

TC

**ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES**



**THE IRAQI EFL PRE-SERVICE STUDENT TEACHERS' ON TEACHING
GRAMMAR AT ELT DEPARTMENTS OF SALAHADDIN UNIVERSITY IN**

ERBIL

THESIS

Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD

(Y1312.020036)

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Akbar Rahimi ALISHAH

September 2017



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1312.020036 numaralı öğrencisi Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD'ın "THE IRAQI EFL PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS ON TEACHING GRAMMAR AT ELT DEPARTMENTS OF SALAHADDIN UNIVERSITY IN ERBIL" adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 02.08.2017 tarih ve 2017/19 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından *oybirliği* ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak *kabul* edilmiştir.

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Tez Savunma Tarihi :14/09/2017

1)Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Akbar Rahimi ALISHAH

2) Jüri Üyesi : Prof. Dr. Birsen TÖTÜNİŞ

3) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

Not: Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında Başarılı olması halinde bu form imzalanacaktır. Aksi halde geçersizdir.

- To my loving parents for their endless supports.

- To my beloved brother and sisters with love.

- To all my teachers who taught me even a word.

FOREWORD

I would like to express my profound gratitude for my supervisor Dr. Akbar Rahimi Alishah for his insightful supervision, excellent guidance and encouragement throughout my thesis.

My special thanks are extended to Dr. Türkay Bulut, the head of English Language and Literature Department, and all the other instructors; Prof, Dr. Birsen Tütüniş, Prof, Dr. Kemalettin Yiğiter, Prof, Dr. Veysel Kılıç, Assist. Prof. Dr. Ferma Lekesizlan, Assist. Prof. Dr. Filiz Çele, Assist. Prof. Dr, Gordon John Ross Marshall, for their encouragement and constructive remarks. I learned a lot from them.

I owe a special thanks to Professor Dr. Ali M. Jukil due to his guidance and support to develop the study. His supervision was helpful when the study faced difficulty, he kindly advised me and solved the problems, without his guidance, my study would have been more difficult.

My deep gratitude to all my friends especially, Dr. Saman Dzaei, Ari Syamand, Muhammad Abdul Aziz, Kosrat Izaddin, Hasan Anwar, Mahmud Imad, lower Payadar Salim and dentist Botan Pishtiwan for their encouragement, motivation and help throughout the program. Also, I would like to thank my new friends Salman and Dyar whom I wish I could know you earlier.

Finally, and most highly, I would like to express my deep thanks to my family, especially my father Ali Mahmood, my mother Ronak Rashid, and my sisters Gizing, Glena and Glpa, also my brother Zirng Ali and his wife Daban for their patience and help, without their assistance and encouragement I would not have been able to finish this work. Also, a special thanks to my dear cousin Ahmad Ezaddin for making me feel never alone even in my hardest time.

June, 2017

Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages</u>
FOREWORD	iii
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
ABBREVIATIONS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ÖZET	ix
ABSTRACT	x
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Research Questions	3
1.4 The Purposes of the Study	4
1.5 The Significance of the study	5
1.6 Definition of the Basic Terms	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Considerations	12
2.2.1 The Role of Grammar	13
2.2.2 Arguments against teaching grammar	14
2.2.3 Arguments for teaching grammar	14
2.3 Which Grammar to Teach?	15
2.3.1 Traditional Grammar	15
2.3.2 Structural Grammar	17
2.3.3 Transformational Grammar	18
2.3.4 Universal Grammar (UG)	19
2.3.5 Functional Grammar	20
2.4 Approaches to Teaching Grammar	21
2.4.1 Teacher-Centered Approaches	21
2.4.2 Learner-Centered Approaches	21
2.4.3 Deductive Approach	22
2.4.4 Inductive Approach	24
2.4.5 Seductive or guided discovery approach	25
2.5 The role of Motivation and Interest	25
2.5.1 Cognitive Approach	27
2.5.2 Implication of strategies	28
2.5.3 The impact of learning environment on motivational strategies	29
2.5.4 Challenges and frustrations	30
2.5.5 Techniques for overcoming the challenges	30
3. METHODOLOGY	32
3.1 Introduction	32

3.1.1 Population and Sample of the Study	32
3.1.2. Instrument	32
3.1.3 Criteria of the Tools	35
3.1.3.1 Validity	35
3.1.3.2 Face Validity	35
3.1.3.3 Empirical Validity	35
3.1.3.4 Reliability	35
3.1.4 Validity of the Questionnaire	36
3.1.5 Reliability of the Questionnaire	36
3.1.6 Data collection Procedure	36
3.1.7 Data Analysis	37
4. DATA ANALYSIS	38
4.1. Introduction	38
4.2 Data Analyses procedures	38
5. CONCLUSIONS	64
5.1 Introduction	64
5.2 Discussion	64
5.3 The Results of Pre-Service Questionnaire	65
5.4 Conclusion	69
5.5 Pedagogical Implications	72
5.6 Limitations of the Study	73
5.7 Suggestions for Further Research	74
REFERENCES	75
APPENDICES	92
RESUME	104

ABBREVIATIONS:

SUE	: Salahaddin University-Erbil
ELT	: English Language Teaching
EFL	: English Foreign Language
L1	: First Language
L2	: Second Language
SLA	: Second Language Acquisition
GC	: Grammatical Competence
UG	: Universal Grammar
TG	: Transformational Grammar
TGG	: Transformational-Generative Grammar

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 3.1: It is Better to Learn English Language Unconsciously.....	34
Table 3.2: The Grammar Should be Taught in Learning English.....	34
Table 3.3: The Grammar Should be Taught as Independent Courses.....	35
Table 4.1: The Results of Pre-service Students Teachers' Perspectives on Learning and Teaching Grammar.....	39
Table 4.2: It is Better to Learn English Language Unconsciously.....	41
Table 4.3: It is Better a Learner to be Exposed to English Language for Learning it.....	42
Table 4.4: It is Better a Learner to Learn English Language Through Instructions.....	43
Table 4.5: The Grammar Should be Taught in Learning English.....	43
Table 4.6: The Grammar Should be Taught as Independent Courses.....	44
Table 4.7: The Grammar Should be Taught Throughout Teaching the Four Skills (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing).....	44
Table 4.8: The Grammar Courses have the Basic Role in the Process of Learning and Teaching English.....	45
Table 4.9: The Grammar Courses are Regarded as Tools to Improve the Pre-service Teachers' Skill and Capacity to use English Language.....	46
Table 4.10: The Inappropriate Methods of Teaching Grammar Decrease the Merits of the Assigned Grammar Course.....	46
Table 4.11: The Current Curriculum is Successfulness for Learning English Language and Teaching.....	47
Table 4.12: The Teachers' Level of Teaching in Implementing Methods of Teaching and Learning English Language via Grammar Courses are Persuasive in the Light of Text Books of Grammar.....	47
Table 4.13: The teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of methods of teaching.....	48
Table 4.14: The teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of activities of learning English Language as a second/ foreign language.....	49
Table 4.15: The teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of and according to English departments Program.....	49
Table 4.16: There is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language acquisition in the universities.....	50
Table 4.17: The pedagogical objectives attained in teaching grammar courses.....	50
Table 4.18: There is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of learning English in the universities.....	51
Table 4.19: The learning outcomes achieved in grammar courses.....	52
Table 4.20: The grammar books provide you with real and native like contexts....	52

Table 4.21: The grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language	53
Table 4.22: The pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses	54
Table 4.23: I like to study and learn English language with others such as cooperative rather than self-learning.....	54
Table 4.24: The curriculum (instructional materials) contents appeal me because it is in accordance with my needs and level.....	55
Table 4.25: You participate in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations	56
Table 4.26: How often are you asked questions to be aware of what is going to be taught and what you are going to learn?	56
Table 4.27: The whole or parts of the lesson's topic is summarized to help you rearrange the important points or ideas of grammar	57
Table 4.28: The type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts better matches pre-service teachers' development	57
Table 4.29: I am provided with opportunities to question or discuss what is not comprehensible or reasonable	58
Table 4.30: The grammar courses effectively connect pre-service teachers inside and outside classroom contexts for pre-service teachers' better learning.....	59
Table 4.31: I am engaged to act out what I study in real activities	59
Table 4.32: The methods of teaching are altered according to my needs, level of comprehension and development (Multi-methods of teaching are used)	60
Table 4.33: I like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and I learn grammar unconsciously	60
Table 4.34: The student-teacher centered approach and interactions	61
Table 4.35: There is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities	62
Table 4.36: Language and specifically communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are used and integrated	62
Table 4.37: Your native language should be strictly avoided in class in explaining English Grammar	63
Table 4.38: The form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar	63
Table 4.39: The underling patterns should be taught by the teacher	64
Table 4.40: The underling patterns should be discovered by the pre-service teachers on their own	65
Table 4.41: The grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects	65
Table 4.42: The translation (traditional) Grammar is the best method in teaching English grammar	66
Table 4.43: The structural method is the best one in teaching English grammar	67
Table 4.44: The communicative approach is the best one in teaching English grammar	67
Table 4.45: The cognitive approach is the best one in teaching English grammar..	68
Table 4.46: The you should be aware of the mentioned methods.....	68
Table 4.47: The grammar is teachable	69
Table 4.48: The pre-service teachers' beliefs of teaching grammar need to be considered	69

**IRAK EFL ÖN HİZMET-ÖNCESİ ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN SALAHADDİN
ÜNİVERSİTESİ ELT BÖLÜMLERİNDE GRAMMAR ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ
ÜZERİNE ATTITUDE**

ÖZET

Bu çalışma esasen hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlerin öğrenme ve Erbil'deki İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümleri, özellikle de Erbil'deki Salahaddin Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce bölümlerinde dil bilgisi öğretimi hakkındaki bakış açılarını öğrenmeyi amaçlar çünkü hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlerin çoğu kalıplardan ve eski metotlardan muzdariptir ve öncelikli olarak yabancı bir dili yeni ve hızlı bir şekilde öğretmeyi ve öğrenmeyi amaçlar.

Sonuç olarak, hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlerin bir çoğu diğer dört beceri (dinleme, konuşma, okuma ve yazma) ile dil bilgisi öğrenme ve öğretme taraftarıdır. Ancak bazı hizmet-içi öğretmenler bu görüşe karşı çıkmaktadır ve dil bilgisini bağımsız bir ders olarak öğretme taraftarıdır. Dilin dil bilgisi olmadan bir hiç olduğu şüphesizdir. Ancak yine de bazı dil bilimciler dil bilgisine ihtiyaç olmadığına inanırken diğerleri de dil bilgisinin gerekli ve öğretilmesi gerektiğini iddia ederler. Dil bilgisi öğretimine ihtiyaç duyuluyorsa, öğretmenler ne gibi yaklaşımlar kullanmalıdır.

Çalışmanın amacını incelemek için, hem nicel hem de nitel araştırma yöntemleri uygulandı ve dil bilgisi öğretme, her bir yaklaşımın avantajları ve dezavantajları ele alındı. Katılımcılara anket verildi. Anket 2015-2016 akademik yılında Salahaddin Üniversitesi Dil, Eğitim ve Temel eğitim Okullarından rastgele seçilen 60 hizmet-öncesi öğretmene uygulandı. Bu öğretmenler bu araştırmanın örnekleme olarak seçildi. Anket öğretmenlerin öğretmenlik ve dil bilgisi öğrenme ile alakalı görüşleri konusunda veri toplamak için kullanıldı.

Sonuçlar öğrencilerin İngilizce dilini bilinçsizce öğrenmeye ve dili öğrenmek için İngilizce diline maruz kalmaya motive olduklarını teyit eder ve hizmet-öncesi öğretmenlerin çoğu dil öğrenmede ve öğretmede dil bilgisinin kritik bir rol oynadığı ve öğrencilere dil bilgisi ve iletişim yetkinliği becerilerini geliştirdiği için İngilizce öğretiminde dil bilgisinin öğretilmesi gerektiğini düşünmektedir. Katılımcılar aynı zamanda pedagojik amaçların dil bilgisi dersleri öğretme ile elde edilebileceğini ve öğrenme çıktılarını başaracaklarını düşünmektedirler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Hizmet-öncesi öğretmenler, Tümevarım, Tümdengelim, Öğrenci Görüşü, Bağımsız bir şekilde dil bilgisi öğretme.*

THE IRAQI EFL PRE-SERVICE STUDENT TEACHERS' ATTITUDE ON TEACHING GRAMMAR AT ELT DEPARTMENTS OF SALAHADDIN UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

This study aims chiefly to know the pre-service teachers' perspectives about learning and teaching grammar at ELT departments in Erbil especially English departments at Salahaddin university-SUE in Erbil, because the majority of pre-service teachers suffer from the pattern and the old methods and basically attempt to teach and learn a foreign language in a new and quick.

Consequently, many of pre-service teachers favor at teaching and learning grammar with four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). But some pre-service teachers are against this perspective and likes to learn grammar as an independent course. There are obvious that language is null without grammar. Yet, some linguists believe that grammar is not needed while some claim that grammar is necessary and should be taught. If teaching grammar is needed, what approach teachers should follow and use.

To investigate the aim of the study, both approaches qualitative and quantitative has been adopted in which the approaches to teaching grammar, the benefits and drawbacks of each approach are discussed. A questionnaire was administered to the participants. The questionnaire was administered to 60 pre-service teachers who were randomly selected from College of Languages, Education and Basic education at Salahaddin University for the academic year of 2015-2016, they were chosen as the sample of this research. The questionnaire was used to gather the data about their perspectives to teaching and learning grammar.

The results confirm that students are motivated to learn English language unconsciously and to be exposed to English language for learning it and majority of the pre-service teachers think that grammar should be taught in learning English because grammar plays a crucial role in language learning and teaching and it helps the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence. The participants, also think that the pedagogical objectives can be attained in teaching grammar courses and achieve the learning outcomes.

Keywords: *The pre-service teachers', Inductive, Deductive, Student perspective, Teaching grammar as independent.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The study deals with the pre-service student teacher's perspectives on learning and teaching grammar at ELT departments. Some linguists state that it is essential for teaching any foreign language, but other see it stops the progress of the process of the acquisition of the second/ foreign language (Krashen, 1982). Even experts of language teaching from past and modern are questioning the idea of including grammar lesson in second language teaching, like who says, Krashen (1982) that stated "The effects of grammar teaching are peripheral and fragile". This constant debate over the usefulness of the form of grammar teaching and as a result the form of grammar instruction, where no one is able to support the claims with conclusively proved research, resulted in many different ways and techniques of organizing grammar instructions, among them exactly are the two important inductive and deductive methods.

The first inductive method is based on the true belief that knowledge of the grammatical rules should be acquired through stating samples of speech that present a particular construction, here students get the rule from the idea and subconsciously learn and know them by reoccurring patterns (Thornbury, 2009).

And the second deductive method is the explicit rules and information about a language are given to the students in the process of language education, and consequently, they exercise these standards when they use the language, which means that the teacher directly shows or tells what he/she wants to teach.

So, teaching grammar have played a central role in language learning, since grammar is a description of the structure and how the linguistic items like words and phrases are combined to construct sentences in a certain language. It usually takes into account the meanings and functions of these sentences have an overall system of a language (Venkateswaran, 1995). Therefore, only experienced teachers can teach this subject, use the adequate method for the students and can be able to change the

teaching of the grammatical structure into the pre-service teachers' needs and their abilities. Through the appropriate method, students obtain linguistic knowledge in the most natural and efficient way by reviewing data in the foreign language what make them comprehensible (Celce- Murcia ,1991).

So the inductive method is one of the two ways in which learners of a foreign language can gain understanding of that language that is called "rules discovery path" in which grammar rules are presented and learners are connected through the study and manipulation of speech examples such as studying the four skills; listening, reading, speaking and writing in an inductive way, without having met the rules, learners study the speech examples and these examples lead an understanding of the grammatical rules. (Morshia, 2005) Unfortunately, students at Salahaddin University still complain their lack of grammatical, communicative competencies and language proficiency, as found that the majority of the students at university in Erbil are suffering from Lack of linguistic items such as lack of grammar patterns that prevented them from speaking English actively. So this study attempts to find out the reasons are the grammar should be taught through four skills or independent subject using the pre-service teachers' questionnaire which is considered a principal instrument of the study to understand their views, perspectives, conceptions or perceptions, comments, and manners towards grammar teaching in the English departments.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Concerning teaching grammar and learning English language as a second/ foreign language, many problems that face the educational system at English departments can be illustrated, because there is contradictory of learners' point of views to teaching grammar.

Pre-services student teachers are divided into two in their conceptions, some of them claim that grammar is better not to be taught as separate lesson as according to (Ellis, 1997; Sugiharto, 2005; Widodo, 2006) the pre-services teachers believe that grammatical rules can be taught indirectly through the process of teaching and learning the four skills; listening, reading, speaking and writing because the purpose of this process is to help the learners obtain communicative competence and language proficiency.

While some of the pre-services teachers' idea on courses are in favor of teaching grammar as separate lesson because they think that grammar is important for teaching any foreign language and teaching grammar has been played a central role in language learning, and this creates a gap between pre-services student teachers' perspectives that may decrease students' motivation for learning English.

Because learners in general do not seem to have a certain conception of what the term 'grammar' is as definition idea, process or value; therefore the study will be an attempt aim to improve grammar lesson in order to meet learners' needs that is most of the learners do not know the basic role of grammar courses in the process of learning and teaching English and that these courses are regarded as an attempt in the hope of improving the pre-services teachers' skills and capacity to use English language.

