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Abstract

Formulaic sequences (FS) are being increasingly recognized in second language learning as a key language component that has a direct impact on language proficiency. A key aspect of FS is how it can be effectively integrated within language teaching and what practices could be used to present FS and introduce it to students. Recently, researchers have reported a growing interest in using FS in teaching language in classrooms.

A mixed method of data analysis was adopted in this study where both qualitative and quantitative data were collected using three instruments “questionnaire, observations and interviews”. 75 Arabic teachers participated in the current study, 72 of them responded to the questionnaire and the others were abstained to access the questionnaire and they were only observed in their classrooms and interviewed afterwards.

The study revealed that 72 % of the participants perceive FS as important cultural language components that have direct impact on language proficiency. The participants recommended several practices and tools used to introduce FS in classrooms. Moreover, the majority of teachers acclaimed that FS should be introduced to elementary Arabic language learners.

Conclusively, FS should be considered as essential cultural language components.

Key words: Formulaic sequences, Idioms, Collocations
# Table of Contents

**Transliteration Symbols**

**Chapter One Introduction**

- 1.1 Rationale and Statement of Research Problem ........................................... 5
- 1.2 Importance of Formulaic sequences ................................................................ 9
- 1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions .................................................................................... 11
- 1.4 Purpose of the Study (Research gap) .............................................................. 12
- 1.5 Statement of the Problem .............................................................................. 12
- 1.6 Research Questions ........................................................................................ 13
- 1.7 Delimitations of the Study ............................................................................. 14
- 1.8 Definition of Constructs ................................................................................ 14
- 1.9 List of Abbreviations and Codes .................................................................. 15

**Chapter Two Literature Review**

- 2.1 Overview ........................................................................................................ 16
- 2.2 Formulaic sequences ..................................................................................... 17
  - 2.2.1 Idioms ........................................................................................................ 20
- 2.3 Teachers’ Perspectives ................................................................................... 22
- 2.4 Findings ........................................................................................................... 24

**Chapter Three Methodology**

- 3.1 Overview ........................................................................................................ 26
- 3.2 Study Design ................................................................................................... 26
- 3.3 Target Pattern ................................................................................................ 27
- 3.4 Participants ...................................................................................................... 29
  - 3.4.1 Participants’ Characteristics ..................................................................... 30
- 3.5 Study procedures ............................................................................................ 30
- 3.6 Data Collection Instruments ....................................................................... 31
  - 3.6.1 Questionnaire .......................................................................................... 32
  - 3.6.2 Observations ............................................................................................ 34
  - 3.6.3 Interviews ................................................................................................. 36
3.7 Procedures..................................................................................................................37
3.8 Data Analysis and Coding.................................................................38
3.9 Coding..................................................................................................................39

**Chapter 4 The Results.................................................................................................41**

4.1 Overview..................................................................................................................41
4.2 Demographic Results.............................................................................................42
4.3 Findings..................................................................................................................43

**Chapter 5 Discussion.................................................................................................61**

5.1 Overview ................................................................................................................61
5.2 Discussion..............................................................................................................61
5.3 Pedagogical Implications......................................................................................66
5.4 Limitations.............................................................................................................67
5.5 Research Suggestions...........................................................................................67
5.6 Conclusions...........................................................................................................68
## Transliteration Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter/Vowel/Diacritic</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Letter/Vowel/Diacritic</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ـ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>س</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ـ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ش</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ـ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ء</td>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ـ</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ـ</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ظ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ع</td>
<td>ζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>غ</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ف</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ك</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ل</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ه</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>و(Consonant)</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>و(Long vowel)</td>
<td>ū/ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ن(Consonant)</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ء</td>
<td>َ</td>
<td>ن(Long vowel)</td>
<td>ū/ē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Rationale and Statement of the Research Problem

Recent years have seen much interest in the phenomenon of formulaic Language (FL) (e.g., Schmitt, 2004; Wray, 2002). In this respect, “formulaicity” and “formulaic sequence” is used in this paper to illustrate a phenomenon that encompasses various types of word strings that appear to be stored and retrieved wholesomely from memory (Wray, A., & Perkins, M. R., 2000).

Definitions of formulaic sequences (FS) are debated, and many classifications and terms are deliberated for well over a century as claimed by Wray (2012). Formulaic sequences are defined as: “Words and word strings which appear to be processed without recourse to their lowest level of composition are termed formulaic” (Wray, 2005, p. 4). Formulaic sequences are explained and constructed in many different ways (Wray, 2002, p. 8). Several approaches for examining FS were identified in literature such as:

1. Phraseological approaches (e.g., Cowie, 1998) including idioms and certain collocations.
   
   This approach defines formulaicity on the degree to which the literal meaning of the words assists in predicting the meaning of the word combination or the degree to which words with similar meanings can be used as substitutes into the phrase

2. Frequency-based approaches (e.g., Biber, 2009; Hoey, 2005; Sinclair, 2004; Stubbs, 1995).

   Focus on the phrases with high frequency occurrences in texts and corpora

As it is difficult to identify absolute criteria to define formulaic sequences, some linguists offered descriptions and /or categorizations of formulaic sequences including Becker (1975), Bolinger (1976), Hatch, Peck & Wagner-Gough (1979), Coulmas (1979, 1994), Yorio (1980), Lattey (1986), Van Lancker (1987), Moon (1992, 1998) and Howarth (1998). The most detailed categorization was Becker’s (1975) six-category taxonomy of adult native speaker formulas. The
six categories mentioned were: Poly-words, phrasal constraints, Meta-messages, sentence builders, situational utterances and verbatim texts.

Other linguists approached it through identifying its main characteristics. Also Wray (2005, p.9) described aspects of formulaicity using more than fifty terms as collocations, chunks, idioms, etc. as shown in figure 1 below.

*Figure 1 Formulaic Language Characteristics*

![Formulaic Language Characteristics](image)

Wray (2005) used the term formulaic sequence, and defined it as follows:

“a sequence, continuous or discontinuous, of words or other elements, which is, or appears to be, prefabricated: that is, stored and retrieved whole from memory at the time of use, rather than being subject to generation or analysis by the language grammar.” (P.09)

The above mentioned definition issued as the principal working definition for this study.

Although as previously mentioned, formulaic sequences include several components as collocations, chunks, formulas, multiword units, idioms, proverbs, etc., this study is only concerned with the ‘true’ idioms and fixed expressions/collocations in Egyptian colloquial Arabic (ECA). Wray (2008) defined the ‘true’ idioms as “a set of not all that frequent but particularly evocative multiword strings that express an idea metaphorically” (p.10). She also described the fixed expressions/collocations as “expressions that seem entirely detached from normal meanings.
and/or do not reflect the normal rules of grammar ………. expressions that are metaphorical but, arguably, are less distant from the literal meaning than idioms.” (p.10).

The collocations are either included in a sentence for example: ‘you’d better’ in English, /fiḥaʔʔa/ "فِي الحقيقة" in Arabic or standing alone like ‘not very well’ in English, /kullu tamām/ "كله تمام" in Arabic.

Idioms and metaphors play a pivotal role in both foundation and comprehension of every spoken language since, among other things; using is an indicator of one’s fluency in a particular language (Irujo, 1993). Idioms are easily identified by listeners as quickly as or even more quickly than typical expressions (Tabossi, Fanari & Wolf, 2009) since they are generally a pervasive feature of many languages (Boers, 2000). Wray (2005) mentioned that idioms are a good example of phrases that if broken up, it means one thing, and “if treated whole, in its accustomed way, it possesses a meaning that is something other than or in addition to, its constituent parts” (p.4). To illustrate this, there is the example of “kick the bucket” in the English language, which means to pass away or to die. As mentioned by Gibbs, Nayak & Cutting (1989), this idiom is considered as “non-decomposable because it is difficult to see any relation between a phrase’s individual components and the idiom’s figurative meaning (e.g., the parts of kick the bucket do not independently contribute to the figurative meaning of the phrase “to die””) (p.64).

This study adopts the definition of idioms: an “expression whose meanings cannot be inferred from the meanings of the words that make it up” (Stein and Su 1980, p.444). In addition, verb–noun collocations seem to be the most frequently studied collocation type (Paquot & Granger, 2012).

Moreover, idioms are usually perceived as larger lexical items whose meaning cannot be easily inferred from the components of the word.
The term idiom is defined by Carter (1987) as “those non-substitutable collocations; that usually occur as more than single-word units and they exhibit semantic opacity” (P. 66). Also it can be specified as: “a multiword unit that occurs within the clause and has a figurative meaning in terms of the whole or unitary meaning that cannot be derived from the meanings of its individual components” Abdou (2010, p.236). This definition is considered the operational definition used in this study. Abdou (2010) mentioned several examples of idioms’ literal meanings versus its semantic meanings, such as the example stated below in Fig. 2:

**Figure 2 Arabic Example**

```
har-u-n ‘ala ‘alam-i-n
fire-NOM-INDF on mountain-GEN-INDF
```

a well-known entity

Abdou commented: “the idiom is originally based on the fact that a fire that is set on a mountain, particularly during night, is visible to people passing by, hence the semantic extension to the state of being well-known”. (P.239)

Several studies of idioms are conducted. These studies may be classified into two categories: studies that focus on the learning of idioms in the first language (Titone & Connine, 1994) and studies of idioms in second / foreign language (Cooper, 1999; Irujo, 1986a; Liontas, 2002).
1.2 Importance of Formulaic Sequences

A considerable proportion of our everyday language is “formulaic”. It is predictable in form and seems to be stored in fixed or semi-fixed chunks. Formulaic sequences are considered a window to target language native speakers’ culture. Research on teaching culture has shown that language and culture are closely intertwined (e.g., Brown, 2007; Kramsch, 1998; Kuang, 2007; Savignon & Sysoyev, 2005; Schulz, 2007; Tang, 1999) and are best acquired together (Schulz, 2007). Brown (2007) describes the interrelatedness of language and culture stating, “That one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture. The acquisition of a second language, except for specialized, instrumental acquisition […] is also the acquisition of a second culture” (p. 189-190).

