Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

What about Teaching Grammar? Jordanian EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud (Corresponding Author)
PhD Candidate
Department of Curriculum and Methods of Instruction
Yarmouk University
Email: 2016230110@ses.yu.edu.jo
Irbid, Jordan 21163
ORCID: 0000-0002-5942-8883

Ruba Fahmi Bataineh
Professor of TESOL
Department of Curriculum and Methods of Instruction
Yarmouk University
Email: rubab@yu.edu.jo
Irbid, Jordan 21163
ORCID: 0000-0002-5454-2206

Ms. Dima Al-Daoud is a PhD candidate in the TEFL Program at Yarmouk University (Irbid, Jordan). Her research interests include EFL, teaching grammar, and CALL.
Dr. Ruba Bataineh is a professor of TESOL at the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Yarmouk University (Irbid, Jordan). Her research interests include pragmatics, literacy, CALL, and teacher education
.

Abstract
This research examinesJordanian EFL teachers' beliefsabout and practices in using the inductive and deductive approaches to teaching grammar, the potential (mis)match between them, and the factors leading to this (mis)match. Teachers' beliefs and reported practices were examined through a questionnairewhereasactual practices were examined through an observation of grammar lessons by the nine female Jordanian EFL secondary-stage teachers involved in this study. Beliefs and practices were then compared, and the findings discussed by a focus-group to glean the factors leading to the (mis)match between teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching grammar. The findings revealed that teachers' beliefs and practices were fairlyconsistentwith respect to the use of the deductive approach and inconsistentwith respect to the use of the inductive approachto teaching grammar. The factors revealed were contextual factors (e.g.,heavy teaching loads, crowded classrooms, time constraints), the adherence to studentpreferences, student weak language proficiency, teacher experiences as learners, and inadequate teacher training.
Keywords: beliefs;deduction; EFL;focus group; grammar;induction; practices

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

Introduction

Teachers' beliefs essentially inform their practices (Bandura, 1986; Borg, 1998, 2003; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Pajares, 1992). Hence, understanding teachers' beliefs may help gain insight into their classroom practices and, eventually,into the nuances of their students' performance(Clark &Peterson, 1986). *Teachers' beliefs*are also known as *teacher cognition* (Schulman, 1986), *belief systems* (Pajares, 1992), *teachers' maxims* (Richards, 1996), and *personal pedagogical systems*defined as "the stores of beliefs, knowledge, theories, assumptions, and attitudes that play a significant role in shaping teachers' instructional decisions" (Borg, 1998, p. 9). Examiningteachers' beliefs may foster the understanding of their practices and help glean ideas which would potentially inform teacher training and catalyze language pedagogy (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver,& Thwaite, 2001).In other words, teachers'beliefs may inform their syllabi, teaching/learning outcome, teaching and assessment strategies, and, ultimately, define their classroom practices (Pajares, 1992).

This research has been partly driven by that of Nishimuro and Borg (2013) in which they put forth several unanswered pedagogical questions. More specifically, this research seeks answers towhether grammar should be taught inductively or deductively. In grammar pedagogy, the difference between induction and deduction is the sequence of instructional steps. In deduction, also known as the top-down present-practice-produce model, the teacher starts by explaining the grammatical rule, providing examples, and, eventually,allowing students to practice.In induction, which follows a bottom-up test-teach-test model,the sequence is reversed. Theteacher starts byasking students to elicit grammatical structures from examples or longer textsto eventually induce the rule and produce similar utterances (Gollin, 1998; Larsen-Freeman, 2000;Thornbury, 1999).

Problem, Purpose and Questions of the Research

Grammar instruction is a matter of controversy (Ellis, 2002, 2006; Richards &Reppen, 2014). Language scholars and practitioners alike do not seem to agreeas to how best to teach grammar.Therefore,several calls have been made for studying teachers' beliefsabout and practices in teaching grammar (e.g., Ashton, 2014; Nishimuro& Borg, 2013; Pajares, 1992; Richards, 1996)to better inform grammarpedagogy.

In Jordan, a developing Middle Eastern country, relatively little research has addressed the issue of grammar-related teachers' beliefs. There has also been little qualitative research into grammar-related teachers' beliefs and practices compared with a plethora of researchon teaching grammar(e.g., Al-Damiree& Bataineh, 2016; Bataineh, Al-Qeyam,&Smadi, 2017; Bataineh &Mayyas, 2017; Mayyas& Bataineh, 2019).Thus, this research examinesJordanian teachers' beliefsabout and practices inteaching grammar, whether or not the teachers' beliefs match their teaching practices,and the causes for the potential (mis)match. More specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are Jordanian EFL teachers' beliefs aboutinduction and deduction in teaching grammar?

