

**AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA**

**College of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Inductive or Deductive Methods of Grammar Teaching: Teachers' Beliefs and  
Learners' attitudes**

**A thesis submitted in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree  
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

**By**

**Lilit Harutyunyan**

**Dr. Catherine Buon, Adviser**

**Melissa Brown, Reader**

**Alexan Simonyan, Statistics Consultant**

**Yerevan, Armenia**

**2012**

**We hereby approve that this MA thesis**

**By**

**Lilit Harutyunyan**

**Entitled**

**Inductive or Deductive Methods of Grammar Teaching: Teachers' Beliefs and  
Learners' attitudes**

**Be accepted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the degree**

**Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

**Committee on the MA Thesis**

.....

**Dr. Catherine Buon, Adviser**

.....

**Melissa Brown, Reader**

.....

**Catherine Buon, Ph.D.**

**Associate Dean of College of Humanities and Social Sciences**

**Yerevan, Armenia**

**September 24, 2012**

**DEDICATION**

**TO MY FAMILY**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank all those people who made this thesis possible, who supported me during my study at AUA.

First of all I would like to express my deepest sense of gratitude to my thesis adviser DR. Catherine Buon for her useful comments, inspiration, understanding and patience.

My special thanks go to my thesis reader Mrs. Melissa Brown for her support and encouragement.

I want to express my warmest thanks to DR. Alexan Simonyan for his enthusiasm and hard work.

My special thanks go to TEFL department members, to DR. Irshat Madyarov, Mrs. Rubina Gasparyan and Liliana Edilyan, for giving me practical knowledge in the EFL field.

I am also thankful to my friends Maria Torikyan and Anna Bayburdyan for their assistance.

And the last, but not least my special thanks go to my family and my husband for his great patience.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
1.1. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.2. Significance of the Study.....	2
1.3. Research Questions.....	2
1.4. The Structure of the Thesis.....	3
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	4
2.1. Defining Grammar.....	4
2.2. Grammar Teaching Methods.....	6
2.3. Inductive and Deductive Methods of Grammar Teaching.....	8
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	17
3.1. Research Questions.....	17
3.2. Research Design.....	17
3.3. Research Participants and Materials.....	18
3.4. Instrumentation.....	22
3.4.1. Semi-structured Interviews.....	22
3.4.2. Field Notes or Observation.....	23
3.4.3. Questionnaire.....	23
3.5. Data Analysis.....	24
Chapter 4: Results.....	25
4.1. Analysis of Interview Data.....	25

4.2. Field Notes or Observation.....	29
4.3. Analysis of Students Questionnaire.....	30
Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion.....	37
5.1. Discussion and Findings.....	37
5.2. Delimitations of the Study.....	39
5.3. Limitations of the Study.....	39
5.4. Applications for Further Research.....	40
References.....	41
Appendices.....	45
Appendix A.....	45
Appendix B.....	47
Appendix C.....	48
Appendix D.....	78
Appendix E.....	80

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Case 1 Background information about research participants.....	20
Table 2 Case 2 Background information about research participants.....	20
Table 3 Case 3 Background information about research participants.....	21
Table 4 Case 4 Background information about research participants.....	21
Table 5 Case 5 Background information about research participants.....	22
Table 6 The results of the questionnaire for the learners.....	31

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present case study was to find out the teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures and learners' attitudes towards the inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures. The study was carried out in the EEC (Experimental English Classes) at the AUA (American University of Armenia). Five groups were selected with their teachers and accordingly were numbered from 1 to 5. Thus, this paper followed multiple-case study design with 5 Cases.

A semi-structures interview was conducted all 5 Case teachers, in order to investigate teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. The study comprises the quantitative data as well. The quantitative data were collected through questionnaire, which was conducted with all 5 Case learners. The aim of the questionnaire was to find out the learners' attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. Besides the questionnaire was distributed to the Case learners, they were asked to answer orally which method they prefer their teachers to use: inductive or deductive one. The classes were also observed during 8 weeks and appropriate notes were made.

Analyzing the responses of the interview and making inferences from the observations, it can be concluded that some of the Cases preferred a mixture of inductive and deductive methods, whereas some of them used only inductive method. It can be concluded from the responses that all the Cases think that learners are more motivated and are highly engaged in the learning process when grammar is taught inductively than



deductively. The learners succeed more when grammar is taught inductively.

The results of the learners' questionnaire was not the same as the results gained from the oral answers, where nearly all the Cases answered that they liked the deductive method of grammar teaching. Nearly all the Cases answers were the same in percentages regarding inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures.

The results of the observations showed that nearly all Cases learners succeed more, i.e., they understand better, when grammar was taught deductively. Thus it can be concluded that the teachers' interview answers and learners' questionnaire responses did not correspond to observation impression and each other.

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Grammar teaching and learning has always had a prominent position in the interests of researchers in the second or foreign language teaching and learning process. Teaching grammar to young learners requires an extensive knowledge of a great number of issues. It is crucial to be aware of various teaching methods and approaches while teaching grammar. Two of such grammar teaching methods are deductive and inductive methods. Deductive method is that the teacher first explains the grammar rules and then practices them with a set of exercises. However, in contrast inductive one is vice versa: the students learn grammar rules through exercises (Nunan, 2003). It has always been an issue of controversy among teachers which method to choose, in order to make the learning process more motivating, interesting and of course effective. Hudson (1992) points out that people have been studying grammar for over 2000 years, however the questions whether and how to include grammar in L2 instruction still are controversial issues.

In this paper main two points of the study will be defined theoretically in order to justify the topic. Then the research questions will be defined. In the second part of the paper, the methodology of the research will be presented in terms of the participants of the study, the data obtained from interview, questionnaire, and notes. In the third part, the results of the study will be presented. And finally, the conclusion will present a short summary of this paper.

### **1.1. Statement of the problem**

The purpose of this research is to find out the teachers' beliefs and students' attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching.

Grammar is one of the important aspects in both language learning and teaching. Grammar has long been an issue of debates for many teachers. There has been a problem, whether to teach grammar or not, whether learners need to learn only grammar structures or not and what kind of method to use for teaching it. Grammar teaching has long been a central concern in English language teaching. Grammar is a mean that makes us speak accurately. Even children can put words together to speak, but only with the help of grammar we can express our thoughts intelligibly.

### **1.2. Significance of the Study**

Grammar is thought to be one of the most important aspects that second or foreign language learners should learn. Therefore, this study is significant for two reasons: first it aims at investigating teachers' beliefs towards the impact of deductive and inductive methods of teaching grammar structures; second it aims at finding out learners' attitudes towards inductive and deductive method of grammar teaching and third, the research is conducted in Armenian setting, where there has been little research conducted on this topic.

### **1.3. Research Questions**

This study was guided by the following research questions:

*1. What are the teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

*2. What are the learners' attitudes towards the inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

#### **1.4. The Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis includes four more chapters:

Chapter 2: This chapter reviews the relevant literature on teaching grammar with some definition of grammar, the methods of teaching grammar and inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching.

Chapter 3: This chapter presents the methodology of the research, i.e. research design, participants, procedure, instrumentations will be presented.

Chapter 4: This chapter describes data analysis, to clarify the final results of the current research, i.e. to provide answers to the proposed research questions.

Chapter 5: This chapter presents the summary of the findings from the data collection, the answers for the proposed research questions, the limitations of the study and the recommendations for further research.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews the literature related to the present study. It will introduce various researchers' and authors' opinions concerning grammar, grammar teaching and methods of presenting grammar structures. Grammar as well as inductive and deductive methods will be defined. The viewpoints of various linguists will be taken into account. The literature review will bring as evidence the arguments of various cons and pros regarding to inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching.

### 2.1. Defining grammar

Grammar has always had a prominent position in the interests of researchers in second or foreign language teaching and learning process. Grammar has rather a complex nature. It is defined in different ways from various perspectives.

According to Azar (2007), grammar is aimed to “help students to discover the nature of language”(p.3.). In other words Azar claims that language is a set of “predictable patterns that make what we say, read, hear, and write intelligible” (p.3).

According to *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners*, grammar is “the set of rules that describe the structure of a language and control the way that sentences are formed” (2002, p. 618).

According to Ur (1991) “Grammar is the way language manipulates and combines words (or bits of words) in order to form longer units of meaning” (p. 4).

Crystal (2004) says, “Grammar is the structural foundation of our ability to express ourselves. The more we are aware of how it works, the more we can monitor the meaning and effectiveness of the way we and others use language. It can help foster precision,

detect ambiguity, and exploit the richness of expression available in English.

Additionally, it can help everyone, not only teachers of English, but teachers of anything for all teaching grammar is ultimately a matter of getting to grips with meaning.”

Pennington (2003) says, "Grammar is an essential tool for success in school, work and life. Our spoken and written words reflect our background, education and ability to communicate" (p.1).

Larsen-Freeman (2001) argues that "grammar is about form, and that one way to teach form is to give students rules; however, grammar is about much more than form, and it is ill served if students are simply given rules" (p. 251).

Beverly (2007, p.1) says, “Grammar is the sound, structure, and meaning system of language. All languages have grammar, and each language has its own grammar” (as cited in Li- Li Lin, 2008, p. 3).

Some people say that learning grammar in L2 is not important, but in order to achieve higher levels of the language, it is obligatory to learn grammar (Musilova, 2010). The more we are aware of how grammar works, the more we can control the meaning and effectiveness of our speech. Grammar helps to avoid ambiguities and it enriches our speech and our language knowledge (Tuan & Nguyen, 2010).

Widodo, (2006) points out that grammar teaching is crucial in the ability to use language. Grammar has its important role in language teaching and learning, as it creates the basis for four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing. In listening and speaking, grammar has a prominent role in comprehension and understanding and expressing spoken language. In reading, grammar enables learners to understand interrelationship of sentences in a paragraph, a passage and a text. In writing, grammar

helps learners to create ideas and put those ideas into written form intelligibly. In this context Duff (2000) says that learning grammar enable learners to express meanings in the form of phrases, clauses and sentences and Long and Richards (1987) add that the role of grammar is crucial in terms of connecting four skills (as cited in Widodo, H.P., 2006 & Asmaa Al-Musharraf, 2007). Rafajlovicova states (2010) “Language without grammar would be chaotic and would certainly leave us seriously handicapped.” (p. 193).

## **2.2. Grammar teaching methods**

There exist different methods of teaching grammar structures. According to Harmer (2001) “A method is the principal realization of an approach. The originators of a method have arrived at decisions about types of activities, roles of teachers and learners, the kinds of material, which will be helpful, and some model of syllabus organization. Methods include various procedures and techniques as part of their standard fare” (p.78).

Brown (2001) describes a method “as an overall plan for systematic presentation of language based upon a selected approach” (p.14).

Language teaching methods were, to some degree, the results of economical, social, political, or educational circumstances. They are partly the result of overall language teaching attitudes and beliefs (LIU Qing-xue & SHI Jin-fang, 2007). One of the earliest methods of grammar teaching is the Grammar Translation Method. As the name shows, Grammar-Translation Method emphasizes the grammar teaching, mother tongue is used during the teaching, vocabulary is not taught in a context, i.e., the words are just translated into mother tongue. Learners start text reading early. Speaking and listening are less concern in Grammar Translation Method, whereas much attention is paid to

writing and reading. The classes are more teacher-centered and learners are passive. Grammar Translation Method has traditionally been dominated in EFL context. This method has been criticized for its limitation of practice, the endless vocabulary learning and grammar learning, which is not in context (Widodo, H. P., 2006; Amber Gallup Rodriguez, 2009; LIU Qing-xue & SHI Jin-fang, 2007 & Brown, H. D., 2001). Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards & Rodgers (2002) point out that this in this method learners are not taught grammar, but about the grammar and vocabulary of the target language (as cited in Widodo, H. P., 2006, p.123).

Around the turn of the 20th century, the Direct Method rose. The main characteristic of this method is that the learners should learn a second language like their first language. Grammar was taught orally through drills, practice and repetition. Interaction is an essential part of the Direct Method. All the instructions were done in the target language. The Direct Method language teaching principles were similar to the first language acquisition. Grammar was taught inductively in this method. Nevertheless, there are some questions regarding to Direct Method, for instance whether the usage of target language without translation will create misunderstanding for learners and how this method will be applied in elementary level (Amber Gallup Rodriguez, 2009; LIU Qing-xue & SHI Jin-fang, 2007; Brown, H. D., 2001 & Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S., 2001).

The Audiolingual Method (ALM) was based on linguistics and psychology. The principle of this method is that learners learn a language through use and practice. A new material is presented through dialogues. Memorization and pattern drills are an important part of this method. Vocabulary as well as the use of mother tongue is limited. Much



attention is paid to pronunciation. The teacher is dominant in the classroom. The Audiolingual Method (ALM) is characterized by the separation of four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Amber Gallup Rodriguez, 2009; LIU Qing-xue & SHI Jin-fang, 2007; Brown, H. D., 2001 & Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S., 2001).

The Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLT) focuses on communicative proficiency and it was advocated in language teaching. It tries not to separate four skills, which allow to connect language and communication. The attention on fluency and accuracy are at high level. The teacher is expected to be an organizer, facilitator, a guide in the classroom, whereas learners are expected to negotiators. Nevertheless, there are some issues concerning to CLT which should be discussed. It is still not clear whether this method work in all levels, and if so how non native teachers are going to use this method in practice. (Liu Qing-Xue & SHI Jin-fang, 2007; Brown, H. D., 2001 & Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S., 2001).

### **2.3. Inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching**

Teaching grammar has long been the issue of debates among teachers: how to teach grammar, which methods to choose, teach or not to teach. Grammar teaching has undergone many changes over a period (Bourke, 2008).

So called traditional grammar teaching approach was criticized for its long, wordy explanations, drills and boring exercises. In 1970s, traditional grammar instruction made a way for new method, which was new with its communicative environment. The approach was called Communicative and was derived from Chomsky's linguistic theories. These theories made revolution in the field of linguistics by having a vivid

impact on language teaching. The main idea of Chomsky's theory was that humans are awarded with a language acquisition device, which enables them to obtain whatever language they are exposed to. There is no need to explain and repeat the same things many times as it was in the traditional method of teaching (as cited in Bourke, 2008, p. 13). Based on Chomsky's theory, "nativists" like Krashen and others argued against explicit grammar learning in favor of natural acquisition (as cited in Bourke, 2008, p. 13).

However, in spite of all reactions against explicit, instructional grammar teaching, instructional learning is still used. In the empirical research, Long found that some types of instruction are necessary and important, learners need them to acquire the structure (Bourke, 2008).

Azar (2007) while observing learners during her writing course has noticed the difference between students who have experienced grammar instruction: they had advantage over those who had not experienced grammar instructions. Those with good grammar ground needed only reminding in order to remember or say something. But those with weak grammar ground needed much time and hard work in order to reach a high level. They need much practice for it, sometimes even not reaching advanced level. In order to have a good grammar teaching and to improve it, Chyi-ching Kao (2007) gives three suggestions. First, teachers' grammar instruction explanations should not be separated and isolated from the context. Learners should understand that grammar is the mean of communication and it should be taught in context. The material should be appropriate for learners to exchange learnt grammar structures in meaningful context. Second, teachers should integrate grammar teaching into the teaching the four skills: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Again grammar teaching should not be isolated

from overall language teaching. And the third suggestion is to teach grammar by motivating and meaningful exercises. Moreover, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman point out three dimensions of grammar teaching: form, meaning, and use. Therefore, students need to learn how to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately (as cited in Tran-Hoang-Thu, 2009, p. 6). In his turn Batstone (1994) mentions that it is the essential part of teachers' work to pay much attention on students' needs for grammar learning. And added, that the teachers should do their best in order to satisfy students' needs (as cited in Xu, J. 2011, p. 7). In these regard it is worth mentioning that Morelli (2003) points out "grammar can be taught traditionally or contextually, but students' perception should be considered by teachers in the decision-making process. Students need to feel confident that educators have met their needs and educators should be willing to consider the attitudes and perceptions of students when making decisions about how to teach grammar." (as cited in Al-Mekhlafi & Nagaratnam, 2011, p. 72).