According to Bada (2000), “The need to cultural literacy in language teaching arises mainly from the fact that most language learners, not exposed to cultural elements of the society in question, seem to encounter significant hardship in communicating meaning to native speakers” (p.101). In addition, a learner may have a good command of grammar and lexicon, but may have difficulty in comprehending the message, and as stated by Abdollahi-Guilani, Yasin, Hua, & Aghaei (2012), communication with second language (L2) lies in the cultural reflections and connotations attached to words and events. According to Wray (2002), the result of teaching these cultural aspects is language that is fluent and idiomatic, yet crafted for its referential and communicative purpose. Recent years have observed much interest in the phenomenon of formulaic sequences (e.g., Schmitt, 2004; Wray, 2002), as apparent in the research of L2 language teaching.

Formulaic sequences can be used to encode cultural ideas, as Teliya, Bragina, Oparina, & Sandomirskaya (1998) have demonstrated for the Russian language and given the aforementioned assumptions/conclusions, the following lines elaborate further on the teaching
of such linguistic components as “formulaic sequences” and their connotations, which helps L2 learner assume a better role in communication.

Research in L2 highlights how FS have received particular attention within written academic discourse, where it is seen to be especially predominant (Adel & Erman, 2012; AlHassan & Wood, 2015; Ellis, Simpson-Vlach & Maynard, 2008). Furthermore, FS are the focus of numerous studies seeking to establish where FS occur most frequently and might therefore be of greatest value to second language (L2) learners (Hsu, 2014; Hyland, 2008a; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010).

Murray (2016) has mentioned that “studies examining the usefulness of FS within EFL textbooks have tended not to conclude favorably, instead raising questions regarding the basis of the authors’ lexical selection (Koprowski, 2005; McAleese, 2013; Wood, 2010)” (P. 29). Furthermore, in their standards for FL learning, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL, 2012) advocated for the application of the “five Cs” of language learning including culture. Culture is considered an essential evaluation tool for proficiency especially for the distinguished, superior and advanced levels.

However, some studies suggest that textbooks may be failing learners (Wood, 2010, Murray, 2016). From a pedagogical perspective, it is not uncommon to see formulaic sequences - especially idioms - receiving minimal attention both in textbooks and by language teachers, while single word items are usually the central concern (Nguyen, 2014). This may be due to the assumption that idiom learning constitutes a difficult part in second language acquisition because their meanings are not always easily predicted from the literal meanings of their constituent parts (Strakšiene, 2009).
1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions

Teachers’ beliefs about good teaching are clearly reflected in their everyday teaching profession and affect their decision-making in the classroom; hence, new curricula would not be implemented if these beliefs were not aligned with the new curricula and their pedagogical implications. Consequently, it is difficult to teach without following one’s deeper convictions about professional teaching (Borg, 2009; Richards, 1998). Beliefs are the core of classroom decision-making according to Clark and Peterson (1986). “Just as understanding teachers’ beliefs are important because these beliefs affect teachers’ strategies, understanding students’ beliefs are also important as they affect students’ learning,” as mentioned by Mohamed (2016, p.5). Moreover, Porter & Freeman and Pajares (1986, 1992) claimed that every teacher holds his/her own beliefs regarding their teaching, students, strategies, roles and responsibilities in the classroom and this verifies why many studies showed discrepancies between teachers’ beliefs and practices such as Sercu (2005). Teachers’ judgments, perceptions, decisions and curricula selection are all affected by the teachers’ perceptions (Lee, 2001). This explains the importance of examining teachers’ perceptions, as it enables linguists to create convenient curricula for teachers which consequently benefits the students in not only acquiring the language but also in mastering it.

And although many studies have investigated learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of various aspects of language teaching and learning (Bell, 2005; Levine, 2003; Schulz, 2001), relatively few studies have examined teachers’ perception of the importance of integrating formulaic sequences in language learning (N. Schmitt, 2004; Boers, F., Eyckmans, J., Kappel, J., Stengers, H., & Demecheleer, M., 2006).

Accordingly, it is necessary to examine AFL teachers’ perceptions about language aspects especially if these aspects are not commonly presented in textbooks and accordingly not commonly presented in classrooms. In addition, it is important to determine if AFL teachers are ready to
implement the changes needed to reach best practices, which enables L2 learners to achieve language competence.

1.4 Purpose of the Study (Research gap)

The studies mentioned above have underscored the importance of FS in language teaching. In addition, they highlighted the impact of FS as a cultural component, which allows student to sound more native when using it. Above all, they mentioned the importance of teachers’ perceptions and beliefs in classroom decisions in general which are examined in many language components except FS in Arabic.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to fill this gap in research by examining teachers’ perceptions of FS importance in language teaching and its impact on learners’ language proficiency. In addition, the study explores teachers’ feedback on the satisfactory / unsatisfactory presentation of FS in language textbooks.

1.5 Statement of the Problem

Nattinger and De Carrico (1992) highlighted the significance and impact of integrating FS in language acquisition. They claimed that formulaic sequences are ubiquitous in language use and they make up a large portion of any discourse. Although several studies conducted have emphasized the importance of formulaic expressions in teaching language, only few studies were concerned with teachers’ perceptions regarding FS importance, its presentation in textbooks, levels of proficiency, etc. In addition to other aspects, such as introducing FS in the classroom and the activities they use to present FS to students in class; all of which fall under teachers’ perceptions of best practices and resources for introducing FS to AFL learners. By investigating the above, this study aims to provide curriculum developers, textbook writers, and teacher trainers/teacher education programs with insights about teacher views concerning the FS and its impact on
language proficiency. Therefore, the research recommends that curricula developers and textbook authors shed light on FS. In addition, suggest changes regarding the possible need for further focus on importance and use of FS in developing AFL learners’ fluency and comprehension in teacher training and teacher education programs. These suggestions are elaborated on extensively in chapter 5.

Furthermore, it offers pedagogical implications on the usage of FS in classrooms from language teachers’ views. The study also aims to explore the inclusion of these sequences by language teachers in the existing curriculum “textbooks” and in teachers’ current practices. The study also detects teachers’ perceptions of FS, what they consider as FS, whether or not they consider FS as an important component of language teaching and how they teach it.

In addition, teachers are asked to mention the satisfactory/unsatisfactory presentation of FS in the textbooks they usually use in their classrooms. The importance of this study stems from the importance of formulaic sequences in teaching L2.

1.6 Research Questions

As an explanatory study on teachers’ perceptions regarding the importance of formulaic expressions in language teaching and their evaluation on its presentation in textbooks, this study addresses the following questions:

1- Do language teachers consider FS an important language component that has direct impact on language proficiency?

2- What are teachers' perceptions of the useful possible tools and practices for including FS in their teaching?
It is hypothesized that language teachers consider FS an important language component with direct impact on language proficiency. It is also expected that teachers perceive that FS are not satisfactorily presented in textbooks they use and accordingly teachers use external materials that they create for FS practices. The practices teachers suggest provide us with pedagogical / instructional insights for presenting FS in language classrooms.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

This study is conducted at the American University in Cairo (AUC), as it is an accessible institution for the researcher with plenty of subjects and materials to be used in the study. The observations and the interviews are done at AUC, but teachers who answered the questionnaire were affiliated to different universities.

The study deals with only Egyptian Colloquial Arabic “ECA”. ECA classrooms were visited, ECA teachers were interviewed and teachers evaluated the sufficiency of FS presentation in textbooks.

1.8 Definition of Constructs

The constructs used in this study are as follows:

Formulas: regular responses to regular communicative situations.

Idiom: a string of two or more words for which meaning is not derived from the literal meanings of the individual words comprising that string.
### 1.9 List of Abbreviations and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>Arabic as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Formulaic Sequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>20 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>31 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>41 – 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>above 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>0 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>4 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>8 – 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>above 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Overview

Multi-word speech (e.g. formulaic sequences) is a vital part of our language, and it plays an essential role in both first language (L1) and second language learning (e.g. Wray, 2002, 2008, 2009, 2013). There is a clear consensus on the importance of formulaic sequences in L1 and L2 learning. The appropriate use of formulaic sequences “has been recognized as a prerequisite for any L2 learner who wants to achieve high proficiency and be accepted in an L2 community” (Siyanova-Chanturia & Martinez, 2015: 12). A series of studies are conducted on L1 and L2 acquisition.

This Literature Review chapter is organized according to the reviewed studies themes. The two major themes as detailed below were idiomaticity and inter-language formulas. This study is concerned with the idiomaticity theme more than the other as it enables the researcher to find answers to the research questions proposed in this study.

To reach a valuable literature review that assist in answering the study’s research questions, not only studies related to formulaic sequences were reviewed but also studies examining teachers’ perceptions and idioms were reviewed.

Several studies on teachers’ perceptions were explored, especially those concerned with the importance of teachers’ perception in the learning process, its impact on learners’ proficiency and language proficiency and its influence on choosing activities in class. Meanwhile, studies exploring idioms, its value in the language and its impact on
language learners’ proficiency were reviewed. Finally, Arabic studies investigating idioms were mentioned.

The chapter is divided into two sections. Section one introduces the role of Formulaic sequences in language acquisition and presents previous research on this topic. A subsection presents previous research on idioms, especially Arabic idioms. Section two discusses the importance of teachers’ perceptions of various aspects of language teaching and learning. Section three deliberates the findings and section four concludes the chapter.

2.2 Formulaic sequences

In the last few decades, several theories were conducted regarding the importance of formulaic sequences and the significance and impact of integrating these expressions in language acquisition. Nattinger and DeCarrico (1992) stated that formulaic sequences are ubiquitous in language use and they make up a large portion of any discourse. Thus, in studying formulaic language, two main aspects are pursued, the first relates to the nature of target language and its development; this is often studied in terms of idiomaticity (Pawley & Syder, 1983; Sinclair, 1987, 1991; Kjellmer, 1990 and Wray, 2002). The second relates to learners’ use of target and inter language formulas and their role in second language (L2) language use (Chafe, 1968; Yorio, 1980; Peters, 1983; Wray, 1992). Other researchers have studied the impact of teaching formulaic sequences on language proficiency and this is considered the third aspect.

