

Teacher Cognition and Grammar Teaching At Tertiary Level

Bekir Canlı¹, İsmail Çakır^{2*}

¹ Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Kahramanmaraş, Turkey

²Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara, Turkey

Keywords

Teacher cognition, teaching grammar, grammar teaching practices, tertiary level

Article History

Received
06.05.2019
Accepted
04.06.2019
Published
30.06.2019

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the teacher cognition and teaching grammar at tertiary level. For the purpose of the study, a qualitative research was carried out. The study utilized a purposeful sampling and three experienced English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors participated in this study. Data were collected by means of semi-structured pre-observation interviews, classroom observations, and semi-structured post-observation interviews. The study results revealed that EFL instructors' cognition and teaching grammar are closely related to their own experience and circumstantial factors. Although the instructors were aware of the current English Language Teaching (ELT) methods, they had to teach English grammar by traditional methods for various reasons. The results of the study suggested that EFL instructors might update their existing grammar knowledge and teaching methods in the light of recent developments in the field. Also, the instructors may benefit from the professional development opportunities in order to reconsider their current teaching practices and revise them with more effective teaching activities. This may enhance the teacher cognition and teaching grammar.

* Correspondence to İsmail ÇAKIR, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Ankara, Turkey.

✉Email: icakir@ybu.edu.tr

Üniversite Düzeyinde Öğretmen Bilişi ve Dilbilgisi Öğretimi

Bekir Canlı¹, İsmail Çakır^{2*}

¹Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye

²Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye

Anahtar Kelimeler	Özet
Öğretmen bilişi, dilbilgisi öğretimi, dilbilgisi öğretim uygulamaları, yükseköğretim düzeyi	Bu çalışma üniversite düzeyinde öğretmen bilişini ve dilbilgisi öğretimi araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla nitel bir araştırma yapılmıştır. Çalışmada amaçlı bir örnekleme kullanılmış ve bu çalışmaya üç deneyimli İngilizce öğretmeni katılmıştır. Veriler yarı yapılandırılmış gözlem öncesi görüşmeler, sınıf içi gözlemler ve yarı yapılandırılmış gözlem sonrası görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları İngilizce öğretmenlerinin öğretmen bilişinin ve dilbilgisi öğretiminin kendi deneyimleri ve durumsal faktörlerle yakından ilişkili olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Her ne kadar öğretmenler mevcut İngilizce öğretim yöntemlerinden haberdar olsalar da çeşitli nedenlerden dolayı geleneksel yöntemlerle İngilizce dilbilgisi öğretmek zorunda kalmışlardır. Çalışmanın sonuçları İngilizce öğretmenlerinin alandaki son gelişmeler ışığında mevcut dilbilgisi bilgilerini ve öğretim yöntemlerini güncelleyebileceğini öne sürmüştür. Ayrıca, öğretmenler mevcut öğretim uygulamalarını yeniden değerlendirmek ve daha etkili öğretim etkinlikleriyle değiştirmek amacıyla mesleki gelişim fırsatlarından yararlanabilirler. Bu durum öğretmen bilişi ve dilbilgisi öğretimi geliştirebilir.
Makale Tarihi Alındı 06.05.2019 Kabul Edildi 04.06.2019 Basıldı 30.06.2019	

Introduction

Cognition which is defined as “the mental action or process of acquiring knowledge and understanding through thought, experience, and the senses” (Lexico Dictionaries English) is considered as an important element in various field of studies such as psychology, literature, and education. Particularly in the field of language education, teacher cognition was described as “what teachers think, know, and believe and the relationships of these mental constructs to what teachers do in the language teaching classroom” (Borg, 2003, p. 81).

Recently, teacher cognition research has gained importance in the field of second and foreign language teaching. This issue has been investigated in order to gain insight concerning how teachers should teach and how to prepare the teachers (Freeman, 2002). Additionally, the term of teacher cognition with respect to grammar teaching was discussed as “(a) teachers’

*İletişim İsmail ÇAKIR, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Ankara, Türkiye.