EFL/ESL teachers know how learners differ in their learning styles. Some learners have holistic style of learning and they learn better when they gather appropriate information by doing little or no analysis. Others have analytic learning style and they learn better by making hypotheses. The learning styles differ from age to proficiency level and educational background; for example, young children have more holistic learning style (Celce-Murcia, M., 1991). Teaching methods as well as learning ways can be different, thus some students may learn by memorizing or hearing the others by reflecting or acting. Some teachers lecture, others discuss, some of them concentrate on rules and so on (Felder & Henriques, 1995).

It is the teachers' decision to decide to what degree and in what way they should deal with grammar in the classroom. There are several ways of teaching grammar and it depends on teacher to decide which one to choose when presenting a grammar rule. Some teachers may choose contextualized communicative activities for presenting specific grammatical structures, while others may choose explicit, implicit, deductive or inductive ways of introducing this or that grammar rule or the combination of the above mentioned techniques (Chyi-ching Kao, 2007 & Tran-Hoang-Thu, 2009).

Hagboldt (1928) gives the following definition for deduction and induction: "Deduction begins with a rule, induction with concrete language. Deductive presentation is very common and needs no illustration. Induction, however, that highly effective way of explaining the problem before the student step by step through careful questioning, requires a thorough grasp of the subject matter and a deep insight into the student's mind at every phase of the lesson" (p. 440).

According to other authors, Felder & Henriques (1995), "Induction is a reasoning progression that proceeds from particulars (observations, measurements, data) to generalities (rules, laws, theories). Deduction proceeds in the opposite direction. In inductive presentation of classroom material, one makes observations and infers governing or correlating principles; in deductive presentation one starts with axioms, principles, or rules, deduces consequences, and formulates applications" (p. 26).

Nunan (2003) mentions that in deductive teaching, the instructor explains a grammatical rule thoroughly and then practices it with appropriate exercises. Whereas in inductive method the instructor gives learners a pattern of language and learners try to discover it by their own.

From the above definitions the following clarifications can be made. According to above mentioned authors and Erlam (2003) deduction is the process that moves from general to specific and induction is the opposite: from specific to general.

In deductive method, teachers first explain the rule and then practice it with various activities and exercises. Meanwhile in inductive method the learners are first introduced to samples of language use and then they try to generalize the rule on their own (Erlam, 2003). Regarding to inductive method Nunan (1997) says that it make learners to work the rules out by themselves, which in his turn helps learners to master the rule more deeply. Learners have the opportunity to develop their own understanding of concrete grammatical rule. He points out that he used both methods while introducing new grammar structure and adds that it also depends on grammar point which method to choose. He knows that learners prefer deductive method, as they do not have to work by themselves, whereas he prefers inductive one as learners need to put mental effort for finding out the grammar point (Nunan, 2003). In his turn Widodo (2006) says that deductive approach can be called rule-driven as well. He mentions that deductive approach has been famous and still stays in many nooks. He cites Eisenstein (1987), who says that deductive method keeps in control learners and do not let them to have fear to make wrong conclusions.

Whether to use inductive or deductive method when introducing a grammar point depends on grammar structure and on teachers' preferences. A teacher should rely on his or her professional experience as well (Nunan, 2003; Widodo, 2006 & Simon Borg 1998). Research by Farrell (1999) conducted on 34 pre-service teachers of English in Singapore shows that teachers use this or that method mostly based on their personal

learning period experience. Thus, some student's wrote in their reports that as future teacher they would not use deductive method, as it did not help them during their learning. Whereas some of them wrote that they would use the way they were taught the grammar in their learning process (as cited in Borg S., 2003, p.102).

There has always been debate concerning to these two methods of teaching, that is to say, which one is better, which gives better results for grammar acquisition. The debate has brought many researchers to conduct research on this issue (Felder & Henriques, 1995). The results have been different. Researchers like Herron and Tomosello (1992) found that inductive teaching has advantages, meanwhile Robinson (1996) found that deductive approach was more effective. Others like Rosa and O'Neill (1999) stated that there is no significant difference between the effectiveness of these two teaching methods. On the other hand Erlam (2003) found that there is a significant difference in the group receiving deductive instructions (as cited in Ellis, 2006, p. 84).

Ellis (2006) states that teachers should not put strong differentiation between deductive and inductive methods, as there are structures, which would be better to teach inductively, and there are those, which would be better to teach deductively. He points out that more complex rules would be better to teach inductively, meanwhile simple rules would be better to teach deductively.

Shaffer (1989) asserted that many students have problems after thorough explanations of the rules. They understand the principles of rules, but cannot apply them in practice and usually they face such problems. In this approach learners are passive participants rather than active thinkers. Fischer (p. 99) and Hammerly (p. 18) were proponents of inductive approach, claiming that learners are creative and cognitively

active during the sessions. At the same time they stated that inductive method is more complex and it would be better to use for explaining relatively simple structures. On their turn Ausubel and Carroll claimed that inductive approach is too difficult for weaker students and only stronger students are able to learn by this approach. In spite of their claim, Ausubel and Carroll could not support their predictions with any research data. (as cited in Shaffer, 1989, p. 395-396).

Another study was conducted by Abdolmanafi (2009) on Persian learners of English regarding to the acquisition of relative clauses. Both groups received instruction about English relative clauses; one group (experimental group) got it inductively, the other (control group) deductively. The findings showed that overall both groups had significantly improved their learning outcomes. But the experimental group showed higher results than the control group. Thus, the author states that inductive method of teaching is better than deductive one as it makes learners work out the rules by themselves, which in his turn made them get deep knowledge.

Shaffer's (1989) pilot study shows that lower students got more benefit from inductive teaching than from deductive one. For example Gollin (1998) states that it is more likely that students understand and remember better when they work for themselves, by thinking and analyzing the structure. However, when time is short and the structure is difficult for students to work out and handle by themselves, a deductive instruction is better to use.

Rice (1945) points out that one of the basic physiological principles of inductive teaching is that learners gain much when they are active in the process of acquisition of

knowledge by themselves. In the inductive approach teachers' role is not to teach, but to help learners to learn.

Chyi-ching Kao (2007) states that experience and research showed that many students benefit from deductive teaching method, as teachers explain the rule directly, they emphasize core points of it and then learners practice the structure again and again until they get to the needed results. However, there are learners who prefer inductive instructions, as there is much motivation for working by themselves and there is much communication in such classes.

As noted by Hedge (2006) and by the STRIMS-project (Malmberg 2000, p.17), it depends on learners which method to choose. They add that most pupils like deductive method, as it helps learners to feel more self-confident and less stressed. Hedge (2006, p. 147) states that the proficient learners prefer inductive method of grammar teaching, as they like when they work out and formulate their own rules. If the learners are quite proficient the inductive approach may be the best way to go since these pupils may be able to formulate their own rules. Cuff (1956) mentions that some grammatical items are so familiar to learners that there is no need to use inductive method. He suggests that teachers need to use both methods from time to time, in order to make learners to think in both ways inductively and deductively. He points out that teachers need from time to time to use deductive approach and from time to time inductive one, in order to make learners sometimes to think deductively and sometimes inductively (as cited in Johansson, 2008, p. 12).

Therefore, in order to make right decisions regarding to which method to choose, the instructors should take into consideration the learners' level, need and so on (LIU &



SHI, 2007).

Felder & Henriques (1995) state, “The distinction between induction and deduction is similar to the distinction between language acquisition and learning. To acquire a language means to pick it up gradually, gaining the ability to communicate with it without necessarily being able to articulate the rules” (p. 26).

Based on the studies provided in the literature review above, it can be concluded that much research has been carried out to investigate the teachers’ beliefs and learners’ attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. So, this study seeks to find out the above-mentioned issue.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides information about the educational context of the study. Thus, it includes the research questions, the research design, the participants of the study, the materials, the instruments used for the data collection and data analysis, as well as the research procedure.

### 3.1. Research questions

This study aimed to investigate the teachers' and learners' attitudes and perceptions towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. The research questions of this study are as follows

*1. What are the teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

*2. What are the learners' attitudes towards the inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

### 3.2. Research design

The present paper follows multiple-case study design. Stake (1995, p. xi) characterized case study as “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances”. Another author like Merseth (1994) defines a case “as a descriptive research document, often presented in narrative form, based on a real-life situation or event.” (as cited in Dooley, 2002, p. 337).

Other authors like Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) defined case study as the “most widely used approach to qualitative research in education.” (as cited in Duff, 2008, p. 21). Stake (1995) states that the case could be a child, a teacher. A teaching program or a school may be a case, but the relationship among the schools or the reason of an innovative program is less considered to be a case, as they are not specific concrete things.

In a case study a researcher examines a case in a more specific and real-life context with a small sample. He/she chooses a small area or a group of people as a subject of the case study (Zainal, 2007). Depending on how much is already known about a topic or about an amount of research conducted on it, Yin (2003) differentiates three types of case study: exploratory (to formulate new questions), descriptive (answering “What?” questions), or explanatory (answering “How?” and “Why?” questions) (Stake, 2008). According to Yin (2003) exploratory case studies are used to explore the situations, which are not clear to researcher in the data. Descriptive case studies are used to describe a phenomenon, which occur within the data, in real-life context. The goal set by the researcher is to describe the data as they occur (as cited in Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 548). And explanatory case studies are used to examine the data in depth in order to explain the phenomenon in the data (as cited in Zainal, 2007, p. 3).

This study is a descriptive one as it examines already existing issue and it answers to “what” question as well.

### **3.3. Setting, Participants and Materials**

The study was carried out in the Experimental English Classes (EEC), run by TEFL program, at the American University of Armenia (AUA) in summer 2012 with the

participation of Communication level learners and teachers. The proficiency level of the learners was defined as high elementary according to the EEC level division: the criterion used to place those students in that level was level promotion or a placement test. The participants and accordingly the teachers, who taught those classes, were chosen based on one-week pre-observation, as the basic grammar structures were taught at that level (see Appendix A). The courses covered all four skills. EEC courses were organized for students whose ages ranged from 6 to 17. Each term lasts 10 weeks. The sessions were held twice a week with one-hour duration. Each class consisted of 10-15 students with the same proficiency level.

The study was conducted in five groups of Communication level 3 and each group with its teacher was treated as one case. Thus, it was considered to be a multiple-case study design with multiple units of analysis (teacher and learners). All five groups were labeled cases and numbered from 1 to 5. Thus, there were 5 cases.

On the onset, the study was designed to last eight weeks, but because of an issue in three of the groups the study was conducted over 6 week, 7 weeks + one day, and 7 weeks.

The number of participants in the first and second cases was 15; in the third case 14; in the fourth case 13; and in the fifth one 14. In the first case the age of learners ranged from 10-16 (both males and females (*Table 1*)), in the second case it was 11-16 (both males and females (*Table 2*)) and third one the age of learners again ranged from 11-16 (both males and females (*Table 3*)), in the fourth one from 9-13 (both males and females (*Table 4*)) and in the fifth one from 10-13 (both males and females (*Table 5*)). The mother tongue of all the participants was Armenian. The English language was

considered to be the learners' foreign language. EEC students met two times a week in one-hour sessions of English. All groups used the same course book assigned for high elementary level students.

**Table 1, Case 1**

*Background Information about Research Participants*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
10	1	-	1
11	1	1	2
12	4	1	5
13	1	2	3
14	-	1	1
15	1	1	2
16	1	-	1
	9	6	15 + 1 (teacher) 16

**Table 2, Case 2**

*Background Information about Research Participants*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
11	2	-	2
12	2	4	6
13	1	-	1
14	1	1	2
15	-	2	2
16	-	2	2
	6	9	15 + 1 (teacher) 16

**Table 3, Case 3**

*Background Information about Research Participants*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
11	-	3	3
12	5	1	6
13	-	2	2
14	1	1	2
16	1	-	1
	7	7	14 + 1 (teacher) 15

**Table 4, Case 4**

*Background Information about Research Participants*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
8	1	-	1
9	1	-	1
10	3	2	5
11	2	1	3
12	1	1	2
13	-	1	1
	8	5	13 + 1 (teacher) 14

**Table 5, Case 5**

*Background Information about Research Participants*

<b>Age</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
10	1	-	1
11	2	1	3
12	-	1	1
13	2	-	2
14	-	3	3
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
	6	6	14 + 1 (teacher) 15

The textbook used in the five cases was “English in Mind 1” Cox & Hill, 2007, which is accomplished by a workbook, and a teachers’ book. The book covers all four skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The study concentrated only on grammar section of the book, as the study was about inductive and deductive grammar teaching.

### **3.4. Instrumentation**

The data collection was accomplished through three instruments:

3.4.1. A semi-structured interviews with teachers

3.4.2. Field notes or observations

3.4.3. Questionnaire for learners

#### **3.4.1. Semi-structured interviews**

The semi-structured interview was conducted with teachers at the very beginning of the study, in order to get information on teachers’ beliefs, perceptions concerning inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching (see Appendix B). It was

decided to conduct an interview with the same questions at the end of study as well, as it was done at the beginning, in order to see whether the teachers had changed their thoughts and perceptions regarding inductive and deductive grammar teaching. However, the plan changed because all the teachers said that they were going to give the same answers as they gave for the interview at the beginning of the study. The interview was conducted in English and included 11 questions. The interviewees were recorded and the interview answers were transcribed. The teachers were interviewed separately.

### **3.4.2. Field notes or observations**

The classes were observed during the all 8 weeks and accordingly field notes were recorded for each class (see Appendix C). The main focus was the teaching of grammar, that is to say grammar explanation: which method teachers used for explaining new grammar structures; to see whether her beliefs and thoughts on grammar explanation corresponded to her work in the class; and finally to see the learners' responses on the methods teachers used in the class: whether they reacted positively or negatively on the chosen method; or whether they were active or passive while teachers used inductive or deductive method of grammar explanation.

### **3.4.3. Questionnaire**

At the end of the study (week 8) a questionnaire was distributed to learners (see Appendix D) to express their attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. The questionnaire was completed anonymously so that the



participants felt free to express their opinions. The questionnaire was translated into Armenian, in order to avoid misunderstandings. The questionnaire included 13 questions with 5 closed-ended options (Likert scale). The options for the closed-ended questions were the following: Strongly Agree, Agree, Indecisive, Disagree and Strongly Disagree.

### **3.5. Data analysis**

The current study contains both qualitative and quantitative data, which were obtained accordingly from semi-structured interviews (conducted with teachers) and a questionnaire (distributed to learners). The questionnaire was analyzed using frequency analyses, which count the frequency of each answer in the questionnaire.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The current paper presents case study design, which was carried out to explore learners' beliefs and teachers' attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. The aim of the chapter is to provide answers to the proposed research questions. Both qualitative and quantitative data were employed, for the present study. The qualitative data were obtained with the help of semi-structured interviews, in which the participants shared their attitudes and beliefs towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching; and with the help of field notes or observations. The quantitative data were collected through the questionnaire prepared for the learners. Thus, this chapter presents detailed information of qualitative and quantitative data analysis, collected during the experiment in order to clarify the picture of the current research.

The results obtained through qualitative and quantitative data aimed to answer the following research questions:

*1. What are the teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

*2. What are the learners' attitudes towards the inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

### **4.1. Analysis of the Interview Data**

To answer the first research question, a semi-structured face-to-face interview was conducted with the teachers of each of the cases (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) under investigation in order to find out their attitudes towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of

grammar teaching. The interview was conducted with five teachers separately at the beginning of the study. The interview encompassed thirteen open-ended items (see Appendix B). It was carried out in English and was recorded. The answers of interviews are interpreted for each case separately.