Regarding the first aspect - which is adopted in this study - Sinclair (1987, 1991) suggested that linguistic materials are to be handled in two different ways: open choice principle and idiom principle. He proposed that: “the first mode to be applied is the
idiom principle, since most of the text will be interpretable by this principle.” (P.114). Similarly, Wray (2002) has adopted a belief that for a reader or a writer of a certain language to be marked as an “insider” in a given discourse community; this can be facilitated by formulas as it facilitates idiomatic production. Also, regarding the insider belief, it has been discussed in the nineties where Kjellmer (1990) claimed that individuals who do not have sufficient ‘insider’ experience, and cannot produce the community’s choices of such expressions in its appropriate situations may therefore seem ‘not quite right’ to insiders. Kathy Conklin and Norbert Schmitt (2008) discussed the commonly asserted and widely accepted notion that formulaic sequences are more easily processed than non-formulaic language. They adopted the hypothesis that formulaicity of formulaic sequences leads to processing speed advantage and the hypothesis proved positive. Same like Irina Vaynshteyn (2005) who examined earlier the use and comprehension of English and Russian formulaic sequences by Russian immigrants who arrived to the United States at different ages. The purpose of this research study was to examine the use and comprehension of English and Russian FS by Russian immigrants, who arrived to the United States at different ages. The study proved that FS influences the processing speed positively. Whereas Kathy Conklin and Norbert Schmitt (2008) questioned whether FS read more quickly than equivalent non-formulaic sequences. In addition, they examined if figurative renderings of FS read more quickly or slowly than the literal renderings of the same sequences. They hypothesized processing advantage for formulaic sequences. They tested the processing advantage by comparing the reading time of formulaic sequences versus control phrases. The results showed that Natives read the formulaic sequences faster than the equivalent controls as well as Non-natives who read formulaic sequences
more quickly than equivalent non-formulaic language. They stated “the reading speeds are slower than for natives, as one would expect, but even at this slower speed formulaic sequences show an advantage” (p.84). In addition, upon examining the processing differences between formulaic sequences when interpreted idiomatically versus literally, formulaic sequences were processed more quickly than equivalent Non-formulaic sequences, however, it did not seem to matter much whether the sequences carried an idiomatic or a literal meaning.

These hypotheses and findings were adjacent to those of Diana Van Lancker-Sidtis and Gail Rallon (2004). They studied FS methods of classification and actual usage by examining the incidence of FS in a screenplay. To develop better methods for classifying FS, an analysis of conversational dialog in a screenplay was first performed, followed by a verification questionnaire, and comparison of these results with measures made on natural conversational speech corpora. A screenplay was selected to document the use of formulaic sequences in interactive talk, making the assumption that the authors were trying to imitate natural speech. The overall results of the study represented that FS make up to 25% of the phrases in the screenplay text.

As for the second aspect relating to inter-language formulas, it was related to Chomskyan grammar by Chafe (1968) and Yorio (1980). “Chomsky’s critique of Skinner’s Verbal Behaviour (Chomsky 1964) and his rejection of behaviorist accounts of language use, subsequent research in (second) language acquisition has concentrated on demonstrating the involvement of creative cognitive processes in language learning and the systematic nature of learner language, particularly in the area of morpho-syntax (e.g. Brown, 1973; de Villiersand de Villiers,1973for first
language (L1); Burt, Dulay, & Krashen (1982); Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) for an overview of second language (L2) Regina Weinert (p.180).

As for the third aspect previously mentioned, some studies as Hsu, 2014; Hyland, 2008a; Meunier, 2012; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010 and Wood, 2002 reviewed the effect that formulaic nature of language has on “instructed second language acquisition” where it has been revealed that FS are of greatest value to second language. Other studies experimented the effect of FS on language proficiency as Frank Boers, June Eyckmans, Jenny Kappel, Hélène Stengers and Murielle Demechelieer (2006) conducted a small-scale experiment to estimate the extent to which (i) the use of formulaic sequences (standardized phrases such as collocations and idiomatic expressions) can assist learners come through as proficient L2 speakers and (ii) an instructional method that highlights ‘noticing’ of L2 formulaic sequences can help language learners add such phrases to their linguistic repertoire. The study showed that the positive effect of ‘phrase-noticing’ on experimental students’ supposed oral proficiency turned out sufficiently profound to be of statistical significance. The data also verify the specific hypotheses about a positive impact of the technique on students’ perceived oral fluency and their perceived range of expression.

2.2.1 Idioms

Idioms’ importance is highlighted in Abdou’s 2011 study “… Gradually because if its repeated occurrence, the originally creative expression shades into an institutionalized unit and becomes part of the phraseological repertoire of the language” (P.39).

As previously mentioned, FS are very important for native competence (Fillmore, 1979) - that is, to sound like a native speaker; it is crucial to have proper knowledge and use of speech formulae (Pawley, 1985, 1991; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Jespersen,
Several studies are conducted to examine the effectiveness of using idioms – as a formulaic sequence – in language teaching. Swinney and Cutler (1979) examined the access and processing of formulaic sequences in native speakers. Reaction times are measured to idiomatic and non-idiomatic phrases in a phrase classification task. The responses to idiomatic phrases were faster than to non-idiomatic phrases. Likewise, using an eye movement paradigm, Underwood, Schmitt, and Galpin (2004) investigated an on-line processing of idiomatic and novel sentences in native and non-native speakers of English. Nevertheless, the results of the study revealed a processing advantage for idioms over novel expressions for native speakers thus not for non-native speakers of English. Succeeding Underwood et al. (2004), Chanturia-Siyanova, Conklin, and Schmitt (2011) conducted a study to support the 2004 study’s finding. They also used an eye tracking to examine an online processing of idiomatic, literal and novel expressions in a story context, by native and proficient non-native speakers of English. The results of the study demonstrated that non-native speakers of English processed idiomatic sentences at the same speed as novel sentences, and at a slower rate than literal expressions. Thus, native speakers of English used fewer and shorter fixations during processing of the idiomatic phrases as compared to the novel phrases, thus showing a processing advantage of idioms over novel expressions. Very few studies on Arabic idioms were conducted especially from the viewpoint that it is a category of formulaic sequences. Khaled Abdullah and Howard Jackson (1998) investigated the types of idioms most likely to be transferred while learning a second language. Their study concluded that second language learners’ idiom comprehension and production is not affected by the degree of similarity to their native language idiom. Abdul-Fattah Abu-
Saydeh (2004) examined literal translation of English idioms to Arabic in order to understand its nature, reasons for its prevalence, and its effect on the translated text and its impact on the Arabic language. Meanwhile, Giuliano Lancioni (2009) studied certain functions of formulae and its specific genres. Giuliano studied the dual agreement, the imperfect-noun analogy, and partial agreement in FS contexts and a provocative solution to an enigma: the birth of case endings. In alliance, Hussein (2009) has conducted a study on Sudanese idioms. In his study Hussein hypothesized that idioms and proverbs express the speakers’ mode and experience the glory and pride of the Sudanese character. In his study “The Semantic Structure of Arabic Idioms” Abdou (2010) concentrated on two significant aspects of the semantic structure of Arabic idioms: their underlying figurative patterns and their isomorphism. His study was corpus based as he mentioned that: “In the case of Arabic idioms, for instance, relying only on introspection and existing dictionaries has some serious shortcomings” (P. 234). He mentioned that these shortcomings are due to the subjectivity of dictionaries, and that it can be influenced by memory. In addition, he mentioned that the existing Arabic dictionaries are neither regularly updated nor based on comprehensive examinations of large corpora.

2.3 Teachers’ Perspectives

Many studies have investigated teachers’ beliefs and perceptions revealing their importance in the teaching process and their perceptions on pedagogical tools. Thompson, 1992; Pajares, 1992; and Richardson, 1997, proposed that teachers’ beliefs affect their behaviors and that there is a strong relationship between teachers’ beliefs and practices. They suggested that understanding these beliefs is essential for improving teaching practices. This notion was adopted earlier by Rokeach (1968);
Feiman-Nemser and Floden (1983) where they claimed that there is no agreement on
the best practices in teaching, accordingly teachers usually rely on their beliefs.
Several language researches were conducted on English Language Learners K-12
highlighting the correspondence between teachers’ beliefs and practices (Byrnes,
Kiger, and Manning, 1997; Flores, 2001; Garrity and Wishard Guerra, 2015; Flores
and Smith, 2009; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, and Driscoll, 2005; Pettit, 2013;
beliefs are considered essential to improve teaching practices (cf. Thompson, 1992;
Pajares, 1992). Pettit’s (2013) extensive review of the literature on teachers’ beliefs
about English Language Learners (ELLs) in K-12 settings emphasized the similarity
between beliefs and practices and suggested that in order to improve student outcomes,
teachers must first adopt the beliefs associated with successful teaching practices for
this population. Moreover, researchers studied teachers’ beliefs from their linguistic
backgrounds. They reported that teachers who have more experience with English (L1)
Learners tend to have more positive beliefs (Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning 1997; Flores
& Smith 2009; Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, & Callahan 2005; Shin &
Krashen 1996). Furthermore, they claimed that teachers who are bilingual tend to have
more favorable attitudes toward students’ home languages and also they were more
likely to use linguistic practices that support the learners’ culture (Shin & Krashen,
1996; Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning 1997; García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias 2005; Lee
and Oxelson, 2006; Flores and Smith 2009; Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011). Other
researchers’ concept guided them to study teachers’ beliefs from racial and ethnic
background (Flores, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1991; Rios & Montecinos, 1999; Su,
1996, 1997; García-Nevarez, Stafford, & Arias, 2005). They revealed that teachers’
backgrounds affect their abilities to provide cultural and linguistic diverse environment in classrooms for students. Although many studies have investigated learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of various aspects of language teaching and learning (Schulz, 2001; Bell, 2005; Levine, 2003; Mohamed, 2015), the researcher did not find any studies examining teachers’ perceptions on formulaic sequences.

