

ATTITUDES TOWARDS GRAMMAR TEACHING METHODS USING A WIHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Jasmina Mirtoska¹

Received 19.03.2025.

Revised 11.05.2025.

Accepted 05.06.2025.

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Attitudes, traditional teaching method, LdL method, five-stage method, WIHIC questionnaire.

Original research



This study is an investigation of university students' attitudes towards three teaching methods (traditional, LdL [learning thought teaching] and a five-stage method by Willis, 2003). The study elaborates on the design, practices, advantages and disadvantages of the three methods, followed by an explanation of the aims and applicability of a WIHIC (What Is Happening In This Class?) questionnaire for testing participants' views of the respective instructional method. The experiment was conducted with undergraduate students (N=77) majoring in English Language and Literature at the South East European University (SEEU), Tetovo, North Macedonia. The WIHIC questionnaire was administered upon completion of a 15-week training period during which the students were taught the English tense-aspect system in the above mentioned three teaching methods. The results were unanticipated to some extent and did not meet all of the expectations previously set concerning the students' preferences of the three instructional settings. (This paper is a part of my PhD dissertation "The Effects of Teaching Methodology on the Acquisition, Retention and Integration of Tense Forms into Spontaneous Speech" completed in 2017 at the Department of English and Center for Teacher Education, University of Vienna, Austria.)

© 2026 SPECTRUM Journal of Social Sciences

1. INTRODUCTION

The literature on teaching English as a second or foreign language offers a variety of methods which have been tested for effectiveness in various settings. One method that has been researched and applied the most in previous research is the so-called *traditional method*. This method has been used in instructional settings longer than any other method but also it has been heavily criticized as a didactic method. A method which has been favored by a considerable number of researchers is the LdL or so-called *teaching though learning* method. Finally, a third method, which has not been empirically tested, is the one suggested by Willis (2003), which is called *five-stage*

method. All three methods have been pre- and post-tested for effectiveness and fostering integration of tense forms into speech in my dissertation, while in this study the main focus is on the students' attitudes towards the different teaching methods.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review section elaborates on the procedure, benefits and shortcomings of all three teaching methods as well as previous empirical application of the methods. This section also defines the WIHIC questionnaire and its applications.

¹ Corresponding author: Jasmina Mirtoska
Email: jmirtoska@mail.com

2.1 The traditional method

The traditional instructional method assumes that successful language learning consists of generating sentences based on previous explicitly presented rules by the teacher (Willis, 2003). The instructional elements that the traditional method includes are deductive learning, error correction, intolerance for mistakes, drills, memorization, translation and frontal teacher centered approach, among others. When traditional instructional method is used for teaching the English tense-aspect system it guides the teacher to start with the *present simple* tense and not proceed to the next tense unless the previous one has been understood (Willis, 2003).

The traditional method as the oldest method of instruction has some advantages and disadvantages. For instance, Willis (2003) and Boumová (2008) outline a few benefits of the traditional instructional method which explain why it prevails. Willis (2003) regards the traditional method (when used for tense-aspect teaching) convenient and forthright which is why it has been favored by both instructors and students. Boumová (2008) adds that this teaching method is time efficient, has the benefit of a routine and fixed sets of activities in the classroom, which give a sense of consistency to both the teacher and the students.

Nonetheless, despite the long tradition and convenience of the traditional method, numerous shortcomings have been pointed out by previous research such as the limited communication element, poor student-student interaction, insufficient inductive approaches, and little or complete absence of grammar or language discovering opportunities in different contexts. Serbessa, (2006, p. 129) labels this teaching method as “chalk and talk” which is also similarly named by Boumová (2008, p. 11) namely, as a “jug and mug” teaching method. This in other words means that the students are served the grammatical forms, definitions and rules and are expected to memorize these and produce accurate sentences accordingly.

Larsen-Freeman (2000, p. 23) criticize the traditional teaching method as it fails to equip the learners with skill for application of the knowledge used in class into the outside world. Others focus on the shortcoming of the point of view of the method itself. For instance, Serbessa (2006, p. 130) claim that lifelong learning skills cannot be achieved if the student is not in the center of the class. Similarly, Pfeiffer and Rusam (1992:426) stress that specifically teaching a foreign language should not be done in a teacher-centered environment due to the fact that the traditional method does not provide opportunities for exploration of the language carried out by the students. Khalid and Azeem (2012) tackle another shortcoming of the traditional method with is the inability to meet the students' needs. In addition, Weaver et al. (2001, p. 18), as well as, Schwerdt and Wuppermann (2011, p. 1) add that “teaching traditional grammar in isolation is not a very practical art”, as well as, “lectures fail to provide instructors with feedback about student learning and rest on the presumption that all students

learn at the same pace” which can only set out some if not all of the learners for failure.