The first question aimed at finding out the teachers' preference concerning inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. Case 1,4, and 5 reported that they preferred the mixture of both methods: first to write the form on the board and then use it inductively during the lessons. There are structures, which are easy to digest inductively rather than deductively and vice versa. Whereas, Case 2 and 3 responded that they prefer inductive method as through interaction students learn better and digest grammar structures easily. They did not get bored and tired and inductive method enables learners to be more actively involved into the lesson. The students are motivated when they draw the rule by themselves.

The second question aimed to find out the teacher's opinion concerning the learners' level of engagement when the grammar was explained inductively. All the Cases reported that the learners are highly involved and excited when inductive method is used, as they have better understanding when the context and objects around them are used. The learners like when the teacher organizes the lesson interactively using games and new activities. Each of the students tries to bring their own examples, sometimes to correct each other. Inductive method enables learners to compare and contrast their ideas, which brought to more effective learning.

The third question aimed at finding out learners' level of engagement while deductive method is used. All the Cases responded that the learners are not much

interested in lesson when inductive method is used, as they get bored. Learners were not engaged into the lesson and were not creative while deductive method is used.

The fourth and fifth questions aimed at finding out whether learners succeed more when grammar is taught inductively/deductively. The majority of all Cases replied that the learners succeeded more when grammar is taught inductively, as they understand grammar structures better. While using that method the patterns are more tangible for the students. Deductive method is more like a drill based. However, one of the Cases responded that both methods can provide success.

To the sixth and seventh questions whether strong learners acquire grammar better when grammar was taught inductively/deductively, the majority of all Cases answered that they do not see any difference in the use of inductive and deductive methods. Whereas one of the Cases answered that it depends on strong learners: some of them are more motivated and succeed than the others when inductive method is used. Regarding to deductive method, she answered that the learners does not acquire grammar better, as they are not the monitors, but the teacher is. And as a result the deductive method make them become less involved into the lesson.

The eighth and ninth questions aimed at finding out whether weak learners acquire grammar better when grammar was taught inductively/deductively. To this question all he Cases gave different answers. Case 1 answered that, the weak learners learn better when grammar is taught inductively, as she uses games and examples during the explanation. Whereas they do not acquire deductively better, as the teacher needs to bring examples from real life situations in order to help them to understand.

Case 2 answered that she could not give correct answers, as she had not had a chance to teach deductively because it is not allowed in their EEC contest.

Case 3 answered that she has not noticed much difference while using inductive method. She added that if the teacher carried out inductive explanation in an organized and accurate way, the learning process would be very effective for the weak students. She added, that when she used deductive method the learners felt less stressed and responsible for the rules and structures, as the rule was served to them in an easy way.

Case 4 answered that in both cases it was based on explained structures.

Case 5 answered that she had not noticed much difference. She added that deductive learning is harder for weak learners than for strong once. But she could not explain why she thought in that way.

To the tenth and eleventh questions whether there was an impact on the acquisition of grammar structures when inductive/deductive methods of teaching grammar was used, all the Cases answered that, there is a visible impact on the their acquisition when grammar structures are taught inductively. Inductive learning makes learning process more communicative and helps the students to digest the target grammar structures more easily. Learners notice the patterns through the examples and use the same patterns to produce their own sentences. Regarding to deductive method they answered that it does not give much impact. However, they added that grammar should be somehow thought deductively. As sometimes there is need to repeat the same structure for many times to make students use the structure correctly and purposefully.

## **4.2. Field notes or observations**

As mentioned above the second data source was field notes acquired during regular class observations: four times a week for eight-weeks. Field notes aimed to answer both research questions.

Before the classes, the teachers were informed about the observations. The observations were done based on two categories: first they aimed at finding out the methods teachers used during their grammar teaching process; the second aim was to provide a general overview of learners' beliefs concerning inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. At the end of the term, the learners were asked questions as to whether they preferred when teachers explained the new grammar structure by writing its formation on the board or by asking them to elicit the rules by themselves with the help of various activities and exercises. Some of the learners were shy to talk while the questions were given but overall the needed answers were given.

### **Case 1**

Most of the learners from Case 1 told that there was no difference what they covered, they liked when the teacher wrote the construction of new rule on the board. They explained that it was easier for them to remember the rule. They liked when they see the rule. Visually it was easy to remember. Just some of the learners told that they liked when they were engaged in the process of exploring the rules. That helped them to find out the rule by themselves, which made them remember the rules.

### **Case 2**

To the same questions the majority of Case 2 answered that they like the way their teacher explained the new grammar structures. They liked inductive method, as their

teacher used only that method. They added that they master the structures better in that way.

### **Case 3**

A small part of Case 3 told that there was no difference for them how the teacher would introduce the new rule. Whereas some of the students told that they liked when the rule was written on the board and explained in that way. They said that it was easier to remember the grammar structures and rules deductively.

### **Case 4**

Nearly the whole group of Case 4 answered that they preferred when teacher wrote the constructions of grammar structures and rules on the board. Visually they remembered better than by exploring the rules by themselves. It is worth mentioning that Case 4 learners were the youngest group in all five cases.

### **Case 5**

Nearly the whole Case 5 answered that it was better to find out the rule through exercises and activities. It helped them to understand how to use the rule in context. But at the same time the whole group said that writing the rule on the board was good as well, as they see the construction of it. However, they finalized with the thought that they liked inductive method more than deductive one.

## **4.3. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire**

This section presents the students' responses towards the methods implemented in practicing grammar structures within each case. It aims at answering the second research question. The students' questionnaire was administered at the end of the term. The aim of

this questionnaire was to determine the students' attitudes towards the methods applied in practicing grammar structures. The questionnaire consisted of thirteen closed-ended items. Hard copies of the questionnaire were given to the students. The questionnaire was translated into Armenian. There were some absences in some of the Cases, thus they did not complete the questionnaire.

By responding on a Likert scale, participants were to show the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the content of the items integrated in the questionnaire by circling one of the answers ranging from 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'indecisive', 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree' (a five-point scale). The questionnaire was analyzed quantitatively using the SPSS program through analysis of percentages, which counts the percentages of different types of answers. The table below (see Table 6) presents the statistical analysis of the results of the items integrated in the questionnaire for five cases separately. The table includes the responses of five cases separately for each of the questions (for detail interpretation see Appendix E). The results obtained through this questionnaire (quantitative data) aimed to answer the second research question that seeks to investigate the learners' attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching.

**Table 6 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Learners (table of percentages for each case)**

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Indecisive	Agree	Strongly Agree
Case 1	Q1	0.0%	0.0%	45.5%	9.1%	45.5%
Case 2	Q1	15.4%	7.7%	38.5%	7.7%	30.8%



Case 3	Q1	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	41.7%	50.0%
Case 4	Q1	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	9.1%	63.6%
Case 5	Q1	0.0%	21.4%	28.6%	7.1%	42.9%
Case 1	Q2	0.0%	9.1%	27.3%	27.3%	36.4%
Case 2	Q2	0.0%	38.5%	7.7%	7.7%	46.2%
Case 3	Q2	0.0%	41.7%	8.3%	25.0%	25.0%
Case 4	Q2	0.0%	45.5%	18.2%	27.3%	9.1%
Case 5	Q2	0.0%	64.3%	0.0%	21.4%	14.3%
Case 1	Q3	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	9.1%	63.6%
Case 2	Q3	0.0%	7.7%	7.7%	53.8%	30.8%
Case 3	Q3	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	58.3%	25.0%
Case 4	Q3	0.0%	0.0%	27.3%	9.1%	63.6%
Case 5	Q3	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%
Case 1	Q4	9.1%	0.0%	27.3%	45.5%	18.2%
Case 2	Q4	0.0%	23.1%	23.1%	53.8%	0.0%
Case 3	Q4	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%	0.0%
Case 4	Q4	27.3%	18.2%	45.5%	9.1%	0.0%
Case 5	Q4	0.0%	21.4%	14.3%	64.3%	0.0%
Case 1	Q5	0.0%	0.0%	54.5%	9.1%	36.4%
Case 2	Q5	0.0%	23.1%	38.5%	30.8%	7.7%
Case 3	Q5	0.0%	8.3%	25.0%	50.0%	16.7%
Case 4	Q5	0.0%	9.1%	36.4%	9.1%	45.5%
Case 5	Q5	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%	14.3%	57.1%
Case 1	Q6	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	27.3%	36.4%
Case 2	Q6	0.0%	15.4%	15.4%	30.8%	38.5%
Case 3	Q6	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%
Case 4	Q6	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%
Case 5	Q6	57.1%	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%	14.3%
Case 1	Q7	9.1%	0.0%	27.3%	27.3%	36.4%
Case 2	Q7	0.0%	15.4%	38.5%	15.4%	30.8%
Case 3	Q7	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	58.3%	25.0%
Case 4	Q7	0.0%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%	72.7%

Case 5	Q7	0.0%	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%	57.1%
Case 1	Q8	0.0%	36.4%	18.2%	9.1%	36.4%
Case 2	Q8	0.0%	7.7%	15.4%	30.8%	46.2%
Case 3	Q8	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%	41.7%
Case 4	Q8	18.2%	18.2%	27.3%	18.2%	18.2%
Case 5	Q8	0.0%	7.1%	21.4%	14.3%	57.1%
Case 1	Q9	36.4%	36.4%	27.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Case 2	Q9	38.5%	46.2%	7.7%	7.7%	0.0%
Case 3	Q9	0.0%	41.7%	50.0%	8.3%	0.0%
Case 4	Q9	36.4%	27.3%	27.3%	0.0%	9.1%
Case 5	Q9	28.6%	35.7%	14.3%	14.3%	7.1%
Case 1	Q10	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%	27.3%	45.5%
Case 2	Q10	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%	23.1%	30.8%
Case 3	Q10	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	58.3%	16.7%
Case 4	Q10	0.0%	18.2%	27.3%	9.1%	45.5%
Case 5	Q10	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	21.4%	50.0%
Case 1	Q11	45.5%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	27.3%
Case 2	Q11	46.2%	15.4%	7.7%	23.1%	7.7%
Case 3	Q11	41.7%	25.0%	25.0%	8.3%	0.0%
Case 4	Q11	63.6%	9.1%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%
Case 5	Q11	57.1%	14.3%	0.0%	21.4%	7.1%
Case 1	Q12	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	27.3%	45.5%
Case 2	Q12	0.0%	15.4%	15.4%	38.5%	30.8%
Case 3	Q12	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%
Case 4	Q12	0.0%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	54.5%
Case 5	Q12	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%
Case 1	Q13	36.4%	9.1%	9.1%	18.2%	27.3%
Case 2	Q13	30.8%	38.5%	7.7%	7.7%	15.4%
Case 3	Q13	58.3%	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%	0.0%
Case 4	Q13	63.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%
Case 5	Q13	71.4%	7.1%	7.1%	14.3%	0.0%

As Table 6 shows, the majority of all five Cases gave positive answers to Q1, which aimed at finding out whether learners liked deductive method of grammar teaching. There were few indecisive answers. There were no strongly disagree answers in Q1 besides Case 2, where only 15% of learners strongly disagreed and 7.7% disagreed with the statement.

As it can be seen from the table, there were no strongly disagree answers in any of Cases for Q2. Besides Case 1, the rest of the Cases gave mostly disagree answers to Q2, which aimed at finding out if the learners liked inductive method of grammar teaching. In Case 1 36.4% strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement, i.e., they prefer inductive method.

The third question aimed at finding out if learners understand English grammar structures better, when grammar was taught deductively. As can be seen in the table, the majority of all 5 Cases strongly agreed and agreed with the statement. There were some indecisive answers and no strongly disagree answers. Only a small number in Case 2 and Case 5 gave disagree answers.

The fourth question aimed at finding out if learners understand English grammar structures better, when grammar was taught inductively. Only a small number in Case 1 gave strongly agree answers. Most of the Cases just agreed with the statement. There were some indecisive in their answers. As table 6 shows, some part of the learners disagreed with the statement. There were few strongly disagree answers in Case 1 and 4.

There were mostly strongly agree and agree answers for Q5, which aimed at finding out if the learners were motivated when grammar was taught deductively. As can be seen

in the table, no one gave negative answers in Case, i.e., they were motivated when grammar was taught deductively. Most of the all other four Cases gave strongly agree and agree answers. And a few part disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagree answers.

As table 6 shows, the majority of Case 1 and 2 gave strongly agree and agree answers to Q6, which aimed at finding out whether learners were motivated when grammar was taught deductively. Case 3 did not gave any strongly disagree and disagree answers. Case 4 gave equal answers (9.1%) in all five items. The majority of Case 5 strongly disagreed with the statement in Q6.

Q7 aimed at finding out if deductive method of grammar teaching helped learners to learn English more effectively. The majority of all five Cases gave strongly agree and agree answers. Only a small number in Case 1 gave strongly disagree and in Case 2 disagree answers.

As table 6 shows, Case 1 have nearly the same number positive and negative answers and a small number of Case were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagree answers in any of Cases, besides Case 4, where the numbers for both positive and negative scale were the same.

The majority of all five Cases, Besides Case 3, gave strongly disagree and disagree answers to Q9, which aimed at finding out whether grammar practice used in EEC classes was not effective. 50% of Case 3 was indecisive in their answers, whereas 41.7% disagreed with the statement and only a small number agreed with it.

Q10 aimed at finding out if the grammar practice used in EEC classes created a pleasant atmosphere in class and helped learners to learn English. The majority of all five Cases gave positive answers to that question. There were no strongly disagree answers.

The majority of all five Cases gave negative answers to Q11, which aimed at finding out if grammar practice used in classes had no benefit on learners' ability to speak English. Only a small number gave strongly agree and agree answers.

The majority of all five Cases, Besides Case 3, gave strongly agree and agree answers to Q12, which aimed at finding out whether interaction among students, practiced in EEC classes, helped learners learn English grammar. 66.7% of Case 3 agreed with the statement and 33.3% were indecisive in their answers.

Q13 aimed at finding out whether grammar practice used in classes made learners less interested in learning English grammar structures. The majority of all Cases, besides Case 4, gave negative answers to that question. 63.6% of Case 4 disagreed with the statement and 36.4% agreed with it.

## CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

### 5.1. Discussion of Findings

This study was conducted to find out teachers' beliefs towards the impact and learners' attitudes towards inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. In this chapter, the findings of the research, as well as the answers to the research questions are presented. Besides, the limitations/delimitations of the study and suggestions for further research are also discussed in the chapter.

The study addressed the following research questions:

- 1. What are the teachers' beliefs towards the impact of inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*
- 2. What are the learners' attitudes towards the inductive and deductive methods of teaching grammar structures?*

Analyzing the responses of the interview and making inferences from the observations, it can be concluded that some of the Cases (1, 4, 5) preferred a mixture of inductive and deductive methods, whereas the other two Cases (2 and 3) used only inductive method. It can be concluded from the responses that all the Cases think that learners are more motivated and are highly engaged in the learning process when grammar is taught inductively than deductively. The learners succeed more when grammar is taught inductively. However, the results also showed that some Cases think that there are grammar structures that should be taught deductively. Analyzing the

responses it can be concluded that the Cases have not noticed any difference in the acquisition of grammar structures between weak and strong learners'.

From the learners' answers in all Cases, except Case 2, it can be concluded, that they liked deductive method of grammar teaching. According to learners' responses, it is easy to remember as the rules are written on the board and visually they remember better. Only Case 2 learners said that they liked only deductive method, as it was interesting and motivating.

The results of the learners' questionnaire was not the same as the results gained from the oral answers, where nearly all the Cases answered that they liked deductive method of grammar teaching. Nearly all the Cases answers were the same in percentages regarding inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. Learners' responses were positive to the use of inductive and deductive methods of grammar teaching. Thus, it can be concluded that learners preferred both methods and there was no difference for them which method would be used for presenting grammar structures. However, it can be concluded from the results that in all the Cases, the grammar practice used in EEC classes is motivating and interesting. It creates pleasant atmosphere for learning English language. The Cases also liked student interaction during the classes, which made them better learn language.

