Surveying Metalanguage through Three EFL Textbooks

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sasan Baleghizadeh
Shahid Beheshti University-Iran
sasanbaleghizadeh@yahoo.com

Ph.D.Stud. M.Yousefpoori-Naeim
Shahid Beheshti University-Iran
m_yousefpoori@sbu.ac.ir

Abstract

Formal grammar instruction in general – as well as teaching metalanguage in particular – has always generated a great deal of heated debate among researchers, teachers, and also materials developers. Metalanguage can be considered as a good touchstone of the emphasis that different textbooks put on formal grammar instruction. The present study, therefore, investigates the quality and quantity of metalanguage embodied in three popular English as a Foreign Language (EFL) textbooks, taught successively in one of the largest language institutes in Iran from 1996 to the present day. The results indicate that the metalanguage included in these textbooks compatibly reflects the trend of the related research during these years, i.e. a period of favoring grammar, followed by a phase of deemphasizing it, and finally a revival of grammar instruction. The results of the study have also implications for materials writers and teachers, which are discussed at the end.

Keywords: EFL textbooks, formal grammar instruction, grammatical terminology, metalanguage

27

INTRODUCTION

One of the famous dichotomies in the field of language teaching and learning is implicit/explicit knowledge and instruction. Implicit knowledge is said to be at work when one is using the language without being aware of the knowledge itself, while explicit knowledge is what one is aware of and can verbalize. Similarly, implicit instruction refers to the type of instruction in which learners are exposed to the language in a certain way without overtly talking about the rules of the language. Explicit instruction, on the other hand, is characterized by extensive use of grammatical rules and serious attention to the language being learned (Ur, 2011).

Metalanguage is most of the time regarded as an essential part of explicit grammar instruction. Macaro and Masterman (2006) include it in their definition of explicit grammar instruction, which they believe is also meant by many other scholars who have researched it. Of course, it should be admitted that the role of explicit grammar instruction in language pedagogy is not fully established yet, but it cannot be rejected either. Furthermore, whether to use grammatical terminology in language classrooms or not has generated quite a bit of controversy in the history of second language teaching (Berry, 2001). Failure to find a strong relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and

language proficiency in a number of studies (e.g., Anderson, Clapham, & Steel, 1997) is one of the most serious reasons often mentioned to abandon any metalanguage teaching in language classrooms. This is, of course, an inconclusive result, as there are a number of other studies that suggest otherwise (e.g., Berry, 1997, 2009; Renou, 2001).

In his paper on the use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom, Borg (1999, p. 96) points out to "a range of theoretical and pragmatic reasons for avoiding grammatical terminology in L2 teaching." Among those reasons, there is the old argument that explicit knowledge of language might not successfully lead to fluency. The situation gets worse when there is the risk of having learners assumes that it is the metalanguage, rather than the language itself, that is the aim of the course, so they might easily fall into memorizing the terms without understanding them or their functional value. Also, learning the abstract terminology of grammar might come as a burden to many learners, as it is basically the job of a linguist/grammarian (rather than a learner) to work with these terms. Borg (1999) also quotes an empirical study by Mohammed (1996) in which terminology-free instruction was found to be more effective than formal instruction using grammatical terms.

There are also arguments in favor of presenting learners with metalanguage, appearing again in Borg (1999) as well as elsewhere. The most significant reason for teaching metalanguage mentioned in Borg (1999) is that terminology provides learners with a shortcut to talk about the grammar of the language. If metalanguage is not available to and shared among learners and the teacher, then it might take a lot of time to clarify a grammatical point or to resolve a grammatical problem that a student might face. In addition, complications may grow when such shortcuts are not used. Grammatical terminology takes some time to learn too, but once learnt, it can serve as an efficient facilitator in the grammatical discussions that teachers and learners get involved in. Gordon (2005) also points to the benefits of equipping teachers with rich metalinguistic knowledge because it can help them have a better understanding of their students' errors and react to them more appropriately. Myhill, Jones, Lines, and Watson (2012) quote many scholars who have argued in favor of metacognitive knowledge and its benefits in writing. They further state that metacognitive knowledge (encompassing metalinguistic and grammatical knowledge as well) is present at every stage of the writing process although there is little empirical evidence that metalinguistic knowledge in particular is beneficial to the development of the writing skill.

