

The Iranian Students & Teachers' Perceptions of the Role of Explicit Grammar Instruction & Error Correction

Ali Mohammad Fazilatfar
Assistant professor, Yazd University

Morteza Beedel
MA, Yazd University

Abstract

Grammar instruction and error correction are among the most hotly debated issues in second as well as foreign language education. Second language researchers and language educators have expressed different and sometimes contradictory ideas about them. Some believe error correction and grammar instruction are not only beneficial, but they are also necessary. Some others believe that only appropriate incorporation of them in the syllabus can lead to improvement in learning. And still a third group conceives of them as a waste of time and detrimental to the learning process. To gain a better understanding of teachers' and learners' perceptions regarding error correction and the role of formal grammar instruction on learning, opinions of 51 teachers and 627 adolescent and adult learners were surveyed by means of two equivalent questionnaires. The participants received two different kinds of treatment in terms of materials, grammar instruction and error correction moves. In one group, learners received more explicit grammar instruction and systematic error correction, while in the other group the focus was on meaning and no systematic correction was provided. The analysis of the obtained data from the questionnaires revealed that differences in the methods of instruction did not lead to a difference in the participants' attitudes about error

correction and/or grammar instruction on learning. Also learners' and teachers' views about these two were close in many respects; however, error correction status diminished in the learners' views as they improved their proficiency levels. On the other hand, more proficient learners considered more credence for grammar instruction in their learning.

Key words: grammar instruction, error correction, explicit/ implicit learning, form focus, meaning focus.

1. Introduction

For more than 20 centuries (Nassaji & Fotos 2004), controversies over grammar teaching have been given the necessary credits from time to time. However, since the introduction of the Direct Method in the late-nineteenth century, the debate over the issue has been a constant one. During the last century, the effectiveness of explicit grammar instruction was questioned. Inductive method of grammar instruction over deductive one was mainly emphasized. In the late 1970s, with the rise of communicative method of language teaching, the role of grammar instruction was diminished and the proponents of the method considered it not only unhelpful but detrimental (Macro & Masterman 2006).

Similarly in the last fifteen to twenty years, language teaching in Iran has seen a very slow change from traditional methods in which deductive learning was stressed and language learning was done through teaching and studying of grammar and translation to more modern methods named communicative approaches.

Despite the turn from traditional approaches of language learning and teaching both in Iran as well as other EFL contexts, some applied linguists point out some research results which indicate the efficiency of teaching grammar in second language classrooms. Findings show that grammar instruction and correction of errors need to be included in language teaching syllabus (Swan, 2007). The question is how to deal with grammar. What is/are the best way/s among others showing to be effective in dealing with grammar instruction? Of course no method of grammar instruction/correction is supposed to be tested in present study; rather the main purpose is

to survey the teachers and learners views whether grammar instruction/correction needs to be included in the language classes. Before considering their views, we need to make a review on the issue and the kind of classifications made in terms of supports for and against it. The applied linguists' views can be grouped under the following three major classes:

I. The first group holds the view that error correction and grammar instruction are not only beneficial, but they are also necessary in learning second language. This group believes, based on the current research in second language acquisition, languages are learned with some degree of consciousness. Schmidt (1990) suggests that conscious attention to form or what he calls "noticing" is a necessary condition for language learning. Language learners need to focus on language grammatical forms, otherwise they focus on the message and do not attend to the forms and fail to process and learn them. The proponents of the view indicate that awareness of target forms plays an important role in L2 learning (Ellis, 2003).

On the same line of thought, there is some evidence pointing to the inadequacies of teaching approaches where the focus is primarily on meaning-focused communication and grammar is not addressed. According to Nassaj and Fotos (2004), in French immersion program in Canada where the learners primarily focused on communication and exposed to meaningful input, they did not achieve accuracy in certain grammatical forms.

