a language teacher’s expertise. How this knowledge is transmitted and acquired by learners is a challenging process due to the complexity of the subject matter and the difficulty in how to approach it. Therefore, the central concern of this dissertation has been the reinterpretation of grammar teaching and learning from the teacher’s point of view. The investigation has led to the realization that we should be thinking more in terms of semantics and pragmatics, rather than thinking of morphology and syntax when teaching grammar. Owing to contributions from SLA research, we have to appreciate the fact that the process of grammar acquisition is not likely to be accounted for by one type of learning process. Therefore, the teaching of grammar is a complex issue and requires expertise in several fields.

The dissertation started with a brief historical overview of grammar teaching and the exploration of the cognitive processes involved in language acquisition, particularly in grammar acquisition providing models of how grammatical structures are internalised by learners. Chapter 3 investigated grammatical paradigms and their influence on language teaching. It might be unrealistic to expect that every language teacher will have the time and inclination to come to a full understanding of different grammatical paradigms, they should nevertheless become as familiar as possible with a variety of descriptions of grammar in order to be in a position to evaluate their usefulness in different teaching contexts. By discussing different types of grammar we came to the notion of pedagogical grammar, a widely used term in different contexts, however, it's meaning is not totally clear. Therefore, an attempt was made to redefine the scope of pedagogical grammar from the language teacher’s perspective. It does not only entail grammars and grammar books used as sources of teaching materials, but pedagogical decisions influenced by the teachers’ belief systems.

The research into teachers’ belief systems has contributed to our current understanding of L2 grammar teaching by investigating what teachers do and believe when they teach grammar and has brought light to some significant findings. Views
of grammars have changed over the years. Despite the advances that have been made in the development of functional grammars, a decontextualized view of grammar persists in a great deal of pedagogical practice. Although teachers are aware of existing trends and theories in grammar teaching, the influence of their own experiences as learners have a greater influence on their teaching practice, than the formal training they received during their studies.

The first conclusion to draw is that there are some discrepancies between teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching and their pedagogical practice. Recent trends have not had much influence on their practice. However, greatly influence teachers’ belief systems. Although they acknowledge the importance of context and the functional orientation in grammar teaching, their practice is characterized by rather deductive presentations focusing on forms, followed by mechanical practice activities. Pedagogical dichotomies implied by existing research (inductive-deductive, focus on form–focus on forms, explicit-implicit knowledge) become blurred in practice and do not exclude each other. This shows that teachers’ apply a variety of teaching approaches unconsciously without any critical examination.

A second conclusion is that for grammar teaching to become more effective changes should be implemented at the level of teacher training, as well. Teachers with a clear understanding of descriptions of grammar, grammatical paradigms and grammar acquisition processes and with an awareness of their own perceptions of these can realistically help learners improve their grammatical competence. Therefore, a course in Pedagogical Grammar should become a regular part of foreign language teacher training. It would bridge the gap between theory and pedagogical practice by identifying and interpreting teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching and by learning to control their influence when teaching grammar. Grammar instruction in teacher education has traditionally meant helping trainee teachers develop a sound knowledge of the rules of the language and providing techniques for explaining those rules. This approach is not appropriate any more. As a result of the shift to meaning-focused communicative language teaching the old concepts, beliefs, and practices of grammar teaching have to be questioned. A course in Pedagogical Grammar should focus on such questioning and will give trainee teachers a sense of empowerment that will benefit their entire future teaching career.
The *Pedagogical Grammar* course in teacher training programmes could assist trainee teachers in identifying their learners’ grammatical needs, develop appropriate programmes to meet those needs ranging from the explicit teaching of grammar and terminology through to a more implicit, consciousness-raising approach. In addition, by exploring their beliefs as part of their personal pedagogical knowledge they could relate theory and pedagogical practice. In this function *Pedagogical Grammar* should help the shift to more meaning-focused practice questioning beliefs and practices of current grammar teaching. Trainee teachers should be helped break away from the deeply ingrained habits of traditional grammar teaching practice. This critical approach brings along trainee-teachers’ professional development and contributes to more effective grammar teaching. Therefore, the course in *Pedagogical Grammar* could work as an interface between linguistic theory and pedagogical practice.

A final conclusion to this dissertation is that we need to see grammar not primarily as a unitary object, whose component parts have to be learnt, but, rather, a device to decode experiences and beliefs connected to it. We need to see the conditions for the teaching and learning of grammar as not alien to the essence of grammar. If we assume that grammar is systematic and functional, then our approach to teaching and learning should be equally systematic and targeted on the achievement of functional goals. In sum, we need to alter our approach towards grammar to meet the requirements of our age and encourage a similar change among learners to improve current practices.
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APPENDIX A
Questionnaire on Grammar Teaching

Dear Colleagues,
Please spare a few minutes of your time to fill in this questionnaire.

