Teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom practices: A case study with five EFL teachers

Tuğba ÇALIŞIR GEREM[1]

Gazi University, Turkey

Gonca YANGIN EKŞİ

Gazi University, Turkey

Abstract

The correlation between teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom application have a critical effect on grammar teaching; therefore, a descriptive analysis of these two terms can provide the necessary information about how to improve teaching and learning process in an effective manner and help teachers eliminate the problems in English grammar teaching. This study aims to analyze the beliefs and practices of EFL teachers in grammar teaching in general and to see the effects of their professional backgrounds or school environment on their beliefs. It also aims to show the reflection of their declared beliefs on their real classroom practices. The data is collected by utilizing a beliefs questionnaire (open-ended questions), initial interview adapted by Mohammed (2006) and by designing an original classroom observation sheet for five EFL teachers with different profiles. Their answers were scrutinized and analyzed by using content analysis to see the differences between their declared beliefs and actual classroom practices. All differences were endorsed and compared in a table. Accordingly, some discrepancies between their declared beliefs and actual classroom performances were observed in terms of grammar teaching.

Keywords: Teacher Cognition, Teacher Beliefs, Grammar Teaching Beliefs, Case study

---

[1]Corresponding Author. Email: calisirtugba@gmail.com

Introduction

There has always been a great interest in "grammar teaching" area, and the questions whether to teach grammar or how to teach it have been a matter of concern for years. Moreover, while English language is taught intensely at schools for years, most people in Turkey complain about being incapable of using or speaking English even though they know the rules of grammar. Some researchers (Aydemir, 2007; Çelebi, 2006; Işık, 2008; Kırkgöz, 2008) took up this subject comprehensively and they suggested that in spite of the efforts and years devoted to English language teaching, an adequate level of proficiency could not be attained by students in Turkey. In addition to this, after a detailed research study, Dinçer and Yeşilyurt (2013) specified the factors negatively affecting speaking proficiencies of EFL learners in Turkey and they found that grammar-based teaching was one of the most important factors affecting the speaking proficiencies of EFL learners. All these triggered the changes in the language education in Turkey. In 1997, 2005 and lastly 2013 three major complementary educational reforms were initiated by the Ministry of National Education (MEB) in language teaching area. With the first reforms, in 1997 and 2005, the aim was to start English teaching from Grade 4 and teaching English with a communicative approach. With new regulations in 2013, language education started at the 2nd grades of schools (MEB, 2013). All these developments gave rise to some crucial discussions and views about the topic "grammar teaching". EFL teachers' beliefs and performances were also affected by these developments, as well. Therefore, a detailed analysis of what teachers believe and do with specific reference to teaching grammar can be fruitful for language teaching area.

Literature review / Theoretical background

Teachers are vital and one of the most valuable parts of education system, and they bring not only their knowledge about the topics ,but also their thoughts, ideas, characters and beliefs into the classroom environment. All these issues make an important concept "teacher cognition" to come to the fore. Teacher cognition topic covers the unobservable dimensions of the teachers. Borg (2003) suggests that teacher cognition encompasses beliefs, knowledge, principles, theories, attitudes and thoughts. Furthermore, Borg (2003) also gives a comprehensive definition to explain the term teacher cognition; "The cognitive processes and structures which influence what teachers do. These include beliefs, knowledge, principles, theories, and attitudes, as well as the thoughts and reflections teachers have before, during, and after teaching." (p. 81)

As it can be clear from definition above, the concept of "teacher cognition" covers the term "teacher beliefs", which is highly significant for the current study. When the literature is investigated, it can be found that the term "beliefs" could not easily be defined by many researchers. For instance, Pajares (1992) tries to explain this term by using some concepts such as attitudes, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, implicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, rules of practice, practical principles and perspective;whereas, Rokeach (1968) focuses on the impacts of teacher beliefs. He suggests that teacher beliefs can have an influence over what one knows, feels and does. This can indicate that teachers' beliefs can lead their actual performances in their own classes. Richardson(1994) also supports this idea by claiming that beliefs can guide one's action. Therefore, understanding EFL teachers' beliefs holds importance to predict their future actions.