All in all, the criticism of the traditional teaching method can be classified into categories which tackle the nature of the method, its teacher-centeredness, the presentation of tense forms in isolation, and the little success in meeting students' needs.

2.2 The five-stage method

The five-stage instructional method, as the name reveals, consists of the five-stages: *Improvisation, Recognition, System Building, Exploration* and *Consolidation*. Willis (2003) points out that this instruction method is beneficial since it allows errors in the initial stages and combines inductive and deductive approaches in the later stages. Additionally, it is advantageous for teaching the English tense-aspect system since tense forms are presented all at once just like in real life.

The different stages have different purposes and different approaches. For instance, while in the first stage, Improvisation, the learners improvise with the subject matter, in the second stage, Recognition, the focus on the form fostering recognition of rules and functions of a given grammatical unit. Moreover, System Building, which is the third stage, inductively provides the students with the prescriptive grammatical rules for clarification purposes (in case these have not been deduced in the previous stages). In the fourth stage, Exploration, the focus in on discovering the subject matter in different contexts, whereas, in the final stage, Consolidation, the aim is integration of for example tense forms into speech through interactive activities.

All in all, the five-stage instructional method permits errors in the initial stage, includes deductive and inductive reasoning, as well as, explicit and implicit teaching, with a communicative element. Moreover, this teaching method integrates the best features of teaching approaches and previous teaching methods into one single method which takes the students' needs, learning styles and knowledge processing steps into consideration, as well as, the natural stages of language acquisition, which as a result, leads to life-long learning skills.

Hence, the combination of various teaching and learning processes and practices doubtlessly indicates that this method is indeed promising and could potentially be favored by both teachers and students.

Nonetheless, since the success of a teaching method depends on many factors, the five-stage method poses some potential concerns. For instance, the stage of Improvisation, which allows mistakes, could possibly affect the learning process, since there is no feedback from the teacher, while in the stage of Recognition there is no guarantee that all the learners will recognize the form of a given grammatical unit. Among other concerns are, the exposure of all tenses at once, which might lead to confusion. Lastly, the integration of grammatical forms into speech in the last stage, as a goal could be challenging to achieve during a limited number of teaching sessions.

2.3 Learning through teaching (LDL)

Learning through teaching as the name suggests is when the learners organize mini teaching sessions for their peers. Jean-Paul Martin created the LdL method inspired by the Communicative approach in order to enable the student-teacher to (Martin, 2002):

“acquire creativity, independence, self-confidence and key competencies, such as the ability to work in teams, the ability to communicate, complex thinking, the competence to seek and find information, explorative behavior, presentation skills, project competence, Internet skills, the ability to structure information and generate knowledge, punctuality, reliability and patience”. (Grzega & Schoner, 2008, p. 169).

Martin (2000), Grzega (2006) and Grzega and Schoner (2008) explain that learning through teaching or in German *Lernen durch Lehren* (LdL), should not be mistaken for a presentation in class on a given topic, but rather a teaching session organized by the student with the teacher's guidance, for which the preparation stages include decision and organization of materials similar to the one of an actual teacher. In addition, Zhao et al. (2012) see the learning through teaching method as a distinctive instructional practice since more learning takes place while teaching due to the fact that the student-teacher is immersed in the instruction process.

In other words, learning a new material with the purpose to teach it to peers is more effective in terms of comprehension and retention than listening to a lecture carried out by the teacher. Hence, the main aim of the LdL instructional method is to encourage the students to learn for teaching purposes rather than solely for understanding purposes. This again enables the student-teacher to dig deeper and to make decisions about delivering the newly gained knowledge to the peers.

Empirically, Pfeiffer and Rusam (1992:425) employed LdL in one of their university courses with the following results: a relaxed atmosphere and higher motivation.

Despite the advantages of this method there are some concerns that can be raised about this method including: the control over coverage of enough material in the classroom; the effectiveness and the competence of the student teacher who has just acquired a new grammatical matter and the ability to convey this to the peers.

2.4 WIHIC questionnaire

The WIHIC (*What is Happening in this Class?*) questionnaire is a survey which has 7 scales among which: *Student Cohesiveness, Teacher Support, Involvement, Task Orientation, Investigation, Cooperation, and Equity*. Moreover, for the sake of the effectiveness of the questionnaire two to three dozens of participant are preferred who will evaluate the items in the survey using a five-point Likert scale with the options: Almost Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Often and Almost Always (Khine, 2001). Dorman et al. (2006, p. 909) point out the applicability of the questionnaire to different classrooms and settings, which is what has been

done in the current study Khine and Fisher (2001), Khine (2001), Dorman et al. (2006) among others, indicate that the questionnaire provides information, as well as, beyond teaching insight, such as: social and background elements..

