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Abstract

This study examined the attitude of teachers of Arabic as a foreign language toward some of the most well known teaching methods. For this reason the following eight methods were selected: (1) the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), (2) the Direct Method (DM), (3) the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), (4) Total Physical Response (TPR), (5) Community Language Learning (CLL), (6) the Silent Way (SW), (7) Suggestopedia (SUGG), and (8) Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Teachers’ attitude toward these eight methods was assessed, and the correlation between teachers’ preferences and some demographic variables were also measured. T-test and Pearson correlation tests were used in this study to derive conclusions from the research questions. 48 male and female Arabic teachers who teach Arabic in the United States took part in this research. They listed their impressions on a Likert Scale questionnaire that has forty items, plus five questions regarding demographic information about the participants. The following results were found: 1- There was a significant relationship between TAFL’s age and the GTM method of foreign language teaching, 2- There were no significant gender differences in the attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching, 3- participants whose native language is not Arabic preferred the CLL and SW methods more than participants whose native language is Arabic. As only 3 of the 48 participants reported their native language as not Arabic, the results of the attitudes toward the CLL and SW methods by these participants are not generalizable because of the small sample size, 4- Those participants with no training preferred the GTM method
more than those who are trained, 5- Those participants who had received training prefer the ALM and TPR methods more than those participants who had not received training, and 6 There was a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the GTM method of foreign language teaching.
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CHAPTER I

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

Research has asserted the impact of effective teaching methods in classroom settings on the learning process, especially with regard to foreign language teaching and learning. Ormrod (1999) pointed out that learning “cannot be left to chance” (p. 7). She also argued that understanding the factors that influence learning (principles) and the processes that underline it (theories) will effectively help teachers promote their students’ learning and facilitate their success.

The teaching methods stem from learning theories; therefore, it is argued that the instructional process and its successful implementation can be an indicator for effective teaching and achievement of desired learning outcomes (Jones-Hamilton, 2001). Larsen-Freeman (2000) argued that studying methods of teaching is important in the field of teachers’ education because it constitutes a valuable part of the base knowledge of teaching. Liu (1995) and Larsen-Freeman (2000) asserted that the study of methods is appropriate and critical to the language teaching field.

The most well-known and well-researched foreign language methodologies, which have been developed and practiced for a long time, are: (a) the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM), (b) the Direct Method (DM), (c) the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM), (d) Total Physical Response (TPR), (e) Community Language Learning (CLL),
(f) the Silent Way (SW), (g) Suggestopedia (SUGG), and (h) Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Although foreign language teaching methodologies have been evolving and developing for a long time, there is a gap between what foreign language researchers advocate and the kinds of methods that are actually applied by foreign language teachers in language classrooms. Moreover, many foreign language teachers tend to prefer and utilize one particular foreign language teaching method over another; however, little research has been conducted on the variables that influence the implementation and utilization of that particular method.

Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the relationship between the attitudes of teachers of Arabic as a foreign language (TAFL) toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching and the way their demographic variables correlated. The study also identified the attitudes of TAFL toward methods of foreign language teaching. It also investigated whether attitudes of TAFL differ in terms of the methods of foreign language teaching they utilized in their teaching.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study are of importance to the Arabic as foreign language institutions, programs, teachers, and teachers’ trainers. Knowing the initial attitude of the teachers of Arabic as a foreign language toward these teaching methods can be of great help in defining the starting point for the training programs. Knowing teachers’
preferences in teaching methods can help curriculum designers when compiling training packages for teachers of Arabic as a foreign language. Reavis (1978) states that good teaching can be recognized by the existence of the ability to know the attitudes of the learners because it helps provide a valid index of instructional quality. Rajecki (1982) says that knowing the teachers’ attitude toward the teaching methods helps the teachers’ trainers to better predict and anticipate their behaviors in general.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

This study investigated the relationship between the TAFL’s demographics and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT). Therefore, the study explored the following research questions:

1. Is there a significant relationship between TAFL’s age and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

2. Are there significant gender differences in the attitudes of the TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

3. Are there significant differences between those participants who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it is was not in their attitudes
toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

4. Are there significant differences between those participants who reported having received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

5. Is there a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

Hypotheses

Based on the research questions, the study formulated and tested the following statistical research hypotheses:

\textbf{H}_1. There is a significant relationship between TAFL’s age and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

\textbf{H}_2. There is a significant gender difference in the TAFL’s attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

\textbf{H}_3. There is a significant difference between TAFL’s who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it is was not in their attitudes toward the
eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₄** There is a significant difference between TAFL’s who reported having received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₅** There is a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**Research Design**

This study employs a descriptive research design. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) are used to identify the attitudes of TAFL toward teaching methods of foreign language teaching. Inferential statistics (Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient and Independent t-test) are used to test if there is a significant relationship between the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching and their demographics.

**Research Variables**

The dependent variable is the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight teaching methods of foreign language teaching. The independent variables are the five demographics of TAFL (age, gender, native language, training, and years of teaching experience).
Research Instrumentation

A survey questionnaire was employed as a method of data collection. According to Johnson and Christensen (2000), the purpose of using a questionnaire is to obtain information about perceptions, feelings, thoughts, beliefs, etc. This questionnaire collected data about the attitudes of TAFL toward teaching methods of foreign language teaching and the TAFL’s demographic variables.

Research Sample

Participants consisted of a sample of teachers of Arabic as a foreign language in selected institutions in the United States. Participation in this study was on a voluntary basis and every participating teacher was sent a hard copy of the survey by the researcher.

Data Analysis

In order to determine if there is any significant relationship between the dependent variable (the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching) and the independent variables, the demographics of TAFL (age, gender, native language, training, and years of teaching experience), the following statistical procedures were used. Descriptive statistics were used to investigate the attitudes of TAFL toward teaching methods of foreign language teaching. Inferential statistics (Pearson Product Correlation Coefficient and Independent t-test) were used to test if there is a significant relationship between the TAFL’s attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching and their demographics.
## Definition of Terms

In order to give the reader a clear understanding of the terms used in this study, the following definitions are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AATA</td>
<td>American Association of Teachers of Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATF</td>
<td>American Association of Teachers of French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATG</td>
<td>American Association of Teachers of German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATSP</td>
<td>American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTFL</td>
<td>American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>Arabic as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>The Audio-Lingual Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLL</td>
<td>Community Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>Communicative Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Direct Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>Grammar Translation Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTASC</td>
<td>Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCATE</td>
<td>National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSTA</td>
<td>Professional Standards for Teachers of Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFL</td>
<td>Standards for Foreign Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Second Language Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGG</td>
<td>Suggestopedia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Chapter I included the statement of the problem, the purpose and importance of the study, the research questions and hypotheses, and the definition of terms. Chapter II contains the literature review, which includes a definition of the attitude towards teaching methods, glimpses of the history of the teaching methods, and a brief illustration on each of the eight methods in this research. Chapter III focuses on the methodology of this research, its structure, the data collection and instruments used, analysis methodology, and the Battery used. Chapters IV and Chapter V, consecutively, report results derived from participants’ replies to the surveys given to them, and list the main findings of this study and their implications for teachers of Arabic as a foreign language.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter is divided into four sections. First is an overview of teaching of the Arabic language, as well as its introduction into the United States. This is followed by an historical review of the methods of foreign language teaching. An overview of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL) will be presented next. The fourth section provides a summary of some previous attitudinal studies related to the teaching of foreign or second languages.

Arabic Language Teaching

Linguistically speaking, the Arabic language belongs to a group of languages known as the Semitic languages. Arabic is the official language of 22 countries, from Morocco to Egypt and throughout the Arabian Peninsula. Many people of Arab origin living in North America and Europe also speak it. Arabic is also used around the world by almost 1.2 billion Muslims in their daily religious rituals (Versteegh, 1997). With regard to the number of its speakers and the extent of its influence, the Arabic language is considered the greatest Semitic language ever and, thus, should be viewed as one of the most significant languages of our present time (Ferguson, 1971 as cited in Katbi, 2000). The United Nations issued a resolution in 1973 to officially acknowledge and utilize
Arabic along with the five official languages, English, French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese, in its various organizations (Faisal, 1982 as cited in Katbi, 2000).

The number of Arabic language learners worldwide has grown at a remarkable pace in the past five years, where in North America alone, the numbers have quadrupled (Wahba, Taha, & England, 2006). Ryding (2006) pointed out that, according to the Modern Language Association statistics, there was a 92% increase in Arabic enrollments since 1960, and a 40% increase just since 1998. Similarly, Al-Batal (1995) stated that there has been an increase in enrollment in elementary Arabic language classes and courses related to the modern Arab world at various U.S. institutions of higher education, as well as an expansion in programs in universities and colleges. Several American universities have established new summer programs in the Arab world in order to provide non-native Arabic speakers with the opportunity to study Arabic in its cultural setting. Edwards (2004) asserted that 9/11 events produced much greater attention and awareness regarding the learning of languages and knowledge of other cultures. Edwards argued that “knowing other languages and being aware of other cultures are definitely perceived now as necessary for national and homeland security” (p. 268). Along the same lines, Allen (2004) commented that, in the wake of 9/11, the U.S. government’s need of expert communicators in Arabic has put Arabic on top of the lists of various government agencies.