Also, most of learners do not know the value of everyday language that is extremely vital to them, and those inappropriate methods of teaching grammar decrease the merits of the assigned grammar lesson and this may be due to the current curriculum that is somewhat not successfulness for learning English language and teaching at University or may be due to the strategies which may not be implemented in appropriate ways which decrease acquiring language skills.

In addition to these facts, there is not a proper environment for the pre-services teachers to understand nature of language acquisition and learning English in the universities and among themselves and communities and learners are not satisfied with the extent of grammar courses and strategies that are implemented in English departments program as found by (Dizayi, 2016).

Most of the speaking demotivating factors are related to the linguistic, environmental, psychological factors that hindered pre-services teachers at Salahaddin University-Erbil from speaking English in the classroom.

As a result, learners are not satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently and they feel lacks of opportunities to develop their skills, knowledge, attitudes and values required for learning English.

1.3. Research Questions:

This study was conducted to provide the answer to the following research questions;

1. What are the factors that have impacts on pre-services teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar?
2. Whether teachers' endeavors for implementing methods in teaching and learning the English language are convincing in the light of textbooks of grammar or not?
3. Should grammar be taught as an independent subject or it should be taught throughout teaching communication lesson in which the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) as integrated skills will be taught?

1.4. The Purposes of the Study

The main purpose of this research to investigate:

1. The pre-services teachers attitudes towards learning English particularly through teaching grammar and provide education providers with insights into pre-services teachers attitudes towards teaching grammar for learning English.
2. The development of positive pre-services teacher attitude so that they can give more importance to the pre-services teachers requirements and interests in learning English and facilitate their achievements.
3. This study also aims to find out the best ways of teaching grammar in order to meet learners' needs. However, it attempts at drawing a picture of grammar teaching from EFL learners' conception and to explore learners' intelligences to teaching grammar to evaluate the current strategies and to reconsider the purpose behind teaching this or that grammar courses and knowing whether the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are convincing in the light of textbooks of grammar or not.
4. The study aims at discovering successfulness of the new curriculum for learning English language and teaching and establishing a proper environment for the learners to understand nature of language acquisition and learning English at University.

Strategies are implemented in English departments program and knowing the views of the 4th grade learners toward the significance of grammar subject and finding out their conceptions on teaching grammar.

5. The study aims at raising the learners' awareness and building their capacities for speaking English fluently and offering opportunities to develop the skills, knowledge, attitudes and values required for learning English and exploring learners' performances in grammar to assess the existing methods and to rethink the purpose behind teaching this or that grammar subjects.

This study is attempting to improve grammar courses in order to meet learner's needs and finding the learners' conceptions on teaching grammar.

1.5. The Significance of the study

This study provides visions for English education providers who involve teaching and learning English as a foreign language to show whether the methods used by teachers in their classes are effective and valuable for their pre-services teachers. So that their current teaching skills can be improved and help to create positive attitudes in pre-services teachers towards learning English grammar. Therefore, the study provides those language teachers with information to know pre-services teachers attitudes and perspectives towards teaching English grammar. Based on the results of the pre-services teachers' questionnaire, English education providers in university will be able to choose the right technique or strategies to provide their pre-services teachers with the highest learning process and also to create a positive attitude towards teaching English grammar. Through providing insights into the attitudes of Salahaddin University pre-services teachers" towards learning English grammar, presenting the importance of the English language and English teaching methods.

The researcher hopes that the studies' findings will be valuable and useful to pre-services teachers and learners of English as a foreign language. The researcher hopes that the findings of the study will be of help to teachers, syllabus designers and materials writers in designing the necessary strategies in teaching grammar, and it be useful to textbook writers, and researchers who work in the field of applied linguistics.

1.6 Definition of the Basic Terms:

Teaching grammar as independent

In the field-dependent/independent model of cognitive or learning style, a field-independent learning style is defined by a tendency to separate details from the surrounding context. It can be compared to a field-dependent learning style, which is defined by a relative inability to distinguish detail from other information around it. Concerning teaching grammar can be dependent through the four skills of language which are listening, speaking, reading and writing, i.e. grammar can be taught through its context. But teaching grammar as independent means teaching grammar as separate courses from its surrounding context. That is said grammar can be taught through its rules and patterns. In this case theorists define these two cognitive styles dependent and independent in terms of how they are different - which makes this a useful model for teachers trying to understand their learners.

Student' Perspective

Research literature in foreign language learning situations do seem to indicate that students perspective towards the process of language learning. In fact, study on the students' and teachers' views on learning a foreign language setting revealed that many students have a more favorable attitude to learn a language. Concerning the role of grammar instruction in learning a foreign language the students have a preferable attitude. The students also believed that in order to master a language, it was necessary to study grammar. Furthermore, more teachers than students believed that it was better to practice language in simulated real life situations than to study grammatical forms explicitly. (Windham, 2017).

Pre-service Teachers'

Pre-service teaching is a period of experimental teaching by the senior students who are guided, because the college student is gradually introduced into the teaching role for a special class by a mentor or cooperating teacher. So the cooperating teacher works with and promotes the pre-service teacher to suppose greater responsibility in classroom management and instruction as the experience progresses. The pre-service teacher starts as an observer and finishes the pre-service teaching experiment as a competent professional. In this study the senior students studying at ELT department are considered as pre-service teachers. Since they are going to start teaching right

after their graduation in language schools or in middle/high schools. (González & Frumkin, 2016).



2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction:

This chapter sheds light on theoretical issues related to the topic such as language teaching approaches and implemented strategies in teaching grammar.

The linguistic analysis carried out by the Greek between the 4th century B.C. and the 2nd A.D. included most of the basic concepts still going on the layman's conception of language or grammar (Allen & Corder, 1980).

Since that period many studies have been conducted to this topic via the evolution of the study. The concept of a universal grammar (UG) of human languages originated with Chomsky's (1968) view L1 acquisition. The evolution of these studies can be summed up as follows:

Traditional as a term is created with reference to many times in Europe and America, for instance, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries school grammars, and especially the Roman, Greek, and Renaissance grammars. So it is an effort to record the principal scope of perspective and approaches found in the pre-linguistic time of grammatical study (Bussmann, Trauth & Kazzazi, 1996). Yule defines traditional grammar as “the description of the structure of phrases and sentences based on established categories used in the analysis of Latin and Greek” (2006, p.251).

Palmer (1984) explains that Latin is the traditional language that was known by all informed individuals and observed as the model for all different languages.

Finally “Traditional grammar has been used in English classrooms for generations.... It is what you do in an English class. Even the fact that students do so poorly with traditional grammar is not seen as a reason for questioning” (Lester, 1990, p. 340 cited in Williams, 2005, p.42).

At the beginning of 20th century structural, or descriptive school of linguistics or grammar is progressed, particularly in 1940s and 1950s, with its advocates prided itself in the application of scientific observations of human languages (Brown, 2007).

Bloomfield and the followers of this school attempt to describe the structure of language as independently as possible, with no indication to connotation. In other words structuralism neglects meaning which was one of the problems of this sort of grammar (1933).

In the decade of the 1960s generative-transformational linguistics or grammar emerged as the influence of Chomsky and his followers. It is a linguistic theory that has a large international status. It is also called TGG, in which Chomsky proposed in his book "Syntactic Structures" in (1957). According to Chomsky this theory is connected mainly with "an ideal speaker/ listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community". So the principal concept of this linguistic theory is the competence that underlies performance (1965).

As a last point, TGG is known as "rule governed", and these rules are not only abstract but also complex. Consequently Chomsky's theory is tended to be overlooked (1966) cited in (Stern, 1983).

As previously presented the concept a UG of human languages originated with Chomsky's conception on L1 acquisition. He explained the fact that virtually all children learn language in their cognitive development and they acquire the language that they hear around them.

In 1970 a new linguistic theory is suggested by Michael Halliday as an option to transformational grammar. It based on the practical sight of language as social communication. In other words, language is observed as a symbol of actuality in which the main point is expressed and organized as a message (Crystal, 2008).

Grammar according to Michael Halliday is a resource for building meaning. He also conveys that speakers and writers use their language resources according to the common context to compose three types of immediate meaning: ideational meaning, interpersonal meaning and textual meaning.

The problem of this sort of grammar is that, "there is no one-to-one match between form and function. Assigning a function to a text or an utterance usually requires

knowledge of the context in which the text is used”, and therefore some students face difficulties to understand it (Thornbury, 2006).

Recently many studies have been conducted to this topic which concern with. Communicating about grammar, interpretation tasks for grammar teaching, options in grammar teaching, teacher cognition in grammar teaching, Asian students’ perceptions of grammar teaching in the ESL classroom, English teaching with grammar? A study on how English teachers at upper secondary school in Sweden use grammar in their teaching, grammar teaching in EFL classrooms: teachers’ attitudes and beliefs, students’ perceptions of grammar teaching and learning in English language classrooms in Libya, current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspectives and these topics can be summed as follows:

For instance “Communicating about Grammar: A Task-Based Approach” has been done by (Fotos, Ellis, 1991). TESOL Book in which they concentrate on “providing learners with grammar problems they must solve interactively integrates grammar instruction with opportunities for meaningful communication”. This study is about the results of an exploratory study of the use of a communicative, grammar-based task in the college EFL classroom. The results of this investigation recommend that the grammar task encouraged communication about grammar and enabled EFL learners to increase their knowledge of a difficult L2 rule.

While “Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching” has been done by (Ellis, 1995). This study examines an alternative approach to grammar teaching-one based on interpreting input. This approach concentrates on helping learners to notice grammatical features in the input, understanding their meanings, and comparing the forms present in the input with those occurring in learner output. The rationale for the approach is explained as are the principles for designing interpretation tasks for grammar teaching.

Another study is related to the current topic entitled “Teaching and Research: Options in Grammar Teaching” written by (ELLIS, 1998), in which the researcher emphasizes how grammar can best be taught in terms of four theoretically motivated instructional options: (a) structured input, (b) explicit instruction, (c) production practice, and (d) negative feedback. The study concentrates on a number of possibilities for the pedagogic utilization of the information it makes available are

considered, based on the distinction between teachers' practical knowledge and technical knowledge. These possibilities are (a) treating the research findings as provisional specifications to be experimented with through teaching, (b) conducting action research, and (c) conducting participatory research involving teachers and researchers working collaboratively. The need for research that investigates how teachers integrate technical knowledge into their personal pedagogical systems is also recognized.

Another study that is related to the topic entitled "Teacher Cognition in Grammar Teaching: A Literature Review" has been done by (Borg, 2003). This study reviews studies of teacher cognition in relation to the teaching of grammar in first, second, and foreign language classrooms. Teacher cognition encompasses a range of psychological constructs and these are reflected in the research reviewed here. The researcher discusses studies of teachers' declarative knowledge about grammar, of their beliefs about teaching grammar, and of their knowledge as expressed through their grammar teaching practices. In addition to highlighting these different perspectives on the study of teacher cognition in grammar teaching, this review highlights key findings from the research and suggests directions for continuing inquiry in this field.

While another research is "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective" also has been done by (Ellis, 2006). In which he presents how learners acquire a second language (SLA) and how it has helped to shape thinking about how to teach the grammar of a second language. This study considers eight key questions relating to grammar pedagogy in the light of findings from SLA. As such, this study complements Celce-Murcia's (1991) article on grammar teaching in the 25th anniversary issue of TESOL Quarterly, which considered the role of grammar in a communicative curriculum and drew predominantly on a linguistic theory of grammar. These eight questions are about whether grammar should be taught and if so what grammar, when, and how. Although SLA does not provide complete solutions to these questions, it serves the valuable purpose of problematising this aspect of language pedagogy. The study concludes with a statement of the researcher's beliefs about grammar teaching, grounded in his own understanding of SLA.

Another study concerns with the “Teachers’ Perceptions about Grammar Teaching” which has been done by Tran-Hoang-Thu in Alliant International University on the December 5th 2009. In this, the study investigates English as a second language (ESL) teachers’ perspectives in grammar teaching. A questionnaire was administered to 11 ESL teachers in a language school in California. It includes 32-items. The results indicate that the participants generally believe that the official study of grammar is essential to the eventual mastery of a foreign or second language when language learning is limited to the classroom. The teachers also believe that metalanguage should be used for learners of all skill levels. Also, they believe that practice is of crucial importance to grammar learning. Finally, the teachers believe that their previous training greatly improved their dependability and skills in teaching grammar.

Also another study is about perceptions of grammar teaching, but it concerns with the students’ perceptions of grammar teaching in the ESL classroom which has been done Anne Pazaver¹, Hong Wang² World Maritime University, Sweden ² and Mount Saint Vincent University, Canada which is entitled “Asian Students’ Perceptions of Grammar Teaching in the ESL Classroom” (2009, Page 27-35). This study was conducted on a group of 16 students from seven Asian countries who were enrolled in a credit ESL course at a Canadian university. The students were interviewed in groups of four by one of four researchers and the data were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. The Study reached that although from similar cultural and educational backgrounds, the Asian students’ perceptions of form focused instruction varied widely. Their different perspectives were based on their previous language learning experiences, their language proficiency, current academic needs, and future profession choices. The information collected is of significant value to ESL teachers who intend to meet students’ needs as well as reduce conflicts caused by different perspectives between teachers and students regarding whether or not grammar teaching should be encouraged in the classroom.

In addition to this another study about “Grammar Teaching in EFL Classrooms: Teachers’ Attitudes and Beliefs” that has been done by Md. Abul Kalam Azad, (2013), because grammar is now rehabilitated in language teaching and learning after years of debate and research on how best to teach grammar has produced a variety of options for the teachers to follow in their classrooms. The present study presents 30

Bangladeshi universities EFL teachers' attitudes towards grammar and its teaching and learning relating to those options. The data analysis indicates that these teachers view grammar as an indivisible part of language teaching and learning and think that formal grammar instruction has a facilitative role in language learning. In teaching grammar, explicit grammar instruction and contextualized use of grammar within communicative activities are preferred and inductive approaches are considered effective and helpful by these teachers. Small class size, use of audio-visual materials and flexibility in teaching grammar are suggested by them for better results.

The final study which is reviewed is about "Students' Perceptions of Grammar Teaching and Learning in English Language Classrooms in Libya" that is done by Gopal Sopin, Ph D, Associate Professor of English, (2015). The study was conducted on a group of 15 students studying in Semester Five, in the English Language Department of Misurata University, Libya. The students were interviewed in groups of three with nine specific questions, and the responses were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim. The findings revealed that although they all came from the same cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds, they had different perceptions regarding the form focused instruction of grammar. The information gathered is of considerable significance to ESL teachers who intend to meet students' needs as well as reduce disagreements caused by different perspectives between teachers and students regarding whether or not grammar teaching should be encouraged in the classroom.

2.2. Consideration:

Many studies have been conducted to investigate languages acquisition and learning, in which language acquisition research focuses on the way of gaining and developing knowledge, "acquiring skills and use of a language by children and adults who already know at least one other language". (School, 2002 p.116). Which some other researchers consider learning as a relatively permanent change in behavior which happens through regular practice (Mosa, Lanejad, 1999).

The researchers which have been conducted in this field have both theoretical and practical significance; the theoretical significance is related to the learners understanding of how language is represented in this mind and whether there is a

variation among the methods language is acquired, processed and the ways of other types of information are getting and processed.

While the practical importance arises from the assumption that the comprehending of how languages are learned will lead to more effective teaching practices (Schmitt, 2002).

In general, the assumption is that the learners learn through their senses, observations, experiment, experiences and inductive or deductive processes in different stages, firstly it will be generalized and finally will internalize. That is to be said that the distinction between learning and acquisition is that the L1 will be acquired and the L2 will be learned.

As most studies found out that acquisition is unconscious, natural, unteachable, and unintentional but learning is conscious, artificial, teachable and intentional. In acquisition grammar and syntax come late. In both learning and acquisition processes, the degree of consciousness will determine whether it is acquisition or learning process.

As Krashen developed monitor theory in the 1970 and presented it in terms of five hypotheses. In which he presented the fundamental hypothesis of the monitor theory which are acquisition learning, natural order, monitor, input, effective filter and holistic model hypotheses.

Krashen concentrates on the different between acquisition and learning; Acquisition is hypothesized to happen in a way similar to L1 acquisition: while Learning is described as a conscious process, in which the learner's attention is directed.

Teaching grammar constantly has remained a controversial subject like the approach and material approved in teaching it. Therefore, this chapter is dedicated to investigate the difficulties and issues faced by a language student in the teaching of grammar which should be taken into consideration. The following points are the main problematic issues in teaching grammar: The role of grammar, argument against teaching grammar, arguments for teaching grammar: Which grammar to teach? Which approach to follow? The role of motivation, grammar Based Approaches, the implication of strategies, the impact of learning environment on motivational strategies, challenges and frustrations. Moreover, finally, techniques for overcoming the challenges.

2.2.1. The Role of Grammar

There is no doubt that grammar is one of the key aspects of a language and in human communication. Without grammar, language is incomplete and cannot be expressed and understood properly. Certainly grammar has played a great role in learning a second and a foreign language. Grammar shapes the language accurately and correctly, therefore knowing some knowledge of grammar rules is necessary for mastering the language (Ur, 2009). While in certain situations, grammar is not needed and its role is not crucial. For instance, in everyday or routine situations grammar is not needed and has no role, especially in predictable and expected situations. That is to say, when there is a shared knowledge and context, by this means; by only lexical language, the message can be conveyed (Thornbury, 1999).