2. What are Jordanian EFL teachers' actual practices regardinginduction and deduction in teaching grammar?

3. How consistent are teachers' beliefs about and classroom practices in induction and deduction in teaching grammar?

To the best of these researchers' knowledge, this research may be the first in Jordan to examine teachers' beliefs aboutand practices in using induction and deduction in teaching grammar. It is hoped to add to the body of scholarly literature on grammar pedagogy and provide answers specific to Jordanian EFL context. The findings of the researchmay be beneficial toeducational practitioners, scholars,curriculum designers, and policy makers.

Related Literature

This section presents previous research on teacher grammar-related beliefs and practices, grammar pedagogy at large, and grammar pedagogy in the Jordanian context.

Research on Teachers' Grammar-Related Beliefs and Practices

Pajares (1992) explored twenty philosophical and linguistic references (e.g., Bandura, 1986; Nespor, 1987; Rokeach, 1968) and came out with the concept of the 'belief system' in which he sees beliefs and knowledge as twins although beliefs are stronger because they involve feelingsthat lead to evaluation and judgment. Even preservice teachers have educational beliefs that cannot be easily changed through teacher education. To enhance teachers' training programs with successful teaching experiences, he suggested investigating the vital relationship between teachers' beliefs and

their educational plans, decisions and practicesand linking them to students' outcomes.Ellis (1998) stated that research findings rarely contribute to actual language teaching and therefore suggested bridging the gap between teachers' technical and practical knowledge to ensure delivering the right message to second language learners through doing action research, collaborating researchers and teachers' efforts in investigation, and studying teachers' personal pedagogical systems.

Farrell and Lim (2005) investigated the grammar-related beliefs and practices of two experienced female teachers working in a primary school in Singapore. Over the period of two months of qualitative investigation, and by means of pre- and post-interviews, with classroom observations in between, the study revealed that the first teacher's belief about teaching grammar explicitly matched her classroom practices. Conversely, the second teacher believed that grammar should be integrated into speaking, writing, and reading butstill conducted most of her lessons deductively. The second teacher attributed her divergent beliefs and practices to time restrictions, long syllabus, and school policy. The researchers surmisedthat both teachers, despite their beliefs, may be reverting tothe traditional instructionthey themselves received as students.

Phipps and Borg (2009) examined the consistency of the pedagogical beliefs and practices of three in-service EFL teachers in a private university in Turkey. Over a period of eighteen months, the researchers attended the grammar lessons and interviewed each teacher after eachclassroom observation. The findings

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

revealed thatthe teachers' beliefs and practices were consistent in most lessons. During interviews, the teachers attributed the occasional mismatch to students' expectations and preferences, curriculum requirements, classroom management factors, and students' negative participation.

Asassfeh, Alshaboul and Alodwan (2012) investigated Jordanian in-service EFL teachers' beliefsabout form-focused and meaning-oriented instruction.The sample consisted of 300 female and male teachers of different qualifications and years of experience that were randomly selected from public and privateschools in two cities in Jordan. All teachers answered a questionnaire, and ten of them were interviewed. The results showed that the public-school teachers' reported belief of the high effectiveness of communicative language teaching was inconsistent with their form-focused practices, unlike private-school teachers who practiced meaning-oriented instruction more because of their cautiousness to maintain the good financial status and reputation of the schools they work in. The authorsrecommended trainingpublic-schoolteachers to practice meaning-oriented instruction.

Grammar Pedagogy: Induction and Deduction in Language Teaching Research

In language research, choosing between induction and deduction to approach grammar instruction is one of the most controversial issues (Ellis, 2006; Nunan, 1998). Some recommended using both approaches (e.g., Azar, 2007; Basoz, 2014; Kunene & Mthethwa, 2020; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards &Reppen,

2014)whereas others recommended teaching simple grammatical rules deductively andmore complex ones inductively (e.g., Ellis, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Some claimed that EFL students prefer deduction and demand grammar rules and terms(e.g.,Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards&Reppen, 2014; Scheffler, 2012; Thornbury, 1999). In contrast, some research highlighted the effectiveness of induction, asteaching/learning grammar in context explicates the relationship between form, meaning, and use (e.g.,Lee, 2019; Mohammed, 1996; Nunan, 1998;Nurullayevna, 2021;Obeidat&Alomari, 2020; Obeidat, 1991; Ramadan, 2019).