In previous studies the WIHIC questionnaire has been used independently or has been paired with other questionnaires testing perspectives or changes of perspectives depending on the different factors. Dorman et al. (2006) combined the WIHIC questionnaire with a TROFLEI (Technology-Rich Outcomes-Focused Learning Environment Inventory); Hoang (2008) combined it with a Test of Mathematics-Related Attitude (TOMRA), while Roberge et al. (2011) used it in combination with VARK which is a visual, aural, read/write, kinesthetic inventory. Moreover, the tests that have been used to determine the students' attitudes and preferences are ANOVA and MANOVA (Aldridge et al.; 2009) as well as a frequency analyses.

3. METHODOLOGY

The participants in this questionnaire were students majoring in English Language and Literature at the South East European University in Tetovo, North Macedonia from the year 2011-2012. The questionnaire was taken by the participants, upon the completion of the 15 week English tense-aspect system training period. The number of participants in each group instructed in a different teaching method was namely 24 for LdL, 25 for traditional and 28 for the five-stage method. The adapted WIHIC questionnaire used in the current study included all of the original 7 scales namely: *Student Cohesiveness, Teacher Support, Involvement, Task Orientation, Investigation, Cooperation, and Equity*, with 7 items each. Furthermore, the focus of the items in the scales was on the teaching practices in each teaching method in order to elicit the students' perspectives and preferences. In addition, the scales included statements concerning didactic choices highlighting the differences of the three teaching methods.

4. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

For the analysis of the students' perspectives, a Tukey test in one-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) was used, as well as a frequency analysis test which provided more in-depth and a one to one comparison of scales and individual items in the scales among all three groups. Additionally, the items were rated with the options 'almost never' with 1 point, whereas the 'almost always' option had 5 points. Table 1 illustrates the means and the standard deviations and whether the differences are statistically significant among the three groups.

Scale		Student Cohesiveness	Teacher Support	Involvement	Investigation	Task Orientation	Cooperation	Equity	N
Mean	LdL*	25.25	27.25	26.71	25.92	26.71	26.00	28.50	24
	Trad.**	24.00	25.80	25.48	24.60	25.88	25.32	29.40	25
	Five-Stage	24.93	27.04	25.54	25.18	28.04	24.96	29.64	28
Standard Deviation	LdL*	3.904	3.554	4.438	3.374	2.851	4.212	4.364	
	Trad.**	3.719	4.000	4.194	4.848	3.898	6.149	4.518	
	Five-Stage	3.887	2.728	4.150	3.662	2.861	3.564	2.857	
F		.710	1.296	.657	.664	3.016	.315	.588	
Sig.		.495	.280	.522	.518	.055	.731	.558	

Table 1. ANOVA Mean and Standard Deviation for Seven WIHIC Scales for all three groups (from my dissertation)

*LdL stands for Lernen durch Lehren (Learning through Teaching)

**Trad. stands for traditional

Statistical significance in preference was not evident in the survey, with the exception of the Task Orientation scale where the alpha level of $p < .05$ was marginally significant for all three groups. This means that the students instructed in different methods had different opinions about their involvement in tasks and hence expressed different attitudes towards the items in this scale. More in-depth insight is provided with the frequency analysis where each item in all seven scales will be compared for all three groups (see Tables 3, 4, 5). The fact that the values for the standard deviation are higher than 1 in the scales: Student Cohesiveness, Teacher Support, Investigation, Task Orientation, Cooperation and Equity, except the Involvement scale, indicates that the students had slightly different perceptions about the items in these particular scales. Specifically, the perceptions of the LdL and the five-stage groups for Student Cohesiveness scale are very similar since the means are as follows: LdL 25.25 and five-stage group 24.93, which suggests that they saw similar presence of cooperation and interaction while being taught in these two methods. The degree of collaboration in the traditional group was perceived to be less present or evident, since it was rated with a mean of 24. For the second stage, namely the Teacher Support scales, the ratings of the groups are as follows: LdL > five-stage > traditional, with a mean of $27.25 > 27.04 > 25.80$, respectively. These ratings were to be expected since there was more collaboration between the teacher and the student in the LdL method due to the nature of the teaching method, while in the traditional one the teacher student interaction is less present since the students were addressed collectively rather than as individuals with individual needs.