Another reason supporting the inclusion of grammatical instruction in language syllabus is the positive effect of corrective feedback on learner errors. In a study done by Norris and Ortega (2000), they reviewed 49 studies on the effectiveness of L2 instruction; they found that the learners achieved substantial gains in learning grammatical structures. By presenting the structures with description and exemplification and giving rules for their uses in an explicit manner, the teachers got much more gains in teaching grammatical points. Therefore, this group seems to state the importance of explicit deductive ways of grammar instruction.

II. The second group believes formal grammar instruction and error correction are only a waste of time which can otherwise be spent on providing more communicative input (Schwartz, 1993; Krashen, 1985). The idea refers to distinction between learning and

acquisition (Krashen, 1982) and the preference of acquisition over learning for which comprehensible input is all that is needed. The advocates of the opinion believe that if input is provided, output would take care of itself. The point is that one can acquire competence in first or second language without producing it. In another word speaking and writing are not essential to acquisition. Additional grammatical rules as a kind of analyzed input are useless; because they have no effect on acquisition (Swan, 2007). Krashen (1993) keeps denying the importance of any explicit instruction in language acquisition. He believes its effect is peripheral and fragile arguing that explicit grammatical knowledge about grammatical features may never turn into implicit knowledge underlying unconscious language comprehension and production.

III. The third group of researchers believes if done properly, grammar instruction and error correction can increase the speed and ease learning second language (Lightbown, 2000; Ellis, 2003). This group in comparison to other above-mentioned groups takes a cautious approach. The proponents of the group do not question the need for explicit instruction but they object to traditional grammar learning which treat language as an object of learning. They argue that grammar lessons consisted of grammatical structures should not be presented explicitly by the teacher in an isolated way. They do not deny a role for explicit instruction but they suggest language learning as a process of "form-function-mapping" (Ellis, 2002) in which the learners are engaged and they need to follow a slow processing to get mastery over. Like other skills, language skill takes a huge number of hours of practice that can not be replaced by provision of a few declarative grammatical rules. What they suggest, no matter presented explicitly or implicitly, grammatical rules need to be presented in a wide variety of contexts. Also the learners need to have opportunities to encounter, process and use the structures in their various form-meaning relationship until they become part of their interlanguage.

Based on the introduction, some points needed to be made clear. The first and the second views are the two extreme cases criticized by language practitioners (Nassaji & Fotos 2004). There are some evidences showing the merely form-focused instruction has not resulted in unconscious use of grammatical constructions at the time

of real use of language. On the other hand, meaning-focused instruction per se in the immersion contexts has not led to the complete accuracy over some grammatical accuracy. The third view presents a moderate view which is feasible and practical. It points out the importance of noticing and awareness of grammatical forms. Furthermore, if this awareness is accompanied with the sufficient provision of various language input and the real use of language in wide varieties of contexts, it can be of ultimate use for language learning.

The other point needed to be clarified is the fact that in majority of the cases the opinions of the teachers and language practitioners are missing in the developments of the new theories relevant to grammatical instruction. They feel there is a gap between research findings and classroom realities. They may think that the results taken from research contexts are the artifice of the research design formed by researchers for some specific aims. The manipulated context and the measuring instruments employed may lack the necessary external validity. Therefore, in the present study, at first, an attempt is made to study the learners/teachers' opinions about grammar instruction and correction in our own Iranian EFL context. Then if they support the positive role of grammar instruction and correction, we present briefly some proper ways of grammar teaching without covering the issue of grammar correction which needs to be handled in other studies.

2. The Present study

Few studies have examined the Iranian teachers and learners' attitudes regarding formal grammar instruction and error correction in foreign language classrooms. As the first step the researchers believe that there should be some research for the perception of learners and teachers' viewpoints; in our case adult and adolescent EFL learners as well as teachers' viewpoints on this issue. The study addresses these two problems through surveying the attitudes of both learners and teachers of English. More specifically the following five hypotheses are tested in this study:

Hypothesis 1: Teachers, adolescents and adult learners of English as a foreign language believe formal grammar instruction and error correction do not have a facilitative effect on learning.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the attitudes of teachers and learners concerning the role of explicit grammar instruction and error correction.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between attitudes of learners who are taught a more grammar focused material and those of learners who take more meaning focused materials.

