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ABSTRACT

Many linguists have tried to answer when and how to teach grammar based on research, as well as whether to teach grammar at all. On the other hand, for many teachers, grammar is the backbone of language learning (Sitorus, 2012). This paper analyzes teachers’ beliefs and practices and their relationship regarding grammar teaching in Kosovo’s public high schools.

Teachers’ beliefs are resistant to change (Williams & Burden, 1997); knowing what the majority of teachers in Kosovo believe to be true regarding grammar and language teaching can lead to an update on the curriculum of English Language Teaching programs in order to prevent a formation of beliefs that could negatively impact language teaching. The background of the study includes the importance of grammar on language learning and teaching, the effects of teachers’ beliefs and attitudes in their classrooms, high school students’ motivation for language learning, and a review of language teaching methods and approaches. Information and data were gathered through a survey completed by 48 teachers who teach in public high schools in Kosovo. Language teachers should be aware of the importance that their beliefs play toward the process of language learning. This study found that EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe that grammar should be taught systematically, explicitly, and inductively and that the Audio-Lingual is the most predominant EFL method used in public high schools in Kosovo. The study also found that teachers’ beliefs regarding the language of students’ responses affect teachers’ expectations on students’ responses and that teachers’ beliefs about explicit and implicit instruction have an impact on teachers’ practiced instruction in their classrooms.

Keywords: grammar teaching, teachers’ beliefs and practices, Kosovo, public high schools, second language methodologies, high school students’ motivation.
©2016 by Marigona Morina
All rights reserved
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to thank USAID for giving me the opportunity to finish my master studies in the U.S. Without their financial support, studying in the U.S. would have remained a dream that never came true.

Secondly, I would like to show my admiration and gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Freddie Bowles for her for the support, guidance, and motivation throughout this process. Being under her supervision can never be less than an honor. Another sincere gratitude goes to the Committee Members, Dr. Felicia Lincoln and Dr. Lu Yu. I have taken many classes with Dr. Lincoln, but what she has taught me is much broader than simply theories. In addition, I would also like to thank Dr. Kayi-Aydar, whom I met during the first year at the University, for helping me have a smooth transition from a different field of study.

I would like to thank all of the EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo who took a time to complete my survey. Without them, this study would not exist.

I would also like to thank all of my classmates at the University of Arkansas for making my stay in the U.S. much more enjoyable. I have learned a lot from them, too.

Last but not least, my family, my Mom, Dad, and Brother, and my friend, Besim, deserve a dozen thanks for their support in every single manner. Thank you for believing in me and encouraging me to give my best. Having you in my life is just a blessing.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction and Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose and significance of the study</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The research questions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope of the study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Beliefs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Review of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approaches and Methods to Language Teaching</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School Students and Second Language Acquisition</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Method</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Paradigm</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Selection</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population and Sample</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions and Generalizations</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis and Results</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question 1:</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Question 2:</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>References</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>Survey Questionnaire</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRB Protocol</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

Introduction and Background

Beliefs influence human behaviors and represent a central construct in all of the disciplines that deal with human behavior and learning (Fisherbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ajzen, 1988, as cited in Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005). They have been difficult to define but known to be formed early in life and to be resistant to change (Williams & Burden, 1997). Studies have shown that beliefs are predictors of a teacher’s behavior in a classroom and a reflection of what a teacher provides in a classroom (Thu, 2009).

Sitorus (2012) stated that, “For many teachers, grammar is the backbone of all language learning” (n.p). Hence, since teachers’ beliefs are powerfully influential, many studies have investigated teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching. The position of grammar in language teaching has shifted for 25 years, specifically from the mid-60s to 1990 (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Rutherford (1987) highlighted that for 2,500 years grammar teaching had often been synonymous with language teaching. Ellis (2002) said that language learning has been associated with grammar because grammar has held a crucial role in language teaching methods and approaches, such as in the Grammar Translation and Audio-Lingual Method. A newer approach, the Natural approach from Krashen and Terrell (1983), completely excluded grammar instruction in language classrooms. Luoma (2004) believed that teachers were focusing too narrowly on developing grammatically accurate speech, which in turn was in conflict with learners’ expectations and objectives for second or foreign languages. However, when it comes to higher levels of language proficiency, the importance of grammar is indisputable (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Some authors have argued that adolescent learners are more motivated to use the language with their peers rather than to learn grammatical rules, whereas others have argued that skipping
grammar may lead to habits in producing incorrect grammatical forms (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Hence, many linguists have tried to answer how and when to teach grammar based on research evidence, as well as whether to teach grammar at all.

Considering the importance of teachers’ beliefs and the importance of methods for grammar teaching in second and/or foreign language learning, this paper will study the beliefs of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers on grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo.

**Statement of the Problem**

Kosovo is a country with approximately two million inhabitants. European External Action Service (n.d) stated that 53% of Kosovo’s population is under the age of 25, which makes it the country with the youngest population in Europe. Many experts believe that the best investment toward children and youth is education. However, since Kosovo is a country in a transition phase, it is facing many challenges to become a socio-economically stable country. Among other factors, the low-quality education represents a critical reason for the struggle in socio-economic development. As Nelson Mandela (n.d) said, “No country can really develop unless its citizens are educated” and Kosovo does not make an exception in this case either. The number of educated citizens in Kosovo is increasing rapidly (GAP Institute for Advanced Studies, 2008), yet integrating quality in education has been a struggle for a while now. In July 2015, the University of Prishtina, the largest public Higher Educational Institution in Kosovo (HEI), was ranked as the 4060th university in the world university ranking (Webometrics, 2015). This is considered as an unsatisfying ranking even by the former rector of the University of Prishtina, as he stated that the university is diminished in world ranking lists (Telegrafi, 2015). Michaelowa (2007) highlighted that the quality of higher education in particular country is
greatly affected by its secondary and even primary education. In this regard, an overview of Kosovo’s primary and secondary education reveals that the country does not stand favorably at these levels either. Specifically, a determinant of quality in Kosovo high schools is the Matura Exam, which takes place right after students have finished the three years of high school, and it is required for obtaining the high school diploma. In 2014, only 45% of the senior high school students who took the Matura Exam on the first chance were able to pass it. Even though the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) has considered these results as satisfactory, the experts of education in Kosovo have admitted that the country needs better quality education.

Baliqi (2010) wrote that the system of the higher education in Kosovo is facing many challenges, initially inherited from the Serbian regime; an isolative and discriminative decade which has damaged the higher education in Kosovo in different ways. Llapi and Peterson (2015) stated that, “Although Kosovo gained its freedom in 1999, the impact of two decades of conflict on Kosovar Albanians was dramatic and dire” (p. 95). While even during the regime, the population of Kosovo consisted of 90% Kosovar Albanians, who spoke Albanian, which is not a Slavic language (Andryszewski, 2000), Llapi and Peterson’s (2015) research showed that Serbs forced the teachers in Kosovo to use the Serbian curricula in schools and banned use of the Albanian language in schools, textbooks, and other resources. For the first and second year of secondary education, in 1995, there were only two books printed in the Albanian language (Shema, 2000). Moreover, Llapi and Peterson (2015) found from their interviews that there were situations when Kosovars attempted to bring some books from Albanian, but were caught by the Serbian Police, who burned and demolished the books.
In the mean time, the fall of Berlin Wall, the fall of communism, indirectly emerged the teaching of English language (Dorneyi, n.d. as cited in De Bot, 2015). Kosovo was also influenced by this event and English language learning started being more integrated in the 1990s. Yet, the interest for English language learning in Kosovo emerged after the war ended in 1999. Now, in public schools in Kosovo, English is taught starting from the 3rd grade of the primary school, whereas private schools introduce students to the English language from the preschool.