Nunan (1998) considered thatin spite of the utility of deduction, the inductive approach to grammar teaching allows EFL learners the opportunity to glean grammatical rules instead of merely receiving them, which helps them see for themselves the relationship between form, meaning, and use and, thus, fosters their retention of these rules.Thornbury (1999) maintained that the deductive approach to grammarsaves time for more practice, better suits mature language learners, and can be readily explained through the examples without much preparation on the part of the teacher. Larsen-Freeman (2000) urged that teachers use a combination of induction and deduction depending on the nature of the rule, the task, and the students' cognitive style. The inductive approach may be used in conscious-raising tasksor in reviewing previously learned forms whereas deduction can work best when explicitness is required or the rule is hard to glean. Ellis (2006) argued that the conflictingfindings of hundreds of

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

empirical studies on the effectiveness of induction and deduction lead to the conclusion that the problem may be in the research itself which must take into account new variables such as the target grammar and learner aptitude.

Ramadan (2019) explored the effect of teaching conjunctions in and out of context on the language improvement of fifty EFL students in Libya. To collect data, students were equally divided to a control group, which was taught grammar out of context, and a treatment group, which was taught grammar in context. Both groups went through pre- and post-tests. The findings revealed relatively little improvement in the performance of the control group tothat ofthe experimental group who manifested fewer cases of misuse, underuse, and overuse of conjunctions.

Kunene and Mthethwa (2020) compared the effectiveness of deduction versus induction in teaching grammar to sixty Eswatini ESL students. The findings revealed no significant differences in the performance of the students taught inductively and that of those taught deductively.However, both approaches were deemed effective, asthe participants in both groups performed better in the post-test notwithstanding age, sex, educational background, previous knowledge, or learning style.

Grammar Pedagogy in Jordan

Abu Houshand Hussein(1987) compared the effectiveness of using deduction and induction in teaching reported questions to 150 twelfth-grade EFL students. The findings revealed that deduction was more effective in teaching reported questions. Similarly, Obeidat (1991) compared the effectiveness of using deduction and induction in teaching conditionals to Jordanian EFL tenth-grade students. Unlike Abu Housh and Hussein (1987), Obeidat(1991) reported that induction was more effective.

Bataineh, Al-Qeyam, and Smadi (2017) explored the effect of form-focused instruction on Jordanian EFL learners' linguistic knowledge. Forty-seven college students of nursing were divided into an experimental group, taught through conscious-raising tasks, and a control group, taught per the guidelines of the textbook, and were pre- and post-tested. Explicit grammar instruction was found to raise learners' grammatical awareness, as the experimental group outperformed the control group.

Obeidat and Alomari (2020) investigated the relationship between the approach to teaching grammar and Jordanian EFL university students' achievement. One hundred and five students were divided into an experimental group, taught inductively, and a control group, taught deductively. The findings revealed that inductive teaching had a positive effect on students' achievement.

The literature seems to favor induction to deduction in teaching grammar; however, it does not deny that there are times when deduction or a combination of the two approaches to teaching grammar is most appropriate.

Method and Procedures

The sample of the study consisted of nine Jordanian female secondary-stage teachers of English in the five all-girl secondary public schools of ArRamtha Educational Directorate in Jordan. The participants were conveniently chosen from a population of fourteen secondary-stage

teachers (65%) in ArRamtha, Jordan, as detailed inTable 1.

Table 1. Participant Attributes

Class Taught	Qualification	Teaching Experience (in years)	Lesson Observed
Grade 11 n=3	MA	16	revision of verb to do
	BA	21	causative sentences
	BA	16	the present perfect tense
Grade 12 n=6	MA	20	verb to do
	BA	22	state and dynamic verbs
	BA	2	a review of nine tenses
	BA	22	simple past and past continuous
	BA	15	past perfect
	BA	17	past perfect

Table 1 shows the number of the participating teachers, their qualification, years of teaching experience, grades they teach, and observedgrammar lessons.

