Students' Perceptions of the Teaching of Grammar

Rex Stardy

Universitas Bunda Mulia

Abstract

The objective of this research is to investigate the students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar as there have been numerous debates among researchers about the importance of teaching grammar. In order to know whose argument is the right one, it is important to compare it with the result of present research. The results of this research have shown that there are several findings that support the theories proposed by some researchers. However, there are also some findings which do not support the theories. Hopefully, this study will be able to give some valuable insights for English teachers about what their students need in learning grammar.

Keywords:

Perception, Students, Grammar

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of Research

Grammar is one important aspect of language that keeps disturbing language learners. Based on the writer's experience in teaching grammar classes, learners have more difficulty in mastering the grammar compared to other skills such as reading, writing, listening and speaking. Learners will spend most of their times struggling with grammar. By considering these facts, some questions arise. What do the learners think about the teaching of grammar? Is grammar so important for the learners? Is grammar going to be useful for the learners in mastering the language? How should grammar be taught? Is it better to teach grammar deductively or inductively? Is it better to teach grammar intensively or extensively? Is it better to teach grammar in a short time or in a longer time? Is it better to teach grammar in isolation or in combination with other skills? Is it better to teach grammar in the native language or the target language? Is it acceptable to

use many grammatical terms in the teaching of grammar? Are grammar drills useful? Is it necessary to correct all grammatical mistakes?

These are some questions that have been disturbing the writer's mind. In order to be able to find the answers, the writer decided to conduct research on this study. Therefore, the main reason why the writer chooses this topic is that the writer wants to investigate students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar. That is, the writer would like to know what the learners think about grammar teaching.

1.2 Statement of Problem

The major research question that will be investigated is:

What do the students think about the teaching of grammar with respect to the following points?

a) The necessity of teaching grammar

b) The use of deductive and inductive approach

c) The use of many grammatical explanations and technical terminologies

d) The teaching of grammar in isolation and combination with other skills

e) The use of native and target language

f) The use of grammar drills

g) The teaching of grammar in a short and in a longer duration

h) Intensive and extensive grammar teaching

i) The necessity of correcting grammatical mistakes

1.3 Scope and Limitation

This study will collect and analyze students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar and the grammar itself. It will focus only on their perceptions or opinions or about what they think about the teaching of grammar. The subject of the study will be limited only to university students in two universities (Atmajaya University and Bunda Mulia University) who are majoring in English.

1.4 Research Objectives and Significance

The objective of this study is to investigate what the students think on the teaching of grammar and the grammar itself. It is very important and necessary to

investigate the students' perceptions towards the teaching of grammar because their perceptions might influence their behavior in learning grammar. For instance, if they perceive grammar as something which is not important and not necessary to be learned, then they will refuse to learn grammar and reject the teaching of grammar. They will think why they should learn grammar if grammar can be acquired unconsciously (Krashen, 1981) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004). Therefore, it is hoped that by knowing the students' perceptions the teacher can identify what the students need and can fulfill their needs. It is also hoped that by knowing their needs, the teacher can also use the appropriate teaching techniques preferred by the students.

Hopefully, this study will give some valuable insights or information about what the students think about the teaching of grammar. The writer also hopes that after knowing what the students think about the teaching of grammar, this study will be able to help grammar teachers refine their teaching skills so that they can teach better and therefore can fulfill the students' needs in learning the grammar.

2. Review of Literatures

There are plenty of studies that have been conducted in relation to the teaching of grammar. Marquez (1979: 36), in her article suggests that "paragraph structure and development can be, perhaps even should be, taught simultaneously with grammatical structure and explicitly done so at every stage of the teaching and learning process." She found out that in every writing class there have been too many exercises that emphasizes on grammar exercises, not writing exercises. For example, the teacher always asks the students to change all the verb forms in a paragraph from one tense to another tense without telling the students what is the purpose of doing such thing. So, basically, by changing the tenses they are just doing grammatical exercises. The teachers never tell them about how to make a good paragraph. So, in this case, the students only learn the grammar but not learn the paragraph. This is the reason why Marquez (1979) proposes that grammar should be taught simultaneously with paragraph structure and development. This should be done so that the student not only learn about the grammar but also the paragraph.

Another researcher like Fortune (1992) has also conducted research on grammar. In his article he studied students' views and preferences towards self study grammar practice. In his study he wants to investigate about students' views or opinions towards different kinds of grammar practices. He wants to know what kind of grammar practice that the students like and dislike. Is it deductive exercise or inductive exercise? His study reveals that most of the students prefer deductive exercises than inductive exercises.

Other researchers like McCarthy and Carter (1995) have also made an investigation about grammar. In their study they have made an investigation about the teaching of spoken grammar. According to them, the teaching of grammar has been based on written examples. They argue that these are not enough. They argue that students need to be given choices between written and spoken examples. So, the purpose of their study is that they want to show that spoken grammar is important for the students so that they can communicate more fluently. These students will not be dependent on written grammar anymore, because according to McCarthy and Carter (1995) written grammar and spoken grammar are different. Written grammar is only used in written context. Meanwhile, spoken grammar is used in spoken context.