As a result of the increasing importance of teaching Arabic as a foreign language, a set of Professional Standards for Teachers of Arabic (PSTA) has been proposed by the
American Association of Teachers of Arabic (AATA). Alosh, Elkhafaifi, and Hammoud (2006) stated that the PSTA was based on, and influenced by, similar work done by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). The PSTA was developed because of a need for qualified teachers; and therefore, its aim is twofold:

1. to make recommendations concerning the knowledge base and skills of a qualified teacher of Arabic, both at the secondary school and university levels; and

2. to guide the development of a teacher certification program offered on a physical campus or through distance study (Alosh et al., 2001, p. 410).

Learners of the Arabic language, particularly American students, usually face some challenges that relate to its nature. There are 28 letters in the Arabic alphabet, as compared to 26 letters in the English alphabet. Arabic is also written from right to left rather than from left to right. Since there are only few cognates between Arabic and English, vocabulary learning is considered a real challenge for learners of Arabic. Diglossia is another challenge for learners of Arabic. The written form of Arabic is different from the spoken form. Most academic language programs in the United States teach Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), which is essentially the language of the media (Cutshall, 2007).
An Historical Review of Foreign Language Teaching Methods

Language teaching emerged as a profession in the 20th century as its foundation was oriented toward developing principles and procedures for the design of teaching methods and materials (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Foreign language teachers tend to be concerned with the best methods associated with teaching and learning a foreign language (Belnap, 2006). Richards and Rodgers (2001) defined a teaching method as “a systematic set of teaching practices based on a particular theory of language and language learning” (p. 1).

As a result of political changes in Europe during the 16th century, French, Italian, and English had increasingly gained importance while Latin had gradually become a subject in the school curriculum. Latin grammar was taught through rote learning of grammar rules, translation, and practice in writing sample sentences. As modern languages were introduced to the curriculum during the 18th century, they were taught using the same procedures that were used for teaching Latin. By the 19th century, this method, known as the Grammar-Translation Method, had become the standard approach for studying and teaching foreign languages in schools (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM)

GTM, also known as the Classical Method, was first used in the teaching of the classical languages, such as Latin and Greek; then it was used to teach modern languages.
Its primary purpose was to help foreign language learners learn and appreciate foreign language literature. It was also believed that GTM would help foreign language learners understand their native language better and would strengthen their mental development (Larsen-Freeman, 2000).

Brown (2000) summarized some of the major characteristics of GTM: (a) Classes are taught in the mother tongue with little active use of the target language; (b) Much vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words; (c) Long elaborate explanations of the intricacies of grammar are given; (d) Grammar provides the rules for putting words together, and instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words; (e) Reading of difficult classical texts is begun early; (f) Little attention is paid to the content of texts, which are treated as exercises in grammatical analysis; (g) Often the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue; and (h) Little or no attention is given to pronunciation (pp. 15-16).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of GTM.

1. The main purpose of learning a foreign language is to be able to read its literature. Literary language is superior to spoken language.
2. The main goal for students is to be able to translate the target language into their native language.
3. The primary skills to be developed are reading and writing. Little attention is given to speaking and listening, and almost none to pronunciation.
4. The teaching process is teacher-centered, where the teacher is the absolute authority in the classroom.

5. Students are taught how to find native language equivalents for all target language words.

6. Learning is facilitated through attention to similarities between the target language and the native language.

7. Deductive application of an explicit grammar rule is a useful pedagogical technique.

8. Students should be conscious of the grammatical rules of the target language (pp. 15-17).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with GTM.

1. *Translation of a Literary Passage*, in which students translate a reading passage from the target language into their native language.

2. *Reading Comprehension Questions*, in which students answer questions in the target language based on their understanding of the reading passage.

3. *Using Antonyms/Synonyms*, in which students are given one set of words and are asked to find antonyms and/or synonyms in the reading passage.

4. *Using Cognates*, in which students are taught to recognize cognates by learning the spelling or sound patterns that correspond between the languages.
5. **Deductive Application of Rule**, in which grammar rules are presented with examples and exceptions to each rule are also noted.

6. **Fill-in-the-Blanks**, in which students are given a series of sentences with words missing.

7. **Memorization**, in which students are given lists of target language vocabulary words and their native language equivalents and are asked to memorize them.

8. **Use Words in Sentences**, in which students make up sentences using new words.

9. **Composition**, in which students are given a topic to write about in the target language.

Hadley (2000) summarized some drawbacks of GTM. It paid little, if any, attention to oral proficiency and there was no sign of spoken language. There was no personalization or contextualization of the lesson to relate to students’ experience. There was no pair or group interaction for communicating practice. There was no concern for the teaching of cultural awareness (Hadley, 2000, p. 108). Richards and Rodgers (2001) concluded that GTM has no advocates as it has no theory and no literature that offers a rationale or justification for it.

**The Direct Method (DM)**

DM was introduced as a reaction to GTM. It was based on the way children learn their native language, where language is learned through the “direct association of words and phrases with objects and actions, without the use of the native language” (Hadley, 2000, p. 108).
Brown (2000) outlined some of the major characteristics of DM: (a) Classroom instruction was conducted exclusively in the target language; (b) Only everyday vocabulary and sentences were taught; (c) Oral communication skills were built up in a carefully graded progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes; (d) Grammar was taught inductively; (e) New teaching points were introduced orally; (f) Concrete vocabulary was taught through demonstration, objects, and pictures; abstract vocabulary was taught by association of ideas; (g) Both speech and listening comprehension were taught; and (h) Correct pronunciation and grammar were emphasized (p. 45).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of DM.

1. The purpose of language learning is communication; therefore, students need to learn how to ask questions as well as answer them.
2. Pronunciation should be worked on right from the beginning of language instruction.
3. Reading in the target language should be introduced early and should be developed through practice with speaking.
4. Objects (e.g. realia or pictures) should be used to help students understand the meaning.
5. The native language should not be used in the classroom.
6. The teacher should demonstrate, not explain or translate.
7. Vocabulary is acquired more naturally if students use it in full sentences, rather than memorizing word lists.

8. Self-correction facilitates language learning.

9. Grammar should be taught inductively where there may never be an explicit grammar rule given.

10. Writing is an important skill, to be developed from the beginning of language instruction.

11. The syllabus is based on situations or topics, not usually on linguistic structures (pp. 26-28).

   Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with DM.

   1. Reading Aloud, in which students take turns reading sections of a passage, play, or dialogue out loud.

   2. Question and Answer Exercise, in which students are asked questions and answer in full sentences only in the target language, so that they practice new words and grammatical structures.

   3. Getting Students to Self-Correct, in which the teacher has the students self-correct by asking them to make a choice between what they said and an alternative answer he supplied.
4. *Conversation Practice,* in which the teacher asks students a number of questions in the target language, which the students have to understand to be able to answer correctly.

5. *Fill-in-the-Blank Exercise,* in which students are provided with all items in the target language and are asked to induce the grammar rule they need to fill in the blanks from examples and practice with earlier parts of the lesson.

6. *Dictation,* in which the teacher reads the passage three times. The first time the teacher reads it at a normal speed, while the students just listen. The second time the teacher reads the passage phrase by phrase, pausing long enough to allow students to write down what they have heard. The last time the teacher again reads at a normal speed, and students check their work.

7. *Map Drawing,* in which students are given a map with geographical features unnamed; then they are given directions to find something.

8. *Paragraph Writing,* in which students are asked to write a paragraph in their own words on a lesson that they have taken (pp. 30-32).

Richards and Rodgers (2001) summarized some drawbacks of DM. It required teachers who were native speakers. It depended on the teacher’s skill rather, than on a textbook. It avoided using the native language, which resulted in a waste of time as well as a failure to get new concepts across. It also overlooked teaching grammar as it focused on vocabulary acquisition.
The Audio-Lingual Method (ALM)

ALM, known also as the Michigan Method, was introduced as a reaction to DM. It emphasized both hearing-speaking activities and gestural-visual and graphic material (Brown, 2000).

Brown (2000) outlined some of the major characteristics of ALM: (a) New material is presented in dialog form; (b) There is dependence on mimicry, memorization of set phrases, and overlearning; (c) Structures are sequenced by means of contrastive analysis and taught one at a time; (d) Structure patterns are taught using repetitive drills; (e) There is little or no grammatical explanation: grammar is taught by inductive analogy rather than deductive explanation; (f) Vocabulary is strictly limited and learned in context; (g) There is much use of tapes, language labs, and visual aids; (h) Great importance is attached to pronunciation; and (i) Very little use of the mother tongue by teachers is permitted.