The third scale, Involvement, produced results which were alike for all three groups. In fact that ratings were slightly higher for some groups than others, namely, LdL > five-stage group > traditional which was a very predictable result since out of all the teaching methods,

the LdL method encouraged and required the most involvement in the teaching and learning process.

The forth scale of Investigation also received the most positive results from the LdL group followed by the five-stage group and lastly the traditional group with the following means: $25.92 > 25.18 > 24.60$. Here it needs to be mentioned that the traditional group had the highest standard deviation (4.848), which means that there has been much variety in answers within the group indicating that some of the participants in this group had the view that they had been involved in investigating the grammatical rules, while others did not perceive the teaching method as such. It follows that, since the method itself did not encourage investigation, the initiative of investigating grammatical rules must have been taken of the students' part rather than initiated by the method or the teacher.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Student Cohesiveness	Between Groups	20.916	2	10.458	.710	.495
	Within Groups	1.090.357	74	14.735		
	Total	1.111.273	76			
Teacher Support	Between Groups	30.666	2	15.333	1.296	.280
	Within Groups	875.464	74	11.831		
	Total	906.130	76			
Involvement	Between Groups	23.785	2	11.893	.657	.522
	Within Groups	1.340.163	74	18.110		
	Total	1.363.948	76			
Investigation	Between Groups	21.306	2	10.653	.664	.518
	Within Groups	1.187.940	74	16.053		
	Total	1.209.247	76			
Task Orientation	Between Groups	62.970	2	31.485	3.016	.055
	Within Groups	772.563	74	10.440		
	Total	835.532	76			
Cooperation	Between Groups	14.115	2	7.058	.315	.731
	Within Groups	1.658.404	74	22.411		
	Total	1.672.519	76			
Equity	Between Groups	18.247	2	9.123	.588	.558
	Within Groups	1.148.429	74	15.519		
	Total	1.166.675	76			

Table 2. ANOVA test for the WIHIC scales for all three groups, (taken from my dissertation)

The means for the fifth scale Task Orientation varied in terms of perceptions, namely five-stage>LdL>traditional with the following means: 28.04>26.71>25.88. Due to the nature of the five-stage method which had the highest variety of learning processes and tasks, the results are reasonable and predictable, while on the other hand, the traditional group provided tasks that were production oriented and lacked the communication or interaction element. Precisely, the difference of the perceptions among the three groups can be seen in Table 2, which indicates that the differences are marginally statistically significant because of the alpha value which is $p>.055$.

The sixth scale of Cooperation was mostly favored by the LdL group with a mean of 26.00 followed by the traditional group with a mean of 25.32, while the perceptions of the five-stage group produced a mean of 24.96. While in the LdL teaching method cooperation was fostered and therefore the students felt more comfortable to cooperate with a student-teacher than with the actual teacher, it is surprising, on the other hand, that the five-stage methods' participants would generate the lowest ratings.

These perceptions could have been caused by the variety of the activities which were designed to tackle the students' individual needs which could have created an atmosphere where the students were more engaged with the tasks than with their peers.

Additionally, another reason for this could be the fact that not all participants liked all five stages of the five-stage method. This could have led to the impression that the tasks they favored less did not enable them to cooperate with their peers.

Finally, the seventh scale of Equity, shows these results: five-stage>traditional>LdL with the following means for each group respectively: 29.64>29.40> 28.50. These results can be explained with the fact that, the students in the five-stage method, received a similar amount of student attention and assistance of the teacher's side, while the same elements similarly lacked for all students equally in the traditional teaching method. Finally, this attention of the teacher was the least evident in the LdL groups since the class was taught by the peers who approached the features of equity in different ways.

Since the fifth scale Task Orientation was the only scale that produced marginally statistically significant outcomes among the three groups where the alpha level was $p>.055$, there is a need to dig deeper and evaluate each item separately in order to gain more insight into the perceptions of the participants for all three groups. This will be achieved with a detailed frequency analysis elaborated here for each scale focusing on the most focal items of each scale. Since frequency analysis of individual items of the WIHIC questionnaire provides more specific insight into the attitudes of the students among the three groups as well as within a certain group, this facilitates drawing conclusions about their perceptions of the methods. In fact, the items that carry most importance and value are discussed for each scale in the following lines. Even though the ANOVA test

didn't show statistical significance for the scale called Student Cohesiveness, the frequency analysis indicated that for item 4, regarding 'peer correction' (see appendix), over 45.8 % of the participants in the LdL group chose the 'sometimes' option while in the traditional group 47 % chose the options 'almost never' and 'seldom'. This is only logical since the first method's aim was to encourage peer correction while this practice was not fostered in the traditional method.