✉Email: icakir@ybu.edu.tr

knowledge of grammar; (b) teachers' beliefs about teaching grammar; and (c) practices and cognitions in teaching grammar" (Borg, 2003, p. 99).

The researchers attempt to explore the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their actual teaching practices. In the language learning area, there has been lots of information reviewed on teacher cognition throughout years. Besides Borg (2003), there have been a number of researchers who indicated that the complex nature of teacher cognition is essential to be explored in details (Andrew, 1999; Freeman, 2002; Richards 2008). It is obvious that in the learning process, there is a need to understand what instructors believe much more than just focusing on their observable behaviors. In this respect, it can be stated that there is a close relationship between the teachers' existing knowledge and their actual classroom practices. Furthermore, the teachers may or may not reflect their knowledge to the actual classroom teaching activities. In this sense, the demand for teacher cognition and teaching has increased in recent years, since it has implications in the field of education. As the research proves, it is safe to say that there is a direct connection between teacher cognition and teaching process. Since instructors' beliefs cannot be observed directly, it is highly necessary to get into classrooms and observe the classroom practices while teaching grammar and analyze the quality of the explanations.

Most of the studies on teacher cognition and teaching grammar reveal that teacher cognition may affect the teaching quality (Nishimuro & Borg, 2013). When instructors have positive beliefs, these attitudes may enhance teaching process and, therefore, it may provide an evidence of improvement in teaching. When instructors have negative beliefs, these attitudes may thwart the teaching process, which eventually may cause poor learning consequences.

Considering all the facts above, it can be asserted that there is a need to conduct further qualitative studies on teaching L2 to understand better what instructors actually do in the classrooms. Admittedly, English is one of the prominent school subjects in all schools from the primary to tertiary levels in Turkey. It means that it is the only foreign language which Turkish students are exposed to most throughout their educational journey. In this respect, it can be stated that there is a great need to fuel the teacher cognition research with regard to grammar teaching to facilitate better English teaching in Turkey. In order to fill this gap, this research aims to examine the instructors' cognition about teaching grammar and their actual classroom practices at tertiary level in Turkey.

Theoretical background

Grammar is described as the set of structures and rules of a language and it is one of the essential components of teaching language. Since grammar has a significant role in EFL, it is considered as an indispensable part of teaching curriculum. In foreign language teaching contexts, it is generally accepted that the place of grammar teaching has been shaped and improved throughout the years. The researchers have argued the deductive or inductive, implicit or explicit methods of teaching grammar, or teaching it integrating with other skills or separately. Therefore, as widely known, a numerous methods of language teaching such as Grammar Translation, Direct Method, Audio Lingual Method, Total Physical Response, or Communicative Language Teaching have emerged in line with the needs of the learners. The teachers have been challenged by these discussions; they have been forced to choose the regarding methods or techniques to teach the target language grammar. While implementing techniques or methods teachers usually yield to their background knowledge, beliefs, practices, and circumstances.

As researchers and linguists have examined teacher cognition with regard to grammar teaching, initially they questioned instructors' demonstrative knowledge about language. In other words, they wanted to seek instructors' existing knowledge about grammar. Bloor (1986)

designed a study to explore and understand the metalinguistic awareness of 63 linguistics students at two universities in England. The aim of the study was to collect data related with the informants' grammatical knowledge and linguistics familiarity. They found out that majority of the participants were not familiar with even basic grammatical knowledge.

Ariogul (2007) carried out a research in order to investigate the relationship between previous language learning practices and teachers' practical knowledge in an EFL context. The data was collected through observations and interviews. It was explored that three sources namely the teachers' existing language learning experiences, their former teaching practices, and teachers' both pre- and in-service education affected language instruction in EFL classes. The study concluded that as the teachers' knowledge is influenced by their prior language learning practices, the teachers should be given chance to discover their knowledge by self-reflection methods.

In order to explore the relationship between grammar knowledge and terminology, Andrew (1999) conducted a study including four different groups of participants, and utilized a test to elicit the differences between the groups. Interestingly, the results revealed that non-native speakers of English (NNS) instructors of English were more successful than the other groups; the native speakers of English were the most unsuccessful group. It was concluded that there was a need for teaching adequate grammar knowledge for teacher education institutions.