The purpose and significance of the study

All of the educational institutions in Kosovo operate under the regulations of the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) and the Kosovo Accreditation Agency (AAK). The study surveyed EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo with an aim to understand their beliefs and practices about grammar teaching, which will later be compared with the contemporary theories on grammar teaching in the field of Second Language Acquisition. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to provide useful information/data for MEST to update EFL curriculum and teaching instructions accordingly, if necessary. Nevertheless, since the study was particularly concentrated on teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching, it could also serve to lead to an update in English Teaching program under the Department of Education at the University of Prishtina.

The reason for interest in this particular theme is that as a recipient of the Transformational Leadership Program: Scholarships and Partnerships (TLP-SP), whose “ultimate goal is creating a cadre of leaders in Kosovo who can drive a significant change and reform in priority economic, social, and political areas” (USAID, 2014), I consider this research project as the initial step of my contribution. From a global perspective, research is important for
development because it gives directions on how to deal with and approach specific problems (Scholarship Positions, 2012). Kosovo, on the other hand, is lacking in research and not only in the field of education. The article by Shkreli (2013) indicated that the University of Pristina, since its establishment in 1970, has not come up with any discovery or invention, which may at some extent be forms of research. There are, however, research institutions that deal with development research and that also briefly address educational topics, but so far no research could be found on teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public schools in Kosovo.

Moreover, being spoken by more than 300 million native speakers, and between 400 and 800 million foreign users, English represents the most widely spoken language in the world. Lerner (1999), the president of Learn the Net.com, stated that even though English is the official language of only seven countries, which make little more than five percent of the world’s population, the majority of online content is in English. But, most importantly, English is the language of science, computers, and commerce. Similarly, Eisenberg (1992) said that English is the new Latin. Most of the advanced discoveries and inventions are done in American universities, where the English language is the means of scientific discourse (Manivannan, 2006). The literature review will elaborate on adolescent learner’s cognitive capabilities on language learning and on the appropriate language instruction according to age so that adolescents have better opportunities for obtaining high proficiency levels.

The research questions

This study explores the most commonly adapted techniques on language and grammar teaching, teacher beliefs about grammar teaching, and the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo. Hence, the paper will
keep track through following the two research questions and the hypothesis:

- **Research Question 1:** What do EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching in a classroom setting?

- **Research Question 2:** What methods and techniques of language and grammar teaching are most used by EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo?

- **Research Hypothesis:** There is a positive relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo; what EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching predicts which methods are most used in public high schools in Kosovo.

**Scope of the study**

The core limitation of this study is that beliefs are not easy to be measured. Another limitation is that there were no data from the relevant institutions regarding the size of the population. Hence, the researcher was unable to find information regarding the total number of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo and the exact number of the population remained unknown to the researcher.

The core delimitation of this study is that the researcher did not interview EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo and nor observe their EFL classes. Hence, there is a chance that not all of the important components have been considered when determining what teachers believe and practice about grammar teaching. Since the researcher did not observe classes, there was no way to ensure that the teachers have responded the survey questions sincerely about their beliefs and practices about grammar teaching. Highlighting on the implied consent that the responses of participants were completely anonymous was a way to safeguard that the sample would respond more sincerely.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

This literature review explores the importance of teacher’s beliefs, EFL teaching methods including the criticism toward them, and high school students’ motivation on foreign language and learning.

Teacher Beliefs

Beliefs are perceptions about the world that individuals feel are true and rely on as a guide to personal thoughts and actions (Harvey, 1986 as cited in Fang, 1996; Richardson, 2003). A study by Pajares (1992) supported the assumption that beliefs represent the best indicators of the decisions that individuals make throughout their lives. Kagan (1992) defined beliefs as ‘Unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms, and the academic material to be taught’ (p.65), and as congruent with teacher’s beliefs are congruent with teacher’s teaching style (Kagan, 1992). Similarly to Kagan (1992), Fang (1992) showed that teachers’ beliefs impact how teachers perceive, process, and act upon information in the classroom, and Williams and Burden (1997, as cited in Thu, 2009) asserted that beliefs are predictors of how teachers behave in the classroom. Recent studies, for instance, Kuzborska’s (2011) study reported a strong relationship between teacher beliefs and practices, and Farrell’s (2015) study found that teachers’ beliefs provide a strong basis for their classroom actions. Hence, teachers’ beliefs should be a focus of educational research (Pajares, 1992). We also have studies, such as from Farrell and Lim (2005), which report a more limited correspondence between teachers’ beliefs and practices. However, more recent studies in the field of ESL and EFL, have reported evidence that teachers’ beliefs have a strong effect on classroom practices (Basturkmen, 2012; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Kuzborska 2011).
Teachers’ beliefs are shaped by many factors, including the discipline subculture, pre-service experience, and the opportunity for reflection (Bean and Zulich, 1992 as cited in Fang, 1996). The assumption that pre-service teachers bring their beliefs about teaching with them to teacher education programs is accepted (Richardson, 1996; 2003; Stuard & Thurlow, 2000). Lortie (1975) suggested that pre-service teachers develop these beliefs from sources including personal experience, knowledge, and experience in schools, which act as a filter of what and how these teachers learn. A more recent study by Zephir (2000) also found that teachers’ beliefs are not inspired and developed from research studies but by personal experience. Williams and Burden’s (2002) study showed that there is a growing body of evidence showing that teachers are highly influenced by their beliefs, which the authors consider as closely related to their values, views, and conceptions; the authors further noted that beliefs are even more influential than knowledge. Similarly, Richardson (2003) distinguished beliefs from knowledge by highlighting that beliefs shape how learning is approached.

As per Kagan’s (1992) definition of beliefs as unconscious assumptions, Farrell (2008) suggested encouraging language teachers to articulate their beliefs to themselves and others in order to bring them to the level of conscious awareness. In this regard, later, Farrell (2013a, 2013b) further suggested that teachers should reflect-on-action, reflect-in-action, and reflect-for-action consciously consider their beliefs.

Fang (1996) stated that teachers’ beliefs can take many forms in their classrooms. For instance, they can be embodied in teachers’ expectations regarding their students’ performances or in teachers’ theory about teaching a particular subject area. In this regard, it is important to mention that teachers’ expectations about their students’ performance have a significant impact
on students’ academic performance (Good, 1987), for what many studies have been conducted. Hence, the importance of teachers’ beliefs is wide since they affect teachers’ practices which they further affect students’ academic performance.

**The Role of Grammar**

According to Oxford Dictionaries, grammar is “the whole system and structure of a language or of languages in general, usually taken as consisting of syntax and morphology (including inflections) and sometimes also phonology and semantics” (n.d). The debate about grammar teaching has gone to an extent where researchers have argued whether grammar should be taught at all. According to Nassaji and Fotos (2004), this debate has been initiated by Krashen’s (1981) distinction between learning and acquisition of language. It was believed that formal grammar lessons would not develop the ability to use the forms correctly but would only develop declarative knowledge. It was claimed that language is acquired through natural exposure. However, Nassaji and Fotos (2004) stated the role of grammar in language classrooms has been reconsidered due to the current research in Second Language Acquisition. Batstone (1994) stated that, “Language without grammar would be chaotic: countless words without the indispensable guidelines for how they can be ordered and modified” (p. 4). Brumfit (2000) stated that, if a person knows a million words in English, but he cannot put them together, then he/she cannot speak English. Moreover, Hinkel and Fotos (2002) noted that grammar has been one of the mainstays in English language teaching all over the world although it has been a thorny problem for many ESL/EFL professionals. Similarly, Ellis (2006) asserted that grammar has held and continues to hold a central position in language teaching.

This evidence indicates that grammar is an important component of language learning. When and how grammar should be taught and how students’ grammar mistakes should be
corrected remain questions to which SLA experts are dedicating much research. However, Zephir (2000) found that teachers’ beliefs are not always inspired and developed by research studies but by personal experience.