Traditional WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%)					
Item	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
Item 1	0	11.8	23.5	58.8	5.9
Item 2	0	5.9	64.7	23.5	5.9
Item 3	0	11.8	52.9	29.4	5.9
Item 4	23.5	23.5	23.5	17.6	11.8
Item 5	0	11.8	29.4	35.3	23.5
Item 6	0	23.5	23.5	47.1	5.9
Item 7	0	5.9	17.6	29.4	47.1
Item 8	0	0	17.6	17.6	64.7
Item 9	0	5.9	0	58.8	35.3
Item 10	0	0	11.8	47.1	41.2
Item 11	0	0	5.9	29.4	64.7
Item 12	11.8	64.7	0	11.8	11.8
Item 13	0	0	5.9	23.5	70.6
Item 14	17.6	29.4	52.9	0	0
Item 15	0	0	17.6	29.4	52.9
Item 16	0	5.9	5.9	35.3	52.9
Item 17	5.9	5.9	47.1	35.3	5.9
Item 18	5.9	0	17.6	47.1	29.4
Item 19	17.6	23.5	47.1	5.9	5.9
Item 20	0	0	41.2	29.4	29.4
Item 21	0	23.5	17.6	41.2	17.6
Item 22	11.8	5.9	29.4	52.9	0
Item 23	11.8	5.9	35.3	29.4	17.6
Item 24	5.9	0	11.8	29.4	52.9
Item 25	0	5.9	17.6	29.4	47.1
Item 26	11.8	5.9	64.7	11.8	5.9
Item 27	0	11.8	0	52.9	35.3
Item 28	0	0	5.9	17.6	76.5
Item 29	0	0	5.9	47.1	47.1
Item 30	0	5.9	29.4	52.9	11.8
Item 31	0	5.9	17.6	29.4	47.1
Item 32	11.8	47.1	23.5	11.8	5.9
Item 33	5.9	11.8	52.9	17.6	11.8
Item 34	0	11.8	23.5	17.6	47.1
Item 35	11.8	5.9	11.8	35.3	35.3
Item 36	11.8	5.9	23.5	17.6	41.2
Item 37	5.9	17.6	11.8	11.8	52.9
Item 38	0	17.6	23.5	35.3	23.5
Item 39	0	5.9	11.8	29.4	52.9
Item 40	11.8	47.1	23.5	11.8	5.9
Item 41	5.9	11.8	52.9	17.6	11.8
Item 42	0	11.8	23.5	17.6	47.1
Item 43	0	0	5.9	17.6	76.5
Item 44	5.9	0	0	5.9	88.2
Item 45	0	0	0	11.8	88.2
Item 46	5.9	0	11.8	5.9	76.5
Item 47	0	0	5.9	17.6	76.5
Item 48	5.9	0	0	5.9	88.2
Item 49	0	0	0	11.8	88.2

Table 3. Traditional WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%) (taken from my dissertation)

In the Teacher Support scale Item 9 regarding the 'presence of the practice improvisation with tenses'

produced the following results: five-stage group 66.7% ‘almost always’; LdL group 62.5% ‘almost always’; traditional group ‘often’ 58%. These results only mirror the teaching method where improvising with tenses was one of the actual stages in the method so it was to be expected that they would rate this item like such.

LdL WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%)

Item	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
Item 1	0	8.3	25	29.2	37.5
Item 2	0	12.5	45.8	25	16.7
Item 3	4.2	8.3	33.3	45.8	8.3
Item 4	8.3	4.2	45.8	25	16.7
Item 5	4.2	4.2	37.5	41.7	12.5
Item 6	0	16.7	45.8	25	12.5
Item 7	0	0	12.5	29.2	58.3
Item 8	0	4.2	4.2	33.3	58.3
Item 9	0	0	8.3	29.2	62.5
Item 10	0	0	16.7	20.8	62.5
Item 11	4.2	0	20.8	20.8	54.2
Item 12	54.2	4.2	25	0	16.7
Item 13	0	4.2	37.5	12.5	45.8
Item 14	0	12.5	20.8	45.8	20.8
Item 15	0	0	20.8	25	54.2
Item 16	0	0	16.7	45.8	37.5
Item 17	8.3	4.2	29.2	45.8	12.5
Item 18	4.2	8.3	37.5	33.3	16.7
Item 19	20.8	8.3	29.2	25	16.7
Item 20	0	4.2	8.3	20.8	66.7
Item 21	4.2	8.3	12.5	29.2	45.8
Item 22	0	8.3	45.8	33.3	12.5
Item 23	0	12.5	37.5	20.8	29.2
Item 24	0	0	12.5	29.2	58.3
Item 25	0	0	12.5	25	62.5
Item 26	4.2	8.3	41.7	25	20.8
Item 27	0	8.3	45.8	33.3	12.5
Item 28	0	12.5	37.5	20.8	29.2
Item 29	0	4.2	12.5	33.3	50
Item 30	0	0	4.2	29.2	66.7
Item 31	4.2	0	8.3	16.7	70.8
Item 32	4.2	16.7	12.5	50	16.7
Item 33	4.2	12.5	25	45.8	16.7
Item 34	41.7	16.7	29.2	12.5	0
Item 35	0	12.5	25	20.8	41.7
Item 36	4.2	12.5	16.7	37.5	29.2
Item 37	4.2	4.2	12.5	37.5	41.7
Item 38	4.2	0	20.8	54.2	20.8
Item 39	4.2	4.2	16.7	41.7	33.3
Item 40	4.2	16.7	41.7	16.7	20.8
Item 41	0	12.5	25	20.8	41.7
Item 42	4.2	12.5	16.7	37.5	29.2
Item 43	4.2	4.2	20.8	33.3	37.5
Item 44	0	0	12.5	16.7	70.8
Item 45	4.2	8.3	8.3	8.3	70.8
Item 46	0	4.2	8.3	25	62.5
Item 47	4.2	4.2	20.8	33.3	37.5
Item 48	0	0	12.5	16.7	70.8
Item 49	4.2	8.3	8.3	8.3	70.8