In a similar vein, Eisentein-Ebsworth and Schweers (1997) implemented a research to discover language instructors' opinions about conscious grammar teaching. The researchers administered questionnaires to survey 60 university instructors of English as a Second Language (ESL) at two universities in New York and Porto Rico. The results showed that Porto Rico instructors tended to perform conscious grammar teaching more than New York instructors. The researchers concluded that most of the instructors' rationale for teaching grammar was not based on a research or methodology but influence of the other sources such as students' demands or school curriculum.

In another study, Cabaroğlu and Roberts (2000) employed a research on development in student teachers' former views on language learning and teaching during a 1-year program. The researchers' purpose was to seek common understanding that instructors' beliefs are inflexible. The study involved 20 participants who attended a course at a university. The study results revealed that almost all the participants', excluding one, previous beliefs on language teaching and learning practices changed in time.

Similarly, Burgess and Etherington's (2002) study intended to explore the opinions about grammar and grammar teaching of 48 English instructors. The instructors expressed optimistic views about grammar teaching and they found grammar teaching useful concerning language learning. The majority of the informants stated that the learners demanded the teachers to teach grammar explicitly. The study has also showed that the learners' past experience of language education, which was based on traditional methods, affected the teachers' methodology. In conclusion, the studies about teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching showed that instructors mostly refer to their past learning experiences as they teach grammar in their classrooms. In other words, teachers benefit from their existing knowledge as they teach grammar.

Considering classroom activities, there is a limited number of studies focusing on the investigation of instructors' real class practices so far. Borg (2003) states that instructors' knowledge about grammar does not mean that they will have more effective teaching; their ability needs to be supported by teaching skills so as to boost classroom practices. Borg (1999) conducted a qualitative study on instructors' practices and cognition to investigate the usage of grammatical terminology at second language classrooms. The data was collected by classroom recordings and interviews of four L2 instructors. The study revealed that the decisions of the instructors were influenced by experiential, cognitive, and contextualized factors.

By the same token, Johnston and Goettsch (2000) conducted a study to explore four ESL grammar instructors' teacher knowledge. Observations and interviews were utilized to gather data about instructors' knowledge and their teaching practices. The results indicated that instructors' knowledge and teacher cognition were interfered and actions were mostly process-oriented. As Borg (2003) stated "The studies of instructors' practices and cognition in grammar teaching highlight the complex nature of instructional decision-making in formal instruction" (p. 104), the demand for teacher cognition in grammar teaching has increased.

More recently, Önalın (2018) carried out a research to investigate EFL teachers' perceptions about teaching grammar by comparing novice and experienced teachers. In order to explore cognitive decisions of teachers' as they teach grammar at a prep school of a state university in Turkey and their rationale for grammar teaching practices, 70 instructors were surveyed. The study results revealed that the participants taught English grammar explicitly to teach the use of target language efficiently. Although there was not a noteworthy difference between the novice and experienced teachers, the former group seemed to teach the grammar more explicitly. It was concluded that direct and explicit grammar teaching were popular in English grammar teaching classes.

To conclude, the key findings in literature review of the present study suggested that the notion of teacher cognition has a complex nature, and there is a need for future studies to be able to solve this complexity. Moreover, since instructors' cognition may be influenced by a variety of factors, it is suggested to conduct further studies in different contexts to be able to explore the inspirations of instructors' classroom activities. Bearing all this in mind, this study aimed to reveal teacher cognition in grammar teaching at a state university in Turkey.

The research questions

The aim of this qualitative study is to concentrate on teacher cognition in grammar teaching, and to examine its classroom practices by focusing on EFL instructors at a state university in Turkey. Thus, this study scrutinizes the following two research questions:

1. What do the EFL instructors claim to do and what do they actually do in their classrooms while teaching grammar?
2. How are the instructors' conceptions of grammar teaching materialized in the language teaching classrooms?