SECTION ONE: Background information
Please tick the appropriate choices and provide the necessary information below.

1. Age:   □ 20-25  □ 26-30  □ 31-35  □ 36-40  □ 41-45  □ 45+

2. Sex:   □ Male  □ Female

3. Academic qualifications:
   □ a bachelor’s degree in __________________
   □ a master’s degree in __________________

4. Years of teaching experience:
   □ less than a year  □ 1-4 years  □ 5-8 years  □ 9-12 years  □ 13-16 years  □ 17 years more

5. Time spent in an English-speaking country:
   □ no time spent  □ a couple of weeks  □ more than a month  □ more than a year

6. Currently teaching at:
   □ primary school
   □ secondary school
   □ other (please specify)____________________

7. Level at which you are teaching:
   □ elementary  □ pre-intermediate  □ intermediate
   □ upper –intermediate  □ advanced
SECTION TWO: Self-evaluation

In this section you are asked to evaluate yourself on a scale by indicating your answer with a tick (✔) in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>What do you think about your own knowledge of grammar?</th>
<th>extraordinarily good</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>not very good</th>
<th>poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What do you think about your own knowledge of grammar books? (e.g. descriptive, prescriptive, pedagogical etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What do you think about your own knowledge of approaches to grammar? (e.g. inductive, deductive, contrastive, eclectic etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION THREE: Teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching

Following are a number of statements with which some people agree and others disagree. We would like you to indicate your opinion by ticking (✔) the appropriate box next to each statement that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with it. If you agree strongly mark a 5 on the scale, if you strongly disagree mark a 1 on the scale. Please feel free to add any comments you wish to make. Respond to each statement as quickly as possible.

1= strongly disagree  2= disagree  3=undecided  4=agree  5=strongly agree

L1= first language or mother tongue
L2=second language or foreign language
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Don’t understand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The most important part of a new language is learning its grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grammar is the study of the rules governing the use of a language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammar should be taught as a means to an end and not as an end itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammar teaching should focus on the form and meaning of structures and their use in context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learners learn grammar best through exposure to language in natural contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grammar should be taught in an explicit or direct way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>When giving feedback, teachers should focus on the appropriateness and not on the correctness of linguistic forms of learners’ responses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Consciousness-raising tasks are good for making learners aware of the specific features of L2 by figuring out the properties of those features themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Focusing learners’ attention on forms is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the acquisition of grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Knowledge of grammatical rules guarantees the ability to use the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In oral practice teachers should not correct learners’ grammatical errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Grammar rules should be discovered by learners rather than explicitly taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Learners’ mistakes should always be corrected as soon as possible to prevent the formation of bad habits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>It is best to give the grammatical explanation first and then practice the rule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The knowledge of terminology of grammar and direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teachers should use the learners’ L1 to explain grammar rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teachers should begin teaching a new grammar point by giving examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Separate treatment of grammar leads to language knowledge which students can use in natural contexts later.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>It is difficult for learners to transfer their grammatical knowledge into communicative language use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Learners need to be consciously aware of a structure’s form and its function before they can use it proficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>When using language to communicate, it is more important to be grammatically accurate than socially appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Learners should understand all the common grammatical terms in the L2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Drilling and memorisation are essential to the successful learning of new language forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>If learners think about the rules while they are talking, it prevents them from communicating fluently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Teachers should always explain grammatical rules to learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Learners should be able to use the common grammatical terms in the L2 correctly when discussing grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Accuracy (correctness of form) is a primary aim in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>New grammatical points should be presented and practiced in situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Teachers should begin teaching a new grammar point by explaining the rule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Teachers should focus on the structure and form, rather than meaning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>The most effective way of teaching grammar involves using sentence-based exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Teachers should help learners to work out grammar rules for themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learners should be encouraged to create language by a process of trial and error.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>If learners memorize rules and facts about grammar, it will help them to produce correct language in spontaneous situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Grammar explanations should be avoided by the teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION FOUR: The practice of teaching grammar in English as a foreign language

In this section you are asked to indicate the frequency of doing different activities in your classes in connection with grammar teaching on a scale from 1 to 5.