As a conclusion, none of the above studies have made any investigation on the students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar. Marquez (1979) only discussed about the simultaneous teaching of grammar and paragraph structure. Fortune (1992) only studied about students preferences toward grammar practice. McCarty and Carter (1995) only investigated about teaching spoken grammar. So, basically, none of the above researchers have conducted any research on the students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar. That is why this study is significant because it attempts to uncover the students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar.

3. Theoretical Framework and Research Methodology
3.1 Theoretical Framework
This part is divided into two parts. In the first part, the writer will discuss some definitions of perceptions given by some theorists. In the second part, the writer

will discuss some theories which are related to the nine major points mentioned in the Statement of the Problem.

3.1.1 The Definition of Perception

According to Richards and Schmidt (2002: 391), perceptions can be defined as follows:

> Perception is the recognition and understanding of events, objects, and stimuli through the use of senses (sight, hearing, touch, etc). Several different types of perception are distinguished: a) visual perception: the perception of visual information and stimuli, b) auditory perception: the perception of information and stimuli received through the ears. Auditory perceptions requires a listener to detect different kinds of acoustic signals, and to judge differences between them according to differences in such acoustic characteristics as their frequency, amplitude, duration, order of occurance, and rate of presentation, c) speech perception: the understanding or comprehension of speech.

According to Hanna and Wozniak (2001: 102) "perception is the process of selecting, organizing and interpreting sensation into a meaningful whole." Another writer like Kotler (1997: 185) defines perception as "the process by which an individual selects, organizes, and interprets information inputs to create a meaningful picture of the world."

3.1.2 The Teaching of Grammar

This part will provide some theories to investigate the nine major issues mentioned in the Statement of the Problem that are related to grammar teaching.

a. Is Grammar necessary to be taught?

According to Krashen (1981) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 127), "language should be acquired through natural exposure, not learned through formal instruction."

In line with this, Krashen (1981) (in Ellis, 2006: 85) argued that:

> Grammar instruction played no role in acquisition, a view based on the conviction that learners (including classroom learners) would automatically proceed along their built-in syllabus as long as they had access to comprehensible input and were sufficiently motivated.

He also adds that "grammar instruction could contribute to learning but this was of limited values because communication ability was dependent on acquisition." (p.85). Krashen (1993) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 129) also adds that:

The effects of grammar instruction are peripheral and fragile. He argues that explicit grammatical knowledge about structures and rules for their use may never turn into implicit knowledge underlying unconscious language comprehension and production. He suggests that studies showing an effect for formal instruction present only modest increase in consciously learned competence consistent with the claims of the Monitor Hypothesis.

Another researcher like Truscott (1996, 1998) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004) also rejects the importance of grammar teaching. He argued that "its effects are temporary and superficial and that grammar instruction alone may not promote what he called as genuine knowledge of language." (p.129)

On the other hands, some proponents of grammar teaching have argued that grammar is important. For instance, according to Schmidt (1990, 1993, 2001) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 127), "conscious attention to form or noticing, is a necessary condition for language learning."

Other researchers like Skehan (1998) and Tomasello (1998) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 128) have also argued that:

Language learners cannot process target language input for both meaning and form at the same time. That is why, it is necessary for learners to notice target forms in input, otherwise they process input for meaning only and do not attend to specific forms, and consequently fail to process and acquire them.

b. Should we use inductive or deductive approach?

Another issue that occurs in the teaching of grammar is whether or not a teacher should use an inductive or deductive approach in the teaching of grammar. According to Larsen-Freeman (1979: 219), "in inductive learning, the teacher presents examples from which the learner includes the relevant second language rule." This definition is also supported by the definition given by Thornbury (1999: 29). According to him "an inductive approach starts with some examples from which a rule is inferred."

According to Thornbury (1999: 54), there are several advantages of using inductive approach. The advantages are:

1. Rules learners discover for themselves are more likely to fit their existing mental structures than rules they have been presented with. This in turn will make the rules more meaningful, memorable, and serviceable.

2. The mental effort involved ensures a greater degree of cognitive depth which, again, ensures greater memorability.

3. Student are more actively involved in the learning process, rather than being simply passive recipients. They are therefore likely to be more attentive and more motivated.

4. It is an approach which favours pattern recognition and problem-solving abilities which suggests that it is particularly suitable for learners who like this kind of challenge.

5. If the problem-solving is done collaboratively, and in the target language, learners get the opportunity for extra language practice.

6. Working things out for themselves prepare students for greater self-reliance and is therefore conducive to learner autonomy.

Besides the advantages, Thornbury (1999: 54) also gives the disadvatages of inductive approach. The disadvatages are:

1. The time and energy spent in working out rules may mislead students into believing that rules are the objectives of language learning, rather than a means.

2. The time taken to work out a rule may be at the expense of time spent in putting the rule to some sort of productive practice.