Based on the researcher's observations the following conclusion can be done. The real picture of the situation was slightly different from the teachers' and learners' answers. There were Cases where the teachers had to explain deductively the same grammar structure for many times in order to made learners to use it correctly in the given context. However, according to both observations and the learners' oral responses,

it can be concluded that learners acquire grammar structures better when it is taught deductively rather than inductively. The exception was again Case 2 where the teacher's answers correspond to real picture, i.e., the teacher only used inductive method and the learners were motivated and always active.

## **5.2. Delimitations of the study**

The study includes several delimitations, which should be taken into consideration in future for further research by other researchers. One of the delimitations is the time restriction. Instead of 8 weeks it will be better to conduct the research within ten weeks. In order to have valid and informative results it will be better to have enough time to instruct the groups than the researcher had. It will be also good to have more participants involved than there was during the study (10 groups instead of 5), in order to have more generalized results.

## **5.3. Limitations of the study**

The study also included several limitations. So the limitations of the study are the following. One of the limitations was that there were absences when the questionnaire was distributed. Thus, not all the learners filled the questionnaire. Another limitation is that there were learners who did not catch the meaning of some of the question, thus they gave wrong answers.

The last limitation was that the study was supposed to be conducted within 8 weeks. During the study there were groups who had practicum and during the practicum no one



was allowed to observe the classes. Thus, there were groups where the study was conducted within 7 weeks.

#### **5.4. Applications for further research**

Taking into consideration how this study was conducted, it would be better to conduct research with more statistical tools and analyses. Besides questionnaire, the study could also include pre and post tests, i.e., to have comparison and experimental groups. Another suggestion is to have a larger sample with students at different levels of proficiency.

According to various investigations and research, both inductive and deductive methods are significantly important in the process of grammar teaching and learning. Different researchers bring different evidences regarding to this issue: some of them consider that deductive method is better than inductive one; others consider the importance of inductive method of teaching based on the several conducted research.

## REFERENCES

- Abdolmanafi, R. (2009) A comparative study of the effect of explicit-inductive and explicit-deductive grammar instruction in EFL contexts: A case study of Persian learners of English. *Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow, Volume 9*.
- Al-Mekhlafi, A. M. & Nagaratnam, R. P. (2011). Difficulties in teaching and learning grammar in an EFL context. *International Journal of Instruction, 4*(2), pp. 69-92.
- Al-Musharraf, A. (2007). *Teaching and Assessing Grammar in English Primary Stage Classrooms that Promote Communicative Language*. Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University College of Languages and Translation Department of English.
- Azar, B. (2007). Grammar-based teaching: A practitioner's perspective. *TESL-EJ, 11*(2), pp. 1-12.
- Baxter, P. & Jack S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report 13*(4), pp. 544-559.
- Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(1), pp. 9-38.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: A literature review. *Language Awareness 12*(2), pp. 1-13.
- Bourke, J. M. (2008). A rough guide to language awareness. *English Teaching Forum, 1*(46), pp. 12-21.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(3), pp. 459-480.
- Chyi-ching Kao. (2007). The Role of Grammar Teaching in College EFL. pp 255-268

- Crystal, D. (2004). *Words And Deed*. Available online at [http://www.davidcrystal.com/DC\\_articles/Education2.pdf](http://www.davidcrystal.com/DC_articles/Education2.pdf).
- Cuff, R. P. (1956). Teaching college grammar by induction and deduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 40(2), pp. 76-79.
- Dooley, L. M. (2002). Case study research and theory building. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3), pp. 335-354.
- Duff, P. (2008). *Case study research in applied linguistics*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum/Taylor & Francis.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 4 (1), pp. 83-107.
- Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a Second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), pp. 242-260.
- Felder, R. M. & Henriques, E. R. (1995). Learning and Teaching Styles In Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(1), pp. 21–31.
- Gollin, J. (1998). Key concepts in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 52 (1), pp. 88-89.
- Hedge, T. (2006). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.
- Hudson, R. A. (1992). *Teaching grammar: A guide for the national curriculum*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johansson, M. (2008). *Who rules the rules?*. University of Gothenburg.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2001. "Teaching Grammar" in Celce-Murcia, Marianne

- (ed.) *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Boston:  
Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Li, L. L. (2008). *The role of grammar teaching in writing in second language acquisition*.  
Alliant International University.
- Liu, Qing-xue & Shi, Jin-fang. (2007). An analysis of language teaching approaches and  
methods: Effectiveness and weakness. *US-China Education Review*, 4 (1), pp. 69-71.
- Luu Trong Tuan, & Nguyen Thi Minh Doan. (2010). Teaching English Grammar  
Through Games. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 1 (7), pp. 61-75.
- Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners: International Student  
Edition*. (2002). Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Musilova, L. (2010). *Grammar games in ELT*. Retrieved from  
[http://is.muni.cz/th/152741/pdf\\_b\\_b1/BP\\_Grammar\\_Games\\_in\\_ELT.pdf](http://is.muni.cz/th/152741/pdf_b_b1/BP_Grammar_Games_in_ELT.pdf)
- Nunan, D. (1997). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal*, 52 (2), pp. 101-109.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York, NY:  
McGraw-Hill/Contemporary.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis  
using SPSS for Windows (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill/Open  
University Press.
- Pennington, M. (2003). *Teaching grammar and mechanics*. NJ, USA:  
Pennington Publishing.

- Rice, W. H. (1945). A unit in the inductive teaching of grammar. *The Modern Language Journal*, 29 (6), pp. 465-476.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodriguez, A. G. (2009). *Teaching grammar to adult English language learners: Focus on form*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/>
- Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (4), pp. 395-403.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand, Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thu, T. H. (2009). Teachers' perceptions about grammar teaching. Alliant International University.
- Ur, P. (1991). *A course in language teaching. Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widodo, H. P. (2006). Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. *English teaching: Practice and critique*, 5 (1), pp. 122-141.
- Xu, J. (2011). Applying active learning to grammar teaching for non-native English majors in EFL class settings. Retrieved from <http://scholar.google.com/schhp?hl=en>
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan bil.9*.

## APPENDICES

### **Appendix A (Preobservation)**

*Group: Com 2 A*

*Teacher: A*

The class started with checking homework assignment, which was about adverbs of frequency (learners had made sentences with adverbs of frequency, e.g., I usually go to school at 8 o'clock.). Then they read a story in Present Simple and then discussed it. The teacher asked them questions in Present Simple from the story and learners gave appropriate answers. Thus the first part of the class passed by repeating Present Simple. Then teacher showed pictures of different signs and asked learner's to tell what they meant. The learners recognized some of them and the teacher asked them what showed those signs. And she brought other examples, e.g., "Close the door", "Open the window" and so on. Then the students understood that those signs and sentences were showing demand, and the teacher told them that it was called Imperative. Then they did other exercises with Imperative in order to deepen their knowledge. Thus the teacher used inductive method of presenting grammar.

*Group: Com 2 C*

*Teacher: C*

The class started with checking homework. After that learners read a text and the teacher wrote down on the board three sentences from the text: “I can speak”, “Rich can’t speak”, and “How can he take part in marathon?”. Then she asked: “Where is the verb in these sentences?” “Which one is the verb?”, “What does “can” mean?”. And one of students told that it was an ability to do something. Then learners started to bring different examples with “can” and “can’t”. The teacher explained that “can” is a modal verb and asked one of the learners: “Can you speak Chinese?”. When teachers saw that learners had already understood the new grammar item she did an activity with them. She distributed flashcards to learners with different pictures showing ability and asked them to make pairs of two in each group. She explained that learners should look at the cards and ask each other questions with modal verb “can”, e.g., “Can you swim?”, “No, I can’t or Yes, I can”. Then they did some exercises with can on order to deepen the knowledge in new grammar item.

Thus the teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching in his class.

*Group: Com 2 F*

*Teacher: F*

The lesson started with checking homework. Then the teacher wrote down the adverbs of frequency on the board with appropriate percentages in front of each of them and asked learners to make sentences using adverbs of sequences. Then they did some exercises with new grammar item.

Here the teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching as well and it was quite interesting.

## **Appendix B (Semi-structured interview)**

### **Interview questions**

*In inductive learning, students are asked to discover grammatical rules by themselves. They are given input and asked to make sense of it by discovering the rule. In deductive learning, a language teacher helps students become aware of particular linguistic features by presenting explicit grammatical rules (Chyi-ching Kao, 2007).*

1. Which method do you prefer to use when introducing new grammar structures: inductive or deductive? Why do you prefer that one?
2. In your opinion, what is the learners' level of engagement when grammar is taught inductively? Why do you think that is?
3. In your opinion, what is the learners' level of engagement when grammar is taught deductively? Why do you think that is?
4. Do you think learners succeed more when grammar is taught inductively? Why?
5. Do you think learners succeed more when grammar is taught deductively? Why?
6. Do strong learners acquire grammar better when grammar is taught inductively? Why?
7. Do strong learners acquire grammar better when grammar is taught deductively? Why?
8. Do weak learners acquire grammar better when grammar is taught deductively? Why?
9. Do weak learners acquire grammar better when grammar is taught inductively? Why?
10. There is an impact on the acquisition of grammar structures when inductive method of teaching grammar is used.



11. There is an impact on the acquisition of grammar structures when deductive method of teaching grammar is used.

### **Appendix C (Field notes)**

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 09.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

The teacher revised Pr. Simple by writing on the board verb 'to be' and 'am, is, are' and '+s, +es, +ies' in front of them. Then she wrote on the board '+s, ch, sh, s, x, o' and told them that they should use '+es' after those letters, e.g., potato-potatoes. After these the teacher tried to make pupils remember what they had covered on the previous lessons by asking them to bring examples with those letters in the word. She also told them that if there was no 'to be' in the sentence then they should use letter '-s' after the verb for third person singular: 'he, she, it'.

Then they did some exercises on Present Simple.

*The teacher made a little revision using deductive method of grammar teaching, as she wrote the rules on the board and after revision she practiced it with pupils.*

Later, teacher wrote on the board the following sentence: 'She is in the cinema' and wrote the interrogative version of that sentence: 'Is she in the cinema?'. And she explained that if there was 'to be' verb in the sentence then they should use 'am, is, are' for interrogative sentences, but if there was no 'to be' then they should use 'do' and 'does' in the interrogative form of the sentence. And she wrote some examples on the board: 'she plays tennis' and 'does she play tennis'. Then she explained that if there was no 'to be' in a sentence then they should use 'does' for third person singulars 'he, she, it'. But if there is no third person singular then they should use 'do', e.g., 'They go to the

theatre' and interrogative 'Do they go to the theatre?'. They did some exercises in order to practice new grammar structure.

*This time again the teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching as she wrote the rules on the board, explained it and then they practiced it.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday, 09.04. Week 1.

### Unit 1

The teacher asked pupils what they did when they had free time and the pupils gave different answer, e.g., 'I play computer game' or 'I like reading books' etc. Then the teacher asked pupils what grammar tense they used when they were speaking about their free time. One of the pupils said that they used Present Continues, but the teacher corrected him and said that they had used Present Simple or Indefinite. She asked them how they constructed Present Simple and wrote on the board the construction of it: 'I + go + to school' and conjugated the sentence: 'You + go, He, she, it + goes'. Then she asked why she had written 's' with third person and one of the pupils said that it was third person singular. Then the teacher talked about exceptions, e.g., 'watches', and wrote that after 'x, ch, sh, ss, tch and s' they should use 'es'. Then she wrote the word 'study' and asked pupils whether they could say how it worked. One of the pupils answered to the given question and after that the teacher explained that if after consonant came 'y' then 'y' did not change to '-ies', e.g., 'play-played'. Then they did some exercises on new explained item.

*The teacher used both deductive and inductive methods, that is to say she mixed those two methods.*

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 09.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

The teacher wrote on the board the construction of Present Simple and explained it one more time for the revision. Then they did exercises and played domino on that topic.

*The teacher used deductive method for revision as she wrote on the board the construction word by word explained it one more time.*

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 10.04

Unit 1

The teacher revised Present Simple by writing on the board the construction of it: 'I, You play.', 'He, she, it plays.', 'We, you, they play.', and interrogative one: 'Do I, You play?', 'Does he, she, it play?'

She explained it one more time and then they played game with domino cards on Present Simple, in order to deepen their knowledge, especially third person singular.

After finishing playing the game, the teacher wrote on the board the following words 'like, love, hate' and 'enjoy' and explained that if there was a verb after those words, they should write the verb with 'ing'. She wrote examples on the board: 'I, You like playing', 'He, she, it likes playing' and 'We, You, They like playing'. Then she wrote interrogative forms of those sentences: 'Do I like playing...?', 'Does she like playing...?' etc.

After finishing explanation they did some activities on the new covered material. The teacher distributed handouts to the pupils and told them to find someone in the group, who liked, hated or enjoyed doing something. After finding they should write on the

handout the name of the person in front of the appropriate sentence, e.g., 'I hate reading' - name who hated reading. After that activity the teacher divided the class into groups, each of three and distributed cards with hobbies and interests to the pupils. The pupils should match the hobby card (dancing) with the correct word card. Those activities were supposed to deepen their knowledge on 'ing' form.

*The teacher explained the new grammatical item deductively, as she first wrote on the board the constructions and then did activities.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 10.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

They haven't covered any new material on that day.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 11.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

The teacher wrote the words 'love, like, hate, enjoy' on the board and the '+ing' form and corresponding sentences with that construction. For example, 'I hate dancing'.

The pupils brought examples with those words and 'ing' form. Then they did some exercises on that grammatical structure.

*The teacher explained the structure deductively as she first wrote the construction and then practiced it with exercises.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 11.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

They haven't covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 11.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

They haven't covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 12.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

They haven't covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 12.04. Week 1.

Unit 1

The teacher wrote on the board the following words 'love, like, hate, enjoy' and explained that after those words they must use 'ing' form. Then she explained that if a word ended with 'e', then that 'e' changed into nothing in 'ing', e.g., smile-smiling, and if a word ended with a consonant then the consonant was doubled when they added 'ing', e.g., hit-hitting. Then they practiced the grammar structure with a ball throwing game.

The teacher threw the ball and told a word and the guy who held it should make sentence with like, love, hate or enjoy words plus 'ing' form.

*The teacher explained the new grammatical item deductively, as she wrote on the board the construction of it and then practiced it.*

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 16.04. Week 2.

## Unit 2

The teacher started to walk in the room and asked pupils what she was doing at that moment. The pupils answered that she was walking and she was talking. Then the teacher asked the pupils to tell the expression she had used for that moment in with Present Continuous (“What am I doing now?”). One of the pupils gave the answer and the teacher continued to add new expressions: ‘at this moment, right now, now, currently, this week’ etc. Then the teacher brought some examples with Present Continuous: ‘My aunt is coming this week.’ or ‘I am reading now.’ She wrote the construction of Present Continuous on the board ‘to be + verb + ing’.

Then they did exercise 2 b (complete the sentences using pr. cont. form of the verbs, e.g., “He ... (take) the dog for a walk) and c (look at the pictures and complete the sentences with the present continues, use the phrases in the box) on page 19.

After finishing completing exercises the teacher asked learners different questions with Present Continuous, e.g., “What Narek is doing?” etc.

*The teachers combined two methods while explaining new material. First she explained inductively then wrote on the board deductively. As she walked around the classroom and made pupils to speak by asking them questions on her action. Then she passed into deductive method and explained the rule deductively by writing on the board.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher, Monday, 16.04. Week 2.

## Unit 1

They haven't covered any new grammatical items.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher, Monday, 16.04. Week 2.