Hypothesis 4: The proficiency level of students has no significant effect on their perceptions regarding the role of grammar instruction and error correction in learning English as a foreign language.

Hypothesis 5: There are not any sex differences between learners about the efficiency of grammar instruction and error correction.

2.1 Method

2.1.1 Subjects

The participants in this study consisted of 627 male and female learners and 51 male and female teachers. Learners were learning English at different levels of language proficiency in different private English institutes in Qazvin, Iran. They had received at least 80 hours of instruction in those institutes. Nevertheless, many of the learners had taken English much longer. They were divided into two groups:

1-Those who received more of explicit grammar instruction and systematic error correction at their institute hereafter called G1 learners.

2-Those whose course did not include any detailed treatment of grammatical points or systematic error correction, referred to G2 learners.

The average age of G1 is 19.5 and that of G2 is 20.5. As learners in a given class were not at all at the same level of English proficiency, proficiency distinction among respondents was made based on the length of time they attended English classes. To avoid the difference conceived as existing between children and adults all subjects below the age of fourteen were excluded from the study.

The teachers, both male (27) and female (24), taught at different language schools. The study required teachers to have minimum teaching experience of two years. The researchers believed the experience extent of two years was essential for teachers firstly to

realize the difficulty areas in their practice and activities that facilitate learning, and secondly to sense the gap if any between theory and practice.

2.1.2 Materials

G1 materials consisted of studying a short, carefully simplified dialog and/or a text followed by detailed explanations of some grammatical structures and the meaning they realize. Firstly learners listen to the dialog, while books are closed. Then the teacher asks a couple of comprehension questions that learners answer chorally. After that they all open their books and the teacher paraphrases the text through synonyms, antonyms, questions, etc. Finally, they have intensive repetitions, chain drills and backward-built up drilling of long sentences.

The reading text of the unit is worked on in much the same way. And the grammar section follows the reading text of the unit. The teacher explains the grammatical points through examples and explanations. This phase is followed by an intensive oral drilling of the new structures. Oral drilling and repetitions are central and recurring themes in all levels of proficiency in G1 classes.

G1 is not provided with enough listening material for the learners, nor are they given any contextualized writing exercises. Errors in G1 are not discouraged; however, teachers are advised to assist learners in overcoming their errors through employing explanations on grammatical points and repetitions. Although G1 is not purely form-focused, the elements of a form-focused instruction are used in it.

G2 materials, unlike the other group, are of a functional/notional type, so grammar is touched upon only briefly. However, grammar difficulty has been observed in sequencing the material, the instruction focus is on enabling students to learn English through encouraging its use in instances of the target-like situations and then trying to use it in different exercises provided. The exercises are controlled and open-ended ones. In the controlled exercises learners answer questions based on the context they encountered. They provide appropriate sentences for incomplete interactions or choose the correct answer from among given alternatives on the listening or

reading clues. In open-ended exercises a context is provided for learners to interact on a given topic in spoken or written forms.

In a typical G2 class, grammatical structures do not receive any detailed explanations. And unlike G1 class, there are not any particular procedures for learning forms. There are not any set procedures for error correction, just those which lead to misunderstanding or causing breakdown of communication get corrected by the teacher. The teacher first tries to elicit the right form from other learners, only if this attempt fails; he provides them with the required form himself.

2.1.3 Procedures

Two questionnaires (appendix 1) were given to the teachers as well as learners of the both groups. Half of the items (1-10) concerned the role of explicit grammar instruction in foreign language classes. The other half (11-20) surveyed the attitudes of the respondents for their perceived role of error correction. Some of the items were taken from Ancker (2000), and Schulz (2001). The learners' questionnaires were the simplified forms of the teachers. Both questionnaires were presented in Persian language in order not to let comprehension problems arise.