A Review of Language Teaching Approaches and Methods

*Explicit versus Implicit Instruction.* Although the role of grammar cannot be denied, there has been a long debate about whether grammar should be taught explicitly or implicitly. Explicit teaching is defined as giving metalinguistic explanations for the grammatical rules, whereas implicit teaching is defined as exposing students to specific grammatical features without pointing out the rules (Cowan, 2014). Krashen (1993) argued that explicit knowledge about language structures may never turn into implicit knowledge. Similarly, Truscott (1996, 1998) argued that the effects of explicit instruction are short-lived and superficial and do not promote “genuine knowledge of language” (p. 120). On the contrary, DeKeyser (1998) argued that if learners have the opportunity for communicative practice, explicit knowledge becomes implicit. Yet, Ellis (2006) stated that, “No published study has directly tested whether explicit knowledge converts directly into implicit knowledge” (p. 97). The author justified the lack of research in this direction due to the difficulty in ascertaining which type of knowledge learners use when they use the target language. Cowan (2014) showed that until recently, arguments in favor of one of these approaches, explicit or implicit, have not been supported by evidence. In this regard, the author mentioned a study by Norris and Ortega (2000) they found that explicit teaching produces better and longer-lasting results compared to implicit teaching. However, a literature reviewed by Nassaji and Fotos (2004) indicated that learners need opportunities to encounter and produce structures that they have learned either explicitly or implicitly. Before assuming which method is better, it is also important to consider that explicit grammar teaching
occurs in two forms, deductive and inductive. Teaching grammar deductively means to introduce the rules before exposing students to the patterns, whereas teaching grammar inductively means to expose students to examples so they can figure out the patterns (Cowan, 2014). Cowan (2014) stated that the latter is considered more useful when teaching intermediate and advanced learners. The author concluded that it is generally accepted that either form of explicit grammar teaching is better than not providing grammar instruction at all.

**Approaches and Methods to Language Teaching**

Ellis (2006) stated that she is not convinced that research demonstrates that there is one preferred approach to teaching grammar. The author considered that the acquisition of the grammatical system of a second or foreign language can be assisted best by a variety of approaches.

*Grammar Translation.* The Grammar Translation Method originated from the teaching of classic languages, such as Greek and Latin (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). This is one of the earliest methods for language teaching, which bloomed in the 18th century and started being applied in the 19th century (Richards and Rodgers, 2014). Richards and Rodgers (2014) highlighted that the Grammar Translation Method, initially known as the Prussian Method, dominated the field of language teaching for an entire century, specifically from 1840 to 1940. However, many authors have stated that this method is still in use. For instance, Horwitz (2012) asserted that the method is still used either entirely or partly in many language classes and emphasizes reading and writing.

When using the Grammar Translation Method, grammar is taught systematically and deductively, whereas vocabulary words are taught based on the textbook used in the classroom. Usually, students must memorize this vocabulary including their translations. Accuracy is an
important component of the grammar translation approach (Stefanllari, Hadaj, Gegaj, Stefanllari, 1991, as cited by Kacani, 2013; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Practitioners of this method include many reading activities in which students are required to translate ‘line by line’ into their native language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013, p. 154). Classes that apply the Grammar Translation Method, draw attention to specific grammatical items by giving exercises, such as filling in the blanks. Teachers who use the Grammar Translation Method check students’ comprehension by making questions in students’ native language (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Horwitz, 2012).

Qing-xue and Jin-fang (2007) highlighted that many linguists have criticized this method for the reason that students have to memorize “unusable grammar rules” and that the student’s communicative competence is not an objective (p. 69, 70). However, one cannot conclude that the method is completely ineffective because the methods of teaching should also depend on student’s age, level of proficiency, and language objectives. The original purpose of the Grammar Translation Method was to help students read and understand literature and to develop intellectual and academic skills rather than developing fluency in communication (Stern, 1983; Lightbown & Spada, 2013). In this regard, Horwitz (2012) stated that since the Grammar Translation Method contributes more to reading abilities than to speaking fluency, the method “is most appropriate for learners who require a very precise reading ability in their second language, such as people who use another language in their research or foreign language learners who use textbooks written in another language” (p. 61). The methods that followed the grammar translation are oral based methods such as Direct Method and Audio-Lingual Method.

**Direct Method.** The Direct Method is an early (1900s) oral-based method that is still in use today. This method is a radical shift from the Grammar Translation because it avoids the use of the first language and translation as a technique and uses the target language as a means of
instruction and communication (Qing-xue & Jing-fan, 2007). This method became popular after the Grammar Translation Method was found to be ineffective in preparing students to use the target language for communication purposes (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). It was named the Direct Method because the “meaning is to be conveyed directly in the target language through the use of demonstration and visual aids, with no recourse to the students’ native language” (p. 25). Hence, EFL classes that use the Direct Method use only the target language. Moreover, students are asked to use the language instead of demonstrating their knowledge of the language. Teachers who use the Direct Method teach grammar inductively and emphasize listening and speaking, and vocabulary over grammar.

However, Horwitz (2012) pointed out that a considerable amount of criticism has been directed at the Direct Method. One objection was that because the method focuses primarily on listening and speaking, some educators feel that the literary and cultural readings associated with the Grammar Translation Method are neglected in the Direct Method. Secondly, by using the Direct Method many teachers face the difficulty dealing with abstract topics, which can be especially challenging in a second or foreign language. Similarly, Qing-xue and Jing-fan (2007) showed that there is a difficulty with the application of this method beyond the elementary stage of language learning and that the absence of reference to the first language requires safeguards against misunderstanding without translating. Moreover, they also suggested that since this method requires teachers with native or native-like proficiency, it is difficult to meet such a requirement.

Audio-Lingual Method. The Audio-Lingual Method is among the traditional language teaching methods and is still commonly used today. Celce-Murcia (1991) stated that, “In 1967
the Audio-Lingual Method had dominated language teaching in the U.S. for over two decades” (p. 459).

According to Qing-xue and Jin-fang (2007), in contrast to the previous method that was preoccupied with vocabulary, the Audio-Lingual approach used syntactical progression as its purpose. However, Lightbown and Spada (2013) stated that although the Audio-Lingual Method arose as a reaction to the Grammar Translation Method, it is still evident that teachers avoid letting beginning learners speak freely because they are concerned that this would allow them to make mistakes, which could turn into habits. Hence, the Audio-Lingual Method philosophy, just as the Grammar Translation’s, is to ‘Get it right from the beginning.’ (p.155).

Richards and Rodgers (2014) defined the Audio-Lingual Method as “a linguistic, or structure-based, approach to language teaching” (p. 66). The authors also added that dialogues for repetition and memorization and drills and pattern practices are the main characteristics of this approach with an emphasis on correct pronunciation, stress, rhythm, and intonation; hence, the approach is oral-based and emphasizes listening and speaking.

Richards and Rodgers (2014) emphasized that this approach has been criticized for its theoretical foundation and practical results. Specifically, the theoretical foundation of the Audio-Lingual Method has been considered unsound in regards to language and learning theory such as Chomsky’s theory of Transformational Grammar. Also, its practical results do not meet expectations because students who are taught through the Audio-Lingual Method are often unable to use their acquired skills in an authentic or real communication outside the language classroom. Similarly, Horwitz (2012) stated that initially the approach was considered a very modern approach as it focused on oral language that is spoken by native speakers instead of being limited to literary language. Yet, the author also mentioned the criticism that has been
made toward the approach. Teachers and learners complained that this approach did not result in preparation for spontaneous conversations and that the approach de-emphasized the “explicit grammar teaching consistent with behavioral learning theory” (p. 63).

**Natural Approach.** The Natural Approach was developed from the late 70s to the early 80s. Krashen and Terrell (1983), who actually developed this approach, stated that, “The Natural Approach is designed to develop basic personal communication skills – both oral and written” (p. 67). The authors further added that the approach is not designed to teach academic English, but they assumed that it can lead to a greater success in the latter.

Horwitz (2012) stated that the Natural Approach emphasizes listening and reading and that this method posits that “just as babies learning their first language need time to listen before they start to talk, second language learners should be given time to acquire sufficient language before teachers ask them to speak or write” (p. 66). Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (2014) affirmed that when the Natural Approach is used, there is an emphasis on input rather than practice. Moreover, unlike the Direct Method, which insists that students respond only in the target language, the Natural Approach allows them to respond in any way that demonstrates comprehension.