This study follows a mixed quantitative and qualitative approach and uses three instruments. The first isa questionnaire,adapted from that of Mohamed (2006), and distributed to theparticipants to determinetheir grammar-related pedagogical beliefs and reported practices. The questionnaire is divided into three sections:one for establishingtheir respective profiles(e.g., qualification, experience), anotheron teachers' grammar-related beliefs (about induction and deduction), and the third which sought teachers' reports of their own classroom practices.

The second instrument is an observation checklist, also adapted from that of Mohamed (2006), which was used to documentthe teachers' actual grammar-related practices. The purpose of the classroom observations was the provision of direct evidence of grammar-related practices to compare to the teachers' self-reported practices. However, due to the restrictions on face-to face instruction and the subsequent lockdown and reversion to online instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic, the second researcher could only observenine face-to face grammar lessons, which may constitute a limitation to the potential generalizability of the findings.

The validity of the questionnaire and observation checklist instruments was established by a jury of ten university professors of linguistics, curriculum and instruction, and measurement and evaluation whose feedback was used to modify the instruments. Since the questionnaire and observation checklist were adapted, their reliability was established by the original author (Mohamed, 2006).

The third instrument was the focus-groupin which the participating teachers discussed their beliefs and practices and what led to themismatch between them. The focus group provided invaluable insights into the data, and allowed the

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

researchers to make up for the limited number of observations caused by the lockdown.

Findings

Following are the findings of the study presented per its questions: teachers' beliefs, teachers' practices, and the potential(mis)match found between them.

TheFirst Research Question

The results of the first research question on the teachers' grammar-related beliefsare summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Teachers' Grammar-Related Beliefs as Gleaned from the Questionnaire

No.	Item	Mean	SD	(%)
1	Grammar should be presented within context (e.g., within reading passages or short stories).	4.11	.928	82.2
2	I give different examples to students to help elicit structures and usage.	4.44	.527	88.8
3	Explicit (direct) teaching of grammar rules is important for the mastery of English.	4.00	.866	80.0
4	Teachers should begin a grammar lesson by explaining how structures work.	3.56	1.014	71.2
5	Students can improve their grammar accuracy through regular practice of structures.			
6	If students receive explicit (direct) grammar instruction, they will be able to correct their errors.	3.67	1.225	73.4

As shown in Table 2, the majority of participantsreported believing that grammar should be presented implicitly incontext(e.g., short stories, poems)and through numerous examples for the learners to arrive at the rule on their own. However, a comparable number of participants reported believing that explicit grammar instruction is instrumental for accurate mastery and self-correctionof errors.

These researchers could not help but notice that the respondents were not strictly committed to one approach or the other. The same respondent would report believing that induction and deduction are equally effective, which was often reflected in their actual practices as revealed through the classroom observation.

The Second Research Question

The second research question addressed the teachers' grammar-related classroom practices. The data was collected through the teachers' responses to a questionnaire about their actual classroom practices(and the researcher's notations on the observation checklist during classroom visits), as shown in Table 3.

http://journalppw.com

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

Table 3.Self-Reported Grammar-Related Practices as Gleaned from the Questionnaire

No.	Item	Mean	SD	%
1	I write the grammar rule on the board before explaining it to the class.	3.33	1.323	66.6
2	I correct students' grammar errors in the class.	4.22	0.833	84.4
3	I allow students opportunities to correct themselves.	3.78	0.833	75.6
4	I use Oral pattern-practice drills (e.g., **T**: He stole the picture. **Ss**: The picture was stolen.**T**: He left the door open. **Ss**: The door was left open).	3.67	0.866	73.4
5	I present grammar structures in whole texts(e.g., structures in a short story).	2.89	1.537	57.8
Total		3.58	0.552	71.6

To compare the teachers' beliefs (as presented in Table 2) with their reported practices (as presented in Table 3), a little

over 82% reported believing that grammar should be presented implicitly compared to 57.8% of self-reported classroom practices. However, deduction-related beliefs and self-reported practices were more closely matched than those for induction. For example, compare 71.2% reporting believing that a grammar lesson should be started by an explanation of how structures work (Table 2) while 66.6% reportingwritingthe grammar rule on the board before explaining (in Table 3).

Table 4 presents the teachers' grammar-related practices as revealed by the observation.