When describing its major characteristics, Rivers (1981) also listed what he called the “five slogans” of ALM:

1. Language is speech, not writing.
2. A language is a set of habits.
3. Teach the language and not about the language.
4. A language is what native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say.
5. Languages are different (pp. 41-43).
Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of ALM.

1. The purpose of language learning is to learn how to use the language to communicate.

2. The major objective of language teaching should be for students to acquire the structural patterns; students will learn vocabulary afterward.

3. The learning of a foreign language should be the same as the acquisition of the native language. We do not need to memorize rules in order to use our native language. The rules necessary to use the target language will be figured out or induced from examples.

4. Language learning is a process of habit formation. The more often something is repeated, the stronger the habit and the greater the learning.

5. The major challenge of foreign language teaching is getting students to overcome the habits of their native language. A comparison between the native and target language will tell the teacher in what areas her students will probably experience difficulty.

6. The native language and the target language have separate linguistic systems. They should be kept apart so that the students’ native language interferes as little as possible with the students’ attempts to acquire the target language.

7. It is important to prevent learners from making errors. Errors lead to the formation of bad habits. When errors do occur, they should be immediately corrected by the teacher.
8. Positive reinforcement helps the students to develop correct habits.

9. Students should learn to respond to both verbal and nonverbal stimuli.

10. Students should ‘overlearn,’ i.e., learn to answer automatically without stopping to think.

11. The teacher should be like an orchestra leader---conducting, guiding, and controlling the students’ behavior in the target language.

12. Speech is more basic to language than the written form. The ‘natural order’---the order children follow when learning their native language---of skill acquisition is: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

13. Language cannot be separated from culture. Culture is not only literature and the arts, but also the everyday behavior of the people who use the target language.

   One of the teacher’s responsibilities is to present information about that culture (pp. 42-45).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with ALM.

   1. *Dialog Memorization*, in which dialogs are used to begin a new lesson. Students memorize the dialog through mimicry and they take the role of one person in the dialog while the teacher takes the other.

   2. *Repetitive Drill*, in which students are asked to repeat the teacher’s model as accurately and as quickly as possible.
3. Chain Drill, in which a conversation forms around the classroom as students, one-by-one, ask and answer questions of each other.

4. Transformation Drill, in which students are given a certain kind of sentence pattern; and students are asked to transform this sentence into another pattern, such as transforming an affirmative sentence into negative; a statement into a question; an active sentence into a passive one; direct speech into reported speech.

5. Question-and-Answer Drill, in which students are given questions and are required to answer them quickly.

6. Use of Minimal Pairs, in which students are provided with pairs of words, such as ‘ship/sheep’, and students are asked to perceive the difference between the two words and be able to say them.

7. Complete the Dialog, in which selected words are erased from a dialog that students have learned earlier. Then, students are asked to complete the dialog by filling the blanks with the missing words (pp. 47-49).

Hadley (2000) summarized some drawbacks of ALM. It failed to deliver what it had promised: bilingual speakers at the end of the instruction. It also did not take into account the students’ various learning styles and preferences. Hammerly (1982) also pointed out that the Audio-Lingual Method’s “goals and procedures were never defined, teacher training and certification were haphazard, the use of technology was poor minimal, and the experiments themselves were deceptive” (p. 237).
Total Physical Response (TPR)

TPR was based on the belief that listening should be developed before any other skill. It argued that students would assimilate skills more rapidly if teachers appeal to their kinesthetic-sensory system. Therefore, TPR utilized oral commands that students carry out to show their understanding (Hadley, 2000).

Brown (2000) outlined some of the major characteristics of TPR. (a) Understanding of the spoken language must be developed in advance of speaking; (b) Understanding and retention is best achieved through movement of the students’ bodies in response to commands; and (c) Adult language learning can be modeled after the way children learn their native language.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of TPR:

1. Meaning in the target language can often be conveyed through actions. The target language should be presented in chunks, not just word by word.
2. The students’ understanding of the target language should be developed before speaking.
3. Students can initially learn one part of the language rapidly by moving their bodies.
4. The imperative is a powerful linguistic device through which the teacher can direct student behavior.
5. Students can learn through observing actions as well as by performing the actions themselves.

6. Students should not be made to memorize fixed routines.

7. Correction should be carried out in an unobtrusive manner.

8. Language learning is more effective when it is fun.

9. Spoken language should be emphasized over written language.

10. Students will begin to speak when they are ready.

11. Students are expected to make errors when they first begin speaking. Teachers should be tolerant of them. Work on the fine details of the language should be postponed until students have become somewhat proficient (pp. 111-113).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with TPR:

1. *Using Commands to Direct Behavior*, in which commands are given to get students to perform an action; the action makes the meaning of the command clear.

2. *Role Reversal*, in which students command their teacher and classmates to perform some actions.

3. *Action Sequence*, in which students are given connected commands, such as “point to the door, walk to the door, and touch the door” (p. 116, 117).

Brown (2000) summarized some drawbacks of TPR. It was only effective in the beginning levels of language proficiency, but it was not as effective with advanced levels.
It had very limited emphasis on the development of accuracy. It paid little attention to students’ language errors. It also relied on imperatives and commands which adult students may feel uncomfortable or embarrassed to follow.

Community Language Learning (CLL)

CLL, also known as Counseling-Learning Method, was founded on techniques borrowed from psychological counseling. It emphasized the role of the affective domain in promoting cognitive learning. Its basic principle was that “the human individual needs to be understood and aided in the process of fulfilling personal values and goals” (Hadley, 2000, pp. 123-124).

Brown (2000) highlighted some of the major characteristics of CLL: (a) The teacher serves as the “knower/counselor” whose role is essentially passive; (b) The teacher is there to provide the language necessary for students to express themselves freely and to say whatever it is they want to say; (c) The class is compromised of six to 12 learners seated in a close circle, with one or more teachers who stand outside the circle, ready to help; (d) The techniques used are designed to reduce anxiety in the group to a minimum and to promote the free expression of ideas and feelings; and (e) The method provides for five learning stages.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of CLL.

1. Building a relationship with and among students is very important.
2. Any new learning experience can be threatening. When students have an idea of what will happen in each activity, they often feel more secure. People learn non-defensively when they feel secure.

3. Language is for communication.

4. The teacher should be sensitive to students’ level of confidence and give them just what they need to be successful.

5. Students feel more secure when they know the limits of an activity.

6. Teacher and students are whole persons. Sharing about their learning experience allows learners to get to know one another and to build community.

7. The teacher ‘counsels’ the students. He does not offer advice, but rather shows them that he is really listening to them and understands what they are saying. By understanding how students feel, the teacher can help students gain insights into their own learning process as well as transform their negative feelings, which might otherwise block their learning.

8. The students’ native language is used to make the meaning clear and to build a bridge from the known to the unknown. Students feel more secure when they understand everything.

9. Students need quiet reflection time in order to learn.

10. In groups, students can begin to feel a sense of community and can learn from each other as well as the teacher. Cooperation, not competition, is encouraged.
11. The teacher should work in a non-threatening way with what the learner has produced.

12. Developing a community among the class members builds trust and can help to reduce the threat of the new learning situation.

13. Learning tends not to take place when the material is too new or too familiar. Retention will best take place somewhere in between novelty and familiarity.

14. In the beginning stages, the ‘syllabus’ is generated primarily by the students. Students are more willing to learn when they have created the material themselves (pp. 94-98).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with CLL.

1. *Tape Recording Student Conversation*, in which students’ conversations are tape-recorded.

2. *Transcription*, in which students’ tape-recorded conversation in the target language is transcribed by the teacher.

3. *Reflection on Experience*, in which students are given the opportunity to reflect on how they feel about the language learning experience as learners and their relationship with one another.

4. *Reflective Listening*, in which students relax and listen to their own voices speaking the target language on the tape.
5. *Human Computer*, in which students choose some part of the transcript to practice pronouncing.

6. *Small Group Task*, in which students are asked to make new sentences with the words on the transcript and the groups share the sentences they make with the rest of the class (pp. 103-104).

Brown (2000) summarized some drawbacks of CLL. It failed to incorporate a variety of contexts necessary for students to use in the target culture. It also neglected some survival skills, as the content was determined by the participants. It made students feel uncomfortable with its lack of structure and grammatical items. Hammerly (1982) also noted that CLL required small classes, which may not be conceivable in many schools. CLL required highly qualified teachers who were bilingual and proficient in interpretation and translation. It also required that students speak the same native language.