The subject 'teacher beliefs' has been studied in relation to different areas of language teaching. Recently, studies covering teacher beliefs and grammar teaching have gained popularity among the researchers and there are some examples of studies considering these two topics together both in Turkey and abroad. For instance, Uysal and Bardakçı (2014) conducted a study about grammar teaching and teacher beliefs through a questionnaire given to 108 teachers and a focus-group interview to investigate Turkish primary-level English language teachers' beliefs and practice patterns of teaching grammar, and the reasons behind these patterns. The results revealed that teachers generally preferred the traditional "focus-on-formS" approach. Likewise, Uztosun (2013) also did a study with Turkish elementary school English teachers in order to reveal their espoused beliefs about the effective ways of teaching English and self-declared practices. Six teachers, working at different state schools in the Northwestern part of Turkey, were interviewed and it was found that although these teachers believed in the importance of teaching English communicatively, their teaching mainly focused on vocabulary and grammar. In addition to these studies conducted in Turkey, there are also some example research studies about the topic "teacher beliefs and grammar teaching" abroad. Borg (1999)'s case studies of EFL teachers in private language schools in Malta also indicated how teacher beliefs affected their practices in grammar teaching. In addition, Ng and Farrell (2003) did a research study by using qualitative techniques, and four secondary school teachers' beliefs about grammar teaching and practices were analyzed by that way. What is more, Farrell and Lim (2005) also compared teacher beliefs and classroom practices of two experienced teachers of primary school in Singapore with interviews, and they came up with the result that teacher beliefs were not reflected in

their classroom practices. Another important study was conducted by Mohammed (2006) via a beliefs questionnaire and interviews. As a result, it was found that ESL teachers in Maldives used deductive approaches to teaching grammar and in the second phase of the study, she introduced inductive techniques to some teachers with 12-week professional development programme. As a result of the study, it was found thatsome differencesbetween teacher beliefs and practices existed after 12-week-in-service training.

As it can be concluded, most studies in Turkey and abroad focused merely on the declared beliefs of EFL teachers about grammar teaching; whereas, there is also a need for the researches connecting EFL teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom performances in literature. Therefore, current research study can be useful and significant to shed light on the differences between EFL teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom performances. It can also present the reflections of these beliefs on their actual classroom performances. It may also give possible reasons for the inconsistencies or overlaps between their beliefs and real applications.

Research questions

In this context, the aim of this study is to investigate what beliefs EFL teachers hold about role of grammar in teaching English and whether EFL teachers' beliefs are reflected in their actual classroom performances. Research questions that lead this study are as follows:

1. What beliefs do EFL teachers in Turkish state schools hold about role of English grammar in educational procedures?
2. Do EFL teachers' beliefs reflect or correspond to their instructional practices with specific reference to grammar?

Method

Sample / Participants

This is a case study of five EFL teachers with different profiles. Teachers were selected with a purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a technique widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases for the most effective use of limited resources (Patton, 2002). In the current study, teachers' own identities were not given for confidentiality reasons, and they were coded as teacher A, B, C, D and E. The qualities of the teachers can be listed as follows:

- Teacher A: a novice teacher
- Teacher B: a teacher with 5-15 years of experience
- Teacher C: an experienced teacher (more than 15 years)
- Teacher D: a teacher working at a school within high socio-economic level district
- Teacher E: a teacher working at a school within low socio-economic level district

Demographic information of these teachers was given in Table 1 below. All five teachers have a BA degree in ELT department and they work in different state schools in Turkey. Teacher A is a novice teacher with 5 years of experience. She began to learn English at the age of 10. She teaches at a state school in Ankara. Teacher B has 12 years' experience while teacher C is the most experienced of all teachers with 18 years. They started learning English at the age of 13. Teacher B works at a school in Kırıkkale; whereas, teacher C works at a school in Aksaray. Teacher D and C were exposed to English at the age of 13, too. They differ from each other in terms of the socio-economic level of their school environment. Teacher D works at a state school with high socio-economic level district (in Çankaya). On the contrary, teacher E works at a school with low socio-economic level district (in Altındağ) in Ankara.

Table 1

Demographic information of teachers

Teachers Variables	A	B	C	D	E
Gender	Female	Female	Male	Female	Male
Age	24	36	49	34	42
Degree	BA	BA	BA	BA	BA
Major	ELT	ELT	ELT	ELT	ELT
In-service	No	No	No	No	No
Experience	1-5 yrs	5-15 yrs	15+	10-15 yrs	5-10yrs
Grades	6th and 8th	7th	7th and 8th	7th and 8th	7th and 8th
Age of learning	10	13	13	13	13

English

Instrument(s)