Table 4. LdL WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%) (taken from my dissertation)

In the Involvement scale, for item 15, all three groups with more than 50%, acknowledged their improved knowledge of tenses regardless of the method they were taught in. This was also evident in the dissertation itself

where the results of the pre- and post-tests both spoken and written showed significant statistical improvement during the training period for all three groups.

Item 21 was investigating the students’ perceptions on the importance and effectiveness of student presentations or teaching sessions on grammar topics.

The LdL group was the one that saw most benefit in this practice since this practice was part of the LdL method, therefore, 45.8% of them rated it with ‘almost always’.

Five-Stage WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%)

Item	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always
Item 1	3.7	7.4	37	40.7	11.1
Item 2	3.7	11.1	44.4	25.9	14.8
Item 3	7.4	18.5	48.1	18.5	7.4
Item 4	7.4	14.8	40.7	29.6	7.4
Item 5	3.7	3.7	25.9	37	29.6
Item 6	0	7.4	33.3	33.3	25.9
Item 7	3.7	3.7	11.1	25.9	55.6
Item 8	0	0	7.4	25.9	66.7
Item 9	3.7	3.7	7.4	18.5	66.7
Item 10	0	0	3.7	33.3	63
Item 11	0	3.7	11.1	33.3	51.9
Item 12	29.6	22.2	22.2	14.8	11.1
Item 13	3.7	0	14.8	22.2	59.3
Item 14	22.2	37	25.9	11.1	3.7
Item 15	0	0	18.5	29.6	51.9
Item 16	3.7	7.4	22.2	18.5	48.1
Item 17	3.7	3.7	48.1	29.6	14.8
Item 18	7.4	7.4	22.2	44.4	18.5
Item 19	11.1	11.1	40.7	14.8	22.2
Item 20	7.4	0	14.8	44.4	33.3
Item 21	3.7	18.5	48.1	22.2	7.4
Item 22	3.7	11.1	29.6	25.9	29.6
Item 23	3.7	11.1	37	33.3	14.8
Item 24	3.7	0	7.4	40.7	48.1
Item 25	0	3.7	14.8	33.3	48.1
Item 26	0	11.1	29.6	44.4	14.8
Item 27	3.7	11.1	29.6	25.9	29.6
Item 28	3.7	11.1	37	33.3	14.8
Item 29	0	3.7	7.4	18.5	70.4
Item 30	0	0	11.1	25.9	63
Item 31	0	3.7	3.7	22.2	70.4
Item 32	0	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2
Item 33	0	3.7	18.5	55.6	22.2
Item 34	29.6	25.9	33.3	7.4	3.7
Item 35	0	14.8	25.9	14.8	44.4
Item 36	3.7	7.4	48.1	29.6	11.1
Item 37	3.7	0	7.4	51.9	37
Item 38	3.7	7.4	48.1	22.2	18.5
Item 39	0	3.7	29.6	40.7	25.9
Item 40	3.7	14.8	44.4	7.4	29.6
Item 41	0	14.8	25.9	14.8	44.4
Item 42	3.7	7.4	48.1	29.6	11.1
Item 43	0	3.7	11.1	7.4	77.8
Item 44	0	0	0	11.1	88.9
Item 45	0	0	0	7.4	92.6
Item 46	0	0	11.1	18.5	70.4
Item 47	0	3.7	11.1	7.4	77.8
Item 48	0	0	0	11.1	88.9
Item 49	0	0	0	7.4	92.6

Table 5. Five-stage WIHIC questionnaire results in percentage (%) (taken from my dissertation)

On the other hand, the five-stage group thought that presentations could ‘sometimes’ be useful with 48.1%,

while the traditional group was least in favor of item 21, namely, 41.2% chose the 'often' option.