3. Students may hypothesise the wrong rule, or their version of the rule may be either too broad or too narrow in its application. This is especially in danger where there is no overt testing of their hypotheses, either through practice examples, or by eliciting an axplicit statement of the rule.

4. It can place heavy demands on teachers in planning a lesson. They need to select and organize the data carefully so as to guide learners to an accurate formulation of the rule.

5. However carefully organized the data is, many language areas such as aspect and modality resist easy rule formulation.

6. An inductive approach frustrates students who, by dint of their personal learning style or their past learning experience (or both), would prefer simply to be told the rule.

In addition to the inductive approach, there is also a deductive approach. Larsen-Freeman (1979: 219) says that ". . . in deductive learning the teacher states the rule and leads the learner in subsequently deducing examples." Similar to that definition, Thornbury (1999: 29) also gives his definition on deductive approach. According to him, "a deductive approach starts with the presentation of a rule and is followed by examples in which the rule is applied."

There are also some advantages and disadvantages of deductive approach. According to Thornbury (1999: 30), the advantages are:

1. It gets straight to the point, and can therefore be time-saving. Many rules – especially rules of form – can be more simply and quickly explained than elicited from examples. This will allow more time for practice and application.
2. It respects the intelligence and maturity of many – especially adult – students, and acknowledges the role of cognitive process in language acquisition.
3. It confirms many students' expectations about classroom learning, particularly for those learners who have an analytical learning style.
4. It allow teacher to deal with language points as they come up, rather than having to anticipate them and prepare for them in advance.

Meanwhile, the disadvantages of deductive approach according to Thornbury (1999: 30) are:

1. Starting the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some students, especially younger ones. They may not have sufficient metalanguage (i.e., language useful to talk about language such as grammar terminology). Or they may not be able to understand the concepts involved.
2. Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom; teacher explanation is often at the expense of student involvement and interaction.

3. Explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation, such as demonstration.
4. Such an approach encourages the beliefs that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rules.

Some researchers like Krashen (1980), Dulay and Burt (1973) (in Shaffer, 1989: 395) have argued that "since language is acquired naturally by means of an innate cognitive process, teachers need only supply comprehensible input without explicitly stating or even focusing on rules." So they agree that deductive approach is unnecessary.

On the contrary to the above statement, researchers like Ausubel (1974) and Carrol (1964) (in Shaffer, 1989: 395) argued that "since adults are endowed with a cognitive network enabling them to understand abstract concepts, teachers should emphasize on this thing and speed up the language acquisition process by giving the learners explicit rules in a deductive learning framework." So, in this case, they agree that deductive approach is necessary.

Other researchers like Fischer (1979) and Hammerly (1975) (in Shaffer, 1989: 395) states that "an inductive approach has a place in the classroom where language learning is treated as a creative, cognitive process." According to them inductive approach is more difficult and it should only be used for teaching simple grammatical structures. In addition to that, Ausubel (1963) and Carroll (1964) (in Shaffer, 1989: 396) have argued that "an inductive approach is too difficult for slower students, and that only brighter students are capable of discovering the underlying patterns of a structure."

c. Should we use many grammatical explanations or technical terminologies in the teaching of grammar?

Should the teacher use many grammatical explanations or technical terminology when he or she teaches grammar? This is an important question that needs to be answered.

According to Brown (2001), the use of many grammatical explanations only happened in the past (in the era of Grammar Translation Method). In other words, the proponents of Grammar Translation Method have argued that the use

of many grammatical explanations and terminologies are necessary in the teaching of grammar. However, it is no longer true in the present era. Brown (2001: 366) states that "in CLT classes, the use of grammatical explanation and terminology must be approached with care." So, in this case, he agrees with the use of grammatical explanation and technical terminologies. However, the use should be limited. Teachers should not give too many explanations or terminologies to the students, because they have already had difficulty in learning the language itself.

d. Should grammar be taught in isolation or combined with other skills?
According to Brown (2001), it is better to include or combined grammar with other skills rather than to teach it in isolation. In his opinion:

> Grammatical information, whether consciously or subconsciously learned, is an enabling system, a component of communicative competence like phonology, discourse, the lexicon, etc. Therefore, as courses help sudents to pursue relevant language goals, grammar is best brought into the picture as a contributor toward those goals. (p. 366-367)

In addition to Brown's statement, Ellis (2006) also gives his thought. He divides grammar into two parts. Grammar that focuses on accuracy and grammar that focuses on fluency. If the grammar focuses on accuracy, then grammar should be taught in a series of separate lessons. However, if the grammar focuses on fluency, then the teaching of grammar should be integrated with other skills, especially those consisting of communicative tasks.

Contrary to the above arguments, the proponents of Grammar Translation Method have argued that grammar should be taught in isolation. Grammar should be taught separately from other skills.

e.   Should grammar be taught in the native language or the target language?
According to Finnochiaro (1974) and Rivers (1968) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979), careful use of the native language for the purpose of explaining difficult grammatical points would be acceptable. They agree that native language can only be used when explanation in the target language have failed. They also add that native language can be used for weaker students who are having difficulty in

understanding particular grammatical points. Contrary to the above statement, Larsen-Freeman (1979: 220) states that:

> Although most opinions would seem to suggest allowing some limited use of the native language, a point that one should consider is that students should be encouraged right from the start to express themselves in the second language and to develop the ability to express idea that they want to say whenever they cannot recall the exact word for which they are groping.

f. Are grammar drills useful?