Method

After carefully reviewing the literature, it was concluded that a case study would provide rich information about teaching and learning processes. In this regard, this case study aimed to investigate the EFL instructors' cognition and to observe their actual classroom practices. It also intended to find out whether there are any differences about what the EFL instructors claim to do and what they do in the actual classrooms. A qualitative approach was utilized for this study as Creswell (1994) emphasized that qualitative research is "an inquiry process of understanding a social or human problem, based on building a complex, holistic picture, formed with words, reporting detailed views of informants, and conducted in a natural setting" (p. 2). Besides, Phipps and Borg (2009) claimed that qualitative studies have the potential to be more productive in advancing the understanding of the complex facts in teacher cognition research rather than methods such as questionnaires.

Participants

The literature review of this study showed that a limited number of studies were carried out on teacher cognition and grammar teaching in EFL in Turkey. The present study was conducted at a state university in Turkey in order to explore typical grammar teaching practices at tertiary level education. The participants of the study were selected by utilizing a purposive sampling and three instructors who work full-time at a state university and have more than twenty years of teaching experience admitted to participate in the study. According to Tongco (2007), “the purposive sampling technique is a type of non-probability sampling that is most effective when one needs to study a certain cultural domain with knowledgeable experts within” (p.147). Since the researcher provided the consent form to the participants, all of them were informed about the research procedure. Also, pseudo names were chosen and given to the instructors as I1, I2, and I3 in order to ensure anonymity of the participants.

Table 1. Background information of the participants

Name	I1	I2	I3
Gender	Male	Male	Male
Age	44	50	46
Teaching experience	21	27	23
Educational Background	ELT	ELL	ELT
Levels Taught	Elementary	Elementary Pre- Intermediate	Elementary Pre-Intermediate

The Instruments

Three data collection instruments of pre-observation interviews, classroom observations, and post-observation interviews were applied to obtain the descriptive and interpretive data. Interviewing is known as one of the most powerful data collection techniques employed for understanding people’s point of views, beliefs and attitudes. “Interviews enable participants – be they interviewers or interviewees – to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view. In these senses the interview is not simply concerned with collecting data about life: it is part of life itself, its human embeddedness is inescapable” (Cohen et.al., 2007, p.349). The interview questions were designed to gain instructors’ cognition in grammar teaching, three experts in the field were asked to check the interview questions, and the questions were piloted first. The pre-observation interviews that adapted from Nishimuro and Borg’s (2013) study were composed of two sections. In the first section, background information of the participants with regard to age, qualifications and years of ELT experience were sought. The second part consisted of 10 open-ended questions investigating the views of the participants about teaching grammar.

According to Gebhard (1999) observation is “non-judgmental description of classroom events that can be analyzed and given interpretation” (p. 35). It enables direct information by providing “live data from live situations” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 305). The observations provide an opportunity for researchers to witness phenomena and comprehend the situation. The aim of the observations was to explore whether the teachers were able to apply what they think in their realistic teaching settings as teaching grammar. The rules of taking the field notes were followed by the researcher during the classroom observations, and to increase its reliability, each instructor was observed in the class while teaching in two sessions.

Finally, the post-observation interview questions which consisted of 14 open-ended items about the participants' classroom practices were adapted from the same study (Nishimuro & Borg's (2013). The rationale for the post-observation interviews was to provide an opportunity to the participants to justify the reasons of classroom activities.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher employed pre-observation interviews, classroom observations, and post-observation interviews step by step for getting data for the study. First, the pre-observation interviews were carried out with the instructors. The interviews were conducted face-to-face and an interview protocol for face-to-face interviews was utilized to limit the potential bias. The interviews were conducted in the participants' offices in Turkish and each interview lasted about 10-15 minutes and they were audio-recorded by the researcher.

Secondly, six hours of classroom observations were carried out in order to focus on what the instructors were doing in relation to teaching grammar and gaining an in-depth understanding of the issue. Particularly, the classroom observations aimed to explore whether there were differences between what instructors claimed to do and what they really did in the classrooms with respect to the teacher cognition in grammar teaching. The rules of taking the field notes were followed by the researcher during the classroom observations, and to increase its reliability, each instructor was observed in the class while teaching in two sessions.