In the scale of Investigation the three groups displayed different preferences to item 22 which tested the 'willingness of exploring tense rules and usages in various contexts'.

Contrary to the practice of serving the rules in the traditional teaching mode, 52.9% of the participants in this groups rated item 22, as a practice that they would like to occur 'often'.

On the other hand, for the five-stage group the votes for item 22 were divided between the options 'almost always' and 'sometimes' each with 29.6%, while 45.8% from the LdL group rated this item by selecting the option 'sometimes'. The preference for knowing the rules before diving into practice was tested in item 24 and was evaluated in the following way: 'almost always' with 58.3% by the LdL group, 'almost always' 52.9% by the traditional group and 'almost always' with 48.1% by the five-stage.

These findings clearly indicate that the majority of the students regardless of the method they were taught in have a preference to knowing the rules before being involved in any kind of activities. The conclusion that can be drawn here is that the LdL group which involved a presentation, practice and production methodology, was actually in favor of the method they were actually exposed to.

In the last scale of Equity, there was a great deal of agreement among and within the three groups. More specifically, items 44, 45 and 46 exploring equality in treatment, opportunities and praise were rated very favorably which can be observed in the following percentages: traditional 94.1%, 100% and 82.4%, five-stage group 100%, 100% and 88.9%, LdL 87.5%, 79.1% and 77.5% respectively. What can be noticed here is that even though the LdL group rated these items with high percentage, the numbers are still lower than the other three groups. This indicates that not all students were given the same opportunity, equal treatment and praise all the time, since the teaching was carried out by student-teachers who were more concentrated on delivering the material rather than the above-mentioned elements of the seventh scale. In addition, these ratings could also be attributed to the actual teacher who involved the students in this teaching method, who did not deliver the same treatment to the student-teacher and the other students in a given session since the focus was mainly on the student-teacher.

5. MAJOR FINDINGS AND OUTCOMES

This study used a one-way ANOVA in order to test students' perspectives towards three teaching methods they were taught in over a period of 15 weeks. The analysis of the means and the standard deviations indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the preferences regardless of the method with the exception of a marginal significance for the scale

of Task Orientation. This was to be anticipated due to the different types and variety of tasks in each method.

The analysis of variance and the frequency test showed that the groups had different preferences with regards to the different scales and particularly some of the items in these scales. For instance, the traditional group provided the least favorable ratings for the Student Cohesiveness scale since there was almost none in their group due to the method, they were taught in. In addition, the majority of the participants for all groups agreed that the method they were taught in helped them improve their knowledge of the English tense-aspect system. Furthermore, there was some preference to discovering the grammatical rules, while there was more favoritism towards knowing the rules before participating in activities expressed by all three groups. The final unanticipated outcome was that the mutual perception among all groups expressed in the Equity scale, while this wasn't similarly distributed among the teaching methods due to their nature. In other words, the students claimed that they have been treated with the utmost respect and equality in all three methods regardless of the practices in the method.

6. CONCLUSION

All in all, it can be concluded that the students preferred cohesiveness within the group, almost all agreed that during the training period their knowledge has improved. Surprisingly, a greater percentage in all groups favored knowing the rules to discovering the rules on their own, which favors the traditional method, rather than the five-stage method which fosters recognition and exploration of rules. Statistically, the only marginal significance was revealed for the Task Orientation scale among all three teaching methods. Finally, the Equity scale was rated with the highest percentage and illustrates that the students felt that they were being treated in a similar way in all three methods. As a final point, what follows from the ANOVA test and the frequency analysis is that all three methods were rated similarly despite their different nature, methods and student centeredness. As previously mentioned, the only scale in which the attitudes towards activities in class and the importance of tasks that involve tense, as well as, the way and timing of introduction of these tasks, varied with marginal significance among all three groups was the Task Orientation scale.