The first potential groups of respondents for each individual item on the questionnaire were collapsed into the three major groups: (I) those who do not believe in grammar instruction and the error correction role in learning represented by the figure 1.00. (II) Those who moderately believe in grammar instruction and error correction represented by the figure 2.00. And finally (III) those who consider a high status for grammar instruction and error correction, represented by the figure 3.00. A score from 1 to 5 corresponding to the number of alternatives for each item in both questionnaires was assigned to each one of the five choices, 5 representing strongly agree, and 1 representing strongly disagree. Assuming a respondent gives positive answers to all the ten items covering the role of formal grammar instruction, he would get 50. Given that the same person does not consider grammar instruction to have any positive effect on learning, he would then hold a negative attitude to all the ten items surveying his opinion about grammar instruction. Such a person would then get 10. However, for the items 7, 11, 12 & 16 (due to the different

wording of the items) the opposite is true, that is, if respondents strongly agree with the idea in these items, they would get 1 and if they strongly disagree, they would get 5.

The variance is 40 i.e., $50-10 = 40$ and as the five potential groups of respondents were collapsed into three possible groups, there would be three possible groups of respondents in each one of G1 and G2 learners as well as teachers. The difference between the three possible respondents- 1.00, 2.00 and 3.00- in each one of the three groups of participants is $40:3 = 13.3$. This score is then rounded down to 13. Hence, those among the participants who get a score from 10 to 23, i.e. $10 + 13 = 23$ are ranked as the ones who hold an unfavorable attitude towards the role of explicit grammar instruction and error correction in their learning. The participants who get a score between 23 and 36 are not those who consider a high status for grammar instruction in learning nor do they hold a negative attitude towards it. And finally the ones whose scores fall between 36 to 50, i.e., $37 + 13 = 50$, believe that grammar instruction highly influence their learning.

To survey the perceptions of the participants about the other ten items on both questionnaires which concern the role of error correction in learning, the same approach explained for grammar instruction, was adopted. The obtained data was then analyzed by means of SPSS software version 11.0. Two sorts of analyses were carried out. The first comparison was made between G1 and G2 learners' responses to the questions. In the second analysis G1 and G2 data was collapsed into one category to find out firstly if students' views made any difference from those of teachers'; and secondly whether the students' views changed with the change in proficiency.

3. Results

3.1 Testing Hypothesis One

To test hypothesis one, G1 and G2 learners' data was collapsed into one category to be compared with the data obtained from the teachers' questionnaires. To do so, one variable chi-Squire test was run to figure out the perceptions of the learners on the influence of grammar instruction on learning English as a foreign language (table 1.).

Table1: Proportion of learners' responses to grammar items

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	11	209	-198.0
2.00	232	209	23.0
3.00	384	209	175.0
Total	627		

Table2: Chi-Square test for learners' attitudes to grammar instruction effect

	Grammar
Chi-Square	336.641
Df	2
Asymp.Sig	.00

* $p \leq .01$

As it is observed among learners in G1 and G2, eleven (1.8%) of them do not consider a high status for grammar instruction facilitative effect on learning, 232 learners (37%) believe that grammar instruction to a medium degree facilitates their learning. And 384 learners (61.2%) strongly believe that explicit grammar instruction improves their learning.

Looking at the difference between the expected numbers and the observed numbers on the one hand, and also the chi-Squire test score (336) on the other which is significant at 2 degrees of freedom, we can announce that the majority of the learner participants consider a high status for the role of grammar instruction in their learning, (table 2).