According to Larsen-Freeman (1979: 223), "once the structure has been presented, keeping in mind our intention to give our students initial practice in manipulating the new item, our next procedure should probably involve some sort of drills." In this case, she agrees to use the drill after the presentation of grammar. However, some researchers or proponents of Communicative approach have argued that grammar drills are might no longer important in the teaching of grammar.

g. Should grammar be taught in a short duration (massed) or longer duration (distributed)?

According to Collins, Halter, Lightbown and Spada (1999) (in Ellis, 2006: 92):

> None of the language program evaluation research has found an advantage for dristributed language instruction. Although the findings thus far lead to the hypothesis that more concentrated exposure to English may lead to better student outcomes, the evidence is not conclusive.

The above statement is also supported by the findings of their study. In their study, they compare two groups of students. The first group (the distributed group) is taught for 10 months. Meanwhile, the second group (the massed group) is taught for 5 months. The result of their study showed that the massed group performed better than the distributed group in learning grammar. So, in this case, it seems that Collin et all. agree that grammar should be taught in a short periode of time.

h. Should Grammar Be Taught Intensively or Extensively?

According to Ellis (2006: 93):

> Intensive grammar teaching refers to instruction over a sustained period of time (which could be a lesson or a series of lessons covering days or weeks) concerning a single grammatical structure or, perhaps, a pair of contrasted structures (e.g., English past continous VS past simple). Extensive grammar teaching refers to instruction concerning a whole range of structures within a short period of time (e.g., lesson).

As an addition, Spada and Lightbown (1999) (in Ellis, 2006: 94) state that "when the learners are not ready to learn the targeted structure, intensive grammar teaching can help them progress through the sequence of stages involved in the acquisition of that structure."

As opposed to the above statement, Ellis (2006: 95) states that "extensive grammar instruction, on the other hand, affords the opportunity to attend to large numbers of grammatical structures. Also, more likely or not, many of the structures will be addressed repeatedly over a period of time." In other words, she agrees that grammar should be taught extensively.

i. Do grammatical mistakes need to be corrected?

James Hendrickson (1980) (in Brown, 2001) divides errors or mistakes into two types: local and global errors. Local errors or mistakes are errors that are still acceptable and comprehensible. In other words, these errors do not make a confusion to the person who sees or hears the errors. The person who sees or hears these errors still understand what the other person wants to convey. On the other hand, global errors are errors that are not acceptable and uncomprehensible. In other words, these errors will make a great confusion to the person who sees or hears the errors. The person who sees or hears these errors will not be able to understand what the other person wants to express.

Hendrickson (1980) (in Brown, 2001: 290) suggested that "local errors do not need to be corrected immediately since the message is still clear and correction might interrupt a learner in the flow of productive communication." Correction could be done after the learner has finished in saying or writing what he or she wants to convey. On the other hand, global errors need to be corrected immediately right after the learner produces the errors. On the contrary to the

above arguments, some researchers in Communicative approach have claimed that grammatical mistakes might not need to be corrected.

3.2 Research Methodology

This section is divided into four parts. The first part will discuss about the Data Source. In this part, we will discuss about the source of the data used in this study. The second part will discuss about the Data Collection. In this part, we will discuss about the method or technique that is used by the writer in distributing the questionnaires and also the duration that is needed by the writer in collecting the questionnaires. The third part will discuss about the Data Analysis. In this part, we will discuss the method that is used by the writer in analyzing and interpreting the data. The last part will discuss the Questionnaire. In this part, we will discuss about the questionnaire that is used in this study.

3.2.1 Data Source

The data for this study are mainly collected from 127 university students in two universities who are majoring in English and who are taking Grammar classes. The students that will be used as the subject of this study are taken from Atmajaya University and Bunda Mulia University. The selection of the data source was mainly based on practical reasons. The two universities that the writer chose were not taken as samples of universities in Jakarta. These two universities were chosen because they are where the writer has worked and is still working. For that reason, the writer has some connection with some of the lecturers and heads of the department. That is why it is easier to collect the data from these two universities. In addition, each of these two universities has English study program.

3.2.2 Data Collection

The writer distributes the questionnaires to several students randomly from different grammar classes. The students are from Grammar 1, Grammar 3 and Grammar 5 classes. The majority of the students are from Grammar 1 classes. The students are asked to fill in the questionnaires within 10-15 minutes. After they

have finished, the writer collects the questionnaires. The collection of the whole data lasts for about a month.

3.2.3 Data Analysis

The data which have been collected will be analyzed and interpreted by using Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS Version 17). Descriptive statistics of the respondents' responses are presented in tables of frequency and percentages, and then they are used as the basis to make data interpretation. Descriptive statistics is a method that is used to describe or illustrate phenomena or the relationship between phenomena which are being investigated systematically, factually and accurately. This descriptive method is used by the writer in order to be able to describe and explain the students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar.