7. SUGGESTIONS

Several suggestions can be made for investigative scenarios of similar nature in the future. Indeed, better results can be obtained if the sample is bigger and the participants' attitudes are assessed over a longer period of time. An additional idea would be to have participants take the same attitudes questionnaire before and after a longer treatment period, namely longer than 15 weeks. Correlating the results of the pre- and post-treatment questionnaire would give insight in the effect of the

teaching method on the changes in attitudes in the WIHIC questionnaire. Furthermore, it would be intriguing to conduct this experiment with participants, who aren't aware of the three teaching methods and do not have prior information about the group they belong to.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORKS

In future investigations, similar to the current one, further tests of correlation can be carried out to see whether any social factors have affected the participants' attitudes.

Previous types of teaching methods the participants have been exposed to can also be factored in in order to see whether these might have influenced the results in the study.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank the students majoring in English language and literature at the South East European University in Tetovo, North Macedonia from the year 2011-2012 for taking part in this questionnaire and providing their honest attitudes towards each method of teaching. Their participation, willingness and eagerness to contribute and foster research are admirable and greatly appreciated.

References:

- Aldridge, J., Fraser, B., & Ntuli, S. (2009). Utilising learning environment assessments to improve teaching practices among in-service teachers undertaking a distance-education programme. *South African Journal of Education*, 29(2), 147–170.
- Boumová, V. (2008). Traditional vs. modern teaching methods: Advantages and disadvantages of each [Master's thesis, Masaryk University]. http://is.muni.cz/th/86952/ff_m/?lang=en
- Dorman, J. P., Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2006). Using students' assessment of classroom environment to develop a typology of secondary school classrooms. *International Education Journal*, 7(7), 909–915.
- Grzega, J. (2006). Developing more than just linguistic competence: The model LdL for teaching foreign languages (with a note on basic global English). *Humanising Language Teaching*, 8(5). <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/>
- Grzega, J., & Schöner, M. (2008). The didactic model LdL (Lernen durch Lehren) as a way of preparing students for communication in a knowledge society. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 34(3), 167–175.
- Hoang, T. N. (2008). The effects of grade level, gender, and ethnicity on attitude and learning environment in mathematics in high school. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 3(1), 20–38.
- Khalid, A., & Azeem, M. (2012). Constructivist vs traditional: Effective instructional approach in teacher education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 170–177.
- Khine, M. S. (2001). Using the WIHIC questionnaire to measure the learning environment. *Teaching and Learning*, 22(2), 54–61.
- Khine, M. S., & Fisher, D. L. (2001, December). Classroom environment and teacher's cultural background in secondary science classes in an Asian context [Paper presentation]. International Educational Research Conference of Australian Association of Research in Education, Perth, Australia.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). Techniques and principles in language teaching. Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J.-P. (2000). Lernen durch Lehren: Ein modernes Unterrichtskonzept [Learning through teaching: A modern teaching concept]. *Schulverwaltung Bayern*, 23(3), 105–110.
- Martin, J.-P. (2002). Lernen durch Lehren (LdL) [Learning through teaching (LtT)]. *Die Schulleitung – Zeitschrift für pädagogische Führung und Fortbildung in Bayern*, 4, 3–9.
- Mirtoska, J. (2017). The effect of teaching methodology on the acquisition, retention and integration of tense forms into spontaneous speech [Doctoral dissertation, Universität Wien]. <https://theses.univie.ac.at/detail/42830>
- Pfeiffer, J., & Rusam, A. (1992). Der Student als Dozent: Die Methode 'Lernen durch Lehren' an der Universität [The student as instructor: The method 'Learning by Teaching' in university]. In U. Jung (Ed.), *Praktische Handreichung für Fremdsprachenlehrer* (pp. 425–433). Lang.
- Roberge, G. D., Gagnon, G. D., & Oddson, B. E. (2011). The ideal classroom: A comparative study of education and nursing student learning and psychosocial environmental preferences. *Institute for Learning Styles Journal*, 1, 1–16.
- Schwerdt, G., & Wuppermann, A. C. (2011). Is traditional teaching really all that bad? A within-student between-subject approach. *Economics of Education Review*, 30(2), 365–379.
- Serbessa, D. D. (2006). Tension between traditional and modern teaching-learning approaches in Ethiopian primary schools. CICE Hiroshima University, *Journal of International Cooperation in Education*, 9(1), 123–140.
- Weaver, C., McNally, C., & Moerman, S. (2001). To grammar or not to grammar: That is not the question! *Voices from the Middle*, 8(3), 17–33.
- Willis, D. (2003). Rules, patterns and words: Grammar and lexis in English language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Zhao, G., Ailiya, & Shen, Z. (2012). Learning-by-teaching: Designing teachable agents with intrinsic motivation. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15(4), 62–74.

Jasmina Mirtoska
University of Vienna
North Macedonia
jmirtoska@mail.com
ORCID: 0009-0002-6753-1431