Grammar is not the focus of the Natural Approach. Hence, practitioners who use this approach in their classes teach grammar only according to students’ communicative needs (Horwitz, 2012). Krashen and Terrell defined the Natural Approach as one of the traditional approaches, which Richards and Rodgers (2014) considered as an approach “without reference to grammatical analysis, grammatical drilling, or a particular theory of grammar” (p. 261).

**Communicative Language Teaching Approach.** The Communicative Language Teaching Approach is designed to develop communicative competence, a term coined by Hymes
(1972, as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Similarly, according to Cowan (2014), Savignon who is one of the founders and of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach, suggested that language teaching should stimulate the development of communicative competence. Savignon (1991) defined the communicative competence as “the ability to interact with other speakers to make meaning, as distinct from the ability to demonstrate grammatical competence on discrete point tests” (p. 264). This approach emphasizes authentic communication and encourages the development of listening comprehension (Horwitz, 2012). Yet, the approach evolved through the idea that largely relied upon the development of four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Cowan, 2014).

This approach encourages activities that carry out meaningful tasks and involve real communication (Qing-xue & Jin-fang, 2007). However, unlike the Natural Approach, which accepts responses in any language that students show comprehension, practitioners who use the Communicative Language Teaching Approach urge students to respond and communicate in the target language (Horwitz, 2012). Breen and Candlin (1980) stated that in CLT classes, the role of a learner is to be a negotiator, whereas a role of a teacher is to be a facilitator of the communication process and an independent participant within the group. Richard and Rodgers (2014) added that a teacher can be an organizer, a counselor, and a group process manager. The authors also explained that classrooms using the Communicative Language Teaching Approach are characterized by pair and group activities, which among others include jig-saw, task-completion, information-gathering, opinion-sharing, information-transfer, reasoning gap, and role play activities.

Horwitz (2012) states that although grammar is de-emphasized in classes that use the Communicative Language Teaching Approach, it is not eliminated entirely. Hence, in
Communicative Language Teaching classes, grammar is taught implicitly and spontaneously based on students’ communicative needs. This approach “eschews explicit grammar instruction and emphasizes collaboration among students to achieve meaningful communication” (Cowan, 2014, p. 32-33).

Qing-xue and Jin-fang (2007) stated that there are, however, problems that arose from the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. Among others they mentioned that it has been put into question how such an approach can be evaluated, how it can be applied at all teaching levels, and how it can be adopted in cases where students are required to take grammar tests.

**High School Students and Second Language Acquisition**

Tragant (2006) stated that the attitude of high school students on foreign language learning is initially positive but wanes quickly. One explanation is that generally adolescents have a tendency to view all school subjects negatively. Another explanation is that the novelty of experience inflates motivation in the first year of foreign language instruction. “A third explanation is that educational practices become less motivating (i.e. feedback becomes more negative, the teaching approaches are less dynamic) as students progress through school” (p. 239). A study by Andrews (2003) surveyed 170 and interviewed 17 English teachers in high schools in Hong Kong. The data from interviews indicated that 76.47% reported that their teachers had negative reactions to grammar teaching.

**Summary**

The literature review showed that teacher’s beliefs are very influential and impact teacher’s decisions about teaching practices. Next, the review of EFL teaching methods including the criticism toward them, and the review of students’ attitudes toward foreign language and grammar learning showed when each method is and is not appropriate to be used.
Lastly, the literature review showed that high school students do not have much interest and motivation to learn grammar. In this regard, it is appropriate to conclude that EFL methods that focus on accuracy over fluency are not appropriate for high school students.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The literature review illustrated that teachers use teaching methods and techniques that are the most adequate based on their personal beliefs rather than based on what research says (Zephir, 2000). In other words, it is very likely for teachers’ beliefs to be determinants for the methods that they use in their classrooms. In Kosovo, no research has been done with a purpose to identify the most common EFL methods adapted by teachers in public high schools in Kosovo, and no research has been done to analyze the correlation and regression between teacher beliefs and practices about grammar teaching. Hence, this research not only identified the most common EFL method used by teachers in public high schools in Kosovo, but it also tested if these practices occur as a result of teachers’ beliefs.

All of the educational institutions in Kosovo operate under the regulations of the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) and Kosovo Accreditation Agency (AAK). The study surveyed EFL teachers in high schools in Kosovo with an aim to understand their beliefs and practices about grammar teaching which later were compared to the contemporary theories on grammar teaching in the field of Second Language Acquisition. Hence, the purpose of this paper is to provide useful information/data for MEST to update English as a Foreign Language (EFL) curriculum and teaching instructions accordingly, if necessary. Nevertheless, since the study was particularly concentrated on teachers’ beliefs and practices of grammar teaching, it could also lead to an update in English Teaching program under the Department of Education at the University of Prishtina.

Research Design

This research was conducted according to Johnson and Christensen’s (2013) educational
research methods. This is a type of applied research, which, according to the authors, is used for “answering real-world, practical questions to provide relatively immediate solutions” (p.10).

Specifically, this paper addressed questions about the most common EFL methods adopted by teachers in public high schools in Kosovo and their beliefs on grammar teaching.

Primary data are the information/data gathered by the researcher, whereas secondary data are the information/data published by other researchers, such as literature, documents, and articles (Bryman & Bell, 2007). In this study, the secondary research was used to introduce the background of the topic and to review the literature. Whereas, the primary research was conducted to answer the specific or customized questions of this study, which may be evaluated based on the secondary research (i.e. literature review). The first research question of this study was about EFL teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching, whereas the second research question of this study was about the most used language and grammar teaching methods and techniques in public high schools in Kosovo. The research hypothesis suggested that there is a positive relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo and that what EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching predicts which methods are most used in public high schools in Kosovo.

**Scientific Method**

This research followed a confirmatory scientific method. The confirmatory method is a top-down or theory-testing approach to research that goes from hypothesis to data collection to acceptance or rejection of hypothesis (Johnson & Christensen, 2013). Specifically, the main hypothesis of this research is that there is a positive correlation between teacher beliefs and their practices about grammar teaching at public high schools in Kosovo. In addition, Johnson & Christensen
(2013) stated that when researchers use terms such as descriptive, exploratory, explanatory, and predictive research, they also describe the primary objective of the research. Hence, following the confirmatory method is also a determinant of the research’s primary objective. However, the objective of this research is not limited to confirming the hypothesis because, as mentioned above, this is applied research with the purpose to influence further decisions on EFL curriculum in public high schools and English Teaching program at the University of Prishtina.

**Research Paradigm**

Johnson and Christensen (2013) provided a detailed overview of research paradigms know as quantitative, mixed, and qualitative research with definitions for each paradigm followed by a table of research paradigms’ characteristics. The introductory definitions for these paradigms given by the authors include the following: (a) quantitative research mainly represents the collection of quantitative data (i.e numerical data), (b) qualitative research mainly represents the collection of qualitative data (i.e nonnumerical data such as words and pictures), and c) mixed research represents the collection of quantitative and qualitative data (p.33). Considering the introductory definitions and overview of characteristics for research paradigms, it was easy to determine that this research’s paradigm would be quantitative research because it followed a confirmatory scientific method, which is one of the quantitative research characteristics. The quantitative method is chosen because the researcher was unable to observe EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo and to do mixed method research.

**Site Selection**

The context of this study included public high schools in Kosovo, a country located in Southeastern Europe in the heart of the Balkan Peninsula. The country is populated by approximately two million people, and it has the youngest population in Europe (IPAK, 2013).
Almost the entire population of Kosovo speaks Albanian, which belongs to the Indo-European family of languages (Elsie, n.d). In 2014, the total population of Kosovo was registered as 1,781,021, from which 174,932 were between the ages 15-19 (Kosovo Agency of Statistics, 2011). According to a publication by Kosovo Agency of Statistics (2015), in the academic year 2014/15 Kosovo had 120 public high schools with 83,743 students from which 47% were female and 53% were male, and 5,358 teachers from which 38.84% are female and 61.16% are male.