3.2.4 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire that is used in this research is divided into three parts: a) demographic data, b) students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar, and c) two open-ended questions. Part *b* was formulated in the form of Likert scale. This scale is a tool that is used to measure the level of agreement or disagreement of the respondents' perceptions towards each statement in the questionnaire. This scale, which was developed by Rensis Likert, is also known as Summated Ratings Method. Basically, the respondents are asked to choose one out of four options in the questionnaire. The options consist of: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. The aim of the questionnaire is to obtain information about students' perceptions of the teaching of grammar.

4. Discussion and Analysis

This part presents and analyzes the data obtained from the questionnaires distributed to university students who are majoring in English to reveal their perceptions of the teaching of grammar.

4.1 Data Description

This part will present the data of the respondents which include the data of their age, sex or gender, university, grammar class, and semester.

4.1.1 The Demographic Data

There are five types of demographic data.

a. Age of Respondents

There are 4 respondents (3.1%) who are 17 years old. There are 34 respondents (26.8%) who are 18 years old. There are 37 respondents (29.1%) who are 19 years old. There are 32 respondents (25.2%) who are 20 years old. There are 11 respondents (8.7%) who are 21 years old. There are 3 respondents (2.4%) who are 22 years old. There are 3 respondents (2.4%) who are 24 years old. There is 1 respondent (0.8%) who is 25 years old. There is 1 respondent (0.8%) who is 26 years old. There is 1 respondent (0.8%) who is 28 years old.

b. Sex of Respondents

The respondents consist of 36 male respondents (28.3%) and 91 female respondents (71.7%).

c. University Respondents

There are 94 respondents (74%) who come from Atmajaya University and there are 33 respondents (26%) from Bunda Mulia University.

d. Grammar Class Respondents

The numbers of respondents who are taking Grammar 1 Class are 64 respondents (50.4%). The numbers of respondents who are taking Grammar 3 Class are 46 respondents (36.2%). The numbers of respondents who are taking Grammar 5 Class are 17 respondents (13.4%).

e. Semester of the Respondents

There are 54 respondents (42.5%) who are in Semester 1. There are 6 respondents (4.7%) who are in Semester 2. There are 38 respondents (29.9%) who are in Semester 3. There are 17 respondents (13.4%) who are in Semester 5. There are 8 respondents (6.3%) who are in Semester 7. There is 1 respondent (0.8%) who is in Semester 8. There are 2 respondents (1.6%) who are in Semester 9. There is 1 respondent (0.8%) who is in Semester 11.

4.2 Data Discussion

This part will discuss 9 problems that have been stated in the Statement of the Problem. In this part, we will compare the result of the data with the theory. We will see if the data support the theory or contradict it.

i. The necessity of teaching grammar

From Table 1 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that grammar class is necessary.

Table 1. Grammar Class is Necessary

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Agree	41	32.3	32.3	33.9
	Strongly Agree	84	66.1	66.1	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

There have been numerous debates about whether or not to teach grammar. Some researchers like Krashen (1981) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 127) claimed that "language should be acquired through natural exposure, not learned through formal instruction."

In line with this, Krashen (1981) (in Ellis, 2006: 85) also argued that "grammar instruction played no role in acquisition."

Another researcher like Truscott (1996, 1998) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004) also rejects the importance of grammar teaching. He argued that "its effects are

temporary and superficial and that grammar instruction alone may not promote what he called as genuine knowledge of language." (p.129) Basically, the above researchers argue that grammar class in not necessary.

On the contrary, there are also some researchers who argue that grammar class is necessary. Some researchers like Schmidt (1990, 1993, 2001) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 127) suggests that "conscious attention to form or noticing, is a necessary condition for language learning." Other researcher like Skehan (1998) and Tomasello (1998) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004: 128) have presented findings indicating that "language learners cannot process target language input for both meaning and form at the same time. That is why, it is necessary for learners to notice target forms in input, otherwise they process input for meaning only and do not attend to specific forms, and consequently fail to process and acquire them." Basically, all the above researchers agree that grammar class is important.

From the above finding, we can see that most of the respondents agree that grammar class is necessary. So, in this case, the research finding supports the theory that states that grammar class is necessary. In other words, the finding matches with the theory proposed by the proponents of grammar teaching such as Schmidt (1990, 1993, 2001) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004), Skehan (1998) and Tomasello (1998) (in Nassaji and Fotos, 2004), etc. Personally, the writer agrees with the students' responses. The writer agrees that grammar class is important. The reason is because grammar cannot be learned correctly and accurately without any explicit instruction.

ii. The use of deductive and inductive approach

From Table 2 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they learn grammar deductively.

Table 2. I Learn Grammar Deductively (i.e., I learn the rule first and then I learn the examples)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Disagree	10	7.9	7.9	10.2

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Agree	90	70.9	70.9	81.1
Strongly Agree	24	18.9	18.9	100.0
Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Meanwhile, from Table 3 below, we can see that most of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that they learn grammar inductively.