## Unit 1

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 17.04. Week 2

## Unit 1

The teacher wrote on the board 'love, like, hate, enjoy' and 'doing' in front of them and brought some examples, e.g., I enjoy reading, I hate dancing etc. Then she distributed handouts with hobbies (cooking, going to the cinema, shopping clothes) and expressions (I like, I don't like, I hate). These hobbies and expressions were written in front of each other and each of the pupils should ask his/her friend (sitting next to him/her), for example, 'Do you like cooking?' and the answer should be: 'I like cooking' or 'I don't like cooking'. They should put a tick in front of the corresponding answer. Then the teacher divided the class into 4 groups (three learners in each group) and distributed handouts and dices to each of the groups. The pupils should throw the dice and ask a question with 'like, love, hate, enjoy'. If the question a pupil made was right then he/she should go forward, if no he/she should go one step back. The one who reached first to the finish won the game.

*The teacher explained the lesson one more time and she used deductive method of grammar teaching, as she wrote the rule and construction on the board and then they practiced it.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 17.04. Week 2

Unit 2

The teacher asked learners what she was doing at that moment and pupils answered that she was walking and she was smiling. Then one of the pupils read the rule of Present Continuous from the book after which the teacher explained the rule orally. She explained that they must use ‘+ing’ form for Present Continuous, ‘to be + ing’ form. Then one of the pupils read some examples from the book. They did exercise 2 b (complete the sentences using pr. cont. form of the verbs, e.g., “He ... (take) the dog for a walk) and c (look at the pictures and complete the sentences with the present continues, use the phrases in the box) on page 19. After completing the exercises the teacher added that there were time expressions, that showed which tense they should use and brought some examples, e.g., I am talking now, I am walking at this moment. Then the pupils brought some examples with Present Continue and time expressions. Later the teacher made two columns on the board and divided the class into two groups (each six person). On the top of one column she wrote ‘+ing form’, on the other ‘simple form’. One group wrote only ‘+ing’ form time expressions the other only ‘simple’ form time expressions. Then the groups made sentences with their written time expressions.

*The explained the rule inductively as she involved the class in the process of explanation and she explained the rule orally as well.*



Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 18.04. Week 2

Unit 2

The teacher continued working on practicing Present Continues. She revised the rule one more time orally and they started to practice it with exercises. But as the oral explanation did not help the pupils to remember the rule, the teacher wrote with big letters on the board verb 'to be+ing' form and separately verb 'to be' and 'am, is, are' (she had to write the rule in that way as the pupils could not get it in any way the teacher explained it.

*The teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching in order to make learners remember the rule and use it correctly.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 18.04. Week 2

Unit 2

The lesson started with reading. The pupils were asked to underline Present Simple and Present Continuous. After finishing reading the text the pupils were asked to tell which sentence was in the Present Simple and which in the Present Continuous tense. The teacher asked the pupils when they used Present Simple and gave the answer by her, that they used Present Continuous for the moments they did at one correct moment. The

teacher asked what she was doing at that moment and the pupils gave some answers that she was walking, she was talking.

Later the teacher assigned pupils to find information at home on Present Continuous and master the new tense.

*The teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching as she did not explained the rule and tried to make learners digest the rule by themselves both through the new text and some examples and through homework.*

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 18.04. Week 2

Unit 2

The teacher asked learners whether they remembered the text about volunteers they had covered during the previous lesson. The pupils answered that it was a person who worked without getting money and brought some examples of volunteer job, e.g., helping in the hospital, at the school. Then the teacher asked whether they remembered where the person in the story was working in Africa. And the pupils told that he was helping poor and sick people in the hospital.

Later the teacher wrote on the board the sentence 'He was helping poor and sick people' and asked pupils to find the verb in that sentence. After getting the reply 'was helping', she underlined that part and asked pupils to tell the tense for that verb and make that sentence interrogative. The pupils gave the answers and when the teacher saw that the pupils had mastered the new grammar rule she asked pupils to make groups (two learners in each group). The teacher distributed flashcards with actions. The pupils should hold them facedown and each of the pairs should ask as many questions as possible to his/her

pair in order to guess the action in his/her pairs flashcard, e.g., 'is he dancing?', 'are they singing?'. At the same time when one of the pairs was asking questions, the other one should answer, for example 'Yes, he is' or 'No, he is not' or 'Yes, they are' or 'No, they are not'.

Later when everyone finished doing the activity, they practiced Present Continuous with exercises from their student's book (ex. 2 b and c, p. 19).

When they finished doing exercises the teacher revised orally one more time the construction of Present Continuous telling that they should use verb 'to be' which was 'am, is and are' plus verb and 'ing' form, e.g., he was laughing, they were smoking, etc. After the revision the teacher divided the class into groups (two learners in each group) and distributed handouts with a picture of an apartment with people in it. Each of the pupils' picture differs from his/ her pair's picture. The pairs should ask questions each other, for example, 'Is mother reading?', and after getting yes or no answer they should circle the difference in their pictures. Later the pair who found out the most differences in the pictures told them aloud.

*The teacher mixed two methods for explaining new grammar structure. As she first made learners two talk about Present Continuous and then wrote the formation of it.*

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 19.04. Week 2

Unit 2

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 19.04. Week 2

Unit 2

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 23.04. Week 3

Unit 2

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday, 23.04. Week 3

Unit 2

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 23.04. Week 3

Practicum.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 24.04. Week 3

Holiday

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 24.04. Week 3

Holiday

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 25.04. Week 3

Unit 3

The teacher asked the learners whether they had heroes or whom they would like to look like. The pupils gave different answers, e.g., 'I would like to look like my mother' or 'My hero is David Beckham, etc. The teacher asked pupils whether they know something about Erin Brokovich. As no one gave an answer, they started to read a text about Erin Brokovich. After that they did an exercise, where they should write answers to the given questions from the text. The teacher paid pupils attention on tense of the questions and told them if the questions were in the Past Tense then accordingly the respond should be in the Past Tense as well. Then the pupils read their answers. The teacher assigned pupils to find information about their heroes at home and write about them.

*The teacher did not explain the rule but she paid pupils' attentions on the Tense of the questions. Thus she prepared them for the new grammar structure explanation.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 25.04. Week 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 24.04. Week 3

Practicum.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 26.04. Week 3

Unit 2

The teacher started to walk around the room and asked pupils what she was doing. The pupils respond that she was walking. The teacher took the chalk and started to write

on the board and she asked what she was doing. The pupils respond that she was writing. Then the teacher asked pupils what they were doing and the pupils gave different answers, e.g., 'We are sitting' or 'We are listening', etc. The teacher asked pupils what Present Continuous showed and the pupils answered that it showed action that they did every day. The teacher told them not to mix it with Present Simple and added that Present Continuous showed action that they did at that moment. Here the lesson ended and they should continue covering new grammar rule on the next lesson.

*The teacher explained the new rule inductively as she started the explanation by making pupils talk and be involved in the process of discovering the rule.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 26.04. Week 3

Practicum

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 30.04. Week 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher n. Monday, 30.04. Week 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 30.04. Week 4

Practicum

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 01.05. Week 4

## Unit 2

The teacher walked around the room and asked pupils what she was doing and the pupils respond that she was walking and speaking. She asked pupils when they used Present Continuous and the pupils replied that they used it for the action that took place at the moment of speaking. The teacher asked pupils when they used Present Simple and the pupils answered that they used for general facts. Further the teacher divided the class into two groups. One group should explain Present Simple to the class, the other Present Continuous. They should come to the board and write the formations of those two Tenses.

*The teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching as she let the pupils to explain the rule to each other.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 01.05. Week 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 02.05. Week 4

## Unit 3

The teacher asked pupils what they knew about Past Tense and wrote on the board the word 'regular' and under it '+d, + ied, + ed' and brought appropriate examples, 'lived, studied, worked'. She told them that those were regular forms. Then she wrote the word 'irregular' and asked pupils how they constructed irregular one. She asked them to bring examples from the text they had covered and pupils found some, e.g., write - wrote, to be - was, say - said, sell - sold, etc. Further the teacher read a sentence from the text

'She loved her job' and asked pupils who could make interrogative that sentence. One of the pupils rose his hand and gave wrong answer, after that the teacher wrote on the board the right one 'Did she love...' and told them that there were no matter whether the verb is regular or irregular, they must use 'did' for making sentences interrogative in the Past Tense. The teacher brought some examples with Past Tense interrogative. Later the teacher wrote on the board 'to be' with its past form 'was, were' and wrote an example under it 'He was in the cinema'. They did an exercise with Past Tense where they should put the verb in right form of Past Tense. Then the teacher assigned pupils to write five important data in their lives using Past Tense. After writing their important data they read them out loud.

*The teacher explained the new grammar structure deductively while trying to make pupils to get involved in the lesson.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 02.05. Week 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 02.05. Week 4

Unit 3

The teacher wrote on the board three sentences 'She found documents', 'Erin Brokovich worked for a law company', 'She studied...'. After that the teacher asked pupils to underline the verb in the sentence and elicit the tense form. She told them that it showed action in the past and wrote the formation of Past Tense. She divided the board into two columns: one with regular verbs, the other with irregular and explained them



how verbs were formed in that tense. The pupils brought some examples, e.g., help-helped, stay-stayed, follow-followed, etc. Later they did exercises 6 (a,c) on the page 28. 6(a): find the Past Tense of the given verbs, example, study-studied, marry-married. 6(c): complete the sentences, use the Past Simple form of the verb, example, 'Last night I (study)... for today's test.'

*The teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching.*

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 03.05. Week 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 03.05. Week 4

Practicum

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 07.05. Week 5

Mid-test

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday, 07.05. Week 5

Mid-test

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 07.05. Week 5

Mid-test

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 08.05. Week 5

Mid-test

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 08.05. Week 5

Mid-test

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 09.05. Week 5

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 09.05. Week 5

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 09.05. Week 5

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 10.05. Week 5

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 10.05. Week 5

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 14.05. Week 6

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday, 14.05. Week 6

Practicum

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 14.05. Week 6

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 15.05. Week 6

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 15.05. Week 6

Unit 4

The learners read a text from the book. After finishing reading, the teacher asked learners to underline regular and irregular verbs in the text. At the same time the teacher divided the board into two columns and asked learners to come and write down the verbs found from the text in the correct column on the board. That was a kind of revision of regular and irregular verbs.

Later the teacher told orally that there were hint words, which helped to decide the Tense form of a sentence. She added that all those hint words were connected with yesterday. Then one of the learners read those time expressions and they did exercise 4 (b) on page 34 (Complete the sentences with your own information, e.g., four hours ago, I was...). Later they did exercise 4 (c) on page 36 (Complete the sentences. Use time expression with age, e.g., David is fifteen now. He started school when he was five. David started school ten years ago.).

*The teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching.*

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 16.05. Week 6

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday 16.05. Week 6

Practicum

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 16.05. Week 6

Unit 4

The lesson started with discussion of sport activities, continuing with listening a text from the book. The teacher wrote on the board the following sentences: 'They played for fifteen minutes.', 'He wanted to give something back.', and 'The bus arrived at the hotel.'. The teachers asked learners to tell the tense of those sentences and got the right answer. The teacher revised Past Tense orally. Then the teacher asked learners to make

those sentences on the board interrogative. After getting correct answer the teacher wrote the construction of Past Simple on the board: 'did+subject+verb'. Later the learners gave short 'Yes' and 'No' answers to the questions written on the board and made special questions as well. The told orally that they should write 'wh' or add it in front of 'did'. The teacher distributed handouts with past questions where learners should answer to the given questions, e.g., when did you go to school?. After answering to given questions the learners should change their handouts with answers with his/her pair and the each of the pairs should tell about his/her friend.

Further the teacher distributed another handout, where the learners should fill in the blanks with correct form of Past Simple Tense. After that they did exercise 2 (b) (Put the verbs from the box in the Past Simple and write them in the lists, e.g., change-changed, see-saw), 2 (c) (Complete the summary. Use the Past Simple Form of the verbs, e.g., 'There (to be) a table tennis championship in Japan in 1971, 2 (d) (Look at the examples and complete the table, e.g., 'Did the Chinese players talk to Cowan?'.; No, they did not' or 'Yes, they did.', 2 (e) (Put the words in the correct order to make questions, e.g., 'you/go out/last night/did?' on page 33.

*The teacher revised the grammar structure inductively.*

Com 3E Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 17.05. Week 6

Unit 3

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 17.05. Week 6

## Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 21.05. Week 7

## Unit 3-4

The teacher distributed handouts and divided the class into groups (two learners in each group). The learners should do exercises on Past Simple Tense. In the first exercise they should put the verbs in the irregular form. The next exercise was the following: fill in the blanks with Past Simple of the correct verb from the list. Then the teacher wrote on the board some verbs. Each of the learners came to the board and wrote Past Simple form of those verbs (irregular verbs). Later the teacher asked learners whether they remembered what kind of expressions they used for Past Simple Tense and the learners gave some answers, e.g., last, ago, the day before etc.

*The teacher made revision inductively*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday 21.05. Week 7

## Practicum

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 21.05. Week 7

## Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 22.05. Week 7

Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 22.05. Week 7

Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 23.05. Week 7

Unit 4

The teacher asked learners how they made interrogative Past Tense sentences. The learners answered that they used 'did' for making sentences interrogative. The teacher asked learners different questions in Past Tense in order to get short answers from the learners, e.g., 'Did you play guitar yesterday?', and the learners gave short answers: 'Yes, I did', 'No, I did not'. They did all these orally and after getting all these answers, the teacher wrote on the board the short answers. Later they did exercise 2 (c) (Put the words in the correct order to make questions, for example, you/go out/last night/did?) on page 33. After completing the exercise the teacher again asked different questions with Past Tense in order to get short answers. She did it in order to see whether the learners really understood the structure and in order to deepen their knowledge. Further they revised Past Tense time expressions and did exercise 3 (c) (Complete the sentences. Use a time

expressions with ago, for example, 'David is fifteen now. He started school when he was five. David started school ten years ago.')

*The teacher mixed inductive and deductive methods.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday 23.05. Week 7

Practicum

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 23.05. Week 7

Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 24.05. Week 7

Unit 4

The teacher started to ask questions to learners, e.g., 'Did you go to school yesterday?' and the learners answered only 'Yes', but the teacher told them to give the full reply like 'Yes, I did' or 'No, I did not'. The teacher wrote those answers on the board and told learners to reply only in that way. Then the teacher asked another questions, e.g., 'Did you play football yesterday?' and one of the learners answered that he had played football the day before. The teacher gave one such kind of question to each of the learners and got right answers. Later they did exercise 2 (b) (Put the verbs from the box in the Past Simple and write them in the lists, e.g., regular (changed) verbs, irregular



(saw) verbs, 2 (c) (Complete the summary. Use the Past Simple form of the verbs, for example, There ... (be) a table tennis championship in Japan in 1971.), 2 (d) (Look at the examples and complete the table, for example, Did Chinese players talk to Cowan? No, they did not or Yes, they did.), 2 (e) (Put the verbs in the correct order to make questions, for example, you/go out/last night/did?) on page 33. They did exercise 3 (Work with pair. Ask and answer questions from exercise 2 (e)) on page 33 as well. Later they did exercise 4 (b) on page 34 (Complete the sentences with your own information, e.g., four hours ago, I was...). Later they did exercise 4 (c) on page 36 (Complete the sentences. Use time expression with age, e.g., David is fifteen now. He started school when he was five. David started school ten years ago.).

*The teacher explained the new rule inductively.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 24.05. Week 7

## Unit 5

The teacher asked learners to read a text from the book and as there were expressions 'have to, do not have to', the teacher told learners that those expressions showed necessity, must. Later after finishing reading the text, learners made sentences using 'have to' and 'do not have to', e.g., 'Do you have to do reading at home?' Each of the learners made questions for his/her pair, thus in that way the whole class was engaged in that process.