Table3: Proportion of learner responses to error correction items

	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	6	209.0	203.0
2.00	510	209.0	301.0
3.00	111	209.0	-98.0
Total	627		

Table4: Chi-Square Test for learners' attitudes to error correction effect

	Grammar
Chi-Square	676.622
Df	2
Asymp.Sig	.00

* $p \leq .001$

Concerning the role of error correction, you can see that 6 learners believe error correction does not improve their learning (table 3). But a considerable number of learners (510, i.e. 81.5%) moderately believe in error correction effect on their learning, and 17.7% of G1 and G2 learners, i. e. 111 students consider a strong positive effect for error correction in their learning. Also chi-Square test score (676.6), which is significant at 2 degree of freedom, leads us to the conclusion that learners in the study consider a positive effect for error correction (table 4).

3.2 Testing Hypotheses Two and Three

To test hypothesis two, we need to run t-test to illustrate the difference in the mean scores of learners and those of teachers on grammar instruction role in learning (table 5).

Table 5: Group statistics on teachers' and learners' attitudes toward grammar Instruction

	Learners	Teachers	Mean difference	T observed
N	627	51		
Mean Score	37.52	36.13	1.39	1.64
Std. Deviation	5.87	4.83		

Not significant at $p \leq .01$, $df=676$

From group statistics we can see that the mean score of students is 37.52 and that of teachers is 36.13. The t-test score is $t=1.64$, which is not significant at $p \leq .05$. So we can say there is no significant difference between the attitudes of teachers and those of learners and both groups have very close ideas about the role of grammar instruction in learning English. Therefore, there is no

difference in attitudes of learners and teachers concerning grammar instruction.

To test hypothesis three, a t-test was run to demonstrate the difference in the mean scores of G1 and G2 learners (table 6).

Table 6: Group statistics on attitudes of G1 and G2 learners toward grammar instruction

	G1	G2	Mean difference	T observed
N	470	157		
Mean score	37.648	37.165	.4833	.892
Std.deviation	5.979	5.564		

What this data tells us is that the mean score of 470 G1 learners is 37.64 and that of 157 G2 learners is 37.16. The difference in the mean score is 0.48. On the other hand as the t-test score ($t=0.89$) is not significant at $P<.05$, it can be argued that there is no difference between G1 and G2 learners. In other words the difference in instruction materials has not influenced the learners' attitudes about this factor.

The same pattern of results has been achieved for the role of error correction ($T= -0.417$ not significant at $p<0.05$). It can be concluded that the two ways of instruction have not caused a meaningful difference in the attitudes of learners in G2 and G2 towards the effect of error correction in learning a foreign language.

3.3 Testing Hypothesis Four

Based on this hypothesis the level of language proficiency of the students does not influence the attitudes of learners about the role of error correction and grammar instruction in their learning. The Pearson Correlations between proficiency level and learners' perceptions about grammar instruction proves that our independent variable is positively correlated with the dependent variable, and negatively correlated with the other dependent variable (opinion about error correction effect on learning). The correlation coefficient for grammar instruction and proficiency is -0.153 , (table 7) which indicates a positive yet weak correlation between the two variables. Hypothesis 4 is thus shown to be false in that

there is indeed a relation between the proficiency of learners and their attitudes towards formal grammar instruction and error correction.

Table 7: Correlation of proficiency and the attitudes of the learners toward error correction and grammar instruction

	Term	Grammar	Error
Term			
Pearson Correl.	1	-.153**	-.149**
Sig.	.	.000	.000
N	625	625	625

	Term	Grammar	Error
Grammar			
Pearson Correl.	-.153**	1	.162**
Sig.	.000	.	.000
N	625	627	627

	Term	Grammar	Error
Error			
Pearson Correl.	-.149**	.162**	1
Sig.	.000	.000	.
N	625	627	627

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

3.4 Testing Hypothesis Five

This hypothesis claims that there are not any sex differences between learners about the efficiency of grammar instruction and error correction. A t-test is run to determine the difference in mean scores of male and that of female learners first on their attitudes about formal grammar and then error correction (table 8).