2.2.2. Arguments against teaching grammar

It is obvious that knowledge of grammar is considered as the base of English language. One of the contentious and controversial subjects in the fields of language pedagogy and second language acquisition (SLA) is the question to teach or not to teach grammar, since it can be acquired unconsciously, it is not necessarily need to be taught. Ellis (1997) argues that grammar is not important as it contributes very little to second language acquisition (SLA).

Also, Sugiharto (2005) authenticates that grammatical competence (GC) is only acquired if learners are exposed to a more comprehensible, meaningful, and pertinent second language input materials. This might be true due to the fact that many immigrants in the UK and USA who did not study English in schools or any other language courses, they learn and speak the language but with far more accurate. This proves that a more comprehensible input is important in learning a language without the need of grammar to be studied. However, this might be true with the young immigrants rather old ones.

2.2.3. Arguments for teaching grammar

The question is that, if grammar is not needed, why almost all the designed course-books for second language learners include grammar and it is regarded as on fundamental parts of each course-book. It is clear that most of the teachers do not want to skip this part in their teaching (Swan, 2001). It is believed that grammar

facilitates the acquisition and learning processes. When someone is in the process of learning English language, grammar is needed as it helps the learner in learning the language easily. Celce-Murcia (1991) argues that grammatical features are not only acquired or learned by exposing learners to a comprehensible input, in so doing; grammar is considered necessary. The knowledge of grammar is momentous owing to the fact that it assists learners to communicate the language more accurately and eloquently. Grammar is considered one of the master skills that help learners in promoting their productive and receptive skills.

For instance, in listening and speaking, grammar plays an essential part in understanding and expressing the spoken language (Widodo, 2006). In the case of vocabulary, grammar is way to help learners in combining some lexical items into a meaningful and accurate sentence. So by teaching and learning grammar, students are able to express some meaningful phrases, clauses and sentences (Doff, 2000).

Even a comprehensive input plays a great role in learning the language without studying grammar, but this may not be applicable for those learners who live in their own country such as Iraq because of the lack of comprehensible input. Thus grammar is needed to be more accurate and fluent in learning and communicating the language (Ellis, 2002).

Also, Swan (2001) reaffirms that teachers even want to teach grammar because of its testability. That is, teachers usually want to teach something that is testable. Moreover, students' expectation in studying grammar is considerable because students want to study some types of grammar and to take tests from the things that are studied.

2.3. Which Grammar to Teach?

The linguistic analysis carried out by the Greek between the 4th century B.C. and the 2nd A.D. included most of the basic concepts still going on the layman's conception of language or grammar (Allen & Corder 1980).

Since that period many studies researches have been conducted on this topic via the evolution of the study. The concept of a universal grammar (UG) of human languages originated with Chomsky's (1968) view L1 acquisition. The evolution of these studies can be summed up as follows:

2.3.1. Traditional Grammar

Traditional as a term is created with reference to many times in Europe and America, for instance, the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries school grammars, and especially the Roman, Greek, and Renaissance grammars. So it is an effort to record the principal scope of perspective and approaches found in the pre-linguistic time of the grammatical study (Bussmann, Trauth & Kazzazi, 1996). Yule defines traditional grammar as “the description of the structure of phrases and sentences based on established categories used in the analysis of Latin and Greek languages” (2006, p.251).

This kind of sentence structure is regularly theoretical in its method and from time to time attempted to use a few classes to a language that was lacking initial consideration whether they are practical and suitable for portraying that language (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). The outstanding problem of traditional grammar is that it is prescriptive in nature. In this case, grammarians attempted to give their own special conceptions depending on their temper. They tried to set down guidelines and rules for the speakers of a language (Aitchison, 1999).

Palmer (1984, pp.15-16) states that “most of these rules of grammar have no real justification ... What is correct and what is not correct is ultimately only a matter of what is accepted by society, for language is a matter of conventions within society”. He also explains that Latin is the traditional language that was known by all informed individuals and observed as the model for all different languages.

Consequently, traditional grammar is fundamentally organized on Indo-European classical language, and for this cause, it is considered a poor model for the grammars of different languages that contrast from Greek and Latin. Even nowadays there are individuals who declare that Latin is more ‘logical’ than English (Ibid).

Another problem of this sort of grammar is that it focuses on the written form of language instead of the spoken, and it rejects the fact that spoken form precedes the written form, and it also lacks a theoretical framework (Aitchison, 1999).

In accordance with the influence of Latin, traditional grammarian established grammatical categories on the basis of notional definitions (parts of speech, tense, and mood) which are universal. Parts of speech are eight sections of discourse (word class) in which they are: noun, verb, adjective, pronoun, adverb, preposition,

interjection and conjunction. In addition, traditional grammarians characterize words inside sentences as subject, verb, complement, indirect object, direct object, and so on. Nouns and Verbs are the words that have the largest scope of occupation (Williams, 2005).

The purposes and approaches of traditional grammar have been criticized especially by linguists because they want to promote one or more new theories. It is probable that this criticism has been overdone. Therefore “the current trend in linguistic studies, involving an attempt to describe the abstract system of rules that underlines the surface forms of utterances, has led to a marked revival of interest in the methods of traditional grammar” (Allen & Corder 1980, p. 251).

Finally “Traditional grammar has been used in English classrooms for generations.... It is what you do in an English class. Even the fact that students do so poorly with traditional grammar is not seen as a reason for questioning” (Lester, 1990, p.340) cited in (Williams, 2005, p.42).

2.3.2. Structural Grammar

At the beginning of 20th century structural, or descriptive school of linguistics or grammar is progressed, particularly in the 1940s and 1950s, with its advocates prided itself in the application of scientific observations of human languages (Brown 2007). In this, the linguists attempt to describe human languages and to identify the structural features of those languages. The study of this type of linguistics is connected with how components of a sentence like phonemes, morphemes, phrases, clauses and parts of speech are assembled and the prevailing paradigm in linguistic research viewed language as a linear, structural system that explained grammatical sequences in terms of separate components that could comprise a sentence. It shows that language has a position of structural models in which expressions are organized to reproduce connotation (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Bloomfield indicates that “The study of language can be conducted without special assumption only so long as we pay no attention to the meaning of what is spoken” (1935, p75). Thus the followers of this school attempt to describe the structure of language as independently as possible, with no indication to connotation .In other words structuralism neglects meaning which was one of the problems of this sort of grammar (Ibid.).

Generally, the linguistic structures are sequenced in a straight way, starting with a simple structure and ending with more perplexing structures (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). Structural linguistics' use is the result of etymologists' experimental investigation of the way can be adopted, and it does not illustrate what is right. Basically, structural grammar describes the language as it exists, comprising its development and progressions. In view of this the local speaker's instinct of having the capacity to produce an infinite number of sentences from a limited set of items are ignored (Ediger & Rao, 2003).

Moreover, grammar is considered as an investigation of the connections and gatherings of words in the context of a sentence, and that is why sentence structure is not only a situated of terms and guidelines to be learned (Ibid).

A noun in English is any remark that can be changed in the structure, and it does not matter whether the word is a noun of a thing, human being or place such as: The-----
----is/are bad. Since the linguist's task is to describe language as it is spoken, not to instruct how it should be written (Thomas, 2006).

Finally, Stern states that the creativity of language, the process of linguistic production and interpretation are overlooked in structural grammar which is considered another drawback of this kind of linguistic use (1983).

2.3.3. Transformational Grammar

In the decade of the 1960s generative-transformational linguistics or grammar emerged as the influence of Chomsky and his followers it is a linguistic theory that has a large international status. It is also called TGG, in which Chomsky proposed in his book "Syntactic Structures" in 1957. According to Chomsky, this theory is connected mainly with "an ideal speaker/ listener, in an entirely homogeneous speech community". So the principal concept of this linguistic theory is the competence that underlies performance (1965).

Richards & Schmitt point out that transformational generative grammar is "an early version of the theory that concentrated on the relationships among sentences that can be observed as transforms or transformations of each other".

In other words, TGG is observed as an arrangement of language study that characterizes the connection between the potential sentences of a language and

between the different components of a sentence and exercises procedures or rules to express these connections, such as the associations among declarative active sentence: (She wrote the message), negative sentences (She didn't write the message), and questions (Did she write the message?). Such connections might be represented by transformational principles (2002).

The transformational grammar in Chomsky's instance indicates that each sentence has two stages of structure which are surface and deep structure, and these "*deep abstract structures*" are altered into the surface structures that describe specific language by procedures called 'transformations' (Aitchison, 1999).

Furthermore, transformational grammar according to Chomsky's assumption suggests that the central properties of language take "from innate aspects of the mind and from how humans process experience through language" (Cited from Richard and Roger, 2001, p.66).

Though transformational generative grammar illustrates how sentences are created in a language but it does not show us how to investigate them. As a result it, attempts to describe rules that can create an infinite number of linguistic sentences in language (Diller 1978) cited in (Stern, 1983).

In addition, Transformational grammarians differ from those of descriptive linguists. It deals with the knowledge that a local speaker owns, that permits them to create and comprehend sentences in real communication. On the contrary, the main purpose of descriptive linguists is the spoken language. Therefore, TGG does not take social and culture distinctions into account which is considered a drawback of the TG (Bornstein, 1984).

As the last point, TGG is known as "rule-governed", and these rules are not only abstract but also complex. Consequently Chomsky's theory is tended to be overlooked (1966) cited in (Stern, 1983).

2.3.4. Universal Grammar (UG)

As previously presented the concept a UG of human languages originated with Chomsky's conception of L1 acquisition. He explained the fact that virtually all children learn a language in their cognitive development, and they acquire the language that they hear around them.

In addition to this some L1 researchers noted when young children produced speech that did not match the adult language their parents did not provide systematic feedback to their speech. Thus, Chomsky inferred that children should have innate language ability. This ability referred to as the language acquisition device as UG. But the question is that whether UG can also explain L2 learning.

The researchers deduced that UG is no longer available to older learners and no longer open to the acquisition of any language, i.e. L2 and foreign languages.

Researchers who study second language acquisition from a UG perspective seek to find out a language user's competence instead of his or her linguistic performance. They used indirect means of exploring that competence, in which the researcher may ask to judge whether a sentence is grammatical or not (Shmitt 2002).

2.3.5. Functional Grammar

In 1970, a new linguistic theory was suggested by Halliday as an option to transformational grammar. It based on the practical sight of language as social communication. In other words, language is observed as a symbol of actuality in which the main point is expressed and organized as a message (Crystal, 2008).

Lock thinks that functional grammar is “the kind of grammar most likely having useful things to say to language learners and teachers”. (1996, pp. 2-3). “The essential motivation for a language is communication and analyzing sentence structure to permit the speakers to replace the meanings as they could. It sheds light on “the appropriateness of a form for a particular communicative purpose in a particular context” (Ibid, p. 1).

Grammar according to Halliday is a resource for building meaning. He also conveys that speakers and writers use their language resources according to the common context to compose three types of immediate meaning: ideational meaning, interpersonal meaning, and textual meaning.

The ideational theme is applying language for indicating our understanding of the world. The interpersonal theme means the relation between speakers, in other words, the relationship between the speaker and listener. And the textual theme is creating relevance to the context via coherence and cohesion (1994).

In this way, the capacity of language point is “its communicative purpose. Language is more than simply forms and their associated meanings. It is also the communicative uses to which these forms and meanings are put”. For instance: “Thank you for sending me the desk”, which is written in a message, and “Thanks you for not smoking”, which is found as a sign in a bus. In these two cases they share diverse function, but same forms. Similarly, the same function can be expressed by different forms, for example: “Thank you for not smoking”, and “No smoking”, that are written as a symbol in a hall and hospital.

The problem of this sort of grammar is that, “there is no one-to-one match between form and function. Assigning a function to a text or an utterance usually requires knowledge of the context in which the text is used”, and therefore some students face difficulties to understand it (Thornbury, 2006).

2.4. Approaches to Teaching Grammar

2.4.1. Teacher-Centered Approaches

Shimon observes that one of the most broadly employed in education course is teacher-centered learning. Giving course objects to the students is done straightforwardly or by oral way. The teacher organizes and controls the whole things in this type of education. What must be educated, when it should be educated, and how it ought to be educated are basically selected by the teachers. Consequently, the learners are fundamentally practiced in what is regarded to be essential for them, not what is outstanding for them, and the process is reviewed by the teacher only (2011).

In the teacher-centered approach Brooks (2010) states that the learners talk less than the teachers. The structure of sentence and writing do well by this method, because the teacher illustrates how the act to be done and how the act can be kept to the learners to assure that they apply. Moreover he “passes on an education to the students”. The teacher puts order that is the essential objective of a teacher-centered approach, and the learners’ performance is to achieve these objectives (Schindler, 2010).

The information is passively accepted by the learners, and the teacher’s task is information supplier, and for learner’s individual development there is no area.

Indeed, the teachers have lawfulness right about the learning. Thus these points are regarded as a problem to this approach. Finally, the class the process of learning will stop, if there is no teacher in the class because the teacher has all the main roles in the class that is considered a disadvantage of this type of grammar (Moore & Hansen, 2012).

2.4.2. Learner-Centered Approaches

A process that is utilized for the interests and requirements of the learners is known as learner-centered learning, which is opposed to teacher -centered learning, since it is not reasonable that all the times, learners rely on their teacher, waiting for instructions, agreement, or admiration, and so on, while the activities can be done by individual, pair or group work as the requirement of the lesson.

Consequently, this kind of style leads to noisy and disorder on the base of learners' pair or group work, particularly with a large number of class. This is regarded as a problem or drawback to this procedure. Even the process of education is more active and enjoyable because the learners participate in this procedure (Jones, 2007).

The process students centered learning deals with listening and speaking, in which the students speak more than the teacher (Brooks, 2010), it can be said that learner self-independence is the basic aim (Shindler,2010).

Wilson& McLellan believe that both teachers and learners are active members who offer obligations for the learner's education, and recognizing how learners are assumed to use the language and how teacher and learners mutually exerted it. Moreover, the teacher is a part of the class, and he is involved in the process of education and he can help the students, even it is somewhat hard for the teachers to scaffold all their students at once, since learners may act on different levels of the same activity (1997). Another problem is that many students particularly college students complain of their disappointments and annoyances on the base that their lecturers put various obligations on them in the process of learning (Falchikov, 2001).

The final point is that, even the teacher centered learning is different from learner centered learning, but they share many resemblances too. First, they share similar principles for example both of them make the procedure of learning going excellently. Second, they use the same book that is similar to both. Third and finally

in every process the occurrence of questions and answers in the procedure of teaching is found (Killen, 2007).

2.4.3. Deductive Approach

In this explicit rules and information about a language are given to the students in the process of language education, and consequently, they exercise these standards when they use the language, which means that the teacher directly shows or tells what he/she wants to teach. This kind of process is actually used when we deal with grammatical rules of a language (Hall, 2011). The student moves ahead “from general to particular, from abstract to concrete” (Lakshmi & Rao, 2004, p.112). Consequently, there are some plans according to Michael Swan:

1. The rules should be appropriate.
2. The rules require being obvious.
3. The rules require making application of ideas already familiar to the students.
4. The rules must be easy.
5. The rules should be correct.
6. The rules should demonstrate obviously what bounds are on the exercise of an agreed figure (cited in Thornbury, 1999).

When the rules are offered in this process, the most important thing is that the presentation ought to be shown with illustrations, be short, include learners’ understanding and permit learners to have an opportunity to customize the standard. For example:

Teacher: The past tense of regular verbs is formed by adding (ed) to the end of the base form of the verb. Thus, look-looked, watch-watched, rain-rained. At the same moment the teacher says: can you change these verbs into the past again? Wash?

Student: Washed.

Teacher: Well done. Work? And so on (Thornbury, 2006).

According to Kumar, Krishna & Rao (2004) the deductive approach goes directly to the main idea. Consequently, it keeps time and strength for both (learners and teachers). It is extremely appropriate for lower class. Moreover, the deductive approach “glorifies memory” since learners are needed to remember a considerable

amount of rules, principle etc. Therefore it is regarded as a quick procedure in language teaching, and particularly in studying the grammatical rules of the language. But at the same time learners' dependency to find out rules by themselves is neglected in this method, which is regarded as a problem.

The deductive approach can be regarded as "dry and technical" according to Allen & Valette (1977) because the learner is denied of the joy of self-action. Moreover, it helps the thoughts that learning of language is essentially a case of knowing rules it concentrates on the memorization of the rules which are speedily forgotten. As a result, this process is not adequate for the progression of intuition as the students is seen as passive participant who is involved in the process of learning and teaching (Thornbury, 1999).

2.4.4. Inductive Approach

It is a process in which the specific rules are not given to the learners, instead the learners are left to discover the linguistic rule they have been working with alone. In other words, students have been moved "from concrete to abstract, particular to general and from complex to general rule" (Lakshmi & Rao, 2004, p.110).

In an inductive process according to Thornbury (2006), the teacher would present the students with a variety of examples for a given concept without giving any introduction about how the concept is used. For instance, to make a distinction between "for and since", these patterns are given to them in order the learner could distinguish between them and how the concept can be used to determine the grammar rule.