Three types of data collection tools were used in this study: interviews, a beliefs questionnaire and an observation sheet. Detailed information about these three tools are given below. Interviews utilized in this study were semi-structured and had two main parts with some open-ended questions: Parts A (participants' background) and Part B (main interview Questions) which are given in Appendix A. It was adapted from Mohammed (2006) and some relevant questions were added to make the topics clearer by taking the guidance of three experts. It was used to gather information about several topics such as, teacher beliefs about their own language learning and teaching backgrounds, beliefs about language learning in general, approach to grammar, beliefs about the role of grammar and lastly their attitude towards students' grammatical errors. One to one interviewing was selected as a source of data collection tool because of two main reasons. Firstly, this is a case study and case studies provide the researchers with the in-depth analysis of an issue. As Dobson et al. (2001, as cited in Nunan, 2001) suggest "the most common type of case studies involve detailed description and analysis of an individual subject from whom observations, interviews and family histories provide the database." The second reason of using an interview in the study is to establish a rapport with the teachers. This helped to get detailed information about teachers' personal beliefs and grammar teaching processes. That is, it helped access more information that might not be gathered just by the questionnaires and classroom observations.

After this interview, open-ended questions from Mohammed's (2006) beliefs questionnaire were utilized to gather more information about the EFL teachers' beliefs about grammar and its role in language teaching. Moreover, information gathered from the beliefs questionnaire was compared with the information gathered from the interviews.

Lastly, an observation sheet was prepared originally and used in this study. This was designed by the researcher, herself and prepared with the guidance of the experts and peers. The items in the observation sheet were prepared by having a detailed review of literature about grammar teaching and teacher beliefs.

There are five main parts in the observation sheet. These parts are as follows: general information about teaching of teachers, information about grammar teaching, activities and

the practices used in the lessons, error correction and lastly observation notes. It has a-three likert scale namely: poor, fair and good. Moreover, observation sheet has also a part allowing the observer to take notes about the lessons. In part A of the observation sheet, there are 25 items about the general behaviors of the teachers in a classroom such as; using realia, graphics, starting with a warm-up or use of mother tongue during the lessons. In the Part B of the observation sheet, the focus is on the teaching of grammar. There are such topics as teaching grammar in contexts, giving the rules directly etc. What is more, Part C of the sheet is about activities and practices that can be used in the classroom such as using drills, fill-in-the blanks activities, meaningful activities etc. The last part is about errors and correction strategies teachers' use for them.

Data collection

An initial interview was conducted with the five volunteer EFL teachers with different profiles and a classroom observation was performed with them, too. For collecting data, five EFL teachers aforementioned above were given initial interviews and beliefs questionnaires. Firstly, teachers were asked initial interview questions. As they were answering the questions, necessary notes were taken by the researcher. Moreover, some complementary questions were also added to have a detailed overview of the relevant issues. After the completion of interview, teachers were also given a beliefs questionnaire to gather more data and cross-check the ones gathered from the initial interview. They were given some time to complete these beliefs questionnaires.

Lastly, these five teachers were observed for two weeks by the researcher and one of her colleagues. (The researcher asked one of her colleagues to observe the classes together to have more reliable results and to avoid researcher bias.) Especially grammar parts of the lessons were investigated in a detailed way by two observers. The researcher was a non-participant observer during this process.

Data analysis

As aforementioned, three types of data collection tools were utilized in this study to gather data: interviews, beliefs questionnaire and observation sheet. The whole analysis of the qualitative parts of beliefs questionnaire, interviews and observation sheets was carried out by utilizing content analysis. During analysis phase, a constant comparison method was used, and qualitative data was quantified to have a general overview of the beliefs EFL teachers

held. Within data analysis of qualitative parts of beliefs questionnaire, first of all, data was transformed into textual forms on Word (Microsoft Office Professional Plus 2013).