**The Silent Way (SW)**

SW was based on the assumption that the teacher should be silent as much as possible in the classroom, while the learner should be produce language as much as possible. It was a reaction to ALM which emphasized repetition and habit formation (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Three hypotheses were formulated that inspired SW:

1. Learning is facilitated if the learner discovers or creates rather than remembers and repeats what is to be learned.

2. Learning is facilitated by accompanying (mediating) physical objects.
3. Learning is facilitated by problem solving involving the material to be learned (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 81).

Brown (2000) highlighted some of the major characteristics of SW. The learner should develop independence, autonomy, and responsibility. Learners should cooperate with each other in the process of solving language problems. The teacher should be a “stimulator” rather than a “handholder” and should be silent most of the time. The teacher must “get out of the way” while students work out solutions.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of SW.

1. The teacher should start with something the students already know and build from that to the unknown.

2. Language is not learned by repeating after a model. Students need to develop their own ‘inner criteria’ for correctness---to trust and to be responsible for their own production in the target language.

3. Students’ actions can tell the teacher whether or not they have learned.

4. Students should learn to rely on each other and themselves.

5. The teacher works with the students while the students work on the language.

6. The teacher makes use of what students already know. The more the teacher does for the students what they can do for themselves, the less they will do for themselves.

7. Learning involves transferring what one knows to new contexts.
8. Reading is worked on from the beginning but follows from what students have learned to say.

9. Silence is a tool. It helps to foster autonomy, or the exercise of initiative. It also removes the teacher from the center of attention so he can listen to and work with students. The teacher speaks, but only when necessary. Otherwise, the teacher gets out of the way so that it is the students who receive the practice in using the language.

10. Meaning is made clear by focusing students’ perceptions, not through translation.

11. Students can learn from one another. The teacher’s silence encourages group cooperation.

12. If the teacher praises (or criticizes) students, they will be less self-reliant. The teacher’s actions can interfere with students’ developing their own criteria.

13. Errors are important and necessary to learning. They show the teacher where things are unclear.

14. If students are simply given answers, rather than being allowed to self-correct, they will not retain.

15. Students need to learn to listen to themselves.

16. At the beginning, the teacher needs to look for progress, not perfection. Learning takes place in time. Students learn at different rates.

17. A teacher’s silence frees the teacher to closely observe the students’ behavior.
18. Students learn they must give the teacher their attention in order not to miss what he says. Student attention is a key to learning (pp. 60-64).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with SW.

1. *Sound-Color Chart*, in which the chart contains blocks of color, each one representing a sound in the target language. The teacher, and later the students, points to blocks of color on the chart to form syllables, words, and even sentences.

2. *Teacher’s Silence*, in which the teacher gives as much help as is necessary and then is silent.

3. *Peer Correction*, in which students are encouraged to help other students who are experiencing difficulty.

4. *Rods*, in which rods can be used to teach colors and numbers; they can be used to teach complicated structures such as statements with prepositions and conditionals; and can also be used to teach abstract things such as making a clock to tell time and creating a family tree.

5. *Self-Correction Gestures*, in which the teacher uses gesture to indicate that students need to self-correct.

6. *Word Chart*, in which the teacher, and later the students, points to words on the wall charts in a sequence so that they can read aloud the sentences they have spoken.
7. *Fidel Chart*, in which the teacher, and later the students, points to the color-coded Fidel Charts in order that students associate the sounds of the language with their spelling.

8. *Structured Feedback*, in which students are invited to make observations about the day’s lesson and what they have learned.

Brown (2000) summarized some drawbacks of SW. It failed to encourage a communicative atmosphere. It left learners struggling for hours or days with a concept that could be easily clarified by the teacher’s direct guidance. Hammerly (1982) pointed out that SW suffered from a lack of teacher’s guidance to students. Also, it failed to involve students in active participation. Hadley (2000) added that SW did not allow learners to work with authentic culturally based materials or hear authentic native speech.

**Suggestopedia (SUGG)**

SUGG, also known as Desuggestopedia, was based on the premise that providing a “suggestive” atmosphere is central to foreign language learning and will lead to “superlearning.” It assumed that creating a variety of relaxation techniques, such as slow music, soft light, cheerful room decorations, and comfortable seating, would help learners to learn the target language (Brown, 2000).

Hadley (2000) outlined some of the major characteristics of SUGG. It attempts to engage both the left and right hemispheres of the brain when learning. It assumes that learning should involve both analysis and synthesis at the same time, using both the
conscious and the unconscious mind. Anxiety is a barrier to learning and thus should be lowered as much as possible. Language is presented in context through dialogues that are culturally based.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of SUGG.

1. Learning is facilitated in a cheerful environment.

2. Students can learn from what is present in the environment, even if their attention is not directed.

3. If students trust and respect the teacher’s authority, they will accept and retain information better.

4. The teacher should recognize that learners bring certain psychological barriers with them to the learning situation.

5. Assuming a new identity enhances students’ feeling of security and allows them to be more open. They feel less inhibited since their performance is really that of a different person.

6. The dialog that the students learn contains language they can use immediately.

7. Songs are useful for ‘freeing the speech muscles’ and evoking positive emotions.

8. The teacher should integrate indirect positive suggestions (‘there is no limit to what you can do’) into the learning situation.

9. The teacher should present and explain the grammar and vocabulary, but not dwell on them.

10. Fine art provides positive suggestions for students.
11. Dramatization is a particularly valuable way of playfully activating the material. Fantasy reduces barriers to learning.

12. The fine arts (music, art, and drama) enable suggestions to reach the subconscious.

13. Music and movement reinforce the linguistic material (p. 81).

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also identified some techniques that are closely associated with SUGG.

1. **Classroom Set-up**, in which the teacher creates a classroom environment that is bright and cheerful.

2. **Peripheral Learning**, in which learning is acquired subconsciously rather than consciously. For example, by putting posters which contain grammatical information about the target language on the classroom walls, students will absorb the necessary facts effortlessly.

3. **Positive Suggestion**, in which teachers use both direct and indirect suggestion means to help them break down the barriers to learning that they bring with them.

4. **Choosing a New Identity**, in which students choose a target language name and a new occupation and they can develop a whole biography about their fictional selves such as talking or writing about their fictional hometown, childhood, and family.

5. **Role Play**, in which students are asked to pretend temporarily that they are someone else and to perform in the target language as if they were that person.
Hadley (2000) summarized some drawbacks of SUGG. It did not provide learners with authentic material. It also required to be implemented in its original and complete format, which does not fit the typical classroom schedule.

**Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

CLT, also known as the Notional-Functional Approach, caused a shift in the field of language teaching from a linguistic structure-centered approach to a communicative approach. It was based on the premise that being able to communicate required not only linguistic competence but also communicative competence. Communicative competence is simply knowing how, when, and why to say what to whom. In other words, most methods of foreign language teaching concentrated on the *how* (grammar) to say *what* (vocabulary). While these components of language are indeed important, the current principle for foreign language study is communication, which also highlights the *why*, the *whom*, and the *when*. It is the acquisition of the ability to communicate in meaningful and appropriate ways with users of other languages that is the ultimate goal of today’s foreign language classroom (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2008).

Canale and Swain (1980) outlined some of the major characteristics of CLT. It incorporates grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence into the communicative curriculum design and classroom practices. It takes the learner’s needs as a basis for its curriculum design. It also creates communicative opportunities that are characterized by interaction and authenticity. It teaches students
about the rules of discourse in accordance with the social conditions of the target language.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) identified some principles of CLT.

1. Authentic language – language as it is used in a real context – should be introduced.

2. Being able to figure out the speaker’s or writer’s intentions is part of being communicatively competent.

3. The emphasis of language instruction is on the process of communication rather than just mastery of language forms.

4. Games are important because they have certain features in common with real communicative events.

5. Students should be given an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions.

6. Errors are tolerated and seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills.

7. One of the teacher’s major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication.

8. Communicative interaction encourages cooperative relationships among students.

9. The teacher acts as a facilitator setting up communicative activities and as an advisor during the activities.

Larsen-Freeman (2000) also listed some techniques that are closely associated with CLT.
1. **Authentic Materials**, in which students are introduced to language materials authentic to native speakers of the target language.

2. **Scrambled Sentences**, in which students are given a passage (a text) with sentences in scrambled order and are told to unscramble the sentences so that the sentences are restored to their original order.

3. **Language Games**, in which games are used in order to give students valuable communicative practice.

4. **Role Play**, in which students play different roles in order to give them an opportunity to practice communicating in different social contexts and in different social roles.

Hammerly (1982) pointed out some drawbacks with CLT. Students will be structurally confused if teaching materials are organized according to communicative acts or transactions. An accurate and detailed analysis of students’ needs is hard to achieve. This approach does not offer valid criteria for selection and gradation of content (pp. 259-260).

**Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL)**

Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL) is a collaborative work by four national language organizations, namely, (a) the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL), (b) the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF), (c) the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), and (d) the
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP). It has resulted in the development of standards for foreign language education.

The philosophy behind the SFLL stated that language and communication are at the heart of the human experience. The United States must educate students who are linguistically and culturally equipped to communicate successfully in a pluralistic American society and abroad. This imperative envisions a future in which ALL students will develop and maintain proficiency in English and at least one other language, modern or classical. Children who come to school from non-English backgrounds should also have opportunities to develop further proficiencies in their first language (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2008).

The SFLL centers around five goals, known as the five C’s of foreign language education (see Table 2.1): (a) Communication, (b) Cultures, (c) Connections, (d) Comparisons, and (e) Communities. The communication standards stress the use of language for communication in "real life" situations. It emphasizes "what students can do with language" rather than "what they know about language. Brown (2000) said that students are asked to communicate in oral and written form, interpret oral and written messages, show cultural understanding when they communicate, and present oral and written information to various audiences for a variety of purposes.

The cultures standards emphasize that cultural understanding is an important part of world languages education. Experiencing other cultures develops a better
understanding and appreciation of the relationship between languages and other cultures, as well as the student's native culture. Students become better able to understand other people's points of view, ways of life, and contributions to the world.

The connections standards stress that world languages instruction must be connected with other subject areas. Content from other subject areas is integrated with world language instruction through lessons that are developed around common themes.

The comparisons standards emphasize that students should be encouraged to compare and contrast languages and cultures. They discover patterns, make predictions, and analyze similarities and differences across languages and cultures. Students often come to understand their native language and culture better through such comparisons.

The communities standards stress the fact that extending learning experiences from the world language classroom to the home and multilingual and multicultural community emphasizes living in a global society. Activities may include: field trips, use of e-mail and the World Wide Web, clubs, exchange programs and cultural activities, school-to-work opportunities, and opportunities to hear speakers of other languages in the school and classroom.
Table 2.1

Standards for Foreign Language Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>Standard 1.1: Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain Information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate in Languages Other Than English</td>
<td>Standard 1.2: Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard 1.3: Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURES</td>
<td>Standard 2.1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of the culture studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain Knowledge and Understanding of Other Cultures</td>
<td>Standard 2.2: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of the culture studied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECTIONS</td>
<td>Standard 3.1: Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through the foreign language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with Other Disciplines and Acquire Information</td>
<td>Standard 3.2: Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through the foreign language and its cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPARISONS</td>
<td>Standard 4.1: Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons of the language studied and their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Insight into the Nature of Language and Culture</td>
<td>Standard 4.2: Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons of the cultures studied and their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITIES</td>
<td>Standard 5.1: Students use the language both within and beyond the school setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home and Around the Word</td>
<td>Standard 5.2: Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using the language for personal enjoyment and enrichment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Previous Attitudinal Studies

Studies related to the attitudes of foreign language teachers toward the teaching method of some foreign languages will be summarized and discussed.

Taira (1982) investigated the attitudes of Japanese teachers of English toward teaching the English language in Japan’s junior and senior high schools. Taira used a self-developed questionnaire to assess the attitudes of the teachers toward four issues: (a) the reduction of English lessons per week in the schools; (b) the psychological disadvantage of Japanese students; (c) the effect of the entrance examination to high schools and universities; and (d) the teaching methods of English used by the teachers.

Results of Taira’s (1982) study found that the teachers had a favorable tendency toward the use of the grammar translation method of teaching, and discovered that class activities were influenced by the entrance examinations to high schools and universities. Over 60% of the teachers indicated they teach grammar analytically. The teaching methods used in Japanese schools and textbooks do not emphasize the improvement of students’ abilities in listening and speaking skills. Taira concluded that the de-emphasis of these skills is partly due to the system of the entrance examinations to high schools and universities, which stresses reading and writing skills, to the neglect of oral language in classrooms, and also partly due to the textbooks adopted in schools. The textbooks used neglected the teaching of listening and speaking skills, which resulted in the students having better skills in reading English than in speaking it.
Pinder (1972) investigated EFL teachers to identify what factors influenced the Florida teachers’ attitudes toward foreign language laboratory methods. One-hundred twenty-three EFL teachers participated in this study, divided into two random samples. Data collection was conducted using two questionnaires. The Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire consisted of 13 items measuring teachers’ personal, educational, and professional background and experience, through demographic information such as gender, age, teaching level, years of experience, and professional training and experience. The second questionnaire, The Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs, included 50 items regarding laboratory and audio-lingual methods. These items were based on approximately 18 different concepts, in particular the “New Key” audio-lingual method, as described by Nelson Brooks in Language and Language learning. Test-retest reliability of The Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs was 0.755.

Results indicate that the attitudes of the teachers toward laboratory and audio-lingual methods were not significantly related to (a) gender, (b) teaching experience, (c) age, (d) academic degree, (e) whether or not the teacher is a native speaker of the language he/she teaches, (f) the method by which the teacher learned the second language (if not a native speaker), (g) the teacher’s experience learning to use the language laboratory, and (h) whether or not the teacher had participated in the NDEA Foreign Language Institute, experienced teacher fellowship programs, foreign language study at a college or university, or workshops focused on recent foreign language teaching methods.
Pinder (1972) stated as a recommendation for future research, that “if future studies related to this one support the findings of this study, then perhaps similar attitudinal studies toward teaching methodology might be examined in foreign language education as well as other disciplines” (p. 55). Therefore, the present research study responds to this recommendation in an attempt to determine which factors affect teachers’ attitudes toward the teaching methodologies. Unlike Pinder’s (1972) study, this research broadly investigates AFL teachers’ attitudes toward eight foreign language teaching methods.

Papalia (1977) used a 5-point Likert scale when he investigated the attitudes, beliefs, and views of 45 teachers in western New York toward their current instructional techniques of teaching foreign languages. He also tested for significant differences between prospective and experienced teachers. Results indicate the foreign language teachers tended strongly to (a) accept students’ feelings and ideas, (b) construct a cooperative climate in the classroom, (c) maximize students’ interaction, (d) use multiple approaches to learning, and (e) promulgate real communication in the classroom. Papalia also found significant differences between prospective and experienced teachers regarding their self-pacing, differentiated homework, testing for mastery, and small-group instruction. Prospective teachers strongly favored these concepts, while experienced teachers were moderately in favor.

Papalia (1973) conducted a similar study regarding the assessment of Florida teachers’ attitudes and behaviors in classrooms. Two major questions were assessed: (a)
Do foreign language teachers believe in open interaction in the classroom? and (b) Do they exhibit classrooms that reflect sensitivity and interests of students in the cognitive, affective, and stimulative domains?.

Forty-six teachers and 1,046 students in western New York public schools participated in Papalia’s (1973) study, which used two validated questionnaires: The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) and the Teacher Description Instrument (TDI). Results indicated that teachers of foreign language displayed, in varying degrees, supportive attitudes toward students. Teachers favored students’ self-motivation and open interaction in the classroom, and seriously moved toward a student-centered concept of instruction. Students identified and rated their teachers’ classroom behaviors, which confirmed the prior results that the foreign language teachers showed student-centered classroom behaviors and actualized learning by being sensitive to the needs and abilities of students.

Alkamoukh’s (1981) research involved the perceptions of Saudi Arabian teachers of the English language toward the philosophy of language teaching, techniques, innovations, and learning behaviors that are relevant to the grammar-translation, direct, and audio-lingual methods of teaching a foreign language. One-hundred forty-four teachers of the English language were sampled in the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia. In the investigation of teachers’ attitudes toward instructional techniques associated with the methods of teaching English, 70.2% of the teachers indicated a positive tendency toward emphasizing the study of literature, written grammar, and translation skills in the
upper level of secondary schools (Alkamoukh, 1981). Teachers (93.1%) agreed that pattern practice is an effective learning technique; however, while 62.5% of teachers agreed that foreign language teachers should accept the syntactical errors made by students as a natural part of language acquisition, 25% did not agree, and 12.5% were undecided. Approximately 85% of the teachers indicated that pattern practice provides a meaningful context for learning to use the language, 72.2% agreed the use of minimal contrasting pairs to teach English sound discrimination is effective, and 86.1% exhibited a positive inclination toward the teaching of listening and speaking skills before reading and writing.

Alkamoukh’s (1981) findings show that the audio-lingual method of teaching is the most preferred by teachers, followed by the direct method, and the cognitive code approach. Teachers least preferred the grammar-translation method, indicating it is least effective in developing oral communication skills. Pattern practice had the highest number of teachers proclaiming its effectiveness in the teaching of English as a foreign language (Alkamoukh, 1981). Although the teachers of English preferred the oral approach for teaching a second language based on repetition, practice, and dialogue, they considered learning rules of grammar and vocabulary lists also important.