2.4 Findings

The major findings of the previous reviewed studies were:

- The studies indicate formulaic sequences importance – especially idioms and impact on L2 learners in terms of reaching proficiency and sounding like a native speaker (Pawley, 1985, 1991; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Jespersen, 1933; Lakoff, 1973; Searle, 1975; Wray & Perkins, 2000). Accordingly, language learners who used FS proved to communicate faster than those who do not (Schmitt, 2008).

- Teachers’ beliefs and perceptions are essential as they have a major impact on language teaching processes. Furthermore, they highlight the influence of teachers’ beliefs on practices (Byrnes, Kiger, & Manning, 1997; Flores, 2001; Garrity & Wishard Guerra, 2015; Flores & Smith, 2009; Gándara, Maxwell-Jolly, & Driscoll, 2005; Pettit, 2013; Wishard et al., 2003).

The most significant study pertinent to the research in hand from the teachers’ perception viewpoint is Mohamed’s (2015) study: Using games to learn vocabulary in Arabic as a foreign language classroom: a study of teacher and student beliefs. Thus, this study examines the importance of teachers’ beliefs and perceptions’ on formulaic sequences rather than vocabulary. As for the formulaic sequences view, following Sinclair (1987, 1991) the researcher adopts the theme that: “the first mode to be applied
is the idiom principle, since most of the text will be interpretable by this principle” (P.14).
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Overview

This chapter describes the methodology followed in this research to investigate teachers’ perceptions regarding formulaic sequences. It is divided into the following sections: 1) Study design; 2) Participants; 3) Target Structure; 4) Data Collection Instruments and 5) Procedures.

Teachers’ perceptions and in class usage of Egyptian idioms and collocations is examined in this study.

3.2 Study Design

This study uses mixed methods in data collection strategies, which combine elements of one method, such as structured questionnaire interviews and questionnaires, with elements of other methods, such as observations (Kertzer & Fricke, 1997; Edin, 1999; Pearce, 2002). “Varying the data collection approach can:

(1) Provide information from one approach that was not identified in an alternative approach; (2) reduce non-sampling error by providing redundant information from multiple sources; (3) ensure that a potential bias coming from one particular approach is not replicated in alternative approaches (Axinn, Fricke, and Thornton, 1991; Edin, 1998)” (P.1).

The data collection instruments used in this study is: questionnaires, observations and interviews. The mixed method allows the data to be analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. Observations, open-form questions in the interviews, as well as the open-form questions in the questionnaires were considered qualitatively analyzed or coded to be quantitatively analyzed – as
detailed below; whereas, closed-form questions in both the interviews and questionnaires were quantitatively evaluated.

This study adopts a triangulation approach as it combines several research methodologies to study the same phenomenon (Denzin, 1970).

The fundamental tenet of triangulation is the application of several method appropriate strategies for assessing the phenomenon. Thus, several different questions can be asked about the same phenomenon and the appropriate method used for each question. Often the purpose of triangulation in specific contexts is to obtain confirmation of findings through convergence of different perspectives. The point at which the perspectives converge is seen to represent reality (Jack & Raturi, 2006, p.345).

This approach endorses the reliability of findings, and also helps in measuring the validity of the data.

The study cannot be classified as purely experimental since the participants in the study were not selected randomly.

3.3 Target Pattern

As formerly mentioned, one of the purposes of this study is to investigate teachers’ perception of the presentation of FS in teaching Arabic as a foreign language section at the Arabic language Instruction Department at the American University in Cairo. While observing the Arabic classes, several formulaic sequences were used by teachers. Examples of FS used by the observed teachers are mentioned below.

Some of the collocations used in classrooms are mentioned below:
إمسك نفسك /؟imsik nafsak/
إمسك الخشب /؟imsik elxajab/
ما شاء الله ma ʃāʾ ʔallāh/
باسم الصليب /besm eʃṣalib/
الحمد لله /alḥamdulillah/
كله تمام /kullu tamām/
صباح الخير، ازيك /šabāḥ elxēr ʔizzayak/
ايه الواحشة دي /ʔēh elwaḥāʃa di/

Some idioms used in classrooms are mentioned below:

الغالي تمنه فيه /elƔāli tamanu fiih/
فوت على عدوك معرش ولا تفتتش عليه مكرش /fūt ʔala ʔaduwwak miʃaraj wala tifati ʔalēh mikkaraʃ/

Some of the fixed expressions used in classrooms are mentioned below:

النظافة من الإيمان /innazāfa min alʔimān/
علم الإنسان ما لم يعلم /ʔallam al-ʔinsān malam yaʃlam/
يرحكم الله /yarḥamukum Allah/
3.4 Participants

This study utilizes convenience or opportunity sampling. This sampling method has been defined as “the most common type of sampling in L2 studies where the only criterion according to Dörnyei (2007) is the convenience of the researcher” (Farrokhi, F., & Mahmoudi-Hamidabad, A.; 2012, p.784). In addition, Creswell (2014) outlined a convenience sample as one in which “respondents were chosen based on their convenience and availability” (p. 158). The 75 teachers in the convenience sample were 3 teachers who were observed and interviewed and 72 teachers who responded to the questionnaire.

The participants were Arabic as Foreign Language (AFL). The teachers were 25 males and 50 Females with different teaching experience. Each participant is either a Master’s or PhD holder in linguistics, and is specialized in teaching Arabic. The combination of gender, working experience and background shad an added value to the research implications. Furthermore, they mostly use specific textbooks for teaching Arabic and this characteristic affected the reliability of the data positively.

Not all participants were exposed to all the instruments used in this study as not to unintentionally direct the group who will be observed to either use FS or not. They were divided into two groups: the first group which included 72 teachers – 24 males and 48 females - most of whom are working at the American University in Cairo as well as teachers from other institutes as mentioned later in this chapter. This group was requested only to complete the online questionnaire. As for the second group, 2 females and 1 male, they were not allowed to access the questionnaire. They were observed while teaching their ECA classes and afterwards they were interviewed.
3.4.1 Participants’ Characteristics

The sampling strategy was chosen to supply the most information possible regarding the research questions. To attain generalization, the sample included (75) language teachers. The sample assigned male and female, long and short experienced AFL teachers. This sampling variation had an added value to the research implications. The online questionnaire has been completed by (72) volunteer participants. In addition, four classrooms were observed and three teachers were interviewed. According to Goodwin & Goodwin (1996), triangulation attains credibility and accuracy and by employing the three instruments of data collection, triangulation has been sought and successfully reached.

Table (1) summarizes the number of participants responding to each data collection instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Participants</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Study procedures

The researcher clarified to the participants the aim of the study. In addition, meetings were conducted with the 3 participants to be observed and interviewed to explain the study's objective and the chosen procedure in implementing the study. All the research requirements' beginning with the time needed and ending with the IRB requirements to be fulfilled as to protect the human subjects. The procedures of the study were detailed as follows:

- One-hour session of your classes at AUC will be observed with a maximum of two sessions
- Interviews will be conducted with the observed teachers

No experimental procedures are required for this study.
In addition, a consent form stating that the purpose of the research is to investigate teachers’ perceptions about formulaic language and its impact on L2 students’ language proficiency was submitted. The findings may be published in a journal and/or presented in a conference. The expected duration of the participation is one to four hours.

3.6 Data Collection Instruments

Data collection is the research’s corner stone as mentioned by Gillham (2008): “The essential point is that good research cannot be built on poorly collected data …” (P. 1). As this study adopts mixed method which “Consist of closed-ended, open-ended questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations” Zohrabi (2013, p. 1.), the main instruments this study uses are questionnaire, observations and interviews as to fulfill the mixed method’s requirements. In addition, the diversity of these instruments are claimed to “supplement each other and boost the validity and dependability of the data” (Zohrabi, 2013, P.1). Combining the three instruments allows the researcher to collect “relatively objective firsthand information” (Johnson & Turner; 2003, p.314). And as previously mentioned, this combination forms a kind of triangulation in order to “substantiate the findings” (Merriam, 1998).

For the purpose of this study, data collection procedures included a teacher’s questionnaire, classroom observations to monitor teacher’s performance, and teachers’ interviews to look more in-depth into the instructional practices used for teaching FS in ECA classrooms.

All data were collected in writing and nothing was recorded. The interviewer wrote the interviewees responses word for word and afterwards the interviews were transcribed and reviewed. As a consequence, the data was treated as confidential.
The quantitative data were collected through the closed-ended questionnaires. As for the qualitative data, it was collected through the open-ended questionnaires, interviews and classroom observations.

All three instruments were aiming to explore teachers’ beliefs concerning formulaic sequences; whether or not teachers consider FS as an important component of language teaching. In addition to reporting their opinions regarding the sufficiency of presenting FS in textbooks they usually use in teaching Arabic in their classes.

The data collection instruments, their design and use are detailed in the below section.

3.6.1 Questionnaire (Appendix I)

Questionnaires are one of the most commonly used methods for data collection. The popularity of questionnaires is due to the fact that they are easy to construct, extremely versatile, and uniquely capable of gathering a large amount of information quickly in a form that is readily process-able (Dornyei, 2003; Rasinger, 2008). In addition, it is claimed to be “valid, reliable and unambiguous” (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p.263).

It was expected that the questionnaire is completed by 40% to 60% of the total sample size. The questionnaire was sent to 160 participants and only 72 participants successfully completed it. This indicates 45% participation.