Table 8: T-test for the difference between attitudes of male and female learners toward grammar instruction

	Male	Female	Mean difference	T observed
N	279	399		
Mean score	37.107	37.644	-.536	-1.138
Std. deviation	5.597	5.958		

Not significant at $p \leq .05$, $df = 676$

According to the output data, the mean score of the opinions of male students about the efficiency of grammar instruction is 37.10,

and that of their female counterparts is 37.64. The difference between the two mean scores is -0.53, since the t-test score ($t=-1.18$) is not significant at $p \leq .05$. It can be concluded that sex is not conductive to a difference in the learners' opinion about the role of grammar instruction in learning English as a foreign language. So, that part of hypothesis pertaining to grammar instruction is statistically confirmed.

4. Discussions

The purpose of the study was not to experimentally prove or reject that either formal grammar instruction or error correction enhances learning on the part of learners. Indeed it has nothing on these issues. The main objective, however, was to reveal the opinion of learners and teachers towards these controversial issues in language learning and teaching. In doing so, this study has succeeded in showing that those who opt for inclusion of some formal grammar instruction in language teaching have some evidence. And although it does not show whether error correction works, it does question the opinions of those who believe error correction should be altogether discarded with since it is among students' unfavorable classroom activities or that it is the cause of frustration and embarrassment on the part of students. Moreover, the findings of this research work help narrow the gap between the theoretically driven research results and the pedagogical considerations. This is mainly due to the fact that in experimental studies an attempt is made to rigorously control the variables in ways that teachers may not consider as pedagogically possible. The results of the study support arguments for the usefulness of employing quantitative data collection with more open-ended qualitative exploration.

The study does not say how or when learners' errors should be corrected. Neither does it put forward any suggestions for the right way of incorporating grammar into syllabi. Nonetheless, the materials writers and teachers can infer variable pedagogical points from the findings of this study. First and perhaps the most important is that Iranian adolescents and adult learners are accustomed to formal grammar instruction and error correction. This fact is evident in the proportion of positive and negative answers to the questions surveying the viewpoints of learners about the efficiency of grammar

instruction and error correction. Second, as students improve their proficiency, they are more inclined to receive grammar instruction. Therefore, in developing materials care should be taken not to include a lot of grammar instruction at basic and elementary levels. And the third is to realize that as students improve their proficiency error correction role in learning diminishes in their views. The inference we can make from this finding is to adopt error correction techniques learners find interesting and effective. Finally, learners showed no significant sex differences in their attitudes to explicit grammar instruction and error correction. Therefore, materials developers need not take this factor into consideration.

References

- Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *Forum*, 38, 20-25.
- Ellis, N. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A review with implications for theories of implicit and explicit language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 143-188.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1993). The effect of formal grammar teaching: Still peripheral. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 722-725.
- Macaro, E. & Masterman, L. (2006). Does intensive explicit grammar instruction make all the difference? *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 297-327.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). Current development in research on the teaching of grammar. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 126-145.

- Norris, J.M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50, 417-528.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Swan, M. (2007). The essential ingredients of a language course. In B. Beaven (Ed.), *Harrogate Conference Selections* (pp.45-54). IATEFL: Darwin College, University of Kent.

Appendix I

Learners' questionnaire

مرد زن ، سن سال ، شغل : ، مدت شرکت در کلاسهای زبان به ترم :
 نام آموزشگاه هر ترم جلسه می باشد . نام کتاب مورد استفاده

دانشجوی محترم از اینکه به پرسشنامه زیر با دقت و صرفاً بر پایه درک خود و نه تحت تاثیر نظر دیگران پاسخ می دهید صمیمانه سپاسگزار می نمایم . پاسخ های شما می تواند در برنامه ریزی های آموزشی و انتخاب متون درسی مورد استفاده قرار می گیرد . لطفاً جمله ها را به دقت بخوانید سپس پاسخی را که به نظر شما نزدیک تر است انتخاب و در مربع مقابل آن علامت گذاری نمایید .