Table 3. I Learn Grammar Inductively (i.e., I learn the examples first and then I try to find the rules)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	12	9.4	9.4	9.4
	Disagree	69	54.3	54.3	63.8
	Agree	39	30.7	30.7	94.5
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Some researchers like Ausubel (1974) and Carrol (1964) (in Shaffer, 1989: 395) argued that "since adults are endowed with a cognitive network enabling them to understand abstract concepts, teachers should emphasize on this thing and speed up the language acquisition process by giving the learners explicit rules in a deductive learning framework." In addition to the above statement, Thornbury (1999: 55) states that "short term gains for deductive learning have been found, and there is some evidence to suggest that some kinds of language items are better 'given' than 'discovered'. Moreover, when surveyed, most learners tend to prefer deductive approach." So, in this case, they agree that deductive approach is neccessary.

On the other hand, some researchers like Krashen (1980), Dulay and Burt (1973) (in Shaffer, 1989: 395) have argued that "since language is acquired naturally by means of an innate cognitive process, teachers need only supply comprehensible input without explicitly stating or even focusing on rules." So

they agree that deductive approach is unnecessary. In other words, they agree that inductive approach is necessary in the teaching of grammar.

From the above findings, we can see that most of the respondents prefer to use deductive approach than inductive approach. Therefore, in this case, the finding supports the theory proposed by Ausubel (1974) and Carrol (1964) (in Shaffer, 1989) and also Thornbury (1999) that states that deductive approach is necessary and important in the teaching of grammar. Personally, the writer agrees with the students' responses. It is better to use deductive approach because it is more efficient (straight to the point) and less time consuming (Thornbury, 1999).

iii. The use of many grammatical explanations and technical terminologies

From Table 4 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their teachers use many grammatical explanations.

Table 4. My Teacher Uses Many Grammatical Explanations or Technical Terms When Teaching Grammar

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Disagree	10	7.9	7.9	11.0
	Agree	93	73.2	73.2	84.3
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	15.7	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Brown (2001), the use of many grammatical explanations only happened in the past (in the era of Grammar Translation Method). In other words, the proponents of Grammar Translation Method have argued that the use of many grammatical explanations and terminologies are necessary in the teaching of grammar. However, it is no longer true in the present era. Brown (2001: 366) states that "in CLT classes, the use of grammatical explanation and terminology must be approached with care." So, in this case, he agrees with the use of grammatical explanations and technical terminologies. However, the use should be limited. Teachers should not give too many explanations or terminologies to

the students, because they have already had difficulty in learning the language itself. So, in this case, the use of grammatical terminology should be limited.

From the above finding, we can see that most of the respondents agree that their teachers use many grammatical terms in teaching grammar. Therefore, the finding supports Brown's (2001) theory that states that it is fine to use grammatical terms in the teaching of grammar. However, the use should be limited. In other words, teachers are allowed to use grammatical terms in a proportional amount: not too little and not too much. Personally, the writer agrees with Brown's theory. Grammatical explanation and terminologies are needed in the teaching of grammar. However, the use should be limited. The reason why it should be limited is because students have already had difficulty in learning the language itself. Teachers should not give extra burdens to the students by giving too many terminologies that make them confused.

iv. The teaching of grammar in isolation and combination with other skills
From Table 5 below, we can see that most of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that grammar should be taught in isolation.

Table 5. Grammar Should Be Taught In Isolation ("grammar only class")

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	18	14.2	14.2	14.2
	Disagree	52	40.9	40.9	55.1
	Agree	37	29.1	29.1	84.3
	Strongly Agree	20	15.7	15.7	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Meanwhile, from Table 6 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that grammar should be combined with other skills.

Table 6. Grammar Should Be Combined with Other Skills (reading, listening, speaking, writing)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	4	3.1	3.1	3.1
	Disagree	5	3.9	3.9	7.1
	Agree	34	26.8	26.8	33.9
	Strongly Agree	84	66.1	66.1	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Brown (2001), it is better to include or combined grammar with other skills rather than to teach it in isolation. In his opinion:

> Grammatical information, whether consciously or subconsciously learned, is an enabling system, a component of communicative competence like phonology, discourse, the lexicon, etc. Therefore, as courses help sudents to pursue relevant language goals, grammar is best brought into the picture as a contributor toward those goals. (p.366-367)

However, the proponents of Grammar Translation Method have argued that grammar should be taught in isolation. Grammar should be taught separately from other skills.

From the above statement, we can see that Brown (2001) prefers to teach grammar by combining it with other skills rather than to teach it in separate grammar class.

From the above findings, we can see that most of the respondents prefer to learn grammar that is combined with other skills. So, in this case, the finding supports Brown's (2001) theory that states that it is better to teach grammar that is combined with other skills like reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

v. The use of native and target language

From Table 7 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that grammar should be taught in the native language.