Finally, after evaluating pre-observation interviews data and classroom observations data, the post-observation interviews were carried out in order to explore the rationale for actual classroom practices of the participants especially the ones which differed from pre-observation interviews. The procedure of conducting pre-observation interviews was repeated to conduct the post-observation interviews.

Data Analysis

In order to determine whether there were any differences between teacher cognition and their actual classroom practices in teaching target grammar, the collected data was analyzed cautiously. Content analysis method was used to examine the qualitative data. According to Hsieh and Shannon (2005), "content analysis is defined as a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (p. 1278). First, the responses to pre-observation interview questions were reviewed question by question to explore the instructors' views about teaching grammar. Next, the researcher compared the responses given to the pre-observation interview questions to classroom observation notes taken in accordance with the same questions by reviewing the notes taken during the observations. Lastly, the post-observation interviews were analyzed again question by question to discover the participants' rationale. In the end, the analyzed data were categorized in terms of the instructors' approach to grammar teaching, the instructors' typical grammar teaching practices, and their rationale for grammar teaching.

Results

Approach to Grammar Teaching

In the pre-observation interview the participants were required to explain their experience of learning and teaching grammar. The Informant 1 (I1) explained that he learnt English by himself because of inability and impossibility of access to the real and authentic learning

environments in the past. He adds that he learnt English from the grammar books on his own without having any guidance. However, when asked the view about the way that grammar needs to be presented in the class, the instructor (I1) puts forth that the grammar should be taught in meaningful contexts. To support his view, during the observation it was noticed that he especially preferred to present the related target grammar using communicative dialogues. As it is included in the interview questions, the participants were asked and observed to find out the effect of the school culture on the lecturers in presenting grammar. The data proves that the school let the instructors choose and apply their own teaching styles, and they were not required to use certain instructional materials. In his responses to the question in relation to the importance of grammar in teaching the target language I1 accepted that grammar was essential in teaching English and it should be presented focusing on the communicative aspect of the language. He also claims that he is efficient and competent enough to teach grammar in his English courses. The other response to the question seeking the place of grammar in teaching language skills and its assessment revealed that grammar teaching should be integrated with other skills rather than teaching it separately. The relationship between teaching grammar and educational system at school was evaluated as follows by I1:

“We definitely have to prepare the students for the exams. That means because of lack of time and motivation, and crowded classrooms, we mainly focus on grammar teaching. And, most of the students want to learn English but some students just want to pass the exams.”

The data obtained from the second participant (I2) reveal that English was learnt by memorizing the grammar rules. Based on his past experience and views about language learning, it was noted that he preferred to use Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) focusing on grammar drills and repetitions of these drills, which regards language learning as habit formation. When asked the role of professional development activities held by the school to support his teaching grammar competence, he states that he didn't find useful to attend the seminars organized by his institution. He thought that grammar needs to be taught primarily and it needs to be integrated with other language skills. His opinion about the role of exams for the students is shown as in the following excerpt.

“Exams are not very important at all, but the students don't think so. Exams display just the numbers; however, learning English is a more important issue when we try to teach new topics and make them motivated. The students should know that they need to study not for high marks, but for knowledge.”

The third participant (I3) acknowledged that he learnt English mostly by himself, and he also found that communicative approach was very popular during his education. He noted that his institution didn't ask any particular style of teaching and the instructors were free to choose any class materials. He also believed that grammar was essential in learning English and he taught grammar efficiently in his class. As other participants, I3 also asserted that grammar needs to be integrated with other skills and presented in realistic contexts. He underpinned his ideas about the role of exams and the motivation of the students while learning grammar as follows:

“Exams motivate the students to study grammar and they want to learn English to pass the exams. Examinations are quite useful to create an ideal teaching and learning atmosphere at the English classes for me.”