1=never 2=rarely 3=sometimes 4=usually 5=always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I explain grammar explicitly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>When teaching new grammar, I teach the form and the meaning together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I use drills with learners to make them use the new forms automatically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I spend a lot of time explaining grammar rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I use activities which encourage students to become aware of grammatical rules.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I isolate the new grammar structure and practice it a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I ask concept questions a lot to make sure they have understood the meaning of grammatical structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I provide learners with a lot of opportunities to use grammar in context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I correct learners’ errors immediately.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I teach the rule first and then give some activities for practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I use the learners’ L1 to explain grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I use grammatical terminology in grammar explanation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I encourage learners to discover things for themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I correct all the learners’ errors to prevent the fossilisation of wrong forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Terminology is difficult for learners, therefore I explain grammar in Hungarian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many thanks for your time and attention.
APPENDIX B
Interview questions to teachers

Do you like teaching grammar or not? Why?
What do you think about the role of grammar in language teaching?
What kind of grammar is needed nowadays by learners?

Do you have any positive or negative experience?
What influences your grammar teaching? (Language teaching theories, personal experiences, needs of the learners, the way you were taught…)

How much time do you devote to grammar teaching?

How do you explain grammar (inductive versus deductive)?
What do you focus on in grammar teaching, form or function or meaning?
Do you encourage your learners to discover things for themselves? How?

How much grammatical terminology do you use?
Do you expect the learners to use them or only to understand them?

When do you correct errors and how?
### APPENDIX C
Observation sheet

School: ..........................................................  
Date: ..............................................................  
Teacher: ..........................................................  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of the lesson</th>
<th>Inductive elements</th>
<th>Deductive elements</th>
<th>Focus on form</th>
<th>Focus on form and meaning</th>
<th>Use of terminology</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
APPENDIX D
Cluster Analysis

HIERARCHICAL CLUSTER ANALYSIS
Dendrogram using Average Linkage (Between Groups)
Rescaled Distance Cluster Combine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K12  9  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K32  29 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K4   1  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K28  25 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K17  14 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K19  16 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K24  21 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K5   2  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K7   4  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K23  20 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K8   5  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K9   6  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤

=⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤

K33  30 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K11  8  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K15  12 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K29  26 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K34  31 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K18  15 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K30  27 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K21  18 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K35  32 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤

=⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤

K22  19 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K25  22 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K26  23 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K13  10 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K27  24 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K31  28 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K6   3  ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
K14  11 ⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤⬤
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APPENDIX E
Chi-square test: items 14 and 45

Questionnaire items 14 and 45

- *It is best to give the grammatical explanation first and then practice the rule.*
- *I teach the rule first and then give some activities for practice.*

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is best to give the grammar explanation first and then practice the rule</th>
<th>I teach the rule first and then give some activities for practice</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>66.412</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>55.963</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>14.605</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
Chi-square test: items 30 and 41

Questionnaire items 30 and 41

- Teachers should focus on the structure and form rather than meaning.
- I isolate the new grammatical structure and practice it a lot.

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers should focus on the structure and form rather than meaning</th>
<th>I isolate the new grammatical structure and practice it a lot</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>22,029</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>17,712</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5,043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
Chi-square test: items 3 and 48

Questionnaire items 3 and 48

- Teachers should help learners to work out grammar rules for themselves.
- I encourage learners to discover things for themselves.

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers should help learners to work out grammar rules for themselves</th>
<th>I encourage learners to discover things for themselves</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>32,837</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>30,298</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear</td>
<td>15,598</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H
Chi-square test: items 6 and 36

Questionnaire items 6 and 36

- *Grammar should be taught in an explicit or direct way.*
- *I explain grammar explicitly.*

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammar should be taught in an explicit or direct</th>
<th>I explain grammar explicitly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't understand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>52,596</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>47,662</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
Chi-square test: items 19 and 37

Questionnaire items 19 and 37

- It is difficult for learners to transfer their grammatical knowledge into communicative language use.
- I teach the form and the meaning together.

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is difficult for learners to transfer grammatical knowledge into communicative language use</th>
<th>I teach the form and the meaning together</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>28,128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19,516</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>5,643</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J
Chi-square test: items 15 and 47

Questionnaire items 15 and 47

- The knowledge of terminology of grammar and direct instruction in the rules is essential if students are to learn to communicate effectively.
- I use grammatical terminology in grammar explanation.

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The knowledge of terminology of grammar is essential</th>
<th>I use grammatical terminology in grammar explanation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>11,156</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>15,125</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
Chi-square test: items 16 and 46

Questionnaire items 16 and 46

- Teachers should use the learners' L' to explain grammar rules.
- I use the learners' L1 to explain grammar.