1. She has been cleaning the room since three o'clock.
2. They have been singing for three hours.
3. I have not seen him since 2007.
4. He has not travelled for a long time. And so on.

This procedure helps the students to be familiar with rule discovery. It also gives more chance to the learners to think and become active participants in the procedure of learning since it trains the mind and gives self-confidence. As a result, it can increase the creativity of the students (Dash & Dash, 2007). The inductive process

depends on the ground of the actual observation, thinking and experimentation; therefore it is regarded as a logical approach (Kumar, 2004).

But, according to Allen & Valette, this kind of approach is regarded as being time and energy consuming in employing out rules and learners may be deceived into considering the rules are the purpose of language teaching instead of understanding the means of the topic. In addition, a lot of skills and tasks are required from the teacher to create an adequate process of teaching. Another problem of this approach is that a few students desire to discover the rules of the examples (1977).

A last point is that it does not make any difference which approach the teacher should use, but the important thing is what the purpose of learning procedures and how to get it. Therefore, the teacher should use an appropriate approach according to the lesson and activities that are done in the class.

2.4.5. Seductive or guided discovery approach

It is controversial to choose either deductive or inductive approach, since each approach has advantages and drawbacks. Even teachers see it is difficult to select the approach to teach in their classroom. As a result, there is a new approach that is so-called seductive or guided discovery. This approach lies between deductive and inductive approach which emerges the best from each. This approach is a purified and modified inductive approach in which learners are exposed to the language first, and then followed by the use of inference, and finally an explicit focus on rules and practice (Saumell, 2012). This depends on the fact that students at the beginning of the lesson have to be engaged into the lesson via asking them questions or giving them texts to work out the rules (Harmer, 2007).

Saumell (2012) discusses a number of advantages of this approach which are quite similar to the inductive approach. It promotes and engages the students in problem-solving activities and tasks and “It helps learners become aware of and articulate their mental processes”. This approach is similar to natural language learning and acquisition. It helps learners to work together and enhances self-reliance. The teacher acts as a facilitator in assisting and guiding the learners to discover the rules and also understand the rules so that they do not confuse and misunderstand.

The advantage of this approach is that it supports analytical learning styles. When teachers adopt this method to teach grammar, learners can exploit their cognitive

skills. That is, students try to think critically to discover the rules with teacher's guidance.

2.5. The role of Motivation and Interest

The word motivation implies that student participates in activity, to use energy and hold on in activity (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). According to Dörnyei, motivation "is an abstract, hypothetical concept that we use to explain why people think and behave as they do" (2001, p.1).

While Ginsberg & Wlodkowski (2009, p.27) point out that "motivation is the natural human capacity to direct energy in the pursuit of a goal". The major components of motivation to learning are enthusiasm, interest, and excitement. In other words motivation lies behind and causes interest, because a motive moves us to attempt an action. It is the root of all our actions (Crump, 1995).

Individuals who feel perilous, unconnected, and slighted are frequently unmotivated to be taught, and vice versa, because Learners' attentiveness, thoughts, attempt, and enthusiasm to persist are strongly controlled by how they feel about the situation they lived in (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2009).

Furthermore, there are distinctions of the stages and types of motivation from a person to another, which indicate that not just stages and quantities of motivation in persons are diverse, but also their types of motivation can be distinct too (Okon, 2013).

It is illustrated by Gardner and Lambert (1972, cited in Brown, 2000) that there are two types of motivation which are integrative and instrumental. The integrative motivation indicates learning the language with the purpose of sharing in the society of its nation types, while instrumental motivation recommends and means that a student learns the language in order to hold the instrumental aims. Thus, the technique and result of learning can be influenced and managed by these two kinds of motivation.

Gardner and Lambert, indicate that learners with large amounts of integrative motivation scored higher on capability tests in contrast to those who are instrumentally motivated (Ibid). Also Cook accepts the proposed classification of motivation into integrative and instrumental motivation which are by Gardner and

Lambert, and these two types of motivation are considered a valuable and adequate element for learning second language. The procedure of learning would be complex for the students, who do not have instrumental or integrative motivation. As a result, learners will meet with issues and challenges to learn and increase information of a second language in the classroom (2008).

These two types of motivation also are introduced by (Wilkins, 1972). If these two types of motivation are compared with each other, the integrative motivation is regarded as the greatest and the ideal motivation according to Ellis. Moreover, it is regarded as an appropriate arrangement and having more capacity (1997). Finally to achieve better motivation, classroom exercises and activities should be done in a wonderful and attractive style without neglecting learner's interests and individual affairs during knowledge replacement (River, 1983).

2.5.1. Cognitive Approach

This approach was suggested in the 1960s and used for teaching second and foreign languages. It concentrates on that language studying "is a process which involves active mental processes and not simply the forming of habits" It offers vitality to the learner's performing part in the process of learning and teaching language, especially in the learning of linguistic guidelines (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

Overt instructions of grammar are focused with the development of Chomskian's assumptions of generative syntax in the 1950s and 1960s and universal grammar. Therefore, grammar teaching and classroom curriculum should be designed to what the learners have already known, providing chances for them to build new implications and accentuating deductive realizing.

According to this approach, language studying apprehended that grammar was excessively complicated to be studied in nature and that language needs mental treatment for students to have the ability to accomplish linguistic competence. In this the foreign language teaching needs covering grammar education as a fundamental system for all proficiencies of foreign language (Hinkel & Fotos, 2002).

The cognitive approach helps learners in all four skills, at the same time and it indicates that competence should precedes performance (Krashen, 1982).

The major characteristics are that reading and writing are important as listening and speaking. The personal education of students are taken into account, therefore instruction is frequently individualized. Grammar can be learnt directly and/or indirectly, but the important thing is that, it should be taught. Since the teacher expects to be able to analyze the foreign language and to have great capacity in the second language (Murcia, 2001).

The main advantage of this approach is that meaning and creativity are considered because it focuses on the conscious of language acquisition as a meaningful system and also focuses on the four skills. (Stern, 1983).

Finally, in the sense of the students' interests and needs, the approaches for teaching and learning grammar are considered teacher-centered, i.e. what they need to learn grammar for, are ignored, therefore the learner is viewed as a passive receiver.

2.5.2. Implication of strategies

Grammar has been described by many grammarians as a group of rules that instruct learners, speakers, and writers on what to say and what not to say or what right and what is wrong (Thornbury,1999). With this concept, grammar takes a prescriptive role, but some regard grammar as a term to refer to a lot of summarizing generalizations on the existent behavior or language. With this concept, grammar has only a descriptive role (Alkhuls, 2000).

The strategies that can be implemented by the teachers can be as follows:

1. **Examples;** in this strategy, the teacher can present example of pattern he wants to teach.
2. **Focus;** in this he draws the learners' attention to the specific structure he wants the learners to learn by underlining that structure.
3. **Meaning;** the teacher present the meaning of the structure preferably through a situation, action, dramatization, or a context. However, the L1 may be used, if necessary, to present meaning or to check understanding of the presented meaning.
4. **Form;** after the presentation of meaning, the teacher discusses with the learners the form of that pattern.

Form may involve factors such as concord, order of words, inversion, inflections, or some function words.

5. **Contrast;** the teacher explains this new pattern and compares it with other related patterns have been learned by students and discusses them with the learners to find out the similarity and differences between them. Such a comparison may handle both areas of meaning and form.

6. **Reinforcement:** the teacher gives more examples to reinforce learners' understanding of both form and meaning.

7. **Parallel examples:** the teacher in this stage asks the learners to offer some parallel structures for discussion, i.e. examples similar to the new pattern in form, and he may ask them questions that lead to those parallel sentences.

8. **Generalization:** in this the teacher assists the learners to drive any possible generalizations especially regarding the pattern form and he asks them to take note of those generalization.

9. **Oral drills:** the teacher starts some suitable oral drills on the new pattern such as substitution drills with their different kinds; chain drills, loop drills, and four phased drills. Here, the teacher's cues and learners' responses are conducted orally.

10. **Visual exercises:** in this stage the teacher asks the learners to related exercise orally.

11. **Written exercises:** after doing the exercise orally, then teacher asks the learners to write down the exercise in their exercise books. Such writing process is an additional source of reinforcement to learning obtained through aural and visual media.

2.5.3. The impact of learning environment on motivational strategies

Cruickshank et al. (2006) state that classroom environment has a significant influence on students' behavior, learning, motivation, interest, willingness to participate, and achievement. It also plays a critical role in language comprehension and production. So, the instructor should create a learning context in the classroom in order to motivate positive social interaction, active participation in learning, and self-motivation (Burden and Byrd, 2007, Chastain, 1988, Richard-Amato and Snow, 2005).

Furthermore, there are two elements of the classroom environment that a teacher can manage effectively to increase learning and improve students' behavior, which are as follow:

1. The physical environment: This deals with the major aspects of the classroom that are independent to the students who inhabit it such as: the shape and size of the room, the arrangement of the seats (i.e. seating arrangement), and the location and availability of equipment and materials. Therefore, such aspects are considered as concrete and observable because most of the students in a classroom like to describe the physical environment in this way.

2. The psychological environment: It sometimes refers to as the classroom climate or atmosphere that influences students' learning, in which it promotes the relationship of cooperative work and helps in preventing discipline problems. The psychological environment deals with these aspects that are consistently related with students' learning such as: emotional tone of the classroom, task-orientation or (learning tasks), and organization (Cruickshank et al., 2006).

2.5.4. Challenges and frustrations

Teaching English grammar is not an easy task; it requires a great endeavor from the teacher to motivate the students to learn English. So, there are some obstacles that the English grammar teachers may face in their teaching, which are as follow:

1. Teaching large classes, in which the classes contain a large number of students.
2. Lack of classroom-equipment such as: good and organized technology, movable seats to promote interaction among the students in the classroom, lighting, is having noise outside the classroom which distracts the students' attention inside the classroom.
3. Lack of students' motivation to interact, in which they should be encouraged to use the language freely and actively.
4. Lack of students' self-confidence because of feeling shy to what they want to express their own points of view.
5. Insufficient use of language, in which the students are not encouraged to use the language daily outside the classroom.

6. The language that the students learn may not have enough prestige for motivating them to learn it.

2.5.5. Techniques for overcoming the challenges

1. Providing a supportive and motivating learning environment in the classroom.
2. Using brainstorming techniques to encourage the students to generate many new ideas themselves to talk about during the lesson.
3. Giving them an opportunity to express their own ideas and to interact with each other actively in the classroom.
4. Connecting the previous lessons with the new ones and relate the material to the students' daily life.
5. Asking the students questions that are related to the subject before starting the lesson.
6. Encouraging them to reduce their shyness by having a good friendly relationship with them.
7. Encouraging student-interaction in the class actively.
8. Asking them to accomplish their tasks in a motivating way, and respecting their points of view.
9. Making them feel the experience of the writer for having effective learning.
10. Encouraging them to grasp the writer's vision, approaches, the beauty of language, and the use of new words.
11. Making them express their feeling of the social issues that are about power, inequality, injustice, and their identity through patterns of grammar or activities. This helps them think critically and question the experiences of the social life in an active and reflective way for better understanding.

3. METHODOLOGY:

3.1. Introduction

This chapter deals with data collection which contains population and sample of the study, participants' questionnaire, its validity and its reliability in addition to statistical means used in this study.

3.1.1. Population and Sample of the Study

Participants of the study are (60) the fourth year senior students and they have experience in learning more than sixteen years, they are pre-in service teachers. Twenty from the College of Education (10 females and 10 males), twenty from the College of Languages (10 females and 10 males) and twenty from the College of Basic Education (10 females and 10 males) in the University of Salahaddin, Erbil are chosen in the academic year (2015-2016). The quantitative method is adopted to find out the student's attitudes to teaching grammar throughout the questionnaire tools.

3.1.2. Instrument

The purpose behind the students' questionnaire which is considered a principal instrument of the study is to understand their view, conception or perception, comments, and manners towards grammar teaching in the English departments. The questionnaire contains (47) items which are designed to discover the pre-service teachers' attitudes towards grammar courses and whether grammar should be taught as separate courses or should be learned unconsciously via communication module (see appendix 1).

The questionnaires are constructed in the form of questions and statements. The items are answered through five options of the level of frequency depending on the Likert Scale. The level of frequency is used for the level of pre-service teachers' perspectives to grammar teaching. The options are: always, often, sometimes, rarely, and never. The highest point takes (4) marks which is always, and the lowest point

takes (0) for the item, which is never. The other given marks respectively. Often (3) marks, sometimes (2) marks, and for rarely (1) mark. In addition, the ethics of researching are taken into account. That is all participants are requested to participate generously that is to say, they were free to participate or not.

In fact among the whole number of the students about (94) students participated, and then (60) questionnaires are chosen because some students changed their mind and they did not complete their questionnaire. The students are required to fill in the questionnaire in the classroom in more than thirty minutes, by the assist of researcher's clarification of the meaning and aims of the questionnaire items. That is to say, all the items are explained and all the participants' queries are answered (See Appendix No. 1).

The questionnaires were used with the students. Also, the students' questionnaires were quite similar except for some changes in wording. Each questionnaire consists of three sections as summarized below.

The options are 0-‘Never’, 1-‘rarely’, 2-‘Sometimes’, 3-‘Often’ and 4-‘Always’.

Table 3.1: Do you think it is better to learn English language unconsciously?

Mean = 3.08	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	8.3
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	25.0
Often	19	31.7	31.7	56.7
Always	26	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.08. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language unconsciously. It can be concluded that pre-service teachers are motivated to learn English language unconsciously and to be exposed to English language for learning it and majority of them think that grammar should be taught in learning English because grammar plays a crucial role in language learning

and teaching and it helps the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence.

Table 3.2: Do you think that grammar should be taught in learning English ?

Mean = 3.13	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
Sometimes	9	15.0	15.0	25.0
Often	16	26.7	26.7	51.7
Always	29	48.3	48.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.58. This output shows that pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language through instructions. Grammar courses have the fundamental role in the process of learning and teaching English since they are considered tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use. Majority of pre-service teachers think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language.

Table 3.3: Do you think that grammar should be taught as independent courses?

Mean = 3.13	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
Sometimes	9	15.0	15.0	25.0
Often	16	26.7	26.7	51.7
Always	29	48.3	48.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.15, This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn the English Language

for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving its objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning the English language.

3.1.3. Criteria of the Tools

The tools have criteria of assessment. The criteria are validity, face validity, empirical validity, and reliability.

3.1.3.1. Validity

Validity is a criterion that cannot be avoided in any qualitative (exploratory) or quantitative (confirmatory) study. Validity is defined as the extent that measures what is intended to measure and nothing else (Heaton, 1990).

Concerning validity in research, Joppe (2000) cited from (Golafshani, 2003) states that a measurable validity determines that the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how accurate the research results are. In other words, it means whether the research instrument helps the researcher to achieve the exact objective of the research.

3.1.3.2. Face Validity

Face validity is one type of validity. As Heaton states “If the items of a test or any other measuring tool look right to other testers, teachers, moderators, and testees, it can be described as having the face validity” (1990, p.159).

3.1.3.3. Empirical Validity

Empirical validity is also another type of validity which is called statistical validity. This kind of validity can be gained as a result of comparing the results of a test or any other measuring tool with another same test at the same time and with the same participants (Heaton, 1990, p. 161).

3.1.3.4. Reliability

Reliability is also an important criterion in any test or research. For quantitative research reliability (Joppe, 2000) cited from (Golafshani, 2003) cited from that it is the extent to which results are consistent over time, and an accurate representation of the total population under study is referred to as reliability, and if the results of a

study can be reproduced under a similar methodology, then the research instrument is considered to be reliable.

3.1.4. Validity of the Questionnaire

According to Babbie (2010, p. 153) Validity is “a term describing a measure that accurately reflects the concept that is intended to measure”. In other words, “it implies that it can be evaluated what needs to be evaluated”, and for the purpose of the study face validity is used, which means the way the test looks right to other testers, teachers, and test designers (Heaton, 1990, p.159). The questionnaire is given to some experts in the field of English language teaching, linguistics, and applied linguistics at Salahaddin university in March 2016 for two weeks to find out their views about the items of the questionnaire as members of the jury (see appendix No.2). Modifications and changes are made to the items in order to meet the jury’s comments and remarks.

3.1.5. Reliability of the Questionnaire

The items of the questionnaire are reliable since the questionnaire is constructed in a way that some items are repeated in different expressions that have the same aims to obtain the same results in the same occasion and time. That is to say, the questionnaire is constructed, administered and its results ended the same way. Because the researcher distributed the same questionnaire twice on 16th of March 2016 and 23rd of March 2016, and this was conducted on (20) participants from the same sample and the answers were given a like.

3.1.6. Data collection Procedure

The survey is related to 60 fourth year students throughout the second term of the academic year (2015-2016). For achieving the given purposes of the study, the researcher carried out the quantitative study, the researchers took the necessary permission for data collection from the administration at Salahaddin University – Erbil, three English Departments of Colleges of Education, Basic Education, and Language. The questionnaire is administered at the three English Departments of the Colleges at Salahaddin University- Erbil on 4/4/2016 to 11/4/2016. The participants of this study are informed to answer the questions after distribution of the

questionnaire. At the same time, they are also asked to keep their names unknown to guarantee trustful replies of the survey.