Varying amounts of explicit grammar instruction, and hence use of metalanguage, can be witnessed in different methods. For instance, the Grammar Translation Method (GTM), as the name suggests, abounds with

grammatical rules. The Direct Method, Audiolingualism, and the Silent Way are among those methods in which explicit explanation of grammatical rules is seen as redundant or even harmful. Community Language Learning could be placed somewhere between the two extremes, as it favors grammar instruction whenever the need arises (Larsen-Freeman, 1986). While GTM, usually referred to as the oldest method, has always been known for its extensive use of grammatical terms (and also memorizing their definitions), many modern language classes, as well as English Language Teaching (ELT) materials, are still replete with various uses of these terms. In theory, we expect not to see much metalanguage used in today's classrooms - as it seems rather "incompatible with most approaches to language teaching in the late twentieth century" (Berry, 2008, p. 19) - on the other hand, we seem to be dealing with a different story in practice as will be revealed in this study, too.

Like many educational issues, the relationship between metalinguistic knowledge and language proficiency is not a simple and straightforward one, which has led to researching metalanguage in language education from various perspectives, including teachers, students, and textbooks. The latter has been rather underexplored and hence has been chosen as the focus of the present study. Such a relationship can also be viewed from the perspective of linguistic competence and performance. Metalinguistic knowledge can be regarded as part of linguistic knowledge, but whether a formal knowledge of language can result in desirable performance is not an easy question to answer. Although, according to Larsen-Freeman (2001), it seems that some learners can acquire the language through mere exposure to input, most learners would have a better performance if they received formal grammar instruction. A short review of some of the more interesting studies in this area follows next.

As for the studies focusing on teachers, Berry (2001), for instance, studied teachers' educational background and their use of metalanguage in the classroom and concluded that teachers' background was a stronger factor than methodology in determining the amount of their metalanguage use. In another study from the teachers' perspective, Andrews (2006) found that longer years of teaching experience did not necessarily lead to higher levels of grammatical knowledge. Finally, in a comprehensive study by Myhill *et al.* (2012), it was found out that the teachers' linguistic subject knowledge had a major role in making grammar instruction an effective tool to improve students' writing and metalinguistic understanding. In his comprehensive review article, Borg (2003) dedicates a section to studies on teachers' KAL (Knowledge of Language) in general and their knowledge of grammar in particular. He mentions a number of studies pointing to the considerable lack of teachers' knowledge of grammar. Interestingly, this finding is not restricted to the papers Borg reviews, as more recent studies in other parts of the world have yielded similar results (Dikici, 2012; Tsang, 2011). Borg (2003) provides a good conclusion in this regard:

A trend emerging from these studies is a concern for the generally inadequate levels of grammatical knowledge held, especially by potential language teachers. On the assumption that an explicit understanding of language plays a major role in the effectiveness of the work of language teachers, these findings suggested the need for language teacher preparation programmes to dedicate substantial time to the development of trainees' declarative knowledge about language. (p.98)

Finally, Berry (1997) goes one step forward by adding students to the picture through asking their teachers how good they thought their students were at grammatical knowledge. He found out that teachers tended to overestimate their students' knowledge of grammatical terminology, which was argued to have detrimental effects on the quality of language teaching in the classroom.