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers should use the learners' L' to explain grammar rules</th>
<th>I use the learners' L1 to explain grammar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>39,152</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>35,948</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire items 11 and 44

- *In oral practice teachers should not correct learners' grammatical errors.*
- *I correct learners' errors immediately.*

Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In oral practice teachers should not correct learners' grammatical errors</th>
<th>I correct learners' errors immediately</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>24,007</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>25,549</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M
Teacher interviews

Interview 1

Teacher 1: She has a BA in Russian and English; over 15 years’ experience in secondary school; works as a mentor; attended numerous further training courses, including mentoring, and using computer in L2 teaching.

Szeretsz-e nyelvtant tanítni, ha igen, miért, ha nem miért?
A válaszom egyértelműen igen, illetve azzal kezdeném, hogy a nyelvet szeretem tanítni, és még azt is szeretném megjegyezni, hogy azért érzem magam szerencsés embernek, mert a szakmám és a hobbim az egy és ugyanaz. Szeretek nyelvet tanítni, angol nyelvet is és magyart is mint idegen nyelvet.

Ezen belül nyelvtant szerzets-e tanítni?
Mivel része a nyelv tanításának, természetesen azt is szeretem.

Mi a szerepe a mai nyelvtanításban a nyelvtannak?
Fontosnak tartom azt, hogy a tanulók annyi nyelvtani ismerettel rendelkezzenek, hogy kommunikálni tudjanak. Ezzel arra utalok, hogy az én tanítási elveimben nem központi helyen szerepel a nyelvtanítás, személy szerint sokkal nagyobb hangsúlyt helyezek a szókincsfejlesztésre, szótanításra, pontosabban a kifejezések tanítására.

Ha azt gondolod, hogy a kommunikáció sokkal fontosabb, mint maguk a szerkezetek, mennyi hibát javítasz és mikor?
Csak a legfontosabb, legdurvább hibákat javítom, mindig igyekszem türelmesen megvárni a tanulót, soha félbe mondatot nem szakítok, erről személyes tapasztalataim is vannak. És megpróbálom utána rávezetni a tanulót, ha kell, akkor akár egy lépéssel visszamegyek, és rávezetem a hibájára, vagy egy gesztussal jelzem, hogy valami nem stimmel a mondatban. Emiatt az ismét játszik szerepet a tanításban, és ők észreveszik, tehát a lehető legkevesebb szórakoztatni én magam a hibát.

Beszéljünk egy kicsit a saját nyelvtanulási tapasztalataidról, amikor te voltál nyelvtanuló, neked hogyan tanítottad a nyelvtant?
Miután elég régen végeztem, régi módszer szerint tanították nekem a nyelvet, az idegen nyelvet. Német tágosatos gimnáziumba kerületem egy olyan csoportba, ahol a többiek már beszélték németül, és én teljesen kezdő voltam. Egy nagyon szigorú és nagyon nyelvtanközpontú tanárt kaptunk, aki azonnal lecsapott, ha a legkisebb pontatlanságot tapasztalta, és egy életre meghatározó élményt adott. Emiatt elhatározottam, hogy én magam is nyelvtanár leszek, de nem olyan, mint egykori tanárom. Elhatározottam, ha én tanár leszek, én soha nem magázom a diákjaimat, soha nem kiabálok velük, és az sem olyan nagy baj, ha nem tudják, hogy mi a “harmadik”, azt hogy kell mondani helyesen. Én akkor, úgy érzem, már akkor elhatározottam, hogy nem ilyen nyelvtanár leszek. Tehát ez a személyes rossz tapasztalat az ellenkező hatást változta ki bennem.

Hogyan hat a saját nyelvtanításodra ez a rossz tapasztalat?
Arra biztatom a tanítványaimat, hogy bátran beszéljenek, nem baj, ha tévednek, hiszen mottónak az, hogy senki nem tökéletes. Az idegen nyelv az egyetlen, amit rosszul is érdemes tudni, mondta Lomb Kató is. Ezzel teljesen azonosulni tudok. A lényeg az, hogy tudjunk beszélni és megértetni magunkat. Amíg megértjük egymást, amíg nem zavarja a megértést, addig a nyelvtannak úgy gondolom nincs akkora szerepe. Magam is jártam sokszor külföldön, természetesen az első mondatom után észrevezésik, hogy nem vagyok angol anyanyelvű, de még sohasem kaptam negatív visszajelzést arra, ha valamit tévesen mondtam.

Az óráidom mennyi időt töltesz nyelvtanítással?
Azt mondanám, hogy az átlagosnál kevesebbet. Annyit, amennyit nagyon muszáj, amennyit a tankönyv, a kurzuskönyv kínál, de nem túl sokat.