**Population and Sample**

All of the EFL teachers working in public high schools in Kosovo represent the population of this study. In 2015, the total number of teachers in public high schools in Kosovo was 5,358 (Kosovo Agency of Statistics, 2015). As per the specific population of this study, no data could be found regarding the number of teachers per subject (i.e. EFL). However, if the total number of teachers, which is 5,384, is divided proportionally to the total number of public high schools, which is 120, then each school would have a total of 45 teachers for all of the subjects. Hence, considering that there are majors and subjects, the researcher assumed that on average every public high school in Kosovo has at least two EFL teachers; that means the researcher assumed that the population for this study was 240.

The researcher used a two-stage cluster sample by initially clustering 7 cities in Kosovo and then selecting a number of EFL teachers in public high schools from each cluster through simple random sampling. The researcher used the cluster sampling method because it was impossible to obtain a list for all of the EFL teachers who teach in public high schools in Kosovo. However, although the researcher aimed to include participants from 7 cities in Kosovo, no EFL teacher from the region of Peja participated in the study.

The survey was published on Survey Monkey and the researcher informed and invited the
population to participate in the research by posting at Kosovo English Teachers Network (KETNET). The use of volunteers as participants restricts the generalizability of the results of this study. In addition, because some teachers are not members of KETNET, the researcher hired two field researchers to distribute the survey to EFL teachers in public high schools in Gjakove and Mitrovice. The first page of the survey was the implied consent informing the participants about the study background, purpose and significance, risk and benefits, and data confidentiality. The survey had 50 respondents. Yet, the final sample size, which represents the population of this study, is 48 because two respondents completed only the first part of the survey. There were also three other incomplete responses, but they were taken into account because they were more than half-completed. The mean age for all participants was from 22-65 (M=38.79, SD = 11.11). Unlike the total number of high school teachers in high schools in Kosovo, which consisted of 61.16% males and 38.84% females, 31.25% of the sample of this study was self-identified as male and 68.75% as female (see Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Highest degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
<td>3-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prishtine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizren</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjakove</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrovice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjilan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferizaj</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrument

This study used a survey as the instrument to retrieve the information/data needed to answer the research questions and test the hypothesis. After getting permission from Connie Kay
Zucker and Thu Tran, the researcher adapted the survey from Zucker (2005) and Huang-Thu (2009). To determine the validity of the measurement instrument, the researcher used the criterion validity and construct validity forms. As per criterion validity, the researcher measured the methods that are used in EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo based on techniques that are characteristics or traits of those methods. As per construct validity, the research had to measure beliefs by giving statements and asking the respondents about their level of agreement. The fact that the survey questions had previously been used by other authors who have measured beliefs and practices indicates the validity of the instrument. For instance, Zucker (2005) reported that bias was minimized because all of the variables were included in the statistical analysis. Zucker (2005) reported the validity of the instrument was supported by including survey items that represented all of the domains that the participants understood. To determine the reliability of the measurement instrument, the researcher of this study used the interrater reliability form. Specifically, two individuals evaluated the instrument by reviewing, taking and timing it.

The survey had three parts. The first part of the survey included questions 1-8 and gathered teacher’s demographical information, such as age, gender, length of teaching experience, the city of workplace, grade level of teaching, the highest degree obtained, participation in conferences, and the number of conducted and published research articles.

The second part of the survey gathered information needed to answer the second research question, which is about the most common EFL method used by teachers in public high schools in Kosovo. This part included questions 9-20. Alternative answers for questions 9-13 had a multi-option format in order to avoid non-matching responses when analyzing the data and bias. Questions 14-20 had alternative answers in a frequency Likert-scale format, which varied from
1-5 (1=always, 2=very often, 3=sometimes, 4=rarely, 5=never).

The third part of the survey gathered information needed to answer the first research question, which is about EFL teachers’ beliefs about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo. This part included questions 21-32, in which participants were asked to show their level of agreement on different statements regarding grammar teaching. Specifically, an agreement Likert-scale varied from 1-4 (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, and 4=strongly disagree). Hence, for the second research question, participants did not have a chance to provide neutral responses because it is assumed that all of the teachers, to some extent, have their own beliefs about grammar teaching methods and techniques.

The instrument also gathered the data that were needed to test the hypothesis. To test the hypothesis, the researcher compared the data from the second part of the survey, about teacher practices, with the data from the third part of the survey, about beliefs.

**Variables**

For the second research question, which aims to identify the most common EFL method used in EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo, the variables are the EFL teaching methods reviewed in the literature: the Grammar Translation, Audio-Lingual Method, Direct Method, Natural Approach, and the Communicative Language Teaching Approach are the approaches and methods that indicate the variables for the second research question. However, the names of the methods were not mentioned in the survey. Instead, the researcher used the methods’ main techniques as characteristics to identify which method is used most commonly in EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo. The techniques of each method, or characteristics, were selected from the literature review. For instance, Question 9 of the survey asked teachers about the skills that they mostly emphasize in their classrooms. As reviewed from Horwitz
(2012), the first alternative, emphasizing reading and writing, is a characteristic of the Grammar Translation Method. The second alternative, emphasizing listening and speaking, is a characteristic of the Direct Method and the Audio-Lingual Method. The third alternative, emphasizing listening and reading, is a characteristic of the Natural Approach. The fourth alternative, emphasizing the development of listening comprehension, is a characteristic of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach.

For the hypothesis of this research, which is answered after two research questions are answered separately, the variables are beliefs and practices. Beliefs are independent variables, whereas practices are dependent variables. Although in everyday life, beliefs are dependent on other experiences, for this paper the researcher considered them as independent because this paper did not study what affects beliefs, but by the time they are formed what effect they may have on teachers’ practices.

Data analysis

Data retrieved from the survey responses for both research questions were analyzed by descriptive statistics, comparing individual variables, and by looking at the questions’ options with the highest percentage of respondents. Then, the researcher looked at the correlation and regression between two parts of the survey, i.e. teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ practices about grammar teaching. The correlation and regression tests were conducted in order to conclude if there is a relationship between these two variables and if practices could be predicted from beliefs. Specifically, for the correlation and regression tests, the researcher compared the responses of questions 10, 11, 12, and 13 with questions 29, 30, 31, and 32. The researcher was particularly interested in testing the correlation and regression between beliefs and practices regarding the ways of grammar teaching in general, instead of testing the correlation and
regression between beliefs and practices particularly for the Grammar Translation, Audio-Lingual Method, Direct Method, Natural Approach, and Communicative Language Teaching Approach. Hence, the researcher chose these questions because they asked about teachers’ beliefs and practices about students’ responses in the native and target language, and systematic or spontaneous, explicit or implicit, and deductive or inductive grammar teaching. To test the correlation, the researcher used the Spearman correlation because the variables had ordinal scales; teachers’ beliefs were measured based on teachers’ level of agreement with different statements whereas methods were measured based on the frequency of using particular techniques. The researcher interpreted the correlation based on Rumsey’s (2010) explanation on how to interpret the Correlation Coefficient.

The collection of data remained confidential. The participants were not required to provide personal information such as name and/or name of the institution they work for. In addition, the information and data were destroyed after the researcher finished the report of results and conclusion.

Assumptions and Generalizations

The assumptions of this study were that the participants truly represented the overall population of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo and that they took the survey seriously and responded honestly.

Considering that there are many other studies that have used similar instruments and got similar findings that teachers’ beliefs impact teachers’ practices, the findings of this study can be generalized. However, the replication of the study would require the interpretation of the findings to be contextualized.
Summary

This study used an educational methodology from Johnson and Christensen (2013). The scientific method of this study was the confirmatory method, whereas the research paradigm of this study was quantitative with a survey as the only instrument. The population of this study includes all of the EFL teachers who teach in public high schools in Kosovo, whereas the sample for this study consists of 48 EFL teachers who took the survey. The population was sampled through the two-stage cluster method; 7 cities in Kosovo were clustered and then the EFL teachers from each cluster were selected through simple random sampling.