Metalanguage has been used slightly differently by different authors and scholars, and thus some definitional clarification seems relevant here. Berry (2005) fully surveys the various definitions of metalanguage, most of which come close to "language about language" (Johnson & Johnson, 1998, p. 212). It is not the aim of this paper to enter into a discussion of the differences between the approaches to metalanguage that Berry describes, as it would unnecessarily complicate the use of the term metalanguage in this study. However, to be in the same framework that Berry sets and to make the results of this study more interpretable, we have made our stance towards metalanguage clear: For the purposes of this study and also for the sake of clarity and practicality, the narrower view of metalanguage, i.e. grammatical terminology, has been adopted in this paper. As Berry (2005, p. 8) puts it, "[m]etalanguage for some seems to be not language about language but (a set of) words about language." This is, of course, not a new stance, and as Berry (2005, p. 8) again mentions, "[a]n unambiguous equation of metalanguage with terminology can be found in a definition by Ellis (1994, p. 714): 'Metalingual knowledge is knowledge of the technical terminology needed to describe language.'" Later scholars have made use of the same definition of metalanguage in their studies too; Tsang (2011), for example, chooses the same definition, which he states has been adopted from Celce-Murcia, Larsen-Freeman, and Williams (1999) and Thornbury (1997).

Although narrowing down the concept of metalanguage to terminology eliminates a number of complications and difficulties in interpretation, focusing on terminology alone has its own challenges. Many terms are not confined with clear-cut definitional boundaries and thus make the researchers' job difficult, but, fortunately, what matters in this study is the frequency of grammatical terms used rather than their meanings and scopes. It still should be noted that some minor problems did exist when it came to making decisions on what

30

words/phrases qualify as *grammatical terms* to be tallied. This will be discussed in more depth in the method section.

In order to trace the trend of grammar instruction in recent years and its reflection in teaching materials, this study aims at comparing three well-known EFL textbooks in terms of the amount of metalanguage (or more specifically, terminology) they use in their grammatical explanations. Metalanguage has been purposefully chosen for this study because it very well represents formal grammar instruction in general, but unlike grammar instruction - which is a vast concept - can be easily operationalized through counting the number of grammatical terms and thus enjoys a high level of practicality when it comes to running a research study. The reasons for selection of these three textbooks as well as the procedures taken to survey them come next.

METHOD

Three British English series – *Headway* (Soars & Soars, 1987), *True to Life* (Gairns & Redman, 1998), and *Total English* (Acklam & Crace, 2006) – (at upper-intermediate level) were selected for the purpose of this study because they have served as the main textbooks of the curriculum of a very popular language institute in Iran. *Headway* was taught from 1996 to 2002, when *True to Life* substituted it and was in use until 2008, and, finally, *Total English* has been used since then.

The assumption is that the choice of different textbooks in this language institute could more or less be a reflection of the trends that research on materials development has come up with in recent years. However, since Iran is one of the rapidly developing countries, it might be argued that the selection of these textbooks might not really match the time when the principles underlying these textbooks were in vogue in the field of research. Another issue pointing to this probable time gap is the fact that it usually takes some time to set the grounds for substituting a textbook in a language institute, especially in a big one. Assessing the market, considering budget limitations, holding teacher-training sessions, and finding efficient ways of advertizing are only a few issues that need to be resolved before adopting a new textbook. All these said, while there is little doubt about the existence of this time gap between the latest findings of research on materials development and/or syllabus design and the selection of a textbook in an Iranian language institute based on those findings, the order in which different textbooks are adopted seems to be in concordance with the order of the relevant research findings.

The second researcher counted all the grammatical terms (including repetitions) in each page of each book and finally added them up to come up with a number representing the whole number of grammatical terms used in each book. The first researcher also checked the counted terms unit by unit to

further make sure that only the desired terms were chosen and counted. In order to eliminate the extraneous effect of the number of the pages on the number of grammatical terms found in each book (i.e., the more pages, the more terms!), the average number of terms per each page was also calculated, representing a more valid criterion for comparison of the quantity of metalanguage included in the three textbooks.