Table 7. Grammar Should Be Taught in the Native Language (in Indonesian language)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	15	11.8	11.8	11.8
	Disagree	47	37.0	37.0	48.8
	Agree	49	38.6	38.6	87.4
	Strongly Agree	16	12.6	12.6	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Meanwhile, from Table 8 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that grammar should be taught in the target language.

Table. 8. Grammar Should Be Taught in the Target Language (in English language)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Disagree	17	13.4	13.4	15.0
	Agree	66	52.0	52.0	66.9
	Strongly Agree	42	33.1	33.1	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Finnochiaro (1974) and Rivers (1968) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979), careful use of the native language for the purpose of explaining difficult grammatical points would be acceptable. They agree that native language can only be used when explanation in the target language have failed. They also adds that native language can be used for weaker students who are having difficulty in understanding a particular grammatical points. Basically, they agree with the use of native language in the teaching of grammar.

Meanwhile, according to Frey (1970) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979: 220), "in early second language learning, translation is not a good idea since it slows down the ability of the student to think in the new language." In other words, Frey (1970) states that teaching grammar in the native language is not good because it

will hinder the students' ability in acquiring the new language. It is better to use the target language when you want to teach grammar.

From the above findings, we can see that most of the respondents agree with the use of native language and target language. It seems that they have no preferences towards the language that is used in the teaching of grammar. In other words, most of the respondents have no objection with the use of native language and target language in grammar teaching. Therefore, in this case, both findings support the theories proposed by Finnochiaro (1974) and Rivers (1968) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979) as the proponents of target language, and Frey (1970) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979) as the proponents of native language. Personally, the writer agrees with Finnochiaro (1974) and Rivers' (1968) (in Larsen-Freeman, 1979) statement that state that target language can be used when the explanation in target language have failed. The reason why the writer chooses native language in the teaching of grammar is because grammar is difficult to be explained in the target language. Each student has their own language proficiency. That is why, not all students are able to understand grammar teaching in the target language. Some of the student (usually half of the students) will have difficulty in understanding the lesson. Based on the writer's experience, even when the writer has used native language in teaching grammar, some of the students (usually only little amounts of the students) still have difficulty in understanding the lesson. However, the results are better when the writer uses native language. By using native language, the students can absorb and understand the lessons better.

vi. The use of grammar drills

From Table 9 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that grammar drills are useful.

Table 9. Grammar Drills (repeating grammatical sentences) are Useful

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	14	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Agree	90	70.9	70.9	81.9
	Strongly Agree	23	18.1	18.1	100.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	14	11.0	11.0	11.0
	Agree	90	70.9	70.9	81.9
	Strongly Agree	23	18.1	18.1	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Larsen-Freeman (1979: 223), "once the structure has been presented, keeping in mind our intention to give our students initial practice in manipulating the new item, our next procedure should probably involve some sort of drills." In this case, she agrees to use the drill after the presentation of grammar. However, according to the proponents of Communicative approach, grammar drills are not necessary in the teaching of grammar.

According to the finding, most of the respondents agree that grammar drills are useful for them. Larsen-Freeman (1979) also agrees grammar drills are useful in the teaching of grammar. So, in this case, the finding supports the theory proposed by Larsen-Freeman (1979). According to the writer's opinion, grammar drills are necessary. Grammar drills can enhance students' ability in learning grammar.

vii. The teaching of grammar in a short and in a longer duration

From Table 10 below, we can see that most of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree if grammar should be taught in a short duration.

Table 10. Grammar Should Be Taught in a Short Duration (for example, Grammar / Structure 1 is taught in one semester only)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	26	20.5	20.5	20.5
	Disagree	43	33.9	33.9	54.3
	Agree	46	36.2	36.2	90.6
	Strongly Agree	12	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Meanwhile, from Table 11 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree if grammar should be taught in a longer duration.

Table 11. Grammar Should be Taught in a Longer Duration (for example, Grammar / Structure 1 is taught in two or three semesters)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	11	8.7	8.7	8.7
	Disagree	47	37.0	37.0	45.7
	Agree	48	37.8	37.8	83.5
	Strongly Agree	21	16.5	16.5	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Collins, Halter, Lightbown and Spada (1999) (in Ellis, 2006: 92):

> None of the language program evaluation research has found an advantage for dristributed language instruction. Although the findings thus far lead to the hypothesis that more concentrated exposure to English may lead to better student outcomes, the evidence is not conclusive.

The above statement is also supported by the findings of their study. According to their study, massed students (students who are learning grammar in a short duration) are better than distributed students (students who are learning grammar in a longer duration). So, in this case, it seems that Collin et all. agree that grammar should be taught in a short periode of time.

From the above findings, we can see that most of the respondents prefer to learn grammar in a longer duration. Therefore, in this case, the finding does not support the theory proposed by Collins, Halter, Lightbown and Spada (1999) (in Ellis, 2006). In other words, the theory contradicts with the finding. Personally, the writer agrees if grammar should be taught in a longer duration. The reason is because grammar cannot be learned in an instant. A person needs time and process in learning grammar.

viii. Intensive and extensive grammar teaching

From Table 12 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree if grammar should be taught intensively.