There are the three types of questionnaires, closed-ended (structured), open-ended (unstructured) and a mixture of closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires. This questionnaire consists of both closed-ended and open-ended items to complement each other. It is divided into three sections. The closed-form questions provide a set of alternative answers from which the respondent must select from yes/no or Likert-scale which is believed to be more efficient than open-ended questions.
because of the ease of their analysis (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989). The closed ended questions are reflected in Sections I and II. Section I represents the participants’ demographics where the participant is asked about his/her age, gender, years of teaching experience and so forth. Section II represents the Likert-scale questions where the respondent is required to choose between the options: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, and disagree or strongly disagree. Examples of Section II questions are:

[FS are considered important in teaching Arabic]

[FS are considered a cultural component of a language]

As for Section III, it represents the open-ended questions. These questions require answers constructed by the respondent and as argued by Gillham (2000) “open questions can lead to a greater level of discovery” (p.5). Examples of Section III questions are:

[Do you consider FS important and have a direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching?]

[What are the advantages of teaching FS - if any?]

Blaxter, Hughes & Tight (2006) divided questionnaires questions into seven basic types, “quantity or information, category, list or multiple choice, scale, ranking, complex grid or table, and open-ended.” (P.170).

The questionnaire includes all question types except for the complex grid type. The questionnaire is posted online, and it was sent to all participants through Google forms.

Additionally, minimal open-ended questions in the distributed questionnaire are used as to allow for quantifying the data compiled.
3.6.2 Observation (Appendix II)

Classroom observation is a preplanned research tool that helps in testing “the veracity of the teachers’ claims and the learners’ judgments” (Soliman, 2001, p. 234). Burns (1999) claims that using this method allows the researcher to observe the classrooms interactions and events, as they eventually occur and Flick (2006) considered this method as an attempt to observe events as they occur naturally. The observation setting was clearly explained to the participants. As observation is time consuming, three teachers were selected and agreed to be observed. Two teachers were observed once and the third teacher was observed twice since her classroom duration was shorter than the others as stated in table 1 below.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) proposed two types of observations: narrow focus and broad focus. As claimed by Zohrabi (2013) “Narrow focus observation usually concentrates on a single element and broad focus on overall picture of what is happening in the classroom” (p. 257). This study adopts the narrow focus type as it concentrated on a single element that is FS as mentioned previously in the Target Pattern section above.

Following the participation and observation continuum – Figure 3 below - mentioned by Vinten, G. (1994) the researcher adopted the complete observer role where the observer only watched and recorded the activities in writing without any involvement in the classroom’s setup. Accordingly, observation data were gathered in the form of verbal explanations. The researcher observed the FS used in ECA classrooms using a rubric (Appendix III)
A (number) of TAFL courses were observed. In the classrooms the following elements were observed:

- FS uttered by teachers
- Different ways teachers present FS
- Way of explaining FS; figurative or literal
- Way of introducing FS; orally or in print
- Pedagogical implications used and their source whether from textbooks &/or self-prepared

The researcher has conducted all observations and the data was recorded in writing. The time spent on observations was five and a half hours in total.

Table 2 summarizes the data collection process including the number of classes observed, their duration and their levels at the American University in Cairo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Class Duration</th>
<th>Number of Times this Class has been Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Low</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.3 Interviews (Appendix III)

Burns (1999) argues that “Interviews are a popular and widely used means of collecting qualitative data” (p.118). Interviews can be conducted in a person-to-person and group form or collective formats as claimed by Merriam (1998, p.71).

Patton (1990) divides interviews into four major types: Informal conversation, interview guide approach, structured open-ended and closed, fixed response interviews. Whilst Burns (1999) presented three types of interviews: structured, semi-structured and unstructured.

This study embraces Interview guide approach according to Patton (1990) or the semi-structured interviews according to Burns (1999). At the beginning, the researcher decided to use structured interviews as they are, basically, verbally administered questionnaires, in which a list of predetermined questions are asked, with little or no variation and with no scope for follow-up questions to responses that warrant further elaboration. Consequently, they are relatively quick and easy to administer and may be of particular use if clarifications of certain questions are required or if there are likely to be literacy or numeracy problems with the respondents. However, by their very nature, such questions only allow for limited participant responses and are, therefore, of little use if 'depth' is required (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008). And according to its nature that allows for limited participant responses, the researcher selected the semi-structured as it is flexible and allows the interviewee to elicit a great amount of data.

According to Merriam (1998), there are different methods of recoding interviews: tape record and taking notes & writing every detail after the interview. The researcher adopted the second method. Thus, all the data gathered was treated confidentially.
Example of the interview questions is stated below:

[As FS was used in your classroom, do you consider FS an important part of Arabic as second language teaching?]

As previously mentioned, this is a semi-structured interview. Accordingly, while conducting the interview the researcher added the below question as it has been perceived important and will add value to the study from her point of view.

[What are the difficulties you encounter while teaching FS?]

3.7 Procedures

The web-based questionnaire was posted online, and it was accessible to all TAFL teachers and students at the American University in Cairo and teachers at other affiliations. In parallel, three ECA teachers – with no access to the questionnaire - were observed in their classes. After the observations, interviews were conducted with the observed teachers to discuss their classroom practices, their perceptions and to elucidate any divergence between their interview responses and the observations.

The participants’ input was compared thoroughly to find out the similarities and differences.

Also, Glesne’s (2006) coding and thematic analysis was employed. The coding process— as elaborated later - was implemented to convert the transcripts of data collected from the qualitative questionnaire section, interviews and observations into patterns and themes as to be able to quantify them.

After sorting and defining themes and patterns, each theme was supported by examples extracted from the available resources (e.g., notes, observation sheets and interview excerpts). Subsequently, results were compared to figure out the similarities and differences among respondents. Consequently, approaching the research questions from different viewpoints by conducting the
questionnaire, observation and interview, would help achieve triangulation and increase the validity of results as various methods have led to the same results. Such plan matched Perry’s (2011) report that “qualitative methods of data collection often look for information-rich data to build theoretical hypotheses” (p.113).

3.8 Data Analysis and Coding

In this study, numerical data is collected through the questionnaire’s closed-ended questions’ results and text data is collected through writing observations, the questionnaire’s open-ended questions’ and interviews results.

This study uses a concurrent embedded design that is one of the six mixed methods strategies mentioned by Creswell (2009, p.210). (See figure 4). Considering that “The concurrent embedded strategy of mixed methods can be identified by its use of one collection phase, during which both quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously” (Creswell, 2009, p. 214). This strategy was chosen as it differs than the concurrent triangulation strategy and other sequential strategies such that it has a primary method that guides the research and a secondary database that provides an auxiliary role in the procedures. The primary form of data collection is the questionnaire, and the minor secondary forms of data collection are the observations and interviews that are conducted to a small sample of Arabic teachers – as previously mentioned. In addition, this model allows the researcher to gain broader perspectives as a result of using different methods and comparing their results as opposed to using a predominant method only. This strategy is less time-consuming as both qualitative and quantitative data are collected at the same time. This would be of benefit to the study due to the time limitation.
3.9 Coding

Coding is the process of organizing the material into chunks or segments of text before bringing meaning to information (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, p.171). For data analysis purpose, codes were assigned to each and every question. Moreover, codes were added to each response so as to simplify the analysis and to reduce the data to meaningful and useful forms relevant to the research questions. The coding formulas are mentioned in Appendix IV.

The below table (Table 3) illustrates cross-reference of the research questions, hypothesis and the questionnaire items related to these research questions and hypotheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Item on Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do language teachers consider FS as an important</td>
<td>Language teachers consider FS an important</td>
<td>Questionnaire Section II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language component that has direct impact on language</td>
<td>language component with direct impact on</td>
<td>Questions: 1- FS are considered important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiency?</td>
<td>language proficiency</td>
<td>in teaching Arabic (or English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| What are teachers' perceptions of the useful possible tools and practices for including FS in their teaching? | FS represented in textbooks aren’t sufficient and that language teachers use extra activities to introduce FS to language learners. | Questionnaire Section III Questions:
4- FS are included in textbooks or not. |
Chapter 4
The Results

4.1 Overview
This chapter demonstrates the findings of the qualitative and quantitative data collected from the questionnaire, interviews and class observations. In addition, it reports on the study’s results with respect to the research questions. These data collection instruments are conducted to examine teachers’ perceptions on the importance of FS in teaching language. In addition, it explored the best practices for implementing FS in classrooms.

As an explanatory study on teachers’ perceptions regarding the importance of formulaic expressions in language teaching, results are presented and analyzed according to two main themes: teachers’ beliefs and teachers’ actual practices.

According to Hickey (1997) “self-report measures, particularly Likert-style scales…. don’t capture the full range of responses, making different contexts appear more similar than they really are” (p. 182). Accordingly, data collection instruments were implemented following a plan to incorporate qualitative data findings and to provide explanation for quantitative results. The qualitative data findings were collected from the questionnaire’s open-ended questions, interviews and classroom observations. Whereas the quantitative results were of the closed ended and Likert scale questionnaire’s questions.

This chapter demonstrates the demographic results and all instruments’ results and its relatedness to the research question. In addition, the chapter includes tables and charts illustrating question responses’ frequency, percentage, cumulative percentage and overall responses.
4.2 The Demographic Results

Section I in the questionnaire represented the participants’ demographics. Results of descriptive statistics showed that among the sample (n= 72), 67% were Females and 33% were Males.

As for the age, 27.8% represented the age range 20 – 30, 33.3% represented the age range 31 – 40 which was the most highly represented age range. As for the age ranges 41 – 50 and above 50 they were represented by 16.7% and 22.2% respectively.

Vis-à-vis the academic achievements, 66.7% were Master’s holders and 33.3% were diploma holders.

Regarding the academic institutions, the results revealed that 75% are language teachers at the American University in Cairo, 5% Ain-Shams University, 5% Cairo University, 5% Leiden University – Netherlands, 5% Free Lance, 2.5% Mississippi University and 2.5% Al Azhar University.