As for the selection of grammatical terms in our search, some general points were taken into consideration. Some broad terms were not included in our frequency count. Examples include *sentence*, *statement*, *question*, *word*, *short answer*, *time expressions*, *structure*, *construction*, and *grammar*. More specific terms, however, were counted (e.g., *phrase*, *clause*, *emphasizing structures*, *link words*, or *conditional sentences*). There were also some terms that did not exclusively belong to the area of grammar but could be considered as grammatical terminology as well (e.g., *collocation* or *textual cohesion*). Such terms were also excluded from our search.

As the rather qualitative part of the study, a few informal interviews were run with a number of branch managers, supervisors, and experienced teachers of the target institute. In the case of more straightforward questions, a few more teachers were contacted via e-mail to increase the reliability of the collected responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Headway, the oldest of the three textbooks, with 108 pages includes 450 grammatical terms. *True to Life*, which was written after *Headway*, has 133 pages but only 358 grammatical terms. Finally, *Total English*, the most recent of the three, incorporates a total of 805 grammatical terms in 140 pages. A summary of the results with the average number of terms per page appears in the following table:

Table 1:
The number of grammatical terms in three EFL textbooks

	Pages	Grammatical Terms	Terms per Page	Publication Year
Headway	108	450	**4.16**	1987
True to Life	133	358	**2.69**	1998
Total English	140	805	**5.75**	2006

As mentioned earlier, the use of metalanguage is one of the evident features of most types of formal grammar instruction, and one can, at least roughly, assess the degree of importance a textbook puts on grammar instruction by surveying the amount of metalanguage used in that textbook.

Accordingly, it can be claimed that the results obtained here support our pre-assumption that after a long period of rather heavy reliance on grammar teaching (*Headway* being one of the last descendants of that period), we see that grammar tends to be deemphasized in many EFL materials (e.g., *True to Life*), which is then followed by a revival of interest in teaching it (*Total English* serving as the prototype), although the methods and techniques through which grammar is taught might be different from the old tradition.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) came to vogue in the 1970s and established itself as a consequential approach in the field by the end of that decade (McDonough & Shaw, 2003), so we would expect to see serious commercial materials written based on this approach gradually come out in the 1980s. *Headway* - published in 1987 - was thus influenced by CLT too, but, apparently, it still retained much of the robust grammatical heritage of older times, as it was not far from those grammar-heavy days yet. Published almost a decade later (1998), *True to Life*, as the name itself also suggests authenticity and other similar principles of CLT, is, or at least attemps to be, more of a CLT-like textbook by emphasizing learning through communication rather than through formal grammar instruction –why in practice it still includes a considerable quantity of formal grammar is what will be discussed later in the paper. Finally, *Total English* (2006) gets past much of the earlier enthusiasm and passion that CLT had generated among its fervent proponents and reflects the later research findings pointing to the need to teach more grammar.

The importance attached to grammar instruction is, of course, traceable not only in the number of grammatical terms used per page, but also in the manner metalanguage has been presented. While *Headway* and *True to Life* share the commonplace way of presenting a "Language Reference" section as a guide at the end of the book, *Total English* boldly incorporates this section into its units, signaling that "Language Reference" is an integral, rather than subsidiary, part of each unit. The "Reference" part in *Total English* quite often takes almost a whole page of a unit, and this is aside from another fixed part on formal grammar instruction in each unit, titled "Active grammar" in which much metalanguage appears too. Thus, while the other two textbooks treat formal grammar instruction only once in each unit, *Total English* prefers to do it twice, which is basically why we came up with a higher number of grammatical terms in this textbook. It should be noted that by "formal grammar instruction," we mean engagement in some sort of metalanguage either through explicit terminology or implicit explanation, rather than inserting any kind of focus on grammar such as grammar practice.