Mit gondolsz, mennyire fontos a nyelvtani formák tanítása?
Előnyben részesítem a jelentést, a formát természetesen olyan szinten kell tudni a tanulóknak, hogy az írott szöveg értésében és a hallott szöveg értésében ez ne zavarja Őket. Illetve a megfelelő nyelvi szintnek, egy átlagos nyelvi szintnek megfeleljenek.

Milyen megközelítést használ sz a nyelvtanításban?
Nyelvtanításban a nyelvtani órák 90%-ban az inductív módszert próbálom használni. Fontosnak tartom, hogy az úgynevezett input személyes jellegű legyen, megpróbálok nagyon sokszor olyan szövegen, anyagon bemutatni a nyelvtant, amihez nekem személyes közöm van, az a tapasztalatom, hogy ez sokkal jobban érdekel a diákokat, mint a tankönyvben levő XY-ról szóló szöveg. Tehát megpróbálom életközeli személyes szövegebe ágyazni a nyelvtant.

Elmondod-e a nyelvtani szabályt nekik?
Az input után megpróbálom a jelentést ellenőrizni, vagy “concept checking”-gel vagy egyszerűen megkérdezem, hogyan értelmezik ezt, - akár magyarul - is az anyanyelvükön. Nem félek, hogy ilyenkor az anyanyelvet használni. Utána megpróbálunk valamilyen szabályt közösen levonni, amit aztán vagy rögzítenek a füzetbe, vagy nem. Az igéidőkkel kapcsolatban például mindig használók “time line”-t, mert annak idején, amikor én tanultam angolt, nekem is nagyon sokat segített.

Ha jól értem, akkor inkább szövegkörnyezetben próbálod a nyelvtant tanítani. Nem fordul elő, hogy a gyerekek keresik a szabályt, és szeretnék tudni mi a forma pontosabban?
Mindenki más a tanítási stílusa. Ha a diákok megszokják, hogy egy szövegben kapják, amiről ők rájönnek, hogy hogyan működik a nyelv, az idegen nyelv, akkor nem keresik a szabályt, Azt veszem észre, hogy szeretik is maguk felfedezni a szabályt, mert ez sikerelményt nyújt nekik. Természetesen én magam szeretek nekik úgynevezett munkókat, segítséget adni. Erre viszont igényük van. Például ha már több igéidőt ismernek időhatározók, amiket meg is tanultnak, és arról beugrik nekik. Vagy egy rögzített szerkezet, aminek a mintájára próbálnak más példákat hozni.

A nyelvtani terminológiát mennyire kell a diákoknak tudni, elvárode-e tölük a használatukat?
Mivel angol nyelvű kurzuskönyvet használnunk, természetesen tartom, hogy a gyerekek értsék a terminológiát, hiszen az instrukciókat a tankönyvi nyelvtani magyarázatokat is angol nyelven kapják meg. Tehát a megértés színtén
ragaszkodom hozzá, de soha nem követelem meg tőlük, hogy angolul válaszoljanak nyelvtani terminológiát használjanak. Mert ők nem nyelvtanáraknak készülnek. Én magam használom a terminológiát, és annak meg nagyon örülök, ha ők is használják. De nem követelem meg.
Teacher 2: She has a BA in Russian, English and Hungarian; over 15 years’ experience in secondary school; works ocassionally as a mentor; attended a mentor course.

Szeretsz-e nyelvtant tanítani? Ha igen miért, ha nem miért nem?
Szeretek nyelvtant tanítani, mert logikus és a nyelv szerves része.

Mennyi időt fordítasz nyelvtantanításra?
Viszonylag sok időt. A nyelvtani szerkezeteket mindig megtanítom, de az órának csak egy bizonyos részét veszik igénybe.

Hogyan tanítod a nyelvtant, elmondanál egy óramenetet, mikor milyen lépésekben vezetsz be valamit?
Én a szerkezetet tanítom. Igyekszem mindig szövegben tanítani, vagy valamiféle szituációban. Na most ez az adott nyelvtani szerkezettel is függ, mert a könnyebbket azt tényleg meg tudom úgy tanítani, mint valami lexikai egységet. Azt úgy szoktam. Amikor olyan nyelvtani anyaghoz érünk, ami vagy előzetes ismeretet igényel, vagy nagyon fontos a továbbiakban, akkor hosszabb időt szánok rá, és akár több órán keresztül is azt a nyelvtani szerkezetet tudatosítom.

Mit értesz tudatosítás alatt?
Én mindig írok, nálam mindig ott van a forma, amely mindenki könnyen számíthat, mert ezt a tanítási tapasztalatomból tudom, hogy ezen a szinten mindenki is meg tudja megtanulni, ami neki is le van írva. Ez fontos. Hiába érti meg, egyébként is meggyőződésem, hogy sokkal többet értenek meg a mai gyerekek, mint amennyire használják a nyelvet. Jóval többet megértenek. De amit megtudnak, ott változtatni, annak nyoma legyen írásban. Én mindig felírom a formát.