Grammar Teaching Practices

The researcher conducted two forty-minute observations in the participants' classes. In the observed classes, all of them typically followed a routinized pattern of a lesson. They went through the following order of actions:

- Greet the class.
- Explain agenda of the lesson.
- Start with a warm-up activity.
- Describe the rules of the structure. (*The present Simple Tense*)
- Provide some examples.
- Ask students to do more exercises to practice the structure from the workbook.

The sequences of the activities seen above show that all of the participants apply almost the same Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model in their classrooms. The PPP model is also known as 3Ps method which “corresponds, in this order, to *presentation* (P1), *practice* (P2), and *production* (P3) (Criado, 2013, p.98). Correspondingly, according to Tomlinson (2011), the PPP model is the approach “to teaching language items which follows a sequence of presentation of the item, practice of the item and then production of the item” (p. xv.). Additionally, PPP may not be defined as a model, method, or approach, but it may be described as a pedagogical strategy among the teachers who work with generally tertiary level students (Criado, 2013).

On the other hand, in I1's classes, Turkish (L1) was dominantly used as the language of instruction. One strong impression from the observations was that the instructor used the board to show the formulas of the grammar units. The instructor wrote the affirmative, negative, question and even negative question patterns of the regarding grammar points on the board, which is widely regarded as traditional way of presenting grammar. Furthermore, he explained each of the forms one by one by providing Turkish translations, too. The following excerpts are taken from the observation notes which show the way the instructors present the target language grammar.

Excerpt 1

I: I go to school every day? (In Turkish) Who wants to make these sentences negative?

S: I do not go to school every day.

I: I do not go to school every day. Let's change it a little bit different. Who wants to make a negative sentence?

S: (In Turkish) I do not play football.

I1 encouraged the students to use the new grammar items. This observation proved that the I1 preferred traditional approach and mainly used Turkish in his classes. The instructor had difficulty in motivating the students to learn and classroom management. The reason for this situation was explained as the crowded classrooms, lack of time and unmotivated learners.

Excerpt 2

The instructor pointed out to one of the unmotivated students who makes noise and asked:

I: Can you repeat what I said last.

S: Silence.

I: I am kidding I did not say anything but please follow the class (in a friendly manner).

S: (In Turkish) OK teacher.

Turkish sentence structure and terminology were dominantly used as the language of instruction in I2's classes. One significant impression from the observations was that the instructor compared the two languages frequently. The instructor expressed that since the students were already familiar with the translation than practices, understanding the rationality of English was important. Therefore, the classes were mainly based on GTM.

Excerpt 3

I: What is the equivalent of the present simple tense in Turkish?

S: Geniş Zaman.

I: Can you tell us the structure of the present simple tense in Turkish?

S: Subject + object + verb.

I: Since you already know the subject, object and verb it is all about a small difference.

In I3's classes Turkish was the most frequently used language as the medium of instruction at classes. The observation proved that the I3 also chose the GTM to teach grammar in his classes and he had difficulty in motivating the learners to learn English. Noticeably, the instructor was able to use the technology effectively.

The instructor pointed to another student and asked:

I: Can you make a new sentence in the present simple tense?

S: Silence.

I: Can't you make a sentence?

S: No response.

I: (In Turkish) You should study more. You are university students.

Rationale for Class Practices

The data regarding the presentation of grammar proves that I1 is in favour of presenting grammar explicitly using mostly first language (L1). He explained that within a certain amount of time, he needed to cover the topic clearly and demonstrate what the grammar rules mean and how they are used. Therefore, he wanted his students to learn the grammar structures so that they could do the practice sections; hence he preferred to use L1 to use the time allocated to teach the teaching points efficiently. Needless to say, there are a lot of instructional materials that facilitate learning target language grammar. However, the results indicate that I1 is not so much willing to use additional materials despite the fact that there is no restriction for them to make use of the regarding materials in the class. In this respect, I1 affirmed that:

"I believe that my students need to be autonomous learners. Because I am not always accessible for them so they need to learn by themselves. To be honest, there are lots of communicative activities in the course books, but it is usually difficult to do group work activities because of the crowded classes and lack of time".