As for the years of teaching experience, the data showed that the most highly represented years of experience was above 11 years (43.7%) followed by 4 -7 years (37.5%) then 0 – 3 (12.5%) and finally 8 – 11 (6.3%).

Table 4 displays the demographics characteristics of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Demographics Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics Characteristics of Sample n= 72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Freq. (n)</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further questionnaire responses were not affected by any of the demographic characteristics. It was apparent that age; gender, highest academic achievements and years of teaching experience had no effect on the respondents’ perspectives.

4.3 Findings

The data collection instruments and their input towards responding to the research questions are detailed below.

**Research Question I:** Do language teachers consider FS as an important language component that has direct impact on language proficiency?

**Questionnaires findings with respect to RQ I**

The closed ended statements used were: statement one in section II: FS are considered important in teaching Arabic (or English). The responses were inserted in the form of a linear scale 27.8% responded neither agree nor disagree, 34.7% responded agree, whilst 37.5% responded strongly agree. The “Agree” and “Strongly agree” responses reflect 72.2% agreement to the importance of FS in teaching language as shown in figure (5). In addition, the cumulative percentages to assure the responses adequacy is illustrated in table (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 5 FS are considered important in teaching Arabic*
Strongly disagree | 0 | 0 | 0
Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0
Neither agree nor disagree | 20 | 27.78 | 27.78
Agree | 25 | 34.72 | 62.50
Strongly agree | 27 | 37.50 | 100.00
Total | 72 | 100

Figure 5 FS are considered important in teaching Arabic

Statement two in section II: FS are considered cultural components of a language. The percentage of teachers perceiving FS as cultural components of a language is indicative to its importance. 9.72% responded neither agree nor disagree, 31.94% responded agree and 58.33% responded strongly agree. These percentages indicate 90.27% agreement that FS are considered a cultural component as shown in table (6) and figure (6) below.

Table 6 FS are considered a cultural component of a language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>9.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.94</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6 FS are considered a cultural component of a language

Statement three in section II: FS have a direct impact on language proficiency. 4.2% replied disagree, 25 % responded neither agree nor disagree, 37.5% replied agree and 33.3% replied strongly agree. These percentages are reflected in table (7) and figure (7) respectively.

Table 7 FS have a direct impact on language competency /proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>29.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.167</td>
<td>66.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>66.667</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the third section, another closed ended question supports the first research question. The participants had to reply with either yes, maybe, no or other. The question was: Do you consider FS important and have direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching? This closed ended question had twelve responses; all responses indicated 100% agreement to the importance of FS and its impact on language learning as indicated in figure (8) below.
The responses to the second question in section III also indicated the support of language teachers to the notion of the importance of FS in language learning. The question was: What are the advantages of teaching FS? The researcher observed teachers’ reference to FS advantages as an endorsement to the notion of FS importance in language teaching. Following are some samples of the responses received.

[They combine accuracy and authenticity-both great for students at any level.] [Getting vocabulary in a context and knowing its cultural connotation, these together make language proficiency improve rapidly.] [You reach a near native proficiency on the long run. It also eases communication in the target language.]

Observations findings with respect to RQ I

As for the observations responses, the first statement questioned whether teachers used formulaic sequences in teaching or not. The observations indicated that all teachers used FS in classrooms and highlighted it in their lessons. The formulaic sequences used varied between idioms, collocations, greetings, fixed expressions from literature & Quran, and turn taking and ending.

Interviews findings with respect to RQ I

The third data collection instrument was interview. The observed language teachers were interviewed to get in-depth information about teachers’ beliefs. The three teachers were interviewed in person.

According to the interview findings, all interviewed teachers agreed on the importance of FS on language students’ proficiency levels. They clarified that they use FS in their classrooms and that they consider FS an important part of teaching language. Teachers’ use several types of FS, the types of FS used by the interviewees varies from greetings صباح الخير، ازيك؟/ṣabāḥ elxēr ʔizzayak/, collocations الحمد لله/ alḥamdulilāh/, fixed expressions النظافة من الإيمان/ennazāfā min alʔimān/, idioms فوت على عدوك معرش ولا تفتئ عليه مكرش/ fūt ʕala ʕaduwwak miʃarraj wala tfutʃ ʕalēh mkarraj/,
metaphors “طفح الكيل” and turn taking “أقولك أزاي؟” / ؟ullak ؟izzāy/ . Although all of the interviewees agreed on the importance of FS, they disagreed on the appropriate level of teaching it. Two of the three interviewees agreed that FS should be presented to students starting elementary level. They claimed that this would allow the students to be more proficient and would expose them to the Arabic culture, which affect their language proficiency positively. In addition, one of the two interviewees claimed that even if the student’s learning style doesn’t allow him/her to fully recognize FS or use it, the student should be at least exposed to culture through introducing FS to him/her. Moreover, this interviewee stated that he believes that it is all about culture. The more the student is exposed to the language culture the more proficient he/she would be. Furthermore, the second interviewee strongly agreed and mentioned the below example:

الضيف:َالأكلَحلوَأوي،َشكرا
المضيف:َبالهناَوالشفا

The interviewee believed that such a simple FS or a “row cultural chunk” – as she named it - should be well known to elementary students as to be able to interact with Arabs and expect what to hear in the right context. She also commented that if the student’s level is higher, he/she could be taught the reply for the abovementioned situation

الضيف:َاللهَيهنيك

The third interviewee stated that it is difficult to present FS to elementary level students, as it would be very hard for them to recognize. The third interviewee also claimed that only very rudimentary collocations could be introduced to elementary level students, as these rudimentary collocations are considered essential in comprehending the language; however, not complicated for the students to recall and comprehend.
**Research question II**: What are teachers' perceptions of the useful possible tools and practices for including FS in their teaching?

Questionnaires findings with respect to RQ II

In the online questionnaire, several questions/statements addressed the issue of implementing FS in classrooms.

Statement four in the second section explored whether FS are included in textbooks or not. Following statement four, statement five in the same section questioned if FS are present in textbooks are they sufficient – from teachers’ perceptions – or not. Figure (9) and Table (8) indicate the results of statement four. The results showed 45.83% agreement to the presence of FS in textbooks, 38.89% neither agree nor disagree, 9.72% disagree and 5.56% strongly disagree. As for statement five, figure (10) and table (9) indicates that only 15.2% claim that the FS presentation in textbooks are sufficient, 41.67% neither agree nor disagree, 30.56% disagree for their sufficiency and 12.5% strongly disagree.

*Table 8 FS presentation in textbooks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 FS presentation in textbooks

Table 9 FS included in textbooks are Sufficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30.56</td>
<td>43.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>84.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>95.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As for the open-ended questions, the participants were asked to mention a couple of FS they find in textbooks. In addition, when teachers were asked to choose which words sequence is considered formulaic, the answers varied among: collocations, idioms, greetings, and fixed expressions “From literature or a native speaker utterance in a specific situation” or other. Examples of the fixed expressions:

علم الإنسان ما لم يعلم /Sallam al-ʔinsān malam yaʕlam/

يرحكم الله /yarḥamukum Allah/

Furthermore, in responding to the third question in section III: In your opinion, what language proficiency levels are appropriate for introducing FS and why? The below figure (11) designates that 60% of the responses encourage introducing FS to all levels even novice language learners.
Table (10) above shows the participants’ responses that indicate that the FS from the participating teachers’ perceptions mostly vary between collocations, idioms and fixed expressions. Confirming that FS are presented in textbooks but not sufficient with an 83.3% agreement to this statement, less than 1% stated that he/she depends only on textbooks in teaching FS. The remaining majority of 99% mentioned that they prepare additional materials to those in textbooks or only depend on their prepared materials. Some of the questionnaire participants’ utterances were as follows:
[Will prepare additional materials to facilitate the understanding], [In addition to the text, I will prepare additional materials in order to provide more situations for using the FS], [both: text book and I add to it because the text book itself is not enough to practice them in class]

The final questionnaire question was also related to the second research question where participants were asked to mention some examples of the activities and practices they use or find most useful in introducing FS.

Some of the utterances were as follows:

[Role play]

[A movie scene, a journalist report to get the FS and speaking in close pairs to practice it].

[Categorizing idioms according to themes].

[Using funny images for idioms].

[Listening, authentic video clips from movies used in teaching culture, Task-based lessons].

The second data collection instrument was the classroom observations. Four observations were conducted in parallel with the questionnaire. The observations were conducted to put hands on activities that are actually used by language teachers.

The observations results varied from one teacher to another, meanwhile, FS were presented by all teachers using different methods – as clarified in the following section.

Observations findings with respect to RQ II

Several activities were used in classrooms to explain FS. Table (10) indicates the different types of activities used by the observed teachers.
Activities/pedagogical procedures teachers use to explain formulaic sequences

Comparing between different cultures in the same situation

Role modeling for the utterances Intonation

Acting the situation

Teachers in classrooms used several tools in introducing and explaining FS. All activities were perceived to be related to the lesson and suitable for the students’ level as the students’ interaction in class was efficient and they used the FS introduced effectively in further activities. Furthermore, some of them used both figurative and literal explanations, while others used only figurative explanations. Some teachers preferred to use both at the same time. Others preferred to use only one of the two methods of explanation.

As for the way of introducing FS, teachers mainly depended on verbal instructions. For example, the teacher mentioned the idiom and asked the students to utter it after she explained it figuratively. Another teacher asked the students to listen to an audio file where the narrator mentioned the idiom and/or collocation and she repeated it; afterwards she explained it to the students. Two of the teachers distributed printed materials where the audio context was transcribed and the FS was listed below with the list of vocabulary. Also, they wrote FS on the board for students to visualize; however, no visual aids were used.