Table 4. Teachers' Classroom Practicesas Gleaned from the Classroom Observation

No.	Item	n	%
1	Presenting grammar in context	1	11.1
2	Giving different examples to students to help elicit structures and usages	1	11.1
3	Starting the grammar lesson by explaining how structures work	7	77.8
4	Giving students the chance to practice structures	2	22.2
5	Writing the grammar rule on the board before explaining it to the class	7	77.8
6	Allowing students opportunities to correct themselves	2	22.2
7	Correcting students' grammar errors in class	8	88.9
8	Using oral pattern-practice drills	0	0
9	Presenting grammar	0	0

structures in complete texts such as giving different structures in a short story		

As shown in Table 4, the classroom observation revealed that (1) none of the teachers presented grammar implicitly through texts, (2) only one teacher presented grammar implicitly through examples for the students to arrive at the rule on their own, (3) eight (out of nine) teachers presented grammar explicitly by writing a rule on the board before explaininghow the structure works, (4) only one teacher allowed her students to self-correct errors whereas eight teachers corrected their students' errors, and (5) only two teachers gave students the chance to practice structures, and (6) none of the teachersused pattern-practice drills.

The Third Research Question
The third research questionaddressed the potential (mis)match between the teachers' grammar-related beliefs and actual classroom practices. The respondents were almost equally divided in their beliefs about the utility of each approach to teaching grammar, but neither group managed to manifest these beliefs in their classroom practices. Below, the resultsare presented, backed up by the data gleaned from the focus-group discussions.

Induction
Even though the majority of the participants reported believing that grammar should be taught in context, none of themtranslated that into practice.During focus-group discussions, teachers attributed this mismatch between beliefs and practice to the following obstacles:

1. Students prefer the provision of rules to examples and shy away from practices which involve participation and engagement.
2. Students are usually not patient enough to engage in an inductive lesson in which texts are analyzed and examples generated.
3. It is difficult to teach inductively in classes with an average of 40 students each.
4. Supervisors present and discuss grammar deductively.

    In the questionnaire, the participants unanimously attested to the need for the provision of numerous examples to help students elicit structures and usage, a belief that was put into practice by only one participant. During the focus-group discussions, the participants evaded this issue, except for one teacher who reported that teachers are used to present grammar explicitly.

Deduction
The majority of the respondentsreportedbelieving that explicit grammar instruction is a catalyst for mastering English andthat thelesson should always be started by writing the grammatical rule on the board prior to explaining it to the class. These reported were almost completely matched with the practices of eight (out of nine) teachers.

During the focus-group discussions, the participants attributed the matching beliefs and practices to the following:
1. Deduction saves time, a precious commodity in light of what is expected of the teacher in terms of covering the entire curriculum and teaching the modules of the prescribed textbook.
2. Teachers and students alike are used to teaching and learning grammar explicitly.

Journal of Positive School Psychology
2022, Vol. 6, No. 3, 6425-6439
Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

http://journalppw.com

3. Twelfth-grade students always ask their teachers to give them a quick and explicit review of all grammar rules in preparation for their General Secondary Education Certificate Examination (Tawjihi).

A teacher who reported not believing in the utility of deduction but was observed to teach deductively explained, during focus-group discussions, that even though she believes that deduction never helps weak students, she resorts to it to avoid using induction in the interest of time. She talked at length about how hard she works, sometimes unsuccessfully, to cover the required six modules of the eleventh-grade textbook.

Another participant reported never writing the grammatical rule on the board before explaining it to class, which was also partially consistent with her practice.She consistently wrote two or three examples followed directly with the rule without discussing the examples with her students. During the focus- group discussions, she explainedthat since deduction is inevitable, writing the examples first may help the students make better sense of the rule on their own.

One participant whose beliefs matched her deductive practices reported, in the focus group discussions, that the secondary stage is packed with content and activities that communicative practice or contextualized learning is not possible. She described grammar instruction as a cursory practical review of major grammar rules as a means to the ultimate end: passing the standardized General Secondary Education Certificate Examination (Tawjihi).

Themismatch between the teachers' beliefs and practices in error correction is striking. Eight of the participants corrected their students' grammatical errors directly, even though one third of the respondents to the questionnaire reported allowing students opportunities for self-correction. Time limitation was the recurring justification throughout the focus-group discussion.

The only participants who taught grammar inductively reported in the questionnaire that explicit grammar instruction does not help students correct their errors, which was consistent with her inductive presentation of grammar. During focus-group discussions, she maintained that allowing students to self-correct not only improves their proficiency but also their confidence in their language ability.