Alkamoukh (1981) simply presented descriptive information about the Saudi Arabian English teachers’ personal and professional background and their attitudes toward four teaching methods: grammar-translation, direct, audio-lingual, and cognitive code. This present study goes beyond Alkamoukh’s study to investigate the relationship
between attitudes of teachers of Arabic toward the distinctive teaching techniques associated with eight teaching methods of foreign languages.

In his recommendations for further studies, Alkamoukh (1981) suggested “a study might be considered to deal with the influence of experience, qualification and foreign training on foreign language teaching” (p.113). This dissertation responded to this recommendation. A two-part questionnaire was developed to measure teachers’ attitudes toward the techniques associated with the teaching methods of foreign languages undertaken in this study. Moreover, it explores the relationship between these attitudes and the teachers’ demographic characteristics identified in this study.

Elmquist (1973) investigated 240 Texas high school foreign language teachers’ attitudes toward methodologies, textbooks, language laboratories, teacher preparation, and other facets of modern foreign language instruction. Teachers’ educational and linguistic backgrounds were assessed for (a) which teachers taught a variety of foreign languages: 38.8% Spanish, 22.5% French, 13.3% German, and 5.4% other; and (b) which teachers held certificates: 42.5% professional certificate, 47.1% provisional certificate. Of the sample, 86.2% of the teachers were certified specifically in the foreign language they taught.

Results of Elmquist’s (1973) study showed that teachers depend largely on the textbooks when implementing their teaching methods and approaches. Various approaches were preferred by the teachers: 17.9% audio-lingual, 9.7% traditional grammar-translation, 74.6% combined audio-lingual and traditional grammar-translation,
and 3.7% other. In a first-level course, teachers stressed listening and speaking (75.8%), reading and translation (4.6%), grammar and writing (13.7%), and “other” combinations of these concepts (5.8%). In a second-level course, teachers indicated different concepts that they stressed: reading and writing (37%), reading and grammar (31.7%), listening and speaking (28.3%), and reading and translating (2.9%).

Teachers reported feeling “tied” to audio-lingual textbooks and an audio-lingual teaching philosophy, although they were not satisfied with an entirely audio-lingual program (Elmquist, 1973). Some teachers agreed that their methods were the best possible (36.2%); although others reported they would like to use another method if they could (67.5%).

The use of visual aids was used by teachers in this sample, such as films and slides (78.8%), magazines and periodicals (69.5%), and records (73.8%) (Elmquist, 1973). Teachers reported using two or more of these aids in their classrooms; however, only 37.5% used posters of various foreign countries.

Similar to other studies presented, Hussein (1989) investigated the attitudes of English teachers toward three methods of teaching the English language in Egypt: inductive-deductive, affective, and notional-functional. Out of the random sample of 200, 185 secondary school teachers in the El-Mansourah district answered a questionnaire that collected their personal and professional information (i.e. age, gender, teaching experience, knowledge of teaching methods, proficiency in the English language, type of education institution, and availability of instructional materials), as well as responses to
attitudinal statements regarding the instructional techniques and strategies associated with each method of teaching English. The attitudinal statements were based on a 5-point Likert scale.

Of the three teaching methods presented in the study, teachers preferred the notional-functional approach the most, followed by the inductive-deductive method, and the affective method (Hussein, 1989). Female teachers had more favorable attitudes overall than males; however, attitudes toward the methods of teaching English were not affected by teachers’ age, teaching experience, or proficiency in English (Hussein, 1989). The teachers’ knowledge of teaching methods, the type of educational institution from which they graduated, and the extent of availability of instructional materials did influence attitudes toward the methods of teaching English.

Results of Hussein’s (1989) study indicated a significant relationship between teachers’ attitudes toward the notional-functional method of teaching and the type of educational institution from which the teacher graduated, in which those teachers who graduated from colleges of education were more favorable toward this approach than teachers who graduated from other types of educational institutions. There was also a significant relationship between the attitudes of teachers toward the notional-functional approach and their knowledge of methods of teaching English, as well as a significant relationship between teachers’ attitudes toward the affective methods and the instructional materials available in schools (Hussein, 1989).
Summary

In this chapter an overall view on the eight teaching methods tested in this research, and some of the most related studies in this regard was given.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the research design, research questions, and hypotheses. It also describes research variables, research instrument and sample, and data collection and data analyses.

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design. Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were used to identify the attitudes of TAFL toward the methods of foreign language teaching. Inferential statistics (Pearson Product Correlation Coefficients and Independent t-tests) were used to test if there was a significant relationship between the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching and their demographics.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

This study investigated the relationship between the TAFL’s demographics and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT). Therefore, the study explored the following research questions:
6. Is there a significant relationship between TAFL’s age and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

7. Are there significant gender differences in the attitudes of the TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

8. Are there significant differences between those participants who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it is not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

9. Are there significant differences between those participants who reported having received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

10. Is there a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

**Hypotheses**

Based on the research questions, the study formulated and tested the following statistical research hypotheses:
**H₁.** There is a significant relationship between TAFL’s age and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₂.** There is a significant gender difference in the TAFL’s attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₃.** There is a significant difference between TAFL’s who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it is was not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₄.** There is a significant difference between TAFL’s who reported having received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**H₅.** There is a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

**Research Variables**

The dependent variable is the attitudes of the TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching. The independent variables are the five demographics of TAFL (age, gender, native language, training, and years of teaching experience).
Research Instrumentation

A survey was employed as a method of data collection. According to Johnson and Christensen (2000), the purpose of using a questionnaire is to obtain information about perceptions, feelings, thoughts, beliefs, etc. This questionnaire collected data about the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching and their demographic variables (age, gender, native language, training, and years of teaching experience).

The questionnaire consists of two parts. The first part is designed to identify the attitudes of TAFL toward some selected methods of teaching foreign language. This part consists of 40 items representing the eight methods of foreign language teaching. Each method is given 5 items. Items 1 - 5 are designed to address GTM; items 6 - 10 are designed to address DM; items 11 - 15 are designed to address ALM; items 16 - 20 are designed to address TPR; items 21 - 25 are designed to address CLL; items 26 - 30 are designed to address SW; items 31 - 35 are designed to address SUGG, and items 36 - 40 are designed to address CLT. The second part is designed to solicit information about the participants’ demographics (age, gender, native language, training, years of teaching experience).

Research Sample

Participants included a sample of TAFL from selected institutions in the United States. Participation in this study was on a voluntary basis and the researcher sent every participating teacher a hard copy of the survey.
The institutions that were selected to participate in this study include the following:

Table 3.1

*Distribution of Participants by their Institutions.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Kansas</td>
<td>Lawrence, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kansas State University</td>
<td>Manhattan, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of California</td>
<td>Berkeley, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of California</td>
<td>Santa Barbara, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of California</td>
<td>Davis, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. San Francisco State University</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. San Diego State University</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. California State University</td>
<td>Fullerton, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. California State University</td>
<td>San Bernardino, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Monterey Institute of International Studies</td>
<td>Monterey, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Defense Language Institute</td>
<td>Monterey, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Georgetown University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. George Washington University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. American University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Howard University</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Middle East Institute</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Colorado</td>
<td>Boulder, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. University of Denver</td>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. US Air Force Academy</td>
<td>USAFA, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>Golden, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Florida</td>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Tallahassee, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Urbana-Champaign, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge, Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>Detroit, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Ithaca, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>Buffalo, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>University Park, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Indiana, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas Austin</td>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot Study

To test the validity and reliability of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted on a sample of 5 professors in the areas of Foreign Language Education and Linguistics, and 10 graduate students teaching undergraduate courses in Arabic as a Foreign
Language, at various universities. This pilot group served as subject matter experts, returning completed surveys with feedback on how to improve the survey items.

Reliability and Validity

The questionnaire items were adapted from Larsen-Freeman’s (2000) principles of the eight methods of foreign language teaching. The items that were chosen for validation were those found to obviously and directly address each method and to be less likely to test more than one method. Each method was given five items and the items were grouped according to the domain/method that they address. The reliability data of this questionnaire was computed using the statistical software program SPSS. Results of the reliability analyses are in Table 1 below. Each method has moderate to high reliability coefficients.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method 1 (GTM)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.879</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 2 (DM)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.996</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 3 (ALM)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 4 (TPR)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 5 (CLL)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 6 (SW)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.033</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 7 (SUGG)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method 8 (CLT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter addressed the study design, research questions, and hypotheses. It also identified research variables and described the research instrument. A description of the study sample was provided. The chapter also explained how data collection and data analyses would be conducted.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the investigation of the relationship between the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT) and participants’ demographics (age, gender, training, native language, and years of teaching experience). The five research questions are presented with the results obtained for each.