After that, semi-structured interview forms, beliefs questionnaire and observation forms were studied many times to analyze and group them under the same content tittle for content analysis. "Content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use" (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). Accordingly, the researcher can use analytical constructs or rules of inference, to move from the text to the answers of the research questions.During content analysis, data was coded and analyzed manually. Coding can be described as the process of assigning low-inference descriptive tags to units of information. This process was done to reduce the data into meaningful segments. Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggest that "incidents" are the smallest "units of information" in a text that can stand by themselves. Such incidents were found and taken as codes in this study. Then, these codes were categorized. Firstly, some incidents were written for every open-ended question in the beliefs questionnaire. A cross(X) was put for every similar answer and these answers were categorized or reduced to higher level groupings or categories. After that, codes were counted and defined in frequencies in tables. By that way, qualitative data was quantified. After the analysis of them, data obtained from observation sheets and beliefs was reviewed for the similarities and the differences between the declared beliefs and actual classroom performances. Then by content analysis, three umbrella terms were found to cover the topics in initial interview, beliefs questionnaire and observation notes, namely: grammar instruction in the class, grammar practice activities and lastly error correction in grammar teaching. After this procedure, some subtitles were gathered from the tools used for the current study and a table (Table 2) was created in the light of the titles given above. All items in the table were scrutinized one by one to see whether there were some discrepancies between the declared beliefs and actual classroom practices of EFL teachers. After the analysis of responses and observation sheet notes, for each item, "crosses (X which equals no)" and "checks (√ which equals yes)" were noted down and by that way differences between EFL teachers declared beliefs and actual classroom practices became clearer. This table was applied to each EFL teachers' answers and they were combined as in Table 2 below.

Results

This case study basically aims to answer the research questions "what beliefs EFL teachers in Turkish state schools hold about role of English grammar in educational procedures" and "whether EFL teachers' beliefs reflect or correspond to their instructional practices with specific reference to grammar". Moreover, if their educational and professional backgrounds or school environment had a reflection on their beliefs about grammar was also investigated. The findings gathered from each teacher were given one by one. Descriptive results of all five EFL teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom performances wererepresented in the Table 2 below. Answers given to the questions revealed three themes namely: grammar instruction in the class, grammar practice activities and lastly error correction. In addition, differences between their actual performances and declared beliefs were illustrated in table 2 together.

Table 2.

Descriptive results of the EFL teachers' declared beliefs and actual performances

	Teachers	A		B		C		D		E	
	Declared beliefs (DB) & Actual Practices (AP)	DB	AP	DB	AP	DB.	AP	DB.	AP	DB.	AP
Grammar instruction in the class	Accepting grammar as a main component of the lesson	√	√	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√
	Presenting grammar in context	√	X	√	√	√	X	√	X	X	X
	Grammar teaching through communication naturally	√	X	X	X	X	X	√	X	X	X
	Giving meaning first and then form	√	√	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Use of extensive grammatical terminology	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

	Giving rules directly	X	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Inductive grammar teaching	√	X	√	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Comparison with the mother tongue	X	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Grammar practice activities	Use of mechanical activities	X	√	√	√	√	√	X	√	√	√
	Use of meaningful activities	√	√	√	X	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Use of communicative activities	√	X	√	X	X	X	√	X	√	X
Error correction	Giving attention to grammatical errors	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Discussing common errors with the sts	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Correcting errors in sts' oral work	√	√	√	√	√	√	X	√	√	√
	Correcting errors in sts' written work	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Correcting errors immediately	√	√	√	X	√	X	√	√	X	X

First research question investigates teacher beliefs about the role of English grammar in educational procedures. Accordingly, teachers' reported beliefs in the table 2 indicated that three teachers except teacher B and C did not see grammar as the main component of lessons; whereas, their actual classroom performances revealed that all five EFL teachers (including teachers, B and C) utilized grammar as a main component in their lessons. This indicates that what they reported to believe about role of grammar is different from what they actually did in their classes.

The second research question is related to the differences between EFL teachers' reported beliefs and actual classroom performances with specific reference to grammar teaching. While answering research questions, teachers' profiles were also considered, and it was found that there were some discrepancies between their declared beliefs and actual classroom performances regardless of their experiences and the socio-economic level of their school environment. Additionally, differences between the reported beliefs and actual classroom performances of all five teacherswere given with probable reasons for each teacher below.

In the part "Grammar instruction in the class", there are some discrepancies between the declared beliefs and the actual classroom performances of teacher A (a novice teacher) except two items. She believed that grammar was one of the main components of the lessons as it could be seen in the responses given to the beliefs questionnaire and initial interview shown in Table 2. For example, in interview, teacher A suggested "Grammar is one of the main parts of a language like speaking, listening etc. Students cannot learn about other skills without grammar, and I do not have any difficulties in teaching grammar. It is very easy to understand and teach." The observation of teacher A for two weeks revealed the same result. Moreover, according to table 2, teacher A believed in the importance of giving meanings before the forms of certain grammar topics. However, it is clear from the results shown in table 2, there were some differences between what the teacher A reported and did in her actual classroom environment. While she claimed to believe in the importance of "presenting grammar in context", "grammar teaching through communication naturally" and "inductive grammar teaching", she did not reflect them to her actual classroom performances. Furthermore, although teacher A was opposed to the "use of extensive grammatical terminology", "giving rules directly", "comparison with the mother tongue", all these factors were observed in the actual classroom applications of the teacher A. In addition to these, "teacher beliefs about grammar practice activities" were also gathered with the questionnaire and initial interview. As it is seen in the table 2, even though teacher A favored communicative activities, she preferred to use mechanical and meaningful activities in observed lessons for two weeks. According to table 2, there was not a discrepancy between what teacher A reported or did in terms of error correction in grammar teaching.