Ha jól értem a formát hangsúlyozod először, és a következő lépés?
A következő lépés mindenféle ott van a tábán, mert ezt a tanítási tapasztalatomból tudom, hogy ezen a szinten mindenki is meg tudja megtanulni, ami neki is le van írva. Ez fontos. Hiába érti meg, egyébként is meggyőződésem, hogy sokkal többet értenek meg a mai gyerekek, mint amennyire használják a nyelvet. Jóval többet megértenek. De amit megtudnak, ott változtatni, annak nyoma legyen írásban. Én mindig felírom a formát.

Milyen feladatokat használsgyakorlásra?
Kezdőknél, főleg elsősoknél, nem mondok, hogy drillezés, de valami ahhoz hasonló. Tehát valami olyasmi, hogy szokja meg, használja, ejtse ki ugyanazt a formát többször - ugyanolyan típusú mondatban - legfeljebb a szavak változnak.

Ha haladunk tovább az órán, még milyen feladatokat használsg?
Akkor a feladatok típusa vális egységegye, bonyolultabbá, amikor már esetleg kreatívnek kell lenni a gyerekeknek, neki kell kitalálni, esetleg, nem azt mondok, hogy ugyanazt a formát, mondjuk egy állító alakot, illetve hátt dépoltol, kiegészíteni, régebbivel ötvözni így.

Tapasztalataid szerint a diákok igénylik-e hogy a forma mindig ott legyen, és a szabályt elmondd nekik? Vagy ez inkább neked fontos?
Hát ez jó kérdés, én azt hiszem, hogy nem igényelnék, viszont tudják, hogy valamilyen módon nem a jegy kedvéért, de számon kérjük illetve utána alkalmazniuk
És én azt mondom, hogy inkább elfogadják. Aztán utána, ha tudják használni, akkor örülnek neki, de valójában azt hiszem a forma inkább nekem fontos, sokkal inkább nekem, én, én úgy látom, hogy a szabályra a formára mindig figyelmeztetnem kell őket. Tehát megvan valahol a fejükben, de a tudatos alkalmazásában inkább én vagyok a kényszerítő erő. Mert én figyelmeztetek, nem a gyerekeknek fontos.

Értem. Nyelvtani terminológiát mennyit használsz?

Az utolsó kérdésem, nyelvtani hibákat mikor és hogyan javítasz?
Főleg írásban, én a nyelvtani hibákat szóban javítom, de csak akkor, ha már tudom, hogy befejezte a mondandóját, mondat közben sohasem. Csak a nagyon durvákat javítom. Én meg szoktam ismételni jól, de nem biztos, hogy bevált. Nem biztos, hogy felhívom a figyelmet, hogy te ezt most rosszul mondtad. Én elmondom jól, és bízom abban, hogy megismétlik. Többnyire azt hallom, hogy visszamondja utána. És talán megjegyzi.
Interview 3

Teacher Three: She has over ten years’ teaching experience at secondary level. She has a BA in English and Russian language and literature, she has recently upgraded her degree to a university degree. She works occasionally as a mentor and attended a mentor course.

Szeretsz-e nyelvtant tanítani, ha igen, miért, ha nem miért nem?
Nem teszek különbséget, hogy szeretek-e vagy nem, elfogadom, hogy szükséges és ugyanolyan, mint a készségek tanítása. Nincs ilyen preferenciám, hogy szeretek-e vagy nem.

Tehát nem szánsz több időt nyelvtan tanítására, mint mondjuk a készségek tanítására.
Nem. Azt gondolom, egyforma arányban tanítom őket.

Mit gondolsz a nyelvtan szerepéről a mai nyelvoktatásban?
Mindenképpen fontosnak tartom. Bár most olyan tendenciát látkok a nyelvtanulóknál,- illetve függ attól, hogy kinek milyen céljai vannak az idegen nyelvvel kapcsolatban-hogy ha valaki nyelvviszgára készül, akkor behatárolt, hogy milyen nyelvtani ismeretekre van szüksége. Manapság a kommunikatív nyelvoktatást helyezik előtérbe, a gyerekek is inkább a kommunikációra helyezik a hangsúlyt. Így egy kicsit talán elsikad a nyelvtan szerepe, a pontosság nem annyira fontos.