1- برای یادگرفتن کامل زبان انگلیسی حتماً باید نکات دستوری آن را فراگرفت .

کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم

- 2- با خواندن و تمرین نکات دستوری زبان انگلیسی را با سرعت بیشتر و راحت تر یاد می گیرم .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 3- خواندن دستور زبان انگلیسی به یادگیری این زبان کمک می کند .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 4- خواندن مطالب و نکات دستوری زبان انگلیسی را دوست دارم .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 5- میزان تدریس دستور در دوره های آموزشی زبان انگلیسی باید افزایش یابد.
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 6 - وقتی به انگلیسی چیزی می نویسم یا وقتی چیزی را که به انگلیس نوشته ام می خوانم به قواعد دستوری به کار رفته در آن توجه دارم .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 7- هر تمرینی که به ما کمک کند تا بتوانیم انگلیسی را در موارد نیاز به کار ببریم (مثلاً با استفاده از متون مختلف ، تماشای فیلم ، پرسش و پاسخ ، اجرای نمایشنامه های کوتاه ، تمرین تلفظ کلمه ها و جمله ها) از تمرین و یادگیری نکات دستوری مهمتر است.
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 8- یادگیری مطالب دستوری تاثیر زیادی در فهم ما از انگلیسی شفاهی دارد .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 9- یادگیری مطالب دستوری تاثیر زیادی در فهم ما از انگلیسی کتبی یا نوشتاری دارد .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 10- دیگران انگلیسی شفاهی یا کتبی ما را فقط زمانی متوجه می شوند که نکات دستوری را دقیقاً رعایت کنیم .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 11- اصلاً مایل نیستم کسی اشتباهاتم را در کلاس مطرح و بعد تصحیح کند .
- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 12- معلم نباید اشتباهات دانش آموزان را در کلاس بررسی کند و توضیح دهد .

- کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 13- اگر معلم تکلیف های کتبی را که تعیین می کند ، تصحیح نکند احساس می کنم وظیفه اش را انجام نداده است .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 14- اگر در صحبت کردن انگلیسی اشتباه داشته باشم ، مایلم معلم آن را تصحیح کند .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 15- اگر در انگلیسی کتبی (نه از لحاظ املايي) اشتباه داشته باشم دوست دارم معلم آن را تصحیح کند .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 16- ترجیح می دهم با دانش آموزان دیگر چند نفری کار کنیم و آنها اشتباهاتم را بگویند تا اینکه معلم در جلوی همه کلاس اشتباهاتم را مطرح کند .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 17- تصحیح اشتباهات مربوط به نکات دستوری مهمتر از تصحیح اشتباهات مربوط به تلفظ و لحن جملات انگلیسی است .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 18- معلمی که اشتباهات دانش آموزان را مطرح و بررسی نمیکند مهارت قابل قبولی در تدریس انگلیسی ندارد .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 19- معلمی که اشتباهات دانش آموزان را مورد توجه قرار نمی دهد اهمیتی به پیشرفت و یادگیری دانش آموزان نمی دهد .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم
- 20- اگر کسی نباشد که اشتباهات ما را یاد آور شود و تصحیح کند نمی توانیم انگلیسی را خوب یاد بگیریم .
 کاملاً درست است درست است نظری ندارم
 مخالفم کاملاً مخالفم

Teachers' questionnaire

مرد زن سن : تجربه تدریس به سال : دوره های آموزشی که تدریس کرده ام :

مدرس محترم قبلاً از صرف وقت شما در پاسخ به پرسشنامه زیر صمیمانه سپاسگذاری می‌نمایم. پاسخ‌های دقیق شما می‌تواند در برنامه ریزهای آموزشی مورد استفاده قرار گیرد. لطفاً جمله‌ها را با دقت بخوانید سپس پاسخی را که به نظر شما در آموزش زبان انگلیسی از همه صحیح‌تر است انتخاب و در مربع مقابل آن علامت گذاری نمایید.