According to the descriptive results of the questionnaire, interview and observation sheet in table 2, teacher B's beliefs and actual classroom performances did not reconcile in terms of the items "accepting grammar as a main component of the lesson", "use of extensive

grammatical terminology", "giving rules directly" and "inductive grammar teaching". Accordingly, teacher B asserted that she did not see grammar as the main component of the lesson. She also believed in the importance of giving grammar inductively without using grammatical terminology. However, in the observed lessons, it was found that teacher B's beliefs and actual classroom performances were different from the beliefs revealed. In addition, when the types of activities she applied for grammar teaching were inquired, she propounded that she used all three types of activities; mechanical, meaningful and communicative. However, as it is presented in table 2, she did not implement all of them in her classroom. Mechanical activities were practiced more than the other kinds of activities in her classes. Lastly, teacher B claimed to apply remedial teaching for the subjects she believed to be the challenging for her students. On the contrary, it was found that she did not utilize remedial teaching strategies in her actual classroom performances**.**

Following the analysis of teacher beliefs and actual classroom performances of teachers A and B (less experienced teachers), teacher C's responses were also scrutinized. Reported beliefs of teacher C in Table 2 revealed that grammar was not the main component of lessons for teacher C. Conversely, he focused on grammar points given in the books, mostly. What is more, teacher C suggested "I teach grammar in my classes, but I give them in context, and the course book we use provides the necessary context for grammatical item." However, it was observed in his classes that even though course book had some reading passages with the grammatical points in it, he did not get students' attention on these structures in context. Instead, he gave the rules directly without utilizing elicitation techniques. Another important result was about the activities utilized in the classes. Teacher C suggested that he did not use communicative activities in his classes, and they were not observed in his classes in the observation sessions, too. He gave a few reasons for this situation: "To tell the truth, I use old techniques, but I believe that they are effective. Moreover, I believe that communicative activities are also effective, but I need more knowledge about them to be able to handle them in my classes. But as far as I know, they require more time and energy to apply them. This means a detailed in-service training for me".

According to the findings given in the Table 2, there were some discrepancies between the teacher D's declared beliefs and actual classroom performances, too. In interview, even though teacher D reported to believe in the importance of "presenting grammar in context" and "grammar teaching through communication naturally", it was found that she did not actually do these in her classes. She suggested "I always wanted to use inductive grammar

teaching, but in our lessons we have to follow the curriculum and prepare our students for high school entrance examinations. Therefore, we need more time to apply inductive grammar teaching. All these can hinder the use of inductive grammar teaching strategies."

However, an inconsistency between the declared beliefs and actual classroom performances could not be found in terms of other items about grammar instruction in the classroom, namely: "accepting grammar as a main component of the lesson", "giving meaning first and then form", "use of extensive grammatical terminology", "giving rules directly", "inductive grammar teaching" and "comparison with the mother tongue". Furthermore, in grammar practice activities part in the table 2 above, it was found that teacher D reported to use meaningful and communicative activities. Furthermore, in interview she suggested "I try to use some meaningful and communicative activities while teaching or practicing grammar. Most of the time, I choose enjoyable activities. I believe in the importance of showing the grammar rules in context. However, I give the grammar rules directly. This makes the topic clearer. My students like this and this is less time consuming. Some of them want to see rules on board overtly." However, even though she reported to use communicative activities in interview, actually she used meaningful or mechanical activities to practice grammar in her classes during the observation while communicative activities were not observed in her lessons. In addition to the activities utilized in lessons, teacher D's declared beliefs and actual performances in the classroom were analyzed in terms of correction of grammatical errors, too. According to the findings indicated in the table 2 above, it is clear that only one difference between the beliefs and the performance of the teacher D was found in terms of the item "correcting errors in oral work of the students". In other words, while teacher D suggested that she did not give importance to the errors in students' oral work; in fact, in observed classes for two weeks, it was found that she corrected them immediately.