*The teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching, as she involved the whole class in exploring the rule.*

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Monday, 28.05. Week 8

Unit 4

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Monday 28.05. Week 8

Unit 5

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Monday, 28.05. Week 8

Unit 5

The teacher wrote on the board the following sentence 'You have to be intelligent, in order to be successful' and 'You do not have to have a lot of money'. She asked pupils whether they could tell the verb in those sentences, as she got right answers, she underlined 'have to' and 'do not have to' in those sentences. The teacher wrote on the board 'have to/has to' and wrote under them 'rules and laws'. She explained that if they speak about rules and laws it was necessary to use 'have to' and 'has to'. She wrote the construction on the board 'have/has to go'. The pupils brought some examples with 'have to' and 'has to', e.g., 'I have to read', 'I have to dance'. Later the teacher wrote on the board 'do/does+s+ have to' and told that the interrogative of 'have/has to' was formed in that way. She wrote some example on the board, e.g., 'Do you have to go to sport?', 'Does he have to study German at school?'. The teacher wrote the negative form of

‘have/has to’ with some examples as well, e.g., ‘You do not have to do to music’, and ‘He does not have to watch a film’. Later they did exercise 2 (a) (Look at the examples from the reading and listening texts. Complete the rule and the table.), 2 (b) (Complete the sentences. Use have/has to or do not/does not have to, for example, ‘If you want to work in the USA, you ... speak good English.’) on page 41. They did exercise 4 (a) (Write tick for the things you have to do at home. Write cross for the things you do not have to do.) on the page 41 as well.

*The teacher explained the grammar structure deductively, though she mixed inductive method as well.*

Com 3E. Case 4 teacher. Tuesday, 29.05. Week 8

Unit 4

The teacher wrote on the board Present Simple and asked pupils to tell when they used Past Simple. The teacher told learners that there were regular and irregular verbs in Past Simple and wrote on the board regular and irregular. She wrote ‘-ed’ under regular. Then she asked learners to bring examples with regular verbs in the sentences. One of the learners brought an example and the teacher wrote it on the board, e.g., ‘I finished my homework one hour ago’. The teacher underlined ‘ago’ and asked learners what it was. The learners answered that it was Past Simple time expression and one of the learners told negative and interrogative forms of that sentence. Later the teacher wrote a sentence told by one of the learners on the board and underlined irregular verb in it, e.g., ‘I wrote a dictation yesterday’. One of the learners made that sentence negative and interrogative and the teacher wrote them on the board. Further the teacher asked various questions with

Past Simple and got short answers, e.g., ‘Did you go to school yesterday?’ ‘Yes, I did’, ‘No, I did not’. The teacher wrote those short answers on the board as well. The teacher asked the learners to list Past Simple time expressions and as she got the answers she wrote them on the board, e.g., yesterday, ago, last night, in 2010 etc. Later she asked various questions in Past Simple to learners in order to deepen their knowledge.

*The teacher used mixed method, as she made learners to found out the rules and then she wrote the construction on the board.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Tuesday, 29.05. Week 8

Unit 5

The teacher explained learners that they should use ‘a’ or ‘an’ before jobs. Then the learners brought examples from the book with ‘a’ and ‘an’, e.g., ‘a pilot’, ‘an engineer’. The teacher added that they should use ‘a’ before consonants and ‘an’ before vowels.

*The teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching.*

Com 3A. Case 1 teacher. Wednesday, 30.05. Week 8

Unit 5

The teacher asked learners what they had to do in order to be considered successful. The learners gave various answers, e.g., have to win medals, have to get up early etc. The teacher wrote on the board have to and started to explain its meaning and the difference between ‘must’ and ‘have to’. She mentioned that ‘must’ was obligatory that the learners did not have any other way or choice to decide, meanwhile ‘have to’ was something that did not force to do a thing, it was obligatory but not like ‘must’. The learners brought

some examples with 'have to', e.g., 'I have to do my homework every day'. Further they did exercise 2 (b) (Complete the sentences. Use have/has to or do not/does not have to, for example, 'If you want to work in the USA, you ... speak good English.) on page 41.

*The teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching.*

Com 3B. Case 2 teacher. Wednesday, 30.05. Week 8

Unit 5

The teacher wrote on the board the word 'occupation' and asked learners to explain the meaning of the word and tell different occupations. The learners answered that it meant 'job' and started to list different jobs. The teacher wrote those jobs on the board and asked one of the learners what the firefighter had to do. As the learner could not answer the teacher explained that the learners had to work hard in order to get good marks. She added that the learners have to, it was necessary to work hard and one more time gave the same question that was what the firefighter had to do. One of the learners said the firefighter had to fight with fire. Further the teacher used all the occupations with the same question, e.g., 'What the shop assistant had to do?' etc. By that way she made learners use have/has to in different sentences. Later the teacher divided the class into groups of five and distributed handouts. The pupils should match the job with the appropriate definitions, which were written with 'has to', e.g., actor-s/he has to perform a role in a play or movie etc.

*The teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching as she did not write the construction on the board, she tried to merge the new lesson with another part of the lesson and explain the new rule in that way.*

Com 3C. Case 3 teacher. Wednesday, 30.05. Week 8

Unit 5

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

Com 3E Case 4 teacher. Thursday, 31.05. Week 8

Unit 5

The teacher wrote on the board 'have/has to' and 'do/does not have to' and asked learners to explain what 'has to' meant. One of the learners told that it meant necessity to something and the teacher put mark of equal between 'have/has to' and necessity to do. The teacher assigned learners to tells two sentences: one with 'have to', the other with 'do not have to'. Further they did exercise 2 (b) (Complete the sentences. Use have/has to or do not/does not have to, for example, 'If you want to work in the USA, you ... speak good English.) on page 41. The teacher distributed handouts and divided the class into groups (two learners in each group). The learners should read rules of the given hotel and fill in the blanks with 'have/has to' or 'do/does not have to'.

*The teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching as she first explained the rule and then practiced it with exercises.*

Com 3F. Case 5 teacher. Thursday, 31.05. Week 8

Unit 5

They have not covered any new grammar structures.

## Appendix D (Questionnaire for learners)

Please, answer to the following questions. Circle the answer according to your perception.

Strongly agree, Agree, Indecisive, Disagree, Strongly disagree:

1.	I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar structures through writing the rules on the board. I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar structures through writing the rules on the board.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
2.	I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar rules through examples and activities. I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar rules through examples and activities.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
3.	I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follow the practice. I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follow the practice.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
4.	I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are explained through examples and activities. I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are explained through examples and activities.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
5.	When grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follows the practice, it motivates me to learn English. When grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follows the practice, it motivates me to learn English.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
6.	When grammar structures are explained through examples and activities, it motivates me to learn English. When grammar structures are explained through examples and activities, it motivates me to learn English.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1
7.	It helps me to learn English more effectively, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then comes practice. It helps me to learn English more effectively, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then comes practice.	Strongly agree Agree Indecisive Disagree Strongly disagree	5 4 3 2 1

8.	It helps me to learn English grammar structures more effectively, when grammar structures are explained through examples and activities. <p>የሚረዳኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር መደቦችን በተለያዩ ምሳሌዎችና በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1
9.	The grammar practice used in EEC classes was not effective. <p>የሚሰጠኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር ስራዎች በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1
10.	The grammar practice used in EEC classes created a pleasant atmosphere in class and it helped me to learn English. <p>የሚሰጠኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር ስራዎች በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1
11.	The grammar practice used in classes had no benefit on my ability to speak English. <p>የሚሰጠኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር ስራዎች በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1
12.	Student interaction practiced in EEC classes helped me to learn English grammar. <p>የሚሰጠኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር ስራዎች በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1
13.	The grammar practice used in classes made me less interested in learning English grammar structures. <p>የሚሰጠኝ ለእንግሊዝ ቋንቋ ግራምራር ስራዎች በሰነድ ስራዎች በኩል ለማሳለፍ ይህ ዘዴ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡</p>	<p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Agree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Indecisive</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Disagree</p> <p>የጥንቃቄ ማድረግ ለእኔ ጥሩ ሊሆን ይችላል፡፡ Strongly disagree</p>	5 4 3 2 1



**Appendix E (The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (table of percentages for each case))**

**Table 1**

<b>Q1</b>	<i>I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar structures through writing the rules on the board.</i>		
		Count	Table N %
	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	0	0.0%
	Indecisive	5	45.5%
	Agree	1	9.1%
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%
	a. Cases = 1		
		Count	Table N %
q1	Strongly Disagree	2	15.4%
	Disagree	1	7.7%
	Indecisive	5	38.5%
	Agree	1	7.7%
	Strongly Agree	4	30.8%
	a. Cases = 2		
		Count	Table N %
q1	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	0	0.0%
	Indecisive	1	8.3%
	Agree	5	41.7%
	Strongly Agree	6	50.0%
	a. Cases = 3		
		Count	Table N %
q1	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	3	27.3%
	Indecisive	0	0.0%
	Agree	1	9.1%
	Strongly Agree	7	63.6%
	a. Cases = 4		

	Count	Table N %
q1 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	3	21.4%
Indecisive	4	28.6%
Agree	1	7.1%
Strongly Agree	6	42.9%

a. Cases = 5

As Table 1 shows, 45.5% of the Case 1 strongly agreed with the statement that they liked when the teacher explains the new grammar structure deductively. Nearly the other part of the Case 1 was indecisive in their answers. And only a small number, i.e., 9.1% of the Case 1 agreed with the statement. Thus, it can be claimed that the Case 1 liked deductive method of grammar teaching.

In Case 2, 30.8% of learners strongly agreed with the statement. 7.7% agreed and disagreed that they liked deductive method of grammar teaching. The majority (38.5%) was indecisive and only 15.45 strongly disagreed that they liked deductive method of grammar teaching.

Case 3 gave 50% strongly agree and 41.7% agree answers and only small part of it 8.3% was indecisive in their answers. Case 3 has 0% disagree and strongly disagree answers. As can be seen from the result the majority like when teacher wrote the rules on board: it means Case 3 liked deductive method of grammar teaching. There were no strongly disagrees answer in Case 3.

The majority of Case 4 strongly agreed 63.6% and 9.1% agreed with the statement and only a small number 23.3% disagreed with the statement. Thus, case 4 liked deductive method of grammar teaching. There was no strongly disagrees answer in Case 4.

43% of Case 5 strongly agreed with the statement and 7.1% agreed with it. 8.6% was indecisive in their decision and only 21.4% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagree answers in Case 5. Thus, Case 5 liked deductive method of grammar teaching.

**Table 2**

Q2		<i>I like the lessons, when teacher explains new grammar rules through examples and activities.</i>																																							
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q2 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Count	Table N %	q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	9.1%	Indecisive	3	27.3%	Agree	3	27.3%	Strongly Agree	4	36.4%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q2 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>6</td> <td>46.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>38.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Count	Table N %	q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	7.7%	Indecisive	1	7.7%	Agree	6	46.2%	Strongly Agree	5	38.5%
	Count	Table N %																																							
q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																							
Disagree	1	9.1%																																							
Indecisive	3	27.3%																																							
Agree	3	27.3%																																							
Strongly Agree	4	36.4%																																							
	Count	Table N %																																							
q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																							
Disagree	1	7.7%																																							
Indecisive	1	7.7%																																							
Agree	6	46.2%																																							
Strongly Agree	5	38.5%																																							
		a. Cases = 1		a. Cases = 2																																					
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q2 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>41.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Count	Table N %	q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	8.3%	Indecisive	3	25.0%	Agree	3	25.0%	Strongly Agree	5	41.7%	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q2 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Count	Table N %	q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	2	18.2%	Indecisive	3	27.3%	Agree	1	9.1%	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%
	Count	Table N %																																							
q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																							
Disagree	1	8.3%																																							
Indecisive	3	25.0%																																							
Agree	3	25.0%																																							
Strongly Agree	5	41.7%																																							
	Count	Table N %																																							
q2 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																							
Disagree	2	18.2%																																							
Indecisive	3	27.3%																																							
Agree	1	9.1%																																							
Strongly Agree	5	45.5%																																							
		a. Cases = 3		a. Cases = 4																																					

		Count	Table N %
q2	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	0	0.0%
	Indecisive	3	21.4%
	Agree	2	14.3%
	Strongly Agree	9	64.3%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 2, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement that they liked when teacher explains new grammar rules through examples and activities. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers and only 9.1% disagreed with the statement. There was no strongly disagrees in Case 1.

In Case 2, 38.5% strongly agreed and 46.2% agreed with the statement in question 1. 7.7% were indecisive in their answers and 7.7% disagreed with the statement, i.e., they do not like when teacher used inductive method of grammar teaching. The majority of Case 2 liked inductive method of grammar teaching. There was no strongly disagrees in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3 41.7% strongly agreed and 25.0% agreed with the statement, i.e., they liked inductive method of grammar teaching. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers and only 8.3% disagreed with the statement. There was no strongly disagrees answers in Case 3.

According to the results, 45.5% strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers and only 18.2% disagreed with the statement. There was no strongly disagrees answer in Case 4.

The majority of Case 5 64.3% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 21.4% were indecisive in their answers. No one gave disagree and strongly disagree answers.

**Table 3**

<b>Q3</b>	<i>I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follow the practice.</i>																																				
<table border="1" data-bbox="175 898 792 1234"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q3 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>7</td> <td>63.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="175 1255 297 1283">a. Cases = 1</p>		Count	Table N %	q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	3	27.3%	Agree	1	9.1%	Strongly Agree	7	63.6%	<table border="1" data-bbox="889 898 1507 1234"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q3 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>7</td> <td>53.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>30.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="889 1255 1011 1283">a. Cases = 2</p>		Count	Table N %	q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	1	7.7%	Indecisive	1	7.7%	Agree	7	53.8%	Strongly Agree	4	30.8%
	Count	Table N %																																			
q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	3	27.3%																																			
Agree	1	9.1%																																			
Strongly Agree	7	63.6%																																			
	Count	Table N %																																			
q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	1	7.7%																																			
Indecisive	1	7.7%																																			
Agree	7	53.8%																																			
Strongly Agree	4	30.8%																																			
<table border="1" data-bbox="175 1381 792 1717"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q3 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>2</td> <td>16.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>7</td> <td>58.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="175 1738 297 1766">a. Cases = 3</p>		Count	Table N %	q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	2	16.7%	Agree	7	58.3%	Strongly Agree	3	25.0%	<table border="1" data-bbox="889 1381 1507 1717"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q3 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>7</td> <td>63.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="889 1738 1011 1766">a. Cases = 4</p>		Count	Table N %	q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	3	27.3%	Agree	1	9.1%	Strongly Agree	7	63.6%
	Count	Table N %																																			
q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	2	16.7%																																			
Agree	7	58.3%																																			
Strongly Agree	3	25.0%																																			
	Count	Table N %																																			
q3 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	3	27.3%																																			
Agree	1	9.1%																																			
Strongly Agree	7	63.6%																																			

		Count	Table N %
q3	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	2	14.3%
	Indecisive	2	14.3%
	Agree	2	14.3%
	Strongly Agree	8	57.1%

a. Cases = 5

As mentioned in Table 3, 63.6% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement, that is to say they understand grammar structures better, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follow the practice. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagree and disagree answers in Case 1.

In Case 2, 30.8% strongly agreed and 53.8% agreed with the statement in the question 3. 7.7% were indecisive in their answers and 7.7% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees answers in Case 2. The answers showed that the majority of Case 2 understood grammar structures better when teacher used deductive method of grammar teaching.

As can be seen in Case 3, 25.0% strongly agreed and 53.8% agreed with the statement. 16.7% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 63.6% strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 4.

The majority of Case 5 64.3% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 14.3% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (14.3) disagreed with the statement. No one gave strongly disagree answers.