Regarding how teachers presented FS, teachers mainly depended on context whilst introducing FS to students. FS introduced was included in a context. The two main contexts the observed teachers depended on were situational and cultural contexts. An example of situational context is when the student sneezed the teacher commented


eyḥamukum الله/
Several whys and wherefores led teachers to using FS, some of which are FS included in the text, raised up by students or initiated from a discussion. As an example the discussion brought up by students about evil eye and envying. Each student mentioned how his/her culture deal with evil eye. Consequently, the teacher explained the Egyptian culture using FS "امسك الخشب"/؟imsik elxajab/ as not to envy someone and "ايه الوحاشة دي"/?ēh elwaḥāʃa di/ when you see a newborn. From the abovementioned examples and others, it was obvious that not all FS introduced were prepared in advance. Some FS were introduced spontaneously especially those which were initiated from a discussion or related to cultural setup brought by the students.

After the teacher introduced FS, the students usually used it in a communicative activity or in writing.

The activities used to present FS in classrooms were mostly pre-prepared by teachers. No textbook activities were used in introducing FS in any of the observed classrooms. FS used in observed classrooms are illustrated in the following table (12).

*Table 12 FS used in classrooms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>؟imsik nafsak</th>
<th>/filhaʔa/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>امسك نفسك</td>
<td>في الحقيقة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>؟imsik elxajab</td>
<td>؟الله أجلان الملام ياسلام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>امسك الخشب</td>
<td>علم النفس ما لم يعلم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>şabâh elxër ?izzayyak</td>
<td>ُعيد جلوسها</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صباح الخير ازيك</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alḥamdulillah</td>
<td>bitā’it maʃāliḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الحمد لله</td>
<td>بثاعة مصالح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kullu tamām</td>
<td>neʃref ءالا فارح الاشعارا/والف دعا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كله تمام</td>
<td>maʃandahaj kursi/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نصرف على فرح العروسة والعروسة معهدوش كرسي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>؟ēh elwaḥāʃa di</td>
<td>fut ءالا يدانوووك مساررف والة تيفاج</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ايه الوحاشة دي</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma jāʔ Allah</td>
<td>ءاله مكاراف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ما شاء الله</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bism ʔiʃalib</td>
<td>فوت على عدوك معرش ولا تفتش عليه مكرش</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>باسم الصليب</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>نابع مباه ويبحب الفشخبر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meʃ keda walla ؟ēh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>مش كدة ولا ايه</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The summary of the main observations results is shown in table 13 below.

**Table 13 Observation Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Teachers use FS</th>
<th>FS related to the lesson</th>
<th>FS suitable for the students' level</th>
<th>Teachers explain FS Figuratively</th>
<th>Teachers explain FS Literally</th>
<th>FS introduced Orally</th>
<th>FS introduced in Print</th>
<th>FS introduced Visually</th>
<th>FS introduced in Context</th>
<th>FS introduced Incidentally</th>
<th>FS introduced were Prepared in Advance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom 4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews findings with respect to RQ II

Subsequently, the interviewees were asked about the tools they use to teach FS in classrooms. The three interviewees agreed that FS can be presented in print or orally or using visuals according to the class proficiency levels and also according to the students’ learning styles. Conversely, they use oral presentation more than the other, as ECA is a spoken rather than a written dialect. The first interviewee stated that she usually uses either drawing or acting to introduce FS to students. She also depends on comparing collocations with each other and introducing to the students different collocates for one verb or noun, for example:

\[
\text{اطلق النار} / \text{atlaq annār}/
\]

\[
\text{اطلق سراح} / \text{atlaq sarāḥ}/
\]

\[
\text{اطلق شائعة} / \text{atlaq ʃaʔaʕ}/
\]

The second interviewee mentioned that he uses different ways to introduce FS, songs, advertisements, television shows and articles. Through these ways, the interviewee is convinced that the students are exposed to culture through FS. As an example:

\[
\text{القرآن الكريم} / \text{al-Qurʾan al karīm}/
\]

\[
\text{أغنية ليلى مراد المشاغل والمشغول} / \text{ʔuNyiyiyit Laila Murad eʃʃaʕil welmjʃūl}/
\]

The third interviewee stated that she would elicit situation that enables her to mention the FS in a context that grabs the students’ attention and allows them to understand the FS and use it easily afterwards.

e.g.: When someone sneezes the teacher reply

\[
\text{يرحمكم الله} / \text{yarḥamukumm Allah}/
\]

Accordingly, the students realize that in the Arab culture when someone sneeze the other person replies using this FS.
Afterwards the interviewees were asked about the activities they use to introduce FS, all interviewees agreed that FS could be introduced like any other language component. They suggested that role plays, watching a movie scene and acting it, student debating, one of the student tell a story using the taught FS, introducing FS and comparing between the students’ culture and the Arabic culture and so forth.

Consequently, the interviewees were asked whether they prefer to explain the FS figuratively or literally or both and why. All interviewees settled that FS should be explained both figuratively and literally. The first interviewee stated that it’s important to do so as to make sure the students aren’t confused, can use the FS in its appropriate position in context and to know the nature of FS like idioms that their figurative meaning isn’t derived from the literal meaning of the words that compose the idiom. The second interviewee claimed that connecting the figurative and literal meaning of the FS to students is essential to enable them to recognize that the Arabic language is thorough and has different levels of difficulty.

The third interviewee stated that she believes that introducing FS in both its literal and figurative meanings should be for elementary and intermediate students. She also mentioned that only figurative meanings should be introduced to intermediate high and advanced students, as their language background enable them to identify the literal meaning of the vocabulary used and understanding that FS are treated as one chunk.

To recapitulate, the three data collection instruments results were attuned. In the three instruments, teachers emphasized that FS are an important language component that has direct impact on language proficiency. This was obvious in the teachers instructing practices used in classrooms. In addition, in the interviews teachers claimed that they found FS presentation in textbooks unsatisfactory and they prepare extra activities and practices to use in presenting FS in classrooms.
Teachers also mentioned that they introduce FS using different tools orally, visually and in print. In addition, they all agreed that FS have to be explained both figuratively and literally.

Commenting on the proposed question asked by the researcher in the interview where the interviewees were asked about the difficulties they encounter in teaching FS, the first interviewee claimed that some students complain that FS especially collocations are very hard to memorize. They assume that memorizing the noun without its collocations is much easier than memorizing both of them at once. However, the interviewee stated that she continues to teach them FS and advise them to write the noun with all its collocations on a flash card to easily memorize it.

The second interviewee mentioned that it depends on the students learning style whether he/she identifies, memorize and use the FS easily or he/she faces difficulty. However, he believes that introducing FS as cultural component is a student right that must be granted, whether the student uses it in speaking or not. In addition, he claimed that students should realize that the language has different levels of difficulty, which he/she will be exposed to when dealing with native speakers. As for the third interviewee she claimed that there are several difficulties that face her while presenting FS. One of the most disturbing difficulties is the cultural barrier between the students’ home country and the L2.

The interviewee claimed that some students find some cultural lingual setups shocking when he/she compares it with his own culture. The following example was mentioned:

/ʔēh elwaḥāfa di/

/da ʃiṭān/

The first FS are uttered when an Egyptian meets a newborn baby. Egyptians claim that such an utterance prevents the good looking/cute newborn from evil eye. The second utterance is used
when a young kid is hyperactive; he is labeled as a devil. The interviewee claims that such FS are very difficult for language learners to recognize or use.
Chapter 5
Discussion

5.1 Overview

This chapter recaps the data analysis and conclusions and discusses the results in regards to the research questions and hypotheses. The research at hand highlights that teachers perceive FS as an important language component that has direct impact on learners’ language proficiency. These findings support the outcomes of the studies mentioned in chapter 2.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section discusses the results in light of the research questions. The second section demonstrates the suggested pedagogical implications; whereas the third section includes the delimitations and suggestions for further research.

5.2 Discussion

**Research Question I:** Do language teachers consider FS as an important language component that has direct impact on language proficiency?

From the previously listed results in chapter 4, language teachers perceived FS as an important language cultural component with direct impact on language proficiency. Several studies in literature (Boers et al., 2006, Hsu, 2014; Hyland, 2008a; Simpson-Vlach & Ellis, 2010) revealed that FS are of greatest value to second language. Other studies in literature underlined the importance of teaching culture, since culture and language are closely related (Brown, 2007; Kramsch, 1998; Kuang, 2007; Savignon & Sysoyev, 2005; Schulz, 2007; Tang, 1999). In the current study, results from all three instruments (Questionnaire, observations and interviews) supported the idea that teachers perceive FS as an important cultural language component that has direct impact on teaching language. This was clear from the responses’ percentages where more
than 70% of the study participants responded that they perceive FS an important language component, more than 90% perceived it as a cultural component of a language and 70% perceived it to have a direct impact on language proficiency. In addition, the observed teachers in their classrooms excessively used FS and it was related to the lesson and suitable to the students’ level. This indicates that teachers believe that FS is important to be presented in classrooms accordingly they prepare in advance to present it in their classrooms. The results also showed that teachers perceive teaching FS to have multiple advantages as mentioned below

[Get to know easily and quickly many cultural concepts related to the new language, in addition to the effectiveness of learning vocab. in collocations that pushes communication in the learned language one step ahead]

[Getting vocabulary in a context and knowing its cultural connotation. these together make language proficiency improve rapidly]

[More proficiency and mastering of the language]

[Provides adequate communicative competence]

The abovementioned results indicate that FS need to be more highlighted by language teachers, textbooks authors and curricula developers. This would have positive impact on the process of teaching a second language and would increase the students’ proficiency levels.

In addition, results revealed that collocations, idioms and fixed expressions from literature are the most used FS by teachers. Observations showed that teachers used these three types markedly in their instructional practices in classrooms. Also on interviewing teachers, these three types of FS were the only mentioned in the interviews. This may indicate that these FS types are the most used
by native speakers – further studies may concentrate on examining the most FS type/s used by native speakers.

Furthermore, teachers’ perception on proficiency level most appropriate to introduce FS for was clearly signifying FS importance. Although, there was a clear variation in teachers’ responses for such question – as detailed below, the majority recommended that it’s beneficial to introduce it to all levels starting elementary/novice.