Lastly, teacher E's declared beliefs and actual classroom application were analyzed and it was found that there were some inconsistencies between them. For instance, even though hereported to use all types of grammar activities, communicative activities were not seen in the observed lessons.

Discussion

In this part, findings were discussed by referring to the research questions guiding the current study. Firstly, teachers' beliefs about the role of grammar wererepresented. In this

procedure, their profiles (in terms of experience and socio-economic level of the schools they work in) were also considered. Secondly, differences between EFL teachers' beliefs and actual performances were discussed.

Initially, all five teachers were asked about the role of English grammar and it was found that teacher A (a novice teacher) accepted that she saw grammar as a main component of the lesson. In fact, this was an expected result. Generally, this may be because of the common belief that grammar is the easiest component of the language to teach. In the observed lesson for two weeks, this was also observed. It was also found that teachers having more experience (Teacher B and C) also taught grammar as a main component of the lesson even though their declared beliefs proved vice versa. In other words, although these teachers claimed not to see grammar as the main component of the lesson, their real classroom performances observed for two weeks proved that they allocated a lot of time for grammar and it constituted the fundamental part of their lessons. Furthermore, Teacher D and E working at schools with high and low socio-economic level consecutively stated that they accepted grammar as main component of the lesson, and they reflected this belief in their classes, as well. As it can be understood from the findings, grammar is an important component of English lessons in Turkey in spite of the curriculum designed with communicative approach, and this situation was also emphasized by some other researchers (Karaata, 1999; Özsevik, 2010).

Secondly, whether there were any differences between EFL teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom applications in terms of grammar teaching was analyzed by considering the findings indicated in table 2. As aforementioned, five EFL teachers' answers were scrutinized by content analysis and three terms were found to be able to cover the topic "grammar teaching" namely: grammar instruction in the class, grammar practice activities and error correction. There were some inconsistencies in what the teachers believed and actually did. They were reviewed with their possible reasons in detail.

In the observed lessons, it was found that four teachers except teacher B did not teach grammar in context. It can be suggested that even though these teachers planned their lessons according to the same communicative curriculum, they did not actually perform the same things. This may be because of the common belief that "presenting grammar in context or using elicitation techniques to teach grammar" is more difficult and time-consuming than "giving the rules directly". What teacher E suggested in the interviews and beliefs questionnaire may exemplify this situation: "I do not actually give the rules in context or I do

not give so much time for the students to discover grammar rules. It may be useful, but I think it is very time-consuming. Moreover, I believe that students want to see the rules overtly, otherwise it becomes so difficult for them to understand."

After the analysis of all five teachers' beliefs and classroom performances, it can useful to consider the items which are highly related to each other such as "giving rules directly" and "inductive grammar teaching" to make the process more meaningful. A detailed investigation of the teachers' responses revealed that teacher A (novice teacher) and teacher B (10-15 years of experience) declared that they did not give the rules directly and they used inductive teaching methods while teacher C, D and E overtly stated that they gave the rules directly and they did not use the inductive grammar teaching strategies requiring more time, effort and active participation of students. Table 2 clearly shows that none of these teachers applied inductive grammar teaching strategies in their classes. In other words, all five participants preferred using deductive grammar teaching in their classes. This inconsistency between their beliefs and performances may be related to their earlier language learning experiences as students. Lortie (1975) describes this situation with the term "the apprenticeship of observation", wherein one's past observations of teachers in the context of the classroom influence one's conception of what it means to be a teacher. These teachers' real classroom applications may be affected by their own experiences as EFL students.

Another crucial finding was about "teaching grammar through communication". Accordingly, what teachers A and D believed and did were different from each other. In other words, despite their declared beliefs, their application in their classroom indicated that they used classical methods which were not in line with learning a language naturally through communication. This discrepancy between their real beliefs and actual practices was probably because they tried to seem to obey what Ministry of National Education suggested for them. That is to say, they avoided giving their real beliefs. Instead, they pretended to focus on communication in their teaching period. As it can be seen in the earlier parts of this study, MoNE with some reforms, in 1997, 2005 and lastly 2013 aimed to start teaching English from earlier grades with a communicative approach. (MEB, 2013). Such institutional or systematic expectations from teachers may get them to conceal their real beliefs. In other words, this may be because of inconsistencies between the EFL teachers' deep-seated beliefs that shaped their backgrounds as learners and teacher trainees and the beliefs they projected to be more in line with the current teaching methodologies they were expected to learn and apply.