Four of the participants reported that deductiondenies students self-correction of errors. Three of them were observed to use deduction, reportedly in the interest of time. A participant reported that only induction enables students to self-correct and learn to make fewer errors.

Another mismatch between reported and actual practices manifested in seven participants' reportingusing oral pattern-practice but using none in the classroom. During focus-group discussions, the participants explained that pattern-practice is used with certain structures (e.g., reported speech, passive) and abandoned with others.

In the questionnaire, almost all teachers reported that grammar accuracy can be improved through regular practice of structures, which was only observed with two teachers who asked students to write examples of their own on the board. In the focus-group discussions, teachers attributed the mismatch between their beliefs and practices to the availability of future opportunities for practice, as the same structure recurs throughout the semester.

Journal of Positive School Psychology
2022, Vol. 6, No. 3, 6425-6439
Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

http://journalppw.com

Discussion and Conclusions

Thefocus-group discussions have revealed that what characterizes the mismatch between the participating teachers' beliefs and practices is its unanimity. The mismatch between beliefs and practices was accepted and justified by the participants who seemed aware of their choices and why they make them. The self-reported justificationswerecategorized into contextual factors, student preferences, student language proficiency, teacher experiences as learners, and teacher training.

First, the mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices was readily attributed to contextual factors, a conclusion backed byempirical evidence (e.g.,Assalahi, 2013; Basoz, 2014; Bataineh, Bataineh, &Thabet, 2011; Bataineh, Thabet, & Bataineh, 2007; Borg, 2003; Breen *et al*., 2001; Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Farrell & Lim, 2005; Freeman, 2002; Mohammed, 1991, 1996; Nishimuro& Borg, 2013; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Thabet, 2002; Yusof, Narayanan&Arif, 2019). During the focus-group discussions, the participating teachers attributed shying away from induction to their busy schedules, crowded classrooms, heavy teaching loads, and time constrains. They were aware that their deductive, teacher-centered grammar approach encourages passive reception and denies their students opportunities for active participation, but, in their own words, they were making the best of a bad situation.

Second, the findings suggest that secondary-stage teachers do cater to theirstudents' preferences. At this stage, students, who are keen on passing the imminent General Secondary Education Certificate Examination (Tawjihi), prefer not only to save time and effort at school but also to use school time to review what they had already learned especially that most students are also privately-tutored. Meeting students' expectations may override the teacher's grammar-related beliefs and, thus, creates a mismatch between reported beliefs and actual practices, which is also consistent with Phipps and Borg's(2009) findings.Jordanian secondary-stage students' test-driven preferencesalso alluded to by Alhabahba, Pandian, and Mahfoodh (2016), may be one of the leading causes forteachers' resort to deductionin teaching grammar.

Third, teachers also reported that their students' generally poor language proficiency, backed by a plethora of empirical evidence (e.g., Alhabahba *et al*., 2016; Bataineh & Al-Kofeiri, 2018; Malkawi &Smadi, 2018)makes it hard for them to read texts toextract rules.Poor language proficiency renders students incapable of self-expression and negotiation of meaning, which forces teachers to prefer form-focused to more meaning-focusedinstruction(Asassfeh*et al*., 2012; Bataineh *et al*., 2017).

Fourth, during the focus-group discussions, teachers reported that they are more comfortable with deduction because that is how they were taught grammar themselves, which is consistent with previous research findings (e.g.,Asassfeh *et al*., 2012; Bataineh*et al*., 2011; Bataineh*et al*., 2007; Phipps & Borg, 2009; Thabet, 2002; Yusof*et al*., 2019). Some studies explained that by teachers' emotional attachment with their experiences as learners (Farrell & Lim, 2005; Nishimuro& Borg, 2013).

http://journalppw.com

Fifth, teacherpracticescan only be catalyzed throughrigorous teacher training (Bataineh, Shawish, &Al-Alawneh, 2019; Richards, 1996; Williams& Burden, 1997), ascontent knowledge does not necessarily make an effective teacher (Assalahi, 2013; Borg, 2006). In Jordan, college graduates in the content areas (e.g., English, translation, mathematics, social studies) are hired as teachers without any certificate or training in pedagogy (Alhabahba *et al*., 2016), and the two-week crash training for novice teachers is hardly adequate. This, coupled with the general tendency to teach the way they were taught, may be thereasons for theteachers' adoption of a deductive, form-focused, and teacher-centered approachto grammar (Light, Method, Rockman, Cressman, & Daly, 2008).