The other noticeable difference in the manner of metalanguage presentation in the three surveyed textbooks concerns the degree of explicitness in formal grammar instruction. To begin with the least grammar-oriented

33

textbook, *True to Life*, we see that grammatical explanation is only subtly included in exercise instructions (and not in separate or easily noticeable charts, boxes, etc). In order to illustrate the point, we take the passive voice as an example because, as Mulroy (2003) states, it is one of the most popular grammatical terms that many teachers, even those avoiding grammatical terminology in general, use. Explanation of the passive voice is embedded in the instruction of exercise 5 in this book (Grains & Redman, 1998, p. 111):

5 Check the passive constructions you underlined with a partner and then with your teacher.

When we use a passive construction, the 'agent' (the person or thing that does or causes the action) is often not mentioned. There are several possible reasons for this:

a. We **don't know** who or what the agent is.

b. We **know** who or what the agent is, but we don't need to state it, either because the agent is obvious or because the agent is less important than the action.

Can you name the agent in the passive examples in brackets in the text?

While *True to Life* chooses to somehow *hide* its grammar explanation in an exercise, *Headway* dedicates a separate section entitled "Active and Passive" to that, being more indicative that a grammar point is going to be discussed:

2 Active and Passive

English has *active and passive voices*.

a. *Maria speaks several languages.*
b. *English is spoken all over the world.*

In (a.) the agent, Maria, is the *subject*.
In (b.) the agent is not given.
Passive sentences are less frequent in spoken English, but they are very common in scientific and official writing.

Finally, *Total English* takes the point to the extremes by encompassing its grammatical explanation in an outstanding box and including it once more in the unit in more depth (The second part is not brought here because of space limitations):

Grammar | passives
 [...]

34

Active grammar

1 a *The dress was bought for $61,000.*
   b *Someone bought the dress for $61,000.*
2 a *The dress was bought by the American, Robert Earl, co-founder of Planet Hollywood.*
   b *The American, Robert Earl, co-founder of Planet Hollywood, bought the dress.*

Meaning

Use the passive when you want:

A   to talk about actions, events and processes when who or what causes the action, event or process is unknown or unimportant. This is often the case in writing (or more formal speech)

B   to put new information or longer expressions later in the sentence

Form

verb *to be* + past participle

Another point concerning the manner of metalanguage presentation in *True to Life* is the less formal language that it adopts in explaining grammar. For example, as can be seen in the section taken from this book on the passive voice, contractions are used ("don't know" or "don't need to") or, less sensibly, the relative pronoun *that* is omitted in a defining adjective clause ("... constructions you underlined ..."). It seems as if *True to Life* does not tend to take grammar instruction that seriously, at least in comparison to the other two textbooks reviewed!

In addition to the amount of metalanguage and the manner of its presentation, the depth and detailedness of the presented metalanguage is also of significance. Going with the same passive examples above, we can see how *Total English* overtakes the other two textbooks in the depth of insight it provides about the passive construction. As well as talking about when (i.e. when the agent is unknown or unimportant) and where (i.e. in writing or more formal speech) the passive is used, it points out a delicate usage/stylistic point ("to put new information or longer expressions later in the sentence") and also gives the formula for the passive form ("verb *to be* + past participle). The last two points are absent in both *True to life* and *Headway*.

There is also an interesting difference between *True to Life* and the other two textbooks in the "Course Overview" (or "Contents") section, which appears at the beginning of almost all commercial textbooks on the market. In "Course Overview" of *True to life*, there is no subsection named *grammar*. There is only a *language focus* part, which introduces grammar, vocabulary, and functions that are taught in each unit. In the other two books, however, the "Course Overview" section has a distinct part entitled *grammar*. It seems for *True to Life* grammar is not important enough to be introduced in a separate column or part.

Finally, the high opinion of *Total English* toward formal grammar instruction can be inferred by looking at the range of grammatical terms it covers. There are a number of terms used in *Total English* that do not appear in the other two textbooks at all. Among such terms are *relative pronoun, reflexive pronoun, mixed conditional, zero conditional, (non-)gradable adjectives, subject questions, narrative tenses*, and *intensifiers*. It should be noted that *True to Life* also uses very few terms that do not exist in the other two textbooks (such as *partitives* or *attitude adverbs*), but it is still not comparable to the terminological variation present in *Total English*.