For the research questions, about teachers’ beliefs, and practices, data were analyzed by descriptive statistics and looking at the questions’ options with the highest percentage of respondents. For the research hypothesis, teachers’ beliefs influence teachers’ practices, a correlation test was needed. For this study, beliefs represented the independent variable and practices represented the dependent variable.
CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis and Results

In this chapter, the researcher presents the results for each of the research questions and tests the research hypothesis. The study focused on three concepts: teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching, teachers’ practices in grammar teaching, and the correlation and regression of teacher beliefs and practices regarding grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo.

**Research Question 1:** *What do EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching in a classroom setting?*

The third part of the survey, which included questions 21-32, was designed to answer the first research question based on the responses of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo. Questions 21-32 asked participants about their level of agreement with different statements regarding grammar teaching. Specifically, an agreement Likert-scale for these statements varied from 1-4 (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=disagree, and 4=strongly disagree). Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the data for the first research question.

Table 2

**Descriptive statistics of the data for the first research question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 21 asked teachers what their level of agreement with the statement that students’ error should be corrected in order to avoid habit formation. This statement shows a characteristic of the Grammar Translation Method and the Audio-Lingual Method. The highest percentage of teachers, 56.52%, responded that they agree, whereas the second highest percentage of teachers, 28.26%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement.

Question 22 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that reading is the means of language learning. This statement shows a characteristic of the Grammar Translation Method and the Natural Approach. From all of the teachers who responded the survey, 60.87% responded that they agree, 26.09% responded that they strongly agree, and 13.04% responded that they disagree with the statement.

Question 23 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that mechanical drills and repetitions are necessary and helpful in supporting language acquisition. This statement shows a characteristic of the Audio-Lingual Method. Survey results showed that the highest number of teachers, 58.70%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 30.43%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement.

Question 24 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the silent period, which is a characteristic of the Natural Approach. The highest number of teachers, 65.22%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 19.57%, responded that they strongly agree that second language learners need time to acquire sufficient language before they are asked to speak or write in the target language. Some teachers, 15.22%, responded that they disagree with the statement, whereas no teacher responded that he or she strongly disagrees with it.

Question 25 asked teachers about their level of agreement with Stephen Krashen when he
argues that students cannot learn a language by speaking and writing because they are productive skills. This argument of Krashen is the philosophy of the Natural Approach since it focuses on listening and reading. More than the half of teachers who took the survey, specifically 56.52%, responded that they disagree, whereas 30.43% responded that they agree with the statement.

Question 26 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that developing students’ communicative competence should be the focus of foreign language classes. The communicative competence is a term that characterizes the Communicative Language Teaching approach. The highest percentage of teachers, 54.35%, responded that they agree and the second highest percentage of teachers, 43.48%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement.

Question 27 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that language acquisition best occurs with interaction. This statement shows a characteristic of the Communicative Language Teaching approach. The highest number of teachers, 53.33%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 44.44%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement.

Question 28 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that students may pick-up errors when they work in pairs/groups. This statement characterizes the Grammar Translation Method and the Audio-Lingual Method. A solid number of teachers, 64.44%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 24.44%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement.

Question 29 asked students about their level of agreement with the statement that as long as students show comprehension, responses can be acceptable in both the first and target language. This statement shows a characteristic of the Natural Approach. The highest number of
teachers who took the survey, 40.00%, responded that they disagree, whereas the second highest number of teachers, 37.78%, responded that they agree with the statement. So the percentage of teachers that agreed with the statement is not significantly different with the number of teachers that disagreed with the statement. However, the number of teachers that responded that they strongly agree with the statement consists of 20.00% of the responses, while the number of teachers that responded that they strongly disagree with the statement consists of only 2.22%. This means that in general the number of teachers who agreed with the statement is higher than the number of teachers who disagreed.

Question 30 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that they should have a specific plan to teach grammar rather than teaching it only based on students’ communicative needs. Systematic teaching of grammar is a characteristic of traditional methods, whereas the spontaneous teaching of grammar is a characteristic of the Natural Approach and Communicative Language Teaching approach. The highest number of teachers, 55.56%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 31.11%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement that teachers should have a specific plan to teach grammar.

Question 31 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that grammar should be taught implicitly. Implicit instruction of grammar is a characteristic of the Audio-Lingual Method, the Natural Approach, and the Communicative Language Teaching approach. The highest number of teachers, 42.22%, responded that they disagree with the statement, but no one responded that he or she strongly disagrees with it. The second highest number of teachers, 35.56%, responded that they agree and 22.22% responded that they strongly agree with the statement.
Question 32 asked teachers about their level of agreement with the statement that grammar should be taught inductively. Inductive instruction of grammar is a characteristic of the Direct Method. The highest number of teachers, 51.11%, responded that they agree and the second highest number of teachers, 33.33%, responded that they strongly agree with the statement. From all of the teachers who took the survey, 15.56% responded that they disagree with the statement but no one responded that he or she strongly disagrees with it.

The results show that the beliefs of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo regarding language and grammar teaching techniques are quite mixed. Figure 1 shows a summary of the division of characteristics based on EFL methods.

Figure 1

Teachers’ beliefs regarding language and grammar teaching methods

![Diagram showing the distribution of beliefs among EFL teaching methods]

Figure 1, teachers’ beliefs regarding language and grammar teaching methods, shows that 25% of the beliefs are related to the Grammar Translation Method, 25% are related to the Audio-Lingual Method, and 25% are related to the Natural Approach. In addition, 19% of the beliefs are related to the Communicative Language Teaching approach, whereas 6% are related to the Direct Method.

**Research Question 2:** What methods and techniques of language and grammar teaching are most used by EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo?
The second part of the survey, which included questions 9-21, was designed to answer the second research question based on the responses of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo. Alternative answers for questions 9-13 had a multi-option format in order to avoid non-matching responses when analyzing the data and bias. Questions 14-20 had alternative answers in a frequency Likert-scale format, which varied from 1-5 (1=always, 2=very often, 3=sometimes, 4=rarely, 5=never). Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of the data for the second research question.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 09</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 9 asked teachers about the skills that they mostly emphasize in their EFL classes and 60.42% of teachers responded that they mostly emphasize listening and speaking. According to the literature review, emphasizing listening and speaking is a characteristic of the Direct Method and Audio-Lingual Method.

Question 10 asked teachers about the language that students use to respond in the class and 72.92% of teachers responded that their students are expected to respond in the target language. This is a characteristic of the Direct Method and Audio-Lingual Method.
Questions 11-13 were multiple questions that asked teachers how they teach grammar, systematically or spontaneously, explicitly or implicitly, and deductively or inductively. Findings show that 72.92% of teachers teach grammar systematically, 62.50% of teachers teach grammar explicitly, and 52.08% of teachers teach grammar deductively. Systematic teaching of grammar is a characteristic of traditional methods, whereas the spontaneous teaching of grammar is a characteristic of the Natural Approach and Communicative Language Teaching approach. Implicit instruction of grammar is a characteristic of the Audio-Lingual Method, the Natural Approach, and the Communicative Language Teaching approach. Inductive instruction of grammar is a characteristic of the Direct Method.

Question 14 asked teachers about the frequency of organizing small group and role-play activities. A solid percentage of teachers, 59.57%, answered that they often organize their EFL classes in small groups and do role-play activities. This is a characteristic of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach.

Question 15 asked teachers about the frequency of requiring students to read the text aloud and translate it line by line. The highest percentage of teachers, 38.30%, responded that they sometimes use this technique in their EFL classes, whereas the second highest percentage of teachers, 19.15%, responded that they rarely use this technique in their EFL classes. This technique is a characteristic of the Grammar Translation Method.