Finally, teachers acquire knowledge from their personal and professional experiences which also inform their beliefs and practices. The literature seems to be divided on how consistent teachers' beliefs are with their classroom practices. Some research suggests that teachers' beliefs are essentially consistent with their practices (e.g.,Johnson, 1994; Kagan, 1992; Ng & Farrell, 2003; Nishimuro& Borg, 2013; Pajares, 1992). However, other reports that teachers' beliefs do not always match their practices (Farrell & Lim, 2005; Phipps & Borg, 2009). In the Jordanian context, the effect of teachers' beliefs on their classroom practices seems to be weakened by the contextual constraints imposed by less than ideal work conditions and students' generally poor language proficiency.

References

[1]. Abu Housh, E., & Hussein, R.F. (1987). *A Comparison between the Inductive Method and the Deductive Method in Teaching English Reported Questions to Eleventh Graders in Jordan*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

[2]. Al-Damiree, R., & Bataineh, R.F. (2016). Vocabulary knowledge and syntactic awareness as potential catalysts for reading comprehension among young Jordanian EFL students. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education* (University of Bahrain), 4(1), 53-59. Retrieved 13 June 2021 from http://journals. uob.edu.bh/JTTE/contents/ volume-1073/articles/article-2397.

[3]. Alhabahba, M.M., Pandian, A., &Mahfoodh, O.H.A. (2016). The effect of integrated instructions on reading comprehension, motivation, and cognitive variables. *Issues in Educational Research*, 26(3), 387-406.

[4]. Asassfeh, S.M., Alshaboul, Y.M., &Alodwan, T.A. (2012). In-service EFL teachers' views of form-focused instruction (FFI) and communicative meaning-oriented instruction (MOI): The case of Jordan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 30(1), 78-91.

[5]. Ashton, P. (2014). Historical overview and theoretical perspectives of research on teachers' beliefs. *The International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs.* Routledge. Retrieved 14 June 2019 from https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4 324/ 9780203108437.ch3.

[6]. Assalahi, H. (2013). Why is the grammar translation method still alive in the Arab world? Teachers beliefs and its implications for EFL teacher education. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(4), 589-599.

[7]. Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-based teaching: A practitioner's perspective. *TESL-EJ*, 11(2), 1–12. Retrieved 20June 2021 from http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej42/a1.pdf.

[8]. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

[9]. Basoz, T. (2014). Through the eyes of prospective teachers of English: Explicit or implicit grammar instruction? *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 377-382.

[10]. Bataineh, R.F,& Al-Kofeiri, Q.M. (2018). Morphological awareness as a potential catalyst for Jordanian EFL students' reading comprehension. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*, 42(2), 66-80. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17951/lsmll.2018.42.2.66-80.

[11]. Bataineh, R.F., &Mayyas, M.B. (2017). The utility of blended learning in EFL reading and grammar: A case for Moodle. *Teaching English with Technology,* 7(3), 35-49. Retrieved 13 June 2021 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1149423.pdf.

[12]. Bataineh, R.F., Al-Qeyam, F., &Smadi, O. (2017). Does form-focused instruction really make a difference? Potential effectiveness in Jordanian EFL learners' linguistic and pragmatic knowledge acquisition. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education,* 2(17), 1-11. DOI:https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0040-0.

[13]. Bataineh, R.F., Bataineh, R.F., &Thabet, S.S. (2011). Communicative language teaching in the Yemeni EFL classroom: Embraced or merely lip-serviced? *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(4), 859-866. DOI:https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.4.859-866.

[14]. Bataineh, R.F., Shawish, L.A., &Al-Alawneh, M.K.(2019). The effect of a professional development program on Jordanian EFL teachers' instructional practices. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*, 43(4), 115-125. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17951/lsmll.2019.43.4.115-125.

[15]. Bataineh, R.F.,Thabet, S.S., & Bataineh, R.F. (2007). Obstacles of using communicative techniques in Yemeni EFL classes. *Grazer LinguistischeStudien,* 67/68,79-92.

[16]. Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(1), 9-38.

[17]. Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36, 81-109.

[18]. Borg, S. (2006). The distinctive characteristics of foreign language teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(1), 3-31.

[19]. Breen, M.P., Hird, B., Milton, M., Oliver, R., & Thwaite, A. (2001). Making sense of language teaching: Teachers' principles and classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(4), 470-501.