Vannak-e a saját nyelvtanulásodban olyan tapasztalataid, amit akár pozitív vagy negatív módon élt meg, és ezek befolyásolják-e a saját gyakorlatadat?
Többféle hatás ért. Több nyelvtanártól is tanultam. Volt részem a hagyományos grammatikai módszerben, volt olyan tanárom, akinél nekünk kellett felfedezni nyelvtani szabályokat és alkalmazni. Én is inkább szívesebben hajlok ez utóbbi felé. De ne zárom ki a másikat sem. Esetenként főleg egyéni oktatásban, magántanítványokkal, akkor egyszerűbb az étet, meg ha olyan képességű a gyerek, hogy felismeri a szabályt és alkalmazni is tudja. Végül is iskolai oktatásban azt gondolom a második talán jobb, mert sokkal élvezetesebb.

Mit gondolsz arról, hogyan kell nyelvtan tanítani? A nyelvtani formát mennyire helyezed a középpontha, funkcióra mennyi hangsúlyt fektetsz?
Mindenképpen szeretem, ha a gyerekek látják azt, hogy formailag hogy néz ki egy szerkezet, tisztában legyenek a jelentésével és a használatával. Azt mindenképpen fontosnak tartom, hogy lássák a formát. Pár óra elteltével összegezzük azokat a funkciókat, amelyeket vettünk, és mikor és hol használjuk őket. Mindig egy bizonyos struktúrára helyezem a hangsúlyt. Izoláltan mindenképpen ott kell, hogy legyen a szerkezet a táblán vagy a könyvben. Amikor a gyerekek felfedezik a szabályokra azokat, szerintem jó, ha látják külön. Annak a híve vagyok, hogy a nyelvtani táblázatok ott legyenek, a szerkezetek világosan behelyettesíthetőek legyenek.

Drillezést mennyit használsz?
Elég sokat, az órán leginkább szóban, kicsit kevesebbet írásban Otthon házi feladatként még főleg egy olyan 10-15-20 mondatot még egyéb feladattípusból, amennyiben van rá lehetőség. Sajnos a könyvekben és a munkafüzetekben ehhez
kevés a gyakorlási lehetőség, ehhez magam is találok ki feladatokat pl. egyes szám első személyből átrakni egyes szám harmadik személybe, vagy bármi ilyet.

A sok struktúrális gyakorlás mellett hogyan ellenőrzöd, hogy megértették-e a funkciót?
Ezt jól segítik a könyvek, mert ott a szövegkörnyezet, vannak segítő kérdések, meg én is teszek fel olyan ellenőrző kérdéseket, amivel meggyőződhetek erről. Legvégző esetben magyarázat és célnyelven is megkérdezem, és akkor mindenképpen kiderül, ha valaki mégis félreértett valamit.

Nyelvtani terminológiát mennyit használsz?
Amennyi a nyelvkönyvben van, azt mindenképpen szükségesnek tartom, például a szófajok nevei, de kell, hogy értsék az instrukciókat is. Minimális szinten el tudják mondani esetleg a szabályt. Ez attól is függ, milyen szinten vannak

Elvárod azt is, hogy ők tudják használni angolul a terminológiát?
Megélégzsem azzal, ha felismerik, rá ismernek és megértik. Feltétlenül nem ragaszkodom a használatukhoz.

Mikor, mennyit és hogyan javítasz nyelvtani hibákat?
Már a prezentációról - ha valami hibás - megpróbálom egyszerre jelezni, illetve a gyerekekkel javíttatni. Amennyire lehetséges. A dril lezésnél is mindig javítok. Gyakorlatilag minden szakaszában a tanításnak javítók a gyakorlás alatt is.

A gyakorlás alatt adsz-e olyan feladatot, amikor teljesen önállóan kell, hogy felismerjék melyik struktúrát kell használni? Mennyire hagyod őket önállóan beszélni?
Nyilván hagyom őket önállóan beszélni azzal a nem titkolt szándékkal, hogy azt a szerkezetet alkalmazzák elsősorban, amit tanultunk, plusz ráépítenek az előzőleg tanultakra.

Ebben a részben javítod-e a hibákat?
Közben az ember figyel, monitorozik, igazából, ha olyasvalamit látok, akkor igen. Ha nagyon belelendülnek, hagyom, hogy beszéljenek, akkor nem mindig javítok. De ha valami nagyon durvát vagy súlyosat vétenek, esetenként beleszólok, illetve jelzem, és akkor elgondolkoznak és megpróbálják maguk javítani a hibát.