3.1.7. Data Analysis

Statistical means are considered the systematic and scientific treatment of the quantitative measurement. They are concerned with the collection, organization, presentation and investigation of information which are assessable in numerical terms (Bhardwaj, 2008, p.6). The quantitative analysis of the questionnaire is performed by using the SPSS system through descriptive statistics like frequencies which are figured to outline the participants' reactions. As a result, these descriptive analyses can assist to discover the general examples of pre-service teachers' ideas about teaching grammar. Therefore in this study, a computer program is used which can be illustrated below:

SPSS program: all the answer and results of the questionnaires are collected and computed statistically. They analyzed by using statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20.0.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter present data analyses of the pre-service teacher's questionnaire that's about their perspectives to teaching grammar at EL departments at Salahaddin University. The result of the study is the average of the means of the pre-service teachers' questionnaire is 2.683.

4.2. Data Analyses procedures

The following section offers the results and argument of the learners' answers to the questionnaire as a tool for data collection, and to recognize the pre-service teachers' perspectives in the direction of teaching grammar in the acquisition and learning English as a second and foreign language at Salahaddin University.

The results of the study are based upon validated results of the research tool. The replies of the participants to the questionnaire are reviewed, summarized, and analyzed by the researcher according to the most frequent answers. The pre-service teachers' questionnaire at college level is listed and explained Table (1):

Table 4.1: The Results of Pre-service Students Teachers' Perspectives on Learning and Teaching Grammar

Appendix (1): The Statistics of Students' Questionnaire											
	N		Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation	Variance	Range	Mini	Max	Sum
	Valid	Missing									
1-	60	0	3.08	3.00	4	1.013	1.027	4	0	4	185
2-	60	0	2.88	3.00	4	1.075	1.156	4	0	4	173
3-	60	0	2.58	2.00	2	1.109	1.230	4	0	4	155

4-	60	0	3.13	3.00	4	1.016	1.033	3	1	4	188
5-	60	0	2.15	2.00	2	0.971	0.943	4	0	4	129
6-	60	0	3.27	4.00	4	1.071	1.148	4	0	4	196
7-	60	0	1.98	2.00	2	1.200	1.144	4	0	4	119
8-	60	0	2.18	2.00	2	1.033	1.068	4	0	4	131
9-	60	0	2.68	3.00	4	1.321	1.745	4	0	4	161
10-	60	0	3.07	3.00	4	0.972	0.945	3	1	4	184
11-	60	0	3.10	3.00	4	0.896	0.803	3	1	4	186
12-	60	0	3.12	3.50	4	1.075	1.156	4	0	4	187
13-	60	0	2.98	3.00	4	1.127	1.271	4	0	4	179
14-	60	0	2.78	3.00	4	1.195	1.427	4	0	4	167
15-	60	0	1.62	2.00	0	1.403	1.969	4	0	4	97
16-	60	0	2.47	2.50	4	1.308	1.711	4	0	4	148
17-	60	0	3.03	3.00	4	1.057	1.118	4	0	4	182
18-	59	1	2.44	2.00	2	1.263	1.596	4	0	4	144
19-	60	0	2.47	3.00	4	1.308	1.711	4	0	4	148
20-	58	2	2.57	3.00	4	1.286	1.653	4	0	4	149
21-	59	1	2.17	2.00	1	1.257	1.626	4	0	4	128
22-	60	0	3.07	3.00	4	1.006	1.012	4	0	4	184
23-	60	0	2.97	3.00	4	1.057	1.118	4	0	4	178
24-	59	1	2.24	2.00	2	1.369	1.874	4	0	4	132
25-	60	0	3.08	3.00	4	1.046	1.095	4	0	4	185
26-	60	0	2.40	2.00	4	1.304	1.702	4	0	4	144
27-	60	0	2.45	3.00	4	1.333	1.777	4	0	4	147

28-	60	0	2.90	3.00	4	1.053	1.108	4	0	4	174
29-	60	0	2.37	2.00	2	1.221	1.490	4	0	4	142
30-	60	0	2.37	2.00	2 ^a	1.301	1.694	4	0	4	142
31-	60	0	2.45	2.50	2	1.227	1.506	4	0	4	147
32-	60	0	3.12	3.00	4	0.958	0.918	4	0	4	187
33-	60	0	2.83	3.00	4	1.224	1.497	4	0	4	170
34-	60	0	2.90	3.00	4	1.189	1.414	4	0	4	174
35-	60	0	2.50	2.50	4	1.269	1.610	4	0	4	150
36-	60	0	3.07	3.00	4	1.087	1.182	4	0	4	184
37-	60	0	2.95	3.00	4	1.126	1.269	4	0	4	177
38-	60	0	2.65	3.00	4	1.376	1.892	4	0	4	159
39-	59	1	2.88	3.00	4	1.052	1.106	4	0	4	170
40-	60	0	2.98	3.00	4	1.112	1.237	4	0	4	179
41-	60	0	1.35	1.00	0	1.351	1.825	4	0	4	81
42-	60	0	1.58	1.00	1	1.306	1.705	4	0	4	95
43-	60	0	2.85	3.00	4	1.147	1.316	4	0	4	171
44-	60	0	2.83	3.00	4	1.181	1.395	4	0	4	170
45-	60	0	3.42	4.00	4	0.829	0.688	3	1	4	205
46-	60	0	3.05	3.00	4	1.080	1.167	4	0	4	183
47-	60	0	3.10	3.00	4	1.003	1.007	4	0	4	186

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The above outputs are pre-service teachers' perspectives to teaching grammar. The options are 0- 'Never', 1- 'rarely', 2- 'Sometimes', 3- 'Often' and 4- 'Always'. This means that the mean between 0- 'Never' and 4- 'Always' is 2. In other words if the mean is more than 2 it is positive, if the mean is 2 it is neutral and if the mean is less

than 2 it is negative. Additional statistical information about pre-service teachers' perspectives is presented as follows:

Table 4.2: Do you think it is better to learn English language unconsciously?

Mean = 3.08	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	8.3
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	25.0
Often	19	31.7	31.7	56.7
Always	26	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.08, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language unconsciously. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.3: Do you think it is better a learner to be exposed to English language for learning it?

Mean = 2.88	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	11.7
Sometimes	14	23.3	23.3	35.0
Often	17	28.3	28.3	63.3
Always	22	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.88, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that more pre-service teachers prefer to be exposed to English language for learning it. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to create a real situation for learning English language.

Table 4.4: Do you think it is better a learner to learn English language through instructions?

Mean = 2.58	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	9	15.0	15.0	16.7
Sometimes	21	35.0	35.0	51.7
Often	12	20.0	20.0	71.7
Always	17	28.3	28.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.58, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language through instructions. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language through instructions that is due to the status of English as a foreign Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order not to ignore instructions in teaching English language.

Table 4.5: Do you think that grammar should be taught in learning English?

Mean = 3.13	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
Sometimes	9	15.0	15.0	25.0
Often	16	26.7	26.7	51.7
Always	29	48.3	48.3	100.0

Total	60	100.0	100.0	
-------	----	-------	-------	--

The mean of this item is 3.13, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers think that grammar should be taught in learning English. This indicates that the departments could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for deciding that grammar courses should be in curriculum for teaching and learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to explain grammar topics in teaching English language.

Table 4.6: Do you think that grammar should be taught as independent courses?

Mean = 2.15	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	20.0
Sometimes	33	55.0	55.0	75.0
Often	7	11.7	11.7	86.7
Always	8	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.15, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that grammar should be taught as independent courses in learning English language, this is due to the status of English as a foreign language in Iraq. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar courses should be in curriculum as independent courses for teaching and learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.7: Do you think that grammar should be taught throughout teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing)?

Mean = 3.27		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	10.0
	Sometimes	7	11.7	11.7	21.7
	Often	11	18.3	18.3	40.0
	Always	36	60.0	60.0	100.0
	Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.27, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers think that grammar should be taught throughout teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.8: Do you think that grammar courses have the basic role in the process of learning and teaching English?

Mean = 1.98		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	7	11.7	11.7	11.7
	Rarely	13	21.7	21.7	33.3
	Sometimes	23	38.3	38.3	71.7
	Often	8	13.3	13.3	85.0
	Always	9	15.0	15.0	100.0

Total	60	100.0	100.0	
-------	----	-------	-------	--

The mean of the above item is 1.98, so it is negatively acknowledged. The above output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers do not think that grammar courses have the basic role in the process of learning and teaching English but they think that grammar is one of the key aspects of a language and in human communication. Without grammar, language is incomplete and cannot be expressed and understood properly. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to choose the best grammar and methods for teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.9: Do you think that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skill and capacity to use English language?

Mean = 2.18	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rarely	9	15.0	15.0	20.0
Sometimes	31	51.7	51.7	71.7
Often	8	13.3	13.3	85.0
Always	9	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.18, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that more pre-service teachers think that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skill and capacity to use English language; this is due to the status of English as a foreign language in Iraq. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught in learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.10: Do you think that the inappropriate methods of teaching grammar decrease the merits of the assigned grammar course?

Mean = 2.68	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Rarely	8	13.3	13.3	21.7
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	38.3
Often	15	25.0	25.0	63.3
Always	22	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.68, thus it is negatively acknowledged. This output shows that more pre-service teachers think that the inappropriate methods of teaching grammar decrease the merits of the assigned grammar course. This indicates that pre-service teachers are satisfied with the applicable methods in teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods motivate pre-service teachers to feel that the process of teaching is for them. It provides inductive or bottom up education that provides individuals activation in their classroom.

Table 4.11: Do you think that the current curriculum is successfulness for learning English language and teaching?

Mean = 3.07	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Sometimes	11	18.3	18.3	26.7
Often	19	31.7	31.7	58.3
Always	25	41.7	41.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.07, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that the majority of the pre-service teachers think that the current curriculum

is successfulness for learning English language and teaching grammar courses. They are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught in learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.12: Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of text books of grammar?

Mean = 3.10	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Sometimes	12	20.0	20.0	25.0
Often	21	35.0	35.0	60.0
Always	24	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.10, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of text books of grammar. This indicates that pre-service teachers are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods are persuasive in the light of text books of grammar and they motivate pre-service teachers.

Table 4.13: Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of methods of teaching?

Mean = 3.12	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	10.0
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	26.7
Often	14	23.3	23.3	50.0
Always	30	50.0	50.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.12, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that more pre-service teachers think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of methods of teaching. This indicates that pre-service teachers are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language; on the other hand, the methods of teaching grammar are persuasive and they motivate pre-service teachers.

Table 4.14: Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of activities of learning English Language as a second/ foreign language?

Mean = 2.98	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	10.0
Sometimes	14	23.3	23.3	33.3
Often	13	21.7	21.7	55.0

Always	27	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.98, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that more pre-service teachers think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of activities of learning English language as a second/ foreign teaching. This indicates that pre-service teachers are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language; on the other hand, the methods of teaching grammar are persuasive and they motivate pre-service teachers.

Table 4.15: Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of and according to English departments Program?

Mean = 2.78	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	15.0
Sometimes	14	23.3	23.3	38.3
Often	15	25.0	25.0	63.3
Always	22	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.78, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of English departments program for learning English language as a second/ foreign teaching. This indicates that pre-service teachers are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language; on the other hand, the English departments programs are suitable and they achieve pre-service teachers' needs.

Table 4.16: Do you think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language acquisition in the universities?

1.62	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	19	31.7	31.7	31.7
Rarely	9	15.0	15.0	46.7
Sometimes	16	26.7	26.7	73.3
Often	8	13.3	13.3	86.7
Always	8	13.3	13.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of the above item is 1.62, so it is negatively acknowledged. The above output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that there is not a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language acquisition in the universities. This is due to that English is a foreign language and universities didn't create such a context for using English in the communication. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to create a real context of English; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.17: Are the pedagogical objectives attained in teaching grammar courses?

Mean = 2.47	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	25.0
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	50.0
Often	12	20.0	20.0	70.0
Always	18	30.0	30.0	100.0

Total	60	100.0	100.0	
-------	----	-------	-------	--

The mean of this item is 2.47, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that the pedagogical objectives are attained in teaching grammar courses. This indicates that grammar courses are regarded as tools to attain pedagogical objectives for improving the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving the pedagogical objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.18: Do you think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of learning English in the universities?

Mean = 3.03	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	3	5.0	5.0	8.3
Sometimes	11	18.3	18.3	26.7
Often	19	31.7	31.7	58.3
Always	25	41.7	41.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of the above item is 3.03, so it is positively acknowledged. The above output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language learning but not acquisition in the universities. This is due to that English is a foreign language and universities created such a context for English language to be taught in a proper ways. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to pay more attention to the process of learning and motivate pre-

service teachers; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in the process of learning.

Table 4.19: Are the learning outcomes achieved in grammar courses?

Mean = 2.44		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	4	6.7	6.8	6.8
	Rarely	10	16.7	16.9	23.7
	Sometimes	18	30.0	30.5	54.2
	Often	10	16.7	16.9	71.2
	Always	17	28.3	28.8	100.0
	Total	59	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.7		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean of this item is 2.44, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that the learning outcomes are achieved in teaching grammar courses. This indicates that grammar courses can achieve the learning outcomes for improving the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving the learning outcomes, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.20: Do you think that grammar books provide you with real and native like contexts?

Mean = 2.47		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Rarely	8	13.3	13.3	23.3

Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	48.3
Often	14	23.3	23.3	71.7
Always	17	28.3	28.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.47, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that many pre-service teachers think that grammar books provide them with real and native like contexts, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 21: Do you think that grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language?

Mean = 2.57		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	8.3	8.6	8.6
	Rarely	7	11.7	12.1	20.7
	Sometimes	14	23.3	24.1	44.8
	Often	14	23.3	24.1	69.0
	Always	18	30.0	31.0	100.0
	Total	58	96.7	100.0	
Missing	System	2	3.3		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean of this item is 2.57, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language. This indicates that grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language. This indicates that the department of English

language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving the learning outcomes, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.22: Do you think that pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses?

Mean = 2.17		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	8.3	8.5	8.5
	Rarely	16	26.7	27.1	35.6
	Sometimes	14	23.3	23.7	59.3
	Often	12	20.0	20.3	79.7
	Always	12	20.0	20.3	100.0
	Total	59	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.7		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean of this item is 2.17, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses because grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skill and capacity to use English language; therefore pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses this is due to the status of English as a foreign language in Iraq. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught in learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.23: I like to study and learn English language with others such as cooperative rather than self-learning.

Mean = 3.07	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	8.3
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	25.0
Often	20	33.3	33.3	58.3
Always	25	41.7	41.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.07. So it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that the majority of the pre-service teachers like and have motivation to study through cooperative interactions. This is due to pre-service teachers' self-motivation to mediate themselves into group working for learning and studying English language. Thus this situation could be actively exploited for implementing cooperative rather than self-learning.

Table 4.24: The curriculum (instructional materials) contents appeal me because it is in accordance with my needs and level.

Mean = 2.97	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	11.7
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	28.3
Often	20	33.3	33.3	61.7
Always	23	38.3	38.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.97, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that the majority of the pre-service teachers think that the curriculum (instructional materials) contents appeal them because it is in accordance with their needs and level. This indicates that the current curriculum is successful for learning English language. The curriculum (instructional materials) contents are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding the curriculum for learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of syllabus that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 25: How often do you participate in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations?

Mean = 2.24		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	15.0	15.3	15.3
	Rarely	8	13.3	13.6	28.8
	Sometimes	16	26.7	27.1	55.9
	Often	12	20.0	20.3	76.3
	Always	14	23.3	23.7	100.0
	Total	59	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.7		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean of this item is 2.24, thus it is positively acknowledged. Again this output shows that the majority of the pre-service teachers confirm that they participate in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations in classroom teaching and learning processes cooperatively. This is due to teachers' implementation of the cooperative methods of teaching and learning. This also indicates that there is student-teacher mediation and practice.

Table 4.26: How often are you asked questions to be aware of what is going to be taught and what you are going to learn?

Mean = 3.08	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	2	3.3	3.3	6.7
Sometimes	12	20.0	20.0	26.7
Often	17	28.3	28.3	55.0
Always	27	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this output is 3.08, so it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers are aware of what is going to be taught and what they are going to learn and they confirm that the strategy of questioning is adequately used. This is due to the teachers' implementation of this strategy of reciprocal teaching.

Table 4.27: The whole or parts of the lesson's topic is summarized to help you rearrange the important points or ideas of grammar.

Mean = 2.40	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Rarely	11	18.3	18.3	26.7
Sometimes	16	26.7	26.7	53.3
Often	11	18.3	18.3	71.7
Always	17	28.3	28.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.40, so it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that pre-service teachers confirm that the whole or parts of the lesson's topic is summarized to help them rearrange the important points or ideas of grammar and

they also confirm the summarization strategy is sufficiently used. This is due to the teachers' use of this important strategy of reciprocal teaching.

Table 4.28: Do you think that the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts better matches pre-service teachers' development?

Mean = 2.45	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	7	11.7	11.7	11.7
Rarely	7	11.7	11.7	23.3
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	48.3
Often	14	23.3	23.3	71.7
Always	17	28.3	28.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.45, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts better matches pre-service teachers' development because it is in accordance with their needs and level. This indicates that the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts is successful for learning English language. The curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts is regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding the curriculum for learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of syllabus of grammar contexts that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.29: I am provided with opportunities to question or discuss what is not comprehensible or reasonable.