About 1/3 of the questionnaire respondents - as mentioned in chapter 4 - stated that FS should not be introduced except for the intermediate high level and above. They claimed that students should have enough background of the language to be able to understand the figurative meaning of FS and use it in appropriate context.

[Upper intermediate and above because they need more proficiency with the language, you can't even guess through the meaning of its words separately].

The remaining 2/3 of the questionnaire respondents as well as the three interviewees stated that FS should be introduced to all levels starting novice. The respondents claimed that introducing FS for novice/elementary students would help them to master the language as they build on the simple FS they learned in these levels for understanding and producing complex FS in advanced levels. Some of the questionnaire responses are:

[All levels because building vocabulary in context and culture should start from the beginning and build on it as the students' levels improve].

[All proficiency levels can be introduced to FS. It just depends on which to be introduced in lower levels and which to be highly sophisticated and hence be introduced and higher levels].
Furthermore, the interviewed teachers also supported this perception. The teachers stated that FS are to be introduced to elementary students in more simple forms than those introduced to intermediate and advanced students. These results indicate that most language teachers recommend introducing FS to elementary level students. This is considered a valuable point to consider whilst teaching language and would add to teachers’ perceptions and tools for preparing their extra materials. In addition, textbooks authors and curricula developers need to shed light on this point in order to accommodate such perception in their writings.

To summarize, the findings responding to the first research question clearly indicate that teachers perceive FS as an important cultural language component that affects students’ language proficiency. In addition, they use FS for language classrooms with different proficiency levels.

**Research Question II:** What are teachers' perceptions of the useful possible tools and practices for including FS in their teaching?

It has been concluded by several research studies that FS are not sufficiently represented in textbooks (Koprowski, 2005; McAleese, 2013; Nguyen, 2014, Wood, 2010). These studies have underscored that it is not uncommon to see formulaic sequences - especially idioms - receiving minimal attention both in textbooks and by language teachers, while single word items are usually the central concern. In addition, some studies suggested that textbooks maybe not fulfilling learners’ expectations. (Woods, 2010, Murray, 2016).

The results of this study partially consented with this claim as reflected in chapter 4. The majority of the questionnaire respondents concurred or admitted that textbooks include FS, however; their position from whether its presentation is sufficient or not wasn’t clear. Conversely, their usage of extra materials along with textbooks to introduce FS in their language classrooms gears towards the insufficiency of FS in textbooks.
Based on the questionnaire results FS mostly presented in textbooks are simple greetings and collocations (e.g.: /taḥt-i-ʔamrak/تحت أمرك, /ʔayy-i-xedma/أي خدمة, /ʔinjāf Allah/ إن الحمد لله , /ʔalhamdulillāh/الحمد لله, /ʔin jāf Allah/ إن شاء الله, /rażā bixuffayy ḥunayn/ رجع بخفي حنين) with minor mention to idioms (e.g.: /〈rażā bixuffayy ḥunayn〉. We can confidently deduc that textbooks and curricula authors need to add more FS with its different types. Also different implications in textbooks and curricula are required to be highlighted to assist both teachers in presenting FS and students to understand and use it appropriately.

This also refers to teachers’ usage of FS in classrooms. While observing the language classrooms, teachers used various tools and practices in introducing FS. All activities were strongly related to the lesson and suitable for the students’ level. Furthermore, teachers explained FS to students both literally and figuratively especially for the intermediate level students. It was only for the third observed high intermediate class that the teacher intentionally explained FS only figuratively and the teacher clarified in the interview that the students already know the literal meaning of the words.

Commenting on how teachers presented FS, it was obvious from the previously mentioned results in chapter 4 that teachers mainly depended on context whilst introducing FS to students. The contexts used were either situational or cultural. This reflects the shortage of linguistic materials that would present FS in various forms.

Finally, the overall findings of the study presented in chapter 3 and 4 revealed that the demographic characteristics of the participants had no impact on teachers’ perspectives as no discrepancies are noticed in the responses.

The majority of the respondents agreed on the importance of FS and its impact on language proficiency regardless of their age, gender, teaching experience and academic achievement.
Demographic characteristics had no impact not only on teachers’ perceptions of the importance of FS and its impact on language proficiency but also on teachers’ practices they use to introduce FS in classrooms.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Activities and in class practices were concluded from the observations that were conducted in parallel with the questionnaire to validate the questionnaire results and to put hands on activities that are actually used by language teachers. Practices used by language teachers had been highlighted by participants from the other two data collection instruments “Questionnaires and interviews”. The participants mentioned some examples of the activities and practices they use or find most useful in introducing FS.

Suggestions from the questionnaire respondents

[I introduce the map of the Arab world and require memorizing and using FS like
الوطن العربي /alwaṭan elQarabi/ and صعيد مصر /ṣaʕīd maṣr/].

[Read situations and ask students to write suitable FS or vice versa write situations represent the FS].

[Real life conversations, songs, political speeches, movies].

[In my activities one student will take the list of FS and the other will take list of explanations and they match].

[Role plays having to use the idiomatic expressions].

[A proper, to the FS, picture or video or an example from real life in a role play].

[Idioms in newspapers or collocations in news headlines].
[Stories that include the idiom or talk about it].

[Example from the other language and same in Arabic to be easy for them].

[Scenes from movies, songs, written media, and most importantly communicating with native speakers].

[story telling / role play]

[real videos and contexts]

5.4 Limitation

Although classes were chosen depending on availability and all classes were at university-level ranging from high elementary to intermediate high classes, the number of classes observed were very few. In addition, time is pinpointed, as a further constraining factor as the study’s time was very limited. Also, the number of questionnaire participants was not sufficient enough to generalize the results.

Furthermore, as this research followed the note taking process during the interview method, this did not allow for first hand data. Only data available from the interviewer’s notes was available.

5.5 Research Suggestions

Since this study was conducted on a small-scale, further studies on larger scales are recommended to be able to generalize the research findings. Moreover, for future research, it is necessary? Advisable to examine the best activities and practices to be used for presenting FS in classrooms in order to provide more implications for second language learning and teaching.
5.6 Conclusions

This study presented valuable data regarding the importance of Formulaic Sequences, its impact on language proficiency and the different tools and practices of introducing it to language learners at the university-level. The methodology of research that was used in this study included surveying teachers’ perceptions, observing their practice in their classes, and interviewing them to achieve triangulation and present more reliable data and results for the readership.

This study opens the door for further researches regarding FS. As this study revealed that teachers perceive FS as an important cultural language component, researches are encouraged to further investigate in the ways of teaching FS and the useful tools of implementing them in classrooms. Furthermore, FS should attain more attention by textbooks writers and curricula developers since the examined participants agreed that FS presentation in textbooks is minimal.

Furthermore, the literature review highlighted a lack of research regarding the best methods of presenting FS in classrooms. The literature review has also pointed that FS are an important language component and have direct impact on language proficiency. Moreover, it revealed that FS are very important for native competence (Fillmore, 1979) - that is, to sound like a native speaker, it is crucial to have proper knowledge and use of speech formulae (Pawley, 1985, 1991; Pawley & Syder, 1983; Jespersen, 1933; Lakoff, 1973; Searle, 1975; Wray & Perkins, 2000).
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APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I: (Demographics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>31 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Teaching</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Institution

Section II: Teachers' Perceptions (Quantitative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Teachers' Perceptions and Teaching Strategies (Qualitative)

Do you consider FS important and have a direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching?

What are the advantages of teaching FS - if any?

In your opinion, What language proficiency levels are appropriate for introducing FS and why?

Give example/s of FS in the textbooks

Why did you consider it an FS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase &quot;From literature or a native speaker utterance in specific situation&quot;</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>Idiom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation in textbooks | Well represented | Represented but not sufficient | Not represented

If FS are presented in textbooks, do you depend on textbooks in introducing FS in class or do you prepare additional materials? Why?

Please state example/s of the activities you use/find most useful in introducing FS
APPENDIX II
Observation

Date: 
Instructor: 
Time: 
Level: 
Class Duration: 

1- Does the teacher use formulaic expressions while teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idioms</th>
<th>Collocations</th>
<th>Phrase from Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- If yes, what were the formulaic expressions used?

3- To which extent the formulaic language is:
   i. Related to the lesson
   ii. Suitable for the student’s level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4- What activities/pedagogical procedures does the teacher use to explain formulaic sequences?

5- Do teachers explain them figuratively or literally?

6- Are they introduced orally or in print? Are they accompanied by visuals?

7- Do teachers explain/present them in context? What kind?

8- What led to using them?

9- Are they introduced incidentally or did the teacher prepare them in advance?

10- What are the students’ responsibilities towards them? Are they given any tasks to do using them? Are any of these tasks communicative in nature?

11- Are the used activities from the textbook or from pre-prepared materials by the teacher?
APPENDIX III

Interview Questions

As FS was used in your classroom, do you consider FS an important part of Arabic as second language teaching?

What activities/pedagogical procedures does the teacher use to explain formulaic sequences?

Do you prefer explaining them figuratively or literally?

What kind of context do you prefer introducing FS in?

What are the difficulties you encounter while teaching FS?
### APPENDIX IV
### CODING FORMULAE LIST

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSA</td>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FSA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FSA2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FSA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FSA4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered important in teaching Arabic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSA5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FSL1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FSL2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FSL3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FSL4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS are considered a cultural component of a language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSL5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FSP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FSP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FSP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FSP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS have a direct impact on language proficiency/proficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FSP5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FST</td>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FST1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FST2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FST3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FST4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the textbooks you use in teaching Arabic, are FS included</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FST5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FS1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FS2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FS3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FS4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FS included in the Arabic textbooks are sufficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FS5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSD</td>
<td>FS important and have a direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FSDIY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS important and have a direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>FSDIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS important and have a direct impact on language proficiency in second language teaching</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>FSDIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>Y3</td>
<td>Y4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>E1</td>
<td>E2</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>