Zavar téged, ha hibát vétenek, és mégis úgy gondolod, hogy nem kellene most beszélni, és a hibát kijavítani?
A szituációitól függ. Van úgy, amikor hagyom, hogy menjene tovább, amikor nem a pontosság a cél. De nehéz megállni, hogy ne javítsak.
Teacher Four: He is the youngest of the interviewees. He has a BA in English and Hungarian language and literature, his teaching experience has been gathered at the secondary level. He has recently upgraded his degree to a university degree.

*Szeretsz-e nyelvtant tanítani, ha igen, miért, ha nem miért nem?*

Természetesen szeretek tanítani nyelvtant is. Úgyanúgy ahogy a többi részét is a nyelvoktatásnak. Nem tudom, nem is szeretnék különválasztani a kettőt, számonra a nyelvtanítás szerves része a nyelvoktatásnak.

*Mennyi időt szánsz nyelvtanításra?*

Ez függ az anyag nehézségétől, függ attól, hogy milyen osztályban, illetve milyen évfolyamon tanítok. Ezt úgy - bár nekem még túl sok tapasztalatom nincs – az ember körülbelül érzi. Ha úgy gondolom, hogy egy nyelvtani anyagrész fontos vagy nehéz, kicsit több időt szentelek ennek a résznek, később is visszatérek rá.

*Vannak-e a saját nyelvtanulásodból olyan tapasztalataid, amelyek pozitívak, és ezért te is hasonlóképpen csináld, vagy esetleg negatív tapasztalataid, amit semmintén nem követnél?*

Szerencsére inkább pozitív tapasztalataim vannak. Azt mondják, az ember nem úgy tanít, ahogy a tanítás mesterségére tanították, hanem ahogy őt tanították. Az én esetemben a pozitív minta, ahogy engem tanítottak, erősen hat rám. A régebbi nyelvkönyvekben eléggé nagy hangsúlyt fektettek a nyelvtanra, az úgynevezett drillezős feladatokra, a szerkezetek begyakorlására. Ezeket én is alkalmazom, de csak keveset.

*Mit tartasz még fontosnak?*


*Ezen az órán az új szerkezetet tehát egy kontextusban mutattad be. A nyelvtani szerkezetek formájára mennyi hangsúlyt fektetsz? Felirod-e külön a táblára általában, gyakoroltatod-e külön? Említetted korábban, hogy a drillezést nem sokat használd, vagy egyáltalán nem.*

Igen, az új szerkezet nyílvan megjelenik a táblán, aláhúzzuk, megmagyarázom, és egy kicsit gyakoroltatom is.

*Mennyi terminológiát használsz, mennyire várod el, hogy használják és megértsek a nyelvtani szakkifejezéseket?*

Nagyon fontosnak tartom, hogy a lehető legtöbb dolog hangozzon el angolul az órán, és bizony ez magában foglalja a terminológiát is. A tapasztalat azt mutatja, hogy a
terminológiával jól megbirkóznak a diákok, természetesen ez nagymértékben függ a nyelvi szinttől és a diákok képességeitől. Például, az hogy "comparative, superlative" gond nélkül bevezethetem, sőt élvezik is, hogy tudják ezeket. Ez természetesen nem azt jelenti, hogy minden nyelvatan esetében bevezetem a terminológiát a célnyelven. Néha arra is szükség van, hogy magyarul magyarázzunk. De mire negyedikeseik lesznek, szinte minden terminológiát lehet velük használni.

Ha jól értem, elvárod, hogy értsék a terminológiát, de nem kéred tölük, hogy használják.
Előbb-utóbbr úgyis rájuk ragad, arról nem is beszélve, hogy a fő szempont az értés, hiszen az instrukciókban is szerepel terminológia, tehát meg kell érteniük. Szerintem fontos, hogy értsék a terminológiát, és nem torpakkal meg ha azt látták hogy "if clause vagy that clause". Elképzelhető, hogy az aktív szőkincsükben ezek a szavak nem szerepelnek, de ez nem is gond.

Az utolsó kérdés a hibajavításra vonatkozik. Mennyi hibát javítasz és hogyan? Fontosnak tartod-e hogy mindig kijavitd a nyelvtani hibákat?
Hogy mindig kijavitok, azt nem tartom fontosnak, azt viszont igen, hogy az elején, amíg csak egy szerkezetre koncentrálunk, a hibákat javítok, hogy jól rögzüljön, aztán később feladattípustól is függ, hogy mennyit javítok. Ahol a kommunikáció sokkal fontosabb, mint hogy például lemaradt egy többes szám vagy ehhez hasonló. Nyilván egy tanár el tudja dönteni, hogy az adott hiba mennyire fontos. Lényeges arra koncentrálni, ha többször elköveti a hibát, mindenféle visszatérek rá. Nem szabad hogy rögzüljön a hiba.
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