Mean = 2.90	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	10.0
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	35.0
Often	17	28.3	28.3	63.3
Always	22	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.90, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers affirm that they are provided with opportunity to ask questions and to discuss what is not understandable, and they have motivation to study through interactions. This is due to pre-service teachers' self-motivation to participate in the interaction process for learning and studying English language. Thus this improves their critical thinking as well as it enhances their verbal thought. This is due to teachers' providence of pre-service teachers' critical thinking.

Table 4.30: Do you think that grammar courses effectively connect pre-service teachers inside and outside classroom contexts for pre-service teachers' better learning?

Mean = 2.37	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Rarely	9	15.0	15.0	23.3
Sometimes	18	30.0	30.0	53.3
Often	15	25.0	25.0	78.3
Always	13	21.7	21.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.37, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that grammar courses effectively connect pre-service teachers inside and outside classroom contexts for pre-service

teachers' better learning. This indicates that grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving the learning outcomes, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.31: I am engaged to act out what I study in real activities.

Mean = 2.37	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	6	10.0	10.0	10.0
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	26.7
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	51.7
Often	14	23.3	23.3	75.0
Always	15	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.37, so it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the students affirm that they are engaged to act out what I study in real activities into classroom activities. This is due to that the majority of the pre-service teachers have motivation to study through cooperative interactions. This is due to pre-service teachers' self-motivation to mediate themselves into group working for learning and studying English language because the cooperative techniques of learning lead to better mediation; moreover cooperative techniques provide equal pre-service teachers' participation. Thus this situation could be actively exploited for implementing cooperative rather than self-learning

Table 4.32: The methods of teaching are altered according to my needs, level of comprehension and development (Multi-methods of teaching are used).

Mean = 2.45	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	23.3
Sometimes	16	26.7	26.7	50.0
Often	15	25.0	25.0	75.0
Always	15	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.45, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that pre-service teachers confirm that their teachers alter methods of teaching according to their levels of development. This indicates that the teachers in a way to provide potential help according to pre-service teachers' current level of development.

Table 4.33: I like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and I learn grammar unconsciously.

Mean = 3.12	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	2	3.3	3.3	5.0
Sometimes	12	20.0	20.0	25.0
Often	19	31.7	31.7	56.7
Always	26	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean here is 2.41, thus this item is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers affirm that they like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and they learn grammar unconsciously because it is motivated by cultural and mediation tools. This is due to the teachers use of technologies such audios and videos that lead to the process of learning grammar unconsciously. That is why the pre-service teachers are in some extent motivated.

Table 4.34: Do you agree with the student-teacher centered approach and interactions?

Mean = 2.83	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	15.0
Sometimes	11	18.3	18.3	33.3
Often	17	28.3	28.3	61.7
Always	23	38.3	38.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.83, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers prefer the student-teacher centered approach and interactions to English language for learning it. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to apply the student-teacher centered approach and interactions in order to create a real situation for learning English language.

Table 4.35: Do you think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities?

Mean = 2.90	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	6	10.0	10.0	13.3

Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	38.3
Often	10	16.7	16.7	55.0
Always	27	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of the above item is 2.90, so it is positively acknowledged. The above output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities. This is due to that English is a foreign language but as international language stepped to be second language, therefore, such a context for English language is available in the most communities in the world and it can be taught in a proper ways. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to pay more attention to the process of learning and motivate students.

Table 4.36: Language and specifically communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are used and integrated.

Mean = 2.50	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	4	6.7	6.7	6.7
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	23.3
Sometimes	16	26.7	26.7	50.0
Often	12	20.0	20.0	70.0
Always	18	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.50, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that pre-service teachers confirm that Language and specifically communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are used and integrated. Also it indicates that their teachers use methods of teaching according to their levels of development. This indicates that the teachers in a way to provide potential help according to pre-service teachers' current level of development.

Table 4.37: Do you think that your native language should be strictly avoided in class in explaining English Grammar?

Mean = 3.07	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	10.0
Sometimes	12	20.0	20.0	30.0
Often	13	21.7	21.7	51.7
Always	29	48.3	48.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.07, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers think that native language should be strictly avoided in class in explaining English Grammar, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.38: Do you think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar?

Mean = 2.95	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	10.0
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	35.0
Often	13	21.7	21.7	56.7
Always	26	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.07, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that students could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.39: Do you think that the underling patterns should be taught by the teacher?

Mean = 2.65	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	5	8.3	8.3	8.3
Rarely	10	16.7	16.7	25.0
Sometimes	10	16.7	16.7	41.7
Often	11	18.3	18.3	60.0
Always	24	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.65, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that the underling patterns should be taught by the teacher. This indicates that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving its objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.40: Do you think that the underling patterns should be discovered by the pre-service teachers on their own?

Mean = 2.88		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Rarely	5	8.3	8.5	10.2
	Sometimes	15	25.0	25.4	35.6
	Often	17	28.3	28.8	64.4
	Always	21	35.0	35.6	100.0
	Total	59	98.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.7		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean of this item is 2.88, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that the underling patterns should be discovered by the pre-service teachers on their own. Even there is a contradictory result with the previous item that the underling patterns should be taught by the teacher. This indicates that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language; therefore, pre-service teachers prefer both methods. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving its objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

Table 4.41: Do you think that grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects?

Mean = 2.98	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	3	5.0	5.0	8.3
Sometimes	16	26.7	26.7	35.0
Often	12	20.0	20.0	55.0
Always	27	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.98, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers think that grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects, this is due that majority of the pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

Table 4.42: Do you think that translation (traditional) Grammar is the best method in teaching English grammar?

Mean = 1.35	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	21	35.0	35.0	35.0
Rarely	16	26.7	26.7	61.7
Sometimes	11	18.3	18.3	80.0
Often	5	8.3	8.3	88.3
Always	7	11.7	11.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 1.35, thus it is negatively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers do not prefer to learn English language through translation (traditional) grammar is the best method in teaching English grammar. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language to avoid translation (traditional) Grammar method in teaching English grammar, and teachers also could exploit this in order to ignore this method in teaching English language.

Table 4.43: Do you think that structural method is the best one in teaching English grammar?

Mean = 1.58	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	15	25.0	25.0	25.0
Rarely	16	26.7	26.7	51.7
Sometimes	15	25.0	25.0	76.7
Often	7	11.7	11.7	88.3
Always	7	11.7	11.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 1.85, thus it is negatively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers do not prefer to learn English language through structural method in teaching English grammar. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language to ignore this method in teaching English language.

Table 4.44: Do you think that communicative approach is the best one in teaching English grammar?

Mean = 2.85	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	3	5.0	5.0	5.0
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	11.7
Sometimes	14	23.3	23.3	35.0
Often	17	28.3	28.3	63.3
Always	22	36.7	36.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.85, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language through communicative approach that is the best one in teaching English grammar according to their perspectives. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language to concentrate on communicative method in teaching English grammar that leads to the process of learning grammar unconsciously. That is why the pre-service teachers are in some extent motivated. Teachers also could exploit this in order to achieve the objectives of teaching grammar in teaching English language.

Table 4.45: Do you think that cognitive approach is the best one in teaching English grammar?

Mean = 2.83	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Rarely	7	11.7	11.7	15.0
Sometimes	14	23.3	23.3	38.3
Often	13	21.7	21.7	60.0

Always	24	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 2.83, thus it is positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers also prefer to learn English language through cognitive approach that is the best one in teaching English grammar according to their perspectives. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language to concentrate on cognitive method in teaching English grammar to achieve the objectives of teaching grammar in teaching English language.

Table 4.46: Do you think that you should be aware of the mentioned methods?

Mean = 3.42	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Rarely	2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Sometimes	7	11.7	11.7	15.0
Often	15	25.0	25.0	40.0
Always	36	60.0	60.0	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this output is 3.42, so it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of the pre-service teachers are aware of the mentioned methods and what is going to be taught. This is due to the teachers' implementation of different methods in teaching.

Table 4.47: Do you think that grammar is teachable?

Mean = 3.05	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	5	8.3	8.3	10.0
Sometimes	12	20.0	20.0	30.0

Often	14	23.3	23.3	53.3
Always	28	46.7	46.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this output is 3.05, so it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that majority of pre-service teachers think that grammar is teachable. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving its objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language. As Hudson thinks that grammar can be teachable “if teachers are sufficiently well-informed about grammar and if the teaching is proactive”. In other words teachers’ experience about grammar, and the way that they use instructions have a great influence in the process of teaching and learning grammar (2010, p.128).

Table 4.48: Do you think pre-service teachers’ beliefs of teaching grammar need to be considered?

Mean = 3.10	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	1	1.7	1.7	1.7
Rarely	4	6.7	6.7	8.3
Sometimes	9	15.0	15.0	23.3
Often	20	33.3	33.3	56.7
Always	26	43.3	43.3	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

The mean of this item is 3.10, thus it is very positively acknowledged. This output shows that the majority of the pre-service teachers think that teaching grammar needs to be considered. They regarded teaching grammar as tools to improve the pre-service teachers’ skills and capacity to use English language. This indicates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught in

learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.



5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter includes discussion of the study, results of the pre-service teacher's questionnaire that's about their perspectives to teaching grammar at ELT departments at Salahaddin University, conclusion, pedagogical implication, limitation of the study and suggestions for further research.

5.2. Discussion

The present study investigated the pre-service teachers' perspectives on teaching grammar at ELT departments in Erbil City especially English departments at Salahaddin University - SUE in Erbil, because some linguists insist that teaching grammar is essential for teaching any foreign language, but other linguists state that it stops the progress of the process of the acquisition of the second/ foreign language. Even experts of language teaching from past and modern are questioning the idea of including grammar lesson in second language teaching or not, therefore this study raised the following questions as research questions which are 1. What are the factors that have impacts on pre-service teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar?, 2. Whether the teachers' level of teaching in applying the methods of teaching and learning English language throughout grammar courses are satisfied in the light of textbooks of grammar or not. 3. Whether the grammar should be taught or not? 4. Should grammar be taught as an independent subject or it should be taught throughout teaching communication module in which the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) as integrated skills will be taught?, were answered through the questionnaire and interviews. The participants of this study were EFL students and teachers at Salahaddin University-Erbil (SUE). College of Education, College of Languages and College of Basic Education.

Also the study hypothesized that learners in general might not seem to have a certain conception of what the term 'grammar' is as definition idea, process or value; therefore the study was an attempt aim to improve lesson in order to meet learners'

needs that is most of the learners might not know the basic role of grammar courses in the process of learning and teaching English and that these courses are regarded as an attempt in the hope of improving the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language.

Also it hypothesized that most of learners might not know the value of everyday language that is extremely vital to them, and those inappropriate methods of teaching grammar decrease the merits of the assigned grammar lesson and this may be due to the current curriculum that is somewhat not successful for learning English language and teaching at University or may be due to the strategies which may not be implemented in appropriate ways which decrease acquiring language skills.

In addition to these facts, there might not be a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of language acquisition and learning English in the universities and among themselves and communities and learners might not satisfied with the extent of grammar courses and strategies that are implemented in English departments program as found by (Dizayi, 2016).

Most of the speaking demotivating factors are related to the linguistic, environmental, psychological factors that hindered pre-service teachers at Salahaddin University-Erbil from speaking English in the classroom.

As a result, learners might not be satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently and they feel lacks of opportunities to develop their skills, knowledge, attitudes and values required for learning English.

5.3. The Results of pre-service teachers' Questionnaire

The average of the means of the pre-service teachers' questionnaire is 2.683. Therefore it is said that more than half of the pre-service teachers acknowledge that grammar has a crucial role in language learning and teaching to assist the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence.

- It can be concluded that pre-service teachers are motivated to learn English language unconsciously and to be exposed to English language for learning it and majority of them think that grammar should be taught in learning English because grammar plays a crucial role in language learning and teaching and it helps the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence. Grammar courses have the fundamental role in the process of learning and teaching English

since they are considered tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use. Majority of pre-service teachers think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions. Pre-service teachers also think that the pedagogical objectives can be attained in teaching grammar courses and achieve the learning outcomes. In this case, it is obvious that pre-service teachers are connected inside and outside classroom contexts for their best learning by effective grammar courses. Pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently via grammar courses. They prefer grammar to be taught throughout teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). They think that grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects, this is due that more pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language and more pre-service teachers affirm that they like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and they learn grammar unconsciously because it is motivated by cultural and mediation tools. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

- The majority of the students believe that the current curriculum is adequate for learning English language and teaching grammar courses. Pre-service teachers are satisfied with the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts and it better matches pre-service teachers' development because it is in accordance with their needs and level .They are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods are persuasive in the light of text books of grammar, English departments program and activities of learning English language as a second/ foreign teaching and they motivate pre-service teachers.

- Also it can be inferred from the pre-service teachers' opinion that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language learning but not acquisition in the universities, but they confirm that there is a proper

environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities.

- The majority of the pre-service teachers like and have motivation to study through cooperative interactions. This is due to pre-service teachers' self-motivation to mediate themselves into group working for learning and studying English language. The majority of the pre-service teachers confirm that they participate in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations in classroom teaching and learning processes cooperatively and this is due to teachers' implementation of the cooperative methods of teaching and learning. This also illustrates that there is student-teacher mediation and practice, where the parts of the lesson's topic or the whole is summarized to assist them rearrange the outstanding points or ideas of grammar. More pre-service teachers affirm that they are supplied with opportunity to inquiry, ask questions and to discuss what is not understandable, and they have motivation to study through interactions. This indicates that pre-service teachers have self-motivation to share in the interaction procedure for learning and studying English language. Thus this improves the critical thinking of pre-service teachers as well as it solidarities their verbal thought. At the same time pre-service teachers confirm that their teachers alter methods of teaching according to their levels of development. This indicates that the teachers in a way to provide potential help according to pre-service teachers' current level of development. More pre-service teachers confirm that they like communication lessons since it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and they learn grammar unconsciously because of motivation of the cultural and mediation tools and this is due to the fact that the teachers use the technologies such audios and videos that lead to the process of learning grammar unconsciously. Also pre-service teachers affirm that Language and especially communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are utilized and integrated. This indicates that the teachers in a way provide potential assistance according to pre-service teachers' current level of development.

- Concerning methods of teaching grammar, more pre-service teachers are aware of the methods and what is going to be taught. This is due to the teachers' implementation of different methods in teaching. Pre-service teachers believe that the inadequate methods of teaching grammar decrease the advantages of the assigned grammar course. This illustrates that pre-service teachers are convinced with the

implemented methods in teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods motivate pre-service teachers to feel that the process of teaching is for them. It provides inductive or bottom up education that provides individuals activation in their classroom, therefore more pre-service teachers do not prefer to learn English language through translation (traditional) in teaching English grammar. Also more pre-service teachers do not prefer to learn English language through structural method in teaching English grammar. While more pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language through communicative and cognitive approaches in teaching English grammar according to their perspectives. This indicates that teachers could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers for learning English Language to concentrate on communicative and cognitive methods in teaching English grammar that lead to the process of learning grammar unconsciously. That is why the pre-service teachers are in some extent motivated. Teachers also could exploit this for achieving the purposes of teaching grammar in teaching English language.

- Concerning grammar courses the majority of the pre-service teachers think that teaching grammar needs to be considered. They considered teaching grammar tools to improve the pre-service teachers' capacity and skills to use English language. This indicates that the departments of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught in learning English. Even the majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language, but more pre-service teachers do not refuse to learn English language through instructions or grammar to be taught as independent courses in learning English language, this is due to the status of English as a foreign language in Iraq. This illustrates that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for determining that grammar courses should be in curriculum as separate courses or to be taught in contexts for teaching and learning English Language, and teachers also could exploit this in order to select the best type of grammar that achieves the objectives in teaching and learning English language. Therefore; pre-service teachers are convinced with the underlined patterns to be taught by the teacher or to be found out by the pre-service teachers on their own. Even there is a contradictory result, but this indicates that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language; therefore, pre-service teachers prefer both methods. This indicates

that the department of English language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be designed for achieving its objectives, and teachers also could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language.

5.4. Conclusion

While throughout working on this study as a whole, the study comes across a number of the most important points that are precious value and have to be paid success attention in future efforts of teaching, since many factors have impacts on pre-service teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar at University in Erbil, because the process of learning and teaching are regarded as a complex process. This complicated process interplays between the teacher's intention in choosing the implemented methods of teaching, preparing classroom settings, motivating pre-service teachers, choosing syllabus, individual learners in participating classroom activities who should be aware of the challenges and frustrations that face him in the application of this complicated process, syllabus that may not achieve the needs of the learners and community and the environment and classroom setting that might not be a proper environment for the learners to understand nature of language acquisition and learning English in the universities and among themselves and communities. The present study has concludes that all these factors have impacts on pre-service teachers' attitudes towards teaching grammar at University in Erbil.

Concerning the teachers' level of teaching in applying methods of teaching and learning English language throughout grammar courses whether they are convincing in the light of textbooks of grammar or not?. The present study has come up with that the majority of pre-service teachers are convincing to the methods of teaching grammar, since more pre-service teachers are aware of the methods and what is going to be taught. This is due to the teachers' implementation of different methods in teaching. This illustrates that pre-service teachers are convinced with the implementing methods in teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods motivate pre-service teachers to feel that the process of teaching is for them. It provides inductive or bottom up education that provides individuals activation in their classroom, therefore more pre-service teachers prefer to learn English language through communicative and cognitive approaches in teaching English grammar

according to their perspectives. That is why the pre-service teachers are in some extent motivated.