Descriptive Data

As it is obvious from Table 4.1 the total number of the participants was 48. Thirty-one males and 17 females took part in this study. Not all of the participants were originally Arabs, or even considered native speakers of Arabic. Out of the 48 participants, three were non-Arabs, while the rest of the participants were Arabs. Table 4.2 has the number of the Arab participants versus non-Arabs, with the overall percentage of each group.

Table 4.1

*Frequency and Percentage of Male and Female TAFL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2

*Frequency and Percentage of Arabic and Non-Arabic Native Language TAFL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Language</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 shows the number of the trained teachers compared to the non-trained teachers.

Table 4.3

*Frequency and Percentage of Training of TAFL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Trained</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants’ preferences for the eight methods of foreign language teaching were based on a Likert scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree). Each method is ranked from most preferred to least preferred followed by the average preference score:

1. Method 8  CLT  (4.167)
2. Method 2  DM   (3.996)
3. Method 4  TPR  (3.883)
4. Method 3  ALM  (3.625)
5. Method 5  CLL  (3.417)
6. Method 7  SUGG (3.25)
Research Question 1

Is there a significant relationship between T AFL’s age and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

There is a significant relationship between T AFL’s age and the GTM method of foreign language teaching \( (r = .51, p < .01) \). There are no significant relationships between T AFL’s age and their attitudes toward the other seven methods of foreign language teaching (DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation (r)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLL</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGG</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

Are there significant gender differences in the attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

There are no significant gender differences in the attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

Research Question 3

Are there significant differences between those participants who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it is not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

There are significant differences between those participants who reported Arabic as their native language and those who reported it as not in their attitudes toward the CLL \((t = -3.93, p < .01)\) and SW \((t = -3.24, p < .05)\) methods of foreign language teaching. For both the CLL and SW methods, participants whose native language is not Arabic preferred these methods more than did participants whose native language is Arabic.

There are no significant group differences in the attitudes toward the other six methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, SUGG, and CLT).
Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUGG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-.553</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 4

Are there significant differences between those participants who received training and those who did not in their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

There are significant differences between those participants who reported they received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the GTM ($t = -2.71, p < .01$), ALM ($t = 2.83, p < .01$), and TPR ($t = 2.296, p < .05$) methods of foreign language teaching. Those participants with no training preferred the GTM method more than those who are trained. Those participants who received training preferred the ALM and TPR methods more than those participants who did not receive training. There are no significant group differences in the attitudes toward the other five methods of foreign language teaching (DM, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).
Research Question 5

Is there a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and their attitudes toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT)?

There is a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the GTM method of foreign language teaching ($r = .43$, $p < .01$). There are no significant relationships between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the attitudes toward the other seven methods of foreign language teaching (DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

Summary

In summary, this study showed significant relationships between TAFL’s age and the attitudes toward the GTM method of foreign language teaching, and a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the GTM method of foreign language teaching. There are no significant relationships between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the attitudes toward the other seven methods of foreign language teaching (DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT). As for the relationship between gender of the teachers of Arabic as a foreign language and their attitude toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT), there was found to be no significant differences. In regards to the relationship between the nature of the teachers’ mother tongue, whether Arabic or not, and which teaching method was preferred, it has been found that the participants whose
native language is not Arabic significantly preferred the CLL and the SW methods more than participants whose native language is Arabic. Training was found to affect which teaching method was preferred by Teachers of Arabic. Those participants with no training preferred the GTM method more than those who are trained. Those participants who had received training preferred the ALM and TPR methods more than those participants who had not received training. There were no significant group differences in the attitudes toward the other five methods of foreign language teaching (DM, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT). Finally, in this chapter, it was found that teaching experience has significantly correlated with the preference toward the GTM. Teacher with longer teaching experience prefer it more than the other seven teaching methods ((DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

This chapter presented the results of the investigation of the relationship between the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT) and participants’ demographics (age, gender, training, native language, and years of teaching experience). The following chapter will be dedicated to the discussion of the results found in this chapter, and relate them to the previous literature. Conclusions will be derived and recommendations made for further studies.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter gives a general summary of the study; its purpose, research questions, and the method used in collecting and processing data. A discussion of the findings of the research will then be presented, followed by some recommendations for future studies and some of the implications for this research.

This chapter includes a discussion of the results obtained in the investigation of the relationship between the attitudes of TAFL toward the eight methods of foreign language teaching (GTM, DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT) and participants’ demographics (age, gender, training, native language, and years of teaching experience).

The results found for Research Questions 1 and 5 showed significant relationships between TAFL’s age and the attitudes toward the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) method of foreign language teaching \((r = .51, p < .01)\). The results also showed a significant relationship between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the GTM method of foreign language teaching \((r = .43, p < .01)\). There are no significant relationships between TAFL’s years of teaching experience and the attitudes toward the other seven methods of foreign language teaching (DM, ALM, TPR, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).
The tendency toward using GTM was reported in many studies. Taira (1982) found 60% of the teachers participating in her study indicated that they teach grammar analytically, and they had a favorable tendency toward the use of the GTM. When it comes to age and the tendency to use this method of teaching, Papalia (1977) found that younger prospective foreign language teachers not only had a strong tendency to (a) accept students’ feelings and ideas, (b) construct a cooperative climate in the classroom, but also (c) younger prospective teachers strongly favored these concepts, while the experienced teachers were only moderately in favor of them. Older teachers with more experience were not strongly in favor of more student-centered classes compared to the younger prospective teachers.

The significant relationship between the age of the teachers and their tendency to prefer the GTM method can be justified on many bases. A quick look at the history of the GTM shows that it is one of the oldest teaching methods. It is reported to be used in teaching languages like Latin and Greek. Maybe it is because the GTM has been around longer than other methods that older teachers would use it in their teaching, since some of them might have used this method when they were learning their foreign languages. This can also justify the preference of more experienced teachers for the GTM.

The results for Research Question 3 found significant differences between those participants for whom Arabic was their native language and those for whom it was not in their attitudes toward the CLL ($t = -3.93$, $p < .01$) and SW ($t = -3.24$, $p < .05$) methods of foreign language teaching. Participants whose native language is not Arabic preferred
both the CLL and SW methods more than participants whose native language is Arabic. As only 3 of the 48 participants reported their native language as not Arabic, the results of the attitudes toward the CLL and SW methods by these participants are not generalizable because of the small sample size.

Results for Research Question 4 show there are significant differences between those participants who reported they had received training and those who reported they did not in their attitudes toward the GTM ($t = -2.71, p < .01$), ALM ($t = 2.83, p < .01$), and TPR ($t = 2.296, p < .05$) methods of foreign language teaching. Those participants with no training preferred the GTM more than those who were trained did. Those participants who received training preferred the ALM and TPR methods more than those participants who did not receive training. There are no significant group differences in the attitudes toward the other five methods of foreign language teaching (DM, CLL, SW, SUGG, and CLT).

Part of the reason why the non-trained teachers tend to prefer using the GTM might spring from the nature of the book use in all these programs. The textbook used in these Arabic programs was entitled *Al-Kitaab* (Al-Batal, M, Brustad K, and Al-Tuonsi, A, 2004). This book is designed in a typical GTM way. In it, each unit starts with a long list of new vocabulary in Arabic with the English-equivalent translation next to it. Then, some grammatical rules are explained. The rest of the chapter is made up of drills that reinforce the grammatical aspects that have been taught to the students.
The way the book was designed exactly fits the main characteristics of the GTM given by Brown (2000), who said that (a) classes are taught in the mother tongue with little active use of the target language; (b) much vocabulary is taught in the form of lists of isolated words; (c) long elaborate explanations of the intricacies of grammar are given; (d) grammar provides the rules for putting words together, and instruction often focuses on the form and inflection of words; (e) reading of difficult classical texts is begun early; (f) little attention is paid to the content of texts, which are treated as exercises in grammatical analysis; (g) often, the only drills are exercises in translating disconnected sentences from the target language into the mother tongue; and (h) little or no attention is given to pronunciation (pp. 15-16).

Lack of needed training might be another reason that makes non-trained teachers tend to prefer the GTM. The rest of the eight methods are more student-centered methods, where authentic texts need to be presented by the teachers to the learners; live-like situations, where the students need to use their language, should be created; and new methods of evaluation, like portfolios and informal assessment, are to be used in order to capture the gradual process of the learners. These tasks do not come naturally to the teachers. Teachers need to have knowledge about these things, and they need training in them before they think of using them. This knowledge and experience are the fruits of the training programs, and are the main goal of all TESL and TEFL training programs. Without the training, the TAFL limit themselves somehow to the use of the GTM, which mainly entails teachers doing translations back and forth between L1 and L2.
The significant preference by the trained teachers for the ALM and TPR methods might come from the nature of these two methods, plus the availability of the learning facilities here in the United States.