Question 16 asked teachers about the frequency of giving fill in the blanks quizzes and quizzes that focus on grammatical items. This is a characteristic of the Grammar Translation Method and Audio-Lingual Method. Results of the survey show that 44.68% of teachers often give quizzes to fill-in the blanks that focus on grammatical items.

Question 17 asked teachers about the frequency of using negotiation for meaning. The
highest percentage of teachers, 48.94%, selected ‘often’ as their respond, whereas the second highest percentage, 42.55%, selected the option ‘always’. There were 4 teachers, 8.51%, who chose the option ‘sometimes’, whereas no teacher selected the last two options ‘rarely’ and ‘never’. Negotiation for meaning is a characteristic of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach.

Questions 18, 19, and 20 asked teachers about their practices regarding speaking and pronunciation skills. Survey results showed that 46.81% of teachers often require well-pronounced, grammatically correct, and full sentence responses from students; 42.55% of teachers responded that they often use pattern drills and memorized dialogue for speaking activities; and 44.68% of teachers responded that they often require their students to repeat the vocabulary words after them for pronunciation activities. All of these techniques are characteristics of the Audio-Lingual Method.

The results show that EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo have characteristics of different methods. Figure 1 shows a summary of the division of characteristics based on EFL methods.

Figure 2

**EFL methods in public high schools in Kosovo**

![EFL Methods Pie Chart]

- Grammar Translation Method: 14.29%
- Audio-Lingual Method: 50.00%
- Direct Method: 21.42%
- Natural Approach: 14.29%
- Communicative Language Teaching Approach: 0%

Figure 2, EFL methods in public high schools in Kosovo, shows that 50% of the techniques that EFL teachers use in public high schools in Kosovo are characteristics of the Audio-Lingual
Method, and 21.42% are characteristics of the Direct Method. Secondly, 14.29% of the techniques are characteristics of the Grammar Translation Method and 14.29% are characteristics of the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. The results of the survey showed that EFL classes in public high schools in Kosovo do not have any characteristic of the Natural Approach.

**Hypothesis**

*Research Hypothesis: There is a positive relationship between teacher beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo; what EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching predicts which methods are most used in public high schools in Kosovo.*

To test the research hypothesis, the researcher did a correlation and regression test between beliefs and practices. Specifically, the researcher paired the question 10 with 29, 11 with 30, 12 with 31, and 13 with 32.

The first pair, which consisted of question 10 and 29, was about teachers’ beliefs regarding students’ responses. Question 10 asked teachers if they expect their students to respond in their native, target, or in any language that they can show comprehension. Question 29 asked teachers particularly if they believe that they should accept students’ responses in any language that they can show comprehension.

**Table 4**

*Correlation between teachers’ beliefs about practices regarding students’ responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Practice 1</th>
<th>Belief 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice 1</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Practice 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.457**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 1</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>Belief 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-.457**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 4, the Spearman’s Correlation test, shows that there is a moderate negative relationship between the belief of accepting responses in any language that students can show comprehension and a practice of expecting students to respond in the target language.

Table 5

*Model summary for the significance of teachers’ belief about students’ responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.435*</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that 19% of the variation in teachers’ practices in expecting students’ responses in their native, target, or any language that they can show comprehension is explained by the belief that teachers should accept students’ responses in any form that they can show comprehension.

Table 6

*Analysis of the variance, teachers’ expectations on students’ responses, of the regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.653</td>
<td>10.054</td>
<td>.003b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11.347</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that the p-value of the predictor’s effect on the criterion variable is statistically significant because the p-value is smaller than .05

Table 7

*Regression with interaction coefficients regarding teachers’ beliefs about students’ responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.510</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.680</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 1</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>-3.171</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows that the equation of the line to predict teachers’ practice based on their beliefs about students’ responses is $y = -0.306x + 3.510$. From the linear regression analysis, we can test the null hypothesis that the coefficient is 0. The t-test found that found that the intercept and variable are significant because the p-value is greater than .05 ($p<0.01$).

The second pair, which consisted of question 11 and 30, was about teachers’ beliefs’ and practices regarding systematic and spontaneous grammar teaching. Question 11 asked teachers whether they teach grammar systematically or spontaneously. Question 30 asked teachers about their beliefs on teaching grammar systematically.

Table 8

*Correlation between teaching and practices about systematic grammar teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Practice 2</th>
<th>Belief 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 2</td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8, the Spearman’s Correlation test, shows that there is a positive, yet very weak, relationship between teachers’ beliefs about teaching grammar systematically and their systematic practice. Because the relationship was not significant, the regression test was not needed for this pair.

The third pair, which consisted of question 12 and 31, was about teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding explicit and implicit grammar teaching.
Table 9

Correlation between teaching grammar explicitly and the belief of teaching grammar implicitly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Practice 3</th>
<th>Belief 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-.491**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 9, the Spearman’s Correlation test, shows that there is a moderate negative relationship between teachers’ beliefs about implicit grammar teaching and explicit practice of grammar teaching.

Table 10

Model summary for the significance of teachers’ belief about explicit teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.490*</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that 24% of the variation in the practice of explicit teaching is explained by the belief that grammar should be taught explicitly.

Table 11

Analysis of the variance, implicit instruction, of the regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>13.560</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7.839</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10.311</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that the p-value of the predictor’s effect on the criterion variable is statistically significant because the p-value is smaller than .05.
Table 12

*Regression with interaction coefficients regarding teachers’ beliefs about explicit instruction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficient B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.568</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief 3</td>
<td>-.301</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.490</td>
<td>-3.682</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that the equation of the line to predict teachers’ practice based on their beliefs about explicit instruction is \( y = -.301x + 2.019 \). From the linear regression analysis, we can test the null hypothesis that the coefficient is 0. The t-test found that the intercept and variable are significant because the p-value is greater than .05.

The fourth pair, which consisted of question 12 and 31, was about deductive and inductive grammar teaching.

Table 13

*Correlation between teaching grammar deductively and the belief of teaching grammar inductively*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spearman’s rho</th>
<th>Practice 4 Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Practice 4 Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Practice 4 N</th>
<th>Belief 4 Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Belief 4 Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Belief 4 N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief 4 Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief 4 Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belief 4 N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13, Spearman’s Correlation test, shows that there is a positive, yet weak, relationship between teachers’ belief regarding deductive grammar teaching and their actual practice of teaching grammar deductively. Because the relationship was not significant, the regression test was not needed for this pair.
CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper is to provide useful information/data for MEST to update EFL curriculum and teaching instructions accordingly, if necessary. Nevertheless, since the study particularly concentrated on teachers’ beliefs and practices of grammar teaching, it could also serve to lead to an update in English Teaching programs under the Department of Education at the University of Prishtina. This research investigated teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo. The first research question of this study was about EFL teachers’ beliefs on grammar teaching, whereas the second research question of this study was about the most used language and grammar teaching methods and techniques in public high schools in Kosovo. The research hypothesis suggested that there is a positive relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo, and that what EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe to be true about grammar teaching predicts which methods are most used in public high schools in Kosovo. The findings were reported based on 48 EFL teachers’ survey responses.

The data showed that EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo generally do not agree with Krashen when he argues that students cannot learn a language by speaking and writing because they are productive skills. They agree, however, with the statement that language learners should have a silent period. There were other responses that did not match with each other as well. For instance, while the number of teachers who agreed that language acquisition best occurs with interaction ranked the highest from the options, the number of teachers who agreed that students may pick-up errors when they work in pairs/groups was again ranked the highest from the options. EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo generally believe in
habit formation of errors and in the helpfulness of mechanical drills and repetitions in language acquisition. Moreover, this study showed that EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo believe that grammar should be taught systematically, explicitly, and deductively.