While all the English teachers and supervisors interviewed described *True to Life* as "the most grammar-free textbook" that they have ever taught, as the results of the grammatical terminology count shows, there is still a considerable amount of metalanguage involved in this textbook (about 3 grammatical terms per page). It seems as if no matter how harshly some researchers of the field

have criticized formal grammar instruction at times, materials writers strongly tend to devote some sections to it when preparing materials for adult learners. The reasons for this fact might be quite varied, but some of the most important ones have been mentioned below.

One of the most important reasons for not writing totally grammar-free textbooks seems to be the learners' general tendency toward receiving some grammar instruction as well as being presented with grammatical terminology. For many, grammar still is an integral part of any language course. Evidence for this claim comes in Yousefpoori-Naeim (2011) in which EFL students' and their teachers' opinions about teaching grammar were elicited. One of the questionnaire items used in his study directly asks for the respondents' viewpoints on the helpfulness of presenting grammatical terminology in learning a foreign language. 81.5% of the students were reported to have positive views on the role of grammatical terminology (with only 5.5% feeling negatively about it). Teachers, probably more aware of the criticisms of grammar and its limitations, were still mostly in favor of teaching grammatical terminology (69.3 vs. 12%). As commercially produced materials, including the three textbooks surveyed in this study, are usually prepared based on careful scrutiny of their readers' wants and are thus market-led (Richards, 2001), it does not sound very plausible to have such textbooks void of any grammatical terminology/grammar.

Another reason for not excluding formal grammar from EFL textbooks lies in the very audience that they try to reach, i.e. learners of English as a foreign language. The distinguishing feature of all EFL contexts is that an environment in which English is naturally used is not readily accessible to learners (Brown, 2001), and so they need to resort to other means to compensate for the lack of sufficient exposure to natural language. This is where grammar comes into play. The need to incorporate grammar into EFL textbooks becomes more evident when we consider the fact that such textbooks are usually aimed at a vast and thus heterogeneous audience. Many EFL learners might not be able to spend any time on learning English outside the classroom, so they need to have a formal reference of grammar to which they can refer to resolve their problems and questions.

The last but certainly not the least reason concerns the audience of such textbooks again, namely adults. Adults, even in an English as a second language (ESL) context, might experience great difficulty picking up the language naturally, as they are well past their critical period. Even if they did, their language would be considerably poor in terms of accuracy (Singleton, 2005). Again formal grammar instruction seems to be what is needed in such a case.

36

CONCLUSION

A survey of metalanguage in three EFL textbooks taught in one of the main language institutes in Iran revealed that formal grammar instruction has gained a lot of strength in recent years, after witnessing a period of deemphasized grammar instruction. Although for many decades, or even centuries (Williams, 2005), grammar has almost always been regarded as an integral part of any language curriculum, with the advent of CLT, particularly its strong version, grammar came to be viewed as an obstacle in language learning, or at its best, as a waste of the precious classroom time, which could be instead spent on more meaning-focused activities. This negative attitude toward the role of grammar in language learning did not, however, last long, as the number of accurate language users was declining - an example being French immersion programs, which failed to yield satisfying results in this regard (Harley, 1992). The reflection of such a back-and-forth movement can also, with a little delay, be traced in EFL materials, as it normally takes time for research findings to find their ways into the commercial materials, which are usually very time-consuming to design, prepare, and distribute.