As for the ALM, according to Brown (2000), there should be little or no grammar explanation and vocabulary should be learned within the context. These two aspects of L2 learning are consistent with what most of the L1 learning programs do in the public schools in the U.S. The phonics system, reading of stories, and the immersion of the new vocabulary into authentic texts, are some of the apparent features that dominate L1 learning processes here in the public schools. As teachers of foreign languages, if the above-mentioned techniques worked well for them while learning their L1 while they were little, those techniques should work for their students while learning their L2. The above mentioned aspects reflect the trends in most of the teacher-training programs where the training programs do not emphasize on the grammar and pay less attention to vocabulary outside the context. On top of that, the existence of language labs in almost all of the FL institutions and the ease of Internet access also shaped the preference of teachers toward the ALM, which appreciates the use of labs and encourages lots of listening. All these things might have directed teachers to prefer the ALM more than any other method.

As for the Total Physical Response (TPR) preference, Dewey’s philosophy might be playing a role. Dewey (1902) stated that learning any language should be done in a way similar to the way children learn their L1. Children usually learn by doing things,
having new experiences on a daily bases, and by repeating actions until they master what they have learned. Dewey’s philosophy originated in the U.S. and played a major role in shaping language-learning teaching all over the country. The TPR argues some of what Dewey believed to be the best way to learn and teach. He argued that students would assimilate skills more rapidly if teachers appeal to their kinesthetic-sensor system (Hadley, 2000). Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Brown (2000) said that meaning in the target language often can be conveyed through actions, and that students can learn through observing actions as well as performing actions themselves. The similarity between what Asher (1993) suggested when presented TPR which argued for Dewey’s philosophy of how education should be, might explain why there was a significant preference among teachers toward TPR. A better answer to this question would have been provided if access to the type of training received had been available.

Conclusions

Based on what has been found in the results and the literature review of this study, this researcher believes that variables, like age, training, experience, and native language of teachers of Arabic as a foreign language, but not gender, have an effect on Arabic teachers’ preferences of teaching methods. Central to the core of the learning/teaching process is the quality of the teachers and their attitudes toward how to teach, if, for any given teachers’ training program, good results might be expected, then such variables need to be taken into consideration.
Implications of the Study

Based on what the researcher has found, the following recommendations are presented:

1. There is a need for training programs for new teachers to help them understand what is available to them and how to choose the best teaching method for each class.

2. The same training programs can be used as a polishing, or updating, tool for older teachers of Arabic as a foreign language. Such programs will help keeping older teachers up-to-date on the new trends and methodologies used in their fields of specialty.

3. Knowing the attitudes of the teachers might also be helpful in the development of training materials for teachers. If a program designer knew, from the beginning, which teaching method is preferred by the trainees, it might help him/her enhance the quality of any material used by choosing what meets the needs or the preferences of their trainees. Taking such preferences into account would eventually result in creation of materials that align with more effective and new methods.

Limitations

This study has some limitations that might affect the findings. These limitations are:
1. The sample was not big enough to assure that the results can be generalized to other situations and locations.

2. The number of the non-native speakers of teachers of Arabic was only three. This puts the validity of their response at risk, because one extreme answer can change the mean in a major way.

3. There were not many resources that discussed the attitude of teachers of Arabic as a foreign language. This limited the researcher’s ability to have a more comprehensive and profound updated understanding of the topic. It caused the researcher to rely on some of the modern studies conducted on the same topic, but which used English as a foreign language.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. It is recommended that this study be expanded to L2s other than Arabic, to see if the nature of the language might have an effect on the teachers’ preferences about the methods of teaching.

2. It is recommended that this study is to be applied again in different locations, where social, economic, and cultural differences exist between teachers, in order to find the nature of other variables that might shape the preference of language teachers toward different methods of teaching.

Summary

This chapter contained a general discussion of the results. The researcher looked back into the literature review and justified the results of his study based on that. Then,
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the researcher delineated some possible implications for the findings of this study, the limitations of the study, and some recommendations for future studies.
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Appendices
Dear colleague,

The attached questionnaire was developed as part of my doctoral dissertation which intends to explore the attitudes of Arabic as a Foreign Language (AFL) toward methods of foreign language teaching. The questionnaire has two parts. The first part is designed to gather information about the TAFL’s demographics. The second part is designed to identify the attitudes of AFL teachers toward some selected methods of foreign language teaching.

Having been selected as one who will contribute to this study, would you please answer the attached questionnaire as truly and accurately as you can. There is no need for you to write your name on the questionnaire, and no way by which you personally could be identified. But, if you want to know the results of this study, please feel free to write your name, school and address and I will notify about the outcomes of the study.

I will be very grateful for the time, effort, and thoughtful attention you will give to complete this questionnaire, and I thank you in advance for your important contribution to this research enterprise. Please leave your completed questionnaire at your department office.

Sincerely,

Sami Seraj
**Survey Questionnaire**

**PART 1:** This part is designed to solicit some information about TAFL’s demographics.

1. What is your age?
   
   (   ) Years old

2. What is your gender?

   (   ) Male
   (   ) Female

3. What is your native language?

   (   ) Arabic
   (   ) Non-Arabic

4. 
   A. What is your major (last degree obtained)?

   (   ) Arabic Language
   (   ) Foreign Language Education
   (   ) TESL/TEFL
   (   ) Linguistics
   (   ) Other - please specify ____________________

   B. Were you trained in teaching methods? Yes (   ) No (   ).

5. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

   (   ) Years
**PART 2:** This part is designed to identify the attitudes of TAFL toward some selected methods of foreign language teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students should translate a reading passage from Arabic into their native language.</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Arabic grammar rules should be learned <em>deductively</em> in which students should be presented with grammar rules along with examples.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Students should be taught to recognize cognates by learning the spelling or sound patterns that correspond between Arabic and their native language.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Students should be given lists of Arabic vocabulary and their native language equivalents and are asked to memorize them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Students should be given one set of Arabic words and asked to find their synonyms and antonyms in Arabic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Students should take turns reading sections of an Arabic passage, play, or dialogue out loud.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students should be asked questions and answer them in full sentences only in Arabic so that they practice new words and grammatical structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Arabic grammar rules should be learned <em>inductively</em> in which students should be presented with examples and they figure out the grammar rules from the examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers should provide students with dictation in Arabic.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vocabulary should be emphasized over grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dialogs in Arabic should be used to begin a new lesson and students should memorize the dialogs through mimicry.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Students should be provided with repetitive drills in Arabic in which they repeat the teacher’s model as accurately and as quickly as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Students should be provided with chain drills in Arabic in which a conversation forms around the classroom as students ask and answer questions of each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Students should be given a dialog in Arabic and then asked to fill the blanks in the dialog after erasing some words from it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Teachers should emphasize oral skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Students should be given commands in Arabic to get them perform an action where the action makes the meaning of the command clear.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Students should be allowed to command their teacher and classmates in Arabic to perform some actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Students should be given connected commands in Arabic, such as “point to the door, walk to the door, and touch the door.”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>The imperative technique is a powerful linguistic device used by the teacher to help students learn Arabic effectively.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Meaning should be made clear through body movement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Students’ conversations in Arabic should be tape-recorded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Students’ tape-recorded conversations in Arabic should be transcribed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Students should be given the opportunity to reflect on how they feel about the Arabic learning experience as learners and their relationship with one another.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Students should relax and listen to their own voices speaking Arabic on the tape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Student should be encouraged to transfer what they learn to new contexts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Teachers should use charts which contain blocks of color to help students form syllables, words, and sentences in Arabic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Teachers should give as much help as is necessary and then should keep silent most of the time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Teachers should use physical objects to teach colors, numbers, and even complicated structures in Arabic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Teachers should use only gesture to indicate that students need to self-correct.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Students need to learn to listen to themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Teachers should create a classroom environment which is bright and cheerful with music and soft lights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Arabic should be acquired subconsciously rather than learned consciously.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Students should choose an Arabic name and a new occupation where they can develop a whole biography about their fictional selves or talk and write about their fictional hometown, childhood, and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Students should be asked to pretend temporarily that they are someone else and to perform role play in Arabic as if they were that person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Teachers should integrate the fine arts (music, art, and drama) as much as possible into the teaching process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Students should be provided with authentic language materials designed for native speakers of Arabic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Students should be given a passage in Arabic with sentences in scrambled order and told to unscramble the sentences so that the sentences are restored to their original order.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Games should be used in order to give students valuable communicative practice in Arabic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Students should play different roles in order to have opportunities to practice communicating in Arabic in different social contexts and in different social roles.</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Teachers should act as facilitators in setting up communicative activities and as advisors during the activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>