As noted in the literature review, Ellis (2006) considered that the acquisition of the grammatical system of a second or foreign language can best be assisted by a variety of approaches. This study shows that actually it is common for teachers to use a variety of approaches and methods in their EFL classes; teachers in public in high schools in Kosovo responded that they use techniques that are characteristics of different methods and approaches. Yet, based on the techniques with the highest percentages of respondents, the Audio-Lingual Method is the most predominant method used in high schools in Kosovo. However, we cannot conclude that EFL teaching in public high schools in Kosovo is done through the Audio-Lingual Method. In this method there is no explicit instruction but a greater number of EFL teachers in public high schools in Kosovo responded that they teach grammar explicitly.

Based on the results from correlation and regression tests on the four pairs of variables, the researcher rejects the null and accepts the research hypothesis for the first and the third pair. On contrary, the researcher accepts the null hypothesis for the second and the fourth pair of the variables. In other words, the more that teachers believe that students can respond in any language that they can show comprehension, the less they expect their students to respond only in the target language. Secondly, the more that teachers believe that grammar should be taught implicitly, the less they practice explicit teaching. On the contrary, teachers’ beliefs about teaching grammar systematically are not predictors that teachers will teach grammar systematically even though there is a relationship between teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ practices regarding systematic grammar teaching. Similarly, teachers’ beliefs about inductive
grammar teaching do not predict teachers’ practices. The researcher considers that teaching grammar systematically may occur as a result of curricula and that is the reason why teachers’ beliefs cannot predict such a practice because it is depended on other factors as well.

Considering the review of literature and data retrieved from the survey responses, the researcher suggests the MEST to offer some language training to EFL teachers by using more sophisticated approaches, exposure to which can shape teachers’ beliefs about language teaching methods. As a result, they may start using methods that are more effective for high school students’ acquisition of language and motivation on foreign language learning. Moreover, since there is a high chance for teachers to develop their beliefs while they are pre-service teachers, the researcher also suggests that EFL teaching program under the Department of should expose pre-service teachers to more sophisticated teaching methods and techniques.

If anyone would like to replicate this study, the researcher suggests considering reformulating and synchronizing the survey questions that were used to test the hypothesis by using correlation and regression. For instance, in this study, the researcher asked teachers if they teach grammar explicitly or implicitly, and then she asked them if they believe that grammar should be taught implicitly. Although it may be assumed that those who do not believe that grammar should be taught implicitly believe that grammar should be taught explicitly, according to research methodology we cannot make such assumptions because the survey did not ask directly about beliefs on explicit grammar teaching. Hence, if a researcher wants to test a correlation and regression between beliefs and practices for the same concept, he/she must raise questions in the same way and with similar options. Further recommendations include conducting interviews with teachers in order to unfold more from their beliefs and observing their classes to analyze more in depth the techniques and methods that they use.
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APPENDICES

Survey questionnaire on EFL teachers’ beliefs and practices in grammar teaching in secondary schools in Kosovo

Marigona Morina, M.Ed. Candidate at the University of Arkansas and TLP-SP recipient, respectfully requests your participation in this survey.

Beliefs are predictors of teachers’ behavior in a classroom, and a reflection of what they provide in a classroom (Thu, 2009). Grammar is an important component of language learning and so there is much research on how and when to teach grammar, yet teacher beliefs are the most influential factor in selecting teaching practices. This research identifies actual EFL practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo and compares them with contemporary suggested practices.

EFL teachers at public high schools in Kosovo, which operate under the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST), are being invited to participate due to the strong collaboration of MEST with United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and World Learning in TLP-SP in particular. Completion of the instrument will be considered permission to use the information you provide in an anonymous manner to compare responses. Please be assured that all information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by applicable LAW NO.03 / L-172: Protection of Personal Data. Participants’ identity will be completely anonymous to the researcher; neither you nor your school will be identified in any publication resulting from this study.

Completion of the entire survey should take not take more than 10 minutes of your time.

There are no anticipated risks to participating in this study. Data gathered will contribute to the research on teacher beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in high schools in Kosovo.

Your participation in the research is completely voluntary. There are no payments or college credits for participating. You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Your decision to withdraw will bring no negative consequences.

Thank you for your time and willingness to participate in this study. Your responses are highly appreciated and will contribute to identifying teacher beliefs and practices about grammar teaching in public high schools in Kosovo. You are kindly asked to complete the survey by April 10, 2016.
Demographics

1. Age:
   a. 22-29
   b. 30-44
   c. 45-59
   d. 60-65

2. Gender: M F

3. What grade/s do you teach? Mark all that apply.
   a. Grade 10
   b. Grade 11
   c. Grade 12

4. In which city do you teach?
   a. Prishtine
   b. Peje
   c. Prizren
   d. Gjakove
   e. Mitrovica
   f. Gjilan
   g. Ferizaj

Teacher’s academic and professional background

5. For how many years have you been teaching EFL?
   a. Less than 2 years
   b. 3-5 years
   c. 6-10 years
   d. 11-15 years
   e. 15-20 years
   f. 20-25 years
   e. more than 25 years

6. What is your highest degree earned so far?
   a. Bachelor
   b. Master
   c. PhD

7. During the last five years, how many EFL conferences have you attended?
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4 or more
8. During the last three years, how many research papers have you written/authored?
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4 or more

Answer the following questions based on your class focus & how you teach grammar

9. In my EFL classes, I mostly emphasize
   a. reading and writing.
   b. listening and speaking.
   c. listening and reading.
   d. development of listening comprehension.

10. In my EFL classes, students are expected to respond
    a. in their native language.
    b. in any form through which they can show comprehension, including the native language.
    c. in the target language (I help students formulate the sentences when necessary).

11. I teach grammar
    a. systematically: based on a plan (e.g. one grammatical item per day).
    b. spontaneously: only based on communicative needs of students.

12. I teach grammar
    a. explicitly, which means I clearly state the grammatical rules by giving metalinguistic explanation.
    b. implicitly, which means I expose students to specific grammatical features but not pointing out the rules.

13. I teach grammar
    a. deductively, which means I introduce the rules before exposing students to the patterns.
    b. inductively, which means I expose students to examples so they can figure out the patterns.

Please show your frequency of using the following EFL techniques in your classrooms

14. I organize the class in small-group and role-play activities.

15. In reading activities, I ask students to read the text aloud and translate (line by line).

16. I ask students to fill-in the blanks and give quizzes that focus on grammatical items.

17. I negotiate for meaning
18. For oral responses, I require well pronounced, grammatically correct, and full-sentence responses from students.

19. For speaking activities, I use pattern drills and memorized dialogue.

20. For pronunciation skills, students are required to repeat the vocabulary words after me.

**To show your beliefs on grammar teaching, please indicate the level of agreement with each statement**

21. I believe that grammar should be taught and students error should be corrected at the beginning of language learning in order to avoid habit formation.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

22. I believe that reading is the means of language learning.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

23. I believe that mechanical drills and repetitions are necessary and/or helpful to support language acquisition.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

24. I _____ with Krashen and Terrell that students should have their silent period, that is “just as babies learning their first language need time to listen before they start to talk, second language learners should be given time to acquire sufficient language before teachers ask them to speak or write.”
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

25. I _____ with Stephen Krashen when he argues that students cannot learn a language by speaking and writing because they are productive skills.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

26. Developing students’ communicative competence should be the focus of foreign language classes.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

27. I believe that language acquisition best occurs with interaction.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree

28. I believe that students may pick-up errors when they work in pairs/groups.
   a. Strongly agree          b. Agree          c. Disagree          d. Strongly disagree
29. I believe that as long as students show comprehension, responses are acceptable in both the native and target language.
   a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Disagree  d. Strongly disagree

30. I believe that teachers should have a specific plan of grammar teaching rather than teaching grammar only based on students’ communicative needs.
   a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Disagree  d. Strongly disagree

31. I believe that grammar should be taught implicitly, which means exposing student to specific grammatical features but not pointing out the rules.
   a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Disagree  d. Strongly disagree

32. I believe that grammar should be taught inductively, which means exposing students to examples to find out the patterns.
   a. Strongly agree  b. Agree  c. Disagree  d. Strongly disagree
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