I2 justified the reason why he used L1 and taught grammar without using in a meaningful context in his classes as follows:

"Although I want to use 100% English in the class because of low level of students I have to use Turkish otherwise they do not understand me at all. Due to their poor level of English competence and lack of time, I had to use just course book".

I2 explicated that he found comparing the grammar structures in two languages very

useful as it provided the students a lot of feedback. And, he also believes that without using the grammatical terminology, it would be impossible to teach English. For that reason, he preferred to use explicit grammar teaching method to facilitate learning the target language grammar.

I3 clarified that he had to use L1 due to students' low-level proficiency of English. He identified that technology was a very effective tool in education. Since he had a lot of classes during the week it was helpful for both him and his students. He wanted to use terminology because he found it helpful to teach grammar in the related units. I3 maintained that he didn't integrate any teaching skills because it was unnecessary for the scope of that certain class and he expressed his thoughts about using extra materials as follows:

“Before the exams in the review week, I bring some extra materials to prepare my students for the exam. Because of lack of time I was not able to add more exercises. But sometimes I use my own exercises too”.

Discussion

One of the most noticeable findings materialized from the data analysis related to the first research question of the study was that the instructors' grammar approaches significantly differ from their actual classroom practices. That is to say, the instructors claimed in their pre-observation interviews that they were aware of the current ELT teaching methods; however, it was observed that they taught English grammar via traditional methods. Although all of the instructors stressed the importance of using communicative activities, GTM was still the most popular method in the class. The results prove that learners' past language learning experiences have a great impact on their teaching styles. Unlike their beliefs, it seems that the participants can't keep away from teaching grammar in the way they learnt or were taught.

Similarly, the classroom practices of the instructors tend to be shaped by contextual circumstances. It should be kept in mind that PPP model is generally appropriate for adult learners, as they taught adult learners at a tertiary level institution, they tended to apply PPP model (Criado, 2013). While using this model, the instructors choose mostly explicit grammar teaching to explain and present the rules of the grammar units deductively because of the students' proficiency level. As Spada and Tomita (2010) supported in their study, the grammatical structures may be taught according to their simplicity or complexity, so the teachers may decide to use whether explicit or implicit instruction while teaching grammar. In order to clarify the teaching point, explicit instruction includes the definition of rules comparing the languages and giving feedback, whereas implicit instruction doesn't consist of any rules and any forms of grammar obviously, but focusing on meaning. Therefore, the instructors prefer to use explicit instruction because they may want to teach better the complex structures of the grammar in English by doing so.

With regard to the second research question, the instructors' cognition of grammar teaching is mainly emerged from their own learning and teaching grammar knowledge and experiences, and this finding is consistent with the results of Borg's (1999) research. Furthermore, instructors found themselves inadequate in grammar and they had to learn grammar structures before they taught in the classes. This finding is congruent with research by Bloor (1986) who highlighted the poor grammar level of teachers. It can be asserted that the instructors should be equipped with the sufficient grammar knowledge to be able to teach English grammar efficiently. No matter whether the teachers are native speakers or non-native speakers of English, they need to learn and improve their grammar knowledge as it is stated in Andrew's (1999) study. The English instructors' teaching practices seemed to be mainly affected by their learning background as they had to learn English on their own. Therefore, the

classroom activities remained limited, and there is a need to enrich the teaching activities at EFL classrooms. Also, L1 was mainly preferred by the participants and the instructors heavily used the terminology in L1. As the instructors complained about the low motivation of the learners, the use of L2 may grasp the learners' attention to focus on the English classes and encourage them to participate in the classes.

Based on the results of the study, it can be stated that limited class hours, demotivated students and crowded classrooms are among the contextual factors that formed the instructors' classroom practices. The instructors may be influenced negatively by these contextual factors because they may feel burn-out and they may not find the power to accomplish teaching grammar as they desire. It is suggested that this problem should be overcome by the help of continuing professional development activities such as seminars, workshops, conferences, etc.