In our case, the above mentioned reflection is present, too. *Headway* (the oldest of the three textbooks surveyed in this study) was fairly filled with grammatical terms. *True to Life*, substituting *Headway* after almost a decade with less favoring attitudes toward grammar, made use of grammatical terminology more scarcely. Finally, *Total English*, the most recent of the three, shows a renewed and, of course, stronger interest in teaching grammar by incorporating a large body of metalanguage throughout its units. Taking a glance at the results obtained here, one might rightly reach the conclusion that it is rather unlikely for an EFL textbook to abandon grammar completely. The main reasons for this, discussed earlier in depth, are that learners still want to be taught grammar and that grammar is an essential tool, especially for adults, in an EFL context.

Although the primary aim of this study was to survey metalanguage in three EFL textbooks and to search for the compatibility of research findings with materials writing trends, the obtained results could have implications for teachers as well. For instance, it is probably not advisable to abandon formal grammar instruction (and also grammatical terminology as part of it) completely. The other implication could be for supervisors, managers, or even researchers. As the informal interviews with teachers in this study revealed, we can rely on their assessment of the textbooks that they teach. Therefore, instead of running a thorough analysis on a textbook, an easier informal (yet reliable) way could be to ask the teachers who teach it. A word of caution here is that more systematic studies, using more formal and planned interviews or

questionnaires, are needed to check if teachers are indeed accurate assessors of the textbooks that they teach.

To add to the external validity of the results found in this study, further studies might be conducted to go through similar procedures to investigate the role of metalanguage in the textbooks taught in other big institutes to see if they also reflect the trend of research traced in this study. It is essential to choose the sample from large institutes, which possess set policies and organized plans, because they expectedly make more informed decisions as to which textbooks to use in their curriculum. In other words, smaller institutes might not be very good candidates because the textbook selection process is not done very systematically or based on serious inquiries in such institutes. Another point worth mentioning is that language institutes in Iran, particularly in Tehran, might be quicker than the ones located in smaller cities in adopting the latest commercial materials, so while we expect to see the same order of changes in textbook adoption in smaller towns, the time each change takes place might be different in these two contexts.

38

References

Acklam, R., & Crace, A. (2006). *Total English: Upper-Intermediate*. Essex: Pearson Education.

Alderson, J.C., Clapham, C., & Steel, D. (1997). Metalinguistic knowledge, language aptitude and language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research, 1*(2), 93–121.

Andrews, S. (2006). The evolution of teachers' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, *15(1)*, 1–19.

Berry, R. (1997). Teachers' awareness of learners' knowledge: The case of metalinguistic terminology. *Language Awareness, 6*(2&3), 136–146.

Berry, R. (2001). Hong Kong English teachers' attitudes towards the use of metalinguistic terminology. *Asia Pacific Journal of Language in Education, 4*(1), 101–121.

Berry, R. (2005). Making the most of metalanguage. *Language Awareness*, *14*(1), 3-20.

Berry, R. (2008). Talking terms: Choosing and using terminology for EFL classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, *1*(1), 19-24.

Berry, R. (2009). EFL majors' knowledge of metalinguistic terminology: a comparative study. *Language Awareness*, *18*,(2) 113-128.

Borg, S. (1999). The use of grammatical terminology in second language classroom: a qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics, 20(1)*, 95-126.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: a literature review. *Language Awareness*, *12*(2), 96–108.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles*: *An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. (Second edition). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Carter, R. (2003). Key concepts in ELT: Language awareness. *ELT Journal, 57(1)*, 64–65.

Dikici, I. Z. (2012). Pre-service English teachers' beliefs towards and its teaching at two Turkish universities. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *1*(2), 206-218.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1998). *True to life: Upper-Intermediate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harley, B. (1992). Patterns of second language development in French immersion. *Journal of French Language Studies, 2*(2), 159-183.

Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 251-266). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. (Second edition).Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mohammed, A. M. (1996). Informal pedagogical grammar. *IRAL, 34*(4), 284-291.

Mulroy, D. (2003). *The war against grammar*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Myhill, D. A., Jones, S. M., Lines, H., & Watson, A. (2012). Re-thinking grammar: The impact of embedded grammar teaching on students' writing and students' metalinguistic understanding. *Research Papers in Education*, *27(2)*, 139-166.