1- نوجوانان و بزرگسالانی که در کلاس زبان می‌آموزند برای یادگیری مطلوب زبان باید الزماً دستور زبان انگلیسی را یاد بگیرند.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

2- در کل می‌توان گفت مطالعه و تمرین دستور زبان انگلیسی بیشترین تاثیر را بر افزایش توانایی فراگیران بزرگسال یا نوجوان در ایجاد ارتباط با استفاده از زبان انگلیسی دارد.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

3- مطالعه دستور زبان انگلیسی به یادگیری زبان کمک می‌کند.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

4- فراگیران نوجوان یا بزرگسال به یادگیری دستور زبان انگلیسی علاقه دارند.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

5- میزان مطالب دستوری در دوره های آموزش زبان انگلیسی باید افزایش یابد.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

6- می‌توان گفت فراگیران بزرگسال یا نوجوان غالباً هنگام نوشتن یا خواندن مطلبی به زبان انگلیسی نکات دستوری زبان انگلیسی را در نظر دارند.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

7- معمولاً تمرین هر فعالیت زبانی که به استفاده واقعی از زبان نزدیکتر است (مثل مصاحبه، پرسش و پاسخ، نامه نگاری، نمایش نامه، تماشای فیلم، ...) از مطالعه و تجزیه و تحلیل نکات دستوری زبان مفیدتر می‌باشد.

کاملاً موافقم موافقم نظری ندارم مخالفم

8- مطالعه و تجزیه و تحلیل نکات دستوری زبان فهم فراگیران از انگلیسی شفاهی را به میزان قابل توجهی افزایش دهد.

- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 9- مطالعه و تجزيه و تحليل نکات دستوري زبان فهم فراگیران از انگليسي نوشتاري را به ميزان قابل توجهي افزايش مي دهد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 10- فراگیران بزرگسال يا نوجوان زبان انگليسي تنها هنگامي مي تواند با افرادي که زبان مادري آنها انگليسي است يا انگليسي را خوب مي دانند ارتباط برقرار کنند که نکات دستوري زبان را دقیقاً" رعایت نمایند .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 11- اکثر فراگیران بزرگسال و نوجوان نسبت به تصحيح اشتباهات زباني خود دذر کلاس احساس خوبي ندارند .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 12- معلم نبايد اشتباهات تلفظ و دستور زبان فراگیران را در کلاس تصحيح کنند مگر آنکه اين اشتباهات به اندازه اي جدي باشد که فهم و منظور را مختل نمايد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 13- فراگیران بزرگسال و نوجوان نسبت به معلمي که تکالیف کتبي تعيين شده را تصحيح نمي کند احساس بدبي دارند .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 14- مي توان گفت معلم بايد اشتباهات فراگیران در انگليسي شفاهي را تصحيح نمايد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 15- مي توان گفت معلم بايد اشتباهات فراگیران در نوشتار را تصحيح نمايد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 16- فراگیران بزرگسال يا نوجوان ترجيح مي دهند اشتباهاتشان را در کار گروهي رفع نمايند نه اينکه معلم آن اشتباهات را به صورت انفرادي تصحيح نمايد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم
- 17- در کل تصحيح اشتباهات مربوط به دستور زبان مهمتر از اشتباهات مربوط به انگليسي شفاهي مي باشد .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم مخالفم

- 18- فراگیران بزرگسال یا نوجوان نسبت به توانایی و مهارت معلمي که اشتباهاتشان را مطرح و بررسی نمی کند تردید دارند .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم
- 19- از نظر فراگیران معلمي که اشتباهات آنان را مورد توجه و بررسی قرار نمی دهد اهميتي نیز براي پیشرفت و یادگیری آنها قابل نیست .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم
- 20- بدون یادآوری و تصحيح اشتباهات توسط معلم ، فراگیران نمی توانند انگلیسي را خوب فرا بگیرند .
- کاملاً" موافقم موافقم نظري ندارم مخالفم