**Table 4**

<b>Q4</b>	<i>I understand English grammar structures better, when grammar structures are explained through examples and activities.</i>																																				
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 674 764 1010"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q4 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="152 1031 269 1052">a. Cases = 1</p>		Count	Table N %	q4 Strongly Disagree	1	9.1%	Disagree	2	18.2%	Indecisive	0	0.0%	Agree	3	27.3%	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%	<table border="1" data-bbox="889 684 1511 1024"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q4 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>23.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>23.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>7</td> <td>53.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="894 1045 1011 1066">a. Cases = 2</p>		Count	Table N %	q4 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	3	23.1%	Agree	3	23.1%	Strongly Agree	7	53.8%
	Count	Table N %																																			
q4 Strongly Disagree	1	9.1%																																			
Disagree	2	18.2%																																			
Indecisive	0	0.0%																																			
Agree	3	27.3%																																			
Strongly Agree	5	45.5%																																			
	Count	Table N %																																			
q4 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	3	23.1%																																			
Agree	3	23.1%																																			
Strongly Agree	7	53.8%																																			
<table border="1" data-bbox="175 1171 792 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q4 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>33.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>41.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="180 1528 297 1549">a. Cases = 3</p>		Count	Table N %	q4 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	3	25.0%	Agree	4	33.3%	Strongly Agree	5	41.7%	<table border="1" data-bbox="889 1171 1511 1507"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q4 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="894 1528 1011 1549">a. Cases = 4</p>		Count	Table N %	q4 Strongly Disagree	3	27.3%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	2	18.2%	Agree	5	45.5%	Strongly Agree	1	9.1%
	Count	Table N %																																			
q4 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	3	25.0%																																			
Agree	4	33.3%																																			
Strongly Agree	5	41.7%																																			
	Count	Table N %																																			
q4 Strongly Disagree	3	27.3%																																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																																			
Indecisive	2	18.2%																																			
Agree	5	45.5%																																			
Strongly Agree	1	9.1%																																			

		Count	Table N %
q4	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	0	0.0%
	Indecisive	3	21.4%
	Agree	2	14.3%
	Strongly Agree	9	64.3%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 4, 45.5% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement, which means they understood English grammar structures better, when grammar structures were explained through examples and activities. There were no indecisive answers in Case 1. 9.1% strongly disagreed and 18.2% disagreed with the statement

In Case 2, 53.8% strongly agreed and 23.1% agreed with the statement in question 4. 23.3% were indecisive in their answers and there were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3 41.7% strongly agreed and 33.3% agreed with the statement, i.e., they liked inductive method of grammar teaching. 25.0% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 9.1% strongly agreed and 45.5% agreed with the statement. 18.2% were indecisive in their answers and 27.3% strongly disagreed with the statement. There were no disagrees in Case 4.

The majority of Case 5 64.3% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 21.4% were indecisive in their answers. No one gave disagree and strongly disagree answers.



**Table 5**

<b>Q5</b>	<i>When grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follows the practice, it motivates me to learn English</i>																										
<table border="1" data-bbox="147 489 764 827"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q5</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>6</td> <td>54.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="152 846 269 867">a. Cases = 1</p>						Count	Table N %	q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%		Disagree	0	0.0%		Indecisive	6	54.5%		Agree	1	9.1%		Strongly Agree	4	36.4%
		Count	Table N %																								
q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Indecisive	6	54.5%																								
	Agree	1	9.1%																								
	Strongly Agree	4	36.4%																								
<table border="1" data-bbox="891 504 1508 842"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q5</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>3</td> <td>23.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>5</td> <td>38.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>30.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="896 858 1013 879">a. Cases = 2</p>						Count	Table N %	q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%		Disagree	3	23.1%		Indecisive	5	38.5%		Agree	4	30.8%		Strongly Agree	1	7.7%
		Count	Table N %																								
q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Disagree	3	23.1%																								
	Indecisive	5	38.5%																								
	Agree	4	30.8%																								
	Strongly Agree	1	7.7%																								
<table border="1" data-bbox="175 989 792 1327"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q5</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>6</td> <td>50.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>2</td> <td>16.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="180 1344 297 1365">a. Cases = 3</p>						Count	Table N %	q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%		Disagree	1	8.3%		Indecisive	3	25.0%		Agree	6	50.0%		Strongly Agree	2	16.7%
		Count	Table N %																								
q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Disagree	1	8.3%																								
	Indecisive	3	25.0%																								
	Agree	6	50.0%																								
	Strongly Agree	2	16.7%																								
<table border="1" data-bbox="891 989 1508 1327"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q5</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="896 1344 1013 1365">a. Cases = 4</p>						Count	Table N %	q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%		Disagree	1	9.1%		Indecisive	4	36.4%		Agree	1	9.1%		Strongly Agree	5	45.5%
		Count	Table N %																								
q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Disagree	1	9.1%																								
	Indecisive	4	36.4%																								
	Agree	1	9.1%																								
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%																								
<table border="1" data-bbox="175 1465 792 1803"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q5</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>21.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>2</td> <td>14.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>8</td> <td>57.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="180 1820 297 1841">a. Cases = 5</p>						Count	Table N %	q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%		Disagree	1	7.1%		Indecisive	3	21.4%		Agree	2	14.3%		Strongly Agree	8	57.1%
		Count	Table N %																								
q5	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%																								
	Disagree	1	7.1%																								
	Indecisive	3	21.4%																								
	Agree	2	14.3%																								
	Strongly Agree	8	57.1%																								

As mentioned in Table 5, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement, that is to say the learners were motivated, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then follow the practice. 54.5% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagree and disagree answers in Case 1.

In Case 2, 7.7% strongly agreed and 30.8% agreed with the statement in the question 5. 38.5% were indecisive in their answers and 23.1% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagree answers in Case 2

As can be seen in Case 3, 16.7% strongly agreed and 50.0% agreed with the statement. 25.0% were indecisive in their answers and only 8.3% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 45.5% strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement. 36.4% were indecisive in their answers and only 9.1% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees in Case 4.

The majority of Case 5, 57.1% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 21.4% were indecisive in their answers and 7.1% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees.

**Table 6**

**Q6** *When grammar structures are explained through examples and activities, it motivates me to learn English.*

	Count	Table N %
q6 Strongly Disagree	1	9.1%
Disagree	1	9.1%
Indecisive	2	18.2%
Agree	3	27.3%
Strongly Agree	4	36.4%

a. Cases = 1

	Count	Table N %
q6 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	15.4%
Indecisive	2	15.4%
Agree	4	30.8%
Strongly Agree	5	38.5%

a. Cases = 2

	Count	Table N %
q6 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Indecisive	3	25.0%
Agree	4	33.3%
Strongly Agree	5	41.7%

a. Cases = 3

	Count	Table N %
q6 Strongly Disagree	2	18.2%
Disagree	2	18.2%
Indecisive	2	18.2%
Agree	4	36.4%
Strongly Agree	1	9.1%

a. Cases = 4

	Count	Table N %
q6 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	1	7.1%
Indecisive	3	21.4%
Agree	2	14.3%
Strongly Agree	8	57.1%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 6, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement, that is to say the learners were motivated, when grammar structures are explained through examples and activities. 18.2% of Case 1 was indecisive in their answers. 9.1% strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement.

In Case 2, 38.5% strongly agreed and 30.8% agreed with the statement in question 6. 15.4% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (15.4) disagrees with the statement in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3 41.7% strongly agreed and 33.3% agreed with the statement, i.e., they liked inductive method of grammar teaching. 25.0% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 9.1% strongly agreed and 36.4% agreed with the statement. 18.2% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (18.2) strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement in Case 4.

As can be seen, in Case 5 57.1% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 21.4% were indecisive in their answers. And 7.1% disagreed with the statement. No one gave strongly disagree answers.

**Table 7**

**Q7** *It helps me to learn English more effectively, when grammar structures are first explained thoroughly and then comes practice.*

	Count	Table N %
q7 Strongly Disagree	1	9,1%
Disagree	0	0,0%
Indecisive	3	27,3%
Agree	3	27,3%
Strongly Agree	4	36,4%

a. Cases = 1

	Count	Table N %
q7 Strongly Disagree	0	0,0%
Disagree	2	15,4%
Indecisive	5	38,5%
Agree	2	15,4%
Strongly Agree	4	30,8%

a. Cases = 2

	Count	Table N %
q7 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Indecisive	2	16.7%
Agree	7	58.3%
Strongly Agree	3	25.0%

a. Cases = 3

	Count	Table N %
q7 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Indecisive	2	18.2%
Agree	1	9.1%
Strongly Agree	8	72.7%

a. Cases = 4

	Count	Table N %
q7 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	0	0.0%
Indecisive	3	21.4%
Agree	3	21.4%
Strongly Agree	8	57.1%

a. Cases = 5

As Table 7 shows, 36.4% of the Case 1 strongly agreed with the statement that they learn English more effectively, when the teacher explains the new grammar structure deductively. 27.3% agreed with the statement. And the same number, 27.3% were indecisive in their answers. There were no disagree answers, meanwhile 9.1% strongly disagreed with the statement in question12.

In Case 2, 30.8% of learners strongly agreed with the statement. 15.4% agreed and disagreed with the statement, i.e., that they learn more effectively when deductive method of grammar teaching was used. 38.5% were indecisive in their answers and there are no strongly disagree answers.

Case 3 gave 25.0% strongly agree and 58.3% agree answers, meanwhile 16.7% were indecisive in their answers. Case 3 has 0.0% disagree and strongly disagree answers.

The majority of Case 4 strongly agreed 72.7% and 9.1% agreed with the statement. 18.2% were indecisive in their answers and there were no strongly disagree and disagree answer in Case 4.

57.1% of Case 5 strongly agreed with the statement. 21.4% agreed with the statement and were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagree and disagree answers in Case 5.

**Table 8**

**Q8** *It helps me to learn English more effectively, when grammar structures are through examples and activities.*

		Count	Table N %
q8	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	4	36.4%
	Indecisive	2	18.2%
	Agree	1	9.1%
	Strongly Agree	4	36.4%

a. Cases = 1

		Count	Table N %
q8	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	1	7.7%
	Indecisive	2	15.4%
	Agree	4	30.8%
	Strongly Agree	6	46.2%

a. Cases = 2

		Count	Table N %
q8	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	2	16.7%
	Indecisive	2	16.7%
	Agree	3	25.0%
	Strongly Agree	5	41.7%

a. Cases = 3

		Count	Table N %
q8	Strongly Disagree	2	18.2%
	Disagree	2	18.2%
	Indecisive	3	27.3%
	Agree	2	18.2%
	Strongly Agree	2	18.2%

a. Cases = 4

		Count	Table N %
q8	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	1	7.1%
	Indecisive	3	21.4%
	Agree	2	14.3%
	Strongly Agree	8	57.1%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 8, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 30.8% agreed with the statement, that is to say the learners learn English more effectively, when grammar structures were explained through examples and activities. 18.2% of Case 1 was indecisive in their answers. 36.4% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagree answers.

In Case 2, 46.2% strongly agreed and 30.8% agreed with the statement in question 6. 15.4% were indecisive in their answers and 7.7% disagrees with the statement in Case 2. There were no strongly disagrees.

As can be seen, in Case 3 57.1% strongly agreed and 25.0% agreed with the statement.

16.7% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (16.7) disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 18.2% strongly agreed and agreed with the statement. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers. And 18.2% strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement in Case 4.



As can be seen, in Case 5 57.1% strongly agreed and 14.3% agreed with the statement. 21.4% were indecisive in their answers. And 7.1% disagreed with the statement. No one gave strongly disagree answer.

**Table 9**

<b>Q9</b> <i>The grammar practice used in EEC classes was not effective.</i>							
		Count	Table N %				
q9	Strongly Disagree	4	36.4%	q9	Strongly Disagree	5	38.5%
	Disagree	4	36.4%		Disagree	6	46.2%
	Indecisive	3	27.3%		Indecisive	1	7.7%
	Agree	0	0.0%		Agree	1	7.7%
	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%		Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
a. Cases = 1				a. Cases = 2			

	Count	Table N %
q9 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	5	41.7%
Indecisive	6	50.0%
Agree	1	8.3%
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%

a. Cases = 3

	Count	Table N %
q9 Strongly Disagree	4	36.4%
Disagree	3	27.3%
Indecisive	3	27.3%
Agree	0	0.0%
Strongly Agree	1	9.1%

a. Cases = 4

	Count	Table N %
q9 Strongly Disagree	4	28.6%
Disagree	5	35.7%
Indecisive	2	14.3%
Agree	2	14.3%
Strongly Agree	1	7.1%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 9, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement, that is to say the learners thought the grammar practice was effective. 27.3% of Case 1 was indecisive in their answers. No one gave strongly agree and agree answers.

In Case 2 38.5% strongly disagreed and 46.2% disagreed with the statement in question 9. 7.7% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (7.7) agreed with the statement in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3 0.0% strongly disagreed and 41.7% disagreed with the statement. 50.0% were indecisive in their answers and 8.3% agreed with the statement,

i.e., they thought the grammar practice was not effective. There were no strongly agrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 9.1% of Case 4 strongly agreed and 0.0% agreed with the statement. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (27.3) disagreed. 36.4% disagreed with the statement in Case 4.

As can be seen, in Case 5 7.1% strongly agreed with the statement. 14.3% agreed and were indecisive in their answers. 35.7% disagreed and 28.6% strongly disagreed with the statement.

**Table 10**

<b>Q10</b>	<i>The grammar practice used in EEC classes created a pleasant atmosphere in class and it helped me to learn English.</i>
------------	---

		Count	Table N %
q10	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	2	18.2%
	Indecisive	1	9.1%
	Agree	3	27.3%
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%

a. Cases = 1

		Count	Table N %
q10	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	0	0.0%
	Indecisive	6	46.2%
	Agree	3	23.1%
	Strongly Agree	4	30.8%

a. Cases = 2

		Count	Table N %
q10	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	1	8.3%
	Indecisive	2	16.7%
	Agree	7	58.3%
	Strongly Agree	2	16.7%

a. Cases = 3

		Count	Table N %
q10	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	2	18.2%
	Indecisive	3	27.3%
	Agree	1	9.1%
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%

a. Cases = 4

		Count	Table N %
q10	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
	Disagree	2	14.3%
	Indecisive	2	14.3%
	Agree	3	21.4%
	Strongly Agree	7	50.0%

a. Cases = 5

As mentioned in Table 10, 45.5% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement, that is to say the learners liked the grammar practice used in EEC classes, which created a pleasant atmosphere in class and it helped them to learn English. 9.1% were indecisive in their answers. 18.2% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagree answers in Case 1.

In Case 2, 30.8% strongly agreed and 23.1% agreed with the statement in the question 10. 46.2% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagree and disagree answers in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3, 16.7% strongly agreed and 58.3% agreed with the statement. Again 16.7% were indecisive in their answers and only 8.3% disagreed with the statement. There were no strongly disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 45.5% strongly agreed and 9.1% agreed with the statement. 27.3% were indecisive in their answers and only 18.2% disagreed with the statement. There are no strongly disagrees in Case 4.

The majority of Case 5, 50.0% strongly agreed and 21.4% agreed with the statement. 14.3% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (14.3) disagreed with the statement. No one gave strongly disagree answers.