The majority of the pre-service teachers like and have motivation to study through cooperative interactions. This is due to pre-service teachers' self-motivation to mediate themselves into group working for learning and studying English language. The majority of the pre-service teachers confirm that they share in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations in classroom teaching and learning processes cooperatively and this is due to fact that the teachers implement the cooperative methods of teaching and learning. This also illustrates that there is student-teacher mediation and practice, in which the parts of the lesson's topic or the whole is summarized to assist them rearrange the outstanding points or ideas of grammar. More pre-service teachers confirm that they are supplied with opportunity to ask questions and to discuss what is not understandable, and they have motivation to study through interactions. This is due to the fact that pre-service teachers' self-motivation for learning and studying English language and to participate in the interaction process. Thus this improves their critical thinking as well as it enhances their verbal thought. At the same time pre-service teachers confirm that their teachers alter methods of teaching according to their levels of development. More pre-service teachers affirm that they like communication lessons since it involves the use of tools like films and documentary and they learn grammar unconsciously because of cultural and mediation tools that motivate them and this is due to the fact that the teachers use the technologies such as audios and videos which lead to the process of learning grammar unconsciously. Also pre-service teachers confirm that Language and specifically communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are used and integrated. All these indicate that the teachers in a way to provide potential help according to pre-service teachers' current level of development.

The majority of the pre-service teachers think that the current curriculum is adequate for learning English language and teaching grammar courses. Pre-service teachers are satisfied with the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts and it better matches pre-service teachers' development because it is in accordance with their needs and level. They are satisfied with the teachers' level in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via teaching grammar; on the other hand, the methods are persuasive in the light of text books of

grammar, English departments program and activities of learning English language as a second/ foreign teaching and they motivate pre-service teachers.

Also it can be inferred from the pre-service teachers' opinion that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of English language learning but not acquisition in the universities, but they confirm that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities.

Concerning whether grammar should be taught or not? The majority of the pre-service teachers think that teaching grammar needs to be considered. They considered teaching grammar tools for improving the capacity and pre-service teachers' skills to use English language. Pre-service teachers are satisfied with the underlined patterns to be taught by the teacher or to be found out by the pre-service teachers on their own. Even there is a contradictory result, but this indicates that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the pre-service teachers' skills and capacity to use English language; therefore, pre-service teachers prefer both methods. And majority of them think that grammar should be taught in learning English because grammar plays a crucial role in language learning and teaching and it helps the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence. Grammar courses have the essential role in the process of learning and teaching English. Majority of pre-service teachers think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar, this is due that majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language. .

Concerning whether grammar Should be taught as an independent subject or it should be taught throughout teaching communication lesson in which the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) as integrated skills will be taught?. The majority of pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language, but more pre-service teachers do not refuse to learn English language through instructions or grammar to be taught as independent courses in learning English language, this is due to the status of English as a foreign language in Iraq. It can be concluded that pre-service teachers are motivated to learn English language unconsciously and to be exposed to English language for learning it. This indicates that students could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English more than through instructions. Pre-service teachers also think that the pedagogical objectives can be attained in teaching grammar

courses and achieve the learning outcomes. Grammar courses effectively relate pre-service teachers inside and outside classroom contexts for pre-service teachers' best learning. Pre-service teachers are convinced with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses. They prefer grammar to be taught throughout teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing). They think that grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects, this is due that more pre-service teachers prefer to learn grammar in context throughout learning English language and more students affirm that they like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and they learn grammar unconsciously because it is motivated by cultural and mediation tools. This indicates that pre-service teachers could easily learn grammar of the language if they lived in real context of English; teachers also could exploit this opinion to help pre-service teachers to participate in situational context of English Language.

5.5. Pedagogical Implications:

In perspective of the expressed conclusions one may illustrates pedagogical implications since one of the main aims to teaching grammar is to help the learners to improve their grammatical and communicative competence. It is not only for knowing and understanding the rules but when these rules are used and to be able to communicative with these rules accurately and fluently.

This indicates that the department of English Language could easily exploit this extent of pre-service teachers' perspectives to learn English Language for deciding that grammar should be taught and courses should be in curriculum as independent courses or to be taught in contexts for teaching and learning English Language.

Also teachers could exploit this in order to choose the best type of grammar that achieves the purposes in teaching and learning English language and to concentrate on communicative and cognitive methods in teaching English grammar that lead to the process of learning grammar unconsciously.

Teachers also could exploit this in order to achieve the objectives of teaching grammar in teaching English language and he should be aware that basically, there are three main approaches of teaching grammar. They are inductive, deductive and guided-discovery approaches or seductive.

It was obvious from this study that the grammar teachers at the three departments of English in the colleges at Salahaddin University- Erbil generally either follow inductive or deductive approaches to teaching grammar. They have not been introduced to guided-discovery approach.

Therefore; it is recommended for the teachers to apply guided-discovery approach because it is considered that is better than the two other approaches since it selects the best from each approach. This is due to the fact that, this approach tries to mix both approaches in a lesson and focuses on both accuracy and fluency. Also this method motivates the pre-service teachers to communicate and also augments pre-service teachers talking time rather than teaching talking time.

At the same time different sorts of learning techniques are preferred to be used particularly those that are familiar and favorable to the pre-service teachers since they enable the learners to master the language better.

Teachers also could exploit the pre-service teachers' perspectives in order to have a friendly rapport with their pre-service teachers for decreasing their anxiety, and to increase their self-confidence to be much involved with the grammar materials.

Also they could exploit this to use cooperative learning approach for providing pre-service teachers enough opportunities to interact with each other actively in the class, and provide motivational feedback on their pre-service teachers' responses and performances in order to encourage them to be more familiar with the process of learning English.

It can be recommended that the departments of English exploit the pre-service teachers' perspectives in order to create an appropriate motivating and comfortable learning environment in the classroom for the pre-service teachers and increase the pre-service teachers' positive attitudes toward learning English.

5.6. Limitations of the Study

There are many limitations in this study. For instance, the pre-service teachers' questionnaire might not include all aspects of teaching grammar.

Also the study was carried out with limited number of participants, since only sixty pre-service teachers participated in this study, not all the pre-service teachers EFL

pre-service teachers and EFL teachers at the three Departments of English Language of Colleges at SUE participated in this study.

Third, since the study was conducted only with pre-service teachers. i.e. fourth grade pre-service teachers at the three Departments of English Language of Colleges in Salahaddin University-Erbil that's why the results cannot be generalized to all of the elementary and intermediate pre-service teachers at the other three grades (First, Second and Third) grade pre-service teachers of English departments in the Colleges at SUE or at other Iraqi universities.

5.7. Suggestions for Further Research

In the light of the expressed results the following points are proposed:

1. The impact of providing feedback to EFL pre-service teachers in teaching and learning English grammar.
2. The role of teachers' gender in the procedure of learning and teaching English grammar.
3. The Impact of the motivational strategies on teaching and learning English grammar.
4. The Impact of the selected syllabus on teaching and learning English grammar.
5. The Impact of the classroom setting on teaching and learning English grammar.
6. The Impact of the adopted strategies on teaching and learning English grammar.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, G., Greenwood, J.D and Peter, M.W. (1981).** The Teaching of English as an International Language. A Practical Guide. *Great Britain: Biddles Ltd.*
- Aitchison, J. (1999).** *Linguistics* (5th ed.). London: NTC publishing.
- Al-Hamash, K., (1978).** *A Survey of English Textbooks in Primary and Secondary Schools in Iraq.* Baghdad: Institute for the Development of English Language Teaching in Iraq.
-& **Younis, H. (1980).** *Principles and techniques of teaching English as a second language.* Baghdad: Institute for the Development of English Language Teaching in Iraq.
- & **Hamdi, Y. (1985).** *Principles and Techniques of Teaching English as a Second Language.* Bagdad: IDELTI.
- Al-Khafaji, A. H & Shayib, M. M. (1987).** *Analysis of English language primary school textbooks in Iraq.* Bagdad: Ministry of Education Press.
- Al-Khuli, M. A. (2000).** Teaching English as a foreign Language. *Amman: Dar Alfalah.*
- Allen, E. D. & Valette, R. M. (1977).** *Classroom techniques: foreign languages and English as a second language* (Rev. and expanded Ed.). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Andrews, S. (2007).** *Teacher language awareness.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. **Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000).** Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System.* 28(3), 355-372.
- Aslam, R. (1992).** *Aspects of language teaching.* New Delhi: Northern Book Centre.
- Azad, AK. (2013).** Grammar Teaching in EFL Classrooms: Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs. *ASA University Review.* Vol. 7 No. 2, cited by 7. (Pages 111 to 126).
- Biarayye, O.F.G. (2009).** *Assessing the suitability of "Sunrise" Program to The Kurdish Learners of the seventh Basic Grade in the schools of Erbil City.*

- Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Salahaddin.
- Babbie, Er.** (2010). *The practice of social research* (12th Ed.). Belmont, Calif: Wadsworth Cengage.
- Benati, A. G.** (2009). *Japanese language teaching: A communicative approach*. London: Longman.
- Bhardwaj, R. S.** (2008). *Business statistics* (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: Excel Books.
- Bishop, D., & Mogford, K.** (1993). *Language development in exceptional circumstances*. Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bloomfield, L.** (1935). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Bornstein, D.** (1984). *An introduction to transformational grammar*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Borg, S.** (2003) Teacher Cognition in Grammar Teaching: A Literature Review. Published in the School of Education, University of Leeds, UK, *LANGUAGE AWARENESS*, Vol. 12, No. 2. (Pages 96 to 108)
- Botha, H. L.** (1987). The role of error correction in communicative second language teaching. *Per Linguam*, 3(2), 46-51.
- Braine, G.** (2010). Nonnative speaker English teachers: Research, pedagogy, and professional growth. *New York: Routledge*. 65 (2): 190-192.
- Brooks, K.** (2010). *Introduction to TESOL: A beginners approach to teaching speakers of other languages*. S.l.: Keith W. Brooks.
- Brown, H. D.** (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco State University: Longman.
- , (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (4th Ed). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brumfit, C. J. & Johnson, K.** (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 1980. *Problems and Principles in English Teaching*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Budinski, K. G.** (2005). *Preparing and delivering technical presentations*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International.
- Bussmann, H., Trauth, G., & Kazzazi, K.** (1996). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. 452 London: Routledge.
- Celece-Murcia, M.** -(1991) "Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language Teaching". *TESOL Quarterl.* 25, pp.459-480.
- (2001). *Language Teaching as a Second or Foreign Language*. (3rd Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Chastain, K.** (1988). *Developing Second-Language Skills; Theory and Practice*. (3rd Ed.). USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chomsky, N.** (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
 ----- (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Mass: M.I.T. Press.
- Christison, M., & Murray, D. E.** (2014). What English Language Teachers Need to Know Volume III Designing Curriculum. *Hoboken: Taylor and Francis*.
- Cook, G.** (2003). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
 ----- (2008). *Second language learning and language teaching* (4th Ed.). London: Hodder Education.
- Corder, S. P.** (1981). *Error analysis and inter-language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crump, C. A.** (1995). Motivating students: A teacher's challenge. Sooner Communication Conference, *Norman, Oklahoma*.
- Crystal, D.** (1985). *Linguistics* (2nd Ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
 (2003). *A Dictionary of linguistics and Phonetics*. USA: Blackwell.
 (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cunningsworth, A.** (1984). *Evaluating and Selecting EFL Teaching Materials*. London: Heinman Educational Books Ltd.
- Dash, N., & Dash, M.** (2007). *Teaching English as an additional language*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.
- Davies, A.** (2003). *The native speaker: myth and reality* (2nd Ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
 ----- (2007). *An introduction to applied linguistics from practice to theory* (2nd Ed.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Day, R. R., & Bamford, J.** (1998). Extensive reading in the second language classroom. *Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*.
- Dhiman, O. P.** (2008). *Understanding Education: An overview of Education*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Dhority, L.** (1991). *The ACT approach: The use of suggestion for integrative learning* (Expanded 2nd Ed.). Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.: Gordon and Breach Science.
- Dizayi, M.** (2016) *Motivating English Foreign Language Students to Speak in English Classrooms*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul Aydin University, Istanbul, Turkey.

- Doff, A.** (2000) *Teach English: A training course for teachers* (14th ed.).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z.** (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
-, & **Ushioda, E.** (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd Ed.).
Harlow, London: Longman.
- Dykes, B.** (2007). *Grammar for everyone practical tools for learning and teaching
grammar*. Camberwell, Vic.: ACER Press.
- Ediger, M., & Rao, D.** (2003). *Language arts curriculum*. New Delhi: Discovery
Pub. House.
- Eggins, S.** (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics* (2nd Ed.). New
York: Continuum.
- Elizabeth, M., & Rao, D.** (2004). *Methods of teaching English*. New Delhi:
Discovery Pub. House.
- Ellis, R.** (1995) Interpretation Tasks for Grammar Teaching. *TESOL Book*.
DOI: 10.2307/3587806View/save citation, cited by: 0 articles, Volume 29. (pp 87-
105).
-, (1997) *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-, (1998) Teaching and Research: Options in Grammar Teaching.
TESOL Book. DOI:10.2307/3587901view/save citation, cited by: 0 articles,
volume 32, issue 1, (Pages 39–60).
- (2002) Grammar teaching-practice or consciousness-raising? In **J.
Richard & W. Renandya (Eds.)**, *Methodology in language teaching: An
anthology of current practice* (pp. 167-174). Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
-, (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.
- (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*.
Wellington [N.Z.: Research Division, Ministry of Education.
-, (2006) Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA
Perspective. *TESOL Book* . At University of Auckland in Auckland, New
Zealand, Vol. 40, No. 1, (Page 83 to 107).
- Falchikov, N.** (2001). *Learning together peer tutoring in higher education*. London:
Routledge/Falmer.
- Feez, S.** (2001) Curriculum evaluation in Australian adult migrant English program.
In D.R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language*

- teaching: A reader* (pp.208-228). London: Routledge in association with Macquarie University and The Open University.
- Ferris, D.** (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (2nd Ed.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Flowerdew, J. & Peacock, M.** (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fotos, S. & ELLIS, R** (1991) Communicating about Grammar: A Task-Based Approach. *TESOL Book*, Full publication history, DOI: 10.2307/3587079 View/save citation, cited by: 0 articles, Volume 25, Issue 4, Winter 1991, (pp. 605-628).
- Fotos, S.** (2001) Cognitive Approaches to Grammar Instruction. In M.C. Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 267-284). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Freeman, D.** (1991) *Consensus and Divergence on the Content, Role, and Process of Teaching Grammar*. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1991: linguistics and language pedagogy: the state of the art* (pp.260-272). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-, & **Anderson, M.** (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finocchiaro, M & Christopher, B.** (1983). *The Functional Notional Approach: From Theory to Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. & Hymas, N.** (2003). *An introduction to language*. (7th Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Gerngross, G., Puchta, H., & Thornbury, S.** (2006). *Teaching grammar creatively*. S.l.: Helbling Languages.
- Ghafoor, N. K.** (2007). *College Students' Errors in Using English Articles*. Unpublished MA thesis: University of Salahaddin.
- Ginsberg, M. B., & Wlodkowski, R. J.** (2009). *Diversity and motivation: Culturally responsive teaching in college* (2nd Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodenow, S. B.** (1839). *A systematic text-book of English grammar: On a new plan: With copious questions and exercises*. Portland [Me.: William Hyde.
- Gordon, T.** (2007). *Teaching young children a second language*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishers.

- González, K., Frumkin, R.** (2016). *Handbook of Research on Effective Communication in Culturally Diverse Classrooms*. IGI Global, Virginia Wesleyan University.
- Haley, M. H. & Austin, Y. T.** (2004). *Content Based Second Language Teaching and learning. An Interactive Approach*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Hadley, A. O.** (2003). *Teaching Language in Context*. (3rd Ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hall, G.** (2011). *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language in Action*. London: Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R.** (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd Ed.). London: E. Arnold.
- Harbord, J.** (1992). The use of the mother tongue in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 46(4), 350-355.
- Harmer, J.** (1998). *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman.
- (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Essex, London: Longman.
- Harmer, J.** (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. (4th Ed.). Longman: Pearson Education.
- (2007) *How to teach English*. Harlow; Longman
- Harrison, A.** (1983). *A Language Testing Handbook*. London: Macmillan Press limited.
- Hart, B., Rinvoluceri, M., Puchta, H., & Stranks, J.** (2010). *English in mind* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasan, A. S.** (2007). The Envisaged Syllabus for Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *Damascus University Journal*, 23(2), 45-61.
- Hassun, H. M.** (2010). *Evaluation of the Teaching of the EFL in the 7th Grade of Basic Education in the Light of the Teacher's Book Recommended for the New Course*. Unpublished MA Thesis.
- Heaton, J. B.** (1988). *Writing English Language Tests; a practical guide for teachers of English as a second or foreign language*. London: Longman group limited.
- Heaton, J.B.** (1990). *Longman Handbook for Language Teachers: Writing English*

- Language Tests*. London and New York: Longman Group UK limited.
- Henke, R. R., Chen, X., & Golman, G.** (1999). *What happens in classrooms? Instructional practices in elementary and secondary schools, 1994-95*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Hinkel, E., & Fotos, S.** (2002). *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.
- Hosseini, S. M. H.** (1991). *Beyond the Present Methods and Approaches to ELT/Education: The Crucial Need for a Radical Reform*. Tehran. Jungle Publication.
- Hua Liu, C. and Matthews, R.** (2005). Vygotsky's philosophy: Constructivism and its criticisms examined. *International Education Journal*, 6(3), pp. 386-399. Shannon Research Press. <http://iej.cjb.net> [Accessed 4-5-2013].
- Hudson, R.** (2010) *Grammar*. In M. Berns (Ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp.126-129) Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Huges, A.** (2003). *Testing for Language Teachers*. (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K.** (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jatoi, H.** (1992). *Gender of Teachers and Teaching Practices in Pakistani Schools*. Paper presented at the Conference on Schooling Effectiveness: Cross-National Findings. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.
- Johnson, H. & Johnson, K.** (1999). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. A Handbook for Language Teaching*. USA: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Johnson, K. E. and Golombek, P. R., eds.** (2011). *Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional Development*. New York and London: Routledge.
- John-Steiner V. and Mahn H.** (1996). Sociocultural Approach to Learning and Development: A Vygotskian Framework. *Educational Psychologist*, University of New Mexico: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates 31(3/4), pp. 191-206 [pdf] available at: <http://webpages.charter.net/schmolze1/vygotsky/johnsteiner.html> [Accessed 10 July 2013].
- Jones, L.** (2007). *The student-centered classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Khalil, R. J.** (2010). *An Analysis of Students' Errors in Tenses*. Unpublished MA

thesis: University of Silemani.