When all five teachers' beliefs about "giving meaning first and then form while teaching grammar" were analyzed, teacher A as an inexperienced teacher suggested that she gave meaning before the form and this was observed in her classes, as well. Other teachers with different qualities (B, C, D, E) emphasized that they gave the form first before the meaning and the observed lessons proved that situation; however, this was not an expected result. More experienced teachers (B and C) were expected to emphasize the meaning first by focusing on their functions. Giving the form first may be an easier way to teach and require less experience.   Another important issue that was analyzed was about the grammatical terminology. Emphasizing grammatical terminology while teaching grammar is one of the controversial issues among EFL teachers. Even though teacher A and B with less experience than the other teachers assumed that they did not use grammatical terminology a lot, their observed classes showed vice versa. All other three teachers declared to see grammatical terminology significant and the reflections of these ideas were seen in the observations, too. All these show that all teachers gave importance to the grammatical terminology related to structure of language and this was probably because they found it easier to teach with grammatical terminology regardless of their different profiles. This may be explained by what Berman (1979) suggested. Accordingly, "giving grammatical terminology is a precise and short way of categorizing and naming language elements, and it can help students with formulating the rules that they will need to be able to learn the language more easily." In other words, these teachers may hold the belief that they could make the structure more comprehensible or easierby giving related grammatical terminologies.

Teachers' beliefs about "comparison with the mother tongue" were also analyzed and compared with actual classroom performances. Only teacher A declared that she did not compare target language with mother tongue. Whereas, her actual classroom performance indicated vice versa. It was found that all five EFL teachers compared target language with mother tongue. This may be related to the situation above. In interview, some teachers reported that using grammatical terminology of target language and comparing it with mother tongue made teaching process easier for them.

The second term in the table 2 was about the activities used for grammar teaching. They were divided into three: mechanical, meaningful and communicative activities. As aforementioned, language teaching underwent a change in 2013 in Turkey and EFL teachers in Turkey were expected to use more communicative activities in their classes according to the curriculum and book suggested by MoNE (Ministry of National education). However,

findings shown in table 2 indicated that there were some discrepancies between what teachers believed and actually did in their classes. For instance, teacher A as a novice teacher specified that she did not use mechanical activities while she favored the meaningful and communicative activities. However, observation notes indicated that she used mechanical and meaningful activities most of the time and in her lessons, and there were not communicative activities at all. This situation was the same with teacher B and C. For instance, even though teacher C accepted that communicative activities could be effective in his classes, he avoided using them for some reasons such as lack of knowledge and time. Moreover, he also believed that they required more energy in terms of teachers. As it can be seen in Table 2 above, teacher D and C also did not use communicative activities in their classes. This can prove that EFL teachers may abstain from using communicative activities even when they believe in the importance of them. It can be explained by what Li (1998) suggested in a study with a group of Korean EFL teachers. Accordingly, Li (1998) investigated difficulties encountered by Korean EFL teachers in the application of communicative activities and propounded four main factors for this situation: difficulties caused by teachers, students, educational system and lastly by CLT itself. The situation in current study may be explained by lack of time and lack of necessary knowledge. In addition to these, the inconsistency between what teachers believed and did could be about the general positive attitudes toward communicative activities suggested by MoNE in newly developed curriculum. Teachers may tend to reflect beliefs more in line with the curriculum instead of expressing their real beliefs.

Lastly, all five teachers' declared beliefs and actual classroom performances were also analyzed in terms of error correction. There were some discrepancies between their beliefs and actual performances of the teacher B and C especially in terms of the item "correcting error immediately. Even though they reported to correct errors immediately, they did not apply this in their classes. In addition, analysis of the results showed that all five teachers gave importance to grammatical errors regardless of oral or written work, and they believed in the importance of correcting them immediately. All these may be because errors get a lot of attention in language teaching area and most of the teachers hold the beliefs that if they ignore the errors, they may be fossilized. Therefore, they believe that all errors (in oral or written work) should be corrected. This finding of the study is consistent with the results of Uysal and Aydın's study (2017). Accordingly, "EFL teachers in Turkey believe that error correction may contribute to habit formation in terms of self-correction among students, pragmatic and appropriate use of the target language, learners' accuracy and fluency." What

is more, these EFL teachers believe that "errors directly distorting meaning while speaking should be corrected." This may indicate that error correction is a significant issue both in oral and written work of the students for EFL teachers not only for the sake of accuracy but also for fluency. The reflections of these beliefs can be observed in actual classroom performances of EFL teachers.