**Table 11**

<b>Q11</b>		<i>The grammar practice used in EEC classes had no benefit on my ability to speak.</i>																									
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q11</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>5</td> <td>45.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 1</p>						Count	Table N %	q11	Strongly Disagree	5	45.5%		Disagree	2	18.2%		Indecisive	1	9.1%		Agree	0	0.0%		Strongly Agree	3	27.3%
		Count	Table N %																								
q11	Strongly Disagree	5	45.5%																								
	Disagree	2	18.2%																								
	Indecisive	1	9.1%																								
	Agree	0	0.0%																								
	Strongly Agree	3	27.3%																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q11</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>6</td> <td>46.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>2</td> <td>15.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>23.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 2</p>						Count	Table N %	q11	Strongly Disagree	6	46.2%		Disagree	2	15.4%		Indecisive	1	7.7%		Agree	3	23.1%		Strongly Agree	1	7.7%
		Count	Table N %																								
q11	Strongly Disagree	6	46.2%																								
	Disagree	2	15.4%																								
	Indecisive	1	7.7%																								
	Agree	3	23.1%																								
	Strongly Agree	1	7.7%																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q11</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>5</td> <td>41.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 3</p>						Count	Table N %	q11	Strongly Disagree	5	41.7%		Disagree	3	25.0%		Indecisive	3	25.0%		Agree	1	8.3%		Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
		Count	Table N %																								
q11	Strongly Disagree	5	41.7%																								
	Disagree	3	25.0%																								
	Indecisive	3	25.0%																								
	Agree	1	8.3%																								
	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q11</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>7</td> <td>63.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 4</p>						Count	Table N %	q11	Strongly Disagree	7	63.6%		Disagree	1	9.1%		Indecisive	0	0.0%		Agree	2	18.2%		Strongly Agree	1	9.1%
		Count	Table N %																								
q11	Strongly Disagree	7	63.6%																								
	Disagree	1	9.1%																								
	Indecisive	0	0.0%																								
	Agree	2	18.2%																								
	Strongly Agree	1	9.1%																								
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q11</td> <td>Strongly Disagree</td> <td>8</td> <td>57.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Disagree</td> <td>2</td> <td>14.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>21.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 5</p>						Count	Table N %	q11	Strongly Disagree	8	57.1%		Disagree	2	14.3%		Indecisive	0	0.0%		Agree	3	21.4%		Strongly Agree	1	7.1%
		Count	Table N %																								
q11	Strongly Disagree	8	57.1%																								
	Disagree	2	14.3%																								
	Indecisive	0	0.0%																								
	Agree	3	21.4%																								
	Strongly Agree	1	7.1%																								

In Table 11, 27.3% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 0.0% agreed with the statement, that practice used in EEC classes had no benefit on their ability to speak. 9.1% of Case 1 was indecisive in their answers. 18.2% disagreed and 45.5 strongly disagreed with the statement.

In Case 2, 7.7% strongly agreed and 23.1% agreed with the statement in question 11. Again 7.7% were indecisive in their answers. 15.4% disagreed and 46.2% strongly disagreed with the statement in Case 2.

As can be seen, in Case 3 there was no strongly agree answers and only 8.3% agreed with the statement. 25.0% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (25.0%) disagreed with the statement. 41.7% strongly disagreed with the statement in Case 3.

According to the results, 9.1% strongly agreed and 18.2% agreed with the statement. 0.0% was indecisive in their answers. And 9.1% disagreed and 63.6% strongly disagreed with the statement in Case 4.

As can be seen, in Case 5 7.1% strongly agreed and 21.4% agreed with the statement. 0.0% was indecisive in their answers. And 14.3% disagreed and 57.1% strongly disagreed with the statement.

**Table 12**

Q12		<i>Student interaction practice in EEC classes helped me to learn English grammar.</i>		
		Count	Table N %	
q12	Strongly Disagree	1	9.1%	
	Disagree	1	9.1%	
	Indecisive	1	9.1%	
	Agree	3	27.3%	
	Strongly Agree	5	45.5%	
a. Cases = 1				
		Count	Table N %	
q12	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	
	Disagree	2	15.4%	
	Indecisive	2	15.4%	
	Agree	5	38.5%	
	Strongly Agree	4	30.8%	
a. Cases = 2				
		Count	Table N %	
q12	Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%	
	Disagree	0	0.0%	
	Indecisive	4	33.3%	
	Agree	8	66.7%	
	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%	
a. Cases = 3				
		Count	Table N %	
q12	Strongly Disagree	0	00%	
	Disagree	1	9.1%	
	Indecisive	2	18.2%	
	Agree	2	18.2%	
	Strongly Agree	6	54.5%	
a. Cases = 4				



	Count	Table N %
q12 Strongly Disagree	0	0.0%
Disagree	2	14.3%
Indecisive	2	14.3%
Agree	2	14.3%
Strongly Agree	8	57.1%

a. Cases = 5

As mentioned in Table 12, 45.5% of Case 1 strongly agreed and 27.3% agreed with the statement. 9.1% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (9.1) disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement.

In Case 2, 30.8% strongly agreed and 38.5% agreed with the statement in the question 12. 15.4% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (15.4%) disagreed with the statement. There are no strongly disagree answers in Case 2.

As can be seen in Case 3, no one strongly agreed with the statement, meanwhile the majority 66.7% agreed with the statement. Again 33.3% were indecisive in their answers. There were no strongly disagrees and disagrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 54.5% strongly agreed and 18.2% agreed with the statement and the same percentage (18.2) was indecisive in their answers. 9.1% disagreed with the statement. There are no strongly disagrees in Case 4.

In Case 5, 57.1% strongly agreed with the statement. 14.3% agreed and disagreed with the statement and the same percentage (14.3) was indecisive in their answers. No one gave strongly disagree answers.

**Table 13**

<b>Q13</b>		<i>The grammar practice used in classes made me less interested in learning English grammar structures.</i>																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q13 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>9.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>2</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>27.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 1</p>					Count	Table N %	q13 Strongly Disagree	4	36.4%	Disagree	1	9.1%	Indecisive	1	9.1%	Agree	2	18.2%	Strongly Agree	3	27.3%
	Count	Table N %																			
q13 Strongly Disagree	4	36.4%																			
Disagree	1	9.1%																			
Indecisive	1	9.1%																			
Agree	2	18.2%																			
Strongly Agree	3	27.3%																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q13 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>4</td> <td>30.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>5</td> <td>38.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>1</td> <td>7.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>2</td> <td>15.4%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 2</p>					Count	Table N %	q13 Strongly Disagree	4	30.8%	Disagree	5	38.5%	Indecisive	1	7.7%	Agree	1	7.7%	Strongly Agree	2	15.4%
	Count	Table N %																			
q13 Strongly Disagree	4	30.8%																			
Disagree	5	38.5%																			
Indecisive	1	7.7%																			
Agree	1	7.7%																			
Strongly Agree	2	15.4%																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q13 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>7</td> <td>58.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>1</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>1</td> <td>8.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>3</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 3</p>					Count	Table N %	q13 Strongly Disagree	7	58.3%	Disagree	1	8.3%	Indecisive	1	8.3%	Agree	3	25.0%	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
	Count	Table N %																			
q13 Strongly Disagree	7	58.3%																			
Disagree	1	8.3%																			
Indecisive	1	8.3%																			
Agree	3	25.0%																			
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Count</th> <th>Table N %</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>q13 Strongly Disagree</td> <td>7</td> <td>63.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Disagree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indecisive</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agree</td> <td>4</td> <td>36.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Strongly Agree</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>a. Cases = 4</p>					Count	Table N %	q13 Strongly Disagree	7	63.6%	Disagree	0	0.0%	Indecisive	0	0.0%	Agree	4	36.4%	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%
	Count	Table N %																			
q13 Strongly Disagree	7	63.6%																			
Disagree	0	0.0%																			
Indecisive	0	0.0%																			
Agree	4	36.4%																			
Strongly Agree	0	0.0%																			

		Count	Table N %
q13	Strongly Disagree	10	71.4%
	Disagree	1	7.1%
	Indecisive	1	7.1%
	Agree	2	14.3%
	Strongly Agree	0	0.0%

a. Cases = 5

In Table 13, 36.4% of Case 1 strongly disagreed and 9.1% disagreed with the statement, that is to say they did not agree with the statement in question 13. The same 9.1% were indecisive in their answers. 27.3% strongly agreed and 18.2% agreed answers with the statement.

In Case 2 30.8% strongly disagreed and 38.5% disagreed with the statement in question 13. 7.7% were indecisive in their answers and the same percentage (7.7) agreed with the statement in Case 2. 15.4% strongly agreed with the statement.

As can be seen in Case 3 58.3% strongly disagreed and 8.3% disagreed with the statement. 8.3% were indecisive in their answers and 25.0% agreed with the statement. There were no strongly agrees in Case 3.

According to the results, 63.6% of Case 4 strongly disagreed with the statement. There were no disagrees and indecisive in Case 4. 36.4% agreed with the statement and again there were no strongly agrees in the statement.

As can be seen, in Case 5 0.0% strongly agreed with the statement. 14.3% agreed and 7.1% were indecisive in their answers and disagreed with it. 71.4% strongly disagreed with the statement.

**Table 14 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (descriptive statistic tables)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q1	11	3	5	4.00	1.000
q2	11	2	5	3.91	1.044
q3	11	3	5	4.36	0.924
q4	11	1	5	3.82	1.471
q5	11	3	5	3.82	0.982
q6	11	1	5	3.73	1.348
q7	11	1	5	3.82	1.250
q8	11	2	5	3.45	1.368
q9	11	1	3	1.91	0.831
q10	11	2	5	4.00	1.183
q11	11	1	5	2.45	1.753
q12	11	1	5	3.91	1.375
q13	11	1	5	2.91	1.758
Valid N (listwise)	11				

a. Cases = 1

Table 14 shows the mean, maximum (5) and minimum (1) scores, and standard deviation of each of the answers for the Case 1, which has 11 participants.

The average attitude for the question 1 is equal to 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.000 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 2 is equal to 3.91 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.044 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 3 is equal to 4.36 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 0.924 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 4 is equal to 3.82 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.471 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 5 is equal to 3.82 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 0.982 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 6 is equal to 3.73 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.348 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 7 is equal to 3.82 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.250 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 8 is equal to 3.45 points (indecisive) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.368 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 9 is equal to 1.91 points which is nearly 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 0.831 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 3.

The average attitude for the question 10 is equal to 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.183 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 11 is equal to 2.45 points (disagree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.753 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 12 is equal to 3.91 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.375 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 13 is equal to 2.91 points which is nearly 3.00 points (indecisive) for the case 1 with standard deviation of 1.758 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

**Table 15 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (descriptive statistic tables)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q1	13	1	5	3.31	1.437
q2	13	2	5	4.15	0.899
q3	13	2	5	4.08	0.862
q4	13	3	5	4.31	0.855
q5	13	2	5	3.23	0.927
q6	13	2	5	3.92	1.115
q7	13	2	5	3.62	1.121
q8	13	2	5	4.15	0.987
q9	13	1	4	1.85	0.899
q10	13	3	5	3.85	0.899
q11	13	1	5	2.31	1.494
q12	13	2	5	3.85	1.068
q13	13	1	5	2.38	1.446
Valid N (listwise)	13				

a. Cases = 2

Table 15 shows the mean, maximum (5) and minimum (1) scores, and standard deviation of each of the answers for the Case 2, which has 13 participants.

The average attitude for the question 1 is equal to 3.31 points (indecisive) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.437 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 2 is equal to 4.15 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.899 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 3 is equal to 4.08 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.862 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 4 is equal to 4.31 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.855 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 5 is equal to 3.23 points (indecisive) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.927 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 6 is equal to 3.92 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.115 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 7 is equal to 3.62 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.121 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 8 is equal to 4.15 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.987 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 9 is equal to 1.85 points which is nearly 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.899 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 4.

The average attitude for the question 10 is equal to 3.85 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 0.899 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 11 is equal to 2.31 points (disagree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.494 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 12 is equal to 3.85 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.068 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 13 is equal to 2.38 points (disagree) for the case 2 with standard deviation of 1.446 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

***Table 16 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (descriptive statistic tables)***

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q1	12	3	5	4.42	0.669
q2	12	2	5	4.00	1.044
q3	12	3	5	4.08	0.669
q4	12	3	5	4.17	0.835
q5	12	2	5	3.75	0.866
q6	12	3	5	4.17	0.835
q7	12	3	5	4.08	0.669
q8	12	2	5	3.92	1.165
q9	12	2	4	2.67	0.651
q10	12	2	5	3.83	0.835
q11	12	1	4	2.00	1.044
q12	12	3	4	3.67	0.492
q13	12	1	4	2.00	1.348
Valid N (listwise)	12				

a. Cases = 3



Table 16 shows the mean, maximum (5) and minimum (1) scores, and standard deviation of each of the answers for the Case 2, which has 12 participants.

The average attitude for the question 1 is equal to 4.42 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.669 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 2 is equal to 4.00 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 1.044 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 3 is equal to 4.08 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.669 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 4 is equal to 4.17 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.835 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 5 is equal to 3.75 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.866 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 6 is equal to 4.17 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.835 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 7 is equal to 4.08 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.669 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 8 is equal to 3.92 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 1.165 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 9 is equal to 2.67 points which is nearly 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.651 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 4.

The average attitude for the question 10 is equal to 3.83 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.835 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 11 is equal to 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 1.044 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 4.

The average attitude for the question 12 is equal to 3.67 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 0.492 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 4.

The average attitude for the question 13 is equal to 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 3 with standard deviation of 1.348 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 4.

**Table 17 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (descriptive statistic tables)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q1	11	2	5	4.09	1.375
q2	11	2	5	3.82	1.250
q3	11	3	5	4.36	0.924
q4	11	1	5	3.09	1.446
q5	11	2	5	3.91	1.136
q6	11	1	5	3.00	1.342
q7	11	3	5	4.55	0.820
q8	11	1	5	3.00	1.414
q9	11	1	5	2.18	1.250
q10	11	2	5	3.82	1.250
q11	11	1	5	2.00	1.549
q12	11	2	5	4.18	1.079
q13	11	1	4	2.09	1.514
Valid N (listwise)	11				

a. Cases = 4

Table 17 shows the mean, maximum (5) and minimum (1) scores, and standard deviation of each of the answers for the Case 2, which has 11 participants.

The average attitude for the question 1 is equal to 4.09 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.375 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 2 is equal to 3.82 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.250 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 3 is equal to 3.91 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 0.924 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 4 is equal to 3.09 points (indecisive) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.446 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 5 is equal to 3.75 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.136 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 6 is equal to 3.00 points (indecisive) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.342 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 7 is equal to 4.55 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 0.820 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 8 is equal to 3.00 points (indecisive) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.414 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 9 is equal to 2.18 points (disagree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.250 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 10 is equal to 3.82 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.250 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 11 is equal to 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.549 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 12 is equal to 4.18 points (agree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.079 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 13 is equal to 2.09 points (disagree) for the case 4 with standard deviation of 1.514 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 4.

**Table 18 The Results of the Questionnaire for the Students (descriptive statistic tables)**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
q1	14	2	5	3.71	1.267
q2	14	3	5	4.43	0.852
q3	14	2	5	4.14	1.167
q4	14	3	5	4.43	0.852
q5	14	2	5	4.21	1.051
q6	14	2	5	4.21	1.051
q7	14	3	5	4.36	0.842
q8	14	2	5	4.21	1.051
q9	14	1	5	2.36	1.277
q10	14	2	5	4.07	1.141
q11	14	1	5	2.07	1.492
q12	14	2	5	4.14	1.167
q13	14	1	4	1.64	1.151
Valid N (listwise)	14				

a. Cases = 5

Table 18 shows the mean, maximum (5) and minimum (1) scores, and standard deviation of each of the answers for the Case 2, which has 14 participants.

The average attitude for the question 1 is equal to 3.71 points which is nearly 4.00 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.267 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 2 is equal to 4.43 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 0.852 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 3 is equal to 4.14 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.167 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 4 is equal to 4.43 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 0.852 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 5 is equal to 4.21 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.051 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 6 is equal to 4.21 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.051 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 7 is equal to 4.36 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 0.842 and minimum of 3 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 8 is equal to 4.21 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.051 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 9 is equal to 2.36 points (disagree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.277 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 10 is equal to 4.07 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.141 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 11 is equal to 2.07 points (disagree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.492 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 12 is equal to 4.14 points (agree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.167 and minimum of 2 point and maximum of 5.

The average attitude for the question 13 is equal to 1.64 points, which is nearly 2.00 points (disagree) for the case 5 with standard deviation of 1.151 and minimum of 1 point and maximum of 4.