- Kearsley, G.** (1994). *Explorations in learning & instruction: The theory into practice database*. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://tip.psychology.org>.
- Killen, R.** (2007). *Teaching Strategies for Outcomes-Based Education* (2nd Ed.). Cape Town: Juta.
- Kochhar, S.** (1984). *Teaching of social studies* (New Ed.). New Delhi: Sterling Private.
- Kong, K.** (2014). *Professional Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C.** (1997). The Privilege of the Nonnative Speaker. *PMLA*, 112(3), 359-369.
- Krashen, S.** (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Krashen, S. D.** (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon p. 60.
-, & **Terrell, T. D.** (1983). *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kumar, K. S., Krishna, K. R., & Rao, D.** (2004). *Methods of teaching chemistry*. New Delhi: Discovery Pub. House.
- Kumaradivelu, B.** (2006). *Understanding Language Teaching. From Method to Post method*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lakshmi, G., & Rao, D.** (2004). *Methods of teaching life sciences*. New Delhi: Discovery Pub. House.
- Lantolf, J. P. and Thorne, S. L.** (2009). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Larsen-Freeman, D.** (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G., Deuchar, M., & Hoogenraad, R.** (1982). *English grammar for today: A new introduction*. London: Macmillan Press in conjunction with the English Association.
- Lewis, M. & Jimmie, H.** (1985). *Practical Techniques for language Teaching*. London: LTP
- Lindsay, P.** (2000). *Teaching English World Wide- A New Practical Guide to Teaching English*. USA: Alta Book Centre Publishers
- Littlewood, W.** (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge [London: Cambridge University Press.

- Lock, G.** (1996). *Functional English grammar: An introduction for second language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, M. H. & Doughty, C. J.** (2009). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. USA: Wiley-Blackwell
- Lumpe, A. T.: in Cizek, G. J.** (1999). *Handbook of Educational Policy*. San Diego: Academic press.
- Macdonough, J. & Christopher, Sh.** (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT. A Teacher's Book*. (2nd Ed.). USA: Blackwell Publishing
- Martin, A., & Marsh, H.** (2005). Motivating Boys and Motivating Girls: Does Teacher Gender Really Make a Difference? *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(3), p. 320-334.
- Martino, W., & Kehler, M.** (2006). Male teachers and the boy problem: An issue of recuperative masculinity politics. *McGill Journal of Education*, 41(2), 113-131.
- Maum, R.** (2002, December 1). *Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in the English Teaching Profession*. ERIC Digest. Retrieved August 9, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED470982.pdf>
- McBeath, R.** (1992). *Instructing and evaluating in higher education: A guidebook for planning learning outcomes*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications.
- McKay, S.** (1986). Literature in the ESL Classroom. In C. Brumfit & R. Carter (Eds.), *Literature and language teaching* 16(4)(pp.191-198). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Medgyes, P.** (2001). *When the teacher is a non-native speaker*. Retrieved August 13, 2014, from <http://teachesl.pbworks.com/f/When+the+teacher+is+a+nonnative+speaker>
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S.** (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Moore, K. D., & Hansen, J. R.** (2012). *Effective strategies for teaching in K-8 classrooms*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Mosallanejad, Parviz.** (1999). *Methodology of Teaching Foreign Languages*. Tehran. Shahid Mahdavi: Educational Cultural and Charity Institute.
- Mujis, D.** (2004). *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications
- Murcia, M.** (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd Ed.).

Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S.** (2011). *Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: Integrating form-focused instruction in communicative context*. New York: Routledge.
- Nation, I. S., & Macalister, J.** (2010). *Language curriculum design*. New York: Routledge.
- Nettle, D.** (1999). *Linguistic diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Nia, M. R., Abbaspour, E., & Zare, J.** (2013). A critical review of recent trends in second language syllabus design and curriculum development. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 2(2), 63-82.
- Norland, D. L., & Said, T.** (2006). *A kaleidoscope of models and strategies for teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Westport, Conn.: Teacher Ideas Press.
- Nunan, D.** (1988). *Syllabus Design*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Okon, K.** (2013). *Teaching English effectively: With special focus on learners' interests*. S.l.: Anchor Academic Publishing.
- Palmer, F. R.** (1984). *Grammar* (2nd Ed.). London: Longman.
- Pazaver, A., Wang, H.** (2009) Asian Students' Perceptions of Grammar Teaching in the ESL Classroom. *The International Journal of Language Society and Culture*. Issue 27, Cited by 23 (Pages 27 to 35).
- Pritchard, Alan.** (2009). *Ways of Learning: Learning theories and learning styles in the classroom*. (2nd Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Reddy, R.** (2008). *Methods of teaching*. New Delhi: S.B. Nangia, A.P.H. Pub...
- Richards, J. C., Hull, J., & Proctor, S.** (1996). *Changes: English for international communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1998). *New interchange: English for international communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
- Richards, J.C.** (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-& **Rodgers, T. S.** (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
-& **Schmidt, R. W.** (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.
- & **Renandya, W. A.** (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthropology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge

- University Press.
- **& Schmidt, R.** (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. (3rd Ed.). Edinburg: Pearson Education.
- Reiber, R. W. & Carton, A S., eds.** (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky: Scientific Legacy. Vole 1: Problems of general psychology. New York: Plenum Press.*
- River, W. M.** (1981). *Teaching Foreign- Language skills*. (2nd Ed.). USA: The University of Chicago Press Ltd.
-, (1983). *Communicating naturally in a second language: Theory and practice in language teaching. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press.*
- Robinson, P.** (1996). Learning Simple and Complex Second Language Rules Under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-Search, and Instructed Conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(01), 27-67 *Cambridge University Press, Printed in the United States of America.*
- Saumell, V.** (2012) *Guided Discovery for Language Instruction: A Framework Implementation at all Levels* .Available at:
<http://vickysaumel.blogspot.com/com/2012/03/guided-discovery-for-language.html> [accessed 9 December 2015].
- Savage, K. L., Bitterlin, G., & Price, D.** (2010). *Grammar matters: Teaching grammar in adult ESL programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Schleppegrell, M.** (2004). The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective. 8(2) *Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.*
- Schmitt, N.** (2010). *An introduction to applied linguistics* (2nd Ed.). London: Arnold.
- Schoonmaker, F.** (2002). "Growing up" teaching: *From personal knowledge to professional practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shakir, K. M.** (2007). *Errors Made by College Students in Using Time and Place Prepositions*. Unpublished MA thesis: University of Salahaddin
- Shimon, J. M.** (2011). *Introduction to teaching physical education: Principles and strategies*. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics.
- Schindler, J.** (2010). *Transformative classroom management: Positive strategies to engage all students and promote a psychology of success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (p.25).
- Siddiqui, M. H.** (2008) .*Teaching of Home Science*. New Delhi: S.B. Nangia, A.P.H. Pub..
- Stern, H. H.** (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford

- University Press.
 (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2006). *An A-Z of ELT: A dictionary of terms and concepts used in English language teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Sopin, G.** (2015). Students' Perceptions of Grammar Teaching and Learning in English Language Classrooms in Libya. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*. e-ISSN: 2320–7388,p-ISSN: 2320–737X Volume 5, Issue 2 Ver. (PP 67-72).
- Streven, P.** (1976). *New Orientations in the Teaching of English*. Cambridge: Welfson.
- Sugiharto,S.** (2005) “Why We Should Teach Grammar: Insight for EFL Classroom Teachers”. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*. 1(1),pp.22-32.
- Thomas, D.W.** (2006). *Schoolmastery: Notes on teaching and learning*. Tinicum, PA: Xlibris.
- Thornbury, S.** (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Thu, TH.** (2009) Teachers' Perceptions about Grammar Teaching. *Alliant International University*. Cited by 7.
- Tiwari, S. R.** (2010). *Teaching of English*. New Delhi: A P H Publishing Corporation.
- Touchie, H. Y.** (1986). Second Language Learning Errors Their Types, Causes, and Treatment. *JALT Journal*, 8(1), 75-80.
- Ur, P.** (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- VanPatten, B.** (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub.
- Venkateswaran, S.** (1995). *Principles of Teaching English*. New Delhi: Vikas p.129.
- Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A.** (1996). *Academic writing intercultural and textual issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub.
- Vygotsky, L.S.** (1986). *Thought and Language*. Translated from Russia by Kozulin, A. London: Cambridge.
- Walker, R. J.** (2013). *12 characteristics of an effective teacher (2nd Ed.)*. Morrisville, NC: Lulu Publishing.
- Walkin, L.** (1990). *Teaching and learning in further and adult education*.

Cheltenham: Thornes.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whong, M. (2011). *Language teaching linguistic theory in practice*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widodo, H. (2006) 'Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar', *English Teaching, Practice and Critique*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 27–38.

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *Linguistics in language teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.

....., (1981). Notional Syllabuses Revisited. *Applied Linguistics*. II, 83-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

----- (1976). *Notional syllabuses: A taxonomy and its relevance to foreign language curriculum development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, J.D. (2005). *The teacher's grammar book* (2nd Ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Willis, J. R. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.

Wilson, B. A., & McLellan, D. L. (1997). *Rehabilitation studies handbook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Windham, C. (2017). The Student's Perspective. *North Carolina State University*. Copyright © 2017 EDUCAUSE.

Wood, T. D. (2012). Teacher Perceptions of Gender-Based Differences among Elementary School Teachers. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 4(2), 317- 345.

Xu, S. H. (2010). *Teaching English language learners: literacy strategies and resources for K-6*. New York: Guilford Press.

Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language* (3rd Ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

www.vwc.edu/images/stories/academics/educ/handbook.pdf

APPENDIX

Pre-service Students Teachers' Perspectives on Learning and Teaching Grammar	
Mahmood Gardeen Ali	
Istanbul Aydin University	
English Language and Litreture	
Stage: 3rd <input type="checkbox"/> 4th <input type="checkbox"/> Date:	
1	Do you think it is better to learn English language unconsciously? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
2	Do you think it is better that learner to be exposed to English language for learning it? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
3	Do you think it is better that learner to learn English language through instructions? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
4	Do you think that grammar should be taught in learning English ? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
5	Do you think that grammar should be taught as independent courses?

	Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
6	Do you think that grammar should be taught throughout teaching the four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing)? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
7	Do you think that grammar courses have the basic role in the process of learning and teaching English? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
8	Do you think that grammar courses are regarded as tools to improve the students' skill and capacity to use English language? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
9	Do you think that the inappropriate methods of teaching grammar decrease the merits of the assigned grammar course? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
10	Do you think that the current curriculum is successful for learning English language and teaching? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
11	Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of text books of grammar? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
12	Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of

	<p>teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of methods of teaching?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
13	<p>Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of activities of learning English Language as a second/ foreign language?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
14	<p>Do you think that the teachers' level of teaching in implementing methods of teaching and learning English language via grammar courses are persuasive in the light of and according to English departments Program?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
15	<p>Do you think that there is a proper environment for the students to understand nature of English language acquisition in the universities?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
16	<p>Are the pedagogical objectives attained in teaching grammar courses?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
17	<p>Do you think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to understand nature of learning English in the universities?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
18	<p>Are the learning outcomes achieved in grammar courses?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>

19	<p>Do you think that grammar books provide you with real and native like contexts?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
20	<p>Do you think that grammar courses are suitable in achieving the objectives of teaching and learning the English language?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
21	<p>Do you think that pre-service teachers are satisfied with their level of awareness and building capacities for speaking English fluently throughout grammar courses?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
22	<p>I like to learn English language with others such as cooperative rather than self-learning.</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
23	<p>The curriculum (instructional materials) contents appeal me because it is in accordance with my needs and level.</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
24	<p>How often do you participate in the teaching process in group, pair or individual discussions such as contributing presentations?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
25	<p>How often are you asked questions to be aware of what is going to be taught and what you are going to learn?</p>

	Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
26	The whole or parts of the lesson's topic is summarized to help you rearrange the important points or ideas of grammar. Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
27	Do you think that the type of curriculum which is represented by teaching grammar contexts better matches students' development? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
28	I am provided with opportunities to question or discuss what is not comprehensible or reasonable. Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
29	Do you think that grammar courses effectively connect pre-service teachers inside and outside classroom contexts for pre-service teachers' better learning? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
30	I am engaged to act out what I study in real activities. Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
31	The methods of teaching are altered according to my needs, level of comprehension and development (Multi-methods of teaching are used). Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
32	I like communication lessons because it involves the use of tools such as films and documentary and I learn grammar unconsciously. Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>

33	<p>Do you agree with the student-teacher centered approach and interactions?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
34	<p>Do you think that there is a proper environment for the pre-service teachers to learn English among themselves and communities?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
35	<p>Language and specifically communication skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening and non-verbal) are used and integrated.</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
36	<p>Do you think that your native language should be strictly avoided in class in explaining English Grammar?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
37	<p>Do you think that form, meaning, and use should be integrated in teaching grammar?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
38	<p>Do you think that the underling patterns should be taught by the teacher?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
39	<p>Do you think that the underling patterns should be discovered by the pre-service teachers on their own?</p>

	Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
40	Do you think that grammar should be taught in conjunction with other subjects? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
41	Do you think that translation (traditional)? Grammar is the best method in teaching English grammar? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
42	Do you think that structural method is the best one in teaching English grammar? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
43	Do you think that communicative approach is the best one in teaching English grammar? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
44	Do you think that cognitive approach is the best one in teaching English grammar? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>
45	Do you think that you should be aware of the mentioned methods? Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/>

46	<p>Do you think that grammar is teachable?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>
47	<p>Do you think pre-service teachers' beliefs of teaching grammar need to be considered?</p> <p>Always <input type="checkbox"/> Often <input type="checkbox"/> Sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely <input type="checkbox"/> Never <input type="checkbox"/></p>

THE MEMBERS OF JURY

Prof. Dr. Ali Mahmood Jukil - College of Basic Education - Salahaddin University.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Himdad Abdul-Qahhar Muhammad - College of Basic Languages - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Wuria Azzaddin Ali - College of Languages - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Anjuman Mohammed Sabir - College of Education - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Abbas Fadhil Latif - College of Languages - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hussien Ali Wali College of Education - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Suhayla Hameed Majeed - College of Languages - Salahaddin University.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Kawa Abdul-Kareem Rasul - College of Languages - Salahaddin University.

Dr. Dlovan Sayfaddin - College of Education - Salahaddin University.

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 11/07/2016-4183



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Sayı : 88083623-044-4183
Konu : Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD
Etik Kurul Onay Hk.

11/07/2016

Sayın Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD

Enstitümüz Y1312.020036 numaralı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı tezli yüksek lisans programı öğrencilerinden Mahmood GARDEEN ALI MAHMOOD' un "THE IRAQI EFL PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS ON TEACHING GRAMMAR AT ELT DEPARTMENTS OF SALAHADDIN UNIVERSITY IN ERBIL" adlı tez çalışması gereği "Students' Questionnaire" ile ilgili anketi

16.11.2015 tarih ve 2015/13 İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Etik Komisyon Kararı ile etik olarak uygun olduğuna karar verilmiştir.

Bilgilerinize rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Özer KANBUROĞLU
Müdür

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : <https://evrakdogrula.aydin.edu.tr/en/Vision.Dogrula/BelgeDogrulama.aspx?V=BELEM5435>

Adres:Başyol Mah. İnönü Cad. No:38 Sefaköy , 34295 Kaçıkçakmesce / İSTANBUL
Telefon:444 1 428
Elektronik Ağ:<http://www.aydin.edu.tr/>

Bilgi için: Canan TOPDEMİR
Unvanı: Enstitü Sekreteri





RESUME



Name and Surname: Gardeen Ali Mahmood

Place and Date of Birth: Feb. 6, 1979 Erbil, Iraq

E-Mail Address: sawian2008@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Bachelor: Salahaddin University-Erbil, College of Languages, Department of Translation. 2008-2009 Academic year.

Master: Istanbul Aydin University, Department of English Language and Literature, English Language and Literature Program. 2017.