Conclusions

The term "teacher beliefs"isone of the most important factors having impact on the real classroom performances of EFL teachers. Johnson (1999) indicates the importance of beliefs by saying that "beliefs have a cognitive, an affective, and a behavioral component ;therefore, they act as influences on what we know, feel, and do" (p. 30). This study also indicates that an analysis of what teachers believe and do may have critical effect on the real classroom applications of EFL teachers in terms of grammar teaching. Accordingly, teacher beliefs may have an effect on the EFL teachers' performances; however, teachers' declared beliefs may differ from their behaviors because of some external factors such as limited time, lack of knowledge and the curriculum adopted. Inconsistencies between what teachers believe and do in terms of grammar teaching is presented by considering three umbrella terms: grammar activities, grammar instruction and error correction. This study suggests that grammar is considered very crucial by EFL teachers even though they report vice versa. Most parts of the lessons focus on grammar teaching in EFL classes in Turkey, which is not consistent with the current communicative curriculum adopted by MoNE. Moreover, even though communicative activities are accepted as very effective, teachers may abstain from using them in their classes because of several reasons. Lastly, error correction is an important issue for EFL teachers irrespective of written or oral works of the students. This can be observed in their real classroom applications of EFL teachers.

References

Aydemir, Ö. (2007). *İlköğretim II. Kademeöğrencilerininİngilizcedersindekullandıklarıbaşarıbaşarısızlıkyüklemeleriveöğrenmestratejileri*(Unpublished MA Thesis). Trakya University, Turkey.

Berman, R. A. (1979). Rule of grammar or rule of thumb? *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 17*(4), 279-302.

Borg, S. (1999). Studying teacher cognition in second language grammar teaching. *System, 27*(1), 19-31.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: a review of research on what language   teachers think, believe, know and do. *Language Teaching, 36*, 81-39.

Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Türkiye'deanadilieğitimiveyabancıdilöğretimi.*ErciyesÜniversitesi SosyalBilimlerEnstitüsüDergisi*, *2*(21), 285-307.

Dinçer, A.&Yesilyurt S. (2013). Pre-service English teachers' beliefs on speaking skills based on motivational orientations. *English Language Teaching, 6*(7), 88-95.

Farrell, T.S.C. & Lim, P.C.P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ, 9*(2), 1-13.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Epistemological and methodological bases of natural inquiry. *Educational Communication & Technology Journal, 30*(4), 233–252.

Işık, A. (2008). Yabancıdileğitimizdekiyanlışlıklarneredenkaynaklanıyor?.*Journal of Language andLinguistic Studies*, *4*(2), 15-26.

Johnson, K. E. (1999). Understanding language teaching: Reasoning in action. Boston: Heinle &Heinle.

Karaata, C. (1999). *Developing the Speaking Skill of the Students at Samanyolu Private High School* (Unpublished MA Thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Kırkgöz, Y. (2008). Globalization and English language policy in Turkey. *Educational Policy*, *23*(5),663-684.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 677-703

Ministry of National Education. (2013). "İlköğretimKurumlarıİngilizceDersi (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) ÖğretimProgramı" Retreived from http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/www/guncel lenen-ogretim-programlari/icerik/151

Mohammed, N. (2006). *An exploratory study of the interplay between teacher's beliefs, instructional practices &professional development*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, USA.

Ng, E.K.J., & Farrell, T.S.C. (2003). Do teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching match their classroom practices? A Singapore case study. In D. Deterding, A. Brown & E. L. Low (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on grammar* (pp. 128-137). Singapore: McGraw Hill.

Nunan, D. (2001).*Research methods in language learning*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Özsevik, Z. (2010). *The use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL Teachers' perceived Difficulties in Implementing CLT in Turkey* (Unpublished MA Thesis). University of Illinois, USA.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307-332.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula(Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp.102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Uysal, N. D., & Aydin, S. (2017). Foreign language teachers' perceptions of error correction in speaking classes: A qualitative study. *The Qualitative Report*, *22*(1), 123-135.

Uysal, H.H.&Bardakci, M. (2014). Teacher Beliefs and Practices of Grammar Teaching: Focusing on Meaning, Form or Forms? *South African Journal of Education, 34*(1), 1-16.

Uztosun, M. S. (2013). An interpretive study into elementary school English teachers' beliefs and practices in Turkey. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry, 4*, 20-33.