Table 12. Grammar Should be Taught Intensively (for example, teaching Present Tense in more than one class meeting)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	2.4	2.4	2.4
	Disagree	26	20.5	20.5	22.8
	Agree	76	59.8	59.8	82.7
	Strongly Agree	22	17.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

Meanwhile, from Table 13 below, we can see that most of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree if grammar should be taught extensively.

Table 13. Grammar Should be Taught Extensively (for example, teaching Present Tense, Past Tense and Future Tense simultaneously in one class meeting only)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	20	15.7	15.7	15.7
	Disagree	64	50.4	50.4	66.1
	Agree	36	28.3	28.3	94.5
	Strongly Agree	7	5.5	5.5	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

According to Spada and Lightbown (1999) (in Ellis, 2006: 94), "when the learners are not ready to learn the targeted structure, intensive grammar teaching can help them progress through the sequence of stages involved in the acquisition of that structure."

The above statement is also supported by White, Spada, Lightbown and Ratna (1991) (in Ellis, 2006: 94) by saying that "intensive instruction also helps learners to use structures they have already partially acquired more accurately." It seems that the researchers above are in favor of intensive instruction.

On the other hand, according to Ellis (2006: 95), "extensive grammar instruction, on the other hand, affords the opportunity to attend to large numbers of grammatical structures. Also, more likely or not, many of the structures will be

addressed repeatedly over a period of time." In other words, she agrees if grammar is taught extensively.

From the above findings, we can see that most of the respondents prefer to learn grammar intensively. So, in this case, the finding supports the theory proposed by Spada and Lightbown (1999) (in Ellis, 2006) and White, Spada, Lightbown and Ratna (1991) (in Ellis, 2006). Personally, the writer agrees if grammar is taught intensively. The reason is because in learning certain grammatical points (especially the difficult ones), students need more time in understanding the lessons.

ix. The necessity of correcting grammatical mistakes

From Table 14 below, we can see that most of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their teachers always correct their grammatical mistakes.

Table 14. My Teacher Always Corrects my Grammatical Mistakes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	1.6	1.6	1.6
	Disagree	16	12.6	12.6	14.2
	Agree	87	68.5	68.5	82.7
	Strongly Agree	22	17.3	17.3	100.0
	Total	127	100.0	100.0	

James Hendrickson (1980) (in Brown, 2001) divides errors or mistakes into two types: local and global errors. He suggested that "local errors do not need to be corrected immediately since the message is still clear and correction might interrupt a learner in the flow of productive communication." (p.290) Correction could be done after the learner has finished in saying or writing what he or she wants to convey. On the other hand, global errors need to be corrected immediately right after the learner produces the errors. So, in this case, he agrees that all kinds of errors or mistakes should be corrected. Contrary to the above arguments, some proponents of Communicative approach have argued that grammatical mistakes do not need to be corrected.

From the above finding, we can see that most of the respondents agree that their teachers always correct their grammatical mistakes. So, in this case, the finding supports the theory proposed by Hendrickson's (1980) theory. Personally, the writer agrees with the students' respondents. Teachers should always give correction to every mistakes made by the students so that the students can learn from their mistakes and therefore they will not make the same mistakes in the future.

5. Conclusion

From the discussion and analysis of the data, it can be concluded that:

1. The students agree that grammar class in necessary.

2. The students prefer to learn grammar deductively.

3. The students agree that their teachers use many grammatical explanations and terminologies in the teaching of grammar.

4. The students prefer to learn grammar that is combined with other skills.

5. The students have no preferences towards native and target language. They use both native and target language in learning grammar.

6. The students agree that grammar drills are useful for them

7. The students prefer to learn grammar in a longer duration.

8. The students prefer to learn grammar intensively.

9. The students agree that their teachers always correct their grammatical mistakes.

References

Brown, H. Doughlas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: an Integrative Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2nd edition. New York: Pearson Education Company.

Ellis, Rod. 2006. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: an SLA Perspectives." *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 83-103.

Fortune, Alan. 1992. "Self-Study Grammar Practice: Learners' Views and Preferences." *ELT Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 2, 160-169.

Hanna, N Richard and Wozniak. 2001. *Consumer Behavior: an Applied Approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kotler, Kevin. 1997. *Hospitality Management*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1979. "Issues in the Teaching of Grammar." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.* Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Marquez, Ely J. 1979. "The Simultaneous Teaching of Grammar and Paragraph Structure." *RELC Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 36-43.

McCarthy, Michael and Ronald Carter. 1995. "Spoken Grammar: What Is It and How Can We Teach It?" *ELT Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 3, 207-217.

Nassaji, Hossein and Sandra Fotos. 2004. "Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 24, 126-145.

Richards, Jack C. and Richard Schmidt. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

Shaffer, Constance. 1989. "A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages." *The Modern Language Journal*, Vol. 79, No. 4, 395-402.

Thornbury, Scott. 1999. *How to Teach Grammar*. England: Pearson Education Limited.