Renou, J. (2001). An examination of the relationship between metalinguistic awareness and second-language proficiency of adult learners of French. *Language Awareness, 10(4)*, 248–267.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singleton, D. (2005). The critical period hypothesis: A coat of many colors. *IRAL*, *43*(4), 269-285.

Soars, J., & Soars, L. (1987). *Headway: Upper-Intermediate*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tsang, W. L. (2011). English metalanguage awareness among primary school teachers in Hong Kong. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 11*(1),1-16.

Ur, P. (2011). Grammar teaching: research, theory, and practice. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 507-522). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Williams, S. D. (2005). *The teacher's grammar book*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Yousefpoori-Naeim, M. (2011). *Comparing teachers' views on the role of grammar and error correction in language teaching with those of their students* (unpublished Master's thesis). Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran.

39

İran'da Üç İngilizce Dil Öğretim Ders Kitabının Metalinguistik Analizi

Doç. Dr. Sasan Baleghizadeh
Shahid Beheshti Üniversitesi-İran
sasanbaleghizadeh@yahoo.com

Dokt.Öğr. Mehrdad Yousefpoori-Naeim
Shahid Beheshti Üniversitesi-İran
m_yousefpoori@sbu.ac.ir

Genişletilmiş Özet

Amaç: Bu çalışma İran'da yaygın olarak kullanılan üç İngilizce ders kitabındaki dilin niteliği ve niceliğini bu kitapların ilgili güncele uygunluğu bakımından araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Yöntem: 1996'dan bu yana, İran'daki önemli kurumlardan birisinde "orta üstü seviyede" ana ders kitabı olarak okutulan üç İngiltere kaynaklı dil öğretim kitabı serisi seçildi. Araştırmanın nicel boyutu olarak, kullanım aralığında yer alan tüm dilbilgisi terimleri dikkate alınarak her üç kitaptaki sayfa başına ortalama terim sayısı hesaplandı ve karşılaştırıldı. Araştırmanın nitel bölümünde dil bilgisi yanı sıra terimler de daha detaylı incelendi. Ayrıca bazı deneyimli öğretmenlerle ve kurum görevlileriyle informal görüşmeler yapıldı.

Bulgular: Araştırmanın bulgularına göre, alanyazın araştırmalarının ortaya koyduğu beklentiler doğrultusunda, piyasadaki en yeni kitap olan Total English, terimlerin çoğunu piyasada en eski kitap olan Headway ile aynı şekilde öğretmektedir. Üçüncü kitap olan "True to Life" ise terim çeşitliliği bakımından bu iki kitaptan sonra gelmektedir. Bu durum konuyla ilgili yapılan araştırmalarla kitaplarda kullanılan dil arasında bir uyum olduğunu gösteriyor. Uzun bir dönem gramer öğretimine verilen ağırlıktan sonra (Headway bu konuda iyi bir örnek) "True to Life" kitabında gramerin daha az vurgulandığı görüldü ama "Total English" ile yeniden bu alana ilgi canlandı. Bu çalışmanın nitel sonuçları nicel sonuçlarını doğrulamıştır. "Total English" kitabının dil konusunu daha ciddi ele aldığı ortaya çıktı. Örneğin etkinliklerle ilgili yapılan açıklamalarda ve ünite içerisindeki geçişlerde metalinguistik komutların kullanıldığı görüldü.

Sonuçlar: Kapsam bakımından sınırlı da olsa, kitapların temel alandaki araştırma bulguları ile öğrenciler için geliştirilmiş materyaller arasında bir ilişki olduğunu gösteriyor. Ancak kitap yazarlarının alanyazın bulgularını yeni materyallerin hazırlanmasında kullanmaları zaman alacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: İngilizce ders kitapları, Resmi dil bilgisi öğretimi, Gramer terminolojisi, Metalinguistik

40