Conclusion

To conclude, although the participants believed that teaching should be student-centered and communication-based, this belief was not achieved by the instructors for several reasons such as demotivated students, crowded classes, and limited number of English classes at tertiary level education in Turkish context. Consequently, the classroom practices have to be mostly teacher-centered and non-communicative. The inconsistency between the participants' thoughts and actual practices indicates that there is an urgency for their professional development (Golombek & Johnson, 2004).

Although the instructors' cognition of grammar teaching was positive, they were not successful to apply their thoughts in the classrooms. The instructors' claims differed significantly from their actual classroom activities. In spite of believing the significance of the theoretical knowledge of grammar in teaching English, they generally taught grammar based on their own experiences.

This study might be helpful to raise the instructors' awareness with regard to grammar teaching and practices of grammar instruction. The participants may be acknowledged about the discrepancy between their expressions and real applications of grammar teaching, and so they might try to find alternative ways to mirror their thoughts and beliefs on their practices of grammar teaching in the classes. The findings of the study may also give a chance to school administrators to have information about the typical class practices at their institutions. The results may be beneficial for material and program developers to see whether their programs and materials run properly or not. As the participants hesitated in a certain degree, a neutral or non-threatening environment may be useful in order to explore instructors' beliefs and their understanding of grammar teaching for further studies. This study employed a case study which included limited number of participants working at a state university in Turkey. Thus, the larger group of participants and various research techniques might provide more data to be able to make generalizations concerning teacher cognition and grammar teaching. Furthermore, the hours of observation may be increased and the classes can be videotaped, also the students' perceptions may be included in further studies.

References

- Andrews, S. (1999) All these like little name things: A comparative study of language instructors' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. *Language Awareness* 8,143–59.
- Arioğul, S. (2007). Understanding foreign language teachers' practical knowledge: What's the role of prior language learning experience? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 3(1). 168-181.
- Bloor, T. (1986) What do language students know about grammar? *British Journal of Language Teaching* 24, 157–160.
- Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System*, 27(1), 19-31.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language instructors think, know, believe, and do. *Language teaching*, 36(02), 81-109.
- Burgess, J. and Etherington, S. (2002) Focus on grammatical form: Explicit or implicit? *System* 30, 433–458.
- Cabaroglu, N., & Roberts, J. (2000). Development in student instructors' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme. *System*, 28(3), 387-402.
- Cognition: Definition of Cognition in English by Lexico Dictionaries.” *Lexico Dictionaries | English*, Lexico Dictionaries, en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/cognition.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Falmer, London
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K., & Morrison, R. B. (2007). *Research methods in education*, Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Criado, R. (2013). A critical review of the presentation-practice-production model (PPP) in foreign language teaching. *Homenaje a Francisco Gutiérrez Díez*, 97-115.
- Eisenstein-Ebsworth, M. & Schweers, C.W. (1997) What researchers say and practitioners do: Perspectives on conscious grammar instruction in the ESL classroom. *Applied Language Learning* 8, 237–260.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from North American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language teaching*, 35(1), 1-13.
- Gebhard, J. G. (1999). Seeing teaching differently through observation. In J. G. Gebhard, & R. Oprandy (Eds.), *Language teaching awareness: a guide to exploring beliefs and practices* (pp.35-58). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Golombek, P. R., & Johnson, K. E. (2004). Narrative inquiry as a mediational space: examining emotional and cognitive dissonance in second-language teachers' development. *Teachers and Teaching*, 10(3), 307-327.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Johnston, B. and Goettsch, K. (2000) In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced instructors. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 56, 437–468.
London: Routledge Falmer.
- Nishimuro, M., & Borg, S. (2013). Teacher cognition and grammar teaching in a Japanese high school. *JALT journal*, 35(1), 29-50.

- Önalın, O. (2018) EFL teachers 'perceptions about teaching grammar: a comparative study between novice and experienced teachers. *Kara Harp Okulu Bilim Dergisi*, 28(1), 109-125.
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380-390.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *REL journal*, 39(2), 158-177.
- Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 263-308.
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Materials development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tongco, M.D.C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research and application*, 5, 147-158.