[20]. Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.

[21]. Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,*32(1), 39-60.

[22]. Ellis, R. (2002). Grammar teaching – practice or consciousness-raising? In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (pp. 167-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[23]. Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: A SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.

[24]. Farrell, T., & Bennis, K. (2013). Reflecting on ESL teachers' beliefs and classroom practices: A case study. *RELC Journal*, 44(2), 163-176.

[25]. Farrell, T.S.C., & Lim, P.C.P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case

study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. *TESL-EJ*, 9(2), 1-13.

[26]. Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from North American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 35, 1-13.

[27]. Gollin, J. (1998). Key concepts in ELT: Deductive vs. inductive language learning. *ELT Journal*, 52(1), 88-89.

[28]. Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 10(4), 439-452.

[29]. Kagan, D. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist*, 27(1), 65-90.

[30]. Kunene, M.W., & Mthethwa, P. (2020). The deductive and inductive instructional approach controversy in Eswatini context. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 10(2), 140-158. Retrieved 22 August 2021 from https://un-pub.eu/ojs/index.php/GJFLT/article/view/4852.

[31]. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[32]. Lee, J. (2019). Experiential teacher education – preparing preservice teachers to teach English grammar through an experiential learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(1), 1-20. DOI:http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v44n1.1.

[33]. Light, D., Method, F., Rockman, C., Cressman, G.M., &Daly, J. (2008). *Overview and Recommendations to the Jordan Education Initiative*. USAID/Jordan: Education Development Center (and RTI International).

[34]. Malkawi, N., &Smadi, M. (2018). The effectiveness of using brainstorming strategy in the development of academic achievement of sixth grade students in English grammar at public schools in Jordan. *International Education Studies*, 11, 3, 92-100.

[35]. Mayyas, M.B., & Bataineh, R.F. (2019). Perceived and actual effectiveness of Easyclass in Jordanian EFL tertiary-level students' grammar learning. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology*, 15(4), 89-100. Retrieved 13 June 2021 from http://ijedict.dec.uwi.edu/viewarticle.php?id=2682.

[36]. Mohamed, N. (2006). *An Exploratory Study of the Interplay between Teachers' Beliefs, Instructional Practices & Professional Development*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. University of Auckland, New Zealand.

[37]. Mohammed, A.M. (1991). *Error-Based Interlinguistic Comparisons as Learner-Centered Technique of Teaching English Grammar to Arab Students*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Salford, England.

[38]. Mohammed, A.M. (1996). The informal pedagogical grammar. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34(4), 285-294.

[39]. Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 317-328.

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

[41]. Nishimuro, M., & Borg, S. (2013). Teacher cognition and grammar teaching in a Japanese high school. *Journal of the Japan Association for Language Teaching* (*JALT)*, 35(1), 29-50.

[42]. Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, 52(2), 101-109.

[43]. Nurullayevna, S.N. (2021). The techniques of explicit grammar

Dima Mahmoud Al-Daoud et al.

instruction. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, 12, 281-284.

[44].   Obeidat, H. (1991). *Inductive Method and Deductive Method in Teaching English Conditional Sentences*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

[45].   Obeidat, M., &Alomari, M. (2020). The effect of inductive and deductive teaching on EFL undergraduates' achievement in grammar at the Hashemite University in Jordan. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 280-288.

[46].   Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-32.

[47].   Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37, 380-390.

[48].   Ramadan, M. (2019). The effectiveness of teaching grammar in context: Teaching conjunctions as an example. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 18, 706-756.

[49].   Richards, J.C. (1996). Teachers' maxims in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 281-96.

[50].   Richards, J.C., &Reppen, R. (2014). Towards a pedagogy of grammar instruction. *RELC Journal*, 45(1), 5-25.

[51].   Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[52].   Scheffler, P. (2012). Theories pass. Learners and teachers remain. *AppliedLinguistics*, 33(5), 603- 607.

[53].   Schulman, L. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Education* (pp. 3-36). New York: Macmillan.

[54].   Thabet, S. (2002). *Obstacles of Using Communicative Techniques in Yemeni English Foreign Language Classes*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

[55].   Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Longman.

[56].   Williams, M., & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[57].   Yusof, N.M., Narayanan, G., &Arif, M. (2019). A teacher's pedagogical belief in teaching grammar: A case study. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(13), 157-165.